UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS
THIRD SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 86—PART 16

JUNE 6, 1940, TO AUGUST 6, 1940

(PAGES 3601 TO 4800)

Copy 3

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1940

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE AGENCY

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION

Appendix

Bituminous Coal Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT G. ALLEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me before the National Fuel Credit Association at Hotel New Yorker, June 6, 1940:

Nature, in her immutable code of laws, has decreed that the life of man shall be a constant struggle. This struggle may be against natural elements or against other men, but strife there must always be. It is self-evident that through this process of strife and struggle we are either destroyed as unfit to survive, or we emerge from the battle stronger and hardier than when we entered it. The capacity of man, his ability to overcome seemingly insuperable obstacles, is developed in this process. There come times in the lives of individuals when they grow weary of the struggle, and the temptation to surrender is great. These people have reached the Rubicon; they either cross over and go forward or they falter and retreat. When free people tire of the burdensome responsibilities of self-government, dictators pick up the baton and carry on. When men prove incapable of taking care of themselves, they must be cared for by someone stronger. As it is with individuals, so it is with industries and with nations. This is the law of life.

Since the World War the bituminous-coal industry has been grievously ill. The multifarious problems confronting it have seemed well nigh insolvable. A great industry has been locked in battle against the economic forces of overexpanded production facilities and diminishing markets. The pages of industrial history are filled with accounts of similar struggles. Persistent and intelligent leadership plus the inexorable workings of economic laws would have rectified the situation eventually. Unfortunately, however, a large segment of the soft-coal industry capitulated a few years ago and the Federal Government was called in to exercise authoritative regulations. The cumulative problems of the industry were dumped into the lap of Uncle Sam. Operators and miners alike cast their worries aside and sat down to wait for the golden harvest of assured profits. This was a false and foolish step which must be retraced at once if a great, free enterprise is to be saved from bureaucratic control and ultimate Government ownership. Let us consider for a few moments the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 in some of its most important phases.

PRICE FIXING

This law is primarily price-fixing legislation. It authorizes the Coal Division of the Department of the Interior to regulate the soft-coal industry. Regulation in the lexicon of bureaucrats is a polite word for control. In passing this legislation Congress supported by the United Mine Workers and by many coal operators completely disregarded past experience and violated all economic laws. Artificial price fixing has never worked successfully in a free capitalistic economy, and it never will. History proves conclusively that profits cannot be guaranteed by mere Government edict without serious dislocations resulting. Nevertheless, we rushed ahead all sail and no anchor and fixed this ill-starred legislation on a great fundamental American industry. The results portend chaos. At the present moment, in the Appalachian area alone, over 500,000 different price schedules have been established. These prices are based on the varying quality, size, and usage of the coal from a specific mine. A variation in any of these factors throws the whole schedule into obsolescence. Cost of production likewise influences these price schedules. You know as well as I do that costs are dynamic and in a state of constant flux. Costs at any mine depend on wages, insurance rates, taxes, State laws, and so forth. Any of these may be changed quickly, with the result that today's prices are obsolete tomorrow. The enormity of the task of administering a half million prices under such dynamic circumstances staggers the imagination. In my opinion, successful administration of this job exceeds all human capacity. Remember that these prices are fixed according to the opinion of one man—a Federal Administrator. When and if these prices become effective, utter confusion and constant litigation will smother the soft-coal industry into lifelessness.

PRICE FIXING AND PRODUCTION

As businessmen we must know that prices cannot be effectively pegged unless production is coordinated into the scheme. Here again we have violated all economic laws by vesting the Coal Division with authority over prices, but at the same time withholding control over production. Knowing the attitude of Federal bureaucrats as I do, I am certain that in the near future Mr. Ickes will be asking Congress to grant him full authority to allocate production at the mines. We should never grant this additional power. Rather, we should withdraw what power we have already yielded. When the Government controls production as well as prices, the last vestige of free enterprise will disappear from the soft-coal industry. It is only a short step from there to outright Government ownership of all bituminous mines. That is an inescapable fact. The present act must either be amended or repealed, or the Government must be given control of production as well as prices.

PRICE-FIXING THEORY

If the theory of price fixing is sound, we should carry it to its ultimate conclusion and use it as a panacea for all ailing industries. Why not fix fees for indigent lawyers so that they may flourish, be they good or bad? Why not establish prices on furniture, pots, and pans so that incompetents can survive? If price fixing is economically right, it should be applied to all ailing segments of industries which are struggling to exist.

Price fixing removes all incentive for scientific improvement in production methods. In our competitive system such improvements have always been reflected in higher wages, higher profits, and lower costs to consumers. Obviously, men will not struggle to progress when they do not have to. Price fixing is bound to lower the standard of living of the American people in a degree commensurate with its effectiveness.

Prices proposed by the Bituminous Coal Division are an attempt to subsidize the uneconomic coal producer out of the pockets of coal consumers. In other words, the proposed price level is sufficiently high so that the inefficient mines can sell at a profit. This is an obvious case of strengthening the weak by weakening the strong. The price-fixing authority vested in the Bituminous Coal Division is sufficient cause alone for immediate revision or repeal of this law. But there are other sad chapters in this tragedy which must be considered.

CONSUMERS

Let us consider for a moment the effect the Bituminous Coal Act has on the consuming public. A cursory review indicates emphatically that this legislation benefits one small economic group at the expense of others. No one can deny that the consumers of coal will be obliged to pay an uneconomic coal bill when the proposed high-price schedule is finally established. Of course, the bituminous industry itself may profit temporarily, but the country as a whole will be worse off immediately, and eventually even the soft-coal industry will suffer a reaction from this vicious statute. If more consumers' dollars must be spent for coal from now on, there will obviously be less for other commodities. This is purely selfish, one-sided legislation. It must be said to the credit of most coal operators that they thoroughly agree with me on this point.

Large coal consumers are prepared today to purchase or lease their own mines in order to escape the restrictions of this coal act. I predict that your largest consumers will own or lease their own mines in the near future if the proposed price schedules are validated. The Roosevelt administration has declared war on monopoly. In this instance they are fostering monopoly with the full force of Federal law.

Let me use a specific example of the effect of this act on the coal consumers of America. The proposed price schedule will increase the cost of coal $1 per ton in the so-called quad cities of Illinois. These cities are Moline, East Moline, Rock Island, and Davenport. The coal bill in this area will be increased by $500,000 annually. There are other examples in the records which show that coal will cost 70 cents per ton more in one community than in a neighboring community. If various area outlines are strictly adhered to, coal will actually cost a different price at different entrances of the same factory.

I realize that the consumers of America are willing to assume their full responsibility in restoring balance to our economic order. They are not willing to be penalized, however, for futile and extravagant experiments of this kind. Such a fundamental necessity as coal should never be made the guinea pig for bureaucratic research. I submit that with half the world in flames and with our own security threatened, the money being wasted on the Bituminous Coal Act should be spent on our national defenses.

COMPETING FUELS

While soft coal is being pink-pilled to death by Mr. Ickes, competing fuels are given free play. It is patently unfair to impede one segment of an industry with restrictions, red tape, and regulations and not apply the same rules to competitors. Coal is strictly regulated if not already controlled; but gas, fuel oil, and hydroelectric power have escaped with full independence and freedom.

Obviously, coal operators will compete at a hopeless disadvantage. They will not be permitted to meet the prices of competing fuels, even though their operating costs would permit them to do so. On the other hand, producers of competing fuels can meet the publicly published and established prices of bituminous coal any time they wish. Pegged coal prices have been established with arrogant disregard of prices at which competing fuels are selling or can be sold. The saddlebags of the coal industry have been loaded with lead. There is nothing fair about that kind of race.

BUREAUCRATIC EDICT

It was apparent to keen observers that untutored political appointees could not save the bituminous-coal industry when men of life-long training had experienced such baffling difficulties. A few examples of absurd bureaucratic regulation will suffice to demonstrate the dangers of governmental meddling with private enterprise.

Since April 1937 coal operators have been prohibited from signing contracts with customers for more than 30 days. This means that coal operators have been proceeding on 30-day schedules. This has increased production and selling costs tremendously. The very essence of successful low-cost production is a long, carefully planned, uninterrupted program. This is largely based on mutually beneficial long-term sales contracts. All this has been scuttled by a handful of Government functionaries.

Here is the second example of debilitating regulation. The Coal Division has decreed that bituminous coal may be sold with the understanding that rebates will be made to customers covering the difference between current prices and the higher established prices if the latter are invalidated at some future day. In other words, the prices to be authorized by the Coal Division will be higher than current selling prices. If the former are declared invalid, a seller may rebate a consumer for the difference. In Indianapolis one large consumer purchases 600,000 tons of coal per year. The present price is 90 cents per ton. Under the proposed price schedules this same grade coal will cost the consumer $1.40 per ton, a difference of 50 cents. The seller, therefore, will be forced by competition to set aside 50 cents per ton to protect his position if the higher price schedule is declared invalid by the courts. That represents the tidy sum of $300,000 a year which the seller must carry in reserve against such a possibility.

A third example may not be superfluous in emphasizing my point. The citizens of many communities have enjoyed the lower transportation costs reflected in water-borne traffic. In fact Uncle Sam has spent millions of dollars in recent years developing our waterways so that these savings might be enjoyed by fortunate consumers in favored areas. Along comes Mr. Ickes with his Bituminous Coal Act and imposes the following decree: Coal must be sold at the same prices in the various marketing areas. Transportation rates into these areas differ and that would result in varying prices, but, obviously, Mr. Ickes cannot trifle with transportation rates. That is the prerogative of the Interstate Commerce Commission. So Mr. Ickes decides to sidestep this obstacle by regulating coal prices at the mine. If you, a consumer, in an area serviced by both water and rail, are in the market for coal and if the water-borne rate is lower than the rail rate, the price at the mine will be increased so that if the coal is shipped by water you, as a consumer, will pay exactly the same as if it were shipped by rail. The coal producer pockets the excess profit. Then to complicate matters further, Mr. Ickes has decided that if a consumer owns his own docks, or if his factory is located within a few yards of the water front, he may still enjoy the benefits of water-borne coal. That, of course, places a premium on real-estate holdings and the luckless consumer who is not fortunate enough to own his own docks or whose factory is not on the water front must pay the higher prices.

Now, what has all this doctoring done to the coal industry? Let the record speak for itself.

In 1936, which was rather a poor year for industry in general, the entire bituminous industry lost $6,524,000. In 1937, which was a good year generally, coal's losses were $37,000,000. This was the first year of the Coal Act. In 1938, the second year of the act, coal's losses mounted to $60,000,000. The 1939 figures, not yet compiled, will approximate 1938. Remember, the bituminous-coal industry is being taxed 1 cent per ton to support this death-dealing law. They are paying for the noose which will hang them.

BUREAUCRACY

I cannot leave you without a few parting shots at the bureaucratic system of government which is developing so rapidly in Washington. The time has come for us in America to either fish or cut bait. We are either going to progress under a democratic system of free enterprise or we are going to retrogress into some devastating form of socialism. Our economy cannot exist half free and half regimented.

Patrick Henry once said:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging the future but by the past."

If the bituminous-coal industry had only walked down the path of experience and read the warning signs which dot the way, it would never have surrendered its independence to bureaucratic control. There is nothing temporary about the legislation which we have just been discussing. When bureaucrats have once wrapped their tentacles around a free institution, the tendency is to tighten the grip. Bureaucrats die hard. Once established they seek to perpetuate themselves, and to spread their sphere of influence. For every ounce of security we gain from bureaucracy, we lose 10 pounds of freedom. This has always been true in the past; it holds good today and for the future. When bureaucrats fail to regulate, they do not confess their inadequacy but they demand full control. That is exactly what is happening with respect to bituminous-coal legislation.

It must be obvious to a student of this problem that the enactment of a mere statute can never save the coal industry. Experienced men operating according to natural economic laws alone can do that. Most coal operators have found that their previous problems were comparatively light compared with the onerous burdens heaped on them by this ill-advised statute. Literally, a swarm of functionaries block, check, trip, and tackle a coal operator in every move he tries to make today.

Listen to this formidable list of salary-drawers who are fattening themselves at the expense of the coal industry: Lawyers, statisticians, coordinators, experts, tabulators, stenographers, re-

ceptionists, directors, enforcement agents, helpers, field agents, doorkeepers, messengers, office boys, commissioners, private secretaries, assistant secretaries, assistant statisticians, assistant attorneys, assistant coordinators, special assistants, committee members, board members, chemists, analysts, engineers, computers, file clerks, rate clerks, price clerks, cost clerks, supply clerks, chief clerks, clerks, division chiefs, bureau heads, assistant chiefs, auditors, advisers, technical advisers, legal advisers, traffic advisers, special advisers, accountants, chief accountants, chief statisticians, telephone operators, inspectors, policemen, samplers, watchmen, etc. This reminds me of the old saying:

"The big fleas have little fleas
Upon their backs to bite them;
The little fleas have lesser fleas
And so on ad infinitum."

You will admit that even a good broken-field runner would have a tough time plunging through that formidable opposition.

It was not necessary for the bituminous-coal industry to yield its free prerogative to the Federal Government. Some years ago professional baseball was experiencing difficult times. They decided to clean up their own mess. They appointed their own administrator. From that time on that industry progressed in an orderly, honorable, and profitable manner. At about the same time, the motion-picture industry was sinking into disrepute. It needed a good house cleaning. It did not rush to Uncle Sam and plead for a life preserver. It likewise appointed its own administrator in the person of Will Hays, and since that time it has regulated its own affairs so successfully that the motion-picture industry today is one of the greatest in America and one which is contributing much to our culture as well as our amusement.

I feel very emphatic about this whole problem. In my opinion, we have taken the first step away from the tried and tested American system of free enterprise. In our struggle to amend or repeal the Bituminous Coal Act we are waging the battle of democracy versus socialism. Make no mistake about that. The men engaged in the bituminous-coal industry are capable of regulating their own affairs if given the opportunity. The cooperation of the Government is requested; its overlordship is rightfully denied. In closing, may I leave with you a few words of wisdom from the lips of Justice Brandeis:

"Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect our liberties when the Government's purposes are beneficent. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

The Social Program and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CAROLINE O'DAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM LABOR

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, in the present crisis, when all of us are deeply concerned over the question of national defense, we must not forget, in talking of ships and guns, of tanks and airplanes, the most important part of our program.

Given time and money, we can build ships and planes, we can turn out guns and tanks; but unless we have a united nation, strong and stout of heart, these preparations will be useless.

We talk of Trojan horses, of fingerprinting and registering aliens, but the actual danger from such influences would be nothing if there was no discontent for it to feed upon.

Our social program is as much a part of national defense as our arms. Other nations have found this so. Recently there was an editorial in Labor which I hope all of you read. It makes the point I am trying to bring home to you far better than can any words of mine. With your permission, I am including it in my remarks today.

A little woman from the plains of Saskatchewan who, with her husband and five children, had been on relief for 6 years, faced the Members of the Canadian House of Commons in Ottawa last week and delivered a speech which is a challenge to the rulers of all democratic countries. Labor was probably the only newspaper in the United States which printed the story.

"Poverty is the greatest of all subversive elements," said Mrs. Nielsen, only woman Member of the House of Commons, after she had described the desperate condition of her neighbors on the western prairies.

In Canada, as in the United States, the authorities are on the alert, and very properly so, to suppress the so-called "fifth columnists"—the traitors in our own household.

The danger is that in our search for spies and saboteurs we will make the mistake that other democracies have made and fail to recognize that no scheme for national defense is worth the paper on which it is written unless hungry men and women, able and willing to work, are given jobs at decent wages.

We must have tanks and airplanes and battleships to guard against foreign invasion. Every sensible American is for that. But to operate those engines of destruction we must have strong arms, clear brains, and loyal hearts.

And yet there are those among us who contend that we must slow up our relief program and neglect the human beings on whom our preparedness program is dependent.

It would be a tragic mistake to heed these unwise counselors. Real jobs at real wages for our millions of unemployed still constitute America's supreme problem No. 1.

Of course, a considerable number of unemployed may be absorbed in the industries which are busy with the tasks of preparedness. That will be especially true if we do not make the blunder of lengthening hours and if we keep wages sufficiently high to provide workers with desperately needed buying power.

The installation of the 30-hour week in all war industries without reduction in pay would be one of the smartest things we could do at this time.

The hundreds of thousands of skilled mechanics now idle would be assured jobs. Production would be speeded up immensely and the resultant increase in purchasing power would give new life to every other industry in the land.

Over the desk of every responsible public official and of every employer who desires to serve his country in this crisis should be emblazoned Mrs. Nielsen's words: "Poverty is the greatest of all subversive influences." Put men and women to work and the problem of cleaning out "fifth columnists" will be infinitely easier.

Work Training Program of National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS A. COLLINS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. AUBREY WILLIAMS, NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, greatly increased production of implements of war of the 1940 variety is imperative if our country must meet any first-class nation in armed conflict. Only limited production is possible until hundreds of thousands of young men and women can be given training in the mechanical and industrial arts. It behooves us, therefore, to consider such training as the foremost need of the moment. It is with much pleasure, therefore, that I commend to the Congress and the country the very sensible statement of Hon. Aubrey Williams, National Youth Administrator, appearing in a news release by him dated June 4, 1940:

"The National Youth Administration is preparing to expand its work-training program in the fields of shop and production workers to provide 450,000 or more young men and women with basic mechanical training," N. Y. A. Administrator Aubrey Williams said today.

Pointing out that N. Y. A. has been carrying on an extensive program of shop, metal, and construction work for several years, Williams announced results of an occupational survey of N. Y. A. employment as of May 20. This survey showed 90,067 youth employed in 43 different industrial occupations, and 32,475 production

workers employed in operations ranging from sewing and canning to quarry work and woodcutting. In addition, the survey showed 96,994 in clerical and other service work, including 2,000 bakers, butchers, cooks, and chefs; 24,770 agricultural and conservation workers; 17,388 professional and technical workers; and 17,970 unskilled laborers.

A group of key executives from private industry will confer tomorrow with Mr. Williams at his office here on ways and means to effect a rapid expansion of N. Y. A. work training and how to obtain quickly the necessary plants, machinery, and other facilities for the larger program contemplated in the President's noncombatant-training program for 1,000,000 civilians.

Williams said that he was moving immediately to shift as many N. Y. A. workers as possible into mechanical projects without delaying until after Congress acts on the President's request for additional money to expand this training.

State administrators and field executives have been summoned to the Washington office during the last 2 weeks to develop information as to the possible extent of this expanded program. Williams said he had been informed that some of the larger resident centers, including those at Quoddy Village, Maine, now employing 525; South Charleston, W. Va., now employing 400; and Algiers, La., now employing 450, could double their employment and training within 60 days, if additional money is made available quickly. This would involve putting on extra shifts and using the present shops and equipment during part of the nights, as well as in the daytime. Williams pointed out that employment could be doubled similarly in the 1,061 local N. Y. A. workshops, and the 1,000 shops owned by public cosponsors in which N. Y. A. youth are employed.

"The national-defense program has brought a tremendous demand from young people for elementary training of the sort we provide on our projects," Williams said. "Industrialists, businessmen, and other employers have come forward with offers to give to us surplus or semiobsolete machinery, valuable for training purposes but no longer used in their plants. Texas State Fair officials, for instance, have offered N. Y. A. temporary use of their numerous permanent buildings until better arrangements can be made," he said.

"During the past winter the National Youth Administration gave mechanical ability tests to 13,638 young men working in 590 shops in 43 States, which showed a high degree of mechanical ability among this group of needy young people. I cite this because it shows that in the group of young people who have not the resources to attend present trade-mechanical schools, there is a great untapped reservoir which should be directed into mechanical pursuits of great value to the Nation," Williams said.

"Of the total tested 6,466 made scores which showed a strong probability that they would be successful in metal and mechanical work, if given adequate training," Williams said. "The tests standardized by the Navy and the Tennessee Valley Authority were given to our workers in airplane and auto mechanics, blacksmithing, drafting, electrical, forging and foundry, machine shop, plumbing, steamfitting, welding, and woodworking shops. We are immediately inaugurating a program of issuing these tests to be given to all youth on our projects where mechanical work is being done. This should enable us in a few months to put our hands upon the individuals who are the best possibilities for mechanical work.

"Starting nearly 2 years ago, the National Youth Administration has been conducting surveys of the costs and possibilities of wider training in mechanical pursuits. Within the last 2 weeks we have dug out of our files a great deal of valuable material dealing with equipment and programs already prepared. Our field people in recent months have canvassed many of the States, exploring the possibilities and actually inaugurating the new development of radio, aviation, and other shops.

"N. Y. A. provides bona fide work on a part-time basis, tied in with elementary related training, and the development of work habits, work discipline, and such essential knowledge as blueprint reading. The work is actual production of socially useful goods, most of which are used locally by charitable and public institutions. We have found that this work experience is what employers want their new employees to have. It also enables young people to learn for themselves what they want to do, and what they can do best.

"N. Y. A. has been aided and advised in its program and in its efforts to induct youth into industry by State and local advisory committees in nearly all communities. These committees are made up of local leaders in business, industry, government, education, labor, and other walks of life. We propose to expand the activities of these committees and to concentrate their efforts upon the job of arranging for the placement of semiskilled young people from our program in the industries where they will be most useful.

"N. Y. A. for the last 2 years has been promoting the development, with local cooperation of classes and other instruction in citizenship, an activity which will be expanded under this program as an essential of national defense.

"Similarly, N. Y. A. has developed through State and local cooperation health programs especially in the fields of preventive medicine, TB control and venereal disease testing along with efforts to provide medical and dental care for its workers. This also should be expanded as a defense measure. Through the resident center or camp type of operation N. Y. A. has had a long experience of success in increasing the general health of youth from underprivileged and low income families."

Number of youth employed, by sex and occupational fields, out-of-school work program, May 29, 1940

Occupational field	Total	Boys	Girls
Grand total	279,664	159,369	120,295
Construction and shop workers	90,067	88,001	2,066
Asphalt workers	260	260	
Blacksmiths	543	543	
Blasters	15	15	
Bricklayers and structural tile layers	2,691	2,691	
Calkers, pipe layers, and coverers	911	911	
Carpenters:			
Finish	5,812	5,812	
Rough	14,118	14,118	
Concrete workers and cement finishers	5,943	5,943	
Electricians	1,372	1,372	
Junior foremen, construction	1,187	1,187	
Lathers and plasterers	556	556	
Operators of building and construction equipment	528	528	
Painters, glaziers, and paperhangers	5,142	5,125	17
Plumbers and fitters	1,305	1,305	
Roofers	923	920	3
Sawyers, lumber	277	277	
Sheet-metal workers	1,682	1,682	
Stone cutters, carvers, and setters	2,865	2,865	
Stonemasons	3,387	3,387	
Structural iron and steel workers	134	134	
Teamsters	220	220	
Tile setters	290	290	
Truck, tractor, and grader drivers	1,597	1,597	
Other construction workers	5,269	5,269	
Cabinetmakers and woodworkers	10,455	10,409	46
Cobblers and shoe-repair men	173	171	2
Enamel workers	95	95	
Furniture finishers	2,988	2,802	186
Furniture-repair workers	3,786	3,675	111
Handicraft workers, not elsewhere classified	2,057	815	1,242
Junior foremen, workshops	1,014	960	54
Lathe operators:			
Metal	589	589	
Wood	1,458	1,454	4
Machinists and tool makers	825	825	
Mechanics:			
Automotive	3,783	3,783	
Aviation	970	954	16
Radio and electrical apparatus	762	762	
Other	959	959	
Molders, founders, and casters	143	143	
Pattern and model makers, wood	359	329	30
Potters, brick workers, and clay-products workers	250	153	97
Upholsterers	550	326	224
Other shop workers	1,824	1,790	34
Production workers	32,475	3,346	29,129
Bookbinders and repair men	1,524	286	1,238
Canning workers	508	137	371
Crushed stone, sand, gravel, and other quarry workers	1,989	1,989	
Junior foremen, production	375	109	266
Seamstresses, weavers, mattress makers, and other clothing and textile workers	26,828	227	26,601
Wood cutters	231	231	
Other production workers	1,020	367	653
Agricultural and conservation workers	24,770	24,008	762
Farmers	1,597	1,588	9
Foresters, forest rangers, and timber workers	1,405	1,405	
Gardeners	3,309	2,792	517
Landscape, greenhouse, and nursery workers	13,155	13,024	131
Livestock, poultry, and dairy workers	722	680	42
Conservation workers not elsewhere classified	4,582	4,519	63
Clerical and service workers	96,994	19,265	77,729
Bookkeepers, timekeepers, and timekeeping clerks	3,200	1,380	1,820
File clerks	11,210	2,741	8,469
Guards and watchmen	547	522	25
Guides and messengers	963	792	171
Radio and telegraph operators	116	111	5
Statistical enumerators, editors, and clerks	1,599	615	984
Stenographers	11,175	797	10,378
Tabulating-machine operators	498	125	373
Typists	21,649	2,298	19,351
Other office-machine operators	1,620	514	1,106
Other clerical and office workers	10,692	2,780	7,912
Beauty-shop workers	206		200
Domestic-service workers (excluding food handlers)	3,216	384	2,832
Janitors and porters, cleaners, and charwomen	3,707	2,610	1,097
Laboratory technicians and assistants	917	337	580
Laundry and dry-cleaning workers	1,845	421	1,424
Nursery-school assistants	4,783	92	4,691
Nurses, assistants, and aides	4,151	298	3,853
Other assistants in hospitals and clinics	2,572	241	2,331
Other service workers	1,546	699	847
Bakers, butchers, cooks, and chefs	2,000	646	1,354
Dieticians and nutritionists	556	5	551
School-lunchroom aides	5,030	159	4,871
Waiters, waitresses, busboys, and dishwashers	1,840	388	1,452
Other food workers (excluding canning workers)	1,356	304	1,052
Professional, semiprofessional and technical workers	17,388	8,271	9,117
Artists, poster and exhibit makers	1,680	836	844

Number of youth employed, by sex and occupational fields, out-of-school work program, May 29, 1940—Continued

Occupational field	Total	Boys	Girls
Professional, semiprofessional and technical workers—Continued.			
Draftsmen, designers, and architects	1,313	1,207	106
Librarians and assistants	4,803	647	4,156
Musicians and music teachers	905	586	319
Photographers	410	300	110
Playground and recreational workers	6,589	3,630	2,959
Rodmen and chainmen (surveying)	403	401	2
Teachers and assistants	579	194	385
Writers, editors (excluding statistical editors)	200	121	79
Other professional and technical workers	506	349	157
Unskilled laborers	17,970	16,478	1,492

Let Us Have Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, our mail is full of letters from anxious fathers and mothers of American boys expressing concern over the probable involvement of America in the European holocaust now in progress.

The radio and press carry today the Italian reaction to American intervention in the contemplated action of the Fascist dictator in the present war.

Of course, following former speeches about quarantine of nations whose ideologies were different than ours, and the denouncing of European and Asiatic dictators, it would seem that we have the very opposite of a good-neighbor policy in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Just where are our friends? Just where is our strength, economic or military, to enable us to challenge these disciples of force? Is a record of spending almost twice our income for 8 years an element of strength in this crisis? My party has voted to stay in session during this critical time—it is ready to remain here, ready to meet every need in our national defense. It has gone on record against blank checks, against the delegation of the few remaining powers of the legislative branch of our Government, since the Executive now has gotten control of the judicial. Must we leave our posts here in Washington and go home and confess to these importuning fathers and mothers that their Representatives can tell them nothing, do nothing, assure them of nothing concerning the things that threaten the security of America?

Have the solutions of domestic problems been so successful under 7 years of the New Deal that we want to just turn over our national defense to them, sign blank checks, and go home?

Can we give them any real assurance that these precious billions now to be added to the crushing load of public debt will do the job and give them the security for which they pray? Can we be sure that the results to be obtained by these new dealers will justify the passage of the onerous tax bill that we must pass this next week? We should remain here at our posts and, outnumbered as we are, deserted by almost all of the forces for economy on the majority side, fight for the assurance of national defense, economic security, and the observance of national neutrality—a real American policy. Let us have peace.

I am including as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 5.

FOREIGN POLICY

Senator PEPPER, of Florida, an administration stalwart, gave an intimation in the debate on Monday of the tactics which Mr. Roosevelt has employed in his effort to dissuade Mussolini from entering the war. For some time now it has been rumored that Mr. Roosevelt had told Mussolini that America would go in on the side of England and France if Italy went in on the side of Germany. Senator PEPPER's remarks were not free of ambiguity, but they tended to confirm the rumor.

Constitutionally, of course, the President cannot declare war, but he does direct the Nation's foreign policy and can go far to lead the country into war. The people of the United States in 1916 wanted to stay out of war, but Mr. Wilson, without their knowledge, was already committed in a secret document to participation to prevent a German victory; a few months later we were in.

It is profitable to speculate on what might have happened if Mr. Wilson had been less determined in 1916 to reshape the world to his own formula. If the allies had not been encouraged by him to continue the conflict, Europe might have had a peace of adjustment which could not have been less durable than the peace of Versailles and might have been far more stable. A million lives or more and tens of billions of dollars would have been saved, the Russian revolution would have been avoided, and the post-war economic adjustments would have been far less difficult.

We should have learned from that experience that America can fight in Europe's wars but cannot dictate the terms of peace. Accordingly, however well meant our interventions may be, they are not likely to prove of much value to us. If our foreign policy is directed, as it has been of late, toward maintaining a certain balance of power in Europe, we shall be drawn again and again into Europe at a cost wholly disproportionate to any advantages we are likely to obtain from our sacrifices.

America's foreign policy should be devised with a view primarily to the welfare of Americans. It is not true, as the colonially minded often assert, that such a policy must be narrowly selfish and therefore injurious to the rest of the world. No other nation would be hurt if, for example, the West Indian Islands were transferred, as they should be, from foreign control. The islands in themselves have little commercial value. We could not use them as a base for offensive operations. The cession of the islands would promote peace by preventing any foreign power from using them against us.

Under Mr. Roosevelt our foreign policy, instead of being directed at such practical objectives, has been provocative. We have succeeded in irritating the Japanese by such proposals as the project to fortify Guam, and if these provocations are continued we shall some day find ourselves obliged to fight under disadvantageous conditions or to confess we were bluffing.

Senator PEPPER's intimation of the direction taken of late by our diplomacy in Europe is another evidence of recklessness in the handling of foreign affairs. Having encouraged the Japanese to regard us as an enemy, we are now encouraging the Germans, Italians, and Russians to take the same view of us. In short, we are inviting Asia and Europe to choose their moment to join in an assault upon us.

It cannot be pretended that this kind of thing benefits anybody. In 1916 it prolonged the conflict and in 1939 it may have encouraged England and France to enter upon a highly destructive war in the expectation that we should shortly be in it on their side.

America needs an American foreign policy. Without it, as Senator LODGE said the other day, our preparations for defense are bound to be inadequate because no one knows what we are preparing to defend.

Commencement Address at Massachusetts College of Pharmacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KNUTE HILL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. KNUTE HILL, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on June 5:

President Ellis, Dean Newton, members of the board of trustees; members of the faculty, graduates, parents, and friends: I deem it a high privilege and distinct honor to be permitted to address you on this, to you, auspicious occasion. Especially to you who have completed your course here at the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy is this a red-letter day in your lives. It is truly commencement for you, and I heartily congratulate you on having so successfully overcome the obstacles and difficulties leading up to the threshold of real and active participation in the duties of your chosen field of endeavor. Commencement. Often during my early boyhood I considered that a misnomer—to call the completion of

the college course commencement. But I fully realized after getting my law degree from Wisconsin University that it was really the beginning of cooperation with and service to those who travel along on life's highway. I am ever interested in the youth of this Nation. Close association with it keeps me young in spirit, keeps me liberal and progressive in thought, and keeps fresh and unsullied my faith in humanity. You young men and women, together with the hundreds of thousands of June graduates throughout the country represent the hope of democracy in the United States.

To my mind there are three great pillars which constitute the foundation for our modern structure of civilization—the home, the church, the school. All three are essential to the progress, the success, and the happiness of our people. Too often today is the sancity of the home threatened by loose living, by too cheap movies, and by too lax divorce laws. The church, too, is losing its former influence. Especially is it waning in the country hamlets and villages. This may be due to the easy access to better sermons and better music over the radio and modern roads which have annihilated distances. However, both parents and preachers still have their part to play in the rearing of our youth, and the schools must supplement and cooperate with these other two prime factors in the protection and education of our young men and young women. It is the peculiar function of teachers to aid these young men and young women to think for themselves, to discover new facts and use life's tools with the greatest amount of efficiency. That makes for good, sturdy citizenship thereby making the home more secure, the church more influential, and the schools more inspiring. Because I believe that the fathers and mothers, the sons and daughters of America today are more concerned about these peacetime pursuits of democracy than in the wartime marching and salutes of dictatorships, I want to discuss with you today the destiny of democracy. We must not minimize the threat to democracy in these serious days, and must build up an adequate defense; but the greatest defense of democracy at all times is to keep its fires burning brightly in the hearts and souls of our American people.

DEMOCRACY'S DESTINY

More than 300 years ago on the rock-bound coast of the Atlantic, not far from this historic city of Boston, landed the Pilgrim Fathers from their little bark, the *Mayflower*. As a protest against the denial of the rights of democracy, they left their native shores to seek a new home in the wilderness of a New World. The autocrats of England were still unmindful of the real meaning of Runnymede and Magna Carta, thereby driving from their midst those men and women whose courage and wisdom would have been an invaluable asset for the establishment of democracy in old England.

Plymouth Colony of 1620, together with the earlier Jamestown Colony of 1607, though quite different in outer form, mark the beginning of democracy in the Western Hemisphere. Too often during our colonial period did the spirit of intolerance raise its mailed fist to strike at the infant democracy—as witness the persecution of Roger Williams and the reign of Governor Berkeley. But this is the price we pay for progress in government as well as in science: Obstacles to overcome, difficulties to surmount, prejudices to conquer. Despite the almost overwhelming odds against its survival, so well was the spirit of democracy nurtured by the early fathers that it grew to be the dominating issue in the colonial period leading up to the Revolution. The spirit of democracy is best expressed in Jefferson's immortal document, the Declaration of Independence. Though it may seem rather trite to quote from this great American classic to you who reside in the city where the famous tea party took place, still I deem it quite proper in these serious days to so do. Listen to these principles as everlasting as the hills, as imperishable as the sun, and as permanent as time itself: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and here may I emphasize the fact that the rights enumerated by Jefferson are human rights, not property rights. We all believe in property rights; they are a part of our plan of living. We love our individual homes and take pride in our various forms of industry. But "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" take precedence over these and too often have been subjected to the tyranny of property rights. In a democracy this is unethical and intolerable. We must place first things first and get a true perspective.

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." How radical this sounds; yet how fundamentally sound in a government where the people are the real sovereigns, the officials merely public servants, and the form and framework of that government is subject to complete change in an orderly and constitutional way by the people through their duly elected representatives. This is the essence of democracy—this is the spirit that cannot die. These principles so splendidly enunciated by Thomas Jefferson and adopted by the Continental Congress of 1776 were worth fighting for, were worth dying for. Therefore, these men of 1776 concluded their declaration with these sublime sentiments: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

There followed 8 long years of patient and heroic effort, of heart-rending struggle, of almost hopeless struggle. Having saved democracy through revolution the wise and patriotic men of those days enshrined this living, pulsing spirit in a grand and noble edifice—the Constitution of the United States—to inspire and guide the coming generations. This instrument is a fitting temple in which to house our common faith, our common heritage. Gladstone, the grand old man of England, said concerning the Constitution: "It is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

What is this firm foundation upon which our governmental structure has been reared? Again may I quote—this time the preamble of the Constitution: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." To safeguard democracy the 13 weak, quarreling, and helpless Colonies were willing to yield some of their sovereign powers to a central authority, responsible to all the people, not to some individual States. Listen: "We, the people of the United States—do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Yet three-quarters of a century later, some States questioned this constitutional provision and only the wisdom and the courage and the patience of the martyred Lincoln could save the Union.

Even today there are those who prate of States' rights, when modern transportation, modern communication, and modern discoveries and inventions necessitate a stronger union than ever. The destiny of democracy is wrapped up in a strong union with a constant adherence to the six purposes expressed in the preamble. This preamble is the alpha of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments, guaranteeing liberty of speech, of press, and of peaceable assemblage, is the omega of the Constitution. However great and good this foundation and framework of our governmental structure is, it is subject to modification and change, the same as our physical bodies. It has been amended in the past, and it will be amended in the future to meet modern conditions and demands. But the spirit of democracy is as changeless and immutable as the soul of man. It must be protected, preserved, and made to permeate the remotest parts of the earth. That is our job. Even as Israel of old was given the Ark of the Covenant to cherish and protect, so we Americans have been intrusted with the ship of state bearing the sacred fires of liberty, equality, and justice. While democracies of Europe and Asia are tottering to their ruin and dictatorships are riding to victory through carnage and ruthlessness and reckless madness, we must keep our heads clear and our feet on the ground. What a sad commentary on our boasted modern civilization and Christianity that nations do not sit down around a common conference table to reason out their international difficulties but revert instead to the old methods of savagery and the jungle.

Must we again assume the role we played with such futility in the last World War? The slogan was, "Let us make the world safe for democracy." Did we? Look at Europe today and tell me that the Old World is safe for democracy when she lies there ravished and wretched, helpless and well-nigh hopeless on present-day Flanders Field. Can we, dare we, again join in this terrible holocaust across the Atlantic? The manifest destiny of democracy is to prevail and be a blessing to all mankind. If entrance into this second World War would accomplish this, then I would say with all my heart: No matter what the cost, it is our duty to ourselves, to the peoples of the world, and to the spirit of democracy itself to go in. But to my mind the only way to "make the world safe for democracy" is to first "make America safe for democracy."

This we can best do by frankly facing our own very serious domestic problems and earnestly making a firm determination to definitely and permanently solve them. "Put your house in order lest the day of reckoning come upon you." Had the nations of Europe set their houses in order, had they shown more of the brotherhood of man, had they practiced more of charity and justice toward one another in their international dealings, there could now be no real cause for the devastating war raging through the lands and on the seas and in the air.

We have during the past 2 weeks enacted legislation for huge defense purposes and mobilizing our industries for production purposes. I am heartily for this program. It is not just as necessary, however, to appropriate billions for defense against unemployment, against poverty, against injustices which permit one-third of our population to remain "ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed"?

Today more than ever we must guard against again being deceived or deceiving ourselves as we were in 1917 by overwrought sympathy, false propaganda, and war hysteria. It is our duty to build up an adequate defense against any foreign dictatorship or group of dictatorships but also our duty to keep ourselves out of the unchristian, ungodly, unholy carnage now going on across the Atlantic.

When the war-mad world becomes war weary and war worn and wiser, it can then find a starting place again for Christianity and civilization. We can then insist on a peace conference which will promise a permanent peace throughout the whole world. We can by example prove to all these nations that a peacetime con-

structive program is far better than a wartime destructive pagent. I say this sincerely, I say this earnestly. I say it because I deeply feel that we Americans have been entrusted with the most sacred duty and privilege ever allotted to any people—to guard, to cherish, to protect democracy until an insane world is again ready to follow the paths of peace and practice the principles of justice, tolerance, and equity that alone can "make the world safe for democracy." To this end let us consecrate "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Democracy! Where we cheerfully abide by majority rule. Where ability, honesty, and perseverance are rewarded. Where personal liberty means "the largest opportunity to be and to do the best that is in you." Where science, invention, and education are nurtured. Where the people are the sovereigns and the officials are public servants. Where "the greatest good to the greatest number" is the slogan. Where we thoroughly believe in Teddy Roosevelt's splendid sentiment: "This country in the long run will not be a good place for any one of us to live in unless and until it is a good place for all of us to live in."

America holds the destiny of democracy in its keeping. Let us guard it well, nourish it constantly, and cherish it forever.

May I commend for your thoughtful and earnest consideration the words of Bishop G. Ashton Oldham in his America First:

"AMERICA FIRST

"Not merely in matters material but in things of the spirit.

"Not merely in science, inventions, motors, and skyscrapers but also in ideals, principles, character.

"Not merely in the calm assertion of rights but in the glad assumption of duties.

"Not flaunting her strength as a giant but bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a good Samaritan.

"Not in splendid isolation but in courageous cooperation for world peace.

"Not in pride, arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples but in sympathy, love, and understanding.

"Not in treading again the old, worn, bloody pathway which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster but in blazing a new trail along which, please God, other nations will follow into the new Jerusalem, where wars shall be no more.

"Some day some nation must take that path, unless we are to lapse once again into utter barbarism, and that honor I covet for my beloved America.

"And so, in that spirit and with these hopes, I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first'."

The New Jersey Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER E. EDGE

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, last Tuesday, June 4, my very dear friend, Hon. Walter E. Edge, former United States Senator, Governor, and Ambassador to France, delivered a very able address at the Republican State convention at Trenton, N. J. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the opening convention last Tuesday we were all heartened with the impressive and general display of harmony. The primary struggle, only a week old, was water over the dam, and the forces lead by former Governor Hoffman indicated in no uncertain terms that there would be no "fifth column" within the legions of the Republican Party.

With the adoption of the Republican platform, all the preliminaries have been disposed of, and we are now preparing with closed ranks to open the campaign.

My role today, therefore, requires a frank and very brief discussion of the practical methods through which to approach the first line of defense as presented by our opponents. I will not discuss issues. They should be left to our nominees, Bob Hendrickson for Governor, and WARREN BARBOUR returning to the United States Senate, both in every way thoroughly equipped for their responsibilities. I will confine my informal talk to a brief review of the activities of our Democratic opponents who were wished on New Jersey through orders from the White House.

Mr. Edison, the son of a distinguished and revered Jerseyman, now Secretary of the Navy, has been selected as the Democratic candidate for Governor.

Mr. "Jimmy" Cromwell, a recent resident of New Jersey, has been named as Senator BARBOUR'S opponent for the United States Senate.

Neither of these gentlemen had any primary opposition, as that is forbidden under the dictatorial control of Boss Hague, of Jersey City. In other words, no other aspirants dared run. For many years past in Democratic circles the so-called free and open primary has been a hollow mockery.

However, this is a Presidential year, and Mr. Hague was greatly assisted in the selection of his State ticket by the President of the United States. Both Mr. Edison and Mr. Cromwell occupied Federal positions of great responsibility. The former is still Secretary of the Navy, in these trying days clearly the most important Federal post, excepting only the Presidency of the United States. Mr. Cromwell was United States Minister to Canada. He, however, was apparently asked to resign, while Mr. Edison still holds on.

Secretary Edison very frankly and, I think, very properly, suggested in the press 2 weeks ago that he recognized the incompatibility of being the Secretary of the Navy, with the great responsibilities of that office, and its control of the expenditure of billions of dollars, and at the same time being a political candidate for the Governorship of New Jersey. As I recall the statement, Mr. Edison indicated his intention of resigning within 30 days. I noticed in the public press only a few days ago that he would now probably remain as Secretary of the Navy until June 30, which would, of course, extend his original 30 days for some considerable period.

I do not want to be technical about this situation. If Mr. Edison, with his engineering background, was an ideally equipped man for the Secretaryship of the Navy, as he must have been, or surely the President would not have appointed him, then in these days, with the war brought almost to our very door, he should remain Secretary of the Navy. That would be his duty as a patriotic American citizen. On the other hand, if for any reason he does not measure up to his present job, then he should not be wished on New Jersey. The governorship of our great State is much too important to be bartered by designing political bosses. In other words, if he is not good enough to hold down the Navy job he certainly is not good enough to be Governor of New Jersey.

Do not misunderstand me. We do not fear Mr. Edison's candidacy. Quite the contrary. Mr. Edison, estimable citizen as he is, has never to my knowledge had the slightest background of service or experience to fit him to assume this great office. I know little about his engineering or technical qualifications. He must possess them or the President would not have designated him to be Secretary of the Navy. Should he patriotically remain in that most important position, Mr. Hague would of course designate some other New Deal stalwart, as he is listening to Mr. Roosevelt these days, and the campaign would proceed just the same. So it cannot be intimated that the observations I have made are from any standpoint either of fear or of any effort to make Bob Hendrickson's campaign a run-away.

As to Mr. Cromwell, I have known him for years. He has charm. He has personality, and, incidentally, he has a considerable amount of money.

I noticed that in his address before the Democratic convention a week ago, as reported in the press, he very carefully discussed two of his former activities—birth control and his criticism of the American Legion. I naturally assume he reviewed these two interesting topics so that they might possibly be removed from the campaign. However, I was still more interested to realize that he failed entirely to touch upon one of his pet theories, a readjustment of Federal taxation. There is no more important subject than taxation and its present relationship to business development and unemployment.

Mr. Cromwell appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives when that committee was considering a revision of the revenue laws. The hearings were held during January 1938, and the testimony appears in detail in House documents. I have read that testimony with much interest. As a matter of fact, I do not disagree with Mr. Cromwell's objective—if I understand it to be a reduction of taxation on industry in order that the latter may be encouraged to expand and thus decrease unemployment.

However, Mr. Cromwell in his testimony stated without qualification that he proposed the repeal or elimination of all the existing estate and inheritance taxes, also all of the individual and corporation income taxes, which, if added to the so-called excise taxes, have produced an income to the Government, based on the figures of 1937, of something over $5,000,000,000, or, if the excise taxes were eliminated, something over two and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. Cromwell's substitute for these taxes was what he termed a "manufacturer's sales tax." In the course of his testimony before the committee he indicated that to the best of his knowledge the wholesale value of manufactured products sold in 1929 was in the neighborhood of $26,000,000,000. It was soon pointed out by members of the committee that if this was the sole substitute after the elimination of inheritance, corporation, and other income taxes, it would require a sales tax in the neighborhood of 20 percent in order to make up the $5,000,000,000 lost, or 10 percent if the present excise tax were continued.

Mr. Cromwell, in exploiting his theory, went further, and, again without qualification, stated that he would have no exemptions on the character of commodities to be taxed. In fact, the question was asked by a member of the committee, "Would you have the same rate on bread and meat as on, for instance, cigarettes and whisky?" Mr. Cromwell replied, "Yes."

In other words, there would be absolutely no exemption on medicine, staples, and necessities of life, but every consumer would pay

the 10- or 20-percent sales tax on every purchase he made, no matter what might be his capacity to pay. Such a system, because of the elimination of most other taxes, would seem very much like transferring the burden of raising necessary governmental revenues from the wealthy to the less wealthy; in other words, completely ignoring the present policy of basing taxes on ability or capacity to pay.

New Jersey has had its experience with the sales tax, and I doubt its popularity here. I am quite sure the electorate of New Jersey will be interested as the campaign progresses in having Mr. Cromwell enlarge on this theory, if he still believes in it.

This is a Presidential year. I listened, as no doubt thousands of other American citizens did, to the President's so-called fireside chat a few nights back. This followed the abortive effort to weaken Republicans, a month before their convention, by calling in the 1936 standard bearers on the plea of national unity.

With the unselfish support of Republicans, as well as Democrats, and without any division in his rush-defense program, I had hoped to hear a message that would have inspired a further display of frank cooperation and nonpartisanship. However, the burden of the entire talk appeared to be an effort to defend Mr. Roosevelt's 7 years as to defense preparation as compared to the equipment of the Army and Navy when he took office in March 1933.

Naturally, the Army and Navy were at the lowest ebb at that time. The entire effort of both Republicans and Democrats in those days was toward disarmament. One conference after another had been held or proposed with the hope that there would be no recurrence of the horrible World War days, and all were convinced the surest way of bringing about continued peace was international disarmament. Unfortunately, that effort failed.

It is startling just to think that in these trying times the President of the United States would try to make it appear by comparison that he had made tremendous advancement in the procurement of Army and Navy equipment. He had to admit in his fireside chat that much of the equipment he claimed for both the Army and Navy was not at hand but on order.

These are not days for that type of evasion, and the patriotic members of the Republican Party are entitled to a franker and more generous exposé of conditions from the Chief Executive of the land.

Again, there is his patronizing of labor and his insistence that social advances already made should not be interfered with in his speed-up program. In my judgment, such a statement was not in place in that message. I believe a large proportion of patriotic labor in this country, with the war at our very door, are quite prepared to temporarily at least give up any advantages they may possess and enlist with capital, agriculture, and all other classes of citizenship, as Great Britain is doing, and give their all in the interest of national defense. It is an insult to labor to put them in a segregated class by themselves.

In a few days the Republican National Convention will select its standard bearers for President and Vice President of the United States. Following the convention in Philadelphia, Mr. Roosevelt will direct the Democratic convention to be held in Chicago whom they are to nominate, himself or a crown prince. In the meantime, Mr. Edison and Mr. Cromwell, fresh from New Deal membership, and apparently exponents of New Deal principles, have been presented to New Jersey by the Roosevelt-Hague combination as the Democratic candidates for the two high and powerful offices of Governor and Senator.

New Jersey, if I do not misunderstand the discriminating ability of its electorate, will select its own Governor and its own United States Senator, free from New Deal taint, free from the Hague-Roosevelt dictatorship, and free to serve and save the people of New Jersey from those catastrophes.

Aviation and Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION POST OF BURLINGTON, N. C.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the American Legion Post at Burlington, N. C., one in relation to the air power, in which mention is made of Gen. William Mitchell, and the other in reference to aliens. I should like to have the resolutions prefaced by a letter from the Honorable Thomas D. Cooper, a prominent attorney of Burlington, N. C., who is a member of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURLINGTON, N. C., *June 1, 1940.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I take this opportunity, Bob, to congratulate you upon your well-known position concerning aliens in this country. You led off with proper warnings several years ago and I believe that you are going to realize now the fruits of such work. Our people now are beginning to realize the importance of adequate armaments for defense and the importance of the alien situation. I hand you herewith copies of two resolutions which I prepared and which have been adopted with enthusiastic unanimity by members of our local post of our American Legion. Such resolutions are self-explanatory and set forth our position about adequate defense and "fifth column" activities. We propose to uphold your position vigorously, and if I can cooperate with you in any way in support of your vital measures for the interest of our country I hope that you will call upon me.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

THOMAS D. COOPER.

Whereas recent world events have shown the demoralizing effect of "fifth column" activities of invading nations; and

Whereas it appears that there are many persons residing in the United States seditiously opposed to our democratic form of government and who have not and apparently do not intend to swear allegiance to our country, but, on the other hand, sympathize with peoples of Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia, and Fascist Italy, in open and unstripped design to invade, plunder, and pillage the smaller and defenseless nations of the world and to overthrow democracy throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Walter B. Ellis Post, No. 63, of the American Legion:

1. That this post reiterate and resolve anew to protect and preserve the liberties of the American people and their institutions of free government and to teach and promote true Americanism throughout our land.

2. That this post declare and condemn any un-American activities subversive to our democratic institutions and form of government and call upon the police powers of our city, State, and Nation to canvass, identify, and suppress any individual connected, directly or indirectly, with any activity, alinement, or association antagonistic toward the principles of Americanism and our form of government, and that appropriate action be taken to arrest, deport, disperse, disband, and dissolve any individual or association of individuals conducting or conspiring to conduct activities subversive to our democratic form of government.

3. That all aliens and unnaturalized residents of our city, State, and Nation be called upon forthwith to declare or renounce their true allegiance to the United States of America; and upon their failure so to do, or upon their failure to declare the intention to bear arms if need be, in the defense of our country, that each and every such person be held for immediate deportation.

4. That in the absence of appropriate legal procedure now provided by law, that comprehensive laws be enacted forthwith for swift, sure, and certain punishment for "fifth column" activities of any kind or nature within the United States of America.

5. That this post memorialize State and National headquarters of the American Legion for approval of this resolution, and that the voice of the Legion be raised in demand for appropriate action hereon.

CERTIFICATE

Herndon Taylor, commander, and Herbert W. Wade, adjutant, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Walter B. Ellis Post, No. 63, of the American Legion, in meeting duly assembled at Burlington, N. C., on the 28th day of May 1940.

HERNDON TAYLOR, *Commander.*
HERBERT W. WADE, *Adjutant.*

Whereas it is believed that the United States today is woefully unprepared for war and has refused to heed the advice of its own, the former Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, in his attempt more than 15 years ago to convince the rulers of this Nation that the airplane could do what Germany now is proving it can do; that future aircraft would mount cannon and that the airplane would revolutionize warfare; and

Whereas Congress has since appropriated billions of dollars for battleships and diminishing millions for aircraft, while the generals and admirals directing this Nation's armed services went on their way scoffing the theory of General Mitchell, while the generals and admirals in Germany took his lessons and advice and studied his methods and tactics; and

Whereas it is believed that "the only defense against air power is air power," and it should be made certain that our air force be no longer subordinated to the Army and Navy; and

Whereas it is believed that this Nation is or may shortly be placed in a perilous position on account of war events in Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Walter B. Ellis Post No. 63 of the American Legion:

1. That this post deplores the inertia of those directing this Nation's armed services and inability to foresee and consequent refusal to heed the advice of our own, the former General Mitchell, who commanded the Air Service of the First and Second Armies in the A. E. F., and this post further deplores the arrest, court martial, and suspension from service of General Mitchell approximately 15 years ago.

2. That this post record its position and recommendation to the Commander in Chief of the United States Army and Navy, the President of the United States, for definite and immediate armaments adequate for national defense, and especially for a separate air force superior in number and equipment to any the world now knows or any nation has now planned, and that the cost thereof be not considered, either in dollars or in the ranks and titles of opposing Army and Navy officers.

3. That this post memorialize State and National headquarters of the American Legion for approval of this resolution, and that the voice of the Legion be raised in demand for adequate armaments as herein stated.

CERTIFICATE

Herndon Taylor, commander, and Herbert W. Wade, adjutant, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Walter B. Ellis Post, No. 63, of the American Legion, in meeting duly assembled at Burlington, N. C., on the 28th day of May 1940.

HERNDON TAYLOR, *Commander.*
HERBERT W. WADE, *Adjutant.*

Unemployment and Idle Productive Capacity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere appreciation of the opportunity extended me that I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the very timely and challenging speech of the senior Senator from Wyoming and Chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. Especially do I wish to call the attention of Members to what the Senator has to say about the imperative necessity of our working out the answer to the problem of unemployment and idle productive capacity. He warns that we must not for a moment think that organization of the Nation for defense will be a substitute for this absolutely essential organization of our productive machinery for the full employment of our people and the full use of our productive capacity. That warning should be earnestly heeded by us all.

As we assemble tonight the world is rushing with appalling speed toward what may be the climax of one of the great crises of human history. Certainly no group could be more deeply concerned than this in the meaning of the crowding events of the past few weeks in Europe, not only because the business of insurance men is the protection of life and property, but because as Americans you are interested in the preservation of those ideals of living which have enabled America to attain the highest standard in the history of civilization.

A new political system, based upon an old doctrine of arbitrary power, repudiating all our faith in individual freedom, threatens to engulf the world. This new system rejects not only our ideals of human relations, it also rejects the economic system which is based upon the theory of private property and free enterprise.

It is profoundly encouraging to note the practical unanimity with which the people of America are uniting from end to end of the country to defend what the President has called our American way of life. It is important in these circumstances that we should understand exactly what we mean by the American way of life and that we should try to appraise the causes which have imperiled it.

THE INALIENABLE RIGHT TO WORK

If there is anything distinctive about our system, if there is any mark which differentiates American ideals of political and economic organizations from those of other peoples and other countries, it is that here we hold it to be a self-evident truth that to every individual God has given rights which no other individual or no organization of individuals, whether political or economic, can take away. The right of every man to work and to possess the fruits of his toil, to think his own thoughts, to speak his own mind, and to worship God according to his conscience, constitute the very basis of the American way of life and these are precisely the ideals which are being swept away, together with life and property, in the tragedy which is now being enacted upon European soil.

The founders of our country, when they wrote the Declaration of Independence, mutually pledged to one another their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to maintain the principles of human freedom upon which they were establishing this Government. I have come here tonight to talk to you because I believe that the preservation of these ideals by our people on this continent constitutes the greatest service that America can perform for a bewildered and tortured world. If we are to succeed in this we must first comprehend that the problems of our time are problems of group or collective activity. It will not do merely to seek a scapegoat on whom to blame our economic ills. Though it is very easy to dramatize and personalize the hardships we are unable to cure, such a course serves only to raise temperature. He makes a mistake, for example, who believes that the European dictators are the cause of the European tragedy. They are only the results of conditions which have not been understood. They are the product of economic causes which have compelled men to turn to government for the solution of the problems of living which had grown too complicated for them to handle by themselves.

The seeds of the present disorder were sown when the Treaty of Versailles was written by the men who were accounted the greatest statesmen of the last generation. They did not intend to produce bloodshed and misery. They and the nations which sent them to Paris were just not wise enough collectively to write and ratify a treaty of peace. The seeds, thus planted, were cultivated by the statesmen who followed during the past 20 years and who lacked the wisdom to establish economic justice in an era which requires a greater degree of cooperation and organization than was ever before needed in all the history of the world.

IMPORTANCE OF GROUP ACTIVITY

A few days ago I rode down Constitution Avenue in Washington in a taxicab. Presently we passed a yellow gasoline truck. The radio in the taxi was telling of the bombing of oil storage tanks in Rotterdam. The headlines of my newspaper were telling of the occupation of the Dutch West Indies by the French to protect the Dutch refineries. The label on the Washington truck read "Shell Oil Co." An economic state with bases at Rotterdam, Holland; at Curacao, Dutch West Indies; at Washington, D. C.; and at so many other spots on the map that to list their names would make a geographical gazeteer of respectable proportions.

Just as oil is produced and distributed for the use of individuals by huge organizations, so it is also with practically every commodity upon which the whole commercial structure rests. Power is made available only through the cooperation of large numbers of persons, because no single person is capable, under modern conditions, of making steam or electricity available for practical use. All of the elements of transportation and communication which only a few decades ago were wholly within the control of individuals are today, so far as modern enterprise is concerned, wholly within the control of groups of individuals, and these individuals have found it necessary to impose organization upon themselves in order to make their purposes effective. Old-fashioned methods of transportation are, to be sure, still available, but they are no longer convenient; they no longer serve our purposes. Our great-grandfathers, every one of them, could provide themselves with all the transportation they needed because every practical man of a century ago could, under the press of necessity, build himself a wagon and acquire a horse, but none of us can equip ourselves with the means of transportation which the modern world demands. We have to depend upon the collective organizations which manufacture locomotives and railroad cars, automobiles, and airplanes, and which make steam, electricity, and gasoline available for instant use by every man.

More than that, indeed, the preparation of food has been moved from the family kitchen to the corporate factory. The power spindle has displaced the distaff. The individual for whose benefit all organizations, both political and economic, are formed is being swallowed up by both.

Thus, organization is the mark of the modern world. The troubles of this generation arise from the simple fact that we have not yet learned how to shape this necessary organization in such a manner as to preserve that individual freedom for the protection and preservation of which the United States of America was established. If we understand the meaning of organization and the necessity of making it serve the individual needs of all our people, we shall understand that the economic organization, like the political organization, must not be permitted to become more powerful than the people. We shall then be in a position to offer to mankind the prescription for peace and prosperity, for lack of which the nations of Europe are today tearing away the roots of civilization, for we can then hold fast to all the material advantages of industrial and commercial organizations while at the same time preserving essential human rights.

Europe has organized for war, and, though much against our will, by that very fact we are now compelled to organize for war also; our real duty is to organize for eventual peace. Europe has organized for destruction because of fear, fear that races and individuals cannot live without pillage and rapine upon one another. We can organize for constructive purposes once we realize that the world provides more than enough for all and that by intelligent distribution of the abundance which surrounds us we can actually, through organization, make robbery and pillage as unnecessary among nations as it is among men. Not upon fear of one another but upon faith in the capacity of our people to cooperate can we give the world that organization of political and economic freedom which it so much needs.

PEOPLE COME FIRST

If we are to achieve this end, we must begin by recognizing that people come first, that they precede all forms of human organization and that all organizations justify themselves only in the degree in which they serve people. A railroad system is built across a continent only because it makes cheap transportation available to people. A telephone system is brought into existence only because people want to communicate conveniently at long distances. A great electric company is possible only because people want electricity in their homes for light and for power. Automobiles, airplanes, electric refrigerators, and every imaginable device which has been invented to supply the luxurious tastes of the modern world are possible only because living people demand them; and so, all industry, all business, and all commerce are organized to produce and distribute the unlimited variety of products which human ingenuity discovers and invents. Though we know that none of these things would be possible without people to buy and to use them, we seem to have overlooked the fact that the complex industrial organization necessary to produce and distribute these products will finally defeat itself if it is not so constructed as to guarantee to people the opportunity to acquire what business offers.

The totalitarian governments of Europe sprang into existence because the economic organization had failed to preserve opportunity for the people. Economic organizations and political organizations are separate entities with separate functions. The one is composed of only part of the people and possesses no elements of sovereignty, though it frequently has more wealth and power and intimately affects the lives of more people than do many political sovereignties. The latter, unlike the former, represent all the people, not part of them, and is bound to do equal justice by all individuals and by all economic organizations. Political organization—that is to say, government—is necessarily superior to any economic organization, but in the modern world, because the political government is circumscribed by geographical boundaries while the economic state is not, the relationship of the two is out of adjustment. This arises from the fact that the economic state acts as though it were an individual while the geographical state can only act as a government, and as Americans, we know, since we were so taught by the Declaration of Independence, that governments are inferior to men since they are established by men.

GOVERNMENTS ENTER ECONOMIC FIELD

It is this confusion of the rights and functions of the two entities that has caused our modern chaos. Germany, Italy, and Russia, because they were unable to create and maintain a democratic economic organization that would provide opportunity and employment for people, were compelled to enter the economic field as governments, and the result has been the horrible war organizations which are attempting to preserve the lives and property of some of their own people by destroying the lives and property of their neighbors while sacrificing the lives of countless numbers of their own citizens conscripted for military service and making slaves of other millions conscripted for industrial service. Great Britain and France, blind as we have been blind to this modern political organization of death, allowed the years to pass, as it grew in power, and having failed within their own countries to protect the rights of people in the modern economic world, find themselves in a disastrous extremity, an extremity which we ourselves now share because the arbitrary organization of whole peoples for war has repudiated the old concepts of neutrality and international comity as well as the principles of democracy.

Though as a result we find ourselves compelled, in defense of our ideals of life, to organize for war so that we may not find ourselves utterly unprepared as other peace-loving nations were, we shall make a tragic mistake if we allow ourselves to think for a single moment that such organization will be a substitute for the necessary organization for peace of which I speak. War, and even preparation for war, may, for a time, seem to solve the unemployment problem. Armies which are assembled for purposes of destruction will, to be sure, use the hands which we have not had the intelligence, by organization and cooperation, to put to work in the productive enterprises of peace. But war solves nothing, for when it is over the same stark problems of people and their relation to the economic structure remain unanswered.

He who imagines that in this great crisis America can dodge this phase of the problem of organization by preparing for war misses the fundamental fact that there is neither peace nor prosperity save in production and in full employment. American business can find no permanent prosperity in the sale of commodities to a modern world at war. Modern war, the aggressors have told us, is a total war. That means not only the destruction of soldiers and of civilians and of women and of children; it means also the destruction of the ability of whole peoples to produce. No European country can pay for anything it gets unless it can produce; for commerce among nations, as among people, is merely the exchange of goods and services; and when the ability of one man, one group, or one nation to produce is destroyed, the whole basis of commerce is destroyed. Even when we ourselves prepare, as we must prepare for our own defense, upon the modern scale we necessarily incur an expense of staggering proportions that can only be met by increasing cooperation and production.

PROBLEM CANNOT BE POSTPONED

Let no one delude himself, therefore, into the belief that our problem of organizing people so that they may all reap the benefits offered by modern science can be postponed by either war or preparation for war. We must ask ourselves, and never let the question for one single moment vanish from our minds, what is to happen in this world after the war is over. Who is to bind up the wounds of war? Who is to assuage the suffering of stricken populations? Who is to preserve the American ideal of free enterprise if we are not to do it? And how can we do it if for one moment we consent to set aside the problem of economic recovery for the benefit of all?

I have no blueprint to offer, but I can recognize the elementary principles which have made America great, just as we all recognize them. We know that the progress of America has been the fruit of liberty, the liberty of every man to work out his own destiny. That liberty has been protected heretofore because here in America men, until recently at least, have always been economically free. Political liberty is the product of economic freedom. When economic freedom is lost political liberty is endangered. That is the lesson Europe teaches us today. The genius and energy of Americans have been free to bequeath all manner of discoveries and inventions to mankind, but as these discoveries and inventions produce a more complex economy, depending in greater and greater degree upon complex economic and commercial organization, the individual has been finding it more and more difficult to preserve his economic freedom. The steady increase of tenant farmers and of industrial workers, whose only property is an uncertain job, has marked the growing instability of our economic system. When people are without property, and when, for any reason, they cannot command the opportunity to work, then the danger to established order arises.

We hear a great deal nowadays of the demand for security. That is the phrase, to be sure, but it is not what is actually meant. People want opportunity much more than they want security. People have always been ready to risk everything, even life itself, in the pursuit of an objective. But when organizations become so complex that the individual is overshadowed and has no sure and certain part in the organization, then it is that dissatisfaction and unrest begin to appear. America has heretofore always sought to preserve the open door of opportunity to people. We have boasted, and rightfully so, that in this country every man who is able and willing to work could work, and by energy and intelligence could rise to the highest positions in business and in industry, as well as in Government. It is impossible to read the names of modern American business executives and political leaders without knowing that this is so. The greatest personal satisfaction I have had as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee has been the realization as a result of my contacts that America is still devoted to the old traditions of freedom, and that American businessmen, no less than American workers, are willing to protect and defend the elementary principles of human rights upon which our country was founded.

We have seen from what has happened in Europe that if the modern economic organization, for all its internal efficiency, fails to preserve economic opportunity for people, the state inevitably steps in to attempt the task which business is not performing. When people cannot find employment in the avenues of private industry they turn to government. When, as in Germany, the dominant figures of the economic world, in order to protect their own interests, seek to obtain control of government, they only lay the ground for the inevitable result, the government will in the end dominate and control business. When that happens, free enterprise is gone and the state has become not only more powerful than the economic organization, but more powerful than the people.

ECONOMIC CONSTITUTION NEEDED

That is the danger which America seeks to avert. It is the danger that America must avert if it is to preserve democracy, and the only way to avert it is to avoid the mistake that Europe has made of not clearly seeing the difference between the economic and the political organization.

Once before the people of this land faced a great crisis of organization. It was after the Revolutionary War when Thirteen Sovereign States were struggling to cooperate for the mutual benefit of their people in an imperfect Union. They saw the need of political organization then and they called together a convention chosen from among the rank and file of the people to draw a Constitution which would give them the more perfect Union that was needed to protect the general welfare.

The political organization which proceeded from that Convention was the work of all, and it gave to the world a Government of

the people, that is to say, a government of all the people; a government which derived its authority not from the desires or needs of any single group, however powerful, but from the desires and needs of a whole people who were determined to provide opportunity and freedom for all.

Our greatest need now is a conception of an economic organization upon the same broad national scale, one which shall not be designed to serve the interests of any group or class, but which, like our political organization, shall be founded upon the abiding conviction that our economic system must be so organized as to serve all.

To accomplish this, it is essential, first of all, to agree that the political function must be reserved to the political organization and the economic function to the economic organization. Once it is made clear that in America it is not the purpose of any responsible leaders to have the Government absorb the economic function, the greatest source of misunderstanding and fear will have been removed. The most effective means the liberal can take now to help preserve democracy and to establish social justice is to make it clear that his only purpose is to protect government from absorption by the economic organization. Likewise, the most effective means the conservative can take now to preserve free enterprise is to make it clear that it is not his purpose to make the economic organization more powerful than the people, but that his only aim is to protect the economic organization from absorption by the state, so that it may better serve the people.

So it seems to me that the opportunity and the duty of America is to perfect such an organization of free enterprise that, by preserving economic opportunity for all it will be unnecessary to appeal to government to perform the economic function. Like our predecessors who drafted our political Constitution, we must draft an economic constitution. Just as they undertook to preserve political freedom for men by fixing the powers and functions of free political organizations, so we must preserve economic freedom for men by defining the powers and functions of free economic organizations.

Such is the challenge that is presented to us. I have an abiding faith that America, founded upon the rock of human rights, will meet it.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the olive branch is no longer the symbol of peace. Bombers, battleships, and armored tanks have replaced it. Peace is an earned possession, based upon large expenditures of money, skillful planning, and hard work. It flowers and becomes a reality only by possessing, in adequate quantity, up-to-date instruments of war. Protection from attack by the bully is afforded today just as it has always been. No bully ever was anxious to attack an individual who is not only able to fight back but able to win. The same true principle applies today to nations. Our country, by carrying out the President's rearmament program, will be so strong within a very short time that no bully nation or combination of them can overpower us.

Now, of all times, is the hour when our people should engage in the clearest thinking and invoke the calmest judgment of which the Nation is capable. Hysteria is deadly. It is a deadly anathema to sound judgment, to quick action; and, conversely, it is the handmaiden of confusion, dissension, and despair. Surely upon careful reflection no person will doubt that our country has sufficient time to arm itself adequately on the sea, in the air, and on the ground. We have no time to waste, though.

The job is being done rapidly now. Positive results not only will be seen but will be felt throughout the world within a few months, and I mean before the year 1940 expires.

It is a well-known fact that our Navy on this very day is the best and strongest this Nation has possessed throughout its history. It now is better than Japan's and practically as strong as England's. Within a short time it will be the most powerful the world has ever known. Thanks to the President and to our colleague from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, and his able Naval Affairs Committee, and to the Senate Committee, our Navy has become strong during the last 7 years. Here is a brief summary of our naval units constructed since 1933. This administration has constructed a total of 111 ships, which is divided as follows: 3 airplane carriers, 11 cruisers, 26 submarines, 7 auxiliary ships, 62 destroyers, and 2 gunboats.

The Navy, in addition to those, has 68 units under construction right now by virtue of authorizing legislation passed by Congress in 1934 and 1938. Here is the break-down: 8 battleships—6 of 35,000 tons, 2 of 45,000 tons; these ships will be completed within the next 2 or 2½ years; 2 of them are about 75 percent completed now. One airplane carrier, 20,000 tons; 6 cruisers, ranging from 6,000 to 10,000 tons each; 27 destroyers, ranging from 1,600 to 1,800 tons each; 14 submarines, 1,500 tons; 12 auxiliary craft.

During the present session of Congress, funds were appropriated by virtue of authorization of the years 1934 and 1938 for the following: Two battleships, one aircraft carrier, two cruisers, eight destroyers, six submarines, and five auxiliary ships. These are to be laid down immediately. In addition to those, Congress during this present session has authorized three additional aircraft carriers of approximately 25,000 tons each; 66,000 tons of cruisers, varying from 6,000 to 10,000 tons each; and 21,000 tons of submarines.

Thus the Navy now has a total of 160 ships, either under construction or to be built, in addition to the units afloat.

Our first line of defense, Alaska, the Philippines, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Panama Canal will be immediately strengthened. Our eastern shores will be provided with air bases and sufficient antiaircraft equipment. Texas has been given one naval air base and should have at least one more to insure adequate protection of our oil supply, which is so vital to national defense, and to insure protection from possible invasion from Mexico.

There is no need to fret about our air force; instead, substitute therefor hard and quick work and we shall fare better. The lone voice of Gen. Billy Mitchell, which cried out 20 years ago in vain in behalf of improved aviation, like a voice in the wilderness, is now being heard and heeded like the voice of a messiah. But alas! Suppose that we, and those nations who think religiously, economically, and politically as we do, had heeded his advice, what a different world we would be living in today. But only the enemies of democracy heard and were convinced. We must remember, though, that it is a characteristic of human nature, and not necessarily a fault, to oppose, sometimes vigorously and always cautiously, change. This is true, likewise, of democracies.

The beaten rut always is more pleasant and offers less resistance than the untraveled wilderness. But our present position in aircraft is not nearly as unfavorable as the public generally believes. To the contrary, it is fairly good. Production will be developed presently to thousands of planes per month. Before pursuing this point further, let me return to the shades of Gen. Billy Mitchell.

It is a sign of wisdom to recognize that most of us dislike the thought of making a change, and we dislike to undergo the definite and positive actions that any change produces. I am afraid that the leaders of our Army and Navy of 15 years ago were intensely human in this regard. They rebuffed the sound and timely suggestions of our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. Ross COLLINS, whose pleas for mechanized forces of defense are known to all Members of Congress. Surely the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman Ross COLLINS, was 15 years ahead of our national thinking on this subject. Our leadership in the Army today is in sharp contrast to that of 15 years ago. Under the able guidance of the Honorable Harry Woodring, Secretary of War; Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army; and Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, we are rapidly acquiring a fully equipped, modern army.

After consulting some four or five sources, whose opinions are entitled to the greatest weight, I think it is safe to state that within 30 to 60 days the entire production of military

planes in the United States will be about 700 per month. Immediately prior to Hitler's invasion of the Low Countries our production of military planes was approximately 500 per month. Near the end of 1940 I have no doubt our production of military planes will be approximately 1,000 per month.

I am told by competent authority that new airplane factories can be constructed from the ground up, including tools and equipment, in not more than 6 months. With that thought in mind it must be obvious that within 12 months hence the number of military planes that this country is capable of producing is astounding. Mr. Henry Ford was making no overstatement of the facts when he stated recently that his plant alone could produce 1,000 planes a day within a few months. Regardless of the boasts of Hitler and Mussolini as to their plane production, it is extremely doubtful if they have a combined production, under present conditions, in excess of 2,800 planes per month. It is even more doubtful if they can maintain that figure.

Under the able and competent leadership of ANDREW J. MAY and Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD and their respective Committees on Military Affairs, our Army will presently be sizably expanded and will be equipped with the most modern automatic guns, armored tanks, armored motorcars, and all necessary equipment.

Too many of our people do not understand that the Regular Army is just one part of the Army itself. The other parts include the National Guard, the Reserve officers, the Air Corps, and so forth. Our present authorized limit for enlisted men in the Regular Army is 285,000—not including officers. Due to "fifth column" activities in Mexico and South America, sound judgment demands that the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army be increased to approximately 400,000.

A few weeks before the World War in 1914 our Regular Army consisted of 4,701 commissioned officers and 87,781 enlisted men. Our National Guard had 8,323 commissioned officers and 119,087 enlisted men. A fairly good start had been made in the installation of our coastal defense.

The Army had 13 experimental aeroplanes. We had practically no modern transportation. The total expenditures for military purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, were $114,500,814.39.

To date our Army, with the additions authorized last year by the Congress, is composed of the following: Regular Army, 13,500 commissioned officers, 227,000 enlisted men. Of this number 70,000 are required to guard our overseas possessions, the Panama Canal, Hawaii, the Philipines, and Puerto Rico.

Our National Guard has a strength of 17,000 officers and 235,000 enlisted men. In addition we have 120,000 Reserve officers.

The air force consists of 50,000 officers and enlisted men. We have 5,500 military planes of all types and of varying degrees of modern usefulness.

In addition to this, approximately $600,000,000 will be rapidly spent for purchasing the finest of automatic rifles, of which the United States has the best; armored tanks, war planes, modernized vehicles, ammunition, and all needed equipment.

The needed expansion of the Army Air Corps has been authorized, together with the construction of necessary training fields for training of a sufficient number of pilots, mechanics, and aerial technicians to man a fleet of 50,000 planes. The problem of plane obsolescence will have to be watched.

All in all, there is no doubt but that we will be adequately armed on land, on the seas, and in the air to meet any emergency within a short time. In arriving at a state of complete preparedness, too much credit can not be given to President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull for helping to mold public approval of the program. I believe it is accurate to state that the President, the Congress, and Secretary Hull have been fully a year ahead of the public in their thoughts concerning foreign affairs and preparedness.

The ghastly examples of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Poland, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium loudly speak Hitler's purpose. France and England are definitely on his schedule. Maybe Russia and South America are. Who knows but that Canada, Mexico, or our country may be attacked? As a matter of common horse sense, it appears to be to our national interest to assist the Allies now in every way possible, short of war. It may be too late to assist them 90 days from now. Mussolini is helping Hitler very materially every day without having declared war.

As we all know, there are very few ways at this moment, short of war, that we can help. The Allies do not need funds now. They have several billions of dollars and securities on deposit in this country. Their paramount need is airplanes. No doubt the lion's share of our present production of planes is going to them. That is as it should be. Doubtless one plane now is worth three to the Allies 90 days hence. A material way for us to help their cause and ours, too, is for the Army to let them have its surplus supplies and especially planes. This could be accomplished without violating the rules of common sense—and not to do so would surely be a violation of that rule—by the Army trading in its planes to the manufacturers for new ones for future delivery. The manufacturers are free to sell these and other planes to the Allies.

We are making rapid strides to protect ourselves against the "fifth column." The greatest measures of preparedness along this line will come from the helpful cooperation of an interested and aroused public. The public is on its toes now. Our law-enforcing agencies are using many old but effective laws to reduce the hazard from this treacherous and underhanded method of attack, and new laws are being passed by the Congress which will materially protect us in this regard. The Department of Justice will revitalize the immigration machinery through vigorous prosecution and through the effective and active work of the Bureau of Investigation. This Bureau should have its active investigative force increased by 500 agents. No objections will come from any source on this needed increase in personnel.

In this serious hour, let us not lose our heads. Time is the greatest panacea man has ever known. Let us patiently wait out and work out of our difficulties. Labor and industry, each in its own effective field, will do its job 100 percent. The team of labor and industry will function like a smooth, well-oiled machine. And above all, let us not talk our country into war.

From these dark days of cruelty and almost total suffering, God will bring good out of evil. But, as Cromwell said, "Let's keep our powder dry."

Do We Need a Man To "Save" Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, for some easily understandable reason, thousands of Federal employees have developed a campaign for a third-term Presidency. The success which has greeted their efforts in the Democratic Party has been accelerated by the European war. Hints that our Nation may become involved in this war have been dropped here and there throughout the Nation in the hope that they might spring forth into an overwhelming "demand" for Roosevelt's renomination and reelection.

Basically there is a weird fallacy behind all this propaganda. There is nothing in the record of American history to indicate that a President who leaves every major problem

with which he began his administration completely unsolved can succeed in guiding his country through a critical period of foreign affairs. By what stretch of reasoning is it possible to believe that an administration which is spending more money daily in time of peace than Great Britain is spending daily in the face of a frightful war can be trusted to manage our national affairs, should we become engaged in the war? Granting every proposition of the new dealers, assuming their contention that war is inevitable, are we ready to entrust the management of our National Government in such a situation to a President who has not succeeded in a single major objective which he outlined at the beginning of his first term in office?

If we must participate in a war, which the Republican Party denies, shall the conduct of our affairs be handed over to an administration which has created more internal hatred among our people than we have ever known before in American history?

The record of the present National Government on preparedness is hardly one to give us confidence in its ability to carry on our affairs in time of grave national emergency. Within the War Department a long-standing feud between Secretary of War Woodring and Assistant Secretary of War Johnson has weakened the Army. The recent struggle between large elements of our Nation who are deeply concerned over air safety and the President in pushing through his reorganization plan involving the Air Safety Board has done nothing to encourage a belief in the potential strength of our aviation if war should come. The constant refusal of our high national officials to permit any demonstration of the effectiveness of air attack upon the battleships we have built in the last 7 years is a third confession of weakness.

Surely a National Government which permits the development of such internal difficulties cannot be trusted to conduct our affairs in the event of war. Surely a President who has demonstrated his complete unwillingness to adopt a specific course, and to pursue it with reference to our own domestic problems, cannot be relied upon to do otherwise in the face of war.

If the danger of our participation in another European struggle is truly imminent, the people of the United States must change their leadership. Our present National Government has demonstrated that it is incompetent in time of peace. In time of war it might prove disastrous.

Dedication of the Columbus Arms Mural in the Hispanic Room of the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. SUMNER WELLES, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein the following timely address delivered by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the dedication of the Columbus arms mural in the Hispanic Room of the Library of Congress, Tuesday afternoon, May 28, 1940, at 3:45 o'clock:

I count it a great privilege to be afforded the opportunity this afternoon, in this beautiful Hispanic Room of the Library of Congress, to take part in the dedication of the mural comprising the arms of Christopher Columbus.

Soon 450 years will have passed since the great discoverer first sighted the lands of the New World in which we live. And while the admiral always maintained, as the words blazoned on his arms demonstrate, "Por Castilla, por León, nuevo mundo halló Colón"—for Castile and for León, Columbus discovered a new world—we Americans know that our New World of the Americas was in truth discovered for a higher purpose and was designed to achieve a far greater destiny than merely to serve as an appanage of the Old World.

Throughout these past four and a half centuries the term "the New World" has come, I believe, to mean, above all else perhaps, in the minds of the peoples of other continents, a land of promise where they could obtain freedom—freedom from oppression at the hands of the tyrant, freedom to think, freedom to speak, and freedom to worship God as they themselves believed right. Even before those colonies which later became the 21 American Republics had all of them achieved their political freedom, in the greater part of the New World men and women had achieved individual freedom. Today, throughout the three Americas comprising Columbus' new world, there still exist the same ideal and the same goal as those which the founders of our republics sought and which they so successfully achieved.

In these darkened hours, throughout a great part of the rest of the world, those liberties which we cherish, and by which we live, have been assailed, and have been, at least momentarily, successfully destroyed. Almost hourly one can see spreading the tide of carnage and of devastation which engulfs millions upon millions of people who desired nothing more than to live their lives peacefully, in amity with all, and as a menace to none, under the form of government which they themselves had devised.

In a physical sense and in a material sense, I realize that we are at last fully aware of these dangers in the Americas. There has never previously existed so comprehensive an understanding, so close a relationship, as that which fortunately—fortunately for each one of them—binds the American Republics together today. Any act of aggression by a non-American power, whether it be committed south or north of the Equator, is a challenge to the security of all and will be so regarded by them.

But, as you and I know, the ability to resist aggression, and to preserve our institutions of freedom, requires something more than mere material preparedness. It requires just as much a moral preparedness.

Too many of us in these recent generations have grown fat—fat, physically, and fat, mentally. We have led ourselves to believe that we were all of us secure because we wanted to believe that we were secure. We had reached the point where many of us even thought only what it was most pleasant—what it was the easiest—to think. And how many of us here in these United States have been preoccupied primarily with what we alleged the country and the Government owed us, rather than with our obligations and our duty to the country and the Government?

As we look back to the earlier days and draw inspiration from the lives of the men and women who created our Republic, and who made our Nation great, we can see clearly that our liberties, our institutions, our very independence were achieved not by blind sloth and self-indulgence, but by sacrifice and by suffering, by austerity and by devotion, and not infrequently by blood and sweat.

The price of our continued security is a rededication of themselves in this sense by our citizens, the eternal vigilance, and unselfish devotion to the public interest of those in authority, together with a continuance of effective and intimate cooperation on the part of all the governments of the Western Hemisphere.

Only in that way, and only in that spirit, can the New World which Columbus found continue to maintain unassailed and unassailable the institutions of democracy which free men and women have here created.

Foreign Trade of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, exports of United States merchandise during the first 4 months of 1940 were valued at $1,359,000,000, the highest figure for this period in any year since 1930. Exports of agricultural products accounted for 21 percent of the total, and showed a net gain of $88,000,000 during the first 4 months of this year compared with the corresponding period of last year. A further comparison of export statistics during these periods shows that exports of raw cotton increased by $97,000,000; sugar and related products, $6,000,000; fresh, canned, and dried vegetables, $4,000,000; packing-house products, soybeans, and edible vegetable oils and fats by about $3,000,000 each.

Nonagricultural exports, January–April 1940, showed an increase of $353,000,000 over the same months of last year. Almost three-fourths of this increase was accounted for by increased exports in five groups—iron- and steel-mill products, $81,000,000; aircraft products, $61,000,000; machinery, $53,000,000; nonferrous metals, $41,000,000; and chemicals and related products, $25,000,000.

United States imports for consumption during the first 4 months of 1940, valued at $834,000,000, were greater than during the same period of any year since 1930 with the exception of 1937. Agricultural imports, including rubber, silk, and so forth, accounted for 52 percent of the total.

The greatest gains during January–April 1940 compared with the same months of 1939 were in imports of crude and semimanufactured materials required by American industry. The most important increases were in the value of imports of crude rubber, $45,000,000; unmanufactured wool, $19,000,000; tin, $15,000,000; cane sugar, $11,000,000; copper and furs, $10,000,000 each; raw silk and petroleum and its products, $9,000,000 each.

Undoubtedly, gains have been relatively less in quantity than in value for both exports and imports, since prices have been advancing throughout the period discussed.

Resignation of Hon. Charles Edison as Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND HIS REPLY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Charles Edison, Secretary of the Navy, to the President of the United States, and the President's reply:

MAY 28, 1940.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you already know, on May 20, 1940, I issued the following statement:

"When I announced my candidacy for the governorship of New Jersey, I told the President that I felt I should not remain as Secretary of the Navy for more than 30 days after the primary. I believed then, and I believe now, that a Secretary of the Navy—the head of our first line of defense—should not also be a candidate for political office. During these trying times there must not be the slightest suspicion that decisions of a Secretary of the Navy are influenced by political expediency."

Accordingly I am tendering you my resignation as Secretary of the Navy, effective at your convenience.

The plans that you and I have discussed, anticipating my withdrawal, are well in hand, and I leave with the full assurance that this action at this time will cause no disturbance in the normal routine of the Department.

In general, the objectives we have striven for over the past 3½ years have in great part been realized, or will be when the present Congress finally passes the current legislative program. The shipbuilding program and plans for its expansion are in good condition, as is the fleet in being. The affairs of the Navy are in the hands of an exceptionally able group of men at this time, from Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Lewis Compton; the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Harold Stark; the Bureau chiefs; and Department heads on.

May I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the fine relations that have existed between us and for the opportunity you gave me to serve my country.

Respectfully,

CHARLES EDISON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 4, 1940.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: First of all, let me congratulate you on your nomination without opposition for the New Jersey governorship. I hope you will be elected; and I say this because you have a deep-seated feeling of responsibility to good government and efficient government, which I hope will be recognized by the people of your State.

I am sorry to lose you as the head of the Navy Department—because you have had experience there, because you understand the multifarious problems of the Navy, and because you have greatly contributed to the present efficiency of the service.

In regard to the date of your resignation taking effect, I apply the old rule laid down by former Presidents when members of the Cabinet or their assistants have been nominated for elective office. I realize that the active part of your campaign for Governor will not begin for a month or two, but I know also that you will want to visit various parts of the State at an earlier period in order to familiarize yourself with all of the sections and all of the problems of New Jersey, even though, because of your previous experience, you are conversant with every section.

I know also that in your present position it will take you several weeks to wind up various matters to the progress of which you are essential.

May I suggest, therefore, that this acceptance of your resignation take place on June 24? This will give you enough time, I think, to finish the immediate tasks at hand.

Also, I want you to know that I will continue to count on your advice in many matters which relate to the defense development now under way, and I hope you will find time during the next few months to come to Washington frequently in order that I may talk things over with you.

I need not tell you of the affectionate personal regard in which I hold you, and of the real admiration I have had for your understanding of naval affairs. I congratulate you on the splendid record you have made.

As ever yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Humanitarian Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE BUFFALO (N. Y.) COURIER-EXPRESS

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, while we are voting billions to plug the holes existing in our country's defense structure, it is heartening to note practical evidence of legislative action directed toward relief of innocent people suffering through the ravages of war. One of these pieces of legislation is House Joint Resolution 501. If this bill is passed, $15,000,000 will be provided for the relief of overrun countries—all too litle; but if the leaders of the House would only permit it to be brought up and voted on at once, our country could set about doing some good right away. The rule for this bill was given by the Rules Committee on May 8, 1940, and yet we have not been given a chance to vote on it.

The most recent evidence of a practical desire to be of aid is evidenced by the bill of my very able colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. His bill is H. R. 9721, and directs that $25,000,000 worth of surplus commodities held by Uncle Sam be turned over to the American Red Cross for distribution to refugees in Europe. Our colleague, with his usual keen recognition of essentials, takes this method of trying to put some of our resources to a practical and humanitarian use. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted to me, I insert at this point a splendid editorial appearing in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N. Y., of June 4, 1940, commending the gentleman from New York, Congressman COLE, for trying to see that some of our surplus commodities be used in helping to save lives:

CHANCE TO SAVE LIVES

Regardless of differences over foreign policy and preparedness and of conflicting sympathies in the present war, all Americans of good will, we believe, will approve the bill introduced in the House by Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Bath, directing that $25,000,000 worth of surplus commodities on hand in the United States be given to the American Red Cross for distribution to refugees in European war zones.

As Mr. COLE reminded the House, the United States "has in warehouses and stockrooms throughout the country millions of bales of cotton, thousands of bushels of wheat and corn, tons of dried fruits—all those things that go to sustain life, and which are so sorely needed by war refugees."

Mr. COLE took cognizance in advance of the argument that we must look out for our own unfortunates first. He conceded that there are millions in this country "who are distressed and living under undesirable and deplorable conditions." But he pointed out that their condition is not comparable to that of the millions suddenly made destitute wanderers on the face of Europe. It might be added that the $25,000,000 worth of surplus commodities on hand in this country is not doing any good lying "in warehouses and stockrooms," to our own "submerged one-third."

Why not turn those surplus commodities loose where they will save countless thousands of lives?

The Bill of Rights My Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ESSAY BY MARILYN BARNETT, OF ASHLAND, OHIO

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an essay written by a young lady who resides in my district.

Six years ago the American Legion of Ohio advocated an Americanism program to be carried on by the school children of the State. Each year the subject selected for the essay contest pertained to Americanism. This year the title was "The Bill of Rights My Protection." Approximately 150,000 essays were written this year as part of the program set up under the efficient leadership of R. B. Gardner, department commander, and W. L. DeWeese, director of junior activities. Out of this number 12 were chosen, and this select few were given a trip to Washington with all expenses paid.

I am happy and proud to put in the RECORD the essay written by one of the winners, Miss Marilyn Barnett, of Ashland, Ohio:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS MY PROTECTION

The founders of our democracy showed amazing foresight when they refused to adopt the Constitution without the understanding that a listing of specified rights would be included. These rights are the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which are known as the Bill of Rights. Although these men and their parents and grandparents had suffered at the hands of unjust governments, their sufferings were not so great as the sufferings of the millions living today in dictator-governed nations. When those wise men formulated the Bill of Rights, little did they know that in years to come those same 10 amendments would guard 130,000,000 people more efficiently than any other law or government could. For the foresight and wisdom of Madison, who did most of the work, and his coworkers, I thank God. The fruits of their labor have saved me from a life of oppression.

I am especially thankful for the first amendment. As long as that amendment plays the part it now plays in the Government of the United States, I need fear no man. For that first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, "the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for the redress of grievances." What more freedom could any fair-minded person want?

While all five sections of the first amendment give me the best sort of privileges, I personally get the most protection from the first section. That section states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The reason religious freedom means so much to me is because I am a Jew. Being a Jew at this particular time in almost every country on the globe is being in a very hazardous position. In the United States, protected by the Bill of Rights, I have nothing to fear. Nothing to fear. How good those words sound. I am allowed to go to a public school. I am permitted to buy clothes, food, and the necessities and luxuries I need and want at any store I choose. I am able to go to the church of my faith and worship God as I choose. At no time am I taunted because of my religion; never am I excluded from things because of my belief.

At this particular time the first amendment seems to play a more important part in my everyday life than do the others. But still I cannot help but realize tne importance of the safeguards guaranteed me by the other nine amendments. Especially the protection against illegal entry and unreasonable searches, and the assurance of a public trial by an impartial jury. With these rights assured, it certainly is the Bill of Rights—my protection.

No Bill of Attainder Under Our System—A Discussion of the Bridges Deportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle. For many years this daily newspaper has been the recognized Republican Party organ in northern California. The author of the editorial, Mr. Chester Rowell, was formerly a member of the United States Shipping Board and is one of the acknowledged leaders of the Republican Party in California. I cite these facts to show that among the thinking people of San Francisco, regardless of party affiliations, there is definite opposition to the enactment of a bill of attainder by this Congress, no matter who the individual may be who is the object of such an attack.

The editorial follows:

Congress is still playing with the idea of deporting Harry Bridges by bill of attainder, regardless of the constitutional prohibition of such a process. It is a curious paradox that those who shout most loudly for the Constitution are often those least familiar with its provisions and least concerned for granting to others the rights it guarantees to themselves. In this case, since the effort to deport Bridges by due process of law failed on a finding of want of proof, it is proposed to substitute undue process of attainder. For surely, these objectors conclude, Bridges is an "undesirable alien," since they do not desire him. And if it is pointed out that there is no general law for the deportation of aliens merely because they are "undesirable," what could be simpler than a special law for the deportation of this particular undesired one?

The attempt is even made to support the proposal by illogic Since Congress has passed special laws to confer citizenship on named individuals, it is argued, why not a special law to expel one who is not yet a citizen and whom these proponents do not want as either a citizen or a resident? They forget that it is one thing to confer a special favor and another to deny to a special individual a general right.

So citizenship, being a privilege, may be specially conferred even in excess of general legal right. But it cannot be denied in that special way. And the general right of an alien who legally entered the country to remain here unless found guilty of deportable offense cannot be taken away by a special legislative act declaring him guilty of that offense without hearing and imposing on him a penalty not thereby applied to others. This is the exact "bill of attainder" which the Constitution forbids. It had been a real evil under despotic governments in England. It has since passed so far out of use and memory that most people had forgotten even the constitutional provision against it. This Bridges resolution is the first time it has been proposed in American history.

In these times, when feeling runs high and when the "fifth column," which has proved so dangerous elsewhere, may have to be dealt with here, it is especially important that we realize the importance of proceedings against only actual evils, and not even against them by denying rights whose protection is important to all of us. There was too much of that, under less provocation, in the last war. The temptation may be greater now, which is the greater reason for being on our guard against it.

Here is an illustration, from the beginnings of Hitlerian Germany:

One of the very last really free speeches made in the free Reichstag of the German Republic was an intentionally offensive one, by a Communist deputy just returned from Russia. It was on the opening day of the autumn session of 1932, just 4 months before Hitler came to complete power, but when he already had a large

party in the Reichstag and his ruffians were defying all law and order on the streets.

The Reichstag being unorganized, it was the rule that the oldest member call it to order and make the opening speech. There were some hundred Communist members, and among them was the oldest deputy, Clara Zetkin, born in 1857 and a particularly bitter and vituperative revolutionist. She insisted on her right, and made a speech demanding the impeachment of President Hindenburg, denouncing the scowling brown shirts before her, and predicting that she would live to "open the first workers' and peasants' council of a Soviet Germany."

Nothing could have been more provocative and "subversive." If any speech was to be suppressed in the last free Parliament of a free Germany, this would have been the first one banned. But the Nazi members, under orders, received it in frowning silence. They were waiting their day, which was soon to come. And when it came they suppressed not merely that provocative extreme of free speech, but all free speech whatever.

The Germany in which Clara Zetkin could make speeches to which nearly everybody objected was the Germany in which Hitler could also make speeches, equally abusive and revolutionary. But it was likewise a Germany in which reasonable men, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, reactionaries, liberals, and radicals could make speeches which, if heeded, might have saved Germany. It was a Germany in which workers could join unions and owners could manage their properties; in which rights were protected and crime was punished by law alone. An aged Communist woman, croaking the last words of bitterness, was the final symbol of that liberty.

Four months later Hitler was in power. Clara Zetkin could not have made that speech. But neither could any member of the Reichstag make any speech, except to join in the unanimous roar of "Ja" to whatever Hitler proposed. No person anywhere, in public or private, could freely express his own views on anything. No one had any rights which Hitler was bound to respect, not even the right to be tried for his crime, to choose or quit his job, to own his property, or to worship God otherwise than as Hitler disposed. Now the world is paying the price.

When Americans propose to deprive persons to whom they object of the rights they themselves claim, they might well recall this incident of Clara Zetkin.

French Pre-war Laws Hindered Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Philip Simms from today's Washington News:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 6, 1940]

FRENCH PRE-WAR LAWS HINDERED INDUSTRY

(By William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign editor)

PARIS, June 5.—With the Germans pounding the Somme front in their drive toward Paris, everyone here now admits that France is paying the price for having attempted too rapid social progress at the expense of national defense while her neighbor, Germany, did the exact reverse.

Today French labor—like British labor—is heart and soul behind the Allied war effort. Leaders who formerly permitted the infiltration of communistic elements now admit their mistake and are doing everything possible to overcome its consequences. But, the tragedy being as it is, France needs planes and guns now, not next fall.

A couple of years ago France's huge program of social legislation brought industry practically to a standstill. The effort was to make over the nation in a day. Wages were raised, work hours shortened, and airplane and other defense industries were nationalized. The program was in large part an excellent one, if it had been worked out over a period sufficient to permit necessary readjustments.

But, due largely to the pressure of left-wing elements in the labor movement, no such time was allowed. Instead, the attempt was to achieve in a few months social gains that might safely have been achieved in as many years.

Sit-downs, slow-downs, and other varieties of strikes became epidemic on a nation-wide scale. Across the Rhine, Hitler was conscripting labor as well as capital and compelling men, women, and children to work day and night on preparation for war. But France, 2 years ago, was turning out 25 to 30 planes a month, and in every other respect French national-defense efforts were suffering disastrously.

Their radicals dropped out of sight quickly after the war began, some of them fleeing to other countries. Today the rank and file of French workers, always tremendously patriotic, are united behind Premier Reynaud, whether they are at their benches or in the front-line trenches.

Americans here say emphatically that France's bitter experience presents a vastly important lesson for the United States.

Expenses of National Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

STATEMENT OF FAYETTE B. DOW BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Fayette B. Dow before the House Ways and Means Committee on the bill (H. R. 9966) to provide for the expenses of national preparedness:

SUMMARY

Owners of automobiles and trucks have contributed liberally and almost continuously to emergency expenditures of the Federal Government since 1917. They have paid and are paying excises upon cars, trucks, parts, accessories, gasoline, and lubricants.

These special taxes produced $1,174,416,070 from 1917 to 1928. Approximately $1,000,000,000 of this sum was collected following the armistice for these levies were continued for several years after other war-emergency taxes were repealed.

Following the war, the States launched an unprecedented highway-building program largely financed through gasoline taxes and registration fees. By 1940, State and Federal revenue from gasoline taxes exceeded $1,000,000,000 per year. Registration fees produced an additional $412,500,000. Special automotive taxes now account for 40 percent of all revenue collected by the average State.

Since 1932 temporary emergency Federal excises on automotive equipment and on gasoline and lubricating oils have produced $2,138,340,518.

These sources have produced the staggering sum of $16,000,000,000 in a little more than two decades.

The tremendous mileage of broad, hard-surfaced highways which has been built with the revenue is an essential contribution by motorists to our national defense.

The proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax is a 50-percent increase. Such obvious luxuries as distilled spirits, beer, and cigarettes, will bear increases ranging from 17 to 33 percent.

The simple average combined State and Federal tax on gasoline now amounts to 5.44 cents per gallon. With the proposed ½-cent increase, the rate approaches 6 cents per gallon, or a tax of 45 percent of the current retail price, an exceedingly high tax on a necessity.

The present tax on lubricating oils ranges from 25 percent to 100 percent of the wholesale price, depending upon the quality of lubricants used. The proposed increase amounts to 12½ percent.

Under the current program motorist taxes must provide approximately $126,000,000, or nearly 20 percent of the total.

STATEMENT RE H. R. 9966

My name is Fayette B. Dow. I am appearing before you today as a representative of the American Petroleum Industries Committee, the National Petroleum Association, the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Western Petroleum Refiners Association, Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association, and the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

At the outset I want to say emphatically that I am not here to oppose additional taxes upon the petroleum industry or its products.

No American citizen can deny that the necessity of preparing an adequate national defense is the paramount task of the hour. Few will quarrel with the bitter fact that the patriotism and ideals of freedom which the citizens of our great Nation possess no longer are sufficient protection against modern mechanical warfare. Obvious to most citizens is the need for huge expenditures upon aircraft, tanks, guns, munitions, and personnel, which recently have

been recommended so that we may meet any brutal challenge to the American way of living.

It is the hope and prayer of this peace-loving Nation that we may never be forced to use these weapons. But we are not a nation of individuals blind to the needs of the hour, and we now clearly see that armed force must be matched with force. We realize that an adequate defense will entail large expenditures, and I believe that we all are willing and ready to make all necessary sacrifices in order to attain our objective.

I also am certain, however, that it is the desire of those who have the responsibility of levying new taxes to distribute the necessary burden as equitably as possible among those who must bear the expense of this program. In the pressing necessity for immediate action, however, it is possible that certain groups may be asked to bear a disproportionate share of this cost, and I therefore ask your earnest consideration of the following facts with regard to taxation of highway transportation and petroleum products.

During the last war emergency, automotive transportation for passenger and freight service had not become the essential it now is and was taxed as business right along with furs, jewels, sporting goods, theater admissions, and similar articles. In 1917, when a 3-percent sales tax was levied on automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles, there were less than 5,000,000 motor vehicles registered in the entire United States.

It has been said, however, that the World War provided the impetus which motorized the Nation within the 10 years following the cessation of hostilities. The yeoman work done by the hastily assembled trucks and motorcars during 1917 and 1918 brought into bold relief the convenience and necessity of automotive transportation. By 1930, the automobile ranked with food, housing, and clothing as the workingman's necessity, and by 1940 more than 30,000,000 vehicles were registered in this country.

In the days following the war, while the automobile was passing out of the luxury classification, the taxes on furs, jewels, and other luxuries were removed. Taxes on automobiles were so productive, however, that the majority of them were retained until 1926, and the last of the "emergency automotive" levies was not removed until 1928. These special taxes borne by motorists produced $1,174,416,070 from 1917 to 1928, and approximately a billion dollars of this sum actually was collected following the Armistice. Motorists, therefore, helped the Nation return to normality during the twenties, and a large portion of their contribution may be said to have aided the Nation in effecting a $10,000,000,000 reduction in its national debt during this period.

Meanwhile, automobile manufacturers produced a consistently better product which was sold at continuously reduced prices. The petroleum industry kept pace by providing consistently improved fuels at retail prices which were slashed from 29.74 cents per gallon, excluding tax, in 1920, to 13.17 cents, excluding tax, by 1940. These accomplishments brought the automobile within the reach of the average citizen and were accompanied by a pressing demand for more and better highways. To provide revenue for these, the States levied taxes on gasoline, and increased registration fees on motor vehicles.

The growth in revenue from automotive sources was little short of phenomenal. In 1919 the car-owning public paid $1,022,514 in gasoline taxes and $64,697,256 in registration fees. By 1940 State and Federal taxes on gasoline were yielding in excess of $1,000,000,000 per year, and registration fees levied by the State were providing an additional $412,494,000.

Most of the States acted wisely and applied these revenues to the construction and maintenance of a magnificent Nation-wide highway system.

Even with the limited number of trucks and relatively inadequate roads of the period, highway transportation made a substantial contribution by moving huge quantities of supplies from the Middle West to the Atlantic seaboard in the last war. Today, due to the cooperation of State highway departments and the United States Public Roads Administration, we have a greater mileage of broad, hard-surfaced highways than any other country in the world. These highways and our 4,500,000 trucks are an essential arm of our national defense, not only for the movement of munitions but especially for the fast movement of the highly mechanized equipment which modern warfare demands. Highway building, even with modern methods, is a slow process, and I am sure we are all thankful to the motoring public for having contributed more than $16,000,000,000 in gasoline taxes, registration fees, lubricating-oil taxes, and in other levies—both State and Federal—to make possible our present highway system.

During the depression, several States developed the habit of misusing their highway funds to finance relief, schools, and many other general functions of government. The result was that the motorist contributed far more than his fair share of the cost of government during those trying times.

By no means were these the only contributions to the Nation's welfare made by motorists during the thirties. During 1932, the Federal Government again called for aid, and again the motorists responded. In that year "emergency" taxes were levied on gasoline, lubricating oils, cars, trucks, and their accessories. Since 1932 these excises have been repeatedly enacted, although they clearly were designated as "temporary" taxes when they were assessed originally. Federal levies upon gasoline and lubricating oil alone produce revenue at the rate of about $230,000,000 annually. Since 1932 they have produced the enormous sum of $2,138,340,518.

Could it be shown that motorists, as a class, are wealthy persons, some justification for the continuation of this heavy burden might be cited. The fact is, as shown by statistics developed by the Department of Commerce, the average motorist in the United States today earns less than $30 per week and obviously possesses no special ability to pay taxes. This is not the motorist of 1917. This is Mr. Average Citizen, who has never owned a new car, and who pays about 2 weeks of his annual income in special automotive taxes alone. This is the man who has a car simply because he needs it in his business, not the sportsman of 1917, who took his family on an automotive adventure once a week. This is the motorist who now contributes 40 percent of all the revenue collected by the average State in special automotive taxes.

Oddly enough, the taxes on luxuries which were imposed along with the automotive excises in 1932 since have been repealed. It evidently is not the present intention to reenact them. But the average motorist, who owns no jewelry or furs, has received no such tax relief and now is being called upon to bear even stiffer levies upon the operation of his vehicle.

I wish again to emphasize that I am not complaining. I am not even objecting. But I am asking that you weigh carefully these facts, in order that you may give thought to the various important considerations involved in levying additional taxes upon car owners, truck operators, farmers who operate tractors, and other users of petroleum products.

Of the $656,000,000 which is the yield anticipated from the new taxes now under consideration, nearly 20 percent will be raised from special levies on motorists. The increased taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil and the increase in the pipe-line tax alone will provide almost 17½ percent of the total sum.

The proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax is a 50-percent increase, which by far is a greater increase than that which is proposed on any other commodity to be taxed by this measure. Such obvious luxuries as distilled spirits, beer, and cigarettes, will bear increases ranging from 17 to 33 percent. While other manufacturers' excise taxes will bear increases of only 10 percent, the taxes on automobiles, trucks, and parts will be increased 16 to 25 percent.

In times of emergency, when new revenue is needed, there is a tendency to think of gasoline in the same terms as tobacco, beer, and distilled spirits; that is, as a nonessential. It is true that foreign countries tax gasoline at higher rates than we do. But they do that with a purpose. They deliberately seek to curtail the size and number of cars in use. We, on the contrary, geared our economy to the internal-combustion engine, both in commercial transportation and agriculture. It is estimated that 25 percent of all motor fuel is used by farmers. The Public Roads Administration estimates that 60 percent of the travel by the average passenger-car owner is in connection with making his livelihood.

The simple average combined State and Federal tax on gasoline now amounts to 5.44 cents per gallon. With the proposed one-half cent increase the rate approaches 6 cents per gallon, or a tax per gallon of 45 percent of the retail price. In some States this combined tax will amount to 8½ cents per gallon, tremendous imposts upon a product which is a necessity.

The present tax on lubricating oils, which is applicable both to automotive and industrial lubricants, ranges from 25 to 100 percent of the wholesale price, deepnding upon the quality of lubricants used. The proposed increase amounts to 12½ percent of the present tax, and here again the intent is to secure an important part of this emergency income from one of the commodities essential wherever the wheels of transportation or industry turn.

The proposed increase in the Federal pipe-line transportation tax also directly will affect the motorists, for increased costs of operation of the petroleum industry must be reflected in increased prices of its products to the consumer.

An individual with an annual income of $4,500 who is married and has one child will pay only $4.60 more in income taxes than he previously was paying, under the proposed income-tax increase. Yet the average motorist who earns about one-third of this sum will be called upon to produce nearly as much additional revenue in special automotive-tax increases.

Gentlemen, I have said that the petroleum industry, and I believe the motorists themselves, have no intention of shirking even a minute portion of their duty to their Nation in this time of need. I believe that it generally is recognized that highway users generously have contributed to the cost of Government during the last two decades, and especially have borne more than their fair share of this cost during the economic emergency from which we hopefully are emerging. They now are contributing 83 percent of all the revenue derived from the special Federal excise taxes.

Under the current program motorists and other highway users must provide approximately $126,000,000 in additional taxes, or nearly 20 percent of the total tax increase which is being sought. Most other classes of taxpayers under this proposal will bear increases of but 10 percent. Motorists and other highway users will be required to pay some $95,000,000 annually more than they would pay if they were accorded the same treatment.

Because motorists and other highway users rely upon the economy and convenience of motor transportation in their everyday life, they are particularly cognizant of the value of this medium in the successful completion of the defense program. For this reason, especially, attention should be directed to the fact that inequitable

increases in their tax burden well may prevent the fullest utilization of these facilities.

In conclusion, may I say that the motoring public has paid the emergency taxes now in force without complaint and in good faith. In the face of a graver emergency they are again willing to bear their share of the added burden. It is sincerely hoped that Government will recognize this attitude by repealing such taxes as soon as the emergency is ended.

The very fact that I am allowed to present these facts is sufficient evidence that our democratic form of government must be preserved. I am sure that the petroleum industry, motorists, and other highway users, along with all other true American citizens, will do all within their power to facilitate the national-defense program and to lend every possible service in the present emergency.

I am sincerely grateful for this opportunity to discuss these matters and I wish to thank you for your patience and cooperation.

APPENDIX A

FEDERAL WORLD WAR AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAXES

1917

(a) Three-percent tax on automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles.

1918

(a) Three-percent tax on trucks.
(b) Five-percent tax on automobiles and motorcycles.
(c) Five-percent tax on tires and tubes.

1924

(a) Tax on tires and tubes reduced to 2½ percent.

1926

(a) Taxes on trucks and on tires and tubes repealed.
(b) Tax on automobiles reduced to 3 percent.

1928

(a) Tax on automobiles and motorcycles repealed.

APPENDIX B

"DEPRESSION" FEDERAL AUTOMOTIVE AND PETROLEUM EXCISE TAXES

1932

(a) One cent per gallon tax on gasoline.
(b) Four cents per gallon tax on lubricating oil.
(c) Two percent tax on manufacturer's sales price of trucks.
(d) Three percent tax on manufacturer's sales price of automobiles and motorcycles.
(e) Two and one-fourth cents per pound tax on tires.
(f) Four cents per pound tax on inner tubes.
(g) Two percent tax on manufacturer's sales price of automobile parts and accessories.
(h) Four percent tax on transportation charge of pipe lines.

1933

Gasoline tax increased to 1½ cents per gallon for period June 16, 1933, to December 31, 1933.

1934

(a) Gasoline tax again 1 cent per gallon.
(b) One-tenth cent per barrel tax on crude petroleum processed.

1935

Tax on processing of crude petroleum reduced to one twenty-fifth cent per barrel.

1938

Crude petroleum processing tax repealed.

(All other taxes still in effect.)

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1940.

To the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives:

The Independent Petroleum Association of America joins other organizations in the petroleum industry in presenting through the American Petroleum Industries committee the position of this industry in regard to the proposed increase in the Federal sales tax on gasoline and lubricating oil and in the pipe-line transportation tax.

The petroleum industry is an integral part of our national life. It is involved necessarily in the welfare of the Government and recognizes that that welfare must be given first consideration. Times of stress, such as the present, place serious responsibilities upon those in governmental office upon whom rests the burden of meeting the unusual demands of an emergency.

We recognize that to raise the large sums required to support a program so comprehensive as that which is now being considered by the Federal Government, every energy and resource must be made available. We further recognize that this is not the time for those who are not bearing the responsibility of the Government to discuss the merits or the details of one proposal as opposed to another. We do conceive it our duty to defer to the judgment of those immediately charged with the task of making available the money required to carry out the national program.

For these reasons, we do not here object to the suggestion that the sales taxes on petroleum products be increased. At another time, when the emergency does not exist, and when opportunity for discussion may be given without the danger of interference with a great national effort, we will raise the various objections which might be properly offered to a permanent program, but which do not seem appropriate in our present situation.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
By RUSSELL B. BROWN, *General Counsel.*

Amendments of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the special, select committee of the House, appointed under House Resolution 258 to investigate the National Labor Relations Board, I have devoted many months to a study of the operation of the National Labor Relations Act, which created the Board, and to the activities of the Board itself.

Our committee did not base its findings upon mere rumors or gossip, nor yet upon the testimony of disappointed litigants before the Board. Our findings are based largely upon the documentary evidence taken from the Board's own files.

Based upon this experience and study, and with no special ax to grind with any faction or group involved, and with no special interest in the subject other than to serve the public as a whole, I believe that I am qualified to know whereof I speak. And, while others have attacked the findings and recommendations of our committee with unmistakable venom, I have, up to this time, refrained from making any reply. In the interest of a clear and logical understanding of the situation and to refute the intemperate and uninformed criticisms launched at our report by those who would like to see the Labor Relations Act continue to be an instrument that could be used by one side or the other of the warring labor factions for the destruction of the other, I think it appropriate that I should discuss with the House the amendments proposed by our committee and the reasons therefor.

I address myself to those Members of the House who, like myself, believe that the general welfare of the country is paramount to the interest of any special group. It is futile to approach with logical argument those who think that the Labor Relations Act is something sacred. I will not seek to answer those who assert that it is proper that the Labor Act should disregard fundamental rights of citizens merely to protect certain special groups or interests; nor will I seek to debate with those who claim that it is the duty of Government to force the workingman to join and pay tribute to unions against his will by a system of regimentation imposed upon him by the present operation of the act. Those questions I leave to be answered by the American public at some future date.

The amendments offered by the select committee have been criticized on the grounds that amendments to the act should be offered by its friends and not undertaken by those who opposed the enactment of the legislation. Every attempt to correct the glaring defects both in the act and its administration have, for the past 5 years, been viciously and venomously attacked by those who are responsible for the enactment of the legislation.

The country has waited in vain for those who were responsible for the legislation to propose amendments to correct the situation. Not one constructive proposal has ever been advanced by that group, and now, after 5 years of known and admitted maladministration on the part of the present Labor Board, the same group, forced by the weight of public opinion, grudgingly comes forward with the shopworn, repudiated and discredited proposal to "pack the court" by the addition of two more members to the already discredited Board. To

some this may appear as a constructive proposal; to the American public it appears as a confession of wrongdoing, coupled with a face-saving device to reward the wrongdoers. No one is deceived, and no one is satisfied.

The question will shortly be presented to the House of whether you will consider the court-packing Norton amendments to the Labor Act or whether you will consider the comprehensive set of amendments offered by the special committee, which this House, by a vote of two to one, created to deal with this troublesome subject. I do not ask any Member of the House to vote for all or any one of the amendments which our committee has proposed. All I ask you to do is to give them fair, open, and deliberate consideration on the floor of this House. If there is any one or more that you believe will destroy the purposes of the Wagner Act, then vote it down. But I believe that our special committee has the right to ask and to expect of this House, after setting up this special committee by a vote of almost two to one, that you will at least consider and vote upon the recommendations which we offer.

Now, let us see what those amendments are and what they are intended to do. The amendments to the first section of the act strike out the general indictment of all industry for its alleged refusal to bargain collectively with employees. That provision has no earthly legislative effect but is a mere recital of purposes and can have no purpose other than to incite a feeling of hostility of employers as a class against the act. We believe this amendment a conciliatory gesture toward employers as a class that would help allay present public criticism. We have also proposed to strike out the declaration that it is a policy of the United States to encourage collective bargaining. That provision has no legislative effect whatsoever and it is obviously not the business of Government to either encourage or discourage collective bargaining. It is only the business of Government to protect the right of employees to self-determination of the question of whether they wish to organize or not.

It has been said, in a statement by the minority of the committee, that this amendment would affect the constitutionality of the act. I challenge the statement, and suggest that the gentlemen who make it, peruse the opinion of the Supreme Court establishing the constitutionality of the act which contains no justification of such a statement. However, these two amendments, as previously stated, have no legislative effect, are unimportant, and can be rejected or accepted by the House without in anywise affecting the substantive value of the act or of the proposed amendments.

A great commotion has been raised about the proposed amendment to section 3, which would prohibit the Board from continuing its practice of ordering the employer to reinstate employees who have been discharged for engaging in sit-down strikes or "willful violence." The objection to this amendment should be made, not to the Congress but to the Supreme Court of the United States. The amendment is taken in almost identical language from the opinion of Chief Justice Hughes in the famous Fansteel case, where it reversed and rebuked the Board for its attempt to compel the employer to take back into employment men who had unlawfully seized the property of the company and engaged in acts of willful violence. All this amendment does is to put the question squarely up to Congress of whether we are going to have law and order or whether we are going to have anarchy under the protective wing of the National Labor Relations Board.

One critic has said that this would cause a man to "lose all right to earn his bread because of a minor scuffle on the picket line." There is nothing in the amendment to justify any such assertion, as it applies solely to acts of willful violence. This amendment deprives no employee of any right, but merely restores to the employer the discretion to decide for himself whether he wishes to retain in his employ persons who are guilty of willful violence. This amendment is necessary, because, notwithstanding the opinion of Justice Hughes in the Fansteel case, the Board subsequently, in another case, sought to reinstate sit-down strikers and had to be again rebuked by the courts.

The next amendment which we propose would make uniform the definition of the term "agricultural labor" by adopting the same definition contained in the Social Security Act. There has been a great demand for such an amendment from Members of Congress representing agricultural districts. I have heard no objection to this amendment, and yet it is significant that the Labor Committee refused to include it in the amendments offered. This amendment, like the others, is submitted for your consideration because we believe that there is an actual and imperative need for it. It is up to the House to determine whether you shall accept or reject it, but certainly, out of all of this agitation, there seems to be no good reason why the agricultural interests of the country should not receive this consideration and be relieved of the uncertainties existing under present law.

We have proposed an amendment which would define the term "collective bargaining." The amendment which we propose, while requiring employers to discuss differences and make every possible effort to compose the same, is not to be construed as "compelling or coercing either party to reach an agreement or to submit counterproposals."

Senator WAGNER, in debating the bill on the floor of the Senate at the time of its passage, said:

> It (the act) does not compel anyone to make a contract of any kind if no terms are arrived at that are satisfactory to him.

In this connection it is interesting to quote from Senator WALSH, another sponsor of the bill, in the Senate debate:

> Let me say that the bill requires no employer to sign any contract, to make any agreement, to reach any understanding with any employee or group of employees.

Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California, Representative WELCH, one of the outstanding advocates of the bill then and now, stated in the debate:

> It does not require an employer to sign any contract, to make any agreement, to reach any understanding with any employee or group of employees.

Why are they unwilling to write their conception into the language of the act?

Notwithstanding the clear language of the act and the positive statements of its sponsors above quoted, the Board repeatedly holds a club over the heads of employers by threatening that, if they do not make counterproposals, they will be held guilty of refusing to bargain in "good faith."

We propose an amendment to section 3 which would abolish the present Board and set up a new bipartisan Board to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The object of this amendment is, frankly and obviously, to do away with the present personnel of the Board to such extent as the President and the Senate may deem desirable in the public interest and thereby bring about changes, not only in the Board, but in the employees of the Board. Apparently, no one seeks to defend the present Board or its personnel. That they have completely destroyed public confidence is a fact so well known as not to be worthy of debate. The proponents of the act themselves admit it by their proposal to pack the Board with two more members in order to change the complexion of its conduct and administration. Our proposal, as contrasted with the Norton proposal, presents squarely and honestly the alternative of meeting the situation openly and frankly and correcting it, or resorting to the patent subterfuge of "packing" the Board.

We also propose an amendment to the same section which would set up an administrator of the act, who would be independent of the Board and conduct the prosecution functions under the act. One of the chief complaints against the administration of this act is that the Board acts both as prosecutor and judge, completely ignores and repudiates our constitutional and judicial system of separation of the judicial and executive departments of the Government.

It is constantly said that the amendments which we propose are drastic. This proposed amendment is drastic. It

has to be drastic to do the job. It does not take away one single right given under the act, nor does it diminish one jot or tittle the force of the act; it merely provides for an orderly administration. It does not even guarantee fair administration of the act. It merely supplies the means by which, in the future, the operation of the act may be administered in a way that will restore to some extent the confidence of the public. If any additional argument is needed for it, it can best be found in the opinion of Judge Major, of the circuit court of appeals, in the Inland Steel case in which he said, in rebuking and reversing the Board in the Inland Steel case:

> It also illustrates, in a minor fashion, what this record, as a whole, convincingly discloses—that is, the danger of imposing upon a single agency the multiple duties of prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner.

Probably the most controversial part of the act is section 9, which gives the Board the power to determine the unit of representation in labor disputes. Under the present act, the Board has unlimited power, irrespective of the wishes of the employees themselves, to decide what is the appropriate unit. By juggling or gerrymandering this unit, one union may be favored and the rival union destroyed. One of the most atrocious examples of this is the Harry Bridges West Coast Longshoremen's case, where the Board, by holding that the whole west coast was an appropriate bargaining unit for longshoremen, completely wiped out and destroyed numerous local units of the American Federation of Labor that had been in existence for years and years, with no right of appeal under the act, and crowned the Communist Bridges king of all the longshoremen on the west coast.

It is beyond question that this is one of the most troublesome matters with which the Labor Board has to deal. It can make or destroy a union, and when it does so, its decision is final, as there is no right of appeal to the courts.

Our committee recommends the adoption of the so-called Garrison amendment, which would take away from the Board the power to make this determination of the unit in disputed cases. The proposal is not the invention of our committee nor is it a proposal coming from any source unfriendly to the act. It is the amendment proposed by Dean Lloyd Garrison, formerly chairman of the old Labor Board, an enthusiastic supporter of the National Labor Relations Act, and of the Board. If this amendment is destructive of the purposes of the act, then our committee disclaims responsibility for that purpose, because there is no more earnest and enthusiastic supporter of the Wagner Act than is Dean Lloyd Garrison.

We have proposed an amendment which would fix a limitation of 6 months upon the right of an employee to make his complaint to the Labor Board. We do not regard this as a vital amendment, but we do think that a reasonable limitation should be imposed so that the work of the Board would not be cluttered with stale claims and the limitation of 6 months was fixed because the Board, itself, has already, by regulation, virtually adopted the same rule. The policy of the Board is now to refuse to entertain any claim over 6 months old unless the claimant can show justifiable reason for not having presented it earlier.

We have also proposed a limitation of 6 months upon the time for which the Board can order back pay. We do regard this as a most desirable amendment. When the Board orders back pay, often after months and years of delay during the proceedings, such back pay continues to accumulate until the order of the Board is finally complied with, notwithstanding the fact that the case may be pending in the courts. Some of the enormous back pay awards have been so unreasonable as to threaten bankruptcy of the employer and to serve as an effective deterrent to prevent him from pursuing his remedy in the courts, at the risk of increasing the amount of back wages to a sum beyond his ability to pay.

We have also suggested an amendment which would require the Board to, as far as practicable, follow the rules of evidence in the Federal courts. There is no provision that would reverse the decisions of the Board for failure to do so, but we do believe that the work of the Board could be facilitated, the size of the records and the length of the hearings reduced and a better administration of the act secured, if the Board and its employees are directed to at least pay some attention to the ordinary rules of evidence.

Of a similar character is the amendment reminding the Board of its duty to decide cases upon the preponderance of the evidence. A similar provision is contained in the Walsh-Healey bill. There is no provision in the act which excuses the Board from this duty. Apparently the Board has construed that provision of the law which says that the courts shall not reverse the Board where its findings are supported by evidence to mean that the Board itself, in its original determination of the case, is not required to follow the preponderance of evidence rule. We have not disturbed the present rule as to court review except to provide that the court may reverse the Board if its findings of fact are clearly erroneous or not supported by substantial evidence.

We also propose an amendment, which no one has objected to, making it mandatory for the Board to issue subpenas to witnesses to either party to the controversy on equal terms. No one would ordinarily believe that such an admonition to a judicial agency would be necessary, but the fact is that, while the employee has had, at all times, the facilities of the Board for subpenaing his witnesses, the same is not true of the employer.

We have also proposed an amendment that where the trial examiner who heard the case submits his findings to the Board and there are no objections thereto, within 20 days by either party, the trial examiner's decision shall become final. This would considerably lighten the work of the Board and we have heard of no criticism of, or objection to, this amendment.

We have proposed an amendment which would give 15 days instead of 5 days after the filing of complaint before the trial could begin. We know of no objection to this amendment. In fact, it is pretty generally the practice of the Board.

We have also proposed an amendment giving the right of appeal to the courts in representation cases. Under the decision of the courts, when the Board makes a ruling as to a unit of representation, there is no right of appeal and the courts have held that, although valuable personal and property rights have been destroyed by such decisions of the Board, that there is no remedy by appeal under the present law and that the remedy lies with Congress and not with the courts.

Of vital importance to the orderly and peaceful process of collective bargaining is the amendment which gives to employers as well as employees the right to require the Labor Board to hold elections to determine which of two rival labor unions has a majority of employees. Formerly, the Labor Board did not even permit an employer, when caught between two warring labor factions, to petition for an election. Apparently for the purpose of allaying public criticism, the Board, about a year ago, issued a regulation permitting employers to petition for an election under such circumstances, but gave no assurances that the petition would be granted. The evidence discloses that, up until very recently, only one such election had been held. This amendment would make it mandatory for the Board to hold such elections upon the application of either employer or employees and thus promptly end such disputes.

Section 8 (1) prohibits the employer from interfering with his employees in the exercise of their right of collective bargaining. The Board has gone to the unbelievable extent of penalizing the employer for even the most innocent conversation with his employees concerning labor disputes. For instance, it has been held an unfair labor practice for an employer to say that "If I had a son, I would advise him not to join a union."

This assumed power on the part of the Board to interfere with the right of free speech has been repeatedly used

to destroy American Federation of Labor unions where the employer has expressed a preference for the A. F. of L. as against the C. I. O. Our committee merely recommends the amendment prepared and proposed by the American Federation of Labor with one exception. We believe that the A. F. of L. amendment might be construed as going too far in permitting interference by employers and therefore modified it to prohibit acts of coercion and intimidation.

We proposed an amendment to section 4 (a) to abolish the Economic Division headed by David J. Saposs. This amendment is in line with the previous action of this House at this session which by a large majority refused to appropriate money for the continuance of the Economic Division. As illustrative of the insubordinate contempt of the Board for the intent of Congress, I am advised that notwithstanding the fact that a number of employees of the Board have been notified of their separation from the service at the beginning of the next fiscal year, the Economic Division is to be retained in defiance of the action of Congress prohibiting the same.

In conclusion let me say that we are confronted by the gravest emergency of our national life. All of our energies are directed to preparation to defend ourselves against modern mechanized warfare. Every resource must be marshalled to produce guns, planes, tanks, ships, and ammunition. Without these things in great abundance, we are helpless and defenseless.

We have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for the purpose of defense, but I say to you that all of the dollars minted since the birth of the Republic will not repel one invader. To be effective, these dollars must be converted into bombs and bullets, ships and planes and tanks.

We may draft the best of the youth of our Nation into the armed service. We may call your brave sons and mine to the colors, but if we do we will merely condemn them to useless slaughter unless we first convert those dollars into modern engines of warfare.

We hear discussions as to the location of our first line of defense. I say to you that today our first line of defense, and our last line of defense, is in the factories and shops and in the great industries of this country. Our safety as a nation depends upon their efficient operation, and that in turn depends upon friendly cooperation and relationship between capital and labor. Neither capital nor labor must be permitted to take advantage of each other or of the Nation.

But, above all, no agency of this Government must be permitted to stir up strife or to strafe or hamstring or persecute the industries of the country upon which our safety now depends.

The evidence adduced before our special committee is irrefutable and overwhelming:

That the Labor Board, as now constituted, is definitely partial to the radical C. I. O., labor movement;

That the Labor Board persistently seeks to punish and persecute the industries of the country, sometimes to the point of bankruptcy;

That the Labor Board destroys legitimate, independent labor unions because they refuse to become affiliated with national unions;

That the Labor Board is honeycombed with employees who do not even believe in our system of private ownership of property, upon which our whole industry is based;

That the Labor Board, itself, with full knowledge of the distorted philosophy of these employees, persists in retaining them in key positions.

There is no more dangerous "fifth column" in this country this minute than some of the employees occupying important positions with the Labor Board and conducting their efforts to destroy capitalism, at the expense of our own taxpayers, under the shadow of the Capitol, and under the protection of the present Labor Board.

I make no specific charges against any member of the Board, except that I cannot fail to be disturbed by the apparent over friendly relationship of Board Member Smith with the notorious Communist Harry Bridges.

I cannot help being disturbed by the overwhelming mass of evidence of Board partiality to the radical C. I. O. group, confessedly infiltrated with communism.

But the Members of the Board themselves know better than you and I do the truth of the situation, and their stubborn refusal to clean house in defiance of Congressional mandate, notably in the case of Saposs, can leave no other belief in the minds of the American people than that they are equally guilty with those they shield, protect, and foster.

The activities of this Labor Board have been condemned in the editorial columns of every metropolitan newspaper worthy of the name.

They have been condemned in the eyes of an overwhelming majority of the American citizens.

They have been condemned by all industry.

They have been condemned by the American Federation of Labor.

They have been condemned by the C. I. O.

If they have any friends left outside of Washington, I do not know who they are.

I appeal to you. I appeal to the coordinate legislative branch to which, God willing, this bill will soon be committed, and I appeal to the democratic administration, responsible for the orderly conduct of our defense preparations, to do something about this situation before it is too late.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, recently there was held in Washington an unemployment conference known as the Interfaith Conference on Unemployment. On June 5, 1940, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] delivered a very able address to this conference. The conference was sponsored by the industrial division of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the social justice commission of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the social justice committee of the Rabbinical Assembly of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Utah be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, my thoughts tonight are deeply philosophical; they may, therefore, be considered very impractical. Maybe they are, but that does not make them untrue. They are spoken as a result of an attempt to understand partially the great world-wide upsetting that is taking place in the world today.

This conference on unemployment was conceived and brought into existence by three gentlemen whose training is in religion. I trust that, therefore, the significant approach to the employment problem will be reflected by what must be the basic thought of these gentlemen; that is, that the true value for our consideration is the worth of man.

The three gentlemen—or shall I call them brethren—have been trained in that school of thought which accepts the concept of revelation and the concept of the entity of the human individual—revelation based upon the theory that knowledge from the eternal world is of worth and should aid knowledge gained in the temporal world; also that the entity of the individual is of worth both here and hereafter.

Businessmen have met, scientists have met, politicians have met, all have offered their solutions to the unemployment problem, but none has given us an all-embracing plan. Many have suggested a

panacea for ills of unemployment. Probably the religious approach in its broad aspects is the one lacking, for religion is merely a bond. It is a tie which connects man with the past and the future. It gives him, therefore, a concept of life broader than his own experience. This in turn gives him a purpose for living and permits his mind to project himself into the unknowns of tomorrow.

We are told by one school of thinkers that the frontiers in American have been lost and that therefore we must create new frontiers that man may have an economic salvation. We are told by other schools that Government's attempts to do so much in solving the unemployment problem have caused business and industry to do little, and that therefore employment is retarded. We are told by another school of thinkers that depressions are overcome by new inventions and that we must await the day of another industrial urge growing out of a mechanical device which will cause new buying habits. We were told by others years ago that the surplus farm products came into existence because women started dieting, that the sugar industry was almost ruined by an advertising slogan which suggested that the ladies "reach for a Lucky instead." If a suger depression followed the reaching for a Lucky, should we not have been saved by the excess expenditure on Luckies?

These economic trends following changing habits are apparent to all, but when we try to make economic deductions from them we become as mixed up in our thinking as did the darky who, on going to a closed bank to draw his savings, was told that his money was gone and he could not get it back. He tried to explain in an economic way what had happened by concluding that the "interest had done eat it all up."

We all know that if 450,000,000 Chinese would wear out one extra cotton garment a year that we could solve our cotton surplus if all of the Chinese could afford to buy another cotton garment, and if we could sell our surplus to the Chinese, and if we could ship that surplus over there, and if in a year we could make and distribute the 450,000,000 garments. Now, you see, the "ifs" seem to be the trouble instead of the surplus and the lack of wealth. What am I trying to say? I am merely trying to point out that men are so intrigued with the idea of the accomplishment of a desired end that they overlook all of the factors entering into its realization.

If society is complex and if the employment problem is complex, how are we ever going to get a simple solution? We can get it by assuming a few simple human values and causing our activities to be directed towards the realization of those values. First, then, let us assume the thesis of our three religious teachers—that the worth of the human individual is the important fact—and build therefore all of our plans toward the end of enlarging the worthwhileness of that human individual. That would mean, I grant, throwing out of the window most of our sloganized, so-called economic social laws. If a happy, well-trained, contented, well-fed, well-employed citizen shall be the Government's objective, let us work to that end instead of making all-important the salvation of those institutions which man has created. In other words, shall the state be the agency of the people or shall the people be the agent of the state? Let us put it in another way, Shall the people be the beneficiaries of government, or shall government be the beneficiary of the people? I am getting involved. Let us just leave that thought by saying that government and people are interdependent. Society must have people and a people must have a society. Let me repeat, though, men should remain at least as important as institutions which men create.

I am probably suggesting something that seems simple, but which in fact in the light of human experience is extremely revolutionary, for in the history and the evolution of culture, the growth and development of that which God made, man, has always seemed of secondary worth to those things which this man himself has made. Since man did not make men, men have been taken for granted. Never have they been thought very important.

Let me put it in another way: A man builds a house, he calls it his, he becomes its master. He loses himself in these three prides which are outgrowths of his creation. "I made a house, I will defend it with my life, it is mine—no one else can touch it, anyone who comes within its shadow shall be subject to my will." Man has thus created what he calls a law of property and a law of political rule growing out of the genius he displayed in building his house. If one of those three things weighs on this man and those who come after him, then he actually becomes not the master of his house and of the economic rule of property which he has created and of the social and political law of control which he has brought into existence, but instead man finds himself the servant of his house, the victim of his economic deduction, and, far from ruling those within his house, he builds so tightly the laws of rule that he himself becomes the least free of all persons in his family. Such is the history of society. The absolute Czar was powerless to abdicate his right to universal rule excepting when he did it in conformity with some unwritten fundamental law that bound him as tightly as he had bound the others. The absolute Son of Heaven whose nod sent men to death could only fan himself in certain ways and could only be looked at by certain people. We today are victims of what those who came before us considered as laws and customs for their protection. This is one of the tyrannies of social life. Let us take an example: Aristotle started observing how men live, he described the household activities of men in carrying on their livelihood. Someone, many centures after Aristotle, works out a law of supply and demand, and men become victims of the deduction. Money is invented, money is man's creature, but the idea takes on so well and so fast that men become victims of that creature. If we should go back to the origins of all of these institutions which bind our thought and cause us to be frightened, we should learn that they are all creatures of man.

There comes a time in the history of states, in the history of churches, that a shifting of the sense of values about what is important and essential and what is unimportant and nonessential causes men to lose much in an attempt to save little. When the great Jewish community had to face a new thought that arose in its own community, a thought which later became Christianity, the Jewish rulers developed a sense of loyalty to the entity which represented their unity and turned their backs upon the rights of individual man to accept a different approach to a fundamental thought. Later on among this same revolutionary Christian group, when absolute loyalty to its will became questioned, war, strife, and death to thousands of men resulted because of a conflict in loyalties. Those two great stands for an assumed attitude place right against right, producing conflicts responsible probably for more individual suffering in our western world than any other two concepts. The great antagonisms caused by these conflicts of loyalties can hardly be understood by an American today who has learned to live and to value his neighbor as a friend, even if that neighbor does worship his God in a way different from his own. Man's changed concepts in regard to persecution, forbearance, toleration, and appreciation have not lessened his faith in God or his love for truth. They have, though, given him different values for placing his loyalties.

Now, as America has shown us how to have many loyalties and still remain at peace with one another, can we not overcome unemployment by many activities without doing violence to a preconceived loyalty to what we call an economic or a social law? We say we do not like regimentation, we say that regimentation destroys individual initiative; but the interesting thing about the persons who live by these slogans is generally that their success is due almost entirely to their having been completely and thoroughly regimented. Once upon a time men tried to build a tower to heaven. They failed of their objective because they destroyed their own unity of action by talking different languages. We in America are talking different languages, and unity of action is thereby destroyed. We are all talking English, to be sure, but one group is proving this slogan, and another group is writing in accordance with that slogan, and a third group is refusing to do good because the effort interferes with some other slogan. Now, if those who want governmental action say that industry cannot solve this problem, and if those who are opposed to governmental action say that Government cannot solve the problem, and if those who favor State action say that the States must solve it because a Federal right is not involved, and those who favor Federal action say that the States must give over what has been their right to the bigger whole, why cannot we accept the thesis of every one of these and put to work industry, Federal Government, the State, and all, in the accomplishment of an end? If my little State of Utah can put at least 5,000 persons to work without Federal aid, let it do so. That benefits 5,000. Are we not all victims of our own slogans?

There seems at the present time to be one way out; there seems to be a unifying factor. We are now today building that unity on national defense. Sad to relate, we are thinking in terms of airplanes, antiaircraft guns, navies, instead of in the terms of men. But since the Greek dramatist discovered that men only unite for war but never for peace, we have found that unity comes easier in responding to the challenge of destruction. Let us accept that technique and overcome, if we can, the dulling effects of unemployment.

But such is the wrong way to move. It is the practical way because man long ago resigned himself to this habit. Why is it that even the success of Hitler's activities, which has brought the fear into the non-Hitler world, causes us to close our eyes to the real elements behind his success? It is because we see only the destruction wrought by the airplane and the submarine and the tank, failing to realize the human factors behind that destruction. Hitler united his nation by social, economic, and religious urges, by spiritualizing a people. He had them all marching for years before he started all his rearmament, his airplane, navy, and tank building. Before he had a military plane he had trained scores of pilots to fly the plane. As a result, these trained human beings were quick to see necessary improvements in the machines. If we build the machine first and train the person to run it later, that person thinks only in terms of mastering his machine. Does it not seem, therefore, better for us to unite our Nation by using every one of those institutions which contribute to the building of our Nation and the making of real American citizens to their utmost first and then turn to machines next? But, someone says, we have neglected the need too long, that it is actually the machine that we must have. Well, then, since we do not have the machine, we can at least train and make simultaneously.

Overcome unemployment, then, if you will, by expanding the activities of those institutions which America counts basic to her life. What are they? First of all, there are the schools. There is not equal opportunity for ordinary grammar-grade education in the United States. Next, expand our hospitals and their availability to

doctors. Build the health of our Nation, and the wealth of our Nation will follow. Build and expand to the utmost the activities of our Army and our Navy, stressing always the peacetime socializing activities of those two great institutions. Expand and make greater our large conservation services, including the recreational services, so that wealth might be conserved and leisure create even more wealth. But this process means governmental activity, say some. But does it? I do not know yet which came first, the chicken or the egg, and I do not know now whether the development of the automobile is due to our great road-building program, or whether our road-building program is due to the development of our automobile industry. I do not care. I do know that good roads will make for more automobiles, and if we must justify them on the score of national defense, they will make for more security for our land. A land of happy, contented, busy, healthful people will add to our national defense. No army was ever hurt because it was made up of strong, healthy, well-trained soldiers who knew why they were fighting and understood well what they were fighting for.

Now, then, I have said enough to show that I am never going to support a single panacea as a cure-all for an intensely complex social evil. But I will support every activity on the part of industry, government, and church which will contribute toward the building of better men physically, socially, mentally; and I can justify my position on the score of building our Nation, developing our common defense, or making democracy secure. There is no one single essential thing in society. There are many essentials, but to me there is nothing in society that is quite so much worth while as the individual who composes it. Develop him and society benefits.

Now, for fear someone may assume that I want to change our whole social and economic system to integrate all activities and thereby create a united whole, let me say that such is not the case. I want to build Americans around the fundamentals of the finest things that America has produced. America as a political and social entity has brought more real happiness and has raised the standards of life for more individuals than has any other political and social institution ever brought into existence. Within the range of this great America of ours, there is room for individual differences, for diverse occupations, both of which can be maintained in a classless society if we but extend to all the possibilities of a well-rounded American life. That can all be done by united endeavor; but where unity brings the loss of the concept of the worth of the individual, it is not for America's good. America can build great monuments like the Pyramids which will live through the ages, but those monuments will stand, as the Pyramids do today, as monuments to the fact that man values what he makes greater than he values himself. If you do not believe that is true, please tell me who were the architects of the great Pyramids? Who were the contractors in the building of the great Pyramids? Who were the stonecutters? And who had charge of the transportation? How many lives were sacrificed in their making? Because the structures were regarded more highly than the men who built them, they stand today as monuments to a dead civilization and a dead nation.

I want to build out of America a society of men—not a monument of rock. If we could have the living spirit of George Washington with us today, we would willingly sacrifice the inspiration of the Washington Monument. But I would probably know that Washington would tell us what he knew so well during his life's struggles—that men would appreciate what he was doing in his day only when they built his greatness in stone. Man values that which he himself has made greater than he values himself because man can see and appreciate what he has made. If man could become more of a partner with God in accomplishing the eternal purposes, maybe he could learn the worth of God's finest creation—man. If we would but realize the wealth-producing possibilities of every man, we would not long leave one idle. The waste that comes from idle hands is society's greatest economic loss. The loss to a nation's morale which comes from 10,000,000 idle, discouraged, and dulled brains staggers any mind which will contemplate it. The vitalization of 10,000,000 souls saved from misspent lives would brighten our Nation as if it were charged with electricity. If you would have life, and that more abundantly, make it more abundant for those 10,000,000 and you make it more abundant for yourself. Let us be done with the waste that comes from 10,000,000 idle men.

Federal Administrative Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM H. KING, OF UTAH

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 18th day of May the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] delivered an address on the National Grange hour, over stations of the National Broadcasting Co., explaining the purposes, the provisions, the objections and the issues involved in the consideration of the Logan-Walter bill. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The so-called Logan-Walter bill is a measure of very great importance. Many believe that it is as important as the so-called Court-reorganization bill, which some have denominated the Court-packing bill. This measure was the result of prolonged study by the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate. Senator Logan, one of the great men of the Senate, a jurist and a patriot, offered the bill in the Senate, and had charge of it until his untimely death. Representative WALTER, a distinguished lawyer, introduced the bill in the House and piloted it through to its passage. Two hundred and eighty-two Members of the House voted in favor of the bill, and only 97 against it.

This measure has received the almost unanimous approval of the leading newspapers of the United States, and has met with general approval in all parts of the country.

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The measure is designed to regulate the regulators and to govern the governors—the men and women employed in the executive branch of the United States Government to administer and enforce the statutes enacted by the Congress. There are hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, all of whom are appointed except the President, who is, of course, elected by the people.

As indicated, this measure is intended to regulate and control administrative officers and employees of the Federal Government in the exercise of their quasi-legislative power and also their quasi-judicial power. The authority of administrative officers to issue rules and regulations is a legislative power—a power conferred by the Constitution on the Congress, but which the Congress cannot, as a practical matter, exercise with respect to the details of many statutes which it is required to consider and finally enact into law to meet the important and serious problems that confront it.

In the exercise of this legislative power, the Federal administrative procedure bill contemplates and requires that Federal administrative officers shall issue regulations; that they shall give notice of their intention to issue particular regulations; and that they shall hold public hearings—if such hearings be requested—before the regulations are issued, in order, as the late Chief Justice Taft stated, that those affected by the statutes, whether Government employees or private individuals, may know how the statutes are to be enforced.

The bill further provides that if any individual is substantially affected by such a regulation when issued, and believes it to be illegal, he may petition the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, within 30 days from the date the regulation is published, to review the same for the purpose of determining whether the regulation is in accordance with the Constitution and the statutes under which it is issued.

Regulations have been reviewed in the courts for a century and a half, if and when such regulations were involved in the merits of some case before such courts. But such a review rarely takes place until several years after the regulation has been issued and after much of the mischief has resulted from an illegal regulation. By the procedure for an immediate review after the regulation has been issued and published, the Logan-Walter bill provides that the legality of the regulation may be determined before the mischief has resulted in the piling up of vast numbers of disputes which must thereafter be settled either by the courts or by means of private bills in the Congress for the relief of those adversely affected by the illegal rule.

PROVISION FOR FULL AND FAIR HEARINGS

As to the exercise of the quasi-judicial authority by any one or more of these hundreds of thousands of Federal administrative officers and employees, the bill requires that the individual shall have a full and fair hearing before his controversy is decided; that he shall have the right to summon witnesses, as he now has in a Federal district court, without obtaining the leave of such administrative officers; that everything which happens at the hearings shall be made a part of the written record of that hearing, so that the reviewing officials, and later the courts, may be informed as to whether there has been a full and fair hearing by officers and employees acting in a truly judicial manner; and also that the deciding administrative officers shall write out their findings of facts and their decisions on the law. As has been well said by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, we all are safer if the deciding officials are required to write out why they think what they think.

In order to insure that the Federal administrative officials, in their exercise of quasi-judicial power in the enforcement or application of statutes, do observe the procedural safeguards stated in the Logan-Walter bill, it is further provided in this bill that all decisions of these administrative officers may be reviewed in one of the various United States circuit courts of appeals located throughout the United States.

This is for the purpose of bringing the judicial review closer to the homes of the individuals who may be affected, so as to relieve them of the time and expense of coming to Washington in many

matters, and to insure that the administrative decision is in accord with both the law and the facts. It is intended by the bill that the scope of judicial review shall be approximately that which has existed with respect to the Interstate Commerce Commission for half a century, and as to trial courts, sitting without a jury, for a century and a half.

MEASURE HAS STRONG BACKING

Before this bill was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives it had behind it the unanimous report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, save for one member who dissented, but admitted in his dissenting report that some of these administrative officers had usurped the power of both the Congress and the courts. A corresponding bill had been unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and is now on the calendar of the Senate. The House bill has been carefully considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee since it passed the House. This committee has directed that a few amendments be offered to the House bill, and that it be called up for passage at this session of Congress.

In addition to this approval by both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, the bill in substantially its present form has been considered by committees of, and upon their reports approved by, the following organizations: The American Bar Association, the National Association of Women Lawyers, and the State Bar Associations of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, my home State bar of Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. It likewise has been studied and approved by the city bar associations of Boston, Chicago (in principle), Cleveland, Dallas, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Phoenix, and St. Louis. The bill has the approval of county bar associations too numerous to mention throughout the United States.

The members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, as well as the members of all of the national, State, and city bar associations which I have just mentioned as approving the bill, are lawyers—but the lawyers do not stand alone in approving the bill.

Various other organizations and members of other businesses and professions have likewise studied the bill through their respective committees, and, based upon reports from such committees, the bill has received the approval and support of the National Grange, an important and honored farm organization whose master has just concluded an able address, the American Federation of Labor, the National Publishers Association, the National Council of Mail Users, Inc., the National Association of Electrical Contractors, the American Manufacturers Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, the Good Government Society, the Citizens Emergency Council, the National Association of Master Plumbers of America, the National Association of Piping, Heating, and Air Conditioning Contractors, the California, Illinois, New York, and Ohio State Chambers of Commerce, and a number of State manufacturers' associations, as well as numerous other local business and professional groups.

Notwithstanding the measure has such universal approval, it has encountered some opposition in the Senate, and the opposition has, thus far, prevented its passage. It is opposed by some employees in a number of the Federal bureaus—employees who have not been elected, but have been appointed. Undoubtedly there are some who do not want to be regulated and controlled by the law in the exercise of their quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions.

"REASONS GIVEN" FOR OPPOSITION

It is pertinent to inquire as to some of the "reasons given" for opposition to the bill. I say the "reasons given" advisedly, for the real opposition, I assume, is due to the same fact which resulted in supporting the court-packing bill; that is, that these individuals believe that the Constitution of the United States is unsuited to present-day conditions, with its tripartite division of limited governmental powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, and the balance of governmental power reserved in that Constitution to the States or to the people in such States. Some may have looked with favor across the seas to totalitarian governments of both ancient and modern times, where all power was and is concentrated in the hands of kings or dictators. These were and are governments where the executive, legislative, and judicial power is controlled by one man or one authority.

The American people are not yet ready to adopt the English system of government, with no written constitution, nor the totalitarian system of Germany, Italy, and Soviet Russia. Special objections to the form of the bill are advanced while professing agreement with its principles. As former judge and former Governor of New York, Nathan L. Miller, has so well said:

"By the process of trial and error administrative law has been hit upon as the most effective weapon to destroy our institutions. Through its channels those who have been well called termites can safely attack the foundations of our American system, for it has been discovered that administrative law screens them from judicial scrutiny. Oh, I know that when one swelled with arrogance oversteps the forms of due process he may not escape the judicial eye, but most of them are clever enough scrupulously to observe all the forms while disregarding the substance of due process, and they can do it in such a way as to thwart judicial review, as we all know."

THE ISSUE BRIEFLY STATED

The issue is up to the American people and that issue is simply this: Shall the Federal administrative agencies of government, in the exercise of quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial power—power which constitutionally belongs to the Congress and to the courts, respectively, but which for convenience has been lodged in these administrative agencies—follow in a modified form the procedure followed by the Congress in the exercise of legislative power and by the courts in the exercise of judicial power? Or shall they be independent of control by either of the constitutional branches of the Federal Government in the exercise of the respective powers?

Notwithstanding the general support for this bill, we have been unable to obtain, thus far, a vote, even though it was passed at a former session, and was returned to the calendar with the understanding that it was to be considered at the next session of Congress.

The American people have regarded as the crowning glory of this Republic the fact that an independent judiciary has been created, and to it the people look to guard their liberties and to prevent encroachment upon individual rights and upon the authority of communities and of sovereign States. The present distinguished Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Hughes, stated on the 16th of this month before the American Law Institute:

"If democratic institutions are to survive, it will not be simply by maintaining majority rule and by swift adaptations to the demands of the moment, but by dominance of a sense of justice which will not long survive if judicial processes do not conserve it. Men pass—the institution survives, with the Nation keenly conscious of the necessity of safeguarding the independence of its courts and maintaining its impartial service."

The Federal administrative procedure bill is aimed at establishing and maintaining the independent and impartial exercise of judicial power, whether by the Federal administrative agencies or by the courts.

Commendation of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE EAST SIDE NEWS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the East Side News, of New York City, on May 25, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the East Side News of May 25, 1940]

ROOSEVELT—WORLD SAVIOR

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

While we commemorate Memorial Day with ever-deepening gratitude that our Nation is still at peace, not the least cause of our thankfulness is that God, who gave us Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson, will in His infinite goodness again give us Roosevelt who shall rescue the Nation from the charlatan, the demagogue, and the spoilsman.

President Roosevelt stands before the world today in clear and undisturbed light as a model ruler of democracy; a man "strong without rage, with overflowing full"; with sagacity and resolution and of a visioned faith which has been our anchorage ground in the stormiest times. He has assumed the heaviest burdens that ever descended on man since Washington knelt in the snow and Lincoln watched the Confederate flag across the Potomac.

The world is aflame. The civilization that we know is now being torn by the mightiest struggle of all history. Sparks from Europe's conflagration are blazing in our own skies; echoes of her strife are sounding at our very doors. The fire still burns; that struggle still continues, but Roosevelt has held the flame at bay.

We do not defend but proclaim the New Deal. We need to retain and reelect to the highest office within the gift of our people a man who has equipped himself so that he may acquit himself in this national emergency. We ask this in the name of democracy which is national in its historic background, in its approach and its willingness to deal with national problems in an American way. Government must enlarge its field of activity and supervision to the end that the weak may be protected against the

strong and rapacious and that the approximation of justice may be attained among all classes of our people.

It was this impatience with the blighting atmosphere of the political and social antiquarian that made Jefferson the foremost liberal of his day; that drove Andrew Jackson on a course for which he was denounced as a bold ruffian; that inspired Abe Lincoln toward a goal for which he was described as the earthly incarnation of buffoonery, and that Woodrow Wilson was cynically pictured as a dreamy professor bent on political and social experimentation. Roosevelt finds himself in a glorious companionship with these grave spirits who spurned futility and negation.

President Roosevelt will yield to the draft. This is definite. The voters of America will speak in tones of thunder and the popular cry will flash like lightning hailing his nomination and election. Though the President has not had a panacea for every trouble that beset our Nation, he possesses a wealth of human understanding for every human problem and for the hopes and the aspiration of the American people.

Roosevelt has restored the faith from which must spring the defenders of the flag and Constitution. He has renewed and reinforced the belief that Government and trusted leaders may hear and heed the cry of the humblest worshipers at the shrine of equality. He has revitalized the answer to the question which has rung through all the ages: "Am I my brother's keeper?" He has sought to establish an order that will give every man, woman, and child the right to stand erect in pride and self-respect to see the stars on high and share the glory of the sun.

National Labor Relations Board Against Sterling Electric Motors, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amended opinion of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit:

[In the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. National Labor Relations Board, petitioner, *v.* Sterling Electric Motors, Inc., respondent. No. 9209. May 7, 1940. Revised May 14, 1940]

Upon rehearing on petition for enforcement of an order of the National Labor Relations Board

Before: Denman, Mathews, and Healy, circuit judges.

Denman, circuit judge:

Our opinion in the first hearing of this review appears in 109 F. (2d) 194. The National Labor Relations Board has petitioned for and we have granted it a rehearing of the entire proceeding. The contentions argued covered a much wider area than those of the briefs. This opinion concerns the issue of the right of Sterling Electric Motors, Inc., Employees Association, a self-organized inside or company union, to be made a party or to have notice and an opportunity to be heard before it can be destroyed by the Board's order of nonrecognition and disestablishment. We discuss and attempt to appraise the congressional intent under the Board's renewed contention that Congress conferred on it this kind of administrative absolutism.

As stated in our first opinion, it was for the "protecting" of the laborers' human right to regulate their creative effort in American society, with their increased power in union organization, that Congress created the Board. Its "protecting" extends as much to the self-organized unions, provided for in section 1 of the act,[1] as to the powerful unions already existing and seeking to increase their membership.

In this case the destruction was attempted by an order forbidding the employer to bargain with its employees' union for higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions—the destroyed functions being the only ones for which the employees created it. The men's association was not made a party or given notice and an opportunity to be heard in the proceeding.

One of the contentions of the Board is that the Union, organized solely to bargain collectively with the employer, is not destroyed because the order does not "run against" the union, but only orders the employer not to have anything to do with it. To us this contention is as absurd as if old Procrustes of the Greek myth had said to an athlete captured on his journey to the Olympics. "You are not to be destroyed for the races for I am proceeding to cut off only the one leg which happens to protrude over the footboard of my bed. If you are barred at the starting line, it is only because you are indirectly affected. My sword 'runs against' your leg—not against you. Besides, I maintain, Lycurgus has given an opinion stating that you are not a 'necessary party' to the amputating process I administer. Can't you see I am only 'protecting' you from running with that leg?" Yet, the Board insists, such was the congressional intent with respect to its and, necessarily, all the many other administrative processes created by Congress.

As well could it be argued by another board, created for "protecting" religious instead of labor organizations (successfully argued perhaps in cases in which the board meets no opposing counsel), that an order does not necessarily affect the religious freedom of the worshippers, though it "runs against" one bishop to "withdraw all recognition from" the parishes of his diocese, or against other bishops to "disestablish" their missionaries, or against the convention to ignore its baptizing clergy, or against the rabbi to disband his congregation, or against the Synod to refuse to consider anything from the Presbyters, or against the Indian priests to withdraw their clans from their ceremonial dances in prayer for rain in the desert. We are not in accord with the view that, where the denial of any such constitutional right appears in any case, it is then "ill-advised" to afford the injured persons the court's judicial power, or to describe with emphasis the wrong done,[2] whether the "protecting" assault be on a mundane or a religious liberty.

The reargument offered nothing new on the Board's contention that Congress intended to relieve the Board of the burden (sic) of serving notice of the charges and time of hearing on the officials of the union in the same plant as that of the employer, who must be served, with the corollary implication of the vexation to the Board, as prosecutor, in meeting the union's evidence, the cross-examination of the Board's witnesses and the argument of the union's counsel, and of the disturbance to the Board, as judge, in facility in reaching a decision on its own charges.

The Board did not, because it cannot, deny that the employer's interest at the time of the trial often may be quite different from, and opposed to, that of the absent union. The employer himself then may want to destroy the union, either because he cannot control it, or because a more powerful rival threatens a strike and a picket line. He then may "ride to a fall" at the hearing, preferring to submit to an order to desist from something already prohibited by the statute, to the pressure of a disliked union he does not control, or to a costly shut-down which may throw him into bankruptcy. The likelihood of such motivation of the employer, whose trial the Board claims determines the life of the union, is obvious not only to those of us who have had intimate contact with industrial disputes of the recent decades, but to anyone who gives the consideration required here of employer psychology. We cannot believe that Congress ignored it, or rather, would have ignored it if, when the Labor Board bill was under discussion, some Congressman then had had the temerity to propose that the Board should destroy a union without notice and an opportunity to be heard.

Nor has the Board made any answer to the obvious fact that it is a greater evil wrongfully to destroy the union itself than it is to destroy a mere contract made by the union with the employer, leaving the union still existing for future bargaining. If it be true as held in *Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (305 U. S. 197, 233), that due process requires notice and hearing when a contract between the union and employer is sought to be destroyed, a fortiori, is it true where the life of the union is at stake?

The case loses none of its importance because, recently, the Board, for the time being at least, divested itself of the power it claims Congress gave it to deny to a union its civil liberty of notice and an opportunity to be heard. This was done by the Board's promulgation of a rule granting that right. The right now exists, the Board claims, solely by virtue of its grant. The Board makes strong and now repeated insistence, first, that Congress can create in the administrative process such absolutism of control over human relations and, second, that it intended to create it in the Labor Board. It is apparent that the Board may annul its rule, attempt to abrogate the right and reassume the absolute power it claims. Significant is the absence at the hearing of any request by the Board for a return of this proceeding for service on the employees' association, to give it an opportunity to be heard on the charge of employer dominance.

Preliminarily it may be said that this court recognizes that no case subject to our review could show more clearly the need for a wise and deliberative exercise of the national administrative process which Congress has created for the control of labor relations in industrial plants throughout the United States. This proceeding was initiated by a Nation-wide union of the American Federation of Labor. It was seeking to bring into its organization the seventy-odd employees of a small manufacturing plant in Los Angeles, Calif. A rival union, organized by the men within the plant, had a membership of 75 percent of the employees. The great brotherhood's national organizers filed a complaint which led

[1] July 5, 1935, ch. 372, 49 Stats. 449; 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 151. See infra for discussion of the Supreme Court's holding that this "protecting" is what the act is created to provide.

[2] Vide the unanimous concurrence in Justice Black's opinion in *Chambers* v. *Florida*, — U. S. — (84 L. Ed. 419, 424, et seq.).

to the Board proceeding in which the destroying order removed its rival. None of the national organizers was an employee of the plant. One of them had his headquarters in Chicago. The central control of the national union was in Washington, with a power and prestige in the American industrial world which, in large part, arises from its millions of associated employee members in unions in every State. It was such cases as this which must have quickened the congressional intent to enact section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act.

In one of the earliest decisions after *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (304 U. S. 1), this court in *Edwards* v. *United States* (91 F. (2d) 767, 780), construed that decision as extending the congressional power even to the planting in California of orange trees whose product is "to be transported" in interstate commerce. It was on this construction of the act that we upheld the Secretary of Agriculture regulating the flow of the product of orange trees into interstate commerce. True, that statement of the law was by two of the three judges sitting, but it now stands for this circuit as a declaration of the broad area of congressional administrative power under the commerce clause. In that and a succession of cases this court has recognized the congressional intent in a widely expanding creation of administrative agencies. Nor has any court gone further in recognizing the congressional intent to free the Labor Board's administrative process from the technicalities of court procedure (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Biles-Coleman Lumber Co.* (98 F. (2d) 16, 17).

The many cases now decided show that, under penalizing restraints or offer of reward, the fruit grower now must consider a Washington bureau's decision before he may safely add orange or walnut trees to the few acres of his orchard, and a small farmer must do the same before he determines his plowing for next season's crop. The shutdown of the single lumber plant supporting a mill town, by the heavy penalties we impose for infractions of the Labor Relations Act, well may mean the disruption of the family life of the employees, whose children must shift to the schools of a distant plant's neighborhood, the foreclosures of homes with the loss of part payments and, worse than this, the mental agony of parents and children that the supporting father may be marked with the stigma of the jobless and indigent.

These disturbing and often tragic results may be deemed to have been considered by Congress as necessary for the ultimate good of the creative life of Americans. However, because that good is to be obtained by powerful bureaus radiating out, through a major and minor officialdom from a distant Washington, the danger to our democracy is always present of the denial of those civil liberties upon which its existence depends. If the Anglo-American civil right to be made a party and to have notice and hearing must be observed in the orderly procedure of a court of law before a decision, as here, can immediately and directly destroy a citizen's property or his liberty to contract to form a labor association, a fortiori must it be recognized in the looser proceedings we have recognized before subordinate and superior bureau officers, whose administrative decisions are finally made far from the homes of the regulated persons.

It has been said that the Board is accuser, prosecutor, judge, and executioner. This is obvious as to the first three functions. In our democracy their exercise requires the greatest of wisdom and detachment when, as here, the accuser and prosecutor sits as judge. The orders it made in this case are not final against the employer, who is a party in the Board proceeding and has the right to appear here and defend against a petition for our decree of enforcement. With regard to the destruction of the absent union the situation is entirely different.

Here, so far as concerns that destruction, the Board, at the instigation of a rival, accuses the union of employer dominance, the Board's attorneys prosecute the accusation, the Board hears and determines the truth of the charge, and the Board orders the execution of the union by its disestablishment. The Board's orders against the employer, a party, may be regarded as preliminary rules to be made absolute by our decree after a hearing of the employer's defense. So far as concerns any defense which could have been made by the absent executed union, denied its civil liberty of due process, without opportunity to produce witnesses, cross-examine, or to be heard in argument, our decree, the Board claims, must make the preliminary rule absolute.

This is the kind of administrative absolutism denounced in democratic assemblies in America as characteristic of the totalitarianism of the Central European Powers. In the consideration of congressional intent, the polemics of deeply moved public men, whose apprehensions are now realized in the conquest of two of the Scandinavian democracies, are not to be ignored. We do not believe that Congress in the National Labor Relations Act intended to make a long start on the road where our civil liberties are to be regarded as the "pale phantoms of objective law" which no longer control our deliberations, as the German chief justice of the first session of the newly constituted court in conquered Poland is reported to have told his colleagues.

It is our opinion that when the Labor Board bill was under consideration, if any Congressman had stated that such absolute power was intended to be conferred on the Board, it would have been denied promptly by the bill's advocates. If its statement had been persistently pressed as expressing the proper congressional intent, we would have expected that its author would have been shouted into silence.

In making these comments we are not oblivious of the heavy burden thrown on the Labor Board in creating a Nation-wide organization in a period of devastating labor disturbance, nor have we failed to take account of the vast number of labor disputes it successfully has solved, both by conference and formal procedure. That a Federal board so burdened should grasp for power as it does in this case is to be expected. To curtail this inevitable overreaching is one of the first necessities of a democratic government and is one of the most important duties of our courts.

The Board cites the same cases of the Supreme Court and circuit courts of appeals on which it relied on the first hearing. In none was there counsel presenting the violation of the civil liberties of the employees and their union. Particularly was there none in *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Pennsylvania Greyhound* (303 U. S. 261), where the Board, free of anyone affected to present the question of civil liberty there involved, was able to destroy the absent union.

The Board correctly claims that its advocacy in other cases has succeeded in destroying other absent unions. It also claims it has established the denial of such civil liberty as a part of our administrative law.

In our first opinion we decided that these cases have been overruled by or are not in accord with *Morgan* v. *United States* (304 U. S. 1, 22, 21), in which administrative proceedings are commanded to observe "the cherished judicial tradition embodying the basic concepts of fair play" and in them men are to have their day in court and to be given the "essentials of a full and fair hearing, with the right * * * to have a reasonable opportunity to know the claims advanced against them * * *." Cf. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1, 47). Our decision in this regard is confirmed by a recent opinion of Mr. Justice McReynolds, who concurred in the result. In that case, in reviewing the area and content of the expanding administrative law, the Court, through Justice Frankfurter stated:

"* * * To be sure, the laws under which these agencies operate prescribe the fundamentals of fair play. They require that interested parties be afforded an opportunity for hearing and that judgment must express a reasoned conclusion * * *."

Federal Communications Commission v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.* (84 L. ed. 361, 366).

The Board cites as determining the congressional intent to create the absolute power claimed here the case of *National Labor Relations Board* v. *National Licorice Co.* (— U. S. —, 84 L. Ed. 533). The report of that case shows no counsel representing the employees or the union. As we read the opinion, the petition for certiorari raised no question of the disestablishment of the union. The case involves the individual contracts of employees with the employer, which on their face showed agreements in violation of the act. The decision that the employer should not perform such obvious violations involves no denial of civil liberty or of the doctrine of fair play established (or rather recognized as fundamental law) in the Morgan and Pottsville cases. The National Licorice case does not mention either of these two decisions.

The National Licorice opinion (85 L. Ed. at 541) holds, in the language of section 1 of the act, the function of the Board to be that of "protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment." Our attention has not been directed to any statute in which Congress has declared its intent to afford such "protecting" which consciously has been held to afford it by condemning the protected party in absentia and ordering its execution. Hence, we cannot believe that the Supreme Court in the Licorice opinion holds that Congress, while intending such "protecting," made it mere mockery by conferring on the Board the power to destroy by disestablishment a union, so self-organized, or to frustrate it in the performance of the very functions which the act requires the Board to protect, without making it a party or giving it an opportunity to be heard.

Before we deem ourselves required to recognize that Congress intended such a denial of civil liberty, the Congress or the Supreme Court, we trust in a case in which the union, absent at the Board hearing, is there represented by counsel, will have to declare it in language so plain that no other possible inference may be drawn from it. We adhere to our detailed reasoning and holding expressed in our first opinion (pp. 196 to 200, 109 F. (2d)).

On the suggestion of the Board that further evidence might be taken on the issue of alleged fraud of the respondent in statements in its notice to its employees, considered on pages 204 to 208 of our original opinion, the respondent applied for an order, which we have granted, for a reference on that issue. The Board has advised us that many of the employee-witnesses are widely scattered since the hearing in October 1937, and that it will take a substantial time to prepare to meet the respondent's proffered testimony outlined in its application. The evidence offered in all likelihood will have to be passed upon by the trial examiner and later in Washington by the Board itself, and several weeks more may transpire before the issue is decided and returned to this court. That the Board does not regard the case as likely to be "moot" is apparent from its statement at one of the several sessions, in response to an inquiry as to the time to be consumed in the referred proceeding, that "the respondent will want to except to the decision."

Since our decision of this issue of disestablishment and frustration disposes of the Board's orders as affecting the association, and since the Board insists on asserting its power to destroy the union without granting it or its members the civil liberty here discussed and has not suggested even now that it will reopen the case as a whole and serve notice on the association, as its present rule requires, we decide it now. We leave to our later consideration the orders solely affecting the employer. Further to delay with regard to this small, self-organized union might amount to an unfair labor practice on the part of this court, for in that period the pressure of the Board's order and of its powerful rival well may persuade the men to give up their self-organization as hopeless, and the protection of section 1 of the act a vain delusion.

The Board's petition for enforcement of its order that the respondent employer shall not bargain collectively with the association and that respondent shall disestablish that union is denied. Decision on the petition for enforcement of other orders of the Board is reserved.

Healy, circuit judge, dissenting.

On the reargument in this case respondent Sterling Motors applied to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, in conformity with section 10 (e) of the act. Leave was granted and the matter is again before the Board for the taking of further testimony. The point of fact to be inquired into is the crucial one on which the Board largely predicated its finding of an unfair labor practice and its order disestablishing the employee union as a bargaining agency.

The statute, section 10 (e), provides that the Board may "modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, * * * and shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order."

In this posture of the case, with the question of law dealt with in the majority opinion threatening to become moot, I regard its decision at this, and for the second, time as not only unnecessary but as ill advised. That would be true, I think, even though the question were still open to rational debate. But debate, in inferior Federal courts at least, has been foreclosed by *National Labor Relations Board* v. *National Licorice Co.*, decided March 4, of this year.

There the Supreme Court unanimously rejected the construction given the act by this court in its original opinion (109 F. (2d) 194). In the present opinion the majority merely reiterate what they said before. While studiously aimed at the Board, the real target of the present attack would seem to be the labor relations law itself or the Supreme Court's interpretation of it.

(Endorsed:) Opinion and Dissenting Opinion. Filed May 7, 1940. Paul P. O'Brien, clerk.

Federal Administrative Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE KANSAS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Bar Association on May 27, 1939, endorsing House bill 4236 and Senate bill 915, the so-called Walter-Logan bill, to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE KANSAS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MAY 27, 1939

Be it resolved, That the State Bar Association of Kansas hereby endorses H. R. 4236 and S. 915, companion bills now pending in Congress, known as the American Bar Association administrative law bill, and the Senators and Congressmen thereby are requested to support said bills; be it further

Resolved, That the essential principles which are involved in H. R. 4236 and S. 915 should be applied, so far as possible, to administrative boards and commissions created and operating under the laws of the State of Kansas. These principles so endorsed are as follows:

1. The general rules and regulations of procedure applicable to all hearings should be adopted, promulgated, and published by each board and commission.

2. Any interested party should have the right to question any rule or regulation so promulgated upon the ground that it violates the Federal or State Constitutions or is arbitrary and unreasonable.

3. Any party interested in a controversy before such board or commission should have the right to a public hearing with privilege of counsel, the right to produce testimony and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

4. The board or commission should be required to make written findings of fact upon which any order is based.

5. Any party to a controversy aggrieved by any order of the board or commission should have the right to appeal to the courts to determine whether the order complained of is supported by the findings of fact, whether or not the parties have been accorded a fair and open hearing, and whether or not the findings of fact are supported by proper and substantial evidence.

National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in regard to the Norton and Smith amendments and include therein expressions in regard to the labor situation in the industrial areas in Michigan, as well as communications I have received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and my replies thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to any changes in the National Labor Relations Act at this time because I am of the opinion that the act has not been in force for a sufficient length of time to enable those who have charge of its administration to determine its benefits in entirety, as well as any shortcomings or changes that experience would enable them to properly recommend to the Congress.

I realize that many individuals, as well as Members of Congress, are of the opinion that too long a time elapses from the time a complaint is made to the Board before it is finally acted upon. In fact, I have received a communication from Mr. Clinton E. Van Pelten, Route 2, Reese, Mich., upon this very subject. I am of the opinion that the contents of this communication are of sufficient importance to call to the attention of the entire Congress, and I am therefore inserting it in my remarks at this point.

REESE, MICH., *April 22, 1940.*

MR. JOHN LESINSKI,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the Norton amendment, which has been sponsored by the A. F. L. to the National Labor Relations Act, it is, if truly quoted, to divide the union into several small groups so as to reduce their strength. If this is done, then there might as well be no union. To reduce their bargaining power would be a step backward instead of forward.

Let us take for example the A. F. of L. craft union; it has small groups which must maintain a complete set of officers for each group. That is where the cost of $5 to $7 a month dues comes in, but that is a small matter compared to what a small group of craftsmen must go through. For instance, if the dye makers had a just grievance and went on strike, and the Buick Co. said, "Grievance or no grievance, if you men do not come back to work, we will get dyes made in other States or in other countries, which has been done, and as soon as these dyes come, we will start the production without you."

Perhaps you do not understand what procedure we must go through under the present law and contract in order to call a strike. The grievance must be taken by the man or men to their foreman; then if they cannot come to some settlement, the man or men tell their foreman that they want to see their committeeman, and under the contract signed by General Motors, the foreman must go to the department head under which the committeeman works, and tell him that the committeeman is wanted in his department. The committeeman talks with the men and then goes to the foreman, and if they cannot settle it, he must ask the man or men if he and the foreman should go to the superintendent. If they say "Yes," the foreman and the committeeman must go to the superintendent, and if it cannot be settled there, it must be turned in to the management on Monday morning to be taken up the following Wednesday, and if it is not settled in

this office, it must be appealed to the Flint Chevrolet central office. The Flint central office looks over the case and notifies the management on what Wednesday they will come to the plant to hear and discuss the case. Then if it is not settled it can be appealed to the Detroit office and notice will be sent to the management on what date the men can come from the General Motors office in Detroit to the plant to meet with the management and the committee to discuss the case. If it is not settled then, it can be appealed to the heads of the Detroit office and notice will be given when the heads of the Detroit office can meet with an international representative. If it is still not settled, if it goes further, it must be voted on by the executive board and referred back to the local union for action. In order to vote a strike vote of a local union, it must be a 75-percent vote of the paid-up membership, and then if voted to strike, a 5-day notice must be given.

To me, this seems a great drama of labor which is being played in the "richest country in the world." After all, when Mr. Lewis wanted Mr. Green to organize the semiskilled workers in America, Mr. Green's answer was "No," but not so with Mr. Lewis. When Mr. Green realized what a mistake he had made by not heeding Mr. Lewis' warning, he is now trying to disrupt organized semiskilled labor at their expense.

On April 7, 1940, in the T. M. A. in Flint, we did not have all different kinds of unions called to Flint to pack the T. M. A. with 18,000 men and 7,000 more who could not get into the building. The C. I. O. called the labor from the factory.

On April 14, 1940, in the T. M. A. in Flint, Mr. Green, of the A. F. of L. held a meeting. In his paper notice he called for different craft unions and auto labor, and I was at both meetings, and I believe I can honestly say that Mr. Green did not have a total of more than 5,000 men in the T. M. A. Sunday, April 14, 1940, and when Homer Martin arose to speak hundreds of men got up and left the building.

The Reverend Father Neil O'Connor, of Saginaw, spoke at the rally in Flint on April 7, 1940. He said, "Make no mistake, the Catholic Church takes no sides on this issue, but leaves it up to labor which side they shall choose, of their own free will, of the unions they want to represent them, as guaranteed them under the Constitution of the United States."

It is merely a matter of choice, and the choice was taken on April 17, 1940. The C. I. O. won by a wide sweeping victory in the General Motor's empire by a 3 to 1 majority of 55 plants out of 60.

Tell me why Congress should meddle with anything which is all over and done with by the vote of April 17, 1940, which was done under the National Labor Relations Board. It was the choice of labor by a secret ballot. Could anything be made plainer to Congress what labor wants? Is there anything un-American about this kind of a choice? On page 1 I explained the steps by which a grievance must be handled. Is there anything un-American about the procedure of handling a grievance? If so, what is it?

Congress can take a very unkindly act toward labor by passing the Norton amendments.

When we Americans go to vote for Representatives in Congress we cast our ballot in secret just as it was done in this National Labor election of April 17. You are chosen by a majority of the people. Nobody can come along and say "Let's change the law and throw them out." That is just what the Norton amendments mean to do, tear down what labor has built, destroy what free-minded and free-thinking people choose to represent them as by the secret ballot of April 17, which was won by a majority of 3 to 1. Is there anything un-American about asking Congress to recognize a 3 to 1 majority?

Respectfully yours,

CLINTON E. VAN PELTEN.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the majority of manufacturers of the United States are not in favor of the National Labor Relations Act as it is in force today. That very fact alone would indicate to any clear-thinking person that the provisions of the law as now in force are of great benefit to the laboring class of people of the United States. In fact the National Labor Relations Act has been termed, since its very inception, as "labor's bill of rights."

One of the largest manufacturers in the United States today, in fact, individually he is the largest not only in the United States, but the entire world, is not in accord with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and never has been, and it is well known that he has only complied with what sections of it he has been compelled to by court order. He has fought the provisions of the act from its inception and today stands out among the manufacturing people of this country, as well as the laboring people, as the one man who has built around himself an empire, and by his acts refuses to comply with law enacted by constituted representatives of the American people.

I may say that I have great admiration for the achievements of Mr. Henry Ford as an individual. He started out on a shoestring and today the great industrial empire which he heads is without parallel in the world's history. But because I can admire Henry Ford, who incidentally is a resident of my congressional district, as an individual, does not mean that I have to condone his acts. I am an American citizen, born in this country, raised under the protection of our flag, and I yield to no man for my patriotic devotion to my country. However, I am very dubious and skeptical about allowing Mr. Ford to build a thousand airplanes a day for us. First, I do not know why the Ford Motor Co. should get all this work. In and around the Detroit area, in which I was raised and still reside, there are many manufacturing plants employing the finest mechanics in the world. These plants, both large and small, are, in my humble opinion, entitled to their share of this work, and why one manufacturer should hog the production of 1,000 airplanes a day is beyond rhyme and reason. I do not think that the United States Government should award contracts to any one individual when this work could be divided not only throughout the Detroit area but throughout the industrial areas of the entire United States.

As a matter of fact, I have another reason why I would not like to see Henry Ford awarded contracts to build a thousand airplanes a day for our Government. Mr. Ford's gigantic industrial empire has its main plant and activities at Dearborn, which is but the nucleus around which his empire functions, not only in this country, with its plants and assembly plants throughout the United States, but also in our neighboring country, Canada, and also most of the important foreign countries, some of which today are countries without names because of the acts of individuals which are so un-American and so foreign to American principles that they are condemned by the high and the low alike in this country. Naturally, when Mr. Ford extended his gigantic empire beyond the realms of the Detroit area and into foreign countries, it was necessary for him to make certain concessions or he would not have been able to do business in these foreign countries. For example, it is well known in the Detroit area that Mr. Stalin sent to the Ford Motor Co. the engineering brains of his country and these Communists were permitted to study the mass-production methods of the Ford Motor Co., in order that they might carry back these truly American innovations to further the Five Year Plan in communistic Russia.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I ask you Do you think it is right for any one man to build for this country a thousand airplanes a day to be used by armed forces, into which we are going to place the very best American stock available to operate them, planes built by a manufacturing plant in which are employed men from countries whose un-American actions and whose forms of government are contrary to American principles? I say, gentlemen of the House, we would be entrusting our military and naval secrets to the plant and we would be further endangering the lives of the American who would have to fly these planes, because these men who are here as representatives of foreign governments are going to leave no stone unturned to do those little acts known as sabotage, which result in very large losses. As a matter of fact, these Communists will stop at nothing. I can personally tell the Members of this House that I know that there was a small strike in Dearborn several years ago when Communists stoned one of the buildings of the Ford Motor Co., and in talking with officials of the city of Dearborn, in the presence of an official of the Ford Motor Co., I was informed that these Communists were stoning the building in which were housed their own people—in other words, the building that the Communists singled out to stone was shielding the Communist workers of Soviet Russia who were here in America studying the mass-production methods of the Ford Motor Co.

I do not believe it would be proper for me to say all that I have about the communistic government without paying some of my respects to Herr Hitler. Mr. Stalin has not been alone in endeavoring to wrest the secrets of mass-production methods from America. Mr. Hitler has engineers from his country employed in the Ford Motor Co. today. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States recently vetoed a bill to naturalize one of Mr. Hitler's citizens for illegal entry,

who at the present time is employed in the engineering department of the Ford Motor Co. I might also call to the attention of the House, and I believe appropriately so, that Mr. Ford has been singularly honored by Mr. Hitler and is privileged to wear one of the highest decorations issued by Mr. Hitler's government. Mr. Hitler not only tendered Mr. Ford this decoration, but Mr. Ford accepted it.

Now in regard to the Norton and Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, I am opposed to all of them, as I explained to the House in the forepart of my remarks. I believe that I understand the problems of the laboring man. I have been in business in my own rights since I was 18 years of age, and I know the problem of the employer as well as that of the employee. Since my election to the United States Congress in 1932, I have served continuously on the Committee on Labor. I had the honor and distinction of being the only Member of the Michigan delegation for 7 years who was a member of the Committee on Labor, and I am today the only Democrat from my State on that committee. I have attended the committee meetings regularly and listened to the testimony of those who favor and those who oppose legislation for the benefit of the laboring man.

My stand on questions of labor is well known. I have always supported and advocated legislation which would benefit the laboring classes as a whole. I have not carried the banner of one labor organization against the other, and I am not interested in the factional fight now going on between our two great labor organizations. Some of the amendments proposed, no doubt, would benefit one organization and perhaps would in some measure retard the activities of another organization. That does not interest me a bit. I am for the laboring man first, last, and always, and for legislation that will benefit the laboring men of this country as a whole. I believe in the principles of union and collective bargaining.

The reports of the National Labor Relations Board show that 81 percent of their decisions were rendered in favor of so-called craft unions, although 75 percent of the American Federation of Labor unions are termed industrial and all the rest are 100 percent industrial. I have been approached by manufacturers in the Detroit area and I have listened to testimony before the Committee on Labor, and I am satisfied that so far as the manufacturers of this country are concerned, they would rather deal with industrial unions because they would be dealing with one representative who has the power to speak for his entire organization, while on the other hand, in dealing with the craft unions, the manufacturer would have to take his problems up with the head of each craft.

Because I have not been altogether in agreement with the principles and the proposals of the American Federation of Labor, its president, Mr. William Green, has seen fit to go into my State and denounce me. I have nothing personal against Mr. Green, but I do not propose to accept his actions simply because I do not choose to follow his dictates, and I do not believe it is fair play for him to go into my State and use the tactics he has. He has informed me that he is going to fight me tooth and nail in my next campaign. In fact, to use his very words, in an address he delivered in Flint, Mich., on Sunday, April 14, 1940, before the General Motors automobile workers, as carried in the Detroit newspapers:

* * * declare war on Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat of the Sixteenth District, for opposing A. F. of L. sponsored amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

This does not frighten me a bit, and I have not lain awake nights worrying about the ultimate results of Mr. Green's war. The workingmen of my congressional district know me as their friend, and when we fight this "war" on the battlefield in the Sixteenth Congressional District in November, I am sure that the fair-minded people and my friends will believe what I have to say because I have a record to back it up.

I was indeed surprised to read the article in the Detroit papers, and on April 19, 1940, I addressed a communication to Mr. Green, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1940.

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GREEN: I have just had brought to my attention an article appearing in one of the Detroit newspapers regarding your address in Flint on Sunday, April 14, before the General Motors auto workers.

I have carefully perused the article, especially point (5) which reads as follows: "Declared war on Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat of the Sixteenth District, for opposing A. F. L. sponsored amendments to the National Labor Relations Act." I need not tell you that I was greatly surprised at this statement, and your emphasizing the word "Democrat," but I note that you did not say anything against the Republicans who have as you yourself know voted consistently against all labor legislation. These same Republicans are attempting to emasculate the Wagner Act; they vote against the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Act and for the enforcement of the Wagner Act, and are now attempting to paralyze these boards.

Yet, you selected me as a target, a member of the Labor Committee who has always favored labor legislation. In my four terms of Congress, I hold as good a record as the man who sponsored this legislation, the late William Connery who was chairman of the Labor Committee. Now, if my record is as good as his was, I can only see one point to the whole situation, and that is, that your personal attitude is a turn-about-face on the present administration and the Democratic Congress.

I gather not only from your speech in Michigan, but also from a part of an address which I heard over the radio several weeks ago which I believe was made before the chamber of commerce or a manufacturers association, that you were willing to stake the benefits of labor legislation for your own personal views and gain. From the lack of applause, it did not appear to me that the delegation before whom you spoke was much in sympathy with your views.

Further proof of the above statement is my letter to you of March 15, 1940, which was in answer to yours of the 14th regarding the Barden amendments. Nowhere in the letter had I stated that I would vote against the A. F. L. amendments. I personally may not agree with some of the amendments, but what strikes me is that you as a labor leader would turn to Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina to sponsor your amendments. On March 3, 1939, Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina did introduce H. R. 4749, a bill which would wholly emasculate the Wage and Hour Act. It provides exemptions on plants and industries in the South which would be to the detriment of your own workers in the North. When you use such poor judgment in selecting an antilabor man to sponsor your amendments, it behooves me to be very careful as to how I vote for those amendments.

You also announced as point (7) "That you are starting a campaign to organize the Ford Motor Co. workers." Well, I wish you good luck and success, although you personally know that you won't do it, as you have tried to organize that company for several years. I personally happen to know something about the service and the employment departments of the Ford Motor Co. This company has always been antilabor, and the employment is controlled completely by a certain personnel who would not give up the free hand they have today in employing labor. They will use the same sort of tactics in labor as they do in politics, and it matters not to them who they hire, be they disbarred attorneys or ex-convicts.

There are numerous other things that have been brought to my attention, in fact, too numerous to mention; however, I am completely convinced that you have turned about-face on your own organization, as well as the administration which made it possible for your organization to grow and receive recognition, which is more than other administrations have done. I am not interested in any misunderstanding between the labor organizations, as that I believe is a matter to be straightened out between the organizations.

My stand on the National Labor Relations Act and the Wage and Hour Act is the same today as it was last year and the year before; and that is that there should be no amendments to that bill at this time. The act should not be changed in any way that would give benefits to one labor organization above any other and to the detriment of 90 percent of unorganized labor. As a Representative from a district which employs more labor than any other district in the country, I believe my duty is to legislate for all people, including unorganized labor.

I have taken this stand for the past 8 years and will not change it now. I was elected by the people in my district and will stand by the labor in my district. As far as you declaring a war on me, I only wish to remind you that that has been done before by the manufacturers and the Ford Motor Co., and I believe that it is up to the people in my district to decide as to whether I have served them, and not the opinion of one person who sees himself defeated and attempts to put labor on the spot. I have had a great deal of correspondence from labor organizations and people in my district regarding labor legislation, and I know that at least 90 percent of all organizations insist that there be no changes to the Wagner

Act and that it should have a chance to work itself out. And I do know that the auto workers are 100 percent against any changes to the act at this time.

I am making this statement to you public so those who have read the article in the newspapers regarding your points may also be acquainted with my side of the story.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI, M. C.

On April 29, 1940, Mr. Green addressed a communication to me in reply to the communication I directed to him on April 19, 1940. His letter is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C. April 29, 1940.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I herewith reply to your letter of April 19. You signed a minority report of the House Labor Committee opposing constructive amendments to the Labor Relations Act, approved and sponsored by the American Federation of Labor. You did it after you had been requested by the American Federation of Labor to stand with us and to support our amendments. You made your decision against us. Having done so, why the necessity of sending me a letter such as you transmitted on April 19?

Your reference to our purpose to organize the employees of the Ford Motor Co. was unnecessary and uncalled for.

The membership of the American Federation of Labor will decide whether I have turned about face on them or whether I am serving their interests as they wish me to serve them.

You say your attitude towards the Labor Relations Act is that no amendments should be made to said act. Well, the American Federation of Labor thinks otherwise. We called upon you to help us and stand with us. You refused. That means you forfeit our support. We are against you and will do everything we can to defeat you for reelection.

Very truly yours,

W. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

On March 14, 1940, I received a letter from Mr. Green, and in order that the Members of the House and the people of the State of Michigan may be fully apprised as to Mr. Green's attitude toward me, I am inserting his letter in these remarks at this point:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1940.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Member, Committee on Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LESINSKI: I am taking the liberty of enclosing for your consideration a public statement which I ask you to accept as an expression of the attitude of the American Federation of Labor toward amendments to the Labor Relations Act. It seems both fitting and appropriate for me to write you because it has been publicly stated that you are considering amendments to the Labor Relations Act.

The recommendations of the American Federation of Labor upon amendments to the Labor Relations Act are embodied in the measure submitted by Congressman BARDEN. We regard these amendments as reasonable, moderate, constructive, and necessary.

We are firmly convinced that a five-member Labor Board should be created in order to inspire confidence in the administration of the Labor Relations Act and to perform the increasing work of the Board. Surely, experience, as well as the development of facts and information which are now available for public consideration, makes such change in the personnel of the Board imperative.

Please consider favorably the recommendation of the American Federation of Labor, included in the Barden bill, relating to "an appropriate collective bargaining unit. This proposal of the American Federation of Labor was taken verbatim from the New York State Labor Relations Act. It is simple and democratic. It is supported by employers and employees in the State of New York. It has worked well and to the satisfaction of all directly concerned. This means that in adopting this amendment we will not be invading the field of experimentation; instead we will adopt a plan which has been tried and which through trial and application has demonstrated its fairness and practicability in operation in the largest Commonwealth and greatest industrial State in the Nation.

This amendment confers upon workers employed in manufacturing plants the right to determine their own collective bargaining unit, to select said bargaining unit themselves, and to engage in collective bargaining through the appropriate bargaining unit which they themselves selected. It eliminates force, coercion, and compulsion. Under the operation of this amendment, workers cannot be compelled to become a part of a collective bargaining unit set up arbitrarily by the Board against their will and in opposition to their expressed desires. I challenge anyone to offer a more practical, free and democratic mode of procedure than this which is incorporated in the New York State Labor Relations Act and which the American Federation of Labor proposes as an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act.

We maintain that no Government board should be clothed with authority to invalidate contracts honorably entered into, when said contracts are negotiated through collective bargaining, between bona fide, free, democratic unions and employers. An amendment covering this point is included in Congressman BARDEN'S bill.

The right of employers to petition for an election under certain conditions seems to be universally conceded as a matter of fairness and justice.

I recognize that amendments to the National Labor Relations Act should be as few in number as possible. These I have enumerated herein are of transcendent importance. Other amendments which we proposed in the Barden bill cover judicial and administrative procedure. In our judgment, they are important, practical, and necessary.

The administration of the National Labor Relations Act, as shown through the investigation made by the Smith congressional committee, is most unsatisfactory. We have been amazed at some of the revelations made relating to maladministration of the act by a biased, prejudiced Board. Congress should face this issue and amend the act so as to provide better administration and at the same time protect the fundamentals and the vital principles of the Labor Relations Act.

The time to amend the Labor Relations Act is now. It should be done by this Congress, which has manifested its sympathy toward and support of the vital principles of the act. Should this Congress fail to act and leave the situation as it now is, there is grave danger that at some time within the near future the Labor Relations Act, the Magna Carta of labor, will be emasculated and perhaps destroyed.

I appeal to your committee to meet the situation promptly, in a broad, constructive way, along the lines I have herein suggested.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

[From the American Federation of Labor information and publicity service. For release in morning papers of March 15, 1940]

President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, today issued the following statement:

"The investigation of the National Labor Relations Board and its administrative policies, conducted by the Smith congressional committee, developed facts and information which made clear the need of constructive amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

"The charge of maladministration made by the American Federation of Labor against the Labor Relations Board was clearly established.

"It now becomes the duty of Congress to take such action as the facts warrant and demand, in order to prevent the Labor Relations Board from continuing its biased and prejudiced administration of the Labor Relations Act. It seems inconceivable that Congress should fail to discharge its duty in this respect. Failure to act at this session may result in future moves to destroy or repeal the entire act.

"Amendments to the Labor Relations Act have been prepared by the Smith committee and submitted to the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives. Some of these amendments are practical and constructive.

"However, it is the opinion of the American Federation of Labor that the amendments offered by the Smith committee as a whole strike in a destructive way at vital, fundamental principles of the Labor Relations Act. The American Federation of Labor has repeatedly stated and emphasized its opposition to any impairment of the fundamental principles of the Labor Relations Act in any way whatsoever. We again urge and insist that its principles and its fundamentals shall be preserved and protected. The Labor Relations Act still remains the Magna Carta of Labor. Our appeal to Congress is to amend and change the administrative features of the act and policies of the Labor Relations Board without impairing its fundamentals so that the Labor Relations Act will be administered fairly to all, just to labor and industry, and in accordance with its spirit and its letter.

"It is the opinion of the American Federation of Labor that amendments designed to accomplish this purpose should be simple, direct, and constructive. If amendments providing for a reconstruction of the Labor Board, the right of employers to petition for elections under certain conditions, the abolition of the right of the Board to invalidate contracts honestly and justly negotiated through collective bargaining, the acceptance of the American Federation of Labor recommendations relating to the selection and establishment of the appropriate collective bargaining unit, and the acceptance of a simplified form of administrative and judicial procedure, were adopted by Congress, the Labor Relations Act could then be applied in a way as to meet general public approval and accord equal and exact justice to all.

"The American Federation of Labor will petition and appeal to Congress to act favorably upon these recommendations and to adopt these simplified, limited amendments to the Labor Relations Act."

My reply to Mr. Green's letter, addressed to him on March 15, 1940, is as follows:

MARCH 15, 1940.

Mr. WM. GREEN,
American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GREEN: Your letter of recent date with reference to changes to the Labor Relations Act received. I am glad to have your views, and wish to state that my original stand when this law was enacted was that I was in favor of a five-man board instead of a three-man, as is the case today.

I cannot agree with you, however, on the Barden bill, as it seems to me it would open a way to emasculate the act, inasmuch as it has too many exceptions.

In the seventh paragraph of your letter you state, "I recognize that amendments to the National Labor Relations Act should be as few in number as possible." That alone convinces me that there should be no changes at this time.

I realize fully that the act could stand some changes, and I would favor them providing, however, that a closed rule could be gotten without amendments. This, however, you know is impossible, and with the attitude of the southern delegation, including the minority party, they would soon emasculate the act so that it would have no effect.

My contention still is that the act should be left alone at this time, with the exception possibly of amending it to a five-man board instead of a three-man, as we now have.

I would appreciate your reaction to my statement by return mail inasmuch as hearings will start Tuesday, March 19.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI, M. C.

I do not believe that Mr. Green is fully apprised of the activities of his organization in Michigan. I have, residing in my congressional district, a man who has been active in the ranks of labor for years, and I believe it would be enlightening to the Members of Congress, as well as those interested in the problems of labor in the State of Michigan, to read the communications I received from Mr. Markey, dated May 11 and May 16, 1940, and I am inserting them in my remarks at this point:

DETROIT, MICH., *May 11, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: The views I am about to express are not confidential; they are recognized in this State. Therefore I do not care what you do with them. I need not explain to you that I have little respect for Frank X. Martel, but if he is right in his actions for the good of his organizations, I have no other position than to support and defend his purpose. Existing in Michigan in the ranks of labor and controlling the Michigan Federation of Labor are an outstate clique of old double-crossers, who have for years used their positions in labor to promote the cause of the employers. Unfortunately, this rotten clique have the confidence of President William Green, and as a result they are able to force their rotten desires on the Federation movement of this State. Green would not threaten you or any other individual within this State; you can readily realize this and the reasons for it.

John Lovett, the representative of the Manufacturers' Association, along with such associated groups as the Association of Michigan Railroads and the Michigan Trucking Association, formulate policy for this group of labor fakers and pass it on to them to force down the throats of Federation people. The secretary of the Michigan Federation of Labor, John Reid, has long been the errand boy of Lovett and has promoted Lovett's interests at every turn of the road. A real example of his rotten tactics—and this can be confirmed by many legislators of this State—was his sponsoring the manufacturers' occupational-disease law and demanding its passage during the 1937 session of the legislature. Former State Senator Joseph C. Roosevelt, and former State Representative Joseph F. Martin, Jr., will vouch for the veracity of these statements. Many of the fakers associated with Reid in his actions are on the pay roll of the employers and the unions at the same time, so too many of these men have unsecured loans with banks and associated interests of the manufacturers' association, and these are easily verified.

From inquiry I know that Martel nor none of the Detroit men were consulted on your reelection before the Green threat, it was based on these conclusions. Lovett requested that Reid ask such action of Green, all associated interests demanded the same of their stooges, and Green readily complied with their wishes. Their only hopes of defeating you by labor means rests in two places and they were depending on them, but I doubt that Martel will go any further than fail to endorse you in spite of their pressure; their second hope was that they would be able to paint your record black and induce myself and others to work against you, but we are wise to them and this is "out," as we will support you more vigorously. Martel will have many more serious problems politically than to defeat you. I know because I very seldom disagree with Martel on serious labor issues of a political nature.

This situation did have one amusing angle. Before the news of Green's threat to defeat you had been published in the paper, several of Reid's double-crossers, who were just as responsible as Reid for the Green threat, wired you that they disagreed with the Green action and they would support you. Their very make-up is so rotten that they found it impossible to follow the moves they demanded of Green. The truth of the matter is just this, they know that they cannot sway 100 votes in the district, and their own foolishness, although profitable, placed them behind the "eight ball" and, realizing this, they quietly double-crossed Lovett and Reid to save their rotten faces.

I would not blame Green too severely in this matter, and I certainly would not punish the Federation because of this threat as it means nothing. Give Bill Hushing the same cooperation as always on labor issues; the mistake was caused by people who have selfish ends in view. I would, of course, respond only to requests from Hushing or the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor and positively refuse to cooperate with such representatives or letters as come from the Michigan Federation of Labor, the A. F. L., Shop Crafts Railroad Unions of Michigan, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Railroad Cooperative Committee as these are the people responsible for Green's action. Add to this list of hostile groups the Grand Rapids Federation of Labor, the Ann Arbor System Federation, the Owosso Federation of Labor, the Lansing Federation of Labor, the Switchmen's Union of North America, the Michigan legislative department of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. All these groups can have the desires passed through the Detroit Federation of Labor or they can appeal to Bill Hushing.

This seems like the logical method of aiding the proper people and punishing the double-crossers. With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ED. MARKEY.

DETROIT, MICH., *May 16, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: To add to the information already sent to you regarding the actions of certain labor leaders in this State. Here is quite conclusive evidence that all is not exactly kosher, and as in your case, I believe William Green and the American Federation of Labor have been misinformed or they are not acquainted with the facts. It is true, I suppose, that Green should do something about these conditions here, but this is not your responsibility nor mine, and I suppose that only continued loss of membership and prestige will eventually cause the necessary reforms.

During and after the recent Chrysler strike, unemployment compensation claims were filed by the greater majority of Chrysler employees; the Unemployment Compensation Commission of Michigan is composed of Chairman Harry A. McDonald (Republican), of Detroit; Dr. Ashley (Republican), of Wyandotte, and John Reid, of Lansing (Democrat or Republican), and also secretary of the Michigan Federation of Labor, refused, by majority vote, to pay the claims of the Chrysler employees. The United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.), and also the United Automobile Worker (A. F. of L.), through their attorneys, Maurice Sugar and Edward N. Barnard, appealed the commission ruling to Referee Rubinoff who, after a hearing lasting many days, awarded 35,000 Chrysler employees compensation for the idle period.

The Chrysler Corporation appealed this decision to the appeal board of the commission, but this board upheld the decision of Referee Rubinoff; then the Chrysler Corporation filed legal action in the city of Lansing before Circuit Judge Leland Carr, and obtained a temporary injunction restraining the payment of the claims until the case could be tried by Judge Carr. In the meantime the Michigan Association of Manufacturers filed a like case in the Circuit Court of Wayne County. Due to the filing of these cases by the employers, it was now the duty of the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission to defend the decision of its appeal board on both the legal actions before the courts, the commission should have been ready to act, as it had for its legal counsel Harry Slavin, who is reputed to be an authority on this phase of law.

Now comes the old story. Recently this unemployment commission met and voted to replace Slavin with a special counsel to be hired by the commission. I understand that Chairman McDonald was supported in this by John Reid, labor's representative, and it was likewise confirmed in this manner by our daily papers. It was also reported in these same papers that the entire commission voted—including John Reid, labor's representative—to hire a woman, Florence Clements, to fight these cases for the commission, and the State of Michigan, with the consent of all commission members, assigned Assistant Attorney General Stanley C. Barker to aid her.

Innocent on the surface, but let's get to the bottom. Florence Clements was in the past, and still may be, on the pay roll of the Michigan Manufacturers' Association. Her duties never were of much value to her employers, and this may be her chance to use her lack of ability to good advantage by losing this case and benefit the employers. Now, let's look at the record of her assistant, Stanley C. Barker. Four years ago he was clerk to Circuit Court Commissioner William J. Griffin. After Griffin's defeat he entered private practice—a very small practice. His political backing is

dependent on William J. Griffin, who is today head of hospitalization-insurance plan promoted by the medical association and employer groups. His record as an attorney is slightly better than that of Florence Clements, and this record would be no compliment to even the most unsuccessful of lawyers.

This move by this commission is a deliberate attempt to keep 35,000 workers from receiving their unemployment compensation and was the plan of the Manufacturers' Association, placed in effect by the commission. I know of no other reason Reid would have to hire an employer attorney than to carry out the desires of the Michigan Manufacturers' Association. Surely if he had been a champion of labor's cause he would have exerted every effort to retain Slavin to defend these claims against the employers' court actions.

When a labor leader will, by his actions, endanger the unemployment claims of 35,000 workers, surely no one like yourself could expect that you would receive just treatment for your support of labor on the floor of Congress. This, of course, will be a political issue in the next campaign. We may not be able to rid labor of his useless services, but we can make him and his followers political double-crossers and rid Michigan politics of them. It is time that this sort of political double-crossing be made public and labor's friends be recognized and supported; the workers are entitled to know these things, and then let them pass judgment on them.

Many peculiar things have taken place in Michigan that surely were not based on real labor needs and always anyone who should disagree with the misleaders are held to scorn and punished by both the employers and these same errand boys of the Manufacturers Association. All things good or bad must end, and let us hope that this fall election will be their end in politics and they can confine the efforts along these lines strictly to their own organizations; there's one place we can drive them and limit their activities to their own people, some day even their own will tire of them.

Kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

ED MARKEY.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to make it plain to the Members of Congress, as well as to those who may read these remarks, that I will always further and support legislation which I believe will benefit labor, but I cannot conscientiously support legislation or amendments to legislation when I do not believe that such amendments and such changes as are advocated by both the Norton and Smith amendments would prove beneficial to the laboring classes of this country.

Hon. Asbury Francis Lever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in view of my long, intimate, and friendly association with former Congressman the Honorable Asbury Francis Lever, who died at his home in Columbia, S. C., April 28, I have asked the privilege of paying tribute to his life, character, and public services. From his college days to the time of his death it was my privilege to be thrown with him frequently and to work with him in many activities, both during his service in Congress and following his retirement. For the past 10 years or more I served with him as a member of the board of trustees of Newberry College, our alma mater, and have, therefore, had opportunity to observe and evaluate his life and work.

Mr. Lever was born January 5, 1875, near Spring Hill, in Lexington County, S. C. He attended the rural public schools until he entered Newberry College, where he graduated with honors in 1895. Following his graduation he taught in the public schools of his State for 2 years, or until he was appointed secretary to the then Congressman J. William Stokes, representing the Seventh District of South Carolina. While serving in this capacity Mr. Lever studied law and graduated from Georgetown University, receiving his LL. B. degree in 1899.

During his college days and for a number of years following there was a great political upheaval in his State led by the late Benjamin Ryan Tillman, a practical farmer, a student of scientific agriculture, literature, and political history. Very few men of his State or country had a wider or more accurate knowledge of the classics than did Mr. Tillman, who was the outstanding political leader of his State for a quarter of a century, and who, in the meantime, served conspicuously as Governor for 4 years, and 18 years as United States Senator. Mr. Lever was not a slavish follower but a pronounced student of the new political philosophy headed by Mr. Tillman, which, in effect, displaced what was frequently referred to as the "aristocratic rule" of the State, and opened a new political field of opportunity to young men of character, intelligence, and ambition who had formerly been denied such privileges for the lack of what may be referred to as "historical prestige." Although Mr. Lever sprang from a sturdy, honest, and highly cultured German ancestry his opportunity for political success was greatly increased by the "Tillman Movement."

He was by nature well fitted for public service. From early manhood he was an easy, capable, fluent, and magnetic public speaker, a man of marked native intellectual ability, with a mind of unusual discriminating capacity, a most congenial disposition, and a delightful frankness in his dealings with others. His first venture into politics was his election to the State legislature from his native county in 1900. In the summer of 1901 Congressman Stokes died and Mr. Lever became a candidate for the unexpired term along with four men of outstanding ability as his opponents. Mr. Lever was elected and came to Congress at the age of 26, and in response to his desire and ambition was assigned to a place on the Committee on Agriculture. Having been brought up on a farm he was not only familiar with farming operations but was vitally interested in the many farm problems affecting his native State and other sections of the country. His services as a member of this committee and his activities in connection with legislation originating from other committees proved that he was interested in our agricultural problems from a national standpoint.

He was unselfish and broad-minded enough to see that the success of the farmer in his State was contingent upon the success of agriculture in every other part of the Nation and was, therefore, always found in the front rank advocating sane and sound legislation designed to promote the welfare of agriculture in all sections of our country.

Following the election of President Wilson in 1912 Mr. Lever became chairman of the Agricultural Committee and was soon recognized as one of the outstanding leaders in Congress. He was a key man in the Wilson administration. The President relied wholly upon his judgment in all legislation pertaining to agriculture, and relied as much upon his political judgment as that of any other man in Congress. The first, and possibly the most worth while, legislative act to which he may be accredited was the promotion and passage of the law providing for agricultural extension service, the importance, value, and extent of which is known and well recognized by leaders of thought and action throughout the Nation. Later he was the author of the Smith-Lever Act and the coauthor of the Cotton Futures Trading Act. He was also one of the leaders and contributed much to the passage of legislation providing for long-term farm credit. In 1919 he was appointed by President Wilson a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board and resigned his seat in Congress. Later he became president of the First Carolinas Joint Stock Land Bank, of Columbia, S. C., and at the time of his death was director of the public relations administration of the farm credit administration, Columbia, S. C. He always manifested a vital interest in the education of youth, particularly the rural youth. He had strong convictions about the separation of church and state, but did not believe any education was complete that did not carry with it the fundamental teachings of the Christian religion. For many years he was a life member of the board of trustees of Clemson College, generally referred to as the A. & M. College of South Carolina. For more than 30 years he was a member of the board of trustees of Newberry College, one of the oldest church institutions of his State, and for the past 5 years was chairman of this board. He was a man

of many parts and devoted his entire life to the promotion and advancement of the social and economic welfare of his State and Nation. He loved mankind and had deep sympathies for the less fortunate, being personally popular among all types of people. He was as well known and highly respected at the time of his death as any man of his State, and when the Recorder has made an inventory of the efforts and accomplishments of those who have devoted their lives and talents in behalf of mankind it will be found that no man in the history of our Nation has to date been responsible for more constructive legislation for the benefit of agriculture and the rural population of this country than the Honorable Asbury Francis Lever.

Third Termites Put on the Heat When Public Does Not Respond; Now Use Chain-Letter Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the third-term boom for President Roosevelt has apparently failed to get off to the spontaneous start with the public which its sponsors had hoped, and today we find that the movement is being given a shot in the arm by means of the old chain-letter gag in an attempt to get the people to write Mr. Roosevelt asking him to break a precedent as old as the Nation and seek the Presidency for a third term.

Now we may expect to see in the newspapers pictures of the mailman toting large bags of mail into the White House urging Mr. Roosevelt to be a candidate. The purpose of these pictures will be to attempt to lead the public to believe there is a spontaneous demand on the part of the people for a third term. They will not reveal that behind the scenes it was necessary for a group to inspire these letters by means of the moldy old chain-letter scheme, which, incidentally, was condemned some time ago by the Post Office Department.

The American people do not have to have the heat put on them to urge them into action when there is something they want done. They demonstrated that conclusively when they told Congress they did not want the Supreme Court packed. And it did not take a chain-letter craze to awaken them either.

The squeeze play now being attempted on John Q. Public appears to have its headquarters in Philadelphia. The original letters are signed by "Anthony G. Neary" and the address is given as "Drexel Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa." The letter is headed "Rally round Roosevelt."

Enclosed with the letter are a number of cards the size of postal cards and these are supposed to be sent to as many other persons urging them to write the President and on and on down the line. The cards give full instructions for addressing Mr. Roosevelt and saying "your letter need not be long, but it should be your own, in your own language, telling him that you personally believe he should serve the country another 4 years. If you wish, you can tell him why you think so."

The final statement says "Sign your full name and your address." Apparently the promoters of the chain-letter idea to stimulate third-term interest intend to create some sort of an honor roll. Could it be the sponsors of the movement will have access to these names and addresses for campaign purposes? Is the Democratic mailing list running short on names?

Apparently they have taken a page from the late Huey Long's political machine of making every man a king. In this case they are distributing neighborhood chairmanships in connection with the chain-letter program. The letter which goes out over Mr. Nearing's signature follows:

RALLY ROUND ROOSEVELT

DREXEL BUILDING,
INDEPENDENCE SQUARE,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 31, 1940.

DEAR SIR: You have been suggested to me as chairman for your neighborhood of the Rally Round Roosevelt movement.

Will you appoint six friends to your committee, invite them to your home, and each of you write to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the White House, Washington, D. C., and ask him to run again for the Presidency? The letters do not have to be long. Even a post card will do.

When the letters have been written, tell each member of your committee to ask two friends to write. They can be men, women, or children, because Mr. Roosevelt is the President of all of us.

We need him. We need his leadership. We know he has never failed in his duty and that he is the man to carry us through the difficult 4 years ahead. But we must tell him.

Millions of letters from us will show the politicians the man America wants as President.

Don't bother to reply to me. Use your paper and postage to write the President. That's the important thing.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY G. NEARY.

Mr. Speaker, I present these to show that it has become necessary to give artificial impetus to this much-heralded third-term talk and so that the people will know the facts when they hear of the great demands being made that the President seek a third term. Then they can question for themselves how many of these were inspired chain-letter demands.

Army Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF WAR AND REPLY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, *June 5, 1940.*

Hon. JOSEPH H. BRYSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated May 24, 1940, forwarding the request of Mr. Dixon D. Davis, commander, American Legion Post No. 3, Greenville, S. C., for information for the American Legion post in Greenville.

The enclosed copy of a speech delivered by Brig. Gen. George V. Strong gives an excellent outline of our problems in safeguarding the Western Hemisphere, and I believe will be helpful to Mr. Davis. I am enclosing also a statement that outlines not only the amount of the 1940 appropriations as requested but shows a break-down of all expenditures during the period 1925–40.

Mr. Davis' statement that he read that there are not enough blankets for the comfort of an enlarged army has been noted. There are sufficient blankets on hand for the present enlarged army. Further extensive increases in personnel would create shortages in this and many other equipment items. These shortages are being provided for by current requests for appropriations.

The Springfield rifle M–1903 no longer is standard for manufacture in the Army, having been replaced by the new M–1 (Garand) rifle. Approximately 40,000 of the new rifles have been manufactured, mostly in the past year. The Springfield rifles on hand will, of course, be retained pending manufacture of a sufficient number of the new automatic rifles.

For obvious reasons a break-down to state types of the approximately 2,800 airplanes now on hand cannot be stated. Deliveries of airplanes from the large amount of funds voted by the Congress a year ago are just now commencing. The absolutely necessary time lag between the appropriation of moneys and actual delivery of these airplanes and other critical equipment is a vital matter, but one for which there is no immediate solution.

The tables printed on pages 421 and 422 of the Military Establishment appropriation bill hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and other statements in this and the hearings before the House committee on the

same bill contain much detailed information that I believe would be of interest to Mr. Davis.

There are approximately 1,500 of all types of antiaircraft guns in the United States and its foreign possessions. About one-third of these have been produced in the past year. There are approximately 350 serviceable Infantry tanks on hand, and about the same number of new models being produced.

While there now exists a shortage in many items of military equipment, this condition is being gradually overcome by current appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1940.

HON. HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRING: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 5 which has just reached my office.

At the outset, Mr. Secretary, please know that I deeply appreciate your furnishing me with much of the information requested in my recent letter to you. However, I must frankly confess that I am considerably disturbed over the general tenor and meaning of certain statements made in your letter.

You speak of an "absolutely necessary time lag" between the appropriation of moneys and actual delivery of airplanes and other critical equipment, declaring that this is a vital matter, but "one for which there is no immediate solution." In this connection I am compelled to raise the question: Should this time lag to which you refer be regarded as "absolutely necessary," that is, should it be accepted as something absolute and necessary which cannot be avoided or eliminated? I say, we must not take that position. Furthermore we should not, we must not follow the path of resignation by saying that "there is no immediate solution" for this or that problem of national defense. We must follow the path of action with unyielding determination to sweep aside obstacles in the getting of results—immediate results.

You state that "while there now exists a shortage in many items of military equipment, this condition is being gradually overcome." It is not very reassuring to hear that this condition is being only "gradually overcome" for our task of preparedness must be accomplished with speed of unparalleled quickness.

I do not wish to appear too exacting in my interpretation of your statements, but, as already indicated, I am considerably disturbed over the general tenor of what you have to say as it suggests that this Nation must content itself with "gradually overcoming" shortages in military equipment, accepting the "time lag" in filling orders as "absolutely necessary." Only recently I was shocked to learn from a high official of the Navy Department that unnecessary "slowness" was being tolerated in the filling of positions in Navy Yards. This is an attitude or point of view which must be deplored for the history of the world today is being written in almost minutes and hours, not years.

Therefore, in response to your letter, I am writing to ask that there be no compromises with time and ordinary obstacles; that the objective be to overcome shortages in military equipment, not gradually but immediately.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HARRY R. DANIELS, ADJUTANT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS POST, MOBERLY, MO.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a Memorial Day address by Harry R. Daniels, a veteran of the last World War:

With the world at large torn asunder by war, Memorial Day offers the people of America an opportunity to emphasize those ideals which will help make the United States fireproof against the conflagration which threatens to consume the universe.

For the past 3 years the world has been edging closer and closer to the precipice of complete international chaos. Japan gave birth to this plague with its invasion of China. Next Austria was forced to surrender its independence to Germany. Italy seized Abyssinia as a prelude to its absorption of Albania. Communism and fascism fought for control of Spain with the Italo-German forces emerging victorious. Czechoslovakia was stripped of its independence at a conference table—forced to bow down to German autocracy when threatened with the brutal destruction which Hitler subsequently visited upon Poland. Tiny Finland made a valiant but futile stand against Russian occupation. Civilization was still mourning this atrocity when Germany reached out to grab the natural resources of Denmark, Norway, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Belgium.

This is no time for the American people to play ostrich with their collective heads buried in the sands of pacifism. The major powers of Europe are engaged in a struggle for survival. The outcome will determine whether or not world affairs are to be dominated by the totalitarian principles which inspire the Rome-Moscow-Berlin alliance. Despite the skeptics who scoff at the suggestion world democracy is at stake—Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini frankly boast of ambitions to humble every nation that respects the individual liberties of its people.

The American citizen who thinks we can keep our country out of war by simply repeating the assertion we are not concerned with the problems of Europe is guilty of wishful thinking. Recent events in Europe have proved that aggressors are indifferent to neutrality policies. The neutral power that refuses to give them aid is coldly labeled as an enemy to be destroyed or ignored.

The significance of Memorial Day reminds us of America's rise to its position of a world power after our unity, as a people, was established in the War Between the States. This unity received its first crucial test in the War with Spain. Our victory in this conflict gave notice to the world that America was firmly entrenched as a major power in the world's affairs and that our citizens were united in support of American principles. In 1917–18 our unity as a people again gave our country the necessary strength to become the deciding factor in the World War.

In the current crisis which confronts the United States we must constantly keep ourselves aware of the principle that unity is still our first line of national defense. No one recognizes this truth better than our potential enemies. The danger signal is reflected in their subversive efforts to destroy our unity, through the promotion of internal group hatreds, discontent, and disloyalty.

It is up to us to heed this warning. We must remember strict adherence to the principles outlined in the Bill of Rights is the essence of our unity. Continued resistance aagainst Communist, Nazi, and Fascist propaganda will help keep us immune against the poison of disruption.

Beware of the peddlers of prejudice. Be chary of those who spout Americanism as a smokescreen for ideas that betray its fundamental principles. Be on guard against emotional appeals invented to make you mad at your neighbor, simply because he goes to a different church or belongs to a certain political party. Scorn the sap who tries to make you believe life under Stalin, Hitler & Co. is one continual round of prosperity and pleasure. Laugh at the loon who argues that slavery under Stalin is paradise compared to the comforts we enjoy under capitalism in America. Ignore the ignoramus who holds up Hitlerism as an escape from hard times and unemployment. Denounce the disruptor who would divide us against each other in his treachery to the cause of Americanism.

To make our unity poisonproof we must strengthen our national-defense facilities spiritually as well as physically. Our faith in the basic ideals of Americanism must be maintained on a high plane, with increasing respect for the protection we are afforded as individuals under the Constitution. It is our job to be militantly suspicious of any propaganda which violates the spirit of the Bill of Rights. We must keep ourselves and our neighbors constantly conscious of the realization our security is assured as long as we stand together united under the bonds of "a nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

On Memorial Day we follow the established custom of decorating the graves of our honored dead. But we must do more than hang wreaths on their monuments if our appreciation of their sacrifices is sincere. They had the courage to die as Americans in defense of American principles. We must have the courage to live as Americans if we want them to know their sacrifices were not without purpose.

Harry W. Griswold

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY W. GRISWOLD, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden and untimely passing of our colleague, HARRY W. GRISWOLD, the State of Wisconsin and the Nation have lost an able legislator and an eminent citizen. Mr. GRISWOLD was a man of

exemplary character, exceptional ability and devotion to the public service. He was born on a farm near West Salem, Wis., on May 19, 1886, and he was an expert on farm problems. His great soul was not satisfied with the dead past, its glooms, and its shadows. He dealt with realities, not fancies. Life to him was an objective; he saw things as they were. He did not fashion them by the more subtle forces of the brain and live in the realm of dreams. In his passing, his district, our State, and the Nation have suffered an irreparable loss.

We read in Holy Writ:

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend.

Our departed colleague did lay down his life in the service of his country and his countrymen.

He was an able, diligent, and conscientious legislator, who unstintingly devoted his energies toward the solution of the distressing and perplexing problems confronting our country. In his zeal he disregarded the physical limitations of an ordinary man, and he laid down his earthly life as a sacrifice on the altar of his country's welfare.

HARRY GRISWOLD was loved by his constituents and his colleagues, regardless of their party affiliations, as he was ever looking for an opportunity to perform some kind deed or act for others.

His devotion to his wife and children and to their welfare was unexcelled, and I know that the sympathy of the entire membership of this House goes out to them in this their sad hour of bereavement.

Our colleague has passed into the Great Beyond, but his spirit will forever dwell in the hearts of his countrymen. Although we shall miss him in our councils, we know that while his earthly body is dead, he has just commenced to live in the mansions prepared by our Heavenly Father. He had the works of godliness as well as faith in God, and we know that he who dies in the name of the Lord shall have everlasting life.

Two Great Reasons Why We Must Keep Out of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Herbert Hoover in Liberty for June 15, 1940:

[From Liberty of June 15, 1940]

TWO GREAT REASONS WHY WE MUST KEEP OUT OF THE WAR

(By Herbert Hoover)

The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are on the march: War, Death, Famine, and Pestilence. Two-thirds of the people in the world are at war. But coming before these old destroyers of mankind are five new horsemen.

The new cavalry are:

Imperialism, the destroyer of the independence of nations;

Intolerance, the destroyer of minorities;

Stateism, the destroyer of personal liberty;

Atheism, the destroyer of faith;

Hate, the destroyer of the unity of mankind.

These are the horsemen of the advance, preparing the way for war and death. After war and death sweep famine and pestilence.

And their camp follower is revolution.

Imperialism has already trampled down the independence of Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, and Denmark. We have witnessed attacks upon China, Finland, and Norway, unable to defend themselves. And now the invasion of Belgium and Holland. And there seems more to come.

We have seen intolerance destroy Jews, Christians, and racial minorities.

We have seen stateism, expressed by the despotisms of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and socialism, destroy liberty in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, and in a half dozen other countries. We have seen its infiltration through the world—including the United States.

Atheism has greatly shattered religious worship in Russia and Germany and weakened beliefs in a score of others.

Hate has grown fiercely since before the first World War began, and its ravages are not alone between races but between classes and religious faiths.

And all the Nine Horsemen have new weapons of destruction. Imperialism has become more dreadful by threat of destruction from the air. Propaganda, the weapon of intolerance, of stateism, of atheism, of hate, is more potent through our rapidity of communication. It now moves through the air over all borders and seas. It comes disguised in the home tongue. Hate has increased its voltage through cruelty of attack upon civilian men, women, and children by food blockade and death by the air. War is more destructive by our chemistry and our machines.

Famine is more terrible by the growth of great cities. Pestilence strikes right and left through the close net of our communications.

Only the Western Hemisphere is free of the full violence of these horsemen. But they affect us. Our emotions are aroused. The attacks upon helpless small nations raise the indignation of all decent men and women. Our economic life is dislocated. The shadow of war hangs over all our decisions.

And from our emotions there are Americans who sincerely believe that we ourselves should go to war. They feel we should be willing to sacrifice our youth and our future to restore liberty against aggression, to assure the recognition of law and human rights.

Reason calls to us not to send our sons into this war. Reason dictates that if we join the military operations of this war, it means the abdication of the remaining seat of liberty in the world. Reason insists the Western Hemisphere should give sanctuary for peace in her flight from all the rest of the world. Reason is final in its demands that we prepare ourselves so that we may defend the Western Hemisphere.

To those who feel that we are not doing our part if we stay out, I may suggest that we look ahead to the end of this war—examine a possibly greater service to mankind. This war will end some time, either in victory or exhaustion. And in that relation we may well explore the grim work of the horsemen—famine, pestilence, and hate.

FAMINE AND PESTILENCE

Western Europe for a hundred years, even in peacetimes, has not produced sufficient food supplies for its own population. It has bought its food by the export of manufactured goods. But on top of this peacetime shortage of supplies, war at once diminishes the food production of every combatant nation. The imports of fodder are cut off or slackened, and the herds must be diminished. The drafting of manpower instantly diminishes the production of milk, and of butter, and of meat. The people eat into their animals and, when war ends, their brood stock is depleted. Beyond this, planting of ground crops must be skipped. The harvesting is imperfect. And, above all, the nitrate fertilizers must be diverted to explosives.

It is true that each nation at modern war rations its population in hope of reducing its food consumption. Scarcity always raises prices and the food goes to those who have the most money. Rationing does secure more equality in distribution and control of prices. It thrusts the hunger upon the civil population. Soldiers, munition workers, and government officials are always well fed. The hunger in the people falls hardest upon the women and children. But rationing has little effect on the total consumption. War experience has proved that armies consume about twice as much food as the same men do when they are at peace. That is partly due to the greater physical need. It is partly due to the inevitable waste and destruction of food in camp, or by invasion, and at sea.

Beyond all this, the food production of the countries free of actual war is also demoralized, for the normal markets are interfered with by blockades and difficulties of credit to war purchasers. Prices are erratic and the farmer is uncertain. Some countries are wholly isolated. Thus production diminishes among neutrals, especially at the beginning of war.

By the necessity of directing food supplies through the whole of the last war I watched these forces unfold with their millions of tragedies.

The food situation in the present war is already more desperate than at the same stage in the World War. Then, except for Belgium, there was no rationing of civil populations until the second or third year. In the present war every combatant country was on bread and meat cards within 90 days. In 1914 Russia was full of food; for years it has been in a state of semifamine. Moreover, today every neutral country in Europe, out of fear, has already mobilized almost its full manpower. The Balkan states, Holland, Belgium, Scandinavia, and Italy will therefore also diminish in food production. The harvest of the Balkan states this year will be reduced. Denmark, now unable to import fodder, must needs kill many of her animals. Many of these smaller nations are already on rations. And in invaded countries there is already famine. It sweeps over Poland.

Out of all these forces, if this war is long continued, there is but one implacable end. That end is the greatest famine in history.

And from lowered vitality by famine comes pestilence. There was a great famine at the end of the World War. The dramatic events of peace making obscured it. And as the people, after the armistice, were mostly fed by American action, there was no major tragedy to attract headlines.

During the 24 months after the armistice in 1918 we sent something over 80,000,000,000 pounds of concentrated foodstuffs from America to Europe. That was more food than we have exported to Europe in the whole of the last 10 years combined. And this food went not only to our Allies but to our former enemies. And of pestilence, an army of typhus came down from Russia on a front a thousand miles long. At its height a million cases raged, with a death rate of a quarter of those stricken. Americans fought that battle and won.

Without all this service, famine, pestilence, and their end in communism would have engulfed Europe. There would have been no peace of any sort.

After the Thirty Years' War a peace was made, and then it is said that one-half of the population proceeded to die from famine and pestilence.

There was no America then.

The conclusion of this observation is "Who will stop the famine after the present war?"

THE SIXTH HORSEMAN—HATE

And now let us examine the destroyer Hate. He will have something to do with the American people. In his modern visage he is probably the greatest of all destroyers.

Racial hates developed to an intensity and over more people in the World War than ever before. From the miseries which followed it came another unparalleled development. That was class hate. Both of them have played a great part in this cataclysm of today.

Hate becomes completely inflamed in modern war. Nowadays fighting quickly flashes from wars between soldiers to wars against civilians. It was not so long ago that wars were fought entirely between soldiers. They had elements of chivalry and sportsmanship. When such wars were over hates did not remain long in courageous men who fought against courageous men.

But where war is made against helpless civilians an implacable hate comes. Do we need to be reminded of the 70 years of hate that survived in our country from Sherman's march to the sea?

As this war goes on, the blockade of food supplies, the attacks on civilians from the air will take more toll from women and children. As action between armies becomes more violent, the long lists of dead stream back from the front into the homes. From these wrongs and sufferings imperishable hates will sink into every household.

And do not let us think that we had not in some lesser degree built up hates in the United States during the last war, although our losses had been much less bitter. We cannot forget the hideous attitudes toward loyal Americans of German descent.

Well do I remember that some days after the Armistice I announced that the food blockade against Germany should be removed at once. That was imperative for reasons of humanity and for the self-interest of the Allies, that Bolshevism could be stopped in starving Germany, and that peace could be made. Despite these obvious reasons, the reaction in every part of the Allied world and the United States was one of indignant opposition and denunciation of any mercy. It took us months to secure so simple an act.

In the end from this furnace fire of hate statesmen no longer are free agents. The bitterness makes sane peace almost impossible. Those of us who observed the making of the Treaty of Versailles knew that the leaders there were consciously or unconsciously dominated by the fires of hate still burning. They had to get their acts approved at home. The sufferings of their people had been too great for rational action.

And one of the consequences of those hates was a treaty which sowed the dragon's teeth of the present war.

In the present war the forces making for hate are even more violent. If this war continues long enough, these hates will sit again at the peace table. Unless there be some allaying force, some entry of reason and compassion, there will be a Carthaginian peace.

The conclusion of this observation is "What powerful nation will still retain good will and reason?"

AND THE CAMP FOLLOWER—REVOLUTION

Hate, this sixth horseman, continues to ride after so-called peace is made. Famine and pestilence, together with the aftermaths of war's destruction—malnutrition, unemployment, and poverty—furnish the fuel to class hate. It is hungry people who revolt in violence. Civilians with filled stomachs do not face machine guns. Helpless, distraught, frustrated peoples accept the leadership of hate, who mobilizes them into revolution. The end is dictatorship and the advance horsemen start on the march again.

AN AMERICAN ROLE

Now America has a role to perform. It can be a great role in our history.

There is no such thing as isolation for the United States. The Monroe Doctrine itself is denial of that. And there can be no such thing as economic or intellectual or moral or spiritual isolation.

There can be no isolation from world effort to allay misery, to save human life, to bring peace, disarmament, reconstruction, and renewed hope from this catastrophe.

There can be military isolation. When I speak of joining in these wars I mean joining in the military side—sending our sons into it.

If we join in these wars, we will start with the already great exhaustion of 10 years of our depression. Then we will further exhaust our already weakened economic strength. And that exhaustion will be in a far greater degree than in the few months we participated in the last war.

And when the war is over we shall need devote our remaining resources to support our wounded, our maimed, our orphaned, and our destitute. We shall need every resource to rebuild our farmers and workers from our own misery and impoverishment. And our sympathies will be justly limited to suffering at home.

If we join in this war, the last great remaining reservoir of economic strength will have been exhausted. And hope of world recuperation will have been delayed while revolution marches unimpeded over the earth.

If we join in this war, we ourselves will develop all the hates that are inevitable from war. We shall have lost the voice of reason in the making of the peace.

And though we stay out, in our indignation at wrong and aggression we must not be led into blind hates against whole peoples. The great masses of the German people and the Russian people did not wish for the wars now going on. The vast majority of both these nations are gentle, decent people who prayed for peace even as did you and I.

And ours is a doubly difficult position. In our emotions we have a different scene from Europe fighting race against race. We have the heritage of every European race. Our war hates are not alone against the enemy. They cruelly divide our own people, not alone for the war but long after.

But if we remain out of war we might, if we have the will to do so, use our unimpaired resources, our courage, our moral strength to do mankind infinite service.

By that service we could allay the destruction of war and the ravages of famine and pestilence. That service of compassion could go far to save civilization and restore hope to men. Free of hate we could exert an insistent voice of reason in the making of peace.

And if we are again called upon for service, we have a right to demand that reason and hope sit at the peace table. Reason and hope for the world call for the restoration of those nations who have lost their freedom.

Amendment of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the wisdom of various amendments now being proposed to the National Labor Relations Act, it is important to view the act and its administration in a proper perspective. This act became law on July 5, 1935. It was bitterly opposed by large employer groups, including the National Association of Manufacturers. Labor supported it and hailed its passage as labor's Magna Carta. This was a true description.

The act was a final recognition by Congress of the essential rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively through freely chosen representatives. Until the act was declared constitutional by the Supreme Court on April 12, 1937, however, those who had fought the passage of the law refused to comply with its provisions. They were encouraged in this position by eminent lawyers. Workers who had placed their faith in this new charter of liberties sadly discovered that they must continue the economic weapon of the strike to secure the rights supposedly protected by the statute. We witnessed a reign of almost unprecedented industrial strife. The peaceful, orderly processes of the statute were not available.

After the decisions of the Supreme Court of April 1937, strikes began to decline, particularly strikes for organizational purposes. When the act became effective its beneficial effect became felt. This has continued, notwithstanding unsupported claims to the contrary.

Let us see if the act has not in fact accomplished what Congress hoped that it would.

Until 1937 the number of strikes called for organizational purposes almost uniformly exceeded the number of cases filed with the National Labor Relations Board. In 1938 there was

a decrease from 1937 of 42 percent in the number of strikes called, and in the first 10 months of 1939 it declined to 46 percent of the total for the same period of 1937.

The National Labor Relations Act is peculiarly effective in eliminating the causes of organizational strikes. The figures show it has accomplished this result, sought by Congress. But in addition strikes of all characters have been on a general decline, which still continues as collective bargaining has grown.

Another purpose intended by this great act was to enable workers to join labor organizations, if they so desired, without coercion on the part of the employer to prevent them from doing so. Is the act accomplishing this purpose? During the period employees have had the protection of this act, the American Federation of Labor reports a membership of 4,006,354 in 1939, whereas in 1935 it reported a membership of 3,045,347; the Congress for Industrial Organizations reports a membership for 1939 of over 4,000,000. The figures of the Department of Labor show that the present total membership is now between eight and eight and one-half million, as contrasted with about three and one-half million in 1935. The significance of these figures as showing the act has accomplished the protection Congress intended cannot be overlooked.

A pronounced purpose of this act was to stabilize working conditions—

> By encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining * * *.

Is the act accomplishing this purpose?

Since the validation of the act in 1937 the records show that whereas prior to 1937 there were very few collective-bargaining agreements in the steel industry, about 350 agreements were reported in 1937 and 500 in 1938. In the rubber industry there are now 40,000 workers covered by agreements, of whom more than 80 percent have been covered since April 1937. Figures show similar gains in other industries, such as aluminum, automobile, and electrical equipment.

These figures are proof of the extraordinary increase in collective agreements, and consequent stabilization of labor relations, since the serious acceptance of the provisions of this act. The great significance of this, especially in these times, cannot be overlooked.

Another aim desired by those who passed this act was that it might peacefully resolve questions as to who if anyone represented the employees; that is, who had been designated by a majority, whenever that question arose. In the past industrial strife was frequently caused by the lack of machinery to determine what labor organizations, if any, was the choice of the employees for purposes of collective bargaining. Does the record show that the act is accomplishing this purpose? The record is clear and indisputable.

Whereas for the 18 months prior to April 12, 1937, the Board held only 76 elections, the record of the Smith committee shows that as of December 1, 1939, it had conducted 2,543 elections in which 1,200,414 valid votes were cast. The great significance of this peaceful and democratic method of resolving these questions cannot be overlooked.

Any discussion of amendments must have full regard of this record which shows that the act is accomplishing the beneficial results intended. To millions of American workers it has been a needed protection. It has meant to thousands of employers as well as employees a lawful means for settling the troublesome problems of representation. The amendments proposed must justify themselves as part of a plan to continue and extend the benefits which have been conferred upon this country as a result of the passage of this act.

The amendments which have been proposed for the most part fall into three general categories:

First. Amendments which seek to relax the unfair labor practices condemned by the act.

Second. Amendments seeking to eliminate certain employees from the protection of the act.

Third. Amendments which aim to change the Board's structure and procedure.

The amendments which seek to relax the unfair practices would turn back our whole history of development of the law of collective bargaining, including the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. The advocates of these amendments do not claim that the unfair practices condemned by the act are not in fact unfair. It is claimed rather that the employer should be permitted to participate in the form and type of organization that his employees should join or not join, and that he should be permitted by advice or expressions of opinion, falling short of threats, to indicate that interest.

The passage of the act forbidding conduct of the employer which would interfere with, restrain, or coerce his employees in their right to self-organization, was based on the fact that employers had available and had throughout our history used their economic control over their employees to forbid workers the right to organize. Interference and coercion need not be couched in terms which unmistakably convey a threat.

It must be remembered that the act does not restrict the right of an employer to say or publish anything he desires on the subject of trade unions, provided it is not used as part of a campaign to interfere with a free choice by his employees.

The report of the National Labor Relations Board to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor upon S. 1000, S. 1264, S. 1392, S. 1550, and S. 1580 states:

> In all of the cases where the Board has found expressions of opinion to constitute unfair labor practices, the expressions of opinion have, as a matter of fact, occurred against a background of open manifestations of hostility to self-organization.

If this statement is true—and as far as I know it has not been challenged—what evil is there that the proponents of the free-speech amendment seek to cure? Has the Board interfered with the constitutional right of free speech? What court has so held? The amendment, if passed, would only encourage the employer interference, the very thing this act, as well as the Railway Labor Act, was designed to eradicate. Why should the standard of what constitutes interference with the right to organize be relaxed? No one can seriously question the constitutionality of the prohibition against interference. See *Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co. v. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks* (281 U. S. 548, 568). If the Board goes beyond proper limits in defining interference with self-organization under the facts of particular cases, then the courts will be, as they always have been, jealous to protect the fundamental right of freedom of speech as guaranteed by our Constitution.

The Board's actions in this regard have been reviewed by the courts many times, and as yet no decision of the Board has been set aside on the ground that it abridged the constitutional right of freedom of speech. This is most reassuring. It is, indeed, surprising to find this situation, because there arise difficult cases. Since there has been no abuse of power by the Board, there is no evil to cure. Even had there been an occasional mistake in this regard, there would be no abuse to cure by legislation, for the present act provides the means for correction of such error by the courts.

A second proposal to relax the unfair labor practices condemned by the act redefines the obligation of "collective bargaining" to require merely that the employer be required to meet with the representatives of his employees. The present law does not seek a legislative definition of collective bargaining. The Board and the courts, however, have adopted the historical meaning of that term—that an employer is required to negotiate in good faith with a representative of a majority of his employees in an appropriate bargaining unit, and if an agreement is reached, shall reduce that agreement to writing.

The figures I have recited before indicate that the act has encouraged collective bargaining and has resulted in the making of more labor contracts than at any time in our industrial history. Is it time to stop that progress? Do the proponents of this measure maintain that collective agreements in industry are not a healthy and salutary condition? To change the meaning of collective bargaining would only furnish a loophole for evasion of good-faith efforts to reach agreement and would bring back the evils the act seeks to remedy.

In *Consolidated Edison Co. of New York* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (305 U. S. 197, 236) the Supreme Court said:

> The act contemplates the making of contracts with labor organizations. That is the manifest objective in providing for collective bargaining.

It is only those who desire to substitute industrial strife for the conference table who can justifiably urge any change to lessen the obligation of an employer to seek agreement with the representative of a majority of his employees. The process of bargaining has decreased industrial strife and stabilized working conditions in industry. The proponents of this act contemplated that incipient labor disputes could be avoided and actual disputes ended if the parties endeavored in good faith to reach an agreement. The history of the administration of the act has justified this belief. What purpose can any amendment serve which would nullify this great accomplishment of the act? Such amendments must be rejected by those who profess to be in sympathy with the fundamental objectives of the act—industrial peace.

The second category of amendments which I should like to discuss are those amendments designed to remove certain employees from the protection of the act.

The act now exempts the agricultural laborer by a redefinition of "employee" in section 2 (3). The Board has interpreted this definition so as not to except from the protection of the act workers in packing, canning, and processing establishments whose work is essentially industrial in character and not agricultural. A proposed amendment to the act seeks to exclude this type of worker from the protection of the act.

To one who professes to be in sympathy with the principles of the act, the only possible validity for this proposal would be that the Board had incorrectly broadened the scope of the act to include workers not intended to be included by Congress. However, there is not the slightest validity to this contention. The courts, when they have had the occasion to pass upon the Board's interpretation of agricultural labor, have upheld it on each occasion. (*Matter of North Whittier Heights Citrus Association,* 109 Fed. (2d) 76, certiorari denied by the Supreme Court; *N. L. R. B.* v. *Tovrea Packing Co.,* decided Apr. 30, 1940, 9 C. C. A.)

If the Board has been correct in its interpretation, is it now the time to say that the workers in the fruit- or vegetable-packing industry should not have the protection of the Wagner Act afforded employees in other industries? One cannot help but be shocked by the revelations of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee whose records recite in detail the denial of elementary civil liberties to workers in these industries in the State of California. Under the pseudo name of "Associated Farmers" industrial employers have organized on the west coast to deny and frustrate the principles of the National Labor Relations Act. Commenting on the evidence in the North Whittier Heights case, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, in sustaining the Board, stated:

> In this status of this industry there would seem to be as much need for the remedial provisions of the Wagner Act, upon principle, as for any other industrial activity.

Who can deny this? To deprive workers engaged in "processing," which has been held to be an industrial occupation, protection afforded to other industrial workers is without reason or justice. Any such amendment would simply be a "green light" for a large group of employers to violate the principles of the act. At this time in our history we should endeavor to strengthen and extend the principles of the National Labor Relations Act, rather than curb or nullify them.

Another proposed amendment would exempt from the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act any employee who has engaged in any willful violence or unlawful seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute with his employer. It is claimed that this is merely a restatement of the principles of the Fansteel case. (See H. Rept. 1902, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) It is clear, however, that to deny reinstatement for every "willful" act of violence, even though it be trivial or provoked by the employer, is going too far. It is going far beyond the Fansteel case, which dealt only with substantial violence and destruction of property by employees. As the Third Circuit Court of Appeals said in the Republic Steel case (*Republic Steel Corporation* v. *National Labor Relations Board,* 107 F. (2d) 472, certiorari denied Apr. 8, 1940), "minor disorders" on the picket line should not deprive a worker of reinstatement under the act. To lay down a rule would be an open invitation to labor spies and other agents of employers to provoke disorders on the picket line. The record shows that the Board has scrupulously followed the doctrine of the Fansteel case as enunciated by the Supreme Court. There is no need to read into the statute a doctrine already there. To go beyond that doctrine, as does the amendment, would penalize employees for minor disorders, whereas the employer who has been guilty of violating the public policy of the land would be relieved of any responsibility. This is not just. These matters must be judged on the facts of particular cases, and decided by a sound judgment. No catch-all phase is the means of doing justice in each case.

Minor disorders are subject to action by local enforcement agencies. Penalties for such violations are fixed by local regulations or ordinances. No one will contend that the employer should be deprived of his right to do business because of his violation of the law. So the employee should not be deprived of his livelihood because of some minor scuffle on the picket line.

This amendment is a modified form of the famous "coercion from any source" amendment sponsored by the United States Chamber of Commerce. During the debate on the original act this proposal was rejected.

Again the same question must be asked the proponents of this measure. What is the evil sought to be cured by this amendment? The Fansteel and other cases has laid down a sound doctrine which eliminates from the protection of the act employees who have engaged in serious misconduct. Can it be claimed that minor violations by employees are of such magnitude that the Federal Government shall displace local law-enforcement agencies, and add new penalties for such acts?

There is no need for its adoption and the harmful results that may flow from its passage justify my opposition to this type of amendment.

The third class of amendments which I shall comment upon deal with the changes in administrative procedure of the Board. Important changes have been urged which affect substantive rights of employees covered by the act. Among these proposals we find:

First. A division of functions now performed by the Board between an Administrator who will have charge of the investigation and prosecution, and the Board which will be restricted solely to a judicial function.

Second. A stricter adherence to the rules of evidence at hearings.

Third. Permitting the courts to reweigh the evidence after hearing by the Board.

What is the purpose of these amendments? Has the recent investigation by the Smith committee disclosed facts sufficient to justify this radical administrative change in the careful procedure set forth in the statute?

We must therefore scrutinize the alleged evil sought to be remedied by the procedural changes dividing the functions of the Board and modeling its procedure after the old-fashioned court trial.

The minority report of the Smith committee states:

> We believe that, in the present state of evidence adduced by the committee, no sound reason has been brought forth for the procedural changes proposed by the majority and, on the contrary, such scanty evidence as is available in the record tends more to impeach the desirability of the amendments than to sustain them. (Vol. III, p. 407, hearings of House Committee to Investigate the Labor Board.)

* * * * * * *

> Despite the elaborate inquiry conducted by counsel for the committee, and the examination by him of many trial examiners and

review attorneys, there is no evidence in the record that these instructions have been violated, except upon such rare occasions as to be of little significance. Nor is there any showing in other respects that the administrative process as it has functioned within the Board, has resulted in any unfairness or lack of due process to parties appearing before the Board. (Vol. III, p. 408, hearings of House Committee to Investigate the Labor Board.)

These proposals to break into separate parts the administrative process now so familiar and well established, in the face of the principles developed from our experience of a half a century, are radical and disturbing. The complexities of administering a labor law and developing national labor policy need not be placed outside the established methods of administering and enforcing public policies. The American worker is entitled to have this law administered by an agency expert in industrial disputes, knowing, as they do, that this statute precisely provides for court review of all adversary orders, in the same manner as provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act for the review of orders of that agency.

The application of technical rules of evidence to Labor Board proceedings will serve no ends of justice. Such a proposal runs counter to the present trend even in the courts of law and equity. It is peculiarly unnecessary to apply technical rules which were designed to prevent lay juries from being influenced by improper evidence, to an agency which is expert in the field with which it deals. It should be remembered that the statute as now phrased and construed by the Supreme Court requires the findings of the Board to be supported by substantial evidence.

No argument can be made that the procedure of the Board does not afford parties before the Board a fair and just hearing. The Supreme Court has stated:

> We construe the procedural provisions as affording adequate opportunity to secure judicial protection against arbitrary action in accordance with the well-settled rules applicable to administrative agencies set up by Congress to aid in the enforcement of valid legislation. *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.* (301 U. S. 1).

Subsequent reviews of Board procedure have supported this judgment of the Supreme Court. Recently Judge Black, speaking for the Court, stated:

> Mindful of the separate responsibilities Congress has imposed upon the Board and the courts, we have carefully scrutinized this entire record. Within the range of our examination has appeared not merely the testimony but also the procedure followed from the filing of the charge before the Board to final decree of the Court of Appeals. The Board and its representatives solicitously guarded respondent's and intervenor's right to a full and fair hearing; manifested liberality in ruling upon evidence proposed by both sides; and conducted the proceedings in a manner calculated to bring about a just result. And as we have pointed out, substantial evidence supported the result which the Board did reach. Notwithstanding, the Court below declined to order enforcement of the Board's order, and the implications of its opinion are that the Board without a proper regard for either the limitations on its power or the evidence made findings all of which had no substantial support. *Bradford Dyeing Association* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (decided May 20, 1940).

The proposed procedural changes would take away the advantages of administrative action without adding any substance to the effective enforcement of the act. The amendment providing for an administrator in charge of the investigations has many disadvantages. The administrator is proposed to be appointed for an indefinite term. He has the sole responsibility for the initiation and prosecution of all violations of the act. He is therefore in a position to control the policy of the Board. To place the total responsibility for the effective development of that policy in the hands of a politically appointed administrator is, to say the least, unwise.

The Board and the act have been under constant attack by those who oppose the principles underlying its philosophy. Recently the Board has undergone an extensive investigation of all its records and actions by the Smith committee. After months of hearings and investigations, the evidence brought forth reveals no more indiscretions or faulty personnel than one would expect to find in any organization of its size. When these minute failures are considered together with a survey of the affirmative accomplishments of the Board, the true friends of the act will say the Board has done a difficult task in a manner which deserves the gratitude and respect of our country.

President Roosevelt stated in his radio talk on the state of our defense on May 26:

> While our Navy and our airplanes and our guns may be our first lines of defense, it is still clear that way down at the bottom, underlying them all, giving them their strength, sustenance, and power, are the spirit and morale of a free people.
>
> For that reason, we must make sure in all that we do that there be no break-down or cancelation of any of the great social gains which we have made in these past years. We have carried on an offensive of a broad front against social and economic inequalities and abuses which had made our society weak. That offensive should not now be broken down by the pincers movement of those who would use the present needs of physical military defense to destroy it.

There can be no doubt that the National Labor Relations Act represents, in its terms and in its accomplishments, one of our great social gains.

Apply the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL BY RAY RUNNION, EDITOR OF THE KANSAS CITY JOURNAL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the other day I read with deep interest an editorial written by Mr. Ray Runnion, editor of the Kansas City Journal of my home city, urging that the Congress take legislative action to assure the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine as a means for making it possible for the Western Hemisphere to remain at peace in keeping with our good-neighbor policy. It appeared in that paper on May 22, 1940.

It is my understanding that some steps have been taken in that direction in the Senate with the thought of incorporating such a provision in another bill now proposed to deal with the general problem of our national defense.

Feeling that Mr. Runnion's editorial provides a material contribution to these discussions, I wish to quote it here. It reads:

A UNITED STATES POLICY—NOW

With the conquest of the channel ports, Hitler's bombers will be within hopping distance of London. His obvious purpose is to bomb and starve England into a surrender that would give him control of the British Navy and the power to dismember the British Empire.

It is time for the United States to formulate an official policy to be followed in that eventuality. It should be the joint work of the President and Congress and should take the form of a congressional resolution.

It should state whether or not we are prepared to enforce the Monroe Doctrine in the event of European aggression on this hemisphere. It should further state whether that doctrine includes Greenland, a point on which there is no precedent to follow.

If we do not unite on a foreign policy to observe in the event Hitler becomes the master of Europe, it is conceivable that Hitler or somebody else will write a policy for us.

The situation in Europe when President Monroe proclaimed the doctrine in a congressional message in 1823 had parallels with that of today. The sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, united in the Holy Alliance, conspired to check the growth of democratic principles and representative government. They proposed, among other things, to overthrow the republics created in Spain's old colonies of Latin America. That was the situation when President Monroe proclaimed:

"In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately concerned. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to

declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Hitler has conquered no territory which is not already overpopulated. To feed the populations of his new empire he would be compelled to exploit thinly populated areas of great natural resources. South America would be a set-up for him.

The United States would be compelled to ask itself—and to provide an answer—whether the extension of the Nazi system to any portion of this hemisphere was "dangerous to our peace and safety."

But, it is argued, Hitler could not send an army across the ocean, and if he could there would be the problem of supply.

The answer is that the United States, wholly unprepared in 1917, had transported an army of 2,000,000 men to France 18 months after it entered the war, and it kept them fully supplied.

This was possible through joint protection of transports by the American and British Navies and because the troops landed on friendly soil. But Hitler will have the British Navy if he wins (the British demanded the German Navy in the last war) and he could convert a hostile South American country into a friendly country by an overnight "blitzkrieg."

It may be argued that we could defeat him before he landed a formidable force. Certainly we could, but we should have to go to war to do it. Whether we went to war to do it is a matter of national policy which should be determined and stated now.

Whatever the policy may be, it is the people who will decide it.

To enable them to reach a decision, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should sponsor a resolution specifically applying the Monroe Doctrine to the present world crisis. The ensuing public discussion would provide a guide of reasonable accuracy for congressional action.

To some the mere suggestion that we form a policy at all will seem alarmist. The answer is that only fools twiddle their thumbs when a Hitler runs loose in the world.

Vocational and Technical Training for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, with a gigantic national-defense program starting in America, we find ourselves with a shortage of skilled and semi-skilled workers. The ultimate line of national defense is to be found in the loyalty, intelligence, health, technical skill, economic efficiency, morale, and character of our citizens. Our schools should continue their efforts to develop citizens who willingly and effectively participate in the processes of democracy, to banish economic illiteracy, to establish a sense of civic responsibility, to develop habits of healthful living, to encourage appreciation of natural resources, and to improve the vocational and technical skills of our people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the American Association of School Administrators outlining facts concerning the contributions which the vocational schools and technical colleges are prepared to make in training workers in occupations which are essential to national defense.

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Our Nation faces the problem of mobilizing all facilities available for national defense. Of crucial importance now is the quick and efficient preparation of an additional supply of trained persons in those occupations essential to national defense.

The American people have already made an investment of one and a quarter billion dollars in more than 1,200 vocational and technical schools and colleges throughout the country. The program of trade and technical education which this investment makes possible is carried on by an experienced administrative organization and a staff of 35,000 skilled teachers. The facilities for defense training now provided by these schools and colleges could not be duplicated in many years.

These schools and colleges, now operating in every State in the Union, can make greater use of their present plants and equipment to turn out trained workers. If funds are made available, these institutions can expand their programs immediately through additional shifts in late afternoon and night periods and in summer sessions. By giving many of the workers intensive short courses—in some instances requiring only a few weeks—these institutions can train at least 1,250,000 workers annually, thus more than doubling their normal training capacity.

This expanded program can be put into operation immediately if Federal funds are made available. In our judgment the greatest efficiency can be secured by administering this program through the established Federal, State, and local educational agencies in close coordination with the agencies responsible for the national defense.

Signed in Washington, D. C., June 6, 1940, by: Carroll Reed, superintendent of schools, Minneapolis, Minn., president American Association of School Administrators, chairman; F. L. Bishop, University of Pittsburgh, secretary, Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education; William G. Carr, secretary, Educational Policies Commission, Washington, D. C.; D. W. Creel, assistant secretary, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C.; L. H. Dennis, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.; Willard E. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.; B. E. Packard, commissioner of education, Augusta, Maine, secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers; S. D. Shankland, executive secretary, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C.; R. O. Small, State director of vocational education, Boston, Mass., president, American Vocational Association; A. J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman, Educational Policies Commission; John J. Tigert, president, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., president, National Association of State Universities.

Proposed training program for national defense in schools and colleges

Facilities to be used	Number to be trained	Average length of training period	Hours of training per week	Cost	Average cost per trainee
A. Public schools:					
Summer schools, 1940	150,000	10 weeks	40–42	$15,000,000	$100.00
Extra shifts during the regular school year.	225,000	12 weeks	40–42	27,000,000	120.00
Expanded trade-extension programs for employed workers.	375,000	36 weeks	4	21,600,000	57.60
Total for public schools	750,000			63,600,000	84.80
B. Engineering schools	[1] 20,000	10 months	40–42	14,000,000	466.67
C. Expansion of facilities requiring capital investment.	250,000	10 to 36 weeks.	4–42	50,000,000	[2] 84.80

[1] This number (20,000) can be trained for 10 full months. Probably many persons to be trained in these colleges would need only 3 or 4 months of intensive training. The total number of different persons who may be trained for $14,000,000 would therefore equal approximately 30,000.

[2] Exclusive of capital investments.

Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

TELEGRAMS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

MOBILE, ALA., *June 5, 1940.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

This organization unanimously urges and implores that all possible aid be dispatched to Allies at earliest possible moment now when days count. While we wholeheartedly endorse all defense measures proposed, what earthly good would they be if Allies suffer early defeat? The Nazis probably wouldn't let us finish them.

B. F. ADAMS & CO.

MOBILE, ALA., *June 5, 1940.*

Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
House of Representatives:

I firmly believe, as do all my friends with whom I have talked, that immediate help should be given the Allies in planes, tanks, all war materials. We firmly concur in Senator PEPPER's proposal,

but it is not far-reaching enough. Defeat of Germany by the Allies is the best insurance we can seek for future happiness and prosperity of this country.

JACK FRIEND.

MOBILE, ALA., *June 5, 1940.*

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Immediate aid to the Allies at this time is our best defense and the Congress promptly should authorize Government credits for the purchase of the products of the United States, also so arrange that all airplanes not now required for national defense may be traded in to manufacturers to be sold without delay to the Allies and also appropriate $100,000,000 or more to the Red Cross to care for refugees in the war area. Nearly all with whom I have discussed the situation in the last 15 days concur in the above expressed thoughts and this message goes to each Alabama Senator and Congressman.

T. M. STEVENS.

Memorial Day, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL BY GORDON WAYNE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under my privilege to extend my remarks, I enclose a powerful, constructive, and timely editorial dedicated to Memorial Day and entitled "Have They Died in Vain?", written by Gordon Wayne, and which appeared in the May 24, 1940, issue of the South Boston Gazette and the Dorchester Beacon, progressive newspapers of the district I have the honor and privilege of representing in this body.

[From the South Boston Gazette of May 24, 1940]

MEMORIAL DAY, 1940—HAVE THEY DIED IN VAIN?

(By Gordon Wayne)

Twenty-six years ago, hell reigned in Flanders Field as man-made instruments of destruction hurled death upon every living organism. From August 1914 to Armistice Day in 1918, the Four Horsemen galloped about the European Continent at a price that can never be fully estimated in terms of the spiritual. We know the material cost, for it is on the defaulted-debts ledger of the American Treasury. Then after 4 years of a terrible holocaust came peace, a troubled peace born out of the unholy conferences at Versailles at which the President of the United States was cruelly deceived and at which the then Vicar of Christ, Pope Benedict XV was not welcome. We do not propose to review the events of a quarter of a century ago. There are a few facts we would like to point out however.

In those days America entered the struggle 3,000 miles away to save democracy and end all wars. We sacrificed the lives of a million young Americans and squandered many millions more of American money. The days intervening between Armistice Day, 1918, and the opening of the second World War 6 months ago, have by no means been happy or propitious for the United States. The greatest economic crisis in all our history fell upon us in 1929 and up to this hour has not been overcome despite the united efforts of a sincere and earnest citizenship in cooperation with its government. Many historians will trace all these unhappy days to the dictates laid down at Versailles.

As we write these words in comparative safety, hell again reigns in Flanders Fields. In the shortest period imaginable we have seen the robot soldiers of the Nazi Hitler lay nation after nation prostrate, while the weak and the impotent are cruelly crushed under the might and power of mentally unbalanced leaders—a ghastly picture which becomes darker with each passing hour.

Within the next week the ordinary billion-dollar appropriation for military and naval purposes will be increased to over $3,000,000,000 at the request of the President. Make no mistake, the United States is preparing for the worst, yet hoping for the best. Where are we heading? Will we be involved? Are the two oceans no longer our most powerful natural protectors? With such weighty problems do we approach Memorial Day, the day which in a special way is dedicated to our war dead. What are your feelings and thoughts as you tenderly place a wreath or flower on the last resting place of your loved ones? What must be the innermost thoughts of those who are entrusted with the task of decorating the graves of their departed comrades in arms? Finally, what must young America be thinking? For it is to young America that we must turn if the worst comes, and to young America will fall the task of carrying on from where their fallen sires now lay. Young America will answer the call as did their fathers and grandfathers before them, but it should not, will not, and cannot refrain from the query, Have they died in vain?

Memorial Day, then, should be a solemn occasion for all of us to implore the God of peace so that the prayers and sacrifices of our hero dead will not have been in vain. In the words of the poet, "They live, they speak, they see." Surely we cannot harbor the thought of having them undergo the tortures they suffered 23 years ago on the battlefields of Europe. Man is required only once to die, and die again they will, if from the great beyond they must powerlessly behold their sons shedding blood for the same cause for which they made the supreme sacrifice these many years now gone. Let us pray, then, to the God of peace—He alone can give the answer to that burning question of the day, Have they died in vain?

All Steps Short of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK O. HORTON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, when does a pig become a hog? Is there any fine line of distinction? Can you tell just where one stops and the other starts?

Those are some of the questions that we are asking ourselves, and we refuse to throw our hat in the air and go along with the procession until we know where we are headed and by whom.

For one thing, we can all be eternally thankful, and that is that no American boys have yet been sent "over there" unprepared to meet modern warfare, as they would have been had they been sent at all.

It is well to remember that we are no better prepared today than we were yesterday, and if our boys go they go unprepared, just like cattle being led to the slaughter. And do not forget that the action of the President June 6 in sending 50 of our planes to help the Allies not only leaves us less well prepared but also constitutes another step toward war.

Oh, no; the Government did not sell these planes to a belligerent; they simply turned them back to Curtiss Co., who will sell them. Just a subterfuge which all the world understands.

Apparently the President is about to sell to a belligerent a quantity of surplus World War stock—500,000 Lee-Enfield rifles; 25,000 Browning automatic rifles from our total stock of 60,000; 500 3-inch Stokes mortars; 70,000 machine guns; 300 light field guns of the English type, heavy field pieces, and millions of rounds of ammunition. I suppose this sale will leave us better prepared also. We can fairly hear the "Trojan horse" laugh.

Whether the President will sell these direct to a belligerent or through a junk dealer is not revealed. Little difference, for again all the world will understand.

Article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in war, provides:

> The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war materials of any kind whatever is forbidden.

The United States as well as Germany are parties to this covenant.

The United States is a neutral, and England and France are belligerents.

The action just taken and about to be expanded by the President is an utter violation of every principle of international law and is tantamount to an act of war.

Under the Constitution it is the Congress, not the President, who declares war.

If this tantamount-to-war action by the President leads to a declaration of war, then actually the President has usurped the most sacred and inviolate right of the Congress.

Such usurpation of power spells dictator.

If you are asking us, we are into this thing right up to our necks now.

What if these little slaps on the Hitler wrist that we are administering by our pitiful help to the Allies do not turn the tide of battle in favor of the Allies; and what reason has the President or anyone else to suppose that they will?

What if Germany wins? What if the President's action has already been construed as a declaration of war by Germany? Would we or would we not be considered by the victor as among his defeated enemies and demands made upon us to pay the cost of the war?

This man Hitler strikes fast when he strikes, and if the President's action has convinced him that eventually there must be war, why not now?

Certainly we have never in our entire history been in such poor shape to defend ourselves as we are today; the world knows that; and just as certainly, with the completion of our present defense program, we will be the best armed power on earth. What comfort can Hitler find in delay?

Kinda looks as if we had "missed the bus" again.

Right now, when 90 percent of our people want to do something for our natural Allies, we find ourselves unable to do anything effective.

There has been a lot of bluff and bluster, but we have forgotten the club and the world knows that even better than we. A far, far cry from the sane and sensible policy of Teddy Roosevelt, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." Bluff and bluster mean nothing without the club.

Hitler and Roosevelt are contemporaries, they came into power at about the same time. Hitler knew exactly where he was going and, like it or not, he went. Roosevelt at all times has been advised of Hitler's every move, has had exact information regarding the development of every new engine of war.

For reasons unknown he has not acted on that information nor has he seen fit to reveal his secret information to the Congress or the people.

The people have never been taken into his confidence.

From the very start the real question before the people, the Congress, and the President was whether this was our war or whether it was not.

That question has never been squarely put or squarely answered. Instead, we fooled around and finally adopted an absolutely unneutral Neutrality Act, which permitted us to play around the edges, but always with the hope that we would not get our feet wet.

Had we at that time decided exactly what our foreign policy was and at once taken steps to make that policy stick, then we would not be in the pitiable and despicable position that we are today.

We have had 7 years of Hitler and 18 months of Hitler's kind of war, and here we are, after all that time suddenly caught with our pants down.

We instinctively want to ring Hitler's neck and render all possible help to the Allies. Still we cannot forget that America comes first and that her interests must not be neglected.

With a possible enemy at our gates and a sure "fifth column" enemy amongst us, we simply cannot applaud the action of our Chief in jeopardizing the safety of our own people in disposing of defense weapons so sorely needed at this time.

Air Mail Pick-Up Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW EDMISTON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 26, 1940:

[From the New York Times of May 26, 1940]

AIR-MAIL PICK-UP SERVICE

In the pressure of measures to provide an adequate air defense, it may be hoped that Congress will find time to authorize the extension of the air-mail feeder service which has been linking 62 communities in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware, and West Virginia into the main network of the air lines. An examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Authority has ruled that this agency lacks jurisdiction either to continue the present service of All-American Aviation or to authorize its proposed expansion to include 210 cities and towns in 7 States. However, the Post Office Department, reporting to Congress on the operation of this unusual pick-up service (by which mail sacks are taken on and discharged in flight), has recommended its permanent establishment. It has also commended highly the safety record of the undertaking, which was inaugurated under the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

In the time that it has been in operation great convenience has been provided to the communities served. Many off-line points which could not hope for many years to become a part of the broad national system of airways have enjoyed the speed and convenience of the air mail. Operating through one of the most difficult winters on record in the mountainous terrain which it serves, a high percentage of scheduled maintenance has been shown, and no casualty has marred the record. In all, 438,145 scheduled miles have been completed and more than 23,000 pick-ups made, with a total handling of air mail of about 75,000 pounds. Certificates are now sought for additional routes which would extend the service to New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky and provide for the transportation of passengers and express, where feasible, in addition to mail. It is highly desirable to continue this interesting innovation in civil flying.

Highways and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1940

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the armed conflict now raging in Europe presents a terrifying threat to the world's social, economic, and political structure. Motorized ordnance and transport, moving relentlessly at speeds never before visioned, have caught nations off guard and unprepared to meet the swiftness and awfulness of this attack. A power-driven hell has been let loose upon earth to sacrifice countless peaceful, innocent men, women, and children to the terrible gods of conquest. No treaties, no neutrality, no covenants, no pledges protect. Never in recorded history has a cataclysm of such inhuman conception and such fiendish execution brought death so swiftly to so many nor so abrupt an end to the national integrity of small countries. While we do not lose faith in the final outcome, there is no place for a policy of delay in making sure the United States is prepared for any eventuality. Now that it has become certain that a nation can throw off every restraint of international law, of honor, of truth, and of human compassion in a mad attempt to rule the world, there is but one course to follow. It is not the course of conquest. It is the course of security—first for our own country, and second for the Western Hemisphere.

And that course, what are its principal objectives? Fortunately there need be little doubt. We have only to follow the pattern set for us by the aggressor, the pattern from which there has been created the swiftest and most effective engine of assault in history. For speed and efficiency of attack can only be matched by an equal speed and efficiency of defense.

We have read aright the first and most obvious of the lessons of this new, this lightning war, and we are preparing—laggard but not too late—to put into the air over this hemisphere such a fleet of airplanes as will outmatch the greatest and most powerful attack that any foreign aggressor may bring against us.

We have not failed to perceive the importance in both attack and defense of those all but irresistible battleships of the land—the tanks. And we will doubtless be fully equal to the task of creating in good season a defensive equipment

of this sort that will completely counter the aggressor's designs.

The tidings of battle that we receive almost hourly by press and radio give full account of the effectiveness of planes and tanks, and we have been duly impressed with their importance as weapons of combat. But we hear much less in the reports from the front of the less spectacular but vitally important functioning of the service of supply, of the skillfully coordinated system of transportation for men and matériel, without which the most efficient combative weapons would be powerless.

Because of its less dramatic quality, because it is less frequently and less strikingly brought to our attention, there is the possibility that we may fail to note the lesson of transport preparedness which is written large for those who care to read in the terrific speed and prompt and massive support of the German advance into the Low Countries.

It was not without definite purpose that Mr. Hitler in 1933, as one of his earliest measures of preparation for the war he has now brought upon the world, began the construction of a system of great motor roads. It is no insignificant fact that these autobahnen, now completed, interlace all the industrial regions and great population centers of the older Germany and are extended as rapidly as possible into each newly conquered province.

These great German highways, the admiration of the road builders of the world, were designed particularly for the service they are now called upon to give. And we may be sure that over them there is moving at this moment the swift and orderly processions of a highly mechanized army and a ceaseless progression toward the front of all the manifold munitions, wares, and goods which are needed to maintain the attacking strength of the combat troops.

Into the making of these great military highways of Germany there was concentrated the utmost of forethought and careful, purposeful planning, and a sustained, intensive productive effort that we, in our own ways, must not fail to emulate if we would successfully meet the challenge that must now be viewed as a definite possibility.

We of the United States of America have viewed with pride the achievements of our own road builders during the last score of years. In that period we have seen the creation of a vast network of main highway arteries, designed primarily for the uses of peace. Through a cooperative endeavor of exemplary efficiency the road-building agencies of the Federal and State Governments have converted matched appropriations of the respective governments into the improvements that have made our Federal-aid highways the magnificently useful arterial system that they are today. The Congress of the United States has never faltered in its support of the Federal-aid highway policy since its inception in 1916, and it is largely to this sustained adherence to a soundly conceived plan that we owe the splendid roadways that we now possess.

I am happy today to be able to say that, while they have been working primarily for the creation of highways of peace in these last twenty-odd years, our highway authorities, under the advice of the War Department, have not been unmindful of the eventualities of war. Ever since 1921 the strategic highway needs of the Nation have been the subject of continuous cooperative study by the War Department and the Public Roads Administration, formerly the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture.

The first result of this study matured in 1922 with the production of the so-called Pershing map, a carefully guarded map of the United States on which were shown all of the highways then considered to be of special strategic importance, with indication of the desired priority of improvement. The Public Roads Administration has been constantly guided by this map and its 1935 revision, first in the approval of roads proposed by the State highway departments for inclusion in the Federal-aid highway system, and second, in its review and approval of the detailed improvement plans submitted to it by the State agencies. To its knowledge of possible defense necessities and its concern that the important highways of the country should be able to meet the tests of war, if it should come, may be attributed the firm insistence of the Public Roads Administration upon standards of design and construction which, at times, have been opposed by some as excessively high and exacting.

Fortunately the Public Roads Administration—the Bureau, as we have long called it—was not unduly swayed by objections to its reasoned demands; for to its seeming rigidity the country now owes in large measure the general war readiness of its major highway system.

But though we may congratulate ourselves upon the possession of highways not ill prepared to meet a war emergency; though we may be confident that there would be no such general highway break-down under the stress of war's usage as widely occurred in 1917–18; we cannot be wholly blind to the presence in our highway system of serious weaknesses, the correction of which has now become our urgent necessity.

We must not overlook the fact that in the more than 20 years during which we have been at this job of road building on a national scale, there have been great changes in the character of motor vehicles and in the present and potential uses of the highways. Some sections of our existing highway plant were built at the very beginning of that 20-year period. They were built to serve types of vehicles that, compared with those of the present, appear primitive indeed; built also to serve a traffic which in volume and weight was but a fraction of the then unforeseeable but now realized heavy movement. Yet so well were they built that they remain today still structurally sound, however inadequate they have become otherwise to the modern service they are called upon to render.

In general, and with the particular exception of some of the older bridges, it is to the great increase in the speed of movement and the tremendous enlargement of traffic volume, rather than to any effects of the weight of vehicles that we must attribute such obsolescence as now exists in the highway system. But such weaknesses as do exist are now known, thanks again to the foresight of the Public Roads Administration, which nearly 5 years ago initiated, in cooperation with the State highway departments, the State-wide highway-planning surveys that now provide us with this important information in practically all of the States. Provision for these important surveys was wisely made in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of June 18, 1934.

With the results of these surveys in large part available, arrangements were made early in 1939 for a reexamination of the highway needs of the modern military establishment and the adequacy of existing highway improvement by a joint committee representing the War Department, the Public Roads Administration, and the American Association of State Highway Officials.

The attention of these committees has been especially directed:

First. To the designation of those strategically important highways to which particular attention should be given, and the indication of a desirable priority of improvement within the designated group of roads; and

Second. To a determination of the vehicle weight and traffic volume capacities needed in the roads and bridges that may be required for military use under any circumstances likely to arise.

Following these two particular lines of study, roads of special military interest have been designated by the War Department under two general heads.

They are:

First. A general system of 78,000 miles of main highways, joining strategically important points and vital areas throughout the United States; and

Second. Approximately 6,000 miles of roads within and adjacent to 101 military reservations which are considered important as Army concentration points.

In consideration of the weight and dimensions of its mobile equipment the War Department has also indicated the standards of design for roads and bridges which should govern the

improvement of all of the designated routes and reservation accesses.

Applying these standards, the Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments, for several months past, have been rating the previously surveyed existing improvement of designated roads of the two general classes, and determining exactly and in detail what further improvements are essential to fit these most important highways to perform their anticipated military service.

In the general strategic system of 78,000 miles, which is composed principally of Federal-aid and State highways, surfaces are found in the main to be adequate in point of strength, less adequate in respect to width and vertical clearance, and largely inadequate in curvature, grades, and sight distances.

The most critical deficiencies are numerous weak bridges, having a rated capacity of less than the 30,000-pound load, which up to now has been the specified minimum for military equipment; and, in passing, it may be proper to note that this standard may require some revision in the light of what is now occurring on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean.

Bridges of less than 30,000-pound rated capacity are found to make up 12 percent of all bridges on the designated strategic system, occurring, on the average, at intervals of about 35 miles. On the average these structures are already carrying a normal peacetime traffic in which the maximum daily load is practically twice their rated capacity, a performance of which they are capable only with the dangerous impairment of prudent factors of safety. Included among these weak bridges are many that are also too narrow to permit passing upon them with safety, and there are many other structures that are deficient in this respect though adequate in strength.

Included among the 6,000 miles of reservation-access roads are many miles, both within the reservations and outside, that are not in either the Federal-aid or State highway systems; and a large part of this mileage is found to be seriously inadequate.

Determination of the further improvements needed on the entire mileage designated by the War Department to render it completely adequate for wartime use is far advanced and is proceeding with all possible expedition. The facts already in hand are such as to indicate without the shadow of a doubt that the further authorization of Federal highway appropriations unanimously recommended by all State and Federal highway agencies are needed, needed for purposes as vital to the national defense as others more generally recognized, needed now, and without any reduction whatsoever. In fact, it is my judgment that it would be desirable to provide that the appropriations authorized by the pending bill shall be immediately available for expenditure, if the occasion demands, and prior to the fiscal years for which they are authorized.

I would emphasize that the administrative knowledge of improvement necessities upon which the requests for these authorizations is based is of the most precise character. No vagueness of belief, but the most positive and accurate knowledge underlies the estimates of the highway officials, a knowledge based upon a most intensive survey of the actual conditions and expected usage of our highway system both in peace and in war, a knowledge which, so far as it has to do with matters of military preparedness is arrived at in full accord with and under the advice of the highest military authorities.

This bill as originally recommended by the committee provided for the authorization of appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 in the following amounts:

For Federal-aid highways	$125,000,000
For secondary or feeder roads	25,000,000
For the elimination of hazards at railroad grade crossings	50,000,000

The bill as passed out by the Committee on Roads reduced each of these amounts. The respective amounts recommended by the committee are the minimum amounts that should be considered.

The need for these appropriations is supported by the fullest and most exact information. It is rendered more urgent by the probable military necessities of the immediate future. I consider that this House bill be recreant in its duty to the Nation if it votes to authorize less than the amounts provided in the bill originally recommended by the committee.

Columbia Broadcasting System Answers Congressman Mundt's Open Question to Radio Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3546 I propounded a question to the radio executives of America growing out of the problem of how far radio should go in broadcasting the horror and hatreds of modern warfare in view of the importance of maintaining steady nerves and clear-headedness as America makes destiny-determining decisions in these significant days. I have received from Harry C. Butcher, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, a very courteous and commendable letter expressing the keen appreciation which C. B. S. has of the problems involved and the sincere steps which it has taken and is taking to guard against highly emotionalized speakers and programs whose broadcasts might render a disservice to the best interests of America. Mr. Butcher assures me the other radio chains are also giving special consideration to the dangers of excesses in war broadcasting.

LETTER OF HARRY C. BUTCHER TO CONGRESSMAN MUNDT

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1940.

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: As discussed with you on the telephone this morning, I am sending herewith a copy of a memorandum issued by the Columbia Broadcasting System, September 5, 1939, shortly after the outbreak of the war, governing general operations in connection with European war coverage. We have earnestly and conscientiously endeavored to follow the principles and instructions enunciated therein.

I am also sending a copy of the N. A. B. report for September 15, 1939, which carries on page 3717 the text of the memorandum of European war coverage as agreed to by all three networks. This agreement subsequently was approved insofar as it applied to individual station operations at the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters held later in September, in Chicago.

I noticed in your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you state that Mr. Kaltenborn is on Columbia. Mr. Kaltenborn has not been on Columbia for some time.

To repeat what I told you on the phone, I think your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that you have given a great deal of thought to this subject, as have the executives of the broadcasting networks and stations generally. We appreciate the responsibilities placed upon us by these trying times and are attempting, I believe with considerable success, to inform the public honestly and conscientiously. Certainly Columbia is making every effort in this direction.

Of course, you realize that the networks and the stations largely obtain their news from the press associations. In the case of Columbia our press association news is supplemented by our own reports by our own men—incidentally all American citizens—from European points. The press associations in general have done their traditionally magnificent job and the service rendered by radio would be virtually impossible without benefit of services by these agencies.

The nature and the facts of the war news definitely create grave concern with the listeners but neither radio nor the press has any control over the gravity of the news. Columbia, and I believe the other networks, have risen to their responsibility. Certainly our response from listeners everywhere indicates a generous approval of our efforts and a warm appreciation of the service rendered.

With best regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

HARRY C. BUTCHER.

Mr. Speaker, I am also attaching to these remarks the two enclosures which Mr. Butcher sent me, showing specifically how the radio industry is recognizing its responsibilities and endeavoring to exercise self-restraint, good taste, and justice in shaping its policies in the handling of war news. I am confident that a continuance of this careful attention to the

problem by radio executives themselves, combined with a thoughtful rededication to the careful observance of the self-restraint they have imposed, can provide a far better solution to the problem than any congressional action which might threaten or restrict the use of free speech on the air. I believe a study of these self-imposed restrictions, together with a review of recent radio programs must convince any reader that with a few unfortunate—although rather conspicuous—exceptions, radio is now trying hard to live up to the standards of public service it has set for itself in the attached regulations. It is to be hoped that exceptions to the rule will not be permitted to mar the record.

I have every confidence that American radio is trying to do a sincere and sensible job of reporting war news to America. In conversation with Mr. Butcher, he told me of how certain radio commentators had been discontinued because their methods were on the side of the hysterical rather than the factual, and he assured me that radio was constantly watching its programs to keep them in harmony with the best interests of the country. It is encouraging to us all to be assured that so young an institution as radio in the field of reporting is already building a tradition and establishing standards which indicate it is paralleling the record of the American press in richly meriting the important responsibilities reposed by the rights and privileges which it enjoys.

I am frank to say that I do not quite share Mr. Butcher's enthusiastic endorsement of the degree to which radio is conforming with the admirable code it has established for itself. As vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting Co., however, Mr. Butcher may be excused for being somewhat inclined to play down radio's excesses and errors and to stress its commendable features.

RADIO IS NOT BLAMELESS, BUT IT IS ALERT TO ITS CHALLENGE

I have heard too many Members of Congress condemning "hysterical radio commentators" and "upsetting radio programs" and have read too many editorial complaints and letters of protest to believe that radio is blameless and that its self-imposed restrictions are either quite inclusive enough or quite sufficiently respected. But radio is young in this field of public service, and I am encouraged and gratified by the fact that, first, it has recognized that the war situation reposes unusual responsibilities upon it; second, it has set up a set of voluntary regulations to govern its handling of war news; third, it has replaced some of its more hysterical and least stable announcers and commentators by men and women with a greater devotion to factual reporting and less of a flair for amateur dramatics; and, fourth, it is keeping alert to the situation and is endeavoring to further regulate itself as new needs for such restraints become evident.

Radio has thus demonstrated its desire and determination to protect its privileges by the intelligent course of establishing its own restrictions against public-penalizing excesses. As a firm believer in the significance of free speech, I am sure this method has many advantages over the various proposals for intensified Government regulation and supervision which are beginning to be discussed informally, and rather too generally, in the congressional cloakrooms.

IF WAR SHOULD COME—PRIVATE RADIO CONTROL WOULD GO

If war should come to America or if America should inject itself into foreign war, complete Government censorship and perhaps Government ownership and operation of radio would probably follow as the night the day. Personally, I would abhor this action but there is little reason to doubt its eventuality. It is altogether too possible that privately owned and operated radio would never again prevail in America should we be drawn or driven into war.

One has only to look at the harrowing experience of the railroads since the Government took them over in the World War to realize what Government-operated radio would do to this great industry if we should go to war again. Too, once a political administration tasted the intoxicating blood of power which would come from Government radio, it is extremely unlikely, and contrary to all the lessons of history, that private businessmen would ever again be given the right to own and operate the radios, determine what programs to use or decline, and hold virtual monopolies over favored airwaves for private profit. Private radio would, in all likelihood, be one of the first and one of the permanent casualties of another war involving America. But America is at peace.

I know it is the hope of Members of Congress and radio executives alike that the peaceful progress of this country can go ahead without new regulations and restrictions being placed on the radio industry. I hope a faithful devotion to the following self-imposed radio regulations and a frequent revaluation of their adequacy by radio itself will prevent emotional excesses and broadcasting bad taste which might goad a disillusioned America to insist on Congressional action to prevent abuses which I am sure radio itself is ready, willing, and able to prevent.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1939.

C. B. S. EUROPEAN WAR COVERAGE—A MEMORANDUM GOVERNING GENERAL OPERATIONS FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE ORGANIZATION

This memorandum is issued to formalize and amplify the instructions under which we have been operating ever since the crisis developed.

Our plan of operation represents no basic change in the policy which this company has maintained in the past. This policy has been to deal honestly, accurately, and fairly with the news and with public discussion.

Columbia's announced policy of having no editorial views of its own and not seeking to maintain or advance the views of others will be rigidly continued.

President Roosevelt said in his address to the Nation on Sunday night that America is the best informed nation in the world. This is because we have in America a free radio and a free press. We shall continue to keep America as well informed as possible on all phases of the war, including the propaganda of various nations and the proposals and discussions which go on in this Nation and other nations about war or any aspect of it. We are not responsible if the facts either help or hinder participants in the conflict or either please or displease advocates in America of any particular line of conduct here or elsewhere.

Columbia, as an organization, has no editorial opinions about the war. It has no editorial opinions about what this country or any other country should or should not do. Those, therefore, who are its voice in presenting or analyzing the news must not express their own feelings. This does not preclude informed appraisals of the meaning of facts. The opinion phase of the situation will be covered by speakers under our usual policy for the fair discussion of controversial public issues.

In being fair and factual, those who present the news for Columbia must not only refrain from personal opinion, but must refrain from microphone manner designed to cast doubt, suspicion, sarcasm, ridicule, or anything of that sort on the matter they are presenting. This should be particularly observed when it is necessary to interpolate comment because an address is being received in a foreign language or in running fragments necessitating the filling in of time between breaks. It should always be remembered that the speaker is entitled to get his own point of view over as effectively as he can.

What news analysts are entitled to do and should do is to elucidate and illuminate the news out of common knowledge or special knowledge possessed by them or made available to them by this organization through its news sources. They should point out the facts on both sides, show contradictions with the known record, and so on. They should bear in mind that in a democracy it is important that people not only should know but should understand, and their function is to help the listener to understand, to weigh, and to judge, but not to do the judging for him.

It is impossible, within any reasonable limits, to define completely this last-mentioned aspect of news analysis. Fairness and temperateness are of its essence.

In this connection, prophecy, so far as possible, should be avoided. It is foolish to say "Germany will be licked in 6 months." It is perfectly proper to say that certain military experts (or the speaker himself, if he be such an expert) believe, in the light of the following known military facts that the defeat of Germany in 6 months might be possible.

An unexcited demeanor at the microphone should be maintained at all times, though the tempo can, of course, be varied with the nature of the news. Dire forebodings, leaving the radio audience hanging up in the air and filled with suspense and terror, of our own creation, are not good broadcasting. We should not tell the listener that, at this very moment, innocent women and children may be drowning somewhere in the Atlantic because another ship may have been torpedoed by a German submarine, or anything of that nature.

The basis of our operations is a staff of trained Americans, both in this country and in Europe, most of whom have had news training with newspapers or press associations, and all of whom have had training in broadcasting in general and in our own operations in particular. We are to continue to use Americans as far as possible, and all our correspondents abroad have been instructed and will be reinstructed not to make use of foreigners (except on those occasions where they are making speeches frankly presenting their own points of view). Foreigners will be used in our regular news coverage only in emergencies when a satisfactory American cannot be immedaitely obtained. In these cases his nationality is to be stated.

We have three main sources of news: (1) The three press associations—the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service; (2) information possessed or obtained by our own staff of editors in the news department and our news analysts here and our news staff in Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, Warsaw, Rome, and Tokyo, and such other points as we cover from time to time; (3) short-wave broadcasts by government-owned European stations and miscellaneous sources of information of various sorts.

In making use of all of these sources, we must at all times be careful to label information for what it is, using the same kind of care that is habitually used by press associations and good newspapers. We must try to distinguish fact from rumor, official information from semiofficial "high sources," and so on, and from mere gossip. Of course, the greatest weight should be given to those things known to be factual. We should make known at frequent intervals that the news received from many sources is censored and that, therefore, it may be incomplete and at times even inaccurate.

If all our own people presenting news will present it in this way and analyze it with due weight given to these factors, we can keep the American public very well informed on every phase of things as they develop, help them continually to appraise and weigh the news, and make them well aware of current opinion throughout the world. It must be recalled that this opinion is, in itself, a fact. For instance, if the British people believe that the Germans are committing atrocities, the fact of their belief is important. That these atrocities are real, false, or unproven is another fact.

Broadcasting of properly identified fact, allegation, opinion, rumor, and all the other attendant circumstances in which the conflict progresses will continue to keep the American listener the best informed in the world. In no other way can he know all that he should know.

In presenting the addresses of foreign statesmen and other speakers, we will be guided solely by news judgment (in the light of program balance). If we present them when the given situation indicates that they should be heard over here, we shall do a fair and honest news job. We will have to use our best efforts to overcome the handicap of one side not talking our language. We also will have to be guided by the breaks of the news. For example, if Hitler speaks one day and no one else does, or if Chamberlain speaks and no one else does, it would, of course, be silly to leave off the speech of one side because we had none from the other. An excellent example of how fair and comprehensive broadcasting can be was furnished on Sunday, when there were speeches from London, from Paris, and from Canada, but none in Germany which were made available for broadcasting. We succeeded in obtaining the text of various Hitler proclamations and statements and presented his side perhaps just as well as if he had spoken.

The point in the foregoing and in guiding much of our operation is that if we will honestly and sincerely try to present the news, regardless of which way it points, we shall do a much better job than if we merely strive for a sort of mathematical fairness. Let us take for example the round-ups of editorial opinion which we occasionally present. Decision to present one of these should be based solely on a belief that newspaper reaction to a given thing (the British-French declaration of war, or the President's speech at the outbreak of the war) is of great interest to the general public. As long as we present them on this basis, we are being honest and fair. The minute we presented one because somebody here had some personal desire to influence public opinion on some given question, we should be operating badly. By the same token, if we refrained from presenting one because it did not reflect the point of view we had hoped for, or if we selected editorials to make a particular point of view emphatic, we would be doing an intolerable kind of job. I know this would never happen here; I mention it merely by way of illustration.

The same thing applies to presenting either individual broadcasts of European government stations or a summary of such operations for a given day. If we were merely on a mathematical basis to present so many minutes of each, it might very often be dull and tedious. If, with honest news judgment, we pick out what is salient, we will do a good job even though on one occasion we might present nothing except that which had been said over a German station or some station presenting the point of view of the other side. Here, too, we must be guided by honest, sincere news judgment and our fundamental purpose of presenting all points of view as the breaks of the news require.

We come now to the question of speeches over here on public questions related to the war. Here we shall follow our traditional policy. If there are persons in America who think we should enter the war, and others who think we should keep out, we shall permit the public debate of this question, selecting as far as possible speakers with varying points of view. We cannot do an honest job for the American public without letting them know that there are varying opinions and that these opinions are being agitated. In the same way, if, for example, the President proposes repeal of the present Neutrality Act, we shall carry as fully as possible the outstanding debate on this issue. The amount of debate naturally will be gaged by the public interest in the current question, its importance, and the imminence of action.

Our own purveyors of news over the air, both here and abroad, will be free to deal with controversial issues discussed in speeches, the same as they deal with any other phase of the general situation. For instance, they may give factual information about the progress of the argument, and our broadcasters from abroad may tell how those countries feel, what their officials are doing, if anything, toward trying to influence a given issue over here, and so on, as long as the broadcaster himself refrains from doing anything that comes out of himself which is designed to influence action one way or the other.

This memorandum has purposely been made lengthy in the hope of clarifying the thinking of all concerned about the general principles which will guide us in broadcasting the war. As a final word, it should be remembered that Americans should know everything we can possibly tell them about every phase of the situation, provided only that it is important that we put it out for exactly what it is, that we do our best to inform and explain with honesty and sincerity, and thus demonstrate once more that radio plays a tremendous part in the maintenance of all that is best in a democracy.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.

NETWORKS ADOPT ARRANGEMENT FOR WAR BROADCASTS

(From N. A. B. Report, September 15, 1939)

Neville Miller made public on Monday an arrangement voluntarily reached by the Columbia Broadcasting System, Mutual Broadcasting System, and National Broadcasting Co. last Thursday in New York for the conduct of their broadcasting during the present emergency. Chairman James Lawrence Fly, of the F. C. C., and his committee, Commissioners Thad H. Brown and Commander T. A. M. Craven, were informed today of this voluntary arrangement at an informal meeting with Neville Miller, president of the National Association of Broadcasters; Niles Trammell, executive vice president of the National Broadcasting Co.; Alfred J. McCosker, chairman of the board of the Mutual Broadcasting System; and Edward Klauber, executive vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. Miller explained that the arrangement had not been made public hitherto because it was felt that as a matter of courtesy the new Chairman of the F. C. C. and his committee associates should be informally made aware of it first.

Mr. Miller expressed satisfaction that the major networks of the country had been able to find ways to apply the experience they have gained in broadcasting many critical events through the years to the war crisis without eliminating that competition which all concerned felt to be so essential to good public service.

The text of the arrangement:

MEMORANDUM OF EUROPEAN WAR COVERAGE

General

Every effort consistent with the news itself is to be made to avoid horror, suspense, and undue excitement. Particular effort will be made to avoid suspense in cases where the information causing the suspense is of no particular use to the listener. For example, news of air-raid alarms should not be broadcast until we actually learn whether or not there has been an air raid; also, we will avoid descriptions of hypothetical horrors which have not actually occurred, such as discussing the things that might go on if another ship were to be torpedoed. In all broadcasts about the plight of refugees, the number of killed and wounded, and so on, we will use our best news judgment and try to avoid undue shock to the radio audience, without taking upon ourselves an unjustifiable responsibility for concealing how bad the war really is.

Broadcasters will make every effort to be temperate, responsible, and mature in selecting the manner in which they make the facts of war and its attendant circumstances known to the audience.

Broadcasters will, at all times, try to distinguish between fact, official statement, news obtained from responsible official or unofficial sources, rumor, and matter taken from or contained in the foreign press or other publications, so that, by reporting and identifying these sources, we can help the radio audience as much as possible to evaluate the news brought to it.

The radio audience should be clearly informed that the news from many sources, whether it be press bulletins or direct broadcasts, is censored and must be appraised in the light of this censorship.

Broadcasts from Europe

Broadcasters will designate, if they choose, broadcasts of news and news analysis, either or both, from Europe at such intervals as they individually deem to be desirable. It is advisable that these broadcasts be by Americans as far as possible, and that each individual broadcaster instruct the persons he employs, either permanently or temporarily in the general principles set forth here. Insofar as European broadcasts contain news analyses, they are to conform to the definition of news analysis hereinafter set forth.

Speeches by foreigners from abroad, public proclamations and statements, and like matter are to be handled by each individual broadcaster in such manner as he deems best to serve his audience, but it is essential that fairness to all belligerents be maintained and that this phase of the operations be carried out in such a way that the American audience shall be as completely and fairly informed as possible.

Broadcasters recognize that, if they do not handle the war with complete responsibility toward the American people, and if they deviate from these principles, they run the risk of involving all other broadcasters in the consequences of their acts. The operation of these principles should include at all times a strong responsibility toward the industry as a whole.

Remotes

If broadcasts become available from scenes of battle, bombed areas, air-raid shelters, refugee camps, and so on, broadcasters will

not deprive the audience of the ability of radio to give them first-hand information, but will use taste and judgment to prevent such broadcasts from being unduly harrowing.

Propaganda from Europe

If broadcasters put on propaganda disseminated by radio stations or the press of European countries or distributed by these countries in any other manner, each will be guided by his own news judgment and endeavor to label precisely the source of the material, and to do this sufficiently often so that no reasonably careful listener is likely to be misled, and he will also be governed by the same rules of fairness in presenting all sides, though not necessarily in the same broadcast, nor need this judgment be a quantitative one. In this connection it is recognized that there are certain hazards in bringing these broadcasts direct to this country and extreme care will be exercised in so doing.

Domestic news

All the foregoing general principles will, of course, apply to domestic broadcasts on any phase of the war. All news broadcasts, whether sponsored or unsponsored, are to remain in the strictest control of the broadcaster in order that the standards herein set forth may be maintained. News analysts are at all times to be confined strictly to explaining and evaluating such fact, rumor, propaganda, and so on, as are available. No news analyst or news broadcaster of any kind is to be allowed to express personal editorial judgment or to select or omit news with the purpose of creating any given effect, and no news analyst or other news broadcaster is to be allowed to say anything in an effort to influence action or opinion of others one way or the other. Nothing in this is intended to forbid any news broadcaster from attempting to evaluate the news as it develops, provided he substantiates his evaluation with facts and attendant circumstances. His basis for evaluation should, of course, be impersonal, sincere, and honest.

In order not to keep the public unduly disturbed and alarmed, each broadcaster, exercising his own news judgment, will endeavor to interrupt programs for news bulletins as little as seems consistent with good operations.

Commercial programs

No propaganda in connection with the war will be allowed in either the commercial announcements or the context of commercial programs. Nothing in this shall be interpreted as barring straight news or news analysis, as herein have been described, from commercial programs.

Speeches

The safeguards of fairness and program balance now applied in the handling of speeches on controversial issues will continue to be applied and, in order to make this effective, every effort will be made to obtain the text of speeches before they are scheduled.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made over Station WOL, Washington, D. C., May 29, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, America rejoices today. These three words, coming as they do from a veteran of the first great World War, must seem a strangely paradoxical introduction to remarks dedicated to the memory of his departed comrades on Memorial Day. Yet, within a few hours' span of the blue Atlantic chaos the like of which civilization has never before experienced, continues to reign in barbaric horror. Simple rules of international law have disappeared, and the great teaching of the brotherhood of man seems to have been entirely obliterated.

While Europeans, human beings like ourselves, hasten terror-ridden to dig new, fresh graves for their mangled dead, we pause as a nation to place new, fresh flowers on our heroes' graves and to rejoice that we are at peace. Rather than a day of sadness for us, this Decoration Day is one of complete gratitude to those who have died for our country, for to them we are indebted for the preservation of the principles of Americanism, which, in offering life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, fundamentally mean peace.

And so we pause to pay our various tributes, and by word and pen, by parade of colors, by religious and patriotic exercises, to testify to them by these so inadequate gestures that they are not forgotten. Individually their deeds may have faded from memory, but collectively the sacrifices made by our soldier dead cry out to us for whom they died, a warning and a challenge to remember why they died.

To remember first and always that there is a God to whom, regardless of our religion, race, or creed, we can at all times turn for guidance. To remember that religion forms the background of our daily life, that it is the bulwark of our home and family, and that it is the safeguard of our national existence. Without it tolerance ceases to be. Man rises above the level of primitive animals, and a neighbor's rights and privileges must be inviolate. So we are warned not to forget that man's right to worship God as he chooses must be preserved.

Our departed heroes challenge us as acquiescent Americans. They bemoan the fact that we know that we are living in the greatest country in the world and talk so little about it. In our self-sufficient everyday lives, we leave the extolling of the precious gift of American freedom to a few golden-voiced orators, and then berate them as political or professional flag-wavers.

We allow subversive influences to thrive in our midst, and leave their chastisement to the veterans' groups which have organized primarily for the purpose of protecting our American institutions in peace as they did in war. In reality every man, woman, and reasoning child in this glorious country of ours should be crusading and boastful Americans. For boast we can and crusade we must. Possessing as the basis of our Government the most nearly perfect document of human rights in existence, the Constitution of the United States, we can speak with pride of its complete success as an instrument in governing, and, as we near the one hundred and sixty-fifth year of our national history, can boast that in all that time never once has the waging of a war of aggression by our country darkened its pages.

For the professor in the university, the man on the bench near us, the doctor, the lawyer, the chemist, the manufacturer, the clergyman, the politician, and all others who with their minds befogged by "isms" other than Americanism, try to belittle by petty criticism our system of government, let us be prepared with counter-offensives. Our privileges are our weapons—weapons we seemingly have forgotten—our religious freedom, freedom of the press, of public speech, our free national parks, playgrounds, recreational music, sports stadia, our rights as workers to organize, our care of veterans, care of the aged and underprivileged, and, mightiest of all, our right to vote without pressure. Truly we should say often "God bless America," and mean it.

We veterans of the World War know the message our dead comrades send to us today. Their challenge resolves itself into a demand that we do all in our power to keep America out of war. Only too well they know its futility. They beg us, as tomorrow we march to their resting places and mark their graves with flags and flowers, not to be satisfied with these simple gestures, beautiful as they are, but to preach the doctrine of preparedness—for in that only lies our national peace and the saving of American youth.

I have no desire to parade my war service during the World War. It is so insignificant in comparison with the thousands of acts of heroism of our American boys in 1917 and 1918 on the seas and in France that it is not worth mentioning. And I only drag it forth on this occasion in order to emphasize the fact that having had the great privilege of serving as an enlisted man with the Twenty-sixth Division in France for 19 months I am in a position, because of that experience, to talk at first hand of the horrors of war and the tremendous need of preparedness.

The fact remains that the United States is now rushing pell-mell to protect itself, finding its protective armaments entirely inadequate. Should we not have learned our lesson from our experiences in the last World War? I served with a National Guard division that landed in France in September of 1917. So unprepared were we, through lack of proper up-to-date equipment and experience, that it was several months—February of 1918, in fact—before the division was in proper shape to actually take the field.

We found that at the last minute our wartime strength of 150 men to an infantry company had to be augmented to 250 which meant complete reorganization. Although the division had served for 6 months on the Mexican border in 1916 and the World War had been going on since 1914, the men had received absolutely no training whatever in trench warfare. Therefore, while the Twenty-sixth Division was considered one of the best National Guard divisions in the country, the entire organization upon arrival in France in those fall days of 1917 was placed in the hands of French Army instructors and compelled to learn in a few short months that which they could have been absorbing in training during the previous 3 years.

In addition to all of this, on arrival in France we were without gas masks; we were without steel helmets. Both of these had to be supplied by the already greatly taxed British supply sources until such time as they could be produced here at home.

Our American artillery at the last moment was forced to discard the well-known 3-inch light field-artillery piece and adopt the famous French 75. Our boys never saw this French gun until they arrived in France. It was completely strange to them, and it is to their everlasting credit and their American ingenuity that they were able to so quickly acquaint themselves with its intricacies and accustom themselves to the sudden change from the old 3-inch gun they had been using for years.

The scarcity of heavier type field guns was also sadly apparent. The 105-mm. and 155-mm. howitzers and guns had to be supplied by the French. If we had any, they were few.

We had no worth-while American machine guns until the American-made Browning was invented, adopted, and delivered in small quantities in the closing days of the war. Even sufficient uniforms were lacking, and it was no uncommon sight to see an American doughboy dressed in a British tunic, breeches, or puttees.

It has always been our boast that the United States had the best infantry rifle in the world, the Springfield. But here, too, there were not enough to go around, and the greater portion of the vast army we raised was equipped with rifles of an inferior grade and hurried manufacture.

Conditions were deplorable and without excuse. From the moment the war started in 1914 it could readily be seen that not only were we inadequately equipped but that the very method of warfare adopted by our military authorities was completely out-moded. We had 3 years in which to prepare and did nothing.

I am by no means a militarist. But, in the light of my own experiences, I cannot but feel that the strongest possible armaments for our land and sea forces will constitute our greatest safeguard for peace. We have never been an aggressor nation. We want nothing belonging to anybody else, but, by the same token, we demand that what belongs to us be left alone by others.

What matters the original cost if never a shell is fired from an antiaircraft gun defending our shores or a torpedo is never shot from one of our naval ships or a bomb never drops from a plane on an enemy target, if by their very existence they serve as sentinels on guard to inform the world that we here in America consider human lives and the preservation of our democratic ideals and institutions to be more precious to us than anything we possess.

And so, fully cognizant of the posthumous desires of our departed heroes—the heroes we memorialize tomorrow—with the accompanying warning and challenge, we have awakened; we accept the torch they have flung to us and solemnly promise them that we will do all in our power to place America in such a position that it will not be necessary to die gloriously for her, as they did, but to live well for her, cherishing and protecting her always. Thus, and only thus, they—our comrades—will not have died in vain.

God bless the United States of America.

Pilot-Training Program Will Be Expanded to Perform Necessary Service for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased at the plans being formulated to expand the pilot-training program in the United States. It has been my desire to assist in this worth-while governmental endeavor and now we are seeing the splendid results of the first few months of this program.

I have had the opportunity to see first hand the instructors as they have tutored the young men learning to fly in the colleges of my district and State.

At West Virginia University, Davis and Elkins, and Shepherd Colleges the youth of the Second Congressional District have responded well to the training. Plans are ready to further participate in the expanded program, beginning June 15.

A day or so ago I discussed this fine work with Grove Webster, of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, who has been in direct charge of this work. I assured him of our desire to go forward under the new schedule, which will make available the training to additional youth of the Nation.

At this point in my remarks I include the following explanatory articles:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY TO TRAIN 45,000 PILOTS AS RESERVES—FLYERS TO STUDY AVIATION COURSE AS CIVILIAN GROUP

(By Eugene Warner)

Creation of a reservoir of 45,000 new pilots by July 1, 1941, was announced last night in plans of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Most of the 45,000 will be college men, 15 percent being drawn from noncollege sources.

Of this number it is hoped to put 15,000 students through preliminary training by September 1 of this year, Chairman Robert H. Hinckley announced.

ONE THOUSAND PLANES AVAILABLE

A considerable but as yet undetermined portion will be drawn from the District of Columbia, which lies in the first training district. The first district will supply 2,800 college men and 690 noncollege men.

Chairman Hinckley disclosed that not enough high-powered planes are available at the moment to give flying students advance training, only 1,000 being available this summer, but added he expected 3,000 to be ready by fall and 5,000 by next spring.

Service will be entirely voluntary, he made clear, without it being necessary for an enrollee to join the Reserves. While the training is coordinated with Army and Navy, it will remain a civilian group of flyers not supervised by the military branches.

WILL RELY ON CONGRESS

Asked where the money was coming from, Hinckley said $5,000,000 was available for the year to come, but that he was going to use it up immediately, relying on Congress to supply an additional $32,000,000 before the year is out.

He said a bill was before the Appropriations Committee now to provide the extra $32,000,000, and said he was going ahead with his high-speed program for the coming summer and fall, regardless of what Congress does about the winter and spring months.

An initial complement of flyers from colleges will finish their primary courses by June 30, 1940. There are 9,810 in this first group. The entire expansion will be based on facilities already set up for them.

AIM TO MASTER RUDIMENTS

Graduates of the C. A. A. courses will by no means be ready for Army or Navy flight, but at least will have mastered the rudiments of aviation. Three additional finishing courses are required by the Army before a pilot is deemed suitable for combat flying.

As an adjunct to the program, 1,500 instructors will be trained this summer. As the huge program rolls forward on many fronts, some 5,000 active and inactive commercial pilots will be given "refresher" courses of 25 hours, refitting them for defense uses.

Another phase of the program will see the "salvage" of thousands of civilian pilots who at some time or another began flying careers at their own expense but for one reason or another have allowed their flying certificates to lapse.

THOUSANDS OF APPLICATIONS

Still another phase will provide for "refresher" courses for 7,000 private pilots who have been inactive in flying. These will be 15-hour tune-ups.

Applications have already been received, the C. A. A. stated, from "thousands of individual candidates who have been thus far unable to take training because of lack of funds." Several hundred colleges and air lines have volunteered to take part in the program, in addition to those already offering courses.

Age limit of applicants has been lifted 1 year. Boys from 18 to 26 may now take the course at Government expense. Last year youths of 25 were the oldest accepted. The noncollege group is now expanded from 6 percent to 15 percent.

Plans for further training have been mapped out for students who finish the first course. The first course calls for 72 hours ground training and 35 to 50 hours in the air. This roughly matches Army requirements.

When the autumn school year rolls around 15,000 boys will be given preliminary training during the fall. In addition, secondary training for 3,000 of the summer-school graduates will begin.

During the spring school semester 15,000 more novice pilots will be launched into the air, and this time 5,000 will start their secondary courses.

APPLY TO COLLEGES

The first district includes Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, New England, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Delaware. Applicants will be under the direction of Earle Southee, at Roosevelt Field, Long Island.

Applicants should apply to the nearest college offering the training courses or to any aviation company in their vicinity. Some 435 colleges which offered courses during the past will continue their courses under the program.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

AERONAUTIC LEADERS FORM PLAN TO TRAIN 54,000 PILOTS—45,000 PRIVATE FLYERS, AND 9,000 ADVANCE STUDENTS ON PROGRAM

An integrated pilot-training program to develop 45,000 private flyers and 9,000 advanced students for the Army Air Corps by July 1, 1941, has been formulated by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Army, and civil aviation leaders.

Designed in answer to President Roosevelt's implied recommendation that 50,000 civilians be trained to fly in the next year, the program, it was estimated today, will cost about $37,000,000. A final draft will go to the White House Saturday.

The civilians instructed under the program would be in addition to the pilots available to the Air Corps under the stepped-up training courses now under way at nine civilian schools.

Whether the projected program would substitute for, or supplement, the plan for 10 "aviation Plattsburgs" advanced by Col. Frank Knox, of Chicago, has not been decided.

EIGHT THOUSAND TO ADVANCE COURSE

Out of the 54,000 flyers included in the plan, 53,000 would receive their primary training, and 8,000 of these would go on to advanced instruction which would qualify them for the Army's school at Randolph Field, Tex., if they so desired.

One thousand more advanced students would be drawn from the ten thousand-odd pilots who have taken the C. A. A. course during the college year now closing.

Primary students would receive between 35 and 50 hours of flying instruction, advanced students between 45 and 50 hours. Those chosen for transfer to Randolph Field would have a maximum of 80 hours.

Established civilian flying schools would be used for all the primary and secondary work.

NOVICES TO BE INSTRUCTED

Coordinated with this training would be the instruction of about 2,200 apprentice instructors to care for the growing number of novice pilots.

To keep a civilian flyer reservoir of military material available for a national emergency, the plan also contemplates affording 35 hours of instruction to 7,000 persons already possessing commercial licenses and 25 hours for 5,000 with private licenses.

The South will be the training ground for virtually all the new pilots to be turned out annually under the Army's air force expansion program.

Brig. Gen. Jacob E. Fickel, assistant chief in charge of training, said the general policy would be to use schools and training centers south of the thirty-seventh degree latitude. Roughly, this follows the northern boundaries of North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona. Southern California is south of the line.

Congress Should Look This One Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CINCINNATI TIMES-STAR

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star for June 1:

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 1, 1940]

CONGRESS SHOULD LOOK THIS ONE OVER

Mr. Roosevelt's request for authority to call the National Guard into full military service should serve as a "Stop, look, and listen" signal on Capitol Hill.

The recent demonstration of the power of Hitler's fighting machine has put the American people squarely up against the greatest preparedness problem of our history. It is not a phoney problem or one that arises from unwarranted public fears. The necessities of the near future are real and obvious.

Mr. Roosevelt is going to remain President in any event until the 1st of next January. Those should be months of hard work and driving production. In any moves Mr. Roosevelt makes, with the world as it is, toward a genuine strengthening of the national defense, he can count on the support of every right-minded American.

But even in this period we should not allow hysteria to confuse the needs of national defense with other things that are quite different. The greatest danger of American participation in the present war in Europe is not the sending of our men into battle on land, on the sea, or in the air. The greatest danger is that, in the fervor incident to the beginning of war, we will entrust powers to an administration, always inordinately anxious for power, that will overnight establish the dictatorship at home that we are so much afraid of abroad.

Appropriations for battleships, fighting planes, mechanized equipment for the Army—all these are urgent necessities in view of what has occurred on the Continent during the past month. Of course, appropriations alone are not enough. The development of a strong fighting force is never a matter only of money. The making of such a force requires money—but it requires, also, organizing ability of a high order in high places and a spirit of discipline, sacrifice, and high patriotism among the mass of the people. We are not going to build up forces strong enough to keep us safe from Hitler if at the same time we conduct, and our public officials are not courageous enough to resist, a series of "gimme" raids on an already hard-pressed Government.

As a matter of course, Mr. Roosevelt should have complete public support in every genuine preparedness move he makes. But the request for discretionary powers to combine the National Guard with the Regular Army is something else again. If it isn't a war move, it at least has strong indications leading in that direction.

The founders of our Republic very wisely entrusted the war-making power to Congress, not to the President. They wanted that great power left in the hands of a large group of men, closely responsible to the people, rather than to one man, farther away in the National Capital. Even in the natural enthusiasm of a great crisis Congress should not give away discretionary powers which, by every reason of patriotism and good sense, it should keep in its own hands.

Amendment to National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY THE SMITH COMMITTEE TO SECTION 9

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, it is expressly provided that representatives selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by a majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in that unit. This section of the act directs the Board to decide in each case, in order to insure to employees the full benefit of their right to self-organization and to collective bargaining, whether the unit appropriate shall be "the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof."

Major attacks directed against the Board by organized labor have arisen from the administration of this provision of the act. These attacks have arisen because of a combination of circumstances involved in the designation of the appropriate bargaining unit and the application of the so-called majority-rule doctrine. When the boundaries of an appropriate unit are established, the organization designated by a majority of the employees becomes the exclusive representative of all. As a result it frequently happens that large minorities of employees may be without representation or may be compelled to affiliate with a union with which they are unsympathetic and to which they are actually opposed. Moreover, application of this provision of the act has resulted in depriving unions of their rights and privileges as the bargaining agents for their members.

The disputes concerning the appropriate bargaining unit fall in well-defined patterns. The simplest form of dispute involves the question as to whether all the employees in the plant of a particular employer shall be grouped together in one unit or whether those employees of special training and skill shall be permitted to associate themselves into smaller separate craft units. In other instances the controversy has assumed broader aspects.

There are numerous cases in which the controversy has involved the grouping of several widely distributed plants of a single employer and the combining of employees in all such plants with one large unit. In such cases the dispute may involve more than mere segregation of employees identified with a particular craft. For instance, one of the several plants of a single employer may be unorganized, or two or more unions may have substantial membership within that plant. In such cases the selection of the larger employer unit may work to the detriment of not only unorganized employees but also to the detriment of the union which may have a majority in one or more plants but a minority of the total number of employees in all plants combined. Cases in this category are related in principle to the controversies in which the Board has grouped the employees of two or more employers, where circumstances indicated that these employers banded together in an organization of their own. Results in such cases have been similar to those in which the Board has joined the numerous plants of a single employer. Unorganized employees have been forced to affiliate with unions or else lose their means of livelihood; other employees have been compelled to abandon union membership of long standing and to affiliate with other organizations.

The results of these controversies have not been pleasant.

When unions have been disfranchised and deprived of their representative functions, strikes and boycotts have frequently occurred. In several cases these defeated industrial unions have threatened employers with drastic action if they proceeded to carry out their statutory obligation of giving exclusive recognition to the victorious organization. Employers

caught in this dilemma have suffered tremendous losses, even when complying fully with their responsibilities and duties imposed by law.

The Board has attempted to avoid some of the criticisms directed against it by adopting a principle of determination of the appropriate unit called the Globe doctrine. The original Globe doctrine provided that in a conflict between a craft union and an industrial union, the employees in the craft union would be given an opportunity to vote as to whether they desired to be incorporated into the industrial union or to remain separate. However, the application of this doctrine has proved ineffective, due to the widely divergent views of the three present Board members. For instance, Board Member Edwin S. Smith has admitted his bias in favor of the industrial type of union, and therefore applies the Globe doctrine only when there is a previous history of collective bargaining for the craft union within the particular plant. Board Member William Leiserson believes that the Globe doctrine should not be applied where there has been a past history of collective bargaining that has culminated in the selection of a bargaining unit and the making of a contract. Furthermore, Dr. Leiserson believes that once an industrial union has been selected and contract entered into, a craft union is forever foreclosed from having a separate collective-bargaining representative. Board Chairman J. Warren Madden believes that the Globe doctrine should be applied in a situation where the majority of a craft unit desires a separate bargaining representative.

The net effect of the application of this formula as applied by the present Board has resulted in more or less chaotic conditions. Board Chairman Madden himself stated that there was no uniformity in the views of the three Board members, and, while there had been some experimentation in an attempt to reach a satisfactory formula, the experimentation has not succeeded in finding a satisfactory formula. Furthermore, this doctrine has created a situation where an industrial union may drive out a craft union and establish itself forever without fear of dislocation.

It should be noted that the formula of the Globe doctrine has no effect in those situations involving more than one plant of a single employer or the grouping of two or more employers in a single bargaining unit. The Board has worked out no system for the determination of these situations, and the result, therefore, has been determined by the pressure upon and bias of the Board members in particular cases.

It has been truly charged by the president of the A. F. of L., William Green, that the Board has committed all the crimes in the calendar in its definition of the appropriate bargaining unit. For example, in the Pittsburgh Plate Glass case, which decision was criticized before the Smith committee by Dr. Leiserson as "thoroughly impractical," there resulted a certification of a union in a unit composed of the several plants of a single employer. In at least one of these plants the union had no representation whatever and, in fact, the plant was not even in the same State as the others. In the Pacific Longshoremen's case, the Board exercised arbitrary discretion, in gerrymandering of a geographical district in determining the proper unit for collective bargaining. By this ruling, working men are obliged to accept the representation of an imposed labor collectivity which they actively oppose. The decision in this case was in direct contravention of the collective labor agreements between the A. F. of L. unions and employers, and had the effect of wiping out valid contracts and destroying an entire west coast federation as a collective bargaining agent.

That the Board's interpretation and application of section 9 is in defiance of the clearly expressed intent of Congress is demonstrated by the comment of Senator WAGNER, who was largely responsible for the National Labor Relations Act. He assured the American Federation of Labor that the principle of free choice of representatives "whether the workers are what are commonly understood to be craft workers or so-called general-production workers" was "completely and perfectly protected" by the act.

As a result of the Board's evasion of the congressional intent in its interpretations of section 9, it has long been apparent that some change is necessary to prevent the arbitrary exercise of the Board's biased discretion. The majority of the Smith committee, in an attempt to arrive at a satisfactory formula that would prevent this or any other Board from emasculating the intent of Congress, adopted the substance of a proposal made by Dean Lloyd K. Garrison, of the Wisconsin Law School, former chairman of the old Labor Board. As a witness before the Smith committee on behalf of the National Labor Relations Board, Dean Garrison stated that the question of the appropriate bargaining unit was one which could not be settled by the Board, by the courts, or by the Congress. It was his suggestion, therefore, that the responsibility for determining the unit should be left to the union themselves. As a temporary solution the Smith committee adopted Dean Garrison's proposal and recommended an amendment along those lines. After more careful consideration, consultation with profound thinkers in the field of labor relations, and a study of legislation suggested by interested groups, the majority of the Smith committee now feels that Dean Garrison's proposal does not go far enough in settling that troublesome question.

The majority found that, in essence, Dean Garrison's amendment proposed to relieve the Board of all responsibility in determining the appropriate bargaining unit when presented with petitions from two or more unions each claiming a different unit. The majority of the Smith committee feels that this proposal is merely one to save the Board from criticism brought on by its arbitrary actions. It further feels that it is the duty, as it is the privilege, of this Congress to protect the rights of American working men in their democratic choice of collective bargaining representatives. To leave employees in bitter internecine warfare would be to deprive them of the gains which have come through the enlightened public opinion of recent years.

The procedural defect in the Garrison proposal of the lack of an arbiter to require the contending units to reach an agreement is provided against by the substitute amendment in that the Board is empowered to compel those units to settle their differences by means of the ballot box. This gives each contending unit as fair an opportunity as the others. There is no chance that the wishes of the majority of a unit smaller than one of all the employees would be ignored; it is their own choice as to the type of organization, if any, they desire for a bargaining representative. By such an immediate and fair determination of differences the reasons for resort to strike action or boycott pressure to settle such differences can be largely removed.

Both Dean Garrison and Mr. Madden agreed that the problem of the appropriate unit was not one for either the Board, the Congress, or the courts to attempt to decide. Therefore, it would seem that the only possible alternative is to leave it to the employees themselves. This is done under the proposed amendment to section 9; all that we have done is to provide the machinery whereby the employees may express their desires; all that the Board is to do is to provide the framework by which those desires may be expressed; and all that the courts are to do is to see that the congressional intent has been carried out by the machinery established.

Some thought may be expressed that, by the terms of the substitute amendment, favoritism is being shown to craft unionism as opposed to industrial unionism. This is not true. The effect of the new section 9 (e) is solely to allow the wishes of the majority of the employees to be expressed while protecting the rights of those employees who desire a smaller unit.

In the trade-union movement the craft type of union has had a long and honorable history. Practically all of the gains achieved by labor prior to the passage of the National Labor Relations Act were achieved through the efforts of this type of unionism. Therefore, to foreclose craft unionism in favor of the industrial type, which has a much more recent history, by legislative or administrative fiat would be working an injustice to craft unionism that is undeserved.

Advocates of industrial unionism have argued that in our form of industrial economy the industrial unit will survive because of its greater adaptability to that economy. I do not share this belief, but I do believe that it is not the place of the Congress to determine that survival; that should be worked out by labor itself. Principles of democracy demand that the rules of the game be made fair to both contestants and that neither side be favored by the Congress. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental purpose of the National Labor Relations Act under the proposed amendments, as well as in its original conception, is the protection and promotion of the right of collective bargaining, not the development of a system favoring any one type of unionism over another, with the accompanying probability of perversion of industrial democracy into single-system labor dictatorship.

In conclusion, this substitute to the proposed amendment to section 9 has the virtues of certainty, expediency, and impartiality. It is certain in that the process for the selection of a bargaining unit is provided by legislative enactment and is not subject to the vagaries of Board personnel; it is expedient in the sense that a solution is to be reached with a minimum of delay and friction; and it is impartial in that no outside agency—neither the Congress nor the Board nor the courts—may select the bargaining units for the workers; they select such units for themselves.

Mexico-United States Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENT E. KELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. RAMON BETETA, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention a very suggestive address delivered over WJZ, of the National Broadcasting Co., on June 5, by Señor Ramon Beteta, the Assistant Secretary of State of the Republic of Mexico.

It will, I believe, be of interest to my colleagues of the House, with the suggestion that having myself lived and carried on business in Mexico, it was my pleasure and honor to furnish to President Wilson, upon his request, the facts upon which he based his Mexican policy during his administration.

Mr. Beteta quotes President Wilson's final judgment in relation to Mexico and the Mexican people. I wish to add my own testimony to that of President Wilson and say that during the 12 years I was there I was treated with every consideration that any businessman could ask for. It was my privilege to know Mexico most intimately from the workers who served me up to and including the President of Mexico and many of the Mexican officials.

When great numbers of Mexican citizens and great numbers of citizens of the United States come to know each other, we find that differences in aim and sympathy cease to exist. For this reason it has delighted me to know that Mexican students are coming to America to study and that we are sending students there to study in their great universities. Such practice can only result in very much better understanding and more just cooperation between these intimately associated American Republics.

I am hoping to speak within the next few days on a subject involving the cooperation of the American Republics.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

(Statement of Señor Ramon Beteta)

The war in Europe, with all its incredible cruelty, devastation, and loss of human life, has had, however, one effect which may prove highly beneficial to the world—the unity of the countries in this hemisphere.

Never before was the existence of a common destiny felt keener than today, or the realization of the need to maintain the spirit of freedom, indigenous to the New World, more clearly understood.

The American Continent has before it the tremendous task of keeping peace and freedom safe for the present generations to enjoy and for future generations to maintain. This responsibility makes cooperation between Mexico and the United States the more vital for both countries and should make all other considerations secondary.

Although Mexico is supposed to be a turbulent country, it is as a matter of fact, a peace-loving nation, whose history has taught her the bitterness of the high-handed methods used by certain European powers. Perhaps on account of it Mexico has gone on record before the world, whether before the League of Nations or in the pan-American conference or in any other international gathering to condemn aggression in any form. Whether it was the conquest of Abyssinia, or the undeclared war against China, or the unlawful foreign intervention in the Spanish war, or the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia and Poland, or the cowardly invasion of Finland, or the uninvited "protection" of Denmark and Norway, or the unprovoked invasion of Luxemburg, Holland, and Belgium. This unfailing record is a guaranty of Mexico's position in the present world crisis. Mexico will never be on the side of the aggressors.

Those who fear that Mexico would fall into the hands of Germany and become the base for an attack against the United States, either know nothing about Mexico or have been misled by certain interests who want to give the wrong impression about Mexico to the effect that she is on the verge of internal disturbances. Happily, there is no danger of an armed uprising of any kind in Mexico. Rumors about so-called "fifth column" activities have been grossly exaggerated. Political minorities, which are free to organize and to express their views in Mexico, the same as in the United States or in any other country where democratic methods prevail, exist there, but they have neither the support nor the sympathy of the present Government of Mexico, which may be called progressive or liberal, but never Nazi nor Communist. Mexico's antitotalitarian attitude is a matter of record and the lack of influence of Soviet Russia is evidenced by the fact that not even diplomatic relations exist at present between Mexico and Russia.

All figures now being published about large numbers of Germans coming into Mexico, posing as tourists, are false. I have exact information to the effect that not more than 100 Germans entered Mexico during the last 3 months and not more than 400 Germans entered during the last year. These figures include men, women, and children, most of whom went to Mexico to visit members of the rather small German colony residing there. The Mexican Government is keeping a vigilant eye on all foreigners who live in the country and will not hesitate to expel anyone attempting to disturb public order or to interfere in Mexico's internal affairs, regardless of the foreigner's political ideology.

In her efforts to raise the standard of living of her working classes, to help the underprivileged groups, and to enforce her labor legislation, in order to give adequate protection to the workers, Mexico has followed the same general policies of other democratic countries. Like them, Mexico is also attempting to preserve individual liberties and democratic methods without ignoring the necessity of correcting the gross injustices of a system whose excesses are responsible for the antidemocratic reactions we are witnessing elsewhere. In following this policy and in seeking these aims, Mexico is neither imitating foreign systems nor accepting imported theories. Years before the Russian Revolution, Mexico launched her agrarian reforms, whose purpose it is to make independent farmers out of the peons, who had been kept in a state of practical servitude by a feudal system based on absentee ownership of land, of which Indian communities had been ruthlessly despoiled. Such reforms are essential for organic peace in Mexico and have been instrumental in making a democratic government possible.

Mexico's economic philosophy is not a complicated one: The reasonable exploitation of her natural resources for the benefit of the Nation as a whole; the improvement of her people's standard of living, which, in turn, will increase her purchasing power and her commerce with the rest of the world.

To accomplish these aims, Mexico welcomes capital which comes with the purpose of exploiting Mexico's natural resources, not her people; investors who are ready to cooperate with the working classes within the framework of the laws of the land; Mexico welcomes such investors and is happy to see them obtain legitimate profits while helping the Mexicans to make their country a better place in which to live.

President Woodrow Wilson, more than 20 years ago, understood Mexico's problem perfectly when he wrote:

"What Mexico needs more than anything else is financial support which will not involve the sale of her liberties and the enslavement of her people.

"Property owned by foreigners, enterprises conducted by foreigners, will never be safe in Mexico so long as their existence and the method of their use and conduct excite the suspicion and, upon occasion, the hatred of the people of the country itself.

"I am speaking of a system and not uttering an indictment. The system by which Mexico has been financially assisted has in the past generally bound her hand and foot and left her in effect without a free government. It has almost in every instance deprived her people of the part they were entitled to play in the determination of their own destiny and development."

The freedom of Mexico to determine her own destiny and development is essential, not only for Mexico's welfare but also for the friendly and mutually profitable relations between our two countries.

Mexico will never be a menace to her neighbor to the North; her natural resources, such as they are, will always be ready for use in the defense of this continent against any aggression, for she will be willing to do her share in any policy of collective security for the New World decided upon by the countries concerned. Mexico's faith in democracy has not faltered, in spite of the apparent destructive efficiency of other governmental systems. Mexico's love of peace and liberty has become stronger during the present world crisis and her determination to maintain her democratic institutions is firmer than ever. Mexico will go hand in hand with the United States and the other American republics in a common effort to maintain the Western Hemisphere free from war and tyranny.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

ARTICLES FROM CINCINNATI TIMES-STAR

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from recent issues of the Cincinnati Times-Star:

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 4, 1940]

HITLER'S ARMING MEANT NOTHING TO ROOSEVELT—INSTEAD OF REPAIRING AIRPLANES, HE PUT UP A $100,000 SUNDAY-SCHOOL BUILDING ON LANGLEY FIELD

(By Morris D. Ervin)

WASHINGTON, June 4.—One thing is pretty sure, and it is that if President Roosevelt really hopes to get nonpartisan support from the Republicans for his rearmament program, he had better not make any more fireside chats like the last.

Time after time he compared what had been done during the 7 Republican years preceding his administration with the 7 years that have followed. As he has done in all his political speeches, he compared present conditions with the conditions that prevailed in March 1933, when he took office.

The Republicans insist that there were reasons, and very good reasons, why the national-defense system of 1933 was and should be a smaller system than the one that the Nation should now have. As a matter of fact, had Coolidge and Hoover advocated one-half the armament program that Roosevelt is now quite properly urging, they would have been accused, and quite properly so, of starting another world-wide armament race.

IT WAS ANOTHER WORLD

Up until 1933 the whole world was depending upon the new systems of collective security. Germany was disarmed, Hitler was still an eccentric painter, our friends, England and France, had the biggest navy and the biggest army in the world, and the whole world was intent on getting along with the least armament possible. Navies were limited by treaty. The League of Nations, which in 1920 Roosevelt campaigned for, was still functioning.

This system of collective security did not begin to break down until 2 months after Roosevelt came into office. It was then that Hitler came into power. Under him Germany began rapidly to rearm and England and France permitted it.

It was not until then that there was any reason for America to enter upon armament extension.

So, the comparison of what has been accomplished during the past 7 years with what was done in the 7 years prior to that is not a fair comparison.

But in view of the fact that the heads of the present administration did know that the system of collective security had broken down in 1933, it is a fair question to ask whether it has done everything during these past 7 years that it might have done.

Assuming that what money has been spent on defense has been well spent, it is still fair to ask whether enough money has been spent. And more money could have been spent without adding to the national debt, for a great deal of money has been spent on nonmilitary projects.

PUBLIC WORKS INSTEAD

It is known, for instance, that of the original $3,000,000,000 fund appropriated by Congress in the first year of Roosevelt's administration, to be spent at his discretion, General Johnson urged Roosevelt, pointing to what was happening in Germany, to spend $2,000,000,000 of that amount to mechanize the Army. Roosevelt thought well of the idea and was prepared to follow the general's plan. But Secretary Ickes got wind of it and talked the President out of it, selling him instead on the idea of a vast program of public works.

This correspondent saw one result of that change in plans. I saw bombers, pursuit planes, and training ships laid up in the hangars at Langley Field, Va., because there was no money to make minor repairs and put them back into service. And I saw the idle pilots sitting around watching the W. P. A. workers erect a $100,000 Sunday-school building in the middle of the post.

Roosevelt indicated in his speech that the United States was slow in getting started, though he lays the blame for that on his predecessors; but he also indicated that everything is pretty rosy now. He gave figures to bear out his assertion.

"ON HAND"

These figures, too, are worth examining. The President, while he used figures for material "on hand" to show the condition of the armed forces in 1933, did not use comparable figures for 1940. His 1940 figures are for material "on hand and on order." When you're faced with a hold-up man there is a lot of difference between having a gun in your hand and one on order from the gun factory. It's the difference between shooting a robber and being shot.

"In 1933," said Mr. Roosevelt, "we had only 355 antiaircraft guns. We now have more than 1,700 modern antiaircraft guns of all types on hand or on order."

A table submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee only 4 days before Mr. Roosevelt made his speech shows that we have four hundred and forty-eight 3-inch antiaircraft guns, no 90-mm. antiaircraft guns, and fifteen 37-mm. antiaircraft guns. The rest are "on order," but many will not be delivered for 2 years.

"In 1933," the President said, "there were only 24 modern infantry mortars in the entire Army. We now have on hand or on order more than 1,600."

The same table shows that we have "on hand" two 60-mm. mortars and one hundred and eighty-three 81-mm. mortars. The rest are "on order."

"In 1933," Mr. Roosevelt said again, "we had only 48 modern tanks and armored cars; today we have on hand or on order more than 1,700."

The same table shows that we have "on hand" 10 light tanks, 18 medium tanks, and 114 combat cars. "On order" there are enough to bring the total for all three up to 1,136 at the end of 2 years.

Prior to 1933 the Germans were building no antiaircraft guns, no mortars, and no tanks. Neither were we. Since 1933 the Germans have been building plenty of them. And we, apparently, have been "ordering" them.

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 5, 1940]

GENERAL WAS FIRED BECAUSE HE TOLD THE TRUTH—PRESIDENT MADE HAGOOD WALK THE PLANK FOR SPEAKING OUT IN 1935 ON AMERICA'S WEAKNESS IN DEFENSE

(By Morris D. Ervin)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The New Dealers in Washington are very touchy on the subject of the present state of the Nation's defenses and resentful of the charge that they failed to build up those defenses as they should during the 7 years they have been in power.

Their answer to date has been that they did more in their 7 years than the Republicans did in their last 7. That is, of course, true as far as it goes. It fails, however, to take account of the fact that Germany did not begin to rearm until after Roosevelt was in office, and that before Germany began to rearm there was no logical reason for this country to do so.

As to the charge that the New Deal wasted money on civilian projects that might have been more profitably spent on rearmament the New Dealers simply deny that it is so.

IT WAS IN 1935

On this subject the so-called Hagood incident, seemingly forgotten by most people, throws some light.

In 1935 Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood was in command of the Eighth Corps Area of the Army, stationed in San Antonio, Tex. General Hagood was an expert on coast defense, and his reputation along that line was high. He had devised some mechanical gadgets to improve coast-defense equipment and was known both here and abroad as an expert in his line.

A subcommittee of the House of Representatives, in December 1935, was holding hearings on military expenditures with a view to ascertaining whether the national defenses were in good shape, whether they were adequate, and whether the money being spent on them was sufficient and was being spent in the best manner.

General Hagood was requested to appear before the committee and testify as an expert. He had no choice but to do so. He came from San Antonio to Washington and testified before the committee on December 17.

FROM AN EXPERT

General Hagood frankly told the committee that the Nation's defenses were not in good condition, that they were not adequate, that money was being wasted on "boondoggling" which ought to be spent on building up the country's Military Establishment.

He said that Uncle Sam was apparently keeping his money in three pockets. There was the money for regular expenditures, such as maintenance of the Military Establishment on an adequate basis, which was very hard to get. There was P. W. A. money which was easier to get, but more difficult to spend for useful and needed purposes. And in the third pocket there was W. P. A. money,

which was very easy to get in almost any quantity but was practically impossible to spend it for any useful purposes.

He said he couldn't get a nickel to buy a pencil for the Army, but he didn't have any trouble at all getting a thousand dollars to teach hobbies to the C. C. C. boys. He told the committee that he had no difficulty at all in getting $200 to build a gravel walk to the "garden house," but he couldn't get $10 to fix a busted steam pipe.

Hagood wasn't telling the congressional committee anything that he hadn't already told the War Department. He testified that he had taken these matters up with his civilian superiors and urged them to correct what he thought were mistakes which were resulting in a waste of money, a weakening of defense.

One would suppose that the heads of the administration would have welcomed the suggestions and advice of such an expert on national defense. But it didn't turn out that way. The testimony of General Hagood was given to the House committee in executive session. On February 11, 1936, it was made public.

ROOSEVELT STRIKES

On February 24, by order of the Secretary of War, General Hagood's command was taken away from him and he was relieved from active duty, a punishment only a little less severe than dismissal from the service.

Members of the congressional committee which had heard the general's testimony defended his conduct and pointed out that he had been summoned to testify by the committee, that he was under oath to tell the truth, and that he was rendering a patriotic service. Other Members of Congress also defended him and protested against the action of the War Department. It availed nothing. General Hagood was kept on inactive service for 7 weeks. Then he was summoned to the White House for a conference with President Roosevelt. Following this he was restored to active service, permitted to serve on active duty for 1 day, and retired.

That was the fate of a man who knew what he was talking about and who dared to advise the administration that the national-defense system was going to seed while public money, in sufficient quantities to prevent it from going to seed, was being "thrown down a rathole." For this service he was cast out of the Army and disgraced.

The "Hagood incident" makes it difficult for New Deal chieftains to escape the charge that the Nation's present predicament is in no small measure due to their shortsightedness and stubbornness, even in the face of warnings by experts. Nor does it help their argument that they are the only ones qualified to undertake the rebuilding of the Nation's defenses and should be kept in office to do it.

We Can Still Give Hope to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE LOUISVILLE COURIER-JOURNAL

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal of June 6, 1940:

WE CAN STILL GIVE HOPE TO THE WORLD

Nashville has joined the long list of cities where pro-Ally rallies have been held demanding immediate aid for France and England. The great battle against the northern French armies has begun. If those armies break, freedom will be murdered in three continents. And the Americas will be laid open to Nazi blackmail, intimidation, conspiracy, and in the end perhaps ruin.

Yet Washington does nothing. In God's name, how long must this paralysis endure? With weak despair we tell each other that tomorrow will be too late, but today we do nothing.

"The Allies are fighting," says Walter Lippmann, "as men fight last when to die is the least of all the evils that confront them. It is at this point that hope is an elixir. * * * For if men are deprived of hope they may still prefer to die where they stand. Most of them will. But in place of an indomitable determination to resist and to make the foe pay the utmost and to mitigate his triumph, utterly brave but utterly hopeless men will come to think of death as a sweet release."

We, and we alone, can give that hope. But we do nothing. Were we willing to take risks we would send them at once almost a thousand planes. We could change our laws so as to speed the delivery of the planes. We could give our hoarded bomb sight. We could provide World War destroyers, World War 75's, World War rifles—the pitiful fact being that these outmoded tools are needed. We could prepare to send food in American ships if that becomes necessary. But we do nothing.

We could serve notice on the Italian tyrant that if he helps to kill France he will be killing what we hold vital for our own and for the world's welfare, and that the deed will never be forgiven. When the will to act seizes us we can be a formidable enemy. But we do nothing.

We could cease pretending that this is a crisis that can be met left-handedly, met without deep sacrifice, met by appropriating money and making big plans for the future. We could start today bending our whole economy and applying every resource of brains and experience to the task of supplying the materials with which other men may save the world. But we hesitate to make the effort. Are we afraid that someone may call this "war"? What does the name matter?

The freemen of all the earth look to America for hope. And we answer that when we have had time to change our minds a little more we shall doubtless do something remarkable.

We have had all the time that fate intends to give us. Now we must act. To act effectively we need daring leadership. We, too, are ready for hard work and for sacrifice, if it is asked of us. But our leaders appear to be afraid of us, and in this they do us wrong. Why are there no high demands from Washington?

This is not sending men overseas.

Relief Agencies and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD AND EXCERPTS FROM RADIO BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced H. R. 9944 to provide military training for C. C. C. enrollees on a voluntary basis for the purpose of building up an adequate force to act as an adjunct to our armed forces in the defense of this Nation. In connection with this proposal I include in my remarks a brief editorial from the Washington Times-Herald and excerpts from a recent radio broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST OF FULTON LEWIS, JR., FROM STATION WOL, WASHINGTON, D. C., WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1940

Now, in connection with all this new defense program, there was one rather interesting program, proposed in Congress today * * * a nonpartisan proposal, by the way, because it was introduced in the Senate by the Republican Senator, STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and in the House by the Democrat, Representative C. ARTHUR ANDERSON, of Missouri.

The purpose of it is to provide the manpower behind the fighting forces—just in case we may need it. It takes far more than the army in the field, of course, to fight a war. The men behind that army—producing guns and airplanes and fighting equipment—are equally important. Even the so-called stand-by plants, which we do not have, but hope to get, to be able to turn out guns and planes and ammunition, are no good unless there are trained men to operate them.

This program is really the brain child of a military engineer from Laconia, N. H., by the name of E. G. B. Riley * * * and as it was introduced in the House and Senate today, it proposes to set up, under the War Department, a so-called home-defense force. The enlistment in that force will be strictly voluntary. The enlistments will be for 2 years * * * and no one in the home-defense force can be drafted for regular military service * * * but—

It is open only to young men, between the ages of 17 and 21, who must have the written permission of their parents or guardians * * * or to older men, 36 years old and over * * * or to any veterans of past wars.

The idea would be to take over a large part of the Civilian Conservation Corps—in which case the individuals would be paid the same amount and on the same arrangement as they are now paid * * * perhaps absorb a large part of the young people on the National Youth Administration pay roll * * * as many people as possible from the W. P. A. rolls.

Under the Army, they would be taught military training as a side light, but, more important, they would be put to work on the improvement of our coast defenses and Army posts and defense equipment of all kinds. Part of them would be trained in various

skilled trades—to be ready to take their positions in industrial plants for emergency production work in time of war.

In other words, the simple objective is to turn as much relief work—in W. P. A. and C. C. C. and N. Y. A. and all of the other relief agencies—as much of the relief rolls as possible, into a force that would be building up our national defense * * * and organizing a trained personnel for the industrial plants behind the guns.

By way of background, that is almost identically the program that was adopted in Germany * * * the program by which Mr. Hitler has been able to build up his industrial production to support his fighting machine * * * except for two very important differences: First of all, in Germany the plan was compulsory on the part of the individual; in this case it is voluntary * * * and the other difference is that in Germany there was no exemption from being drafted for military service; in this case there is.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

WHY NOT LET THE C. C. C. BOYS THEMSELVES DECIDE?

It is planned, as part of the national-defense effort, to let down to some extent the pacifist bars that hedge the Civilian Conservation Corps—C. C. C.

Up to now these boys have been carefully shielded from the horrid fact that wars happen now and then. Now, with Adolf Hitler's young, hale, and hearty legions stomping around Europe and a lot of us fearing a direct or indirect blitzkrieg over here, the C. C. C. boys are to be given what is interestingly described as nonmilitary military training.

As far as we can digest this term, it means that they are to be taught how to valet a tank, chambermaid a fighting plane, dust up after a cavalry horse, and so on, but are not to be shown how to shoot a gun of any kind.

The main reason for this delicacy is that the C. C. C. was started in 1933 by pacifists who mortally feared it might become militaristic, and that the pacifists are still hanging onto it.

Contributing to the discussion, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt says that the best kind of universal training for youth would be nonmilitary—cultivating character, self-discipline, and big muscles.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE (Republican, Massachusetts) says:

"It would be far better to have universal service for all boys of 18 for a 6 months' period and expose the well-to-do boys to the broadening and hardening influence of Army life, rather than confine it to a single class which happened to be in moderate means financially."

Very true, but the country is not yet in the mood for conscription. That may come later. Meanwhile, we can prepare for conscription by training a lot of potential noncoms in the C. C. C.

With all due respect, there is a good deal of softness in the above-outlined thinking, no matter who utters it.

Poor boys are not drafted into the C. C. C. We think, indeed, that the regulations ought to be loosened to let well-to-do boys enroll if they want to.

CLASS ISSUE IS HOG WASH

The notion that some frightful wrong is done a poor boy by teaching him how to fight is so much hog wash. The British and French Empires were built mainly by poor boys who were born fighters, and who enlisted in the appropriate outfit to go out and fight—Kipling's Ortheris, Mulvaney and Learoyd, the French Foreign Legionnaires, and the like.

It may be most unfortunate, but the world is coming around again to a fighting era. Any nation which neglects to train plenty of fighting men and equip them with the best weapons is likely to wake up some morning to find foreign colonial Governors telling all its people, rich and poor alike, what they may do and what they may not do.

This country, being big and rich and somewhat addicted to handing out free and unpleasant advice to dictators, is in considerable danger.

TWO KINDS OF CAMPS

To calm the fears of those who think straight-out military training for the C. C. C. would be somehow antidemocratic, we have a suggestion.

Why not leave it up to the C. C. C. boys themselves to choose between military training and the dam building, flood control, and forestry work the C. C. C. now does?

Those who freely elected to do so would take careful instruction in how to shoot and care for a rifle, how to manage a bayonet to best advantage, how to run and repair a tank and fire its assortment of guns, how to lay a big gun on a target 4 or 5 miles away, etc.

Those who elected to go on conserving land would be free to do that.

There could be two kinds of C. C. C. camps; one kind for combat troops, and the other for labor battalions.

Such a plan of free choice for the boys themselves between military and nonmilitary work in the C. C. C. would be the most democratic plan ever heard of in such a case as this. And it would give the born fighters among these boys the break they ought to have. If war should come to us, these boys would be ready to jump into action as noncoms to train the draftees and volunteers.

The main thing to bear in mind in all these defense efforts is that we need an Army of 1,000,000 mechanic-sergeants, plus 50,000 planes, and 100,000 pilots, and that these needs will not wait.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

LETTER FROM DR. JOHN A. HUNNICUTT AND DAN MAGILL

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter regarding national defense and preparedness which I have received from Dr. John A. Hunnicutt, chairman, and Hon. Dan Magill, secretary, of an organization of World War veterans, of Athens, Ga., as follows:

JUNE 4, 1940.

Congressman PAUL BROWN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: We welcome your support of our efforts to restrain by public opinion the growing volume of propaganda aimed at our entering the European war upon a basis that will make our future national existence dependent upon fortunate international alliances.

As our initial statement pointed out, we are wholeheartedly in favor of preparedness for defense against foreign aggression, as well as internal enemies. We believe that no cost is too great, nor any burden too large, but that our people will willingly bear them in order to safeguard our national existence. At the same time we are opposed to our Congress being stampeded by war hysteria into taking action that would gradually or precipitously put us into the war before it is evident that we must follow such a course in order to defend ourselves.

At this moment there is no evidence that we are actually endangered by a threat of invasion, although we realize that there are forces loose in the world which are potentially inimical to our welfare. In our opinion, our immediate objective should be to arm ourselves to the limit against the time when we might be actually attacked in some form or another. But while we are pursuing that objective, we should carefully, intelligently, and as accurately as permissible appraise those potentially inimical forces which might become a menace to us.

In view of the fact that our foreign policy must be made by Congress and the President, and inasmuch as their actions are controlled by public opinion, we deem it of the most vital importance that Congress and the President be allowed to form their judgment without interference from those who, because of their personal fears or because of ulterior motives, might attempt to arouse public feeling in favor of hasty and ill-considered measures. For that reason we are apprehensive over the propaganda that several of the war commentators are feeding to millions of Americans.

We are confident that our President is aware of our national position, and that his desire is to prevent our becoming involved as a belligerent in the war, not primarily because of any feeling of reluctance to aid those nations who desire to maintain peace but because he knows that once we have entered another European war as an active participant we then irrevocably become a part of the European system. When that step is taken we must be prepared forever after to make alliances and enter into combines which we think are to the interest of our national existence. We will then be unable to act with national independence and to pursue policies in regard to other nations which in the past has been our privilege, because we will then be compelled to act in accordance with the national aspirations or self-interest of those of our allies who might be in most danger from rivals. When we have thus become a part of the European system we will then have abandoned our traditional policy of opposition to foreign entanglements. On the other hand, if we should enter this war, and after it is over withdraw into ourselves, we will be leaving the European countries to fix those conditions out of which may come another war in which we will again become a belligerent because of the lack of a well-defined foreign policy. In other words, we are faced now with the grave question of having to decide not only whether we shall send American soldiers to European battlefields, but whether we shall for all time to come be compelled to follow a similar course. For it is not the lives of the young men of eligibility for this war that are hanging in the balance but the lives of millions of American boys yet in their infancy and teens and millions yet unborn. Therefore, at such a time and confronted with such a far-reaching question we feel that our President and our Congress must have the support of a sane and responsible public opinion.

We believe that the President and Congress aim at developing a foreign policy which will permit us to direct our sympathies and lend our strength to the support of those countries in the world that are most peacefully inclined and most desirous of

maintaining civilized practices. We also believe that the primary desire of President and Congress is to protect the interest of the United States now and safeguard it in the future, by refraining from taking steps now that will perpetually involve us in European wars. We believe our President and our Congress are fully aware of our physical and psychological nearness to events throughout the world, and that insofar as we can we must exert such influence as we can, short of war itself, upon those events.

We realize further that, because of our complex position in the world, it is not an opportune moment to publicize a foreign policy that might weaken the influence we are capable of exerting in the world. It is unfortunate, from a standpoint of national unity, that the present state of the world prevents the President and Congress from defining our position in relation to this war and European power politics. It would be dangerous to allied morale if we should officially declare to the world that we are concerned primarily with our own defense, and to restrict the limitations of our national action, for if those limitations should fall short of what the Allies might hope from us, or what the aggressors might fear from us—and the present state of public opinion would demand that they should—our moral influence against aggression would be considerably weakened.

Because our President and our Congress cannot define the limitations of our possible action in regard to this war, there is a lack of surety and definiteness within our own country in regard to our position. And because there is this uncertainty and this lack of surety and consequent feeling of uneasiness among our own people, and since it is manifestly not expedient for our responsible leaders to reassure us by announcing the limitations of our foreign policy, we regard it as of utmost importance that all forms of propaganda which prevents us from thinking sanely should be resisted and made ineffective by an opposing public opinion.

This propaganda is coming to us in newspapers, magazines, through the radio, and in moving pictures. At the risk of being misunderstood it is the duty of those of us who believe in our President and our Congress to assist them by counteracting insofar as we can the forces that, for one reason or another, are seeking to guide their thinking and action into a path fraught with danger to us now and in the future.

It seems to us that every opportunity that arises should be seized upon to uphold our President and our Congress and all other agencies working toward preparedness, and that extremists and irresponsible elements seeking to push us into the war as participants on the battlefields of Europe should be checked. For it appears that we are now in the process of making a decision as a Nation of far more gravity than fortuitous participation in a struggle involving the momentary ambitions of one nation or a group of nations against whom our feelings have been aroused or to defend some relatively temporary economic advantage we hold in another part of the world, or to revenge some wrong committed against our nationals or interests or the nationals or interests of another country. What we do must inevitably determine whether in the future we shall have, as we do now, relative freedom of national action. That is the great question our President and Congress must decide, and in the name of our future they should and must have the cooperation of a people uninfluenced by propaganda of the kind our organization is opposing.

Very truly yours,

JOHN HUNNICUTT, *Chairman.*
DAN MAGILL, *Secretary.*

Taxes for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., for June 5:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 5, 1940]

TAXES FOR DEFENSE

If present plans in Congress are carried to completion there will be few citizens of the United States who will not realize that the national defense is a costly business and that it is a responsibility which falls upon every last shoulder in the land. For once at least there is no talk of soaking merely the rich. On this occasion—surprisingly, too, because it is an election year—the aim is to spread the load in such a way that only the completely impoverished will not feel it.

This, of course, is as it should be. To each and every individual, the maintenance of our collective security is a matter of primary interest. The more that fact is impressed upon the minds of all our people, the more certain we can be that the huge sums now being raised will be wisely spent and the more surely the administration will be held to a strict accountability for the expenditures it makes.

In withholding temporarily approval of some of the revenue-raising proposals before Congress, notably the suggestion for an increase in the debt limit, the Republican leaders are not in any sense registering opposition to the national-defense program. They are simply reflecting the popular determination that this time the money of the people will be used exclusively for the purposes named and will be distributed by men whose only concern is that the country shall receive full value for its investment.

Considering the waste which marked our course in the World War and still later the extravagances of the New Deal in seeking to correct our domestic troubles, this is a wise precaution. From all appearances there are serious days ahead—days when the country will have to give freely of its resources in order to protect its people and its property.

In any scheme of national defense, financial stability is only slightly less important than are arsenals full of guns, harbors clogged with warships, and airdromes bulging with planes.

Keep America at Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, LOCAL 401, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I attach hereto a resolution of the American Federation of Teachers, University of Washington branch, at Seattle, setting forth graphically the views of that organization relative to the maintenance of American neutrality. As this resolution expresses the general sentiment entertained by many liberal and progressive groups of my State, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In these days of hysteria, when neighbor is inclined to be pitted against neighbor, when unscrupulous persons are encouraged to vent their spleen upon their enemies by hurling charges of subversive activities against them, we should be careful that we do not allow ourselves to become victims of ill-considered legislation.

The resolution is as follows:

THE MAINTENANCE OF AMERICAN NEUTRALITY

Whereas America's participation in the present European war would place our democratic institutions in the most serious jeopardy and engulf our people in the common destruction; and

Whereas there is evidence that the majority of the American people are opposed to our entrance into the war, and to all acts, words, or policies which might lead to such involvement; and

Whereas the membership of this body shares with the rest of the American people its sympathy for the neutral victims of the armed antagonism between powerful empires; and

Whereas past experience has shown that such a laudable sympathy for the innocent victims of war can be so played upon by war propagandists as to circumvent the pacific desires of the people and involve us in war; and

Whereas not only our public press but spokesmen for our Government have recently allowed themselves to become instruments of such a propaganda technique: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body goes on record as urging that the press and our responsible public officials use every caution against any inflammatory or partisan words or acts that might in any way tend to lead us into war; and be it further

Resolved, That this body urges every citizen and organization of citizens to give expression to their opposition to American participation in the war and to protest all acts and speeches leading in that direction; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Congress of the United States and to the public press.

Passed at general membership meeting, American Federation of Teachers, Local 401, May 28, 1940, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

King County (Wash.) Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to be delivered by me in keynoting King County Democratic convention to be held in Seattle, Wash., June 8, 1940:

At the outset, may I express my deep appreciation of the honor of addressing you today. I hope the views I express will be your views. I want to be informative as to the immediate problems affecting the party. So distressing and complex are the problems of the Nation, I have some doubt in my ability to fill the bill. I keenly feel the things I am about to say, and be assured of my sincerity in trying to present them as I see them.

To assemble on the eve of a campaign is no new experience to many of you here. I see old political friends. Some who have carried the banner of democracy in this community for many years. To again see those faces and those of you new but welcome to us, with all the determination and eagerness apparent to take up the cudgels for the traditional causes of the Democratic Party is ample reward for coming 3,000 miles to address you. For I must go back immediately. Congress still has work to do.

Politics is filled with discouragements. I often wonder that you have the courage and faith to continue. You work and struggle, year in and year out, campaign after campaign, for those causes you believe right, and then circumstances beyond your control in one stroke often smash your very hopes. It is the courage to carry on that makes the faith of the Democratic Party.

It is a faith that has made our party the oldest political party in the history of the world. For over 140 years we have given continuous service to American democracy.

Someone aptly said, "With a Republican his politics is his business, but with a Democrat it is something akin to his religion." Had men and women like yourselves not carried on; had there been apathy to the American duty of being a party worker, democracy, as we know it, would not exist. It is the great party system of checks and balances, kept alive by the party worker, that is the very basis of the American system.

Oh, I have heard scoffers belittle the political worker. Say that he or she is a politician. That he or she goes to silly political meetings. That he or she is one of those political pests always trying to get me to vote for somebody or something, when I am one of those independents who doesn't care or knows nothing about politics. Why, in this day, with the crash of democracies heard on every side; when those same scoffers fear for the continuation of our American system, you should be proud to be classed as a party worker.

You are the good citizen. You have, for many years, helped keep alive a great party in a country where the party system is the very roots of a free democracy. And best of all, you have been the member—you are a member—of a party that for over 140 years has been fighting the forces of reaction, greed, and special privilege. Hold your head high!

You and the party have been and will be called names. Sponsorship of liberal ideas always subjects one to such opposition tactics, especially if the opposition is traditionally conservative.

Changes sponsored by us in the past 7 years were the needed changes. Ideas have attached to us because we are the party in power. If you had a new liberal thought, what would be the use of going to the Republican Party with it? It has never been a forum for liberal or new ideas. It never will be. It wants to go back to the "Good Old Days." Yes; the good old days of wild speculation of 1929 and the resultant depression—want, poverty, and bread lines of the early thirties. We stand to go forward!

So it has been our job for the past 7 years to temper and absorb these ideas. Such has been our duty. We have done that duty well. Out of the melting pot of America—from the common man, from the farms, the sea, from labor and from the exploited—has come the strength and fiber of this party. Not wealth nor big business. These people are all good Americans, even though they sometimes don't think like those entroned in the high places would like them to think. In time of emergency—yea, in time of war, God forbid—they become the fiber and brawn of the Nation.

What is more important—these people are ours. And out of the bosom of the Democratic Party has come the strength of the liberalism and progressivism of America.

Yes; hold your head high. You are a member of a party that has been part of the American way long before a Republican was ever heard of. Maybe it is the Republican Party that needs a new baptism of patriotism. This party does not. We have fought and built Americanism for 140 years. We know what it means.

The same issues are here. The opposition will use the same old tactics. Let me tell them right here and now that the welfare of the common man and the American way of enhancing his welfare is still the objective of this party, and we are still on the firing line. If there be a "fifth column" within our party to that objective, let him forthwith, before we get going, join some other political organization more in keeping with his views. Shame on the individual or party who says that the oldest political organization in this country has no right to continue that fight; that we have no right to continue fighting for the democracy and Americanism we helped to build. I hurl that misstatement back at them. We go forward. That is why it is good to see you here with your spurs on.

So, before this campaign begins, let's have an accounting. Republicans have been going around the country making lots of speeches. They remind me of a colored fellow who once came into my office when I was prosecuting attorney here. He said he wanted a divorce. I inquired as to his complaint. "Dat woman," he told me, "she jest talk and talk and talk, night and day. Ah's a workingman and Ah jest can't get mah rest. She's driving me crazy." I asked him what she talked about so incessantly. "Ah don't know," he said, "she don't say."

But the leaders have been going around talking. Hoover, Dewey, Vandenberg, Willkie, Taft, and the others. Now, we must assume that the leadership of a party is symbolic of the party. Let's look at that leadership.

Hoover: He still wants to be President again. I really believe he is more sincere than most of them. At least he has a record from which the American people can judge. But the American people want no more of Hooverism. The party leaders are having a heck of a time wondering what to do with him, because much to their discomfort, every time he pops up, the people are again forcibly reminded of the "good old days," "the chicken in every pot," and "prosperity around the corner"—the days when Republican policies pummelled this country into the worst depression it has ever known. You recall conditions. Some of you remember them too vividly. Bread lines, hunger, bank failures, hunger marches, foreclosures by the hundreds, unrest, and fear. Judges were torn from the bench by angry farmers over foreclosures. Mobs stormed city halls. That's pretty tough on the Republicans.

And it's even tougher to remind the voters of the leadership of the Democrats—the party that brought the country out of the tailspin. So they hush, hush Hoover. But there he is. Still running for the Presidency. He is the stepchild of the Republican National Committee. But the same old crowd who put him in are behind the scenes. The Pews, Mrs. Hanna McCormick, Weirs, the Tom Girdlers, and all the bankers. Someone once said, "All Republicans are not bankers but all bankers are Republicans."

Look at the old crowd here locally. I need not mention names. So they say to the public: "Don't judge us by those days and that leadership; we're a new crowd. We are all reformed." This is somewhat true, because we made some of them put on halos.

But it is amusing to now to hear them praise some of the New Deal reforms. And in the same breath say now that you have done a job, turn it back to us. Why, ladies and gentlemen, it's the same old engineer, the same old train crew, that wrecked the whole thing in '29. Remember what a time we had getting back on the track and running? They have just put Hollywood trick mustaches on the crowd. So when one becomes recognized, or serves as a reminder, they trot out another.

Then there is that great master mind of international and domestic problems—Mr. Dewey. He went out into Iowa last month and closed a ringing speech with this: "Any foreign farm stuffs that compete with the produce of the American farmer will be barred from the market. The current low price of hogs is due entirely to the Democratic administration and foreign pork swamping the country. When I am President we will place an embargo on foreign pork." The farmers cheered. Why not? They had visions of hogs swarming in from all borders.

An analysis of the importation of hogs will reveal the astounding fact that pork-meat imports for 6 years up to '38 were less then 1 percent of the domestic production and in that year reached the great high figure of 1½ percent. Moreover, the tables show that even in '38 when the pork exports reached that high level, the domestic price was tops—9.48 cents. And yet, the moneyed interests of New York pour finances into that kind of a campaign of misinformation.

In Maine, last month, Mr. Dewey said, "Let's have a two-ocean Navy" and 10 minutes later said, "I'm going to quit spending money and balance the Budget."

All the Republicans, and particularly this gentleman, have had a lot to say about the W. P. A. And what a terrible thing it is. You know—feeding the hungry and the unemployed. They are going to turn it all back to the cities and States when they get in. I hope the Republicans in the State administration and in the city council don't hear about this. They will all turn Democratic. But anyway they are criticizing it. It is easy to criticize reliefers. It is hard for them to fight back. They are pretty humiliated, 95 percent of them, as it is. You can pick on a fellow who makes $65 a month or less. And it is easy to find flaws in a vast job such as the W. P. A., which had to find work projects quickly to keep people from starving. Some of them are apt to be a little rough. I need not enumerate many of the good projects of the W. P. A. Dewey leads us to this by ending many a foolish dia-

tribe claiming that the Democrats are responsible for unemployment. Everybody knows we inherited unemployment from the Republican Party as a result of the worst panic and depression this country has ever known. But out of that we had to find quickly things for these people to do. Some bad, some were too hastily gotten up, but most were good. Every community can point to schools, sewers, parks, playgrounds, and worth-while projects enhancing the value of the money spent.

It is amusing that so many of these critics accept the benefits of the things they criticize. And I have had Republican local officials in this State write me pleading for Federal grants for projects and find them the next week on Republican platforms hollering about spending money for P. W. A. and W. P. A. projects.

But Mr. Dewey should say thanks twice over for W. P. A. This is a good one. Back into 1938, before the presidential bee bit him, Mr. Dewey wrote Mr. Corrington Gill, the then Assistant Administrator of the W. P. A. I quote excerpts from the letter:

"MY DEAR MR. GILL: I am gravely concerned at the possibility of interruption of the W. P. A. project in my office. The discontinuance of this project would be nothing short of a calamity to me and the administration of justice. For the past 2 years this project has been continuously assisting in racket investigations of great importance. These successful prosecutions would not have been possible, with one exception, without the tremendous volume of accounting labor expended in each. Unless intimately connected with the office, no one could have any conception of the work done by the 25 W. P. A. accountants and the 10 staff accountants regularly attached to my office.

"By way of illustration, my office has been working for more than 2 years upon an organized monopoly in the electrical industry maintained by fraud and violence. This contractor's monopoly has, in my judgment, cost the national, State, and municipal governments, for electrical work in the city of New York, many millions of dollars in the past decade. The savings to the Federal Government alone, after the monopoly has been broken, would, in my judgment, pay for the continuance of the W. P. A. project for 10 years.

"The economic loss to the community as a result of this racket has been tremendous, and its destruction by arrests during this past week made an important contribution to the peace and security of industry and labor in New York."

After reading the letter we get an entirely new conception of some of the extraordinarily fine services rendered by the W. P. A. It appears that the work of the W. P. A., by his own words (and I'll bet he wished he hadn't written them), and the credit for breaking up these gangster rings is due largely to the fine work of these workers which the Democratic Party furnished to Mr. Dewey for 5 years. The second "thank you" should come from the resultant fact that had it not been for their intelligence and labor it would not have been possible for Mr. Dewey to get all the publicity that made him be considered as a Presidential nominee. Mr. Dewey continued to use these able people for 5 years without trying to raise their pay, kept them on W. P. A. wages, to something commensurate with their value. Gives you a rough idea what might happen to you if he were running the show. This also gives you a rough idea of the new group. They either do, or deliberately try to, misinform the people.

He is for participation in world affairs in New York and an isolationist in the Middle West. If this is the best leadership the Republicans can muster, they ought to do what a prominent Republican here in Seattle suggested a couple of weeks ago. Call off their convention.

To compare his wishy-washy foreign policy with that of the leadership now in Washington is like comparing a minnow to a king salmon.

VANDENBERG: He has been striding up and down the Senate for many years, and you can search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you will not find a single piece of progressive legislation that he has even introduced, let alone passed, in all these years of membership. He was a Member of the Senate during the depression days. He sat and watched the Democrats build up from the wreckage his crowd inflicted. Now, he says, give it to me. What contribution did he ever make to the problem in those times of stress? Where was he during the Hoover days with his now so-called purged ideas? And let the voters of this Nation recall that Mr. VANDENBERG's most potent activity in the United States Senate was his recent oppcsition to the administration's neutrality legislation. Let the people further recall, and that should not be difficult, that the thing that drew us, more than any other, into the last war was the sinking of our ships by Germany. Without the administration's neutrality bill that would have occurred again. Since the enactment of the bill and since the beginning of the war, not an American ship has been sunk because of the provisions of this bill. From the record it would appear that Mr. VANDENBERG, the now great Republican leader, would have it otherwise.

Well, our colleague TAFT is a nice, quiet fellow that some of the big boys trotted out in their campaign to try and prove to the American people that they are a rejuvenated crowd. He is part of that disguise. And, of course, the name "TAFT" will have quite an appeal to the old moneybag Republican group. He is good for a lot of collections to the campaign fund around Wall Street. So, they surged on him, and they are dragging him around the country trying to popularize him by photographing him with dead fish, dead ducks, and dead Republicans.

Willkie: Now, there is a fine candidate to present to the people of the Pacific Northwest. The head of the greatest private utility corporation in the United States. The Republicans, at least some of them, expect to carry our section under that leadership when the Democratic administration has brought into being in this section the most profound public-utility program the world has ever known. Why, the very basis of our Pacific Northwest liberalism has been founded upon the principle of public ownership of utilities. Oh, what a wreck that crowd the Willkie crowd of eastern utility magnates would make of Coulee and Bonneville. Surely they don't think the people of this section, who have fought so long for these projects would believe that a Willkie would mother and encourage this program. What havoc would they play with our section, which, because of this program, now enjoys the cheapest power rates in the whole world. Why, even the rank and file of Republicans in this community can't take that one.

Gannett: Then, there is that great liberal newspaper publisher of New York, Frank Gannett. You will recall he is the fellow, through his newspapers, that fought the abolition of sweatshops in the garment centers of upper New York. He is another rejuvenated Republican leader. His great fort has been crying about the terrible business conditions wrought upon the country by those awful Democrats.

Yet Mr. Gannett knows, in his disguise, that 100 of the largest corporations in this country, which he adequately represents, made more profits in 1939 than in the peak year of 1929. He knows further that the first 250 corporations, at the very time he is making all these speeches, made more in the first quarter of this year by 50 percent than a previous period last year. In his campaign of fooling the people again he hollers to high heaven that the Democratic administration has taken the profit motive out of business.

But, listen to this. The Gannett newspapers reported a net profit of $1,302,320 for 1939. A substantial increase over the previous year. But here is the real pay-off—at about the time this report was made this candidate was made public by a typical "New Deal business ruining" speech and a fellow Republican publisher heralded his debut under the caption "A candidate amid ruins." Poor fellow, he hardly knows where his next breakfast is coming from. He publishes a farm paper in the Northeast. On March 30 in an editorial in that paper he said feed prices were too high. In Nebraska, 6 days later, he told a group of farmers that farm prices for feed were too low and they weren't getting enough for their grain. I could go on with other Republican hopefuls, but what's the use? If some sincere Republican came to Congress to represent the farmer, is it any wonder he does not know where to turn with that type of leadership? Yet the Republicans in this State will ask the voters this fall to send Republicans to the House and Senate to fall in line with this type of eastern control. And further, to add to a group that have consistently, in the Congress, voted against every important development project, defenses, ship lines, and the vital things for the development of this section.

The local Republicans assembled here a few days ago. I was interested in the proceedings. I took my information from the Seattle Times. I assume it is correct. The account reads "The program adopted by the convention pledged its efforts toward the restoration of business confidence, elimination of fear, and return of free enterprise. It expressed faith in public education as an investment for public funds and expressed opposition to war." Now, there's a great platform. It is really specific as to what this party would do in meeting our problems. Then it says in a stirring plank, "We are opposed to a third term for the President and third termites must be removed from office everywhere."

But even as general and as vague and, may I say, as typical as these Republican planks are, we have done and are specifically even taking care of these things. They might as well have come and met with us. Business is making more profit than ever. It would be boresome to quote figures.

The fear they want eliminated is the fear on the part of the special-delivery crew that the Democrats will continue in power.

As to the schools, this administration has diverted more public funds to the construction of school buildings than any previous 10. Four thousand new buildings, 1,500 additions, and added fire-proofing, recreation facilities and classrooms to 28,000 more. In the State of Washington alone, since 1936 the administration has been awarded 269 such projects with a total donation of Federal funds in the amount of $3,660,221—broken down as follows: New construction, 36 projects, funds $590,295; additions, 29 new projects, funds $235,909; remodeling, 123 projects, funds $1,693,110; additions and remodeling, 78 projects, funds $1,093,347; new construction, repair, and additions, 3 new projects, funds $47,560. We have fared well.

This is an increase in said activity which the Republicans laud, of over 2000% from the prior 7 years. I have no figures on higher education but if the Republicans have any doubt about that, I suggest they take a ride and inspect the new improvements out at our own University of Washington.

All during the Republican administration, from the World War period on, school construction lapsed. A 1933 survey showed over 700,000 school children attending schools either condemned or unsanitary.

Let's go further with our Republican friends. Into the field of public health. Thousands of people, prior to 1932, with low incomes coul'd not receive hospitalization. Each year over 2,000,000 cases of illness went without medical treatment. Many people died of preventable illness. In this field we have made progress with

public funds. Much more needs to be done. But the Republican administrations did notoriously nothing. We have constructed a hundred and fifty-six new hospitals, 66 additions, and remodeled 1,436. This has been coupled with great national progress in sanitation.

The Surgeon General has recently said that W. P. A. and P. W. A. sanitary work in the South alone had advanced malaria control over 20 years.

The Republicans could have just as well stayed home than to have advocated their war plan. As a matter of fact, they could really carry it out by continuing to vote for me. The advocacy of that plan has been contained in the Magnuson resolution (H. J. Res. 66), before the Congress for the past 4 years. I will discuss their foreign policy later.

Then the convention, says the Times, heard some witty remarks from their keynoter, elected delegates favoring Dewey, and went home. Amen.

Six days later one of the most prominent Republicans in this community suggested, in a Nation-wide news article, that they nominate a Democrat for the Presidency of the United States. After reading the account of this convention, I know just how that fellow feels.

I examined the rest of their deliberations carefully. Let me give you a few choice gems. They should amuse you. Here's one: "The time has come to entrust our upward spiral of social progress to practical liberals, such as the Republican Party has always provided." I am glad they admit it has been upward. For 50 years this same party turned deaf ears to these reforms. Here's another: "The methods of appropriating and expending tax money must be changed." Yes; income taxes hit the Republican leadership pretty hard. They would like to get into power again to shift it back to the housewife with a sales tax and to the homes with a property tax. Federal money, you know, comes mainly from income taxation. Then in conclusion someone suggested a rallying cry as follows: "Back to prosperity with Republican courage." Sounds familiar, doesn't it?

Why do they want to be back in power? Isn't it fair that the American people point-blank ask the Republican Party leadership what they intend to do? Is it fair to the American people that they continue to stuff you with such platitudes? And, in order to make definite political issues, let us take some of the concrete things the present administration has sponsored; let us take the cold record, and ask them some questions.

Do they favor the repeal of those portions of the Social Security law providing for unemployment insurance?

In lieu of a national system of old-age pensions, which I will speak of later, do they favor the repeal of the present matching system, paying little as it does in some States, but yet a thousand times more than ever paid under any Republican administration, upon which score their record is a complete blank.

Do they favor the repeal of the minimum wage-hour law, abolishing child labor and sweatshops?

The law the Democrats had the courage to pass, even though a great portion of its membership from the South in the Congress was opposed to it. A law which every western Republican knows helps western industry by allowing it to compete with cheap eastern and southern labor, which in some cases was being paid as low as 9 cents an hour.

Do they favor the repeal of the law restricting the marketing of fraudulent securities? The Republicans let these investment houses go hogwild. Many of you in this very audience were burned.

Do they favor the repeal of the Bonneville, Coulee, and T. V. A. agencies, which are bringing to the rest of the country the cheap electric rates that we here enjoy? I can tell you, however, about these so-called rejuvenated Republicans, that two of these projects, which gives this State the greatest future of any State in the Union, is opposed by the Republicans in the Congress year in and year out.

Do they favor the repeal of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which saved thousands of people from being thrown into the streets here locally?

Are they against the Civilian Conservation Corps? One of the finest pieces of legislation passed by our administration, saving thousands of young men from the vicissitudes of idleness and crime.

Do they favor the repeal of Federal deposit insurance? God knows, during their times, they let enough banks fail. And, if for no other reason alone, we could ask the voters to return us to power, upon the fact that since the Democratic administration, not only can you put a dollar in the bank and know it is safe, but there have been comparatively no bank failures. Prior to this law, a thousand banks failed every year.

Are they against the rural electrification program, instituted by us, which has resulted in electrifying 1,700,000 farms with all the benefits, as compared with 744,000 before R. E. A.?

Are they against our farm-credit and farm-tenancy program?

What have they got to say about Federal Housing? The city of Seattle is now being favored with some splendid housing projects.

Are they against our laws recently passed prohibiting convict labor?

Are they against the splendid food-stamp plan, our antilynching bills, our insistence, under Democratic leadership, of railroad labor standards, extension of the civil service, our bills for the veterans? I know the veterans will recall that Hoover ran them out of Washington with gun points.

Are they against the 40-year fight, which finally culminated with a Democratic Congress, which passed the Railroad Retirement Act?

Are they against the Democratic House which passed the Anti-injunction Act of 1932, which protects labor from a discriminatory use of injunctions to break strikes?

What are they going to say to the Federal employees of the Post Office Department relative to our administration making mandatory the 40-hour workweek?

Let them tell our maritime workers whether or not they seek to repeal the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and, if they want to get right close to home, let the Republican leadership of this State tell the people whether or not they are opposed to many of the public works projects in this community, sponsored by this administration, I refer to the new courthouse, the Ballard bridge, Lake Washington bridge, the establishment of a new ship line to the Orient from our port, after the Dollar crowd had wrecked it, the new clipper service to Alaska, the Bone-Magnuson cancer bill, and the many highways, streets, playgrounds, and other valuable projects in this district.

Now, we all, I know, are a grateful people. Even some Republicans are grateful, strange as it seems, I wonder however, in local criticism by Republican leadership of this administration, whether or not they know that for every $3,000,000 paid into the Public Treasury by this State, our own Democratic leadership has been responsible for having reallocated back in valued public-work projects $7,000,000. The actual figures are that the State of Washington, since 1933, has paid into the United States Treasury $32,000,000 and gotten back $74,000,000.

There is no need to burden you further. Merely compare this record with any 1 or any 10 Republican administrations. So I hope that this convention will go on record, not only with concrete planks for the correction of abuses remaining to be tackled, but also to go on record for the continuation, not only of the social legislation mentioned, but these other activities. But please be specific. Let's not give to the people the same banal platitudes that came out of the Republican convention.

Keep your platform liberal. We will win if we continue to set our sights toward the rank and file and the comman man. We cannot fail, as against the Republicans, because they have never shown the slightest understanding of his problem. Our problem is still the same—to continue our efforts to correct the abuse of the concentration of wealth, power, and special privilege. Specifically, may I suggest that we go on record for the furtherance of our social-security program, so as to include a definite plank for national old-age pensions. I have a personal interest in hoping this convention will endorse my Alaska project. I know further that you will tackle our State problems with equal liberal vigor.

I now would like to briefly discuss three timely and important problems confronting the party in this State.

I have been hearing some talk that labor—and when I speak of labor I refer to both the leadership and the rank-and-file workingman—has lost sight or possibly misunderstands the purposes of this administration with reference to their welfare. I still say that this administration has done more to carry out its pledge to foster the cause of the wage earner than any administration in the history of this country. That is natural, because the party itself is composed of the workingman, and he is an integral part of our organization. What we have done has not been motivated by whether they would vote for us or not, but because it was a job to do. Who has exploited labor more than the big business tycoons that are still the force behind the Republican Party? Who has called the laborer more names than these same people that are now raising the finances to get the Republican Party back into power? I need not recall to labor what was attempted by the Weirs, the Pews, the Girdlers, and others of that type, who now make up the Finance Committee of the Republican Party.

Now, I have no quarrel with the traditional policy of labor to remain independent of political parties. In that position, labor becomes a more potent force to politically accomplish their end. And if the Democratic Party ever turns from its aim to aid labor, then I say they should turn, as a unit, to another political group. I merely ask, before that decision, that labor looks at the record of progress for their rights, wages, and conditions under this administration and compare it with their fare under previous administrations, run and controlled by the same crowd that now make up this finance committee. There should be no question in the mind of labor leaders as to who, as a party, has been their friend. I know that there are some things and some personalities objectionable, but the batting average of the Democratic Party under this administration for labor, carefully examined, fairly appraised, would make the average Republican administration look like a Texas bushleaguer as against a Babe Ruth. I know one thing further that labor sticks by their friends.

Why, much of our criticism has been based upon the accusation that we have leaned too far toward labor. I don't think we have gone far enough, and I think this convention should go the further distance in their advocacy, not only in commendation for the accomplishment of labor legislation but that the party continue a strong adherence toward the continuation of these gains and labor's problems.

Let me again come close to home by way of illustration. It was amusing to me to read a plank from the Republican State platform, pledging that party to be against all antilabor initiatives. Now I am glad they took that stand, but when it comes to reward by way of political support to a party, I know that it is without great

difficulty that every laboring man and every labor leader in this community knows who sponsored at last election the most vicious antilabor initiative ever proposed in this State. We all know that the power behind the scenes for that initiative was composed of the men who now support, and always have, the Republican Party in this State. And it is further without any difficulty that every worker will recall that during the last campaign, with possibly one exception, every Democratic candidate, for high or low office, publically denounced and privately worked for the defeat of this measure. The Democratic platforms and every Democratic meeting advocated this defeat. The Republican platform was then strangely silent on the subject. Republican candidates side-stepped the issue, so I say it is amusing to now see them in their desperate attempt to get votes, telling labor what they are going to do for them. Labor leaders and workers are not fooled that easily.

The workingman will recall, and his memory is not short, that the only recognizable Republican contribution to minimum hours and wages, the rights to organize and collective bargaining, was to close their eyes to the whole subject, while employers, contributing money to the Republican machine, perfected elaborate systems of industrial spies and other devices to harass the workingman. I wish everyone could have the opportunity to read the La Follette report. There would be no question after that as to how labor would vote in reference to the Republican Party.

Recent events have given rise to a definite American problem. It has currently been called a "fifth column." Let us not fool ourselves nor side-step this issue. The people of the country are entitled to know how both the Republican and Democratic Parties stand on this question. However, let us attack the problem sanely. We want no witch hunts. There should be no hysteria about it. This party is against any sabotage of our efforts to protect this Nation. I, personally, have worked too hard and too long on defense measures to see them broken down by some sneaking individual. I have a wholesome respect for an outspoken man of convictions, and, under our American system, allowing the formation of all political parties and units, that man can find a place to expound his political ideas. You remember the injustice of some of the accusations during the last World War period. And I cannot too strongly warn you, in your traditional intenseness for Americanism, that you do not forget the very precepts and underlying foundations of our democracy, the right of free speech, free assemblage, and to worship God as you please. Let me further warn those within our party, or any other party, who would abuse that privilege for espionage purposes, that it is the firm intention of this administration to deal with them quickly.

Now, let's be practical about this. We know that were these people, whether they be Communists, Fascists, or otherwise, if they were to meet in the open, form their political party, which under our American system they have a right to do, they would not in this State get a hundred votes. The problem is, therefore, that they know this too, and their plan is to bore from within. Oh, let's be frank. We probably have some in our party of this type. I know the Republicans have some Fascists in their organization, trying to bore from within. I know, further, just as sure as I am standing here, that 99 99/100 percent of the rank and file of this party are just as good Americans as ever walked the streets of Seattle. If the remaining percentage do not like that American way, if they have any objection to our party, we can deal with them promptly, but we cannot accuse on suspicion, and the real American way is to have facts before decision. If we have been guilty of anything, it has been a certain American tolerance, and it is easy for those of the opposition, who have been engaged in few battles for tolerance and human rights to all of a sudden arouse themselves and point a finger at someone.

Another crisis faces us. It would be useless for me to review the events of Europe. They are too vivid in your mind. The horror of war is close. The tread of Armies and the crash of gunfire is heard around the world. The task of those who would enlighten America upon its place in international affairs becomes extremely difficult. Flashing headlines render many judgments obsolete before they reach print. Every agency of enlightenment is needed. We want no lesson enforced by rows of steel. It is time for cold realism.

It is probably useless to remind our political opponents now that our refusal to accept the League of Nations might have contributed to the disaster. That our Fordney-MacCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariffs were expressions of economic nationalism which, imitated in other lands, made for poverty and disorder in wide areas of the globe. That, although we led in the Nine Power Treaty, when Japan violated it in Manchuria, the Republicans in power and America were as blameworthy as Great Britain in failing to impose an embargo. These are without argument. This is only to remind, when they criticize our foreign policy, that these played a part in the convulsions that now afflict Nanking. That these are things the Republican Party can answer for.

Turn of events in Europe has placed the problem of defense uppermost in the minds of our citizens, but this administration has not been unmindful of our defense needs. Your delegation in Congress has not been asleep as to the needs of the Pacific Northwest. It is amusing to hear critics say, "What have you Democrats been doing the past few years?"

I have served on the Naval Affairs Committee some years now, and I know what has been going on. If any Republican wants to take up that cry, let them go out to Sand Point, Bremerton, Kodiak, Sitka, and Unalaska, Anchorage, Fairbanks, McChord Field, etc. What was at these places prior to 1933? And there is more to come. Our Navy is inferior to none. We may have a two-ocean Navy. We have built gradually and soundly. There was no ship construction during the previous three administrations. We need more airplanes, and, of course, recent events have taught us that we need to mechanize the Army and change some naval tactics. It has been pointed out forcefully that now speed is needed in this emergency, and so, under the leadership of the present Democratic administration, we have sanely set to that task. We are not only going about defense but we are facing the truth and giving the people facts and passing a tax bill to pay for it. A party of courage in a campaign year.

In this job we have a great commission. First, defense shall have the right-of-way, and there are bills passed to this effect. "There shall be," says the Congress and the Chief Executive, "no war millionaires"—meaning no profiteers in our defense efforts. Senator BONE and myself have long advocated this policy in the Bone-Magnuson bill. Democracy means more to us now than ever before; that democracy shall survive; therefore let us talk more about duties and less about rights. Democrats and Republicans alike need a baptism of patriotism. No man deserves to live under this flag who won't buckle in and put his shoulder to the wheel in this crisis without a profit. I am glad to say that industrialists are rallying around.

Second, the tax to pay for it is based upon the same income-tax theory. It will be equitable. We are all going to pay our share, and God knows we are willing.

"There is no need," says this administration, "to lose the gains made by labor during the past 7 years." If the navy yards, and I helped to write this bill, are speeded up, the 40-hour week is still intact. We said they might work 48 hours, but if they did, they are to be paid time and one-half overtime for it. No need to change any labor standards until the unemployed have been absorbed, and labor is willing to stand in with us in this. Neither capital nor labor should take undue advantage of this situation—labor has not. Let us have no industrial sabotage. I sat in on hearings on this matter and they cooperated in every way—America is just as dear to them as to any of us.

If we have grown soft, events have made us realize that we now have to toughen our fiber. And there is not a tougher bunch than the rank and file of the Democratic Party.

Our job is to save America—not Europe.

We are going to build our defenses so as to insure hemispherical defense. We want no foreign "ism" to set its foot here, in Latin America, or in South America, for that matter. There is not an American within the sound of my voice who would not give to keep this hemisphere inviolate. The danger is present. Let us not be fooled. Let us tell the world that the first foreign aggressive foot to be set on the soil of North or South America will be resisted—and with all the might and power at our command. Once the world understands that, our danger is removed.

Seven years ago the Democratic Party in this State assembled in convention. It was a time of stress, peril, and fear. The country was in the throes of its greatest panic and our very institutions were threatened. The Nation cried out for leadership. The Democrats in this State believed they had found a leader to bring them out, to the happiness that was once the possession of every American. Washington was the first State in the Union to instruct a delegation, pledged to nominate the present incumbent and leader of the Democratic Party.

That choice has been one of the great accomplishments of the party in this State. That leadership, as chosen, did not fail.

Again we are to meet, and as a sovereign State, and direct another recommendation. Again the Nation stands in peril. It is a different kind of peril. Democracy in the world is being threatened. And again the Nation needs strong leadership.

I would be derelict to my own convictions and to this convention if I did not express the sincere hope that the State of Washington follow the excellent and wise procedure of 7 years ago and send to the Chicago convention another instructed delegation to insist upon the nomination for the Presidency of the United States the same leader who tackled the job so effectively for us in 1932, and who is tackling this present peril with such dispatch and saneness—the greatest humanitarian of all time—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

A Million-Dollar Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. HENRY J. BERKOWITZ

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by Dr. Henry

J. Berkowitz, of Portland, Oreg., entitled "A Million-Dollar Reward." The address follows:

The news and editorial columns of the American press have during recent days carried a story which has set wagging the tongues of all the American people. Dr. Samuel Harden Church, president of Carnegie Institute of Technology, speaking for a group of Pittsburgh citizens, has offered a reward of $1,000,000 for the arrest of Adolf Hitler, in order that he be delivered to the League of Nations for trial.

The idea, from a practical point of view, is fantastic, and it could be interpreted as an unneutral act involving our entire country. I do not believe, however, that the offer was made with any hope of its ultimate accomplishment, nor was it intended to be pro-Ally propaganda. I regard it as a gesture on the part of a group of men who are terrified at the thought of this country being dragged into the war as a result of that terrible train of events set in motion by Adolf Hitler. The sum of $1,000,000 is merely a symbol of what these men believe it to be worth to have this country saved from the incalculable disaster of war. It is fruitless to argue that the capture of Hitler would not mean the end of the war. In fact, all speculation along these lines is meaningless. The whole episode brings to focus the important fact that nothing is too great for the American people to pay for any insurance policy against participation in this war. There is no other subject today that so occupies the American mind. All other subjects of conversation have become secondary. All local and national problems are dwarfed by this tremendous source of worry. Can we be saved or must we go down the awful road that leads to the same precipice upon which we tottered in 1917?

As a matter of religion, the offer of a million-dollar reward for Adolf Hitler has particular interest when interpreted as an indication of a deep desire to escape disaster. For the church and the synagogue, for rabbi and clergyman, war is the most terrible of all crises.

When war comes the preacher must walk along a path almost as narrow as a razor edge, with pitfalls on either side. If on the one hand he becomes an amateur commentator on the war, the congregation had better stay at home and listen to the radio. There are many more competent interpreters of the news than the minister in his pulpit. People do not go to church or synagogue to get a news bulletin, but to hear some rumor of God, some revelation of the eternal will in a crumbling world. It is the preacher's opportunity to take ancient teachings out of an ancient book and give them new life. "God is our refuge and our strength, and ever present help in time of trouble."

There is the other side of the razor edge, however. With a mass of human suffering which staggers the imagination, caused by the greed and rapacity of reckless men, we cannot shut our eyes to it or say we will have no dealings with it. This is the dilemma of religion in wartime. There are peculiar occupational risks in preaching when the world takes up arms. The preacher is moved by his emotions. His deep concern with great moral questions sweeps him readily into crusades. He finds himself driven by circumstances beyond his control, and he has to make choices between comparative standards of national morality.

After the last war a devastating book was published called Preachers Present Arms. That book ought to have a place on our desks beside the Bible. When we read what ministers said and did before and during the last war, and then place alongside the monstrous evils that came out of that war, for which so many preachers whooped it up mightily, we may well bow our heads and ask God's mercy. This book quotes sermons, addresses, and resolutions uttered by American ministers and rabbis during the last war. I will quote only one, an utterance of the best-known bishop in the United States, spoken some 21 years ago.

"This war is bringing the world into a fellowship and a brotherhood that before seemed only a dream. The outcome is to be a sweeping away of autocracy in all its forms and the establishment of democracy and world-wide brotherhood, including those nations at this moment fighting against us. Two thousand years ago Jesus gave to the world the message of the brotherhood of man. Today we stand face to face with its realization."

Read that last sentence today in the light of your daily papers. Could any words be more ironical? If we were to utter the same words today, what assurance would we have that they would not end in blight, desolation, and ruin?

One thing can be safely predicted, and that is when it is all over, the world will again be disillusioned as it was after 1918. We will know then as we knew 20 years ago, that it was all a sinful and terrible waste. The tragedy of children of today is not that they would suffer and die in war, but the sure prospect that they would live to repeat the embitterment and rude awakening that came when the slogans had lost their hypnotic spell and our eyes were opened to grim reality. We are just at the point now where we are beginning to forget the steps that dragged the world into the depths of September 1939. We forget the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, the desire to make peace with Germany at the expense of Russia. We forget that Lord Lothian said, "Hitler will be our buffer between Great Britain and Russia." The policy then was not the defense of democracy nor the rights of small nations. It will be years before history again dares to put its verdict upon the ineptitudes and betrayals of British and French policy. To say this does not mean that I lack sympathy with England and France in the present war. As a Jew I would be less than human if my whole heart and soul were not wrapt up in the cause of the Allies. But we must not fail to face the realities of history. I truly pray for some miracle that will permit America to remain aloof, because I know of no other means of preserving democracy and human values and resources for the service of the world after the war. But like all my fellow Americans, I am not sanguine about the future.

The more one sees and hears of what is now transpiring, it looks as though we are being forced again to take sides. America is not neutral today. The overwhelming majority of our people are heart and soul with the Allied cause. Thus, organized religion, together with all other American institutions, will be forced into that dilemma that it faced before. It is enough to make any sincere religious leader throw up his hands in despair. I am not willing to predict today what I will do or say if this country is forced into the war. I have preached peace consistently for years, but I realize now that we have been at war since 1914, and that the intervening years from 1918 to 1939, were just a breathing spell. Not one evil was remedied, not one change was wrought in human affairs. The entire political and economic struggle, together with all the moral standards of men and nations, have remained unaffected. We stand today where we stood about 1916. It was an election year then, as it is now. The American people were completely antiwar, and yet the paralysis of our reason and sanity had already set in.

Today I only can suggest to you how deep is the dilemma of religion. What are the church and the synagogue to do? Shall they close their doors and adjourn the meeting until it is all over, or shall they bless the war and make it holy, or shall they save their dignity and honor by keeping silent on the issues and trying to adopt a program that is consistent with the highest principles of religion?

In the first place it is impossible for organized religion to go out of existence in wartime. It cannot say, "We ask you to follow the law of God, but we are willing to wait until you go out and murder your brother first."

In the second place, organized religion cannot permit itself to follow the example set by Germany. There a subservient church was compelled to issue what it called "a word for proclamation from the pulpit" shortly after the war began last fall. The spiritual forces of the Reich were mobilized in support of German arms in the following terms:

"The German people is called to arms for the land of its fathers, for its freedom, and for its honor. We members of the German Church are conscious of our unity as we pray for our people and our fatherland, for the Führer, and the armed forces."

By this statement the leaders of the state's church blessed the state's banners and dedicated their Bibles and the hymn books not as guides but as sources of inspiration for those who follow the Führer. This statement by the German Church was issued while death and destruction was being rained upon the helpless Polish population in their towns and villages. God deliver the religious forces of America from a regimentation that would bring it to such a low estate.

Since the churches cannot close, and since they must not become mere echoes of a propaganda ministry, what is their place in our time? They cannot evade responsibility for taking an attitude and bearing witness in relation to the events which now hold first place in the world's attention. Silence and inaction are impossible. To say nothing and to ignore the issues by which the destiny of humanity will be determined for centuries would be like bearing false witness. I confidently believe that no matter what happens the United States will continue to be a nation of free churches and, for the most part, of free pulpits, and I therefore wish to suggest a few of the positive attitudes that can be taken at a time like this.

1. We must repent for the past errors and inadequacies of the pulpit.
2. We must defend the liberties of press, platform, and pulpit.
3. We must constantly brand war as evil.
4. Explore and expose the hidden causes of war.
5. Study the conditions of a just peace and assist in their furtherance.
6. Bring help and comfort in practical ways to the innocent victims of war-torn lands.
7. Pray without ceasing for the reestablishment of universal good will.

These are some of the principles to which the synagogue can cling without compromising its ideals or stultifying its purposes.

It is exceedingly hard for us Jews to drive out of our hearts the spirit of militancy in the face of the incomparable outrages that have been visited upon us. If ever a people might be said to have a just cause for war, it is the Jew. It hardly seems as though there is any choice left for us, but war upon our enemies with the hope of their complete annihilation. Yet no Jew, no matter how great his lust for revenge, can turn to his synagogue and ask its blessing upon the shedding of his enemies' blood. Despite everything, the religious institution and its religious leaders must struggle with might and main to hold high the banners of love and mercy, teaching men to resist hatred.

In closing, let me admit again the dread of the days we are facing, the decisions that they will require, and the terrible spiritual struggles they will create.

We are all intensely human, and while the church is a divine institution it is made up of human beings and subject to the limitations of human beings. That is why I sympathize with the gesture that was made to offer a reward for the capture of the one most responsible for this chaos. It is a last desperate effort to avert that awful multiplicity of problems—moral and spiritual and material—that war brings into every phase of human life. Would to

God a way might be found to extricate ourselves from this ghastly tangle, but no matter what betides, do not look to your religion to betray its trust or to barter away its ideals for the sake of security.

Three Aces Versus the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of June 1, 1940:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of June 1, 1940]

THREE ACES VERSUS THE NEW DEAL

The three tiptop American aces and authorities on aviation and air defense are now in publicly proclaimed agreement on the proposition that President Roosevelt's politically motivated defense program is "cockeyed."

That is quite enough to make the American people sit up, take notice, and call a halt. Not a halt on effecting actual defense, but a halt on the third-termites' partisan procession which, in Maj. Al Williams' words, is "tramping in the death march of the British admirals."

Major Williams recently toured Europe and intensively studied the airplanes and aeronautical methods and organizations of the principal powers of that Continent.

Now, in a blistering denunciation of the Roosevelt purpose to help the Allies at the expense of our own national defense and national security, he has placed himself on record somewhat more vigorously than Col. Charles A. Lindbergh and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacher, his fellow aces, but in substantial agreement with those two gentlemen.

All three of these men love their country above all other things on the face of the earth.

All three have served their country well and ably.

All three are nationally and internationally famous.

All three are recognized as unselfish, nonpartisan devotees of strong and effective national defense.

All three are indisputably experts in their field.

It means a great deal, therefore, that all three agree that the Roosevelt policy is not merely faulty but actually of such a character as to imperil the best interests of the United States.

If you were in need of a surgical operation, you would welcome the services, or at least the counsel, of the three foremost surgeons in America.

If you were in need of legal advice, you would respect the opinions of the three foremost lawyers in the country.

America is now interested in national defense, which, all parties agree, centers primarily in air defense.

America, therefore, should welcome and act upon the expert counsel of her three foremost air-defense authorities: Charlie Lindbergh, Eddie Rickenbacker, and Al Williams.

What do these men say?

Lindbergh says this:

"If we are in danger of war, it is not because European peoples have attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of America, but because certain American people have attempted to interfere with internal affairs of Europe. * * * We need not fear a foreign invasion unless the American peoples bring it on through their own quarreling and meddling with affairs abroad. Our eyes should not search beyond the horizon for problems which lie at our own feet. * * * There is no longer time for us to enter this war successfully. * * * Let us stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion. * * * If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war. No one wishes to attack us, and no one is in a position to do so. * * * The only reason that we are in danger of becoming involved in this war is because there are powerful elements in America who desire us to take part. They represent a small minority of the American people, but they control much of the machinery of influence and propaganda. They seize every opportunity to push us closer to the edge. * * * Let us turn our eyes toward our own Nation and its defense."

And Rickenbacker says this:

"Each new instance of the bloody tragedy and suffering in Europe should restrengthen us in our efforts to keep out of that war over there. * * * Even if we wanted to go to the aid of France and England—which God forbid, unless we want to end liberty and free, representative government in this country for at least a century—we have nothing to offer those countries. * * * We are now enjoying liberties and a standard of living which we certainly will never see again, and which our children will probably never see again, if certain forces now at work are allowed to mislead us in the next 6, 12, or 18 months. * * * We could never transport troops abroad in the present circumstances, even if we were foolish enough to want to. * * * So let us serve free, representative government both at home and abroad by concentrating on solving our real problems here, to protect us from the menace of foreign invasion, which, in spite of what we hear, is still, at the worst, a long way off. * * * The greed and selfishness of a few, while reprehensible, are less to be feared in leading to American entanglement and involvement in the present war than public misunderstanding, resulting from misinformation and inflammatory propaganda. * * * Nothing caused the present European war that has not caused every European war for centuries. * * * Let's keep our heads and work for a real national-defense program—a defense of our own country, not somebody else's. * * * What we need is an enlargement of the plane-producing industry, subject to ready conversion for war use—our use."

That's what Rickenbacker says.

It's what every really competent authority on national defense has been saying for weeks and months.

Now, how about the third American ace? How about Maj. Al Williams? What does Major Williams say? This:

"Our air-defense development has been retarded by politics and bureaucracy. * * * For 5 years this administration has persistently meddled in international power politics and, at the same time, failed to provide an adequate national-defense system for the country. * * * This country is not the knight errant of the human race. The blood of America belongs to America—to no man or group of men—and it must not be shed or mortgaged again in foreign wars; nor on foreign battlefields. * * * As a knight errant of the human race, some men would have the United States pose before the world, while the knight's armor, his sword, and his shield are made of tin and of obsolescent design. * * * Our aircraft production has been muddled through this administration's persistent dumping of everything to the Allies. * * * We are confronted by coiners of dangerous international phrases—coined in subversion of the safety and peace of America. Congress alone can save us, and we alone—we ordinary Americans—can save Congress by telling these representatives of ours that we are determined to mend and put our own house in order * * * and to build a defense of this country. The President wants airplanes in great numbers right now—to toss into this war. If he wants thousands of planes without waiting to build up an air force first, then production of planes for Europe is his goal—not the defense of America. * * * President Roosevelt's panicky "flight schedule" for the air invasion of America is ridiculous, worthy of Hollywood, and certainly not of the White House."

That's what Maj. Al Williams said to the National Aviation Forum, meeting in Washington under auspices of the National Aeronautical Association, and when he said it, his listeners, all experts in aviation, responded with loud, long cheers.

Congress had better note those cheers—and note that they represent the sentiments of millions in the great patriotic American rank and file—millions without any official spokesman other than their representatives in Congress.

A Good Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BROOKLYN DAILY EAGLE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Daily Eagle of June 5:

[From the Brooklyn Daily Eagle of June 5, 1940]

A GOOD EXAMPLE

Few things have been more stimulating in the present hour of uncertainty than the example supplied by the three recognized party organizations which have put aside partisan differences to work shoulder to shoulder for the Red Cross relief drive in Brooklyn.

The Democratic, the Republican, and the American Labor Parties, acting through their representatives, agree to place their organized party machinery in motion in a fund-raising effort to alleviate, in a measure, the distress, suffering, and destruction which have engulfed millions of human beings in Europe. It is a three-in-one effort, beginning next Monday, which merits maximum success.

While the party organizations themselves evidence their usefulness in an exceptional undertaking, the cause for which their services are drafted is one which appeals strikingly to the true American spirit of generosity.

It is a solemn hope and prayer that Brooklyn's peace-loving inhabitants, now summoned to give generously toward meeting emergency abroad, may never be called upon to experience the same horror and terror afflicting those in whose name the Red Cross appeals for aid.

Hold to the Fundamentals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1940

ADDRESS OF MARTIN A. FLEMING, CITY JUDGE OF CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Martin A. Fleming, city judge of Chattanooga, Tenn., to the graduating class of Father Ryan High School, Nashville, Tenn., on June 6.

This excellent address contains timely and wise counsel to young people upon the fundamentals of life. Church, home, schools, and government, as forcefully pointed out by Judge Fleming, are the fundamental institutions upon which our lives must be securely fastened.

HOLD TO THE FUNDAMENTALS

We meet today to congratulate you, the members of the 1940 graduating class of Father Ryan High School, who are now completing your secondary school training, and I hasten to add, for some, your final school work. A feeling of victory is attached to this occasion for you. About 12 or 13 years ago you started to school. Out of each hundred boys and girls who started with you, I am informed by educational specialists, that about 50 finished the grammar school and about 15 are now graduating from high school, and I am told that on the average only about 2 will complete a college course.

You have made a good start for the trip before you, having shown that you have, to a large degree, courage, sacrifice, intelligence, and character, from which success comes. This, too, is a great occasion for your parents. Many of them have made sacrifices that you might complete your high-school work. They may well feel proud of you today. They are not looking backward, they are looking forward, filled with the hopes that you may continue your training, that you may use your ability to think, and that you will properly evaluate your duties as citizens—a task and obligation you are soon to assume.

My daily task is to preside over a court. I see the wrecks of humanity parade before me each day. I have an opportunity to see that the neglected child in the home is most often a menace to society. I seldom see a person in my court who has attained the secondary school level. I have concluded that the child who does not attend church and who does not have Christian teachings and the Christian controls is seriously handicapped in this great race for right thinking, right living, and Christian citizenship. Seldom do I see a person in my court who has been trained in the fundamentals of citizenship, the responsibilities of voting, the cooperation of one citizen with another, the loyalty of a citizen to his State and Nation.

These dregs of society as a rule are those who desire to get all and give nothing. They can picture mountainlike the faults of the other fellow but can never see the troubles of their own. They are practically always leeches of society and seldom are they the conscientious contributors. A noted crime expert said the other day that in order for a criminal to be successful he must start his career before he is 12, reach the height of his career by the time he is 18, and be killed by a gangster or policeman by the time he is 22 and leave an estate valued at less than $100.

I wish to speak this evening briefly on the subject, Hold to the Fundamentals. I am bold in the assertion that there is no church that believes more fundamentally than the Catholic Church that the home, the school, the church, and the government are the essential features of our society that must be preserved and handed down to posterity better improved and finer.

May I speak briefly on the home?

The home is the main institution of society. The early years of a child's life, as you know, are the most impressionable. They are the years that yield most quickly to Christian teachings and controls. They are the years when proper moorings are implanted, when the right sense of directions are given the child. I was impressed by a short story that I read a few years ago. A governor of a State had a holiday. He decided to visit the penitentiary and interview the 10 prisoners in death row. He found that they all were intoxicated at the time they committed the crimes. They were with bad companions and they all had had very very little moral and Christian training. I feel that the time to prevent crime is in the high chair and not the electric chair.

I hope that the home as a social institution will soon regain the place in society that it once occupied. It is not a point of departure, as our fellow Catholic has said. Father Flannagan, of Boys Town, has repeatedly said, "There is no such thing as a bad boy"; he has said frequently that there are neglected children, and that a different set of circumstances, a set of intelligent, Christian parents would have changed the picture entirely. Napoleon once said that the greatest need was Christian homes and parents. He was not always wrong. Again I say that if we have more Christian training in the homes, we will reduce our divorce rate in society.

There are just two kinds of people in this world—the good and the bad. The good want to do right because it is right. The bad want to do wrong because the wrong is attractive to them. I cannot reiterate too often that we need Christian teachings in the home.

Secondly, the school. The school is a great institution for the preservation of democracy. It has become a great business. I am told that there are over 30,000,000 boys and girls daily attending school, that there is a $10,000,000,000 plant housing and accommodating these young citizens, and that the annual cost of education in our Nation exceeds $3,000,000,000. I visited the largest public school in the South a few days ago. I had the good fortune to speak to their 2,500 students. Later I visited a classroom and conducted a forum discussion. I was greatly impressed by the extensiveness, the democracy, and the soundness of their teachings.

It seems to me as I read, visit, and discuss the daily problems, that the high schools are sticking to the fundamentals. Most of the teachers are native-born, conservative, and are not indoctrinated with the philosophy of free thinking. Do not misunderstand the term "free thinking." I mean as it applies to the undermining of the basic teachings. Much of the false teaching, I feel, is being done in the higher institutions. There are those who advocate the "isms"; many of whom parade under the cloak of academic freedom. There are those who preach race hatred, free love, and infidelity. I maintain that an institution that permits such teachings to go on should not be tolerated in a Christian country.

The hand, the head, and the heart must be trained if the child is to be fully educated. A person with a trained hand may make a decent living, but will he live a contributing life? A person with a trained mind may be able to understand history, mathematics, or jurisprudence, but what good would that trained mind be if he spends a big portion of his life reading history or calculating the number of years in his prison sentence? An educational institution supremely equips a boy or girl when it sends him forth capable of earning a living, with a well-trained mind and a heart that beats sympathetically for the unfortunate, who loves his fellow man and who lives a life of Christian service.

Our American people have a reverence for education. Education is expensive, but the people bear the cost willingly in the hope that finer citizenship will be the reward. I urge you young people to continue your educational training if it is at all possible. If you can't, remember the will to grow was learned by Lincoln after he attended school about 2 years, as well as it was by Woodrow Wilson, who attained the highest degrees. A school is not a place where failures can be transformed into Solomons, but it is the best place to enter the field of learning.

Thirdly, I would urge you to participate actively in government. Wars are going on in Europe. Thousands of innocent people will lose their lives. This is the time for us to keep cool, calm, and think twice before we do too much speaking. This is an excellent time for us to be deliberating the prices of democracy and the duties of citizenship. The cost of freedom and democracy has been expensive. The monuments at Bunker Hill and Lexington and Kings Mountain speak in unmistakable terms the truth of their assertion that democracy did not come free. Men like Nathan Hale and Sam Davis have immortalized the spirit of freedom. These young men regretted that they had but one life to give for the cause they loved. Men like Washington, Grant, Lee, Pershing, and thousands of others have had a conspicuous part in winning an imperishable place in this struggle for democracy.

We have not been a warlike nation since our beginning. I read an interesting statement a few days ago from a new book. It said that since the beginning of our Nation, about 163 years ago, we had participated in 6 wars lasting 23 years. In the same span of time England has taken part in 54 wars lasting 102 years, and France had taken part in 53 wars, lasting 99 years. Our main achievements have come from our peaceful activities and not our wars. The fundamentals of democracy, freedom of press, speech, and assembly are the safeguards of liberty and must be exercised if they are to be preserved. I recommend that you young people actively participate in the various phases of citizenship. Never fail to vote in any election. A voting man is a contributing man. A voting man is a respected man.

Again I say the day for you to assume the leadership for constructive civic enterprise is not far in the distance. See your tasks clearly, assume your responsibilities uncomplainingly, and do your duties as citizens gladly. When Thomas Jefferson wrote his own epitaph he did not write about the political offices that he had held, not even the Presidency. He wrote about his civic achievements.

Lastly, love your church. It seems unnecessary that I dwell on this phase of your life. I realize that the church has a big task in training the conscience of the person. I have remarked a thousand times that a person could not possibly have a conscience who could kill a man, be brought to the jail, and within an hour be

asleep and perfectly forgetful of any of the experiences attendant to such an awful crime. To keep alive a conscience that acts as a stop sign to the acts of wrong, is one of the primary functions of a church. The Christian tasks of the church are too well known to all of you for me to repeat.

If you have a proper sense of the values of the fundamentals and hold fast to them, I do not fear your future. Yours is a life of joyous service, with a multitude of friends and a peace of mind that knows no equal. Again I congratulate you and your parents and wish for you life's best.

Where Did the Seven Billion Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO HERALD AND AMERICAN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers who have felt a sense of security because they believed their Government was preparing for national defense have a right to inquire specifically as to the use made of the $7,000,000,000 appropriated for national defense. The inquiry is even more pertinent now that the debt limit is to be increased by $4,000,000,000 and a drastic tax increase imposed upon the people for national defense. The people should be realistic enough to demand information from the administration as to whether this tax money is to be used for our national defense.

If the situation is so critical that the President should request power to order out the National Guard to defend this Nation from a "fifth column" or to quell disturbances in nearby nations, I wonder to what extent this country should strip itself of its own means of defense and stand in the presence of such an emergency with Uncle Sam's hands literally tied behind his back. I can think of nothing more disastrous than to deprive ourselves of the military implements necessary to defend ourselves from within as well as from without.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Herald and American, Chicago, Ill., under date of May 25, 1940:

[From the Herald and American of May 25, 1940]

WHERE DID THE SEVEN BILLION GO?

As important to the country as the appropriation of the billion and a quarter dollars that President Roosevelt has asked for the country's defense are these questions that all thoughtful Americans are asking this administration:

What has become of the $7,000,000,000 that have been appropriated for Army, sea, and air defense in the last 6 years?

What have we to show for it?

If $7,000,000,000 have left us defenseless, what will become of the new billion and a quarter that Congress is ready to appropriate?

Senator BENNETT CLARK of Missouri has already demanded information as to what had happened to these seven billions.

"Money that has been poured down a rat hole!" exclaimed the Senator.

Are we, then, to have more of this "rat hole" policy or genuine and immediate defense?

Waste would seem to be the only stable policy of this administration.

A congressional investigating committee has just reported that the administration of the W. P. A. throughout the Nation has been marked by "waste, politics, private gain, and benefits to Communists."

If there has been waste of money in a profoundly human activity of the administration, like the W. P. A., this waste policy might apply to appropriations for defense as well, and certainly we ought to have some defense after spending $7,000,000,000.

But we haven't got it!

Seven billion dollars have been spent and we are utterly unprepared.

Testifying behind closed doors, the high command recently unfolded the startling facts that we have a protective force so poorly equipped that it is actually short of uniforms and blankets and that our bombers are so outmoded that "it would be suicide to send them against modern equipment."

That's only a detail in our unpreparedness.

It is a hideous scandal.

Another $7,000,000,000 might be spent by incompetent New Deal politicians and we would still be unprepared.

We are unprepared after 6 years of bogus preparedness because we have been ruled by men apparently more concerned as to whom the public moneys went to than to what they went for.

Let us now have genuine preparedness, not merely a free distribution of the people's money by and to the politicians.

Let us investigate, from top to bottom, the W. P. A. and other Government projects.

Unquestionably, we shall find the same waste everywhere, the same political favoritism, if not corruption, that an investigating congressional committee has already found in the W. P. A.

If there has been any corruption or political chicanery in the handling of our $7,000,000,000 defense fund—that comes dangerously near to being treason in our present defenseless State.

Let us save the Nation from extravagance and political corruption.

We cannot afford to have an empty shell of preparedness.

False preparedness might destroy our Nation.

We must act promptly and vigorously to save it.

We must have visible results.

We must cut out all waste, all partisanship, all personal ambition.

Seven billion dollars for defense have disappeared.

Congress should find out where it went to.

With $7,000,000,000 spent for defense we ought to be impregnable.

But we are, instead, the most vulnerable first-class power in the world.

The American people demand an accounting—now. They demand defense, not politics.

Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

LETTER WRITTEN BY A 16-YEAR-OLD HIGH-SCHOOL GIRL PLEADING FOR THE AID OF CONGRESS IN EXTENDING AID TO THE ALLIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received today from Margie Alice Davis, a 16-year-old high-school girl. Miss Davis implores Congress to provide immediate aid for the Allies, and I commend the expressions of this young girl for your reading.

FRANKFORT, N. Y., *June 6, 1940.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOUGLAS: I can't understand why our Congress will not help the Allies, the countries with whom we have had such amicable relations for years and years. Why should we care if Germany likes us or not? The Germans are just vandals, going about destroying all the beauty in the world and wiping out the work of centuries with a few moments' bombing. Some people don't realize that as soon as Germany finishes up in Europe, if she can, she will be right over in this hemisphere, trespassing on our neutrality. And the time to stop Germany is now. We can't wait until she gets so powerful that we shall be beaten. Everyone is so sure that after we get our new air force we will be unconquerable, but you can never tell. The Germans say God is with them. It can't be the real God, because He must be with England and France. They probably mean the god of war.

I positively do not mean that we should send our boys over there to fight, but I do think we might cooperate in every way and send the Allies airplanes by the hundreds, tanks, guns, part of our food surplus, several warships, and other necessities. Imagine what that would do to their morale, and it wouldn't hurt us at all. Germany might not like it, but what do we care? After all, we may pretend that it would cause us a great deal of anguish to cut off diplomatic relations with her, but really it would make very little difference to the majority of the people in this country. It would make more jobs if we were to increase our production of war materials, thus making conditions much better in this country.

Please, oh, please do something, if you possibly can. I know many other people who feel as I do that Germany must be beaten for once and for all, right now. I don't see how you Congressmen can possibly think that Hitler won't try to come over here after he mops up Europe. I think that in your heart of hearts you realize the fact, and would like to help the Allies and smash Hitler. What's the use of pretending that you don't care? Everyone else in the country does, and they want the Allies to win. This letter isn't war hysteria, because I am not afraid of war, but I should be one of the first to enlist for ambulance driving or some such task.

I just feel that we should help England and France, two democratic nations such as ourselves, with all the supplies and everything else they want. You say then that this would make Germany declare war on us. What of it? I say. I guess Germany is pretty busy without coming over here right now. Please try to do something. I'm trusting in you to start the movement, Think of America before you refuse to help the Allies.

Sincerely yours,

MARGIE ALICE DAVIS.

The Duty of Congress to Remain in Session in This Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, while we legislate in this Chamber the war in Europe continues without abatement. The drive which is now being made into France by the German hordes, in which every known mechanized unit of destruction is employed, should cause all of our people to keep calm and to repel the war hysteria which seems to permeate the very atmosphere which we breathe. I am confident that the wish and the will of the people of our Nation is that we do not become involved in this European war, and I am in full accord with their praiseworthy determination that we keep out of this conflict. We need our men and boys of America that they may engage in the useful arts and trades of civil life within the borders of our country. We do not subscribe to any policy which will lead us closer to this war. Our policy should be to legislate wisely and very cautiously in this critical period and to the end that we may avoid any involvement in this foreign controversy.

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday the President of the United States, and without the sanction of the Congress, released a vast number of our United States Navy planes, and vast stores of war munitions, to the Allies for their use in this war. We have heretofore assumed a passive attitude in the role of an observing nation—and it has been the wish and will of the Congress that we remain neutral in this conflict—but the action taken by the Chief Executive in rushing all available supplies for immediate use by the Allies in this war materially changes our position; we are no longer an observing and neutral nation; we are a participating nation in this conflict. In other words, the President has entered our Nation in this war—all contrary to the wish and the will of the vast majority of the people of our country. Almost immediately a warning was issued by those who speak for the Italian Government to the effect that the United States of America must keep out of this war or suffer invasion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this one act on the part of the President of this Nation might be the act which would involve us in war—it might well be the sole cause of sending our men and boys into this terrible conflict, and it might be that step which would send an untold number of our kith and kin into a war which would take its toll in human life. We must exercise caution; we must proceed slowly; we must avoid participation in this European war.

Mr. Speaker, it has been proposed that certain legislation should be enacted which would extend to the President of the United States the power, in peacetime, to exercise full control over the National Guard and the Organized Reserves and that with such power to extend the further right to call those branches of our military forces into active duty and to assign them for service either within or without the borders of the United States of America, as the President might see fit. This is a most unusual request for additional power to be placed in the hands of the President. May I say that altogether too much power has already been granted to the President, and too little power remains in the Congress.

The job of determining our policies in this critical period is far too big for any one man to assume—it is a job in which the representatives of the people have the right to extend their voice and their aid. I am convinced the people desire their representatives to aid during this national emergency in their effort to keep our country out of this war; they do not entrust their destiny to any one man, and they do not entrust their destiny, and the destiny of their sons, to the President of the United States, because he appears to be leading our Nation into war, as he has led us into the greatest debt the people of this Nation have ever witnessed.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Congress represent the people of this Nation, and may I venture the suggestion that all of our people are vitally interested in everything which is done respecting our foreign policy; they are deeply interested in the question of calling out the National Guard and the Organized Reserve, and they have an interest in the question of where they are sent in this critical period; they are interested in everything that is done in this critical period which might tend to lead us nearer this European war. Our people want peace; they do not want war. They do not want any act committed by our military forces which might engender a hatred against us; they want every officer and every public servant to keep his feet upon the ground and to exercise clear thinking at all times in order to avoid involvement in this war. Our people want the combined thought and wisdom of their representatives in the Congress to aid in shaping the policy which our Nation should pursue in this hour of anguish and distress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the people of our country do not want to entrust any one man with the sole authority and the sole power to determine our policies respecting the war or our involvement in it. They want the combined wisdom of the Senate and the House of Representatives on all of these highly important questions, which might well mean the loss of life to an untold number of Americans in war, the destruction of our form of government, and the end of liberty and freedom in this land we love.

Let us remain in session during this crisis, and let us legislate respecting these highly important problems which mean so much to the people of our country.

Amendments to National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., for June 6:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 6, 1940]

LABOR LAW REVISION

In voting to take up the proposed amendments to the Wagner Act at this session the House has made a sound decision.

While the Nation is in the throes of carrying out the vast new program for national defense a solid basis for industrial peace will be needed more than ever before. We should have the smoothest-working machinery which can be devised for the prompt settlement of disputes and it should be administered by a fair-minded and unbiased board.

No one can honestly pretend that the present Board and the law as it now stands are really adequate to meet this need. The act has numerous serious flaws. The board has thoroughly discredited itself by its evident bias in the opinion of a large proportion of organized workers and employers of labor. Even if it mends

its ways it will be badly handicapped at the start by its past record and the reputation it has won as a troublemaker.

There is no question of our need for industrial peace. Ships, planes, and motors cannot be built, factories erected, raw materials transported and men taught new skills with the required speed unless labor and industry lend full cooperation to the task. Costly strikes at this crucial period will threaten not merely our economic welfare but our national security.

The amendments which are before the House now were not, of course, framed with the present situation in mind. It may well be advisable in the months ahead to set up new and better machinery to handle the problem than anything that has been suggested so far. But the revisions already framed form a program which has been considered carefully and can be adopted without delay. They will put the Government in a far better position than it is under the present law and the present Board to deal with the situation.

Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

ARTICLE BY DR. BARUCH BRAUNSTEIN

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have taken the liberty to insert an article entitled "Anti-Semitism—Symptom of the Disease That Kills Great Nations." This article is interesting in the fact that the writer takes a most extraordinary view of a condition which is of little importance. He, of course, is entitled to his own viewpoint, for, after all, such rights are protected under the Constitution of the United States. Likewise, others have the same right.

This article was sent to me by Dr. S. Newman, who some time back took exception with my stand, which is based entirely upon the fundamental principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. I shall ask those who read this to study it very carefully, and I am sure that they will find a most extraordinary reasoning, which I shall discuss at some future date.

ANTI-SEMITISM—SYMPTOM OF THE DISEASE THAT KILLS GREAT NATIONS

(By Dr. Baruch Braunstein)

(The following is a speech delivered before the Institute on Contemporary Jewish Affairs, sponsored by the National Council of Jewish Women, in Washington on December 12, 1939, and published in Vital Speeches.)

The most tragic fact of Jewish history is that one-third of all the Jews of the world, numbering altogether less than 16,000,000, are either exiled or exterminated or facing exile and extermination: 600,000 in Germany, 250,000 in Austria, 400,000 in Czechoslovakia, 12,000 in Memel, three and one-half millions in Poland.

A few years ago we ridiculed Robert Nathan's prophetic insight in his remarkable little book, Road of Ages. He envisages all Jews of Europe exiled. No nation offers them hospitality. So they begin the long trek to the Gobi Desert. This is no longer a figment of the poet's imagination but a hard cruel fact. For this fate even the darkest persecutions of Jewish history has not prepared the modern Jew. In former times exiled Jews always had some place to go. When Jews were driven out of Palestine, other parts of the Roman Empire welcomed them. France welcomed the exiled English Jews in 1290. Each time France expelled her Jews in the fourteenth century they could go to Germany, Spain, and Italy. When the catastrophe befell rich and prosperous Spanish Jewry in 1492, the Empire of the Turks eagerly invited them. The Russian pogroms of the last century found America's gates open. Today, however, we witness the spectacle of millions of Jews thrust into exile without a welcoming sign from any nation. Even the intergovernmental refugee committee, grateful as we are for the lofty spirit that brought it into being, finds few havens for the exiles. They sail the seven seas in boats that are unseaworthy and find ports shut in their faces. They storm across land borders to find bayonets of the frontier guards turning them back. For these kind of tragic times modern Jews are utterly unprepared.

What has happened is this: Based on a Hegelian conception of the racestate, the leaders of the New Germany are determined to construct a raceempire (Volksgemeinschaft). This new philosophy teaches: "Wherever Germans live there is Nazi Germany." Austria, Czechoslovakia, Memel, Danzig, Poland, have now become Germany on the thesis that "Wherever Germans live there is Nazi Germany."

Nor is the process of Germanization of Europe completed. There are Germans in Switzerland. Three Belgian provinces are German, so is Alsace-Lorraine, Schleswig-Holstein is German. There are Germans in Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia. All this means that these places belong to Nazi Germany. Indeed, they are Nazi Germany by virtue of Germans living in their borders. This augurs ill for both the future of Europe and for the Jews still living there. Once Hitler creates the Pan German Europe (in which Germany "pans" Europe), we must reconcile ourselves to the tragedy of the present situation.

Now if I could be convinced that Hitler's ravenous appetite would be satisfied with Europe, then we would write "finis" to the history of the Jews in Europe—and fear no more. I cannot be taken in. Some call Hitler a madman. More precisely he believes himself to be a messiah, moved by a passion to convince the world that the New Germany ought to be the pattern for all the world. That as he has convinced the Germans, Czechs, Poles, et al., the Jews were their misfortune, so he passionately desires to convince the world they are the misfortune of all people everywhere. This is a genuine fear. Prof. L. B. Namier of the University of Manchester voiced it: "When the head of Louis XIV fell, all the monarchs of Europe felt their necks, and now that the blow has fallen upon German Jewry, all the Jewries of the world are wondering what will be their fate." Their fate is obvious if Hitler's role as messiah is effective.

In the service of that role all Germany is absorbed. Going out of Germany is World Service (Welt-Dienst) that feeds newspapers everywhere (whose chief American representative lives in St. Albans, W. Va.). The Congress for German Foreignism is working for Stuttgart. The Deutsche Ficht-Bund has world-wide contacts from its offices in Hamburg. After the war this bund tried to convince the world of Germany's guiltlessness in the World War. Now its greater aim is to convince the world that no matter what happens nor where—the Jews are responsible and guilty. The Dies committee has revealed the power of these organizations, of both the right and left. Should they amalgamate their power domestically as their chiefs have done on the international scene, hurt and tragedy for the Jew will be inescapable. Between the upper millstone of fascism and the lower millstone of communism the Jew will be exterminated.

What should the Jews reply in their own behalf to the world?

In the first place, we are convinced—contemporary events prove that this thesis is correct—that when a nation embarks on a program of anti-Semitism it ends with war. That is the course of events: Anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, anti-Protestantism, antidemocracy, and finally comes the destruction of the peace of the world. Anti-Semitism leads to war. There is no other way out. It is the inescapable end, and events of our day prove our case.

In the second place, we must point out that we, living in democratic America, hope that America shall remain a democratic power and a great nation, and that we shall work in that direction. But no nation remains great that refuses to encourage the interpenetration, the cross-fertilization of the many peoples, races, religions, cultures that live within it. The moment a nation determines upon a policy that shuts her from the currents of new ideas, that nation is doomed.

Spain is a case in point. Spain was to medieval times what Great Britain is to our own world. She spanned the seas. The sun never set on her domains. For many centuries Moslems, Christians, and Jews worked together for Spain's glory. They produced the maps of Spain. It happened that a Jew first incorporated the travels of Marco Polo into a map. Together they created the instruments of navigation that supplied eyes to the Spanish seamen. They discovered new worlds for Spain. Spain excelled in music, literature, science. Then a frightful blight settled upon the nation. She exiled her best minds. Those among her thinkers and scientists who refused to go suffered death and extinction in prison and at the stake. Spain fell from her greatness. Not because Jews were exiled. This is said uncritically because of some Jews' conceit. Jews were only an incident in her fall. Spain fell (as every nation that duplicates her folly will fall) for she hermetically sealed herself against the progress that comes when peoples, races, religious patterns, are allowed the free process of interpenetration and cross-fertilization. Therefore, one who wants to see the sixteenth century mind goes to Spain today. In the same way that those who will want to see the twentieth century mind in the twenty-fifth century will surely go to Germany. Spain fell. Germany will fall. Any other nation will fall from her greatness that hermetically seals herself against the outside world. The Jews' exile is but the symptom of the disease that stifles a nation's greatness and kills it.

Therefore I say forthrightly that anti-Semitism is not Jews' problem alone. It is America's concern, too. Therefore I insist that when anti-Semitism appears here it ought to be called to the attention of the American people. Anti-Semitism is directed not against Jews alone. It is directed ultimately against the destruction of all greatness in any nation. In a sense the German Jews were partially responsible for the fall of the Weimar Republic in Germany. They refused to see that anti-Semitism, while first striking at them was ultimately destined to undermine the foundations of the republic. Of course, it was a heroic gesture when the Jews bore the brunt of it themselves. It was heroic insofar as they thought it was aimed at them and at them only. But today we see the picture more clearly. Anti-Semitism was the beginning. Its end came with the destruction of the republic and the beginning of war. This is the inescapable curve of contemporary history. Let us learn its lesson.

On the coasts of all warring nations sensitized instruments are built to warn of the approach of enemy aircraft. Jews are the sensitized instruments that must warn the American people of the

approach of the enemy, an enemy not directed against Jews alone, but against the American people itself. If we refuse to sound the warning, we are false sentinels. We are treasonable to America.

In the third place, Jews must not yield to the threats of the anti-Semites. "Lay low. Don't be prominent. Refuse public office." These are threats of the anti-Semites. They demand that no Jew shall hold public office in America—in which, perhaps surprising to some, certain Jews agree. To my mind, when a Jew enters American public office he goes not as a Jew. No more than when a Protestant or a Catholic enters public office does he go as a Protestant or Catholic. They all enter as Americans. Jews have served America just that way. I thank God for the great public service, often at high sacrifices, given by men like Brandeis, Cardozo, Lehman, and all others who serve America in this hour of crisis.

I recall my late friend Mr. Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo telling me what happened when Mr. Hoover invited him to the United States Supreme Court. He was called to the telephone at Albany and told that the White House was telephoning. "I knew Mr. Hoover was not going to ask me about the weather here. I knew he was going to ask me the fateful question: 'If nominated, will you serve?' * * * Not an easy question. I did not want to go to Washington," Mr. Justice Cardozo said. "It meant leaving every fond memory I had. For all my memories were bound up with New York and with Columbia University, my alma mater. I hated to go to a strange city." * * * But he was asked to serve. No matter at what personal sacrifice. He placed his great legal mind at the disposal of his Nation during one of its most critical hours. It was his duty. He could not have done less.

Once before, in order to meet a crisis in Jewish history, we asked for the ghetto. Those ghettos became the foulsome prisons for Jews for 500 years. We ought to seek no moratorium on Jews in public service in America in order to forestall a temporary crisis. It is a trick of the anti-Semites. Then they will say with some justice: "When the Nation needs Jews most, they desert her." Beyond our own personal safety we place our patriotic duty to America. We shall not yield to the threats of the anti-Semites.

In the fourth place, Jews ought to profit by the mistakes of the immediate past in Germany. There some Jews believed that anti-Semitism was directed not even against them, but against other Jews there called eastern European Jews.

Some Jews in Germany tried to ride the bandwagon of reaction to personal safety. They naively believed that Hitler would be "tamed" when he came to power. Some helped him to power. Now we know that protection cannot be purchased from a racketeer. Let us learn this lesson. * * * Now we ought to know that when we ride the bandwagon of reaction we play directly into the hands of the anti-Semites, as well as into the hands of the destroyers of democracy. The exiled wealthy of Naziland know this to their great sorrow.

We owe it to ourselves and to America to make our position clear. No one can do it for us.

This is a terribly tragic time. Jews need wisdom and courage, fortified by a faith that tyranny and brutality, any more than darkness, cannot last forever. Morning comes after every dark night. Jews are not a people of a day or of a year. Their life's span is measured in centuries. In patience there is faith. Meanwhile our hands and energies are not atrophied. We are the sensitized instruments warning our Nation of the approach of the wreckers who parade at first as our enemies alone. We continue to contribute to our Nation every atom of value in our people's life, collectively and individually, refusing to bow to the threats of anti-Semites who would deny us our share in helping make and keep America great and mighty. We recognize that when any Jew is attacked, all Jews are attacked. Bitter experience has taught us. Our world is too small for any isolated attacks upon any segment of Israel. We join hands with many peoples, cultures, and groups in American life to build America strong, so that she might today serve as an exampled nation of light to a world fast growing dark. Hatred of any group in America's family of people would extinguish that light. To do less would brand us as false Americans and bad Jews. In this crisis when America can once again be a light unto the nations we will do no less than be true Americans by being good Jews.

What Lincoln Would Say Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SULLIVAN

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I have, in this request, included an article entitled "What Lincoln Would Say Today," by Mr. George E. Sullivan. This article is compiled from statements made by President Lincoln and should be very interesting to every Member of the House because it expresses the thoughts of a man whom every one must admit was a good and stanch patriot.

Two articles appear in this issue of the RECORD and they are entirely different—one from the viewpoint of President Lincoln and the writer of the article; and the other from the viewpoint of Dr. Baruch Braunstein and, I presume, Dr. S. Newman who was kind enough to send me that article with his compliments.

WHAT LINCOLN WOULD SAY TODAY

(By George E. Sullivan)

(A realistic adaptation to present-day conditions of the sound American ideas of this great martyred President, in accord with his great speeches and writings. Lincoln courageously exposed the going conspiracy in his time which had actually invaded Government circles.)

Eight score and four years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal—a truly Christian concept.

Sorely handicapped was its great mission until its new birth of freedom in a Civil War, when it abolished Negro slavery with which the freedom-loving Colonies had been afflicted by the British Crown's pernicious promotion of the slave trade.

A famous Statue of Liberty was thereafter erected, and a period of progress and prosperity enjoyed unequaled in the world's history, in striking contrast to the havoc and misery uniformly produced by mercenary and war-breeding anti-Christian forces under their denial of the universal brotherhood of man.

A new test faces our Nation today. It is whether this Republic, and its salutary checks and balances, shall be discarded for a fake republic constituting a virtual dictatorship and founded upon anti-Christian deception, discrimination, and depredation, and parading as a democracy, a much-used disguise of enemies of our Republic.

An intensely organized, and financially powerful, international anti-Christian horde, seeking world conquest, has long been engaged in insidious invasion of this Nation, penetrating and polluting practically every phase of American life, and insolently demanding tolerance for its intolerance, and license to destroy freedom.

Politics, finance, economics, business, and education have all suffered terribly from its blight. Even tax-supported educational facilities have been flagrantly misused to destroy fundamental concepts of constitutional American liberty. Insolent propagandists for the horde have the temerity to claim for its members brains and culture superior to our own, obviously confusing deceit with brains and barbarism with culture.

Palpably and demonstrably, no member or supporter of this anti-Christian and anti-American horde is eligible for officeholding in our Nation, yet a truly alarming number of them now occupy vitally important official positions—executive, legislative, and judicial. Their harmony in substituting craftily devised restraints of liberty in place of true liberty, and steering our ship of state steadily toward the reefs of final bankruptcy, make it impossible not to believe that all understood one another from the beginning and are working under a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck at the foundations of our Republic.

The plan or draft is incontrovertibly of Socialist vintage—compounded largely of old deceptions with a new label or veneer. No form of collectivism is compatible with constitutional American liberty or can ever produce anything except a dictatorship, no matter what the label. Misbranding it "American" or "Christian" cannot change its essential nature. Whether national or international, and whether Jewish, non-Jewish, or anti-Jewish, it will still be inherently anti-Christian and anti-American, no matter what crackpot intellectuals, either cleric or lay, may say to the contrary. Instead of removing abuses, any collectivism multiplies and aggravates them by making cogs of human beings.

The real danger now confronting America arises from the un-American "fifth column" right in our midst. Its nefarious work has proceeded without appreciable molestation for a very long period. Officials sworn to defend this Republic have defended instead the insolent proposition advanced by the horde that the right of "free speech" includes right to advocate overthrow of our Republic by force and violence. Members and supporters of the horde holding public office appear to be immune from dismissal by the present administration. Those responsible for these conditions now announce a campaign to eliminate this un-American "fifth column." The American people have the right and duty to believe, however, that no trust should be placed in such announcement.

American patriots are now told, in quite plain terms, that they will be stigmatized as members of a "sixth column" if they expose the real identity and make-up of the anti-American and anti-Christian horde chiefly constituting the "fifth column." It is said to be un-American and un-Christian to do so, because of the resentment inevitably following such exposure and the possibility or likelihood that such resentment may develop into hatred of the ruthless horde by the American people. Hatred, of course, never cures or settles anything, and no one should incite it. However, the American people are not children to be kept in the dark about the imminent jeopardy of their Republic and their lives and liberties. It should, accordingly, be considered a high honor to be a member of such "sixth column." It should be made great and

powerful, extending from coast to coast, and prepared to defend our Republic and our firesides from onslaughts of the "fifth column," from which those in high office have failed to protect us. Regardless of the particular racial or other make-up of the anti-American horde, the full facts must be made known and unflinchingly dealt with. No racial or religious cloak can possibly protect the horde, nor can any member or supporter of political world-Jewry or any world-conquest organization or group honestly claim to be a loyal American.

The international horde promotes and manipulates panics and wars. Through clever financing of both sides of a war, it obtains the confidence of each, yet cunningly contrives to reduce both to exhaustion from mutual slaughter for easy tax-over and subjugation by the minority group constituting the horde. Its manipulations preceding and during the last World War, and its efforts immediately thereafter to promote civil wars in all crippled nations, leave no room for serious doubt about this. It has recently become quite evident that our own entry into the last World War was due chiefly to machinations of this horde, which is now seeking to embroil us in the new World War.

Let me warn most solemnly against a repetition of the deceptions of 1916–17 which would put an end to this Republic. In 1916, a President, on intimate terms with leaders of this international horde, marched at the head of a "preparedness parade," and secured reelection upon the slogan "He kept us out of war." Yet early in 1917, in cooperation with a supine Congress, he succumbed to the efforts of this international horde to put us into that World War. As early as June 3, 1916, a still earlier supine Congress passed an act which undertook to authorize the President to assume astounding dictatorial powers in time of war or when war is imminent, which patently un-American act stands unrepealed even now. The present Congress has a plain duty to repeal that act, particularly as the same warmongering group to which President Wilson succumbed in 1917 appears to be in high favor with our present President, and similar propaganda methods and mediums appear to be operating at high speed.

To the mothers in this Nation, living and dead, I must direct a few words. Time and again, they have sustained the most costly sacrifice—that of their own dear sons engaged in the service of this Republic. When the sacrifice has been in the cause of freedom, as was the case of the five sons of noble Mrs. Bixby in the Civil War, the anguish of the bereavement has been somewhat assuaged by a solemn pride. But when such lives are snuffed out not in the cause of freedom, but as victims of gross betrayal and deception, as in 1917 and 1918, and when similar propaganda methods and mediums now seek to embroil us in the new World War at the behest of the same unscrupulous horde of world aggressors, no truly informed mother in America can possibly remain silent while the Congress now in session seems disposed to ape the supine Congresses of 1916 and 1917.

If America has the good sense to keep out of Europe's wars, and to keep the machinations of this anti-American and anti-Christian horde out of America, our great Republic may endure to the end of time.

If our present Congress, with the true facts now available, abdicates its constitutional duty to defend our Republic, and gives further aid to this international anti-American horde, it will surely go down in history as the "Disloyal Congress."

Every one of intelligence knows that a large standing army in a Republic constitutes the reverse of national defense and a dire threat to the Republic, particularly when enemies of the Republic have penetrated public office and may misuse such standing army to coerce, disarm, and subjugate loyal American citizens, who constitute the real bulwark of internal defense in a Republic.

Again, do not be deceived by any proposal to require general arms registration as a supposed protection against the "fifth column." Be prepared rather to consider it as an insidious move against a patriotic "sixth column." Members and supporters of the "fifth column" would without doubt spurn compliance with the requirement, which would result in producing merely a list of the loyal Americans who possess arms, and their particular location—something of inestimable value to the enemy within the gate. Any such arms registration requirement may prove to be merely a preparatory step to attempted disarmament of loyal American citizens in violation of their constitutional right to "keep and bear arms." Unless loyal Americans maintain their right to keep and bear arms, they may experience here what occurred in the early bloody days of "red" Spain, under so-called loyalists, so warmly commended by high officials of our Government as defenders of "freedom" and "democracy." Our loyal Americans should be encouraged to keep and bear arms in every American home as the finest bulwark of internal defense against long-coddled subversive forces now strongly entrenched in our midst. Those seeking to disarm loyal Americans and render them helpless are self-confessed enemies of our Republic. Really loyal officials would, instead, direct their disarmament efforts against aliens generally and all members and supporters of subversive groups.

Loyal Americans of all races and creeds, and regardless of party affiliation, should lose no time in inaugurating a national campaign to remove from public office all members and supporters of this organized international anti-American and anti-Christian horde and to return our Republic to its true functioning. It is quite obvious that many now holding public office should never again be entrusted with any kind of public responsibilities or even remain at large, and their efforts to be reelected insult the intelligence of the American people.

If political parties persist in evading the real issue upon which the future of this Republic depends, its candidate should be spurned as one would the plague. There is an obvious deficiency in honesty or intelligence or both when a going conspiracy is altogether ignored or is attacked by mere empty gestures and without dealing with the conspirators at all. Write-in ballots may yet win the day, even without a new party, in such a national emergency as this, a real national emergency to save the Republic, not a fake emergency artificially created to insure against saving the Republic. The people can demonstrate that they are the masters.

Such of the press as persist in deceptive and disloyal propaganda may soon learn a salutary lesson—namely, that a paper without subscribers cannot keep its advertisers.

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us fearlessly perform the special tasks of this generation as an example for future generations, to the end that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

The Great Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

ARTICLE FROM ST. PAUL PIONEER PRESS

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of February 18, 1940:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of February 18, 1940]

THE GREAT BETRAYAL—THE (UNITED STATES) POLICY AFTER THE WORLD WAR—MOST DISASTROUS IN MODERN HISTORY

(This political testament of the late James Wallace, president emeritus of Macalester College, was written shortly before his death, to give to those among whom he lived the benefit of his matured opinion on the great world events of his time. Those who agree and those who disagree with his indictment of post-war policy will be equally interested in this unique document.)

I am now in my ninety-first year, having been born March 12, 1849. Since my graduation as valedictorian of the class of 1874 of the College of Wooster, Ohio, my life has been devoted to the profession of teaching in college. My alma mater asked me to become junior professor in Greek and history.

Later I was made dean and then president of Macalester College.

I am a bit older than the Republican Party, and knew of it from its inception. Up to the Civil War I was a strong Republican and as a boy joined heartily in the campaign to elect Abraham Lincoln. In fact, until Woodrow Wilson's time I had never supported a Democratic national ticket. But at the close of the Great War in 1918 we reached a point in our history, and in the history of Europe, and of the world, which has led me to form an opinion which I wish to leave on record before my journey's end, as my mature judgment on one dominant issue. As my physical condition now indicates that the end is not far away. I state my conclusion briefly. It is:

"The policy pursued after the great war by those that became the leaders of the Republican Party, was the most treasonable toward the great cause of world peace, justice, cooperation, and the settlement of disputes around the council table, the most treasonable," I say, "and the most disastrous that can be found in modern history." This conclusion, like all mature judgments on great issues has a background of facts, and to this background I wish to call attention.

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

Americans speak with scorn of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia by Britain under the leadership of Neville Chamberlain. Shamed silence would better become us. For the great betrayal of modern times—the most infamous, the most momentous—occurred 20 years ago in Washington, not last year in Munich.

Chamberlain abandoned Czechoslovakia under threat of immediate attack by an overwhelmingly powerful air force upon his scandalously unprepared nation. But 20 years earlier, Americans betrayed their own interest in world peace, and in doing so, they betrayed Czechoslovakia and the world besides; and this infamous betrayal was under no threat to our safety, but under the leadership of men filled with personal spite and blind partisanship. Our act then led straight to the debacle of Munich, by a road clearly marked.

For three score years I was a Republican, but I must say that the policy of the Republican leaders after the great war was treason to the great cause of world peace, justice, order, and civilization. It was the most disastrous policy into which any nation has been

led in all modern history; it started a train of disasters, from Manchuria through Abyssinia to Spain and back to China.

And it dragged not only our international prestige but our internal morale down to a new low. For to achieve their purpose and afterward to defend it, the assassins of the world's great attempt to climb above the barbarism of war had to poison the minds of millions of Americans—make them suspicious of Britain and France; make them timid, fearful; make them believe themselves inferior to other nations and thus afraid to cooperate with Europe lest they be outsmarted.

Americans were exhorted to have no foreign policy lest some risk be run; we must not run 1 percent of risk for 100 percent of gain. And in direct consequence of our course our annual appropriations for defense have increased $1,000,000,000 in a decade.

THE PEACE LEAGUE

The rising generation does not know and the passing generation seems to have forgotten the almost universal demand during and after the war for an international league of peace. They never knew or have forgotten how this demand climaxed a century of discussion of means of eliminating war and of establishing procedures and machinery for insuring peace.

American leaders had been devoted to conciliation and adjudication of international disputes. Lists of arbitration treaties and arbitral awards show that the United States stood second only to Great Britain and her dominions in the frequency with which international disputes were settled by verdict of neutrals. In the first Hague conference the Americans backed the Russian proposals for disarmament; in the second their strong leadership created the Court of Arbitration. Before the Great War nonaggressive policies, backed by strong peace societies in the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, France, and certain other countries, gave their people confidence that there could be no hostilities between them.

Then came the Great War. Its colossal losses brought home to all thoughtful men that one government, or even one man, may start a war, and that any assurance of peace depends upon effective pressures upon lawless nations. The logic of events had demonstrated how all voluntary machinery for world peace breaks down if one nation believes in war as a national policy. * * *

The United States Chamber of Commerce in a great referendum voted 2 to 1 for economic and military sanctions, and by 96 percent "That this country take the initiative in forming a League of Nations." Ninety percent of the newspapers supported the program. By March of 1919, a month after the peace conference had accepted a draft of the League Covenant, 34 out of 36 State legislatures in session that year had passed resolutions of support, and 33 Governors had endorsed it. Gompers and his labor forces were for it.

PLAN SUPPORTED

Nearly all of the women's organizations, the law associations, the universities and other educational bodies, the churches lined up in support. The principles of world-wide religion, as taught particularly in the New Testament, were overwhelmingly in favor of the peace and justice for which the League of Nations stood.

Outstanding Republicans supported the League, past and future Presidents and Secretaries of State, distinguished presidents of universities. The League was supported overwhelmingly by the older and abler Republicans, those most competent in foreign affairs, who richly deserve the confidence of the rank and file.

Of the nations invited to form the League, all except one, after careful but comparatively brief consideration of the merits of its specific provisions, united in support of this new organization. Other nations applied for admission. No nation asked for a single reservation. The one exception was the United States of America. The world's strongest country, the world's greatest democracy, with already 120,000,000 people, leading in wealth and resources, and devoted to the cause of national and international peace. The world organized to frame a covenant to put cooperative pressure on aggressors. Our Republican-controlled Senate, by a margin of 2 votes, was the one barrier to the making of an effective League of Nations. As one looks back, the thing seems utterly incredible. How could it happen?

ATTACKS BEGUN

The League was openly opposed by a few violent or embittered Senators with no vision of international peace founded on justice, by some timid souls afraid of having the strongest country on earth adopt a constructive foreign policy, by a great chain of rabble-rousing newspapers notorious for their unscrupulous misrepresentations, and especially by the personal and partisan enemies of Woodrow Wilson, with their public propaganda amply financed by two Pittsburgh magnates.

Approval of the League would have exalted the Democrat Wilson, but a direct attack was too dangerous, hence the plot was to emasculate the League with reservations. No other nation insisted upon even 1 reservation; but the Republican Senators smothered it with 14 reservations. To gratify personal hatred and for partisan advantage, a skillful and fanatical minority of United States Senators betrayed the world's hopes of organized peace and of the substitution of international justice for war. To maintain party harmony and unity, many Republicans who believed in the League joined in betraying it. "They gave to party what was meant for mankind."

TREATY OF VERSAILLES

Part of the campaign was and is to vilify the Treaty of Versailles and teach the American people that Woodrow Wilson made a mess of it. The treaty is blamed for the present ills of Europe, and all its major rectifications of previous European crimes are ignored. The treaty reestablished an independent Poland a century after its ruthless dismemberment. It restored Alsace-Lorraine to France and freed Czechoslovakia from Austrian tyranny. It restored to Denmark territory seized by Prussia in 1864; it freed Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania from Russia; and so on. Only the most prejudiced and the most ignorant, or those most indifferent to human liberty, can denounce the Treaty of Versailles as being, in the main, a bad settlement. Except for the unlimited reparations—which were soon reduced and were extinct before Hitler came to power—the treaty was moderation and appeasement compared to what a victorious Germany would have demanded. For this statement there is plenty of evidence aside from the terms imposed by Germany on Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

Even without the United States, for a dozen years the League of Nations was a highly useful organization in keeping the peace in Europe. It promptly settled such dangerous incidents as the dispute over the Aaland Islands, the fighting on the Greek-Bulgarian border, the Italian attack on Corfu, and (as late as 1933) Persia's seizure of British oil concessions. But in 1931 the disastrous effect of America's refusal to aid a world-peace plan was made manifest. Japan seized a great area of Chinese territory, twice as densely populated as the United States. It was a deliberate and wanton aggression; Japan's guilt was obvious to the dullest wit in America.

And then what was the policy of the world's greatest nation?

President Hoover, in traitorous disregard of the principles to which he had given allegiance in 1918–20, but in accordance with the ideas which dominated the great betrayal of 1919, would commit the United States to no cooperation with other powers to safeguard the peace of the world against attack by a criminal state. The United States had 44 percent of Japan's external trade, and no economic sanctions could be effective without American participation. The President would not consent to any such effective pressure against an aggressor state.

UNITED STATES FRIENDLESS

At Munich Chamberlain crucified the Czech democracy, because he was intimidated by Germany's air power and disheartened by the thought that if war began he could not replenish his air fleet from the United States. It is indeed hard to imagine legislation more cowardly, more short-sighted, more distinctly contrary to the country's interests, more directly pointed against the world's ideals of assured peace through international cooperation than this miscalled neutrality legislation.

Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese have given us Americans many lessons in the effects upon the world of the absence of any effective organization for cooperative security. And all too likely another World War will be necessary to reteach Americans what they learned in the last World War and what the betrayers of 1919 succeeded in making them forget.

Not long ago a Senator observed that the United States had no friend on earth. He probably spoke what was substantially true; and who is responsible for bringing the prestige and reputation of the United States to the lowest level of its history? Who is responsible except the bigoted, craven, narrow-minded traitors who persuaded Uncle Sam to withdraw into his own shell, regardless of the world issues involved in the policies of the countries which make force the first aim of the state?

MY LAST WORD

My last word to my fellow countrymen is: Realize the responsibility and the power of this colossus among the nations. Desert the leaders who in the words of the prophet Jeremiah made us in the eyes of the world "an astonishment and a hissing." They have brought our whole civilization to the brink of another catastrophe. Again, as in 1919, it is crystal clear that there can never be tolerable security for any nation—even for this great and formerly isolated Nation—until enough of the nations firmly combine to insist that the peace shall be kept. Citizens of my beloved land, forget two decades of disastrous retreat. Remember that no part of the world can ever be a decent place in which to trade, and live, and hope while every armed nation retains the power to imperil civilization itself whenever it chooses. Let the greatest of all nations resume again the leadership which none other can supply. O my countrymen, advance firmly to the establishment of effective organization for international law and order.

Roosevelt Shows His Hand and Sends Our War Equipment to Europe—Are Our Boys Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt shows his hand as he orders some of our war equipment and some of our best dive bombers sent to certain belligerent powers in

Europe. Many characterize such action as an act of war. It certainly is unneutral.

On May 31, the President advised Congress that—

The expansion of our defense program makes it necessary that we undertake immediately the training and retraining of our people, and especially our young people, for employment in industry and in service in the Army and Navy.

How can we properly train pilots when the President disposes of our airplanes which are needed for training purposes? But the tragic part of the President's action lies in that he is making our country a participant in the wars of other nations against the will of our people.

If Hitler wins the war, will it promote friendly relations for him to know that we aided his enemies and sought to ruin him and his country with our war equipment? If the Allies lose, will they not condemn us for not having supplied men as well as arms, airplanes, and munitions? If the Allies win, will they not criticize us for having given too little and for giving only at a price? It looks as if our boys are next to be sent overseas to fight Europe's battles if the war lasts for some time.

War propagandists are urging American participation in war. It is true that much of the propagandizing is subtle, but hidden beneath the veil of smooth language lies that invitation, if not a demand, to spill American blood on foreign soil. The following news article discusses some of the latest war propaganda:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader]

SUBTLE PROPAGANDA

Life magazine devoted much of its space last week to a discussion of America's position in respect to the great war now being waged in Europe.

Discussing the war and the course of action that is being suggested to the United States, Henry Luce, the editor, said:

"We may never fight side by side, comrades in arms of Britain and France, but we know now that, fundamentally, their struggle is our struggle."

In the same issue of Life, Walter Lippmann, the columnist, expresses this opinion:

"Every war which involves the dominion of the seas is a world war in which America is inescapably involved. The hour has come when we face the prospect of living alone in a hemisphere of weak states in a world of gigantic conquering military states."

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the president of Columbia University, also participates in Life's symposium on the war. He says:

"It is usual to speak of a European war and then for many to add that such a war can be no concern of ours. But the present conflict is a world war. Governments on at least two continents are engaged in that type of assault, of arson and of murder which is euphemistically called war. The issue is between two types of civilization, two types of life, two ideals of government and social order. That conflict, if settled against us, will put the world back for generations to come."

Accompanying these articles are three distinct pictorial presentations. One describes the German military activities. Another the wholesome, comfortable, and pleasant life of France in peacetime. A third presents a similar picture of English peacetime life.

Luce, Lippmann, and Butler make no statement to the effect that we should participate directly in the war. Neither do they say that we should not.

But all of them seek to establish the impression that this is our war.

If that objective is accomplished, the next step—actual American participation—will follow. Editor Luce knows this. So do his associate commentators.

The Argus-Leader has outlined in some detail Life's presentation of this subject because it is typical of a broad campaign now being waged primarily in the East. This campaign, it seems, has as its first objective the creation of the attitude in the United States that England and France are fighting our war.

The American people are a fair people. They are willing to fight their own wars and are not inclined to hide behind 2,000 or 3,000 miles of water while somebody else does the bloody work.

So, these propagandists conclude, if we can convince the people that this is their war, American help for the Allies will be readily forthcoming.

Their campaign is subtle, to be sure, but it is not commendable. It is properly subjected to the damning indictment that it lacks candor—in other words, plain honesty.

As Luce, Butler, and Lippmann obviously believe this is our war, let them be forthright. Let them be frank. Let them say exactly what they feel our course should be.

Then this subject can be discussed as it should be, as all subjects should be argued in a democracy.

The Argus-Leader, for its part, does not share their obvious convictions. It does not believe that this is our war. If we felt that way about it, we would be insisting that our Government become associated with the Allies to the full extent of our ability in the prosecution of the war.

The American program, as we see it, should be one of intense preparation for war but of nonintervention. We should build in this country the world's greatest military machine and be ready for the worst.

Immediate Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES BRYANT CONANT

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over Columbia Broadcasting System May 29, 1940, under the auspices of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, of which William Allen White is chairman:

Introduction by Mr. White—read for him by the announcer:

This organization, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, is Nation-wide. I, its national chairman, happen to be a Midwesterner, bred and born. Our aims are definite and limited to making public sentiment that will persuade the United States to throw its economic and moral weight on the side of the nations of western Europe that are struggling in battle for a civilized way of life. As I stated in my invitation for the formation of the committee, these nations constitute our first line of defense. It is therefore fitting that I, a Midwesterner, speaking for this Nation-wide organization, should introduce President James Bryant Conant, of Harvard University, a New Englander, who will speak for this committee.

Last September President Conant wrote to my neighbor, Governor Landon, concerning the current debate on the so-called neutrality bill. At that time he said, "I believe that if the Allies are defeated by a totalitarian power the hope of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization will be jeopardized."

He also added, "As the discussion has developed, it appears to be taken as a premise that the only matter before the country is how to keep the United States out of war. If every phrase must be chosen so as to avoid the charge of being a war monger, a blanket censorship has been cast on public debate. Should we not examine without fear the advantages and disadvantages from our own selfish point of view of every angle of foreign policy? Must we not assume that a democracy can make a rational choice on matters of war and peace? If not, war has already defeated democracy on this continent. This is to me the vital point."

Tonight Dr. Conant has the broadest liberty to speak his mind and say his say freely in the cause of liberty as it rises out of catastrophe and crisis in western Europe.

President CONANT. Mr. White has asked me to talk to you this evening about my personal views. He has asked me to tell you what I think the United States should do in the present crisis which confronts the world. I am going to try to state facts and draw conclusions as I see them.

There is no need for me to dwell on the agonizing news of the last few days. Tonight the Germans stand on the shores of the English Channel and along the Somme. Tomorrow looms before us like a menacing question mark. A total victory for German arms is now well within the range of possibility.

As a result of these developments one simple question must be considered by every citizen in the land tonight. Can we as a free nation, considering first and foremost our own best interests, tolerate the overwhelming of the Allies, the capture or destruction of the British Fleet?

Let me ask you to visualize our future as a democratic free people in a world dominated by ruthless totalitarian states. There are those who argue that Hitler's war machine, when its task is done in Europe, will be converted to an instrument of peaceful industrial activity. I do not think so. There are those who imagine that a government which has broken promise after promise, which has scorned the democratic countries and all they stand for, which mocks and laughs at free institutions as a basis for civilization—that such a government can live in a peaceful relationship with the United States. I do not think so.

To my mind, a complete Nazi victory over France and England would be, by necessity, but a prelude to Hitler's attempt to dominate the world. If Germany were triumphant, at best there would result an armed truce. This country would be feverishly endeavoring to put itself into an impregnable position based on a

highly militarized society. Our way of life would be endangered for years to come. If this be so, what should we do in these desperate, tragic hours?

We must rearm at once, that much is clear. The vision rises before us of the United States suddenly left alone and unprotected in a totalitarian and destructive world. It is obvious we are unprepared to meet an emergency of this nature. It is also obvious that our first aim must be to prepare with all rapidity. England's failure to listen to Winston Churchill, warning of approaching danger, is responsible for her plight. We must not make the same mistake. We are all agreed on that.

I need stress no further the necessity for rearmament at lightning speed. There is hardly a dissenting voice on this issue.

My purpose tonight is to urge another course of action equally important. I am advocating immediate aid to the Allies. I shall mince no words. I believe the United States should take every action possible to insure the defeat of Hitler. And let us face honestly the possible implications of such a policy. The actions we propose might eventuate in war. But fear of war is no basis for a national policy. In a free state public opinion must guide the government, and a wise public opinion on matters of foreign policy can result only if there is a continuous, clear-headed, realistic discussion of all eventualities, including war.

At this moment, the entry of the United States into the war certainly does not seem necessary or wise. For the present we are not prepared to render more aid as an active belligerent than we can render as a nonbelligerent. If our actions short of war are immediate and effective, they may suffice. If, on the other hand, we continue to be confused in our thinking and dilatory in our actions, our aid may come too late. Then the possibility of war under highly unfavorable circumstances would soon confront us. Our previous fear of war might well result in the certainty of a conflict without the support of powerful nations. The pacifist would then, indeed, have dug the grave of liberalism.

What are then the actions that can be taken at once?

Let us state a few of them: First, the release to France and England of Army and Navy airplanes and other implements of war, without impairing our own security; second, repeal of the laws which prevent United States citizens from volunteering to serve in foreign armies; third, control of exports with the purpose of aiding the Allies by avoiding leaks to Germany and giving priority to France and England; fourth, the cooperation of our Maritime Commission with the Allies in every way possible under our present laws to expedite the sending of supplies and munitions. These steps, if promptly taken by our Government, would render effective aid which some experts believe might tip the scales in favor of an Allied victory. Furthermore, they would be of infinite value in strengthening the morale of the Allied nations and would serve notice to the world that our resources were now enlisted in the democratic cause.

I have purposely avoided the use of the words "moral issues." The younger generation, in particular, is highly suspicious of this phrase. Their feeling is chiefly due to a widespread misinterpretation of the reasons for America's participation in the war in 1914–18. I have avoided this issue, not because I sympathize with those who proclaim that there is no fundamental difference between the actions and aims of the democracies on the one hand and the totalitarian powers on the other. Far from it. There is to my mind all the difference between piracy and peaceful trade; all the difference between ruthless tyranny and enlightened intercourse among free men.

But I am endeavoring to confine my argument this evening to a realistic appraisal of our foreign policy. Let me make this clear. I advocate no moral crusade to distant lands. If crusading were a proper policy, we should have had more than one provocation for war in the last dozen years. I am arguing that the changed military situation in Europe actually threatens our way of life.

At this moment, today, the war is in effect veering toward our shores. The issue before the United States is, I repeat, can we live as a free, peaceful, relatively unarmed people in a world dominated by the totalitarian states? Specifically, can we look with indifference as a nation (as a nation, mind you, not as individuals) on the possible subjugation of England by a Nazi state? If your answer is "Yes," then my words are in vain. If your answer is "No," I urge you as a citizen to act.

Write or telegraph to the President of the United States, to your Congressman, and your Senators, stating your belief that this Nation must give immediate, effective aid to the Allies. Let your elected agents of government have your thoughts. Urge that Congress stay in session to consider emergency legislation as may be necessary, and speed the process of rearmament.

Above all else, let us consider the situation boldly. This is no time for defeatism or despair. The Allies may be expected to hold out if they have help from us and the promise of further help to come. The wrath of moral indignation is impotent in days like these. A struggle to the death is once again in progress on the fields of western Europe. The British Isles are making ready to stand a siege. Action is the only answer, action which may help immediately, action which will be to the Allies an earnest and encouragement of help to come. If you think it important to our national welfare that assistance be rendered immediately, if you want the struggling peoples of France and England to know where we stand, do your part to arouse public opinion. It is not too late but it is long past time to act. I urge you—let your voice be heard.

Footnote on the Last War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, to those who are overzealously rushing preparations for a great era of lasting prosperity based upon the new European war, let these figures, released on Armistice Day, 1939, come to dampen their ardor.

The United States Treasury Department has added up the amounts still owed to us by the European nations as a result of the World War which ended 21 years ago. Including principal and interest, Europe is indebted to Uncle Sam in the sum of $14,497,161,340.22.

Fourteen billion dollars would be a substantial boost toward the return of our national prosperity, but no economist in his right mind expects to see any large part of the entire sum repaid in his lifetime or the lifetime of his children.

Here are the figures; let us read them and weep:

Great Britain	$5,497,069,379.48
France	4,180,628,819.88
Italy	2,024,150,441.19
Germany	1,259,870,431.25
Belgium	453,324,480.11
Russia	394,992,092.46
Poland	263,166,398.70
Czechoslovakia (now claimed from Germany)	165,762,044.80
Rumania	63,999,476.67
Yugoslavia	61,779,062.52
Greece	34,523,635.29
Austria (now claimed from Germany)	26,011,672.09
Armenia	23,803,104.11
Estonia	21,029,440.02
Latvia	8,668,365.93
Finland	8,233,157.56
Lithuania	7,760,608.08
Hungary	2,388,730.08

National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW A. DUNN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, my reason for being opposed to the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act is because I do not believe they are necessary. The act has not only been beneficial to the laboring people of our country but also to the employers of labor. Until the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act there was not a time in the history of our great country that the laboring people had the opportunity to express their opinion regarding their working conditions. A law which will permit the employee to bargain with his employer is not only a progressive but also a humanitarian measure. There has been less trouble between the employee and employer since the National Labor Relations Act has been established—that is one of the reasons why I am opposed to any amendments which will have the tendency of weakening the act.

Our Economic Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., of June 3, 1940:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of June 3, 1940]

OUR ECONOMIC DEFENSES

The specter of German economic penetration is gradually being substituted by our leading alarmists for the threat of a Nazi invasion. We are being told now that while Hitler probably will not undertake a physical invasion of the Western Hemisphere, at least for a substantial period of time, he will bring us under economic domination when and if he conquers Europe.

Why we should have any more to fear from the economic than from the armed might of Germany, this newspaper confesses its inability to understand.

Assuming a complete German victory in Europe, and assuming further an attempt to bend American economy to the needs and purposes of the German barter system, what have we to fear? Aside from some readjustment of our trade relations with South America, so as to permit the importation to the States of a greater volume of South American goods which normally we would not need, no radical change at all would be necessary, and no real hardship would be imposed. Indeed, were it not for political considerations, were it not for the necessity or desirability of knitting the Americas more closely together, of keeping out the foreign influence, it would not even be necessary to alter our trade policy with respect to South America.

For the truth is that this is the most economically self-sufficient country on earth. And if we include the entire Western Hemisphere, were it possible to build a wall around this continent which would isolate it from the balance of the world, we could get along very comfortably, we could continue our development unchecked, we would be deprived of nothing necessary to human life and comfort, and could build up a standard of living not heretofore approached.

From a purely material standpoint, the world has nothing to offer us which we couldn't get along without. Take rubber as an example of our inherent self-sufficiency. This country has relied upon imported rubber because it is cheaper and because the arrangement has been generally satisfactory. But were the supply of imported rubber entirely shut off from this continent, we could in a short time supply all of our needs. Not only has it been demonstrated that rubber can be grown successfully in Brazil, along the whole northern coast of South America, in Central America, and as far north as the finger of Florida, but we have in actual production here in the United States four or five proven synthetic rubbers. These are more expansive than the natural rubber, but they are its equal, even superior to it in many respects.

What is true of rubber is true of virtually every other necessity. Our natural wealth is almost limitless, and we have no more than scratched the surface of its possibilities. We could get along very well producing for ourselves and consuming only our own products, were such an extreme step to become necessary.

As a matter of fact, from a purely economic standpoint, foreign trade is not and never has been of vital importance to this country, despite the great emphasis placed on it of late. Traditionally we have consumed 90 percent of what we produced. We could stretch it to a hundred percent without suffering physically.

Of course, nobody proposes that we should voluntarily do anything of the sort. Foreign trade is desirable, and should be encouraged and safeguarded so long as it does not interfere with our domestic economy. There are articles for the production of which certain peoples and certain places are particularly adapted. There are certain natural products found in limited areas only. It is a natural and mutually profitable arrangement for peoples to exchange such products. It amounts in the end to barter, by whatever name the trade may be known—cotton for tin, automobiles for coffee, wheat for tea. Moreover, and this is the more important angle, the exchange of products among peoples—short of undercutting competition—increases human contact and thus tends to promote good will.

So that the desire of the American people is to go on trading and dealing with other peoples as in the past; to treat all alike; to accept from abroad such usable merchandise as we do not produce for ourselves; to open our doors generally to the products of other countries, up to the point where they do not undermine our own output, and to sell in turn to the world such of our own production as the world may want. But if the worst comes, we can get along very well without any of this business. We are the least vulnerable people on earth.

The Preservation of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY, BEFORE CONNECTICUT STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] at the Connecticut State Democratic Convention, held at Hartford, Conn., on June 3, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I was greatly complimented by the invitation to address this convention of Connecticut Democrats, conveyed by my good friend and your distinguished senior Senator FRANK MALONEY. I was immensely pleased to be able to accept it.

My pleasure is increased because of the opportunity it affords me to witness what I understand will be the unanimous renomination of Senator MALONEY, in whose behalf I had the honor to appear on the platform in this State 6 years ago. I trust his selection as your standard bearer again this year is only a prophecy of his overwhelming reelection next November.

I deeply appreciate the generous words employed by my dear friend Homer Cummings in presenting me to this convention. There is no man in America for whom I entertain a more affectionate regard than I entertain for him. Twenty years ago, out on the fringe of the Republic in the city of San Francisco, he delivered the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention held there. In eloquence, in vision, in sincerity, in comprehensive delineation of issues, in profound appeal to the mind and heart of a nation, that address has not been excelled before or since. I am proud of his friendship. I am reassured by his presence here tonight.

These are ominous days through which we are living. They are fraught with the possibility of incalculable injury to our American way of life and to the democratic way of life wherever it has existed throughout the world.

So terrible is this truth that I feel less inclined, less in the mood to deliver a partisan address than I have felt in many a day. Because the issues that confront the American people today, the decisions which they must make tomorrow, are infinitely deeper than party labels and immeasurably more important and far-reaching than the ambitions of selfish men or selfish groups of men.

However, it seems that in the midst of the crisis which faces the world and which faces us we cannot escape a certain amount of partisan fulmination and adulation, depending on the identity of the fulminator and the adulator.

It is probably just as well that this is so. No man should, and no political party should be permitted to avoid the consequences of their exercise of authority, either in normal or abnormal times. Under our system of government the political party has been the means through which millions of men and women have expressed their opinions on the subject of government; and politics in its true sense is the science of government. Therefore, while in all emergencies and crises it is the duty of the people to subordinate their partisanship to the larger interests of the country as a whole, it is not necessary that they forego the right to examine and re-examine the records made by political organizations which have exercised power, or the records and attitudes of men who have been elevated to high responsibility through the exercise of the political rights of the people.

Throughout the Nation today millions of men and women whose primary interest is not the mere success of a political party but the preservation of American democracy in its broader and deeper significance, are surveying and will continue to survey the records of those whom they have trusted, and those who will ask for either the renewal or an original grant of that confidence.

They have the undoubted right to do this. They have the right to make all the comparisons which are available. They have the

right to examine the measure of success or fruitfulness which has accompanied the administration of power by men or parties in the past, in order to judge its probabilities in the future.

In doing this, they, as well as we, should insulate themselves as far as possible from the narrow partisanship which claims all virtue for itself and denies it to all others.

In this spirit I shall discuss the record which has been made during these past 7 years under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

These have been unique years in the history of our country and of the world. Problems so baffling and stupendous, so intimately interwoven with our individual and collective lives, and yet so far-reaching in their effect upon our present and future outlook as a people, have arisen at every turn of the road and at every step we have taken, that the wonder is not so much that we have traveled so far and accomplished so much, but that we did not surrender to the inexorable fate which all pessimists announced had overtaken us.

We live in a world that refuses to be stationary. We live in a world that is peopled by seething billions of human souls, who, if possessed of normal souls, are striving for a better world and for a better place in that world for themselves and for their children.

In the effort to attain that goal, clashes of personal interests, of group interests, of racial interests, of national and international interests, are inevitable, and these clashes leave their scars upon the face and heart of humanity in our day, just as they have done in all the ages of man's history.

In the effort to bring some form of order out of the resulting chaos, to clear away the debris which has choked the channels of progress, and to coordinate the moral and intellectual strength of the masses whose faces were set toward the goal of their aspirations, governments have been ordained. Sometimes they have been imposed on the people by brutal and ruthless methods. Sometimes they have been set up by the peoples themselves, based upon the inalienable right of every human being who submits to authority to have a voice in its creation.

It is possible for me to speak on this occasion only in the barest outline of the record of these past 7 years carved out of the history of the United States. If in speaking of this record I appear to be somewhat partisan, I can assure you that I am not more so than those who condemn it with bitter indiscrimination and seek to destroy the faith of the American people in a great new era in order that on the wreck of that destruction they themselves may rise to power and authority.

Remembering our own repeated failures in the art of accurate appraisal, we may temper our judgments concerning any man who has failed at prophecy concerning the ability or the achievements of another. But if we are fair, which connotes the element of justice, we should be able to recognize and admit the greatness of a man on the basis of a record of undisputed achievement, even though that man be our contemporary, and even though some of those who indulge in the appraisement may differ from him on some or many proposals or positions.

So today I feel that we are justified in pausing for a brief period to pay tribute to a man who will be honored by countless generations of Americans yet unborn, and to a record made by him and those who have labored with him in behalf of the American people.

No President since or save Lincoln has faced so grave a crisis in our political life as did President Roosevelt on that gray day of March 4, 1933, when he took the oath of office as President of the United States. Because we are prone to forget dangers when they have disappeared, let me briefly recall the conditions which faced him and the country on that historic day.

During the period of depression which had then existed for more than 3 years, the industrial machinery of the Nation had been slowing down until it had practically reached a standstill. To use a quotation which is rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongues of Republican candidates for President, "The economic system had stalled on dead center."

Millions of wage earners—estimated at between thirteen and fifteen millions—dismissed by their employers because they had no work for them to do were in despair. Those who were fortunate enough to have any left were living on their savings. The markets of the world closed to our surplus products. The wheels of industry stopped revolving. The smoke no longer ascended to the heavens from the chimneys of industry. Then came the epidemic of bank failures. Slowly at first—one here, one there, one yonder—scarcely noticed by those who were vainly seeking jobs, banks had been failing throughout the country.

Then more and more of them collapsed, each weakened link dragging down still others. Suddenly the whole Nation awoke to the danger. A great wave of panic swept across the country. Men and women beat against bank doors, fought each other, and fought those who had been placed on guard, in a fruitless effort to enter those banks and withdraw their precious savings. When they were turned away they went with white faces and dazed expressions to stand in bread lines. And in those lengthening bread lines there were mutterings and ominous threats and imprecations.

In a speech in this State a few days ago at the Republican State convention, the junior Senator from Connecticut made the facetious statement that in 1932 the American people succumbed to a charming voice.

It is true that the Americans had succumbed in 1932. But it was not a charming voice to which they succumbed. For 4 long and tragic years they had gradually succumbed, not to a charming voice but to a tragic series of disasters to which those then in power contributed or were helpless to avert.

This was the picture which confronted Franklin D. Roosevelt and his new administration and the Congress of the United States when they assumed office on March 4, 1933.

There were able and honorable men who doubted the ability of Mr. Roosevelt to deal with this situation, just as there were able and honorable men who doubted the ability of Lincoln to deal with the conditions which confronted him in 1861. The manner in which he confounded these gloomy predictions is now as definite and important a part of our national history as are the acts of Lincoln.

Did he deal with the banking situation? Were we as a party remotely responsible for the banking situation which he faced? Does it lie in the mouths of those who contributed to this disastrous condition to condemn the method by which it was eliminated?

During the 4 years previous to Mr. Roosevelt's inauguration there had been more than 6,000 bank suspensions in the United States, not including 3,400 banks which could not reopen following the bank holiday.

Immediately our whole banking system was reorganized. It was placed on a sound basis. The Federal Deposit Insurance Act was passed, and a new confidence was restored to the millions of Americans who wanted to trust the banks in which they wanted to deposit their savings.

Since the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been in operation the number of bank failures has been reduced to 51 per year.

Will those who seek to be restored to power because they say they do not like what we have done tell the American people whether they will repeal the guaranty of bank deposits and restore the faithless conditions which made it necessary? The American people are entitled to know. What is the reply?

From 1922 to 1930 six and one-half million skilled workers had participated in the greatest construction boom the Nation had ever witnessed. But by 1933 nearly all these skilled workers had lost their employment because the boom had collapsed.

It was not possible for the Government to bring about the reemployment of all these men. In the first half of 1933 factories producing durable goods had employed only 44 percent as many men as in 1929, lumber mills about 45 percent, cement mills about 44 percent, and steel mills about 54 percent, and many of those still employed were working on shorter hours.

In order to bring about as much reemployment in these lines of industry as the Government could undertake, the Public Works Administration was created. Its objective was the building of projects that would not compete with the products of private industry but would stimulate additional purchases and thus further the employment of labor.

These Public Works projects called for more than $2,000,000,000 worth of materials. The men employed on them were not employed by the Government but by private enterprise, which was stimulated and assisted by the Government; and it is a tribute to those who have had charge of it to be able to say that it was accomplished without waste, graft, or misappropriation of any kind anywhere in the United States.

During the same period the Work Projects Administration was employing from two to three and a half million men and women who were otherwise unable to secure employment in private industry; and the results of this employment have been the erection of permanent and beneficial public improvements in almost every hamlet throughout the Nation, all of which have enhanced the standards of life and brought to these communities permanent improvements which they could never have secured without the aid of the National Government. And in addition to these physical and material values the program has taught the American people to believe, and to know, that their National Government is not some austere and remote and unapproachable entity yonder in Washington that takes no account of the welfare of the individual citizen, but that their Government is a humane government, and that it is the agent and servant of all the people, capable and willing to bring to their assistance and their rescue its experience, its knowledge, and its power.

In order that industry might be able the better to weather the storms of these 7 years, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was strengthened, and authorized to aid large and small business alike, and this agency has enabled thousands of industries and businesses of every character to survive. Will any man, regardless of political persuasion, declare that this should not have been done? Let him answer.

Seven years ago the condition of the American farmer had declined until agriculture as a whole faced bankruptcy. We all know that industry and agriculture are handmaids in our economic system. Industry depends on those engaged in agriculture to purchase its products, while agriculture likewise depends on those engaged in manufacturing and distribution of manufactures to buy and consume their farm products. There can be no such thing in America as permanent industrial or commercial prosperity without prosperity on the farms. For years political parties had promised the farmer that he would be placed on an economic basis equal to that of industry, so that the farmer by his own just share in the national income might enjoy prosperity himself and at the same time help others to prosper.

The Roosevelt administration is the first administration in the history of the Nation to make a real effort to keep this pledge. I do not claim that the task has been yet accomplished. But I do claim that the annual income of the American farmer has

increased from four and a half billion dollars in 1932 to more than $8,000,000,000 in 1939; and that this increased income has gone into the purchase of the products of manufacturing plants throughout the Nation, and especially in New England, bringing additional profits to investors and additional employment to workers throughout the Nation.

New life was injected into the farm-loan system, affording additional credits to agriculture, which had completely dried up during the previous 4 years prior to 1933.

In order to cope with the plight of urban home owners, who were losing their homes through foreclosures at the rate of a thousand a day, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created, which, since its creation, has made loans to more than 1,000,000 home owners in the aggregate sum of more than $3,000,000,000 thus saving the home and also the mortgage holders, and what is equally important, preserving more than a million firesides and hearthstones in this Nation. Will those who condemn the record we have made in Washington tell these million home owners in the Nation that they should have been left to their own fate, driven into the streets and out of homes in which they had invested their savings, but which economic conditions for which they were not responsible rendered them unable to hold without the aid of the Government?

During this period the Civilian Conservation Corps was established, with camps all over the Nation; and during the period of their existence more than 2,500,000 young men between the ages of 18 and 25 years have found the meaning of a new relationship between them and their Government and their fellowmen. If these years of economic grief and travail had done nothing more than take these young men from idleness and hopelessness and train them in service to themselves, their families, and their Nation, the physical, moral, and spiritual gains would have been worth infinitely more than it has cost in taxes or in public debt.

Are there any in this Nation who are so bereft of vision or who are so blinded by narrow partisan considerations as not to congratulate America on this great accomplishment?

In the interest of honest business and honest investment we have enacted laws and set up agencies to protect the people from fraud and deception and manipulation in the issue and sale of securities to the American public. Surely no sane person will contend that those upon whom commerce and industry must depend for the constant infusion of investment funds to keep them going are not entitled to the fullest knowledge regarding the conditions of those corporations in which they contemplate investing their money. Surely no sane or honest person will contend that these investors are not entitled to be protected from fraud and manipulation in the sale of these securities.

In order to give the American investor the right and the opportunity to ascertain the truth about any investment before he makes it and to protect him in the enjoyment of his rights as an investor after he makes it, we have set up the Securities and Exchange Commission, not for the whimsical or capricious control of the private affairs of men and women, but for the protection of honest investment by the only power that can protect them, the Government of the United States.

Will those who condemn and criticize and who seek to rise to power on a wave of discontent which they foster tell the American people that they will withdraw this form of protection from them and restore the chaotic conditions of 1929 to 1933? The American people are entitled to know the answer. The people of New England are entitled to know the answer. The people of Connecticut are entitled to know the answer.

In an effort to afford assistance and guidance to the youth of the Nation, the Youth Administration was established, which has served American youth in a manner never before undertaken by this or any other government.

Will those who find no good in this administration tell us what they would have done or, more to the point, what they did not do for the education and encouragement of the young men and women of America?

During these 7 years we have written more just and far-reaching laws for the benefit of American labor than was ever written before by any or all previous administrations. We have given to labor the right to bargain collectively over wages, hours, and conditions of labor. Will those who seek now to cajole the American people into another era of "ragged individualism" take them into their confidence and tell them whether they propose to withdraw this right or weaken its administration? Will they explain to them why they never thought of granting to them this measure of justice when they were in control?

Will they also take us into their confidence and advise us whether they propose to break down the Fair Labor Standards Act, designed to assure to the American worker a just wage for his labor and a reasonable measure of time for rest and recreation?

It may be that the Labor Relations Act and the Wage and Hour Act need some amendment. No law is perfect, and experience here as elsewhere will point the road to wise and fair determination of any change that is needed. But when these acts to guarantee to labor the rights enjoyed by other classes of the American people are to be amended, let them be amended by the friends and not the enemies of those who hew the wood and draw the water and earn their bread in the sweat of their brow.

In addition to all these things, this administration, under the leadership of the President, has devoted time and study to the fate of the aged and the unemployed. Other Presidents and other administrations and other political parties fulminated in terms of profound sympathy for the aged and the unemployed. But they never got far enough to do anything about it. The Roosevelt administration enacted the social-security law, making the beginning of what I hope will ultimately become one of the soundest and wisest functions of government in the United States. Certainly society owes it to those who approach old age after a lifetime of service to it without a competence to guarantee a sense of security in their declining years. It owes it to those who are deprived of employment without their own fault to hold out the hope of security during periods of unemployment. And society owes it to the rising generation of boys and girls to make some effort to give them room for work and service among their fellow men.

But our opponents complain that, although the objectives of this program are laudable, we have not done it in the right way. They with a straight face announce that they could have done it better, and that they can administer these laws and these programs more wisely and more faithfully than those who are responsible for their inauguration.

They say that the cost has been too great; that because of this we are headed toward bankruptcy.

Let us take a look at the record. On the 4th of March, 1929, 4 years before Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated, the public debt of the United States was a little more than $16,000,000,000. On the 4th of March, 1933, it was a little more than $22,000,000,000, an increase of more than $6,000,000,000. During the last 3 years of the previous administration there was a deficit in the Treasury. But this deficit, and this increase in the public debt, were and are not reflected in a single public improvement anywhere in the United States. Not a schoolhouse, or courthouse, or sewer system, or waterworks system, or playground, or street improvement, or pavement, or hospital, or additional highway system, or other form of public improvement can be found in this broad land which was established, repaired, or improved by the creation of these deficits, or this increase in the public debt. I do not complain of that. I do not state or insinuate that there was any improper expenditure of these sums represented by borrowed money. I do not think there was.

But, inasmuch as it is claimed that the Roosevelt administration has been guilty of waste and extravagance, that it has headed the Nation toward bankruptcy, let us see what the facts may be. Some of these critics complain that the program which we have carried out should never have been undertaken. Others complain that even if it should have been undertaken too much money has been expended in its consummation.

You may be interested in a partial break-down of this program in relation to dollars. Here it is in part:

Highways and streets	$4,173,000,000
Sewers, waterworks, and public utilities	1,328,000,000
Educational buildings	921,000,000
Public buildings	951,000,000
Engineering structures	269,000,000
Conservation, flood control, reclamation, rivers and harbors, T. V. A., etc	4,308,000,000
Aviation facilities	145,000,000
Parks, playgrounds, gymnasiums, and other recreation facilities	972,000,000
Public housing	364,000,000
Rural electrification	124,000,000
National defense	4,688,000,000
Total	18,233,000,000

These figures do not include $500,000,000 appropriated by the States to match Federal road funds, and almost $2,000,000,000 supplied by State and local bodies as their portion of the Public Works Administration program, nor does it include $500,000,000 under contract for loan by the United States Housing Authority and more than $3,000,000,000 worth of construction generated with private capital by the Federal Housing Administration.

What have the people gotten for their money? Here are a few of the things they have gotten: 80,000 miles of new highways; 265,000 miles of new streets and country roads repaired; 9,600 new educational buildings; 770 new hospitals; 1,600 new courthouses; 1,500 new sewer systems; 2,400 new water systems; 282 new city electric systems; 3,400 new playgrounds and athletic fields; 380 new large bridges; 29,000 new small bridges; 4 T. V. A. dams; 220,000 miles of new rural electric lines; 1,200 new post offices; 27,700 new low-rent dwelling units completed and 58,000 under construction; and the planting of 1,750,000,000 new trees in the denuded areas of the United States.

These are some of the things which the American people have secured for the expenditure of their money. But, in addition to these physical additions to the facilities for the enjoyment of life, they have obtained enduring proof that their Government is the agent and servant of the people, and that it proposes to demonstrate here in America that democracy can be made to work and function in any emergency that confronts this great Nation.

In his fireside chat with the American people a week ago, the President gave the American people some of the details of our effort to prepare ourselves for national defense and for the preservation of the things we have been building up, and the way of life which is sacred to the American people.

This program has related itself chiefly to our domestic problems. But the domestic field does not encompass the entire situation which faces America today. We are confronted today as never before with the obligation to preserve this democratic way of life.

We have been trying to prove to the world that this is the best way of life, and that it is worth preserving.

Nations in almost every continent who have believed in that way of life have become the victims of ruthless aggression because they were not prepared to resist those who would destroy it. Cities, homes, industries, nations, civilizations have been laid waste in Europe and Asia, and other cities, homes, industries, nations, and civilizations are today threatened as they have not been threatened in all the recorded history of man. The inventive genius which has brought to mankind the means of a better life now threatens to destroy that life and the things which make it worth living.

We in America rest under a tremendous obligation today. More than a century ago James Monroe inaugurated the doctrine that bears his name; that the Americas were to be the proving grounds of a new democracy, which should be set up in the Western Hemisphere for the service and enjoyment of the peoples of this hemisphere, and also as an example for the rest of the world.

We have thus far defended, preserved, and extended it. But we cannot assume that wishing alone will continue to make it so. We cannot assume that those who have no respect for democratic governments elsewhere will respect ours in America. They respect only those whom they fear or whom they know to be able to withstand their assaults.

We want peace in America. We have drawn more closely together throughout North, South, and Central America, not because we have any designs upon our neighbors, not because we want anything they have save their friendship and their cooperation, but because we know that in unity there is strength and that the problem of protecting democracy and liberty in any part of America is the problem of protecting it in all America.

We want peace throughout the world. There is no nation on earth against which we desire to become an aggressor. We pray that civilization and applied Christianity may yet triumph and lift their bruised heads above the scream of shells and the roar of devastating planes and tanks and all the agencies of death and incredible horror.

But as we have toiled in this land to develop our free institutions, as we have fought to create a nation devoted to freedom and equality, as we have sacrificed treasure to improve the standards of life for men and women here, so shall we struggle to the limit of our capacity to preserve these things from corrosive or destructive influences within our borders no less than from any ruthless juggernaut that may assail us from without.

Therefore we shall be ready. We shall prepare. We shall arm that we may not be caught unawares like so many others have been caught in the holocaust which now sweeps over so much of the world.

In this great task there is no room for partisan rancor or selfish aggrandizement. It serves no purpose now to blame one or another man or group for not knowing years in advance what the world was coming to. From 1921 to 1932 we deluded ourselves with the belief that wars of aggression were at an end; that each nation might pursue in peace its own purposes, so long as those purposes did not infringe on the rights of others. We signed treaties of disarmament. We signed treaties of arbitration. We renounced, with all the world, war as an instrument of national policy. Navies were reduced. The world rejoiced that at last an era of peace had come upon it.

The world has learned its bitter lesson. Treaties supposed to have been sacred have been thrown into waste baskets. Territory that was supposed to be inviolate has been ravaged. Men, women, and children whose only offense was that they were human beings have been murdered and driven from their homes. Throughout the world mankind is now inquiring whether Christianity is a mockery and whether civilization can survive.

In the midst of all this we find the oceans narrowing and the world contracting. We are again realizing that we are a part of the world and that there is no assurance that the lust for power and wealth may not seek to engulf our Nation and our people in the catastrophe which has overtaken others.

In the midst of these threats we call upon our people for unity. We know that call will find a response in the hearts of all our people, regardless of race, color, nationality, or condition. We know that Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, white and colored, rich and poor, native-born and foreign-born will rise to the task which faces us. The hosts of free America will protect the freedom of America under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt not because he was elected as a Democrat but because he is the President of the United States and the spokesman of our people. We trust him because he has guided the Nation out of the depths of a cruel despondency in our domestic affairs. We trust him to guide us in the solution of our international affairs.

As a humble participant in the events of recent years in Washington, I am proud to proclaim the accomplishments of the Roosevelt regime. I am proud to have had a part in these events. You are likewise proud of these unprecedented advances.

It is a pleasure for me to come here to the State of your senior Senator, who, so far as I can recall, has never voted against a measure for the benefit of labor, or a measure for the relief of human suffering, or a measure designed to give greater social security to those who need it. He has on many occasions lifted his eloquent voice and consecrated his fine mind and his sincere heart in support of the progressive measures which Congress has been called on to enact. We know not what the future holds for us. But we know that in the strength of our people and under the benediction of God we shall endure forever.

The Meaning of Colonel Heg's Life Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk I delivered yesterday at Heg Memorial Park in Racine County, Wis., the subject of the talk being The Meaning of Colonel Heg's Life Today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Someone has said that no one is dead who is remembered. We meet today to do honor to a man who lives in our hearts and minds today. We meet today to do honor to the ideals this man cherished—ideals which live today in his memory just as they lived during his life. They were American ideals.

Colonel Heg lives today and everyday, just as the Norwegians who died a few short weeks ago while fighting for their homeland, live today and everyday. In these days we are knowing full well this life is not all. It is just an interlude.

No man can kill an ideal. No man can kill the eternal spirit of freedom and justice. Truth crushed to earth rises again. Justice and liberty have always survived their oppressors. Learning has survived ignorance. Science has survived darkness. Christianity has survived paganism.

Bigots and tyrants may reign for a time. The champions of right may fall, but always before the last pages of history are written, right has survived wrong.

Colonel Heg died, but his cause survived him. The sons of the Vikings died by the hundreds a few short weeks ago, but their spirit and their ideals live on.

We meet today to do honor to Colonel Heg. The story of Colonel Heg is well known even to those who are not of Scandinavian blood. Almost everyone knows the story of the man who came from a Norwegian pioneer settlement at Muskego, Wis., to lead a regiment of immigrant soldiers, recruited principally from the Badger State, but also from Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota, for the battlefields of the South in the Civil War.

It is the heroic story of a brave soldier and a good commander who was killed in action in the battle of Chickamauga in northern Georgia on September 20, 1863. But the story is much longer than these few, barren facts would indicate. It is the story that begins in 1829 and ends in 1863.

It begins in a little village in southeastern Norway and it ends on the battlefields of Chickamauga. There is a great deal in this life story which is characteristic of the life many of our forebears knew.

To begin with, he had a boyhood in the Old World. Then he had a trans-Atlantic migration. Then there came a contact with the American westward movement. Then came a taste of frontier life in Wisconsin and later identification with a community which typified many of the significant developments among all our immigrant people.

Colonel Heg's experiences were a little more varied than those of most of our forbears, however, for they included an overland trek to the gold fields of California, and some experience in the mining camps of the West, though eventually he returned to the community on Lake Michigan where he began a career in local and State politics that resulted ultimately in his leadership of a regiment of Scandinavian immigrants in the Civil War.

In many respects the achievements of this man have made his name a symbol among Norwegian Americans of the contributions made to America by pioneer ancestors of all Norwegian Americans. While he himself made a distinct contribution to American life, the importance of his life lies primarily in the fact that his story was typical of the progress of transition and growth that marked the lives of thousands of immigrants who came to America and to Wisconsin.

Hans Christian Heg was born just 4½ years after the pathfinders of the Norwegian immigration to America sailed out of Stavanger for the New World.

It was in the spring of 1840 that Even Heg and his wife with their four children started on the long journey to far-off Wisconsin. Heg sold his property and embarked with quite considerable means in his possession.

On May 17 they left Drammen. They stopped at Göteborg (the Göteborg I sailed out from last summer after war started), Sweden, to take on a cargo of iron, and then sailed for America. They reached New York 11 weeks later; then they followed the customary route to the West. They went by river and canal to Buffalo and then by steamer on the Great Lakes to the city of

Milwaukee. Heg and his party disembarked at Milwaukee, though some of the others continued the journey on to Chicago.

From Milwaukee Heg left for Muskego, which was a typical pioneer community. Hans Christian Heg was 11 years old when he came to this settlement, and he passed the remaining years of his youth in Muskego.

Young Hans Heg became known as an alert, intelligent lad. By 1845 his father had become a part owner in the newspaper known as the Northern Light. This paper became the Norwegian organ for the free-soil party and Hans Heg, who was 18 years old when the paper was established began to be an active worker for the free-soil party by 1848. That same year gold was discovered in the Sacramento Valley. Heg joined the deluge of gold hunters.

He returned to Muskego in 1851 to take over the 320-acre farm which had belonged to his father. In 1851 shortly after his return he married the daughter of a Norwegian immigrant of 1843. At 22 he was already a leader of the Norwegian settlers. Politics again interested him and as an ardent free-soiler he became increasingly interested in the new Republican Party.

Heg detested slavery and as evidence of the sincerity of his belief, he played his heroic role in the Civil War. It is interesting to speculate on what this believer in freedom would have thought of the world today.

At any rate, his principles, like those of many another Norwegian immigrant, were free to develop in an American atmosphere. Heg's ideals, like those of his Norwegian compatriots in America, evidenced a deep faith in American doctrine, in American democracy, in American equality, and in our concept of human freedom. With his fervent belief in these principles, it was only natural for Heg to enter actively into political and civic work.

By 1861 he had finished a very creditable term in a State office. By that time the slave question had reached its critical point. Lincoln called for volunteers. The Civil War began.

At that time there were about 75,000 Scandinavians in the United States. In view of the heroic battle of the Scandinavians this year, it is particularly interesting to recall that the Scandinavians in America in these war years gave their strength and their lives for American unity just as bravely and as cheerfully as they might have for their native land.

They made a good record, and they earned recognition for their loyal Americanism. Like the Germans, Irish, and other nationalities, the Scandinavians loved their new country, and they were willing to make sacrifices for it.

On August 20, 1861, a call came to Wisconsin for five additional regiments. One of these regiments was composed entirely of Germans. On September 25, 1861, a number of the State's leading Scandinavians held a meeting at the State capitol in Madison. At this meeting they formally decided to form a regiment.

Governor Randall believed in the movement, and on October 1, 1861, he issued a commission as colonel for Hans Christian Heg. Back in the autumn of 1861, a number of stirring calls were written by Colonel Heg. In view of the events of this year, it is interesting to reread some of these statements.

On October 5 Colonel Heg wrote, "That which we learned to love as free men in our own fatherland—our freedom, our government, our independence—is threatened with destruction. Is it not our duty as brave and intelligent citizens to extend our hands in defense of the cause of our country and of our homes?"

On November 16, he wrote, "Let us band together and deliver untarnished to posterity the old, honorable name of Norsemen."

By December 1861 the Fifteenth Wisconsin Regiment had been organized under the supervision of Colonel Heg and assembled at Camp Randall in Madison. By February 1862 there were about 3,000 men in the camp and several other regiments were being organized. The majority of the regiment were of Norwegian blood, but there were also some Swedes, some Danes, and a few Americans and some Germans. Those were hectic days and in the next 3 years the Fifteenth Wisconsin Regiment played a valiant part in the activities of the Union forces in northern Georgia and in Kentucky and in Tennessee. Colonel Heg, who looked something like Stonewall Jackson, stayed with his regiment continuously. Colonel Heg made a gallant record and displayed his gallantry and his bravery on more than one occasion.

The final chapter in Colonel Heg's military career was written on September 19, 1863. On that day he was exposed to the fire of the enemy from noon until sundown. It was at sundown that he received his mortal wound. After he received it he rallied his men once again and rode on for about a quarter of a mile. Loss of blood finally obliged him to give up his command. On the following morning, that is, September 20, 1863, shortly before 12 o'clock, Colonel Heg died. Wisconsin mourned his death, and one newspaper wrote, "The State has sent no braver soldier and no truer patriot to aid in this mighty struggle for national unity than Hans Christian Heg. The valorous blood of the old Viking ran in his veins united with the gentler virtues of a Christian and a gentleman."

In the December 1920 issue of the Wisconsin Magazine of History, there is an article which deals with Col. Hans Christian Heg. I would like to quote the last paragraph of that article. It reads: "Colonel Heg has often been spoken of as a Norwegian, still more often as a Norwegian-American. These are both honorable titles. It is perhaps more appropriate, however, simply to say that he was an American. His is a story of one who threw himself fully into the current of the life of the new and adopted country. Without reserve, he gave the best that he had to America. He knew the trials as well as the opportunities of pioneer life in the West. He learned to believe in and to cherish our American institutions and ideals.

A man of the West, he joined the mighty throngs that brought California into the Union. He served his community in many humble local offices. Chosen by popular election he served the people of his State in a not unimportant official capacity. Finally he gave himself without qualification to his country when its flag was in peril and leading a brigade of the American Army he died fighting for that flag.

That is the life story of Colonel Heg. That is the story which serves as an index to the character of the man. Let us briefly analyze that character. Such an analysis is valuable to us because it will enable us to apply those character traits to ourselves and to our problems today.

Let me quote from an article in the "Emigranten" written at the time he was selected as a colonel.

"Young, powerful, and attractive, honorable, unimpeachably honest, to a high degree considerate of the welfare of his subordinates, with a splendid fund of practical, sound sense, and with the increased knowledge of men and things which his work as a State official has given him, he is the best man of all the Norwegians in America whom we have to lead such an undertaking. Our countrymen can gather about him as their chief with unqualified trust."

Those qualifications are the qualifications we need in our leadership today. For lack of them, our preparedness has lagged and our national economy has "bogged down."

Elsewhere it has been said of Heg that he was a careful and critical observer, quiet and accurate in his observations. Though quiet and taciturn in his work, he was known as a jovial companion outside the service.

He was absolutely fearless, though he tempered his daring with intelligence. In these dark days it is well also for us to recall that Heg had the gift of dissipating gloom and discouragement. In its place he inspired cheer and confidence. That, too, is something which we need today.

We need also Heg's rare gift of self-possession. Even in the midst of the severe exposure of 1863, Heg's remarkable poise never deserted him.

Above all, Colonel Heg was a just, human, and merciful man. When he was a Wisconsin prison commissioner he wrote, "The penalty of the law is justly due to its transgressor, but in the midst of deserved wrath, it is Godlike to be merciful."

Probably it was this very bigness of spirit which enabled Heg to deal justly with those under him, even when they were of different temperaments and different nationalities.

In his company Norwegians brushed shoulders with Swedes, Danes, and Germans, but they were all Americans. They pulled together for the common cause. In this connection I might add that Carl Sandburg in his magnificent biography of Abraham Lincoln points out that without the hordes of Scotch, Irish, Scandinavians, Germans, and English who swelled the northern ranks, the rising war tide of the South could never have been stemmed. It was the immigrant who made the northern Civil War victories possible.

Colonel Heg was such an immigrant, and even in the gloomiest days of the Civil War he retained his simple immigrant faith in the ultimate success of right. His letters to his family abound in this faith. They abound likewise in references indicating his deep love of family and home. Here again, we find in his nature a knowledge of the abiding values which we do well to recall today.

Why do we do honor to the memory of this man? What lesson can we learn from his life—lesson that will give us direction and guidance in these days of doubt and hysteria and indecision?

Colonel Heg was a patriot. We need patriots today. A patriot is one who loves his country and the principles for which that country stands. But a patriot is also willing to make sacrifices. He made the supreme sacrifice. He wasn't even born in this country as you have seen, but he did have an idea, a great idea, about the value of this country and the great freedoms that this country possessed. I repeat his words: "Our freedom, our Government, our independence are threatened with destruction. Is it not our duty as brave and intelligent citizens to extend our hands in defense of the cause of our country and our home?"

There is a challenge for you and me in this day.

In Colonel Heg's day they had "fifth columnists," but they called them something different. I believe if Colonel Heg were living today that he would speak out militantly against those forces in our midst that seek to create division in our ranks, that seek to undermine the unity of this people. I'm going to mention some of those groups, because I think no finer commemorative service could be held on this occasion for this great soul that has gone ahead in the journey, this life that left its citadel of clay at Chicamauga. I'm sure he, if he were living, would oppose these groups the same as I believe his spirit is opposing them now. What are they?

1. That group of aliens or citizens who live in this country and who are not devoting themselves 100 percent loyally to America. Some of these folks belong to organizations which have taproots in the various capitals of Europe. These groups think more about the welfare of other nations than America. America needs, as I have said, 100-percent loyalty.

2. The second group I call the parlor pinks and the internationalists who have found it convenient to hobnob with the communistic group with headquarters in Russia. It has even been alleged that some folks high up in government have been associating with this group.

3. The third group consists of our public officials whose laxity has permitted disciples of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism, to come to America and teach their doctrines not only in various labor and social groups, but in our colleges.

4. The fourth group consists of pseudo-intellectuals who have been guilty of causing a patriotic erosion in our youth. We find many of these in our educational centers. For years they've talked America down and never talked her up, but they are always ready to live on the fat of America themselves.

5. Another group is the defeatist group. We find them everywhere. Looking at the situation, they can see no hope economically or politically for America. They see our unpreparedness, and through their defeatist attitude slow up every constructive activity. They are a factor which must be reckoned with in our present situation.

6. Another group that we must eradicate is the so-called Fascist or Nazi group—the same type that handed Germany over to Hitler—they are always damning democratic processes. They don't know it, most of them, but they have become inoculated with insidious suggestions from the "fifth columnists" who are tools of some overseas government.

7. The next group consists of Government agencies which, through scatterbrained administrators, have hamstrung business, harrassed business with unnecessary rules and regulations, have sabotaged industry, initiative, and invention.

8. The next group is the racketeer. You find him in many phases of our life; in business, in labor, and in government. The labor racketeer has done more damage to labor's cause than any other force.

9. There is another group which consists of men in all stations of life who let indifference, inaction, lethargy, smugness, and complacency dictate their course. They are the men who will not meet the issue. They put off and keep on putting off the problems they should solve today.

Yes; I believe Colonel Heg would tell us all to bring light to this situation. "Give the people light, and they will find the way." He would tell us to bring light, so that the men in these various groups would see the need of getting out of those groups and devoting themselves 100 percent to patriotic service to the Nation. He would tell us to tighten our belts and meet the problems head on.

He would recognize that we are living in a world that is decidedly different than what it was a couple of years ago. Everywhere, except in America, democratic principles are extinct. Everywhere, including America, the day of ease is gone. We are the treasure house of the world, and we have to protect our treasure, and to do that we'll be called upon to dig down as we never did before to provide a preparedness program that will insure us against the marauder and the pillager nations. We don't want that thing to happen here that has happened to nations in Europe—neutrals and combatants alike. This is our America, and if men like Colonel Heg would die for her, it is right on this day in his memory that we pledge ourselves to live and sacrifice for her.

I could go into detail and tell you what that sacrifice will mean, but I believe I've said enough. We can build ourselves anew into a strong, virile, united people through the avenue of sacrifice. I'm sure no one who hears me will fail to meet the demand of this period. With charity in our hearts, and with courage there, and with the willingness to give, if necessary, until it hurts, I'm sure America will come through and see the dawn with a brighter day.

And I likewise believe it is fitting for us to rededicate ourselves to the ideals which Heg cherished—to renew our covenant with his deathless principles. These are not just words. We must do just that or our freedoms will disappear.

However, it is not enough for us to do this. We must do more. If we fail to do more we render the sacrifices of all the Colonel Hegs of the world valueless.

If we fail in our obligation to those champions of the right who have died, they will have died in vain.

It remains for us not only to rekindle their ideals, but to keep the flame burning. That means that we must see to it that our children are taught these ideals and understand their true worth.

We do not have to teach them any politics or any creed. We need only to give them the fundamental training, so that they can make their own decisions.

Let us educate our youngsters to respect truth and honor and the sanctity of the pledged word. Let us teach our children to revere fair dealing and justice. Let us teach our youth to reverence the great spiritual values. Let us teach them not only their rights but the rights of others. Let us write into their minds the knowledge of the great freedoms and their value. Let us burn into their hearts the necessity of preserving a love of home and family and country and God.

Other lands whose doctrines we reject are not content with a mere academic education for their youth. They drill into their youth the unholy doctrines which will rule their lives.

If we teach the doctrines of right with equal diligence, our youth will be competent to make their own political and social decisions. If they are well grounded in the principles we love and believe in, they can be trusted to apply them to any situation and any age. Knowing individual honor, they will inevitably know national and international honor. Let the churches and schools of our land accept this challenge and train our children in the ethics of the Christian life. Let every teacher and clergyman catch the glory of this adventure. Then shall we have preparedness indeed.

Knowing honor and knowing ideals, it follows that the lives of our children will be living reminders that the Colonel Hegs of the world will survive their oppressors.

War Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER T. BONE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, on the evening of June 7, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] addressed a large gathering in the city of Washington, called together to protest against the possible entrance of America into the World War now raging. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the address delivered by the Senator from Montana, whom I regard as one of the most brilliant, outstanding, and courageous men in public life.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

I am happy to have this opportunity to speak before you on this occasion. No subject is more vital than war, and no situation more serious than that which we face in this country today.

A mad hysteria grips many of our people—a hysteria produced in New York and Washington. It is time for plain speaking, and I intend to do just that.

Let me read what a distinguished American has to say about the war:

"There is no place in this fight for us. It's going to be bad enough as it is. As you love America, don't let anything that comes out of any country in the world make you believe you can make a situation one whit better by getting into the war. * * * There is no reason—economic, financial, or social—to justify the United States entering the war."

Who said this? It is the statement of our Ambassador to Great Britain, Joseph P. Kennedy, made December 12, 1939, in the Church of the Assumption in Boston, Mass.

I agreed with Mr. Kennedy when he made his statement some months ago, and, unlike some of our distinguished columnists and interventionists, I agree with him now.

A well-known writer recently referred to me as an "isolationist." What people really mean when they call you an isolationist is that you no longer consider this country a British colony—or that you are someone who doesn't want to see the youth of our country killed and maimed on the battlefields of Europe.

There are many people in this country who feel we should enter the war now. To all these I say: You personally can go. Go to Canada and join the Allied forces, or volunteer here for ambulance service abroad. The belligerents can use you in their mechanized warfare, whether you are old or young, college professor or newspaper columnist. Or send your money if you don't want to send your life. The belligerents will be glad to take either. But don't try to involve this country in the war by preaching propaganda designed to have our Government force the young men of this country to do what you are afraid to do.

Several years ago there was a play on Broadway in which two men were discussing war. Both agreed they would never, never go to war; that neither was cut out to be a soldier. A few days later the two men met and one of them was in Army uniform. "How come?" asked the other. "Oh, I heard a band," replied the newly recruited soldier.

Once again the bands are playing. Before we join the Army, let's find out what it's all about.

Those who want the United States to get into the war tell us we must do it to preserve democracy and Christianity and freedom and enlightenment. Well, will we preserve democracy and Christianity and freedom and enlightenment by going into the war?

The very first thing that happens to a democracy in wartime is the suppression of all free speech. It should be remembered that every foreign accent becomes the sound of the devil every "white collar" worker and factory hand and farmer—all faced with higher and higher costs of living—soon find themselves accused of aiding and abetting the enemy whenever they ask for a higher income.

It has been well said that the first casualty in war is truth. Well, the next is the democratic process. I would be a little more impressed with the idea that this is a war to save democracy if the people who are shouting this slogan—both here and in Europe—had done something to help democracy before the war broke out.

There is great work to be done on behalf of democracy here. What about self-respecting jobs for 10,000,000 unemployed? What about the work of eradicating poverty and disease among that large section of the people so truly described as the underprivileged one-third of our Nation? What will happen to all our great plans for reconstructing happy and useful lives for these millions of people? Will democracy be best served by building a strong, healthy, and prosperous Nation in the United States or by hiding the top-heavy debts and limping economy of depression-ridden

America under a new and huge military machine, and joining this machine to that of the bankrupt politicians of Europe in the bloodiest Armageddon known to history?

We are told that Europe is on fire—that we should help put out this fire before the wind shifts and the fire reaches us. I want to do everything possible to help put out that fire. I want to do everything to help the Allies stamp out the brutal forces which seek to dominate Europe and perhaps the world. But by setting the United States on fire we will not help put out the fire in Europe.

The newspapers today are full of letters and exhortations from people who urge us to get into the war in one way or another. But note one thing—the writers are all well past war age! Where are the letters and statements from our young men whose blood will be shed?

At Yale the other day 1,400 students signed a petition urging the Government to take no steps that would put us into war. And then what happened? A leading professor—who is also the dean of one of their colleges—immediately replied that the students were "confused." Confused indeed! The exclamation of that one professor received more attention in certain newspapers than the petition of fourteen hundred young men.

Day by day we see more and more statements inciting us to join the Allies. Of course the writers don't think we ought to send troops. Not yet. Simply start off by sending planes and supplies and then the American taxpayers' money. On all sides we hear the term "all aid to the Allies short of war." Now this is a handy catch phrase. The only trouble is you can't put your shirt tail into a clothes wringer and then pull it out suddenly while the wringer keeps turning.

We have decided to supply the Allies with all the airplanes and guns they can buy and we can sell. The Attorney General of the United States has ruled that under a law of July 1919 it would not be a violation of international law for us to sell the Allies a large supply of rifles, 75 millimeter guns, and ammunition officially labeled as "obsolete" war stocks.

We are thus doing by indirection what we would not do directly, and what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had in effect said we should not do when its members voted 19 to 2 against the Pepper resolution which sought to do this very thing.

Bearing in mind that we are presently engaged in a mad race to rearm our own country and bolster our own national defenses it may seem inconsistent to some that we should be shipping out of the country these munitions. I would have no objection but we should be careful not to take steps which could involve this country in war.

Constantly, we hear the cry—give—don't sell—the Allies planes and guns. Let us analyze this idea a moment. Perhaps I shouldn't use the word "analyze." It's very unpopular in a period when billions of dollars are requested of and appropriated by Congress in the time it takes one man to shout across a room.

It is one thing for you as an individual to give the Allies all your money and all your property but quite different for us as a government to do the same thing. When the Government takes such a step it is tantamount to a declaration of war. Many well-meaning people want the Government to do this, not realizing its implications—others want to prey upon your credulity, knowing it means war.

But why is it necessary to give the Allies anything? The British Empire alone covers one fourth of the earth's surface. It has the richest domains in the world—all sending dividends and resources home to London. England is not exhausted or poverty-stricken or anywhere near such a condition. Why then should we regard the British as objects of charity? Great Britain does not so regard itself.

Why then this premature and exaggerated propaganda to make gifts or loans to the Allies? The fact of the matter is that the warmongers in the United States recognize these are important steps that must first be taken if they are to get this country into the war.

If the United States becomes involved in another European war this country and its people will underwrite all the tragic and costly mistakes of the Allied statesmen during the 20 years since Versailles. Do the American people want to do this? Do they want to pay with their boy's lives and with their hard-earned savings the tremendous bill that will be presented? Here is what the last war cost us: 126,000 American boys killed, 234,000 American boys wounded, 360,000 total casualties.

Was it worth it? Yes; perhaps—to those who made money out of it. Who else gained by this sacrifice? The answer is too well known to need elaboration. And what was the money cost of the last war? The answer is: $45,000,000,000 in direct cost. The equivalent of $1,000 for every family in the country—rich, middle class, and poor. And after this expenditure, what? Twenty years of peace marked by the biggest speculator's boom in the history of the world and the greatest depression known to mankind.

That's what the last war cost us. Shall we do it again? Think it over. Do you want to give the life of your husband, your brother, your son, or grandson, plus $1,000 to this cause? Some who have no sons, who sit in their swivel chairs and clip coupons say, "Yes." But the workers of America—the workers and the young of the Nation who will be called upon to make the real sacrifices—say, "No."

Remember what you gave 20 years ago in a war whose slogan was a war to end all wars—a war to make the world safe for democracy. Did we end all wars? Did we make the world safe for democracy? No. And we will not destroy Hitlerism by going into this war. For what is Hitlerism but the expression of brutality and violence that breeds on economic catastrophe? Wipe out the cause of that catastrophe—the failure to build a sound and prosperous economy—and we will wipe out Hitlerism.

Let us restore employment and prosperity in the United States. Let us end the extremes of millionaires and paupers and booms and depressions. The doctor who can't cure himself cannot cure another—not to mention the entire continent of Europe.

The big question now is whether democracy can be preserved. It can if we avoid steps that are likely to involve us in war. Does that mean we should leave our country defenseless? Certainly not. Up to now I have been opposed to the building up of great armaments for three principal reasons: I didn't believe them necessary when there was no war or threat of war; I regarded vast spending for armaments as an undue burden on the people; and that once having built up big armaments there would be an increasing tendency to use them.

In view of the European situation it is necessary for us to modernize our national defense and take precautions against any eventuality. Armaments are like everything else—new inventions supersede the old devices. We cannot defend a twentieth century republic with the weapons of the nineteenth century. Therefore, I approve of the program of modernizing our defenses, but I emphatically disapprove of using the present emergency as an excuse for shaping a war machine beyond our defensive necessities in the Western Hemisphere.

Some in this audience are too young to remember the last war. Let me tell you a few things that were said then. If the Kaiser won, we were told, the United States and South America would be his next victims. The Germans would take over the British Fleet and occupy Canada.

In this war, as in the last war, the victors will be the Horsemen of the Apocalypse—Famine, Disease, and Death. Starvation and poverty will hold sway throughout Europe. If Hitler wins he will have the same problems that the Allies will have if they win—feeding hungry populations, endeavoring to prevent great revolutions from sweeping through the conquered countries. These problems will be more than sufficient to occupy Hitler or the Allies.

Let us face these realities instead of bogey stories about air bases from which giant hordes of planes will bomb New York, St. Louis, and New Orleans.

After the war the world will look to and need a strong and prosperous democratic nation, a country that can lend its resources, not toward building instruments of death, but instruments of life—homes and hospitals, laboratories and universities. Let's not make war on men; let's make it on poverty.

Vocational Training of Additional Persons for Occupation Essential to National Defense—School Administrators Say Job Can Be Done by Expanding Programs of Schools Now Operating—Federal Financial Aid Is Only Thing Necessary and Should Be Provided

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

LETTER FROM CARROLL R. REED

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from leaders in the field of vocational education should be encouraging to those who like myself have wondered just what should be done to meet the need for additional trained workers in essential industries and professions. It is worth the careful consideration of every Member of Congress.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1940.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: Many Members of Congress have recently requested facts concerning the contributions which the vocational schools and technical colleges are prepared to make in training workers in occupations which are essential to national defense.

The attached statement prepared by representative educational leaders and the accompanying data which we have secured from the United States Office of Education are intended to give you these facts and the assurance of united support in solving this important problem.

Respectfully yours,

CARROLL R. REED, *President.*

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Our Nation faces the problem of mobilizing all facilities available for national defense. Of crucial importance now is the quick and efficient preparation of an additional supply of trained persons in those occupations essential to national defense.

The American people have already made an investment of one and a quarter billion dollars in more than 1,200 vocational and technical schools and colleges throughout the country. The program of trade and technical education which this investment makes possible is carried on by an experienced administrative organization and a staff of 35,000 skilled teachers. The facilities for defense training now provided by these schools and colleges could not be duplicated in many years.

These schools and colleges, now operating in every State in the Union, can make greater use of their present plants and equipment to turn out trained workers. If funds are made available, these institutions can expand their programs immediately through additional shifts in late afternoon and night periods and in summer sessions. By giving many of the workers intensive short courses—in some instances requiring only a few weeks—these institutions can train at least 1,250,000 workers annually, thus more than doubling their normal training capacity.

This expanded program can be put into operation immediately if Federal funds are made available. In our judgment the greatest efficiency can be secured by administering this program through the established Federal, State, and local educational agencies in close coordination with the agencies responsible for the national defense.

Signed in Washington, D. C., June 6, 1940, by: Carroll Reed, superintendent of schools, Minneapolis, Minn., president American Association of School Administrators, chairman; F. L. Bishop, University of Pittsburgh, secretary, Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education; William G. Carr, secretary, Educational Policies Commission, Washington, D. C.; D. W. Creel, assistant secretary, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C.; L. H. Dennis, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.; Willard E. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.; B. E. Packard, commissioner of education, Augusta, Maine, secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers; S. D. Shankland, executive secretary, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C.; R. O. Small, State director of vocational education, Boston, Mass., president, American Vocational Association; A. J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman, Educational Policies Commission; John J. Tigert, president, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., president, National Association of State Universities.

Proposed training program for national defense in schools and colleges

Facilities to be used	Number to be trained	Average length of training period	Hours of training per week	Cost	Average cost per trainee
A. Public schools:					
Summer schools 1940	150,000	10 weeks	40 to 42 hours	$15,000,000	$100.00
Extra shifts during the regular school year	225,000	12 weeks	do	27,000,000	120.00
Expanded trade-extension programs for employed workers	375,000	36 weeks	4 hours	21,600,000	57.60
Total for public schools	750,000			63,600,000	84.80
B. Engineering schools	[1] 20,000	10 months	40 to 42 hours	14,000,000	466.67
C. Expansion of facilities requiring capital investment	250,000	10 to 36 weeks	From 4 to 42 hours	50,000,000	[2] 84.80

[1] This number (20,000) can be trained for 10 full months. Probably many persons to be trained in these colleges would need only 3 or 4 months of intensive training. The total number of different persons who may be trained for $14,000,000 would therefore equal approximately 30,000.
[2] Exclusive of capital investments.

More Dollars and More Cents for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1940, President Roosevelt, addressing the farmers of the Nation, said:

That program (the reciprocal trade agreements program) has brought results—results * * * in better markets for our farm goods—results which are mathematically proved in terms of pounds and bushels and dollars and cents.

What has the New Deal trade program meant to the farmer in dollars and cents? Since 1932 the value of the farmers' foreign market has declined $7,000,000. On the other hand, the value of the American market to foreign producers has increased $230,000,000. This represents a direct loss to the farmer, in dollars and cents, of $237,000,000.

	1932	1939	Loss to farmers
Agricultural exports	$662,000,000	$655,000,000	$7,000,000
Competitive agricultural imports	296,000,000	526,000,000	230,000,000
Total			237,000,000

What has happened to our foreign markets in terms of pounds and bushels?

United States exports of major agricultural commodities

	1932	1939	Percent change
Hams and shoulders, pounds	65,217,927	57,879,112	−11.3
Bacon, pounds	18,173,249	10,590,063	−41.7
Lard, pounds	552,134,918	277,271,534	−49.8
Oleo oil, pounds	42,409,410	5,466,157	−87.1

United States exports of major agricultural commodities—Continued

	1932	1939	Percent change
Oleostearin, pounds	7,534,347	153,317	−98.0
Evaporated milk, pounds	39,305,309	27,496,838	−30.0
Inedible animal oils, pounds	63,965,554	25,574,339	−60.0
Barley, bushels	7,043,415	5,410,028	−23.2
Wheat, bushels	54,879,484	[1] 63,214,293	+15.2
Wheat flour, barrels	5,795,462	[2] 7,746,595	+33.7
Apples, bushels	15,889,710	7,867,145	−50.5
Pears, pounds	112,607,431	97,193,198	−13.7
Cottonseed oil, pounds	44,854,534	3,879,739	−91.4
Unmanufactured tobacco, pounds	411,159,483	358,489,238	−12.8
Raw cotton, thousands of pounds	4,803,146	2,409,374	−49.8

[1] Approximately 62,000,000 bushels were exported under the wheat export subsidy plan.
[2] Approximately 5,000,000 barrels were exported under the wheat export subsidy plan.
Source: Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce, December 1932 and 1938.

The decline in exports of these 15 commodities alone has resulted in the loss of markets, in pounds and bushels, for 2,887,000,000 pounds and—excluding subsidized wheat and flour exports—for 76,017,000 bushels of the goods which the farmer produces.

On the other hand, competitive imports have increased. The increase in imports of 12 commodities alone has resulted in a loss to the farmer, in pounds and bushels, of 612,199,000 pounds and 12,369,000 bushels.

Increase in selected competitive agricultural imports, 1932–39

	1932	1939	Percent change
Cattle and beef (dressed-weight basis), pounds	82,495,000	440,092,000	+433.5
Pork (excluding lard), pounds	5,748,000	40,967,000	+612.7
Live turkeys, pounds	45,827	117,730	+156.0
Cheese, pounds	55,623,477	59,071,059	+6.2
Oats, bushels	58,786	4,293,000	+7,202.8
Poultry, pounds	111,961	125,633	+12.2
White potatoes, pounds	43,614,902	93,859,166	+115.2
Corn, bushels	344,240	490,000	+42.3
Flaxseed, bushels	8,038,867	16,028,133	+99.4
Edible vegetable oil and fats, pounds	98,684,000	128,727,417	+30.4
Unmanufactured wool, pounds	[1] 15,600,569	[1] 102,565,000	+557.4
Barley malt, pounds	52,532,636	101,130,100	+92.5

[1] Exclusive of carpet wool.
Source: Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce, December 1932 and 1939. Foreign Crops and Markets, Feb. 10, 1940, and Apr. 30, 1940.

Through increased foreign competition in the home market and declining markets for our goods abroad, the farmer has suffered a total loss of markets, in pounds and bushels, for 3,499,199,000 pounds and 88,386,000 bushels of the products he grows.

Is this how the New Deal sells more pounds and bushels—gets more dollars and cents for the farmer?

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, from what I have been able to learn it appears that due to limited debate it will be most difficult to obtain time to discuss the tax bill, and it also appears that due to the nature of the rule under which the bill will be considered it may be difficult to offer amendments.

For this reason, I am making my remarks now in the RECORD in order to present matters connected with the tax bill which I believe to be of the greatest importance right at this time.

INCREASE IN TAXES UNIVERSALLY APPROVED

The people of the United States are apparently almost all agreed that the cost of national-defense expenditures should be met to the very greatest possible extent by current taxation. I doubt that they realize the full extent of what this would really mean but certainly the spirit which prompts people to almost demand taxes is most heartening evidence of a marked resurgence of a fundamental patriotism and quite a different attitude toward our country from that which all too many Americans have recently held.

The general purposes of the tax bill must, therefore, command the support of all; and a Member of the House can hardly vote against the bill without placing himself in the position of not only failing to cooperate in the national-defense effort but also playing the demagogue. I shall, of course, support the bill.

There are a number of most serious questions, however, which present themselves. The first is the wisdom of increasing excise and consumption taxes, particularly at a time when the country is still badly in need of an additional flow of consumer buying power and before the defense program has had a chance to have any influence on the still serious volume of unemployment. In my judgment the effective date for excise- and consumption-tax increases should be postponed until the volume of production in the country has shown a general increase.

The changes proposed to be made in income-tax schedules are, I am convinced, right and should have been made before this. It may well be that the rates in middle and upper brackets should be increased even more than is proposed in view of the need which our Nation clearly faces. It should be observed, however, that these changes will not become effective until next year. And it must be added that since these changes include a broadening of the base and bringing many people of modest income within the income-tax group, certain other types of taxes become even more important if the burden is to be fairly distributed.

EXCESS WAR-PROFITS TAX SHOULD BE INCLUDED

For example, I am utterly unable to understand why an excess-profits tax on profits arising as a result of national-defense expenditures and war trade is not included in the bill. There is no more revolting aspect to war than the contrast between the slaughter of soldiers on the one hand and the reaping of exorbitant profits by a few favored individuals at the expense of this human carnage on the other. Furthermore, American businessmen will not expect anything else of us but that we will lay such excess-profits taxes as will prevent this situation from developing. I have received many letters from businessmen on the subject of taxation and far from opposing excess-profits taxes they express wonder why it has not been done before and why it has not taken precedence over even so logical a move as the lowering of the income-tax exemptions and the raising of the rates.

Furthermore, I find no evidence as yet that it is necessary to bribe American producers to meet the needs of their Nation with profits far in excess of normal healthy profits. I should bitterly resent such an implication if I were one of those producers.

And excess-profits tax, be it remembered, does not apply to normal profits but only to a portion of the profits made in excess of normal profits resulting from war trade.

If this Congress goes home having done nothing to prevent the growth of another crop of war millionaires such as the last war produced our people will have good reason to say to us that we have not done our duty and have failed to provide anything like equality of sacrifice as between different groups and different industries as we all alike face an uncertain future. What will you say to your farmers who have lost their foreign market as a result of the war, or to your people, some of whose necessities of life will be higher in price when they ask you why you asked them to pay—as they are willing and almost eager to do—out of their small incomes, but failed to provide against the grossest inequalities arising as a result of excess profits accruing in future to munitions and allied industries.

TEXT OF H. R. 9513—TO BE OFFERED AS AMENDMENT

I am earnestly in hopes that I will not be prevented by any parliamentary technicality from offering as an amendment to the tax bill the provisions of H. R. 9513, an excess-profits tax bill which I have had before the House in substantially its present form since the first day of the session. This measure has been drawn with greatest care, and would, I am informed by tax experts, raise upward of $500,000,000 of revenue even at present production levels. The text of this amendment follows:

SEC. 2. The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 706 the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER E—WAR EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 750. Normal tax.

"If any corporation is taxable under section 1200 with respect to any year ending June 30, beginning with the year ending June 30, 1940, there shall be imposed upon its net income for the income-tax taxable year ending after the close of such year ending June 30 a war excess-profits tax equal to the sum of the following percentages of such portion of its net income for such income-tax taxable year as is in excess of its base period net income:

"Ten percent of the portion of such net income which exceeds the base period net income by 10 percent or less;

"Twenty-five percent of the portion of such net income which exceeds the base period net income by more than 10 percent but not more than 25 percent;

"Fifty percent of the portion of such net income which exceeds the base period net income by more than 25 percent but not more than 50 percent; and

"Seventy-five percent of the portion of such net income which exceeds the base period net income by more than 50 percent.

"SEC. 751. Exemption.

"The tax imposed by section 750 shall not apply to any corporation whose net income for income-tax purposes for the taxable year is $10,000 or less.

"SEC. 752. Net income.

"For the purposes of this subchapter the net income for the year with respect to which the tax under section 750 is imposed shall be the same as the net income for income-tax purposes minus the sum of—

"(a) Taxes: Federal income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes paid or accrued during the taxable year, to the extent not allowed as a deduction by section 23, but not including the tax imposed by section 750.

"(b) Dividends received: An amount equal to the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b) of chapter 1.

"(c) Amortization for capital expansion: In addition to any amount allowed as a deduction by section 23, a reasonable deduction for the amortization of the cost of buildings, machinery, equipment, or other physical additions to, or improvements of, the corporation's plant or facilities, constructed, erected, or installed, on or after January 1, 1940, to the extent such cost has been actually borne by the corporation.

"(d) General credit: The amount of $10,000.

"SEC. 753. Base period net income.

"(a) General rule: The base period net income shall be an amount equal to the average amount of the corporation's annual net income for three of its income-tax taxable years ending during the calendar years 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, respectively, such 3 years to be selected by the corporation; or, if the corporation was not in existence during the whole of each of the calendar years 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, the average amount of its annual net income for the income-tax taxable years ending during such of those calendar years the whole of which it was in existence, except that in no case shall the amount of base period net income be less than 5 percent or more than 15 percent of the adjusted-capital investment in the corporation.

"(b) New corporations: If the corporation was not in existence during the whole of any one of the calendar years 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, the base period net income shall be an amount equal to 15 percent of the adjusted capital investment in the corporation, unless the corporation was established by merger, consolidation, or succession or similar corporate interests already in existence during any one of the years of the base period, in which case the total net income of such predecessor corporations shall be employed in computing net income of the base period.

"SEC. 754. The adjusted capital investment.

"The adjusted capital investment shall be an amount equal to the aggregate adjusted basis, as defined in section 113, of both the tangible and intangible property of the corporation to the extent that the adjusted basis can be computed as provided in section 113, plus the book value of such property the adjusted basis of which cannot be so computed, minus the fair market value of tax-exempt securities, 85 percent of the fair market value of securities of other corporations owned by the corporation, and the unpaid amount of the corporation's borrowed capital: *Provided, however,* That in computing the adjusted capital investment, intangible property of the corporation shall not exceed 20 percent of the total and such computation shall be made as of the last day of the preceding income-tax taxable year (or, if the corporation has no preceding income-tax taxable year, as of the date of its organization).

"SEC. 755. Other laws applicable.

"All provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of the tax imposed by chapter 1 shall, insofar as not inconsistent with this subchapter, be applicable in respect to the tax imposed by section 750, except that the provisions of section 131 of that chapter shall not be applicable.

"SEC. 756. Publicity of returns.

"For provisions with respect to publicity of returns under this subchapter, see subsection (a) (2) of section 55.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT. HOW ABOUT MONETARY RESOURCES ALREADY IN TREASURY? WHERE IS NATIONAL CREDIT?

It is proposed in this bill, as I understand it, to increase the national debt limit by $4,000,000,000. We must, of course, take whatever methods are available to us to give the country the defense which in this tragic time it needs. But I believe it is, as a matter of fact, unnecessary to increase the public debt and that there are far better and sounder ways, in addition to taxation, of providing funds for national defense. I believe it is wrong for the Government of this great Nation to be compelled to borrow and pay interest on its own national credit—which is precisely what it does when it sells a bond to a bank for a demand deposit on the bank books. Not only do I believe this is wrong but I believe the assertion by Congress of its constitutional right and duty to originally create the money or credit of the Nation is an essential element in true national defense and a matter which must not be too long neglected. If we are to meet the totalitarian challenge, we must not only increase our military defenses but must have our people and our factories at work at full capacity. It is true, of course, that we are nowhere near a danger point as yet with regard to the debt and that we can carry, if we must, a considerably larger debt than we have now. But anyone who has looked twice at the situation and at the probable cost of the national-defense program will know that we cannot expect to sustain this whole effort by an indefinite expansion of interest-bearing public debt.

No thoughtful person will question the statement that the only reason interest-bearing Government bonds are regarded as sound is because their value is sustained by the production of wealth by the people of America and the power of the Government to tax. Then it must be recognized as equally true that United States currency or national credits—or non-interest-bearing bonds, if you prefer—will, if paid directly into circulation, be given value by the production of wealth by the people of America and the power of the Government to tax. And furthermore, the only way inflation can take place in either case is if the total amount of either interest-bearing debt or non-interest-bearing money or national credit is increased more rapidly than production of real goods and services increases.

The only difference is that in one case the interest-bearing public debt increases and in the other case it does not.

If interest-bearing bonds of the United States can constitute a base for expansion of private-bank credit—as they do—then non-interest-bearing bonds of the United States or United States currency can afford a base for an expansion of public credit. It is all a question of whether the private banks or the Government itself is to enjoy the advantage which accrues inevitably to someone every time money or credit is originally created, to be paid for and given value out of future production.

On this point I should like to quote the great English economist, David Ricardo, who in 1824, said this:

> If the view which I have taken of this subject be a correct one, it appears that the commerce of the country would not be in the least impeded by depriving the Bank of England of the power of issuing paper money, provided an amount of such money, equal to the bank circulation, was issued by government; and that the sole effect of depriving the bank of this privilege would be to transfer the profit which accrues from the interest of the money so issued from the bank to government.

Many bills have been introduced which would give to this Nation command of its own credit. I shall not go into them now except to say that the essential step is purchase by the Congress of the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks.

And to those who believe there is some virtue still inherent in a metallic reserve, I would only point out that there is now completely idle in the Treasury some $3,500,000,000 of gold and silver and that the $18,000,000,000 Kentucky gold hoard, which now constitutes a 100-percent gold reserve behind the gold certificates and gold-certificate credits which have been given to the Federal Reserve banks could be used—if gold certificates were called in and replaced with currency backed 40 percent by gold—not only for all bank reserves presently held in gold-certificate credits, but also as backing for $27,000,000,000 of Government currency or credit, if issued against a 40-percent gold reserve. And may I point out that Federal Reserve notes today are issued against a 40-percent gold reserve.

So why increase the public debt? Either by use of the metal stocks or by exercising the unrestrained right of Congress to create the money of the Nation an increase in the public debt can be avoided.

My final point would be this. If the public debt is to be increased at all—if we are to depend upon this method for our national-defense effort—then it ought to be increased not $4,000,000,000 but some $25,000,000,000. Every Member of Congress knows that if we are to carry out the kind of national-defense program which has already been outlined and forecast in legislation, it will take at least that much money in the next 5 years.

And the only way to avoid that large an increase in public debt is to take those steps which will put all our unemployed people back to work and increase America's production of wealth to some $100,000,000,000 a year.

We must face one or the other of these two courses of action. Either we must do the things necessary to enable American producers to run their farms and factories at full production without fear that the demand for their products will fail, either we must remove the obstacles to full production including the obstacle of our outworn credit system—or else we must be prepared for an increase in our public debt far larger than anything anyone has yet had the courage to publicly discuss. It is obvious which of these courses offers by far the most certain hope for the successful defense of democracy against the totalitarian threat.

The Party of the "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, each of the two frequently employed terms, "fifth column" and "blackout," like "democracy," has a dual meaning for they are in reality words employed by the sponsors of the "fifth column" to mark progressive disintegration in society and destruction of Christian government.

The people who coined these words actually believe that they possess the power to blackout common sense and sound reasoning in a majority of the American people while their own "fifth column" marches on to establish a democracy, or communistic state, on the ruins of our Republic. They actually believe that they can, by the prodigious use of propaganda, fool us into this war as they swept us into the World War.

The supreme egotism of the internationalists is remarkable, for they actually believe the "fifth columnists" can continue to fool the people as they have the majority in Congress for the past 7 years. This I do not believe they can do, for the American people are beginning to recognize that the internationalists are the real leaders of the "fifth column," in spite of the fact that Congress, and particularly the Senate, is still asleep.

I realize, of course, the composition of Congress today, for many Members were elected to follow, and have hung on to, the President's coattails for 7 years. Yet, I cannot imagine anyone so stupid as to follow him over the precipice to bankruptcy, war, and internal strife.

However, the situation in Congress, and particularly in the Senate, cannot be corrected until the people express themselves, or, to represent them, elect men with strong chins and stiff spines, instead of supplicants with knee pads and nose rings.

My concern, however, is for the people in my State and for the people in other States who do not realize that we are using worthless, inflated money which will collapse under an inescapable inflation that will wreck our currency as it has wrecked the currency of other countries.

My concern is for those who do not realize that Government bonds will be repudiated when we exhaust our national credit, and that we are now moving swiftly toward national bankruptcy.

My anxiety is for those who do not realize that their savings and securities will be as worthless as the German mark that could be bought for a dollar per bushel after inflation wrecked the German monetary system.

I wonder how the people will feel when they realize that the men they elected to Congress to preserve, to protect, and defend their rights passed an act which has made beggars of us, and which will impoverish our grandchildren; an act which has made it impossible for us to protect ourselves except possibly by investing—if we have anything to invest—in real estate, or other similar permanent property; an act by which Congress gave all gold and sound standard money to the international money changers who are guiding the unseen hand of the administration; an act under which we, the people, pay for the transportation, for handling, for storing, and for protecting the gold now stored at Fort Knox, and other places, a property that does not belong to our Government, or to "We, the people," but which belongs instead to a group of private and international bankers.

This is a brief statement of the damage you and I sustained when the men we sent to Congress voted for the Gold Reserve Act, an act which President Roosevelt signed, and which the Supreme Court held constitutional. This act is not only unconstitutional, but is a most flagrant violation of Government obligation to a loyal people, and a bona fide cause for impeachment of the President and those who held this atrocious deception constitutional.

The people have the power to demand that their Representatives file impeachment charges, and that the Senate hear the charges, on the penalty of removal from office, or forceful public reprimand of Congress if it fails in its duty.

Would you say, in view of what has happened to you and to your Government, that all elected and appointed public officials who have deprived you of any part of your property and your full constitutional liberties and rights should not be removed from office? You must furnish the answer, Mr. Citizen, for you are still the power in this Nation; so use it before you lose it.

Do you realize that if every Member since the First Congress had adhered strictly to the Constitution as given to us we would today be the most prosperous and best-governed nation in the world? Do you realize what it would mean to you if Congress had passed only constitutional legislation, or if your President had vetoed all unconstitutional legislation, and if you had been protected by a Supreme Court composed of men who would, without fear or favor, have declared all legislation unconstitutional that did not conform to the most conservative or literal meaning of the Constitution of the United States?

Do you realize that had we always elected such men to office there would be scarcely any laws to be enforced, except a few criminal, nuisance, and other simple corrective measures? In other words, had each and every elective and appointive official done his duty, we would have been a nation composed of a united American people with the same freedom and liberties for each group and individual as the Constitution guaranteed to all the people when it was first ratified.

Do you realize that we, the people, and our national business and industries are crucified on a legal structure which has deprived us of at least 50 percent of the rights and liberties that we reserved to the States and to ourselves in the Constitution, and that we are now on the verge of losing our Government? This, you must bear in mind, has been accomplished not by violence but by enactment of a mass of unnecessary laws, which you should not forget is the procedure employed to bring about persecution of the people and centralized dictatorial governments.

Do you realize that all this, and much more, has happened to you and your Government because the legislative, the executive, and the judiciary departments have willfully ignored and misinterpreted the document that gives you the greatest protection—the Constitution of the United States?

Do you realize that majorities in Congress, Presidents, and Justices of the Supreme Court, who have ignored or misinterpreted the Constitution and upheld unconstitutional acts, are potential members of a "fifth column" which is responsible for the present disintegration and rapid decline of the Government and for the existence of the communistic "fifth column" which is now threatening your very life, liberty, and happiness? It is this internationalistic "fifth column" which dominates the Executive, Members of Congress, and which has crippled and nearly wrecked our courts, so that fair trial is an exception instead of the rule—a domination that has left us with a Justice Department, intelligence units, and law-enforcement officials who pillory loyal citizens and protect the Communist and his financial sponsors who are deliberately engaged in sabotage of industries and destruction of our Government. If you do not know this, take heed, for you are heading for catastrophe.

I can see no way to correct the deplorable situation which confronts us today except for the real Democrats to shed the New Deal and join with the real Republicans in reorganization of a Republican Party to operate under the Constitution of the United States. Such coalition would leave all liberals, radicals, Communists, rubber stamps, coattail riders, New

Dealers, and the rest of the "fifth columnists" with their financial sugar daddies who dominate both major parties, and other riffraff, in one un-American party, which could be labeled "The Party of the Fifth Column." I can see very little difference between these different groups, for all of them are set to liberalize the Constitution and anyone who engages in such change, except as set forth in the Constitution itself, can only be considered an enemy of the United States. This places him in the "fifth column."

It should be clear to all that were we a Nation composed of a people who believed in the fundamental principles of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution, we could be nothing but a united, patriotic people. The fact that we have had, and have now, persons among us who disparage or ignore the Constitution should be evidence in itself that our Government has been too lax in its own obligated duty to the people of this Nation, and in the enforcement of the Constitution itself. To look for a "fifth column" as the American warmongers and ballyhoo men are now doing is, if nothing else, ridiculous, because the biggest "fifth column" is the Communist Party, its fellow travelers and transmission belts. They are the most virulent enemies of the United States, and may be so accepted by the statements they make in their own press.

It should be clear, even to the dumbest new dealer, that there is only a degree of difference between a real Socialist and a Communist. As a matter of fact, the only difference is that the Communist is a specially trained Socialist. It should also be clear to the administration and to the Justice Department that the American people cannot be fooled much longer, for they realize now that the New Deal and the Russian deal are just about the same. Both of these deals are controlled by the same type of people in governmental, social, economic, and financial life.

Let us now suppose that the rehabilitated Republican Party should be fortunate enough to select a Presidential candidate who actually and sincerely believes in the fundamental principles of this Republic as it was given to us by the founders of our country. Would he be supported by the people of this Nation? My personal opinion is that he would receive the support of every loyal American citizen who has his own interests and this Nation's interests at heart. To prevent catastrophe and general collapse of the Government will require the utmost cooperation among those who have the interests of the Government at heart. It should be clear that such cooperation has not existed in the past or, as a matter of fact, for over 30 years. This deplorable state of affairs is largely due to the fact that Congress has failed to function as the leading, the regulatory, and the only branch of the Government to which people have delegated power to act for them.

The next President should, when Congress meets in the first joint session, request that he be divested of all extra-constitutional power which Congress has granted to the executive department over a number of years. He should request that all powers except those given to him in article II of the Constitution be repealed so that they may be restored to Congress, the branch of the Government from which these powers were unlawfully transferred. He should also request Congress to repeal all legislation which is in conflict with the Constitution and under which the people have been deprived of property and other rights which they reserve to the States and to themselves in the ninth and tenth amendments. He should request Congress to repeal all legislation which has launched the Government in the field of private industry, in competition with the people themselves. Many of these organizations are now operating as private corporations under the charters of the District of Columbia, the States of Delaware and Maryland, and probably other States as well. There are so many of these organizations that it is difficult to keep track of them. As a matter of fact, I believe they are even forgotten by Congress itself.

It should be clear to the Members of Congress that we have not the power under the Constitution to create such organizations, for such rights and privileges are reserved by the people to themselves so that they can establish sufficient earnings and pay for the administration of this Government in the future as they did before the New Deal unfortuniately slid into office.

The new President should suggest that Congress repeal our banking acts, for they were drafted by our enemies in order to deprive our own people of standard international secured monetary protection for their investments. The most contemptible of these acts are the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 and the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. It was the Federal Reserve Act that made the Gold Reserve Act possible, and it was the un-American majority in Congress that enacted this legislation which has deprived the people who elected them to office of their own personal property—gold.

The new President should request the State governments to assume their proper function under the Constitution of the United States. This would restore balance and permit the States representation in the Government of the United States. He should assure industries, business, and labor that they would be free to operate and enjoy the liberties and rights which they reserved to the States and to themselves in the Constitution. He should assure the industrialists and business people of this Nation that the Government has erred in its prosecution and persecution of the people who have toiled and slaved to make this Nation what it is today. If this is not done, the people no doubt will themselves step forth in the protection of their own rights in order to protect their homes and the security of this Nation.

Government investigation, regulation, and prosecution of criminals is lawful, but when the "fifth column" is allowed to operate free and under the benevolent protection of the New Deal, as it has for the past 7 years, one cannot but wonder what the final outcome will be.

The new Republican President should assure the farming industries of this Nation of the right to supply our own home markets and the American people with food. No one, I believe, will disagree with this statement, for if the Government deprives our own farm industries of their normal markets, the Government destroys farm industries and jeopardizes our national security in leaving our people dependent upon foreign production for the vital necessities that should be developed and produced in the United States.

It is my firm belief that the Government should not allow the prices on farm commodities to be set in the grain pits and the stock markets of financial centers. Farm production should be treated like other production so that farmer-businessmen may be assured of a price that will furnish them incomes comparable to the incomes of other industries. The Government should not allow the farmers of this Nation to be crucified by fanatical gamblers, nor permit the prices of commodities to be regulated by these people who have made fortunes on the farmers and on farm and food production.

The new President should ask Congress to repeal all emergency legislation, for we have never been confronted with an emergency and are not now faced with any emergency except the New Deal, which is in reality a calamity. The greatest emergency of any which confronts our people today is to get rid of the New Deal, for it is patterned upon that of Russia and is supported by the Communist Party. This should be clear, for Mr. Browder and his communistic associates have boldly proclaimed in their own books that they are heart and soul behind the New Deal leader and his party. This should be sufficient evidence to anyone of intelligence that the Communist Party and the New Deal are identical—the real destructive "fifth column" in the United States.

Troubled Days Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I want to include a timely editorial that appeared in the Washington Daily News on last Saturday, June 8. I think the views expressed in this editorial are entitled to the consideration of the Members of this Congress. I just do not think it is quite fair to the people of this country for the membership of Congress to quit and go home during the present crisis. As a matter of fact, I cannot understand why the President would want Congress to adjourn. It seems to me that in view of the perplexing problems confronting our Government he should want Congress not only to remain in session but want the Members of Congress to share the responsibility of making decisions that are vital to the American people.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 8, 1940]

TROUBLED DAYS AHEAD

Certain happenings in Washington in the last few days might well contribute to public uneasiness at this crucial time.

There is, first of all, the drive of administration leaders to persuade Congress to finish its business and get out of town in 2 weeks. The proposed dead line is June 22. It is pointed out that the Republican National Convention will open at Philadelphia 2 days thereafter. That might justify a recess, but not adjournment.

The men who operate the Government's executive branch doubtless feel that they could cope more skillfully with the emergencies that arise if unhindered by the conflicting counsel and restraints of the legislative branch. And maybe they could. But that is not the democratic, representative process under which our Government is supposed to function.

In more comfortable days the President would have earned a laugh by his press-conference remark that Congress could serve no purpose by staying in session except to make speeches. But laughs have been coming hard in the last few weeks, and the future hardly offers a jocular countenance.

Even with Congress in Washington, the executive branch has been putting some policies into effect without legislative concurrence.

The surprise arrangement by which Army and Navy planes were made available to the Allies, for instance, was accomplished by dusting off an old law permitting the Government to turn planes back to the factory as a sort of down payment on new models. The factory then, also acting legally, resells the planes to the Allies.

Maybe that was the wise thing to do. The only point made here is that it was done without the knowledge or consent of Congress—and while Congress was in session. Moreover, it was done at a time when Congress, after several days' urging, had failed to give its sanction to the Pepper resolution authorizing the Government to make direct sales of weapons to the Allies. One can't help wondering what things might be done with Congress gone home.

In the weeks and months ahead the Government will have to make some difficult and vital decisions, and make them in the swirl of unpredictable events. The public will be more confident in those decisions if it knows they represent the composite judgment of all Government officials who are responsible to the people.

The President and his subordinates in the executive branch are not the only ones the people hire by the year.

The Line of Demarcation Between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

LETTER FROM THE GEOGRAPHER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mrs .ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting letter from the Geographer of the Department of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 8, 1940.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MADAM: Your letter of June 4, 1940, is received in which you request a definition of the line of demarcation between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres.

There are certain types of hemispheres that are precisely defined, and there are other hemispheres which do not have specific limits. As will be explained below, the Eastern and Western Hemispheres belong to this latter category.

The Northern and Southern Hemispheres are exact concepts. The Northern Hemisphere comprises exactly one-half of the area of the earth, in which the North Pole is at the center. The Equator constitutes the exact line of demarcation between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres, since by definition the Equator is the line which is equidistant from the north and south poles of the axis of rotation of the earth.

A hemisphere in which the Capitol dome in Washington is the exact center is another precise hemisphere. The outer limit is a great circle on the earth's surface which is an oblique line passing north of the equator on one side and an equal distance south of the equator on the other. The Navy Department publishes charts of this character, one with Washington as the center and another with San Francisco as the center, showing the distances from the central points and the great-circle courses from the central point to all parts of the world. On each of these charts, which are useful in connection with radio bearings, an exact hemisphere may readily be indicated. An infinite number of such hemispheres may be defined exactly, each with a specific central point, such as the State House in Boston or the Eiffel Tower in Paris.

None of these hemispheres which are precisely defined take account of the distribution of land and water on the surface of the earth. They are simple geometrical hemispheres. When it comes to defining geographical hemispheres in which land and water distributions are involved the problem becomes essentially different. Nature's disposition of land and water areas follows, of course, no simple geometrical pattern, and there is usually no single mathematical hemisphere which exactly corresponds to any particular idea which is entertained. Moreover, nature does not provide sharp boundaries, such as man devises for property fences and national frontiers.

The geographical concept of a land hemisphere and a water hemisphere, so demarcated as to place in the first the maximum area of land surface which is above sea level and in the second the maximum area of oceans and seas, illustrates the difficulties of exact delimitation. By painstaking computation a land hemisphere may be determined, closely approximating the maximum land area. The center of the land hemisphere is in western Europe somewhere in the vicinity of Berlin. Within a radius equal to one-fourth of the earth's circumference, measured from that center, lie all of Europe, Africa, continental Asia, North America, and the greater part of South America. This geographical concept of land and water hemispheres is useful, in spite of the fact that published maps of these two hemispheres differ slightly in delimitation.

The demarcation of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres is even more difficult, because it involves both the distribution of land and water and historical considerations. The question at once arises, east or west of what? The Western Hemisphere is the New World which Columbus discovered by sailing west. By the Eastern Hemisphere we mean essentially the Old World, comprising Europe, Asia, and Africa; and by the Western Hemisphere we mean the American continents and appertaining islands. The continental areas of the Old World and the New World are very unequal, however, and the longitudinal extent of Africa and Eurasia is nearly 208°, which is 28° in excess of half the circumference of the equator. No simple pair of meridians 180° apart can therefore be selected which will place all of Africa and Asia within the same hemisphere—although by common consent they are regarded as belonging within the Eastern Hemisphere.

The necessity of precise demarcation of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres chiefly concerns cartographers rather than geographers or political scientists. Two hemispheres, exactly equal in area, are usually mapped within two circles. Map makers begin by selecting a meridian in the Atlantic Ocean somewhere between Africa and South America, which bears a simple relationship in the number of degrees of longitude east or west of the prime meridian which they prefer to use, and which serves their purpose best with reference to Greenland, Iceland, and other islands in the North Atlantic Ocean.

Within the last century the meridian of Greenwich has been increasingly used as the prime meridian in various countries, and map makers who use Greenwich as the zero meridian usually take the meridian 20° west of Greenwich at their line of demarcation in the Atlantic Ocean. In order to make a map of the Eastern or Western Hemisphere, comprising exactly one-half of the area of the earth, cartographers must therefore take the opposite meridian, namely, 160° east of Greenwich. In the Atlantic Ocean the meridian 20° west of Greenwich serves remarkably well, as it places all of Greenland, except a very small area in the northeast, within the Western Hemisphere, and the larger part of Iceland within the Eastern Hemisphere. It has the minor disadvantage of placing the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands in the Western Hemisphere, contrary to their historical association with the Old World. In the Pacific Ocean, however, the meridian 160° east of Greenwich is anomalous in that it places New Zealand in the Western Hemisphere (whereas Australia

is in the Eastern Hemisphere), and that it places the eastern portion of Siberia in the Western Hemisphere.

Many map makers, however, use zero meridians other than that of Greenwich. For example, the meridian of Ferro, the westernmost of the Canary Islands, was adopted at a scientific conference in Paris in 1630, as the prime meridian. The meridian of Ferro, subsequently found to be almost 20° west of Paris, or approximately 17°40′ west of Greenwich, has been used very widely and has been employed on maps published in Germany, Austria, and Yugoslavia even within the last 20 years. French maps of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres today frequently use the meridians 20° west of Paris and 160° east of Paris as the line of demarcation between the hemispheres.

Although maps of these two hemispheres differ slightly in their limiting meridians, depending partly upon the selection of a zero meridian, they almost invariably agree in placing all of Europe and Africa and most of Asia in the Eastern Hemisphere, and all of the American continents in the Western Hemisphere.

Your interest in a line of demarcation between these two hemispheres is related, in part, if I understand correctly, to an interpretation of the policy which was enunciated by President Monroe in his message to the Congress on December 2, 1823. In that message, as you will recall, reference was made to "the American continents," to "this hemisphere" (mentioned twice), to "either continent" (North America and South America), and to "their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic." This geographical concept evidently related to the New World as distinguished from the Old World, and there appears to have been no thought at that time of laying down a pair of meridians, placed diametrically opposite each other, on one side of which one policy was to be followed and on the other side of which an entirely different policy was to be followed.

Except for purposes of making maps comprising exactly one-half of the earth's surface, it therefore seems better to regard this hemisphere in which we live, in relation to the land areas of the world, as comprising North America (including Central America and the West Indies, and also Greenland) and South America, together with all islands appertaining to the two continents. In order to include the westernmost islands of the Territory of Alaska and to embrace an area roughly approximating one-half of the earth's surface, it is necessary to include a considerable portion of the Pacific Ocean. For convenience the international date line might be regarded as a provisional western limit of this hemisphere. The vast areas of the high seas in both the Atlantic and the Pacific have no bearing upon the practical problem of delimiting the hemispheres, except as it affects the map maker. Otherwise we are concerned only with land areas—with continents and islands, large and small.

There is no dispute regarding the continents and related islands which are embraced within the Western Hemisphere. The limits of the conventional hemisphere of the map makers differ but slightly, depending largely upon the zero or prime meridian on which the map is constructed. The geographical or historical Western Hemisphere is not quite so extensive, and its limits are defined neither by Nature nor by common agreement.

Very sincerly yours,

S. W. BOGGS, *Geographer.*

Open Letter to President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. AMOS PINCHOT

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter from Hon. Amos Pinchot:

NEW YORK CITY, *May 20, 1940.*

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that an effort is being made to break down, presumably with your consent, the anti-third-term tradition—that is to say, the tradition that no man shall be allowed to exercise the powers of the Presidency for more than 8 consecutive years—I am taking the liberty of writing you this letter.

For, occupied as you have been, and indeed overtaxed by the duties and responsibilities of your office, it is possible that you have not taken time to consider the probable effect of the third-term drive, not primarily on yourself or your party, but on the country and the character and direction of American political thought. For, in the last analysis, it is the people's thinking that will shape the country's future.

Abraham Lincoln, in a little-quoted passage in his first inaugural, said:

"The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people * * *" who have "wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief; and have, with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their hands at very short intervals."

And perhaps he would have spoken more strongly had he known that in the next three-quarters of a century the President's authority would be so enlarged—by statutes, by job and money patronage, and by an overgrown Federal bureaucracy, extending its control to State and city politics in every section—that today any man who has served two terms in the White House and wants a third can override opposition and make himself his party's candidate.

Mr. President, if you renominate yourself, for that is what it amounts to, your party will have to fight in the coming campaign on three vital and essentially related issues. They are vital and they are related because they raise the question, What are the proper limits of the authority of the President of the United States?

These issues will be (a) the immense powers you have already gained and the far greater powers you tried to secure in 1937 and 1938 through a series of bills which, if passed, would have given you the full authority of a dictator; (b) your attitude toward America's involvement in the war; and (c) your desire to break down the anti-third-term tradition and become the first American to remain in the White House for 12 years in a row.

I am not a Democrat. And I am not writing this letter out of any wish to see your administration avoid errors that might insure its defeat next fall. On the contrary, I believe it has been in too long and become too strong. And, though it did many needed and beneficial things in your first term, your second term has tragically failed as an instrument of recovery, progress, and reemployment. It has left unsolved every serious national problem. And it is evident that a change is required.

But what seems to stand out as clear and important in the situation is this: Any party that goes before the people in a Nation-wide effort to convince them that the President should be armed with the sort of powers that were provided in the bills referred to will be doing a major disservice. For it will be defending a legislative program which, had it not been defeated, would have assured a puppet Congress, a puppet Court, a puppet press, and a Government-controlled economic system to be steered, allowed to go ahead, or hauled back like a toy boat sailing in a pond at the end of a string.

Later on I will raise the question whether this country should or should not enter the European war. Obviously it is a question on which everyone is entitled to his own opinion. But at this point it may be said that, in your handling of foreign relations, you have gone far toward laying down the proposition that you, instead of Congress, should have authority to make the choice between war and peace. More than that, while you have frequently declared your preference for peace, in a more or less perfunctory manner, you have followed up such declarations by making almost every argument that might justify our entry into the war.

No political party in this democracy can afford to defend the doctrine that the President shall decide the issue of war and peace, any more than any party can go to the people on the proposition involved in your third-term drive, namely, that your presence in the White House indefinitely is indispensable. And, Mr. President, if the Democratic Party does defend these propositions—and it will have to if you are its candidate—it will be turning American thinking away from democracy, away from peace, and away from the basic ideas of life and government that have nourished and sustained our Commonwealth for a century and a half.

I. YOUR 1937 AND 1938 BILLS

Space forbids a discussion of the expansion of Presidential authority which you have actually accomplished from 1933 to the spring of 1937. This was the period in which a subservient Congress, in the name of emergency, gave you practically every power you asked for over agriculture, industry, business, foreign relations, taxation, and the spending of the public funds. And the results are sufficiently evidenced by the country's present condition.

But I would like to refer, at some length, to the powers which were embodied in the White House bills proposed by yourself and your advisers, and defeated in 1937 and 1938. For in these measures we have an authentic, unchallengeable record of your intentions on the subject of concentrating power in the President's hands. Consequently, in order to make clear, in brief form, the purpose and meaning of these measures, I have gathered together some of their more significant provisions, and have redrafted and condensed them into a single measure, using simple and untechnical language.

And here I would like to emphasize the fact that there is no provision or even implication in this condensed measure, which, for convenience, we will call the Presidential powers bill, that is not found in the bills they are condensed from. And I may add that, if you will show me any provision in my bill which, in substance, is not found in your bills, I will be glad to send you my check for $1,000, to be donated to any charity you may select.

"A bill to authorize the President to enlarge the powers of the Presidency in peace and war; to control Congress; regulate industry; censor the press and radio; guide constitutional decisions of the Supreme Court; and for other purposes.

"Title I. Reorganization of the executive branch of the Government

"SECTION 1. The President is hereby authorized (a) to change the name and functions of the office of President, or (b) to abolish that office and set up another in its place.

"SEC. 2. The President is authorized (a) to change the name and functions of the executive departments, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, the National Labor Relations Board, and all other agencies and offices in the executive branch of the Government; or

"(b) to abolish them.

"SEC. 3. The President is authorized to nullify and prevent the enforcement of laws passed by Congress by abolishing any or all agencies set up by Congress to enforce its laws.

"Title II. Control of industry

"SECTION 1. The President, acting through a Board of five persons, appointed by and responsible to himself, is authorized to establish a standard minimum wage not to exceed $1,200 a year—except as hereinafter provided, and a workweek of whatever hours the Board may decide to be fair.

"SEC. 2. (a) The President's Board may at any time set aside the standard wage and fair workweek established in accordance with section 1, for any industry, class of industries, or individual concern, and fix whatever wages and hours it may see fit.

"(b) The President's Board may thereafter change hours and wages as often as it may see fit.

"(c) The President's Board may require any employer to establish, in addition to fair wages and hours, whatever other labor conditions it may see fit.

"SEC. 3. The President's Board may cancel agreements between employers and employees arrived at through collective bargaining, if and when it decides that the facilities for collective bargaining are ineffective.

"SEC. 4. Violation of any provision of this section shall be punishable by a fine not to exceed $500, or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both. Each employment of a person in violation of this title shall be considered a separate offense. (Example: A publisher or broadcaster employing 1,000 person in violation of this act would be punishable by a fine not to exceed $500,000, or imprisonment not to exceed 500 years, or both.)

"Title III. Control of the press and radio

"SECTION 1. The provisions in title II, giving the President authority to change wages, hours, and other labor conditions, at discretion, shall apply to the newspaper and radio industries, to the end that the President shall be empowered to discriminate against or discipline any newspaper or broadcasting company whose policies do not coincide with those of his administration.

"SEC. 2. Anyone who publishes and transports across State lines, or through the mails, any material known by such publisher to be false, shall, upon conviction, be barred from the use of the mails for 6 months, and shall be fined not less than $1,000, and imprisoned for not more than 2 years.

"SEC. 3. The question whether such material was false and whether the publisher knew it to be so shall be decided by an appropriate authority.

"Title IV. Government contracts

"SECTION 1. The President, acting through the Secretary of Labor, is hereby authorized to blacklist, at his discretion, and render ineligible for Government contracts for a period of 3 years, any contractor whom the National Labor Relations Board shall report (but need not prove) to have engaged in an unfair labor practice.

"Title V. War powers of the President

"SECTION 1. Upon a declaration of war by the United States against any nation, large or small, the President is hereby authorized:

"(a) to fix, by proclamation, and to adjust, and readjust, at any time, upward or downward, at his discretion, the maximum price at which any article or product or any property or right or interest in property may be bought, sold, leased, or contracted for, whether such articles, products, property, etc., shall relate to war or not.

"(b) to fix, by proclamation, and to adjust, and readjust, upward or downward, at discretion, the maximum wage, compensation, or contract price of all labor and services, whether such labor and services shall relate to war or not.

"SEC. 2. By virtue of the authority granted to the President in the foregoing section, to fix and change at will, and without limit, the maximum prices and compensations for articles, products, and services (which includes the price of newspapers, periodicals, print paper, etc., and the compensation for advertising, entertainment, and other services) the President is empowered to censor the publishing and broadcasting industries, and, if need be, to make unprofitable any newspaper or broadcasting company which refuses to follow the instructions of the White House.

"Title VI. Reorganization of the Supreme Court

"Whereas certain provisions of this or other acts of Congress, enlarging the President's powers over Congress, business, agriculture, and other phases of American life, might be held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to add to that Court six new Justices of his own choosing."

I repeat that, incredible as it may seem, each and every power in the foregoing bill is taken from actual bills sponsored by yourself or your advisers in the period referred to. And the fact that they did not shock the country, even more than was the case, was mainly due to two circumstances. In the first place, the bills were introduced at intervals, so that their force and meaning was never fully grasped by the people; in the second place, they were radically altered by congressional committees before they were given publicity.

For example, the power provided in the condensed bill to change the name and functions of the Presidency, or abolish that office and set up another in its place, is found in the typewritten White House draft of the reorganization bill dated February 16, 1937, in titles I and V, and also in the revised draft of February 22, but not in the drafts debated on the floor of Congress. Both of the original drafts were made after consultation with you by means chosen and paid by you for the purpose.

Likewise the highly coercive power to change and rechange, without limitation, wages, hours, and other labor conditions in the publishing, broadcasting, and other industries, was given you in the original Black-Connery bill, introduced by Senator Hugo L. Black, now Supreme Court Justice, on May 24, 1937. And the same is true of the other powers granted you in the condensed bill. Talk about economic royalists! These bills would have established an economic, plus a political, royalism such as was never before contemplated in a free country.

Also it should be noted that the bulk of these bills made their appearance under misleading declarations of purpose. The court-packing bill was offered to the country as a more or less routine measure designed to lighten the labors of Federal justices. The Black-Connery bill, which would have set up an executive dictatorship over capital and labor, was introduced as a mere wages-and-hours measure. As I remember, you referred to it as a bill "to put a few dollars in a poor devil's pay envelope at the end of the week."

The reorganization bill sailed under the colors of an efficiency measure, and was preceded by a message from the White House stating categorically that it would not increase the President's power. While the war-powers bill was printed under the reassuring caption, "A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense, and promote peace."

Mr. President, your lost battalion of bills was a political and economic monstrosity. It was a reduction to legislative form of a dream of unrestrained executive ambition, a dream which, unfortunately, was more than a dream, and which still persists, as shown by the unceasing efforts of your administration to strip Congress of its constitutional functions, and vest in the Executive more and more power over the economic and political organization of the country. It is evident that, had these bills been enacted, they would have put this country on the path, not of creeping socialism, but of galloping collectivism and dictatorship. And it seems equally evident that they were drafted by men who, having lost interest in the American way of doing things, were going on the principle that the only good democracy is dead democracy, and that the Constitution is a fine thing to praise, but a better thing to maim or destroy.

II. FOREIGN RELATIONS

So much for the issue that would be raised, should you seek a third term, by your program of 1937 and 1938, and your continuing desire to acquire authority at the expense of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. Now let us turn, for a moment, to foreign relations. For here again it would seem that no party would be justified in asking the American electorate to accept certain propositions which you have laid down.

In the opinion of experts of good standing, the worst thing that could happen to England and France would be for the United States to become physically involved in the war. For this would necessarily divert our natural and industrial resources from the Allies. Our entry would mean that our productive energy would be required to strengthen our sadly lacking and obsolete Military Establishment. The job of suddenly putting this country on a war footing would be an enormous one. The Allies do not need manpower. They need all the planes and various other kinds of equipment we can furnish, and more.

Unfortunately, though the New Deal has seen the European war coming since 1937, it has been as impractical and inefficient in military matters as in the matter of recovery. It has spent 7 billions. It has talked a great deal about modernizing our system of defense, just as it has talked about balancing the budget, restoring employment and farm incomes, and carrying on a large housing program. But it has done exceedingly little. And now, at the end of 8 years, with war sweeping the world, we have no Army to speak of, a very small air force, inadequate coast defenses, practically no antiaircraft guns, and a paralyzing public debt which will make adequate military preparations possible only at the cost of a serious sacrifice in the standard of living.

For 7 years, under your leadership and that of the Brain Trust, your administration has been carrying on an economic war against depression. And the results have not been gratifying. For there has been little coordination or effective administration, less foresight and consistent planning, and no steady application of horse sense. And the question arises: Under the same kind of leadership could a military war be effectively waged? No, Mr. President, if we want to help the Allies—and 9 Americans out of 10 do—common sense demands that this country shall stay at peace; that it shall keep its shirt on and not be rushed across the ocean

into ill-considered adventures in Europe or Asia, where we cannot fight effectively in any case.

And yet, you have moved steadily to a position far beyond that authorized by Congress and approved by the American people—namely, that of aiding the Allies by making our industrial output available to them. Indeed, your administration has advanced to a point where, with one foot in the war and the other in the air, it should be comparatively easy for it to throw this country irrevocably into the conflict.

A little over a year ago, your personal representative in Paris made an address, in the presence of high French officials, which, if less than a promise, was more than a hint that America would fight for France, should war occur. Less than 2 months later, you yourself publicly recorded your belief that, in case of war, America's "physical involvement" would become a "virtual certainty."

In the recently published American White Paper—which must be taken as authorized since you have publicly recommended it, and it was compiled with the help of at least one member of your official family, and with access to official files—it is stated that, in conversations with the Attorney General and the Secretary and Under-Secretary of State, you have taken the stand that, while you will not send an expeditionary force across the ocean, you might be willing to send our Navy and air forces.

A week ago, in your speech before the Eighth American Scientific Congress, you again expressed an intention to keep the country at peace. Nevertheless, almost in the same breath, you all but declared war on Germany. And dramatically, in an appeal to fear, you restated the arguments for armed intervention. Last Monday, Secretary Hull, in an address of mysterious meaning, before the American Society of International Law, seemed to say, but did not quite say, that we ought to intervene in an effort "to keep alive in the world the principle of order under law."

What do such statements mean, Mr. President? Why this mystery? Why this facility in never quite saying it? I have been convinced for a long time that you sincerely believe that this country ought to enter the war, and that, if you are reelected, you will move rapidly in that direction. But, in any case, your statements indicate a misconception of the scope and functions of the Presidency and, one may add, an overlooking of the fact that the decision between war and peace must, under our Constitution, be made not by yourself but by Congress, in the light of future circumstances, if and when the occasion arises.

In short, your position seems prematurely taken and more prematurely spoken, and inconsistent with your expressed resolve to prevent a black-out of peace. And, what is more, it comes near to laying down the proposition that, when the people elect a President, they give, in advance, to a single individual, a mandate to commit 130,000,000 people to war, and all that war means.

Again, an analysis of the utterances of various administration leaders—Secretary Ickes, Senator Pittman, Under Secretary Welles, et cetera—since the third term drive began in 1937, reveals an intemperate and inflammatory quality better suited to create international friction and hatred, and a war psychology in our country, than to keep America in such a relation to Europe that, conceivably, it might act as a mediator to bring the present unspeakable disaster to a close.

One does not question the sincerity of these and others among your advisers. In fact, it is their sincerity that makes them dangerous. But it is possible that their judgment may have been influenced by the consideration that only through an expectancy of war or war itself can the feeling against the third term be overcome, and they themselves be assured the opportunity to continue their usefulness to the country in an official capacity.

Nothing can exceed the horror with which public opinion in the United States regards the savage and inhuman course of Adolf Hitler and his government. Yet what is to be gained by continually shaking one's fist at him across the Atlantic Ocean, or by the endless stream of threats and invective that flows eastward out of Washington? Certainly it has had no tendency either to help the Allies or to check or embarrass Hitler? In Germany it has probably strengthened Hitler's hold on his people. In America it has undoubtedly excited the public, clouded its judgment, and increased the likelihood of our being drawn into war.

Despite the so-called American liberals who have found pleasure and profit in running down the United States, we have a great country. On the whole, it is a generous and enlightened country and a tolerant one. It has made mistakes and will make others, plenty of them. But in the long account it has developed a higher degree of freedom and opportunity than has been found in other nations. And this should not be sacrificed in a rash and barren excursion into a war which would help no one, a war for which we are unprepared, a war that might destroy millions of our young people and at the same time tear down what we have built in seven generations of effort.

The American people, Mr. President, have done a good deal for themselves in 150 years, which, after all, is but a tick of time in the world's history. Likewise, they have done a good deal for humanity. And the possibilities of the future are larger and finer than the accomplishments of the past. And of one thing they may be certain in this time of uncertainty. They should continue on the path of peace and democracy which they have followed, faithfully, in the main, and kneel at their own and no other altars.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT.

War Propaganda—Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESSES BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two addresses delivered by me, as well as a series of articles entitled "Twenty-five Years Ago." One of the addresses was delivered by me at the second annual Citizenship Day celebration in New York City. This meeting was sponsored by the New York Journal-American.

It is with much pleasure that I note the growth of the movement to celebrate Citizenship Day, and I personally consider it a privilege to have spoken to this meeting in New York in 1939, as well as 1940.

I shall furnish the articles for printing in the RECORD at a later date.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT ON JUNE 1, 1940

No one likes to be a sucker, but it is far worse to be a sucker after one has been told how he is to be fooled.

We were told how we were to be propagandized for our participation in war and the blueprint is being followed.

There is no need for pussyfooting in this crisis. Patriotism calls for plain talk. There is a drive to take us into the European war. The original moves were secret, but now it is too plain to hide. I have been told that the propaganda directors are surprised at the rapid change in sentiment. However, I am not one who believes there has been such a change of sentiment as the papers, lecturers, Government officials, and radio commentators indicate. I know there has been some change, but as yet the great majority of the American people are not willing to get into this war. The situation is that some of the timid have gotten brave. They will allow themselves to be quoted in the newspapers. Some speakers who desire our participation, even though they have not as yet gone far enough to say so openly, were the same individuals who were quietly talking in the clubrooms and to their friends about how the isolation sentiment was breaking down. They did so on the quiet before, but now they are doing so from the lecture platforms and before luncheon clubs. Government officials have shaded their words to a more active intervention in the conflict. They are playing safe by wanting to get into this war only part of the way.

These are the same individuals who asked for the amending of the neutrality law in order that we would remain neutral, or that is what they said. Some of us said then that they were not interested in amending the bill to be neutral, but that it was a guise to get part way in. Now, they want to get a little further. Tomorrow they will want a declaration of war.

With all of this organized move, the cause of peace is not lost. If the people of this country will remain calm and not be swept off their feet, we will stay out. The great danger in this battle for peace is that those who want to stay out are not organized, while those who are pressing for our entrance are not only organized but organized well. Those who want to stay out are not financed, but those who want to get us in are not only financed but financed well. Certain newspapers are active for intervention in the war. Did you ever check the background, the former employment, the record of some of these well-known "impartial" commentators? It will not only be interesting but startling.

What did I mean when I said, "We were told we were to be propagandized"? Let me explain.

I shall quote from an English authority, Sidney Rogerson, who wrote a book on this subject, not for American consumption but as a part of a series for England.

Let me quote: "Our main plank (of propaganda) will be the old democratic one." Now, just think a moment of the speeches you have heard about this war, think of the articles you have read and you will immediately see the main plank was just that. Recall how the king, a monarch, talks about democracy as his speech comes to American homes by way of radio? Remember how the sirs, lords, dukes, and others appeal for us to help democracy?

Let me quote again: "We shall as before send over our leading literary lights and other men with names well known in the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table." Recall the visit of Duff Cooper, his lectures at good-sized fees over the country, and how he assured us that he was not interested in getting

us in. Today he is directing the ministry of propaganda. His visit to our country was good experience for him as to the propaganda to be used. Others, such as Anthony Eden, the King and Queen, to cite a couple, are easily remembered. The English Embassy has held such a party, and as a Washington newspaper states, and I quote, "Subscribers for last evening's benefit were carefully chosen before being invited to pay their $10," and so they were. Leaders in our public life were there to get a good dose of war propaganda, sugar-coated with tea and music.

Again quoting from the propaganda plan: "We should exploit the views and experiences of American nationals who might be serving in our forces or those of our Allies. We should make much of them, decorate them, single them out for mention in dispatches, and in the press, and use their stories as propaganda material to their own people."

May I recall for you the amount of space given to the service of Nicholas Roosevelt who advocates our more active intervention? Others could be mentioned, but time does not permit.

Remember the stories of Anne Morgan, the sister of the international J. Pierpont Morgan, who made millions out of the last war? Recall her stories of atrocities?

This is the same Miss Morgan who came to Washington and held a dinner at a most fashionable Washington hotel, serving a French peasant menu. A society column said, and I quote: "A wave of enthusiasm to help fighting democracies in general, and France in particular, rippled through the crowded room. * * * Many in the gathering recalled in whispered comments that similar meetings were the order of the day in the last war when Miss Morgan's Committee of Civilians for the French Wounded was working at top speed, and afterward, when her Committee for Devastated France began its work."

You see that Miss Morgan, and again I note she is the sister of the banker, J. Pierpont Morgan, who made millions out of the last war, is not new at the game of drumming up war spirit; and may I add to those not familiar with the Washington scene, the use of social activities for propaganda is one of the most effective ways of getting what the propagandists call "the proper people"?

I quote again on the blueprint of our being made suckers, newsreel men "should be the first to be allowed to 'shoot' pictures of air raids in order that a proper volume of pictorial horror will be available in one of the few great countries where atrocity propaganda will still be operative."

We have been saturated with this type of pictures. People will gasp when they see the pictures and say, "Isn't it terrible?" No one questions how terrible, but we should think clear through to know that our entrance into the war shall give us the experience of realizing that our own sons, husbands, and friends would be in just such a terrible scene, if they get swept from their sound, common judgment of staying out of this war.

Speaking of propaganda in the last war, may I quote from a noted authority:

"The great success of British propaganda in the United States should not be attributed to a professional group of propagandists but to native American volunteer propagandists. Once these natives had acquired the 'correct' frame of mind, they were enlisted for the 'duration of the war'."

Again the same course is being pursued. We are seeing American societies, under all types of titles, moving for our more active participation. They are not advocating sending the boys over, not yet. On this "not yet" depends the life of your son. May I quote from a well-known playwright who has become a propagandist for our participation, a playwright whose background is worth investigating. He said: "We must go to the Allies' aid with all the power that we can command. We cannot send an army 'now'." His only qualification of sending an army was that it would not be sent now, but the future would mean—and his statement definitely indicates that it would mean—sending the boys later.

Just think this proposition through. They advocate sending our planes, our guns, our material (even though they say we are not prepared ourselves and that we could not defend ourselves), to the battlefields for the cause. If the material will not win the war is it not only expected but natural to suppose that we would be enough interested in the cause to send the boys if they are needed, if the material wouldn't be enough to win. Just common sense will prove to anyone that if we take this step, it will not be long before the boys are sent to man the planes and the guns. Don't be fooled, America.

In the last war, it has been stated, and I quote: "It was in the group known as intellectuals that the best body of propagandists were enlisted." Sir Edward Grey sent certain Englishmen over, and I quote, "to meet people, particularly those connected with the universities." Again that course is being used, and many of our college and university presidents and professors are native volunteer propagandists for our entrance in the war. They will advocate sending students to their death while they remain as "brain trusters" to tell us how to win the war.

I do not have the time to continue to give references on this propaganda drive, but if you write me at Washington, D. C., I shall send you more material on this subject.

Do not think of this war as something far away. Just get in mind and keep it there, that we are closer to war today than we were in 1916. Certain Government officials, yes, very high Government officials, who are saying we are not close to war are lulling you into false security. Your boy will be called, to have his head blown off on the battlefield or maybe just a leg or an arm, to have his lungs filled with poison gas to cough the rest of his life, or maybe he will come home to you a shell-shocked wreck, if we continue the same drive to war that our country has experienced in the last 6 months. America cries out for the administration to solve the problems of our own country such as unemployment, yet these are neglected while all of the time is given to the international schemes of those who have failed in our own problems. I am not pro-German, nor pro-English, nor pro-anything except pro-American. I believe in a strong national defense but I am tired of this hypocrisy of preaching peace while taking us into the war. I call for my country to awaken to the danger of those who call for peace while their actions mean war.

Our young men want to live to make our country a better place for future generations—through peace.

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT ON CITIZENSHIP DAY, JUNE 2, 1940

Last year it was my sincere pleasure to speak to the young people of New York at the first celebration of Citizenship Day. At that time, Sanford Stanton, Messmore Kendall, and I discussed the possibility of a day being designated in this country for that purpose. The growth of the program has been even more rapid than we expected. I welcome you as citizens.

The enthusiasm and vigor of youth are important. Your fresh outlook on issues is a contribution. When you achieve citizenship, you become a partner in the biggest and most important business in the world, that is, the Government of the United States of America. You have become a stockholder in a mutual society. It gives you privileges and calls upon you to exercise your rights. We have great problems to solve in America today. We need men to solve them. We need men,

"Men, whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men, whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who have honor, men who will not lie."

The youth of this country have a challenge. Never in the history of this Nation was there a greater need of exercising the right of citizenship than today. Even the great challenge of 1861–65 does not compare with the challenge America faces today, a challenge of failing to solve our own problems here and the danger of involving ourselves in war to solve other people's problems abroad. Either or both will be fatal to democracy, as we know it.

We have a great Government. It is not perfect, but it is the best in the entire world. Because it is not perfect should not discourage us. It gives us a task to complete, the task of making it better.

The outlook for youth today is not bright, but that does not mean that we will be quitters and fail to exert all of our efforts to make it better. It was not a bright future for those who came to this country when it was first founded, but they took off their coats, got to work, and established the foundations for our great Government. You may say they had new frontiers. They did have, but we have new lands to explore, lands of science, lands of education, lands of tomorrow's future. America is not through.

And to the older citizens let me say the youth of this country love their country, but we do not want war. We know war is not the way of helping our country. We have educated ourselves to build, not destroy. We have educated ourselves to make this a better world in which to live, not a world of war in which to die. We are interested in democracy, far more than some who are now proclaiming themselves to be the champions of democracy by asking for our intervention. We know liberty will be the sufferer if we go to war. We want to save democracy, save it right here where it exists.

I realize that the "isms" of other foreign countries may have an appeal to some of the younger people who face unemployment, but that beautiful mirage painted for you will disappear as you see those "isms" in action. Ask the American who has lived over there what gladness filled his heart, what caused that lump in his throat, when the boat steamed up to the Statue of Liberty, with her torch to welcome the world to America's great liberty.

When anyone tells you that you should become a Communist, a Nazi, or a member of such foreign organizations, ask that individual what liberties you would have in those countries that you do not have in this country. Ask him if you would be guaranteed the right of free speech, the right of free press, the right to worship God as your conscience dictates. Ask him, if you would be arrested, you would be guaranteed a right of trial by jury. When he tells you that you would be guaranteed a job, ask him if it is a job in the factories, in the offices, in the fields, or a job in the trenches.

The great difference between many governments and that of the United States is that our Government was built on the theory that the government is the servant of the people. Today many governments are built on the theory that the people are the servants of the government. I regret that we have some officials who share such an opinion as the latter.

Americans are free men. They will not and cannot tolerate being slaves or servants to any group, be it government, be it a class, or servants to a party. No country in the world has more liberties than we have, and the great Constitution gave them to us. Our forefathers protected them, handed them down to us. We have a

duty to hand them down to our children. These rights and liberties must be guarded by every good American citizen.

When the world is seeing foundation stones being torn away, it is no time to tolerate under the name of emergency the destruction of the foundation stones, the sound traditions, of our own country. America needs men who recognize that this Government is a government of law, not men; that no man is indispensable.

The great document, the Constitution, has in its amendments, the Bill of Rights, composed of the first ten amendments. You may remember them from the study of civics. Even if you do not, they are yours. They have made your life a better one. They are your protection when you need them. What are some of those amendments? The right of free speech, the right of free press; the right to worship God as your conscience dictates; the right to peaceably assemble; the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances; the right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures; the right to be tried by a jury and the preservation of life, liberty, and property of an individual. These and many others are given to you by the Constitution. They are given to you regardless of your race, religion, or position. Too many persons believe in free speech for those who advocate things they believe in but not for those who oppose them. Free speech means free speech to all or free speech to none. When you set yourself up to determine what should or should not be free speech, you are striking at a fundamental right of your fellow man. What if he did the same and felt that you should be deprived of your right? Again the spirit of being a regular fellow must prevail. Don't do unto others what you would not have them do unto you. We must all say that we shall protect the rights of others as though they were our own. We shall not take privileges we refuse our fellow men. The tragedy is that too many Americans do not realize how great our liberties are. We have them every day, and we overlook their existence to protect us in need. We may never be arrested, but if we are, we want our constitutional right to be tried by a jury. We may never want to speak at a public meeting, but if we do, we want our constitutional right protected. If someone tries to deprive us of our life, liberty, or property, we want to be able to have the constitutional right to protect ourselves. Don't think of democracy only as abstract government. Think of it as something in your everyday life. It contributes to your happiness throughout the day.

Because we love democracy, we must exert our influence to save it. The way to save it is to save it where it exists—right here. Majority rule is wonderful, but that majority must never be tyrannical. The greatness of America is the protection of minorities.

All youth like sports. In sports the underdog is protected. A good sport is not one who would take advantage of his associates because he has the power to do so. Our duty is first to our own country. The minute we enter war—and let us hope that day never occurs—these liberties we have will be curtailed and stopped. The first casualty of war is liberty. Everything is controlled in war today. Your radio program will be regulated by Government, your newspaper will be hampered by Government. What you eat, how long you work, and your everyday life will be controlled by war regulations. Do not be deceived that war is a nice thing, a place for adventure, a chance for medals. Ask the soldier who has seen and felt front-line trench duty and you will hear what war is. You will see fellows with their heads torn off, fellows coughing out their lungs, trying to escape the terrible poison gas, blind fellows, crippled fellows. No; war is not fun. Furthermore, if you go to war and happen to come back safe and sound, although the odds are against you, remember that you are coming back to start paying for the war in which you fought. You, who were not born when the last World War started, are suffering today from the results of it. Some of the roots of this depression go back to that war. Youth pays the terrible penalty of war not only in their sacrifices in the trenches but in the demoralization that follows.

America's hope is peace. America's liberty calls for us to remain at peace, not because we fail to see a challenge to liberty but because we desire to protect liberty in the greatest democracy on earth—right here in the United States.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Ordination of Msgr. Thomas A. Sharkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, Member of the House of Representatives from New York, at the Columbus Club in Brooklyn, N. Y., on May 30 1940. The address was delivered at a dinner celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the ordination of Msgr. Thomas A. Sharkey, pastor of St. Martin of Tours Church in Brooklyn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reverend toastmaster, Very Reverend Monsignor Sharkey, reverend clergy, honored guests, and friends of our guest of honor, it is with a deep sense of responsibility that I rise to address this marvelous gathering of parishioners of St. Martin of Tours and friends of our distinguished pastor. I know that there is in the hearts and minds of all of you more appropriate and more beautiful thoughts that each would like personally to convey to our jubilarian—all of which makes me the more conscious of my responsibilities.

Such occasions as this are not frequent and, indeed, I cannot recall a similar outpouring of the people of St. Martin's. We who have been permanent parishioners of only this parish are, therefore, without precedent for this gathering and it puts us who assume to speak for you in quite the same position as was the young priest who was singing—or trying to sing—his first high mass in the church where his uncle, a venerable monsignor, was pastor. The uncle was proudly sitting in the sanctuary as the young man labored along in his best monotone—until he reached the preface. Having been given the key by the organist, the young priest had no alternative but to select his own and to struggle on until he reached a point where his voice could go no higher or lower, in fact, was lost. The organist gave the key again, the young man started, and the same thing happened again and several times. The situation became very tense, and something had to be done. The monsignor arose, walked to the center of the altar, raised his hand to the organist, faced the congregation, reassured the young priest and said "Give the boy a chance. He is only a beginner." It is probably very fortunate for you and very comforting to me that I do not have to sing.

On Monday, February 16, 1891, the New York Times consisted of but 8 pages. Cleveland was President. The free coinage of silver was the issue of the day. Nat C. Goodwin was appearing in the play The Nominee. Ayer's Sarsaparilla was prominently advertised, as was Royal Baking Powder. The Grace Presbyterian Church at Stuyvesant and Jefferson Avenues was opened. The A. O. H. in Kings County was nearing a settlement of differences that started in 1884. A lawyer occupied the pulpit in a South Third Street church. The Bushwick Democratic Club obtained the site on Bushwick Avenue and Hart Street for a pretentious clubhouse. The Reverend Dr. C. R. Blackhall, of Philadelphia, in discussing parochial schools before the Baltimore Baptist clergy said, "The Catholic parochial school is antagonistic to the institutions of the country and ought not to be tolerated."

But more important to us tonight, on that day February 16, 1891, in Brooklyn, Thomas was born of Joseph and Ann Sharkey.

He lived the life of a normal, healthy American boy and, as if destined to be the answer to Dr. Blackhall's remarks, he studied in parochial schools, at St. John's Preparatory School and College, and entered St. John's Seminary, displaying throughout a marked brilliance in studies.

On Saturday, May 29, 1915, the New York Times consisted of 20 pages. Chancelor von Bethmann-Hollweg said, "Germany will fight till assured 'no enemy, alone or combined, will again fight her.'"

Sharp notes were being exchanged over the sinking of the Lusitania on May 7.

"Joe the Greaser" and "Dopey Benny" confessed to a gang killing.

Mexico is in civil war with Pancho Villa and Carranza the leaders.

Students hold numerous peace meetings. Only 10 men and 11 women are on the list for school teacher. Lewisohn Stadium at C. C. N. Y. is dedicated.

But far more important to us tonight, on that day in Brooklyn, eight young men, Reverends Edward Glankowski, Joseph Shreider, James McConnell, Jeremiah King, Stephen Cottone, William Buckley, and Thomas A. Sharkey were ordained to the holy priesthood by Rt. Rev. Bishop Charles E. McDonnell in a 5-hour ceremony at the Church of St. John the Baptist.

Immediately thereafter Father Sharkey entered upon his chosen work—serving with distinction in three parishes—serving with a holy zeal—a helpful attitude and a sympathetic nature—endearing himself to all his people and culminating this phase of his life in a most creditable discharge of the complex and important post of rector of the Diocesan Institute of Philosophy at Huntington—supervising the constructing of the seminary, the assembling of the faculty and the organizing of the course of studies—until—

On Saturday, May 2, 1931, when the New York Times consisted of 40 pages, when the Empire State Tower—the tallest in the world—was opened by President Hoover, when business was hopeful of an upturn, when the Brooklyn Dodgers were in seventh place and Twenty Grand won the Wood Memorial, and when Ireland gave land to 70,000 farmers—ending a 50-year fight against absentee landlords, there took place an event—far more important to us than these—Pope Pius XI, in recognition of noble service appointed Father Sharkey a Papal chamberlain with the title of Very Reverend Monsignor; and on Wednesday, May 6, 1931, when the New York Times had increased to 52 pages, and told that Catholic charities in New York raised $1,157,000, the Pope emerged from the Vatican for but the third time to dedicate a new College for the Propagation of the Faith, and 10 of the most prominent

priests of the Brooklyn diocese, including Monsignors Hoar, Metzger, and Flynn, there took place an event—most important to us—affecting most intimately the spiritual lives and well-being of the people of St. Martin of Tours—for the Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas A. Sharkey was appointed pastor of our church.

He followed in a line of noblemen of God—Fathers Donohue and Lynch and Monsignors Reilley and Flynn.

He came to us, and he came among friends. He has, with his staff of able assistants—and we are justifiably proud of Fathers Caton, McKelvey and Diviney—served us with distinction and zeal.

The years of his pastorate have been difficult, fraught with the problems besetting the world and its people, priests and laity.

His sincere application to the work of his office, his deep appreciation for the beautiful, and his philosophy of life have added to the comfort and happiness of his flock. They are all here tonight, in body or in spirit, to pay tribute to a priest of God. A tribute so well earned by a life of good—well lived.

And to you, Monsignor Sharkey, they felicitate with you tonight and join with me in expressing their and my abiding loyalty, faith, and devotion—praying to God that there will be for you many more years of health and service in the vineyard of the Lord and particularly at St. Martin of Tours—this tribute is deserved—you have honored us.

America's First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY AT NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATION EXERCISES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the inspiring address of the Honorable Charles Edison, Secretary of the Navy, at the graduation exercises of the United States Naval Academy June 6.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Admiral Brown, members of the graduating class, and friends, as Admiral Brown has indicated, at few times in our Nation's history has the attention of the American people been more focused on a Naval Academy graduating class and their brothers in service than today. The unhappy series of events of this year has belatedly awakened our citizens to a keen and active interest in our Nation's defense. Shipyards are working at full speed on 66 new naval vessels, plane factories are speeding up construction of war planes, gun and powder factories are working at full capacity to provide fighting equipment for ships and planes. We are determined that, if needed, our first line of defense will not fail. In the words of our Commander in Chief, the President, "The fleet must be ready."

For 4 years, and in some cases 5, the Naval Academy staff has guided you and helped you to fit yourselves to take your places in that fleet. You have worked hard, for the task has not been light. Nor are the duties which lie ahead easy, if well done. You are entering one of the most competitive of all professions, but one worthy of your mettle. You will find able guidance and willing help, but it will not be forced upon you. For those who seek it, it will be given gladly by those who have gone before you. Not all of you will have the same assignments, but, like the fleet, each of you must be ready. I am confident that you will be. The Nation expects you to be.

While at the Academy you have lived in an atmosphere of naval tradition. The walks on which you have daily trod bear the names of gallant naval officers of other years. The buildings in which you have worked bear the names of others who have made their contributions to the proudest of naval traditions.

Memorial Hall, in which you took your oath to defend our Nation against all enemies, is a veritable shrine of those traditions. The chapel in which you have worshiped contains the mortal remains of that untitled knight of the sea, John Paul Jones, whose letters and reports advise: "It is not enough that an officer of the Navy should be a capable mariner. He must be that, of course, but a great deal more. He should be, as well, a gentleman of liberal education, refined manners, punctilious courtesy, and the nicest sense of personal honor. In relation to those under his command he should be the soul of tact, patience, justice, firmness, and charity."

Some of these attributes you now have. Others you must needs cultivate. But all the sterling qualities enumerated above might, in the Nation's hour of need, avail little, if you have not those other manly qualities of which President Theodore Roosevelt spoke when he said: "Every officer in our Navy should feel in each fiber of his being an eager desire to emulate the energy, the professional capacity, the indomitable determination, and dauntless scorn of death which marked John Paul Jones above all his fellows."

Many of the heroes whose names and deeds make brilliant the tapestry of our naval tradition have displayed personal courage of the highest order in the heat of battle. Others have distinguished themselves by the daring of plans for a venture made in the solitude of their cabins. But, whether it was Farragut ordering his ships full speed ahead amidst the exploding torpedoes of Mobile Bay or Dewey calmly making his resolve to enter Manila Bay, the fundamental quality which made possible glorious victory was willingness to assume responsibility for the act by which victory was won.

I commend to you this officer-like quality. I urge you to develop it in your daily performance of duty in order that you, at the crucial moment, will not be timid. The officer who shrinks from responsibility in small things will never be worthy of responsibility for great things.

You will doubtless make mistakes. Be not discouraged by them. It has been said that it is no disgrace to be ignorant, but it is unpardonable to remain so, if by ignorance a life may be sacrificed, a ship lost, or a potential victory turned to defeat.

You have the tools with which to work. You may feel that your studies are over and for a short time shrink from further study. But all education is a continuing process, and those who would succeed as naval officers will early resume the study of their profession. You will find pleasure as well as profit in exploring those avenues of naval history, science, strategy, and tactics which your busy schedule at the academy has limited.

Our ships of today are vastly improved over those of a few years ago.

Our training methods and the general battle efficiency of the fleet have reached an all-time high in excellence. In both there is still progress to be made. I feel certain that among you there are those who will contribute materially to that progress. Use your imagination and the tools of your academy training to give to the service your share of progress. It may be your contribution which tips the balance of victory.

I congratulate you not only on your graduation but also on your entry into that great fraternity of the sea, the United States Navy.

I congratulate your mothers and fathers on havings sons who could measure up to the rigid requirements for a commission in our Navy. I congratulate the American people on having such fine young officers added to the fleet which stands incessant guard on our ocean frontiers.

If every graduate of every institution of learning in the Nation went forth with the same brand of Americanism as yours, our security within would be certain. For security within as well as from without, the Nation must have more than the tangible elements of strength represented by ships and planes.

It must have that intangible strength as well, strength which comes from the primary virtues, from adherence to the faith of our fathers, from the keeping of that faith with our God. The liberties we enjoy in this most blessed of nations are not only a priceless heritage, they are a sacred trust. I have every confidence that each of you will always be worthy of that trust.

Perfectly Legal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News for today:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 10, 1940]

PERFECTLY LEGAL—ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

The impression is being given that the sale of airplanes, cannon, and small arms to the Allies is, as Senator PITTMAN called it, perfectly legal. Ever since The Hague convention of 1907, the United States Neutrality Act and the British Foreign Enlistment Act, 1870, it is illegal for a nation not at war to furnish any belligerent with troops, ships, munitions of war, money, or with commodities of direct or indirect use in war. A private individual can do it at his own risk. So we "sell" them to an individual—or do we?

Press reports have said that the Attorney General's office has approved this as legal at international law. What the Solicitor

General really said was that it is lawful to sell surplus war materials to an individual or corporation. He couldn't have honestly said that it is lawful for our Government to furnish its military equipment to a belligerent. If you can sell an airplane, you can sell a battleship—or a regiment.

What is this clever little scheme? It is, explains Senator PITTMAN, like trading in an old auto to a manufacturer for credit on some future purchase of a new one. Then, says Senator PITTMAN, "we don't know what the manufacturers will do with the stuff we trade in, and it's none of our business."

What do you think of that for frankness and honesty by a mouthpiece of our great and honorable Government? We know exactly what the manufacturers will do with the stuff. We procured them to do it, make it our business, and are a party to the deal. In other words, that statement is false and this action is a subterfuge to conceal something which, under our own law and international law, is an act of war.

Congress had under advisement the sale of this material in this way. A committee of the Senate overwhelmingly rejected it as a violation of international law and an act of war. It is the duty of Congress alone to authorize war. This is no action short of war. It is war. In defiance of the Congress and the Constitution, the President, by a slick trick has circumvented the war-making power and arrogated to the Executive a right to commit this country to an act of war.

It will be interesting to see what will happen to the Senator's auto trade-in theory when it comes to shipping our "surplus" 75-mm cannon. We did not buy them from any American company. We bought them from France. Is France now going to furnish us any trade-in cannons? They are not surplus in any true sense. They are the only reserve artillery we have. General Marshall testified that, instead of getting the new 101-mm guns we need, our General Staff had decided to recondition these old 75's because the new guns would cost too much and take too long to get. The fact is that under present methods they would take years to get.

Much the same thing is true of our reserve supply of rifles. We will get new semiautomatic rifles only 2 years hence, and then only for a fraction of the force we should need in war. We are not making any other shoulder rifles. What we are getting ready to send abroad is a necessity for home defense. The Navy planes are not even reported by the Navy as obsolete. They are "temporarily in excess of requirements" because the reserve pilots for them "have been ordered to Pensacola."

What is being done is an act of panic and imprudence, but skip that for the moment. The truly dangerous significance of this act is the Presidential usurpation of congressional war powers. He is frothing to get Congress to go home. He secured a recess to present debate on this. If he dares do this with Congress in session, what can we expect when Congress is gone?

If it is the will of this country to commit this act of war, let's do it. But let's do it without any small cheating, and let's do it as the Constitution intends, as an act of the direct representatives of the American people, who alone are charged with this responsibility.

National Defense and Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG OF MICHIGAN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, last evening I made an address over the radio on the subject of national defense and foreign policies. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about my viewpoint and my purpose, I ask the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, we are all prayerfully thinking these days about our foreign policies and our national defense: About peace and war. In respect to these things we confront a condition, not a theory, in the presence of volcanic European events. We must deal with it frankly for the sake of every human and material value we hold dear.

We are no longer "neutrals" except technically. We are now more accurately described as "nonbelligerents." A "nonbelligerent" is a nonfighting ally. By overwhelming national sentiment, and by administration policy, we are "nonbelligerents" on the side of France and England and Norway and Denmark and Finland and Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The transition inexorably began with the repeal of the arms embargo. It rushed ahead on the impulse of our deep sense of outrage and horror when one innocent, continental nation after another succumbed to the ruthless blood lust of Nazi and communistic conquest. It has matured in every ghastly bulletin from the shambles of Europe and in every program which the administration has serially developed. It has both sound and unsound stimulations. It is sometimes fed by an unreasoning anxiety that America herself is in imminent danger of extermination if the Allies lose. On the other hand, it more solidly flows from the clear conception that America is safer if the Allies win; and it has real substance in the necessities which might confront us, under the Monroe Doctrine, if the Allies do lose.

There is no use in longer arguing the merits of this transition. It is here. We are no longer "neutrals." We are "nonbelligerents" on the allied side. The rational thing for all Americans is to face these unavoidable facts—clearly and cool-headedly—on the basis of these irretraceable developments. The only practical question today is: Where now, and what next?

The problems of a nonbelligerent, which still hopefully says it has no intention of becoming a belligerent, are far more delicate and dangerous than the problems of a neutral, because it is a difficult and perilous role to be half in and half out of this war. Therefore, there is greater need than ever for care and prudence in charting our course, lest inflammatory exhortation, on the one hand, and impulsive emotions, on the other, shall force us unwittingly to the final step which makes a full-fledged belligerent out of us, despite the universal assurance and demand that we shall stop short of this final plunge.

Let us try, then, to examine a few basic considerations.

First. There is no such thing as literal isolation in this foreshortened world as a result of recent events at home and abroad. Recent events have been no more destructive of isolation than of many another "preblitzkrieg" conception. The simple truth is that we face new world facts. We may still be nationalists as distinguished from internationalists. We may still be noninterventionists. We may still be insulationists. I am personally all of these things. But we cannot be isolationists.

Second. The problems of the United States are simplified if the Allies win. One very practical example will suffice. All of these Allies have American possessions. Their disposition, in the event of Allied defeat, may become an immediate challenge to our Monroe Doctrine. If this war should come to the Western Hemisphere in challenge to the Monroe Doctrine (which, for this purpose, includes Canada), we shall become belligerents overnight. I have voted within the week—with a unanimous Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that no possessions in this New World may be transferred to a non-American power. It is straight notice that we consider it our business to stop conquest in the Western Hemisphere. We have said the same thing for 100 years. It is our business. There is but one belligerent to whom it could ultimately apply. At this point we would fight. But I beg of you, my fellow countrymen, to remember that we must have something to fight with, and we must have it here and not in Europe.

Now these two paragraphs describe tangible reasons—entirely aside from our abhorrence of Mr. Hitler's demonstration during the last 6 months of contempt for international good faith, and for the humanities we cherish, and for the democracy we love—these two paragraphs describe tangible reasons why the United States has a definite stake in Allied victory. But before we measure the extent of this stake, and what we should do about it, let's examine a few other basic considerations for the sake of ultimately arriving at the right answer for America, against whom, remember, no nation has committed one single act of war.

First. America is not automatically lost if the Allies lose. Our interests are not that inseverable. If they are inseverable we ought to go to war tomorrow with everything we possess and any other course would be cowardly suicide. But 99 percent of our most earnest interventionists insist they would stop short of actual war participation. Therefore, it must be that we generally agree Allied fate and ours are not necessarily one and the same. We want and we intend that America shall survive no matter who wins in Europe. We intend to survive in the post-war world whatever it may be. I am frank to express my own view that an exhausted Nazi conqueror is not calculated soon to ask for more war when once he lapses into armistice. But I do not suggest that we rely upon this thesis. I suggest simply that our prospectus must contemplate our ability to survive regardless of who wins in Europe.

Second. Though "isolation" is out, "insulation" still remains. The two oceans are still, relatively, our priceless friends despite alarming time tables which fabulously magnify our hazards. But the oceans alone are not enough. We must arm against all eventualities. As swiftly as possible we must build an impregnable national defense. Not for war in Europe—God forbid! But against war if it ever comes to our own homeland or any of its essential outposts. We can allow nothing to interfere with this objective, and we dare not subordinate this objective to any other consideration, no matter how nobly meditated or persuasively urged. We must prepare conclusively to defend ourselves and New World democracy under the Monroe Doctrine. That is our responsibility. It also is our greatest promise of final influence in behalf of those nations with which we sympathize when the ultimate world readjustments come.

Now, when we lay this second set of fundamentals alongside of the first set of fundamentals, our proper course—as "non-

belligerents"—begins to take clear pattern. Since our foreign policy has traded "neutrality" for "help-the-Allies-non-belligerence," we should render this help to the utmost of our capacities within our obligations under treaties and international law—but always limited by two additional restrictions. These limitations, always insistently proclaimed by the authors of our new policy themselves, are that we shall not under any circumstances actually enter this war abroad, and we shall not impair the essential nucleus of our own presently meager defenses for the sake of arming others.

Our paramount requirement is that we shall constantly remember the limitations as well as the premise. It is too tragically easy for the transition from neutrality to non-belligerence to maintain a frenzied tempo which races on and over the precipice, despite sincerest motives to the contrary. A parachutist has some difficulty in deciding not to be a parachutist after the parachute starts to descend. So, I repeat, this new role of non-belligerent—a sort of twilight zone between war and peace—puts the duty of a greatly intensified vigilance upon us to see to it that while we help the Allies, we do not hurt America while assuming that we help America.

Now, let's examine a few more fundamentals in the light of these conclusions.

First. If we go to war—or if we drift into war—we shall substantially lose all of our own liberties overnight in a regimentation which will curse us with all the plagues of dictatorship; and, even in our ultimate victory, we should sit amid the ashes of our own bankruptcy and disintegration. I have seen the case stated no better than in an editorial sentence in the Detroit News: "We do not believe anything to be gained for America and American democracy by helping the Allies, can compare with what would be lost by involvement in this war." Here let me add one statement of fact, not argumentatively, but to make the record complete. If, as a result of what may be construed as direct intervention by our Government, if Germany should declare war on us, we should be at war regardless of our own purpose to the contrary. This is not to be feared, if it be our own deliberate purpose, but it is not to be ignored in considering the status we propose to occupy.

It almost seems silly to even mention international law at the moment of its complete disappearance from Europe. I do so only that we may have fully in mind the implications of what we shall do. Article VI of The Hague Convention binds us to an acceptance of the following doctrine:

"The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power (which is what we legally are presumed to be, to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war materials of any kind whatever is forbidden."

This does not apply to our commercial trade. It would apply to our Government. I do not characterize the President's recent order respecting the trade-in of Army and Navy supplies. The case is not entirely clear. I simply state the facts, because the American people are entitled to all of the facts when peace or war is the issue. Personally, I shall not vote to go to war indirectly unless I am willing to vote to go to war directly, and this I shall not do unless the war comes to our own homeland or to its essential outposts or to our national interest.

Second. We are not prepared to go to war, even if we would, and—though we help the Allies to the utmost best we can within the law—we dare not hamper or impair the new beginnings of a real hemispherical defense for our own United States on any theory that we can in some safe fashion defend ourselves by proxy on alien battlefields. There is no final substitute for the self-contained American defense of America.

Let's pursue this latter theme a little further. The President gave us this advice a few days ago: "Let us not be calamity howlers and discount our own strength." Well and good. But here is parallel advice: "Let us not be wishful thinkers and pretend to a strength we do not possess." This latter folly ought to require no emphasis in the light of current European history. Indeed, the President himself has not hesitated to strip our unpreparedness naked to the world. We should fool none but ourselves if we pursued any other course. We confront a condition not a theory.

Aside from an excellent one-ocean Navy (which is now distantly concentrated in the Pacific Ocean) we are unprepared, in any real sense, to go to war or to approach it. Just a few typical examples. Assistant Secretary of War Johnson said this week that full delivery of the new Garand rifles to the National Guard will not be completed until June 1941, and that tanks and field pieces for an army of 1,000,000 men will not be in hand until January 1, 1942. Our new battleship program will not be completed until 1944. We do not have 50 fighting planes competent for equal combat in the technique disclosed by contemporary war. So it goes.

We are not only unprepared for war, but we are unprepared to do much more, beyond what is already being done, to "help the Allies"—until our own production is vastly multiplied—if we cling faithfully to the limitations heretofore set down. They do not need credits for perhaps another 2 years. They are already getting practically everything, within these limitations, which is available and for which transportation is available. Until we step up our own production, there is little more we could contribute except the very things which we need ourselves in the development of our own defense against our own eventualities. In this latter field we could only divide and dissipate our own strength in return for having made an indecisive contribution to those with whom we sympathize.

We cannot afford to dissipate our own strength if there is any such contingent menace ahead as we are constantly warned by the sponsors of our new status. We cannot have a chip on each shoulder and both arms in a sling.

So this brings us to another fundamental. Our paramount duty is the swiftest possible development of a completely adequate defense for our own homeland and its essential outposts; and our chance to substantially expand our "Help the Allies" program is largely contingent upon what we do to put our great industrial facilities into defense production on an effective scale to serve both objectives.

Although we have spent many billions on the Army and the Navy in the last 6 years—and always with the assurance that each appropriation would produce adequate preparedness—we have not remotely obtained anything like adequate preparedness. This does not intend undue criticism—because the whole technique of war has changed in the last 6 months beyond reasonable anticipation. But this new technique is about 95 percent a matter of industrial mass production. The Army and the Navy and particularly the Treasury Department cannot cope with it. They are no more trained to cope with it than they are to step into a great motor plant and run it. The old procurement methods won't do. They are too much a failure. We have paid penalty enough for them. We confront a condition, not a theory.

This is a job for a civilian procurement administrator—the best mass-production expert available in the land. The President recognizes this need by setting up a civilian advisory board. It contains the best mass-production expert in America. We do not yet know to what extent he will be given freedom of action and authority.

I express the hope that it may be complete. In whatever degree we cling to the old methods and procedures we shall cling to the old wastes and disappointments. Nothing short of supreme efficiency and expedition will do. I still wish we might see last October's report of the President's own War Resources Committee, which undoubtedly canvassed this problem in realistic fashion and undoubtedly pointed the way to essential reform. I still fail to understand why this key report should have been hermetically sealed against inspection by any Member of the Congress. That is an unhappy mystery which I cannot fathom. But this we know: The task of preparedness is not too difficult if private industry, at long last, gets the right-of-way. As a neutral we could afford the luxury of a little dalliance. But as a nonbelligerent we can afford nothing short of swift and certain results to produce a defense fully equal to the responsibilities for which we propose to prepare. Making appropriations is not enough. We tried that before. The important thing is how efficiently these appropriations are expended. And thus we see our own necessities take clear form, and our chance to help the Allies is in this same mold.

Now, let's pass on to some other phases of the grim problem which we confront.

In facing our new vicissitudes we could serve our preparations no more realistically than to write a new commercial and political treaty with Japan, if reasonably possible, which would stabilize our relations in the Far East, where we most emphatically confront a condition and not a theory. A pacified Pacific could be almost equivalent to half a navy in our scheme of defense. Still more important, a demonstration at the moment that two great world powers can agree in peace and friendship would be a beacon of hope in a world of gloom. The abrogation of the old Jap-American Treaty of 1911 has cleared the track for a new agreement unless statesmanship is bankrupt at one end of the line or the other. That was the purpose of the abrogation, as expressly stated in the preamble of my own resclution on this score last July and in my constantly reiterated subsequent appeals.

There is another phase right here at home which can no longer be smugly ignored and which has a direct bearing upon any decisions which may take us closer to the theater of war. Financially, we are as unprepared as we are in the physical field. Next March we shall have reached our $45,000,000,000 debt limit. Yet our tenth annual and consecutive operating deficit for this next year will be in excess of $3,000,000,000, without taking any account of these latest gigantic defense expenditures. The new taxes originally proposed, though heavy and burdensome, will only pay 20 percent of next year's operating deficit, with no account of these latest defense proposals. A crisis is obvious. There is no use blinking it. We are at the end of the road of deficit spending. We are at the bottom of the barrel. We confront a condition, not a theory.

A sound public credit is the first line of national defense. There is but one way we can fortify that line. It is the cruel, hard way of paying and paying and paying. There is no such thing as inexpensive war or inexpensive preparation for war or inexpensive deficit spending. Even without war, our problem is utterly serious. With war, it would be appalling. The "neutral" has become a "nonbelligerent"; but the "nonbelligerent" must frankly weigh all of these considerations before needlessly hastening by a single hour that ghastly moment when we go to the war or when the war comes to us.

This Congress should not adjourn until it realistically attacks unpreparedness on the fiscal as well as the military front. As a matter of fact, it should not adjourn at all so long as there is any emergency which calls for its cooperation, because no delegation of its constitutional powers and responsibilities to the Executive can adequately substitute for its own constitutional voice. We are still a peoples' democracy.

Congress should horizontally reduce every other appropriation, except for fixed charges, by at least 10 percent for the next fiscal year. It should reduce all Federal salaries above $3,000 by 10 percent. It should assess new taxes to pay our new bills. We cannot eat our cake and keep it too. So let's confront this condition honestly and courageously, no matter how disagreeable the task. The administration's initially proposed little tax bill was not much more than a mustard plaster on a cancer.

There is still another phase at home—the treachery of the Trojan horse—the technique of the "fifth column." We are more susceptible to it than any other land because of our zeals for civil liberties. These zeals must be kept courageously alive. On the other hand, there is nothing in the Bill of Rights which requires Columbia to nurse a viper in her bosom. Those who are not for us are against us; and the quicker we draw this line, the safer we shall be. No party which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force has a right upon our ballots; and no subversive activities—aimed at our destruction from within—have a right to survive when we are closing ranks to protect the Republic. Here, again, we confront a condition, not a theory: and, unfortunately, we confront it within the very ranks of Government itself.

Now let me recapitulate. We want a national defense which will meet every emergency—and Congress, without regard to party, is voting almost unanimously for all the President asks in this respect. We want a foreign policy which, while frankly and helpfully recognizing our obvious allied interest under present conditions, does not needlessly intensify this emergency nor create new ones.

The American people, myself emphatically included, want the Allies to win. Most of us are ready wholeheartedly to help—but it is vital that this help stay within the essential limitations I have described. But, above all else, the American people insistently demand that we keep out of war itself abroad: and they are eternally right in this demand. We have ceased to be "neutrals." That is water over the dam. We are "nonbelligerents"—and we must not drop the "non," unless the war comes to our homeland or its essential outposts. We must not critically impair our own essential defenses to make indecisive contribution to the defense of others. We must prepare to survive in the post-war world, whatever it may be.

We want complete and adequate defense. We want effective expenditure of our prodigal defense appropriations. We want to get what we are paying for. Then, for the sake of our own indispensable solvency, we must prepare to meet the bills. There is no need for hysteria. Hysteria defeats reason. We can do no better than to recall the sturdy words of President Roosevelt when, in 1933, he was in the midst of an earlier crisis. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyses" our judgments. It was good advice then. It is good advice now. We are entitled to deepest apprehensions and we are justified in preparing for a maximum emergency; but America can survive in tomorrow's world—whatever that world may be—if we think things through and if we consult American necessity at every turn of the hard road. There is need for cool, deliberate judgments. There is need for unity of action after full, free, and untrammeled discussion. There is need to protect our democracy against attack from ambush and against its own disintegration. There is no need for us to go overseas and join this war abroad; and there is no justification for any policies which would threaten this calamity. The place for us finally to "save democracy" is right here at home.

Reconstruction of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESSES BY PRESIDENT KALLIO, OF FINLAND

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, in the turbulent and seething war-mad Europe, we can but admire the people of the Republic of Finland, who are turning their attention with vigor to the paths of peace, after a compulsory peace following the short but bloody war with the Soviet war machine. The Finns preserved their independence and their freedom, they preserved their institutions and their government.

Led by their president, Mr. Kyosti Kallio, they are facing resolutely the tasks that will bring order out of the war conditions. The inspirational leadership of this little republic is evident in the addresses of President Kallio, which I desire to extend into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Two addresses, one on the occasion of the signing of the treaty of peace on March 14, 1940, and the other on the occasion of the resignation of the government on March 27, 1940. I ask it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPPECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND, MARCH 14, 1940

Citizens, you heard yesterday over the wireless and read today in your newspapers the peace terms, on the basis of which we shall now have to build up our future.

We have experienced, to our astonishment, the revival in the Soviet Union of the interests of Peter the Great. We see, repeated once again, the striving which our history has known so often, to cut off a great part of the province of Viipuri, and of its liberty-loving population, from the nation to which, on racial, historical, and geographical grounds, it rightly belongs. These national ties, however, are so strong that we shall jointly endure and seek to alleviate the hard fate which has befallen both the citizens affected and the nation as a whole. And we must be capable of doing so, for the Finnish people and independent Finland with all our national rights are still left to us from the war, with the exception of the areas mentioned. Their loss is our deplorable misfortune, but history will place to our credit account our tenacious struggle for our right, a moral victory the value of which we cannot at present estimate.

The losses caused by war are in many respects hard to bear, but we trust that those civilized nations which recognize the fundamental principles on which our defensive struggle was based, will make it their duty to support us in the work of reconstruction.

Yet highly valuable as the help of foreign nations has already been to us so far, it is essential that we should trust in our own powers. A living sense of national unity has been our strength in the clash of battle at the front and behind the front. And it will be our most trustworthy source of strength also in the future.

The nation may rest assured that the Government's purpose has been to prevent by the conclusion of peace the continued destruction of the vital energies of the Finnish people in the unequal struggle with a great power which we have had to carry on alone.

Comparing the heroic defense our people have maintained and the peace terms, we are overwhelmed with grief at the mutilation of our country. Yet our brain tells us that we must concentrate all our forces in a unanimous work of reconstruction as we go forward to meet our future. And there are possibilities enough for us to build up our own future, for the Finnish nation has been preserved, our state machinery is unimpaired, and Finnish national feeling and honor remain, purified and more conscious than ever of their future tasks.

Our army, with all its equipment, is still in being to protect our existence, and the joint struggle has drawn us closer together, enabling us to feel more clearly than before our unity of fate with those on whom the horrors of war have fallen with the greatest severity.

We do honor to the thousands who have fallen in the defense of what was most sacred to us.

As for the army, I thank, as its most visible symbol, its foremost man, Field Marshal Mannerheim, who, with amazing skill and energy, has successfully, in his capacity of commander in chief, conducted our defense. I know that I am interpreting the feelings of the entire nation in saying that this war has brought Field Marshal Mannerheim closer than ever to the hearts of the people.

I join with all my heart in the recognition and the thanks expressed by the field marshal in his order of the day to the officers and men of the army and the Lottas for their self-sacrificing work and untiring labors.

The population behind the front similarly deserves recognition of its devoted work.

We must, however, remember that great and lasting responsibilities remain to be borne by the Nation, for the dependents of the fallen, the war invalids and other victims of the war, the population of the ceded areas and their livelihood remain our lasting concern. In this respect the work done by ex-President Hoover has been of extreme value already while the war was proceeding.

I express my thanks to the Swedish nation for the great sacrifices it has made on our behalf. My thanks are also for the arms and equipment which Sweden and the western powers in particular have generously given us.

The repulse of the enemy was beyond the power of the Finnish Army alone. It was impossible for us to obtain foreign aid on any considerable scale after the governments of Sweden and Norway had refused to allow the passage of allied troops through their territory.

I dare, nevertheless, to hope that the essentiality of a northern defensive alliance has become evident during this war also to our neighbors.

In the course of a short but stern war the Finnish has gained rich experiences, which point the way to it in the future.

I hope with all my heart that the spirit of unity which has upheld us in our trials will grow in firmness, for on it depends the prosperity and future of the nation.

Let us remember that our fate is in our own hands. Let us show by our actions that Finland and the Finnish people are capable also, in the present circumstances, of fulfilling their historic duty as the outpost of western civilization.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND TO THE RESIGNING GOVERNMENT: MARCH 27, 1940

On the grounds you have brought forward I have accepted your resignations from membership in the Government, although the cooperation between us and also with the House of Representatives has been good and founded on complete confidence.

The period of 4 months during which you have borne the responsibility of government, has been fatefully burdensome both for you and the nation as a whole. You did not think of yourselves and your personal comfort when, on the second day of the war, you consented to accept the responsibility for the government of the nation although you knew that this peace-loving country was not adequately prepared for war and that the aggressor had resorted from the first moment to the use of all the instruments of modern warfare.

In our great trial we found our firmest support in a people united and determined to defend itself, which fought heroically for its country with the inadequate arms at its disposal. And at this moment of leave-taking I can establish with pleasure that you, as members of the Government, did your utmost to secure a supply of munitions, with the result that the defensive capacity of our army is quite different from what it was at the outbreak of the war.

And with the same determination and courage, with which you fulfilled your duties during the war, you embarked, when the opportunity came, on negotiations for peace, to preserve the vital forces of our small nation from destruction. In regard to the immoderate peace terms there can be no two opinions among the nation, yet the people and its parliament have understood that even an onerous peace is preferable to years of sanguinary war in the face of great odds with all the terrible destruction and unforeseen consequences that would entail.

Our country, it is true, is mutilated, a matter which we mourn, but the Finnish people, alive to our duty, our independence, and our heroic army, these still exist. These are the foundation stones on which we shall continue to build up our future.

On my own behalf and on behalf of the nation I thank you for having steered, with incomparable skill and energy, the destinies of our country in its hour of suffering. And on my own behalf I thank all of you for your good and confidential cooperation, and hope that those resigning members of the Government, too, who are not members of the new Government I have just appointed will, though in other circumstances, lend their knowledge and experience for that constructive work on which all of us must now embark for the good of our country. I wish especially to thank the prime minister for immediately forming, at my request, a new Government, and consenting to continue with you the work of reconstruction to which with warm hearts and firm hands we must devote our energies.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

DISCUSSION BY SENATORS BONE, BROWN, LEE, AND WILEY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a discussion by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself on the subject of national defense.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcer MCCORMICK. This is the American Forum of the Air. Listeners from coast to coast are invited to hear the American Forum of the Air.

We bring you another program presented by WOL in cooperation with WOR and emanating from the Willard Room of the Hotel Willard, in Washington, D. C.

Information as to how you may receive a copy of tonight's proceedings wil be given at the conclusion of the broadcast. Tonight the American Forum of the Air wil be presented in two parts. First you will hear prepared presentations from each of the four participants. This will be followed by extemporaneous discussion.

Questions anent tonight's subject are invited from the audience here present and likewise from listeners throughout the country.

You may send a telegram to the American Forum of the Air, Washington, D. C., and an attempt will be made to answer it while this broadcast is in progress.

The American Forum of the Air is arranged and directed by Theodore Granik, pioneer in educational radio discussion and newspaper columnist, who will preside as chairman.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. McCormick.

With a horror-stricken world watching a war-torn Europe, with its devastating destruction of hundreds of thousands of human beings in a fury described by eye-witnesses as a "hell on earth," America looks to its own defenses.

Warning that a possibility exists that all continents might become involved in "world-wide war," President Roosevelt on Friday asked Congress to adopt an additional program to secure America's defense.

Leaders in both Houses of Congress indicated swift adoption of the President's program, which would bring the total bill for American rearmament defense to some $5,000,000,000.

But while Congress has been in considerable agreement on the question of spending the moneys for defense purposes, the problem of raising it appears to be the subject of much dispute. The administration plan would increase practically all existing taxes by approximately 10 percent, and increase the national debt limit $3,000,000,000. Concurrent with the tax discussions, an economy bloc is demanding that cuts in other Government expenditures should accompany increases for national defense. Another group suggests that the tax base should be broadened, to add some 2,000,000 persons to those now paying income tax.

Receiving considerable attention are the bills by Senator BONE, of Washington, providing for a war-profits tax, and by Senator LEE, of Oklahoma, providing for a plan to draft capital in time of war. The Bone bill, in which a group of Senators had joined for introduction and consideration, has among its stated purposes "to tax the profits out of war by steeply graduated income and other taxes" in order to provide for effective national defense and to discourage war profiteering.

As reported out by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the Lee bill is designed "to promote peace and national defense through equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to the ability to lend to the Government."

The bill provides that whenever Congress shall declare that war or the imminence of war has created an emergency, which, in the judgment of the President is sufficiently serious to necessitate the drafting of manpower, the President is authorized to have taken a census of the net wealth of the Nation; the said wealth of each individual shall then be subject to the borrowing power of the United States.

With Congress weighing these and other proposals and methods of financing national defense—and war if it should come—the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion on the subject tonight.

We are privileged to have as our speakers Senator HOMER T. BONE, of the State of Washington; Senator PRENTISS M. BROWN, of Michigan; Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma; and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

Following short prepared statements, they will engage in an informal, round-table, extemporaneous panel discussion.

During the second half hour of the program, our guests attending this broadcast are invited to submit questions from the floor to the participants. And again, in response to many requests for listening audience participation, we extend an invitation to our listeners-in throughout the country, who are unable to come to Washington to witness this broadcast, to join in the program by telegram only. We cannot take them by telephone. Kindly wire to the American Forum of the Air, care of the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. We will submit the questions to the participants in order of receipt.

And now, as our opening speaker, Senator BONE:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOMER T. BONE

Senator BONE. The whole picture of warfare has completely changed in the last few years. Any nation that expects to win a modern war is compelled to mobilize the entire population. It is compelled to bring within the orbit of warfare not only human beings who do the fighting and the making of war munitions, but also to lay hands upon the assets of the people to pay the frightful cost.

It cost about 75 cents to kill a man in Caesar's time. This cost rose to about $3,000 per man during the Napoleonic wars; then to $5,000 in our American Civil War; and then to $21,000 per man in the World War. Estimates of cost of the present war indicate that it may cost the warring countries not less than $50,000 for each man killed. When you consider a war on a large scale, these figures add up to total bankruptcy for all of mankind. Engaging in war now means straining every financial as well as physical resource.

Methods of taxation such as we employed in the World War would be utterly futile. World War tax levels fell far short of meeting the requirements of that war. Unless we tax to the utmost limit to pay for any new war as we fight it, we would pile up a mountain of debt that would utterly crush the generations that follow. It would go far beyond that. The financial impact of such a debt would destroy our system of government. The Nation could never pay such a bill. The staggering addition to our pension obligations after such a new war would in itself present an unanswerable problem.

There is one cold, hard fact about war. If your boy is drafted, this Government will not draft 50 percent of him. It will draft 100 percent of him. If it took your son from a $5,000-a-year job, it would not guarantee him any part of his prewar earnings. He

would receive the wage of a soldier in the ranks, although he would be compelled to give up 100 percent of his capital, which is a sound mind and a good body.

We have a constitutional provision which says that a man may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. When we draft your boy's body, that is called by some folks "due process of law," but the great minds in the legal world decided that this language does not mean what it says and that you cannot likewise draft property without paying just compensation for it.

Confronting the harsh fact that you cannot draft property like you can draft a boy, there remains only one way to make property bear somewhere near the same burden that the drafted soldier boy has to carry. There are no constitutional barriers to taxing income from property, and this offers one satisfactory way of making property subject to a mild form of draft. Certainly if the boy is compelled to give up months of time and probably his life or his health, the man who remains at home ought to be content to give up a substantial share of his net taxable income to fight the war and to pay for it, as far as possible, while it is being fought. That is why some of us in the Senate and in the House of Representatives introduced certain war-tax legislation. This legislation has been savagely denounced by some folks who think it is all right to draft 100 percent of your boy and shoot him to death, but object to a capture of a substantial part of the net profits of men during a bloody war.

S. 1885, now pending in the Senate, with companion bills in the House, would accomplish this purpose. If this sort of legislation had been in force during the World War, the taxes collected under the bill from net profits would have paid for the war when it was finished and peace was declared. It would not have collected enough money to also make the huge loans to European nations which were never repaid.

This bill does not change the present tax system, but merely increases the tax levels to a point where no human being could possibly profit out of war. It would not go into effect until war was declared, and would automatically go off the statute books on a declaration of peace. It is a pure and simple war-time tax measure.

When we entered the war in 1917 a petition signed by leading economists in 48 of the greatest American universities was presented to Congress urging that precisely this kind of legislation be adopted. Two hundred and fifty economists of every description in these great universities signed this statement. Among them we find H. G. Moulton, then of the University of Chicago; Thomas Nixon Carver; Albert Bushnell, Hart; and the ultraconservative O. M. W. Sprague, of Harvard University. Among the Yale University faculty members appears the name of Irving Fisher. It is of interest to note that Prof. Raymond Moley also signed the petition.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars not only endorse the tax program in S. 1885, but made a Nation-wide campaign for its adoption. Fifty Senators asked for its consideration.

It is sufficient to say that the bill allows all the normal exemptions and deductions now allowed in the regular revenue laws.

One thing you can be dead certain about, and that is that if this bill becomes law no one would make any profit out of war. That scares a lot of fellows who still hug to their breasts the illusion that this or any other nation can plunge into one of these modern total wars and emerge with its system intact. Unless both our parties are utterly hypocritical and lied to the people in their platforms, they will have to do the very thing this program calls for. If we do not mobilize the income of the country and draft it to pay for a war as we are fighting it, the only alternative is to add billions to the already swollen debt, in which event we might as well prepare to bury the American economic system, for it would surely be doomed. Financing a war now by going into debt would lead to a runaway inflation, which in itself would be sufficient to smash the capitalist system. Giving up the major part of the profits and net income of stay-at-home Americans during a war would be a comparatively slight contribution to preserve America and keep it as safe as possible and as solvent as possible in this mad world of ours. It would be merely the application of common horse sense and good social insurance. One need only contemplate the cost of preparing for war to realize what the cost of actual warfare might be.

It is charged, and with a great measure of truth, that our political parties write utterly meaningless platforms. I call attention to the fact that the Democratic Party solemnly assured the country that in the event of war in which the manpower of the Nation is drafted, all of the resources of the country should likewise be drafted. If the party did not mean what it said in that declaration, it was guilty of an outrageous fraud on those who trust the party.

Not to be outdone, the Republican Party upon two or three occasions likewise demanded that the Nation should draft for its defense not only its citizens but also every resource which might possibly contribute to success. As late as 1936 the Democratic Party in its platform pledged the country to take the profits out of war.

The Republican Party is guilty of fakery and fraud unless it, too, makes good on this solemn pledge. We would have no hesitancy down here in Washington in laying rough hands on the body of your boy and drafting him, but some of us get pretty lily-fingered when it comes to property. It is time for the American people to compel these two political parties of theirs to be men and not mice and to deal with the subject of war taxation and war profits exactly as they have promised to do.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator BONE. And now we present Senator PRENTISS M. BROWN, of Michigan.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PRENTISS M. BROWN

Senator BROWN. Time prevents any discussion of the question of whether or not large expenditures for defense are necessary. I spoke over the National Broadcasting System last Tuesday night upon that subject, and my conclusion was that while I think there is very little likelihood of the invasion of the United States by Hitler even if he is successful in his war against the French and English, yet we cannot afford to take any chance and must spend the money necessary to defeat any aggressor in the world.

Thus I have been converted from one who has spent military money grudgingly and reluctantly into one who feels that the time has come when we must arm ourselves against the most relentless and conscienceless aggressor of modern times.

The question tonight is, How can it be financed? That happens to be the question now before the Finance Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member. First, let me say that I do not think the job of getting up an adequate tax bill can be done hastily. I do not think it can adequately be done unless Congress does one of two things: Either remains in session for several months, or recesses with instructions to the Government experts and subcommittees to proceed with hearings and report a bill back to Congress in the early fall. I think the latter method is better.

Even without the defense program, our tax structure was badly in need of revision. We cannot pay the defense bill by a flat increase in taxes. We cannot pay it with one supertax. We must keep in mind tax justice. We must not dry up the sources of investment capital which is sorely needed to carry on a defense program. The tax bill must be carefully drawn with the advice of the Government's experts, with the advice of business, finance, labor, and the consumer. All are vitally interested. It may be that we can do something temporarily within the next few weeks, but I feel that a full and adequate tax bill should be undertaken.

Our national income for the past 3 years has averaged about sixty-eight billion. Our taxpayers have paid annually, exclusive of social-security taxes, just under five billion. You can see that about 7 percent of the national income is paid in Federal taxes. No one knows what the extraordinary expenses of defense will be. The present requests of the President approximate $2,000,000,000. These, of course, are round figures.

There is a general idea that these extraordinary defense expenditures should be spread over a 5-year period. To meet them there are three methods that have been suggested: (1) to tax; (2) to borrow; (3) to issue paper money. I reject the latter entirely as utterly illogical and against the interests of the wage-earning and salaried classes. The increase in money simply raises prices, and it is a long and difficult battle to raise wages to meet them. This leaves us taxation and borrowing. It is probable that we cannot prepare a tax bill early enough to avoid increasing the debt limit. Reluctantly I will vote to increase it. The main burden of defense should be borne by tax increases. The time has come when we cannot continue to raise approximately five billion in taxes and spend something over eight billion, as we have done for the past 3 years. This gap must be closed. Regardless of other considerations, the time has come when we must not only shoulder the defense bill but we must bring our receipts and expenditures into closer balance.

The estimates of tax receipts for 1940 are $4,800,000,000. The estimates of expenditures before the defense program was announced was approximately nine billion—in other words, an expenditure of twice our receipts. The expenditures for 1940 will now probably approximate $10,000,000,000. We cannot finance defense without using many different means of taxation. To my mind the following occur: (a) A 10-percent increase in income taxes with consideration given to some readjustments; (b) some additional excise taxes, particularly on whisky and beer; (c) possibly an increase in tax on cigarettes; (d) a tax on governmental bonds; (e) a tax on war profits; (f) a manufacturers-sales tax.

I do not favor the La Follette plan of broadening the base. The return from taxpayers who have incomes below the present exemptions is inconsequential. The main argument for it is that it will make more citizens tax-conscious and more interested in economy in government. I cannot go into a full discussion of that subject within the few minutes allotted me. The experience of my own State with the sales tax is such that I favor the enactment of a national manufacturers' sales tax. It has been estimated that a 2-percent tax of this character, with exemption of food and clothing, would bring in approximately $800,000,000. It is true that such a tax to an extent is somewhat more of a burden upon those in the lower-income groups, and I would couple such a tax not only with the exemption as to food and clothing, but also with a rejection of any idea of applying the income tax below the present $2,500 and $1,000 exemptions.

In addition to these taxes, I am firmly of the opinion that the greatest effort should be made to lay aside some of the present expenditures. If the defense program results in considerable industrial expansion, as it will, we should be able to get along without some of our present public-works programs. I applaud the President in his veto of the river and harbor bill. I think that a careful survey would reveal other expenditures of this sort that should temporarily cease. I wish we could make an average reduction of 10 percent in expenditures. I am frank to say, however, that I do not believe this can be done by a simple

application of a percentage figure to all expenditures—there must be some selection—but nevertheless, we should strive mightily to cut expenditures other than defense to the extent of five hundred million to one billion dollars.

In short, I do not believe that the national defense can be financed by any financial hocus-pocus, by any one tax. It must be financed by a tightening of our other expenditures and a careful, deliberate, scientific, well-considered revision of our entire tax structure.

My fellow countrymen, we may as well face the facts. There will be no material reduction in our annual expenditures, even when the defense problem is met. Many so-called emergency expenditures have become and will remain permanent. The total of Federal taxes necessary to meet our annual needs as far as we can now see them approximates $9,000,000,000 and will, conservatively speaking, for some years. This is about twice our annual tax receipts for the past 3 years. This is about 12 percent of our national income. There is no relief in sight. The only answer to our problem despite hoped-for economy, despite hoped-for passing of the war threat, is an annual tax bill of about twice what it has been in the past. Let us face the facts. Let us meet the challenge by paying the bill. Let us remember that no other great nation is blessed as are we.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator BROWN. We present as our third speaker Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOSH LEE

Senator LEE. For more than 20 years the soldiers who fought in the World War have been asking Congress for legislation that would draft capital as well as men in case of another war. Senate bill 1650 is my answer to that demand. So far as I can learn, there has been no other effort in 20 years to translate that idea into the language of a statute.

There are those who favor a proposition as long as it is in general terms, but when it is reduced to the specific language of a bill, they hide behind the convenient excuse of saying, "I favor the principle, but I do not like this particular bill," when as a matter of fact they do not favor the fundamental principle.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to discuss only the fundamental principles involved in the proposition of drafting capital in case of war.

It is true that the bill itself provides the detailed machinery for applying such a proposition, but I am not concerned with those particular details. I am concerned only with the fundamental principles involved in mobilizing financial resources for war purposes.

Any satisfactory plan must, above everything else, be capable of providing adequate finances as they are needed.

As I see it, there are three fundamental propositions which confront us:

First, should a system of financing war permit profiteering and guarantee exemption of profits from taxation? If you answer this in the negative, you must then answer the question, How could the Government sell enough bonds to finance a major war if the profit incentive and tax-exemption privileges are removed? This brings us to the second proposition:

Should the purchase of bonds be voluntary or mandatory? If you say voluntary, you must then answer the question, What guarantee have we that each individual would buy his fair share of bonds if, for example, they bore only 1-percent interest and were not exempt from taxation?

This brings us to the third proposition:

Should the amount of bonds which each individual purchases be determined by the individual or should it be determined by a schedule based upon his ability to lend which would apply to all alike in the same class?

Before any proposition can be considered fairly, it must be considered in the light of the alternative. Therefore, in considering my proposal for a system of forced loans according to ability to lend, we must consider the alternative, which is the voluntary method used during the World War.

Defects of voluntary system

In order to refresh your memory, let me call attention to some of the defects of this method.

First, I indict the voluntary method of financing war because it guarantees profiteering.

Normally, Government bonds bear 2-percent interest or less, but during the World War we paid from 3½ percent to as high as 4¾-percent interest on the war bonds.

In other words, if war should come again and we should use the same system of financing which we used before, the Treasury Department would, in effect, issue the following invitation: "Come on, boys, and profiteer again. We will double your interest rates and guarantee you exemption from taxation."

When America entered the war, the soldiers gave up civilian jobs at $7 a day and took their places in the Army at a dollar a day and a chance to die. This sacrifice was willingly made, but it shocked our patriotism when we came home and learned that 22,000 millionaires had been made out of a war that cost our buddies in blood and money.

Second, I indict the voluntary method of financing war because it is inequitable.

There was no uniform system by which each person's ability to lend was judged. The amount in many cases was left to the arbitrary guesswork of the Liberty Loan committees.

It would be just as practical to have a system of voluntary taxation, leaving to each individual whether or not he would pay taxes, and also how much he would pay.

The amount of bonds each individual bought was determined not by a fair and just schedule, but by pressure, patriotism, or profit, none of which are fair yardsticks for determining the ability to lend.

Third. I indict the voluntary method of financing war because it breaks down when it is most needed.

During a war the most important objective is to win the war.

In spite of the fact that the United States was not in the World War very long, yet our voluntary system of financing was breaking down. I know we are told that the bond issues were oversubscribed, which statement is correct but very misleading.

These issues were oversubscribed, but not altogether from a voluntary standpoint. In every nook and corner of the United States we had high-pressure committees going into people's places of business, going to their homes, going to public meetings in order to sell their quota of bonds.

We had strong-arm committees and kangaroo courts threatening and intimidating people to force them to buy what was said to be their quota.

The Government spent a total of $45,878,000 in order to sell those bonds.

Millions of colorful billboards were plastered all over the United States. Heartbreaking scenes appeared everywhere, pleading with you to buy bonds.

Several trainloads of captured war paraphernalia made tours all over the United States in order to dramatize that campaign. Boy Scouts, 4-minute speakers, beautiful girls, torchlight parades, and bonfires were all used to create enthusiasm in order to sell those bonds.

Wounded and disabled soldiers returned from the front and made tours through the country pleading with people to buy bonds.

In other words, after staging the most gigantic selling campaign in the history of the world, we were able to oversubscribe the Liberty Loans.

Now, let us look at the amount of oversubscription, because I believe those figures will tell their own story. The first Liberty Loan was oversubscribed 52 percent and that last one was oversubscribed only 16⅔ percent.

In other words, with all of the pressure and emotional appeal which the genius of America could create, the oversubscription slumped from 52 percent to 16⅔ percent.

Each successive bond issue was more difficult to sell than the preceding one, as indicated by the cost of advertising, which doubled with each successive bond issue.

But that is only half the story Now let us look at the rising interest rates which it was necessary for the Government to pay in order to coax enough money out of hiding to continue the war.

The first issue bore 3½ percent, the next 4 percent, the next 4¼ percent, and the last 4¾ percent; and if the war had continued long enough, judging from history, we would have reached the point where the Government could not have borrowed money at any rate of interest. Then we would have turned to the printing presses and destroyed ourselves, all for the lack of an efficient system for reaching the wealth which is in this country.

Here is America, with an estimated wealth of $350,000,000,000, and yet we had to fight two wars, one abroad and one at home, in order to raise $21,000,000,000 with which to pay for the guns the soldiers carried.

Ladies and gentlemen, we should have a smooth-working, efficient system which would raise money as it is needed, according to each person's ability to lend. This system should be based upon the backlog of the actual wealth which exists in the United States. It should not be necessary for the Government to stage a campaign of ballyhoo in order to finance war. We should have a system backed by the force of law by which we could borrow the credit represented by the actual wealth in America and translate that credit into cash. The plan which I propose would do just that.

Financial resources have been referred to as the sinews of war. At least, we know that two things are necessary to win a war. They are men and money. If we are able to supply the one but not the other, we are still defenseless.

During the darkest days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln went to New York to raise more money to feed and clothe and arm the soldiers. He saw that the bankers were holding out for better terms. He stood up with the fire flashing from his eyes. He said: "I can draft a widow's only son. I can take her only means of support from between the plow handles and place him at the front of the battle where his life will not last 6 minutes. But I cannot lay my hands on enough money to pay for the food he eats before he is shot."

It was true in the Civil War; it was true in the World War; and unless we do something about it now, it would be true in case of another war.

Now, therefore, I recommend as a substitute for our loose-jointed, haphazard voluntary method of financing war a plan which would bring about three major changes in our present method:

First, the purchase of the bonds would be mandatory instead of voluntary;

Second, the amount purchased would be determined according to ability to lend instead of pressure, patriotism, or profits; and

Third, there would be no profits, but each one would bear his proportionate share of the cost of financing the war.

Chairmamn GRANIK. Thank you, Senator LEE. And now as our concluding speaker, in the first half of tonight's forum, we present Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

Senator WILEY. Congress and the people of this country are awake to the fact that the days of American ease are vanishing. This Nation must equip itself so it can meet any emergency. Let us be realistic. That means taxation. We can't borrow forever. The bill for defense preparations must be paid. This is no time for political evasion. This is a time for realistically meeting the issue.

Any tax that is imposed should be based primarily upon the ability to pay. That's the basic philosophy of the income tax. One of the first things we have to consider is the matter of adjusting the income-tax rate. I believe there are three feasible suggestions which are now being considered by Washington officials:

1. The first suggestion which has been made is to broaden the base so that the income tax starts on single folks having over $500 income and on married folks having over $1,000 income.

2. The second suggestion is an income tax of 5 percent on all incomes over $500, payable at the source, just the way the social-security tax is collected.

3. The third suggestion is an additional 5-percent tax on all incomes without exemptions. This could be collected, or part of it could, in the same manner that the social-security tax is collected. It has been estimated that this tax would produce approximately $2,000,000,000. It would apply both to individuals and unincorporated business income.

The extra tax on corporate income should be such as the Treasury should determine to be sound and equitable.

In considering these tax proposals we must realize that our first job is to get preparedness. Our preparedness must not be obstructed by absence of financial resources.

The problem is bigger than simply raising the money. We have to see what effect a tax has on production, accumulation of capital, utilization of capital, savings, etc. It, therefore, appears, as I see it, that we'll probably have to have a combination of increased taxation and borrowing, because increased taxation won't start coming in until some time in the future.

Another reason why we shall need this combination is that to finance military construction it will require enormous sums of money, and if it is to be raised solely by taxation we may put a burden on industry which may be a destructive burden and interfere with our getting military preparedness as quickly as possible. That's our first objective.

I agree with those who say that the time is not far distant when we shall have to analyze our whole tax problem. There may have to be a restatement of that problem in terms such as we have never known them before. However, this is no reason why we should go off half-cocked on this measure.

There is no time now to revamp the whole system of taxation; therefore, we will have to put a tax through known as a defense tax or a preparedness tax.

I know that with our tremendous assets and our particularly large amount of idle money, we would have no trouble to finance a loaning program (and that's what some folks want to do—just borrow), but up ahead there is a day of reckoning, and we may as well face the issue squarely now and raise part of the load by direct taxation.

Closely allied to this tax program is the idea that the people must get 100 percent value in their preparedness program. By so doing, by saving excess costs, we will cut down the cost of preparedness. We want to find men who know how to cut costs for the Nation instead of increasing costs.

The ancient Greeks at Thermopylae swore to transmit to their children the freedom of Greece unimpaired. We have to choose now between leaving our children an America unimpaired, fully equipped to meet any emergency, but with an increased debt; or an America with less debt and possibly without her freedoms. This day demands that we choose what course we will pursue.

This taxation problem has many angles to it. If we were to attempt to finance the program by taxation, it would throw the burden on our standard of living and would delay the process of the absorption of the unemployed. By borrowing part of the costs, the burden wou'd be thrown on capital rather than on the standard of living. As the program progresses and conditions change we might raise more of the money by taxation, especially if the unemployed were absorbed.

Special taxes, called sometimes excise taxes and luxury taxes or war taxes, should be considered by experts and applied so that the tax would release commodities and types of labor and types of equipment for the program.

There is no need to get hysterical about the situation. This preparedness program should have a desirable effect in diminishing unemployment relief. In other words, a good deal of W. P. A. he'p could be turned into preparedness use. Likewise C. C. C. and many of the men released from the Public Works program ought to be absorbed in the defense program.

There is no fear or hysteria here in relation to this preparedness program, and with spiritual guidance and direction, we are going to keep out of this war.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator WILEY. And this concludes part I of tonight's American Forum of the Air.

And now, as part II of the American Forum of the Air, we present an informal panel discussion on "Methods of Financing National Defense—and War If It Should Come."

During this portion of the program, our guests attending this broadcast are invited to submit questions from the floor to the participants. We also extend an invitation to our listeners-in throughout the country, who are unable to come to Washington to witness this broadcast, to join in the program by telegram only. We cannot take them by telephone. Kindly wire to the American Forum of the Air, care of the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. We will submit the questions to the participants in order of receipt. Senator BONE will open the discussion.

Senator BONE. Well, I think it is probably only fair to those present and to the radio audience to make one thing very clear. This discussion has taken this sort of a slant. Senator LEE and myself have been discussing pure wartime taxation; that is, forms of taxation that would be imposed by legislation in the country in the event of and during a war. Our brethren, Senator BROWN and Senator WILEY, have been discussing forms of taxation that would and should be applied now to meet the present-day needs of military and naval expansion. I think we are all in agreement on that, are we not? So that there is no point of difference here.

Senator LEE and I were merely discussing what we thought ought to be done to finance a war which may or may not be imminent—God knows I wouldn't suggest that it is imminent, because I think there is enough ill-grounded fear in the country of our immediate participation.

Mr. LEE. May I chip in there, Senator BONE, to say that I agree on that that Senator BONE has discussed, an excess-profits tax. I am a coauthor of that and an enthusiastic supporter. I have discussed a wartime loan proposition that would be in the form of a forced loan. You cannot finance a war as you fight it. No nation has ever been able to. England was able to pay only 36 percent with the steep tax she had before.

Senator BONE'S measure would raise revenue to help retire the bonds that would be purchased under the bill which I advocate.

Mr. BROWN. In my judgment, the main question before the American people at the present time is this: Shall we immediately prepare to defend ourselves? The methods of financing are not so important at the present time as is the fact that we must be doing that job. I believe that the American people are ready to undertake a much heavier tax burden than they have undertaken in the past. No one could say that war ever brings with it any good thing, but in this particular case a realization has been brought to the American people of the necessity of meeting their financial obligations. We have too long been going on without undertaking the full burden of our present needs.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. WILEY, would you care to say something?

Mr. WILEY. I don't want to get into any altercation or discussion with my associates here in relation to the merits of their bills. In fact, I joined with some of my brethren to bring the bills into the open because I think the subject of taxation is one that every unborn child is interested in, together with us who are living in this day and generation.

The thing that I do agree with, after examining the bill—and I say frankly about the bill introduced by Mr. LEE, which was disapproved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy on the ground that the plan to force the loan is not conducive to peace and not in the interest of national defense—that I rather think that I agree fully with those conclusions. I cannot see how the bill would promote peace or national defense. The language of one of the alleged objectives is, to wit, drafting the amount of money according to the ability of the individual to lend, but an examination of the language of the bill doesn't bear out, to me, that that result will follow.

Mr. LEE. Do you think we should borrow money on a voluntary basis?

Mr. WILEY. I want to conclude this statement here.

There are a good many other objectives. Among them I don't think the bill is feasible or workable. For instance, when you talk about going out and taking an inventory of the assets and then base that inventory value as something that the Government should compel a loan on, every one of us knows that the values we have today, if a war comes or if something else happens, generally go out the window tomorrow, with the result that any inventory in the first place is not something that is stable.

Mr. LEE. The bank requires it before it makes a loan to you, doesn't it?

Mr. WILEY. I am saying what the fact is in that connection.

Secondly, I believe the operation of the same would have a tendency to paralyze the economic life of the Nation. And war itself has the power to paralyze, without the Government itself making a contribution, the economic life of the Nation. In other words, values from which you derive income are largely the result of the increase in the economic flow. Just like you add economic life to a current: It gets rapid, it produces.

Now, for instance, yesterday this information was handed to me. It has been estimated that if we have an income in this country—and it will be about $70,000,000,000 in 1940, and out of that we will get income taxes of $2,500,000,000. Now my theory is that if you would put that two billion into operation, instead of a $70,000,000,000 income you probably would have a $140,000,000,000 income, and you would be losing correspondingly the money that you would want in taxes.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BONE?

Mr. BONE. One thing that I think every realistic thinker in the country must face now is the fact that the cost of preparing for war has risen in recent years. I am quite glad that my brother, PRENTISS BROWN, is the one that has to figure out the ways and

means of raising the money. But I have served for a great many years on the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and I want to point out to all of you folks here and out on the air that when I came down to the Senate a certain type of warship cost us $3,000,000. Today that ship is costing $9,000,000. The last battleship we built cost $27,800,000. That same type of battleship today will cost not less than perhaps $80,000,000—from twenty-seven and a half million dollars or thereabouts to eighty millions. If you think you are not going to be taken to the cleaners you want to change your mind. I served for two and a half years on the Munitions Committee, and I know how rough those boys got.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BROWN, did you have a word?

Mr. BROWN. I would just like to call the attention of the audience to the fact that $45,000,000,000 in round figures that we have on it—and that is the people's indebtedness—$17,000,000,000 of it is the unpaid debt of the World War of 1914–18. So I thoroughly agree with what Senator WILEY says, and what I think is the program of the President, and that is to finance this defense measure now, because we must keep in mind that we are not in war. Like Senator BONE, I think the chances of our getting in are very slight. But we must bear the burden during the time that the program goes on.

Mr. LEE. Senator BROWN, do you think that you can raise enough money by taxes to meet the present demands for national defense?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, I think we can.

Mr. LEE. Three billion dollars?

Mr. BROWN. A great many people feel that we could do the job without raising the debt limit, and we can't borrow any more money without Congress raising that debt limit.

Chairman GRANIK. I see a question from the floor.

Mr. WHATLEY. Mr. Chairman, in regard to Senator BONE's statement of increasing the cost of steel, cement, battleships, cotton, may I ask Senator BONE whether it is his opinion, in view of the admitted necessity of both financing defense and conserving the purchasing power of all the people, America in this instance can afford the luxury of highly speculative profits, which are essentially speculative rather than having a rational place in a productive economy. I refer particularly to steel, cement, particularly to cotton, and other such basic commodities which are substantially affected by competition and foreign trade and by dictatorial economists, and the obvious need of reducing the spread between the price the farmer gets and the price the consumer in the world market pays, even if it involves nationalizing to some degree the distribution of such commodities.

Mr. BONE. That question is rather too involved for me to answer it offhand. I can't see any justification for a three-time spread in the cost of preparedness. I have felt, and very sincerely, that we are only getting about 50 cents on the dollar in defense for every dollar of the taxpayers' money we are spending. They were getting 60 cents on the dollar. We should be wise enough and smart enough to get 100 percent of the dollar. I know that labor is not getting three times as much as it did a few years ago, I know that steel is not getting three times as much. I know these costs find no justification whatever in the mind of any thinking person.

The point is that we are entitled to have 100 cents in national defense for every dollar we take out of you. I think that calls for the most rigid and sweeping investigation, and if there is no other way to get accurate results in the way of information, if there is no other way to protect America, then we ought to nationalize the munitions business and build our own ships, and build our own instruments of war.

Chairman GRANIK. There is another question from the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. Does anyone know Secretary Morgenthau's solution for raising the revenue?

Mr. BROWN. I have no authority to speak for Secretary Morgenthau. I do know the estimates that were presented to the Finance Committee which cover the present Doughton bill, introduced in the House of Representatives. Without particularizing, the plan is this: To up income taxes by adding 10 percent to the amount that would be paid by each taxpayer, the amount of the tax, next March, to up certain excise taxes, whisky, brew, and cigarettes, which it was hoped would raise about $400,000,000, and income tax, $200,000,000. There were no other particular proposals in the estimates that were presented to the Finance Committee. I do not want you to take that as being complete at all. That would raise roughly $600,000,000, of which $200,000,000 would be raised between now and January 1, and the balance thereafter.

Chairman GRANIK. Here is a telegram:

"Please ask JOSH LEE if most effective defense step would not be to aid Allies? Would this not be cheapest means to safeguard America?

"ARTHUR MARKEL.

"WASHINGTON, D. C."

Mr. LEE. That might be. However, that involves another question. It certainly gives us concern when we think of what might happen if the Allied fleet should fall into the hands of the Nazis. It might mean the abandoning of the Monroe Doctrine and building a wall around the United States, and spending every cent we could raise and scrape for national defense, living under a cloud of fear the rest of our lives.

Chairman GRANIK. Another question from the floor.

Question. What is your collective opinion of a national lottery to raise capital?

Mr. BROWN. I personally reject that scheme and any other plan of that kind which is not based upon justice in taxation. Taxation is a means of distributing wealth, a means of leveling to a certain extent, speaking economically, and I believe that it is vital to use it in that way. Of course, its main purpose is to raise money, but I have never brought my mind to the place where I could conceive of our Government entering into the gambling business to raise its funds.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you have a comment, Senator LEE?

Mr. LEE. Mr. Granik, money can come from only two sources, either income or savings. Our national income of, say, $62,000,000,000 is not sufficient to finance a war of any major consequence. Therefore, if we finance a war we would have to do it by borrowing upon some of the savings. And then with reference to what Senator WILEY said concerning my bill, so far as his criticism was concerned I would just ask him back, what about the old voluntary system of raising money? Wouldn't it have all of the defects that he points out, and more?

Mr. WILEY. If I am to answer that question, I would say that there is a vast difference between our reaching again into a situation where we say to Government, "You can go right in now and build up another bureaucratic crowd," which this bill calls for, because you have got appraisers in every township in the country, and they shall come in and say how much you are worth, and then after that the bill provides that you are going to be assessed so much that you have got to loan to the Government. Well, if you haven't the money, then there is a provision in the bill that you can arrange with the Government to borrow it from the Government and pay 6 percent. But the Government need only give you bonds that would bear 1 percent, or not anything at all.

Mr. LEE. Then you favor paying high rates of interest in order to sell the bonds during the war, and allow profiteering?

Mr. WILEY. I certainly don't favor profiteering.

Mr. LEE. How can you get it sold if you don't make it mandatory?

Mr. WILEY. Well, that is a matter which I think the American people, once they are aroused to the stakes that are in the game, will come through with nicely.

Mr. LEE. It cost us $84,000,000 to arouse them, and all the volunteer work we could do before, and some bought who couldn't hold them. They gave them up, and the bonds wound up in the hands of the banks with a profit to them and a loss to the little fellow.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I have heard that argument, and I have also heard that if you are going to get an income in a nation, you can't strangle the source of that income. Let me show you. It has been estimated by the Treasury this year that we have an income of $70,000,000,000, as I said, and that will produce under present income taxes $2,500,000,000. But if our income should go up to $90,000,000,000 during a period—and that is what we are shooting for, more business—then under the present scale we would get income taxes of $5,700,000,000. Now what we are after is income so that the income itself will cut the load of carrying the preparedness program. In other words, we don't want to just borrow. If we keep on borrowing, we are just going to have obligations for our children and grandchildren to pay.

Now by using our heads we realize that sometimes too many checks operate to check the flow of the stream; the same thing applies in the economic flow in our Government.

Mr. BONE. You are almost going to have to meet wartime conditions here if we follow the program laid out for us now. I think we are all well aware of the implications of this suggestion of 50,000 airplanes. It takes a crew of 30 men to take care of one airplane. If we have 50,000 planes, that means 1,500,000 men in the standing Army to handle the airplane program alone. And they want 750,000 in the Regular Establishment. That means two and a quarter million men under arms in the United States, and if you folks have any idea what that costs you had better revise your estimates. The cost would be staggering, and that is a peacetime program.

Chairman GRANIK. We have another question from the audience.

Mr. MILTON HOFFMAN. I would like to ask this question from the floor. If a number of men wish to live in a house, some of them owning the materials to build the house and others being capable of doing the construction work on the house, isn't it just that all of them contribute of that which is needed to build that house? And we have the wherewithal in the United States to build our defense, we have the material and the labor. It should be required of both the owners of the material and the owners of labor to contribute in proportion toward the building of an adequate defense of the United States.

Mr. BONE. I agree with that; but even if we do that, the problem is how to solve the tax problem.

Mr. WILEY. That is it.

Mr. BROWN. We do that by the kind of taxation that I have tried to advocate tonight, that is taxation with justice, a just tax, and it is going to take the Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, the entire Congress, a good deal of time to work out a fair and just tax, but the result of it is to bring about the result that is desired by the gentleman who just asked this question.

Mr. LEE. But even after you have got your stiff tax program, I still insist if you fight a major war you are going to have to borrow. If you borrow, then when you ask people to lend are you going to put it on a voluntary basis or on a mandatory basis if they buy. And if they buy those bonds on a voluntary basis, are you going to leave it to them how much they buy? Then will

not the richest, who by training are more accustomed to resisting a patriotic and emotional appeal, buy less, or else will they not be motivated by pressure, honor, patriotism, or any of those fair yardsticks of determining the amount of money which each one should lend? And are you going to use the profit incentive or are you going to use a system to find out the financial ability of each person to lend?

Mr. BROWN. Senator Lee, I agree with you that if we get into war, it is going to be necessary to borrow. For the defense program it may be necessary to borrow a little, but by no means would it be necessary to resort, in my judgment, to the extreme measure provided in your bill. But if we go into war, then it may be necessary to do something along the lines you suggest, and I am very happy that you have suggested that bill to Congress for consideration if that unfortunate time ever comes.

Mr. BONE. Let me suggest to my brethren that the best estimates we were able to obtain at the Treasury indicate that under the measure S. 1885, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, signed, I believe, by all of the gentlemen at this table, if you were having the Senate consider it, it would have raised from the income that we enjoyed in the year 1928 some nearly $10,000,000,000 out of private income. That will give you some idea of the amount of money that could be obtained.

Mr. WILEY. I think we are all agreed that in case of war not only life but the property of the nation is dedicated to the defense of the nation. Our disagreement comes in relation to the mechanical device that will bring about the most constructive results.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to the American Forum of the Air presenting a discussion on "Methods of Financing National Defense—and War if it Should Come."

And now for a final word from Mr. McCormick.

Announcer MCCORMICK. Thus we conclude another broadcast in this season's series of the American Forum of the Air.

This program emanated from the Willard Room of the Hotel Willard, in Washington, and was a presentation of WOL, in cooperation with WOR.

In the interest of education, there are printed and distributed, free of charge, the entire proceedings of these broadcasts. When requesting copies by mail, please enclose 5 cents to defray postage and mailing expense. Address your requests to station WOL, Washington, D. C.

You are invited to witness the broadcast of the American Forum of the Air. No tickets are necessary.

This series of programs is arranged and directed by Theodore Granik, radio and newspaper commentator, who presided as chairman, and originates each Sunday through the facilities of WOL in the Nation's Capital.

Stephen McCormick speaking.

This is the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Free Institutions and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE BILL OF RIGHTS REVIEW

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Granville Clark, dated May 16, 1940, and entitled "Free Institutions and the War," published in the Bill of Rights Review, summer 1940 number.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bill of Rights Review—summer 1940 number]

FREE INSTITUTIONS AND THE WAR

Is there a clear and direct relation between the outcome of this war and the maintenance of free institutions as we know them in the United States? Is it really important from the standpoint of safeguarding our civil rights—which constitute so vital a part of free institutions—that the Allies shall not be defeated? If so, how important is it? What do we mean by an Allied "defeat" or a "serious defeat"? What would be the effects on us, the people of the country, and upon our children and grandchildren? If we deem it vitally important for us that the Allies shall not be seriously defeated, what shall we do about it? If we conclude to do nothing and let events take their course, what will be the position of the United States if Hitler wins?

These are the crucial questions now confronting the American people. They have been smothered and brushed aside and evaded. But now, under the pressure of events, they return inexorably for an answer; and at last they must now be faced up to with all the knowledge and clarity of mind we can command.

We affirm that the people of this country should have and do have a vital concern that Germany shall not decisively win this war. We affirm that this conclusion rests on solid reasons. We affirm that to ignore them would evidence a lack of reasonable intelligence unworthy of the American people. If this conclusion be sound, the further issue arises as to what we can and should do to prevent the result or, alternatively, to meet the contingency of a Hitler victory.

We discuss these points briefly. We do so because in our view all other public questions, from the standpoint of their effect on American values and the lives of all of us and our descendants, sink into insignificance before them.

Why is it important or vital to us that the Allies shall not be defeated? We cannot discuss that question until we know whereof we speak when we mention "defeat." If we mean only that after a prolonged struggle neither side can impose its will on the other, and that a "negotiated peace" is concluded, that is one thing which would be serious enough for us and the world. But if we mean an Allied defeat of the same character and scope as that suffered by Germany in 1918, it is a situation the implications of which have been clearly envisaged by only a small fraction of our people. It is of this latter contingency that we speak.

It is difficult to visualize what a serious defeat of the Allied Powers, in the sense mentioned, would really mean. It is hard because the consequences for the whole world would plainly be so vast and for the United States so grave that, human nature being what it is, we tend to shrink even from contemplating them. But that does not mean that it is wise or prudent any longer to hide our heads in the sand.

Will anyone be so naive as to suppose that, if Nazi Germany compels the Allies to submit as completely as did Imperial Germany on November 11, 1918, the imposed terms would be less severe? Surely we can now all see that they would be far more sweeping and ruthless. In the supposed contingency it is certain that the Allied naval fleets and most if not all of their merchant fleets would be surrendered or destroyed, their air fleets taken over, their armies disbanded. Thus they would be literally helpless before the enemy. It is difficult or impossible then to perceive why virtually any desired demands could not be imposed. It is hard to see how the surrender of all colonial possessions or even the dominions could be resisted with the exception of Canada and the West Indian islands (which we must prevent) and the possible exception of Australia and New Zealand, which we might prevent.

It is hard to see what could stop the actual occupation of a disarmed England and France and their subjection to virtually the same status as western Poland and Czechoslovakia. If anyone is so disturbed as to revolt at this possibility, has he not forgotten the power of modern weapons—the machine gun, the tank, and the airplane—in the hands of a ruthless enemy against an unarmed people, no matter how brave or how numerous?

It is hard to see what would prevent the complete occupancy or domination of all Europe and the Near East and of all Africa, perhaps in conjunction with Italy which would have become a subordinate partner in the division of the spoils. It is hard to see in truth why the whole world outside the Western Hemisphere would not be held or completely dominated by three great authoritarian powers—Germany, Russia, and Japan. It is hard to see how any free government could exist outside of North America and Latin America. It is hard to see how England and France, disarmed and held in bondage, could revive their power for generations, if at all.

If this whole picture be deemed too dark, let the flaw be pointed out. But let us squarely meet the hypothesis of a serious defeat for the Allied powers instead of any longer sidestepping the issue with loose or wishful thinking.

The putting of the case does not imply that we believe these dire results must come to pass. It does mean that they may come to pass and that there is sufficient possibility of their occurrence to justify and require immediate consideration of our course.

What, then, would be the position of the United States if a serious defeat of the Allies had actually occurred either because we had turned our backs and done nothing to stop it or because our aid was too late or ineffective?

It is as certain as possible that in the event of an Allied defeat as serious as that imagined we would not permit Germany to occupy the British West Indies. We would without doubt have to take over (either directly or as agent for the Pan American Union) Bermuda, Jamaica, Barbados, and Trinidad, and other British, French, and Dutch possessions in the West Indies. Rather than have Greenland in German hands during the coming air age, we would try, at least, to take over Greenland, and probably Iceland, both of which would otherwise fall to Germany. In short, we would secure our outposts almost as a matter of course. We would enter a firm alliance with Canada, and perhaps with Australia and New Zealand, if their independence survived. We would seek to cement our relations with Latin America and to turn the whole Western Hemisphere into a solid defensive alliance. At the same time we would proceed to arm on the sea and in the air on a scale never dreamt of in this country in time of peace, to organize our industry and train our young men, especially, by hundreds of thousands for service in the air.

There is no real chance that the United States would "lie down" in a dangerous world in which the rule of force alone had just triumphed. The American people, while highly unmilitary, are by no means unwilling to fight when definitely threatened (which

is a very different thing); and we would not wish to go down without a struggle. With all the measures just mentioned, and considering our vast resources of materials and of resourceful men, we might well organize a power that could stand off the world.

But even if by a great effort we could organize that power what must also give us pause is the consequences to the American way of life that would be involved if we stood virtually alone in a violent world in which the efficacy of force had been demonstrated.

In the material realm what would it cost to defend our interests and commitments in such a world? The mere money cost for military and naval preparation alone would amount to not less than ten to fifteen billions of dollars per annum. The figure may seem fantastic but let us consider together. We are about to spend over $3,000,000,000 per annum now while at this writing the fleets, the air forces, and the armies of the Allies are mainly intact. If those forces have vanished and we stand alone, is it not certain that a modern "two-ocean navy" on a greatly enlarged scale would be deemed essential and would be approved by the virtually unanimous consent of the people? Is it not certain, too, that our air force would need to be multiplied on a vast scale, our Army enlarged and equipped with modern weapons, our young men put in training? Is it not certain that universal compulsory service would be deemed necessary almost as a matter of course? Are not these things clear? If not, what alternative would there be except submission to the enormous military resources at the command of the dominant powers?

These things in our land of high wages and prices cost money. Even in the last year of peace England was spending for armament a sum equivalent to seven to nine billions of dollars per annum for us; and her preparations were even then insufficient. How could we with any degree of safety do less? It is as sure as possible that from the standpoint of taxation alone our people would be subjected to burdens never before even thought of.

But it would be in the intangible field of American values that the real revolution would come. The necessary preparation would involve organization. The pick of our young men would be in uniform; our industry would be largely harnessed to military preparation much as was Germany's from 1933 to 1939. We would live in a state of constant tension and pressures for conformity would necessarily increase. Under the pressure of self-preservation many of our customary liberties would necessarily be restricted. It would be a counsel of despair to say that this would be the end of the American way. We can even have faith that in spite of a vast organization of the national life we could still retain most of our essential liberties. But one thing is certain—that the tensions, the pressure, and the dangers to free institutions would be such as we have never encountered and that the avoidance of this condition of affairs is devoutly to be wished.

If this diagnosis is sound what should be done? Obviously the prevention of an Allied catastrophe is the remedy. But how?

It may be that there is still time—though not for long—by measures short of war to furnish sufficient aid to the Allies to forestall the consequences we have envisaged. We believe that it is in our purely selfish national interest to take these measures at once. Being weary of vague generalities—such as "we should sympathize with the Allies and help them" but without specifying in what manner—we offer the following concrete suggestions:

First. Repeal the Johnson Act so as to permit private loans to the Allies. If we really want them not to be defeated, what difference does it make that years ago they defaulted on their vast debts from the last war? What difference does it make either if we deem them unjustified in the default—a question upon which opinions will always differ? If we really believe that it is in our national interest that they shall not be defeated is it not common sense to aid them at least with private credit voluntarily supplied by our citizens?

Second. Let the law that prohibits Americans volunteering in the Allied armies be forthwith repealed. Since there are aviators and others who feel the call to serve against Hitler why should we forbid it? Their aid might be invaluable.

Third. Let our Government facilitate in every way the procurement by the Allies of the most modern planes and arms we can supply. Let no "secrets" be withheld; let permission be given freely for the sale or charter of our shipping in order to safeguard their lines of supply by sea; let our Government see that the terms of these charters and sales are reasonable.

Fourth. Let immediate steps be taken to stop entirely the export of copper, tin, rubber, and other war materials to Russia or other countries, whence these materials may find their way to Germany. It is said that a principal "leak" in the blockade is through Vladivostok. If so, stop it. What sense does it make to aid with war materials the formidable enemy of the Allies—if we really wish them to be saved from defeat? Incidentally, let us cease our objections to the opening of our mails—a right which we virtually conceded in 1916 and one which Britain cannot afford to forego without handicap. Let us cease enforcing such a technicality as requires exported war planes to be hauled across the Canadian border by horses.

Fifth. Let our Government see to the doubling, at least, of our merchant-ship-building capacity so that in a long war a new supply of ships may be forthcoming to insure communications. Let these new ships be sold or chartered to the Allies on reasonable terms, without profit.

Sixth. Let a great public discussion be begun as to the advisability of governmental grants to the Allies, so that, when they are needed, public opinion may be formed and the Congress can act quickly. Let this question relate to outright grants, not loans. For what is the use of piling up new debts that we know cannot be repaid? Let discussion proceed also as to other ways of private and governmental help, that would place our full resources, short of actual military participation, at the disposal of the Allies and the invaded small nations. Let Congress remain in session continuously, so that it may respond to the national need.

All these measures would be "short of war," in the sense that they would involve no military action. There is, indeed, no use in saying that they would be within the bounds of impartial neutrality. But let the Nation first decide whether it is a major national interest that the Allies shall not be defeated. If so, it follows that we ought not to fool ourselves by pretending to be strictly neutral.

It is, of course, impossible to say whether the application of all measures short of military participation would turn the scale. However, this is no sound reason why these measures should not be forthwith applied. Meanwhile let there be a searching national debate as to whether it is in the national interest to go further; and if so, to what extent and by what means; or whether we shall stop at measures short of military action and permit the war to come out as it may.

In any event, simultaneously with the measures and public discussion just mentioned, it will be only common sense greatly to enlarge our own military preparations and to solidify our national unity. Ordinary prudence requires that the Nation should get ready to play an effective part whatever the national decision may be. If that decision be to take a military part in the war it is apparent that our contribution should not be "too little and too late." On the other hand, if the decision be not to participate with arms it is none the less vital that we prepare to meet the vast threat with which we would be confronted in the contingency of a catastrophe to the Allied cause.

We submit that the foregoing represents a coherent program which we owe to ourselves as a matter of mere common prudence—if we really value our safety and our institutions.

If it be said that such a program tends toward war, as compared with a policy of drift and strict "neutrality," we deny the proposition. We are as anxious as anyone to avoid military participation in this war. For how could any responsible person be rash enough to advocate war except to preserve our integrity and our free institutions? But we sincerely believe that full aid to the Allies without military participation, accompanied by greatly increased preparation, instead of drifting us toward active war constitutes the best chance of avoiding it. Rather, we submit, it is the "blind isolationists" and the extreme pacifists whose views, if they prevailed, would most likely create a situation in which the American people, as a last resort, would find themselves involved in mortal combat or in a complete revolution of the national life as a means of self-preservation.

We have made some progress in facing up to the facts of life in the world of today. Many have been blind, many ill informed. In last September President Conant, of Harvard, in a letter to Governor Landon said that if the Allies "are defeated by a totalitarian power the hope of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization will be jeopardized." For this conservative and sensible observation he was criticized as a "warmonger." Will there be anyone to have that effrontery now?

Now, at last, even the most blind of us knows what the thoughtful and informed knew from the start—that this is a cruel and a bitter war. And even the most ignorant must now perceive that a German victory, with all that it would imply, would be a grave threat, if not to our immediate safety, at least to the maintenance of the "American way" of life. Yet our public opinion has still a long way to go before it realizes the full measure of the issue and before it will be able to form coherent ideas as to what should be done.

Most of all should those who really care for the integrity of free institutions and our civil rights encourage their countrymen to consider well what is at stake. Above all others, whatever their views on domestic questions—whether so-called radicals or liberals or conservatives—men and women devoted to the basic principles of American life should be most alive to recognize that these principles are faced with the gravest threat from abroad that they have ever been called on to meet.

It is willingness to face the facts, to think them out, to use our knowledge and foresight and imagination, that most of all is needed now. Will our people rise to the occasion? We should like to give a clearly optimistic answer but cannot do so. On the dark side it was recently said: "The United States is dangerously unprepared in its mind, its economic organization, and in its defenses to survive the twentieth century." On the brighter side we can remember that we have not in the past been helpless in emergencies when we saw the light in time.

We can be neither confident nor hopeless as to whether the American people will show sufficient intelligence and resolution to meet this crisis. We only know that our first duty is humbly to confess our past complacence and blindness and humbly pray that the clear vision and courage of the best days of our past will return to us anew.

GRANVILLE CLARK.

MAY 16, 1940.

National Defense and American Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES BY HON. HENRY F. ASHURST, OF ARIZONA, AND TELEGRAMS

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD short excerpts from speeches I have delivered in the Senate, a copy of an entry in my diary made on October 14, 1918, and a number of telegrams I have received urging American aid to the Allies.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22, 1940

AMERICA

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to say a word, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Arizona interrupt me at any time.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

I have already announced myself as a candidate for reelection to the Senate. I am opposed by two or three able candidates. I wish it understood that I am not disposed to go home in order to look after my political fortunes when one of the most acute crises in history is upon the human race. I am not just now paying much attention to whether or not I return to the Senate, must as I desire to do so. Whether or not I am returned is of such small importance to the Senate and the country compared to the present posture of world affairs that I am willing to remain here in Washington if it will be of any assistance to the country.

The President may safely be trusted. He has with such almost telepathic ability horoscoped the situation as to our foreign affairs that we may well trust him. Trusting the President, however, does not excuse us from performing our constitutional functions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with the Senator from Arizona. It is not a question of trusting the President. Everyone trusts the President of the United States in an emergency of this kind. It is a question of what is to be done in this situation, and as to Congress performing its own plain duty.

Mr. ASHURST. Much as I should like to go home, weary and tired as I am here, I shall vote against adjourning, and shall protest against any adjournment, so long as we have any further duties here.

* * * * * * *

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, for taking the time of the Senate at this critical hour I make due apology, and the contribution I now propose to make will be to read to the Senate a speech I delivered in the Senate over 23 years ago, to wit, on April 4, 1917, which speech will be found in volume 55, part 1, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Mr. President, of all the plagiarists in this world, history is the most persistent. History is constantly repeating herself. I now read from my 23-year-old speech, as follows:

"Mr. President, the United States is great not simply and solely because of her vast area, but because she never seeks revenge—she simply demands justice. Our Government came into life not only as the fulfillment of the bright dream of liberty-loving persons, but as the fulfillment of a task as well. Our free States are not mere abstract longings for justice and peace, for when the States were formed these abstractions and longing were galvanized into life and translated into communities seeking concrete justice and liberty.

"Civil liberty on this continent was a worthy but denied and baffled sentiment until it became articulate in our Declaration of Independence. The Declaration itself would have been nothing more than an eloquent and accurate recital of the philosophy of liberty except that its principles were vivified and enforced by the American patriots. Liberty cannot survive if it does no more than parade around in nightgown and slippers looking for comfort, safety, luxury, and ease. When democracy is attacked it must repel force with force. Democracy will not survive if in times of danger it does no more than preach the doctrine of philosophical nonresistance, simper sentimental regret over a deadly wound it receives, and with lustrous, soft-expressioned eyes view with pensive melancholy decisive action aimed for its destruction.

"If we are to keep our Nation powerful for good in the affairs of men and continue to work out the altruistic problems to which our country was dedicated, we must present to other nations an unweakened fiber, a courage both moral and physical, a mind free from trash and slush, flexed muscles and thews that have not been debilitated or degenerated by sensuality, security, and luxury.

"Our governmental system is and was intended to be one which shall be nourished by the individual instead of one which shall nourish the individual. The individual should give strength and sustenance to the State, not receive strength and sustenance from the State. It is easy and pleasing to indulge in smug complacency and self-deception and thus evade the unwelcome thought of national defeat or degradation, but it is neither wise, judicious, nor statesmanlike to do so. It is wiser and safer to be on guard and preclude all possibility of danger than to hide our fears of danger in the secret recesses of our closets.

"We are living in a day of wonders. Gigantic events are coming so rapidly that they tread upon each other's heels, and among the lessons being taught is the fact that men may be heroes, but unless they are drilled their heroism will end only in unavailing martyrdom. Our mountains are filled with copper and iron ore, but these cannot instantly be converted into battle craft. Preparation and vigilance only can work the necessary changes. Men do not ascend to eminence, strength, and power by a single leap or by growing overnight. It is only by steady tread that a man moves up the rough and rugged path to success. Those who reach eminence and distinction are they who subject their lives to the fires of intellectual and physical endeavor. Success and efficiency, in war and in peace, come only after many years of anxious striving and long-sustained effort. He who expects something for nothing has already begun to decay. There is nothing worth possessing that we get without effort. To compensate the world for what we use is the profound law of all life. Liberty, security, peace, health, and happiness must be paid for. We must face problems as they are presented, not as we should like to have them presented.

"So it is with a nation. It holds its place and preserves its liberty only by never becoming careless and by never despising nor underrating nor running from an opponent. Ever since the days of the children of Noah men have sought to build them a tower which they might ascend in a day of trouble and thus escape the hardships and the clash and din of this world. But such cannot be; under Nature's harsh yet profound laws we must meet and overcome dangers and perform duties; we cannot build a tower lofty enough to take us above and beyond the trials and duties of this life.

"In the annals of every nation it has frequently been necessary to protect innocence and peace by vigorous action. Persons who think with any degree of accuracy are bound to know that this is not a world of automatic righteousness and self-acting justice. Innocence alone is not sufficient to protect the innocent.

"No man making a pretense toward statesmanship would for a moment assert that it would be moral or righteous for us inertly and supinely to sit by and twiddle melting notes on a harp of peace, the while our progress, spiritual and material, our liberties—the most cherished deposits confided to human hands—the blessings of our industry, the fruits of our toil and self-denial, were being subverted or annihilated. It is honorable and righteous to oppose with force those who forcibly attempt to subvert and destroy any of the attributes which adorn and elevate humanity.

"A government designed to make life pleasant for its people is frequently obliged to take some immediate measures to insure the survival of its people. Sometimes in a nation's history it is required to be fearless as well as careful.

"Surely no one could quarrel with those luminous souls who advocate peace at any price. I respect them, but I am not of them. In their hearts repose sentiments of love for all mankind. They believe that Mars is dead instead of red. They think they perceive this earth to be a beautiful temple within which are walled peace, contentment, and plenty; a temple domed with rosy hues; a temple within which turmoil, strife, and struggle are blackballed, and from which all crime, vice, cupidity, hate, envy, rage, and revenge are banished till time itself shall be no more. They see, however, a vision of heaven, not of earth. Evil things constantly assail man on this mundane sphere. Envy, deceit, fraud, force, foaming revenge, livid fires of malice and hate, bigotry, cupidity, greed, lust for world power, and kindred evil passions inveterately attack the human heart and must be combated, not surrendered to. The liberties of our citizens—yea, our very security in the future—will be preserved by public servants who have their eyes to the sea, not by those who have their ears to the ground.

"If our country is to retain, as I believe she will, her historic position as the leader and noble pioneer in the vanguard of progress and human liberty; if she is to remain the beautiful exemplar, we must keep her, in senate, in court, in camp, in field, and in home, true to the principles upon which she was founded.

"What shall it profit a nation if, by keeping an unpunctured skin, it rots its heart? What shall it profit a nation to keep a full pocket and lose its soul? America must not only rear temples, build cities, conquer deserts, enchain the bolts of Olympian Jove, hew down mountains, and harness waters that pour destructive floods; she must also heal sore wounds, crush bigotry and race hatred, struggle for liberty, endow the youth of the land with standards of courageous patriotism, and constantly pour fourth her long-enduring strength for the vindication of American rights and the preservation of human justice on these shores."

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
March 30, 1938

SEA POWER

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it was sea power that saved Rome from Greece.

It was sea power that saved Greece from Persia.

It was sea power that gave to the Phoenicians the command of the ancient maritime world. Sea power built up the far-flung commercial empire of Carthage. Sea power made Athens ruler of vast territories, and it was sea power that made the Rome of antiquity mistress of the civilized world. Rome could not have subsisted without her sea power, because nearly all her wheat came overseas.

When Spain had great sea power she dominated Christendom; and Spain's decline began when storms and British seamanship wrecked her great armada.

The sea power of the American Colonies with the sea power of France won the American Revolution.

Although it would seem that Napoleon's domination was broken at Waterloo, his defeat really took place in 1805, when Lord Nelson off Cape Trafalgar destroyed the combined French and Spanish fleets and prevented the invasion of England. The naval blockade defeated the American Confederacy.

During the World War the Allies would have starved had it not been for sea power.

EXTRACTS FROM DIARY OF HON. HENRY F. ASHURST, OF ARIZONA, UNDER DATE OF OCTOBER 14, 1918

Monday, October 14, 1918

When the Senate convened the galleries were empty (no visitors allowed because of influenza); the sun shone, but the day was cold. Senators charged that Wilson had softened toward Germany and that (by opening correspondence with the German Government) he was resuming "note writing."

Senators were mystified, as the President had not taken any of them into his confidence. Many feared that the President's "altruism" would lead him to a reply to Germany that would lack directness. We knew that an ambiguous reply would chill the ardor of the people and depress the Liberty loan. The strain was enormous; the rumors were that the President's mind was not made up, so I resolved upon my own course; I called an automobile and went to the Executive Offices of the White House, where the President's secretary, Mr. Tumulty, read me a three-page letter he had just sent to W. W. urging that a firm reply be sent to the German note. Mr. Tumulty's letter was eloquent and embraced a coherent plan for future peace. I then dispatched a note to W. W., saying that I was in the Executive Offices and desired an interview with him. He received me graciously; we exchanged salutations, whereupon the following dialogue took place:

"Sen. H. F. A. Mr. President, you might as well know in advance that I am going to say plain and unpleasant things. The time for plain talk is here.

"Pres. WILSON. Why, my dear fellow, sit down and tell me what is the matter.

"Sen. H. F. A. Mr. President, the Senate, the press, and the people are nervous; they expect and desire that you demand an 'unconditional surrender' of the German armies. Please give assurances that your reply to the German note will be one that will meet America's expectations. If your reply should fail to come up to the American spirit, you are destroyed. It is now widely feared—indeed, charged in the Senate—that by your 'notes' to the German Government you are signing away with the pen much of the advantage that our valorous soldiers won with the sword.

"Pres. WILSON. So far as my being destroyed is concerned, I am willing, if I can serve the country, to go into a cellar and read poetry the remainder of my life. I am thinking now only of putting the U. S. into a position of strength and justice. I am now playing for 100 years hence; I laid down my terms to Germany in my fourteen points speech to Congress on January 8th last, and in my 4th of July speech and my speech of September 27th. When Germany fully meets our terms, we are through. Can it be that the people do not remember my fourteen points and my speeches of July 4th and September 27th?

"Sen. H. F. A. No, Mr. President; they do not remember the details of those speeches.

"Pres. WILSON. Well, I remember.

"Sen. H. F. A. Mr. President, it is feared everywhere that an armistice would permit Germany to gain some advantage by diplomacy that she could not obtain militarily.

"Pres. WILSON. I am not making armistices, they must be left to the commanders in the field.

"Sen. H. F. A. Do you intend to demand that Alsace and Lorraine shall be restored to France?

"Pres. WILSON. Read my speech of January 8th, 1918, wherein I said: 'The wrong done to France by Prussia in the year 1871 in the matters of Alsace and Lorraine must be righted.' Now what was that wrong? It was the taking of Alsace-Lorraine.

"Sen. H. F. A. The Allies should demand of Germany a ship for every ship sunk by the German submarine.

"Pres. WILSON. Such matters can be left safely to the peace treaty.

"Sen H. F. A. Mr. President, you should, as a symbol, require the German commander actually to deliver his sword to General Foch, Haig, or Pershing in Berlin.

"Pres. WILSON. Why?

"Sen. H. F. A. Because symbols, next to habit, most powerfully influence human beings."

He then asked me to speak in the Senate and say that the country need have no fear as to what he would do. I started to leave, and told him I was "somewhat" cheered. He said, "Why are you only 'somewhat' cheered?" And I told him that his failure to demand unconditional surrender would give him leisure in which to read poetry, and that he would read it in a cellar to escape the cyclone of the people's wrath, and I then walked out.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid with every bit of war material available.

Mr. and Mrs. G. M. ANDEREGG.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Seems imperative United States forward Allies all possible military equipment immediately regardless of their ability to pay. Our national interests directly involved and situation critical. Above has unanimous endorsement of our entire personnel and their families.

TOMBSTONE MINING CO.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
I am in favor of selling or giving to the Allies every bit of war material and other equipment that can be made immediately available to them. Vote to outlaw the Communist Party.

CHARLES O'CONOR ROBERTS,
1327 North Fourth Avenue, Tuscon, Ariz.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid with every bit of war material available.

FLORENCE L. POND.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid with every bit of war material available.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES NOSEK.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid with every bit of war material available.

Mr. and Mrs. E. HARDGRAVE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge repeal of neutrality, complete and immediate aid for Allies.

WILLIAM DE COOK.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid with every bit of war material available.

J. J. KELLEY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
United States Senate Building:
I hope you will support any program to send all possible aid to the Allies, whether they can pay or not.

MURIEL REYNARD.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Have President give direct aid to Allies now. Notify Congressman MURDOCK and Senator HAYDEN.

Rev. OSCAR L. SMITH.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Please vote to rush every possible help to Allies.

ETHEL A. HOPKINS,
Editor, Hoofs and Horns.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

HENRY ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Many here think we should send all our planes to the Allies free.

MRS. C. M. WOOD.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

SENATOR ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Please vote for any direct aid to the Allies.
HERBERT PAINTER.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We want direct and immediate aid sent to the Allies, please.
LOGAN FAMILY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

SENATOR ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Suggest every aid to Allies to stop Germany.
Dr. C. A. SCHOFIELD.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to use your influence in having this country supply immediately all available war material to the French and British.
FREDERICK B. PATTERSON.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate:
To defend our own country I beg you to send equipment to Allies before it is too late and we are left alone and friendless in a world full of enemies.
FRED C. MCCORMICK.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST:
Urge all possible material assistance be rushed to Allies.
W. P. MCCLELLAND.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Situation necessitates neutrality repeal. Complete entry in war. Speed necessary.
RUBY L. SAWTELLE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
For the sake of humanity and the United States, let's declare war.
JAMES M. SAWTELLE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Aid Allies now. Outlaw Communist Party now. Act today.
C. M. LEE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urge repeal of neutrality law and immediate help for Allies.
J. D. MCNABB.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST:
Urge United States immediately give Allies direct aid.
LOUISE OTIS.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
For God's sake, sell or give arms to Allies.
VIC GRIFFITH.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
United States Senate:
Give Allies every aid possible.
FLORENCE and ALBERT GORMAN.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Care United States Senate:
You must fight in Congress to back up France and Britain immediately with all our material resources. Thank you.
Your constituent,
JAMES RIGLEY,
3255 East Speedway.

BENSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate:
Strongly urge all possible direct aid to Allies immediately.
J. G. F. SPEIDEN.
K. I. JORDAN.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urge immediate utmost participation Army, Navy in aid of Allies.
J. B. TENNEY.

NOGALES, ARIZ., *June 8, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST:
The members of the local American Legion post respectfully request that you use your influence to cut red tape and enact immediate legislation to aid Britain and France by selling them any and all war supplies that they may need.
MERRILL KNAPP, *Adjutant.*

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 8, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Please give Allies all aid possible, airplanes, tanks, etc.
J. J. KELLEY.
W. C. PEPPINE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST:
Strongly urge immediate dispatch all possible war aid to Allies.
K. MCEWEN.
A. MCEWEN.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
In the interest of democracy, members of Mount Moriah Lodge, F. and A. M., Douglas, Ariz., urge immediate material assistance be given the Allies.
W. R. PINKERTON,
Worshipful Master.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
We are heartily in favor of sending all war supplies as fast as possible to the Allies, especially airplanes, tanks, rifles, and ammunition.
DOUGLAS LABOR COUNCIL,
E. F. VICKERS, *Secretary.*

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge shipments as fast as possible of all war materials to the Allies, especially airplanes, tanks, and guns.
DOUGLAS TYPOGRAPHIC UNION,
E. F. VICKERS, *Secretary.*

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to hasten legislation shipment airplanes, tanks, and all war supplies to the Allies.
MILLERS CAFE,
STEVE PRYOR.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily urge you to do all you can to hasten shipment of airplanes, tanks, rifles and all war supplies to the Allies as fast as possible.
BEN LEVY.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator H. F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urge you give immediate unlimited aid to Allies without any question as to payments or credit.
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CLERKS, LODGE NO. 716.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
We urgently request you to use all your influence to promote immediate aid to the Allies of every kind and class without reserve.
THE BARBERS UNION
OF DOUGLAS,
C. C. EDWARDS,
Secretary, Local 735.
J. W. RODGERS,
President.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Urgently request you to give all assistance possible in hastening equipment, munitions, and supplies to the Allies.
THIRTY REGISTERED VOTERS, EMPLOYEES, GADSDEN HOTEL.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST:
Please do everything in your power to rush planes, tanks, and all other war materials to the Allies before it is too late.

MIKE E. SIMON CO.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Urgently request you to give all assistance possible in hastening equipment, munitions, and supplies to the Allies.

F. O. MACKEY,
Gadsden Hotel.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned American citizens, urge that Congress adopt measures that will permit the Government to furnish the Allies with available war material, such as planes, tanks, guns, and other equipment, to be sent to them immediately. We also urge that Congress remain in session until this crisis is over.

H. E. Moore, W. A. Nowlin, R. E. Northup, Gladys L. Brittain, Pearl Ables, Ruth Derry, C. C. Wolf, Mary McMillen.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Help the Allies now with ammunition, machines, money, food, and medication. Destroy nazi-ism. Save democracy and humanity.

ISAAC YETTE.
HARRY GRUBER.
JOSEPH ELBERG.
HYMAN CORNELL.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Begin America's defense by immediate aid to Allies. Abolish pretense of neutrality. Send all possible material aid to France now.

Helen S. Nicholson, Julia Atkinson, Keyes Allegra Frazier, Helen Wetmore, Ralph Wetmore, E. L. Wetmore, Oralia Soza, Gilbert Soza, Mannuel Soza, Nelle Miller, Mable Hill, Louise M. Hoffman, Charles C. Hoffman, R. L. Parker, Ben Anderson, Mrs. Raymond Booth, Raymond Booth.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
We ask you to give England and France every assistance.

MARY KANNALLY.
LUCILE KANNALLY.
VINCENT KANNALLY.
LEO KANNALLY.
NEIL KANNALLY.
Oracle, Ariz.

NOGALES, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
On behalf of the Patagonia Civic Association you are urged to support any sound movement whereby our Government can furnish Britain and France with war materials and other equipment or supplies as may be made immediately available to them without involving the United States in an open declaration of war or other cause that might necessitate this Government to furnish manpower in the Eastern Hemisphere.

H. B. RIGGS, *Acting Secretary.*

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Please supply immediately to Allied armies all armaments possible.

FRANZ EBERHARD.
LUCY EBERHARD.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY ASHURST,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
The undersigned urge you as our representative to do all in your power to aid the Allies by furnishing them with every bit of war material that can be made immediately available to them by United States. Please relay this message to Senator HAYDEN and Representative MURDOCK.

W. H. McConnico, Joseph Higgins, Joseph D. McAllester, Chas. A. Logan, Wm. Misbaugh, Wm. J. Weaver, Paul E. Laos, J. W. Chappell, Frederick O. Knipe, Geo. F. Foster, S. E. Grimes, T. O. Bailie, W. Fred Kain.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senator HAYDEN,
Representative MURDOCK,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
As a voter, urge United States render immediate aid, financial and munitions of war, to England and France in freedom's cause.

MALCOLM MIDDLETON.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Arizona Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge Congress remain in session until world affairs calm down, also Congress retain control over National Guard.

O. E. GLOVER, *Attorney.*

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned, earnestly request you to exert every effort to induce our Government to furnish Great Britain and France with all available war materials and any other assistance possible to give them.

Power & Home Equipment Co., A. C. Sears, president; A. L. Ball, J. V. Hirt, Roy Lowry, Louise Lowry, Lawrence J. Hayes, Paul N. Elmquist, J. H. Camer, Elizabeth A. Sears, P. V. D. Neff.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
I am chairman of the war relief fund drive of the Tucson Chapter of the Red Cross and as such I should be perhaps neutral but personally I am in favor to send to the Allies immediately all war supplies of any kind we can spare.

JAN DIEMES.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge you to give all possible aid to Allies immediately.

MARY TORRANCE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

HENRY ASHURST,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Urge immediate and effective aid to allied armies in aircraft and munitions. Repeal present Neutrality Act. Do something before it's too late.

CLIFFORD R. and GRACE MCFALL.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Give Allies all planes and armament we can spare.

JOHN W. SMITH.
MARIAN S. SMITH.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
The Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Hoping you will favor all measures giving direct aid to Allies.

GRACE GALE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Arizona citizens expect your utmost efforts to immediately send every available bomber, tanks, and guns in America to the Allies. Remember Chamberlain's mistake.

Dr. CHAS. H. TWEED.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
My entire organization and myself urge you use your influence in helping the Allies every way possible.

GEORGE CHAUNCY,
Manager, Tanner Motor Tours.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Give the Allies all possible supplies in the way of planes, ammunition, and machinery.

FRANK B. RICKETTS.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
This camp supports unanimously a program of furnishing immediately to the Allies ammunition and equipment at present available, shipments to continue as fast as same can be produced without

injury to our own armament program. Members of this camp offer their service in any capacity acceptable.

CAMP BEN DANIELS, No. 8,
U. S. W. V.,
C. A. BRUCE, *Commander.*

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY ASHURST,
Senator from Arizona, Washington, D. C.:
Urge immediate material aid in every possible way to Allies.

RICHARD A. MORSE.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senator HAYDEN,
Representative MURDOCK,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
As a voter urge United States render immediate aid, financial and munitions of war, to England and France in freedom's cause.

ELIZABETH DAGGETT.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Let us give unrestrictedly what we can spare of our war machines, our surplus foods, and other necessary resources that may aid the Allies in prosecuting their war against Germany. With best wishes for your continued good health, I remain yours very truly.

WARREN WILLIAM.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Kindly rush legislation to get needed equipment, rifles, airplanes, and ammunition, to the Allies.

J. J. THORNBER.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
The Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Beg you support all measures giving direct aid to Allies.

MARGARRETTE R. TANNER,
Road Box 2751, Tucson, Ariz.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senator from Arizona, Washington, D. C.:
American Legion, Tucson, Ariz., demand you support all legislation to assist Allies short of going to war.

LEE GARRETT,
Commander, Morgan McDermott Post, Tucson, Ariz.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
I thoroughly approve of sending at once all possible United States Army and Navy planes, guns, and other munitions to the Allies.
Sincerely,

REGINALD JENNEY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge United States policy changed that our Government may furnish Britain and France all war material, such as planes, tanks, guns, and all other fighting equipment whatsoever, as may be needed by them and can be made immediately available by us. Approve course recently suggested by Senator PEPPER.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES B. DAVY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senator HAYDEN,
Representative MURDOCK,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
As a voter urge United States render immediate aid, financial and munitions of war, to England and France in freedom's cause.

BURCHARD F. TIEMANN.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senator HAYDEN,
Representative MURDOCK,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
As a voter urge United States render immediate aid, financial and munitions of war, to England and France in freedom's cause.

DORSEY MERCER.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Furnish England and France all war materials immediately available in United States with Godspeed.

Arthur E. Skillicorn, George Albright, Lucille Cheney, A. H. Strasser, J. H. Gooding, A. Nikas, F. M. Deshinley, B. E. Woods, Wm. H. Powers, W. H. Johnston, George Skillicorn, John W. Gibson, S. M. Stinson, J. S. Hardwicke, M. R. Rutledge, S. O. Miller, R. Wright Russell, R. Flanagan, P. J. Decesare, B. F. Berry, P. D. Frick, L. D. Park, Dan V. Cronin, B. E. Berry, I. Presnky, Omer K. Anderson, M. E. Beard, R. L. Martin, Clinton M. Gower, Ruth Webster.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senator, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
We urge you, Senator HAYDEN, and Representative MURDOCK, render every possible aid, financial and munitions of war of all kinds and classes, to the Allies immediately. Also urge that you eliminate all disturbing red tape. Furthermore, request this Nation discard our pretense of neutrality, and announce unequivocally the fact that we intend to render every possible aid and assistance at this critical moment to England and France. Please inform those mentioned above.

SOUTH SIDE CIVIL CLUB,
A. L. GUSTETTER, M. D.,
President.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 9, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Give Allies all possible aid.

GEORGE TOOLEY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 9, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senator HAYDEN,
Congressman MURDOCK,
Washington, D. C.:
Please give the Allies all aid that's possible, consisting of tanks, airplanes, etc.

FRED C. CARRILO.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 8, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
The undersigned American citizens urge that Congress adopt measures that will permit the Government to furnish Allies with available war material, such as planes, tanks, guns, and other equipment. We feel such available war materials should be sent to the Allies immediately, and that Congress remain in session until this crisis is past.

CARL H. COLE.
W. S. SCHLOTZHAUER.
E. W. RAY.
J. R. FROST.
M. J. ARNOLD.
W. W. CROSS.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Wish to advise you that I strongly favor our Government being permitted to furnish the Allies with all possible war material and equipment so that same be made available to them immediately and before it is too late to help them and ourselves.
Regards.

P. G. BECKETT.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 8, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
We earnestly urge you to do everything you can to rush planes, tanks, and other war materials to the Allies.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, DOUGLAS COUNCIL.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Send Allies materials they want now. Don't wait too long.

BILL ALLEN.
HENRY VALENCIA.
JAMES BENSON.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
We implore you, in the name of God, humanity, and America, to give all possible aid to the Allies immediately. Their failure is our disaster.

SOL GERBER.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY ASHURST,
Unitd States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Because of America's interest in the preservation of democratic ideals, may I urge cooperation of the Government of the United States by furnishing as promptly as possible, planes and other equipment to the Allies. Victory of dictatorships would be major catastrophe that would jeopardize freedom as we know it.

ALFRED ATKINSON,
President, University of Arizona.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senator HAYDEN,
Congressman MURDOCK,
Washington, D. C.:
Give all possible assistance to the Allies, consisting of airplanes, arms, and ammunition.

MAXIMO E. SOTO.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid, planes, and any necessary war materials.

Mrs. K. BOYD MOOREHEAD.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urge giving Allies direct aid, planes, and any necessary war materials.

GEORGE W. FERGUSON.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge that the administration and Congress immediately take necessary measures to ship to the Allies all planes, tanks, guns, and other equipment now on hand, even to the extent of stripping ourselves. In our opinion, it is imperative that action be taken at once.

GEORGE T. and JOICE M. FISHER.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Senator ASHURST,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Send Allies all materials possible.

PHILIP POSNER.

BISBEE, ARIZ., *June 8, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
Washington, D. C.:
Let me urge that you provide immediate passage of legislation whereby our Government may furnish to the Allies war material and equipment. This material can be replaced before we shall need it but England and France are sorely in need of material and equipment and we should do this much for those who are in our front-line trenches, and I feel definitely the Congress should stay in session until this terrible crisis has passed. We must realize our terrible danger.

FOLSOM MOORE.

JUNE 8, 1940.

To Hon. FOLSOM MOORE,
Editor, Bisbee Daily Review, Bisbee, Ariz.:
Your patriotic telegram appreciated. You are correct in your conclusions. War and Navy Departments seem to be moving with celerity in forwarding the materials and equipment before it is too late. You are also correct in your conclusion that Congress should remain in session to perform its duties and should neither dodge nor abandon its responsibilities.
Kind regards,

Senator ASHURST.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned members of Tucson Typographical Union, will heartily approve any plan which will provide an abundance of planes, tanks, munitions, medical supplies, food, etc., for the Allied forces immediately. We believe that relegating red tape to oblivion for accomplishment of above will preclude interference with our national economic situation in the future. Request support of yourself and colleagues for immediate action.

John Douthit, Bud Simms, Grover Linn, Art Fountain, Will Francis, Luke Encinas, Francis Smith, Harley Shaw, Mart Landros, Ted Wallace, George Byus, Jr., Sollis Runnels, Robert Hunter, Charlie Hill, Jr., Harold Royaltey, George Cooke, Ted Carty, Gilbert Tully, Art Warner, Frank Free, George Meskell, Albert Tully, W. F. Quesenbury, Jack Gay, Al French, A. H. Davis.

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned citizens of Graham County, Ariz., feel it is to the best interests of our country to give every material aid to the Allies, short of actual participation in the war. We urge you to put forth every effort to immediately release to the Allies war materials such as planes, tanks, guns, and other needed equipment that can be replaced. If the Neutrality Act prevents such transfer, then revise the Neutrality Act.

S. L. Crandall, J. B. McNutt, Charles Waughtal, Fred D. Jensen, G. B. Barney, Harold R. McBride, Spencer Kimball, Geo. Vongausig, Joe Horowitz, W. R. Major, D. L. Ridgway, Orville Green, Lamar Bellman, Sadie M. O'Bryan, Walter Searles, Amos Cook, Norman Crockett, S. Brinkerhoff, U. V. Walton, George Goldstein, M. K. Jimmie, Leo Cluff, Virgil Burtcher, Glen Posey, Mary Long, Carl C. Kohn, C. L. Richards, V. P. Richards, E. D. Householder, Mae O. Curtis, R. D. Lansden, R. J. Boegen, H. Hamilton, A. C. Leggett, Leland Branch, A. E. O'Bryan, Brooks Baker, D. M. Leggard, Elliot Long, D. L. Baker, J. L. Hammond, Jesse Aldrete, Roland L. Jenkins, Wm. Day, Dave Wolfson, Eli Krupp, C. M. Clawson, Jack Evans, M. Holbert, F. B. Rawson, E. T. Kempton, W. A. Peck, J. Green, A. Lieberwitz, Andy A. Blake, Willard Pace, H. A. Waters, F. B. Jacobson, Toed Waughtal, G. A. Golding, C. P. John, Mrs. W. B. Lewis, W. B. Lewis, Roxie Allred, Duke Morris, W. H. Riestem, Mrs. Christeen Norman, Otto Hagedorn, Weldon Birchfield, Max Wignall, Fred Goodman, Daphna Birchfield, Hazel Rattey, Gerald L. Foot, C. L. Roach, W. C. Rawson, M. Richmond, R. C. Williams, F. P. Misak, A. N. Despain, H. M. Carson, Jr., V. A. Lines, Sam Foote, W. L. Clare, C. S. Conway, Ruela Feine Foote, Archer Stratton, A. C. Rabb, Martin Toft, E. Clyde Avey, G. A. Rhoads, Wesley F. Jones.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
In favor of doing everything possible for immediate help of Allies before it is too late. Delay would involve calamity.

John Siegle, Dorothy Siegle, Benjamin Brunswick, Allie Mae Payne, Janette Ludwig, Otis Pinnell, Walter Murphy, Lula Payne, Carl Morris, Louise Morris, Fred Krivel, Rosemary Krivel, Laura Williamson, Stanley Williamson, Joseph Beebee.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 6, 1940.*

The Honorable HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned, believe that the United States Government must assist the British and French Governments by furnishing them all available war materials such as planes, tanks, guns, and other war equipment. We request that the necessary action be taken immediately.

Frank Drachman, Edw. G. Gay, Fred L. Blane, Lucile Jones, Geo. W. Chambers, W. A. Sage, Jr., M. M. Garrett, John P. MacIver, H. C. Lage, L. B. Martinez, Gilbert Acosta, Louis Renaud Gonzalo, T. Urias, Herman Fields, Clara M. Schell, W. G. Winter, William Davidson, W. P. Hearn, F. Orozco, Jr., H. F. Hintzen, Bernard Heiner, Roy Elias, Hobart W. Herron, Frank Rosas, Charles O. Giffin, Frank Gallego, M. S. Van Brundt, Amalia Terrazas Conception G. Soto, Joe Hubbard, Jr., Elsie Feuerman, Virginia Hutton, Georgia Nunez, R. R. Brena, M. Nevares, Sr., Frank J. Cordis, Grank Grijalva, Reuben Gold, Antonio Leon, Lee Jacobs, Bertha Celaya, Carl Griffin, Louis Caballero.

Commencement Exercises at New York University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY CHANCELOR HARRY WOODBURN CHASE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, June 5, 1940, I enjoyed the honor of attending the one hundred and eighth commencement exercises of New York University, which I am proud to claim as my alma mater. During the

impressive ceremonies on that occasion the distinguished chancellor of the university, Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, delivered a notable address calling for the rededication of ourselves to the ideals for which democracy stands. I feel that his very able and patriotic appeal should have widespread circulation. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to greet the graduates of New York University who have now received their degrees. There are nearly 5,000 of these degrees. As the president of the Carnegie Foundation recently pointed out, the number of degrees now conferred at a single commencement by Columbia and New York University alone now equals the sum total of all the degrees conferred by all the colleges and universities in America in 1900.

You who have received these degrees represent, in your origins, every country in Europe and every continent on earth. A few of you—comparatively few in these unhappy days—are here as visitors from other countries. The overwhelming majority of you have led and will lead your lives within the American framework. Your ancestors, whether near or remote, came to this country for many reasons—religious freedom, enhanced opportunity, freedom from racial persecution, love of liberty. But all of them came here because they felt that America offered something they did not have at home. It was the land of opportunity, the land of promise.

You have come to this moment as living witnesses of the fact that that opportunity still exists. I am not unaware—indeed, I have reason to be especially aware—of the sacrifices which your families and yourselves have made, in many instances, to make it possible for you to receive these degrees. I honor them, and you, for these sacrifices. But, nonetheless, there is no other country on earth today in which any conceivable sacrifice would have made possible for most of you the education which you enjoy. Here is a private institution, bound by no ties of party or creed, with no discrimination save that of ability and fitness. No matter how much individual colleges and universities may restrict their numbers and specialize their student bodies, it still remains true that the American system of higher education as a whole offers a more broadly based and a more varied educational opportunity than has been offered in any country at any period of the world's history.

If you ask why that is so, there can be only one answer. Institutions like this, opportunities like this, exist because America believes it to be important that they should exist. And we believe this to be important because we believe that only by the existence in this country of a large, well educated, well disposed, informed body of citizens, trained in accordance with their abilities, and contributing to the society in which they live, can our free institutions, in the long run, be preserved.

There is no one of you, no matter how great his personal sacrifices may have been, who is not heavily in debt to the social order which has made his education possible. It is no small matter to have been born, and to have grown up, in a society which has put at your disposal the accumulated knowledge and artistry of the race, which has made available to you its specialized skills and techniques, which has encouraged the search for truth. And, more than that, this system of education has not sought to coerce your minds. It has sought to develop you into responsible and balanced people, competent to weigh evidence and to arrive at sane judgments. Our system of higher education may be, as some of its critics have said, mass education, in the sense that it attempts to educate a great many people. But its aim is certainly not mass psychology. Nothing is more abhorrent to it than that regimentation of emotion and will, that distortion of the intellect, which disposes men and women to follow blindly the demagog and the dictator. It is rather centered about the belief that the individual has worth and dignity, that free institutions rest on our ability to develop free people capable of understanding and of directing them.

Now, the generation to which the majority of you belong has grown up in a confused and bewildering world. There was the profound post-war dislocation of the twenties; there was, in this country, the exaltation of materialism, the accelerated and hectic pace of life in every field. Then, almost overnight, the picture changed. There was not only a depression in industry and agriculture; there was a depression in spirit. Optimism about the future gave way to a deep pessimism. For the first time in our history the question was seriously raised in many quarters whether an ample future was possible in this country. The negative aspects of democracy have been kept constantly before your eyes; unemployment, the underprivileged, failures of individuals highly placed to meet their public responsibilities, friction between business and Government, insidious appeals to prejudice, voices proclaiming that democracy was an outworn way of life have resounded both here and abroad.

The result has been that that faith in ourselves which has been such a signal characteristic of our whole history has been temporarily obscured. There has been abroad in the land a spirit of defeatism which some day, I believe, we shall look back upon with wonder. And, more than this, there has been a growing tendency to question moral values. Archibald MacLeish recently pointed out that a school of writers, disillusioned by the last war had, in all honesty, written about war in such a vein that many of us had become so cynical that it was difficult for us to see that there are sometimes moral issues in war. Within the last few weeks two university presidents have publicly stated that "good" and "bad" were words which meant little to the younger generation any more.

All this makes up a depressing picture. It is well that a people should search its soul. It is well that it should become more keenly aware of the deficiencies in its way of life and that it should try to correct them. But loss of faith in ourselves and denial of moral values—these strike at the heart of our free civilization. If faith is gone and a sense of moral values is gone, then no expenditures for adequate national defense can guarantee our future.

I do not believe, however, for a moment, that these things are gone. Surely in these last tragic weeks there must have come home to everyone of us a new sense of the worthwhileness of the institutions of a free civilization. Denmark and Norway and Holland and Belgium differed in many details of their culture from each other and from ourselves. But they were like each other and like ourselves in their attempt to work out their destinies with regard to the freedom of the individual, the ideal of justice in the social order, the ideal of morality in international relationships.

They, and we, have preferred public opinion to the concentration camp, courts of justice to the Gestapo, peace to war, school and the university to the labor camp, liberty to regimentation, the public forum to the impositions of dictators, the right of citizens to live in peace together to the persecution of men and women because of their race and their religion. Who among us is there who can honestly say in his heart that there is no difference in moral values between such civilizations and the resurgence of barbarianism which has overthrown them? Search your own lives. Consider what they would be like under the rule of a totalitarian state.

Consider, on the other hand, what, with all its imperfections, the American State, with its free way of life, has done for you. Is not this thing we call our American democracy worth our faith and our support? Do its values not stand out for all of us in sharp relief against that of a system willing to wreck the happiness and future of the world if only it can dominate that world by force?

I wish that in this hour we might all rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which democracy stands. I wish that we might do this, not merely in our words but in our lives. For our democracy will stand or fall in proportion to the sense of responsibility which the individual feels for its preservation. Democracy cannot be imposed upon a people. It must be always an expression of their own inner spirit or it is lost.

What sacrifices we may be called upon to make in order to preserve our way of life no one can tell. But if only we, as individuals, have faith in its obligations and its ideals, and if we manifest that faith by our works, it will prevail.

CONFERMENT OF HONORARY DEGREES

(The candidates upon whom honorary degrees were conferred were presented by the secretary of the University, Harold O. Voorhis.)

Mr. VOORHIS: Elizabeth Cutter Morrow, called most appropriately to service ad interim in the presidency of Smith College, her Alma Mater, she has distinguished herself in so many capacities that the honor we would do her is quite eclipsed by the tribute she pays us in gracing this occasion. Whether as teacher and administrator, as leader in civic affairs, as alleviator of human distress in wartime and in peace, as poet and author, as first lady of an embassy, as stump speaker in her late husband's successful senatorial campaign, or as consummate maternal genius throughout in an eminent household, the measure of her remarkable attainments is the measure of our admiration and respect in tendering her our Doctorate of Humane Letters.

Chancellor CHASE: Elizabeth Cutter Morrow, to all that you have done in the course of your busy and useful life you have this year added an experience, as Acting President of your Alma Mater, which has not only been happy and fortunate for your students, but I am certain, enlightening and educational for you as well. It has seemed altogether appropriate to us that, as you are about to graduate from that severe curriculum in the field of adult education, we should join with all your friends and admirers in signalizing that fact, and in token thereof we pronounce you Doctor of Humane Letters and welcome you to the body of honorary alumni of New York University.

Mr. VOORHIS: Carl Sandburg, migratory songster of the prairies, whose stark, pungent, vibrant—and whimsical—verses have caught and cased in amber forevermore the idiom and the spirit of mid-America as is; son of a Swedish immigrant blacksmith, alumnus of antecedent incarnations no end: Bricklayer; harvest hand; hotel flunky; coal heaver; house painter; volunteer infantryman at Puerto Rico in '98; Illinois collegian; Milwaukee mayor's secretary; magazine editor; Chicago reporter; foreign correspondent; editorial writer; university lecturer; Harvard Phi Beta Kappa poet; author of a dozen books of verse; historian and biographer, withal, of Abraham Lincoln and his times, in a monumental work which, truly, also "belongs to the ages." May he now belong to us as a New York University doctor of letters.

Chancellor CHASE: Carl Sandburg, as American in your genius as Walt Whitman, yours has been one of the chief creative voices

of our generation. It was inevitable that you should occupy yourself with that great American statesman from your own State, who, like yourself, saw American life steadily and saw it whole. Because of your contribution to America and to American literature we today confer upon you our degree of doctor of letters.

Mr. VOORHIS: Horace William Baden Donegan, rector of St. James Church in this city since 1933 and, previous thereto, assistant rector of All Saints Church in Worcester, Mass., and latterly rector of Christ Church, Baltimore; educated at St. Stephens College, Oxford University, and Episcopal Theological School; trustee of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine and of other notable agencies of the Protestant Episcopal denomination; enhancing the rich traditions of distinguished ministerial service in a singularly influential parish, and at the same time devoting himself with conspicuous success to concerns of social and spiritual welfare that traverse the broadest reaches of the faith, he is a benefactor of us all, and we would now pronounce upon him a fervent benediction in the form of our honorary doctorate of divinity.

Chancellor CHASE: Horace William Baden Donegan, head of one of the important parishes of your church in this city for the last 7 years, you have demonstrated qualities of religious leadership of a distinctive character, while at the same time you have administered with great skill the affairs of your parish. It is with pleasure that we now confer upon you our degree of doctor of divinity.

Mr. VOORHIS: Nathan Bristol Van Etten, today celebrating his fiftieth anniversary of graduation from our former tributary, Bellevue Medical College, has not only served a full half century in the general practice of medicine in this city, but extended widely the benefits of his wisdom and experience through high medical executive capacities: President of Morrisania City Hospital, and Union Hospital, past president of the Bronx Borough, Bronx County, and New York State Medical Societies, of the Greater New York Medical Association, of the New York Society of Medical Jurisprudence, and of the Medical Alumni of this university. Able practitioner and counselor, stanch bulwark against the pandemic threat of quixotic schemes of socialized medicine, he now stands at the threshold of the highest office in the medical profession of this country, the presidency of the American Medical Association. Our prescription for him reads: Doctor of public health.

Chancellor CHASE: Nathan Bristol Van Etten, a half century ago you were graduating from what is now the New York University Medical College. Today you stand here as president-elect of the American Medical Association. The years between have been crowded with achievement. You have taken with high seriousness the oath of your profession. You have been active in promoting the service of that profession to the public good. For what you have done, and for your active pursuit of the ideals you symbolize, we now pronounce you doctor of public health of New York University.

Mr. VOORHIS: John Philip Hogan, president of the American Society of Civil Engineers. For 25 years following graduation in arts and science at Harvard, he served this city with conspicuous ability, particularly in the realization of that life-giving miracle, the Catskill Aqueduct. In subsequent professional practice he has become recognized as an outstanding authority on water supply and related problems. As military engineer in France during the first World War, he received many deserved citations and was raised to high command. As vice president and chief engineer of the New York World's Fair, he not only directed its vast and inexorable schedule of construction but was responsible for the solution of the fundamental problem of giving the waterlogged and waste-incrusted meadows of Flushing requisite stability for construction. Engineer extraordinary, he is presented for our honorary engineering doctorate.

Chancellor CHASE: John Philip Hogan, in the profession you adorn none has rendered greater service than you. Your latest achievement is the solution of the difficult engineering problems that were associated with the building of a world's fair on Flushing Meadow. The verdict of your own colleagues is abundantly evident in your presidency of the American Society of Civil Engineers. In recognition of your great professional services we now name you honorary doctor of engineering.

Mr. VOORHIS: Gano Dunn, native New Yorker, alumnus of City College and of the engineering school at Columbia; president of the J. G. White Engineering Corporation since 1913; past president of the New York Electrical Society, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, and the United Engineering Society; past chairman of the Engineering Foundation and the National Research Council; effective officer and delegate at many international scientific congresses; able counselor of national defence agencies; honored member of a score of distinguished professional and learned societies; valued director and trustee of various banking, industrial, and educational establishments; president of the Cooper Union for Advancement of Science and Art; humanist and man of affairs; he is presented for the degree of doctor of science.

Chancellor CHASE: Gano Dunn, in the midst of a crowded professional career, the latest achievement of which is the streamlining of the island of Haiti, you have somehow found time for so many varieties of public service that the mere recounting of them would turn this citation into a biographical essay. These are matters of record for all men to read. You have contributed to education, to business, to national and international affairs, and all your life you have been concerned with the advancement of science in many fields. You are entitled to any honorary degree in the whole category, but we have chosen that of doctor of science, which I now confer upon you.

Mr. VOORHIS: Frank Aydelotte, A. B., Indiana; A. M., Harvard; B. Litt., Oxford; American secretary to the Rhodes trustees since 1918, and president for the past 10 years of the American Association of Rhodes Scholars; sometime normal and high-school teacher of English and professor of that subject at Indiana University and M. I. T.; trustee of leading foundations for the advancement of learning; president of Swarthmore College for the past 19 years, where he repaired the plumbing, extended the plant, bolstered the endowment, pioneered the "honors" movement among American colleges, sweetened faculty salaries, balanced the budget, and brought tears to the students when he announced last fall his withdrawal to accept the directorship of that crowning citadel of higher education in this country—the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton; scholar, educator, administrator, author, editor—doctor of laws of New York University, if you please, Mr. Chancellor.

Chancellor CHASE: Frank Aydelotte, the degree we give you today bears witness both to our recognition of what you have done for the cause of education and to our faith in what, as head of the Institute for Advanced Study, you will be doing over the years that lie ahead. For myself, I hail you as a respected and admired colleague, and with genuine pleasure I confer upon you our degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. VOORHIS: Leslie Jay Tompkins, bachelor of science, New York University, 1890; bachelor of laws, 1892; master of science, 1894; master of laws, 1897; and doctor of jurisprudence, 1903. Amidst service at the bar these many years, membership in the New York Assembly, right-hand aid to the New York district attorney, and the writing of erudite and practical works on various branches of the law and the practice thereof, he has maintained for nearly 50 years an official connection with this institution, successively as librarian, assistant treasurer, registrar, and for the past 41 years as professor of law. Verily has his useful life been translated nobly and indefeasibly into the vital structure of this institution; wherefore we tender him, in grateful acknowledgement, the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Chancellor CHASE: Tommy, you received your first degree from New York University just 50 years ago. Two years later you became actively associated with New York University, and it has never been the same since. Your hand helped in many, many ways to guide its destiny. For more than 50 years you have been guilty of conspiracy in that you have helped to train men and women for bar and bench. Yours has been a useful, a distinguished, and a productive career, typical of the highest ideals of your profession. Therefore, and in consideration thereof, we now tender you, under the hand and seal of your alma mater, the degree of doctor of laws, to have and to hold in perpetuity.

Military Establishment Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I want to express my pleasure over the passage of the Military Establishment appropriation bill, and especially my gratification for the inclusion of the item for funds to purchase additional land for Fort Devens, Mass. This increased acreage will be invaluable in training men and in maneuvers. Fort Devens serves as a protection for one of the greatest industrial areas in the country, and this addition to it was needed very badly. I was most interested in the speech of my colleague from Mississippi, Mr. COLLINS. The distinguished gentleman has made an amazing and admirable record in his work for the mechanization of our Army. Some of you may recall that years ago, in fact in 1926, I introduced the first educational order bill in Congress. If the provisions of that measure had been carried out steadily and increased during all these years, we would now have the nucleus for an adequate national defense. We would have the trained personnel available to turn out the war materials very rapidly.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY JACK W. CARLEY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently made by Mr. Jack W. Carley, one of the editors of the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn. This address is such an eloquent and timely discussion of present-day questions in America and in the world that I take great pleasure in asking that it be printed in the RECORD. It is truly inspiring to have such sentiments expressed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, comrades, members of the auxiliaries, to all free men and women present; the hallowed soil on which we stand has been bought by those whose bodies rest within at bitter, sacrificial cost.

This is no place for platitudes. This is no time for tears. They who have died for country demand of us something more than that.

Nothing we might say or do here could add one whit to their glory or detract from the sublimity of their sacrifice. Their place is fixed in the history of this Nation for all time. They have been praised in poetry and their deeds are recounted in song.

BETRAYED BY BLINDNESS

They do not need us here this afternoon, but we, my friends, have dire need of them—need of their faith, their courage, and their complete willingness to subordinate self to needs of country.

Somewhere they live on, no longer earthbound to this selfish and insane world, and their voices—if we choose to listen—yet speak to us, aye they cry out to us not to betray them further.

For they have been betrayed by us—betrayed by our blindnesses and our hypocrisies—betrayed through the fact that we have permitted those things for which they died to be threatened with destruction.

They threw us a torch and unless we spring to the alert its flame will go out.

They get nothing out of our coming here this afternoon. We may get something out of it if we will. If we fail to do that then this becomes a futile, blasphemous gesture.

RECENT EVENTS SHOCKING

No war veteran here can possibly misunderstand or fail to see the evil which is abroad. None can fail to view the future with apprehension. There is no longer time for recrimination, no moment in which to wonder how or why we failed. Our obligation is to build now so strongly that the evil winds which blow cannot destroy that which the dead who lie here created—they and their comrades in hundreds of thousands of military and naval graves.

How shocking have been these past few weeks. I cannot help but think as we stand here in this secluded, safe, and quite spot of other American war cemeteries across the seas, two now under fire—two in the hands of an aggressor—and of the land in which those men lie being ravaged and despoiled by the very forces which we a quarter of a century ago hoped had been eliminated for all time.

What a foolish dream it was, and how foolish we to idly go our way thinking that these evil things abroad in the world could never touch us.

MUST ARM FOR FREEDOM

Why, even as we meet here, those who, if they could, would destroy all that the American pattern of life means meet elsewhere to nominate a convicted agent of a foreign government to be President of the United States. What idiocies do we permit, indeed, in the name of freedom.

What mockery have we made of that priceless possession of freedom of speech and free assemblage.

To what strange and unthought-of degree of national impotency in defensive strength have we permitted our indifference and our refusal to see bring us.

And yet we quarrel and equivocate when all the omens, all the whisperings of evil tidings, warn us to gird ourselves as one people, dominated by but one ideal—the perpetuation of freedom with justice.

It is a wonder to me that these graves do not open and those within stand up to damn us for our lethargy and lack of foresight and for our irrationality.

NATION IN DANGER

The whirlwind rises ominously on the horizon, and yet we wait.

This Nation is in danger. What, ask the dead, are we going to do about it?

Money alone, billions of it, will not, of itself, do the job.

First of all it is going to take faith and a rededication of the soul and spirit to the things which we hold to be primarily and fundamentally American.

It is going to take concerted will to do.

It is going to take manpower and it is going to demand sacrifice of free and easy methods and free and easy thinking.

This task which must be done is not going to permit of petty, partisan political bickering. It is going to demand that those with great ambition place national zeal above self-desire.

It is going to require that there be rooted out all internal activities which have as a goal the destruction of the American pattern, and that the rooting out be done without fear or favor.

It is going to require all that we possess in way of national energy and native ingenuity. Not the least of the tasks before us is to clean our own house without, at the same time, resorting to the abhorrent methods by which totalitarianism succeeds. This Nation must be stern with the agents of the dark within, but it must be fair and it must be careful lest hysteria and injustice become motivating forces.

So far as this Nation alone is involved in the chaos spreading over the earth, there is no sure prior pattern for action. We do not yet know all which we will have to defend. Circumstance may widen our orbit at any hour, but while we are preparing for the storm it is equally essential that our neighbors prepare, particularly those to the south.

The term "good neighbor" is high sounding. It is important that we keep our eyes open lest it be as deceptive as it is high-sounding. Good neighbors are not those whose premises have a satisfactory outward appearance and at the same time permit rotten things within. If there's to be national house cleaning there must be international house cleaning on this hemisphere from Cape Horn to the Great Lakes. The Dominion to the north is already doing her cleaning.

There is no use building a barrier at the front door if the back is to be left wide open. Malarial control in Shelby County would be ineffective if our neighboring counties failed to take similar steps. The elimination of subversive groups in this country will be only partly effective if our neighbors continue to permit colonization by totalitarian groups. The enlistment of all of the American republics in a common cause is only one of the major tasks to be accomplished.

SANITY NEEDED

If ever in the history of this Nation there has been need for complete sanity in leadership, it is now. This is no hour for political claptrap or partisan, political jousting. It is imperative that the voices of acknowledged military, naval, and industrial experts be permitted to prevail. We must believe in the quality of their reasoning and take their advice.

No great national effort such as this emergency demands—and this is a grave emergency—can be successful unless there is complete harmony among all elements—among political leaders, among industry, among labor, among the military and naval forces. We must demand and see to it that harmony prevails and that no one element uses the other as a stepping stone to selfish goals.

There are some things which cannot and will not be permitted and those who underestimate the temper and energy of the mass of American people in that respect are blind indeed. The sight of a felon running for office of President of the United States, and as the representative of an international political force which seeks world revolution and the destruction of all Christianity and civilization implies does not set well with present American temper and energy.

The sight of a shipyard, wherein are being built vitally needed naval vessels, tied up by a strike which could have been averted had reason been permitted to prevail at a conference table, does not set well on the conscience of the American people.

VETERANS KNOW SACRIFICE

The thing that each of us has got to recognize is that each must make sacrifices commensurate with the national need. It is better to give up a little or much now than to have to give up all we possess and all we hold dear later.

I believe we veterans know what giving up means and what the word "sacrifice" in behalf of others means. Our knowledge was not acquired the easy way. The harmony which we demand of others must prevail, too, among the living veterans of this Nation. The energy and the voice represented by all the veterans of wars in this Nation is strong. We have been taught a high concept of duty. We know what is loyalty and what is disloyalty. Let the voices of the war veterans speak in unison and those in high places will not dare ignore it.

There is no human being, no matter how exalted his position, or how great his resources for information, who can foretell where, when, or how the present conflict which shows every sign of spreading, is going to end. No element is so difficult to control once it is unleashed than that force we call war.

In many respects the history of a quarter century ago is being repeated with painful monotony. Old lines have been reestablished, old sectors are being reoccupied in many instances by the very men

who fought in them in the war that was to have ended all wars. So closely is the old pattern followed that even regiments occupy the very areas they occupied once before.

On the other hand, there are some elements which are entirely new, and ambition for conquest has reached undreamed-of peaks.

It is no exaggeration to say that this conflict has passed far beyond the point of geographical and territorial considerations—that it has become, at last, a conflict between good and evil as we know them, between civilization as we know it, and a force which will lead us back to beastiality, the jungle, and slavery.

None of us, however, need be afraid of the future if we dare face facts, if we dare sacrifice, and if we guide into the proper channels for strong defensive building the unlimited energy represented by the will of the American people.

If we do the things we know must be done and which we know how to do, come the world against her, this land of free men yet shall stand.

DEMOCRACY BEST

Democracy yet remains the best national system yet devised and this Nation represents the greatest undertaking for democracy which could be conceived. They lie who say that democracy is decadent and that might shall triumph over right.

They lie who say that we cannot achieve as our forefathers achieved.

They lie who say that the Christian way of life is not best and that faith in God and in true national idealism do not provide the right way to national contentment.

There is work to do. Voices call to us from behind the Concord walls, from the waters of Lake Erie, from the beach at Tripoli, from Gettysburg and San Juan, from atop the China wall, from the forest in Argonne—call us to be on guard and to do the job the way the dead did theirs—with full valor and full desire.

Let's have done with useless chatter. Let's do this job as these men, lying here, demand through us, demand that it be done, now, and in such a way that no victor, however mad he may be, will dare strike.

This ground here is sacred.

It shall be kept sacred—free from desecration by any tyrant—whoever he may be.

The Congress of the United States Should Continue At Its Duties During This Critical Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 days I have been firmly convinced that Congress should remain in session. I have come to this considered conclusion after weighing what I believe to be all factors that should determine a Member in coming to a publicly known position on this matter.

WE MUST KEEP AT POSTS

I have receive many letters from residents of my district and State asking me where I stand on the question of adjournment. I have replied that I felt the people have a right to expect their elected Representatives to remain at their posts of duty in these times of stress. It is impossible for any of us to foretell what may happen from one week to the other; in fact, from one day to the next. As Members of Congress we should be ready to meet the problems which are certain to confront us increasingly in the immediate future. We can best do this by standing by to discharge our duties.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too strongly state my feeling at this hour on the possibility of adjournment of this session of the Congress. We have a responsibility as individual Members to share the burden with the Chief Executive, in being able to promptly cope with situations which can and will arise. We have been chosen by the citizens of the Republic to legislate and safeguard and protect the best interests of this land and its institutions.

PEOPLE ASK CONTINUANCE

I shall be compelled, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the adjournment of Congress when such a resolution comes before our body. I am hoping that the leadership will not go too far with plans for "quitting." I know that the men and women in West Virginia and the other 47 States of the country are not going to look with favor on such a procedure.

There is no doubt in my mind and heart but that the Members of this body desire to do their high patriotic duty in the continued defense preparation for the country. We realize we must not waste time in strengthening the defenses of the Nation.

It is the duty of Congress to provide now, not when it is too late, the means for making the weapons with which to protect ourselves. We do not desire participation in the present war, but if this country is forced into conflict let us be feared by the aggressor who dares to fight against an America which will at all costs continue to preserve its democratic form of government.

ALERT NOW TO DANGER

We are awake to the enemies within our gates. It is tragic that we waited until this hour of danger to weed out those individuals who live in this country, but hold allegiance to lands across the sea. They continue to attempt to tear apart the solidarity of our people and undermine our fine citizenship. We must be increasingly alert to this danger.

Indicative of the growing sentiment of the public on the question of congressional adjournment is the following splendid and thought-provoking editorial from the New York Times of Saturday morning, June 8:

CONGRESS MUST STAY

If the leaders of Congress have not abandoned in their own minds all expectation of an early adjournment, it is time for them to face the fact that the course of events and the interests of the American people simply do not permit of such action. At one of the most critical moments in the world's history, at a time when there is work to be done every day to strengthen the bulwarks of this democracy, it is unthinkable that the institution through which the will of the American people is expressed should shortly go into hibernation for a period of 7 months, subject only to the President's call to meet in special session, abandoning both its obligations and its opportunities.

It is the patriotic duty of Congress to remain in session now, for one reason, because the various defense measures already on its calendar must not receive slipshod attention in a hurried drive to get away from Washington. But that is only a beginning of the responsibilities of Congress. There will be other defense measures the need of which cannot now be foreseen but on which action will be imperative long before snow flies again and Congress meets next January. There is the increasingly critical problem of defense finances that ought to be met without delay; the wholly casual and inadequate "token tax" which is now in view must be supplemented with a far more adequate and more carefully considered tax program, and the sooner we begin the better. There is the need of a defense force which is adequate in manpower as well as matériel; the case for a democratic system of universal compulsory military training has now become overwhelming. Above all, in the great crises which lie ahead, in the dark hours that may bring news which will profoundly shock this country, it is proper that Congress should be continuously in session so that it may share the responsibilities of the Executive and speak with the voice of the American people.

The right course of action is plainly to recess for the two conventions and then come back to work. That will be hot and uncomfortable. It will spoil many summer plans. But the American people have every right to expect patience, fidelity, and intelligence on the part of their chosen representatives in such a crisis as we face today.

OBLIGATION IS CLEAR

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States do have the right to expect their Members of Congress to continue on the job, and with patience, fidelity, and intelligence—meet the crisis. We must not fail them now. Devotion to duty demands our facing of the facts—our obligation is clear.

Let America Be on Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement

made by me before the House Committee on the Judiciary in support of resolution introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable CLARENCE J. MCLEOD, before the Judiciary Committee of the House, House Concurrent Resolution 55:

We stand today the most favored nation on earth. Representing 7 percent of the population of the world, we have created and possess more in material wealth than most, if not all, of Europe combined. On 6 percent of the world's acreage we provide one-half of the world's foodstuffs. On the youth of this Nation we expend each year for public education as much money as the rest of the world combined. Our cultural attainments are equal to, if not superior to, our material possessions.

Here we enjoy the rights, privileges, opportunities, and freedom unknown to other peoples and their governments. Here we have established a standard of living and a way of life that has become the envy of other civilizations and nationalities in the Old and New World. From the very beginning of this Government, we have extended a beckoning and a welcoming hand to the oppressed and underprivileged people of other lands. We have invited them to come here, find an asylum, and share the gift of freedom and human rights established in this hemisphere for the first time in history.

Those people and their descendants now constitute the great masses of our people. Countless thousands came to share and enjoy the blessings of humanity which their own land did not provide.

Paradoxical as it may seem, we now discover that a misguided, misled, and recalcitrant minority, but militant and vocal, seeks to destroy, by subtle and subversive means through force, violence, and bloodshed if necessary, every principle of liberty and justice that their ancestors and kindred embraced with an appreciation known only to those released from bondage.

We may be the richest country on the globe but we shall also be the most stupid if we stand idly by, shirk our clear and undebatable duty as representatives of a free people without taking prompt and effective measures to combat, destroy and overcome the very forces that seek to destroy us.

It is my firm conviction that it is within the purview of our Constitution that our sovereign state has the right to maintain itself. Assuredly we have the right to repel a foe from without, and just as certainly we have the right to attack a foe from within. The objective of both is or may be the same.

We have done very little to meet the treasonable activities of the "fifth column" subversive groups known to be in our midst.

The Dies committee apparently is the only agency of the Government that has openly undertaken the task of ferreting out and turning the spotlight of publicity on the danger that lurks on our very doorstep.

The brazen purpose, openly stated and secretly served, fostered and abetted by dictators in Europe, of Communists, and other alien groups working to overthrow this Government, have proceeded unchecked, and have been encouraged by the indifference of government itself. To pamper, coddle, dine, and employ, without reason, the enemies of our freedom and our country, will not be tolerated by the people of this Nation. Such practices are repugnant to the conscience and offensive to the patriotism and loyalty of the American people. The time has come when we must strike quickly and hard. Brute force seems to be the only yardstick in the world. Self-preservation is an inborn instinct of the animal kingdom, and it is also the law of individuals and nations.

One of the proposed instruments of attack on these groups that are boring from within is the resolution of my able and distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CLARENCE J. MCLEOD, now before this committee for consideration.

It suggests and asks action on the part of the legislatures of the States for the enactment of laws prohibiting or denying the use of the American ballot by any party, political or otherwise, that seeks to overthrow this Government by force. It may be argued that such action may be unconstitutional; that it might violate the first amendment to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution gives to every individual the right to discuss freely any and all questions; to criticize public officials for their opinion and their acts. But I do not believe the Constitution is so broad that it permits anyone to advocate the destruction of the Government.

The Communist Party is not a political party. It advocates the overthrow of this Government through revolution if necessary. It has had a ticket on the American ballot. A political party seeks the election of candidates to public office who shall administer the established form of government. The Communist Party hopes to elect candidates to public office to destroy the established form of government and, therefore, is a revolutionary party not entitled to any rights in the machinery of the American ballot system.

The resolution before this committee is a timely and patriotic proposal. It has my full and complete support. I appeal to this committee to report it unanimously to the House of Representatives for action.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of freedom.

The Bill of Rights—My Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

ESSAYS BY CAROLYN GUTERMUTH, ARCANUM, OHIO, AND JOAN SENDELBACK, DELPHOS, OHIO

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure and honor to have two winners of the American Legion Americanization Essay Contest in my district.

The American Legion has sent to me the winning essays of my constituents, Miss Carolyn Gutermuth, of Arcanum, Ohio, and Miss Joan Sendelback, of Delphos, Ohio.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these two winning essays:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS—MY PROTECTION

(By Joan Sendelback, Delphos, Ohio)

The wisest and best insurance policy ever issued was the one written nearly 150 years ago when our forefathers, seeking to insure for all time to come those inalienable rights of men as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, added to the Constitution the first 10 amendments, commonly known as the Bill of Rights.

The rights set forth in these amendments set America apart from every other nation on the face of the earth. It is these rights which attract millions of immigrants to "the land of the free," to a new home, a new life, a new country, which guarantees to them the very rights and privileges denied by their own government. Being forced to seek them elsewhere, they found them in a new government, which guaranteed them, not out of generosity but because they are the God-given rights of every man regardless of race, creed, or color. The 10 amendments in the Bill of Rights are then the greatest safeguard to our freedom, to our democracy.

The most important of these 10 is the first amendment, which states in the pact that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." Because of this amendment, I can worship God according to the dictates of my conscience, and worship the God of my heart, not of the state.

Because of this amendment, too, I can think and speak openly without fear of dread secret police or concentration camps. Yes; the Bill of Rights guarantees freedom of speech and press even to those who seek to undermine the foundation of the democracy which grants them these privileges—privileges denied them by their own government.

The next important amendment is the fourth which declares that the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things seized. This amendment protects me against seizure for political reasons or for any other reason where there is no clear or just cause, and protects my property against search or seizure without a lawful and valid reason. In other words it substantiates the old proverb that "a man's home is his castle."

By the fourth and fifth amendments I am guaranteed protection from being held to answer for a crime unless indicted by a grand jury and, if so indicted, I am entitled to a "speedy and public trial," by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime was committed. I cannot be arrested and sentenced to prison merely for political views as is being done in so many lands today. I have every right and opportunity to prove myself innocent of the crime, and if once proven innocent I cannot be arrested again for the same offense.

The eighth amendment guarantees that any fine or punishment inflicted upon me shall be in proportion to the crime committed. This amendment prevents a recurrence of earlier history where many were sentenced to death for crimes which today are considered trivial misdemeanors.

To safeguard those of our rights which are not specifically set forth in the Constitution, the ninth amendment was added, preventing the Government from depriving us of any of our God-given rights merely because they are not mentioned in the Constitution.

Thus we can see that the Bill of Rights is our greatest heritage, our best insurance, our greatest protection guaranteed to us because it is our right, given to us by God, the giver of all good things.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS—MY PROTECTION

(By Carolyn Gutermuth, Arcanum, Ohio)

Last night the more I pondered over the title of this year's American Legion essay, the more absurd it seemed. A mere scrap of paper my protection! How silly! I would leave that service to the police department. I could see a big, brawny policeman several times a day patroling his beat past our house.

What could I write about? Oh, yes; I know; that 12 amendments to the Constitution had been proposed in 1789 and that 10 of these had been ratified in 1791. Later, these amendments became known as the Bill of Rights. I knew all that. They stated very specifically certain rights to which I was entitled and which the Federal or State Government could not deny me.

But that was simply a matter of history, which anyone might read. Finally I gave up and went to bed. I slept and dreamed—

I was in a large house plainly but strongly constructed of enduring granite. The house stood on a small rocky island, surrounded by an angry sea. The huge frothing waves broke incessantly upon the rocks and tore viciously at the very foundation of the house, trying again and again to sweep it to destruction.

The house stood firm and unshaken. As I watched these savage waves in their wild fury, I was glad for the protection of this house.

Over the door was chiseled deep in stone the name, a strange name—"The Bill of Rights."

From the window I could see the waves cut deep crevices in the rocky island. By an odd coincidence, these crevices appeared to form the word "Constitution." But as the waves receded these crevices filled immediately with the rocky soil, leaving the island intact.

As I continued to watch, I was amazed to see words in huge letters appear on the crest of the menacing waves—dictatorship, intolerance, forbiddance of peaceful assembly, suppression of control of religion, suppression of free speech, controlled presses, government control of radios, prohibition of the right to keep and bear arms, violation of personal property and effects, confiscation of personal wealth, trial without indictment by grand jury, quartering of soldiers in homes, trial delayed again and again, convictions without trial by an impartial jury, third-degree tactics, illegal imprisonment, denial of right to legal defense, excessive fines, prohibitive bail, too severe punishments for minor crimes, despotic powers of government, political persecutions, race prejudices, blood purges.

These are the terrifying waves which were dashing against this house, trying to undermine it and destroy me.

Suddenly I realized I was not alone. The house was filled with people; people of every race and creed, the rich and poor, the young and old, the educated and the ignorant, the sick, the lame, and the blind—America's millions safe within the protecting walls of this house, called the Bill of Rights.

The lawless waves continued to pound. The house stood firm, a bulwark of protection in a storm-tossed sea.

When I awoke, the dream stayed with me. It was so real I was glad to be an American, whose forefathers had builded so wisely and well. Here in my house, the Bill of Rights, constructed on the firm ground of the Constitution, I was safe from the storms of the world.

Something Every Congressman Should Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE EDISON (NEBR.) ECHO

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Edison Echo published at Edison, Nebr. Mr. John Stevens, the writer of this editorial, is a man of mature years who has been a leader in public matters throughout that territory for a long time. I commend this to the Members of Congress, and I hope they will read it very carefully.

[From the Edison (Nebr.) Echo]

Those people who claim that a man may get too old to learn are mistaken. We are now learning a new meaning for the word "neutrality," and some other people are going to have to learn it too. Heretofore the guy who didn't give a darn which side won a war and wouldn't do a thing to help either side has been considered neutral; but that is no longer true. In the present war in Europe you are not going to be accepted as a neutral unless you are strongly pro-British. If you don't care who wins the war and are not willing to help on either side, then you are a pro-German and the council of defense will make you kiss the British flag and some brave patriot will come in the nighttime and paint your buildings yellow.

And another thing you are going to learn is what defense means. Billions of American dollars are being appropriated under that name, to be used to carry on a war wherein we have nothing at all to defend. The spending is being done for means to carry on a war across the ocean, and not to defend our own country. We have been told that Omaha and cities similarly located are open to aerial attack from Europe, but not a cent is proposed to be spent to prepare Omaha or any other inland city to defend itself against such attack. If it be true that such cities are subject to such attack, then they should be prepared to defend against it.

However, if you don't like any of the military and political maneuvers of the present and want to remonstrate against any of them, you had better speak quickly and talk fast, for the time is coming when you will have to shut up and pretend to like it whether you do or not. That thing that Lindbergh called hysterical chatter is sweeping the country and the victims of the hysteria are in the saddle, so you had best be careful what you say—or think.

There is an effort to increase the jitters by the prediction that Italy will enter war on Germany's side. The things that are already being accomplished indicate that Italy and Spain are both actively aiding Germany, and the Allies haven't found it out. Hitler could not do all that unaided, and it is probable that he would not have undertaken it unaided. So if we are going to fight to save the King we may as well understand that we will have to fight Italy and Spain.

Bill of Rights—My Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY EDITH ROETHER, McCOMB, OHIO

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for several years the American Legion of the State of Ohio has sponsored an annual essay contest on subjects dealing with Americanism. This year the subject was Bill of Rights—My Protection. Pupils from the 4 highest grades of school were eligible to compete in this contest and 3 are selected from each grade as State winners, totaling 12 in number. The number of participants have increased each year until this year it reached 150,000.

It gives me great pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the essay of Miss Edith Roether, McComb, Ohio, a constituent of mine, who was awarded 1 of the 12 prizes offered in this contest.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS—MY PROTECTION

I shall always keep on my desk the paperweight of the three little monkeys. In addition to the lesson it has always taught, "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil," it serves to remind me of what I would be like without my protection, the Bill of Rights: a hand over my eyes to keep me from seeing the truth, a hand over my ears to keep me from hearing the truth, and a hand over my mouth to keep me from speaking the truth when I see and hear it.

The Bill of Rights has removed the hand from my eyes. They can be opened wide, if I myself will let them be, to see truth and right. The hand is gone from my ears, and I may hear the truth. It is gone from my mouth, and I may speak freely the opinions which I believe to be right.

Like many of the people of Europe today, I am not a puppet to be moved at will by the hands of a controller who holds the strings. I am free to speak, to assemble, to petition, and to worship as I will, so long as I do not destroy the rights of others for which my country stands.

I may thank the Bill of Rights for the fact that "my home is my castle." My home, my person, my papers and effects are secure against unreasonable searches and seizures.

If I am arrested on the charge of breaking the just laws of my county, the Bill of Rights again protects me and gives meaning to the court axiom, "A man is innocent until proven guilty." I am assured at all times of fair treatment in prosecution, trial, and punishment. In all criminal prosecutions I enjoy the right of a speedy trial by an impartial jury and the right to be justly defended. I am protected from excessive fines and cruel punishment. In suits at common law, where the value in controversy exceeds $20, I have the right of trial by jury.

In addition to the enumerated rights in the bill which I possess, the ninth article further protects me by declaring that the eumeration of these rights cannot be construed to deny others retained by me.

When I see the state of other countries of the world today, I realize how wise the early citizens of my country were in insisting that the Bill of Rights become part of our Constitution. Without it our Constitution might have been just another brilliant document to be twisted to mean what a ruling mind would have it mean. The Bill of Rights has made my Constitution and my country the leaders of democracy. The end of American democracy would be the end of my protection; the Bill of Rights and I will work with the rest of the American youth to keep my protection secure.

Wool Under Reciprocal-Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary Grady of the State Department will tell you that no tariff reduction was made on wool, but that is because he does not know anything about wool or sheep. Since he can probably add and subtract, he no doubt would tell you that 10 sheep would be left after 5 of a bunch of 15 jumped through a hole in the hedge. Wrong; there would not be any left.

Just like wool. They did not lower the duty on wool. They just lowered the duty on wool 50 percent, and to judge from their shadow-boxing they do not know it yet. Sure, they call it rags and waste over there—city-slicker stuff—that is so they can ship it in under the 50-percent tariff reduction.

Rags over there, but virgin wool over here. If you do not believe it, just ask the objectors to the truth-in-fabrics bill.

Because of this 50 percent tariff reduction on wool a total of 794,436 pounds of wool rags was imported in 1938, and 8,417,818 pounds in 1939, or an increase of 1,060 percent. Of this total, 465,257 pounds of rags were imported in 1938 from the United Kingdom alone, and 6,163,722 pounds from the United Kingdom in 1939, or an increase of 1,325 percent since the reciprocal-trade agreement with Great Britain.

Naturally the war is slowing up imports, but if there is any England left after this war there will certainly be millions of pounds of blood-soaked rags (virgin wool) find their way to our shores and into the fabrics that some of your kids wear.

A pretty thought, is it not?

No one can tell what this war is going to mean in depreciated currencies, but there is no doubt that win or lose, we are in for the greatest economic upset of all time.

It does seem like a fool time to be virtually throwing our markets open to the world.

Well, after 7 years of being caught without our umbrella we should be getting used to a soaking.

Launching of Steamship "Exchequer"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith a short speech made by me at my home town of Pascagoula, Miss., on June 8. The occasion was the launching of the steamship *Exchequer* built for the Maritime Commission. The launching of this great ship is another incident in our preparedness program. The whole launching program was broadcast by the Columbia Broadcasting System. The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow citizens, it was my privilege to make a few remarks on the occasion of the laying of the keel of this great vessel, it would seem, only a few weeks ago. It is, therefore, with distinct pleasure and gratification that I have returned in a flying trip from the stirring scenes in the Capitol of the greatest democracy on earth to join you, my neighbors and friends, to participate in your jubilation at the launching of this beautiful ship. As we as Mississippians and Americans look upon this mighty product of brains, brawn, steel, and sweat, our hearts exult with gratitude and justifiable pride. For here we shall shortly witness a spectacle resplendent in its glory and magnificent in its achievement as the good ship *Exchequer* glides majestically into the placid waters of the singing river. Today our thoughts go back to a period of more than a year ago when a group of civic-minded citizens headed by our friend and neighbor, the dynamic and unselfish Hermes Gautier, set about to bring this plant here. This ship represents the fruition of all of our dreams. It is not only the largest ship ever launched within the borders of the great State of Mississippi; it is not alone the most modern ship of its type; but it also represents the greatest tonnage ever assembled anywhere in the world in the form of an all-welded bottom. It is a far cry from the canoe of the Pascagoula Indians, which was first launched on the banks of this historic river to this great leviathan of the deep.

Moreover, the launching of this ship marks the acquisition of another unit in the Nation's program of national defense. For after a disheartening decline in our merchant marine in the decade between 1920 and 1930, the American Congress created the United States Maritime Commission, which is so effectively restoring American strength on the seven seas. The United States Maritime Commission has devised and is now executing a 10-year program for replacing the obsolete vessels in our merchant fleet, which will provide this Nation with the fastest and most efficient, and probably the most modern, fleet of merchant vessels in the world. The *Exchequer*, which you admire here today, is a prime example of the efforts of this Government to bring about this muchly desired objective. A cargo vessel of the C-3 type, she will do better than 17 knots. Her cargo-handling machinery is among the most efficient in existence. Her navigating equipment, as well as her propulsion machinery, will give the utmost in safety as well as economy of operation. In the event of war she and her 32 sister ships, now constructed or under construction, can effectively supply the fleet. If that should not be necessary, they can transport the strategic raw materials which will be needed by this country in the event of such a national crisis. An efficient merchant-marine fleet is as essential in times of war as are the mighty battleships under direct control of the Navy. It is true that vessels of this type are not combat ships in the sense of waging a naval battle, but of equal importance is the fact that each merchant ship can be used to bring the materials and products necessary to the intense industrial effort involved in a modern war. Tin, chromium, manganese, and rubber are as essential under modern warfare in a great national crisis as are men and guns.

The construction of these Maritime ships thus being as much a part of our national defense as the wearing of a uniform or the shouldering of a gun, I am confident that every man, from the humblest Negro laborer who handles a piece of timber to the skilled draftsman who lays out the plans of the ship, is fully aware of the importance and the patriotism of their several endeavors. So-called "fifth column" activities, sabotage, and other subversive activities should be frowned upon in the important task of building this portion of the Nation's defense line as strongly as they would be condemned in the armed or naval forces in our first line of national defense.

Let every American who enters yonder gates to perform his daily task consider himself as much a patriot as he who wears the uniform of a sailor, a marine, or a soldier in the armed forces of his country. God forbid that this country, the haven of the oppressed—the home of the free—and the beneficiary of the heritage left us by our forefathers in the greatest model of free Government ever conceived by the human mind, should fall prey to a foreign foe as the result of internal dissension and domestic quarrels. Let us go forward as one great united American people in a common fight, should the occasion demand, against a common enemy of our democratic form of government. United, backed by the greatest natural resources in the world, we cannot fail.

Modern wars as we are now witnessing abroad are no longer fought upon fields of chivalry, nor are they won by patriotism alone. No longer can we rely upon a patriotic upsurge of activity after trouble confronts us. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Norway, and Holland, as well as England and France, now only too sadly realize that the only answer to the would-be world dictators is a preparedness program which permits the aggrieved nation to meet force with superior force. So today, our Nation, which you and I

love better than our own lives, is engaged in a preparedness program to meet that force not with equal force but with superior force should the occasion arise. In our combat ships—the first line of the country's defense—under the authority of Congress we have built since 1933, or now have under construction, a total of 160 ships. When our present program is completed our Navy will have an aggregate tonnage of more than 2,000,000 tons, which will comprise a Navy of approximately 522 vessels all told. The present program of the Maritime Commission is none the less ambitious. In an effort to be prepared for any eventuality as well as the peaceful pursuit of international trade in the field of merchant marine, the Maritime Commission is engaged in a program for the construction of 152 ships. The *Exchequer* is the forty-seventh to be launched; 36 are already in operation. This Maritime Commission program alone will cost in excess of $150,000,000. Over $20,000,000 of this money will be spent in Pascagoula alone. It is hoped that the *Exchequer* will be but the forerunner of many more ships of the 500-ship program of the Maritime Commission which will be built at Pascagoula.

For that matter I shall here and now be so bold as to prophesy that before many more months have passed we shall be building destroyers and other smaller combat boats for the naval fleet here on the Mississippi coast. Nature has bounteously and lavishly created the natural facilities for such an undertaking.

It can therefore readily be seen that as a result of this gigantic program this country is in a far better position with regard to its need for both naval and nonnaval ships than it was in 1914 when the clouds of war, which are now engulfing Europe for a second time in our generation, first descended upon the Old World. At that time the United States had but 93 ships of this type available for use in foreign trade.

The American people have always been a peace-loving people. Never has the American sword been unsheathed in the cause of imperialistic conquest. Never has an American gun been fired in a war of exploitation, conquest, or self-aggrandizement. We have ever followed a policy as a nation of live and let live. American wars without a single exception have been fought upon the noble heights of idealistic government and stabilization of world order. America today wants no war. Having learned its lesson on previous occasions, America now has no thought of setting out in another war with the purpose of making the world safe for democracy. The thought uppermost in American minds everywhere is to be let alone and allowed to follow the paths of peaceful pursuit of normal existence. But as our eyes scan the world horizon and we see the death struggle for power on the one hand and for national existence on the other, we realize that it would be asinine stupidity of the worst type for us to stick our heads in the sand like the proverbial ostrich and fail to prepare for any eventuality. Self-preservation and national existence, not to mention the preservation of our cherished philosophy of government, as set out in the Declaration of Independence, are obligations of the most vital and compelling importance. So today, we in America, peace-loving as we are, are concerning ourselves with the necessity of preparing to meet such an eventuality. Every loyal American insists that this preparation go forward with accelerated speed lest our land, and our people too, be left to the mercy of a foreign aggressor or a combination of foreign powers who might see fit to launch a "blitzkrieg" at this Nation—the wealthiest prize in the Western Hemisphere. Americans everywhere as a united people have willed that they shall not come, they shall not see, they shall not conquer.

Finally, my friends, you and I have gathered here on this historic spot from far and near to witness this resplendent spectacle of the launching of this great ship as another bulwark in our national defense. As a community recognized for its hospitality, we are, indeed, happy to welcome within our gates and have present with us on this colorful occasion so many friends from neighboring cities. We especially recognize the gracious presence of the officials of the Maritime Commission and the executive vice president of the American Export Lines, Mr. Slater, and his staff, who will operate the *Exchequer* when it is completed. In the name of the President of the United States—that great man who in this time of peril to civilization is at the helm of the ship of state—Franklin D. Roosevelt; in the name of the American Congress; in the name of the Maritime Commissioners; and in the name of patriotic God-fearing Americans everywhere, I extend the heartiest and most sincere congratulations to Mr. Bob Ingalls, his staff of competent officials, and to every patriotic, home-loving employee of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, who, by their devotion to and their service of their country, their diligence, their skill, their engineering genius, and their many hours of honest labor, have made possible this great achievement. You have wrought well. You have built a sturdy ship.

All honor to a great, patriotic organization of capital and labor. May the two working shoulder to shoulder continue united and harmonious in the patriotic task before us of shortly making America the mistress of the seas.

Let Us Be Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer of June 6, 1940:

LET'S BE REALISTIC

It is an inescapable law of economics that there is no such thing as something for nothing. Eventually, one way or another, everything must be paid for.

That is a fact we should keep well in mind as we contemplate the new defense program, the fiscal record of the present administration, and the future of our public business.

Although a great deal has been said and written about debt and taxes and deficits, it is the literal truth that none of this has come home yet to the man in the street. That is so because we haven't yet begun to pay the bill. Taxes haven't caught up to the spending. We still are doing it on borrowed money. So that the average man's reaction to complaints about extravagance is to shake it off with the reflection that he hasn't felt any of it.

But the very fact that we haven't felt the pinch yet makes it certain that the pressure will be doubly severe when it comes.

Let's look at the facts:

When Mr. Roosevelt assumed the Presidency, the public debt stood at approximately $22,500,000,000. It had come up from a low point of around $16,000,000,000 over a period of 6 or 7 years. The fact that the Hoover administration had accumulated a deficit during its 4 years was one of the major talking points of Mr. Roosevelt during the campaign of 1932. He dwelt at length on the dire results of a policy of borrowing to meet deficits, declared that the only practical method of meeting such problems is to quit incurring deficits, and promised to trim public expenditures by a full fourth in order to bring the Budget into balance.

Well, this same public debt today, after 7 years of Mr. Roosevelt, is in the neighborhood of $44,000,000,000, and Congress has just authorized an extension of the over-all-debt limit from $45,000,000,000 to $49,000,000,000.

What the debt will be by the time this year's spending and this year's authorizations are totaled up nobody knows.

So we come to the defense emergency of today with a Treasury not only empty, but forty-odd-billion dollars in the hole. It is not the purpose of this discussion to inquire into why with all this unbelievable spending, Mr. Roosevelt has failed to provide for the national defense. That is water over the dam now. We can't do anything about it. It is everywhere agreed that we must have an impregnable defense. We don't have it. Apparently we haven't anything remotely approaching it. So there's nothing for it but to get busy.

Very well. As a starter, Mr. Roosevelt asked for an immediate appropriation for emergency defense of $1,182,000,000. Remember, appropriations already contemplated for the incoming fiscal year would have pushed the public debt up to or beyond the $45,000,000,000 limit. This is extra. A few days later, he asked for $1,277,000,000 more. Already, therefore, the total cost of regular and emergency defense items has been pushed up to the impressive figure of $4,600,000,000.

There is a great deal of doubt existing as to the ability of the various governmental agencies to spend this much money efficiently as rapidly as it is being appropriated. But they will make the effort. The money, we may be sure, will be spent. And unless past performance means nothing a great deal more will be appropriated before Congress adjourns.

Thus far, bear in mind, we as taxpayers haven't paid a single dollar of this extraordinary cost. True, our taxes for the past several years have been at about the World War peak. Still, they have been meeting but little more than half of the outlay. The New Deal spent $6,000,000,000 in 1934; $7,000,000,000 in 1935; $8,600,000,000 in 1936; $8,400,000,000 in 1937; $7,625,000,000 in 1938; $9,000,000,000 in 1939. During much of this time taxes yielded just about half what was spent.

So that even before any of this new defense spending came along, we were running in the hole, as indicated, from three to

four billion dollars a year. Under the best of circumstances, therefore, it would have become necessary either to raise taxes or curtail spending sharply very shortly now, if complete fiscal collapse were to be avoided.

Well, what is the situation now? To date Congress has taken up for consideration a tax bill which is expected, if passed, to raise about a billion dollars a year. It will accomplish this chiefly by raising rates under existing tax laws. There also is some vague talk about curtailing nondefense expenditures.

The billion-dollar tax bill, if passed, will represent the very first direct levy on the taxpayers to meet any of the extraordinary demands of the times. And it is plain that it will only scratch the surface. It will fall several billion dollars short of meeting the new expenditures for defense, to say nothing of meeting ordinary expenses which already, as noted, are running far ahead of revenue.

In short, the people of the United States face, in the immediate future, a tax burden never before dreamed of, much less borne in this country. At the time the new defense spending began Government—local, State, and National—was costing about a third of the national income, if the deficits are taken into consideration. Within a year, at the present rate of acceleration, governmental exactions well may amount to half of the public income. Out of every dollar you earn 50 cents will be earmarked for government.

You haven't felt this yet. But you will very, very soon, regardless of who is in the White House, regardless of what party is in power.

In these circumstances, and in the light of the record, doesn't the situation call above all else for an administration that knows the value of a dollar—an administration that understands and is capable of applying ordinary financial horse sense?

Let Congress Stay and Saw Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GALESBURG (ILL.) REGISTER-MAIL OF JUNE 7, 1940

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Galesburg (Ill.) Register-Mail of June 7:

[From the Galesburg (Ill.) Register Mail of June 7, 1940]

LET CONGRESS STAY AND SAW WOOD

Just at the time when everybody else is being urged to work harder and to slug away all the more earnestly at important business, Congress proposes to pack up and go home.

Month after month of work is tiresome for Congressmen, it is said. So it is for all of us. Congressmen have campaigning to do this fall, they protest. The country isn't interested in that.

The country is interested in getting its work done.

The country is interested in seeing that the armament program is actually followed through and results shown.

The country is interested in seeing that arrangements are made to pay for armament. It is ready to be taxed for security.

For Congress merely to appropriate any requested number of billions of dollars and then go gaily home is not good enough.

Congress may have its faults. But they are the faults of the people. Congress is the people in action. To argue that its presence in Washington would somehow hamper and handicap the preparedness effort seems foolish. We have not reached the point which England reached when it turned everything over to Churchill.

Congress is highly valuable in times like these as a sort of national listening post and broadcasting station in Washington. Its presence should have a steadying influence on the President, a constant reminder that he is responsible to the people, a constant source of strength in the thought that the "other half of the defense team" is still pulling.

A tax bill to take care of increased military expenditures should be passed before Congress adjourns. The old political belief always was that to levy taxes in an election year was unpopular. This year things are different. The Nation is aroused. It may be more unpopular not to levy taxes than to levy them.

The session should not close before definite provisions have been made for the Alaskan and Pan-American Highways. Both are defense measures that should be pushed forward this summer, not next year. Access to Alaska and the Canal Zone will not wait. There are many other vital measures awaiting action.

The European situation cannot be predicted 24 hours in advance. The rise of any morning's sun may look upon some completely unforeseen situation. Congress, direct representative of the people, should be on hand, not at the discretion of the President to recall it, but because, like everybody else these days, it is sticking to its job.

Our Own Back Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SALEM ECHO

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Salem Echo, published by Ira Gossett Hawk, of Plainview Farm, Lynchburg, Ohio, on June 7, 1940:

[From the Salem Echo]

OUR OWN BACK YARD

Now that Europe has the so-called total war, Americans realize more and more each day that we are not as safe as we thought. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Holland. It makes the chills chase up and down our spines when we think of them, but we cannot help it. Still we lose many hours of sleep looking into the future. The more we think of the horror of what is happening in Europe, the more easily we can be influenced by propaganda, which could draw us into the conflict.

Is it our fault that a man is ambitious? Are we responsible for Europe? Instead of getting the mote out of our neighbor's eye. we should take the beam from our own.

With all the unemployment in our own back yard, we have enough to do in putting our own Government on a sound basis, and to clean up our own dirt, without getting the others out of their mess.

What is happening, we seem to be unable to stop, but we can be prepared to do what is best for our country. To be prepared, we must set our house in order.

There are many men working for the Government of the United States of America. Are they there to help and protect their country, or to draw a fat salary?

Do they make laws for the good of the Nation of people, or to derive personal gain? Do we as a people believing in freedom take our Government for granted?

Large organizations invest money in foreign lands, and then when it faces destruction, they want the Nation to help them, consequently drawing us into war. Should we be responsible for ccmpanies so situated? They knew they were taking a chance when they invested their money, and weren't they doing it for personal gain?

As in Norway, "fifth columnists" are trying to undermine the governments of every country in the world; but in the United States the lawmakers have taken drastic measures to prevent such tactics here.

We must work for peace if we are to have peace.

We have a wonderful country; but it could be so much better if it were not so selfish, and did things for the good of our homeland. And if people would keep their fingers out of the other fellow's soup, they would not get burned.

A Plan for Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

LETTER AND BULLETIN FROM FRANCIS X. PHELAN, DEPARTMENT COMMANDER, UNITED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a letter received from Francis X. Phelan, Massachusetts department commander of the United American Veterans, in which he enclosed a copy of a bulletin containing interesting, constructive, and affirma-

tive instructions to the members of his organization under his jurisdiction showing active, not passive, cooperation in our national-defense program.

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT,
UNITED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Boston, Mass., May 27, 1940.

JOHN J. MCCORMACK, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find copy of the plan of action for preparedness adopted by the United American Veterans.

This organization is composed of all men who have served in the armed forces of these United States either in time of peace or war.

If you have any comments or suggestions pertaining to this plan, I would appreciate it very much if you would advise me.

I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS X. PHELAN,
Department Commander.

BULLETIN NO. 1

DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS,
UNITED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Boston, Mass., May 20, 1940.

Now is the time for calm and deliberate thinking, and we must not become panicky or hysterical, either in our thoughts or actions. While I do not anticipate this country becoming involved in the present European war, I am cognizant of the fact that we are in a state of unpreparedness. If an emergency should ever come the civilian populace will immediately turn to the veterans for guidance. All our members have at some time or other served in the armed forces of this country and have had a military training and which training has taught them to think clearly and act with precision. While the world at this particular time is in a turmoil of war it becomes the duty of the United American Veterans to set aside what other program and objectives they had planned to reach or accomplish and to now devote their time to passing along to the general public their knowledge of how to prepare for an emergency, it it should come, in an intelligent manner. And with this in mind I am submitting to you and all members of the United American Veterans the following plan of action:

1. Classes will be formed for the instruction of the general public and also our own members in the use of gas masks, on the effects of gas, and on the classification of gases. It is suggested that as we have many members who are in the active service and who have received this instruction, they be assigned as instructors.

2. Classes should be formed in the operation and maintenance of field kitchens, with the personnel of each kitchen unit being thoroughly trained in their respective duty. Again, members who are in the active service and who have received this instruction could be used as instructors.

3. First-aid classes to be formed, at which the general information pertaining to first aid would be given. It is suggested that any qualified member of the Red Cross or any other agency familiar with first-aid work be requested to furnish an instructor. The general public should be invited to attend these classes.

4. A classification of all the members in each respective post as to their particular trade be made, listing each member, his address, and his particular trade. The general public could be invited to be classified by the post, and their names added to this list of classifications of trade, these consolidated lists to be sent to the State Department in order that we might be able to turn them over to the proper authorities when the demand for skilled men is needed. I might add that this is a very important function and should be most accurate in its information.

5. That a list will be made of all privately owned motorcars in the city or town in which our respective posts have their headquarters, giving the owner's name, address, registration, and kind of cars, which cars could be used in any emergency if one should arise. It is suggested that at some later date, when each post has made a complete list, that a test mobilization be put on by each post to ascertain just how quickly these cars could be assembled in case of emergency.

6. A complete list of all motortrucks in the city or town in which our respective posts have their headquarters be made giving the name of the owner, address, tonnage of the truck, and its registration, these trucks to be used for the transportation of material and supplies if an emergency should arise. It is suggested at a future date that a test mobilization of this list be tried to see how promptly these trucks could be assembled in case of an emergency.

7. That all members of each post form themselves into an intelligence unit, always on the alert to ascertain and report any activities that might be suggestive of a "fifth column" or sabotage. This information should be immediately forwarded to the proper officials for investigation. It is suggested classes be formed in intelligence work and qualified instructors be asked to conduct the courses.

8. That the auxiliaries of each and every post immediately form nursing units and sewing units. The nursing units should be formed in classes and instruction given not only in first aid but in the care and evacuation of the sick or injured. The sewing classes should be given instruction in the making of bandages and sterilized pads.

Again I wish to reiterate that I do not offer this program as one of preparing for war but as one for preparing against war. I request that each post commander keep constantly advising this office of their work and accomplishments of the above program.

I am,

Yours in comradeship,

FRANCIS X. PHELAN,
Department Commander.

Amendment of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of today:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 10, 1940]

KEEP THAT PIGEONHOLE EMPTY

The Senate Labor Committee is preparing to pigeonhole for the Smith bill to revise the National Labor Relations Act and reform its administration.

This measure passed the House, 2 to 1, last week. But a majority of the Senate committee has long resisted all proposals for change in the Labor Act. And the Senate's Democratic leadership, under administration pressure to get Congress out of Washington in 2 weeks, wants to smother this and other domestic legislation, on the pretext that all attention must be centered on matters of national defense.

Revision of the Labor Act is no minor or purely domestic issue. The need for it, apparent long before the war broke in Europe, is much greater now. The American industrial machine cannot function with the full efficiency demanded by the great task of rearmament if Labor Board officials and employees, biased against industry, are allowed to go on throwing sand on its bearings and monkey wrenches into its cogs. All labor would be wise to welcome this proposal to put sense and justice into the Government's protection of labor's rights. For if, in months to come, the Labor Board continues to function as foolishly and unfairly as in years past, there will be irresistible public demands for something far more drastic than a corrective revision of the Labor Act.

The Senate should demand that its Labor Committee report out the Smith bill promptly for debate and a vote before adjournment. That pigeonhole should be left empty. The Senate cannot afford to abdicate in the face of its duty to the country to finish the job on which the House has done its part.

True Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FLINT (MICH.) DAILY JOURNAL OF JUNE 7, 1940

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial published in the Flint Daily Journal of Flint, Mich., under date of June 7, 1940.

In these days when we hear so much of "isms" and "fifth column" activities, it is refreshing to read an editorial embodying old-fashioned Americanism. If our Nation is to exist as we now know it, it must be because our citizenry are devoted to the Constitution, to the flag, and to those great American principles which have become our heritage.

The Dies investigating committee has clearly demonstrated to the Nation that un-American activities exist in our country. The American people, then, should awaken to their

responsibility and help rid this country of those whose doctrines are disloyal and whose hatreds of American institutions is apparent.

The United States Supreme Court in a recent decision affirmed the right of a State to require students in school to salute the American flag. While the radicals of the country opposed this decision, loyal citizens everywhere acclaimed it.

The Flint Daily Journal, of Flint, Mich., contained the following editorial upon the decision of the United States Supreme Court heretofore mentioned. This editorial is thoroughly patriotic and American and should be widely read. The editorial follows:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal of June 7, 1940]

COMPULSORY

There is not much reason to become unduly excited on the score of ultraliberalism merely because the United States Supreme Court has ruled, in a 8-to-1 decision, that school boards can compel students to salute the American flag.

There is too much disposition sometimes toward relaxing in the direction of undoing the essential ties to patriotism. We are all too much inclined, in the name of freedom, to think that freedom means an exemption from other fundamentals.

Why should any of us object to the salute to the flag? And, how better can the young people be taught the real lessons of our American democracy than by first learning that they must salute the symbol of our democracy.

The lesson we may have learned in the last few years from the obvious evidences of subversive activities in this country is that home defenses need more protection—and the salute to the flag is one of the outward ways of demonstrating genuine loyalty to the cause this country represents.

If there were anything arduous, frightening, or prejudicial in the act of saluting the American flag perhaps disagreement could be taken with this decision of the court. But, since it is the American flag, and considering the meaning of that flag, it is only fitting that this ruling should make us "stand up and cheer."

The Third Army Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Third Army maneuvers, perhaps the greatest peacetime military concentration in American history, were recently held in the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana which I have the honor to represent. The fine people of that district appreciate the action of the Government in holding these maneuvers there and I have received good reports of the fine feeling manifested by the people and the soldiers. The Eighth District of Louisiana is well situated for such maneuvers. The Federal Government owns a great deal of the land where the maneuvers were held. As the Representative of the Eighth Congressional District, it has been my happy privilege to cooperate with the military authorities in every respect. I can assure them that they will continue to have our support and cooperation. We welcome the prospect of having 120,000 men in the district for the maneuvers later this year.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks I include a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Alexandria, La.:

Be it resolved by the board of directors of the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, on motion made and carried, at the conclusion of the Third Army maneuvers, admittedly the greatest peacetime concentration of troops in American history, that the community is proud that its hinterland has served the national interest as the maneuver area and proud also of the opportunity to be host to such a distinguished portion of the Federal military forces as constituted the Third Army; but be it even more especially

Resolved, That the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, record the fact that it has been extremely impressed during the period of the maneuvers involving more than 70,000 troops, by the excellent bearing and deportment of the soldiers of the United States Army. At no previous time in the rather lengthy experience which our community has enjoyed with the Regular Army have our citizens been so genuinely pleased with its military visitors as upon this occasion: Be it, therefore, further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armies, to the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, to the members of the Military Affairs Committees of both Senate and House, and to the Senators and Congressmen from Louisiana, with the request that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Proclamation by the Government to the People of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

PROCLAMATION ISSUED MARCH 14, 1940

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of the proclamation of the Government of the Republic of Finland to the people of that brave and harassed country on the occasion of the cessation of the war with Soviet Russia.

The spirit of the people of this northern nation, which, God be thanked, has preserved its independence and freedom in spite of the unwarranted attack of the communistic Soviet Government, is of such a character that we can well take inspiration from it.

Reconstruction is the order of the day, and in a world seething with the bloodiest warfare of all time, Finland tragically holds a torch aloft. I know I speak the wish of millions of Americans when I say: May God bless Finland.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNMENT TO THE PEOPLE OF FINLAND, MARCH 14, 1940

By a treaty of peace signed yesterday hostilities between Finland and the Soviet Union have been brought to an end.

On the outbreak of hostilities on November 30, the Finnish people took up their defense against the superior forces in a spirit of unanimity which set an example to the whole world. With the same unanimity our army and the Finnish people who supported it by their labors maintained their defensive struggle for three and a half months.

In the defense of the fatherland and our most precious values, thousands of our best men have fallen and even more have sustained permanent injuries. The fatherland will eternally remember their heroic deeds and bless their memory. The number of those, too, who lost their lives behind the front is great.

When the Government of Finland decided to cease hostilities and conclude peace with the Government of the Soviet Union, this step was taken in the firm conviction that the nation would thus be preserved from still greater misfortunes.

By the joint efforts of our heroic and well-led army and the entire nation, and the blood sacrifices of Finnish youth, we have been able, in spite of cessions of territory, to preserve the dearest of our values, our liberty, to save our national honor, and thus redeem for ourselves the right to an undisturbed work of reconstruction.

While the great war still goes on the nation turns from works of war to tasks of peace.

The Government recognizing the sacred memory of the heroic dead and the value of their deeds, is conscious of its duty to embark with all possible speed on the reconstruction of the country. The Government will have specially at heart the care of the dependents of the heroic dead and the invalided. The duty of the Government will further be to take care of the dependents of those lacking private means who lost their lives or were invalided behind the front. One of the first duties will be to see that justice is done to the inhabitants of the ceded areas and their existence speedily organized, and also that homes destroyed in the aerial bombardments are rebuilt.

The nation thus has before it a work of reconstruction and resettlement calling for the utmost exertions and sacrifices. Yet, taking into account the rapid progress made by the nation after it had achieved its independence, the Government believes that this gigantic work will succeed.

At its hour of fate the nation drew together in the protection of the Fatherland in full unanimity. From now onward the nation must tread its path more closely united than ever before. The nation had been steeled by countless reverses. History shows that Finland, thanks to its unyielding tenacity, has before this successfully emerged from times of hardship.

United, trusting in the Almighty and in each other, we go forth to build a new future.

What Is Needed for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Republican leader of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Saturday, June 8:

Originally it was my intention in this talk to review the present session of the Congress. It was then expected this might be very close to the date of adjournment. It is now obvious there should be no adjournment for some time to come, if we are to deal intelligently and thoroughly with the new problems confronting us.

I do not believe this Congress should adjourn with so much necessary work to do. I believe the folks back home will feel a bit more comfortable if they have on guard here in Washington their own representatives, who possess their confidence gained through the years.

The Republicans, realizing the desires of the people, want to stay in session just as long as they can be of service. They want to stay here and discharge their constitutional responsibilities, instead of delegating those powers to others. They want to stay here and exercise their influence in steadying the Nation. They want to stay here to study and debate thoroughly all these tremendous issues. I believe the people expect them to do so.

Economy is still a vital necessity in this Nation. The fact that we are faced by a need for the rapid creation of a national defense on a scale vastly greater than has ever before been required in peacetime is no reason for us to throw caution to the winds; to toss economy out the window; to embark on a wild, hysterical effort to overcome by sheer spending of money the neglect which has brought us to our present state of inadequate national preparedness.

There is growing evidence of a spirit on the part of some people in high places to begin spending on an unlimited scale. This must not be tolerated.

To permit a spirit of hysteria, recklessness, or violent emotionalism to take over the helm of Government or to direct the building of a national defense is to invite waste, extravagance, graft, and, worst of all, the piling up of a huge new public debt without actually accomplishing the creation of an adequate national defense.

Let us spend what is necessary for an adequate national defense, but let us be sure it is efficiently spent. We do not want, and we cannot afford to have waste and worse in the creation of our national preparedness again as we had it in the first World War.

We know billions were wasted during the last war because of unpreparedness and our futile efforts to make the too-hasty spending of stupendous sums of money compensate for our previous national short-sightedness. We cannot afford to repeat that foolish course. We were able to overcome such tremendous handicaps then because we were a rich Nation with practically no Federal debt. We are still a rich Nation—but the Federal debt has grown to proportions which threaten the security of even our rich country.

Reckless spending and waste by the New Deal has made necessary the imposition of tremendous taxes upon the American people. The surplus capacity to borrow which we should possess to care for the extraordinary expenses of defense is gone, frittered away by the experimenters, who knew how to do well only one thing—spend.

Today, without taking care of $1 of the huge defense bill, we find our debt limit of 45 billions will be reached February 1. The first call was for $700,000,000 new taxes and to increase the debt limit $3,000,000,000. Already the Ways and Means Committee believes this is not enough and is boosting further both the debt limit and taxes. We must not forget this increasing of the limit is a step toward inflation and national bankruptcy.

This first call for taxes will be followed by another bigger demand next year, after the election. No one in this country will escape these taxes. The people must begin to plan to pay the heavy cost of the New Deal joy ride.

Critics of unwise spending policies were cried down by the experimenters in the administration who believed we could borrow and spend our way out of the depression.

But certainly those critics whose warnings have now been so amply and tragically confirmed deserve a fair hearing when they now speak against the same sort of waste, extravagance, and recklessness in government which have in 7 years brought us to the difficult and dangerous situation in which we now find ourselves.

The Republicans in Congress have fought resolutely to bring back sanity to government. We have opposed experiments which would drain the Public Treasury. We have fought for economy in government in order to avert the very financial crisis which has been brought on by wild, indiscriminate New Deal spending.

We have fought to give business, small and large, a chance to operate so it might give jobs at American wages to millions of our countrymen. We have fought to restore to the people, through their Representatives in Congress, powers which were mistakenly entrusted to the President and the bureaucracy. We have fought to give this country the benefit of a real two-party government. We have striven to make the minority party in Congress today a fearless, vigorous opposition, ready to support those measures which would contribute to the public welfare, and equally ready to oppose proposals we believed would retard recovery and be harmful to the country. And we appreciate the patriotism of those Democrats who have often joined us in our battles.

There has been much loose talk about abandonment of the two-party system, so to speak, and the silencing of all constructive criticism in a so-called "unity of effort."

Unity of effort we should and must have. But we also need and must have fair, honest, constructive criticism unless we want to pile mistake upon mistake. There can be real unity of effort without any abandonment of the traditional American two-party system. To insist that the two-party system be given up is to insist that only the majority party has any patriotism, any interest in the safety and security of the Nation, or any desire for an adequate national defense. To assert such a thing would be absurd.

Without constructive criticism to curb the spenders we might be plunged into a wild nightmare of extravagance which would gravely endanger not only our constitutional Republic but our very defense itself.

We Republicans have placed, and will continue to place, the welfare of our country first. The Republicans in Congress are 100 percent for American security.

There has been a studied effort on the part of some to create hysteria in this Nation. Hysteria is unwarranted. This is a time when, if we are to take the actions essential for our welfare, we must be cool and calm.

We must not lose any time in bringing our defenses to a point where America can defend herself from any attack. We do not expect any attack, and we certainly hope there will be none. Prudence, however, demands adequate preparedness.

Republicans in Congress can be depended upon to give solid support to all real defense measures. Naturally they resent efforts to make national-defense measures vehicles for granting dictatorial powers to the Executive.

Let the elimination of politics in defense matters be the resolute purpose of both parties.

This can be accomplished by sincerely directing defense measures to their avowed purpose. There is more to defense than headlines and appropriation by Congress of huge sums of money. We want this money honestly and prudently spent for the type of weapons and materials which will most quickly give us the greatest measure of protection where it is most needed. This can be done only through the appointment of men and women who have demonstrated in the past their capacity to get results. This is no job for the Government playboys or the experimenters. The people are demanding constructive work, prompt action, and careful planning, instead of beautiful phrases, glittering promises, and impressive gestures.

No defense can be considered effective without curbing the subversive forces now commonly called the "fifth column." We Republicans have never courted them. We are in no way responsible for their existence as a menacing factor in our national life.

It is too late now to discuss why they are here or who encouraged them. They are here, and we must take prompt and vigorous action to see that they cannot operate in America as they did in Norway, Holland, and in other countries. America must rid herself of Trojan horses. We must suppress those forces which are ready at a crucial moment to destroy the Nation.

Unfortunately, many of this group have been able to secure important berths in our Government. Those in the Government service who are known to be hostile to our constitutional form of government should be eliminated without a minute's hesitation, and those outside Government must be checked with equal promptness.

It will be of no avail to spend billions for defense and then wake up too late to the realization that we have permitted the "fifth column" to checkmate all those preparations and to scuttle America. The elimination of the subversive forces must be a primary part of our defense.

Let's go calmly about building our national defense with the least loss of time, effort, and money. Meanwhile let us continue to hold on to our constitutional form of government; let us continue to hold on to the Bill of Rights; let us continue our traditional two-party system of government; let us not abandon our liberties and our rights and our privileges simply because some people begin to cry "wolf." Prepare? Yes. But let us keep our heads while we do it.

What the American People Should Not Overlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BUCYRUS (OHIO) TELEGRAPH-FORUM

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial of Rowland R. Peters, editor, Bucyrus Telegraph-Forum, Ohio, that appeared in the May 23 issue of that publication, entitled "What the American People Should Not Overlook."

I hope that every Member of this Congress will avail himself of the opportunity to read Mr. Peters' timely remarks.

[From the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum of May 23, 1940]

WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD NOT OVERLOOK

However agreed the American people now are or may become with President Roosevelt's war-preparedness program, they should not overlook the regrettable fact that their country is not financially prepared to enter into such a program and that responsibility for our unpreparedness rests solely upon Franklin Roosevelt. Whatever defense measures are finally adopted by Congress must, because of 8 years of new dealism, be another mortgage upon our future generations.

Like Nero, Mr. Roosevelt and his corps of extravagant spenders have been fiddling while Rome has been burning. The President himself has talked much about his hatred for war, but he has done nothing to prepare for the day when he might be called upon to prove this hatred. There is absolutely no credit due him for his defense message. Any person could have asked and said as much without offering specific recommendations for paying the bill.

There are but two avenues open for congressional travel in the fulfillment of an adequate defense program. One is new taxes, the other a boost in the legal debt limit. All other avenues have been closed by the Roosevelt administration. The facts should today be uppermost in the public mind. And the people should also not overlook that were it not for Mr. Roosevelt's meddling in Europe's affairs our defense problem would not now be as pressing as it is.

It is clear that President Roosevelt is using the European war to further his own political interests. By his personal utterances against totalitarian policies, utterances which date back to his dedicatory address at Chicago's Outer Drive Bridge several years ago, he has imperiled America's international security just as he has over the last 8 years imperiled her domestic security. He wants America put into a position where it will believe next November that it cannot survive without his leadership. He wants events to be such that the people will overlook and excuse the condition into which he has put the country's financial and economic structure.

President Roosevelt has failed as a President. He has broken a trust with the American people. A man who cannot be a successful Chief Executive in peacetimes most certaintly could not be a successful Chief Executive during wartimes. And a man who has repeatedly broken faith with the public during peacetimes most certainly should not be entrusted with the Nation's affairs during wartimes.

Today he is making every effort to build himself up for November. So far he has refused to reveal his political intentions, but they are obvious. He is offering key posts to Republicans. Why? Is it not that he is attempting to break up the high command of the Republican Party to open a clear track for the party he deserted shortly after he took office back in 1933?

America is not as close to war as Mr. Roosevelt would have the people believe. It is as close as it is only by reason of his own interference in matters which are not our business, however much they concern us. We need to be prepared for any eventuality. We need a defense upon which we can rely for national protection, but our first line of defense should be the elimination from public affairs of those who have brought the situation as close to America as it is and who have closed all doors to preparedness without further mortgaging our future. Preparedness is more than military strength. It is financial and economic security plus military strength. Mr. Roosevelt has robbed us of the former and thrown the latter into financial danger. So long as he is President we cannot have domestic nor international security.

National Defense and the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM PROF. J. L. SELLERS AND EDITORIAL COMMENT THEREON

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter appearing in the Lincoln Star, of Lincoln, Nebr., on June 5, 1940, entitled "Defense—Problem No. 1," from Prof. J. L. Sellers, of the University of Nebraska faculty. I also ask to have printed in the same connection an editorial commenting upon the letter of Professor Sellers, written by J. E. Lawrence, editor of the Lincoln Star, and published on June 5, 1940.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of June 5, 1940]

PEOPLE'S FORUM—DEFENSE—PROBLEM NO. 1

To the EDITOR OF THE LINCOLN STAR:

The world of our colonial ancestors was a linear world. Men of those days moved slowly over the level waters. They followed the worn valleys of streams and sometimes threaeded the mountain passes. Their heavier commerce was borne by wind or gravity. Man moved independent of wind and gravity only by painful exertion of animal power. Land barriers of mountains, deserts, and vast expanses defined the orbits of land communication, and the seas connected the threading inlets. The possession of a few well-selected spots as bases for sea patrol controlled the routes of the world and made sea power the decisive factor in human affairs. The fact that no one continent possesses or produces all the commodities for human existence makes the control of the interconnection of continents vital to the people of every continent. The North American continent is not self-sufficient and probably can never become so.

As long as man's activity was confined to the surface of the land and the water, a great navy gave us our security, and doubly so while we remained friendly with the other greatest naval power. With our fleet in the Pacific and a friendly fleet in the Atlantic we felt fully protected.

The world has changed. Man has left the surface of land and water. He travels beneath the waves and he pierces the stratosphere. Communication has abandoned its linear grooves. The air encircling the earth is a network of air lines of infinite numbers piled layer upon layer and completely intercommunicable. There are no barriers; there are no bottlenecks; there are no impregnable heights and no inaccessible fortresses. What does a Louisburg, a heights of Abraham, a rock of Gibraltar, or the bluffs of Vicksburg mean in these days? Attacks can be brought against any position. Advantages of defense due to inaccessible positions have disappeared.

How has this affected warfare? The old assertion that it is more costly to attack than to defend is completely obliterated. The new speed has given the great advantage to offense. The entire area of every country is open to attack as soon as an enemy can establish an air base within flying distance. The enemy does not have to enter by harbors or by railroads or by motor trails. He is borne on the ever-present air. A nation cannot concentrate its defense in one place to meet attack. The defense must be scattered over the entire region. The offense concentrates its strength and assaults the weakest and most vulnerable point with lightning speed and destruction, and the defender has no chance to collect strength to meet it.

The new blitzkrieg has made defensive warfare a futile illusion. The only defense that exists in these days is an offense against the base from whence the attackers can come.

This is a changed world; a world of a new dimension. A nation that does not recognize this fact and adapt itself to the crisis will go the way of the eight liberal states that so recently were but are no more.

J. L. SELLERS.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star of June 5, 1940]

HEART AND CORE

(By J. E. Lawrence, editor)

One single paragraph of the Monroe Doctrine, as it came from the pen of the fifth President of the United States, to dominate

American foreign policy over a period of more than a hundred years, is sufficient to show why it is heart and core of present American interest in the present European war. That paragraph follows:

"It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injury or make preparations for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere, we are of necessity more immediately connected, and, by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers, the political system of the Allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their systems to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it and whose independence we have in great consideration and just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purposes of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

That paragraph walks again as a result of developments in Europe. It does not, the language makes plain, limit itself to actual physical invasion of the territories of the two American Continents. Specifically, it extends itself to any attempt to interfere with or control the affairs of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Then the Holy Alliance of Europe was considering steps to reestablish the influence of Spain, and of the Spanish crown among the South American republics. Now, it would seem that the Monroe Doctrine is doubly vital to the American people.

It is of greater importance because the problem of the security and safety of peaceful peoples has been increased infinitely by the changes in modern warfare. Defenses which were looked upon as adequate if not impregnable no longer are the insurmountable barriers which they were. The English Channel, with its narrow strip of water, was sufficient to safeguard the British people from invasion for 800 years. No military expert pretends it is an imposing obstacle today.

Elsewhere on this page is a discussion of the new problem of national defense by an able, scholarly historian. What he sets forth in condensed form is true. Water and land have been conquered by the new methods of transportation—by the airplane and by mechanized land forces. The strategy of war, a war of conquest, has changed. Previously in conflicts between evenly matched nations it was the attacking armies which bore the brunt of battle. Today it is the defending armies which are confronted with graver problems, if not called upon to bear the heavier losses in men and materials. More than ever before war strategy has changed to make the best defense a spirited offense.

In practical application, if, as Monroe said, it was an unfriendly act 100 years ago to attempt to fasten the policy of aggression and conquest on countries of the Western Hemisphere, it becomes doubly so today. Can the American people complacently approve of the establishment of naval and air bases in South American territorial waters? Can they permit European nations to secure a foothold in South America? Can they let that happen without gambling dangerously on the future?

Those are questions which naturally this country would like to dodge. It prefers peace. It is committed so strongly to peace that it hesitates, at times, to give thought to developments intimately connected with peace. They have been told many times by ambitious leaders exercising dictatorial powers as the representatives of totalitarian governments that democratic institutions are outlawed and that the happiness and contentment of the peoples of the world depend upon the substitution of totalitarian governments for democracies. The Western Hemisphere is the last, as well as the first cradle of liberty. It must be preserved.

The American Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the pen of Ben Hur Lampman and published in the Portland Oregonian of the issue of May 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of May 30, 1940]

DO WE LIVE FOR AMERICA NOW?

If one of ours might come back on this day of memory from the field where he fell, the grave that is nameless, or arise from the green fathoms of ocean, he would find the Americans to be offering garlands as his memorial, while rededicating themselves to the precious traditions and liberties for which he yielded his life. He would be young, we think, this hero for whom April never shall come again, nor the plow in the cornland nor the tryst at the crossroads. And this is just about what he would say to those who came afterward, when the pain was at an end and the gun smoke had drifted away:

I died for America. Say, if you will, that the confusion of lesser issues, the babel of voices in controversy, the charges and countercharges, were chaos to me. Say, if you will that I went lightly and with laughter to my sacrifice, unaware of the disputes and stratagems of the statesmen, as youth advances to an adventure, to the greatest adventure of all—still is this true of the score that I paid; I died for America. For the valleys you love, for the home in the valley, for the cities that were and that should be. For the traditions that were and are far dearer to us than the spring of the year or the wheat field of autumn. I died for America.

The planning, the statecraft, the scheming, I left to the others, far wiser than I. And this I knew only, that there was a need. All they might say, though they said it with tongues of flame, or the cool reason of logic, meant less to me than a single idea, constant, unchanging, an ideal—and the ideal was the land that I loved. The word was a hymn in my thought. The word was America. And what else had significance? The girl at the gate, the plow in the cornland, the immediacy and urgency of April, though these were all in all to me there was something else that was more. In the thunder of battle or the stillness of pain, by land or by sea, I died because I believed.

There is a gladness even in fear, when the flesh shrinks from the testing, and this I have known. Do not grieve for me now. These wreaths that you bring me shall wither, and soon, as all wreaths must wither. Do not grieve for me now. If you have a service to do me, a tribute to pay, think instead of the part that I played, and the price that I paid, for the home that you have in the valley, and the city that rests by the river.

Well I know, well we know—says the voice from the past, the voice out of history—that you, too, are willing to die for America, to die as I died. But the voice that I raise is one of a chorus of voices, of lips long since stilled, and the question we ask of you now is of few words and simple. Have you lived for America, you who came after? For we testify now, we who have warrant and authenticity, that it is simpler far to die for America than to live for her. One dies in a moment, one lives through the years—and there are no temptations in death, no lingering weakness, no last indecision. Are you living for America now?

And he might say, this one of ours, on the day we keep with fidelity and that which we consider devotion: Ask of your hearts, you Americans, kinsmen of mine and comrades still, if you live for America now. For it is evident to the dead, who were guided to death by a constant ideal, that the cynicism and insincerity of politics have misled you, that self-interest has counseled, and demagogs have swayed. It is evident to the dead that often you have asked yourselves, in the exercise of your franchise, not "Is it best for America?" but "Is it best for me?"

It is evident to the contemplative dead that you have misused, at your comfort and convenience, those liberties for which the shattered frigate sank and the last trench was taken. It is evident to the patriotic dead that you have given hearing to the sophists because their words were pleasing, and have closed your ears to the earnest and the sincere. It is evident to the dead that you have made a mockery of your common traditions and political sport of your heritage of liberty. As did we—say the dead—yet we died. And in death there is purification and understanding.

Ask yourself, "Is it best for America?" Ask yourself, "Have I self-interest beyond or beneath my Americanism?" Ask yourself, "What have I given to America?" And again, "What can I give?" Put it plainly, "They died for an ideal, and the ideal is America; how have I kept it?" Ask yourself, as they ask you, "They died for America, in the laughter and terror of youth—cannot I live for her now?" For they say to us now, on this day of their memory, this hour of the crisis, when gusts assault the flame, they, the torch-bearers, "We are those who died for our country, for the home in the valley, the city beside the untroubled river. Are you living for America now?"

If one of ours might come back from the field that is only a date in a history book, from the secret, green depths of the sea, in the uniform of his service, with the glow of his heart in his face, and it so very young, this is what he might say to us now. This is what he must say.

Benefits Under Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT BY THE RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement by the Railway Labor Executives' Association supporting S. 3920, now on the Senate Calendar, to liberalize the benefits paid unemployed workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Railway Labor Executives' Association has unanimously endorsed S. 3920, a bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, introduced by Senator WAGNER and favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce and now on the Consent Calendar.

In support of the association's position, the following facts are respectfully submitted:

(1) In order to make the solvency of the railroad unemployment insurance system absolutely certain, this association sponsored the original Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act on an ultraconservative basis.

It was deemed advisable to proceed on that basis 2 years ago, because at that time most of the States had launched their unemployment-insurance systems on a somewhat similar basis.

However, since then, many of the States have liberalized their unemployment-compensation systems with the result that, during the current year, at least 50 percent of the more than 160,000 railroad employees who are drawing benefits receive less than they would have secured under State laws.

The average benefit during the base year has been only at the rate of $7 per week, an amount obviously so inadequate as to require no further argument on that point.

(2) Under the present system, a railroad worker who becomes unemployed must wait, on the average, 38 days before receiving any benefits. It needs no elaboration by us to indicate that interruption of a regular income for so long a period will have most unfortunate results for railroad workers who are victims of unemployment.

(3) It cannot be successfully challenged that the railroad unemployment-insurance system is financially capable of supporting the benefits provided in S. 3920. On the contrary, there is an ample surplus in the fund to take care of the increased benefits proposed by S. 3920. These increased benefits, in a year like the present, would amount to the sum of $12,000,000.

(4) Certain administrative provisions of the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are forcing many thousands of railroad employees to register for waiting period credits which, in most cases, will be of no use to them. Experience has indicated the desirability of simplifying the act in this and other respects so as to relieve railroad workers of unnecessary burdens without jeopardizing the solvency of the system.

(5) If the unemployment-insurance system is to remain simple, it will be necessary to fix base years and benefit years. Both the railroads and the standard railroad labor organizations agree that the base year should be the calendar year and the benefit year should begin July 1 of each year.

(6) Unless action is taken at the current session of Congress, revision of the unemployment-insurance system will be delayed until July 1, 1941. We submit there is no substantial reason for any such delay. On the contrary, the reasons for immediate action are convincing and impelling.

We feel it is only necessary to direct the attention of Members of the Senate to this situation to convince them of the desirability of taking steps to correct the intolerable condition which now exists.

Permit us to repeat that in making this appeal we are expressing the unanimous sentiment of the authorized representatives of the 21 standard railroad labor organizations now functioning in the transportation industry, and we are also confident we are expressing the unanimous sentiment of the approximately 1,000,000 American railroad workers who are active members of those organizations.

In every State of the Union are hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of railroad workers who will be vitally affected by the legislation we propose. In their name, as well as in the names of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, we take the liberty of urging immediate and favorable action on this most important bill.

A. Johnston, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; D. B. Robertson, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; J. A. Phillips, Order of Railway Conductors of America; T. C. Cashen, Switchmen's Union of North America; V. O. Gardner, The Order of Railroad Telegraphers; C. L. Darling, American Train Dispatchers Association; B. M. Jewell, Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.; H. W. Moun, International Association of Machinists; J. A. Franklin, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America; Roy Horn, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; Felix H. Knight, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America; L. M. Wicklein, vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; J. J. Duffy, vice president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Geo. Wright, vice president, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers; Geo. M. Harrison, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; F. H. Fijazdal, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; A. E. Lyon, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; M. S. Warfield, Order of Sleeping Car Conductors; James J. Delaney, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; S. J. Hogan, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; Jos. P. Ryan, International Longshoremen's Association; J. G. Luhrson, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association.

The Alien Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ASHEVILLE (N. C.) CITIZEN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article addressed to Editor of the Citizen, a daily newspaper published in my home town of Asheville, N. C., entitled "The Alien Question," and signed "An American."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen]

THE ALIEN QUESTION

EDITOR OF THE CITIZEN:

Just let a guy have a brand new idea that is contrary to what men probably would have thought during the days of George Washington and you will see the "horse and buggy" boys grab their muzzle-loaders, buggywhips, and pitchforks, and go on the warpath to destroy that man. Those same old fossilized backseat drivers have just about ruined England and France, and if their moth-eaten ideas are followed in the United States our great national-defense program will be an international joke.

Think of the lives that could have been saved had England listened to a progressive like Eden instead of following the leadership of an ultraconservative like Chamberlain.

Gen. Billy Mitchell, 15 or more years ago, on the lecture platform and in articles that appeared in nationally circulated magazines, warned the American people that the next war would be fought in the air as well as on the ground and water, and that we should arm accordingly. What happened? The "horse and buggy" brass hats said, in effect, that wars were not fought that way during the days of George Washington and, therefore, General Mitchell was all wet. They were so peeved at General Mitchell for having a new idea that they kicked him out of the Army. Now, who was right: The "horse and buggy" boys or the late Gen. Billy Mitchell?

About 5 years ago Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS introduced a bill in the United States Senate providing that all aliens be registered, fingerprinted, and photographed, so that the Government could deport the millions of foreigners who have illegally entered the United States, and also that the Government could know at all times where the aliens are and what they are doing in this country. Senator REYNOLDS also proposed that immigration be stopped for a period of 10 years, or until American industry could absorb the millions of unemployed American citizens, and decent aliens who

have come to this country legally to become law-abiding, loyal citizens of the United States. What happened? Senator REYNOLDS, like General Billy Mitchell, got nowhere with his sound and wise ideas. The "horse and buggy" boys laughed at the Senator's proposals, saying, in effect, that George Washington favored unrestricted immigration, and, therefore, Senator REYNOLDS was all wet. However, Senator REYNOLDS will not likely suffer the fate of General Mitchell and lose his job because he had a fresh, crisp idea. The American people, having seen what aliens, affectionately referred to as Trojan horses and "fifth columnists," have done to Holland, Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, France, and England, know that Senator REYNOLDS was eternally right, and that his bills should have been enacted into laws years ago.

One of the greatest needs in this country today is for the American people to listen more to the thinking men of 1940 and less to what men are supposed to have thought in 1776. George Washington never dreamed there would ever be flying machines, radio, steam engines, and steamboats, so why try to make everything Washington, Jefferson, and other revered American statesmen and patriots thought, more than 150 years ago, apply to conditions existing today? Conditions change, and governments and their armies must change to meet new conditions.

AN AMERICAN.

Roosevelt and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me a very able and brilliant editorial from the Birmingham News of June 6 last, written by Mr. Osburn Zuber, under the caption "Roosevelt and the War." I think the editorial ought to have the widest possible distribution. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham News of June 6, 1940]

ROOSEVELT AND THE WAR

Every man who has ever served in the White House has had to bear criticism, some of it deserved and some not deserved. Franklin D. Roosevelt doubtless realizes that as well as anyone, and expects his share of criticism, which he probably does not mind too much; he has shown that he can take it. Yet few men who have occupied the Presidency have been subjected to as constant and as bitter a bombardment of criticism as Franklin D. Roosevelt, and in still fewer cases has so much of it been unwarranted and unfair.

Since the very first months of his administration, President Roosevelt has been under unrelenting attack by certain groups—and nobody needs to name them. The "Roosevelt haters" have made that term a famous one. How they do hate Roosevelt! They always have; they always will. They did not say so much against him in the first 2 or 3 months after he took office in those dark days of 1933, when he was giving this Nation as marvelous an example of dauntless and inspiring leadership as it has ever had during a crisis. The banks were all closed when his administration began, and business was at its lowest ebb; nobody knew what was going to happen to the country. And Franklin D. Roosevelt took firm hold of the helm the minute he was sworn in, and he spoke needed words of encouragement to the country, and he started doing things at once, with the wise acquiescence of a Congress which did not deserve the epithet of "rubber stamp" which the Roosevelt haters soon started hurling at it.

For a few months the President's critics withheld their fire, while Mr. Roosevelt, by the force and magnetism of his leadership, was restoring the public confidence that was so badly shaken then, in 1933, that now we can hardly realize how desperate we did feel in those days. But the Roosevelt haters were sharpening their knives. And soon after some confidence had returned to the American people—and to American business itself—and economic conditions had begun to improve, they unsheathed their sharpened knives.

Ever since then they have been hacking away, in season and out. There is no closed season on hating Roosevelt.

Now our country is facing another grave crisis of a different sort. The trend of events in the war in Europe raises great potential danger to our national security. We must arm and prepare ourselves for any possible eventuality, and we must do it quickly.

Again President Roosevelt is giving the country strong and courageous leadership in a critical time. He has spoken frankly to the country and he has made bold recommendations. Congress and the public alike have responded to his leadership. Congress and the President are working together—as "a team," in Mr. Roosevelt's own words—in this emergency.

How about the Roosevelt haters? They find themselves in a somewhat embarrassing situation. They are, naturally, in favor of the defense program which the President has launched; but they are very reluctant to speak well or think well of Mr. Roosevelt. In this grave hour, they cannot forget that they do not like Mr. Roosevelt, and that this "madman" in the White House is "ruining the country."

While their natural impulses make them want to applaud what the President is doing now for national defense, they cannot help relapsing into the old mood of dislike of Roosevelt's domestic policies. Alternately, it seems, they want to cheer and jeer.

So how are they meeting this awkward situation? They have gotten under way what appears to be a well-organized campaign of sniping, of petty pin pricks here and there, of quibbling over details of defense policy, and the like. What the President proposes is right, they say; but he is doing it all wrong they add. And what he should do is to appoint somebody—some one man—to do the whole job. The American people regard the President as the "one man" to direct the Nation's efforts in a crisis like this.

They have gotten under way also another line of attack, which is that Roosevelt should have let the country know about all this danger long ago, instead of waiting, as they say, until disaster was upon us, only to find out that we have no defensive strength "worth speaking of." They say that either Roosevelt did not know about it when he should have, and is therefore incompetent, or else he knew about it and did not tell the people, and is therefore untrustworthy. He should start telling the people "the truth," they say, and treat them like "grown-ups."

How shamefully unfair! Roosevelt has been warning this country of possible dangers for at least 3 years. And what did the Roosevelt haters do every time he said anything? They promptly yelled: "Roosevelt is trying to get the country into war!"

They did that when the President spoke at Chicago, nearly 3 years ago, of the menace of "gangster" nations. They did it when he spoke nearly 2 years ago, about the time of the Munich appeasement, of the necessity for America's relying more on arms and less on words. Every time they howled: "Roosevelt is trying to get us into war!" He told them, and they would not believe him. He told the American people about this danger faster than they were willing to accept his statements. For the people were misled by the Roosevelt haters who said that Roosevelt was trying to get us into war."

Only a few months ago, shortly after war was declared in Europe, President Roosevelt had one of the hardest fights of his life to get Congress to modify our ridiculous and utterly useless neutrality legislation. Who can forget how hard he had to fight to get that done? And who is there who today will say he was not right about it? And still they say, "Roosevelt should have told us sooner."

This editorial is no protest against criticism. We say that anybody ought to criticize any administration whenever he has grounds for criticism. We recognize that there are and always will be differences of opinion. To fair criticism of Roosevelt we do not object. This newspaper itself has criticized the President very strongly for some things, but it has never failed to praise him when it thought he deserved it. This paper has criticized the President, but it has never hated him. That is the difference; and that is what we object to—blind hatred of the President by those who will never grant that he may be right about anything.

Certainly Roosevelt has been right about this danger for years, and the people would not heed his warnings until they got scared by what they saw happening in Europe. They did not heed his warnings largely because the Roosevelt haters were saying the President was trying to get us into war.

Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in the midst of the worst depression in our history. It was not a depression of his making. And he did his level best to pull the country out of it, with, we believe, marked success, despite the calamity howling still to be heard.

Franklin D. Roosevelt as President now has to face as grave an international situation, perhaps, as has ever confronted the United States. He is not responsible for the war abroad, or for its effects on us. And he is doing his level best to steer a wise course for the Nation.

Meanwhile, the Roosevelt haters, knowing that he is trying to do the right thing, nevertheless, cannot forget that they do not like Roosevelt and are not supposed to say anything kind about him. They are trying to take advantage of this national crisis by using it for political purposes. Openly they are using it to try to block a third term. They are belittling him and poisoning people's minds against him.

Third term or no third term, Roosevelt is our President for at least 7 months more, and these may be the most fateful 7 months in all American history. Yet there are many who still chant the old hymn of hate.

They ought to be profoundly ashamed of themselves.

Keep Free From Foreign Entanglements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the Washington Times-Herald for May 24, 1940:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 24, 1940]

IN THE NEWS

There are many hotheads, and quite a proportion of boneheads, in the United States who are urging the country to get into the European war.

These folk probably think they are moved by some sort of high idealism.

As a matter of fact, they are merely the weak and vacillating victims of propaganda and hysteria.

A few months ago they, like all other intelligent Americans, were cool-headedly calculating the unavailing cost of the last war, the utter failure of America's high objectives of permanent democracy, of open covenants openly arrived at, of self-determination of all peoples.

The facts of history have not changed.

It is the thistledown thoughts, the tumbleweed minds, blown hither and thither by every changing puff of propaganda or breath of hysteria, that have changed.

Some of our leaders are probably influenced, as Wilson was influenced, by a desire to occupy an important place in history, and to take a big part in world events—violating the injunction of the fathers of the Republic to keep free from foreign entanglements.

But most of us small fry are animated by no more intelligent motive than the moth which sacrifices itself in the flame, impelled by hysteria and dazed by the blinding glare of publicity and propaganda.

Fortunately, there are experienced men in responsible positions in the United States to warn us foolish and flighty moths to keep our impressionable heads and preserve our inflammable wings.

Rear Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, spoke last Saturday before the graduating class of the Naval War College.

Said the admiral:

"The people of this country are still painfully aware of the result of the last World War, when we sent 2,000,000 men abroad and spent thirty or more billions of dollars to make the world safe for democracy; then at the end witnessed a relapse of the high ideals and a resumption of the old nationalistic policies that planted the seeds of future wars.

"Why should we spend our blood and treasure until there is assurance that they will be spent to a far better end than in 1918?

"The Atlantic Ocean," continued the admiral, "still remains a large body of water, and the probability of plane attack from overseas on this country will remain remote for some time to come."

The admiral concluded with this sound statement:

"Command of the seas is and will remain the primary factor in our plan of national defense, and as long as we have it we are safe from successful enemy invasion."

Fortunately for our blessed and beloved country, our sea defenses are in better condition than our ridiculously insufficient land defenses.

According to Secretary Edison, our Navy will be adequate as soon as our battleships now building are redesigned to resist the powerful weapons of modern airplanes, and as soon as we shall have a fleet of airplanes sufficiently large and powerful to cooperate with our ships of war and to defend them from the attacks of enemy airplanes which might otherwise annihilate them.

This cooperative fleet of modern airplanes, however, we do not seem to be in a very good way to secure soon.

In the debate in the United States Senate Saturday on unpreparedness, Senator CLARK, of Missouri, a World War veteran and former commander of the American Legion, said the United States at the present time, according to General Arnold in his testimony before one of the House committees, has only 58 planes which are not obsolete.

Said Senator CLARK:

"I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, but I am advised by members of those committees that General Arnold testified before the Appropriations Committee, not once, but a number of times, that the maximum production of the American airplane factories by July 1, 1941—somewhat more than a year from now—would be slightly in excess of 6,000 planes, 2,800 of which were to go to the American Army and the remainder to the Allied armies or various other foreign countries."

So even if all the plane production of 2,800 planes allotted to America should be delivered to the Navy, it would be 2 years before the Navy would have the 5,000 up-to-date, modern planes necessary for successful cooperation in American defense.

The contention of Senator CLARK, Democrat, was sustained by Senator LODGE of Massachusetts, Republican, who is a member of the military subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and in addition an Army Reserve officer.

Senator LODGE said:

"The facts, as the Army officials have stated them to us, and they have not been controverted, are that by July 1, 1941, there will have been produced in this country about 6,000 military planes, about half of which will go into our own defense establishment, and the other half will go abroad."

So it will be clearly seen that we are far from adequately prepared even in our best-prepared and most important arm of defense—the Navy.

And the best thing for an unprepared nation to do is to stay out of war if it honorably can.

Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, typically sound and sincere American, speaking under the auspices of the Coalition of Patriotic Societies, said last Saturday:

"The President has a right to make the United States invulnerable, but I will continue to oppose any move to send troops abroad. I will protest against pork-barrel methods and stand against repeal of the Johnson Act.

"In the first place, I will say without any reservation that this European war is not ours, and don't let anyone tell you otherwise. In the second place, no head of any nation is justified in plunging a nation into a war that is not theirs. * * *

"No matter how high our ideals and no matter what we sacrifice in money and men, we cannot bring peace to Europe.

"The situation today is sympathy for the Allies. This sympathy does not justify taking on their war. * * *

"Here is what that would mean to us. First, we would abolish democracy and get a dictatorship. Second, there would be an increase in the national debt. Third, there would be a loss of life running into millions and a loss of property running into billions. Fourth, there would be a depression worse than this and a continuation of dictatorship, and then more European wars.

"Keep these things in mind and stay out of war. I pray in this crisis we will keep faith in ourselves and faith in our form of government."

Senator CAPPER'S words of warning are apt and immediately applicable when he says:

"Every time we send supplies, advance credit, and do all the things 'short of war,' then we have the final step—war."

Our position on the side of the Allies is getting to be like the position of Italy on the side of Germany, except that we are not as neutral as Italy.

Italy does not supply Germany with arms and ammunition to the detriment of its own forces and the injury of its own safety and security; nor does it tolerate any hostile interference with its own political rights and national independence.

Those who wish our America to abandon its neutrality and plunge into a terrific war do not realize what that would mean in our utter unpreparedness.

We would soon find ourselves fighting not only Germany, but Italy, Russia, and Japan.

We would be harried on our east coast as well as on our west coast.

Men we would have in plenty for defense, but no munitions, no modern guns, nor modern planes, no sufficient mechanized forces.

We would be unable to send aid to our allies.

We would be unprepared even adequately to defend ourselves.

In 2 years we might be properly prepared; but in 2 years our country might be destroyed.

Says Colonel Lindbergh, truthfully:

"If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war. No one wishes to attack us and no one is in a position to do so."

As a matter of plain fact, these European nations have their own private quarrels. They have always had them and will always have them.

It is a species of tribal warfare, based on alien interests and foreign policies and jealousies, which are none of our affair.

Our ancestors founded this great free Nation to be independent of these race antagonisms and tribal conflicts.

Let us keep free of them.

Let us maintain our independence.

Let us defend our own land and our own liberties, and neither sacrifice our own interests to fight on foreign ground, nor invite alien conflicts to invade our shores.

A Mother Writes an Open Letter to the Democratic Party on the Third-Term Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, from the hearts of the mothers of men, have always come some of the finest sentiments and the most profound thoughts of American history. As this country lives at peace in a world gone mad with war and enjoys self-government in a world walking backward toward one-man dynasties, each mother's son of us might well forget pride in party and pomp of partisanship and search his soul to be sure his actions and decisions work for the preservation of Christianity, peace, and free government on this continent.

Mr. Speaker, we who live so close to the forest of politics may sometimes forget the very trees of independent thinking and free determination upon which politics depends. While we in Congress work and worry about budgets and amendments, the mothers of America are today praying and pleading that the Republic we guard may be preserved and perpetuated for their sons and daughters. Ours is a tremendous responsibility. Self-serving decisions, now, by those of us who must decide, may prove the treacherous means by which this Republic shall be plunged into chaos and by which our free institutions may be forced into a black-out of tyranny.

Once denied the rights and traditions of self-government, a disillusioned and deceived people soon cease to exercise the decadent prerogatives they still retain. A coronation takes the place of an inauguration; strong men become the masters of the State, and citizens pay homage as its creatures. There is no such thing as immortality for democracy; when men cease to be fit to rule themselves or deny their ability to produce leaders in a sequence, totalitarianism becomes the order of the day whether by force of arms or by a "creeping collectivism" by which men slowly let slip through their hands the destiny and heritage for which their forefathers so valiantly sacrificed themselves.

WHETHER BY THIRD REICH OR THIRD TERM, DEMOCRACY MUST NOT DIE

Whether it be by a Third Reich or a third term, self-government once ground underfoot by power politics and one-man rule is slow to rise. History reveals the sorry lesson that frequently a nation once having given up the right to govern itself and change its leaders in orderly succession, never again ascends to the high degree of freedom and liberty which it once enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, I for one have been slow to believe that President Roosevelt would terminate his second administration by a selfish drive for continued power in violence to every tradition of self-government which Americans throughout the land hold dear. But, of late, his actions and the reports from those who know him best indicate that he has yielded to the self-serving satellites who cling to him because their own positions depend upon his continuance in office for 4, or 8, or 12 more years. All arguments advanced for a third term apply with greater validity to terms four and five than they do to term three.

THE BULLET, THE BALLOT, AND THE BAYONET

While the rest of the world resists with bullet and the bayonet the pagan onrush of one-man government, it is inconceivable to me that free Americans by secret ballot will bring upon themselves the loss of liberty and the destruction of free choice which so many of the people of other lands are so valiantly resisting. But quick decisions and snap judgments are so easy, and repentance is such a slow and painful procedure in the twilight of a democracy. For that reason great patriots of all parties are today praying that the President will not run again. I have faith enough in the clear-sightedness of the American electorate to believe he would be defeated, but, if so, he should be spared the humiliation of that defeat in what would be the bitterest and most acrimonious campaign of them all. And if by a remote chance an electorate with its judgment clouded by fears from abroad and faint-hearted faith within should throw away the lessons of antiquity and elect the President (Roosevelt or any executive) for a third term, the country should be spared such an inglorious ending to its star-kissed history.

A MESSAGE FROM THE MOTHERS OF MEN

Mr. Speaker, you and I, perhaps, and the colleagues who surround us, may be accused of thinking selfishly as we condemn or commend one man's desire to perpetuate himself in Presidential office. Critics might smirk that we stand to profit or lose as individuals, or as officials, or as political soldiers of fortune by the President's decision to seek or to sacrifice opportunity for self-perpetuation in office. Our hope that he might measure up to the patriotic stature of a Washington or a Jefferson in declining even to seek the opportunity to transform the Presidency into a princely post, or our hope that he will use the great power and prestige of his office as a selfish tool to attempt his reelection may be colored by our political philosophy, our congressional responsibilities, or by our having so long paid homage to a party label. But not so with the mothers of men in America, whose first consideration is that their sons may be spared the horrors of war and that they may aspire to high office through public favor by the same formula that American sons of the past have always used to move upward from the plow or the pulpit to the Presidency.

Therefore, I have received permission of the House to publish the following communication received by me from a thoughtful and intelligent mother of my State. This open letter to the Democratic Party comes to me from Mrs. Mildred Dunsworth Fort, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. She signs herself An Independent Voter. I do not know which party label holds her loyalty, if any, but I dare any Member of this House to read this letter and doubt or deny the sincerity of the soul from which it was inspired. Mrs. Fort is not a politician. Her vision is not colored by being a candidate for any public office. Homemaking is her profession. She seeks no patronage of any kind. She is neither rich nor poor but represents the typical American mother whose heart is with her family and whose hope is with a free America in which self-government may go forward without involvement in foreign war for another century and a half, unsullied and unscathed by surrender of our traditional form of government at home.

Mr. Speaker, there are greater things in life than party victory or partisan advantage. Democrats and Republicans alike cherish higher ideals of patriotism than political patronage and partisan success. Above any party comes America. I hope every Democratic leader in America reads this open letter. I dare to hope that some among them will speak up before it is too late and assure this country in this critical hour that we shall be spared the actual threat of one-man rule at home so we can unite as patriots should and as Americans must, to prepare ourselves against any possible attacks from one-man governments abroad.

A MOTHER'S OPEN LETTER TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ON THE THIRD-TERM THREAT

(By Mrs. Mildred Dunsworth Fort)

Foreword by the letter writer.

I have waited in vain for someone else to say what I have said in this open letter to the Democratic Party. I have watched with incredulous amazement this party, which was the pride and joy of

my father and grandfather, selfishly and insanely betraying itself and its country by instructing its delegates to vote for Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, when all of them, including the President, know that as a patriotic American citizen, he is not eligible to run for that office again.

Sadly I have watched Illinois, the State of my birth, Iowa, Wisconsin, and an ever-lengthening string of States all following along in the third-term path like so many stupid sheep. It is not an admirable picture. Were Mr. Roosevelt possessed of the qualities of the Angel Gabriel himself it still would not be an admirable picture, because it represents a long step toward that one-man rule against which England and France are fighting so desperately today.

Unity! How can we have unity with a man in the White House who is willing to cast aside a tradition which has guaranteed us a continuation of freedom from the possibility of a one-man government, and that, for the selfish purpose of keeping himself in a position of power.

And so, while there is still time to speak, while there is still freedom of speech, as an American citizen, a daughter of pioneers, and a mother of sons, I speak out against this dangerously un-American trend toward a third term. I speak out that I may do my part in helping to preserve the good old American way of a government which, by choice, by custom, and by tradition cannot and will not tolerate a third term for any man under any conditions.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

GENTLEMEN: I wonder if you realize to what extent the American spotlight has been concentrating in your direction? For you have an unprecedented opportunity at this time to bring either good or evil to this beloved country of yours and mine. If you in large numbers are loyal Roosevelt followers first, and patriotic American citizens second, you will, in all probability, indulge the President in his apparent desire to run for a third term. But that would be a calamity which I cannot believe your party will countenance for the following reasons:

1. Because you know as well as do most thinking people, that to encourage the President to run for a third term would be to bring grave danger to our democratic processes. It would mean the establishing of a precedent which could and probably would become a definite step toward a dictatorship. There is no emergency, not even war itself, that could possibly warrant the establishment of such a gravely un-American precedent.

2. Because you in all honesty know that the distrust and fear in our hearts, engendered by the unpredictableness, instability, and extravagance of the Roosevelt regime, are justifiable.

3. Because you, too, realize that the President has had so much power mistakenly delegated to him by Congress that he can no longer look at the Nation's problems in an objective manner. That already he is intolerant of independent thinking, even having gone so far as to have tried political purges against those of you who dared to differ with him.

4. Because you, as well as we, resent the insidiously dangerous radicalism with which the present administration seems to be flirting.

5. Because you cannot help but note that decent American citizens are appalled over the fact, that for the first time in the history of their memories, politics have been injected into the Supreme Court, and men have been appointed to that high office who have not earned the right to that signal honor through personal integrity nor distinguished service, but have received it simply because of political expediency. What wonder is it that we Americans go to bed each night with fear in our hearts, when this last stronghold against subversive invasion of our rights is being increasingly manned by members subservient to the executive branch of the Government.

If your party further betrays the American people by sponsoring a third term, I believe that it will have sounded its own death knell. For democracy cannot live under a leadership that thinks nothing of smashing protective traditions in order to retain power. Nor can it live under an abdicating Congress and a supine Supreme Court. And I say to you, "If your party is so spineless, so full of "yes" men, that it will allow itself to be thus used as a stepping stone upon which radicalism, masking under the name of liberalism, may enter more completely into the American political picture, then it truly deserves to die."

What has become of the Democratic platform of economy and decentralization of power in government upon which the present administration came into office, the platform upon which the Democratic Party was built in 1840 and to which it held steadfastly until 1932 and to which the present leadership deemed it wise to give lip service in 1936? And have you forgotten the platform of 1896 which carried this significant statement:

"We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and maintained our Government, that no man should be eligible for a third term of a Presidential office."

If being conservative means being determined to regain and conserve those rights which until recently had been ours because of long-established custom, tradition, or by Constitution, then we are conservative.

If being conservative means holding to the good old American way of a government of checks and balances which provides an effective safeguard against would-be self-perpetuating political machines and one-man governments, then we are conservative.

If being conservative means having a desire for an administration that will conduct the affairs of government in an orderly, businesslike, and efficient way and encourage us to conduct our lives in the same manner, then we are conservative.

If being conservative means being absolutely and uncompromisingly against a third term for any man in any party, under any conditions, then we are conservative.

When Hitler heard of England's change in the personnel of her Government in the midst of war, he probably exclaimed, "Such stupid bungling!" But we say, "What magnificent courage!" In the face of such courage, and when democratic countries abroad are giving their life's blood to retain the blessed privilege of changing their leadership when and if they desire, are we going to present to the world an abject picture of a great and rich country grown too cowardly and too fearful to let go of the coattails of one man when his term should very properly be over? Are we going to lack even the courage to cast our vote for democracy?

We are becoming increasingly aware of the fact, that if we expect to continue as a republic in this perilous period in world history, we must invest with power only those men who have the steadiness and the stability of a Washington or a Lincoln; men, whom we and the whole world can trust; men, who in the bigness of the task before them, forget themselves and in that forgetting become the great men of our times.

Sincerely yours,

MILDRED DUNSWORTH FORT,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Transfer of Naval Planes to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 7, 1940:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 7, 1940]

ROOSEVELT GOES TOO FAR

President Roosevelt has found a way to send 50 planes of our Navy to the British and French Allies without action by Congress. More armament, from the Army's left-over supplies, perhaps old destroyers from the Navy, and munitions from the last war, are to follow, the reports say. Some Americans will be in favor of this, and some will oppose it. But all ought to recognize it for what it is—an act of war.

Fifty planes is a token, not real aid. Fifty planes will not win a single small battle or delay the advance of Hitler by 2 hours. The 50 planes are intended as reassurance to the Allies, a pledge that as fast as President Roosevelt can do it we shall send help. Equally the act means to their enemy that he must expect to face all the weapons which American industrial efficiency can produce.

Mr. Roosevelt accomplishes by Executive order what his satellite, Senator PEPPER, has not been able to persuade Congress to authorize.

This is fundamentally wrong. The President owes his loyalty to the American people. He has told them his policy is aid "short of war." And this is not short of war.

The Constitution says that Congress shall have the power to declare war. President Roosevelt commits the country to a course which means that Congress will have no choice but war if the enemies of France and Britain engage in reprisals on the United States for our official aid to their foes.

We do not need the words of Virginio Gayda, Mussolini's unofficial spokesman, to tell us that turning over planes from our Navy to their enemies will be accepted by Germany and any allies she may draw to her side, as war. We know how we should regard it if the case were reversed. The technicality that these planes are "trade-ins" to the Curtiss Co. on new planes not even begun means nothing.

Let's face this thing, then, for what it is. The President commits this country to war, if Germany is strong enough to make it, without consulting the country. How different the course of Woodrow Wilson, who laid before Congress the policy he was pursuing with European governments, emphasizing its grave implication, inviting approval or disapproval.

If there is a reason for our taking part in this war, it is that our way of life is threatened. That is as simple a way as we know of saying it is a war for democracy.

Our way of life, our system of democracy, includes a legislature, an executive, a system of courts. President Roosevelt gives the legislature—that is, Congress—the run-around, and the case will not come before the courts.

If we are to take sides in this war, we have a right to look at the cards of those whom we support. We have a right to pledges that the help we give shall not again lead to a futile peace. If the President has any such assurances, the Nation has not heard of them or had an opportunity to make a decision.

We know, as all our readers must know, that a majority of Americans are heartily on the side of Britain and France. It may be a nine-tenths majority. But we know that they have not said through their representatives that they are ready for Government help to Britain and France—that they have had no chance to express themselves.

It is not the American way to enter a war by the back door. It is not American to begin a war for democracy by giving up democracy.

Fortunately, laws seemingly prohibit a transfer of old guns, and the President has now asked Congress for authority to turn in army guns for resale to the Allies. This throws the question into Congress, where it should have been answered before Mr. Roosevelt adopted the subterfuge to send the token of 50 warplanes.

Germany's Preparation for the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. SLATTERY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO HERALD-AMERICAN

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Chicago Herald-American of June 7, 1940, written by Robert P. Vanderpoel, dealing with the preparations Germany made for the present war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY CLOSELY FOLLOWS WELL-DELINEATED PLOT; WORLD AWAKENS SLOWLY

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

"France has just placed rush orders in the United States for 300,000 tons of steel."

As this dispatch came over the news desk on Thursday afternoon someone remarked:

"The war has been going on for 9 months; what have they been doing during all this time?"

For 6 years Germany prepared for conquest. Openly, almost boastfully, it announced to the world that a new day was to come, a day of Nazi leadership. It told its own people that they must sacrifice butter for cannons.

AMUSED AT FIRST

The rest of the world was a bit amused at first, then a bit indignant. But after all, this fantasy of a superior race meant to rule the world was nothing much to worry about. Wasn't Germany exhausted by the World War, and hadn't every economist declared that it would be impossible for this country to recover in less than two or three generations?

The Germans had no gold. They had to resort to primitive methods of barter to maintain even necessitous international commerce. Many of their best men were leaving the country and the imagination and initiative of those remaining was being destroyed under the impact of the most severe regimentation witnessed in modern times.

THEN CAME MUNICH

Certainly there was nothing to fear.

Then came Munich. One of the great democracies of Europe was sacrificed to the monster that previously had interested world statesmen more as a curiosity than as something that could devour.

Old, peaceful Chamberlain and peace-loving, idealistic Daladier returned home, disillusioned men, prodding their nations to awaken to a realization of the viciousness of this thing created by Hitler.

Armament activities were increased. But when war came—as it was inevitable that it should—the French and British were still woefully unprepared.

STARVING THE MONSTER

There followed the quick conquest of Poland. England and France tightened their belts a bit and continued confident of their ability to starve the monster. America remained pretty much aloof—it was not its war.

With the aid of the "fifth column," Denmark and Norway were quickly overrun. The "fifth column" was a surprise, though it need not have been, for its tactics were revealed in detail by former Nazi insiders, including Hermann Rauschning.

It was not until the "blitzkrieg" against Holland and Belgium that public opinion in America began to awaken to the fact that after all we had a big stake in what was taking place in Europe and what these events portended for the future of the world.

INTENT ON PEACE

We were just as intent on peace as were Chamberlain and Daladier.

But the pattern being followed by Hitler was to the last detail so closely akin to that previously delineated by erstwhile cronies that some people in this country began to study it and found that what was taking place in Europe was not a realinement of political boundaries, a reshuffling of the balance of power, but a world economic, political, and social upheaval that carried the gravest threats not alone to the British and French Empires, but to the United States of America.

QUIBBLING OVER DETAILS

Today we are working feverishly to arm—as did France and England after Munich—but we are still quibbling over details, quarreling among ourselves, still pretending—as did France and England—that we can go on pretty much as we have before, only with a little more emphasis on armament.

When German-inspired revolutions take place in South America we shall reach the Munich stage. When the Nazi fleet begins to unload troops in Mexico we shall begin to wonder why we did not place large orders for steel, tin, manganese, quicksilver, and what not many months, even years, earlier.

Where to Start on "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL OF JUNE 6, 1940

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 6:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 6, 1940]

WHERE TO START ON "FIFTH COLUMN"

The House in passing another thumping W. P. A. appropriation voted to bar Communists and Nazis from W. P. A. projects. The move in Congress to deport Harry Bridges by special congressional action is undoubtedly gaining headway. The Department of Justice asks citizens to give it tips on "fifth column" activities. This all fits into a plan for a new and much more stringent test of Americanism.

But let us go back a bit and see where we ought to start. What about the hundreds of men and women in Government positions, some of them in very high positions, who have held, and for all we know still hold, ideas that are not traditionally American? We do not say that they are "fifth column" workers. We do say that some of them, by their utterances, their membership in "fifth column" organizations, their official actions, have given aid and comfort to "fifth column" movements.

The Dies committee named 200 Government employees as members of the American League for Peace and Democracy at a time when this outfit was a Communist-front organization. There were 25 of these memberships in the Works Progress Administration, 14 in the Social Security Board, 22 in the Rural Electrification Administration, 12 in the Interior Department, 5 in the War Department, 32 in the Department of Agriculture, 30 in the National Labor Relations Board (including 1 Board Member, Edwin S. Smith), 13 in the Treasury Department, 13 in the Department of Labor, and 14 in the Navy. The rest were scattered in other departments by ones, twos, and threes.

When this came out the Dies committee was attacked mercilessly. Some of those who are most anxious now to track down the "fifth column" sided with the near Communists. There was even the attempt to discredit Chairman DIES by palming forged documents off on the country. What has been done about all this? The country would like to know the situation in Washington, as it is asked to be on guard against "fifth column" activities.

What about David Saposs, economist of the N. L. R. B.? Mr. Saposs was presented as having written that "bourgeois democracy is a sham." His articles indicated time after time that he had little faith in the American way. When Congressmen questioned him, he tried to counter by saying that he had been setting

for the thoughts of others. But his explanations did not explain and even the minority members of the special committee that was investigating the Labor Board—his own friends—deserted him. He is still on the Government pay roll, in a key labor position.

What about Edwin Smith? As we said above, Congress is thinking of deporting Harry Bridges. But Mr. Smith, of the N. L. R. B., journeyed to Baltimore to a midnight meeting with Bridges, at which labor problems in the maritime unions were discussed. The least you can say is that Board Member Smith was working with Bridges to shape the maritime-union situation. And the way it has been shaped up it is one of the worst "fifth column" spots we have. Shall we send Bridges back to Australia and keep Edwin Smith in a key job in Washington?

If we are going to clean up the "fifth column" in America, we are surely not foolish enough to keep its former dear friends on the Government pay roll.

Farm-Machinery Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of a great President we are now making progress on our serious problem of national defense. With justice and wisdom he has issued a warning to those who would profiteer out of the present crisis. In connection with this warning, I want to again call to the attention of the House an old enemy of the American farmer, to wit, the Farm Machinery Trust.

Last year I introduced H. J. Res. 368, being as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Temporary National Economic Committee created by Senate Joint Resolution 300 of the Seventy-fifth Congress for the purpose of investigating monopoly and the concentration of economic power, be, and is hereby instructed to report and recommend to the Congress at its next session legislation to effectively and permanently break up and destroy the trust and monopoly now existing in the agricultural implement and machinery industry of this country, the existence of such trust and monopoly, and its destructiveness to the farmers of this country, being well known, and also having been conclusively established by an investigation of the Federal Trade Commission pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution 277 as adopted by the Seventy-fourth Congress. The report of this investigation is available to the committee and to the Congress as House Document No. 702, third session, Seventy-fifth Congress.

Last year, in a speech appearing on page 14200 of the RECORD, I called to your attention certain facts revealed by the report of the Federal Trade Commission regarding the unfair practices of the farm-machinery monopoly. The International Harvester Co. has for years dominated and controlled the farm-machinery market and has headed the monopoly in this field. They have charged the farmer whatever seemed necessary to meet the cost of gigantic sales and promotion forces and to pay generous expense allowances and fabulous salaries to many officials.

In 1927 the International Harvester Co. paid a total compensation per officer of $142,940 to each of 11 officers, $147,524 to each of 12 officers in 1928, $161,193 to each of 13 officers in 1929. The president of International Harvester Co. in 1927 received $353,386; in 1928, $405,909; in 1929, $412,860.

I now want to call to your attention that the International Harvester Co. has lost and is losing many millions of dollars in Europe which will probably be charged to the cost of production of farm machinery in America. Some years back this company lost in Russia a plant worth approximately $38,000,000, a sort of contribution to the Communists. In 1938 they owned two plants in Germany, which plants are now doubtless turning out implements of destruction for the Nazi war machine. They own three plants in France whose fate we cannot yet predict.

Figures prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture show the relative and proportionate advance in the prices of farm machinery since 1910. Assuming that a plow or harrow sold during the years 1910–14 for $100, its average price during the following years has been as follows:

1915	$103
1916	107
1917	122
1918	155
1919	160
1920	165
1921	159
1922	142
1923	147
1924	154
1925	153
1926	153
1927	154
1928	153
1929	152
1930	152
1931	150
1932	142
1933	138
1934	144
1935	146
1936	149
1937	154
1938	158
1939	155

We cannot predict the future, yet many well-informed persons believe that after the war, whoever wins, the bottom is going to fall out of the prices of farm products. If the Farm Machinery Trust performs in the future as it has in the past, instead of lowering the prices of farm tools and machinery as the price of cotton, corn, wheat, and other farm products fall, they will raise the price of such tools and machinery in order to maintain the level of their income. Unless restrained from so doing, the International Harvester Co. will doubtless shortly begin to recoup foreign losses out of the pockets of the American farmer.

Farm poverty is the difference in price between what the farmer has to sell and what he has to buy. In our fight to secure parity for the American farmer, we have tried to raise the price of the things he has to sell. We should also endeavor to fight for economic equality and justice for the farmer by compelling a reduction of the unfair prices of certain things the farmer has to buy, such as farm tools and farm machinery.

My father still uses on his farm implements that I used as a boy. He cannot afford to replace worn-out equipment with new machines. No family-sized farmer can today afford to own adequate equipment.

Mr. Speaker, so long as I am in the Congress and so long as the Farm Machinery Trust continues its evil ways, I shall continue to fight for its destruction. May the American farmer soon be relieved from paying tribute to this unconscionable monopoly.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN A. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BINGHAMTON (N. Y.) PRESS

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton Press of June 7:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of Friday, June 7, 1940]

ONE POINT NOT COVERED

In his demand in the House on Wednesday that the national administration make a weekly accounting to Congress in terms

of national defense, Representative EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, certainly performed an outstanding service to the people of the country at large and wrote into the record something which is going to be important later on. Mr. HALL was undoubtedly encouraged to make his demand for an accounting by the fact that he demanded something of the same sort just a day or so before Mr. Roosevelt went before both Houses of Congress in what a great many radical New Dealers think was an ill-advised message on national defense and our lack of it.

Some of the Republicans in the House probably thought Mr. HALL was getting off on the wrong foot then, and perhaps some of them think so now. Yet it would appear that our Congressman carried back from his constituency here in the southern tier of New York State a rather accurate reflection of what they are thinking about and what they want in terms of national defense.

But we think that there is one point which Mr. HALL didn't sufficiently stress in his demand. The accounting of things actually accomplished is particularly necessary because of the characteristic pattern of the New Deal in terms of procrastination, detailed delays, and the habit of making promises serve for accomplishment.

How many more planes has the Army or Navy on this date than they had when Mr. Roosevelt admitted to Congress that he was the commander in chief of an army and navy inadequate to do a reasonable defensive job for the security of the American people?

How many contracts have been let? How many guns have been delivered? How many air bases have been started—let alone finished? How many uniforms for fighting men are passing through the shops?

How many howitzers and machine guns and field pieces and antiaircraft batteries have been authorized? How many American industrialists have been given M-Day orders?

In short, what has been done?

That is what the American people want to know. And that, we think, rather than the question of economy, should have been the principal point made by the Representative of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District in his demand for a weekly accounting.

But at least a start has been made in the right direction. Unless the leaders of Congress, Democratic and Republican alike, are entirely blind they will see for themselves how necessary it is in view of past performances that they keep the whip on the backs of those frisky young colts that have been drawing the Democratic wagon with so little regard to the load and such a profound disregard of the road.

The team may have been halter-broken, harness-broken, and buggy-wise once, but it has been ambling up strange woodland paths and taking an awful long time to get to town. Too much has rattled out over the tailboard because of its flighty jumping. It's time that team buckled down to the collar and did some real pulling before the old farm goes up in smoke and flame one of these days or goes under the hammer because the oats were all fed out to critters that wouldn't pull.

That is bound to be the case in any organization where wide-eyed idealists are found in places that should be occupied by practical men and women. Do you remember The Song of the Bandar Log in the Mowgli stories? Do you remember that fragment of the refrain:

> "Things that are noble and kind and good,
> Done by merely wishing we could."

and that other bit:

> "Now we're going to—Never mind!
> Brother, thy tail hangs down behind."

That in essence is the theme song that has characterized the performances of the New Deal in various matters for the past 7 years. Five-dollar words and gorgeous promises, glittering prospecti and lovely theories have been made to serve the purpose of things done well and things done completely.

And it is that characteristic of Mr. Roosevelt's administration which worries a great many Democrats as well as Republicans, mugwumps and nincompoops in this day when dark clouds gather on the eastern horizon of the Atlantic.

Everybody knows how short the time may be. It takes no such brusque reminder as that which came from Virginio Gayda, Mussolini's mouthpiece, to convince us that we haven't any time to waste in the actual manufacture of guns and tanks and planes, particularly planes. There was a time when no responsible crowned head or political dictator of Europe would have dared to say such a thing to the United States either in person or through a mouthpiece. The fact that it has been said should be a sufficient hint.

What has been done? Actually, what has been done since Mr. Roosevelt delivered his defense message to Congress and pleaded guilty to a lack of foresight and preparedness in this country in the years of big spending for boondoggling and supposed personal security while threat upon threat mounted in Europe?

Flag Day—Be American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1940

STATEMENT BY CHARLES S. RYCKMAN

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, Friday, June 14, our nation will join in celebrating Flag Day. As American citizens we pay homage to this symbol of our national unity and this symbol of our inalienable rights under our Constitution. As we see one nation after another deprived of its freedom, we cannot fail to realize more clearly and more vitally than ever before the real meaning and the growing importance of our flag in the world of today.

One of the best statements on this subject which I have read appeared in this morning's (June 10) Washington Times-Herald, written by Charles S. Ryckman, and I include it herewith as part of my remarks:

(By Charles S. Ryckman, winner of a Pulitzer prize for the best editorial of the year)

The campaign conducted by your newspapers to encourage public display of the American flag has provided a valuable background for the observance of Flag Day.

As a result of that campaign the American people have put the flag of their country in every lofty place, and the stage is beautifully set for this most important patriotic occasion.

In a few days appropriate ceremonies will be held throughout the United States in honor of the birthday of the American flag.

As in the past, the many alert and vigorous patriotic organizations of the country will devote traditional observances to the history and significance of the beautiful emblem which is symbolic of American peace and freedom.

The American Congress, on June 14, 1777, in the earliest and darkest years of the Revolution, decreed that the magnificent banner of stars and stripes should be the permanent flag of the new Nation.

The anniversary of that historic occasion has never been without great significance, and has never been held lightly.

In war and peace the American people have always remembered to pause in their undertakings and enterprises to recall the incidents and inspiration which gave shape and character to their beloved flag.

It has never been mere bunting and color to us, and never will be.

It has always lived as truly as we have lived, and has embodied the soul and spirit of America, and wherever it has flown it has always quickened the pulse and brightened the eye of those privileged to be under its protection.

This year, somehow, is different.

Not different entirely because there are new and grave perils.

Not different in the sense that there has been indifference to patriotic duties in ordinary times, and that love and gratitude are sharpened by danger.

But different in the larger sense that we have new understanding and reverence for the flag upon which we have centered our faith and love and devotion.

Nowhere on earth is there cause for this flag to be feared or hated.

Nowhere on earth does its approach herald the coming of oppression.

Nowhere on earth do its unfurled folds accompany forces of aggression, plunder, and destruction, turning peaceful countrysides into devastated and desolated battlefields, and turning whole populations into helpless and hopeless refugees.

Wherever it appears, this flag of ours is a symbol of peace and mercy and humanity.

Wherever it flies, it promises charity, comfort, and happiness.

Awed and almost unbelieving that such a flag remains to shelter and inspire any country of the earth, millions of suffering people in persecuted lands envy us this splendid and beautiful banner of freedom and faith.

Why should we not pridefully and reverently honor such a flag?

Why should we not set apart a day for recalling its origin?

Why should we ever let it out of our sight or minds or hearts?

In recent days, ships bearing the American flag have entered the harried harbors of belligerent or war-menaced nations, and have come away laden with those fleeing disaster and death.

These fortunate people can tell us what it means to see the Stars and Stripes at the masthead, bespeaking peace and safety.

These people can tell us what it means to be coming back to America under that flag.

Their tears of gratitude and prayers of thanksgiving should guide us all.

Shall any of us be less glad than they that this is America, and that the flag of the United States is our flag?

Let us all play our full part as Americans on Flag Day.

Attend the programs in honor of Old Glory.

Hold the flag aloft, lift your shining eyes to it, praise it, and wave it.

It is the grand and glorious flag of our prized and beloved America.

Show and shout your Americanism, and be American.

Preparation for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. USHER L. BURDICK, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Council for the Prevention of War, on June 7, 1940:

That period in our history between the dissolution of the Continental Congress and the beginning of this Government has been named by our great historians "the critical period" in American history. Critical because several years elapsed before this present form of government was set up, and in the meantime there was, in fact, no government. By common consent the Colonies held to the idea of a strong national government, but from the ending of the Revolution to the beginning of this Government many years had to pass before their common dream of a national democracy was fulfilled.

As I view the situation today, we are living again in a second critical period of our history. We have now conducted our Government for 150 years. We have practiced democracy, and, while we have blundered time after time, we still have the possibilities of a greater democracy, or we have the possibility of having taken from us whatever there is left of freedom in America.

The world seems to be turning away from democracies, not because the theory of a democracy is wrong, but because they do not respond fast enough in an emergency. Europe has always been a volcano of wars, and since the first settlement at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, Europe has had 303 wars. This is due in a great measure to the building up of a single nationality to the exclusion of all others; and when the land area reaches the saturation point in population the economic force from within that nation causes an expansion. When all surrounding territories are similarly saturated the result is war. Neither a democracy or any other form of government can stop these economic explosions, which, in plain language, means that people living in cramped economic conditions have just as strong a desire to live as any other class.

This being the situation, there is nothing within the power of this Government that can be done to settle conditions in Europe, unless we take off all restrictions on immigration to the United States and let the overflow population enter this country regardless of their condition. If we did this, we would have to revise our own economic house or the millions who might come here would meet the same economic fate that drove them from Europe. There is nothing we can do in actual fighting or in aiding others to fight by supplying them with engines of war that will in the slightest degree, settle conditions in Europe and bring peace to the major portion of the people of the world. We made that mistake in 1917; our slogan was "to make the world safe for democracy," but when peace came, a peace was made in writing. By the terms of that document, many little unnecessary democracies were set up on the theory that these would be buffer states to prevent future war outbreaks among the major states. Nothing was done in the treaty of peace to establish economic equality between the nations—nothing was done to ease the economic conditions responsible for the World War. On the contrary, very harsh economic terms were imposed on the vanquished and when that pressure became too strong to be endured, the second explosion occurred, and is taking place as I speak to you today.

If this country could free the people of Europe from interest burdens, tax burdens, and landlord burdens, and permit the people of Europe to enjoy the riches of their own labor, I would say let us start today to put that program into effect in Europe and establish permanent peace throughout the world, for I assert openly that there can be no world peace until the people of the world have granted to them by their governments the right to enjoy the fruits of their own labor. I am sure we could not do that in Europe and my reason for saying that is that we are not doing that in the United States, and we could hardly qualify as peace messengers when the thing which we would have to do in Europe is something we have never done here.

There is at the present moment in this country clear evidence of a dangerous economic pressure. The reason that this pressure in the past has been relieved is because we had such an expanse of territory that we could move on from one bad experience to new lands and start life all over. We have reached in the last 20 years, the end of free land. There are no more Indians to drive off a thousand gardens of Eden. We are stalled from this avenue of escape. It isn't due to the fact that we have too many people; we haven't half enough. It is due, however, to the fact that a great mass of the people in this country cannot enjoy the fruits of their own labor. As evidence, I ask why should we have over 60,000,000 people in distress in this country of free opportunity? Why should we have 12,000,000 people unemployed and who want to work and cannot find work? Why is it necessary to foreclose on a million farm homes because the farmers cannot pay their debts? Why should a million city and town people be dispossessed and driven out of their homes? It cannot be said that these millions deserve this fate. A few might be negligent, careless, and thoughtless, but when you run this figure up into the millions, we have to admit that the loss of these homes is not due to any fault within the human control of the unfortunate home owners.

Our job is to set legislation in operation in the United States that will undo what legislation has done. Legislation has caused the unrestrained growth of special privilege. Legislation has permitted a few to obtain control of the many necessities of life of the people in this country, and in the operations under this special privilege, a few have become too rich and too many have become too poor. When we make mild attempts to limit interest rates; when we make attempts to set a yardstick for electricity and power and make this great natural resource of power available to all the people at living rates, those of us who make a stand for the people are branded as meddlers in the affairs of business. When we attempt to pass a law to control the credit of this Nation and use it for the people instead of letting "special privilege" control it, we who make a stand for this move are pointed out as undesirable Members of the National Legislature.

Until we settle this matter here at home, and give every citizen the right to work and enjoy the fruits of his own labor, we are not prepared to tell other nations what to do. We are not prepared to assist them in their wars when we are unable to stop their wars. Remember what happened to us in 1917. We loaned and lost $12,000,000,000, which, if paid back to us today with the same interest which we are compelled to pay under our private banking system, Europe would owe us $24,000,000,000. They owe us the lives of 1,000,000 men. We plunged ourselves in debt from which we will never recover, and I ask you for what? Did we settle anything? Did we prevent future wars? No. Did we remove from the people of Europe that interest cancer caused by the use of the people's money by a private banking system? No. We did none of these things. Why make the mistake again?

If we want this democracy to live, let us make it work for the people and show the world that a democracy is the best form of government. Let us not meddle with any nation—let us work out our own solution of our own great problems.

Beware of war hysteria—it is being generated in this country as rapidly as public opinion can be created. If this country is attacked by any power or powers, I want this country to be in a position to defend itself by means best fitted for that defense. Personally, I am willing to give the last dime I possess to the defense of this country. But I know that billions invested in useless battleships will not be a proper defense. I have fought against this program of battleship building ever since I came to Congress, for I knew that even in the last war our battleships, 90 percent of them, did not participate in the war. I know that a battleship today can be blown up from the air. I know they are being blown up.

The real engine of defense of the United States is not a battleship. The real engine of defense is a strong American heart set on defending this country. People without homes, people without proper food, people poorly clad in a land of plenty, are not hard to defeat. How about the American with a home to defend? How about an American who daily receives the benefits of a democracy? How about an American who knows that he can enjoy the benefits of his own labor and that there are no special laws for him or against him? He will fight and our ingenuity will devise for his use the machinery for defense.

That is what I believe to be the first step in the defense of the United States. Make our Government, in the eyes of our own people, worth defending. When you do that, no "fifth column" can work. No "fifth column" works anywhere unless the ground is prepared for it. Want, misery, suffering, starvation, and the crushing of hope constitute the soil in which the seeds of the "fifth column" grow.

Don't blame people, especially our own citizens, who are listening to advocates of other theories of government. Remove the cause, and no other theories of government can take root.

Should this country, through public opinion created artificially, decide to enter the European war as it did in 1917, I could stop the whole performance if Congress would pass one law. That law would provide that before we could conscript men to go to battle for the cause we espoused, we would first conscript wealth enough to run the war; money enough to provide for the wives, children, and dependents of the men at the front; money enough to pay pensions to our veterans for the next 50 years; money enough to furnish hospitalization and care for millions of sick and disabled veterans; money enough to take care of the dependents of millions of veterans who will die prematurely after the war is over; money enough to build and rebuild, contrive and build all the engines of war which might be necessary in carrying on a modern war of scientific destruction of human life. If that law were passed there would be no sentiment in the United States for our entry into any European war. We could complete the annihilation of the war shouters by taking over all private plants in the United States that are engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war.

Let us operate this Government that every American citizen will be glad to read the lines written by Longfellow in his Ship of State:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity, with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea,
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee; are all with thee."

—*Longfellow.*

How the Annenberg Case Was Made—Law Enforcement Agencies Should Receive Liberal Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is one activity of the Government that does not, in my opinion, receive the publicity that it should. Not from the standpoint so much as praising those responsible for the work, as the effect it will have on our tax collections. I refer to the activities of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Commissioner of Internal Revenue Guy Helvering has reasons to be proud of the work of Hon. Elmer Irey, Chief of the Intelligence Unit, as well as Irey's men, for the success that has just come to them in the case of Moses L. Annenberg, of Philadelphia. Not only has Annenberg entered a plea of guilty before a Federal judge in Chicago for income-tax evasion, but he has agreed to pay the Government over $10,000,000 in additional tax assessments, penalties, and interest.

When the general public read of how this man, who felt that he was too big and powerful to be required to abide by our income-tax laws, has been brought to the bar of justice and made to pay a fortune it will realize that they too will meet the same fate if they do not play fair with the Government.

The Intelligence Unit makes the citizen pay, regardless of whether his income is derived legally or illegally.

Last week I insisted that Congress should see that the appropriation for this Unit is increased before we adjourn. The new tax bill broadens the income-tax base. It provides for additional excise taxes and it increases taxes from the bottom up. This means a great deal of additional work for the Internal Revenue Bureau. We cannot expect this Bureau to handle a million or more returns without additional help, nor can we expect Mr. Irey and his men with his small force to assume more burdens without more help. At least 100 inspectors and agents should be added to this force because, as I have repeatedly pointed out, the record of the Intelligence Unit over a period of 10 years or more shows it brought to the Treasury $30 for every dollar we have heretofore spent for enforcement of our income-tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, I have just read in last Thursday's St. Louis Post Dispatch a most interesting article showing how Irey and his men trapped Annenberg. Under permission granted me I include that article, written by Marquis W. Childs, as part of my remarks. The article follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

TAX MEN BRINGING ANNENBERG TO BOOK SPENT 5 YEARS LABORIOUSLY TRACING PROFITS FROM RACING NEWS EMPIRE—TREASURY'S BIGGEST CASE TOOK EQUIVALENT OF 10 MEN WORKING 10 YEARS—THOUSANDS QUESTIONED; HUNDREDS OF BANK ACCOUNTS CHECKED—WHEN AGENTS FINISHED THERE WERE 55 FILING CABINETS OF EVIDENCE FOR GRAND JURY—HOW EXTRAORDINARY DETECTIVE JOB WAS DONE

(By Marquis W. Childs)

CHICAGO, June 6.—It took 100 man-years—that is, the equivalent time of 10 men working 10 years—to make the income tax against Moses (Moe) L. Annenberg who is today sitting in United States Judge James H. Wilkerson's court hearing his attorneys argue why he should not be sent to jail.

If it is any consolation to Annenberg, absolute dictator of the horse-racing industry until the Government stepped in, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and particularly the agents of the intelligence unit, have spent more time and effort on him than on any of the other noted and notorious individuals who have been charged with tax evasion, and that includes a motley company, ranging from the late Andrew Mellon to Al Capone.

It took 420,000 separate and detailed computations to figure out just what Annenberg's tax bill should be. Thousands of men and women in every part of the United States were interviewed. Hundreds of bank accounts were examined with the most scrupulous care and transactions checked from one bank to another until it was shown who spent the money, where, and why.

FIXING OF PUNISHMENT

Annenberg has pleaded guilty and the proceedings in court are only to determine his punishment, with his chief of counsel, Weymouth Kirkland, arguing that much of the Government's evidence is improper and the inferences drawn from it unfair. Annenberg has agreed to pay $8,000,000 in taxes, Kirkland argued, and that is at the rate of more than twice what a taxpayer would have paid on the income in question under ordinary circumstances.

But no matter what the exact truth may be with respect to separate points in the lengthy Annenberg indictment, two amazing facts stand out. One is the development by this obscure and almost illiterate man of an industry which, in volume of profits at least, ranked with the largest in the country. It took organizing genius of a high order, plus complete ruthlessness.

Equally extraordinary is the detective job that was necessary to bring about Annenberg's plea of guilty. Not very much that was lurid or melodramatic went into this job. It was the painstaking accumulation over 5 years of a mountain of facts. At the time that the case was presented to the grand jury 55 filing cabinets were made ready for use. Documents stacked high in room after room were organized and indexed.

HOW HE BEGAN CAREER

Intelligence agents, working under the immediate direction of Arthur P. Madden, head of the office here, followed Annenberg's past back to his origins. He was born in European territory that has been alternately German and Polish, came to Chicago with his parents as a boy and quickly got a job as canvasser for Hearst's Chicago Evening American. By 1904, when he was 27, he had become circulation manager for the Chicago Examiner, a very tough assignment in view of the newspaper warfare that went on here.

Before this warfare reached its peak of violence, enlisting many plug-uglies who were later to be Chicago's top gangsters, Annenberg was transferred by Hearst in 1907 to Milwaukee to be publisher of the Wisconsin News. It was here that he started his own newspaper and magazine-distributing business which was to have an important part in his later rise to power and wealth. By 1920 he had so proved himself that he was sent to New York and was made circulation manager of all Hearst's newspapers and magazines as well as publisher of the New York Daily Mirror. Six years later he had pushed his own enterprises to such a point that he felt compelled to sever his Hearst connection.

BEGINNING OF INQUIRY

By 1935 he had become one of the Treasury's major problems. What was apparently no more than a routine examination of the books of Annenberg's General News Co. here was started. Actually, agents photographed hundreds of records, knowing that they were at the beginning of a long, long trail.

General News was one of the companies sending race results to bookmakers all over the country, nearly 10,000 in all. These customers were designated in the loosely kept accounts in code. X-23-BY would represent a smoke shop in Harrisburg, Pa., or a poolroom in Tulsa, Okla. Twenty-five men were put to work

translating this code material. They didn't trace every customer, but they managed to identify thousands.

General News had 38 branch offices throughout the country and the question next arose whether to examine each of these branches in order to determine if the income reported on the books of the company's headquarters was correct. It was decided to take samples in six or seven branches in order to get a cross section. Discrepancies were found in the records of two—in Baltimore and Los Angeles—and it was thereupon decided to concentrate on the Los Angeles Branch.

YEAR IN FINDING CUSTOMERS

A crew of men worked for nearly a year and finally identified and found virtually all of the customers of the Los Angeles branch. The bank accounts, the telephone, telegraph, and other records of each of these customers were in turn combed, and when the job was finished the Treasury agents knew that the Los Angeles branch had taken in considerably more money than had been reported on the books in Chicago.

As an indication of the extent of this task, the intake of the branch covering only the city of Chicago was $3,285,000 for the 4 years, 1933 to 1936. The home office books for the same period showed a total income from the 38 branches of approximately $20,000,000. The final conclusion was that the Los Angeles office had not reported all the intake. It had disappeared in graft, despite hard-boiled Annenberg supervisors who traveled over the country keeping a watchful eye on branch operators.

All this, it must be remembered, was only one phase of the case. Part of the task was to go over the bank accounts of Annenberg, scattered from Maine to California, and of all the members of his family and his close associates, using a technique developed by the intelligence unit in the Capone case. Even without a canceled check, an item can be taken from an individual's bank record and traced to the place where it was cashed. This method was originally developed by N. E. Tessen, who was in charge of the fraud phase of the Annenberg investigation.

It was important to show where money was spent and what for because Annenberg had entered many so-called expense items on the books of his company that were really for his personal use or for members of his family. In this roundabout way Annenberg had been very generous with his sisters, son-in-law, his seven daughters, his wife, his son, and others.

HOW THE AGENTS WORKED

Here is how this phase of the investigation was carried on. Take, for example, a member of Annenberg's entourage living in Philadelphia. A watch is put on her mail. She is known to be corresponding with a furrier in New York. The furrier is interviewed and says, "Yes; she bought a leopard jacket for $200 and has just ordered a mink coat for $2,500." These expenditures are checked against entries in the books of certain Annenberg companies.

The most extraordinary and seemingly irrelevant information went into this vast haystack. How many pairs of silk stockings were charged to a certain account in a certain New York store over a period of 18 months—804, which must be some sort of a world's record. Who sent what cablegrams from Habana to what boat and why. The cost of vintage champagne per case.

Without any coercion or third degreeing such an investigation assembles more information about the individual than he himself may possess. It is likely to turn up curious quirks of human nature. One of the individuals involved in the Annenberg case was applying under a fictitious name for an apartment in Essex House in New York. Asked for references, he wrote on the stationery of an Annenberg company, of which he was an executive, giving a glowing account of Mr. Blank, his virtues and his high degree of solvency.

FROM HEARST TO DOORMEN

Thousands of people were interviewed not only in this country but in Canada, Cuba, and Mexico. They ranged from lords of the earth, Mr. Hearst, at his palatial San Simeon, to scrub women, hat checkers, doormen.

There emerged a fairly clear picture of Annenberg's own holdings. His property in Milwaukee, including a theater and a drug store, was carried on his books at about $3,500,000. His property in New York, including an apartment house on Park Avenue, was valued at around $5,000,000.

When he bought the Philadelphia Inquirer in 1936, for a reported price of between $12,000,000 and $13,000,000, he raised nearly $8,000,000 in cash from his companies and through loans from his associates. Some of this came in large amounts, several millions from the Cecilia Co., top Annenberg holding corporation. Again it came in small amounts. William L. Molasky, an Annenberg associate in St. Louis, advanced $150,000 of the money used to buy the Inquirer, and this "loan" was the object of lengthy investigation by revenue agents.

OUTLINE FILLS A BOOK

Only a short time ago, after 5 years of work, Agent Madden and his assistants put together an outline of the case for possible use when and if it should come to trial. Even in outline form it filled a book as broad and thick as a dictionary. This history of an amazing career and an amazing investigation will probably remain buried in the Treasury archives. But for future students who may want to know something about a curious, troubled time in the world's affairs it will be an invaluable source book.

Disposal of American Farm Surpluses for the Benefit of European War Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK GANNETT DELIVERED AT RUTLAND, VT., JUNE 7, 1940, AND ENDORSEMENT BY FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Frank Gannett and statement by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange:

A grave food shortage confronts Europe now and a still greater shortage after the war. Famine threatens all the nations involved in this struggle—famine that will be worse than war itself, for it will mean the starvation of untold millions.

Thirty million men are in uniform. Behind the lines, two men are busy supplying each soldier with munitions and material. The total number engaged in military service is approximately 90,000,000, or twice as many people as are gainfully employed in the United States.

These men are not producing food or wealth. They are engaged in the revolting business of mass murder, of killing each other, of destroying everything in the path of the great war machine. These 90,000,000 have been withdrawn from all enterprise—from agriculture, fishing, mining, manufacturing.

Fear of invasion of the neutral countries has made it necessary for a long time to maintain large standing armies withdrawn from productive fields. Fishing, which has been a large source of European food, has been disrupted in extensive areas. Europe had the coldest winter in 10 years. Much feed and food were destroyed by frost, and there is a shortage of next year's seed.

Even Russia has poor prospects for food this year. Their crop will be far below normal.

The transportation of food products to the nations at war has been seriously interrupted, and Lloyd George in February predicted hungry mouths in England. Transportation within the countries at war has been disrupted. Railroads and highways under forced military service have been wearing out, and if the war should end even tomorrow, it would take a long time to restore normal transportation facilities.

In England, France, Germany—wherever the devastation of war may spread—incendiary bombing at harvest time may destroy the already meager food supply. The situation is so bad that Europe is threatened with the worst famine in all history. Starvation makes the difference between civilization and barbarism.

In the face of this awful situation in Europe, our Government is appropriating this year a billion dollars to aid agriculture, most of which will be used to restrict production. Crops this year are restricted by the program of scarcity fostered by the New Deal. Think of it! Millions hungry and in want, while our Government spends money to cut down our supply of food products. We are also told that we now have on hand surpluses of corn, wheat, cotton, and other products waiting favorable marketing conditions.

Here is great opportunity for America. We have almost unlimited possibilities in the production of food and clothing. America can keep millions from starving and from freezing to death in the coming winter.

The Red Cross, of course, has been doing splendid work. Millions are responding to its noble appeals. But however generous individuals will be, the Red Cross can supply only a meager part of the help that is needed.

Therefore, I make this proposal: That Congress should make a new appropriation up to $500,000,000 to purchase our surplus agricultural products, this amount to be made available dollar for dollar as France, England, and other designated countries purchase foodstuffs in the United States in regular commercial transactions. Meat, wheat, corn, lard, butter, powdered milk, and cotton are products most needed.

I suggest that our donated agricultural products be supplied through an organization such as Mr. Hoover set up during the last World War, to be distributed to refugee and needy groups.

Five hundred million dollars should cover, at $125 each, the annual food cost for the 4,000,000 refugees who already have become a burden on France and England.

If in this way we could move $1,000,000,000 worth of foodstuffs to the sufferers in Europe, we could undoubtedly—if we ended the New Deal scarcity program—abandon our policy of restricting production and save at least a large part of the billion dollars that we are this year giving to farmers for decreasing production.

This aid that I have suggested is especially necessary because the currencies of the countries at war have fallen in value. For ex-

ample: The pound sterling, which formerly was worth $5 in our money and could buy 5 bushels of wheat at $1 a bushel, has fallen to less than $3.30, so that today a British pound sterling can buy only 3⅓ bushels of wheat at $1 a bushel. In other words, the drop in the value of the British pound means an increase of 50 percent in the price of our food to a British consumer.

My proposal would overcome this disadvantage, and make it possible for these brave people who are in great need to buy our food at a reasonable price. Because of the great need of airplanes and war materials, these nations are spending their money here largely for war materials. As a result, the farmers of America are suffering from a loss of their export markets. As the war continues, less and less food will be exported from America to Europe. The increase in the activity of a few plants filling war orders will not offset the tremendous loss that will be suffered by our farmers.

My proposal not only would help the farmers market a billion dollars' worth of food, but it would give to all America the great satisfaction of helping to feed the victims of this unspeakably cruel war. It would teach the American people anew a moral lesson: "It is more blessed to give than to destroy."

And it would not be necessary longer to plow under our crops or kill little pigs. Along that line I would suggest going further. Every restriction on normal food-crop production should be lifted at once. What starving Europe may not need before its devastated fields can again produce, we may need if war should come to us. We should be growing full, normal crops this year.

How our farmers would rejoice if they were given the "go" sign to produce all the crops they could grow. With famine certain for Europe in the coming year, all the food that we can produce could be marketed, with the assistance of the Government, along the lines that I have proposed. Congress has here an opportunity of rendering tremendous service to mankind.

This would not only be a great humanitarian program, but it would be good, sound business. Every businessman endeavors to help a customer finance a purchase of any sort. This is another illustration of the need in government of good, sound business experience.

If our farmers could sell their crops abroad, they would enjoy prosperity. Prosperity for the farmer means prosperity for the country. In fact, the Nation cannot prosper unless the farmer prospers.

Entirely apart from the need of warding off starvation from millions in Europe, we must give constructive help to agriculture, or our agricultural exports will continue to decline even during the war. Our agricultural exports already have fallen in value almost one-half. They averaged a billion and a quarter dollars a year under President Hoover. They have averaged only three-quarters of a billion under President Roosevelt.

While our farm prices were depressed and our agricultural exports were decreasing, our farmers have suffered another blow through the Hull trade treaties permitting foreign agricultural products to enter our markets and depress prices here. If someone benefited by them, it was not the farmer.

The farmer is the foundation of the market for manufactured goods. Research shows that among our farmers there is an unlimited market for bathrooms, radios, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm machinery. If the farmer had his just income of four or five billion dollars more a year, every farmer would have $666 to $800 more a year to spend. What a market there would then be for the products of our cities! There would be such a demand for these things that city industries would have to work to capacity to supply the demands.

There is another reason why our farmers must have increased income. What America's future shall be will depend largely on the economic status of American agriculture in our lifetime. If 25 percent of our gainfully employed, contributing the unpaid labor of 22,000,000 of women and children and fifty billions of capital, are to continue to have their income reduced as now to 10 percent of the national income, disintegration lies ahead. With agriculture so impoverished, the physical, intellectual, and moral quality of that new blood stream from farm to city must deteriorate as it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain schools, churches, and social standards in rural districts. Thirty-one percent of the Nation's youth is fed, clothed, and educated by our farmers on less than 10 percent of the national income.

The population of our cities does not reproduce itself. Ten city adults bear only seven children. The vitality of our cities must be replenished by that continuing blood stream from the soil. Whether the youth who migrate to the cities shall be educated, grounded in American ideals and prepared for life's work, or shall be ignorant, unskilled, discouraged, and fertile soil for alien "isms," must necessarily depend in large part on the restoration of a just price level for our rural population. There is no time to delay.

The National Grange, through its Washington representative, Fred Brenckman, today issued the following statement regarding the disposal of American farm surpluses for the benefit of European war refugees:

"There is much to be commended in the speech made by Frank Gannett, the Rochester publisher, at Rutland, Vt., June 7, advocating the disposition of surplus American farm products for the benefit of the war refugees of Europe.

"Mr. Gannett urged the enlargement of American aid to include foodstuffs necessary to save millions of European refugees and avert what might become one of the greatest famines in history.

"He proposes that Congress appropriate up to $500,000,000 to purchase American surplus agricultural products if France, England, or any other designated country purchases the same amount of foodstuffs in the United States in the regular course of business. These foodstuffs would be donated to the unfortunate victims of the European war.

"This is a practical and humanitarian plan and is worthy of careful consideration not only by the farm groups of the United States but by Congress as well. Congress should thoroughly explore the possibilities of this proposal and if found feasible should act upon it before adjournment."

Get Out the Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, everyone who believes in American ideals—in the freedom to express one's honest opinions and in the democratic election of Representatives to Congress—will be interested in an incident which recently happened in Richmond, Va. A young man dared to say that requiring a poll tax to be paid in eight States in the South before permitting a person to vote means denial of the right to vote in many instances, and that it should therefore be eliminated. For his adherence to the American principle of democracy this young man lost his job, due to the fact that the company for which he was working was threatened with a boycott by certain un-American Richmonders unless the young man was discharged. In order to prevent further retaliation against this young man, I shall not use his name, but under my leave to extend my remarks I am entering the speech which caused the loss of his job. This speech was broadcast April 19, 1940:

For the past 2 years the ——— Young Democratic Club has sponsored a get-out-the-vote campaign in order that a larger number of the people in Richmond and vicinity might participate in choosing the men and women who are to represent us in public office on a city- and State-wide scale.

November 5 we will cast our votes for President, Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen. These people will make laws, amend and abolish other laws. Our relations on a Nation-wide scale will be determined by these elected Representatives of the voters in Washington. It is they who will govern our relations with other countries of the world. Local issues that seem completely disconnected from Washington's influence will of necessity follow the line laid down by the President and Congress.

Many problems face us as Southerners and Americans. Some of them are peculiar only to the South; others we hold in common with the rest of the United States.

Of great importance to us as Americans is the question of the foreign policy of the United States, or, in plain language, how shall we, as a nation, conduct ourselves in dealing with all other nations of the world. Which nation shall we favor in our trade agreements; which ones shall we place at a disadvantage? Will Japan be allowed to continue buying war materials from the United States to be used in the war against China? How about the people in our colonies—Puerto Rico and the Philippines—shall they be allowed their independence or will they continue to be ruled from Washington? In our relations with our neighbors to the south of us, Latin America, shall we establish the good-neighbor policy or apply the policy of the big stick? How must we act toward the warring nations of Europe? Shall we become involved in the European war?

Of equal importance is the question of Washington's attitude toward social, economic, and labor legislation affecting the entire country. The past 8 years have seen drastic changes in the approach of our national legislators and Chief Executive to these problems. The paralysis of our national economy following the economic crash of 1929 made it imperative that the Federal Government pass legislation to help lessen the suffering of our people. It has been during this period that the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide work for the people, when private enterprise was not able to do so, has been recognized. The large number of families needing direct financial assistance that could not be given by local and State agencies made it necessary for the Federal Government to provide money for direct aid to these people. The inability of individual States to provide schools, parks, roads, hospitals, and other essentials for the well-being of the Nation demanded that Washington do the job. The evils resulting from long hours and low pay in industry brought about

legislation to establish maximum hours and minimum wages, thereby putting more people to work and increasing the total income of the Nation's wage workers. Bitter strife between workers and employers was lessened through appropriate legislation and the establishment of responsible government boards for the examination of employer and trade-union relations, saving millions of dollars in lost time by prompt settlement of labor disputes. All of this legislation, social, economic, and labor, is now up for examination. Shall we continue along these lines or shall we go back to the days of 1930, 1931, and 1932?

As southerners, one of the most important problems of this time is that of making it possible for all of our people to take part in the selection of our national, State, and local representatives. This means that the South must be allowed the right to vote. This is as true of Virginia as of the rest of the South. The plain fact is this: Only one out of four persons is eligible to vote in the eight Southern States where payment of a poll tax is required before one can vote. In the rest of the United States where no poll tax is required, three out of four persons, 75 percent of the adult population, vote in the elections for national, State, and local officers. This means that three-fourths of the people in Virginia and the South have absolutely no voice in the Government—be it national, State, or local. Inasmuch as this condition exists in the South it cannot be said that our elected representatives are truly representative of the people. The people who rule the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, and Virginia are not the representatives of the entire people. Nor are the governors, State legislators, members of city councils, mayors, and county officials representatives of the majority of the people. The same is true of the Senators and Congressmen in Washington who are from these States. We can take as an example one man in Congress in the public eye at the present time who was elected by only 4 percent of the population in his district. Can it be said that he represents the people in his district? Yet he is accepted as such. This is not the democratic way.

The poll tax was slipped over on the Southern people. Every kind of trickery was used. In our own State it was done in the Constitutional Convention of 1902 and even today has never been submitted to the people of Virginia for ratification. Were the people of this State able to express themselves on this subject, I am sure that Virginia would not have a tax scheme that disfranchises three-fourths of its citizens. And if this three-fourths were not disfranchised, if they were allowed to express their needs and desires by means of the ballot, I am sure that the history of Virginia in the past would have been entirely different from that we have known, and the position of Virginia as a State in the Union would be that of a leading one as it was in the old days. Virginia once led the Union in many fields; today she is among the most backward in the Union as regards literacy, wages, crime, disease, housing, and many other things. And all of this is directly traceable to the disfranchisement of the Virginia people. Such a degeneration is inevitable in a society where the people do not have a voice in their rule. As that greatest of all Democrats, Thomas Jefferson, said, and I quote, "Every government degenerates when entrusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositories. The influence over government must be shared by all the people. If every individual who composes their mass participates in the ultimate authority, the government will be safe."

There is only one way for the people of Virginia to rid themselves of the poll tax, and that is by amending the State constitution. This will take 4 years. But there is no other way of doing it. However, there is a chance of making it possible for the people of Virginia to vote for national representatives; that is, for President, Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen. A bill has recently been introduced in Congress by LEE GEYER, Democrat, of California, that will make it unlawful for any State to require the payment of a poll tax in order to qualify for voting for any of the national officers. While this is certainly not the final answer, still it would represent a long step forward and should be supported. We urge that you give all possible support to the Geyer bill. But the problem of doing away with the poll tax completely can only be done by getting as many people as we can to participate in the State elections and gain enough strength to defeat the poll tax by amending the constitution. Once this is accomplished and the people assured of a voice in the State government, it will be possible for Virginia to go ahead and take her rightful place in the Nation.

Knowing these things, and appreciating what they mean, impresses us with the importance of voting, of having our say in the Government. It makes us realize that if we do not express our needs and desires by means of the ballot, then we can never be sure that the Government will act in accordance with what is best for the majority of us. Not to take part in the political life of a democracy is a very dangerous thing. That is why we, the members of the ——— Young Democratic Club, urge you to prepare yourself to vote. The picture is not nearly so dark as it looks if we examine the methods by which it is possible for us to bring democracy back to Virginia. It is primarily a question of each one of us using his influence, of explaining the need of people casting their ballots. This can be done in a number of ways, the following being an example that can be expanded upon: Most people in Richmond and vicinity belong to some kind of an organization, such as churches, clubs, trade-unions, and the like. It is through these organizations that it is easiest for us to influence the largest number of people. Go to these organizations, tell them about Virginia and how only one out of four of our people can take part in the making of laws that will affect them directly. Explain to them how it was possible for the people who already have the right to vote to express themselves on the question of better housing and a modern form of city government in the recent city primaries when they defeated Mayor Bright, the man who opposed slum clearance in Richmond and who fought to maintain the archaic bicameral form of city government. Tell them how progressive voters in Richmond elected a man committed to clearing the slum areas that breed crime and disease, a man who agrees with the majority of Richmond voters that the present form of city government is out of date and must be replaced by the one-body form of government, which will make it necessary for the body to act on questions and will not allow a vital question to be evaded by passing it backward and forward from one body to the other until it is lullabyed to sleep as has so often happened in the past.

The unicameral form of city government lets the people know exactly how individual members of the city government stand on all questions; there can be no evading and passing the buck. This is what Richmond needs and has asked for. Richmond needs other things and it can get them if we will act. Explain these things to all these groups. Once they understand as you do how important it is, then they too will act. And they in turn will get others to act.

But we still have the poll tax and before one can vote it must be paid up in full. That means that it must have been paid for 3 years back. The tax is $1.50 a year plus a few cents penalty, so if you owe for 3 years it will cost you $4.80. After you pay your tax you must register before you can vote. Having done these two things you will be listed as eligible to vote.

To pay your poll tax go to the city hall. You also register at the city hall. However, there is another thing and that is, you must have paid your poll tax 6 months before election day or you will not be allowed to vote. The dead line for paying the poll tax so that you can vote in November 1940, is May 5. You must pay your poll tax before this date if you are to have a voice on these vital questions facing us now.

Don't forget: There are only a few days left. Pay your poll tax. Tell your friends to become qualified voters. Let's get out the vote.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY SLATTERY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harry Slattery on June 3, 1940, on the progress of the Rural Electrification Administration and its work.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The lights are going out all over Europe. The Rural Electrification Administration is helping to turn them on all over rural America."

They were striking words, spoken to me from the heart of a man high in the esteem of the American people and high in the ranks of American jurisprudence as I sat with him on a recent evening.

Those words stuck in my heart. And if a phrase can embrace all the challenge and significance of an idea, that phrase is today's inspiration for the rural-electrification program: The lights are going out all over Europe; * * * R. E. A., as we call the Rural Electrification Administration, is helping to turn them on all over rural America. And as I speak to you tonight there are thousands of farm families along new R. E. A. financed rural power lines from coast to coast who listen by the light, and hear by the magic of radio, that electricity has brought at last to their farms. They know much of the story I shall tell, and I trust they hear me with approval. To all of you, I report the progress of a development for the people of rural America that is closely linked with the lives and livelihoods of every one of us.

America needs light today; light for the mind, and light for the eyes. With that thought in mind I want to acknowledge with deep sincerity my gratitude for the opportunity to speak to you tonight—my gratitude to the blue network of the N. B. C. and to the Washington Evening Star. For these Star Forum programs are designed to bring light to our minds. And this brief discussion of the R. E. A.'s endeavor to help bring light to the eyes of rural America will, I think, stand up to that tradition.

For more than 30 years I have been intimately associated with the conservation and electric power program in America. Twenty-five years ago I watched the beginnings of the movement to bring the benefits of electricity to the farms of the country. I heard the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, sterling leader and statesman, repeat often the slogan which he carried on the masthead of his weekly paper. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." He was one of the first to voice the hope of bringing the blessings of electricity to the families of rural America. He had the vision.

Twenty-eight years ago I saw the great strides already achieved in rural electrification in Ontario, Canada, and on my return from that trip I saw and talked with the great Steinmetz, wizard of electricity, at work in his General Electric Co. laboratories in Schenectady. He spoke even then of his belief in a network of transmission lines that would gird this country border to border, and reach into every hamlet and every home. He had the vision.

I watched Gifford Pinchot, when first Governor of Pennsylvania, endeavor to awaken the Keystone State to the need for rural electrification. He had the vision.

In his efforts to decentralize industrial activity, Justice Louis D. Brandeis early saw the need and potentialities of electricity in small villages, towns, and on the farm. He also had the vision—and still has, I assure you.

During the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, the grandfather of the present Secretary of Agriculture, affectionately known to thousands of you in the Middle West as "Uncle Henry" Wallace, urged the cooperative electrification of our rural areas.

He had the vision then. His grandson, Henry A. Wallace, the present Secretary of Agriculture, has the vision now as indicated by his achievements for the farmer's welfare and for rural electrification.

President Roosevelt has told how, while he was visiting Warm Springs some years ago, an idea crystallized into a plan of action. The idea which he had long cherished was: Electricity is a necessity of modern life and ought to be found in every village, every home, every farm, in every part of the United States. The plan of action was the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration. All of us know he had the vision.

Today the work of the Rural Electrification Administration has brought that vision of these men and many others to a reality—electricity on the farm is a fact for hundreds of thousands of our people. For many more, it is on the march.

I wish it were somehow possible for you out there on the loudspeaker end of this discussion to shoot questions at me as I go along, then we'd have a real forum, but I think I can anticipate many of your possible queries.

What is this rural electrification?

Why is the Federal Government stimulating the development of electric service for unserved farm families, anyway?

Who benefits—only the farmer?

What does it cost, and who's going to pay the bill?

How is the program carried on, and what has been accomplished?

Let's turn the pages of the book of rural electrification on the march and sift the answers. The facts are simple and plain.

Rural electrification means, obviously enough, the taking of electric service to unserved rural areas of the Nation. But it means more than that, too. It means the extension of opportunity for farm families to live on a plane equal to that enjoyed by the family in the city. It means bringing to the farmer new tools for making a better living—doing a better job of working a livelihood from the soil. It means better sanitation and a stepped-up standard of farm health. It means increased living comfort for all the farm family—not the comfort that softens a man's muscles, but the comfort that promotes leisure and an opportunity to plan, to think, to sharpen the mind through intelligent use of leisure.

For the boy and girl on the farm, rural electrification means a renewed interest in seeking his or her place in life, in the country—not in the harried confines of a city shop—or in the too-long line that still leads to a dismal employment office.

These things are the real essence of rural electrification—and the Rural Electrification Administration and its program are designed to speed the sound development of these basic improvements for the agricultural arm of the Nation.

As late as 1925 the established private power companies had extended electric service to only about 200,000 farms. At that time there were nearly six and a half million farms in America. From 1925 until 1935 service was extended to about half a million more, but the unplanned character of these rural extensions, often simply short fingers reaching out from the cities, merely skimmed the cream of potential rural consumers and left more than five and a half million farms unserved.

Nine farm families in every ten did not have, and many of them had forsaken the idea of ever being able to get, electricity.

They needed it. And it was important to the Nation as a whole that they have it. I say it was important to the Nation because the efficiency and convenience of life in the city had developed rapidly, largely as the result of electricity, while people who lived in the country still had to get along with old-fashioned, and for some farm work, almost pioneer types of equipment. Socially and economically, country and city were thrown increasingly out of balance. In terms of effective living the agricultural arm of the Nation grew proportionately weaker as the urban arm became stronger.

No one needs an economist to explain that such a situation undermines the strength and the competence of our whole social and economic organism. And a situation that did not make good economic sense had to be remedied.

The Nation could not afford to have five and a half million farm families living in the era of the kerosene lamp while the rest of the Nation, the Nation in which they had to live and make a living, went speeding on, geared up for the age of electricity.

The Nation could not afford to have more than five and a half million farm families handicapped for want of the modern tools for better living and more effective production that had become such potent instruments for progress in the city home and factory.

It was evident that electricity could bring the farm family, insofar as electric service and its attendant advantages were concerned, into closer social and economic parity with the city family. And in 1935 the growing appreciation of these facts, coupled with the need for added stimulus to national and employment industry running in low gear, set the stage for the timely establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Congress acted under the dynamic intellectual and practical leadership of such men as Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska, Congressman SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and Congressman JOHN ELLIOTT RANKIN, of Mississippi—provided the funds for actually building rural power lines. Construction took the place of conversation, and the rural electrification program was under way. R. E. A. started lending money; low cost electric service started to spread, slowly but with growing vigor into unserved rural areas; and the money used to build the lines prompted new activity in a hundred trades and crafts.

First benefits of the new rural electrification went to the farm family. Electricity lit the farmer's evening—sped his completion of a dozen nightly chores. Electricity sprang to action for the farm woman in her kitchen * * * pumped the water for her many tasks and retired the awkward pail that had bent her back on countless trips to the pump. Farm youngsters turned to their school books with more enthusiasm and less eyestrain. Across the face of isolated countrysides thousands of folks thrilled to the magic of their new-found perfect farmhand—low cost electricity at the snap of a switch.

And across the face of industrial America a new stimulus was felt as the demands of rural line construction piled up new orders for wire and insulators and poles and hardware, piled up new demands for the services of workers in the mines, in transportation and in electrical equipment factories.

The new rural electrification built new outlooks and new incentives and new tools for the farm family while it bolstered employment and the pay roll of the Nation.

Who benefits from the far-reaching program to take low-cost electricity to the Nation's farmsteads? The farm families, yes; but you and I as well. For each fundamental improvement in the lot of one branch of our national family spreads its benefits through the whole economic and social fabric of America.

During the first 5 years of operation, concluded last month, R. E. A. lent $270,000,000 for the construction of rural power lines to serve 850,000 farm families and other rural users. A relatively small amount of this money has been made available for financing farm wiring and plumbing and for the construction of generating plants in places and in situations where electricity could not be purchased wholesale at rates which would permit the rural electric systems to provide low-cost service to their consumer-members and pay out as the law requires.

Two hundred and seventy million dollars is a tremendous sum of money, but it has been lent strictly as an investment. The law under which the Rural Electrification Administration operates requires that all this money be returned to the Treasury, with interest, within 20 to 25 years.

The American people, through their Government, have made this investment in the people and the prospects of America's most basic industry—agriculture. It is a sound investment. The cash will be repaid by the farm families who use electric service. And these families will also pay the small interest charge on that cash. But the return of actual value to you and me as taxpayers will exceed a hundredfold the money returned to the Treasury. No economist can compute the value to the Nation of the new vitality, the new standard of health and of living, the new impetus to better farm production, or the whole new outlook on life in a democratic United States that is the fundamental product of the rural electrification program.

Money is the lifeblood and action is the creed of this dynamic effort to speed the electrification of rural America. But the job could not have been done as it has been done without the enlistment of new attitudes and new principles of management.

The new attitudes and the new principles are those of cooperation.

Cooperation is the idea and the method that has made possible most of the rural electrification stimulated by the R. E. A.

And cooperative principles of management—principles designed solely for the purpose of providing service, unhampered by the demand for profits—these principles are the operating device for building and maintaining the new rural electric systems.

Nearly 90 percent of all R. E. A. loans have been made to cooperative organizations of progressive farm people. Their functioning is simple, democratic, and well adapted both to the temper and the interests of the farmer and to the job of providing electric service in rural areas.

This is how the cooperative grows and works in the field of rural electrification.

A group of farmers who want service meet and organize as a corporation. They apply to R. E. A. for a loan. The amount of the loan depends upon the amount of line that must be built, the engineering and related problems that must be met in building comprehensive service for the area to be served, and the number of farms that will use the service. After a thorough investigation of the economic, agricultural, and engineering factors that will affect the financial and service success of the cooperative—and providing, of course, that the investigation proves the feasibility of the intended construction, R. E. A. grants the loan.

All farmers who are to take service join the cooperative. Eacn pays a nominal membership fee into the treasury of the cooperative, and this money is used to offset the expenses of organization and initial development. Each member has an equal vote and voice in the management of the cooperative, and this, I submit, is a pattern for true democracy in action.

The cooperative employs a manager and other competent personnel to handle specialized tasks of operation and management. These employees, responsible to a board of directors elected by and from the membership, run the business as any other sound business is run—always with this exception, however, that their responsibility is to the members, the folks whom they serve, rather than to stockholders. Their entire effort is directed toward the maintenance and improvement of service—a service job, undiluted by demand for profit.

The farmer-member's responsibility to his cooperative is simple. His sole obligation is to pay his bills for current, to use his electricity wisely and abundantly for the improvement of his home and his work, thus contributing to the financial soundness of his cooperative, and to take an active part in the affairs of his system to the end that it serve the whole farm community completely and as fully as possible.

Throughout all stages of the cooperative's organization and development the staff of the Rural Electrification Administration works with the staff and membership of the cooperative, smoothing its way in matters of law, assisting in the engineering and maintenance of the lines, helping the farm families to initiate the most practical and profit-producing applications of electricity.

That, in brief, is the way these rural electric cooperatives function.

All these answers to the questions which I posed myself point up the final question which always comes to the alert mind, "So what?" What does all this mean in terms of accomplishment—accomplishment we can weigh and appraise? Does it all add up to a tangible result that justifies the expenditure of time and money and tremendous effort? A practical America wants results. These are the results to date of the R. E. A. program to electrify rural America.

More than 600 R. E. A.-financed rural electric systems are now in operation. These systems are serving over half a million consumer-members and new members are being added every day. Nearly a hundred other systems are being speeded to completion and each tomorrow brings to my desk reports of construction completed, lines energized, the juice turned on. These additional systems will serve half again as many farm families and other rural users. Awaiting the momentary allotment of funds for construction are plans for 75,000 miles of power line destined to bring service to many thousands more. Moneys already allotted will ultimately bring electric service to 4,000,000 rural people.

Farmers in 45 of the 48 States have enlisted R. E. A. cooperation. Only in 3 States no R. E. A. power systems have been set up. There, in some instances, the farmers have been prevented in various ways from building and operating their own electric distribution systems. But I hope we will eventually bring R. E. A. to these States.

This movement for rural electrification owes no little to the firm support of the agriculture organizations like the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers' Union, and others.

I want to take this occasion to say, too, that the success of the R. E. A. program is due in a large part to the devoted day-in-and-day-out efforts of the men and women of the R. E. A. staff both in Washington and in the field.

Since the inception of the R. E. A. program the number of farms served with high-line electric power has increased by 150 percent. In 1935, 1 farm in 10 had central station service; today 1 farm family in 4 enjoys the new opportunity and incentive for more effective life and work on the farm that comes with the magic of electricity at the click of a switch.

These have been the physical, the tangible results of the R. E. A. program.

Less tangible, but no less real and important, are the human results.

Written in the eyes of thousands upon thousands of farm women is a joy and sense of new freedom from drudgeries inherited from the pioneers. The electric refrigerator; running water, pumped with electricity; a bright light over her sink; an electric bulb in her hen house, prompting extra egg income from her hens—these things are not mere gadgets for improved living to the farm woman—these things are symbols of a dream come true.

Better farm management, made possible by electric equipment, reflects the electrified farmer's new sense of opportunity to make his farming a more profitable and a more satisfying way of life.

Farm youngsters have a yen to stick to the old place, because the old place is a better place—as good as the city cousin's—when electricity turns on the lights.

Only they who toil in the highlands and along the river bottoms, they who work the soil to fill the larder of our Nation—they know best how great are these results. To them the new rural power lines are symbols of their modern pioneering, a new source of power for their modern progress.

In a letter to me commemorating the fifth anniversary of R. E. A., President Roosevelt acknowledged the significance of these human results in these words: "* * * even in a complex industrial economy such as ours the roots of national well-being strike deeply into the soil. But particularly in times like these, all who strive to bring to the life of the American farmer new comfort, new power, and new dignity may take special pride in their task."

We do take special pride in our task. But it is the pride one feels as he accepts a challenge, such a challenge as was implied by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace when he said to our R. E. A. staff recently, "Electricity in agriculture is going to be enormously more important than any of us now appreciate."

We are challenged by many things today. Many are grim but many others are promising. America has never looked down, and she never shall, so long as her men and women, free and independent in thought and action, can join together of their own will to accomplish common ends for the common good.

Our problems as a nation are grave, but no chaos in the tides of human affairs can match the spirit of our confidence in the future of America.

And I say to you, every one, that the electrification of rural America by and for the farmers themselves is a vital, democratic action that is proof, positive and triumphant, that our American way of life is virile and equal to every challenge of the future.

Is Roosevelt Trying To Dissolve Congress So He Can Plunge the United States Into Another Foreign War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, Roosevelt has most likely committed an act of war in ordering our war equipment traded in to help the Allies. The stratagem of turning planes back to the manufacturer with the proviso that he in turn transfer the material does not deceive anyone. Is the country ready to approve such intervention? Does the Congress approve of it? Does Roosevelt believe that war is inevitable and that we should now begin by supporting war on European battlefields?

No one seems to know what the President's policy is, because he has not taken the country into his confidence, nor has he explained the significance of his far-reaching action, nor has he divulged how far he will go. When it was brought to Roosevelt's attention that the Republicans desired to have Congress continue in session for the duration of the emergency, he is alleged to have said, rather sarcastically, that he saw no good reason for Congress to remain in session except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches. Is Roosevelt trying to dissolve Congress so he can plunge the United States into another foreign war?

It might be well for certain interventionists to read the following newspaper editorial, which quotes a passage from a book written by Hilaire Belloc, an English writer:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald]

UNCLE BARBARA MANVILLE

Sometimes the United States as a nation—Uncle Sam—makes us think of Barbara Hutton and Tommy Manville. Through no particular merit of their own our ancestors lucked into and took away from the Indians a fabulously wealthy and beautiful country.

Below this country's surface soil was a world of petroleum, coal, iron, copper, gold, silver, and natural gas. Its surface soil over large areas was so fertile as to be capable of producing crops of unheard-of richness and size. That soil continues so fertile that we have to pay our farmers not to produce too much—in contrast to Europe, which hovers endlessly on the brink of serious food shortages.

We occasionally act as a nation like some inheritor of great wealth who does eccentric and highly expensive things because he or she can afford them, or thinks so.

Our Navy Department has now released to the Curtiss-Wright plane factory at Buffalo 50 first-line bombers, somewhat outmoded

but very serviceable, for immediate reshipment to the Allies. The move is reported to have been made "with White House approval, if not actual order."

What we think it means is that President Roosevelt has decided to sell the American people the idea that they should go to any lengths that may be necessary to enable the Allies to win the war.

The first step will, of course, not be the last, unless the war ends almost immediately—of which there seems little chance. Soon it will be 500 planes that the Allies must have, then probably another 500, and so on. It is now easy to foresee another A. E. F. going to another war to end war.

We believe the President has the magnetism and the popularity to enable him to sell actual if not declared participation in this war to the American people, just as Woodrow Wilson was able to do in 1917.

We have no doubt that the President sincerely believes the Allies must win if the world is to go on being livable for typical Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen. And he may be right. He may be more far-seeing than isolationists who view with horror a second American attempt to bail Europe out of one of its endless wars.

To assist the President as a coordinate branch of the Government, we think Congress should sit through to next January 3, either in recess or in actual session; that it should not adjourn.

Of course, if we get into this war, the thing for us to do is to put out every ounce of strength in an effort to win it.

CAN WE BAIL THEM OUT THIS TIME?

Whether we can win it for the Allies is another question. Italy, Russia, and Japan were lined up with the Allies in the World War; Russia was impotent by the time we went in. Even so, it took the Allies 52 months and our weight to beat the Germans. This time, Italy is tied up with Germany; Russia is at least benevolently neutral toward Germany; and Japan is trying to muscle the white man out of the Far East. Maybe even American man- and machine-power can't enable the Allies to win this time.

In this connection, we reproduce a passage from a book by the eminent English writer, Hilaire Belloc—The Cruise of the Nona, published in 1925, and sent to us with the passage marked by Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth. Mr. Belloc was recalling the World War:

"The most comic part of the affair was the attitude toward America. We dared not insult America, for we were naturally as keen on getting American help as is a drowning man on catching a deck chair.

* * * * * * *

"In their ignorance many people came to believe that it was the duty of the Americans to come over and help, and, what was more astounding still, it was represented to them as a matter of life and death, not to us, but to themselves. The Americans were told—Heaven knows whether any of them believed it—that if the Germans, Austrians, Bohemians, Slovenes, Croats, Bulgarians, Turks, etc., won in their push against the English, French, and Italians, that if the half-baked won against the baked, the next thing would be a sailing of the conquerors over the sea for the rude domination of Scranton, Pa. Fiddlestick-ends!"

"But people did really talk like that. They shook their fingers at the United States, and said: "It will be your turn next."

That's the way the English think about us between wars.

Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I am being deluged with messages from citizens in my district and in fact from all over Minnesota, expressing opposition to the adjournment of Congress at this time, or as long as the war situation is as disturbing as at present.

I am glad to be able to report that the Republican Members of Congress are in almost unanimous agreement on this subject and have voted to oppose adjournment. The press has already been advised of this decision by Minority Leader JOSEPH MARTIN.

I am also pleased to be able to say that my conversations here with several Democratic Members indicate that they are also opposed to adjournment at this time.

For the benefit of those who are in doubt on the subject I submit the following typical letters which arrived among many others in this morning's mail:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 6, 1940.*

Congressman JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Now more than ever we need able statesmen at Washington. I know you to be such and I plead with you to stay in session during this time of war hysteria. We want no part in this war. I am afraid that if our Representatives leave Washington they may never be called back. I feel that our grand Republic is in danger, as well as the life of my sons.

With best wishes for your success, I am

MRS. A. J. LEONARD.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 7, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the past you have shown your good will by supporting legislation which the people of this State asked for. With war pending, it certainly would not be wise to adjourn Congress at this time, as that would too easily pave the way for a dictatorship. Never do the citizens of the United States want to be ruled by a dictator. We treasure our freedom and respect our ancestors who fought for it too much for that.

My sincere belief as well as everyone else's is that this country should not become entangled in war. However, we do believe it vitally important to be prepared. Please do everything in your power to keep us out of war and to keep Congress from adjourning.

Sincerely yours,

LORRAINE MEUERS.

ROCHESTER, MINN., *June 6, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEXANDER: America must not be made the cat's paw of Great Britain.

Congress must remain in session to rescue this great Republic of ours from the ferocious jaws of the international plunderbund that threatens to destroy and devour the Nation completely—and will unless the elected guardians of our Government stay on the job and eliminate those who would sell our country for 30 pieces of silver—or gold, perhaps.

Yours sincerely,

S. O. SANDERSON,
Chairman, Minnesota Stabilization Council.

MINNESOTA DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
St. Paul, Minn., June 8, 1940.

JOHN G. ALEXANDER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution a motion was passed, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in view of the present world situation it is the desire of this body that the Congress of the United States should remain in continuous session, recessing from time to time, as the Congress may deem wise. Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress."

Thanking you for your consideration of this matter, I am,

Very truly yours,

(Mrs. T. J.) DOROTHY L. KENNEDY,
State Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, why adjourn? Are we not being paid to serve 12 months in each year? I shall hope the administration will not press the matter further.

"We Do Not Want Your Blasted American Planes," Lord Beaverbrook Advises America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night, immediately after the President's unprecedented order to strip our American defense system by ordering the Navy to sell 50 of its best bombing planes to the British and French, Fulton Lewis, Jr., made one of the most remarkable and significant broadcasts of his career. Fulton Lewis, Jr., is rapidly coming to be recognized as the outstanding radio news reporter in

America, and his studied and seasoned judgment merits the careful consideration of every citizen in America who does not want to see his country swept into the maelstrom of a foreign war on the wave of an inspired hysteria by highly paid warmongers.

ARE WE TO INVITE ATTACK FROM JAPAN BY SCUTTLING OUR OWN DEFENSES?

In view of the attitude of English lords and leaders and their disdain for American planes during the long months which the war has already been in progress, it is small wonder that west coast citizens in California, Oregon, and Washington, as well as thoughtful citizens throughout America, are beginning to wonder whether a policy of stripping our own meager defense establishments and depriving this country of the few modern arms and airplanes which we have is not virtually sending an invitation to Japan and Russia to "come and get us" since we are exposing our vast resources and democratic institutions to the wrath of the world by releasing them for sale by private companies to nations now at war.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to this thought-provoking broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., of Thursday, June 6, 1940:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking from the studios of WOL in Washington. There's one very hot flash of news that has just broken here. Fifty fighting planes of the United States Navy are on their way tonight for service with the allied armies in Europe. They are gathering at this moment at an airport in Buffalo, N. Y., being flown in from all sections of the country, and from there they will go across the Canadian border and become the property of the British Government.

It is not a direct sale by the Navy Department to the Allies. The procedure is that these planes are being turned back by the Navy Department to the Curtiss Co., of Buffalo, and in return for them the Curtiss Co. will supply the Navy later on with more up-to-date planes. It seems the new ones will have puncture-proof gasoline tanks and armor protection.

The Navy Department says that the transaction is distinctly to the advantage of the Navy, and what the Curtiss Co. does with the planes after they are turned back in is the business of the Curtiss Co.—not the Navy Department.

As a matter of fact, the plan is, however, for the Curtiss Co. to sell these planes immediately to the British Government * * * and they'll be rushed across the Atlantic to the Allied armies.

This, of course, is the program that has been proposed for some days by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida. His suggestion has been that the President be authorized to sell any part of the planes or guns or other fighting equipment of the Army and Navy to the Allies in return for the unfinished orders which are under construction in this country for the British and French.

For more than a week Senator PEPPER has been promoting that idea, and on two occasions his resolution has come up before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The first time it was voted down, 21 to 1; the last time—day before yesterday—it was 19 to 2.

Even this afternoon there was a sharp fight in the Senate when Senator PEPPER made his fourth consecutive daily speech on the subject, but apparently the resolution was not necessary, because from these developments tonight the President seems to have decided to carry out the program anyway.

It begins to appear that the British and French Armies will be able to replace the fighting equipment they lost in Belgium out of the surplus supplies that we have on hand left over from the World War; that is to say, it appears that they can if the things we have are any good to them.

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau said today that he is in favor of the idea. It really is a decision for the Secretary of War to make, but the reports late this afternoon are that the War Department is agreeable—in fact, the War Department is supposed to have given its official O. K.—and inasmuch as the law gives the administration the power to sell any surplus supplies there would seem to be nothing in the way.

The present indications are that the Allies may be interested in a couple of hundred of the so-called French 75's; also, in several thousand old-type machine guns, and possibly in about fifteen or twenty thousand rifles.

Now, there is one story in the news today that seems to call for some very frank and honest and candid telling of facts, so we might just as well plunge in.

This morning certain news dispatches stated that the American Ambassador in London, Mr. Joe Kennedy, and the American Ambassador in France, Mr. William C. Bullitt, have been sending urgent messages to the President and the State Department here, and those messages have been urging that American airplane factories hurry up with their construction of fighting planes for the British and French Governments.

The President's Secretary, Mr. Stephen T. Early, was asked specifically about that today. He said that he does not know about any particular call to the President, but he does know that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Bullitt have been sending numerous messages of that kind to the officials here in Washington; and with that confirmation from the White House those stories have been given great emphasis in the news today. The general picture has been painted that the Allies are gravely in need of these ships that we are building for them; that our own factories are unduly slow in turning them out. There is a lot of talk about the "bottlenecks of the aircraft industry," and the general implication is that the aviation industry is falling down and failing to keep up to schedule, and the Allies are suffering as a result.

Just for your information, nothing could be further from the truth, and in all fairness to the American aviation industry, those stories seem to call for a few cold, hard facts. This may step on the toes of certain individuals, and I suppose they'll be very displeased about it, but they'll just have to be displeased, because I think you're entitled to know the facts.

To begin with, more than a year ago—after Munich—there was one manufacturer of large-sized aviation engines in the United States who had enough foresight to see what was coming in Europe, and he made an offer to the British Government to build in Canada a large engine plant, which would have been ready for production at the time the war started, but his offer was turned down—flatly and unequivocally.

DON'T WANT OUR BLASTED PLANES

Last November, the famous Lord Beaverbrook, who was in charge of all British airplane production, came to the United States (this was 2 months after the war was under way), and he met a group of American plane manufacturers, and he told them:

"Don't for 1 minute get the idea that we are planning to buy any of your blasted planes." That is the exact quote as it was given to me by two of the men in that group. They said that Lord Beaverbrook told them that the British planes were far superior to those that were being made in this country; so were the British engines. He said that England could, and would, produce all of the planes and engines that she could use.

As a matter of fact, at that stage of the game, the French purchasing commission, in the United States, was actually placing orders for fighting planes. A great many of those ships already have been completed and delivered, and before the war was 6 weeks old, the French had signed a contract with American engine producers to build additions onto the existing engine plants. They signed a contract on the 10th day of last October, with the Pratt & Whitney Co. in Hartford, Conn.—about which I'll tell you more a little later—to build an additional plant. That additional plant was built immediately, and today it is turning out 300 engines a month for the French Government, and has been for several weeks.

About the first of February, the British began negotiating with Pratt and Whitney, to build a further addition, so they could get more engines, but they wanted to get a little lower price on the engines. There was haggling about this detail and that detail—all of them minor—and it was not until 2 weeks ago that they ever got around to signing the contract. They lost 4½ months, in argument and discussion. It's only in the last few days that the ground has been broken for that new plant. It will be 8 months before the first engine can be turned out, which means about the first of next March. If they had signed the contract back in February, without that delay, they could have had the additional plant in production, in less than 3 months from today.

There are certain manufacturers of airplanes, who build the finest types of fighting planes for the Army and Navy, with whom the British have been dickering ever since last November. In that case, too, it's the same general story, a matter of minor details, a question of whether they could get the price down a little lower. It's just a matter of a few thousand dollars in each case, and in several of those cases the contracts are still not signed. The dickering is still going on, in some cases for as long as 7 or 8 months, in other cases 3 or 4 or 5 months.

The French are getting their planes—the ones for which they placed their orders. It's quite true, they would like to be able to get still more, but on the other half of the story there are the cold facts. One of the complaints by the British has been that they would prefer to buy these planes on credit, instead of paying cash, which the cash-and-carry law requires, and that's a bit of background to go along with these stories that the American aircraft industry is falling down in producing planes for the Allied armies.

Now, that brings us around to the report which I promised last night to give you this evening—about what I was able to find out yesterday on this matter of the airplane engine industry being a bottleneck of the aviation industry in general.

That point, you know, was brought out by President Roosevelt in connection with his program to build the airplane production capacity of the country up to 50,000 planes a year. You recall his explanation that airplanes can be turned out only as fast as we produce engines to power the planes, and so the spotlight of the national-defense program was turned immediately on the airplane engine industry, as the key to the entire question.

There's been so much conflicting information and misinformation about the actual status of the engine industry that it's been impossible to know just what the facts really are and that's the reason I went yesterday to Hartford, Conn., to try to get a first-hand picture for you as to just what the real story is.

The Pratt & Whitney Co. in Hartford is one of the only two engine companies in America that are turning out airplane engines of the size required for fighting planes; the other is the Curtiss-Wright Corporation. There is a third company—the Allison Corporation—which is a division of General Motors, but that one is just getting started. The two big ones are Pratt & Whitney and Curtiss-Wright, and it was Pratt & Whitney to which I went yesterday.

First of all, by way of giving you a general picture, that plant is now turning out about 800 engines a month, which may sound like a very small number. You may picture the plant as one little medium-sized building, with a group of men using hand tools.

Get that thought out of your head, right now. The actual buildings of that factory cover 30 acres of ground—that's the actual ground space—and the daily pay roll is 13,000 men. Thirty acres is a good sized farm in some parts of the United States.

Almost everything is done by machinery, but not machinery as you generally think of it. These are machines as big as a house. The same sort of machines that are used in the big automobile factories, multiple drills as large as a summer cottage, that drill 25 or 30 screw holes in a crankcase casting, all simultaneously and automatically; the assembly line, just in itself, covers acres of ground; there are testing plants, automatic grinding machines for making gears; the whole production is mechanized from beginning to end.

As I told you before, there is one large new addition to the factory, built for the French, which is now turning out 300 engines a month, all by itself, and they have broken ground on another addition which will be even larger.

There have been stories that it would take 2 years to get actual production out of any new plants that the engine manufacturers might build. They told me yesterday that that probably is true, in the case of manufacturers who are not making this type of engine already and who would have to start from scratch, but they point out that they were able to get the French plant into production in less than 8 months, and they say they can do the same thing on further additions.

As for the machine-tool industry being a bottleneck for them, that seems to be true in a rather peculiar way.

The Pratt & Whitney Co., for example, does not make all of its own parts for these motors. There are certain parts, certain peculiar gears, for example, that are made for them by various small machine-tool companies, all through New England, and on some of those items there does seem to be a bottleneck. These little companies only have a capacity of so much per month, but that is being cured to a large degree and as fast as possible, because those little companies are now expanding, to be ready for increased orders, and by the time this new addition for the British is ready they probably will be able to meet the demand.

There does seem to be one more possible bottleneck from the machine-tool industry.

And that is that if Pratt & Whitney, for example, want to double their present capacity, and in order to supply the engines for a production capacity of 50,000 planes a year for the United States, both they and Curtiss-Wright would have to just about double their plants. In order to do that, it means they'll have to get all of these various types of machines about which I told you just now, to equip the additional buildings, and that seems to be a possible rub.

These machines have to be made individually. Each one is a special design, and the machinery is highly complicated. So far they've been able to get whatever they needed, but for any tremendous program, there might be a delay. That's the reason the President, here in Washington, has been concentrating his attention on expanding the machine-tool industry in every possible way.

As for personnel to operate the expanded plants there seems to be no serious problem, there the system is to train additional men all the time alongside of the experienced workers who are now operating the machine. You see this work is not the sort of work that takes years of training. The machines are so automatic that they merely require attention; they do all of the measuring and precision work themselves, and so it's easily possible to train the men to run these machines in the time that it takes to build and equip any new plant.

So there's the story, and it does not seem to be quite so black as it has been painted in some of the past reports.

One last thought. The heads of this engine industry insist that all I've told you applies only to expansion of the industry at the places where the industry now exists. You know, the Army and Navy want any additional facilities to be located in the Middle West, away from the exposed positions of Connecticut and New Jersey.

These engine manufacturers say that will be far more difficult, it will take far more time, and it will be far more expensive. They say, furthermore, that the reason they can do as well as they can in New England is because there is a plentiful supply of manpower there, emotionally and traditionally suited for precision work. If they moved to the Middle West, they would have to take their labor along with them in all probability.

Well, that's the top of the news as it looks from here. Until tomorrow evening—good night!

Changing Horses in the Middle of the Stream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, changing horses in the middle of the stream is a great deal better than not getting across. England and France, when the test came, found it necessary not only to change their civil leaders but their military leaders. But they did not do it quickly enough to avoid disaster. It is regrettable we cannot change horses before Roosevelt gets us into war.

In both France and England politicians, backed by unthinking masses of the people, did exactly what the New Deal has been trying to do here in America—work less and spend more, waste instead of save, insist upon "the more abundant life." Then, when war came, they found themselves unprepared, just as we here in America are unprepared. They waited too long, and the next few weeks may tell the story as to whether they will pass out of existence as nations. If they do, it will be because, desiring to spend and waste what they had, they laid by nothing, made no preparations to meet the war cloud which they could plainly see arising in Germany.

In Germany, men and women, boys and girls, worked toward one end—to prepare themselves for conquest.

We are not seeking conquest. We do not desire war. Nevertheless, for the last year or more, the President has been steadily driving in that direction. He now tells us that war is imminent.

Well, he has done all that one man could reasonably do to provoke war. He has done all that one man could do, by favoring the Communists and John L. Lewis and the C. I. O. and by permitting his wife to entertain the Communists in the White House, to encourage the "fifth column" to keep us from being prepared for war; to bring about a condition where, if war comes, a radical change will have to be made here in America, in the operation of our industries, to enable us to meet the emergency, to prepare not for aggressive war but to defend our Nation.

He should at once get rid of those in his administration who have been trying, as they say, "to remake America." Last week, his Attorney General, Jackson, resigned from the Guild. Another one of his advisers, Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, did the same thing. Long has the Guild been charged with being Communist-controlled; with having communistic ideas. These two high Government officials, with the approval of the President, clung to that organization to the last minute, until they could no longer remain in it and escape the charge that they were not patriotic; that they belonged to the "fifth column." Their repentance comes rather late. Some doubt its sincerity.

The extent of the President's sympathy for the "fifth columnists," the manner in which he has aided them, his failure to adequately prepare, is shown by an editorial from the June 6, 1940, issue of the Sturgis Daily Journal, of Sturgis, Mich., which, because of its soundness, I here reprint:

PREPAREDNESS "ON ORDER"

A strike of C. I. O. workmen engaged in the construction of two cruisers and four destroyers in a New Jersey shipyard is a timely warning of the kind of cooperation this country will have from John L. Lewis and his followers in its belated efforts to prepare itself against possible aggression from abroad. A month's delay in the completion of these ships might make the difference between victory and defeat in a life and death struggle with invaders. To the extent that such a stoppage of work is tolerated this Nation is taking grave chances.

In a far lesser emergency another President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, told striking policemen of Boston that "there is no

right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, at any time." His forthright courage resulted in his nomination for the Vice Presidency and eventually resulted in his elevation to the Presidency.

Is John L. Lewis to have the power to dictate the speed and the extent of our preparedness? If so, this Nation will find itself in far worse condition than France and England were in when Hitler started his "blitzkrieg" against them.

In a nation at war such a stoppage of work on essential equipment would be rated as treason. Workers would be given orders to return to their jobs or else. In France or England today, as well as in Germany, such an attempt to interrupt production of war materials would result in the perpetrators facing the firing squad. The right to strike is a luxury that no nation can afford when the invader is on its soil.

France realizes too late the price that it is likely to pay for its new deal. A short 3 years ago Leon Blum, head of a so-called "popular front" government, was telling the people that he had brought about a new social order. Workers were told to work less, produce less, and divide more. Production was disrupted by sit-down strikes and hours were drastically reduced. The rate of aircraft production fell off as much as 40 percent. What wouldn't France give today for the airplanes that those workers could have produced if saner counsel had prevailed?

Too late, the French people awoke to their danger. They didn't give Premier Blum and his "popular fronters" a second term, let alone a third one. The French new dealers taxed and taxed, spent and spent, and brought the country to the very edge of economic ruin. By the time Daladier took over it was almost too late. Hitler was on the march.

President Roosevelt revealed in a recent fireside chat that the United States owns a few modern planes and antiaircraft guns and has "on order" many more. Planes and guns "on order" in France and England are not having much effect in stopping Hitler. Planes in the air and guns in the hands of trained soldiers are the only defense against mechanized hordes of invaders.

Under the New Deal regime this country has spent $7,000,000,000 in 7 years on the Army and Navy and the President admits that our defense is still "on order."

Surely this country will have the gumption and the grit to demand the ablest leadership that it can get, and recognize now that its gravest danger is from within, rather than from foes beyond the Nation's borders.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot change horses until November. It is regrettable that we cannot. But we can prepare for November, and all those who love their homes and their country; who do not want to see their husbands, their sons, their brothers, their fathers, sent to make war on foreign soil should gird themselves for that battle.

Not only that, but everyone should start working at once to see that the New Deal gets an overwhelming defeat at that time; that those who would involve us in foreign war, that those who from within would remake America, are thrown out of public office.

Our "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System, New York City, June 9, 1940:

The war in Europe today is a conflict of ideologies. Nations embracing the freedom and liberty of individuals are pitted against the dictatorships of the proletariat. An amazing but most dangerous sequence to this struggle in Europe, however, is the world-wide movement on the part of many persons residing in all lands to forsake their loyalty to nationality when confronted with the choice between nationality and ideology.

These persons make up the "fifth column," and both Stalin and Hitler maintain "fifth columns" in every land. Wherever the troops of the German Fuehrer have invaded foreign territory they have found a Nazi "fifth column" ready for instant cooperation to insure the success of the invasion. Austrian Nazis, Czechoslovak Nazis, Polish Nazis, Danish Nazis, Norwegian Nazis, Dutch Nazis, and Belgian Nazis have long since formed themselves into "fifth columns"—waiting for the coming of their ideological master. Polish Communists and Finnish Communists worked together with Stalin for the defeat of their own governments.

Both Stalin and Hitler have "fifth columns" in the United States. Stalin's "fifth column" in the United States is much the older, the more experienced, and by far the larger of the two. Only with respect to their common treason to the Government and institutions of this country are they on a par. Both operate with complete devotion to their foreign dictators and without the faintest trace of loyalty to the United States. In my opinion, membership in both is enlistment for treason.

Whatever its outward appearance, the "fifth column" must of necessity be engaged in conspiracy.

In its report to Congress in January of this year, the Dies committee declared that "the Communist Party of the United States is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party."

In describing the Communist Party as a conspiracy, we are not guessing. It is not even necessary for us to arrive at such a description on the basis of a great mass of cumulative evidence. The fact is that the Communist Party itself has in the past frankly admitted is conspiratorial character. We need only let the party speak for itself.

Some years ago when the Communist Party was much younger in this country, it published a volume entitled "Lenin on Organization." The book bears the imprint of the Daily Worker Publishing Co. It appeared as volume I of the Lenin library. It is important here to bear in mind that Communists consider the writings of Lenin as authoritative.

Let us, therefore, look at what Lenin had to say about the nature of an "organization of revolutionaries" or a Communist Party as it is set forth in his book published by the American Communists.

"Such an organization," wrote Lenin, "must of necessity be not too extensive and as conspiratorial as possible."

Naturally, a conspiracy must restrict its membership drastically. A conspiracy aims to enlist a small, highly disciplined, and trained minority of malcontents. In the parlance of the Communists, this small minority has commonly been described as "the vanguard of the proletariat."

Being a conspiracy, the Communist Party is of necessity committed to many forms of illegal acts. In another one of his books which has been reprinted by the Communists in the United States, Lenin wrote:

"Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are very poor revolutionaries."

The same doctrine of the use of illegal forms of struggle is contained in the "Program of the Communist International." Like the writings of Lenin, the "Program of the Communist International" is accepted by American Communists as an authoritative expression of the principles of the American Communist Party.

One of the methods employed by the Communist Party to gain adherents and influence has been to set up innocent-looking "fronts" which Earl Browder described as "transmission belts." Among these Communist Party "front organizations" which serve as units in Stalin's "fifth column" in the United States are the American Youth Congress, the National Negro Congress, the International Workers Order, the International Labor Defense, the American Student Union, the Workers Alliance, and the League of American Writers. I could add a hundred more if my time permitted. Millions of Americans have been drawn into the Communist Party's zone of influence through their membership and activity in these organizations. Browder himself has estimated that nearly 2,000,000 Americans "go all the way with the Communist Party in its full program."

Naturally, a major part of the program has been to keep us soft, to see to it that as a nation we are economically unsound and, above everything, unprepared to defend ourselves. In fact, the Communist Party through its front organizations has done much to weaken the defense of America. One has only to read the program of the American League Against War and Fascism, which in 1937 was superseded by the American League for Peace and Democracy (recently dissolved), the leading transmission belt for the Communist Party, to get concrete proof of the antidefense propaganda so widely disseminated by Communist-front organizations. I shall now read from the program of the American League Against War and Fascism: "Article I—To work toward the stopping of the manufacture of munitions. Article III—To demand the transfer of all war funds to relief." In other words, this organization advocates the stopping of the manufacture of arms not alone for shipment abroad but also the stopping of the manufacture of arms for our own use. Then it recommends that we transfer the funds set aside by Congress for the Navy and Army to the W. P. A. or to some other relief agency. Article VII of the same document reads "To win the armed forces to the support of this program."

This, my friends, is a sample of what Communist-front organizations in the United States advocate. In effect, in my opinion, it borders on treason, and as a result of this propaganda and the vacillating attitude of our Federal administration, we, as a Nation, find ourselves less prepared for defense than at any time in our history. Is it, therefore, any wonder that Eugene Vargo, prominent Soviet economist, should have said only a few days ago in an article in the bimonthly paper, "Bolshevists," that "victorious proletarian revolutions in many countries and in their

colonial holdings are maturing"? Or is it surprising that American newspapers of the past week carried the caption "Italy Laughs at United States Army"?

But the most serious aspect of this whole question of the "fifth column" in the United States is the fact that our own administration at Washington has given these un-American "front organizations" such shocking encouragement. High Government officials from the White House down have lent the vast prestige of their names to subversive outfits. There is not a front organization among those which I have named which has not had the blessing of our Federal administration. Address of welcome after address of welcome has been given to "red" guided assemblies by leading new dealers.

Ever since I have been a member of the Dies committee, I have observed the reluctance on the part of the national administration to cooperate with the committee. I have also observed a reluctanee on the part of many of our high Government officials to avail themselves of important information on un-American activities given to and correlated by the Dies committee. Further, various high Government officials, whose duty it is to enforce the laws, have woefully neglected their duties when the statutes relate to foreign agents, sabotage, conspiracy, or deportation. The coddling of Harry Bridges by the Secretary of Labor, and the quashing by the Attorney General of indictments handed down by the Federal grand jury at Detroit against 17 Communists and Communist sympathizers, are typical cases.

Thousands of Communists or Communist sympathizers have been appointed to Government positions; many Communists and Communist fellow travelers have been appointed to key positions in our Government at yearly salaries ranging from $4,000 to over $6,000. Only the other day a prominent Communist sympathizer, according to testimony given to the Dies committee, was appointed to a key position in the Office of Education. Communist meetings have been held on Government property and in Government buildings. In some instances only Communists, or those approved by Communists, could procure employment on certain Federal projects.

The "fifth column" in the United States has flourished under New Deal rule. It has literally fed at the same trough. In some respects it is synonomous to the New Deal, so the surest way to removing the "fifth column" from our shores is to remove the New Deal from the seat of government. We must do this if we hope to rebuild our Army and Navy to their proper level. And I think we will all agree that both need prompt attention. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and as a World War veteran, I frankly admit that we are woefully unprepared, probably more unprepared than we were prior to our entry into the World War.

And no one will deny the need to look to our own security in these troublesome times. But to be secure, we must not only prepare to defend ourselves from without, but we must also guard against enemies from within. We must drive the un-American groups into the open, incorporate and license them, fingerprint the membership, and deport the deportables.

The President of the United States should forthwith call upon department heads to immediately discharge every Communist or Nazi presently employed in our Government.

If we, as a people and as a government, will show this amount of backbone, we will be accomplishing immeasurable good for this great Nation. We will likewise be saying in unmistakable language to the whole world that regardless of your foreign ideologies, we intend to retain for ourselves the representative form of government, with its infinite possibilities and with its guaranty of liberty, of freedom, and of democracy. And in a renaissance of patriotism, with a show of power, and with a firm resolve to go forward again as a united but proud nation, we can be a beacon light of strength and good will in a world of despair.

Roosevelt Commits an Act of War and Should be Checked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the country was shocked by Roosevelt's recent action in ordering that some of our modern airplanes be transferred to certain belligerents in Europe. Where one nation intervenes on behalf of certain belligerents and supplies them with implements of war from its own stock of armaments, a situation arises wherein the aggrieved nation may consider such intervention an act of war. In his treatise on International Law, volume 2, section 96, page 104—Longmans, Green & Co., 1906—L. Oppenheim states the following:

INITIATIVE HOSTILE ACTS OF WAR

Hostile acts of force initiative of war are such hostile acts as are considered by the other party acts of war, since, as has been stated above (p. 55) hostile acts of force may be committed by a state against another without war breaking out thereby, the passive party acquiescing in the act. For a war to commence by unilateral hostile acts of force it is at least necessary that the passive party declares, expressis verbis, or through unmistakable conduct, that it considers these hostilities as acts of war. Of what kinds of acts these hostilities may consist it cannot be decisively laid down. They may, to give examples, consist of occupation of a part of foreign territory, an inroad into a foreign country, the blockade of a harbor, an attack on the frontier, an attack on a man-of-war, the capture of a merchantman, and the like. And it must be specifically observed that the respective acts of force need not at all be intended to be hostile, provided they are hostile de facto. Thus acts of force by way of reprisals or during a pacific blockade or an intervention may be considered acts of war by the passive party, and thereby contain the commencement of war, although they were not intended as acts of war.

That a war initiated by acts of force without a previous declaration or manifesto of war is nevertheless war according to international law, nobody denies. But many writers assert that the commencement itself of such a war contains a violation of international law. If this were correct, many important, and in their results far-reaching, wars of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries would have been begun with a violation of international law. But the very fact of these numerous wars having been commenced through hostile acts of force only shows that the practice of the states never adopted the alleged rule of the necessity of a declaration or a manifesto of war. This does not mean that a state would be justified in opening hostilities without any preceding conflict. There is no greater violation of the law of nations than that committed by a state which commences hostilities in time of peace without previous controversy and without having tried to settle the difference through negotiation. But after negotiation has been tried in vain, a state does not act treacherously in case it resorts to hostilities without a declaration of war, especially after diplomatic intercourse has been broken off.

Certainly, under the thesis presented by L. Oppenheim, Germany might consider Roosevelt's intervention an act of war, and this might mean the commencement of war with the Nazi Government.

Congress has not given approval to such transfer of our military supplies. In fact, Roosevelt's action can be construed as a grave injustice to Congress and to the American people. The following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal asks that Roosevelt be checked:

ROOSEVELT SHOULD BE CHECKED

President Roosevelt told his press conference Friday that he was asking Congress for authority to dispose of some Government guns and ammunition for the benefit of the Allies in Europe. This is not only asking for additional authority to send guns, but for a vote of confidence in his policy of sending Government warplanes. That moves the United States into the position of an informal ally of Britain and France.

Congress faces a serious decision. Whether Mr. Roosevelt plans now to state this country's case and explain his policy has not been told at this writing. He may only ask for this increase of power. The gravity is there, whether he explains to the country or not.

Sending the Allies a few hundred Government guns and a few thousand Government rifles, declared "surplus," is no more decisive an act than making available to them airplanes declared "obsolete." In fact, the airplanes are likely to be of much more help, if they are to be sent in such numbers as suggested by Mr. Roosevelt's offhand remark that planes can get out of date "darned fast." To make the planes available he has used a permission intended to make possible an up-to-date air force by trading in older planes, but never intended to give a President authority to send Government armaments to belligerant powers.

This is where the question becomes one of making war. Every plane, every gun, and every shell that our private manufacturers can turn out can be sent to any country which buys them, without any breach of neutrality. It is when the Government begins to aid with its own supplies that the Nation has intervened and the strategem of turning planes back to the manufacturer to transfer the material does not deceive anyone. A plane can become out of date very soon but still travel many miles on many missions. Motorcars are out of date, too, but we don't trade in a car as "obsolete" until its successor is ready for delivery. So much for the detail. The canvas is broader than that.

Is America ready to intervene? That is what Congress has to decide. Is it ready to vote the President powers never before granted except in wartime, including the power to make war without declaring it?

Congress has to say whether the country is ready for this. Congress may feel itself in a spot. Its Members may feel they must either vote the President every power he asks or else weaken our Government in the face of other nations.

As a matter of fact, this consideration amounts to very little in any practical way. For the administration would not be weakened in the eyes of any government so as to affect its course

toward us. Hitler and his associates are not going to attack us sooner or any later because of this decision, but if and when he thinks it is a good time to do it. Britain and France are not going to be any less friendly. They are in a perpetual state of peeve toward us, in peace as in war, because we do not put all our resources behind them, financial and physical. Finally, no government on earth does not know that in case of defense the President—any President—would be voted, overnight, everything the country has.

Is the United States ready to intervene? Is Congress ready to vote the President power which thereafter leaves to him the decision as to whether and when we will intervene?

We do not think the country is ready for this. The public has not been asked. The President has not taken it into his confidence about the significance of the steps he has taken and the extent he proposes to go. Are we in the war now or not? Is it President Roosevelt's belief, as it is the belief of many, that war at some time is inevitable and that our policy should now be to begin our defense by supporting war on European battlefields?

Congress, if it votes approval now, must realize that hereafter it is out of the picture—that it henceforth becomes only an appropriating body. It is not in our conscience to say that the people of the United States are ready for that stage of dictatorship.

United States Housing Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

LETTER FROM GOV. SAM H. JONES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE OF LOUISIANA
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, June 5, 1940.

Hon. T. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I believe that you would be serving the interests of the people of Louisiana if you would use your efforts to see that the bill making appropriations for the United States Housing Authority is passed by the House of Representatives at this session.

There is great need for additional housing in Louisiana, and there will not be sufficient funds to carry out this program fully unless this act is passed.

Very truly yours,

SAM H. JONES,
Governor of Louisiana.

War Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF BLUFFTON COLLEGE, BLUFFTON, OHIO

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BLUFFTON COLLEGE,
Bluffton, Ohio, June 3, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
Congressman Fourth Ohio District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am very much concerned about the definite drift toward war which it seems to me is apparent in this country. If we enter the war we are in definite danger of losing many of those things which we would be trying to defend. As I see it we are in much greater danger of ultimate loss of our liberties if we do enter than if we stay out.

Further advances in help for the Allies, short of war, are almost sure to eventually draw us into the conflict. Let us refrain from moving another step in that direction.

One of our greatest present dangers is from war hysteria. You could scarcely make a greater contribution to this country than in doing your best to replace war hysteria with cool, critical thinking on the part of our people.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD L. RAMSEYER, *President.*

The Task of This Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered yesterday by the President of the United States at Charlottesville, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Newcomb, my friends of the University of Virginia, I notice by the program that I am asked to address the classes of 1940. I avail myself of that privilege but I also take this very apt occasion to speak to many other classes, classes that have graduated through all the years, classes that are still in the period of study, classes not alone of the schools of learning of the Nation but classes that have come up through the great schools of experience; in other words, a cross section, a cross section just as you who graduate today are a cross section of the Nation as a whole.

Every generation of young men and women in America has questions to ask the world. Most of the time they are the simple but nevertheless difficult questions, questions of work to do, opportunities to find, ambitions to satisfy.

But every now and again in the history of the Republic a different kind of question presents itself—a question that asks, not about the future of an individual or even of a generation, but about the future of the country, the future of the American people.

There was such a time at the beginning of our history—at the beginning of our history as a Nation. Young people asked themselves in those days what lay ahead, not for themselves, but for the new United States.

There was such a time again in the seemingly endless years of the War Between the States. Young men and young women on both sides of the line asked themselves, not what trades or professions they would enter, what lives they would make, but what was to become of the country they had known.

There is such a time again today. Again today the young men and the young women of America ask themselves with earnestness and with deep concern this same question: "What is to become of the country we know."

Now they ask it with even greater anxiety than before. They ask, not only what the future holds for this Republic, but what the future holds for all peoples and all nations that have been living under democratic forms of government, under the free institutions of a free people.

It is understandable to all of us, I think, that they should ask this question. They read the words of those who are telling them that the ideal of individual liberty, the ideal of free franchise, the ideal of peace through justice is a decadent ideal. They read the word and hear the boast of those who say that a belief in force—force directed by self-chosen leaders—is the new and vigorous system which will overrun the earth. They have seen the ascendancy of this philosophy of force in nation after nation where free institutions and individual liberties were once maintained.

It is natural and understandable that the younger generation should first ask itself what the extension of the philosophy of force to all the world would lead to ultimately. We see today, for example, in stark reality some of the consequences of what we call the machine age.

Where control of machines has been retained in the hands of mankind as a whole, untold benefits have accrued to mankind. For mankind was then the master and the machine was the servant.

But in this new system of force the mastery of the machine is not in the hands of mankind. It is in the control of infinitely small groups of individuals who rule without a single one of the democratic sanctions that we have known. The machine in hands of irresponsible conquerors becomes the master; mankind is not only the servant; it is the victim too. Such mastery abandons with

deliberate contempt all of the moral values to which even this young country for more than 300 years has been accustomed and dedicated.

Surely the new philosophy proves from month to month that it could have no possible conception of the way of life or the way of thought of a nation whose origins go back to Jamestown and Plymouth Rock.

And conversely, neither those who spring from that ancient stock nor those who have come hither in later years can be indifferent to the destruction of freedom in their ancestral lands across the sea.

Perception of danger, danger to our institutions may come slowly or it may come with a rush and a shock as it has to the people of the United States in the past few months. This perception of danger, danger in a world-wide area—it has come to us clearly and overwhelmingly—we perceive the peril in a world-wide arena—an arena that may become so narrowed that only the Americas will retain the ancient faiths.

Some indeed still hold to the now somewhat obvious delusion that we of the United States can safely permit the United States to become a lone island, a lone island in a world dominated by the philosophy of force.

Such an island may be the dream of those who still talk and vote as isolationists. Such an island represents to me and to the overwhelming majority of Americans today a helpless nightmare, the helpless nightmare of a people without freedom; yes, the nightmare of a people lodged in prison, handcuffed, hungry, and fed through the bars from day to day by the contemptuous, unpitying masters of other continents.

It is natural also that we should ask ourselves how now we can prevent the building of that prison and the placing of ourselves in the midst of it.

Let us not hesitate—all of us—to proclaim certain truths. Overwhelmingly we, as a nation—and this applies to all the other American nations—are convinced that military and naval victory for the gods of force and hate would endanger the institutions of democracy in the western world, and that equally, therefore, the whole of our sympathies lies with those nations that are giving their lifeblood in combat against these forces.

The people and the Government of the United States have seen with the utmost regret and with grave disquiet the decision of the Italian Government to engage in the hostilities now raging in Europe.

More than 3 months ago the Chief of the Italian Government sent me word that because of the determination of Italy to limit, so far as might be possible, the spread of the European conflict, more than 200,000,000 people in the region of the Mediterranean had been enabled to escape the suffering and the devastation of war.

I informed the Chief of the Italian Government that this desire on the part of Italy to prevent the war from spreading met with full sympathy and response on the part of the Government and the people of the United States, and I expressed the earnest hope of this Government and of this people that this policy on the part of Italy might be continued. I made it clear that in the opinion of the Government of the United States any extension of hostilities in the region of the Mediterranean might result in a still greater enlargement of the scene of the conflict, the conflict in the Near East and in Africa, and that if this came to pass no one could foretell how much greater the theater of the war eventually might become.

Again on a subsequent occasion, not so long ago, recognizing that certain aspirations of Italy might form the basis of discussions between the powers most specifically concerned, I offered, in a message addressed to the Chief of the Italian Government, to send to the Governments of France and of Great Britain such specific indications of the desires of Italy to obtain readjustments with regard to her position as the Chief of the Italian Government might desire to transmit through me. While making it clear that the Government of the United States in such an event could not and would not assume responsibility for the nature of the proposals submitted nor for agreements which might thereafter be reached, I proposed that if Italy would refrain from entering the war I would be willing to ask assurances from the other powers concerned that they would faithfully execute any agreement so reached and that Italy's voice in any future peace conference would have the same authority as if Italy had actually taken part in the war, as a belligerent.

Unfortunately, to the regret of all of us and to the regret of humanity, the Chief of the Italian Government was unwilling to accept the procedure suggested and he has made no counter-proposal.

This Government directed its efforts to doing what it could to work for the preservation of peace in the Mediterranean area, and it likewise exercised its willingness to endeavor to cooperate with the Government of Italy when the appropriate occasion arose for the creation of a more stable world order, through the reduction of armaments, and through the construction of a more liberal international economic system which would assure to all powers equality of opportunity in the world's markets and in the securing of raw materials on equal terms.

I have likewise, of course, felt it necessary in my communications to Signor Mussolini to express the concern of the Government of the United States because of the fact that any extension of the war in the region of the Mediterranean would inevitably result in great prejudice to the ways of life and government and to the trade and commerce of all of the American republics.

The Government of Italy has now chosen to preserve what it terms its "freedom of action" and to fulfill what it states are its promises to Germany. In so doing it has manifested disregard for the rights and security of other nations, disregard for the lives of the peoples of those nations which are directly threatened by this spread of the war, and has evidenced its unwillingness to find the means through pacific negotiations for the satisfaction of what it believes are its legitimate aspirations.

On this 10th day of June 1940 the hand that held the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor.

On this 10th day of June 1940, in this university, founded by the first great American teacher of democracy, we send forth our prayers and our hopes to those beyond the seas who are maintaining with magnificent valor their battle for freedom.

In our, in our unity—in our American unity—we will pursue two obvious and simultaneous courses; we will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation, and at the same time we will harness and speed up the use of these resources in order that we ourselves in the Americas may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense.

All roads leading to the accomplishment of these objectives must be kept clear of obstructions. We will not slow down or detour. Signs and signals call for speed—full speed ahead.

Yes; it is right that each new generation should ask questions. But in recent months the principal question has been somewhat simplified. Once more the future of the Nation, the future of the American people is at stake.

We need not and we will not in any way abandon our continuing effort to make democracy work within our borders. Yes; we still insist on the need for vast improvements in our own social and economic life.

But that, that is a component part of national defense itself.

The program unfolds swiftly, and into that program will fit the responsibility and the opportunity of every man and woman in the land to preserve his and her heritage in days of peril.

I call for effort, courage, sacrifice, devotion. Granting the love of freedom, all of these are possible.

And—and the love of freedom is still fierce, still steady in the Nation today.

Editorials on President's Address at Charlottesville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Editorials Praise Roosevelt's Speech," appearing in the New York Times of this date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1940]

EDITORIALS PRAISE ROOSEVELT SPEECH—MANY DECLARE HE SAYS WHAT PEOPLE THINK IN PLEDGING AID TO STEM NAZI TIDE

Editorial comment on President Roosevelt's address, in general, pledged that the people of the country were ready to back him fully to assist the Allied forces.

Following are excerpts from editorials gathered by the New York Times and the Associated Press:

HOLDS OUR WORK IS TO GIVE AID

From the New York Herald Tribune:

"President Roosevelt has revealed how far his efforts went to open some other solution to Mussolini than that which he has taken and to which he has consigned the people of Italy. They were futile, and Italians are now committed to a course which, whatever the outcome in terms of power politics, is bound to be disastrous for them. But since this has happened, we cannot undo it. We can only accept it as deeper proof of the conviction that, as the President says, 'victory for the gods of force and hate would endanger the institutions of democracy in the western world,' and, in his eloquent and moving words, that the only 'isolation' open to us is the isolation 'of a people lodged in prison, handcuffed, hungry, and fed through the bars from day to day by the contemptuous, unpitying masters of other continents.' Mussolini has tied his people to the wheels of Hitler's tanks; we can only, for our part, lend every material aid in our

power to those still fighting for freedom and prepare ourselves as well and as quickly as we may to meet the test of a struggle for which no compromise is possible."

ASSERTS "COUNTRY IS READY"

From the Chattanooga Times: "Mr. Roosevelt understated the case when he asserted 'the hand that holds the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor.' The program called for by President Roosevelt with 'full speed ahead' will have to include compulsory military training and a brake on excess profits accruing from the filling of Government orders. It remains to fill in the details of the Nation-wide program of universal service which is implicit in Mr. Roosevelt's address. The country is ready for such a program."

SAYS PEOPLE BACK PRESIDENT

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer: "Mussolini has brought home to the American people the danger that threatens all free people. The people, more than ever, will back the President in giving aid to those embattled nations which are carrying on our fights."

HOPES IT'S NOT TOO LATE

From the Buffalo Courier Express: "Mr. Roosevelt served notice to this effect: Mussolini has thrown his sword into one side of the scales. Now America throws into the other side certain things which may outbalance the weight of that sword.

"It is the fervent hope of the American people that the scale may be balanced before it is too late."

ASKS BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

From the Louisville Courier-Journal: "Mr. Roosevelt was in a realistic mood. His words were precise; his meaning unmistakable. Today obviously is done with pretense.

"What we need is a blueprint for swift, decisive action. Once the pattern is fixed, Mr. Roosevelt will find America ready to preserve its heritage."

HOLDS MAJORITY SUPPORTS HIM

From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette: "This [speech] may not be neutrality in a strict sense, but the fact is the overwhelming majority in this country supports the President's position fully."

DECLARATION'S TRUTH "OBVIOUS"

From the Washington Post: "The truth and justice of Mr. Roosevelt's declaration is so obvious that no voice is likely to be heard in contradiction. But the present unanimity of American opinion only emphasizes the tragedy of the period, prior to September, when the President time and again drew much the same conclusion and the country failed to recognize its importance."

HIS JUDGMENT IS APPLAUDED

From the Memphis Commercial Appeal: "The President's speech showed well-considered judgment. Indignation was there, of course, but it was mild compared to the expressions heard on every hand. What form the assistance he pledged will take is our greatest concern. If we read his speech aright, the determination is there to meet the problem realistically."

HIS ACTION CALLED POPULAR

From the Des Moines Register:

"The Register believes that President Roosevelt has decided it (the matter of aiding the Allies) in the way that the vast majority of Americans wanted it decided. We shall be lucky, mighty lucky, if even this prevents a disastrous Allied collapse in the near future."

SPEAKS FOR OUR DEMOCRACY

From the Waterbury Republican:

"His (Mr. Roosevelt's) unreserved and vehement pronouncement of American sympathy with the Allies against the totalitarian governments rings in tune with our own democracy's reaction to what is going on in Europe."

"WHAT THE NATION THINKS AND FEELS"

From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune:

"If Mr. Roosevelt spoke too bluntly, he will no doubt be disillusioned by Congress. But we suspect that his address did little more than give official utterance to what the Nation thinks and feels."

ASKS SACRIFICE OF REFORMS

From the Boston Herald:

"The President said 'We still insist on the need for vast improvement in our own social and economic life.' The 'effort, courage, sacrifice, devotion' for which he called will be more readily forthcoming, more enthusiastic, if he himself will have the courage to sacrifice some of the reforms which he initiated in a period of peace."

Chinch-Bug Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. GOODWIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 568, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $500,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to combat the imminent menace of chinch bugs to the corn crop in certain States, in accordance with the supplemental estimate of the President contained in House Document No. 736, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

The sum asked for in this resolution is included in the Agricultural Department supplemental appropriation—

For the control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insects * * *

In other words, chinch bugs.

A new generation of chinch bugs is now hatching. In 2 weeks they will be migrating to rich, succulent cornfields. The destruction they will cause must be viewed from an economic, social, and national-defense angle. If not checked, such a plague will bring hard times to our farmers, railroads, elevators, and businessmen.

Money many times in excess of the amount asked for in this appropriation will be necessary for the relief of these people if the pests are not destroyed now. We cannot wait for the money from the agricultural appropriation bill. To be of any benefit, we must have it now.

Mr. Speaker, this chinch-bug plague which now faces our middle-western farmers has been in the making for a long time. Its history reaches back into the late dry autumn of 1939 in a territory that embraces parts of five States—the section of our country commonly called the heart of America. Weather and crop conditions have been very favorable for chinch-bug life. The adult insects weathered the winter nicely, hibernating in the small-grain stubble and corn stover that was left in the fields. So you see the adult bugs were already present in great numbers and in good health early this spring.

Early this spring State entomologists of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri reported that the bugs were present in major numbers—numbers so large that spring hatchings threatened a population of plague proportions. Entomologists of these States recognized the potential seriousness of the situation and met in a conference at St. Joseph, Mo., on April 10. This meeting was reported to me by the Honorable Mark G. Thornburg, Secretary of Agriculture of the State of Iowa. Mr. Thornburg told me that potentially the Middle West was faced with the most serious insect problem in its history. Many of us were genuinely alarmed at Mr. Thornburg's report and on May 7 I wrote Mr. Dante M. Pierce, publisher of the Wallaces Farmer in Des Moines, asking him to give me a first-hand report on the situation as he and his private investigators found it. I quote from the report of the well-known authority, Mr. C. V. Gregory, who is an official of that paper:

Regarding Mr. Goodwin's letter to you of May 7, he has been correctly informed about the chinch-bug situation. Potentially it is probably worse in Iowa this year than it has ever been. I am attaching herewith a map showing the infested parts of the State. There is nothing that can be done in a practical way to combat the chinch bugs in small grain. After the small grain is harvested, however, they move like an army on the march from the small grain fields into adjoining corn fields where the greatest damage is done. At the time they start to move into the corn fields they can be combated rather effectively by heading them off with a line of creosote which must be renewed daily for several days.

For a number of years the United States Department of Agriculture has been furnishing creosote without charge for distribution through the county agents. My understanding is that this year the appropriation for pest control is inadequate and that the policy of the Department is going to be to spend as long as it lasts and that will be the end of it. The probability is that the demand for grasshopper poison in the West will use up these funds before we need them to combat chinch bugs here in Iowa, which will mean that farmers will have to depend on their own resources to do the job unless the Department should see fit to change its policy and earmark a certain portion of its pest-control money for combating chinch bugs. There is another possibility, and that is that weather conditions may do a pretty good job of controlling the pests. For 2 or 3 weeks after the bugs hatch out in the spring they are delicate and tender, and during that period are killed rapidly by damp, cold weather such as we have been having so far this spring. The bugs are now hatching in the southern part of the State, and a continuation of cold, wet weather through May would probably reduce their numbers sufficiently so that damage would be relatively slight.

More recently the well-known Iowa secretary of agriculture, the Honorable Mark G. Thornburg, writes:

In regard to the chinch-bug situation, I wired you as to the extent of the infestation, as reported to us by the field men from the extension department at Ames. I have a letter from the county agent at Leon, which is in the southern part of the State, in which he states that some of the farmers are plowing up their small grain because of damage done, and in a few weeks the chinch bugs will be in the corn. The farmers are plowing up a few rows around their fields and are putting them in soybeans to protect the rest of the corn. As you know, the adults are laying eggs at this time, and the eggs will not hatch for 3 or 4 weeks; it is the second brood that will do the damage to our corn.

For your information, I learned last night from our State entomologist that chinch bugs are bad on Henry Wallace's farm, and that the entomologists advised them to plow their wheat under, which they are going to do next week, hoping to kill some of the bugs. Their barley, they think, will make a fair crop. This is being done to keep the bugs out of their hybrid corn.

I also have your letter in which you mention the recommendations of Mr. Hoyt, Chief of the Bureau of Entomology. I have taken this up with our entomologist, Dr. Carl J. Drake, who, I think, is very practical and who has had a lot of experience in field work, and he doesn't agree entirely with Mr. Hoyt on plowing up the infested area. He hesitates to put out information urging the plowing under of the corn at this late stage. However, we are very glad to get the information.

As you know, we already have stations for the distribution of creosote, but if conditions continue as they are, the little amount that we have in Iowa will soon be expended. If the Federal Department is going to help at all, it should be done immediately. An exact count of the infestation at Johnston Station, near the Secretary's farm, might help, and I will have a count made just as soon as I can get hold of the inspector. I understand there are three Federal men working in Iowa under the Extension department at Ames, and they, no doubt, are reporting direct to the Department at Washington.

Up to the present time nothing has been done to control this chinch-bug plague except to put a few trained entomologists in the field to observe the progress of the insects. A new generation of chinch bugs will be hatched within the next 2 weeks. They will then start to migrate into the rich, succulent cornfields which lie nearby. Unless this vast insect army is stopped, as it starts its march, hard times are sure to come to our farmers, our business people, our railroads, and our elevators. There will be no corn to sell; no corn to feed to our hogs or our cattle; no hogs or cattle to be shipped by truck or rail to markets; no grain to be shipped to our markets or handled by our elevators. The farmers will ultimately lack purchasing power with which to patronize the business people of their communities. That will be the result of the destruction of our staple crops. At this point let me say that money, many times in excess of the amount asked for in this appropriation, will be necessary for the relief of these people in the months to come.

It is a fundamental military rule that an army fights on its stomach. Well-filled larders of grain and meat are fundamental to our national defense. The destruction of a large part of 1940's cereal crop is a serious threat not only to our national economy but to our military preparedness. We are faced with an insect "fifth column" of terrifying proportions. Now is the time to prepare for this invasion. To wait on the general agricultural deficiency bill will be too late. We need this money now. To procrastinate or to "pull a Chamberlain" is to invite an economic catastrophe.

Gentlemen, I urge you to pass this resolution promptly, while there is yet time to save our crops.

America's Cliveden Set and the "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address entitled "America's Cliveden Set and the 'Fifth Column,'" which I delivered Saturday evening, June 8, 1940, over Station WJZ, New York City:

At this juncture the primary threat to our national security is not a mere matter of guns, bayonets, and tanks. There are new methods of attack just as effective. There is the "Trojan horse"; there is the "fifth column." Both seek to betray the Nation, guileless and unprepared for treachery. Traitors, saboteurs, espionage agents, and spies are the provocateurs and the manipulators of the new strategy. They must be vigorously dealt with. They must be stamped out at the very threshold of their operations. Their poison spreads quickly. That contagion can so weaken a nation as to make military and naval weapons of a defending nation useless and the courage and fearlessness of its soldiery of no avail. Stark tragedy prevails in Norway and the Low Countries because of the diabolical cunning and treachery of the "fifth column."

It shall not happen here.

Couriously enough, the words "fifth column" were originated by the Spanish general, Quiepo d'Llano, in 1936 during the siege of Madrid. He was in charge of Franco's broadcasting. Four columns were marching under Gen. Emilio Mola against Madrid. General d'Llano reported the advance of General Mola, but added that the city would be taken by a "fifth column," meaning that at the appropriate moment insurgent Spanish sympathizers and spies in Madrid would help to overwhelm the city's defenders. Their main job was to sabotage and destroy all possible public services, like the electric-power houses, the telephone exchanges, the plants of the water companies, the sewage systems, and the airports. All media of communication were to be the objective of such sabotage, with the result that Madrid was completely disorganized from within, and its capture was made comparatively easy.

I say without peradventure of a doubt that this country is loaded with Nazi spies at this very moment. Companies of them are meeting in secret in New York City, on Long Island, in Detroit, in Chicago, in Philadelphia, in San Francisco, in New Orleans. I would like to disclose certain information in my possession indicating some of the activities of these vile creatures, but I dare not for fear that the disclosure of their nefarious practices would forestall their apprehension. I will tell the complete story in the not far distant future. Already the authorities have seized and questioned many of these saboteurs. The information unfolded would make your hair stand on end. Every instrumentality known to chemical science and all the tricks of the photographic arts, and the most ingenious inventions are at the command of these vipers in our very bosom. The Trojan horse approaches the ancient city of Troy and we stand well night like Laocoon, with huge snarling snakes entwined around our limbs seeking to destroy us. What are we going to do about it?

This so-called "fifth column," as pointed out by President Roosevelt and the Department of Justice, I repeat, is not made up of spies alone. There are the propagandists, the Bundists, the Nazi Turnvereinists, the Communists, and others under the direction of Moscow or Berlin. The aim of these groups, the President asserts, "is to create confusion of counsel, public indecision, political paralysis, and eventually a state of panic." We cannot remain indifferent. Indifference is dangerous. Indifference is fatal. One of the strongest weapons I know of with which to fight this invisible foe is the right to tap wires, which is now banned. In the interests of national defense, and particularly to destroy as quickly and as expeditiously as possible the network of Nazi and Communist spies that extends from Canada to Mexico, and from New York to San Francisco, I have offered House Joint Resolution 553, which reads as follows:

"Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to conduct investigations in the interests of national defense, and for that purpose to permit wire tapping

"*Resolved, etc.,* That the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice be authorized and directed to conduct investigations, subject to the direction of the Attorney General, to ascertain, prevent, and frustrate any interference or attempts or plans to interfere with the national defense by sabotage, espionage, violations of neutrality laws, or in any other manner.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 605 of the act June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), shall not apply to investigations authorized by the provisions of this joint resolution."

In a word, this resolution seeks to abrogate the former statute which prohibits wire tapping. It gives the right to the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to conduct investigations, all subject to the direction of the Attorney General, to ascertain and frustrate any interference with our national defense by espionage and sabotage. The greatest weapon the F. B. I. can have to track down and punish spies, saboteurs, Trojan horses, and "fifth columnists" is the privilege to tap wires and to intercept all wired or wireless types of communications and messages.

I would be most loath to allow wires or short-wave messages to be tapped in times of normalcy or peace. But we are now in times of national emergency, and the restrictions now obtaining may have to be suspended. Just as in a period of war, the writ of habeas corpus may be abridged and certain inalienable rights temporarily suspended, so in times of danger and peril—although short of war—inroads must necessarily be made upon those rights if our democracy is to be preserved. We cannot minimize the danger of the thousands of Moseleys, Fritz Kuhns, Pelleys, Browders, and other Nazi and Communist sympathizers and spies in our midst. There should not be the slightest possibility of a Trojan horse. We should not be deceived as were the inhabitants of the old city of Troy. We must

"beware the Greeks bearing gifts." If we are to deal adequately with these traitors who would stab us in the back, we cannot shoot powder puffs at them. We need heavy weapons to ferret out their dens of iniquity. We can only do that successfully by wire tapping. There may be abuses of the privilege of wire tapping, but that is part of the price we must pay for our national security and safety.

Under my bill all wire tapping must be under the authority and direction of the Attorney General. I have great confidence in Attorney General Robert H. Jackson. I have discussed this measure with Department of Justice officials, and they have agreed that if this bill becomes operative every separate wire-tapping operation would have to be authorized by the Attorney General personally in writing. Under the wise and humane guidance of Attorney General Jackson there will be no recrudescence of the evils of the so-called Palmer raids of the World War period. There will be no "blitzkrieg" on labor under the guise of a holy antialien crusade as was the case under former Attorney General Palmer.

Attorney General Jackson has approved the purposes of my resolution, and under date of May 31, 1940, he wrote me, as follows:

MAY 31, 1940.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This acknowledges your letter of May 27, requesting my views concerning the desirability of House Joint Resolution 553, which proposes to extend the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to conduct investigations in the interests of national defense.

In compliance with your request, I have carefully examined the proposed legislation.

Section 1 of the joint resolution, proposes to authorize and direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to conduct investigations, subject to the direction of the Attorney General, to ascertain, prevent, and frustrate any interferences or attempts or plans to interfere with the national defense by sabotage, espionage, violations of the neutrality laws, or in any other manner.

The objective desired to be attained by the legislation is clearly commendable.

Section 2 of the joint resolution would exempt the investigations authorized by section 1 from the provisions of the Communications Act, which were recently construed by the Supreme Court as banning the introduction in evidence in the Federal courts of information obtained by tapping telephone wires.

In a statement made by me to the press on March 15, 1940, the following observations are found on this general subject:

"In a limited class of cases, such as kidnaping, extortion, and racketeering, where the telephone is the usual means of conveying threats and information, it is the opinion of the present Attorney General, as it was of Attorney General Mitchell, that wire tapping should be authorized under some appropriate safeguard. Under the existing state of the law and decisions, this cannot be done unless Congress sees fit to modify the existing statutes."

The philosophy underlying the foregoing remarks, which were directed to the activities of the underworld, would seem applicable with even greater force to the activities of persons engaged in espionage, sabotage, and other activities interfering with the national defense.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

There have been extravagant and unfounded charges made against J. Edgar Hoover, in charge of the F. B. I. It is charged that he was actively engaged in these so-called Palmer raids. This is utterly false. The late William J. Flynn was the man in charge. At that time Hoover was a special assistant attorney general, and he handled the prosecution of many cases. He had nothing to do with the arrest or so-called persecution of individuals. He simply handled the cases in the courts as they were presented to him. This was back in 1919. Mr. Hoover had nothing to do with wire tapping. This was wholly in charge of the said William J. Flynn. Incidentally, Hoover was appointed to his present position by Harlan F. Stone, now Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and who was at that time the Attorney General. Justice Stone is an outstanding liberal. He appointed Hoover to his present position as head of the F. B. I. only after a most careful investigation. If Hoover had been involved in any of these so-called Palmer raids or persecutions, certainly Justice Stone would not have appointed him.

Some have suggested that there be no wire tapping unless authority therefor be based on an ex parte order of a Federal district or circuit judge. I have considered this suggestion carefully. It would not be workable. In many States there is but one Federal judge. This is the case in Maine, New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Kansas. It might be extremely difficult to obtain the signature of a judge in those States. Time would be of the essence. Action must be speedy to be effective. A judge might be ill or on vacation. Secrecy is also essential. There are eavesdroppers even in courthouses. There is an old saying: "Three men can keep a secret if two men die." Furthermore, it might be necessary in large States, like Montana, to journey 500 miles to the home of a Federal judge. In the interim the purposes of the investigation would be nullified.

The cruel experiences of the Norwegian and Low Countries resulting from the infiltration of the "fifth column" must give us pause. While there is no ground for hysteria and panic, nevertheless we must take stock and reflect on the possibilities of similar activities in this country. That espionage and sabotage can be practiced here by foreign agents with serious and detrimental effects on our national defense is apparent. Our experiences in the World War show us that "it did happen here." Many of us have vivid recollections of the tremendous Black Tom explosion during the World War which was later formally adjudicated by an international tribunal to have been brought about by German agents. Black Toms would be multiplied a thousandfold in another World War involvement. Many of us remember also the destruction by German spies of the international bridge between the United States and the Canadian borders over the St. Lawrence River. Our harbor defenses, airports, airplane factories, munition plants, military posts, navy yards, drydocks, waterways, power plants, telephone and telegraph exchanges, all these would easily be subject to the perfidious activities and depredations on the part of Nazis, and/or Fiscist spies and saboteurs. Some very disquieting testimony has been produced on the subject before the Dies committee. For example, refugees from the Netherlands, from Queen Wilhelmina down, have told amazing stories as to how thousands of apparently innocent Germans turned out to be advance agents of the Nazi Army. Nazi parachutists landed with lists of addresses of Nazi sympathizers and Nazi opponents in their pockets. There are just as many, if not more, Nazi traitors in this country who would destroy America even as their colleagues in Holland destroyed that peaceful country. To the surprise of the Dutch Army officers, it was discovered that the records of the Dutch Army and Navy uniforms had been stolen by Nazi spies. Thousands of Nazi parachutists, after landing, paraded through Holland in Dutch uniforms. Nazi domestics in Norwegian homes kept diaries and intimate records of conversations of their mistresses and masters, particularly when the latter uttered anti-Nazi sentiments. Often these records were complete with photographs stolen by these Nazi spy domestics from the albums in the homes in which they served. A high official of the State Department unfolded to me an amazing tale concerning parachutists who landed in Belgium. It would appear that Brussels, and other cities in Belgium, contained huge billboards and fences on which appeared poster advertisements of a so-called German coffee. At a certain designated place in these huge poster advertisements was a designated mark which could be torn. The tearing would dislodge a portion of the poster on the reverse side of which there was contained a list of names and addresses of Nazi sympathizers, locations of airplane factories, telephone exchanges, electric light and power houses, and other strategic places, all of which were marked for destruction by these Nazi sympathizers and spies and the parachutists.

It shall not happen here!

The best method of prevention is the right to tap wires and intercept private short-wave messages.

I cannot with any too great a degree of emphasis indicate to you the effectiveness of wire tapping. After the dreadful Lindbergh kidnaping in 1932 there literally followed a wave of abductions of children, accompanied by extortion. This plethora of kidnaping cases lasted from 1933 to 1935. But it was only because of the right to tap wires that all but one of these nefarious cases were solved and the culprits punished. The detection of espionage, like kidnaping in the old days, is impossible without the right of wire tapping. Be it remembered also that I have received the promise of the Department of Justice that the wire tapping will be used only for the purpose of leads. The actual recital of the conversation will not be used as evidence. It would be used primarily as a basis of application for a search warrant.

Every other country permits wire tapping. Frankly, to break down the vast Nazi espionage operations, particularly east of the Mississippi, involving women and even children, wire tapping is essential. Many of the State and Federal officials, including heads of departments, are innocent dupes of Nazi spies—including some designing females. Again in due time I will unfold an amazing story in this regard.

Wire tapping is indeed necessary to our national defense. It will aid the ferreting out of spies who have made their way into our arsenals, airplane factories, and munition plants. No honest individual can be hurt by such investigation. On the other hand, such investigation will do much toward tightening up our national defense and frustrating any plans to bore from within. The old saying, "A stitch in time saves nine," is applicable in this connection.

Incidentally, it will be necessary to increase the number of operatives employed by the F. B. I. At the present time there are only 927 of them. Of this number, only 150 are assigned to national defense. On July 1, 100 more operatives will be added for the purposes of national defense. And there is a bill now pending to increase by 500 the number of F. B. I. men who would be used exclusively for purposes of national defense. If this latter bill passes, there will be 750 F. B. I. men for national defense. This is outlandishly small for a country with a population of approximately 130,000,000. This is outlandishly small when we contemplate that the New York City detective force alone has over 2,000 members. Moreover, the F. B. I. receives regularly over 2,500 complaints daily concerning sabotage activities and "enemies within our gates." I would be willing to increase the F. B. I. to a force of at least 2,500. I wager there are over 50,000 suspects in this country—Nazis, Communists, and Fascists—who might well be the subject of investigation.

The President of the United States, with remarkable foresight, took steps last June to coordinate all investigative activity pertaining to espionage, counterespionage, and sabotage, by placing it under the control of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department and the Naval Intelligence Division of the Navy Department.

In the interests of efficiency and national security, the President instructed that the F. B. I. was to act as a clearing house for complaints pertaining to national-defense matters and to handle them as they arise. At that time, I am confident, he foresaw the dreaded menace of the "fifth column" and Trojan horse, and took these progressive steps to fortify the internal security of the Nation.

When war broke out across the seas last September, the President on September 6, in a public statement, called upon all law-enforcement agencies to promptly turn over to the nearest representative of the F. B. I. any information in their possession "relating to espionage, counterespionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of the neutrality laws." I here and now express my appreciation of the fine foresight of the President, and the splendid work of the F. B. I.

At all costs the internal security of the Nation must remain inviolate. This necessitates that every possible instrumentality of protection be placed in the hands of the skilled, trained investigators of the F. B. I., in order that they might more effectively carry on their duties. Equipment, manpower, and the learning of science must be marshaled on the common front of national defense.

No barriers must be placed before the F. B. I., because its job is difficult enough as it is. Every possible facility, such as wire tapping, should be utilized in combating the foreign foes within our midst who are engaged in espionage and sabotage. The G-men were deprived of a powerful weapon in their combat against spies and saboteurs when wire tapping was banned. Today, the situation is such that they should have permission to utilize the investigative technique of wire tapping. My bill provides just this. The present state of the Nation and the future maintenance of our internal security demand that the F. B. I. not be handicapped any longer by being unable to use this effective instrument of detection in its splendid work. For that reason, my bill authorizing the use of wire tapping should be promptly passed.

Cliveden is the name of the country estate of Lady Astor, situated in the Thames Valley. It was the headquarters of the so-called Cliveden set, which, up to a short time ago, sought to effect an entente cordiale with the Nazis under Hitler. Its members deceived themselves into the belief and hope that Hitler would be the bulwark against the rising tide of Bolshevism. It has been charged that this so-called social set which met at Cliveden influenced appointments in the British Government, including the British Cabinet. Undoubtedly, too, this Cliveden set had a strong effect on the foreign policy of Great Britain. And under Chamberlain, they gave it a pro-German slant. They sent Lord Halifax to Germany, who was then an avowed pro-German. They thwarted the efforts of Anthony Eden, who sought to prepare England against the rising Nazi tide. They aided in developing the closest relations between General Goering and the British Ambassador, Sir Neville Henderson. Untold wealth was and is at the command of the Cliveden set. The Viscount and Viscountess Astor own the Sunday newspaper Observer. The brother-in-law of Lady Astor, John Jacob Astor, owns the controlling interest in the London Times. These two papers sought to lull the British into a false sense of security. They endeavored to make the British actively dislike some of the French officials. Even Roosevelt's rise to bower was greeted with derision.

Viscountess Astor has denied that there was even such a thing as a Cliveden Set. She said it was all mischievous rubbish and slander started by the Communists. She cannot so easily disavow her responsibility. Even though all the charges against her are not true, some of them are true and damaging. Like Lady Macbeth, Lady Astor says "Out damned spot," but some of the stains remain.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post of March 24, 1939, she says: "If we don't get appeasement, we will get war." She and England apparently are getting both. She said further: "Munich was neither a deliberate betrayal of democracy nor a pusillanimous sell-out to a bluffer." I say, subsequent events have proven it to be both. It would have been better indeed if Lady Astor and her Cliveden Set had kept their noses out of British politics.

There are many Cliveden sympathizers in our midst. They work under cover. They are all the more dangerous and their treachery is all the more insidious. There are Nazi Cliveden Sets in Yorkville, in the Borough of Manhattan, and in Ridgewood, in the Borough of Queens in New York City, and in Hoboken, N. J., and in Detroit, and in scores of other places. These traitors don't use the mails. They are too slick for that. Also, the mails are too slow, and fingerprints are left on the envelopes. These Cliveden and espionage agents come together from great distances. They use short-wave radio and telegraphic means of communication. All our efforts to smoke them out will be in vain, unless we can avail ourselves of the right to tap wires and intercept messages.

I and my colleagues in the House are anxious to get your reaction to my bill. Do you want F. B. I. agents to have the right to tap wires in the interests of national defense? Let me have your views with all possible dispatch. Address me in care of the station to which you are listening, or to my office in Washington, D. C.

"The Party of the Fifth Column," Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Daily News, June 10, appears an item entitled "Declare War at Once," and to which were appended the names of about 30 educators, lawyers, industrialists, and economists. Mr. Speaker, it was people of this kind who ran the Wilson administration and who are now running the New Deal and the Government of the United States. Their ability is clearly evident in a national debt that will be over $50,000,000,000 at the end of this month. And their Americanism is evident in that most of them are members of the "fifth column" that has given its blessings to the actual saboteurs and destroyers of our Nation's industries and our Government.

I grant that in this motley crew there are a few who, through ignorance, join hands and become pawns of these international wreckers, but, as we often hear, ignorance of the law is no excuse. However, the gentlemen who said, "Declare war at once," should now, in order to conform to their own advice, leave the United States on the first boat and defend their alien principles. There is nothing to tie them here, and the American people recognize the actual promoters and financiers of the World War, and therefore object to sacrificing any of their sons to fighting for the same motley money changers and munitions makers.

I am astonished at the ignorance shown by the majority in Congress which has in the past 4 years gone along with the head of the "fifth column" and the New Deal party. The action of the majority in Congress and particularly in the Senate is a farce which I shall credit to lack of actual knowledge of national and international conditions.

"Fifth column" activities are as old as international intrigue, and while I am not interested in the court procedures of the past, still, it is well to bear in mind that "What is past is prologue." Deception, intrigue, and murder to maintain power may be found in the history of Egypt and in the history of Rome, where poisoning was a royal art. Today, similar distorted mentalities deceive and poison the human mind in the press, over the radio, and in the portrayal of pictures that are a living lie and deception in themselves.

However, let us as I said forget the past, for, after all, our interest lies here in our own homes in America, now and in the future. Gold has been a lodestone of vice and a corruptive power in the hands of those who now own and control this valuable property. It began in the early history of this Nation, and in order that you may be served with opinions beside my own, let me quote from Save America First, a pamphlet:

AN ENGLISHMAN BECOMES OUR FIRST SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Soon after making his gift, Robert Morris suggested to General Washington that he appoint a young man named Alexander Hamilton as aide-de-camp, saying that as young Hamilton was an expert financier he could render invaluable services in handling the finances of the Army. Hamilton, who had been born a British subject and trained in British banking and business methods, soon won the confidence of General Washington, and when 11 years later the general had become the President he installed young Hamilton as our first Secretary of the Treasury. It was rumored that the appointment was made on the advice of Robert Morris and Haym Salomon, but be that as it may, it is beyond question that Hamilton was better fitted for the office than any other man then available, as his later record revealed.

During his year as Secretary of the Treasury, Hamilton placed the national credit on a sound financial basis, following as far as possible, the plans and principles long since adopted by the Treasury Department of the English Government. But as later events revealed, Hamilton accomplished something of even greater importance during his year as Secretary of the Treasury—he formed substantial contacts and friendships with leading Members of Congress, who were later to repay his favors in a most substantial manner. After

a year in office and without a word of warning to President Washington, Hamilton resigned, announcing his intention to devote his energies to private business. Since Hamilton had planned the Treasury Department and was the only man in America who understood its intricacies, his sudden resignation precipitated and spread throughout the Nation a loss of confidence in the Government's financial security. Immediately Government finances became involved and Government credit impaired, and when leading bankers and businessmen announced their loss of confidence, now that Hamilton was no longer in control, a wave of fear and uncertainty engulfed the Nation. Beyond question, this is exactly what Hamilton and his friends had planned and expected—to precipitate a break-down of the Nation's financial structure, as the first step of a conspiracy to gain control of the Nation's banking.

About 1 year after his resignation, and with conditions growing from bad to worse, Hamilton petitioned Congress for a charter for a national bank, urging that by no other means could national confidence be restored and the Nation's financial structure preserved. When first made the request was refused, but later as conditions grew worse, and his friends in Congress had done their work, the petition was granted, and Hamilton was given a charter for "The Bank of the United States," the said charter to expire in 20 years. Concerning the internal organization of the new bank, the following may prove interesting: In form and power, it was a duplicate of the Bank of England. Much of its stock was bought by English bankers. The gold which sustained its credit had been brought from England. In brief, the original "Bank of the United States" was little other than a branch of the Bank of England, as Hamilton had planned it should be, from the day he took office as Secretary of the Treasury. Patterned after the Bank of England, financed with English gold, and with much of its stock owned in England, the bank began its operations, and how did it operate?

It operated as surgeons usually operate, by "cuttitng out" something; and in a few years, the bank had "cut out" the happiness and security of most of the Americans in America. And this is how the bank operated:

It restricted its loans, (1) to Englishmen who had lately arrived to get in on the "ground floor" and who at once bought a controlling interest in existing companies, and when this was not possible, started similar companies in competition; (2) made loans to those merchants who would make their foreign purchases in England; (3) made loans to those American Tories of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, who had opposed our War for Independence * * *. In brief, this "Bank of the United States," restricted its loans, as far as possible, to those English, and pro-English Americans, who could be counted on to aid in placing the American people under the financial tyranny of Mother England.

As the inevitable result of this concentration of money and control of credit, it was but a few years until this crew of pro-English pirates had captured the American ship of state, together with most of the wealth therein contained. That such a result was inevitable was indicated many years later by Pope Pius XI. In his remarkable monograph, Forty Years After, published in 1931, Pope Pius XI said, "This power (concentrated economic domination) becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit, and determine its allotment." It was the fact of "allotment" which made the tyranny of the Hamilton bank "particularly irresistible." For the bank's loans were "allotted" mainly to the English and pro-English. This system of concentrated money and controlled credit, Hamilton inaugurated in 1791; a system which in a few years had given a few men complete control of our banking, industry, and commerce, to the end, that Englishmen, and the pro-English Americans who had opposed the War of Independence, received most of the Nation's profits, while those who had fought and won the War of Independence, had been driven out of business and their properties foreclosed.

In brief, what England had lost at Yorktown and Saratoga, she had regained in New York and Washington: She had lost the battle with bullets, but won the battle with gold, and again the American people, as in the days of the Colonies, were the victims of English tyranny. True, they still retained their boasted liberties, the freedom of speech and assembly, but these were of no avail, for Hamilton could say with Rothschild, "Give me the power to control a Nation's money, and I care not who makes its laws." But here again, as in 1765, Mother England had overreached herself—too many Americans had been victimized by her greed, too many merchants and manufacturers had been driven out of business, too many farmers had lost their land, and too many workmen were walking the streets, while newly arrived Englishmen possessed their jobs; indeed, conditions had grown so desperate that even the Congressmen controlled by this Bank of the United States, were afraid for their lives and jobs. So it happened that in 1811, when the bank's charter was about to expire, and it was certain that Congress would refuse the petition for another 20-year charter, England, fearing the loss of her "racket," repeated her trick of 1776, and forced America into war—the War of 1812.

You may understand from this that the "fifth column" began operating in the early days of our Government and has continued to operate because Congress has failed to recognize the danger that lies in allowing private control of a property, gold, which represents national as well as international values. Congress has unwittingly extended this power, for in 1869 the National Bank Act was passed, an act for which the Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P. Chase, is alleged to have said:

My agency, in producing the passage of the National Bank Act, was the greatest financial mistake of my life. This act has built up a monopoly that affects every interest in the country. It should be repealed, but before this can be accomplished the people will be arrayed on one side and the banks on the other side in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what has happened, for such division has taken place. The international bankers, their stooges, pawns, and marionettes, comprise the real "fifth column," the war makers and those who furnish implements of destruction. Opposed to these are "we, the people," who still believe in the fundamental principles of this Government as expressed in the Constitution. I hope this is clear and understandable, so that those who are interested in this issue will be better informed of what I have selected to call the "invisible government."

If the President of the United States is sincere, if he has the slightest regard for his obligated duty, he should take care that the laws be faithfully obeyed. I want to remind him that the Constitution is the primary law of this Nation, and, unfortunately, the very law which he has apparently willfully and deliberately ignored. It is not too late to correct this error, and in justice to himself and in respect to the people he serves he should cut the ties that have bound our Nation to the international gold hierarchy and set the gold aside as a security for the people and the Nation that he is supposed to serve. If he fails to set this Nation free from this international "fifth column" of money changers, he may by such acquiescence be assumed to be adhering to the enemies of the United States, giving them aid and comfort, and the Constitution calls that treason.

Let us make no mistake. The international bankers are the actual power behind war and the undermining of all governments. You can see they began early in the history of our own Government, and they have now reached the point where they are actually in complete control of all the gold in the world. It is our duty to expose this, and in the exposure of it lies our greatest protection. Let us not forget the words of St. John, 8: 32:

And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free.

A Congressman Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address entitled "A Congressman Reports," which I delivered Thursday evening, June 6, 1940, over station WMCA, New York City:

Among the myriads of letters I receive, one in particular intrigues me. It is from my friend, Samuel Salzman, a very distinguished son of a very distinguished father. He speaks of the efficiency of the Nazis in reclaiming and putting to military use wastes of every description. He deplores the fact that we have made no organized effort to gather the vast products that go to waste in our country that could be readily used to help build up our defense machine and mechanism.

Mr. Salzman says, "There are probably from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 men who shave every morning. Each one of them throws away his razor blade after he is finished. If there was some way to save these blades, you can readily see that in a period of a month almost 900,000,000 blades could be accumulated. In this way," he continued, "important quantities of steel can be gathered for munitions manufacture." His point is well taken, and I have asked the Ordnance Department of the War Department to consider this matter with a view to developing some entity to take advantage of the suggestion. It will be worthy of earnest study to develop an

organization to handle the recovery of waste products that are now lost to the Nation and that might be used to great advantage in our armament industry. Iron, steel, and other useful metals may be rescued, e. g., from the tons and tons of used cars that are junked each year and which are now, unhappily, being sent, for rich profits, to Japan for that wily nation of Nippons to convert into life-destroying machines.

We are living in perilous times, and our emotions are apt to overcome our judgment. In our desire to checkmate and destroy "fifth columnists," we are apt to overshoot the mark. There is grave agitation at the present time for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens. It is strange, but true, that the great hardship from such regulation might fall upon citizens and not aliens. I am wondering if one were to stop, on any street in our great city, 10 citizens, especially if they were of middle age or older, and ask them to prove that they were citizens, whether more than half of them would not have great difficulty in producing the evidence. Fires, floods, and other acts of God have destroyed public buildings and places where, for example, final citizenship papers have been lodged or filed. Many old duplicate final papers have been misfiled or lost. In the old days midwives helped bring into the world annually thousands of babies. No records of birth, in most of those instances, were ever made.

Thus, the native-born will be greatly put to it if asked to prove their citizenship. Millions of natives, born in the Hinterland, or sparsely-settled sections, could not possibly prove their nativity because many towns, counties, and States in the old days never required the registration of birth certificates. How many of my listeners can now produce witnesses who were actually present at their births; yet the affidavits of such eye witnesses are usually required in the absence of a birth certificate.

The late Will Rogers, not so many years before his demise, sought to get a passport. He was sorely put to it to prove that he was a citizen because he could not produce his birth certificate.

There will thus be given opportunities for blackmail and dreadful persecution. The aliens will register and be fingerprinted and the evidence thereof will be proven upon demand. But, what of the native-born and naturalized who cannot produce documental evidence?

Socalled "fifth columnists" are not going to worry about the act. They will register. They will be too slick not to. Furthermore, be it remembered, that there may be far more saboteurs and spies, bundists, Gestapos, and Ogpu agents and Communists among the citizens rather than there are among the aliens.

Incidentally, 360,000 Russians, 365,000 Germans, 500,000 Poles, and 700,000 Italians will have to be registered and fingerprinted if the proposed bills pass the Congress.

Our beloved President has been accused by those who think only in terms of politics of being derelict in allowing our military machine to run down. Of course this charge is absurd. No one has sought to protect this country against foreign foes to a greater degree than our President. It is well, however, to point out that during the 7 years of the Roosevelt incumbency, and prior to the present Seventy-sixth Congress, not one Republican Member, either of the Senate or the House, came out in favor of increased armament. I have had scanned the RECORDS of the House and Senate from the Seventy-first to the Seventy-sixth Congress in an endeavor to find the remarks or speeches of Republican Members of the House or Senate which advocated the strengthening of our Army or our Navy or our airplane service; and, strangely enough, with three minor exceptions—namely, Senator Johnson of California, in the Seventy-second Congress; former Senator Robinson, of Indiana; and former Representative Goss, of the Seventy-third Congress—there is not a word. The Republicans have been strangely silent. In none of these Congresses from 1929 to 1938 was there any advocacy of any developing or increasing of our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or airplane service. It does not behoove the Republicans, therefore, to make any charge in this regard against our President. In fact, we are all in the same boat. We have all been lulled into a sense of false security. But, above all, it lies not in the Republican mouths to complain.

We are all naturally interested in the third-term possibilities for the President. Frankly, I don't think Roosevelt wishes a third term, but circumstances may force him to a different conclusion. In fact, assurances were given to intimates of the President recently that he does not want a third term and would not accept one "unless conditions in Europe were so grave that no other course lay open." Frankly, the last few days have indicated to us that no other course is open. This may be deemed as fairly definite assurance that the President will accept a third-term nomination.

Furthermore, Democratic congressional cloakroom gossip indicates practically no opposition to another Roosevelt term.

War, doubtless, will be the foremost topic at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions. War dominated both in 1916, 24 years ago. "What shall be our attitude?" was the issue then as it will be in Philadelphia and in Chicago. The Democratic slogan in 1916 was, "Wilson kept us out of war," and thus he deserves reelection. This time the war presents a different background. It is not the question that Roosevelt kept us out of war, but will conditions permit us to remain at peace? We must all be prepared for the dreadful possibility that we shall be compelled sooner or later to fight in self-defense. Preparedness is our best assurance of peace. Which of the parties shall be the better suited to bring about the best possible preparedness? Which of the candidates shall be better suited to achieve national security? These will be the burning questions for the Nation to decide.

Thank goodness for the Monroe Doctrine, and President Roosevelt's interpretation of it, to wit, that Canada, despite its aid to Britain as a belligerent, will come under its protection. Consistent with such attitude of benevolent neutrality and to assure quicker delivery of planes to the Allies, Secretary of State Hull has properly interpreted the Neutrality Act to permit American pilots to fly American-made planes, bought by the Allies, to certain Canadian ports of embarkation. Heretofore, such planes had to be delivered at the Canadian border and pulled over the line by a rope. Three cheers for Hull. Realizing the importance of Canada, Secretary Hull has sent as our new Ambassador to Canada one of our most successful and experienced of career diplomats, Jay Pierrepont Moffat. He was with Sumner Welles in Europe.

Canada means a great deal to us. She is our best customer. We are her best customer. We need her badly for much of and many of our basic supplies, to wit: Nickel, radium, zinc, asbestos, platinum, and lead. The money we have invested in the Maple Leaf Colony is stupendous. I shudder to think of a British defeat. However, we may have to face many disagreeable, frightful eventualities. Canada may yet become the head of the new British Empire. However, I hope not.

Many young people are writing to me that they do not want to go to war. Neither do I. I loathe war and all that it implies. But war may come to us. What then? Shall we wait until it is too late? Shall we let our military machine run down so low that it will be absolutely useless? You cannot fight the Nazis with apples and powder puffs. You must have tanks and airplanes and bombers to do that. Remember, Hitler will not attack us directly, but will attack us indirectly. He would stab us in the back by way of Mexico or South America. If and when war comes to us a la Hitler, courage is insufficient. Millions of mere soldiers are not enough. Remember Belgium, Holland, Norway, France, and England. They made a terrible mistake. Shall we? The most modern of machines and weapons are essential. We are arranging for their preparation and manufacture now in Washington. The letters that come in from the young men and women prove that they are ignorant of the problem. It is a difficult question, I admit. In such a perplexity we must rely upon the experience of the Army and the Navy. We must not consult the pacifists, the isolationists, the Communists, the Socialists, or any American Cliveden set.

The recent utterance of Dr. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of the Library of Congress, might well be read by my young communicants. Dr. MacLeish apologized for his sheer pacifist views expressed in the decade after the first World War. He now knows he was then wrong. He deplores the cult of rabid antiwar pleas, plays, and books by men like Latzko, Don Passos, Hemingway, and Aldington, which deluged America after that first World War involvement, and which writings he now claims is responsible for the wrong thinking which permeates a large section of the present generation of American young people respecting their patriotic obligations. The good doctor now holds that his own generation of writers and thinkers is considerably to blame for the widely prevalent state of moral disarmament among our youth. The works of those misguided writers and zealots have borne bitter fruits. They, incidentally, were responsible for the Arms Limitation Conference in 1921. When we look back and see how we and the Allies scrapped war ships which could not be used to advantage, we see how ridiculous were those post-war sentiments.

The President lives in the White House. Why is it called the White House? Because, prior to 1812, we were unprepared as we are unprepared now. After the Revolutionary War, there was a great antiwar hysteria. Everyone became a pacifist, with the result that Great Britain took advantage of that unpreparedness, entered our portals, and invaded the Capital. There was no resistance. We had no army to speak of. The British were able to burn the Capitol Building and much of Washington. The smoke was so great that the stone from which the White House had been built was covered with soot and black smoke. It was necessary to paint the stone white. Hence, the term "White House." The burning of our Capitol, and the ruin of our White House in 1812 should serve to remind us that nevermore shall we have a national defense that is inadequate for all purposes.

I am happy to note that the Civil Service Commission has stated that, as a matter of policy, it would not in the future certify to any department or agency for any position any person when it has been established that he or she is a member of the Communist Party, the German bund, or any communistic or Nazi organization. So far, so good. Now, what about the Communists and Nazis already in the Government service? They should receive the same dose. I am importuning the Civil Service Commission to segregate these traitors in the Government service, and, in common parlance, give them the "bum's rush." If the Civil Service Commission has no such power, we in Congress must give it to them. In ordinary times I would not talk this way. As a lawyer and a responsible member of the Judiciary Committee, I could not. Such discrimination might not be deemed according to Hoyle. But, in these times of stress and danger, certain rights heretofore deemed inalienable must be temporarily suspended. When the Nation is in peril, strange things must be done to protect it. We are in peril of the "fifth columnists" and Clivedens. There are many Kuhns and Pelleys out of prison. There are many Browders roaming around who should be in convict's stripes and lodged in Leavenworth, as Browder soon will be. It is

for this reason that I say the Nation is in danger. The Government shall at least have the right to say who shall or who shall not be in its employ. Imagine bold spying Nazi Turn Vereiners or Browderites taking orders from Berlin or Moscow in positions of power in the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in the Chief Engineer's office of the War Department, at the Panama Canal Zone Board of the Navy Department, in the Bureau of Geodetic Survey in the Treasury Department. See how dangerous that would be? They could act as a pipe line of information to our enemies.

England's invulnerability to foreign attack has frequently been mentioned. No invader has set foot upon British soil for 900 years. In 1066 William the Conqueror crossed the channel from Normandy and captured Britain. Strangely enough, the invasion of England from Norway a little time before helped materially William's efforts, for the Norwegian invasion diverted the British soldiers to the north and thus weakened their forces in the south and aided William in his victory at the Battle of Hastings. In 1585 Philip of Spain, with his Spanish Armada, attempted invasion but was defeated by Sir Francis Drake. In 1759, the period of our French and Indian War, the Franch Navy was worsted in its attempt at invasion. In 1804 Napoleon assembled an army of 100,000 to cross from Boulogne. He failed despite aid from Spanish and French fleets. During the World War, the German cruisers bombarded coastal towns and zeppelins dropped bombs on London. However, our Revolutionary naval hero, John Paul Jones, was the only one who successfully invaded England. He raided Whitehaven, a British port on the Irish Sea. He captured its forts by surprise, spiked its guns, and raised the Stars and Stripes. He actually attempted to set fire to the ships in the harbor. He might have gone further, but was called off.

Let us turn back to some of the pages of our early history. Let us go back to the days of Jefferson. Louisiana at the beginning of his administration was a possession of Spain and was about to be ceded to Napoleon, who had captured Spain. But Jefferson said that Spain might have retained Louisiana quietly for years owing to her "pacific disposition" and her "feeble state." Jefferson felt, however, that Louisiana in the hands of the French, and particularly in the hands of Napoleon, would become a thorn in the side of America. Jefferson sent emissaries abroad, and Napoleon, primarily because he was sorely beset and needed money, was persuaded to sell us Louisiana.

The purchase was a stroke of genius for Jefferson, who excluded from North America any base for what Walter Lippmann calls 'the conquering revolutionary imperialism of Bonaparte." Jefferson did not rely upon the width of the oceans as do some of our pacifists. He relied upon the breadth of his diplomatic insight. He did not want any foreigners at our door. There may be many snide foreigners at our back door soon, particularly if Hitler wins. He, like Napoleon before him, seeks world dominion. There is Greenland, owned by Denmark. There is Curaçao in the West Indies near Venezuela and Surinam, commonly known as Dutch Guiana, owned by Holland. There is French St. Pierre and Miquelon, south of Newfoundland; French Guadeloupe and Martinique between Puerto Rico and South America. There is French Guiana in South America. There is Canada and Newfoundland, with Labrador a dependency of Newfoundland. There is Bermuda. In the West Indies there are the Bahamas, the island of Jamaica, the British Leeward Islands, the British Windward Islands, British Guiana, and British Honduras.

The mention of this vast domain of mainland and islands must give us pause. The State Department is giving serious attention to the possibility of the unspeakable Hitler laying claim to all, or part of, this territory. This thought occurred to me: Why ought we not offer France and/or England a suitable amount of credit for the transfer of title—say to Bermuda, the Bahamas, or Jamaica, St. Pierre and Miquelon, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and British and French Guiana? Such credit to be taken out in trade; that is, no money should pass, but the credit could be used in this country for the purchase of much-needed airships, supplies, and munitions.

Think about this, my gentle listeners. Let me have your reaction. Write me your views, addressed to this station or to me in Washington. President Roosevelt might well follow the example of Jefferson and purchase another type of Louisiana.

Reports have reached us of the unspeakable horrors inflicted by the Nazi troops dominated by the fiendish Hitler. They have made it a point to drive thousands of pitiful refugees in front of them. They forced them to go along certain designated roads and the Nazi troops advance alongside the refugees. The latter act as a sort of shield for the Nazis. Gestapos disguised themselves as refugees and mingled with them and prevented them from communicating with each other or with the French or the English. It is said that the columns of these unfortunates made easier the German advance. The Allies dared not shoot down these refugees. When a certain objective was reached, the command would be given and the Nazi troops mowed down scores of these homeless. They were also bombed by Nazi planes. The Nazis lifted the bodies of these refugees and piled them high as barricades or left the bodies in huge masses to impede the advance of the enemy.

This unspeakable brutality bears out the message that Sumner Welles brought back with him from Europe. He conferred with Goering, who said that Hitler, to gain his objectives, would smash every known precept of humanity.

Declarations of Loyalty of Pacific Fishermen's Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

A LETTER AND TWO DECLARATIONS OF LOYALTY TO UNITED STATES

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter and two declarations of loyalty.

In these days when so much is said against the aliens and when some would legislate against them as a class merely because a few might be disloyal, it is very enlightening and comforting to receive such communications as these. These people are to be complimented for their very clear statement, which should set at rest any further discussion on this point so far as they are concerned.

SEINE AND LINE FISHERMEN'S UNION OF SAN PEDRO,
Terminal Island, Calif., June 5, 1940.

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to acknowledge receipt of your kind complimentary letter of May 31, 1940, in regard to our declaration of loyalty to the United States of America which has been publicly announced through the press.

At our general meeting held on the 16th day of May 1940 a motion was carried unanimously by the membership to instruct the secretary to publicly issue said declaration, to clarify all misleading propaganda against the alien fishermen on false grounds by some so-called professional patriots and as to the doubt of questionable loyalty of the citizens of Japanese extractions.

We have approximately 730 membership in our union, composed of aliens and citizens, the aliens who have resided in this country for number of years and have raised children who are citizens by birth, supported by them for livelihood as you know, and are all law-abiding peoples.

As it is already stated in the San Pedro News Pilot, I am a citizen by birth, served in the United States Army during the last World War and a member of the American Legion, employed in the United States Post Office at Hawaii for 11 years, served as a secretary of the Republican Precinct Club, Second Representative District for 8 years, and was candidate on the Republican ticket for the board of supervisors from west Hawaii in the year 1934.

Kindly rest assured that as long as I am here, I will look into all matters of alien controversy or investigations as to the subversive group of suspicious persons, and will be the first one to report to the Government authorities should I discover any persons who are detrimental to our beloved country for immediate arrest.

I am enclosing our declaration and one from the Nisei (second generation—citizens) Fishermen's Club of the Pacific which is our fraternal organization, two copies for your reference.

Thanking you for your many past favors rendered to the people and for your thoughtful consideration in this matter, I am

Faithfully yours,

KINZO WAKAYAMA, *Secretary.*

SEINE AND LINE FISHERMEN'S UNION OF SAN PEDRO,
Terminal Island, Calif.

DECLARATION OF LOYALTY TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Know All Men by These Presents:

That this is to publicly announce and declare ourselves of loyalty to the United States of America in the event of her emergency for national defense.

All the membership of the Seine and Line Fishermen's Union of San Pedro, Terminal Island Branch, Terminal Island, Calif., composed of alien and citizen fishermen, jointly cooperate and stand by with the Government policy, to which we are tremendously obligated.

We will hereby assure full support and render service to this country upon demand at all times.

KINZO WAKAYAMA,
Secretary for the Membership of the Seine and Line Fishermen's Union of Terminal Island Branch, San Pedro, Calif.

Dated May 17, 1940.

NISEI FISHERMEN'S CLUB OF THE PACIFIC,
Terminal Island, Calif.

DECLARATION OF LOYALTY

Know All Men by These Presents:

That we, the members of the Nisei Fishermen's Club of the Pacific, Terminal Island, Calif., an organization composed of all citizens of Japanese extraction by birth, do hereby declare ourselves that, in the event of emergency of our beloved country, the United States of America, we will stand in rank and file to defend this country and, furthermore, will cooperate and uphold the policy of the Government as faithful and loyal citizens.

We will be at service on demand to furnish the fishing vessels which have been chartered for fishing purposes to the Government immediately upon request.

TED SUGIMOTO, *President.*

MAY 17, 1940.

Wanted—A Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted—A Military Policy," by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, the distinguished military expert, which supports the contention which I have submitted many times to the Senate, namely, that we must have a military policy thoroughly developed and well thought out if all the money we are appropriating is to be expended intelligently.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1940]

WANTED—A MILITARY POLICY

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

We have just had a terrible object lesson.

We have seen two great and rich powers taken by surprise, defeated in the first battle of a great war and placed in a position of the gravest jeopardy by another power far their inferior in material and human resources, but far their superior in immediate striking force.

We are a great and rich power, too. We have even greater resources, material and industrial, than either of the defeated ones. But we are weak when it comes to the translation of those resources into fighting forces, and we are weak very largely because we have no coordinated plan for defending ourselves. Of course, the Army has plans, and the Navy has plans. There is even a makeshift affair called a joint board, which occasionally gets together and does a little collective planning; but its members are all busy men with many other pressing duties. Nowhere is there an organization or an agency which has nothing else to do but to consider the broad general outlines of our national defense as a whole.

What we need is to formulate a comprehensive and intelligent military policy (using the word "military" in its broadest sense) which, taking into account our geographical position, our resources, our needs and the character of our people, our relations with other powers and our vital interests, will form the basis for all our organization and expenditure for national defense.

We do not have such a policy now, or anything resembling one.

We have, it is true, just chosen certain men to plan the industrial basis for our armed strength, to organize our resources to provide the material of war; but we have not chosen men to plan how this material is to be used, how our armed forces are to be organized, what purposes they are to serve—in a word, what we mean to defend, can defend, must defend—and how best to defend it. Such planning falls rather within the province of the soldier, the sailor, and the diplomat than within that of the industrialist, the economist, and the politician. It is obvious that neither the voting of great sums of money nor the organization of material and industrial resources will serve to keep us secure unless these moneys, these resources are translated into fighting forces, and unless these forces are of such size and are so designed, based, and organized as to give full support to our foreign policies and protection to our vital interests.

A single example will make this clear. We are now learning from the war in Europe certain most valuable lessons as to the employment of air power in war.

Yet we have no existing permanent means of making a continuing and comprehensive study of this subject. The Army can report on its own views, but there will usually be divergencies of opinion as between the General Staff and the Air Corps; the Navy can report on its particular problems relating to air power, but this is only part of the picture. What we must know is just what part air power is going to play in the whole, broad set-up of our defenses, what it can do, what it cannot do. What happens now is that the President in determining Executive policy, or congressional committees in making appropriations, must weigh half a dozen different recommendations and assertions and make decisions which may be vital to the safety of the country without the benefit of the sort of well-weighed professional study and advice which they should have at their disposal.

Surely it is clear as crystal that while losing no time in making a start toward the creation of instruments of war, we should also lose no time in determining upon a military policy which shall walk hand in hand with all other elements of state policy, in close and mutual support. Such coordination is the secret of the German successes; it is also the secret of our own national security in the midst of a troubled world.

We have never had a true military policy. In all our history, we have hastily and wastefully built up improvised defense forces after we started to fight, have somehow won through without disaster, and then have immediately allowed these forces to fall into decay until we are confronted with a fresh emergency. We can no longer do this with safety. Improvised forces, whether land, sea, or air, are worse than useless in modern war. We must stand or fall on what we have when the war starts, both in machines of war and trained men. The time limits of modern war have been so reduced that there is no longer opportunity to gird our loins after war has begun. Unless we can learn these lessons, so terribly taught by immediate events, we shall perish, and we shall deserve to perish.

We must plan, and plan now, to meet imminent danger, immediate emergency; but we must do more than that. We must plan for the future of America as well as for the present; for the safety of our children, as well as for our own. We must set up a permanent planning agency, which shall be concerned with the defense of the state, now and for the future, and which shall command such a measure of public confidence as to assure its own permanence.

We might call this agency the College of National Defense. It should be composed of a group of the most able, widely experienced, and progressive officers of the Army and Navy, with one or two of the best career men from the State Department, and at least one top-flight economist. In the beginning, the staff should be somewhat larger (because of the imminence of danger and the tremendous amount of pioneer work to be done) than it need be later. To assist in this work, we should call to the aid of the staff the best and brightest of our younger officers, at first to work as assistants, later on in annual classes as students after graduation from the Army or Navy War Colleges, or after completing certain special courses.

The primary duty of the College of National Defense should be to advise the President in his constitutional duties as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States; its first job, the formulation of a military policy. It should prepare special reports as the President might require on specific subjects. Its help and advice should be available to the committees of Congress which are concerned with national defense. It should work in close collaboration with the new Council of National Defense, and with the State, War, and Navy Departments.

In initiating this plan, we can do little more than select the very best men available, on the ground of experience, intelligence, courage, and proven ability, and say to them:

"Gentlemen, you have a blank check. You may call in to assist you or to consult with you any officers of the armed services you need, any officer of the Foreign Service, any civil servant of the Government. You may have any money you require for research, travel, technical advice, and clerical help. Every item of information in possession of any Government agency is at your disposal. Time is of vital importance, that direction may be given to our efforts and our expenditures. What is required is a military policy for the United States and detailed plans to implement that policy."

Of course, such a policy and such plans would not be static and lifeless things. Constant revision of detail would be essential. Firmness in principle, flexibility in detail to meet changing conditions would seem the soundest approach to the problems.

One great and tremendous advantage would be immediately gained—the support of that public confidence which can be the only secure foundation for any continuous program of national defense. But to insure this the caliber of the men chosen to direct the college of national defense should be such as to leave no doubt either of their ability or their devotion. Fortunately, we have such men. We have, for example, Admiral William D. Leahy (retired), lately Chief of Naval Operations, and before that commander in chief of the battle force, whose gifts of character, intellect, and experience can be far better employed to his country's benefit in a time like this than as Governor of Puerto Rico. We have Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, who was Chief of Staff of the First American Army in the World War, and has since been commandant of the Command and General Staff School, Deputy Chief of Staff, executive

secretary of the Baker board for the coordination of our aviation policy. We have Brig. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, former commanding general of the General Headquarters Air Force, now in a position of great responsibility, it is true, as assistant chief of staff for operations and training, but whose knowledge of modern air forces and capacity for clear thinking could be made of even greater service. There are others of no less merit and ability in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Foreign Service. Let a group of such men as these be given full freedom, time, money, and help. This is no moment for precedent or for politics.

We are going to spend immediately $5,000,000,000 for the national defense. We are going to spend other billions in the future. These are large sums, but we do not begrudge them. They are needed.

Let us, however, make sure that for each dollar spent we get a dollar's worth of national security. Let us spend a little of this money in planning how to spend the rest. This will pay us rich dividends—in economy and in safety and as an investment in the future of America.

We are fortunate in that we have a little time in which to do these things; but we have no time to lose. The better we plan now the less of our freedom we shall have to give up in order to be safe.

Warren G. Harding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS, OF OHIO

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me at Marion, Ohio, on June 9, at a memorial service in honor of ex-President Warren G. Harding. This service was under the auspices of the Marion (Ohio) Lodge of Elks, and sponsored by the State officers of the Elks. It was supported and participated in by the Elks lodges of Ohio. President Harding was a member of the Marion lodge of Elks. He was made a member 50 years ago. All those members of that lodge who are yet living and who were taken in when he was were present at the meeting. This meeting was held at the beautiful Harding Memorial Monument erected at Marion in honor of their illustrious former citizen.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, brother Elks, and—as President Harding was so fond of saying—my fellow countrymen, this service furnishes an opportunity for those of you who were neighbors and friends of President and Mrs. Harding to show how highly you esteemed them. It furnishes an opportunity to those of us who are members of the Elks fraternity to show how proud we are to feel and to know that we were closely bound to Mr. Harding by ties of fraternal obligation and fraternal affection. It gives all of us a grand opportunity to prove our devotion to our country and its institutions and our loyalty to the flag by showing proper respect for one of our country's most illustrious dead.

A nation's standard of civilization is accurately tested by the customs of the people as they show, or fail to show, proper respect for their dead. Veneration for the tomb and reverence for their dead were characteristic of the strong nations of earliest history. This simple inclination of these unlettered ancients to keep fresh the memories of their dead is unmistakable proof that the natural instincts of man cry out for the eternal companionship of those he loves.

"Who hath not learned, in hours of faith,
The truth to flesh and sense unknown,
That life is ever lord of death,
And love can never lose its own!"

And with the hymn writer let us say:

"There is a scene where spirits blend,
Where friend holds fellowship with friend."

The people of Marion performed no small task when they assumed and carried out the colossal task of raising this beautiful memorial to the honor of their most distinguished citizen. This beautiful edifice and its grandeur symbolizes the respect which the American people feel for one of their statesmen.

In all generations nations have erected monuments as proof of their love and affection for their honored dead. No nation has surpassed ours in this respect. All over our land a thankful people have recorded the virtues of their forefathers in literature, in art, in song, and in enduring bronze and granite. The choicest treasure of an individual who has lived right is his memory of his life's experiences—"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." The greatest wealth of any nation is its national memories. When Greece was richest in treasures her greatest treasure was her culture. When Rome ruled the world her richest treasure was that which held her empire together—law and government. The national memories of our country are richer than our mines of gold, our fields of corn, or our cattle on a thousand hills. Our national memories are more ennobling than our great cities filled with the treasures of art and the trophies of war. In these days of wars and rumors of war our national memories, which inspire our patriotism, are a safer defense for the Republic than our strong, efficient armies or our swift, magnificent navies.

ISSUES IN HARDING'S CAMPAIGN

The administrations of all of our Presidents have been marked by some important and distinctive event or circumstance. Mr. Harding's administration was no exception in this respect. Some national political campaigns have been waged largely on a question of the personality of the candidates; others have been waged on some one or more important issue while the personality of the respective candidates may not have been given much consideration. Not since the days of slavery and secession was any campaign waged more completely on a great issue than was the Harding-Cox campaign of 1920. The issue of that campaign was a profound one. The leaders of one of the parties advocated the entry of the United States into the League of Nations. The opposite party, headed by Mr. Harding, opposed the entry of America into the League of Nations. Mr. Harding was elected on that issue by probably the greatest vote any President had received up to that time. This election on this issue was the outstanding event connected with the Harding administration. There are few people who would not agree that subsequent events have shown that the people were right at that time. Even today the people are almost unanimously opposed to the entrance of the United States into the present World War if the same can be avoided. Had our country entered into the League of Nations, we no doubt would have been required to act as the big policeman in all the international difficulties that have arisen and are now exemplified by the Great War. Instead of making the world safe for democracy, the great World War did more to destroy democracy and Christianity than any other event in the history of the world.

Soon after Mr. Harding's entry upon his duties as President, he began a program intended to encourage peace among the nations of the world. In his administration a great disarmament conference was held and the United States, in keeping with her promise in that great conference, proceeded to disarm and did destroy many of her battleships. Other nations did not keep their promise, either in spirit or in truth. The Hughes Disarmament Conference, at that time hailed as a great success, long since has passed into ineffectiveness. The Kellogg Peace Treaty, signed by practically every nation in the world, has long since been broken and thrown upon the scrap heap, and the League of Nations is itself impotent. In spite of all these failures of nations to keep their promises and in spite of the great conflagration which threatens to destroy the world, history will give to Mr. Harding and his administration credit for having taken a gigantic step in the right direction. It would seem that national prejudices are yet too strong and human nature is yet too perverse for the world to hope for world-wide and everlasting peace. Mr. Harding was a man of peace, but apparently the peoples of the world were not yet ready to fulfill the Biblical prophecy that the time would come when nations would beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and that war would be no more.

Within this beautiful tomb lies the remains of a man who served in the United States Senate during the last World War. He knew the cross currents that the great war set in motion. He knew the hopes and ambitions of the leaders of the different nations involved, and when the war was over he knew how profound and sincere was the desire of the people that no longer should the world be scourged with war.

Let me give you a few excerpts from his inaugural address that will give you a fair appraisal of Mr. Harding as he entered upon his duties as President of the United States. Listen as we hear him say:

"The recorded progress of our Republic, materially and spiritually, in itself proves the wisdom of the inherited policy of noninvolvement in Old World affairs. Confident of our ability to work out our own destiny, and jealously guarding our right to do so, we seek no part in directing the destinies of the Old World."

The following language should convince anyone that the United States was sincere in her desire to cooperate for world peace:

"We crave friendship and harbor no hate. But America, our America, the America builded on the foundation laid by the inspired fathers, can be a party to no permanent military alliance. It can enter into no political commitments, nor assume any economic obligations, which will subject our decisions to any other than our own authority."

He appraised accurately the wishes of the people with reference to big armies and navies, and said:

"We are ready to associate ourselves with the nations of the world, great and small, for conference, for counsel; to seek the expressed views of world opinion; to recommend a way to approximate disarmament and relieve the crushing burdens of military and naval establishments."

He welcomed the countries of the world to imitate America when he said:

"When the governments of the earth shall have established a freedom like our own and shall have sanctioned the pursuit of peace as we have practiced it, I believe the last sorrow and the final sacrifice of international warfare will have been written.

"We shall give no people just cause to make war upon us; we hold no national prejudices; we entertain no spirit of revenge; we do not hate; we do not covet; we dream of no conquest; nor boast of armed prowess.

"If, despite this attitude, war is again forced upon us, I earnestly hope a way may be found which will unify our individual and collective strength and consecrate all America materially and spiritually."

With reference to preparedness, he spoke kindly but firmly when he said:

"I wish for an America no less alert in guarding against dangers from within than it is watchful against enemies from without. Our fundamental law recognizes no class, no group, no section; there must be none in legislation or administration.

"If revolution insists upon overturning established order, let other peoples make the tragic experiment. There is no place for it in America. When world war threatened civilization, we pledged our resources and our lives to its preservation; and when revolution threatens, we unfurl the flag of law and order and renew our consecration."

These are the words of one who must have loved his country. It must not be forgotten that President Harding died while serving his country. He was a martyr to this strenuous and exacting service.

TOMB OF UNKNOWN SOLDIER

Another important event transpired during Mr. Harding's administration, and although it did not have in itself any great political or economic problem, still it was so full of human interest that it was then, and will continue to be, a great event in the minds and hearts of the American people. Millions of people since the days of Harding have already found their way to Arlington Cemetery and have stood in awe as they realized that in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier lies the body of a young man whose identity is known but to God. As they watch the sentry in his rhythmic march back and forth all day long their hearts are moved and they think the best thoughts of which they are capable. So long as people have respect for government and honor those who have given up their lives for the perpetuation of constitutional government, that long will the people visit this shrine of American patriotism and pay their tribute of respect to those who have given up their lives for the sake of their country and will dedicate themselves more thoroughly to the causes of liberty and freedom.

When Mr. Harding dedicated the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, he was at his best. He made a great speech. The occasion gave his kindly nature a chance to empty its fountains of love and sympathy.

Let us appreciate Mr. Harding's sentiments honestly and take him at his word when we listen to what he said in that great speech. Here it is:

"This American soldier went forth to battle with no hatred for any people in the world, but hating war and hating the purpose of every war for conquest. He cherished our national rights and abhorred the threat of armed domination; and in the maelstrom of destruction and suffering and death he fired his shot for liberation of the captive conscience of the world."

Likewise he must have been sincere when he said:

"Ours are lofty resolutions today, as with tribute to the dead we consecrate ourselves to a better order for the living. With all my heart, I wish we might say to the defenders who survive, to mothers who sorrow, to widows and children who mourn, that no such sacrifice shall be asked again."

And again he said:

"Hundreds of mothers are wondering today, finding a touch of solace in the possibility that the Nation bows in grief over the body of one she bore to live and die, if need be, for the Republic."

He was expressing the hope that was in the heart of every American when he said:

"As we return this poor clay to its mother soil, garlanded by love and covered with the decorations that only nations can bestow, I can sense the prayers of our people, of all peoples, that this Armistice Day shall mark the beginning of a new and lasting era of peace on earth, good will among men."

The failure of Mr. Harding's prophecy was tragical. The cruelties of those in ancient times who studiously attempted to outdo each other in acts of human cruelty do not compare in total to the millions of soldiers and civilians who have been outraged and killed as the result of the actions of the madmen of Europe in the past few weeks.

The millions who have visited the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the millions yet to come who will visit and will read the beautiful inscription thereon will know that President Harding dedicated the monument and expressed the sentiments that are embodied in the beautiful inscription:

"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

My friends, and especially my Brother Elks, President Harding had the social qualifications that made him a great fraternalist. We are proud of his membership in our organization. One of the finest compliments that could be paid to any man is carried on the literature of one of your civic organizations here in Marion and it is especially appropriate in its application to Mr. Harding: "Loved most by those who knew him best" is a great tribute, especially when it comes of those who knew him best.

THE FLAG

All over the land these June days communities, societies, and fraternal organizations are observing Flag Day. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks by its ritual makes it compulsory upon the local lodges everywhere to observe Flag Day with appropriate services. I think this is the only fraternal organization among the great fraternities of the land that compels this observance. It shall not be my purpose to enter upon a eulogy of the American flag. These stirring times, however, encourage one in that direction. The toast of this great American fraternity to the great American flag cannot be surpassed for beauty of language or accuracy of description. Every Elk worthy of the honor of being an Elk swells with pride when he hears the Elks' Toast to the Flag. Let me recite it to you:

"The gentle breeze with lingering caress kisses the folds of no flag that can compare with it in beauty. There is no such red in budding rose, falling leaf, or sparkling wine; no such white in April blossom, crescent moon, or mountain snow; no such blue in woman's eye, ocean's depths, or heaven's dome, and no such pageantry of clustering stars or streaming light in all the spectrum of the sea and sky."

My friends, does the American flag mean as much to us as a people as it did in pioneer days or as it did in the days of the Civil War? In those days the patriots were not more patriotic than the patriots of today but there can be no question that there are hundreds today in our country who do not respect our flag. In the pioneer days there were few, if any. There were few even 20 years ago. At least, I do not remember up until about 20 years ago of ever having heard or seen anyone anywhere speak or act disrespectfully of our flag or of the country for which it stands. Since then I have been shocked at what I have heard and seen. In my work, when I was a member of the Immigration Committee of the House of Representatives and was a member of a special committee of Congress to investigate subversive activities, I saw and heard many things that caused me to wonder why we were not more strict in this respect. You can imagine the shock that any true American would receive to hear men sneeringly state, as I have heard while cross-examining witnesses before the committee, that if given a choice between service upholding the American flag and service upholding the red flag of communism they would take the side of the red flag of communism. This has occurred more than once in my experience. For more than a dozen years I have spoken at many places over this country, calling attention to this situation. I felt then that I was a sort of John the Baptist crying in the wilderness and that many thought that I was unduly alarmed. But today we see men who subscribe to a philosophy called communism holding high places in our Government. They will probably not openly speak against the American flag, but they are dissatisfied with American institutions and they conspire with those who would change our form of government and do it overnight. The "fifth column" has been at work in America for years, and there is more than one kind of a "fifth column." We pride ourselves on our education and our refinement, but skillful propagandists have reached into our schools, into our clubs, into our fraternities, and into our churches in a most clandestine manner. I am glad that the people are awakening, and I hope that no consideration and no quarter will be given to those who restrict their Americanism by any conditions or reservations whatsoever. I know that I am loyal to my country, and I think every other person should know his own conscience. Those who have the least disloyalty in their natures or in their make-up should be watched and investigated, and, if necessary, liquidated.

I am sure you will agree with me in an expression of these sentiments. I am for free speech but I am not for free treasonable speech. I am for free press but not for such filthy, unpatriotic, and un-American stuff as is flooding our papers and the mails written by those who would give their lives to see our land of liberty fall before the forces that scoff at righteousness, defame Christ, and deny God Almighty.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me read to you, and give you my version of a few lines of a familiar old poem:

"When Freedom, from her mountain height,
Unfurled her standard to the air,
She tore the azure robe of night,
And set the stars of glory there:
She mingled with its gorgeous dyes
The milky baldric of the skies,
And striped its pure, celestial white
With streakings of the morning light."

* * * * *

"Forever float that standard sheet!
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us!"

CONCLUSION

My friends, on behalf of this great fraternity under whose auspices we are here gathered today, let me thank those responsible for this meeting, and thank those who have given us their presence and efforts. And let me say that we appreciate your presence thus honoring a great American, and honoring the flag

of the greatest country in the world, and honoring yourself by being here. My friends, let us together salute the flag in the service of which President Harding died a martyr to his duty, and let us pledge allegiance to the flag by reciting in unison:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands—one Nation, indivisable with liberty and justice for all."

"Forever float that standard sheet!
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us!"

* * * * *

"In the beauty of the lillies
Christ was born across the seas
With a glory in His bosom
That transfigures you and me.
As he fought to make men holy
Let us fight to keep men free."

Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able radio address delivered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on the American Forum of the Air on June 9, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ruins of ancient Rome still bear the vivid scars of a battle fought in 312. In that battle Constantine the First gained the blessings of Christianity for the western world. From the eventful issue of that battle flowed the fresh waters of a new stream of learning, culture, and beauty, which bathed Europe in a new and dynamic spirit.

In 732, Charles the Hammer, in what is now France, hurled back the unchristian masses of Abdur Rahman—and the world remained a Christian world.

In France today another battle rages. That battle, too, holds in its bosom the same issue: Shall Europe and the western world, your world and my world, still enjoy the blessings of religion or shall the pagan gods of Woden and Thor take the seat of our Jehovah?

At the beginning of Godly time, Moses on Mount Sinai took Jehovah's commandments and, as they were then inscribed upon tablets of stone, they have since been impressed deep into the consciousness of the civilized world. Now, more than the Philistines of the ancient world, has the German Fuehrer challenged these commandments—challenged the first commandment of a sovereign God, the second commandment that dignifies man.

This issue, too, will rise out of this battle. Shall the Ten Commandments still live as the basic code of a God-fearing world, or shall pagan fantasy and racial vanity, by an apostate's sword, dethrone them?

Our own Declaration of Independence stirred the world with this straightforward declaration: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Do men have liberty as an inalienable right? Is freedom the inheritance of all? That issue, too, will be settled by the crash of tanks, the clash of arms, and the heroic bravery of dying boys clinging to every clod of civilization's soil in France at this very hour.

Our standard of living, the kind of house we live in, the sort of food we eat, the clothes we wear, the picture show, the theater, the automobile, the travel we enjoy—that, too, out of the strange complexity of modern life will be determined by that battle, the roar of which so touches the heart of the world that we can almost hear it here, as its drama thunders through the consciousness of the earth.

The amount of money we take from public welfare, education, housing, the restoration of our soil, the replenishment of our forests, from disabled veterans, dependent mother and child, from the unemployed begging for the chance to work—that, too, is an issue in the outcome of this struggle. For all America knows that we cannot, rich as we are, carry incalculable burdens of armament, build illimitable ships, guns, airplanes, trucks, tanks, air bases, forts, without robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The taxes we pay, whether rich or poor, or moderately well-to-do—that, too, awaits the outcome of this bloody contest. The debt limit has already been lifted without ceremony. New taxes are now in process of imposition. We have, in the Senate in the last 3 weeks, voted appropriations approaching $5,000,000,000. It is not a question any longer of how much money to appropriate. It is merely a question of what is the capacity of our country to turn out instruments of defense for our people and our world.

Whether your son must grow up to be a soldier, whether the Reserves, the National Guard are called into service; whether conscription, maybe, comes back to take a man from every household; whether great citizen armies shall again man the borders of America's defense; that too, is being fought out by those who have laid their bodies and laid their lives, their hopes and dreams, the love they had for their beloved, in the pathway of Hitler's cruel military machine, as it lumbers ruthlessly on toward the heart of France, the heart of democracy, and the heart of religion.

Whether this Western Hemisphere is to be the land in which men, nourished in the vigorous atmosphere of freedom, shall reach through the persistence of their peaceful pursuits, the greatest heights man has ever reached, almost the hilltop of man's dreams, or whether this hemisphere shall be profaned by the hell of war and preparation for war by the infiltration of "fifth columns" or Trojan horses, by sabotage, by fomented strife, this also, they die for in France tonight. For that, too, will be determined by the hand upon which the dove of victory shall eventually light.

I have spoken no fantasies. I have spoken facts. I have not been a dreamer in seeing these unhappy issues. I have been a realist, speaking as well as I know how, painful, ugly, irresistible fact. Filled as my heart has been with the evil forebodings of the future, if the last democracy except ours is crushed and disarmed and made a Hitler vassal, I have for the last 3 weeks been begging my colleagues in the Senate that we act now to aid the Allies in methods, short of war, to crush Hitler in Europe and to keep the spread of war from America's shores.

Every word I have said, I have said as an American, thinking first and always of my country. If I knew that America could continue to be the America into which you and I were born, the America that we know now, the America in which we had hoped to die, I should not hazard any risk or call upon my colleagues for any action in a war 3,000 miles away, even if it contained an issue dear to the heart of every decent man, woman, and child, for I am not unaware of my duty as a citizen and as a Senator, to think only of my country and its safety, as against the welfare of every other people or person in all the world. But when I know what a terrible ordeal, how much sacrifice of blood from the holy homes of America is being borne on the wings of inexorable Time toward us, if we alone must stand against dictatorship or submit to the mailed fist of Hitler, which shall crush every sentiment we cherish, if it did not take our soil, I should be unworthy of the high office I hold if I did not speak with the earnestness of a troubled heart the convictions which move me.

When the American people thought the American Senate, by unanimous vote, was granting every requested appropriation for the national defense and therefore, was doing all in its power in the most effective way to defend America, I offered a resolution, which said in substance, that the President, as our trusted leader and Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, should be authorized to sell, at a fair price, for cash, and delivered in this country, to the Allies, such war planes, parts and equipment as could be spared without imperiling our own defense, with the right in the President to replace such stocks from equipment of the same character in the process of construction in the factories of this country for the Allies and which could soon be delivered.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate voted down this resolution 12 to 1. They said it would violate international law. I answered Hitler had murdered international law, as he has murdered the sons of neutral Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Luxemburg and the unoffending sons of every other victim of his unprovoked aggression. I said that the conscience of the world would not let a man whose hands were bloody with the death of decency the world over claim the benefit of a decent code of conduct prescribed for and by the decent peoples of the world. And I said that the Sir John Simons, the Chamberlains and the Baldwins and all the others who waited and quibbled about legalistic terms bore upon their souls the terrible price their peoples have had to pay for their blindness. And I said further that the one hope there was of international law ever coming back to the councils of men was to strike down the hand of Hitler, who had substituted force for law the world over.

Later I offered an amended form of that resolution, calling attention to the Kellogg Pact, under which Hitler's Germany, the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and other victims of the Nazi invasion in Europe had renounced in solemn terms war as an instrument of national policy, and that if we gave aid, short of war, in the mild form that I had suggested, to our fellow signatories to this solemn pact, against the unprovoked aggressions of another signatory to this reciprocal covenant, we should rather be upholding than breaking down international law and the most sacred form of international agreement-treaties among nations. By this resolution I proposed to allow the President, in his discretion, when he could do so without imperiling the national defense, to sell other instruments of war which might belong to this country to the Allies.

Again the Foreign Relations Committee, by a vote of 19 to 2, struck down this hope.

Finally I proposed yet a third resolution, which is now upon the table in the Senate, in which I called on the Congress to back up, with their confidence and support, the President in exercising the authority that he now has, under existing law, to give aid, short of war, to the Allies by the transfer of airplanes and other war material. Of course, I pointed out the existing law that permitted him to exercise the power which he is now exercising, as all of you know, and knowing, applaud. The President, as Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, charged with the defense of our country, knows that the best way to strike down danger is where danger is, and that the best way to destroy a tiger is in his lair and not after he springs.

The President knows and you and I know that it takes 4 years to build a battleship, 2 years to build a cruiser or destroyer, 1 year to build a bomber. He knows that to fulfill the obligations of the Monroe Doctrine and to keep the war and the enemy away from the Western Hemisphere we have over 43,000 miles of coast line to defend, from Iceland in the North Atlantic, around the coast of North, Central, and South America to the Horn, and thence along the western shore of our continent to Alaska. He knows that there are two oceans and that our Navy is in the Pacific only.

He knows that a dominant Hitler would not wait for us to establish naval and air bases in South America; for us to mobilize and train a great army for the South American countries; to build armies, navies, air corps, and coast defenses for the Western Hemisphere; to clean out the cancerous "fifth columns" which have eaten into the vitals of every nation on this continent. He knows that it is closer from Africa to the bulge of South America by far than from the United States to the same point; that there is more than fear to sustain the probability that the dictatorships of the world are already working in close and intimate collusion as part of an evil scheme to dominate the wide world.

If we were engaged in war, it would be the duty of our Commander in Chief to use our forces to the best advantage.

Under existing law, therefore, when the President allows the trade-in of an old airplane for a new one of latest design, the exchange of old guns for the newest, he is making the wisest and best use possible of our armament, while at the same time, diminishing the burden of armament upon the back of the taxpayers of the country by the allowance he gets for the older materials.

The President has already taken the action the law allows him in these respects. I imagine tomorrow the Senate will reverberate with criticism against him from those who refuse to see the larger interest of our safety and security.

I have been heartened immensely by the thousands of telegrams, the many more thousands of conscientious letters which have poured in to me and to other Senators from every nook and cranny of our country, from rich and poor, farmer and laborer, man and woman—from the troubled heart of America. I feel in what has come from the homes and factories and the farms of America in this crucial time, a new spirit, a resurgence of the spirit that always lies under the outer crust of the American people. It is the spirit of God-fearing, patriotic men and women who love their church, whatever it be, who love their country and its institutions. I feel something of that same sentiment that moved the pioneers and those who fought not only for liberty in the Revolutionary War, but for freedom in the Civil War, for the deliverance of the Cubans; the spirit of those who fought in the war of 1914 to 1918, when another German military machine, which spoke of treaties as scraps of paper and who aimed at the mastery of the world, raised its ugly head the first time.

The response of our people, and the response I know our people are going to continue to give to the President and to communicate to the Congress, all that I have felt, moves me to breathe the words of that song which has so stirred the devotion of our people, "God Bless America, My Home, Sweet Home."

Sale of Supplies to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD immediately following the address of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], inserted in the RECORD at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON], the address delivered on the same evening at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In October 1939 the repeal of the embargo was debated on the floor of the United States Senate. It was said that the Neutrality Act was helping Hitler—a rather strange statement to be made by administration leaders who wrote the bill and placed it on the statute books.

EMBARGO DEBATE

They said we must repeal the embargo on arms and war materials so that we could be neutral and keep out of war. Yet these same people today who talked about neutrality then are now in consternation and panic over German victories and demand all the arms and ammunition, warships, and guns in our possession for the Allies—a blank check for the use of the world's two greatest empires. A strange brand of neutrality.

While we were debating the acquisition of the island bases on our Atlantic coast last Thursday we learned that the President had taken upon himself the right to furnish fighting planes for his favorites in the second World War.

STRIPS US OF OUR FIGHTING PLANES

In one breath Mr. Roosevelt says that we have no adequate defense and that he needs five or ten billion dollars to provide real defense, and in the next breath he strips us of our fighting planes, guns, and war materials and proposes to send thousands of guns, millions of rifles, and thousands of planes to the dearly beloved King of Great Britain and the Emperor of India.

Let us not be deceived. Damaged, deteriorated, and obsolete war materials are not acceptable to Great Britain, engaged in a death grapple with a scientific military people. The Empire demands the finest and best, most powerful and destructive weapons of war in our possession. Anything less than that is useless and would prove only an encumbrance and lead to sure and certain defeat.

BEST BOMBERS BEING RELEASED TO THE BRITISH KING

I make the charge that our best bombers and our finest aircraft are being released for service to the British King. There is no use to camouflage this bloody business into which we are being led, step by step, into final, total war.

Crusading for war by helping the Allies with everything short of war is sham and camouflage. Short of war means long on war. Short of war puts you into war, involves the Nation in empire intrigues and leads our hopeful youth into the bloody shambles of European battlefields. That is the certain and inevitable tragic end to it all.

WASHINGTON AND NEUTRALITY

George Washington said:

"Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side."

These are the words of our first and greatest President. If I have to choose between Roosevelt and Washington, I will follow the advice of the Father of our Country.

Sunday's papers prominently display General Pershing's demand for compulsory military training—that is, conscription. It gives great space to Pershing's demand for unlimited American arms supplies for his Allies of World War days.

He asserted the Allies are "fighting a war for civilization," and are "holding our front line." I take this to mean that unlimited arms sales to the Allies means all the guns, all the ships, all the war planes, all the rifles and ammunition, and other war material the Allies can lay their hands on by means of their own money or by means of credit, which it is now proposed we extend them as we did in the first World War.

UNLIMITED ARMS AND WAR SUPPLIES TO THE ALLIES

If we give unlimited arms and war supplies to the Allies, how are we going to train our own Army. With cornstalks and broomsticks? Is there any Americanism in such a foreign-minded proposal?

Of course, I am not surprised that Sir John J. Pershing, knighted by the King, should make this demand upon America.

The United States cannot afford to give or sell any of its equipment. Army experts point to the shortage of officers, the lack of uniforms, and proper equipment for the American Army. They say we are short of uniforms. Yet it is proposed that we give these supplies to the Allies. We lack shoes, blankets, or even canteens for these men. The Army is short of guns for its own training purposes. "The sale of World War stocks to the Allies has depleted even outmoded supplies." The press reports today that many of our rifles have been recently sold to the Allies. Further than that, these experts say we have not enough military stations to house our conscripts, that there is a shortage in uniforms and tents.

SEVEN BILLION DOLLARS FOR DEFENSE IN 7 YEARS

Then what became of the $7,000,000,000 we appropriated for defense during the last 7 years?

A fine state of American defense. Now Congress is asked by some people to give unlimited supplies to Britain and France. Who is there that places the foreign soldier before the American soldier? Let them speak now before it is too late.

I take it that the Senator from Florida accepts the advice of Mr. Pershing and that he is ready to follow him in unlimited sales to the Allies. By the time these distinguished gentlemen get through with Uncle Sam he will be lucky if he has his shirt left.

If that is an American policy, it is of very recent origin.

The Senator maintains that after Hitler there is no international law, that it is scrapped and we need pay no further attention to treaties or conventions.

AFTER THAT UNCLE SAM WILL HAVE NO GUNS

May I say that after PEPPER Uncle Sam will have no guns, no warships, no ammunition, no airplanes, nor any other war materials—after PEPPER has poured all our defenses into the lap of the British King.

Today's Times-Herald quotes Lord Lothian as follows:

"BRITISH NAVY NEEDS SHIPS—LOTHIAN HINTS AT HEAVY LOSSES

"PITTSBURGH, PA., June 8.—Great Britain, ruler of the seas for centuries, is in need of naval destroyers as well as airplanes for its fight against Germany, Lord Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States, declared here today.

"His admission that England needs destroyers indicated the British Navy may have suffered greater losses than had been revealed previously.

" 'We need ships—naval destroyers—as much as we need planes,' Lord Lothian said in an interview here while en route to Washington, Pa., to address the graduating class of Washington and Jefferson College.

" 'We need guns, too—antiaircraft and machine guns. We lost almost all of our equipment in Flanders and the Germans now have seized many of the French manufacturing plants in the north, around Lille.' "

BRITISH PROPAGANDA—THE "SEVENTH COLUMN"

Now that the British lord hath spoken, it is up to us to comply with ships, naval destroyers, fighting planes, and other war materials. And this member of the British nobility is the commencement speaker at Washington and Jefferson College. Well, it's a good thing that Washington and Jefferson were not there to challenge the power of British propaganda.

And this is all in the name of democracy.

It seems to me that the nations which are referred to as democracies are empires—world-wide, far-flung empires. France is an empire. That empire has been won by conquest and aggression. The swords of the French imperialists are dripping with blood. They have acquired their territory by aggression. That empire extends into Asia, Africa, and America. It is not European alone; it is world-wide. France is an empire won by aggression and war, and everyone knows it, or should know it, and its territory exceeds the territory of the United States by 1,206,000 square miles.

THE FAR-FLUNG EMPIRE OF BRITAIN

The records show that Great Britain extends over 13,302,000 square miles of this earth—more than four times the area and extent of our mighty America. The far-flung empire of Britain, scattered over one-third of this mighty earth, upon which the sun never sets, was won by aggression and war. It was won by bloodshed, won by swords dipped into the blood of nations now enslaved by that empire; and yet we hear Senators and Representatives talk about defending these "democracies." If that be democracy, God save the word!

Anthony Eden said on the state of British democracy in 1928: "We have not got democratic government today. We never had it, and I venture to suggest to honorable members opposite that we shall never have it. What we have done in all the progress of reform and evolution of politics is to broaden the basis of oligarchy."

LET US SAVE DEMOCRACY HERE

We have a democracy here. Let us save that democracy. Let us attend to our own affairs and preserve and protect our own people, including our 12,000,000 unemployed.

If we enter another destructive World War, democracy may disappear from the earth. We may scrap our own institutions. We may ruin the work that our fathers and founders laid down in this country, which they have bequeathed to us, which it is our sacred duty to uphold, and which we are sworn to uphold.

DEFENDING BLOODY AND AGGRESSIVE EMPIRES

I am weary of hearing about defending democracies which are nothing but bloody, aggressive empires, which hold hundreds of millions of enslaved people under their imperial rule. We are still nursing our wounds from the last war "to save the world for democracy." We are still trying feebly to collect billions of unpaid war debts which the debtors solemnly promised to pay but never paid; and yet they have the nerve to come over here to us now and ask us again to defend their democracies—democracies, indeed!

America should not support or adopt any scheme of foreign policy, whether in the form of treaty, alliance, or league, which binds the United States to help maintain or impair the territorial integrity or the social, economic, or political institutions of other countries.

These are the principles which I am firmly convinced furnish our people and our Government the safest and wisest rule of conduct in the present grave emergency. I have full faith that they are the principles approved by the great majority of my fellow citizens. Practically all the Presidents of the United States who have spoken on this subject from 1789 to 1915 have laid down the same principle as the settled rule and guide for America's foreign policy.

LET US PERFECT THIS HAVEN OF LIBERTY

Let one people, one country, one flag, mean just that and nothing more. Let us act for ourselves. Let us perfect this haven of liberty. Proclaim to the nations that we will not serve others; we will not yoke ourselves with kings; we will not stoop before Europeans. We have but one hope, one desire; in our own hearts we place America first.

America first. Write it across the skies. Proclaim it to all the world. Standing here in the midst of a world crisis, we renew our pledge to our own independence, to our own liberty. We defy those who strive to yoke us like oxen in a mill. We serve notice on all foreigners: Hands off our Government. You shall not command us. You shall not control America in this hour. You shall not sacrifice our honor to glut your ambition. You shall not crucify the American people upon a cross of kings.

Why I Am An American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Hon. Chauncey P. Overfield, secretary of the Utah Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, who is one of the leading citizens of Salt Lake City, in my State, enclosing a copy of an address delivered over station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, on May 29 last by Hon. J. Reuben Clark, Jr., former Ambassador from the United States to Mexico, on the subject Why I Am An American.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clark's address may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am an American because I believe in a government of laws and not of men, and in a national allegiance to high principle and lofty ideal instead of to a personal sovereign.

I am an American because I believe in a government with three distinct, separate branches, each mutually independent of the other, with no power of delegation or appropriation of rights or powers by any one to or from any other.

I am an American because I believe that government "must derive its just powers from the consent of the governed" and that branches of government and officers shall have such powers and such only as shall be given by the people; because I believe that the assumption by branches of government or by officers of rights or powers not specifically conferred upon them is usurpation; and because impeachment or other trial lies against any officer who so usurps rights or powers not specifically conferred.

I am an American because I believe in the greatest possible measure of self-government and because I believe in a federal system of government which keeps local affairs in the hands of local governments.

I am an American because I believe in a bill of rights which places wholly beyond the reach of lawful government certain matters affecting "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and specifically the right of freedom of conscience and worship, the right of free speech and a free press, the right peaceably to assemble and petition government, and the right to gain and hold property without molestation except by due process of law.

I am an American because under our form of government the people of the United States have made a progress never before made by any other people in the world in an equal time during the whole period of recorded history.

I am an American because standards of life and of living of the entire American people are far beyond those enjoyed by any other people in any other part of the world, either now or at any other time, which is a living testimony and evidence of the kindly beneficence of our free institutions.

I am an American because this Nation has no scheme or plan of conquest, because it has a respect for the rights of other peoples

and of other nations, because it promotes justice and honor in the relationships of nations, because it loves the ways of peace as against war, as shown by the repeated peaceful adjustment of its own international disputes, because it has conquered the land greed which so afflicts the nations of the world, as demonstrated in Cuba and the Philippines.

I am an American because my country abolished slavery after it had become deep-rooted and because men still are free to work, and are secure in the enjoyment of the products of their labor.

I am an American because I firmly and earnestly believe that the Constitution is an inspired document designed by our Maker to set up a government which would make sure and secure the rights set forth in the Bill of Rights, and particularly the right of freedom of conscience and worship.

I am an American because I believe that the destiny of America is to be the abiding place of liberty and free institutions, and that its own practice and enjoyment of these blessings shall be to the world a beacon light which shall radiate its influence by peaceful means to the uttermost parts of the world, to the uplifting of all humanity.

Connecticut Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address which I made at the Democratic State Convention held in Hartford, Conn., on June 3, as I accepted renomination as a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With a feeling of gratitude that is beyond my gift of expression, and a feeling of humility that I cannot and will not attempt to explain, I accept the nomination as a candidate for United States Senator. If there is a way that I can properly show my appreciation of your confidence and friendship, it seems to me that I may best do it by my conduct in the coming campaign and in the Congress, if I am reelected. With a continuation of your cooperation, and the assistance of the people of our State, whom I have some reason to believe approve my record, I am confident of reelection. I renew my request for your help, and I ask the support of every man and woman in Connecticut who believes that I have the qualities and the experience and character that are so necessary to men who serve in the greatest legislative body in the world.

I shall not now review my record as a Member of Congress, but shall do it as occasion provides the opportunity in the days ahead. With my record I am not completely satisfied, because it always seems that we should be doing more—but of my record I am proud, for there is not a thing I have done that I would now undo, nor a vote I have cast that I would now recall.

I continue to have the same great pride in the leadership of President Roosevelt that I had when that leadership saved the Republic in the financial and economic panic in 1933.

I likewise have a pride in the accomplishments of our party during these long and uncertain years, and, while we have made mistakes, I am confident that we have those qualifications of leadership so vital in these days of world-wide darkness.

We are about to enter upon a political campaign that will call for the best that men possess. The seriousness of the times demands an especial care of what we say, for of greater importance than our political success is the need for a national unity of purpose. Fulfillment of that need requires a self-discipline and fairness and toleration. The campaign should be contested upon the record and devoid of animosity and personalities. On my record I am willing to rest my case.

Several years ago, when first nominated for public office, I stated in a speech of acceptance that I had no greater hope or ambition than that my public service would reflect a credit upon myself and my family and those who voted for me. From that day until this hour there has been no increase or lessening of my ambition.

Men elected to public office must ever be mindful that their duty is to all of the people, and that in the Congress men are the representatives of every person within their constituencies. I have never for a moment neglected that thought or duty, and without hesitancy I respectfully ask for the support of all of the people of my State who feel that I have the qualifications which they believe are necessary in their Representatives at Washington.

Taking the oath of a Senator seems to bring a humility that is complete, and is a solemn reminder of a tremendous responsibility. And now—as I approach the end of my term—I am not only willing, but anxious, that those who oppose us, or whoever opposes me, open the record and call the roll.

I shall ask that he or they point out what was wrong or what he or they would do differently. I shall ask if there is a man or a group or class on whom I cast disfavor or for whom I showed especial favor. My references are the working people of my State—be they the people on the farm or in the factory—and the manufacturers, and the bankers, and the veterans, and those who temporarily know or have known the distress of unemployment. I offer these references with confidence because I have endeavored to meet the obligations of my trust without a thought to race or creed or color or politics. I very clearly understand that the people of my State have given me an honor that comes to few men in any generation, and in my effort to convince them of my appreciation I have been unable to find enough hours in any day. If I am reelected—and I expect to be—I shall ask God's continuing help and direction in a work that is difficult at best—and impossible without His help.

In this brief and simple speech of acceptance I make little mention of politics and less of issues. I shall endeavor to be temperate and careful and fair in what I have to say in the months ahead. Indeed, much of what men now say will be drowned by the thunder of war. We are living in compartments of days, and no political opinion can be firmly fixed, no suggestion or fear can be regarded as too fantastic, and no idea scorned. Men seeking public office must pretty much be judged by their past and their record—as Patrick Henry declared "the future must be judged."

It is my opinion that in an hour of world crisis and peril it might be dangerous to "take" men who are untried and who have given no evidence of their industry, integrity, and judgment.

We are living in one of the saddest periods of history. In the years just behind us we witnessed the horsemen of distress and despair in the form of dust storms, hurricane, drought, and flood. As a powerful Government we went to the aid of those afflicted, just as we went to the aid of those affected by unemployment and sickness and otherwise in great need. By so doing we strengthened our national honor and brightened our national armor.

In the effort to do good the shock troops of righteousness sometimes trespassed on posted land. In the embargoes against unfair practices a little harm accompanied great good, but out of the experiences we grew stronger and we came to know each other better. A little while ago we had supposed the worst was behind us and that we were approaching social and economic tranquillity.

And then, out of the eastern and the western skies, came the crack of guns and the smoke clouds of war. The world rushed into a period of madness that has brought tens of thousands of orphaned children and another generation of broken-hearted widows and gold-star mothers. We find much of the world about us torn by paganism and barbarism, and lighted only by flashing guns and burning homes. Hate has magnified, and, paradoxical as it seems, love has intensified. This war is the opposite of the way of life which God directed, but God gave men an irrevocable free will and the charge to work out their salvation.

I cannot believe, and I don't believe, that this is the end of religious civilization. I want to believe, and I do believe, that we are more likely witnessing the beginning of the end of world madness. These men of ignoble ambition and with a lust for power will one day find their worlds come crashing about them.

Amidst all of the sadness and misery and the seemingly endless sorrow and despair stands the United States—the last great and powerful dwelling place or light and understanding. It seems that we are about to be called upon to lead the way back, though how or when we shall do it only God yet knows. We do know that we must be strong—that none will dare insult or attack us—and so strong that we can destroy any that might be that crazily ambitious. Not only must our arms and our Army be sufficiently strong, but we must be spiritually strong and completely united. Hatred must be banished and misunderstanding erased. Each of us must have the help of each other, and all of us must have the help of God.

As a nation we have earned the right to peace, and we have been taught to love and respect peace-loving people. Those in distress and suffering torture and terror have a moral call on such aid as we can give them without sacrificing our own people. There is a call to defend God's teachings and the dignity of man. May God give us the strength to hold high the torch of liberty and hold forth a strong arm of help.

May we ever be mindful of the sacrifices and the lessons of our own founding fathers and never forgetful that for us liberty is sweeter than life itself. May we ever cherish the ideals and institutions and traditions of the early patriots who made it possible for ours to be a great and powerful nation. May we keep faith with them. May God bless America.

Nomination of Hon. Francis T. Maloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY RICHARD JOYCE SMITH NOMINATING SENATOR MALONEY FOR REELECTION

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Richard Joyce Smith, a distinguished Connecticut lawyer, at the recent Democratic State Convention in Connecticut, in nominating the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] for reelection.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Democrats of Connecticut have come together at a time of utmost gravity. It is impossible for us to enter upon the deliberations of this convention without giving heed to the difficulties and dangers our country faces. The stirring message of the distinguished leader of the Senate uttered here last night has made a profound impression. We recognize our duty as Americans. We accept also our responsibility as the party in whose hands has been entrusted the Government of the country. Let us resolve to keep faith with our fellow citizens. Let us establish within our own ranks a united front, bent only upon achieving all necessary measures for the defense of the Nation and the preservation of our people's freedom.

As the party at the helm in these critical days, ours is a gigantic responsibility. But we have much to work with. Within the past 8 years we have reconstructed the spirit of our own people. The state of the Nation would have been less secure today but for the courageous leadership of our great and able President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He alone among the statesmen of the world has properly appraised the growing forces of aggression, and it has been through his clear insight and his resolute will to act that during the past 8 years the foundation for the new program of defense has been laid.

Behind him, in support of him, and with him for renomination and reelection, a solid phalanx of citizens once more is forming throughout the land. We of Connecticut join that phalanx today.

Connecticut Democrats owe a special duty to the President at this time. The part that our State must play in the new program for national defense is vital. The genius of our people for precise craftsmanship and the highly developed industries which our skilled artisans have made possible constitute in many ways the key to the program. If Connecticut fails the President's objectives may not be attained. We must make certain, therefore, that Connecticut's important functions shall be prosecuted in full harmony and in complete accord with the patriotic aims of the national administration.

Because of this new task, it is fortunate that we had already determined to nominate our candidate for the Senate at this spring convention. We now have an opportunity to exhibit an early and a continuing solidarity; to begin our campaign at once and to prosecute it with unremitting vigor for victory in the fall—victory not only for our own party, but victory for a leadership in our Government that will insure strength and enlightenment for our national undertakings.

With these grave problems facing us, with the eyes of the country watching the response that Connecticut is to make to the President's call, I rise with pride and with confidence to renominate our able senior Senator, FRANCIS MALONEY, of Meriden.

What is it that entitles a public official to a renewed expression of the voters' confidence? What is it in a man that warrants his role as lawmaker in a democratic country? Certainly during these critical times no one should be retained in office as a matter of course.

The tests, so it seems to me, are basically three:

First. The candidate must be a thoroughgoing American. His mind and his heart must be imbued with an abiding faith in our country. He must be a courageous patriot, prepared to take an irrevocable stand against any force whether from within or from without our borders which may threaten the life of the Nation or the sacred principles of American liberty.

FRANCIS MALONEY preeminently meets that test.

Second. By his public acts and his private life, the candidate must have demonstrated that he is a man of honor, a man of the strongest moral fiber, a man in whose breast unceasingly beats the resolute determination to be honest.

FRANCIS MALONEY preeminently meets that test.

And Third. By his record, by his accomplishments, and by his convictions steadfastly held, the candidate must have demonstrated not only his ability and his conscientious sense of duty, but also his understanding of the needs and aspirations of those whom he represents.

FRANCIS MALONEY preeminently meets that test.

The love of country, the devotion to the principles of free government which the career of FRANK MALONEY exemplifies are not to be described by high-sounding words or flamboyant phrases; those qualities of patriotism are too much a part of the man himself. Every person who has had occasion to discuss problems of government with our senior Senator knows, as I know, that in each issue he has been called upon to face, his first and his last concern has been the ultimate welfare of his Nation and his State. With courage, with determination, even when expediency has seemed to point another way, he has held firmly to the course dictated by his patriotic conscience. Such is the man whom we Connecticut Democrats may proudly offer to the Nation's service in this hour when Americanism must be, above all other things, resolute and courageous.

I need not dwell long before this convention on the personal character of FRANCIS MALONEY. In every act and deed of his public and private life his character is eloquently portrayed. You may go back to his own city of Meriden, as I have done, you may talk with people of all stations of life—those who knew him as a boy, working hard to help his family—those who knew him in the Navy during the World War—those who have been associated with him in business—those who have been for him and those who have opposed him in his political career—and to all of them the name of FRANCIS MALONEY is an honored and a respected name.

Integrity and rectitude may be virtues with their own compensations—certainly FRANCIS MALONEY was a man of character long before he entered public life. But I say to you that in these days, when representative government is facing criticisms and questions not hitherto known, it behooves us Americans to consider well the kind of man we propose to place in office. On this score, our senior Senator stands forth without a blemish.

So I come again to the final test of the nomination I propose. FRANCIS MALONEY has been a Member of Congress for 8 years—2 years as Representative from the Third District, and 6 years in his present term as Senator. He took his first congressional oath at a time when this Nation was reaping the disaster that followed years of reactionary government. At that time he pledged himself to serve the people, and not the special interests. He has been true to that pledge. He has worked hard and continuously for legislation designed to improve the condition of the underprivileged, to help those who have suffered most from the economic upheavals of this generation, and to aid organized labor in the attainment of its just status in our industrial society. We have gone far during the past 8 years toward a realization of these sound objectives of Government, and our own Senator's contributions have been among the best. Eight years ago FRANCIS MALONEY was a champion of social reform. He remains a champion of social reform today. Eight years ago he was a friend of labor. He remains a friend of labor today. Eight years ago, 10 years ago, 12 years ago FRANCIS MALONEY was a liberal in Government. He is a liberal today, and 6 years hence he still will be a liberal.

These are important considerations. We must be on our guard lest the present emergency be seized upon by some groups to wreck the liberal program our party has initiated. We stand with President Roosevelt. FRANCIS MALONEY stands squarely with the President on the proposition that the new program for national defense can be carried out promptly without surrendering one essential part of any of the major laws our liberal Congress has enacted.

The position which FRANCIS MALONEY has won among his colleagues in the Senate and members of the Executive Department in Washington reflects honor and credit upon Connecticut. A careful student of legislation, an accomplished parliamentarian, and an eloquent speaker, his advice and counsel have been continuously in demand. He has been chosen for some of the most important and difficult subcommittees of the Senate. His work in those capacities has been pursued with unflagging energy and with unsurpassed effectiveness. The admiration and esteem in which he is held in Washington today are testimony of his brilliant career as Connecticut's Senator. His popularity among all his colleagues shows that they, like those of us who have known him at home, are readily won by his innate sincerity, his sense of fair play and his remarkable attribute of kindness.

But if Senator MALONEY has gone far in Washington, he has not done so at sacrifice of the problems of his own constituents. Most of the delegates at this convention know personally of his willingness to serve and his readiness to understand.

Probably no other Senator from Connecticut during a single term has done as much as he for the cities, the towns, and the individual citizens of the State. He remains a Connecticut man—a native son whose own life and own interests have been so intimately attached to Connecticut people, Connecticut places, and Connecticut institutions that he will always have a common touch with his fellow citizens here. He knows instinctively what they feel and what they strive for. He is bound to them by a loyalty rooted deep in his heart.

This, then, is the man I nominate—a courageous Connecticut patriot, an honorable gentleman, a friend of his fellow citizens, an able and enlightened statesman.

America faces the future with an anxious heart. No one dares contemplate how drastic may be the needed action during the next few years to defend our Nation and to preserve our liberties. Let us place strong and able men in the seats of our National Govern-

ment—men of courage, men of action, men with clear heads and understanding hearts—men like FRANCIS MALONEY.

Our stalwart President Roosevelt needs the best that Connecticut can give him for the tasks that lie ahead. Connecticut's first service to him is to return FRANCIS MALONEY to the Senate. The President needs Senator MALONEY. He will be heartened to know that we of his party in Connecticut are united in our determination to renominate and reelect our senior Senator.

My fellow delegates, in a few hours this convention will have moved on into the glorious annals and the great traditions of our party. Before we meet again in the spring of an election year mighty tides in the affairs of mankind will have risen and receded, momentous events in the history of our Nation and our State will have taken place. Let us make certain that the record of this convention will be written in terms of a unified and enlightened understanding of our responsibilities.

Because we hold firmly and irrevocably to the principles of government for which the Democratic Party stands, we believe that a Democratic victory in the fall is essential to the happy outcome of the trials ahead. We believe this, not selfishly, not arrogantly, not because we ourselves want power, but because we are convinced that a government under the Democratic Party will have the healthy support of the common people of America, without which no government can survive a crisis. For that victory, for the people's victory, I give you as the leader in Connecticut our Senator and our friend, FRANCIS MALONEY.

Mr. Chairman, with the affection of deep friendship and with the pride of a Connecticut citizen, I nominate as Democratic candidate for United States Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Meriden.

Achievements of F. B. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER BY PAUL S. ANDREWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times by Mr. Paul S. Andrews, of Syracuse University, under date of May 15, 1940, and which letter was published in the New York Times on May 19, 1940, entitled "Achievements of F. B. I.—Americans Found to Owe Debt of Gratitude to Bureau."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHIEVEMENTS OF F. B. I.—AMERICANS FOUND TO OWE DEBT OF GRATITUDE TO BUREAU

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I should be grateful for space to say a word not so much in defense as in praise of J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Bureau under his leadership deserves the deep gratitude of decent Americans, of fathers and mothers no longer ridden by the fear of kidnaping, of banks and their thousands of customers and depositors. Since Congress gave the Bureau charge of bank robbery cases, this type of crime has been reduced about 75 percent, and as a result bank robbery insurance rates have been lowered between 30 and 40 percent in various States.

Businessmen and individuals, the potential victims of gangsters of the Dillinger type, should be glad that the Dillingers have found that robbery with violence is neither safe nor healthful. Prosecutors throughout the country and local police departments get big dividends from the fact that the Bureau of Investigation in its technical laboratory is using, and makes available to all, up-to-the-minute methods of crime detection. In its identification division, too, with nearly 12,000,000 fingerprints, it has the world's most effective means for the identification of criminals.

Its National Police Academy, training selected local police officers and sending them home again, has made instruction in modern crime detection methods available to nearly a hundred thousand police officers throughout the country. Still more, the Bureau, by cooperating in the inauguration of 183 police training schools in the United States, has served as a clearing house for information, services, and assistance in police training.

PERCENTAGE OF CONVICTIONS

Decent men and women everywhere who care deeply that the law shall be enforced, feel safer because the Bureau has been so thorough and efficient, and at the same time so fair, that out of every 100 persons taken into court by it and charged with crime, 96 have been convicted.

It has been stated, and I believe not contradicted, that no breath of scandal has touched the Bureau. Out of 52,000 convictions obtained by it in the courts, not one has been reversed for any alleged violation of civil liberties in the course of the investigation. Not one has been reversed on any charge of brutality, of third-degree tactics, of cruel or inhuman treatment.

On April 4 the United States Attorneys' Association passed a resolution praising Mr. Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its fair and efficient investigations, for the valuable training and crime statistics, services provided to other law-enforcement agencies, for its high standards of ethics and conduct, and for its high regard for the preservation of civil liberties.

Last, but by no means least, of the Bureau's achievements is the fact that nowadays when our American children play "cops and robbers," every little boy wants to take the part not, as in the old days, of the robber but of a G-man.

OPPOSITION IS ACTIVE

There are powerful groups interested in crippling the Bureau. Mr. Hoover stated on April 18 that in the previous week the Communist Party of America issued orders for concerted action against the F. B. I., urging attempts to involve F. B. I. agents in situations where they might be accused of crime or improper activity. Every kidnaper, racketeer, gangster, dope peddler, secret foreign agent, would be glad to cripple it. Its work against these gentry will never be finished until we reach Utopia.

Not everyone realizes that in America 1 out of every 26 persons has been arrested for an offense more serious than a traffic violation; that every 21 seconds there occurs a murder, an aggravated assault, a burglary, a car theft, a robbery, or larceny. Not everyone knows that in this year of 1940 it is probable that in 1 out of every 17 homes crime will be a visitor—either some member will be charged with an offense or will have suffered a loss through crime.

Moreover, in September 1939 the Bureau was designated as a clearing agency for the investigation of espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities. For 5 years before 1938 the F. B. I. investigated an average of 35 espionage cases a year. In the 12 months of 1938 there were 250 such cases; in 1939 the total had grown to 1,651 new cases. On March 14, 1940, Senator REYNOLDS stated in the Senate that the Bureau was then receiving 250 such complaints a day.

The Bureau does not shrink from fair and factual criticism. It welcomes it. But to have it crippled by the underground activities of criminal termites would amount to a calamity.

PAUL SHIPMAN ANDREWS.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, *May 15, 1940.*

Youth and Our Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on last evening the President said in his address to the Nation:

Again today the young men and the young women of America ask themselves with earnestness and with deep concern this same question—what is to become of the country we know?

The youth of America is bewildered. We are all bewildered. On Friday, June 7, Robert Coddington, a Moline high-school honor student, delivered a most interesting commencement address. His subject was Youth and Our Foreign Affairs. It was most interesting to me because it represents the voice of one who might become cannon fodder in an unjustifiable war, or a patriot in a war of defense. As I interpret this speech, it is a plea for us of mature years to do nothing rash, but he is with us, rash or right.

Hang the expenses and taxes. We can pay them or invent "phony" money—but only God can make a Robert Coddington. Part of the speech of Robert Coddington on the subject of Youth and Our Foreign Affairs is as follows:

Undoubtedly one of the most important problems that must be faced by the youth of America—in fact, everyone in America—is that of our foreign policy.

The present generation was brought up in the colorful post-war period so recently ended, and to use a figure of speech, "Took its foreign affairs and funny papers in the same glance."

There is certainly no problem as to arousing public interest in our foreign policies today. The question is one of considering situations, aims, and means and confining the three effectively to steer the United States along any course it is deemed

desirable to follow—and it is a question that America's youth must eventually answer.

But now let us examine the accomplishments of our elders regarding foreign affairs.

To begin with, it might be an excellent idea to find out just what our foreign concerns are. In a general sense there are three: First, defense, which consists in the protection of our shores, our nationals, and our property; second, trade and investment, which cover all our monetary and business transactions with the rest of the world; third, sentiment, which might be defined in this case as our unforgotten affiliations with the old countries and our national prejudices.

These three factors and associated problems provide considerable employment for Mr. Hull's State Department and are unavoidably dealt with according to two general rules which have been established by the American people through the course of our existence. They are: First, the Monroe Doctrine, which forbids any further territorial penetration into the Western Hemisphere by any European or Asiatic power; and secondly, a general isolation policy, which has as its basic idea, "Keep out of foreign entanglements and foreign wars."

As the result of popular demand for adherence to these principles our entire foreign policy, present and past, can be included under the head of one or the other; and they constitute precisely all our ancestors have bequeathed us in the way of established policy. On the general premise of noninterference—the United States with regard to Europe and Asia—has our Nation been built.

Now, how are these policies working today? Are they adequate to our needs? Do they express our real aims and desires? Those are pertinent thoughts and they lead us to consideration. Sticking to our original divisions, for the sake of clarity, let us find out what there is to be said for the Monroe Doctrine.

Now, this principle applies primarily to the Western Hemisphere. Adopted first as a defense measure against Europe, it has come to mean not only that but the United States' domination of Latin America and Canada through investments, trade, and the Navy. It has resulted in the establishment of naval bases as far east as the Philippine Islands and the construction of one of the greatest fleets in the world—for not only the protection of our own coasts but for the protection of North and South America and all the lands between.

The last two administrations have softened the military aspects of the situation by the adoption of a good-neighbor policy which strives to promote understanding, better trade relations, and cooperation through our bailiwick by the use of the helping hand. Loans, advice, and reciprocal trade agreements have all helped to better our interhemisphere relations enormously and to increase our trade balance to a not inconsiderable degree. At least Latin America does not seem to consider our domination as too unpalatable; and that is the main value of the good-neighbor policy.

There, in short, is the Monroe Doctrine of 1940. It secures us the riches of the Western Hemisphere. It is enforced by a mighty Navy which renders a foreign attack most doubtful. It provides security, protection, peace, prosperity for the United States.

What thinks the youth of America? The youth of America only hope that they may continue the intelligent and adequate maintenance of this Doctrine. And now—consider the other policy of isolation. Since the start of the latest European war the United States has been in the position of "interested neutral." We have forbidden our ships to traffic in belligerent waters, withdrawn war protection from Americans in war zones, and adopted a cash-and-carry neutrality arrangement which compels belligerents to pay cash for munitions and supplies and to transport them in their own ships. We have definitely refused to loan any more money to the world in general until past debts are settled. In short the United States appears to be "going to sit this one out." Congress caps the climax of 20 years of isolation begun at Versailles in 1920 by quietly reaffirming our continued intentions in that direction. The Nation's vast majority nod in perfect accord. We, in the United States, intend to remain strictly neutral in this second World War.

The youth of America is one with its elders in this desire to keep our Nation at peace. But there is a question in youth's mind—a doubt. Our studies have shown us clearly what happened in America just before our entrance into the last war—that sudden growth of war fever. Might it not happen again? There is every reason to suppose it might and, ladies and gentlemen, the question is put squarely to you as our elders—our leaders and guides.

The United States is in such a position from the standpoint of defense and sufficiency that war need never come—unless we desire it. And you, ladies and gentlemen, representing our citizenry will be responsible for any course we may follow as far as this war is concerned. Youth can do little or nothing. We will share your views—as we are part of you—and we will go as did our fathers in 1917 if you command it. You have educated us to consider the United States worth fighting for. But it is our plea that you will be very cool and calm and careful in the trying times to come—that you will think—and if you send us—you will do it in a cause worthy of America's future.

Remember youth must carry on after you have gone. Our Nation literally depends on your reactions to world events.

In conclusion, one can say that the youth of America believe that the past and present generations of American citizens have done a pretty decent job as regards our foreign affairs. We have prosperity, national security, and peace—the things the rest of the world are fighting for today—and have prepared and are preparing ourselves to keep them. We may chose our own course, but youth hopes and prays that the decisions our elders make for these troubled times will be the right ones for America.

We ask you again to give America's world problems your closest and most intelligent consideration.

The "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN A. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE STAMFORD (N. Y.) MIRROR-RECORDER

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Stamford (N. Y.) Mirror-Recorder:

[From the Stamford (N. Y.) Mirror-Recorder]

THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

One finds frequent mention in the press today of "fifth column" activities.

If there is a "fifth column" in the United States, where is it, and what is it? How does a "fifth column" operate?

"Fifth columns" got their name from an incident in the Spanish Civil War. A Franco general told of four columns of troops marching on Madrid, and referred to a "fifth column" of civilians in the city who would rise to aid the troops. Since then "fifth columns" have developed in Norway, in Holland and Belgium, in England and France.

MARTIN DIES, chairman of the Dies committee, tried for 2 years to convince the people of this country that groups within it were seeking destruction of their Government. This Member of Congress dug up evidence, paraded that evidence before the Nation, and sought action against subversive groups. His reward was given in the form of sarcastic criticism by President Roosevelt, ridicule by New Dealers, and an effort to eliminate the appropriation for his committee.

Today, however, President Roosevelt feels differently about Congressman DIES and his efforts. The President has just let newspapermen know that it is from the Dies committee that evidence of "fifth column" activity in the United States comes to light. Mr. Roosevelt is much concerned with that activity and wants something done about it. The Justice Department, through Attorney General Jackson, is asking Congress to give it jurisdiction over the immigration service so that G-men can keep a closer watch on aliens. The Attorney General proposes registration of all aliens. He wants registration of every privately owned firearm in the Nation.

For success of "fifth column" effort, according to members of the Dies committee, three conditions are necessary: (1) The presence of propaganda agents reporting directly to a foreign government; (2) an organized body of supporters, augmented by a larger unorganized group of sympathizers who will give aid or fight suppression of the "fifth column"; and (3) indifference of the country under attack to "fifth column" activities during the initial phase of their operation. All of these conditions have been present in the United States.

The Dies committee found Communists reporting directly to Moscow and under the control of the Russian Government. It found German Nazi representatives here paid by and reporting to the German Government. It found organized Communist groups in some large labor unions. It found Fascist adherents working within employer ranks, creating fears of labor and selling the idea that fascism would be preferable to democracy, because it offered a way to bring workers under strong Government discipline. Both in Spain and Norway, on the basis of available evidence, "fifth column" activity was centered in groups other than labor. The committee also found plenty of indifference on the part of this country to "fifth column" activities.

The "fifth column" here, as visioned by Mr. Roosevelt and the Justice Department, is not made up of spies. Rather it is made up of propagandists, of groups of sympathizers with other forms of government, of groups interested in fomenting racial hatred of sectional differences or class antagonisms. The aim of these groups, the President asserts, "is to create confusion of counsel, public indecision, political paralysis, and, eventually, a state of panic." As a result of these new techniques, armament programs may be dangerously delayed. Singleness of national purpose may be undermined. Men can lose confidence in each other, and therefore in the efficacy of their own united action.

The recognized problem in this country is to keep disruptive elements under control without abolishing or limiting too severely the essential personal liberties.

Post-War Writers and Pre-War Readers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ARCHIBALD MacLEISH

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. Archibald MacLeish before the American Association for Adult Education, in New York City, entitled "Post-War Writers and Pre-War Readers."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two facts bearing upon the educational influence of the writer are worthy of present notice. The first is the attitude toward the contemporary crisis of the young generation in America. The second is the responsibility for that attitude of the writers of the generation to which I belong.

Much has been said of the attitude of the young generation—some of it critical, some of it in explanation. Certain journalists, irritated by the unwillingness of the young generation to see the world as they see it, have gone so far as to accuse that generation of cowardice or of indifference. These comments can be dismissed. You cannot indict a generation of cowardice, even where there is evidence of cowardice, and here there is none.

The essential characteristic of the attitude of the young generation in America is neither indifference nor lack of courage, either physical or moral. It is something very different—something John Chamberlain put with precision in the New Republic 5 months ago: "If I have the right to generalize from talking with 120 boys and girls in 4 widely separated regions and cities beyond the Alleghenies," wrote Mr. Chamberlain, "I should say that we have a younger generation which needs none of Mr. Stuart Chase's semantic discipline. The boys and girls tend to distrust all slogans, all tags—even all words." The characteristic of the attitude of the young generation which most disturbs their elders is their distrust not only of all slogans and all tags, but even of all words—their distrust, that is to say, of all statements of principle and conviction, all declarations of moral purpose.

Whether or not even so distinguished a journalist as Mr. Chamberlain was justified in generalizing from his conversations with four groups of boys and girls I do not undertake to say. I can only testify that within my own experience Mr. Chamberlain's statement would seem to have been true at the time when he made it and to be still true today. Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and the retreat to the channel may have demonstrated to young men and young women in America that the question is not whether we will choose to join or not to join the Allies—that the real question is whether the thing which has strangled the Allies will also strangle us, and when and what we can do about it. But the profound distrust of words and of principles which Mr. Chamberlain found last fall would still seem to characterize a considerable part of the young generation today.

That is one fact. It is a sobering fact. To my way of thinking, it is a more sobering fact than our lack of planes, our lack of antiaircraft guns, our inability to manufacture in adequate quantities an adequate automatic rifle, or any of the other weaknesses in our physical preparation. If the young generation in America is distrustful of all words, distrustful of all moral judgments of better and worse, then it is incapable of using the only weapon with which fascism can be fought—the moral conviction that fascism is evil and that a free society of free men is worth fighting for. If all words are suspect, all judgments "phony," all convictions of better and worse fake, then there is nothing real and permanent for which men are willing to fight, and the moral and spiritual unpreparedness of the country is worse than its unpreparedness in arms. For fascism, we will do well to recall, is not merely a superior mechanization of arms or a superior production of superior airplanes. Fascism is also a faith which is no less powerful because it is a negative faith in obedience, in discipline, in brutality, in death. A free people cannot fight fascism unless it believes with even greater conviction that freedom is good and that slavery is evil—that freedom is good and can be attained and that slavery is evil and can be opposed. A free people, because it is a free people, will permit the free expression of all opinions. But unless it reserves to itself the right to believe, and to believe with all its force, that freedom is worth having and worth keeping, it cannot keep its freedom long.

That is one fact. The second fact is this—that a large part of the responsibility for this state of mind in the generation of men and women now young belongs to the writers—belongs specifically to the best and most sensitive and most persuasive writers—of my generation who created in many minds this distrust not only of the tags, not only of the slogans, but of the words themselves. The war books of men like Barbusse, Latzko, Dos Passos, Ford Madox Ford, Ernest Hemingway, Erich Maria Remarque, and Richard Aldington were not only books written against the hatefulness and cruelty and filthiness of war. They were also books filled with passionate contempt for the statements of conviction, of purpose, and of belief on which the war of 1914–18 was fought. And they left behind them in many minds the conclusion that not only the war and the war issues but all issues, all moral issues, were false—were fraudulent—were intended to deceive. You can open the pages anywhere and find this.

Here is Dos Passos in a novel which became part of the essential experience of an entire generation—Three Soldiers: "So was civilization nothing but a vast edifice of sham, and the war, instead of its crumbling, was its fullest and most ultimate expression. Oh, but there must be something more in the world than greed and hatred and cruelty. Were they all shams, too, these gigantic phrases that floated like gaudy kites high above mankind? Kites, that was it, contraptions of tissue paper held at the end of a string, ornaments not to be taken seriously."

Here is Ernest Hemingway in one of the finest novels of our time, A Farewell to Arms: "I was always embarrassed by the words 'sacred,' 'glorious,' and 'sacrifice,' and the expression 'in vain.' We had heard them, sometimes standing in the rain almost out of earshot, so that only the shouted words came through, and had read them, on proclamations that were slapped up by billposters over other proclamations, now for a long time, and I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it."

These are the honest words of honest men; of writers of great skill, integrity, and devotion. They say what all of us after the war would have said if we could. They say what all of us who were in the war believed. But they are nevertheless words which have borne bitter and dangerous fruit.

For the inevitable and natural effect of these words upon the generation which read them in childhood was bound to be the effect we now witness. That generation was inoculated against any attempt in its own country by its own leaders to foment a war by shouting rhetorical phrases or waving moral flags. But it was left defenseless before an aggressor ready to force war upon us. Above all, it was left defenseless against an aggressor whose cynicism, whose brutality, and whose stated intention to enslave presented the issue of the future in moral terms—in terms of conviction, and belief. To suspect not only the tags, not only the slogans, but "even all words" is to stand disarmed and helpless before an aggressor whose strength consists precisely in destroying respect for the law, respect for morality, and respect for the Word.

The post-war writers whose work educated a generation to believe that all declarations, all beliefs are fraudulent, that all statements of conviction are sales talk, that nothing men can put into words is worth fighting for, and that there is a low-down to everything—those writers must face the fact that the books they wrote in the years just after the war have done more to disarm democracy in the face of fascism than any other single influence. Many of them have written other books since. Some of them—men like Hemingway and Dos Passos—have devoted themselves to the fight against fascism with all their talents and all their courage. But the fact nevertheless remains.

I ask leave to point out that I am not undertaking to judge these writers. I have no right to judge them. And if I did my

hands would be tied because I felt as they did and wrote, insofar as I was able, as they were writing. But I do undertake to maintain that what they wrote, however noble it may have been as literature, however true to them as a summary of their personal experience, was disastrous as education for a generation which would be obliged to face the threat of fascism in its adult years.

What the moral may be, if there is a moral, I shall not attempt to say. Perhaps writers, having so great a responsibility to the future, must not weaken the validity of the word even when the deceptions of the word have injured them. Perhaps the luxury of the complete confession, the uttermost despair, the farthest doubt should be denied themselves by writers living in any but the most orderly and settled times. I do not know. But this I think I do know: That unless we regain in this democracy the conviction that there are final things for which democracy will fight, unless we recover a faith in the expression of these things in words, we can leave our planes unbuilt and our battleships on paper, for we shall not need them.

The labor we have before us is not an easy labor. Those who wish to see us weak will employ every means of deception, of misrepresentation, and of fraud to keep us so. They will suggest to us that we cannot defend ourselves against fascism without ourselves becoming Fascists. They will tell us that we cannot assert our belief in the institutions of a free society and our intention to defend them without becoming as nationalistic, as intolerant, and as savage as those who attack our institutions. They will tell us that we cannot make judgments of good and evil without becoming ourselves burners of books and regimenters of men's minds.

We can believe them if we wish. But if we do believe them, we will have lost not only our courage but our common sense. To say that liberty can be preserved only by refusing to believe in liberty enough to fight for it, is to say what no man in his senses thinks. And to argue that liberty worth fighting for is liberty already lost is to argue without history or understanding. The contrary is the truth. Only liberty which is strong enough to defend itself is strong enough to be truly liberty and truly tolerant. Only liberty for which men are willing to fight is liberty which can or ever could survive.

Hinds County (Miss.) Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY M. NEY WILLIAMS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. M. Ney Williams on June 4, 1940, at the Hinds County (Miss.) Democratic Convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, gentlemen, and fellow Democrats, the Democratic Party came into being as a defender of all the people and was founded on the great principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. In bringing this great party to the American people Thomas Jefferson dreamed of the benefits that would be enjoyed by a free people for centuries to come.

As time passed on this party proved to be the party that the people looked to for refuge from the special interests, as it stands for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

In the latter years of the history of the Democratic Party Grover Cleveland was called to the White House by the voters of the Nation, and his first term as President was to carry out the platform and principles of his party. The reforms made during this 4 years did not meet with the approval of big business and the special interests, and though a candidate for reelection, he was defeated. The next 4 years of Republicanism, with all of its favoritism to the few, caused the people to appreciate the preceding 4 years of true democracy, and Cleveland was again elected President of the United States. His two terms as President have gone down in history as great achievements of a great President of a great party.

The passing of Cleveland as the leader of democracy in the United States caused many to wonder who would come forth to lead this party of the people.

In 1896, at the Chicago convention, a young Congressman, William Jennings Bryan, was acclaimed as the nominee of our party and its leader.

His sympathies were with the common man, and his ideas of government were just 20 years or more ahead of the times. Bryan had the love of God and his fellow man in his heart, and though never elected President, he preached democracy so earnestly and so truthfully to the American people that today he is known as one of the greatest exponents of the Democratic Party.

His undaunted courage and his belief in the principles of democracy bound him to the American people, and he was loved and respected not only by his own party but by all parties and all people. He was so popular with his people that he was known as the Great Commoner.

In 1912, just as the world was facing an international war crisis, the Democratic Party offered to the people of the United States Woodrow Wilson for President. He was elected and reelected in 1916. Mr. Wilson was the war President, and by his wonderful mind and ability, he was able to command the American Congress and give proper assistance to the allied nations with manpower, materials, and money. He was a great war President.

The next great Democrat to enter the party as a national figure was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In 1932, after 12 years of Republican rule, our people found themselves in a state of confusion and bankruptcy. Banks had either failed by the thousands and closed up, or they were in such critical shape that their usefulness was gone.

The railroads were on the brink of ruin, as they had no money to purchase new equipment, and their properties were decreasing in value every day.

Factories over the country had closed by the thousands, and this paralyzed industry.

Cotton was worth about 5 cents per pound, and corn about 20 cents per bushel, and other agricultural products were worth practically nothing.

Unemployment had run into the millions, and the American people wondered if the Democratic Party, through its leader, could save the Nation.

On the day of the first inauguration of President Roosevelt, he asked God to help him, and asked Congress to give him sufficient powers to relieve the existing emergency.

The existing emergency was relieved and the United States of America was saved.

President Roosevelt is truly a man of the people.

He has tried to provide for old-age assistance, better schools, better hospitals, unemployment, social security, good roads, abolishment of slums and better housing conditions for the poor, and many other things for the good of common humanity. He is now trying to provide the ways and means to keep his country out of war.

The critics of the President are against preparedness, but this same bunch want the protection of this Government.

Some of our beloved Democratic Senators and Congressmen have seen fit in the past to fight the President on some of his policies, thinking, of course, that the President would become unpopular and that they would grow in popularity, and some of them thinking that they were bigger men than the President; but God bless your souls, this bunch has been getting back in the political bed with Roosevelt for the past year so fast that the President can't get the cover tucked in the bed before another Senator or Congressman is trying to crawl in. I am happy to see them returning to the fold, and am also happy that they discovered the fact that the people have endorsed the President and that public sentiment is so strong for Roosevelt, that even his enemies in his own party cannot longer hold out against him.

This country is now in the greatest crisis in its history, and we need a man at the head of our Government who knows the people of the New World as well as the Old World.

Some Republicans and a few disgruntled Democratic Members of Congress said if Congress repealed the neutrality law that it meant that the President was immediately placing the United States at war with Germany. This was months ago, and we are still a nation of peace.

The Congress has just voted the largest peacetime appropriation in history for national defense, and this was done at the urgent request of President Roosevelt. Some critics say that this means we are going to war, but the President says that proper preparedness will help keep us out of war.

I believe the President is right. I believe that the United States with its exposure of hundreds of miles of coast line on the Atlantic, on the Pacific, and the Gulf of Mexico, should be the best prepared country on earth. The people of the Nation are so strong for this preparedness of the President, that members of all parties almost voted unanimously in Congress for the bill to provide the money for this armament program. In the midst of this crisis, why should we try some man of our own party, or some other party, to lead us through? The saving of the United States is nearer and dearer to the hearts of the people, than this sickly maudlin sentiment about a precedent of electing a man President for a third term. Roosevelt saved our country from the devastation of depression, and he will try to save it from the horrors of war. I believe that Hinds County should give its endorsement for a third term for Roosevelt, and that Hinds County should instruct its delegates to the State convention to vote solidly at the Chicago convention for a third term for President Roosevelt.

I thank you.

The "Fifth Column" Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY H. I. PHILLIPS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun:

[From the New York Sun]

THE SUN DIAL—THE "FIFTH COLUMN" WORKER

(By H. I. Phillips)

He takes all America has to offer with a smile and awaits a chance to return the favors with a machine gun.

He coils in the flag, hides in the quartet singing the National Anthem, and crouches behind the Bill of Rights.

He accepts your invitation to dinner and makes a mental blue print of your home so he can return and snatch the silver.

He lets you help him on with his coat while he plans to steal your shirt.

He lets you pay his golf fee while he figures out how much powder it would take to blow up the clubhouse.

He becomes your week-end house guest and spends most of the time estimating how good a target for bombers the children's bedroom would make.

He applauds America First programs and laughs himself to sleep over the fact his face didn't betray him.

He makes soap-box orations in a public park under police protection and denounces the system that protects him.

He takes off his hat when the flag passes, but he never removes his foreign collar, regardless of what passes.

He stands when The Star-Spangled Banner is played but eases his conscience by assuring himself that he was tired of sitting anyhow.

He looks like a man but performs like a rattlesnake.

He shakes your hand while his wandering eye measures you for a knife in the back.

He is the skunk that walks like a man, the hyena that waltzes like a patriot, and the rat that masquerades as a human being.

He not only bites the hand that feeds him, but eats the other hand for dessert.

He says, "It can't happen here," while planning to help the enemy do it.

He screams at the Dies committee as un-American, talks loudly about freedom of speech, demands that the Constitution remain uninfringed, and then goes back to his rat hole for a good long laugh.

He sips the wine of hospitality—and secretly plans to sock his host with the empty bottle.

He is the kind of rodent who would accept help from the good Samaritan, ask the Samaritan to wait for him in the corner drug store, and then bomb the drug store.

He renders evil for good, thinks the double-cross is the noblest work of man, and eats with his knife because he never wants to have to depend on a fork when the time comes to stab his host.

He would steal the pennies off a dead man's eyes, but prefers nickels.

He is a skunk in sheep's clothing, and that turns us to a libel suit from the skunk family.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM MONTANA FARMERS UNION NEWS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very able and interesting editorial published under the heading "Act now," in the Montana Farmers Union News of May 22, 1940.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montana Farmers' Union News of May 22, 1940]

ACT NOW

With Congress chafing to adjourn, and with the tremendous armament program taking precedence over all other legislation, the outlook for the passage of the farm legislation sponsored by the farmers' union and supported by the Department of Agriculture appears less and less probable at this session. Except for the possible effect that failure to do so might have on the average Member of the Congress when asking for the farm vote, we may as well take the cynical view that what he is most vitally interested in is to retain his $10,000-a-year job; and if he hasn't openly opposed the farm bills, he is perfectly safe in going to the farmers with protestations of his fealty to their interests.

There is no way in which the farmer can know if he is telling the truth or not, but there is a way now, before the Congress adjourns, of demanding that the farm legislation be acted upon. And the farmers' militancy or passive acceptance of what now appears to be a lost hope can determine just who in Congress are honestly concerned to see the farm legislation passed.

Last month 20,000 farmers made history by their response to a call by the farmers' union for a mass meeting in St. Paul. If 100,000 farmers would sit down today and write just a letter to their own Representatives and to the particular groups of Members of Congress who have introduced the legislation and have acted as a sort of steering committee, demanding of them all that Congress do not adjourn until definite action has been taken on the farm legislation before adjournment; that this be made a special order of business before adjournment; that a roll-call vote be arranged for, which will put every Member of Congress on record for his vote on this question, then we will know where they all stand. And we shall be able to evaluate the extent to which influence for the passage of the legislation has been brought to bear.

If a sufficiently large and unequivocal demand is made, it may safely be said that the squirmings of the politicians in Congress will probably have the effect of an earthquake on the Capitol Building. There will be wailing and weeping about the "rules" preventing any such action; that the routine of legislative procedure must be orderly and cannot be upset; that doing so would establish a dangerous precedent of yielding to pressure groups and numberless other excuses presented.

Very well. Let us then ask them "how come" that the ordinarily dilatory (the Congressmen would prefer the word "deliberative") procedure under the rules was not in evidence in the action of Congress on the $1,500,000,000 armament program? This was certainly an appropriation that called for deliberation and cautious procedure, because, in the vernacular, "that kind of dough isn't hay" even to this country. But the few who tried to make themselves heard suggesting that thought be given to the question will probably be accused of all manner of unpatriotic impulses. But the cold fact stands out that the "rules of procedure" on legislation, can and are set aside and all considerations of economy are thrown out of the window, when the steel trust and all of the large major industries (outside of agriculture) see tremendous profits in sight.

The politicians will argue that protection of this country is of paramount importance, an argument with which we all agree. But let us not be stampeded. Let us analyze conditions somewhat.

Aircraft fighting machines have injected a new note into modern warfare. Even now, alarmists are suggesting that invading forces could be dropped from airplanes into this country, carried from some foreign aggressor. That it is immediately necessary to provide for such contingencies. Suppose we shut our ears for a moment and consider this possibility on a factual basis.

Where might this attack come from? Japan? Japan is about as busy as it can be in China. It is short of raw metal materials. If America stopped shipment of scrap iron and metals generally to Japan, her show in China would be over very shortly. England, France? They do not appear to be in a position to defend themselves from Germany alone. Their source of supply of planes appears to be the United States. Germany? Germany is "spreading itself out so thin" and taking in so much territory that even if it should win a so-called victory tomorrow, it would be short of effective German population to police much of the conquered territory and would have to return it or blow up trying to maintain its advantages.

Moreover, all of these countries are exhausting themselves at a tremendously accelerated pace because war is no longer, mechanized as it is, a matter of attrition. It is speeded up to a tremendous tempo by advantages of mechanization. But news dispatches of today show clearly that even machines manned by men must have a base within easy and sure reach. Tactical requirements of the highly developed mechanized German Army compelled securing bases in Holland and on the English Channel, a half hour away from England before attacking.

The development of a war economy and the concentration of all efforts of this country on the production of armament isn't going to help the small farmer to stay on his farm and make a

living for himself and his family in peace and comfort. It is not going to increase materially the purchasing power on which the farmer depends by increased employment in industry. This is definitely demonstrated by conditions in England and France at the present time. There is no decrease in unemployment to any marked degree. There is an increase in hours of labor and decrease in amount of wages paid. And tremendous increases in profits for the munitions industries.

It is not to your interest as farmers to docilely submit to what appears the inevitable. If we are going to drift into a war economy, you are strong enough to get your share of its profits if you demand it. But you've got to make yourself heard and not let yourself be fooled.

If the Northwest Farmers Union becomes vocal enough and militant enough, and don't approach the Members of Congress as humble petitioners but as sovereign citizens demanding your rights, you will get a prompt hearing. Otherwise you will get nothing now and less in the next session of Congress—if any.

H. S. BRUCE.

I Am Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LEE E. GEYER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I extend in the RECORD an address given by myself over KFVD on June 6, 1940, as follows:

My friends, this is Congressman LEE E. GEYER reporting by transcription direct to you from the Nation's Capital in his weekly broadcast.

Several times I have stated that I would not discuss the international situation lest I might in some way add to the wave of insane and unjustified hysteria sweeping over the country. I have received so many requests to make that subject the topic of conversation in one of my early broadcasts that I have decided to devote the time today to it.

I do not speak as an expert nor do I speak as one who deems his opinions of more value than those of my hearers. I merely give you the benefit of conclusions I have reached from being exposed to the atmosphere of official Washington. Let me say at the outset that I believe in adequate preparedness and that I am convinced that preparation that was adequate 10 years ago no longer meets the requirements of our country against such an onslaught as has been going on in Europe the last few days. I do not mean by this that I expect an invader, but that we should have adequate protection for the same reason that we have fire insurance on our homes. If the fire does come, we will then appreciate the protection we have supplied ourselves. But this is not the angle that really concerns me most. I am concerned as to what will result from the state of mind of the public that is developing along with this armament program.

How far will the public allow the officeholder desiring to cover up past misdeeds to go in inciting neighbor against neighbor in a search for an imaginary member of the "fifth column"? Men in law-enforcement positions are already using this technique to retain themselves in office. Will the waving of the flag and the chasing of straw men keep our incompetent and vicious characters in the position to continue to prey upon the people?

Then there are the "outs" who desire to become the "ins." They, too, are forming organizations of self-styled patriots whose real purpose is not to safeguard our democratic way of life but whose sole aim is to defeat some of our faithful public servants by spreading falsehoods. They are seizing upon the present state of mind to place into office either themselves or someone of their particular choice. This because they are either paid cash in hand or because they wish revenge for having not received some coveted appointment. Will the voters really look at the records of their officeholders when it comes to forming their opinions, or will they be swayed by the emotions?

I am also concerned as to what is going to happen to our social and labor gains of the past 7 years. Will labor unions be broken up with the open-shoppers using the time-worn cry of "alien agitator"? This has been used effectively when there was no war hysteria. What will happen now? Will the Wagner Labor Act be practically destroyed in its effectiveness? Already those who were responsible for the antilabor Smith committee are licking their chops in anticipation. They are saying boldly that we cannot have our defense program held back by labor troubles fostered by "fifth columnists." Real enemies to our Nation must be eradicated. But let's be sure they are enemies. What will happen to the wage-hour bill? Will sweatshop conditions return? The industrial lords in the poll-tax States are again hoping for 5-cent-an-hour labor.

What about civil liberties? Will we forget entirely that the first amendment to the Constitution declares: "The Congress shall pass no law abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of religion, or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Will this portion of the Constitution to which certain elements give such eloquent lip service be entirely set aside? Already HAMILTON FISH, one of the oldest Republican Members of the House and by that reason an important member of the Rules Committee, has declared: "The Congress needs no reason for deporting a man. It is enough if we don't like the color of his eyes."

Under the present whipped-up hysteria will people be silenced because they dare to speak against our going into war? Will our people, exercising their right of peaceable assembly, be raided by self-appointed defenders of democracy while those who are sworn to defend the provision of the Constitution under which they are meeting stand by and secretly encourage it?

What about the freedom of worship? Already the hooded hordes are riding. They are again attacking Jews and Catholics, who have among their members some of the finest of our American citizens. Will our people be allowed to publish what opinions they might have, even though it might differ from that held by the majority? Will the trade-unions be allowed to picket and distribute handbills? These practices have been declared exercising freedom of press and assembly and hence are protected under the Constitution.

What about the alien? Must they all suffer because there might be a few who are enemies? The flood of alien bills introduced into the Congress is alarming. Already one vicious one has been passed, but the President in his good sense and wisdom vetoed it. Let the Congress beware the oppression of minority groups, for this is an insidious cancer that rapidly eats into the body politic until no minority group is secure.

We are all members of some minority group, either racial, religious, or political. Hitler rose to power by stepping on the necks of one group after another. He took them in stride—trade-unionists, Catholics, Masons, Jews, and, finally, all whom he classed as aliens. The process has already started here. Yes; I am concerned for our unemployed. The Congress just passed a bill that contained a pitiful pittance. A mere drop in the bucket. The excuse given by many for refusing to increase the amount was that we needed the money for defense. It seems to me the best defense a democracy can have is to keep its people happy and contented, with everyone having a job at a decent living wage.

It was Lincoln who told us that "the best defense lies not in bristling guns and armaments, but in the spirit of our people." This armament program will take up a very small part of the slack in unemployment. The work will be largely done by machinery, it will require special skills, and it will be located in a comparatively few places. The bulk of the money voted for defense purposes will go for material which means those who already control the wealth of the Nation will but increase that which they already have. It is no wonder that the representatives of the large corporations are swarming Washington with patriotic offers of assistance.

No, I fear we have pushed the needs of 11,000,000 people into the background because our people have kept their ears tuned to the radio and their eyes on the headlines.

What about two very splendid bills that are being petitioned out of committee, having as their objective better pensions for our senior citizens. Can these people subsist on news from abroad? Do they thrive on statistics as to the number of airplanes shot down or the number of people safely evacuated across the English Channel?

What about our schools? Will we again go through what we did before the last World War? Will we shorten school terms, overcrowd our classrooms, pay teachers less, and cut down on equipment? Will we again have teachers fearful of teaching the history and geography of foreign countries lest they be discharged as members of the "fifth column"? Will we again teach hymns of hate and cut from our music courses the works of some of the great masters?

Another concern. What about paying for this preparedness program? Are we going to go into this vast financing program without overhauling our money system? No wonder certain financial interests are strong for the program. As to the tax source. Will the load be saddled on the consumer and those least able to pay? Or will we tax securities now exempt, high incomes, and excess profits coming as a result of the preparedness program? We of the progressive bloc have bills providing for the last-mentioned tax program, but as yet are unable to get them out of committee.

Yes, I am concerned about the effect of this war on our people, even before it ever reaches the stage of threatening to take us in. The entire picture is already changing. It is doing something to us. Something to our people. Even the tone of my mail is undergoing a change and a Congressman's mail is always a good barometer as to the thinking of the people.

Friends, I don't want this little talk with you to be construed as objecting to a program of physical preparation against a possible invader. As I stated before I feel it would be national suicide to ignore this important precaution. The object of this thinking out loud with you is to get all to see the picture as I see it developing in the Nation's Capitol. We can all do our part to keep conditions as nearly normal as possible. Let us insist that there shall be no black-out in the rights and privileges guaranteed under the constitution to all our people. If democracy is to

continue in the United States, we must protect it at every turn. We cannot preserve it by destroying it bit by bit. Keep your letters rolling in to your Congressmen stressing this point and demanding no entry into the world war.

Perhaps next Thursday I will discuss the war itself in its more direct relation to us. Will you be with me?

Dr. Robert R. Moton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL REFERENCES TO DEATH OF DR. ROBERT RUSSA MOTON

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials which comment upon the death of Dr. Robert Russa Moton, who succeeded Booker T. Washington as president of Tuskegee Institute and who served for 19 years in that capacity. I have selected these editorials from the pages of the New York Times, the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., and the Birmingham Age-Herald, of Birmingham, Ala. They speak eloquently of the career of this unselfish, devoted figure, who sought always to create better understanding and an increased racial tolerance.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1940]

DR. MOTON

Dr. Robert R. Moton is dead, but the idea of education to which, as president of Tuskegee Institute, he gave 19 years of his life goes on. Emanating from the mind of General Armstrong, whose objective was "to teach the Negro to lift labor out of drudgery and toil by putting thought and skill into it," continued and developed by Booker T. Washington, consolidated by Dr. Moton and guided today by Dr. F. D. Patterson, the program, while making normal adjustments to keep courses in line with current events, still falls within the original pattern. "We shall prosper," said Booker Washington, "in proportion as we learn to glorify and dignify labor and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life."

In this continuity Dr. Moton's work will live. But in the passing of the man himself, "calm, unostentatious, unpresuming," with his great qualities of mind and heart, Dr. Moton's friends and all members of the Negro race must feel a deep spiritual and human loss. It will be met by a people who under the Tuskegee idea "found a way to industry, integrity, and thrift," and they will meet it with that fidelity of which Dr. Moton spoke at the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial 18 years ago Memorial Day. "No group in all our country has been so loyal," he said. "Whether bond or free, the Negro has served alike his country's need."

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1940]

DR. MOTON

There are many famous names which must be mentioned in any definitive history of the Negro race in America, and among the number that of Robert Russa Moton should be included. He was the protégé of Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee Institute and succeeded him as president there is 1915. But he also was closely associated with the pioneer work at Hampton, where he had the guidance of Brig. Gen. Samuel Chapman Armstrong and of the Reverend Dr. Hollis Burke Frissell. From these friends, as well as from the most gifted and distinguished leader of his own people, he acquired a practical philosophy for the advancement of the colored community in the United States.

"You and I," Dr. Moton told his students, "belong to an undeveloped, backward race that is rarely for its own sake taken into account in the adjustment of man's relation to man, but is considered largely with reference to the impression which it makes upon the dominant Anglo-Saxon. The question which the Nation must face, and the Negro as a part of the Nation, must soberly and dispassionately consider, is the mutual, social, civic, and industrial adjustment of two races, differing widely in characteristics and diverse in physical peculiarities, but alike suspicious and alike jealous and more or less prejudiced each toward the other. I believe that, unless democracy is a failure, it is entirely practicable for the white and the black races of America to develop side by side, in mutual helpfulness toward each other, each making its own contributions to the wealth and culture of our beloved country."

This surely is an honorable doctrine. From it vast good already has come. No other race anywhere, at any time, has made more rapid or more convincing progress in health, wealth, culture, spiritual evolution. It is evidence of the essential strength and vigor of the African stock in the New World that it has prospered, and it likewise is testimony to the elemental liberality of the white majority that its growth has been aided so generously and so consistently.

Dr. Moton was a bridge between his people and their neighbors. He will be remembered by both groups for his services to the ideals which they share.

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald of June 5, 1940]

ROBERT R. MOTON

The people of Alabama, white and black, unite with a vast company extending throughout the land in grateful homage to the good and greatly useful life of Robert R. Moton. Dr. Moton, the successor of Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee Institute and for 19 years its president, died last Friday night at his home in Gloucester County, Va. He had been forced by ill health to retire from active work at Tuskegee in 1934.

Robert R. Moton was descended from a member of an African tribe who was captured by the chief of other tribesmen and at length sold as a slave in Virginia.

This great man's mother and father were slaves. He himself was born on a Virginia plantation in 1867 just after slavery had been abolished.

It is said that members of the family in which his mother and father served encouraged young Moton to further his education. He enrolled in Hampton Institute, at Hampton, Va., in 1885 and was graduated in 1890. It was from Hampton that Booker Washington had been graduated and it was through Hampton that Dr. Moton's long and close friendship with Dr. Washington developed.

After his graduation young Moton had remained at the institute and soon became commandant of cadets. Sharing Dr. Washington's views on educational and racial problems, Dr. Moton became a protégé of the pioneer leader and long was associated with him in his lecture tours and other work.

It was in 1915, following the death of Dr. Washington, that Dr. Moton was chosen for the presidency of Tuskegee.

In addressing his students at that time, he said: "I believe that, unless democracy is a failure, it is entirely practicable for the white and black races of America to develop side by side in mutual helpfulness toward each other, each making its own contributions to the wealth and culture of our beloved country."

Dr. Moton's whole life, emerging from the shadow of slavery, was devoted to the service of that ideal and to a lofty exemplification of wise ways of advancing its realization.

He believed that the two races could go forward together. He saw his deep faith justified in notable and successive forward steps in racial relations. He himself was one of the foremost contributors to that heartening progress.

Here in Alabama, of course, there is special recognition of his service, widespread sorrow over his passing, because it was in this State that much of his most significant work was done. He valiantly and steadfastly carried forward his labors at Tuskegee despite the poor health which at length compelled his retirement.

He sought his great goals ever through the means of understanding, good will, and cooperation. His high accomplishments as a mighty testimony both to the man and his methods.

The President's Address at the University of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time merely to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] who made the statement a moment ago that President Roosevelt, in his address last night, had "declared war against the world." The President did nothing of the kind. The President is trying to prepare this country to defend itself. If he expressed his indignation last night at what took place in Italy yesterday, I am constrained to say that he expressed the indignation that is felt by the people of this country; but that was not a declaration of war. [Applause.]

The President realizes his responsibilities. He and the American people resent with indignation seeing a nation pounce upon a helpless country when it is down, or seeing the leader of a nation, when he thinks the battle is won, move in, or swoop down like a vulture, to feast upon the remains. [Applause.]

With reference to the adjournment of Congress, I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] that I am willing to stay here just as long as it is necessary; and I believe a great majority of the Members on our side of the House feel the same way about it.

You Members who think the President was severe in his statements last night should read the following editorial from this morning's New York Times:

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1940]

MUSSOLINI AT WAR

With the courage of a jackal at the heels of a bolder beast of prey, Mussolini has now left his ambush. His motives in taking Italy into the war against the Allies are as clear as day. He wants to share in the spoils which he believes will fall to Hitler, and he has chosen to enter the war at the precise moment when he thinks that he can accomplish this at the least cost and risk to himself. This is the end of all these weeks and months of hesitation, all this eager watching, all this cautious sniffing of the air, all this splendid courage held in leash so carefully for some sure sign of the weakness of the victim. Fascismo marches when it thinks that it smells carrion.

It is questionable whether any other statesman in our time has done a greater wrong to his own people. For it is the overwhelming testimony of those who know Italy best that, given a free choice, uninfluenced by the gigantic official propaganda to which they have been subjected, the Italian people would have chosen to remain at peace. It is true that they dislike Britain. It is equally true that they believe themselves to have been unfairly treated by the French. But they have a cultural unity with France that is more profound than all political disagreements. In their traditions, their manner of thinking, their heritage of law and culture, they are part of that western European world of which France is a part—and of which the Nazi Germany of Hitler has never been, and could never be, a part. Even in the case of the British, their dislike is certainly no greater—it is in many ways considerably less, since it is not compounded with the same fear of a great alien power at the Brenner Pass—than their instinctive dislike and distrust of the Germans.

Given a wiser leadership, given a clearer view ahead, given an opportunity to follow their own natural inclination and desires, the Italian people could readily have remained at peace. They could have been a stabilizing rather than a destructive force in Europe. They could have continued to serve as the custodians of western law and Latin culture. They could have conserved their strength to help build a new order on the smoking ruins of a broken world.

Unfortunately this was not to be. By every artifice of propaganda, by every pressure that dictatorship can bring to bear, by every goad he could apply, Mussolini led the Italian people away from peace, away from the position of respect which they could have held so easily, away from their own best interests. For it does not seem believable that participation in this war can be in Italy's best interests. It does not seem believable that the people of Italy can profit from this cynical adventure into which they have been led. It does not seem believable that out of it can come gains for them great enough to compensate for the losses they must suffer, morally and materially. It is possible, in the event of a final German victory, that they will be awarded the jackal's share of the killer's spoils; it is much more likely that the killer, having slain his prey, will turn upon the jackal. It is still more likely—it is certain—that in the event of a German defeat and the destruction of the Nazi system Italy will find herself at the war's end friendless, bankrupt, and dishonored.

If there was ever a decision made by one man, and not by a whole people, it is the decision that now takes Italy into the darkness of night and makes her a moral enemy of every democratic people. If that decision had to be made, if the Italian people had to be led upon this tragic course, it is at least fortunate, from our own domestic point of view, that the decision was made by a dictator and not by his people. For there are great numbers of Americans of Italian ancestry—fine, loyal citizens of the Nation which they or their forebears adopted as their own—who can in all justice lay the responsibility for this crime at the door of Hitler's accomplice, a traitor to the true interests of his country.

Acquisition of Island Outposts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WILMINGTON (N. C.) STAR

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the form of an editorial from the columns of the Wilmington Morning Star of Wilmington, N. C., issue of Saturday, June 8, 1940, entitled "These Outposts Needed."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (N. C.) Star of June 8, 1940]

THESE OUTPOSTS NEEDED

The time is appropriate and even pressing for the United States to contemplate the advisability of acquiring Dutch, French, and British islands and continental possessions in the Western Hemisphere as a defense measure.

A gracious thing for France and Britain to do, in the circumstances, would be to cede theirs without delay. As for the Dutch, the Government of Holland is still functioning in England and its decisions would command respect. A sale to this country could not well be put aside.

The strategic value of these lands is shown by a glance at the map. British, Dutch, and French Guiana are at the eastern tip of Venezuela. The Windward and the Leeward Islands, under British and French flags, stretch northward above Trinidad, a British isle, off the northeast Caribbean shore of Venezuela. Just above Venezuela are the Dutch West Indies. In the Caribbean off Cuba and southwest of Haiti, is Jamaica, a British possession. At the gooseneck of Mexico and Central America is British Honduras. With these areas under control of the United States, the Carribean and the Gulf of Mexico could be made safe against alien entry both on the water and by air. North of Cuba and perilously near Florida's toepoint are the Bahamas and Nassau. Further north in the Atlantic, almost directly off the North Carolina coast, is Bermuda. Their possession would be invaluable in event of attempted invasion. The Panama Canal, the southern Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf coast, would be protected if we possessed them and adequately equipped them with naval, military, and air bases.

So far as France and England are concerned, relinquishment of their possessions would go a long way to discharge their unpaid war debts and establish credits so greatly needed now for the purchase of war needs. Holland has nothing to lose and much to gain by a sale.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS was laughed at when he proposed acquiring even a part of these lands. War, then, was an academic theory in most minds.

REYNOLDS was charged with imperialism. But recent events in Europe have turned men's minds to thoughts of an American invasion and provisions for its prevention. How better could we prevent it, in addition to building impregnable continental defenses, than by extending our defense lines to these outposts? It is a matter the Federal authorities ought to include in the program for making America safe for all time now being drafted.

Fixing the Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the current number of the United States News, fixing the responsibility for the present condition of our national defense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News of June 14, 1940]

FIXING THE BLAME—WHY WASN'T AMERICA TOLD OF THE INADEQUACY OF HER DEFENSES? WHAT DID POLITICS HAVE TO DO WITH OUR COURSE? THE PRESIDENT SHOULD RENOUNCE A THIRD TERM AND PUT AMERICA ON A WAR BASIS FOR DEFENSE

(By David Lawrence)

American public opinion has shifted so rapidly in the last few weeks that many observers regard the change as phenomenal. But it isn't. The change from a state of indifferent isolation to a state of alert awareness of the dangers that face American security is the result of a simple and natural process—the conquest of fallacy by truth.

For several years now we have been fed fantastic propaganda about the origin of war. Sincere though misguided men among us, so-called liberals have been insisting that only munitions makers bring on wars. Or else the contention has been seriously advanced that profiteers contrive in diabolical ways to involve our sons in war.

The blame for the present plight of France and Britain must be placed on those statesmen who refused to face the truth and

to drive fallacy to the wall. We in America contributed our share to the debacle. Even the Senate of the United States by its widely publicized munitions investigation gave credence to the doctrine that munitions making makes wars. All over the world the charges and counter charges were exploited. And what was the result? The democracies including ourselves stifled the making of munitions by private industry and coincidentally failed to build up the Government plants which were urged so eloquently as the proper alternative.

What powder-making factories do we have today? We haven't a first-class plant available to make munitions. We have been misled just as were the British and French before 1937. It takes a long time to build up a supply of munitions and to develop the technique of munition making. Only last week a few of the "educational orders" designed to give private industry the stimulus for an expanding production were let by our Government. This should have been done 2 and 3 years ago.

INDIFFERENCE TO SECURITY IS INEXCUSABLE

The same group of men who smeared the private munitions makers smeared also a President of the United States on the ground that he dragged America into war to protect our credits and trade. This libel on the character of Woodrow Wilson was widely disseminated so as to bolster the theory that wars are made for gain and not for the defense of ideals or human liberty.

Public opinion became antiwar but at the same time public opinion became antidefense. Indifference to security is inexcusable. The names of the men who have been responsible for failing to permit America's defenses to be built up should be written plainly on the tablets of American history so that this generation may know who it was that conceived the plot to weaken the war defenses of democratic nations.

BLAME FOR OUR UNPREPAREDNESS MUST BE FIXED

It is not too late to institute an inquiry into what influences were at work in the United States between 1934 and 1940 to sap the economic vitality of the Nation on the production side and to frustrate the granting of the requests of the Army and the Navy for new weapons and adequate supplies.

The blame for unpreparednes must be fixed and fixed soon. America today has very few airplanes, hardly any mechanized weapons for the Army's use, and not enough transports or patrol vessels to take care of contingencies on our long sea coasts. Why have our defenses been neglected?

Certainly the facts about the world situation have been known to our Government. Our military and naval intelligence representatives abroad have told their superior officers in Washington for 3 years just what Germany has been doing. President Roosevelt has had detailed reports from diplomatic representatives of the United States stationed in foreign capitals. The danger that faced the democracies has been well known to the President. Why did he fail to tell the American people so that the Congress would respond by appropriating the necessary sums to build up our airplane industry for defense purposes?

The most commonly advanced explanation is that if Mr. Roosevelt had attempted to arouse the nation, he would have been called a "warmonger" and that he would have been refused by Congress the grants of funds. But this is no answer. Leadership based on revelation of the facts may fail temporarily, but if the debate is begun soon enough truth will in time prevail.

What would have happened had Mr. Roosevelt tried in January 1937 to advise the people of the United States of the need for enlarged defenses? He might have been balked by public opinion for the time being but if it were clear to the people that Mr. Roosevelt wanted nothing for himself, that he had no third term ambitions, the people would have accepted his argument as a disinterested expression.

Mr. Roosevelt even in 1938 and 1939 had nothing to lose by urging preparedness—nothing except possibly a third term. And many a fair-minded person will say that as between a political loss for oneself and the development of a policy which in the long run looks to the protection of the people against foreign aggression, the doubt should have been resolved in favor of an uncompromising campaign for national defense.

Ambition has ruined many a statesman in history. Consideration of self has beclouded the vision of many a would-be leader of democracy. Conversely, the heroes of centuries of human achievement have been men who have cast aside all thought of self in the sacrifices that bring spiritual rather than material compensations.

We are on the verge of war. No man can foretell how soon we will realize that all democracy faces a threat of extinction and that we must recognize a state of war exists now against our own democracy. These are not times when wars are declared. They simply happen overnight and only the democracies insist on taking time for the formalities while the aggressors bomb airdromes and render defenses impotent.

The President's duty is very plain. He must sacrifice his political ambitions for the good of the Nation. He might well consider the recommendation to the Congress of a program putting America immediately on a war basis. At the same moment the President ought to announce that he will respect the American tradition and refuse to run for a third term.

NATIONAL UNITY CANNOT BE BUILT ON DISTRUST

A change in the presidency is not likely to cause any dislocation in industry especially if Mr. Roosevelt will appoint now or give power to men already appointed to accelerate the industrial production of the Nation for defense. Whether another Democrat is chosen—and there are many capable leaders in the Democratic Party—or whether the country chooses a Republican, the fact remains that at this of all times democracy must prove the worth of its institutions. In the middle of a critical period, Britain changed prime ministers last month and so did France.

If America is to go into war, it must be with a leadership that is freed from the handicaps that would face a third-term President. National unity cannot be built upon foundations of distrust. And unhappily industry today does not feel that the President is as concerned about the national defense as he should be or else he would not be temporizing with advisory councils and insisting on maintaining the restrictions and barriers that have hamstrung industry for the last 7 years.

ALL POLITICAL AMBITIONS MUST BE SACRIFICED

Mr. Roosevelt cannot do the job of directing industrial operations himself. He must delegate authority and do so promptly. He must also tell the people the truth about the need for a modification in the restrictions imposed by the New Deal on business management and industrial production. If this is not done, it will be said with emphasis on every side that the administration is more interested in saving the New Deal than in saving America.

To attain the desired end—national unity—the third-term issue must be disposed of by the President himself. To refuse a third-term nomination would, to be sure, disappoint the selfish politicians and parasites who infest Washington and who have imposed long enough on the good nature of a generous-minded President.

But to refuse a third term would put the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt alongside that of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. The excuse of a war emergency, offered by the proponents of a third term, is a shallow one. To surrender the democratic process in the face of a challenge to democracy itself is to misconstrue the innate capacity of the American people to govern themselves and to give their lives and their properties for an ideal.

The time has come for men in public life to raise the quality of statesmanship by sacrificing the political ego for the common good. Only by such an example can the thousands of men young and old in our midst be encouraged to make the supreme sacrifice of self. For such sacrifices will have to be made if the women and children in our cities are to be protected from the bombs that can be so readily dropped by aircraft operating from nearby ocean bases left unprotected by the defeat of Britain and France.

Will America learn the lesson of her neglect of defenses of these last few years or will historians fix the blame for America's downfall on the blindness and selfishness of her political leaders of today?

Unemployment and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PIUS L. SCHWERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT AND YOUTH

Mr. SCHWERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege for me to join with the unemployment-conference group of the House of Representatives during the past 3 months. This group was divided into various subcommittees, and I was assigned to the Committee to Study Unemployment in its Relation to Youth. Our subcommittee submitted its report some time ago. Many of our suggestions have already been undertaken; but I believe the report of the subcommittee to be well worth the study of every Member of the House, and I therefore append hereto the report of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and Youth which we submitted to the whole Unemployment Conference Committee.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND YOUTH

We of the Committee on Unemployment and Youth believe that keeping the youth of our Nation engaged in some regular activity is one of the most important questions of the day. Check-ups on the matter of unemployed youth indicate that young persons between the ages of 16 to 24, who are out of school, able to work, and desirous of obtaining employment, but unable to find it, constitute about one-third of the total youth population. This unemployed group seems to be almost equally divided between girls and boys. About one-fifth were found to be under 18, two-fifths between 18 and 20, and two-fifths from 21 to 24 years of age. About a quarter of the group had left school at completion of the eighth grade and a fifth on graduation from high school. The unemployed young persons who had never had work had a better education,

measured in terms of school-grade attainment, than the others who were without jobs. The unemployed youth had been out of school from a few months to 10 years or more. Almost all who had never had work, and a large proportion of the others, had left school at a time when they were faced with the fact of scant likelihood of their getting a job. Even so, 75 percent of them had left without completing high school. As far as this group is concerned, it seems likely therefor that programs emphasizing a return to school for regular high-school or college courses would be acceptable in a very few cases.

One of the first matters to be considered for the youth and its engagement in some activity would naturally be the question of education and the guidance of our youth. It is our belief that in times of economic stress more, rather than less, education is needed. We therefore agree with the report of the Educational Policies Commission in many of its recommendations. We believe that every American child should receive a minimum of 10 years of education, said education to include the fundamentals and in addition some instruction in mechanics and mechanical skills. Having made 10 years of education the minimum, we desire to report that we agree with the New York State suggestion, which was that education should continue to that age where a boy or girl can get a job and keep it. This would entail possibly 15 years of education, and it should be arranged so as to give our youth more vocational guidance and business training than they are today receiving. Any child needing financial assistance to secure the 10-year minimum education should receive that help, whether it be in the nature of transportation, medical care, food, shoes, or any services of that kind. In addition any child showing capability to use further training to good advantage should receive similar assistance to proceed beyond the 10-year minimum to the 15 years above mentioned.

We have naturally considered and worked for the field covered by the N. Y. A., which has been of such great assistance during recent years in the matter of keeping our youth in school. We believe that this assistance should be continued—that it makes our youth appreciate the value of an education, at the same time teaching them to use their hands in support of themselves. These N. Y. A. grants are of great value in the conservation of human resources. The boys and girls that receive this training are the leaders we must have for the future. Cooperative part-time programs in diversified occupations in connection with education should be established in more of our communities; and it must be remembered that the Government is already advancing a part of the money needed in this type of work. We believe that the Government should give whatever grants-in-aid are needed to enable the States to provide adequate education to all the children of our land.

The C. C. C. is another governmental project which our committee heartily endorses for the benefit of the youth of the country. It takes these lads off the street corners, out of pool halls and other places of that type. It allows them to receive the benefits of regular hours of eating and sleeping, as well as the advantages of outdoor life. While thus assisting them physically it accomplishes improvements for the community in which any camp is located and allows these lads to assist in the support of their families. Our suggested changes for the C. C. C. would be to have certain camps include a specified number of hours per week for military training and to have other camps devote a specified number of hours each week to vocational training, the choice in each case to be made by the enrollee.

Turning to the farm: Organizations such as the 4–H clubs and cooperative groups of that nature, to properly instruct our youth along agricultural lines, aid all youth interested in agriculture. Here again we must call attention to the fact that wages that can be paid by the farmer cannot be compared with those paid by industry. Thus it is only natural that many of our younger people frown on farm work, forgetting the fact in many cases that they are benefited by the outdoor employment and, what is more important, that their employment usually includes their keep (board, room, laundry, on any other sort of job are, indeed, big items). In view of the special character of the agricultural problem the committee feels that measures should be taken toward organizing general and vocational education for young agricultural workers. This could be handled very well in the schools of the rural districts. And the committee also feels that the Government should encourage the creation and development of agricultural cooperatives.

With the personnel and employment managers of industry requesting and demanding skilled labor for the past 10 years or more it was only natural that there would come a time when no more skilled labor would be available. I know from personal experience that for many years these employment managers have been asking for a certain type of worker, with so many years' experience, and that they were not willing to take any mechanically inclined youngster, or one who had had vocational training, as an apprentice. For this reason we have now reached the point above named, and the Youth Committee believes that the real means of furnishing this Nation with skilled labor is now through the medium of the youth. We, therefore, favor the installing of every possible phase of vocational training in our schools, in the N. Y. A. program, and in the C. C. C. camps, to assist in properly supplying us with youth who have a foundation and who with a little additional experience would rapidly become skilled laborers. There was a time in the past when an applicant for a position was appreciative of his opportunity of serving as apprentice at a somewhat lower wage than others in the plant. This same applicant in those days advanced along the line until after about 4 years he was rated as a mechanic or as a skilled laborer rather than as an apprentice, and his wages were treated accordingly. During recent years there has been no apprenticeship in most plants, and youth entering industry has demanded the same pay as the skilled workers in that industry. This should be broken down, and apprenticeship should be properly and justly handled so as to assist in bringing about a proper number of skilled laborers. The next step would naturally be to have industry cooperate and use these lads who have taken vocational training at various places, giving them an opportunity of putting their training into practical usage. We believe that this would not only assist the youth unemployment question, but at the same time it would assist industry; and there would not be a shortage of skilled labor. The only other method would be by regulation of apprenticeship, such as above referred to as being in existence some years ago.

Our recommendations therefore are:

1. A minimum of 10 years' education and raising the school-leaving age to 16 years of age, at the same time prohibiting employment of children under 16 years of age.
2. Continued education for children showing capability to use same to good advantage, to a point reaching 15 years of education.
3. Financial assistance to children needing same during these years of education.
4. Establishment of cooperative, part-time programs in diversified occupations in various communities.
5. Continuance of the N. Y. A. and the giving by the Government of grants-in-aid needed to enable States to provide above adequate education to all the children of our land.
6. C. C. C. camps to include a specified number of hours per week both for military training and for vocational training—choice to be made by the enrollee.
7. Measures toward organizing general and vocational education for young agricultural workers.
8. The Government to encourage the creation and development of agricultural cooperatives.
9. Further development of vocational education.
10. Regulation of apprenticeship, providing (1) regular promotion of apprentices, (2) progressive increase in wages, (3) adjustment of number of apprentices to trained workers in the same enterprise, and (4) recognition of the principle of equal pay for equal work.

We believe that a careful study of all of the above recommendations will meet with the approval of the entire membership of the Unemployment Committee of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted.

PIUS L. SCHWERT, *Secretary.*

An Appeal to the Conscience of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS E. BURKE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An Appeal to the Conscience of America," by Thomas E. Burke, who is the general secretary-treasurer of an organization of skilled workers known as the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States and Canada. This article was published in the official organ of the Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters for June 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters Journal for June 1940]

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA

(By Thomas E. Burke)

Western civilization today is confronted with the gravest crisis in its history. What appeared at first to be the outbreak of a second World War has now become a vast nihilistic revolution. Its leaders are a fanatical group of irresponsible dictators, using all of the vast powers of modern science and machine to achieve their goal. The objective of this revolution is not only the destruction of the liberty of free peoples and small nations, but, also, the annihilation of religion, culture, and those concepts about the dignity of man which underlie the modern world and give meaning to life.

This scourge of ruthless destruction is sweeping over Europe like an uncontrolled forest fire. It shifts now this way or that with

every change of wind. But today even the wind is not left to chance; it is manipulated by a propaganda of hatred and base deception, culminating in such activities as the so-called "fifth column" penetration. Daily it is becoming clearer that the struggle which is now raging is not between the Allies—England and France—and the Nazis, but rather it is a death struggle between civilization and barbarism. No one who believes in a God-centered world, in the inviolate dignity of the individual and the right of people to govern themselves, can contemplate without deep apprehension the progressive envelopment of even one small nation under a condition of anarchy.

Mankind stands appalled at every succeeding act of revolutionary might. Civilized nations refrain from descending to such counter acts of destruction which imitate the ruthlessness of these nihilistic dictators. For these men and their deeds stand condemned before the bar of public opinion. A catalog of their actions is a record of disaster.

They have ruthlessly and cruelly destroyed one small nation after another and placed them under the oppressive hand of the monster's yoke.

They have prevented the members of an ancient race from worshipping God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

They have desecrated the churches, seminaries, and religious orders of one great branch of the Christian church in lands now under their domination.

They have closed the schools and colleges of peaceful people under their domination lest the truth prevail.

They have destroyed the great labor movements and cooperative societies that brought great beneficial results to the workers, both from a political and economic standpoint for over a hundred years. They have destroyed those that opposed them and placed thousands of suspects in concentration camps to starve and die.

They have incited domestic insurrection within the borders of peaceful nations and used such insurrection as an excuse for invasion.

They have ruthlessly invaded the ancient kingdoms of Denmark and Norway by treason and treachery. And have previously invaded, like a thief in the night, the progressive Republics of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland, and now as we go to press these cowardly monsters have invaded the peaceful and progressive kingdoms of Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg with their deadly weapons of destruction and without a moment's notice. The murderous villany of these reptiles, these insane madmen, has never been equaled in all human history. They and their hirelings and sympathizers must be destroyed, or they will destroy every priceless treasure of progress and liberty that has taken thousands of years to secure. They have made the Gestapo, the concentration camp, and the firing squad the kind of rule that they will impose on all they bring under subjection.

Today America, the greatest and most powerful neutral in the world, stands upon the threshold of an historic decision. She cannot avoid making a decision at this time upon which the destiny of the world will largely depend. The destruction of one neutral after the other is a threat to all neutrals. But more than that many of these small neutrals had the temerity to rely on their traditional neutrality in the belief that America would never let freedom down or desert the moral rights of small nations to self-determination.

The wanton destruction of life and property has now so shocked the moral conscience of man everywhere that from all corners of our land there has come a ground swell of public demand that America dare to speak and act in this hour of grave crisis in behalf of human destiny and civilized intercourse between nations. America is called at this hour to defend their spirit of brotherhood among peoples of all races, creeds, and nations that are now being attacked by insidious propaganda and hatred.

No sane person believes that this nihilistic revolution is the considered or collected will of the German people; it is rather the objective of a small group of irresponsible usurpers and buccaneers who have seized control of the military power of an ancient people. They are prepared to use the military power not only to oppress and terrify their neighbors, but to terrify and suppress all who protest within the state.

Our appeal then to the conscience of America rises above any political divisions or narrow partisanship; it springs from the pressure of no group or class in our society; it rests upon no race, creed, or color. Rather, it represents the inherent tradition and spirit of freedom-loving pioneers who made this country a land of liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal in the sight of God.

It comes from American labor that loves this land and its great traditions and knows history and the stupendous sacrifices made in bloodshed and untold suffering endured down through the centuries by mankind and especially the common people, to bring to us the democratic way of life and the freedom and liberty we enjoy today. And which are the basic fundamental principles on which our great movement is founded to maintain and preserve them in perpetuity, no matter what the cost in blood and treasure. We would not be worthy of the name of men if we allowed this great legacy of liberty and freedom, so dearly bought by the heroes and martyrs who gave their lives to secure it and passed it on to us to perpetuate, if we failed in our duty to preserve it for ourselves and posterity.

Therefore, in this hour of deepening world crisis that has upset the peace and tranquillity of all peoples and our own in particular, it is a duty we owe to them to dare to have a purpose firm and dare to make it known.

First, it is our belief, based on common sense, that the Congress of the United States should take such constructive action immediately as will make it possible for our country to defend our ideals of civil liberty and government resting upon consent against any attack from within or without.

Second, that the Congress of the United States should provide the fullest measure of economic cooperation for the Allies, other than war, so that we may play our part in putting an end to international anarchy.

Third, that the Congress of the United States should provide the fullest measure of economic cooperation to all of the nations of the world as soon as this nihilistic revolution has been ended and the civilized rights of all peoples are restored and government by law is substituted once again for a government by violence in the world.

At such a time in the world and in the face of such a situation, perhaps the gravest that we have faced in centuries, it would not reflect either the spirit or the genius of labor did we not express our convictions and appeal to the conscience of our great country to look forward across the horizon, not behind, to take account of its responsibilities as the most powerful neutral in the world, and then determine what course of action will best assure the perpetuation of the democratic way of America and also give aid and support to those who are valiantly committed to that way, in whatever part of the world they may dwell.

Pay-Up Day Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, when I look at the tax bill we have before us today, it is obvious the American people need not speculate any longer as to just when pay-up day will come, because it is here right now in this bill, and more to come, I fear.

This bill alone will extract in the next 5 years an estimated $7,000,000,000, which will in the final analyses come from the pockets of the real backbone citizens of this country, mostly from the pockets of the farmers, laborers, and small-business men, who are already burdened almost to the limit.

This $7,000,000,000 will in the main leave the channels of trade so far as its circulating value is concerned, as all tax dollars do, thereby affecting the whole economic business and financial structure of our Nation, which in itself has the most detrimental effect on national defense for which this very taxing bill is supposed to provide funds with which to buy, especially since the great planners and spenders have already almost bankrupted our Treasury with a deficit of $48,000,000,000 staring us in the face within a few short months.

Of course this bill will pass just as it was written by the New Deal powers, because it has been brought to the House under the gag rule, in other words, it is "take it or leave it." What else can any Member of Congress do now but to vote for it, because we want defense, and plenty of it. But you know and I know and the American people know that if this administration had made good use of the $7,000,000,000 they have spent for national defense the last several years, there would be very little necessity or reason for passing this tax bill today had our President and his servants refrained from meddling in the quarrels of other nations, as has been their practice for years.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, here is a case where the innocent must suffer with the guilty, we must all swallow this bitter pill, prescribed by a doctor who has proven he cannot handle our case. Let us hope and pray that even though his medicine will not cure our economic ills that at least it will not destroy our fine American youth on the field of battle.

Defense and Preparedness Revenue Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, while it is never a pleasant duty to enact measures providing for taxation for the raising of revenue, yet we all know that it is necessary that such be done when an occasion or circumstances arise that require it.

The suggestion made to the Congress by President Roosevelt calling for a program of national preparedness and for the furnishing of revenue to defray the expenses thereof unquestionably is proper and a commendable move, especially is this true in view of the conditions existing at the present time throughout the world.

International banditry is stalking the world, and it is indeed wise that the United States is taking appropriate steps to protect our own American people from any assault or invasion. This is a time when the people of the United States should be as much united as possible, and it is the duty of all American citizens to stand loyally by and cooperate in that which is for the best interest of our people and our Government. This is no time for people to put their party above the Government's interest. In normal times no one should find any particular fault with what might be considered normal criticism.

In the main, Republicans as well as Democrats are willing and anxious to cooperate with President Roosevelt as Commander in Chief of our country, but there are some who cannot refrain apparently from sniping at the President, harping and criticizing almost every move he makes. Some Republican politicians have criticized President Roosevelt, saying that our country should have been better prepared before this. While I have always favored and shall continue to favor all adequate measures calculated and intended and necessary to make our country positively safe from any attack from whatever source, I do not blame President Roosevelt nor the American people, because no one apparently anywhere expected a madman to unleash himself in such bitter fury against every nation almost with which they come in contact.

I recall very well that during the administration of the Republican Party, which was in power from March 4, 1921, until March 4, 1933, some things happened to weaken the strength of our governmental defense. While I am not criticizing any Republican President, as I am confident he and his party did what they believed to be best at the time, but it was during President Calvin Coolidge's administration when the Republican Party was entirely in control of the management of our Government, they scrapped 30 of the United States Government fighting ships and sent them to the bottom of the sea. The same were valued at $279,256,000 and were made a total waste. So the Republican leadership in one fell swoop sunk $279,256,000. Now our Government, under President Roosevelt, is compelled to replace these, and Congress is required to enact legislation to provide the revenue in order to pay for these replacements and build our Navy and air forces and other defense forces more strongly than ever before. So those who criticize President Roosevelt for not being more prepared at this time do so for political reasons. Nothing that President Roosevelt could recommend or do would meet their approval, but they do not say anything about these 30 naval vessels that they sunk in the seas. Would it not have been better even if the United States Government at the time desired to get rid of any of these fighting vessels for them to have been sold to some smaller or minor nation and put the money received therefrom into the United States Treasury? Suppose, for instance, small nations like Holland and Belgium, neither of which has wronged anyone in this generation, and yet they have been ruthlessly trampled upon and without justification or reasonable cause. Their civilians have even been ruthlessly murdered. Anyway, these 30 vessels which under President Coolidge's administration were mostly sent to the bottom of the sea, could have been sold for many millions of dollars, and had that been done it would have made it unnecessary to raise the amount of revenue that is now required.

Files of the American Potash and Chemical Co. Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of the column of the Washington Merry-Go-Round. This insertion had to do with the files of the American Potash and Chemical Co. case. On May 10, the Merry-Go-Round again discusses this subject.

In order that injustice be done no one, and that the record be complete, I am inserting in the RECORD today the May 10 article. The article follows:

NOTE.—The Washington Merry-Go-Round is in receipt of a photostatic copy of a letter from Charles Fahy, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, stating that while the files of a case in which Edmund Toland, counsel of the House investigating committee, had previously been connected, had been secured by one of Toland's aides, they had been returned that same day and now are intact in the possession of the N. L. R. B.

If Congress Quits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from today's issue of the Washington Post:

IF CONGRESS QUITS—EMERGENCY NEEDS
(By Mark Sullivan)

About Congress, the question is: Should it go home next week, as Mr. Roosevelt wishes, or should it remain here, with perhaps recesses of a few days at a time, such as would accommodate Congressmen who wish to attend the national conventions of the two parties?

The most obvious argument for Congress remaining here runs thus: Emergencies are certain to arise. They cannot be foreseen—they will spring up suddenly, out of turns the war in Europe will take, out of actions by the dictator governments of Europe. To these emergencies, our Government must adjust itself, and must do it instantly. As to many emergencies, the President does not have the power to act. He can only get the necessary power by action of Congress. If Congress is there, and if a step proposed by the President has general support, he can get the necessary power from Congress in a few hours.

If, on the other hand, Congress is not here, dangerous situations will arise, some emergency will have happened, action by our Government will be necessary. With Congress not here, there will be temptation upon the President to act without authority, to exceed his authority. That way lies distortion of our form of government. That may lies excessive expansion of Presidential power. That would be the path toward one-man government. That we do not want.

There is a third possibility, a third way of providing for the situation. It has not been suggested yet, at least not publicly.

But it is likely to be suggested. If the plan of having Congress go home makes headway, someone will make this proposal. The proposal will be that Congress, just before adjourning, pass a blanket resolution, conferring discretionary powers on the President. Then, as emergencies arise, with Congress away, the President could take such action as he wishes.

But that way, too, is the path toward expansion of Presidential power. That, too, would be a path toward one-man government. That we do not want.

What is so far said here is the most obvious argument for Congress remaining in Washington. It speaks for itself.

There is an additional argument for Congress remaining here, not so widely understood, but equally strong.

There has existed, during this administration, ever since its beginning, on the part of a group not large in numbers but strongly entrenched, an effort or desire or tendency to take the United States into a changed form of society. To give a name to what the new form would be, would run risk of inexactness and would excite disagreement. Some think that the new form, once brought about and operating, would ultimately not differ materially from communism. Some who would resent the word communism, would agree to the word socialism. The official term for the only Communist government existing in the world includes the word Socialist—the official name of Russia is "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

But to use either socialism or communism as the term for what some desire or anticipate in America, would run risk of inexactness. Also it would encounter the dialectical objections of those who believe in the new order. They would deny that the thing they wish is either socialism or communism.

There is a third word that might be used. The proposed new order could be called "collectivism." Hardly could the advocates of the new order deny that word as the description of it. If they should deny it, they could be refuted. Some of them have themselves used that word.

But let us dismiss all the words. Let us just say that there exists an attempt or wish or tendency to bring about a new order, which would include, among other features, a great increase of power for the Government over the individual. It would include also an immense centralization of power at Washington, and, within the centralization at Washington, an immense increase of power for the executive branch of Government.

That the new order is desired, or being attempted, or comes as a tendency, is common knowledge. It is taken for granted; offhand allusions are made to it. Evidence of it is in the records of investigations by committees of Congress.

To those who wish to bring about the new order, or who think the new order is desirable, or who think it inevitable in the present state of the world—to all such the war is opportunity and justification. In war, at any time, there is a strong tendency toward centralized power and toward one-man power. It was present during the Great War. It was practiced under President Wilson. But under Wilson it was practiced as an emergency condition only. Wilson, being a strong believer in our constitutional form of government and in individual freedom—Wilson, as soon as the war was over, surrendered all his war powers, turned back to Congress all the extraordinary power he had been granted.

The tendency toward centralization, and toward expansion of executive power, natural in time of war or defense against war, should be guarded. For guarding it, the presence of Congress in Washington is indispensable.

Adjournment Unthinkable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1940

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to adjourn the Congress is a proposal, in my judgment, which is utterly without justification. With Europe on fire, with momentous problems confronting us, decision in respect to which may affect the destiny of 120,000,000 Americans for years to come, the proper place for Congress is in Washington and not scattered in the 48 States of the Union. This sentiment is reflected in letters which all of us are receiving. It is reflected in editorial comment on a broad basis. I believe it to be the sentiment of the Nation as a whole. I trust that the Congress will not be placed in the position of abandoning its post of duty at this time of great emergency. The following excerpts from the recent pages of the Washington Post, New York Times, and Boston Herald are typical of newspaper comment in this connection:

[From the Washington Post]

SHOULD CONGRESS GO HOME?

Mr. Roosevelt is at this moment doing a strange thing. He makes it plain that he wants Congress to go home soon. To suggestions that Congress should merely adjourn for the national conventions, and return between and after the conventions, Mr. Roosevelt shows obvious dissent. His attitude is that Congress ought to go home after caring for a few pending measures. To make their going more justifiable, he has said that if need arises he will call them back.

Yet Mr. Roosevelt must know that any day, almost any hour, conditions will arise that will call upon him for action of the highest importance, and action, which in many cases he cannot take without new power from Congress. Mr. Roosevelt and the United States are obliged to adjust themselves from day to day to emergencies created by dictators—Hitler, whose summoning of his Reichstag is confined mainly to occasions when he wishes it to serve as background and stooges for a speech to the world; and Mussolini, whose parliamentary body sometime ago obligingly voted itself out of existence.

That, under these circumstances, Congress should be away from June until January is almost unthinkable.

* * * * * * *

It is inevitable that either (a) Mr. Roosevelt must get from Congress an enormous grant of discretionary power; or (b) Congress must remain in session to give him specific powers as need arises. Neither Congress nor the country is willing to give Mr. Roosevelt a great grant of discretionary power.

[From the New York Times]

CONGRESS MUST STAY

If the leaders of Congress have not abandoned in their own minds all expectation of an early adjournment, it is time for them to face the fact that the course of events and the interests of the American people simply do not permit of such action. At one of the most critical moments in the world's history, at a time when there is work to be done every day to strengthen the bulwarks of this democracy, it is unthinkable that the institution through which the will of the American people is expressed should shortly go into hibernation for a period of 7 months—subject only to the President's call to meet in special session—abandoning both its obligations and its opportunities.

It is the patriotic duty of Congress to remain in session now, for one reason, because the various defense measures already on its calendar must not receive slipshod attention in a hurried drive to get away from Washington. But that is only a beginning of the responsibilities of Congress. There will be other defense measures the need of which cannot now be foreseen but on which action will be imperative long before snow flies again and Congress meets next January. There is the increasingly critical problem of defense finances that ought to be met without delay; the wholly casual and inadequate "token tax" which is now in view must be supplemented with a far more adequate and more carefully considered tax program, and the sooner we begin the better. There is the need of a defense force which is adequate in manpower as well as matériel; the case for a democratic system of universal compulsory military training has now become overwhelming. Above all, in the great crises which lie ahead, in the dark hours that may bring news which will profoundly shock this country, it is proper that Congress should be continuously in session, so that it may share the responsibilities of the Executive and speak with the voice of the American people.

The right course of action is plainly to recess for the two conventions and then come back to work. That will be hot and uncomfortable. It will spoil many summer plans. But the American people have every right to expect patience, fidelity, and intelligence on the part of their chosen representatives in such a crisis as we face today.

[From the Boston Herald]

LET CONGRESS REMAIN

Whatever doubts there may have been about the advisability of having Congress remain in session, ready to deal properly and promptly with any issue which may arise, have disappeared in the last few days. There is terrific pressure on the White House from the people and our foreign spokesmen to take steps which would be equivalent to a declaration of war without the slightest necessity or provocation. Immediate aid to the Allies is essential, of course, but also essential is an absence of hot-headed action which would commit us irrevocably. There can be no better provision than an informed Congress, constantly on the alert, a Congress which would play somewhat the same part as the Parliaments of England and France, to which the leaders report periodically and to which the people look. The Republican Members of the House have formally declared for such a policy and no valid opposition to it has been voiced yet.

The President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as such he must exercise his discretion constantly. But we are not at war. There is no reason to believe that we cannot keep out of war while exercising our undisputed rights as a nonbelligerent. There is no compelling necessity for relaxing the safeguards against war, and one of the best of the protective devices is a Congress which, while not intruding on the Executive

department, will insist that its own prerogatives must not be ignored.

The extent to which Congress has cooperated with the President and, most of all, the speed with which it has legislated, are ample evidence that the Senators and Representatives will not hinder prompt action when promptness is imperative. Their desire to do everything to aid this Nation by aiding the Allies legitimately is not less than that of the President.

The people will feel less apprehensive if Congress sits in Washington just as long as the domestic effects of the war cannot be foreseen. The crisis may come in a few days or a few weeks or may be deferred for the rest of the year. But in any event, there will arise problems as momentous as any which have confronted us since Sumter was fired on or the South and the North laid down their arms. Decisions must be made which will affect our destiny for years to come. The open arena of Congress is the proper place for a deliberate discussion of them.

Anti-Third-Term Slogan—"If We Draft Roosevelt, Roosevelt Will Draft Us"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the newspapers were filled with reports of the fist fights which enlivened the State Democratic convention recently held in Texas, at which convention the delegates were pledged to the Honorable JACK GARNER for President.

It was rumored that these fist fights were held because some of the Jack Garner anti-third-term patriots erected in front of the convention hall a sign which stated, with more truth and bluntness than poetry or finesse, "If We Draft Roosevelt, Roosevelt Will Draft Us."

ALL MOTHERS WHO HAVE SONS OF MILITARY AGE, PLEASE NOTE

Confirmation of the truth of the slogan seems to be found in President Roosevelt's recent statement that he approved of an editorial in the New York Times calling for universal military training at this time under the force of conscription.

America Girds for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. MARVIN JONES OF TEXAS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. MARVIN JONES of Texas and broadcast over a coast-to-coast network of the National Broadcasting Co.'s blue network Friday, May 24:

In these days, when "there is war in the skies," it is amazing that an announced candidate for the Presidency of the United States should attempt to divert the attention of Americans from the grave danger that threatens democratic civilization. Senator Taft, in his speech at Topeka, Kans., on May 18, accused the New Deal of attempting to rivet attention on the war situation in order to divert attention from what the Republican candidate termed "its domestic failures." The people of America know that it is not the New Deal, as stated by Senator Taft, that compels our attention to the European situation, but the dreadful news by cable and radio that comes from Europe.

Republican Candidate Taft stated at Topeka, "Under the cover of war the New Deal domestic program is sneaking on." And this he said on the day following the thunderous response of the Congress of the United States to President Roosevelt's call to all Americans to grid ourselves to protect our liberty and the Nation. The Roosevelt recovery program has achieved a remarkable record of rebuilding, conserving, and improving our natural, agricultural, and human resources. We are no longer the beaten and prostrate Nation that was turned over by the Republicans in early 1933, but stand today a vigorous, united, and powerful people that can bend tremendous energies and vast wealth to the task of maintaining peace, or if our shores are menaced, to prosecute war victoriously.

Our farmers today are mobilized into a force of nearly 6,000,000 volunteer cooperators in the New Deal farm programs advanced to cope with our farm problems. Through thousands of A. A. A. committeemen chosen by farmers at nonpartisan elections in every agricultural county, each farmer has a democratic voice in carrying out the farm programs in his locality. With our farmers working together, American agriculture stands prepared to meet whatever demands may arise.

Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the idea of American democracy, early in the past century, concerning the efforts of Bonaparte to partition the earth at his will and to devastate with fire and sword, urged the union of all in resisting enemies within and without, and stated, "If we do not act as a phalanx * * * our Nation will be undone." Thomas Jefferson had small use for those who would cause dissension when "total war" in Europe threatened democracy in his day.

As chairman of the agricultural committee of the House of Representatives, it has been my privilege to take part in the great program directed toward the rehabilitation of our agriculture and the conservation of our natural resources. I have confidence in the judgment of American citizens acting as the final jurors to decide whether or not the New Deal agricultural program has achieved to a large degree the fulfillment of the promises to American farmers made by Franklin D. Roosevelt at Topeka, Kans., in 1932, when he spoke as the Democratic Presidential candidate.

Speaking at this same city in the heart of America's bread basket, Republican Candidate TAFT advanced no program for agriculture and conservation except to say that he would look to his Republican advisors from the various States to aid him.

The Republican Party leaders and aspirants for the Republican Presidential nomination are trying desparately to win back the farm vote. They know that without the farm vote they have no chance to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress. And farmers are not going to be deceived again by the promises of a political organization that for more than half a century lured them into supporting its candidates for national office. Farmers have had their eyes opened to the empty promises of that party which until 1920 had never recognized that there was such a thing as a farm problem.

The facts show that it is utterly impossible to rely upon any promises the Republican Party, in its desperation, may make to you. I am going to prove this by reviewing the record of that party. I am going to show you what the Republican Party promised the farmers and how it has always and everlastingly and deliberately failed to keep its promises. It has failed the farmer because it has no sympathy with the farmer. It believes farmers are easily deluded and can be told anything and promised anything. You remember that the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1928 told an Iowa farmer that he was "too —— dumb to understand." But the Republican Party found out in 1932 that farmers are not quite so dumb as the Republican Vice Presidential candidate in 1928 thought they were.

Let me review rapidly Republican Party promises and failures since 1920, the year the Republicans for the first time came to understand that there was a farm problem, and discovered, too, that "the farmer is the backbone of the Nation." For 50 years it had believed that the farmer was not worth mentioning. In 1920 the Republican Party leaders, alarmed at the gathering storm, thought it worth while to recognize the farmer, and in its platitudinous way it promised to do something for him. What it did was to pass an emergency tariff bill raising rates on imports that in no way helped the farmer. It followed this legislation by enacting the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, which still further boosted rates and paved the way for the Smoot-Hawley bill.

In 1924 the Republican National Convention pledged itself "to place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industry to insure its prosperity and success," and President Coolidge from the White House declared "something must be done for agriculture." What was done? Republicans in Congress, with the help of Democrats, passed the McNary-Haugen bill in 1927, and Mr. Coolidge, who had said "something must be done for agriculture" vetoed it, because his Secretary of the Treasury, with his ear turned toward Wall Street, said it was "economically unsound." Again in 1928 the Congress passed the McNary-Haugen bill, and when Republican and Democratic leaders visited the White House to plead that it be signed, the Republican President told them, "Go see Mellon." Fine chance the McNary-Haugen bill had getting past Mr. Mellon. The McNary-Haugen bill would have helped agriculture at that time before European countries had turned to nationalistic policies. The condition of agriculture steadily grew worse, and in 1928 farm leaders went to Kansas City and, almost on their knees, begged the resolutions committee to give them an effective farm plank. For their pains they were virtually driven from the convention doors, while the platform committee proceeded to declare that "the Republican Party pledges its strength and energy to a solution of the farm problem." And what was its solution? The Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. And then the Republicans gave us the Federal Farm Board,

another stupendous blunder that did exactly the opposite of what it was supposed to do by accumulating farm surpluses instead of controlling them and cost the taxpayers almost half a billion dollars.

After 12 years of control the Republican Party's promises to the farmer amounted exactly to zero. Yes, less than zero, for in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, agriculture was in the worst condition ever known. Farm prices were the lowest since before the Civil War, and farm income had shrunk to the lowest on record—four and three-quarter billions.

In 1932 corn sold for 10 cents a bushel, wheat at the lowest price in 300 years, hogs for $3 a hundred, and cotton for 5 cents a pound. Agriculture was prostrate and farmers desperate.

Republicans now assert that the New Deal administration has done nothing for agriculture, although one of the leading aspirants for the Republican Presidential nomination, Mr. Dewey, announces as his farm program eight objectives, all of which a Democratic administration has already initiated and is carrying out. The Republicans endorse almost every objective of the New Deal farm program, but claim that if entrusted with government they will administer the program in a better way.

They assert that the farmer is no better off today than he was before the Democrats took over the reins. Of course, they are meticulously careful to avoid any reference to the dark days of 1932.

Let us recount some of the things which the recent administration has done for agriculture in the little more than 7 years it has been in power.

Within a brief period after President Roosevelt entered the White House, the Democratic Congress had enacted and the President had signed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. Almost immediately farm prices increased and a better feeling existed throughout the country.

The farm program has been attacked on every side. It was attacked in the courts. It was attacked in the press. It was attacked in the forum and on the air. The tariff barons call the program a subsidy, forgetting that under the tariff system the American people pay billions in subsidy to the beneficiaries of the tariff. And yet, through it all, the farmers somehow have won out and have grown stronger in the face of adversity.

Much of the opposition was from the enemies of agriculture, some of whom looked upon the program as a good political target, and others thought they saw a chance for business advantage. They had misled the farmers so often they felt they could do it again, but this time they have not succeeded, and the farmer support has grown stronger through the years.

Every year more farmers have participated in the program until in 1939 6,000,000 farmers took part in the various wings of the program. The opposition has cried "wolf" too often.

One of the advantages of the farm program has been the increase in farm income and farm buying power. Cash farm income has doubled. Purchasing power has nearly doubled. Retail sales to farmers are twice as great as in 1932. Smokestacks that rusted in idleness are active again. Soil conservation and soil building have become a reality in the vast farming areas of our country. Forest conservation has made great strides in the last 7 years. A great amount of erosion-control work has been done on hundreds of thousands of acres.

Alongside soil conservation has gone human conservation. Through rehabilitation loans more than a half-million destitute farm families have again become self-supporting and have been given a new hope. Nearly 800,000 farm homes have been refinanced at the lowest interest rates that have prevailed in this country. This has enabled literally hundreds of thousands of farmers to save their homes.

The production credit corporations have furnished current credit to the farmer at the lowest interest rates that ever prevailed in this country. The same thing is true in the financing of cooperatives.

At the beginning of this administration about 10 percent of the farm homes had the benefit of electricity. Most of these homes were located near the great industrial centers. Now more than 25 percent of the farm homes of the United States have the benefit of this fine labor-saving commodity, and the lines which have been financed stretch into the distant communities far away from the busy marts of trade.

Some of the critics charge that the farmers have been "sold down the river," but they fail to tell when this was done or who made the sale. The sale was made when the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was enacted in 1930. Coming as it did, it began the slow process of destroying our world trade, thus leaving the surplus-producing farmer stranded.

For several years we have been buying surplus farm commodities and distributing them to low-income groups. I am rather proud of the fact that Senator TOM CONNALLY and I were joint authors of what is known as section 32, which provides the funds for distribution of these surpluses both at home and abroad. Under this provision and under supplemental funds made available for the same purpose, the so-called stamp plan has been put into effect. This plan serves a triple purpose: It tends to assist in the handling of the surplus. It furnishes supplies for the low-income groups. It also stimulates work through regular channels from the tillage of the soil to the final work of distribution of the finished product.

Compared to the situation that existed in 1933, agriculture has made remarkable progress. The tillers of the soil are still short of equality, but they are on the road, and we propose to help them stay on that road.

The national farm program is part and parcel of our national life. It is thoroughly justified as an offset to the tariff, in which the surplus-producing farmer can have no part. In the years to come it will be even more vital to our national welfare than it has been in the past.

The farmers have demonstrated that they can manage their own affairs. The program has been handled largely through committees of farmers in the great stretches that constitute rural America. So long as the details of the program are handled by the farmers they are assured of a sympathetic administration.

Every dollar that has been paid to the farmers has gone back into the channels of trade. It has stimulated business activity everywhere. The program is being improved from year to year through suggestions made by the farmers themselves and by those who are working with them. It is no time to turn back. It is no time to surrender the progress that has been made. Any changes that are to be, any improvements in the program, should be made by those who are friendly to the cause.

Farmers, which do you prefer—the political party of broken promises or a political party that promises and performs?

Amendment of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

STATEMENT OF GEORGE Q. LYNCH, GENERAL PRESIDENT OF PATTERN MAKERS LEAGUE OF NORTH AMERICA

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there was delivered at my office this morning a written statement, dated June 10, made by George Q. Lynch, general president of the Pattern Makers League of North America. After investigation, I find that the Pattern Makers League of North America is one of the oldest affiliates of the American Federation of Labor; that its members are highly skilled craftsmen.

When the letter from President Green, of the A. F. of L., was read by Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, during the debate on the Smith amendments, to put it mildly, I was shocked. It seemed to me that President Green had absolutely reversed himself in taking the position he did in this now famous letter. In my remarks, I stated that it was my opinion that his attitude, as set out in his letter, certainly could not reflect the attitude of the majority of the rank and file of the great American Federation of Labor. I am still of this opinion. The statement issued by Mr. Lynch very emphatically supports my position. I thought that the statement of Mr. Lynch would be of interest to all members of the House who might have been persuaded to vote for the Smith amendments as a result of the letter from President Green. The statement follows:

That all Trojan horses do not carry the colors of one stable is evidenced in the "blitzkrieg" pulled by the top command of the A. F. of L. by joining forces with recognized reactionaries to destroy labor's front-line defenses established by the National Labor Relations Act.

This move was preceded by all the solemn promises to respect understandings and agreements always given prior to the application of the modern "blitzkrieg." If we are to deal effectively with this technique, working men and women must face the facts. Here is the record:

The 1938 convention of the A. F. of L. listened to a bill of grievances against the members of the National Labor Relations Board. By action of that convention a three-man committee was appointed to consider amendments to the Wagner Act. This committee was not empowered to submit definite amendments to the Congress based upon its own arbitrary conclusions. This was wise, because one member of that committee has a consuming passion for opposing all governmental assistance for labor, with special emphasis on New Deal assistance.

This committee met, with advice of counsel, and drew up concrete amendments to the Wagner Act. It is not denied, but admitted, that representatives of employer groups were consulted by committee counsel and even contributed suggestions for improving the act from the viewpoint of their clients.

Not to be hampered or delayed by the processes of incompetent democratic procedure, the committee did not consult the executive council on their proposals, but submitted their handiwork direct to Senator WALSH to be dropped in the Senate hopper.

The executive council, which was to meet only a few days later, was thus left with the alternative of signing on the dotted line or displaying division in top rank A. F. of L. leadership. Perhaps because C. I. O. was then pressing hard on all flanks the executive council accepted the first alternative, but not without considerable internal heat.

Before this meeting of the executive council, in January 1939, but after the amendments had been submitted in the Senate, the Pattern Makers League called attention to the dangerous provisions of many of the amendments from the viewpoint of working people who work.

Our league offered no objection to efforts aimed at removing biased members of the Board. We favored the position, however, that this could be accomplished under the existing law and without danger to the act itself. We outlined the method.

We did not then, nor do we now, consider the Board biased because of its efforts to deal vigorously with such men as Ford, Rand, Weir, Girdler, and Gene Grace who were then, and still are, openly flouting the law of the land. The Supreme Court to date has supported this viewpoint on Board actions and orders.

The membership reaction against these proposed A. F. of L. amendments was so pronounced that they were dropped, in public statements, until only three remained defended. These were incorporated in the Norton amendments and publicly approved by the A. F. of L.

Even at this juncture our league held to its position that opening the act for any amendments in this Congress was not only inexpedient, but downright dangerous, to the best interest of labor.

Following investigation of the Labor Board by a special House committee, Congressman HOWARD SMITH then introduced committee amendments to the Wagner Act. We were promptly assured by the A. F. of L. that the Smith amendments would not be approved by the federation. One important A. F. of L. international union immediately opposed them "lock, stock, and barrel."

In an N. B. C. broadcast, date of February 17, 1940, President William Green stated:

"Now, I want to make clear the position taken by the American Federation of Labor with regard to certain amendments proposed and sponsored by some employers' associations. We are against them. We will oppose them with our full strength. We will try to do our utmost to see to it that both political parties adopt a progressive attitude with regard to the National Labor Relations Act."

To this clear statement of position we added our "amen."

This statement was certainly accepted to mean opposition to any amendments proposed by HOWARD SMITH, the recognized spokesman for "employers' associations" in the Lower House.

The record now shows that with a few unimportant exceptions, which will cause no chagrin to the smug satisfaction of Congressman SMITH and the interests he represents, the A. F. of L. top leaders have endorsed the Smith program "cap-a-pie."

The outstanding features of the Smith amendments provide the following in terms important to those affected.

The term "employee" is redefined for purposes of reinstatement with back pay. This is only a political gesture against sit-down strikes. Public opinion and the Supreme Court liquidated the sit down 2 years ago.

However, under another Smith amendment, endorsed by the A. F. of L., a violation of law by employers is not a violation of law unless it is a preponderant violation. Slapping around one active union man at a time in an industry employing 5,000 would hardly be construed as preponderant opposition to unionism.

Moreover, no Board decision against an employer can be made to stick until the employer has been given every opportunity for artful legalistic dodging and stalling before a United States Court of Appeals. For many long years labor has struggled to get labor relations out of courts. This amendment reverses our time-honored battle and throws us back into courts by statutory provision. Any organization rightfully expects its members to follow defined policy. This sudden shift into reverse gear however, leaves the subordinate staff confused and wondering: "Where do we go from here?"

In the 1938 convention the A. F. of L. properly condemned the Board for delayed decisions. This court of appeals amendment will delay decisions to a degree that will make the Board's record of performance resemble speed lightning by comparison.

And by way of applying bigger and better brakes against too much speed in the interest of labor the Smith amendments, endorsed by the A. F. of L., will divide the functions of the Board into two parts by placing in the hands of one man the arbitrary right to investigate and prosecute all complaints against alleged unfair employers. We await the appointment of the paragon of wisdom and virtue who will fulfill such duties to the satisfaction of all parties at interest.

But why go on? All of the Smith amendments were designed for one single purpose: To hamstring the legitimate efforts of organized labor. They are so bad that they never could have passed the lower House without A. F. of L. endorsement to serve as camouflage for their real intent and purpose.

We have repeatedly said that opening the National Labor Relations Act for amendments in this Congress would lead to emasculation of the rights of labor under the act. We said this however, without knowledge or thought that our own parent body would become an accessory before the fact.

June 7, 1940, will be remembered as a dark day in American labor history. Let the record show that the Pattern Makers League of North America was not even a silent or indifferent partner to the intrigue.

The law must now go to the Senate. A righteously aroused membership should send a veritable barrage of protests to their Senators. There must be no black-out of our newly acquired industrial freedom to belong to, and be active in, unions of our own choosing.

We give it as our opinion that this vote in the lower House, and the cooperation which supported it, will be more revealing than effective. The proposals still have to pass the Senate and be signed by the President to make them law.

Much to the expressed dissatisfaction of some seeking special privileges, the President of the United States stands as a bulwark to protect the underprivileged. Therein lies our safety against effective aggression of "blitzkriegs" to destroy labor's hard-won human rights.

Congressman SMITH's proudest boast is that he has never voted in favor of a single measure which aimed to benefit labor. Congressman SMITH voted for these amendments. He still maintains his antilabor record unblemished.

What the Stars and Stripes Stand For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, June 9, 1940:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 9, 1940]

WHAT THE STARS AND STRIPES STAND FOR

It is fitting that we should be asked to display the national colors this week—Flag Week. Yet this act can have little meaning without the realization that the flag is only a symbol—a symbol for America.

America is more than a flag, more than an anthem, more than patriotic oratory. It is more, even, than—

"THIS LAND

"My own Manhattan with spires, and the sparkling and hurrying tides, and the ships,
The varied and ample land, the South and the North in the light, Ohio's shores and flashing Missouri,
And ever the far-spreading prairies cover'd with grass and corn."

America is the sum total of many, many men and women, great and small, quick and dead. It is the sum total of the things they did and are doing to make democracy work. It is action. It is work undertaken to give substance to ideals.

America is George Washington forsaking the plow at Mount Vernon for the cold and the hunger of Valley Forge. It is Thomas Jefferson, with no taste for public office and a skin too thin for the acrimony of politics, accepting that office and enduring that acrimony for the sake of high duty. It is Abraham Lincoln taking up the sword to save the Union, and then bidding the States to bind up their wounds "with malice toward none, with charity for all." America is the sum total of its heroes giving meaning to Jefferson's inalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But, perhaps even more, America is a great host of lesser figures with less glamorous histories—men who saw tasks that needed to be done and did them, men who saw wrongs that cried to be righted and righted them.

There are, for example, the able and far-sighted administrators like Albert Gallatin, Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury. This French-Swiss immigrant, who never learned to speak good English, not only put an end to the congressional custom of making lump-sum appropriations without designating the specific purposes for which public money was to be used, but he also introduced the present system of Treasury reports, halved the national debt, financed the War of 1812, and became the father of Federal aid

for the building of our great network of roads that he saw to be necessary for binding together a great country.

Then there are the men of righteous anger like Benjamin H. Bristow of Kentucky, whom Grant unwittingly called to the Secretary of the Treasury. Bristow was horrified to see how greedy hands were looting the public coffers. Investigation soon convinced him that the distillers of St. Louis were paying taxes on only a third of the whisky that left their warehouses. That was the beginning of the exposure of the Whisky Ring. The trail of bribery led to the White House itself. Bristow obtained more than 250 indictments in St. Louis, Chicago, and Milwaukee, but convictions, unfortunately, were few, and he lost his own post for his zeal.

But Bristow's work was not in vain. He became one of the first soldiers in a great crusade that took form as the Nation's growing wealth tempted the buccaneers to make corruption part of the warp and woof of America. The New York Sun exposed Oakes Ames and the Credit Mobilier scheme, which cost the United States millions of acres of land and millions of dollars, ostensibly given for building our first transcontinental railroad, but actually siphoned into the pockets of the robber barons. Here in St. Louis, Joe Folk fought Butlerism. In New York, the lances were raised against the Tweed ring. Only the other day, Boss Pendergast left the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth. The prosecution of the heirs of Huey Long is current history in Louisiana. So the crusade continues on one front and another.

Courage is perhaps the best synonym for the concept of America—courage as it was exemplified by old Bob La Follette and Nebraska's George Norris and their little band as they stood up in the Senate in 1917 and faced the stormwind and the tempest in a vain effort to keep us out of the first World War, steadfastly shielding the last spark of reason and conviction against all-engulfing hysteria.

America means a less spectacular kind of courage, too. It means the kind of courage that enabled the elder La Follette and his sons after him to make Wisconsin a model of honest and advanced government, the kind of courage that kept Senator Norris fighting for his Tennessee Valley dream until it became a reality, the kind of courage that sent a Jane Addams into the slums of Chicago to establish Hull House, as a model for so many projects that are making concrete the hope and promise of the Bill of Rights.

More important than anything else, perhaps, America means a high sense of justice, a scrupulous respect for the rights of all, even the most unpopular minorities—a sense of justice such as that of John Peter Altgeld, Illinois' eagle forgotten. There was something in the destiny of this man that would not allow him to settle into the comfortable life of a small-town Missouri lawyer. There was something that drove him on to Chicago and the executive mansion in Springfield. There, in the face of the most articulate and powerful elements in the State, he pardoned those Haymarket rioters who had not been hanged. That was in 1893, and the next year, before the hue and cry had subsided, he bitterly protested against President Cleveland's unconstitutional use of Federal troops in Chicago's Pullman strike. Altgeld was hounded into poverty and almost into obscurity. But not quite. Vachel Lindsay was able to say to his spirit:

"A hundred white eagles have risen, the sons of your sons,
The zeal in their wings is a zeal that your dreaming began.
The valor that wore out your soul in the service of man."

America, of course, is Holmes, and Brandeis, and Cardozo, the judges, shaping the law to the will of the people. It is also Brandeis, the advocate, pleading for decent working conditions for the women of Oregon, and striving with his insurance system to assure the workers of Massachusetts the secure enjoyment of the fruits of their toil in the twilight of their years.

America, too, is the educators—Mark Hopkins on his log and Robert Hutchins in his Gothic tower, working, in Jefferson's words, "to diffuse knowledge more generally through the mass of the people, realizing that knowledge is power, and that in a democracy power belongs to the many, not to the few."

And America also is the writers—Tom Paine and Harriet Beecher Stowe and John Steinbeck, those with the power of words that move men.

America is also the great legion of the unnamed. It is the Quaker doctor and nurse and teacher going up into the hills of Kentucky. It is the labor organizer defying tar and feathers in the almost feudal pockets of the southern hills. It is the employer who cheerfully complies with a wage-hour law and a Wagner Act. It is the good citizen who makes an honest income-tax return and marks an intelligent ballot each election day.

There is no need to call the roll longer. America is all those who know how to make democracy work, all those who know that their duty is to do the task at hand.

This America is more than a flag. It would be great without any banner or anthem or slogan. And no mere salute to a bit of bunting, no mere singing of a song, is sufficient to make any man a part of this America. Patriotism is in the deed, not in the symbol.

Will Want to Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) SUNDAY CALL

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Sunday Call:

WILL WANT TO KNOW

The new income-tax law being prepared in Congress to raise an additional billion dollars in Federal revenue is the beginning of the end of happy days for the groups which have been draining the Treasury. It will lower exemptions for single persons to $800 and for married persons to $2,000.

The new law will create 2,000,000 new income-tax payers, make 2,000,000 more Americans aware of the cost of their Government. When they go on the tax rolls they will want to know more about these billions being poured out to reliefers, to farmers, to veterans, for housing, new dams, municipal power plants, swimming pools, and all the other things which are nice to have if you can afford it.

As a starter, these 2,000,000 new income-tax payers, many of them earning as little as $17 a week, will probably want to know what economies are going to be made in the Budget that goes into effect in July. Nobody will mind being taxed for the Nation's defense, provided money isn't being wasted elsewhere.

They may even ask, these $18 and $20 a week taxpaying wage earners, why W. P. A. should not be abandoned in favor of a direct relief system. If it is to be continued, they will want to know what it is doing to retrain the unemployed for work in defense industries and why there aren't places for some of them in the Army and Navy.

Unpreparedness in 1917

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 2, 1940.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 2, 1940]

UNPREPAREDNESS IN 1917

The United States went to war with Germany on April 6, 1917. In December 1917—8 months later—we had 165,000 men in France, some of whom sailed without rifles and were totally devoid of artillery, airplanes, tanks, machine guns, trench mortars, and other munitions and supplies produced in the United States. Through 19 months Pershing fought our war abroad almost wholly from first to last with guns, munitions, airplanes, hand grenades, and materials either borrowed or bought from the Allies in Europe.

The Ordnance Department at Washington spent nearly $4,000,000,000 from April 1917 to June 1918, in an effort to build 20,000 guns of all calibers and equip them with munitions. The Civil War was fought for less. Despite this truly vast expenditure and effort only 133 guns and 600 shells of a single caliber reached Pershing in time for use at the front.

The Allies had perfected an effective hand grenade. The War Department rejected this and placed orders for 20,000,000 distinctive American hand grenades. These, however, were too complicated and Pershing bought hand grenades for our troops from the British.

We spent more than a billion dollars in our 1917–18 aviation effort. No American fighting plane ever reached the front. A few American-made observation planes appeared in France and these were so badly constructed, clumsy, and dangerous that our flyers dubbed

them "flaming coffins." The Allies had produced some good fighter planes and sought to turn over to us all plans for expeditious mass production. However, we rejected these planes which had come from the laboratory of actual war and decided to produce typically American motors and planes with wasteful result.

The War Department spent $116,000,000 on gas for our chemical-warfare units in France, yet Pershing fired only gas bought from the Allies.

We built three picric-acid plants and seven more plants to produce phenol required for picric, and all of these produced nothing for use in the war.

We built a powder plant at Nitro, W. Va., for $70,000,000; a plant at Nashville, Tenn., for $90,000,000; and nitrate plants at Sheffield, Ala.; Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Toledo, Ohio; Perryville, Md.; and Cincinnati costing $116,000,000, and all of these produced not 1 pound of powder or nitrates for use in the war. After the war these plants were sold for a salvage value which was a crime against the American taxpayer.

The War Department planned for an Army of 4,000,000 men and 86,000 horses. For these were ordered 41,000,000 pairs of Army shoes; 50,000 sets of double harness; 110,000 sets of single harness; 945,000 saddles; 2,800,000 halters; 1,500,000 horse brushes; 2,000,000 feed bags; 1,000,000 horse covers; and 195,000 copper branding irons. These figures are not hearsay; they were developed in the course of a Senate investigation of war preparations.

Railroads taken over by the Government in 1917 had been paying stockholders a billion dollars annually, but the administration deficit at the end of 2 years was $1,350,000,000. The taxpayers received the deficit, stockholders nothing.

The Government spent about $1,200,000,000 on Army cantonments for troops in training on the cost-plus plan by which the Government paid for all materials and labor, leaving efficiency and economy to contractors. These camps cost millions more than necessary in excess labor and wasted materials.

About $50,000,000 was spent on spruce production for airplanes, yet 92.6 percent of all spruce used for this purpose was bought independently of the main project. Railroads to carry spruce lumber were built at a cost of about $10,000,000 and were not used.

Some of the port terminals built were never used.

It might be well for those who are assigned to the pressing job of rebuilding American armaments in 1940 and 1941 to extract from the Senate records and read the evidence taken by its investigating committee early in 1918 when charges were openly made that "the Military Establishment of the United States has fallen down" because of "inefficiency in every bureau and in every department of the United States." Senator Chamberlain, a Democratic Member of the Senate investigating committee, made the above charges in a speech in New York and added, "I speak not as a Democrat, but as a citizen of the United States."

We are now approaching a somewhat similar period in American history. A mighty effort at rearmament for national defense must be made. The American public will again want action, will undergo sacrifices to obtain action but above all it will demand capacity on the part of those who will be called to serve.

Brief for H. R. 9381

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker: First. National defense cannot be made adequate without adequate rail and water ways.

The United States is a land of vast distances. No one can predict where there may be need to concentrate men, munitions, and war matériel.

From time to time the place for such concentration may shift.

No matter how many tanks and guns, no matter how much ammunition we may manufacture, we must be prepared to haul them where we want them when we want them.

A railroad is no better than its bridges.

A water way is no better than its clearances.

Second. Neither can peacetime transportation service be adequate without adequate rail and water ways.

Third. Railways are no longer able to build bridges to serve, not only their own needs, but also the expanding needs of their competing carriers, the waterways.

The situation of the railroads presents a serious problem, as everybody familiar with the subject admits. Looking at the figures for the past 5 years, it appears that with the exception of the year 1935, the railroads have never earned as much as 2 percent upon their investment. In 1938, after payment of fixed charges, there was a deficit of $123,000,000, which may be compared with an income in 1930 of $524,000,000. It is true that conditions were somewhat improved in 1939, when there was a net income after fixed charges had been paid of $95,000,000.

On the whole, however, the situation of the railroads was well expressed by President Roosevelt in his Salt Lake City speech, made on September 17, 1932, when he said:

> Now, there is no reason to disguise the fact that the railways as a whole are in serious difficulty.

I may call attention also to the statement made by the President in that same speech, devoted as it was to the railroad question, where he said:

> The problem of the railroads is the problem of each and every one of us. No single economic activity enters into the life of every individual as much as do these great carriers.

The situation is further illustrated by the fact that at the present time 109 railroad companies of all classes are undergoing reorganization, either through the process of receivership or bankruptcy. These 109 companies operate 77,414 miles of railroad or 31 percent of the total railway mileage of the country.

The situation of the railroads, particularly with respect to impaired railroad credit, was such that the President of the United States, in the spring of 1938, appointed a special committee, composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a representative of the Department of Commerce, the Administrator of the Farm Security organization, a representative of the Security Owners Association, a representative of railroad management, a representative of railroad labor and three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to make a study of the transportation problem, particularly as it affected railroads.

In the message delivered to the Congress by the President, bearing date of April 11, 1938, in transmitting to Congress the recommendations of this committee, the President referred to the fact that the problem of railroad transportation had become increasingly difficult. In the report made to the President and by the President transmitted to Congress, the three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as shown by House Document No. 583, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, fully recognized the serious situation of the railroads, saying, among other things:

> The continuing decline in the spread between revenues and expenses, along with the current loss of traffic, have, generally speaking, resulted in the destruction of railroad credit. Few railroads are in a position to borrow. With earnings so largely consumed in paying operating expenses, taxes, and other obligations, little is available for improving plant no matter how necessary such improvement may be. The railroad plant, especially its equipment, is constantly wearing out or becoming obsolete. Efficient operation requires constant renewal and replacement. To the extent such renewal and replacement are impeded, transportation efficiency is lessened and cost is increased.

In the fall of 1938, after the railroads had been defeated in their effort to secure a decrease in the wage rate, the President appointed a committee of six persons connected with the railroad industry, three of these being railroad presidents and three being railroad labor executives. In making this appointment, the President is quoted by the New York Herald Tribune as saying, at a press conference on September 20, 1938, in substance that the question of wage reduction is subordinate for the time being to the broad question of railroad rehabilitation. He pointed out that he had made recommendations for railroad rehabilitation at the last session of Congress, but that Congress had adjourned without enacting any laws helpful to the railroad, one-third of which are already in

bankruptcy. It is a well-known fact that the President requested this Committee of Six to bring forward recommendations which would represent a forward step in the matter of railroad rehabilitation.

The Committee of Six, after very careful consideration of all factors entering into the problem, made a series of concrete recommendations, one of which had to do with the reconstruction of bridges and other facilities. The language of the Committee in summarizing its recommendation was:

> Adoption of policy that whenever, in connection with the improvement of navigable waters * * * a railroad is required to alter or reconstruct bridges or other facilities, it be reimbursed by the Government for all costs in excess of any direct benefit accruing to it.

This recommendation went to the President under date of December 23, 1938.

In the hearings which were had on a bill which is substantially the same as H. R. 9381, held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce on May 17, 1939, a table was introduced showing that certain railroads shown in the table, over a period of years, had expended $48,209,756 in rebuilding and relocating bridges at the command of the Federal Government. The table further showed that of this amount, $28,480,267 was expended for the improvement of navigation and $17,890,528 was expended for the improvement of railroad facilities. In other words, in the period of years covered by the table, the railroads have been called upon to pay practically $28,500,000 to improve water transportation, without any benefit whatever to the facilities of the railroads from the viewpoint of railroad transportation.

It is only necessary to call attention to the extended hearings held by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, extending from January 24, 1939, to March 30, 1939, to understand the serious situation of the railroads and the necessity for giving relief wherever that can be done without sacrifice of the public interest. Particular attention may be called to the testimony of Commissioner Splawn and to the tables which he there introduced, showing that for the first 11 months of 1938 the class I railroads of the country incurred a deficit of $145,277,364, and that among the deficit railroads in that period were such important lines as the Atlantic Coast Line; Baltimore & Ohio; Boston & Maine; Chicago & North Western; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific; Missouri Pacific; New York Central; New York, New Haven & Hartford; Northern Pacific; Pere Marquette; St. Louis-San Francisco; Seaboard Air Line; Southern Railway; Southern Pacific; and many others which could be mentioned. As stated previously, the 1939 showing is a little better, but the conditions which brought about the improvement were attributable to a stimulated and temporary improvement, due to war conditions abroad.

Fourth. H. R. 9381, the Truman-Hobbs bill, simply fixes these facts and provides the only practical remedy.

There is no question but that the Army engineers have the power to order the repair, remodeling, improvement, relocation, or rebuilding of any railroad bridge crossing a navigable steam, if the needs of navigation so require.

This bill simply requires that in the exercise of this power, a hearing be given to interested parties and that the Army engineers shall ascertain the equities in the event they find it necessary to order the improvement of a railway bridge.

In such event the bill requires the Army engineers to charge the bridge owner with "such part of the cost of the improvement as is attributable to the direct and special benefits which will accrue to the bridge owner as a result of the alteration, including the expectable savings in repair or maintenance costs. And that part of the cost attributable to the requirements of traffic by railroad or highway, or both, including any expenditure for increased carrying capacity of the bridge, and including such proportion of the actual capital cost of the old bridge or of such part of the old bridge as may be altered or changed or rebuilt, as the used service life of the whole or a part, as the case may be, bears to the total estimated service life of the whole or such part:".

The United States is required to bear "the balance of the cost, including that part attributable to the necessities of navigation."

Of course, other contingencies are provided for. The benefits to any highways must be borne by the proprietor of the highway. Where a relocation or alteration is desirable from the standpoint of the owner of a park, for instance, the park owner is required to participate in defraying the expense.

Essentially, the bill is sound, fair, and altogether equitable. It charges every proper element of cost against the railways which should be borne by them. The Government is required to bear whatever the residue of cost may be after all the deductions have been made. Bear in mind, the basis of the order for the improvement is the needs of navigation. Therefore, since a perfectly good railroad bridge, adequately serving railway needs, is to be remodeled solely because of the needs of the competing carrier, it is manifest that navigation should be taxed with an equitable share of the cost.

Whatever this equitable share may be is left to determination of the Army engineers. This is fair. The Nation gets the benefit both for peacetime service and for national defense. The Nation should be willing to pay what its own Army engineers certify to be equitable.

Fifth. The bill is the product of 4 years' hard work.

The authors, the Interstate Commerce Committees of both House and Senate, and their experts, after full hearings upon every phase of the transportation problem, many consultations with competent advisers, have produced a bill which has no "bugs" in it.

A very similar bill was passed by both Houses of Congress last year, but was vetoed by the President after Congress adjourned.

This year the President suggested certain amendments. These have been included in the present bill.

It has the cordial support of every one of the 21 railway brotherhoods; the unanimous and cordial support of the President's "committee of 6"; all of the railways; both committees, both Houses of Congress and, by analogy, of the Supreme Court.

This bill, as its preceding version, follows the philosophy set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States in its decision in the case of *N. C. & St. L. Rwy. Co.* v. *Walter* (294 U. S. 405), relating to the alalogous problem arising there in the elimination of grade crossings. There is no distinction in principle between the equities arising from the elimination of a grade crossing where a highway intersects a railway, and the equities arising from the improvement of a railway bridge which crosses a navigable stream. Hence the application of the philosophy of the Walters case to the problem thought to be equitably solved by this bill.

The proponents of the bill are clearly convinced that there will not be any great cost entailed upon the Government by making this bill law. The railroads have already, under the orders of the Army engineers, rebuilt or altered a considerable number of the bridges which might otherwise come within its purview. The railroads have already thus expended over $28,000,000 for the improvement of navigation out of a total of forty-eight million they were compelled thus to expend. There should not be a great many more of similar expenditures to be required. But whether much or little, the Government cannot be required under this bill to pay one cent until it has been certified, after full hearing, by its own Army engineers, that the Government's contribution is necessary for the improvement of navigation.

This bill will not cost the Government a cent unless the Government's expenditure is both necessary and right. If any expenditure meets this criterion it should be made.

We know how exceedingly engrossed in foreign affairs the President is. We have no criticism of his vetoes of this bill. We know that other things are uppermost in his mind. But we sincerely believe that this bill will militate to the distinct advantage of the national defense which is at this time the preeminent consideration of every American.

Sine Die Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY L. MOSER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

PART OF AN EDITORIAL FROM THE READING TIMES

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Reading (Pa.) Times:

LET CONGRESS STAY AND SAW WOOD

Just at the time when everybody else is being urged to work harder and to slug away all the more earnestly at important business, Congress proposes to pack up and go home.

Month after month of work is tiresome for Congressmen, it is said. So it is for all of us. Congressmen have campaigning to do this fall, they protest. The country isn't interested in that.

The country is interested in getting its work done.

The country is interested in seeing that the armament program is actually followed through and results shown.

The country is interested in seeing that arrangements are made to pay for armament. It is ready to be taxed for security.

For Congress merely to appropriate any requested number of billions of dollars and then go gaily home is not good enough.

Congress may have its faults. But they are the faults of the people. Congress is the people in action. To argue that its presence in Washington would somehow hamper and handicap the preparedness efforts seems foolish. We have not yet reached the point which England reached when it turned everything over to Churchill.

Congress is highly valuable in times like these as a sort of national listening post and broadcasting station in Washington. Its presence should have a steadying influence on the President, a constant reminder that he is responsible to the people, a constant source of strength in the thought that the "other half of the defense team" is still pulling.

A tax bill to take care of increased military expenditures should be passed before Congress adjourns. The old political belief always was that to levy taxes in an election year was unpopular. This year things are different. The Nation is aroused. It may be more unpopular not to levy taxes than to levy them.

The European situation cannot be predicted 24 hours in advance. The rise of any morning's sun may look upon some completely unforeseen situation. Congress, direct representative of the people, should be on hand, not at the discretion of the President to recall it, but because, like everybody else these days, it is sticking to its job.

The Newfoundland Fish Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland fish deal has been ended by the action of the Congress in passing a bill making it impossible to import free of duty fish processed in Newfoundland.

This act became a law today and the fishermen of Maine and New England may breathe a little easier.

Some measure of protection has been achieved although much still remains to be done.

The Newfoundland fish deal became a matter of Nation-wide interest and concern following the exposure of the plan on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 8, 1940.

In my speech on the subject that day I went in detail into the secret development of this project by securing changes in Treasury regulations with this program definitely in view.

STARTED IN STATE DEPARTMENT

The State Department first broached the matter to the Treasury, but a 164-page printed brief was later filed with the Customs Bureau by the corporation concerned to argue for this change, which would indicate there was considerable doubt as to its correctness. Otherwise why so much argument?

REDRESS REFUSED ON HEARING

An extended hearing was then held before the Customs Bureau, pointing out the disastrous effect to Maine fishermen of importing 15,000,000 pounds of fish from Newfoundland duty free and urging that the regulation be put back as it had been for many years. This was refused.

TWO-HUNDRED-THOUSAND-DOLLAR GRANT BY NEWFOUNDLAND

It appeared that an American concern which had already closed a fish plant at Vinalhaven had expended over $50,000 in developing this Newfoundland project and expected to spend $700,000 more and was to receive a grant of $200,000 from the Newfoundland Government "to take their fishermen off the dole," although it was going to put our fishermen out of business.

"AMERICAN FISH?"

The regulation proposed to call the Newfoundland catch "American fish" and thus let the fish in duty free, although they were caught in Newfoundland by Newfoundlanders, processed by Newfoundlanders, and sent to the United States in ships manned by Newfoundlanders.

PROTECTION FOR AMERICAN FISHERMEN

That proposal is now definitely terminated by legislation adopted by the House and Senate with the collaboration of all the Members of the Senate and House from Maine and New England.

MAINE FISHERIES ASSOCIATION

This shows again that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Some protection for America has been secured. Much remains still to be done. In this a militant Maine Fisheries Association can be a tremendous help.

United States History Supports Roosevelt in Dispute Over National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a well-written newspaper article from the Washington Post of Sunday, June 9, 1940. This article by Mr. John G. Norris very ably discusses the matter of giving the President power to use the Reserve components of the Army.

Since this article was written the House Committee on Military Affairs has reported favorably the bill referred to, but only with great limitation.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 9, 1940]

UNITED STATES HISTORY SUPPORTS ROOSEVELT IN DISPUTE OVER NATIONAL GUARD

(By John G. Norris)

Some antiadministration circles call it "another Roosevelt grab for power" and demand that Congress be kept in session all year rather than grant it.

The Army says it is necessary for the proper defense of the Nation, so that it may act with free hands and in a businesslike way in case of trouble.

What is it all about, anyway, this congressional row over giving the President power to order out the National Guard?

Boiled down, the situation amounts to this:

Existing law provides two methods by which the National Guard can be brought into action when war threatens. One is when Congress declares a national emergency to exist, in which case the President "orders" the guard into Federal service. Under another statute, the President can "call out" the guard "whenever the United States is invaded or in danger of invasion" without any prior action by Congress.

The controversy is over a bill introduced by Chairman MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee, at the request of President Roosevelt, which would permit the Chief Executive to order the guard into Federal service if he considers it necessary before Congress convenes next January. The House Military Committee had the measure under consideration all last week behind closed doors and is still deadlocked on the proposal.

Crux of the situation is that when the guard is ordered into Federal service it becomes a part of the Army of the United States and is under complete control of the Commander in Chief. It can be ordered anywhere in the world and is no longer subject in any way to State control. When "called out," however, there are certain restrictions on its use. It cannot be sent outside of the United States and it is still under some State control, all promotions, discharges, and recruiting being in the hands of the Governors of the 48 States.

"Ah," say opponents of the measure, "the President's purpose is revealed, he wants power to send troops overseas on some pretext or other. For he already has full power to mobilize the guard if the United States is attacked."

No, answers the Army, the situation is quite different. What we fear is trouble in South or Central America. Should a Nazi-Communist inspired "fifth column" uprising occur in Latin America and the country involved calls upon us for aid, there are not enough United States Regulars available to handle the situation, the Army chiefs state.

"By acting swiftly," Gen. George C. Marshall told the committee, "the conflagration might be put out with a fire extinguisher; while if we delay, it may be necessary to call out the whole fire department."

Probably only a small number of National Guard men would be needed in such a situation, say 20,000 to 30,000 to relieve Regulars stationed in Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone, so the latter could be rushed to the scene of the trouble, Army heads argue. Why, then, should they have to wait for Congress to be called back to Washington when time is so important and a major mobilization is not involved?

The generals also point out how much red tape would be involved in having to deal with 48 Governors in handling the troops, getting replacements, promotions, relieving inefficient officers, etc.

The reluctance of the Army high command to rely on a force which is surrounded by legal restrictions and red tape is a natural conclusion, based upon the lessons of history. It is a phase of history that is not found in school textbooks. It is at time, ludicrous, but more often tragic.

Factual accounts of the wars in which the United States has been involved too often show battles or campaigns lost because the Army commander did not have full control of the militia supposed to be a part of his force. Battle plans often had to be changed because a State Governor was the real commander of such troops.

How the Army feels about the matter is well illustrated by an official publication issued for instruction of Reserve officers and civilian committeemen who would have charge of selective service in an emergency. The pamphlet paints an entirely different picture of the Revolutionary War than our schools teach.

"The militia by its very nature was completely unsatisfactory," it concludes. "The American Army was in constant danger of final disaster. * * * Because the Central Government lacked power to raise an effective army, the war dragged out for 7 years, during which the Americans employed a total of almost 400,000 men, while the greatest strength of the enemy in any one year (1781) was but 42,000."

During the War of 1812, history records that militia commanders, acting on the theory their force was supposed to be used only to repel invasion, three times refused to cross the Canadian border when ordered to do so.

On one occasion a force of Regulars was annihilated because the militiamen would not cross the border to come to their aid. During the same war, the Governor of Massachusetts refused to call out the militia of that State to fight the British.

Douglas Southall Freeman's great biography of Robert E. Lee and other histories of the Civil War tell of how often the Southern commander was thwarted by the refusal of a Governor to send some of his troops outside the State.

The Spanish-American War gives an illustration of the divided control of the militia which is almost comic opera. It is a tale of how the District of Columbia National Guard marched off to war and returned the same day, quite like the King of France and his 50,006 men "marching up the hill and down again."

The writer has often heard the story from an old friend, Lieut. Col. W. L. Hazard, Officers' Reserve Corps, who was then a corporal of the District militia.

"President McKinley called out the District troops on April 19, 2 days before Congress declared war on Spain," Colonel Hazard declares.

"We formed at the armory, which was on the site of the present Archives Building and marched up Pennsylvania Avenue with bands playing and crowds cheering.

"We went into camp on the Dalecarlia Reservoir to wait further orders. One of the War Department legal experts told the President he could not call out the Guard for service in Cuba. The orders were quickly revoked, and all of us went home for dinner that night."

Today the situation is somewhat different. In time of war or an emergency declared by Congress, the National Guard becomes an integral part of the Army, unimpeded by State control. But, argues the Army high command, Congress is not always in session and wars are no longer declared. The totalitarian nations strike without warning. "Fifth columns" pave the way.

Confidential reports received here from Latin America have official circles worried. They tell of undercover plans for Nazi uprisings should Germany win a quick victory over the Allies. A revolution in any country within bombing range of the Panama Canal by pro-Nazi forces would be a serious threat to the United States and one which would require instant action by the United States.

Yet the House Military Committee is said to be divided on the President's proposal, with the likelihood they will not recommend the bill except with limitations.

The issue seems to comprehend more than the immediate proposal. In a way it sums the whole challenge of the totalitarian states to the democracies. Can the latter, with their constitutional limitations on the powers of the Executive, and in the United States the added complications of States' rights, meet the dictators on their own ground?

We have seen that Great Britain and France have so far failed to do so. "Muddling through" seems quite inadequate to cope with the modern streamlined authoritarian state.

The question is whether democracy can meet the challenge and still retain its principles; whether authority can be granted to the Executive to act swiftly and still not give up our liberties. It is an issue that will arise time and again as the administration presses it preparedness program.

Some clear and nonpartisan thinking is required, not only of the House Military Committee men today but of all our leaders in the days that follow.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics' Need for a New Engine Research Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, included in the supplemental national-defense appropriation bill for 1941 which will be under consideration Wednesday is an item of $2,000,000, with authority for contract authorization for $6,400,000 additional, for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Despite the fact that this committee's activities is not known even to all Members of Congress it has been in existence 25 years.

Without fear of contradiction I make the statement that no private or Government organization has even approached the record of this committee in its contributions to aeronautics. Today this committee has at Langley Field, Va., the outstanding research laboratory in the world. It has another in course of construction at Moffett Field, Calif.

This appropriation and authorization is for a new engine research laboratory.

During the Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt administrations, not once but many times, I have joined with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in assailing amendments to strike the appropriation for this activity from independent offices appropriation bills. Members ignorant of the outstanding achievements of this committee have sought to destroy it. Today you cannot find a man in this country interested in, or who has the least knowledge of aeronautics, who will not support my statement that the

advancement of aviation in this country is due to the research work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The committee has now as its chairman, Dr. Vannever Bush. The members of the committee serve without compensation.

Dr. George W. Lewis is the Director of Aeronautical Research and one of the best informed men in the world in this line.

Col. Charles H. Lindbergh was for many years a member of the committee. His term expired last December and at his own request he was not reappointed. This, I think, was due to his interests in private corporations. Colonel Lindbergh took an active part in its deliberations until his separation from the committee and the value of his contributions cannot be estimated.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the Members of the House should know something about the proposed new research laboratory and the necessity for it. Therefore under the permission granted me I include as part of my remarks excerpts from the hearings before the Appropriation Committee. They follow:

Dr. BUSH. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics asks an authorization to the extent of $8,400,000 for an engine research laboratory.

This laboratory is not intended as a developmental laboratory, but is a research laboratory. It is intended to provide for aircraft engine research exactly what is provided by our Langley Field laboratories for airplanes. It is fundamental research. It is an engine research laboratory.

We have a small amount of engine research going on at Langley Field at the present time. There is considerable need for additional work in that line; or, as it is best expressed, if you will allow me to give you the opinion of General Arnold and Admiral Towers in regard to it, as follows:

General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, says in a letter to me dated March 5, 1940:

"Reference is made to the action taken at the last meeting of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics authorizing the submission to the Bureau of the Budget of an urgent supplemental estimate for the construction and equipment by the Committee of an aircraft engine research laboratory.

"Although I was a member of the special subcommittee that recommended this project, I wish to submit the matter from the standpoint of the Army Air Corps. The future needs of the Air Corps for better aircraft engines require that the Government take appropriate steps to provide adequate engine research facilities. I am convinced that the proposed engine research laboratory is necessary to furnish a proper balance between aerodynamic and engine research and that it is essential in order to bring about the needed progress in the improvement of aeronautic power plants in the United States.

"The need is definite and urgent and delay may prove costly. It is of great importance to the Army Air Corps that the proposed laboratory be placed in operation at the earliest possible date."

Admiral Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department, in a letter to me dated March 6, 1940, says:

"I have just examined the supplemental estimate of appropriation in the form in which you are about to submit it to the Bureau of the Budget for the construction and equipment of an aircraft engine research laboratory by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

"As Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy Department it is my duty to provide the Navy with aircraft of the highest possible performance. Therefore, this project is of great significance to the Navy. The aircraft power plant is the heart of the airplane. It is largely around improved engines that aircraft of improved performance are designed.

"Engine research has not received sufficient attention in this country because adequate engine research facilities have not been available. It is my judgment, after careful study of this problem, that the most effective action that can be taken to meet this condition is to provide without delay for the construction and operation by the committee of an adequate aircraft engine research laboratory as proposed."

Mr. WOODRUM. At a total cost of $8,400,000?

Dr. BUSH. Yes.

NATURE OF PROPOSED LABORATORY

Dr. LEWIS. The engine research laboratory will consist of five major items. First will be the power-plant laboratory, including shops. That power-plant laboratory will provide for single-cylinder and multicylinder investigation to improve power output and economy.

There will be in that laboratory some fuels and lubricants research.

There will be in that laboratory facilities for supercharger research. This is the one important problem that we have right at the present time—the supercharger. The air war on the other side is a high-altitude war. The fighting is going on above 20,000 feet. Superchargers are essential to our airplanes now.

There are three types of superchargers. There is one type that is driven by the exhaust from the engine. Then there is the two-speed gear-driven supercharger and there is the two-stage supercharger, where compressed air from one stage is delivered to another stage for further compression. This whole field must be investigated to improve supercharger efficiency and range.

This laboratory will also have a section where studies will be made of the possibilities of recovery of waste heat from the exhaust of aircraft engines. The heat energy that is being lost through the exhaust is a very large proportion of the heat energy that is in the fuel. We are absorbing some of it now in the exhaust-type supercharger, but we are going to study the possibility of also doing it either by a gas turbine, by jet-propulsion methods, or by other methods.

The second item that we have is something that does not exist elsewhere in the world. It is very, very desirable. That is a power-plant wind tunnel. This wind tunnel will have a throat diameter of 25 feet and an air speed at sea level of 300 miles per hour. In it we can conduct research on engines up to 3,000 horsepower.

This wind tunnel will be evacuated to a density corresponding to 30,000 feet altitude. This tunnel will permit the study of the complete full-scale power plant under flight conditions, with the propeller operating, and using supercharging up to 30,000 feet. We can investigate the engine, supercharger, and propeller in this wind tunnel up to 30,000 feet and get the answer, rather than taking months in flight tests to obtain the most efficient combination of engine, supercharger, propeller, and nacelle installation.

At that altitude the speed in that wind tunnel will be 490 miles an hour.

That kind of research equipment does not exist anywhere in the world. That tunnel is going to take a little longer to build than the other units of the engine research laboratory. Research on the improving of the power output of engines to be used for the present procurement program is under way at Langley and will be transferred to the new station.

In the last 10 years the horsepower of engines has been doubled without increasing the size of the engine. Military airplanes must now fly at speeds of 400 to 500 miles per hour. To obtain these speeds the engine power must be further increased without increasing the over-all size of the engine. This problem is tied up definitely with the third unit of this laboratory, which is the fuels and lubricants laboratory.

This fuels and lubricants laboratory is a very important part of the whole picture. We have to have fuels of a high octane number of our engines will "burn up" at high-power output.

We have also to study safety fuels. The use of fuels of this character with a fuel-injection system must be studied. In this laboratory facilities will be provided for the investigation of new and better fuels for aircraft engines and new and better lubricants for high-power output.

We also have the problem in that laboratory of overcoming the deficiencies of the carburetor and using the fuel-injection system.

The laboratory will also be provided with an instrument laboratory for the construction and development of instruments required in connection with the measurement of fuel-air ratios and engine-operating conditions to find out in flight the actual operating conditions for maximum efficiency and safety.

Then the next item is an engine torque stand. After the information on the single cylinder and other units of the engine has been obtained the complete engine and propeller are investigated on a torque stand. It is not a very expensive piece of equipment. It has a horizontal air intake and a vertical exhaust. The air is supplied by the propeller. This torque stand will be capable of investigating a 4,000-horsepower aircraft engine.

There we can determine on the engine itself some ground conditions affecting the supercharging, the cooling, and the vibration characteristics of the whole power plant. We will also study the stresses in engine parts.

This problem is tremendously important, now that we are trying to get more power out of a given-size cylinder; and at the same time we have to find the metallurgical answer to take care of higher working stresses. We have to find better materials that will be able to withstand these stresses.

The next unit in the research laboratory will be the hangar and engine-flight test section. This equipment will consist largely of a brick and steel hangar, with certain special equipment, such as a thrust balance for ground adjustment and check of factors affecting power-plant thrust; special facilities for exchange and overhaul of aircraft engines; cooling-blower equipment for ground operation of installed engines over a period sufficient for check of new devices before flight. In the last analysis, the results of single-cylinder and multicylinder investigations must be a final check in flight. The hangar and its equipment are necessary for this purpose.

The laboratory will also include an administration building, with provision for heat, power, and water supply, and other facilities for the laboratory in general.

The total amount required is $8,400,000.

DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATE

Mr. WOODRUM. How much personnel is it going to take you to operate this laboratory?

Dr. LEWIS. Two hundred and twenty persons, at an annual operating cost for all purposes estimated at $650,000 per year.

Mr. WOODRUM. Did you have a break-down of this $8,400,000?

Dr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. Put that in the record at this point.

Dr. LEWIS. Yes, sir; the break-down is as follows:

Item 1. Power-plant laboratory and shops		$3,950,000
Building	$1,700,000	
Equipment	2,250,000	
Item 2. Power-plant wind tunnel		3,100,000
Item 3. Engine torque stands		200,000
Building	$150,000	
Equipment	50,000	
Item 4. Fuels, lubricants, and instruments laboratory		400,000
Building	$250,000	
Equipment	150,000	
Item 5. Hangar		200,000
Building	$180,000	
Equipment	20,000	
Item 6. Administration building		250,000
Building	$180,000	
Equipment	70,000	
Item 7. Miscellaneous: Heating, power, and water supply, roads, fences, fuel tanks		300,000
Total		8,400,000

Mr. LUDLOW. There is no governmental research of engines being done in the United States now? It is all done by private establishments, is it?

Dr. LEWIS. There is very little scientific research being done on engines in this country. Private establishments are concerned chiefly with development problems relating to their own engines. The aircraft engine research work that is being done at Langley Field represents the major portion of all fundamental research on aircraft engines in this country.

Mr. LUDLOW. And that is very limited?

Dr. LEWIS. That is very limited. The engine experimental laboratories at Wright Field and at the Naval Aircraft Factory are for developmental purposes.

Mr. LUDLOW. You propose to construct in connection with this research station a wind tunnel, do you not?

Dr. LEWIS. Yes, sir.

Dr. BUSH. This item is exceedingly important to the Nation's defense program. To assure improvement in the performance of American aircraft I believe that nothing is of greater importance.

Shall We Adjourn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following:

SHALL WE ADJOURN?

A new morning dawns as evening approaches
And this is our plight as it finds us
The spenders are spent and spent lenders are lent
For defending fake cures that now ail us.

With world all aflame and Congress in session
We're told by F. D. we're not needed
The money and credit are all that he cov'ts
And so that's why our cry is not heeded.

Says Franklin "All rights now claimed by our Congress
Just sign away now as you're told to
Then get out of town and do not stay around
Or you'll get in my hair and I'll scold you."

Now shall we adjourn as war is approaching
And leave it to Franklin to guide us
To war unprepared and to war while we're scared
So that Franklin can rule as he wants to?

Oh no! Let's remain! Our country now needs us!
Let's stay on the job as we ought to,
To keep us from war and its horrible scar
And from all the disaster it leads to.

Our Congress should serve as danger approaches
Let's serve with our utmost devotion
The people who sent us to serve and dissent
From this dangerous course of our Nation.

Acquisition of Island Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLES FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several months ago I introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with the Governments of France and Great Britain relative to the acquisition of islands in the Caribbean, the North Atlantic, and in other locations. During the past week I have from time to time clipped interesting newspaper articles in reference to this subject, which is of supreme interest at the present time. I ask unanimous consent that the articles referred to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISLAND BASES NEEDED

(By Ludwell Denny)

Immediate American acquisition of Allied possessions in the Caribbean and north Atlantic is essential to their and our defense, many here believe. The Senate Naval Affairs Committee recommends acquisition of more Caribbean air bases.

This would follow logically the President's warning to Congress of the short air distance from foreign bases to our mainland, and the Army and Navy testimony that any attacker would have to hold bases in this hemisphere.

Our occupation of the island bases would provide quick and effective defense, while the vast preparedness plan launched by the President will take from 2 to 4 years for completion.

Two-thirds of those questioned in the Gallup poll sometime ago favored trading the old war debts for those Allied strategic possessions, as proposed by Senator LUNDEEN.

Despite the President's sensational speeches of the last week there is little fear among experts that Germany could or would invade the United States. But there is fear of resumption of Nazi penetration in Latin America, and of German seizure of Allied strategic bases in that area—especially if Hitler wins in Europe.

That probably would mean war. The United States challenges German control over any area in this hemisphere. Transfer of sovereignty to a foreign power, of course, is forbidden by the Monroe Doctrine. But even indirect German control would be resisted by the United States.

To prevent any such eventuality, it is urged that this Government take preventive action now--with the consent of the Allied governments, Canada, and the Pan American republics—and for their benefit as well as our own.

Only the United States is able to protect the vital approaches to the North American mainland, the Panama Canal, and upper South America, which are: Greenland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, the Allied Caribbean possessions, and the Guianas. The Allies and Canada have their hands too full in Europe and the Latin American republics are unprepared.

The United States might not be strong enough to recapture those far-flung outposts from Germany if she "blitzkrieged" them or if they fell to her as the legal spoils of European victory. But our Army and Navy would be strong enough, if in actual occupation of those bases, to discourage German claims. One hundred of our planes based on those islands would be worth a thousand or more of our mainland planes.

As Colonel Lindbergh pointed out last night, not only bombers but a large army would be required to invade this country. But bombers and a very small force of parachutists and marines would be sufficient for German seizure of the now weak allied islands.

So long as the United States does not neutralize and protect those weak allied possessions and Greenland, they are a standing invitation to attack by German raiders with whom they are now officially at war. The very existence of belligerent territories in the Panama-Caribbean area is an anomalous menace to the safety and peace of the United States and the hemisphere.

If Germany defeats Britain and France—as she has already defeated Denmark (Greenland) and Holland (Dutch West Indies and Guiana)—the United States automatically would be brought at best into serious diplomatic and economic conflict with Hitler, and at worst into war. With Nazi minorities already strong in certain Latin American countries, even the threat of such a conflict might easily shatter the present uneasy Pan American solidarity—probably the worst blow of all to our natural defenses.

Confronted by a much less dangerous situation in the World War, Woodrow Wilson quickly acquired the strategic Virgin Islands from

Denmark by purchase—and with the certainty that under military necessity he would take if he could not buy.

The Allies have no good reason to refuse to sell but excellent reasons to unload them on us. Economically most of them are a burden, as reported last year by the British colonial minister.

On the military side they are a liability to the Allies—assuming the Allies do not seek more conquest here. The Allies need elsewhere the ships, troops, and planes now inadequately guarding the American hemisphere.

Moreover, the Allies would profit by a wiping out of their old war debts to us and perhaps by the acquisition of gold—which we do not need and they need greatly.

The only legitimate arguments raised against such a solution are: (1) United States imperialism, and (2) rights of the natives. Both objections can be met completely by the United States acting as a mandate power for the 21 American republics.

Such a status would be preferable to present Allied imperialism in this hemisphere, which invites German imperialism here.

WEST INDIES ACQUISITION BY UNITED STATES HELD PREMATURE

A proposal by an English economist that some of the British West Indies be sold to the United States is considered premature by Chairman PITTMAN, Democrat, Nevada, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sir George Paish, who in the World War was economic adviser to the Chancelor of the Exchequer, suggested yesterday in a London speech that Britain exchange some of her insular possessions on this side of the Atlantic for American airplanes and pilots.

Any such trade, in Senator PITTMAN'S opinion, would be similar in nature to the resolution of Senator PEPPER, Democrat, Florida, for the sale of Government-owned airplanes to the Allies. The Pepper resolution was tabled by the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, Senator PEPPER alone supporting the measure.

FEAR PLANE SALES

Some authorities felt that a direct sale of war planes by the Government itself would be in the nature of intervention and might be construed by Germany as an act of war.

Senator PITTMAN believes the Allies have plenty of money for the present to buy such materials as they need and can get in this country.

"I don't think the question of lack of gold exchange exists today," he said, "and it probably will not exist for at least a year.

"It would obviously be an advantage to the United States to have sovereignty over all the islands in the Caribbean or in the Atlantic adjacent to the United States. But this does not appear to me to be the proper time for consideration of such matters."

HAVE ENOUGH MONEY

Senator ELBERT THOMAS, Democrat, Utah, another member of the Foreign Relations Committee, said that in his opinion the Allies had money enough to keep up their purchases for at least 2 years.

"But if the British and French Navies appeared to be in danger of defeat, then it would be well for us to acquire the West Indies," he said.

"However, I think the purchase price should be applied against the war debts rather than be paid in cash. That would enable England and France to get credits in this country, after the war is over, since they would no longer be in default, and the Johnson Act would not operate against them as at present."

Senator THOMAS also suggested that Great Britain could build up dollar exchange by supplying the United States with reserve supplies of rubber and tin from British Malaya.

BAHAMAS VALUABLE TO US, ADMIRAL SAYS

Rear Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, said yesterday United States ownership of Bermuda, the Bahamas, and the British West Indies would be of great military value for air bases.

Representative JAMES W. MOTT (Republican, Oregon) raised the question of defense values of these islands now owned by Britain, but explained he was not asking the admiral to speak on matters of policy.

IN PAYMENT

"Possession of any islands that lend themselves to basing aircraft obviously would be of great military value," Admiral Towers said.

"Then," Representative MOTT commented, "I think it might be of advantage to Great Britain if she ceded them to us in payment, say, of the war debts."

BRITISH ISLANDS HERE COSTLY TO ENGLAND

Diplomatic quarters predicted today that fulfillment of congressional proposals to acquire British possessions in the Western Hemisphere would prove costly.

They recalled that the Royal West Indies Commission recently reported that such possessions face three major problems—overpopulation, depressed agricultural prices, and a need for broader social services—and recommended that Britain spend $5,000,000 annually for the next 20 years to improve conditions.

Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN (Farmer-Labor, Minnesota) advocates acquisition of a large number of foreign possessions in this hemisphere in settlement of World War debts. Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS (Democrat, North Carolina) has offered a resolution empowering the President to negotiate for the purchase of some of these islands.

The commission's report recommended that the British possessions' economic policies be reoriented to absorb population increases and advised that "whatever steps are practicable" be taken to improve agricultural exporting conditions.

BRITON FAVORS EXCHANGE OF ISLANDS FOR PLANES

LONDON, May 23.—Sir George Paish, economic adviser to the Chancellor of the Exchequer during the World War, yesterday proposed that Great Britain exchange some of her West Indies possessions for United States airplanes and pilots.

"The danger of not being able to command enough cash resources to buy what we need," he said, "is a matter of life and death."

CAN SPARE AN ISLAND

He said some Americans had suggested to him that Britain cede some of the West Indies colonies in payment of her war debt to the United States. He added that the time was perhaps more opportune than ever before.

"Surely out of this vast empire of ours," he said, "we can spare one or more of the West Indian Islands."

UNITED STATES DEAL FOR INDIES URGED—PAISH FAVORS GIVING ISLANDS FOR PLANES AND PILOTS

LONDON, May 23.—The United States should trade all the airplanes and pilots Great Britain needs for part of the West Indies, it was suggested yesterday by Sir George Paish, who was economic adviser to the Chancelor of the Exchequer and the Treasury in the World War.

Addressing members of the Sound Currency Association, he said Americans had previously suggested to him that Britain should give up part of her holdings in the West Indies in payment of her war debts. Perhaps the time is more opportune now than ever before for adopting that suggestion, he added.

"Surely out of this vast empire of ours we can spare one or more of the West India Islands in payment," he said.

Britain won the first phase of the war by keeping the seas open, he said, but where was she to get enough exchange to buy what she needed? The solution, he said, seemed to be exchanging some of the West Indies for United States airplanes and pilots.

America's Duty to Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Washington News, which points out rather clearly, I think, that America's duty to democracy is to keep democracy working on this continent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 11, 1940]

REALISM

Full-page newspaper advertisements appearing in many cities yesterday blazoned the line "Stop Hitler Now." They were signed by the "Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies," president of which is William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., great editor and great citizen.

The appeal, like the prohibition experiment, was "noble in purpose." Otherwise it was not so good. The committee, for whose personnel and high purpose we have the greatest respect, might better be called the "Committee To Get America Into the War by the Back Door."

Some Americans, with every right to an opinion, honestly believe that we should now be in the war in Europe. This is not to debate that point. It is rather a plea for realism instead of emotion, and for consideration of the fact that all the armed democracies of Europe combined have not been able to stop Hitler's mechanized military might even with equipment 10 years ahead of anything we possess in quantity. "Stop Hitler Now"—what with? Our bare hands and the bared breasts of our youth?

Though the fact is not yet generally realized, Hitler has already determined the broad lines of our national life for at least another generation. Even with an ocean intervening, European totalitarianism has made obsolete our American way of life, temporarily at

least; permanently unless we modernize our thinking and our national planning. Our country at present is not, as Mr. White's committee states, "still the most powerful nation on earth." To continue to think in terms which ignore the realities is to invite the disaster which has befallen European democracy.

We do not agree, but we respect the right of opinion of those who believe that we should be fighting with the European democracies today. Time may alter the situation, but today it seems inescapable that the surest way to help our friends in the European democracies is first to demonstrate to the dictators that we can help ourselves. Our present job is production for war, not participation in it. We must neither meddle nor muddle. Safety for, and service to, democracy, like charity, must begin at home. Mobilization of our national resources, our genius for mass production and our manpower, to insure a safe haven for democracy in America, will be the surest means of guaranteeing its ultimate revival in Europe.

Our immediate task is to show that our democracy can profit by the mistakes of others, and that the fire of liberty will be kept burning here. Our job today is not to stop Hitler. Our job is to start thinking. Thinking in terms of service to our country rather than service from it. Thinking in terms of defense and self-protection rather than of comfort and personal privilege; thinking in terms of increased production rather than decreased working hours; thinking in terms of the sacrifices that democracy is worth in dollars of capital and man-hours of labor; thinking of two related sentences in Premier Reynaud's remarkable interview yesterday with William Philip Simms in which he said: "In recent years especially, France has tended to speed social advances to the neglect of her national defenses." And, "the spirit which makes a people seek social progress in times of peace, also makes crusaders of them and their soldiers in times like these."

Let's have a truce on bluff and bluster. Let's avoid being edged, via the back door, into any fight until, if we ever must go in, we will be prepared to finish it.

And the foregoing expresses our sentiments about the belligerent tone that characterized the President's address last night at Charlottesville, Va.

This is no time to be talking loudly while carrying a feather duster.

Imports of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

TABLE COMPILED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD some figures compiled by the Department of Commerce which show the tremendous increases in the imports of farm products in 1939 over 1938. These figures will give an idea of what the administration's policy of deliberately given away the American market under the trade-agreements program has cost the farmer.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States imports of agricultural products for calendar years 1938–39

[U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

Import items	Unit	1938	1939
Cattle	Head	424,022	753,570
Canned beef	Pound	78,597,000	85,863,000
Mutton, fresh	Pound	43	105,000
Hides and skins (total)	Pound	181,951,000	323,446,000
Cattle hides	Pound	59,650,000	134,107,000
Sheep and lambskins	Pound	32,649,000	63,776,000
Silver-fox fur skins	Number	16,468	133,251
Barley	Bushel	126,000	776,000
Oats	Bushel	7,183	4,293,000
Wheat (all)	Bushel	3,829,000	10,747,000
Wheat flour	Pound	14,289,000	17,279,000
Hay	Ton	18,954	48,348
Wheat byproduct feeds	Ton	58,394	458,957
Chickpeas, dried	Pound	7,728,000	8,332,000
Potatoes, white or irish	Pound	45,820,000	93,859,000
Potato starch	Pound	6,746,000	10,984,000
Tapioca	Pound	230,879,000	382,803,000
Sago	Pound	11,803,000	22,807,000
Arrowroot	Pound	5,653,000	8,346,000
Peas, canned	Pound	450,000	1,159,000
Pineapples, prepared	Pound	31,524,000	74,991,000
Apples	Bushel	26,020	45,982
Cherries, fresh	Pound	855,000	1,482,000
Wool, unmanufactured	Pound	104,274,000	245,970,000
Wool noils, wastes, and rags	Pound	3,803,000	18,343,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	Pound	71,406,000	82,447,000
Flaxseed	Bushel	15,364,000	16,028,000
Castor beans	Pound	114,073,000	162,611,000
Maple sugar and sirup	Pound	3,984,000	12,268,000
Cheese	Pound	54,432,000	59,071,000
Milk, fresh	Gallon	6,008	22,056
Milk, dried and malted	Pound	80,735	2,465,032
Casein	Pound	417,000	15,832,000
Eggs, in shell	Dozen	231,784	328,523
Brazil or cream nuts	Pound	28,647,000	32,500,000
Filberts	Pound	2,357,000	3,629,000
Pecans	Pound	147,000	214,000
Cashew nuts	Pound	26,069,000	29,466,000

NOTE.—1939 increases over 1938.

Sale of Reserve Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY MAJ. AL WILLIAMS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Maj. Al Williams appearing in yesterday's edition of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 11, 1940]

UNITED STATES CANNOT SPARE SINGLE FIGHTING PLANE AT PRESENT

(By Maj. Al Williams)

The administration is helping the Allies by selling our reserve airplanes back to the manufacturers, who will sell them to Britain and France.

Helping the Allies is one thing, and all right. But I cannot think of the Allies first and the United States second.

Our reserve air system is one of the weakest links of what should be America's strongest chain—air power. Our Army and Navy Reserve aviation groups have never been much more than a pitiful joke. Shortage of planes has been the chief deficiency, with red tape and obsolete flight training of Reserve pilot personnel close behind.

We should have paused before saying, "Let's help the Allies—let's give them our airplanes, especially our second- and third-line planes." We cannot afford to rob ourselves of a single military or naval airplane at this time.

American air power is negligible to the point of being nonexistent. We have two air services—one with the Army, the other with the Navy. Germany, England, Italy, and France rate far above American strength in the air. Our air defense is deplorably weak.

The administration insists we need 50,000 warplanes, and apparently refuses to heed the warnings of Army and Navy air experts and civilian airmen that we must train pilots to fly those planes.

The mass-production capacity of American industry to build aircraft is unsurpassed—provided we work according to sound plan. But where, and how, and with what shall we turn out pilots overnight or anywhere near as fast as we build planes?

Pilot training takes time. Don't be misled by the recent estimate of the Civil Aeronautics Authority that it can turn out 45,000 pilots in a year. It may train 45,000 pilots to fly little commercial planes (40- to 250-horsepower jobs) in a given time. But modern first-line war planes never use less than 1,000-horsepower engines and have landing speeds of 60 or more miles an hour.

What are you going to train your small plane pilot in, after he gets his license to fly the little job? His air education must progress by stages. He cannot jump from a 75-horsepower job to handling a 1,000-horsepower airplane.

We need every high-powered plane we now have, and thousands more, to train our young air fighters to handle real fighting ships—when and if we ever get them. If we had 50,000 superlative fighting planes on our airports today, we would be the laughingstock of the world—because those planes would be obsolete before we could train enough pilots to handle them.

We would have to build about 15,000 advanced training planes to cover the educational gap between the small commercial planes and the first-line fighters. Every military plane—old or new—is worth its weight in gold to us right now as an advanced trainer.

American Citizens of Italian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON POST, NEW YORK TIMES, AND NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune, all of June 12, 1940, dealing with Americans of Italian descent.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1940]

AMERICANS ALL

Yesterday's newspapers reported that the Italian and Italo-American residents of our large eastern cities had listened with deep gloom and foreboding to the fateful words transmitted to them from Rome.

Much of their dismay, no doubt, was due to a realization of the rash and ignoble course to which the Italian fatherland had been committed by the will of its master. Much of it was due to fears for the fate of kindred and friends. But much of it must also have been due to an apprehension of their now uncomfortable situation among neighbors whose nerves and emotions have been tortured by the cataclysmic succession of disasters in western Europe.

News from England a few hours later tended to increase such fears. There had been angry rioting in the Italian quarters of London, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and even Belfast. Only energetic action by police saved harmless shopkeepers and restaurateurs from injury and possibly death.

Meanwhile, many prominent Americans of Italian birth or blood hastened publicly to repudiate the Duce and to reavow the complete allegiance of their followers to the United States. Among these were Representative D'ALESANDRO and Mayor LaGuardia. The mayor warned against demonstrations and promised to preserve the neutrality of the sidewalks of New York. His radio speech contained much sound advice, despite the past occasions on which Mr. LaGuardia, himself, has not remembered to follow it.

We shall do well in this crisis to take the loyalty of our Italian-born citizens and their descendants as much for granted as we expect our own to be taken. Nothing can be more dangerous to the Nation than the fear-inspired fantasies whereby an element of the population, numbering many millions, and yesterday much admired for industry, sobriety, and good nature, becomes today a gigantic horse of Troy. This applies also, of course, to that other large body of our citizens who are of German or Austrian antecedents.

This is a good time to chasten ourselves with the recollection of what incalculable tragedy was wrought upon innocent persons during the spy phobias of some 20 years ago. If ever we reach the point where anyone of German or Italian blood becomes, ipso facto, suspect, we shall have adopted the racial superstitions that we have so roundly and justly condemned in the Nazis. Moreover, we shall have created a confusion and disunity which the real "fifth column" will assuredly turn to its advantage.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1940]

OUR ITALIAN NEIGHBORS

Because his own blood is largely Italian, Mayor LaGuardia could speak fittingly on this week's historic Monday, to and for this city's Italians. Because even his political opponents trust his native impulses at a time like this, he could speak fittingly to and for all of us, of whatever origin. He took it for granted that Americans of Italian birth and descent will, like himself, put the interests of this democracy ahead of those of a foreign government—particularly when the acts of that foreign government are an affront to democracy everywhere, as they are to honor and to decency.

He gave due warning that demonstrations in front of consulates will not be permitted, and that "the persons and property of foreign subjects, as long as we are at peace with other countries, will be fully protected." He also gave warning that consular officers will be expected to "adhere strictly to their consular duties." Opinion in the Italian colony seems to support the mayor's position. There need be no surprise that this should be so.

We believe that there should be a friendly realization, among Americans who are of different origin, that this is a trying time for our Italian neighbors in this city, that they are concerned about relatives and friends in Italy, and that they cannot rejoice in hardships that Italy may have to suffer, any more than they can be proud of the shame which Mussolini has brought upon a lovable and gifted race. Like the rest of us they will hope that the real Italy will in God's good time reassert and redeem herself.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1940]

AMERICANS BY CHOICE

The first reaction among Americans of Italian origin to Mussolini's degradation of his own and his country's fair name is, from a strictly American point of view, encouraging. Of course, many Italians in this country are Fascists at heart. So, also, among the mass of Americans of Italian origin, a passionate pride in Italy exists. Neither is open to fair criticism. But, if the first reports are correct—and they have been duplicated in all the city's newspapers with one exception—the news of Italy's declaration of war was received with anything but enthusiasm in our various "Little Italys" and the reaction of the American born was overwhelmingly pro-American rather than pro-Italian.

This is as it should be—and as it was in the case of the German elements in 1917. It goes without saying that it is almost impossible for the average alien who came to this country as an adult to shake off his or her intense feeling of sympathy for the mother country. But the very fact that most of them are Americans by choice and that their children born and educated here are Americans by training and environment makes it equally natural that the great mass of those of foreign parentage are Americans at heart.

There are, of course, exceptions. But no one who has traveled extensively through this country and spoken with the youth of the Nation can help being struck with the extent to which, outside of a few large concentrated colonies of foreign-born, the children of foreign parents are cast in the same mold as the sons and daughters of the older American stocks. This is America's salvation. If the reactionary racist theories of Europe were soundly grounded and should become widely accepted, the dissolution of the United States would be inevitable. If the Americans of German origin were to regard themselves—or be regarded by others—as Germans, and those of Italian origin as Italians, and those of British or Dutch origin as English or Hollanders, there would be no Americans today. Fortunately, no such condition exists. Descendants of these various stocks may have a sentimental interest in or attachment for their parents' country of origin, but it would be utterly ridiculous to look upon Franklin D. Roosevelt or Arthur H. Vandenberg as Hollanders, or Wendell Willkie or Herbert Hoover as Germans, or Thomas E. Dewey as an Englishman. It would be equally false to look on our earlier leaders, like Lincoln, Grant, Jefferson, Washington, and Robert E. Lee as Englishmen.

The Italian element will doubtless pass through some unpleasant days and nights. They cannot help but resent the fact that Mussolini's "stab in the back" has aroused such intense distaste among the mass of Americans. But they are a good stock, and have contributed much to the country's growth and welfare. Mayor LaGuardia's stern but friendly reminder that they are Americans first, last, and all the time will doubtless help them to preserve their balance, even if the Fascist agents in this country—who are many—copy the Nazi tactics of moral blackmail by threatening persons who refuse to carry out the agents' orders with injury to their relatives on the other side of the Atlantic. They may also derive comfort from the realization that the best way of proving that Mussolini is not typical of Italy's best blood is by being unswerving in their loyalty to the United States.

Taxation During the Twenties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when Woodrow Wilson left the office of the Presidency in March 1921 he left on the statute books a schedule of income-tax rates which might have been the means of avoiding the depression of 1929 had they been kept in effect by the Republican administrations which followed. The reason I say that is because those tax rates would have prevented the accumulation of the great surpluses and fortunes of the twenties which were in part the cause of the failure of our economic system during these years to distribute sufficient mass buying power to sus-

tain production at its comparatively high level. Furthermore the United States Government would have derived additional revenue in the amount of approximately $11,500,000,000 during the twenties had the Wilson surtax rates remained in effect. That amount of money could have been used to cushion the shock of the collapse of October 1929 in such a way as to prevent the cumulative increase of unemployment and depression.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith certain tables in this connection which I believe will be self-explanatory. They have been prepared by Mr. Charles C. Whiting, of Springfield, Ohio, and I wish to express my deep appreciation for the work he has done.

Table A shows the number of income-tax returns, by classes of income, which were filed in the years 1921 to 1929. Significance of this table lies in the very great increase in the number of returns filed—particularly in the topmost brackets.

Table B shows the figures regarding income taxes for the three classes: $5,000 to $10,000, $10,000 to $25,000, and $25,000 to $50,000. Here the main things to be noted are the average rate per cents on total income of the tax.

Table C is a complete showing of the changes which have taken place in surtax rates and in amounts of surtaxes on incomes of certain sizes since 1921, though they do not of course include the changes made by the tax bill passed on yesterday.

Table D deals only with incomes between $500,000 and $1,000,000, and shows, first, the actual taxes collected on these incomes between 1921 and 1935; second, the taxes that would have been collected had 1921 rates been kept in effect; and third, the increase in revenue that would have resulted on this class of incomes alone.

Table E shows the same facts as to incomes of $1,000,000 and above.

Table F gives a summary which indicates that $11,540,000,000 would have been collected in revenue had the 1921 rates remained in effect throughout the twenties. It also shows how it was the people in the high and not in the middle brackets whose savings were far the greatest as a result of this.

There will, I know, be various comments and interpretations upon the figures here submitted. I think it is obvious, however, at the very least that sound tax policy is to be found in the maintenance of substantial rates on those with ample ability to pay in times of prosperity, and that unless this is done the groundwork for depression is being laid.

TABLE A.—*Number of individual returns filed 1921–29*

Class of income	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929
$5,000 to $10,000	353,247	391,373	387,842	437,330	503,652	560,549	567,700	628,766	658,039
$10,000 to $25,000	132,344	151,329	170,095	191,216	236,779	246,730	252,079	270,889	271,454
$25,000 to $50,000	28,946	35,478	39,832	47,061	59,721	57,487	60,123	68,048	63,689
$50,000 to $100,000	8,717	12,000	12,452	15,816	20,958	20,520	22,573	27,207	24,073
$100,000 to $150,000	1,367	2,171	2,339	3,065	4,759	4,724	5,261	7,049	6,376
$150,000 to $300,000	739	1,323	1,301	1,876	3,223	3,267	3,873	5,678	5,310
$300 000 to $500,000	162	309	327	457	892	892	1,141	1,756	1,641
$500,000 to $1,000,000	63	161	141	242	479	468	557	983	976
Over $1,000,000	21	67	74	75	207	231	290	511	513

NOTE.—The above table of returns shows clearly the rapid increase in the number of returns during the years immediately following the World War, and a reference to the table showing the amounts of net income, taxes paid, and the average rate percent of tax on net income, show very clearly the evident manipulation of the revenue act changes to materially benefit those with incomes in the higher brackets.

TABLE B

	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929
CLASS $5,000 TO $10,000									
Returns filed	353,247	391,373	387,842	487,330	503,652	560,549	567,700	628,766	658,039
Total net income	$2,378,759,237	$2,641,904,702	$2,653,026,193	$2,991,187,905	$3,463,852,012	$3,838,953,366	$3,895,759,157	$4,282,520,130	$4,481,575,786
Total taxes	$68,871,422	$70,387,912	$54,074,735	$28,827,944	$19,149,177	$20,272,195	$20,664,502	$22,895,853	$9,550,599
Average rate, percent of tax on income	2.89	2.66	2.04	0.96	0.55	0.52	0.53	0.53	0.21
CLASS $10,000 TO $25,000									
Returns filed	132,344	151,329	170,095	191,216	236,779	246,730	252,079	270,889	271,454
Total net income	$1,958,156,206	$2,255,871,780	$2,538,079,115	$2,855,396,811	$3,544,898,379	$3,660,622,482	$3,748,057,507	$4,037,853,104	$4,025,233,375
Total taxes	$126,886,410	$123,575,960	$103.109,350	$78,068,669	$74,171,952	$72,464,803	$74,225,906	$82,757,745	$59,893,017
Average rate, percent of tax on income	6.48	5.47	4.06	2.73	2.09	1.98	1.98	2.05	1.49
CLASS $25,000 TO $50,000									
Returns filed	28,946	35,478	39,832	47,061	59,721	57,487	60,123	68,048	63,689
Total net income	$979,629,305	$1,208,273,932	$1,350,680,468	$1,599,848,363	$2,032,239,284	$1,954,653,219	$2,051,770,684	$2,826,502,829	$2,174,458,126
Total taxes	$112,909,840	$125,697,249	$103,600,750	$109,359,811	$120,688,692	$112,796,680	$119,475,301	$136,568,322	$113,904,197
Average rate, percent of tax on income	11.52	10.43	7.67	6.83	5.94	5.77	5.82	5.87	5.24

TABLE C.—*Surtax table showing various changes for period 1921 to 1936, inclusive*

Act of year	1921		1922–23		1924–25		1926–31		1932		1934		1936	
Class of income	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
$5,000											4	$40	4	$40
$6,000	1	$10									4	80	4	80
$8,000	2	50	1	$20					1	$20	5	180	5	180
$10,000	3	110	1	40					1	40	6	300	6	300
$12,000	4	190	2	80	1	$20	1	$20	2	80	7	440	7	440
$14,000	5	290	3	140	1	40	1	40	3	140	8	600	8	600
$16,000	6	410	4	220	2	80	2	80	4	220	9	780	9	780
$18,000	7	550	5	320	3	140	3	140	5	320	11	1,000	11	1,000
$20,000	8	710	6	440	4	220	4	220	6	440	13	1,260	13	1,260
$22,000	9	890	8	600	5	320	5	320	8	600	15	1,560	15	1,560
$24,000	10	1,090	9	780	6	440	6	440	9	780	17	1,900	17	1,900
$26,000	11	1,310	10	980	7	580	7	580	10	980	17	2,240	17	2,240
$28,000	12	1,550	11	1,200	8	740	7	720	11	1,200	19	2,620	19	2,620
$30,000	13	1,810	12	1,440	9	920	8	880	12	1,440	19	2,900	19	2,900
$32,000	14	2,090	13	1,700	10	1,120	8	1,040	13	1,700	19	3,380	19	3,380
$34,000	15	2,390	15	2,000	10	1,320	9	1,220	15	2,000	21	3,800	21	3,800
$36,000	16	2,710	15	2,300	11	1,540	9	1,400	15	2,300	21	4,220	21	4,220
$38,000	17	3,050	16	2,620	12	1,780	10	1,600	16	2,620	21	4,640	21	4,640

TABLE C.—*Surtax table showing various changes for period 1921 to 1936, inclusive*—Continued

Act of year	1921		1922-23		1924-25		1926-31		1932		1934		1936	
Class of income	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount	Per-cent	Amount
$40,000	18	$3,410	17	$2,960	13	$2,040	10	$1,800	17	$2,960	24	$5,120	24	$5,120
$42,000	19	3,790	18	3,320	13	2,300	11	2,020	18	3,320	24	5,600	24	5,600
$44,000	20	4,190	19	3,700	14	2,580	11	2,240	19	3,700	24	6,080	24	6,080
$46,000	21	4,610	20	4,100	15	2,880	12	2,480	20	4,100	27	6,620	27	6,620
$48,000	22	5,050	21	4,520	16	3,200	12	2,720	21	4,500	27	7,160	27	7,160
$50,000	23	5,510	22	4,960	17	3,540	13	2,980	22	4,960	27	7,700	27	7,700
$52,000	24	5,990	23	5,420	18	3,900	13	3,240	23	5,420	30	8,300	31	8,320
$54,000	25	6,490	24	5,900	19	4,280	14	3,520	24	5,900	30	8,900	31	8,940
$56,000	26	7,010	25	6,400	19	4,660	14	3,800	25	6,400	30	9,500	31	9,560
$58,000	27	7,550	26	6,920	20	5,060	15	4,100	26	6,920	33	10,160	35	10,260
$60,000	28	8,110	27	7,460	21	5,480	15	4,400	27	7,460	33	10,280	35	10,960
$62,000	29	8,690	28	8,020	21	5,900	16	4,720	28	8,020	33	11,480	35	11,660
$64,000	30	9,290	29	8,600	22	6,340	16	5,040	29	8,600	36	12,200	39	12,440
$66,000	31	9,910	30	9,200	23	6,800	17	5,380	30	9,200	36	12,920	39	13,220
$68,000	32	10,550	31	9,820	24	7,280	17	5,720	31	9,820	36	13,640	39	14,000
$70,000	33	11,210	32	10,460	25	7,780	17	6,160	32	10,460	39	14,420	43	14,860
$72,000	34	11,890	33	11,120	26	8,300	18	6,420	33	11,120	39	15,200	43	15,720
$74,000	35	12,590	34	11,800	26	8,820	18	6,780	34	11,800	39	15,980	43	16,580
$76,000	36	13,310	35	12,500	27	9,360	18	7,140	35	12,500	42	16,820	47	17,520
$78,000	37	14,050	36	13,320	28	9,920	18	7,500	36	13,220	42	17,760	47	18,460
$80,000	38	14,810	37	13,960	28	10,480	18	7,860	37	13,960	42	18,500	47	19,400
$82,000	39	15,590	38	14,720	29	11,060	19	8,240	38	14,720	45	19,400	51	20,420
$84,000	40	16,390	39	15,500	30	11,660	19	8,620	39	15,500	45	20,300	51	21,440
$86,000	41	17,210	40	16,300	31	12,280	19	9,000	40	16,300	45	21,200	51	22,460
$88,000	42	18,050	41	17,120	31	12,900	19	9,380	41	17,120	45	22,100	51	23,480
$90,000	43	18,910	42	17,960	32	13,540	19	9,760	42	17,960	45	23,000	51	24,500
$92,000	44	19,790	43	18,820	33	14,200	19	10,140	43	18,820	50	24,000	55	25,600
$94,000	45	20,690	44	19,700	34	14,880	19	10,520	44	19,700	50	25,000	55	26,700
$96,000	46	21,610	45	20,600	35	15,580	19	10,900	45	20,600	50	26,000	55	27,800
$98,000	47	22,550	46	21,520	36	16,300	19	11,280	46	21,520	50	27,000	55	28,900
$100,000	48	23,510	47	22,460	36	17,020	19	11,660	47	22,460	50	28,000	55	30,000
$150,000	52	49,510	48	46,460	37	35,520	20	21,660	48	46,460	52	54,000	58	59,000
$200,000	56	77,510	49	70,960	37	54,020	20	31,660	49	70,960	53	80,500	60	89,000
$300,000	60	137,510	50	120,960	38	92,020	20	51,660	50	120,960	54	134,500	64	152,000
$400,000	63	200,510	50	170,960	39	131,020	20	71,660	51	171,960	55	189,500	66	218,000
$500,000	63	263,510	50	220,960	39	170,020	20	91,660	52	223,960	56	245,500	68	286,000
$1,000,000	65	583,510	50	470,960	40	370,020	20	191,660	54	491,460	58	533,000	72	641,000
$2,000,000	65	1,233,510	50	970,960	40	770,020	20	391,660	55	1,041,460	59	1,123,000	73	1,371,000
$3,000,000	65	1,883,510	50	1,470,960	40	1,170,020	20	591,660	55	1,591,460	59	1,713,000	74	2,111,000
$4,000,000	65	2,533,510	50	1,970,960	40	1,570,020	20	791,660	55	2,141,460	59	2,303,000	74	2,851,000
$5,000,000	65	3,183,510	50	2,470,960	40	1,970,020	20	991,660	55	2,691,460	59	2,893,000	74	3,591,000
Over	65		50		40		20		55		59		75	

TABLE D.—*Individual income class $500,000 to $1,000,000, years 1921 to 1935, inclusive*

Year	Returns	Total net income	Actual taxes paid	Tax figured, 1921 rates	Possible increased revenue, 1921 rates
1921	63	$42,780,426	$25,112,090	$25,112,090	
1922	161	107,670,678	38,559,344	63,202,688	$24,643,344
1923	141	95,107,209	25,498,434	55,827,932	30,329,498
1924	242	158,462,179	42,585,301	93,017,299	50,431,998
1925	479	327,367,523	53,674,188	192,164,578	138,490,390
1926	468	317,881,202	53,665,366	186,596,266	132,930,900
1927	557	378,166,589	64,265,391	221,983,788	157,718,397
1928	983	670,861,671	116,424,264	393,795,801	277,371,537
1929	976	669,877,752	106,218,910	393,218,240	286,999,330
1930	318	211,693,377	34,288,780	124,264,015	89,975,235
1931	149	102,310,704	15,456,946	60,056,383	44,599,437
1932	86	57,874,331	19,016,370	33,972,774	14,956,404
1933	81	56,700,000	21,221,000	33,082,900	11,861,900
1934	86	59,464,000	30,745,000	34,725,368	3,980,368
1935	109	73,811,000	38,323,000	43,327,057	5,004,057
Total	4,899	3,330,028,541	685,054,384	1,954,347,179	1,269,292,795

TABLE E.—*Individual income class of $1,000,000 and over, years 1921 to 1935, inclusive*

Year	Returns filed	Net income	Actual taxes paid	Taxes figured, 1921 rates	Possible increased revenue using 1921 percentage
1921	63	$49,411,329	$31,419,726	$31,419,726	
1922	67	141,386,993	49,517,639	87,235,774	$37,718,135
1923	74	152,071,881	35,788,475	93,828,350	58,039,875
1924	75	155,974,475	47,207,203	96,236,151	49,028,948
1925	207	422,456,852	66,867,521	260,655,877	193,788,356
1926	231	494,393,917	81,893,331	305,051,046	223,157,715
1927	290	600,640,846	98,657,237	370,595,401	271,938,164
1928	511	1,108,863,041	185,141,211	684,168,495	499,028,284
1929	513	1,212,098,784	191,054,006	747,864,950	556,810,944
1930	150	359,904,655	61,097,659	228,539,456	167,441,797
1931	77	166,059,869	26,885,723	105,448,017	78,562,294
1932	20	35,239,556	16,476,166	22,398,118	5,921,952
1933	50	86,857,000	27,759,000	55,154,195	27,395,195
1934	33	57,775,000	32,211,000	36,687,130	4,476,130
1935	41	73,630,000	41,499,000	46,755,050	5,256,050
Total	2,360	5,116,764,198	993,473,897	3,172,037,736	2,178,563,839

TABLE F.—*Summary of individual income-tax returns for years 1921 to 1935, inclusive*

[All amounts in dollars except returns]

Class of income	Returns filed	Net income	Taxes paid	Possible taxes using 1921 average rate percentage	Possible increased revenue
Less than $3,000	45,304,388	$82,545,492,209	$263,136,643	$450,903,145	$187,766,502
$3,000 to $5,000	16,847,390	64,444,229,654	282,720,981	677,109,097	394,388,116
$5,000 to $10,000	6,568,564	44,609,510,339	507,055,211	1,289,340,240	782,285,029
$10,000 to $25,000	2,640,740	39,161,986,486	1,169,452,597	2,537,693,871	1,368,241,274
$25,000 to $50,000	609,401	20,732,806,227	1,455,282,570	2,378,475,976	923,193,406
$50,000 to $100,000	211,840	14,319,256,596	1,740,452,142	2,750,475,161	1,010,023,019
$100,000 to $150,000	46,312	5,586,028,025	935,269,791	1,788,632,303	853,362,512
$150,000 to $300,000	32,593	6,905,647,480	1,283,071,653	2,774,590,746	1,491,519,093
$300,000 to $500,000	9,000	3,415,166,243	691,128,055	1,772,596,224	1,081,468,169
$500,000 to $1,000,000	4,899	3,330,028,541	685,054,384	1,954,347,179	1,269,292,795
Over $1,000,000	2,360	5,116,764,198	993,473,897	3,172,037,736	2,178,563,839
Total	72,277,487	290,166,915,998	10,006,097,924	21,546,201,678	11,540,103,754

The 2,339 individuals in the over $1,000,000 class for returns filed during the years 1922-35 were saved $931,408 per return.
The 4,836 individuals in the $500,000 to $1,000,000 class during this period were saved $262,467 per return.
The 8,838 individuals in the $300,000 to $500,000 class were saved $122,365 per return.
The figures which have been used in the tables above have been taken from the statistical data relative to individual income-tax returns as published in the Abstract of Statistics by the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA, AND REPLY BY COMMISSIONER T. A. M. CRAVEN

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a letter on the subject of television, written by me to Federal Communications Commissioner T. A. M. Craven on June 3, 1940, and his reply thereto.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE,
June 3, 1940.

Commissioner T. A. M. CRAVEN,
Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CRAVEN: We note in the press that you joined with the Commission in its report dated May 28, 1940, concerning the matter of television. Will you please inform me of the Commission's action? May I request that you give your reasons for now concurring with the majority, with whom you previously disagreed? I am particularly anxious to know whether television is to go forward as a new industry or is it to be stifled by Government bureaucracy.

I am aware that responding to inquiries from Congressmen has been questioned in your case. A Senator and a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, I believe, has the right to be informed of your views and your reasons for voting as you have in this important matter of television.

Therefore I would appreciate a prompt reply.

Yours very sincerely,

ERNEST LUNDEEN.

JUNE 5, 1940.

The Honorable ERNEST LUNDEEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LUNDEEN: Acknowledgment is hereby made of your letter dated June 3, 1940, requesting me to inform you of the Commission's action of May 28, 1940, concerning television, and to give my reasons for now concurring with the majority, with whom I previously disagreed.

Since you have raised the issue of your right to this information, I request that it be made clear that I have no objections to giving reasons for my vote on any official action of the Commission, when such is specifically requested by a Member of Congress. I do this as a matter of courtesy and without questioning the right of a Member of Congress to undertake such a procedure. However, in this instance I know you will understand my hesitancy to emphasize publicly and controversially any differences of opinion which I may have had with my colleagues. To do so unnecessarily invites the specter of dissension, even when, as in the instant case, there existed within the Commission merely honest differences of opinion.

It may be recalled that I dissented from the Commission's action of March 23, 1940, because in my opinion this action, among other things, appeared to retard unnecessarily the development of television as a service to the public. On the other hand, the later Commission action of May 28, 1940, is intended to facilitate progress in television. Thus, while the two actions are related they present an entirely different set of circumstances as to the future. I am more interested in the future of television than in the past, and hence judge the later Commission action in the light of future progress.

Naturally I do not agree with some of the details of the Commission's television report of May 28. Likewise I would be more satisfied with a procedure for the future different from that suggested in the report. Nevertheless, I concur with the Commission in its broader objectives. The differences I now have are not of sufficient importance to justify a dissenting vote. I see no logical reasons for me to insist upon details, or even upon a different procedure, provided the Commission can agree unanimously on some broad, constructive objective leading to more rapid progress in television.

It is my opinion that the Commission intends to encourage actively the promotion of television as a service to the public in their homes. It is my belief that as soon as the scientists of the industry can come to an unbiased agreement with respect to the best current engineering practices for television, the Commission will authorize full commercialization to be undertaken by licensees of television broadcast stations. In the near future the chairman of the Commission will call to Washington the leading television engineers of the country for the purpose of encouraging higher standards and coordinated approach to research. Thus, with this cooperation between the Commission and the industry, technical progress and agreement on basic standards of the best current engineering practice can be facilitated. In this connection I do not believe anyone will condone "stalling" by any licensee, engineer, or manufacturer on the question of the best current engineering practices in television.

In addition, the Commission intends to grant immediately several pending applications for television broadcast stations throughout the country. The Commission will authorize these licensees to transmit television programs while, at the same time, requiring them to keep their stations abreast of scientific progress by undertaking research leading to uniformity in the external performance characteristic of the transmitters.

The foregoing appears to me to have the broad objective of facilitating rapid progress toward the adoption of proper uniform standards of current engineering practice for television. At the same time there is the intention of authorizing television broadcasting stations operated by private enterprise on a regular business basis as soon as this is consistent with the adoption of proper uniform engineering standards for transmitter performance. With such objectives television can move forward faster than it has in several years past, because the Commission again presents some incentive to the television pioneers of the Nation. The Commission's report indicates it will authorize full commercialization of television as soon as the engineering opinion of the industry is prepared to approve any one of the competing television systems.

Since I am vitally interested in making constructive progress to start television as a vast new industry, with all its implications as to service and employment, I see no logical reason for insisting upon one method in preference to others, provided all of us can agree on something which is intended to stimulate progress. While I regret the Commission's rules will not permit immediate commercialization by experimental television station designed primarily to broadcast television programs, my colleagues prefer another method also designed to achieve progress on to the

ultimate goal of good television service to the public. I recognize that other methods may possibly achieve the desired goal by a different route. Therefore, under the circumstances, I see no valid reason for dissenting in this respect. I am confident that the Commission will not delay authorizing commercial television by waiting unduly for the unknown inventions of the future.

While I have advocated public trials of different television engineering developments, if such be necessary to get television started, I recognize that this procedure has disadvantages as well as advantages. I also recognize, and have also advocated, the desirability of the industry progressing uniformly and concurrently with respect to standards of engineering practice. Uniform standards should be the ultimate goal. Personally, I prefer that the Commission refuse to approve or disapprove standards at this time because of the disagreement among the engineers of the industry. However, I have no basic objection to the Commission prescribing such uniform standards from time to time, provided such standards are broad in base and subject to change; and provided further that such action does not preclude public trial of technical developments of the future. In this connection, any standards adopted or prescribed today will be changed in the future anyway, as new inventions are made, or as public opinion dictates. No one can stop inventive genius or control public opinion. For example, I cannot envisage either the television industry or the Commission being bound 10 years hence by the best engineering practices current today, even though standardization will influence the situation. Improvements undoubtedly will occur requiring frequent changes even in basic standards. While the problem of obsolescence is a factor to be considered, I do not believe that factor alone will or can stop progress or prevent changes for the better.

Therefore, in connection with this engineering phase of the television problem, it appears useless for me to insist upon a specific procedure.

Summarizing the foregoing, it is my estimate of the situation that, at a relatively early date, there can be established by private enterprise several television stations throughout the Nation rendering a competitive commercial television broadcasting service to the public. Each of these stations will be capable of broadcasting programs to the public with transmitters having the best uniform engineering performance possible at this time. Of course, in making this estimate I have to disregard the possible economic influence of the European war. I cannot foretell whether the effect of such economics will stimulate or retard the development of the television industry.

I believe in getting television started as a new industry as soon as possible. I think it is ready to undertake the initial construction now. I know that you will agree with me that any quibbling on methods or raising the ghosts of the past will not contribute constructively toward the progress which must be made on the long road ahead before television is established as an acceptable service to the public on a Nation-wide competitive scale. In America we are at a critical point. Unity of action is necessary, not only in Government but also in industry, as well as between the Government and industry. This is no time to insist upon specific methods, provided agreement can be reached on broad principles of constructive action, designed to attain a definite goal.

Very truly yours,

T. A. M. CRAVEN, *Commissioner.*

P. S.: I have discussed this reply to your inquiry with the chairman of this Commission. He informs me that we are in close agreement on the broad objective of facilitating progress in television.

American Expeditionary Force in Present War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

SPEECH BY W. A. S. DOUGLAS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a speech by W. A. S. Douglas, which appeared yesterday in the Washington Times-Herald. Mr. Douglas has demonstrated beyond any doubt that we cannot enter the European war and refuse to send our boys.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 11, 1940]

SECOND AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE TO CLIMAX UNITED STATES AID TO BRITISH, FRENCH—ALLIED NEED FOR MANPOWER HELD GREATER THAN IN WORLD WAR

Speaking over station WOL last night, W. A. S. Douglas, of the Times-Herald staff, ex-soldier and recently a war correspondent in the European battle zone, presented the conclusions of an Army officer friend who insisted that present governmental actions in regard to the Allies are acts of war against the totalitarian states and that such actions cannot fail to bring into Europe an American expeditionary force.

Douglas quotes the authority as firm in his belief that the war will come to us without our going after it.

"WRONG IMPRESSION"

Douglas said:

"I talked to a high-ranking military officer yesterday who told me that there appears to be a generally accepted conclusion throughout the United States that this country can get into this second World War to influence its course and its outcome without sending boys and young men across the seas.

"He tells me—and I am presenting his case to you because I consider him one of the smartest soldiers of today—that advocates of intervention are trying to give the impression that France and England do not need men and that therefore we can arrive at the status of a belligerent without sending a single boy to fight in Europe. The argument overlooks the fact that the decision to be a belligerent is irrevocable—as Mussolini's decision is irrevocable—and that the supplying of troops follows also as an irrevocably developing fact.

"CITES LAST ENTRY

"Remember, these are not my thoughts, but the thoughts of a man for whom I have the greatest respect. Those of us who remember the last war, he reminds me, can remember also that when entrance by the United States was discussed, it was insisted that the Allies had all the men they needed and that what they wanted was nothing but credit, cash, and supplies.

"They got all that. Then there came, and very quickly, too, that 'token' army. And then, although the cash, the credit, the munitions, and the supplies were going over and the 'token' army was ready, there burst upon us conscription—and that army, 4,000,000,000 strong, from which stemmed the American Expeditionary Force.

"ENGLAND NEEDS MEN

"I think that England today is badly in need of manpower. The fact that British conscripts and volunteers are found on the French left wing seems to substantiate that alleged shortage.

"There is, my friend states, a definite similarity between the set-up of the first World War and the set-up abroad today. He can see no reasonable chance of the Allies winning a short war. In fact, if this war is going to be short, everything points to the defeat of the Allies. Therefore, if the United States should become a belligerent, we would be either backing a lost cause or else be furnishing cash, credit, supplies, munitions, and men for a long, costly, and bloody war; a war which, my military friend declares, is going to come to us in the long run—if the Allies lose—without our going after it.

"ARGUMENTS IN PROOF

"He pointed out to me his basis for proof that the need of the Allies for more men is greater and more urgent today than in the last war. And here are his presentations in sequence:

"One. There was an eastern front in the last war held by the Russians until the "red" revolution.

"Two. Italy was on the side of the Allies in the first World War.

"Three. Belgium remained with the Allies and gave excellent account of herself all through the first World War. Now she is out of the picture.

"FLANDERS DISASTER

"Four. England and France never suffered in the first World War such punishment as they have experienced recently in Flanders.

"Five. In the first war, Germany and Austria were allies, but operated as distinct units at least until the middle of the war. And at no time was there the coordination or the rigorous discipline over Austria, as is now being exercised by Germany.

"Six. England must keep a large and well-trained army at home.

"Seven. In the first World War the French used a tremendous number of colonial troops. There has been no sign of their presence in this war so far and it seems obvious it has been considered necessary to keep them in the colonial possessions.

"Eight. This is a gasoline war. Mechanics and other men skilled in driving and service of tanks, trucks, and planes must be at a premium. Such men are plentiful in the United States in comparison with those among the allied personnel and within recruiting or conscription reach.

"REMINDS OF PERSHING

"He reminds me that General Pershing insisted from the start of the landing of American boys in France that none of these could be used for replacements in French and British regiments. He says Pershing insisted on this despite efforts made by President Wilson to have him give in to the pleas of Lloyd George, Marshal Haig, and Marshal Foch. My friend believes that if we do get involved we are much less likely to secure that firmness of purpose regarding trench and field loans of manpower to blend with French and British manpower than we were in the last war.

"He states that thousands of draftees sailed out of Hoboken without knowledge of firearms or squad drill. I distinctly remember a humorous circumstance along those lines myself.

"Disembarking American soldiers were passing an inspecting officer on the pier at Liverpool, England. It was plain to see that they were still soldiers in the making. And their officers were also new. There was one Florida lad who came by, looking fairly well;

he had almost passed the officer when the latter suddenly noticed that he was minus his wrap-around puttees.

"ASKS ABOUT PUTTEES

"The recruit's breeches just flowed into his socks, and his socks flowed naturally into his boots.

"'Where,' snapped the disembarkation officer, 'are your puttees?'

"'Puttees? puttees?' asked the boy. 'Whaddyemean, puttees?'

"'Your leg coverings,' explained the officer. 'Those wrap-arounds they issued you. Long khaki strips you wind around. Don't you see what these other men are wearing?'

"The lad from Florida laughed loud and long, and then hitched up his blouse to show both puttees wound carefully 'round the region of his stomach.

"'Joke's sure on me, Cap,' he answered grinning widely. 'I thought that was a cholera belt.'"

German Credit Renewal Plan Is Negotiated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of June 2, 1940.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of June 2, 1940]

GERMAN CREDIT RENEWAL PLAN IS NEGOTIATED

NEW YORK, June 1.—Representatives of Wall Street banks are returning from Europe with a plan for renewal of an agreement with Germany covering commercial credits, informed banking sources said today. The plan, it was learned, was worked out in discussions in Rome for submission to a committee from local banks which had extended credits to Germany.

A temporary arrangement calling for gradual reduction of outstanding credits was made last December. It expired yesterday. Under it Germany paid interest ranging from 3 to 4 percent and cut the estimated indebtedness from $46,000,000 to $40,000,000.

The new plan, it was said, probably followed closely the expired agreement, but disclosure of the details awaited return of the negotiators. They are due home within the next 10 days.

Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

LETTER FROM PHILIP B. FLEMING

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 18, 1940.

Mr. J. S. CAPPER,

President, Toro Manufacturing Corporation, 3042 Snelling Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: It was good of you to send me the report entitled "Typical Cases Illustrating Adverse Effects of Wage and Hour Law Upon Employees, Employers, and the Employment Situation." You state that the report was prepared by a committee of 10 or 12 persons in Minneapolis and St. Paul, who had made a survey of the various concerns in that area affected by the wage-and-hour law. I have undertaken to make a careful study of each situation presented, and for that reason have been unable to furnish you with a reply at an earlier date.

Apparently, the purpose of the report was to gather together and circulate information in connection with instances in which the Fair Labor Standards Act was thought by the authors of the report to have created hardships or to have had other undesirable results. In other words, the report is a compilation of so-called hardship cases rather than an analysis of the effects of the wage-and-hour law. For this reason, it could not but paint an unfair picture of the way the law is working.

The Fair Labor Standards Act is a national law having Nation-wide application. Any law of this character must of necessity result in some isolated cases of alleged hardship, but I believe that it is entirely unfair to regard such cases as being the typical results of the law. Even assuming some of the cases in the committee's report to be cases of real hardship which the law has created, they seem insignificant when considered beside the hundreds of thousands of cases in which the law has had an admittedly beneficial effect. I shall now undertake to comment on the cases in the committee's report in the order in which they are presented.

1. This case involves a certified public accountant who is a duly elected secretary of a corporation, although not a member of the board of directors, employed at a salary of over $5,000 a year. He is in charge of the audits and accounts for the company's branch offices as well as its main office. Periodically, he works over 42 hours a week when required to make audits of the branch offices which are located outside the city. It is stated that the Wage and Hour Division was asked for a ruling as to whether this employee was exempt as employed in an executive, administrative, or professional capacity. It is also stated that the ruling of the Division does not give the company complete assurance that this employee is exempt.

Whether or not an employee is employed in an executive or administrative capacity depends upon whether his employment satisfies the conditions set forth in the Administrator's definition of those terms. (See sec. 541.1 of the enclosed regulations.) Similarly, to be exempt as a professional employee, the conditions of section 541.2 of the Administrator's regulations, which defines the term "professional," must be satisfied. These definitions were promulgated only after lengthy conferences with representatives of various business groups, and there was singular unanimity of opinion that the definitions were so clear that any employer could readily determine therefrom their applicability to his employees.

It has been the consistent policy of the Division to refrain from expressing an opinion as to the applicability of these definitions to particular cases. The decision in an individual case is purely a question of fact, and it was felt that an ex parte presentation of facts was hardly a proper basis upon which to render an opinion. Further, although the Administrator has authority under the act to issue regulations on this matter, he can give no binding assurance that a particular employee is or is not employed in an exempt capacity. Nevertheless, we attempt to be as helpful as possible by explaining the broad outlines of the definitions. Thus, we have informed all inquirers that a certified public accountant usually satisfies the requirement of the professional definition that the employee's work be "based upon educational training in a specially organized body of knowledge." If the other parts of the definition, which can be readily applied by the employer, are satisfied, the certified public accountant is exempt. From the brief statement of the employee's duties which are contained in your committee's report, there would seem to be little doubt that the employee is within the exemption. I should think that if the facts are as given in the report, any employer could determine that the employee was exempt by merely reading section 541.2.

2. The second case summarized concerns a young woman employed at a salary of $140 a month. It is stated that, although she enjoyed a 3-week vacation with pay, was never docked for sickness, and worked less hours during the year than if she had worked 44 or 42 hours per week, her employer was informed that it owed her overtime compensation for certain workweeks in which she worked in excess of the maximum workweek applicable under section 7 of the act.

Quite clearly, the overtime provisions of the act apply on a workweek basis. Section 7 (a) (2) expressly provides that no employer shall work his employees for a workweek longer than 42 hours without paying them time and one-half for each hour over 42. If language expressed by the national legislature is to be given its plain meaning, the conclusion seems inescapable that the act provides no method whereby hours may be averaged over a period of longer than one workweek for the purpose of determining compliance with the basic overtime provisions of section 7. Further support for such an interpretation of section 7 (a) (2) is found in the fact that some flexibility with respect to overtime requirements is prescribed. Sections 7 (b) (1) and 7 (b) (2) provide a partial overtime exemption with respect to employees employed pursuant to certain types of collective bargaining contracts. If the conditions of either section 7 (b) (1) or section 7 (b) (2) are met, the employees need be paid overtime only for hours in excess of 12 a day or in excess of 56 a week. These exemptions are explained in greater detail in our Interpretative Bulletin No. 8, a copy of which is enclosed.

It is not believed that an amendment to the statute providing for an averaging of hours over a period of 2 or more weeks would be workable. Some of the difficulties presented by such a provision are that it would greatly increase enforcement difficulties, complicate employer's record keeping and remove much of the stimulus to regularize employment. Moreover, if the experience of the N. R. A. can be taken as a guide, an averaging system inevitably breaks down in practice unless it is reenforced by a strong union contract, as provided for in section 7 (b) (1) or 7 (b) (2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, or unless the averaging period is extremely short.

On the question of enforcement, the individual worker would not know whether he was being paid less overtime than was legally required unless he understood clearly what the averaging provisions meant, was informed when the period began and kept a daily and weekly record of the hours he worked. He would then have to wait until the end of the period and would have to be able to add and divide before he could decide whether he had any overtime pay due him. How serious this problem would be may be realized when it is known that many of the employees of those who advocate an averaging provision can neither read nor write nor keep records of their own as to time worked. This means that some of the very sections of industry which are most in need of a limitation of hours would be deprived of the most effective policing method—complaints by individual employees.

A similar enforcement difficulty would confront the Government inspector. Evidence of the violation could be had only when the final paycheck was available after the end of the period, and then only as a result of a laborious process of computing the average for each employee. The inspector would then be confronted with the dilemma of trying to relate particular violations with particular shipments in interstate commerce. Even in cases of flagrant violation of the hour standards, criminal action would become difficult, and in our enforcement policy it would be necessary to show interstate commerce for the entire period instead of for a particular workweek, as is now the case.

One of the objections sometimes raised to the Wage and Hour Act is that the record keeping is complicated. Any method of averaging involves more elaborate records than are now necessary and the longer the period to be averaged, the more complicated the necessary calculations. The exemption presumably must apply to individual employees and the employer would have to know not only what plant average hours were, but before he could decide whether to work an employee overtime in any given week, he would also have to know what the employee's record had been in previous workweeks of the period. In some small plants this might almost double the bookkeeping previously required.

In a number of ways the averaging provision would tend to accentuate fluctuations in employment and in earnings and thus defeat one of the major purposes of the act. Thus an employer who found, near the end of an averaging period, that a particular employee, or group of employees, was going to have a substantial amount of overtime, would either lay these employees off or put them on such short time that their average would be reduced to the legal limit. In the case of irresponsible and fly-by-night operators, the lay-off method would probably be preferred, since employees who were paid off at the end of 12 weeks, after having 48 or more hours per week, could hardly be shown to have worked more than 42 hours as an average over a 14-week period. Thus, the number of evasions possible under this provision would, in fact, be almost endless.

Finally, "the averaging procedure was declared by N. R. A. to be the provision most difficult to enforce and most subject to abuse" (N. R. A. Work Material No. 45). It was found that, with averaging, elaborate systems of checking and recording were required, employees were uncertain of their rights, and that the provisions were unduly complex and cumbersome, with many loopholes for evasion.

3. Case 3 is substantially the same as case 2, and would not appear to merit any additional comment.

Cases 4 and 5 of the committee's report relate to the applicability of the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Since these provisions are administered by the Chief of the Children's Bureau and not by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, the following comments concerning cases 4 and 5 are those of the Children's Bureau.

4. This case involves the children of a charwoman who assist her in performing her services and whose work is said to be in violation of the child-labor provisions of the wage and hour law.

Section 3 (l) of the Fair Labor Standards Act defines oppressive child labor as "a condition of employment under which (1) any employee under the age of 16 years is employed by an employer (other than a parent or a person standing in place of a parent employing his own child or a child in his custody under the age of 16 years in an occupation other than manufacturing or mining) in any occupation * * *."

By section 3 (g) of the act the word "'employ' includes to suffer or permit to work."

Section 12 (a) of the act provides that "no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in commerce any goods produced in an establishment situated in the United States in or about which within 30 days prior to the removal of such goods therefrom any oppressive child labor has been employed * * *."

Whether or not the minors involved are employees of the mother's employer at common law, nevertheless, under the provisions of section 3 (g) of the act, this employer suffers or permits the children to work. Furthermore, the work which they are doing is performed in or about an establishment where goods are produced for shipment or delivery for shipment in commerce.

However, regulation No. 3, issued by the Chief of the Children's Bureau on May 8, 1939, under the authority conferred upon her by section 3 (l) of the act, makes certain exceptions for the employment of minors 14 to 16 years of age in occupations which "will not interfere with their schooling" and "which will not interfere with their health and well-being." Section 441.2 of regulation No. 3, paragraph 2, allows the employment of a minor between 14 and 16 years of age in occupations which will not require "performance of any duties in workrooms or workplaces where goods are manufactured, mined, or otherwise processed." Under this regulation, a minor between 14 and 16 years of age may be employed as an office boy or to clean up around the offices in a factory building so long as he has no duties to perform in the workrooms or places where the goods are manufactured or processed.

However, such employment is subject to certain limitations set forth in section 441.5 of regulation No. 3. Attention is called to paragraph (2) of this section, which requires that the work be performed outside school hours, and to paragraph (f), which limits the workday of a minor between 14 and 16 years of age to the hours between 7 a. m. and 7 p. m.

From the facts of the case submitted, it does not appear whether or not the minors are over 14 years of age, or whether the work they perform in the factory office terminates at 7 p. m. If the minors are over 14 years of age, and if the work they perform is done outside school hours and is completed by 7 p. m. each day, and if the work is confined to the offices of the establishment, then such employment will not be deemed to be the employment of oppressive child labor.

Your attention is directed to laws of Minnesota on Women, Minors, and Children, and particularly to chapter 8, section 7, of the Laws of 1912, which forbids the employment of children under 16 years of age after 7 o'clock in the evening.

5. This case involves the applicability of the child-labor provisions of the act in the case of a 17-year-old boy employed to deliver products in the performance of which duties he uses his employer's private automobile and a light delivery truck.

The power of the Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor to determine what occupations are particularly hazardous for minors between 16 and 18 years of age is derived from section 3 (l) of the Fair Labor Standards Act and not from section 12 (b). The latter section empowers the Chief of the Children's Bureau to make investigations and to bring actions for violations of the provisions of the act.

The language of order No. 2, issued November 27, 1939, clearly indicates that this order was promulgated after very careful consideration and after the receipt of evidence upon which the order was based. It shows that the occupation of a minor under 18 years of age as a driver or helper on a motor vehicle is hazardous for the eight reasons set out in section 422.2 of the order. It makes no difference under order No. 2 that the driver or helper is a husky boy or that the products he handles are of a light nature, or that the vehicle which he drives is a pleasure car. Consequently, if the employer is engaged in the production of goods which he ships or delivers for shipment in commerce, he is subject to the oppressive child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and to order No. 2, issued by the Chief of the Children's Bureau under authority conferred upon her by section 3 (l) of the act.

Therefore, the employment described in this situation constitutes the employment of oppressive child labor.

In line with finding No. 7 of order No. 2, attention is directed to chapter 327, Laws of 1935 of the State of Minnesota, dealing with the issuance of chauffeur's licenses, and to the order of the Secretary of State establishing a minimum age of 18 years for an applicant for a chauffeur's license.

A copy of order No. 2 is enclosed.

6. This case involves foundry employees working on a 40-hour-week basis. The number of hours worked week by week fluctuate from 40 to as low as 16. In order to obtain extra work in the slow weeks, certain of the regular employees made a deal with the company to unload carloads of materials at a stipulated price per car, the work to be done at night, on Sundays, or at other times when the foundry was not in operation. It is stated that no supervision was necessary because the work was to be done on a stipulated contract price per car. The Wage and Hour Division is criticized for ruling that these regular employees engaged in unloading the cars in the manner described above were still employees of the company and not independent contractors, and that, therefore, they were entitled to overtime compensation in any week in which they worked in excess of 42 hours.

It is my opinion that these employees would not be considered independent contractors even under common law. The fact that they are paid on a per-car basis is not at all determinative. The men were regular employees of the company. They were not engaged in the independent calling of loading and unloading cars, nor is that the type of work which is ordinarily performed by individual independent contractors. I believe that it would be unrealistic to take the position in this case that these workers were employees during part of the workweek, and that during the balance of the workweek, while working on the same premises and performing closely related work, they were independent contractors. Even in the absence of the Fair Labor Standards Act there could be no other conclusion but that these employees were employees of the company even while they were engaged in loading and unloading cars.

In this connection a further criticism is made of the position of the Division with respect to employees who work for two or more different employers. It is stated that such employees may work any number of hours without being entitled to overtime compensation. It is also stated that if Congress was correct in its opinion that employment in excess of 42 hours is detrimental to the health, efficiency, and well-being of workers, such excessive work during the week is equally detrimental when performed for two or more separate employers. Finally, in connection with this point, it is asked how the detrimental nature of the work is changed if overtime is paid.

In the first place, it is not necessarily true that an employee may work any number of hours in a workweek without being entitled to overtime compensation, simply by working for two or more different employers. If you will refer to paragraphs 16 and 17 of Interpretative Bulletin No. 13, a copy of which is enclosed, you will observe that if the several employments are not completely disassociated, such employments should be considered together for the purposes of the act. Thus, if in the case you present the employers make an arrangement for the interchange of employees, or if one company controls, is controlled by, or is under common control, directly or indirectly, with the other company, the two employments will be considered together for purposes of the act, and overtime compensation will have to be paid.

In the second place, it is quite true that excessive work even for two completely disassociated employers may also be detrimental to the well-being of workers. Nevertheless, to interpret the Fair Labor Standards Act so as to require the payment of overtime compensation in that situation would be to do violence to the act and to disregard completely its plain language. Congress provided in section 7 that "no employer shall employ * * * any of his employees * * *" in excess of 42 hours a week without paying overtime compensation, but it enacted no limitation upon the number of jobs an employee might have. It merely forbids the employer to work his employees more than 42 hours without paying overtime. Perhaps Congress should have gone further and prohibited any employee from working over 42 hours in any event. This, however, it did not see fit to do. It should be pointed out quite definitely that the so-called inconsistency in the example put has not resulted from any strained administrative interpretation of the act. Rather, the interpretation made seems the only one which the plain purport of the statutory language legally permits.

Finally, the purpose of the requirement of overtime compensation was to discourage employers from making the employees work over the maximum workweek prescribed. The overtime provision is clearly a penalty. True, the detriment to well-being of workers exists as much in a case where overtime is worked and paid for as where it is worked without being paid for. Had it desired to do so, Congress might have absolutely forbidden the employment of any worker beyond a certain number of hours in a workweek. Presumably, however, it felt it more desirable to attempt to achieve the same result by merely imposing a penalty for the overtime hours rather than by forbidding such hours.

7. In this case it is stated that a wholesale firm employed truck drivers and, through collective bargaining with the union, had agreed to give the drivers enough hours at overtime compensation so that their weekly pay check would be the equivalent of the pay formerly received under a 48-hour workweek. A certain truck driver of this company requested that he be given additional work in the retail stores in order to acquaint himself with that most important part of the business. I assume that the retail stores were conducted as part of the wholesale firm's business. If not, the discussion in connection with the previous case, concerning employment of an employee by separate employers during the same week, is applicable.

If the driver in question works more than 42 hours in the aggregate in any week for the employer, even though his time on Friday and Saturday is spent in the retail store, he must receive the requisite overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of 42 in the week. Nor is this result unfair. As long as the truck driver is simply acquainting himself with the work by observing, it is one thing; but when he starts working in the store, it is only fair that the hours so spent be considered "hours worked." This problem is further discussed in the later examples.

8. This case involves a regular employee of a customs brokerage and freight business concern who, for the purpose of gaining experience, asked to be assigned certain work in the foreign traffic department of the company. It is stated that this experience would be of value when the employee returned to his native country. Under the arrangement this employee was to devote a number of hours each day to work in the foreign traffic department with the understanding that he was to receive no compensation for such services. By requiring payment to the employee for such work, the division is alleged to have obstructed an ambitious worker.

Quite clearly the Fair Labor Standards Act requires an employer to pay his employees wages at the rate of at least 30 cents an hour for all hours worked by the employees. If an employee was engaged in work covered by the act, and it appears from the statement of facts that he was, the act requires that he be paid not less than the minimum wage. The fact that the employee at some future date planned to return to his native country, and the additional fact that his father operated a similar business in Sweden, are circumstances which cannot be taken into account under a national law such as the Fair Labor Standards Act. In other words, the law cannot always consider the motives of employers and employees. The fact that an employer and employee agree that there be no compensation is, of course, immaterial, since Congress intended to prevent the parties from bargaining for employment at less than the minimum-wage rate. It is to be observed, however, that even if no compensation was paid the employee for the hours devoted to the foreign traffic department, the Wage and Hour Division, for purposes of enforcement of the act, would take the position that there has been no violation of the minimum-wage requirements of the act, provided that the total hours worked, including time spent in the traffic department, did not exceed 42 hours, and the employee averaged 30 cents per hour for all hours worked during the workweek. See the enclosed copy of R-609.

It should also be pointed out that Congress did recognize that under certain circumstances it might be necessary to provide for the employment of inexperienced employees (learners and apprentices) at less than the minimum wage rate in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment. See section 14 of the act and Regulations, part 521 and 522, copies of which are enclosed.

9. This case, which is said to close the door of opportunity, involves a schoolboy who quit school in order to learn to operate a tabulating machine in a Des Moines, Iowa, wholesale establishment. The employer consented, the boy went to work, and no compensation was provided. After 3 months it was decided that the boy should be paid $20 per month, the feeling being that in case of accident he could then recover under the workmen's compensation laws. Three months later the boy was raised to $65 a month, and later to $75 a month. At some later date it is stated that the Division determined that this young man had not been paid in accordance with the law, and that $123 in back wages was due.

The Fair Labor Standards Act defines the term "employ" to mean "to suffer or permit to work." Quite clearly, therefore, this boy was an employee. However, as long as he was in the office merely for the purpose of practicing on the tabulating machine and did not perform any work for the employer, the act would not appear to apply. When he begins to do more, he must be treated like any other employee. This, of course, is a factual question which cannot be determined from the digest of the case given in the report.

It should be pointed out, however, that it is erroneous to assume that the act would not have applied in this case had the company employed this boy without paying any wages at all. Although the payment of wages would be an indication that the boy was working for the employer, the mere fact that he was working without compensation would not prevent him from being an employee. Therefore, if the Wage and Hour Division investigator informed the company that it would have owed the boy nothing under the act if it had not paid the boy wages while learning, such advice was clearly in error. As pointed out above, section 14 provides a procedure under which employers may secure special certificates authorizing the employment of learners and apprentices at less than the minimum wage.

10. This case involves an employee who travels by truck among various States. He transports certain automobile accessories into other States and then travels over a route for the purpose of selling these products. It is stated that he solicits customers, makes the sale, delivers the product, collects the price, and returns to his home office with whatever goods he has been unable to dispose of. He is paid on a commission basis and is said to receive $4,500 to $5,000 a year. It is stated that this employee is not considered as an outside salesman under the Administrator's regulations, and that the employer has notified the employee that he cannot continue his work unless he confines his activities to 42 hours a week. It is not stated that the division has ruled this employee to be outside the outside-salesman exemption. Furthermore, it does not appear whether an opinion has been asked in this case.

Of course, you must realize that it is virtually impossible to determine, on the meager factual statement presented in this digest, whether or not this employee falls within the definition of the term "outside salesman" appearing in section 541.4 of the Administrator's regulations. Here, as in the case of the executive and professional definitions, we do not ordinarily express opinions as to the applicability of the definition upon an ex parte presentation of fact. This definition also was promulgated only after consultation with many representatives of business groups, and all agreed that the definition was sufficiently clear to enable employers to apply it without difficulty. In the case you present, no facts are given which would bar the applicability of the exemption. It is possible that additional facts exist which would indicate that this employee is engaged in making recurrent routine deliveries, and therefore is not exempt under the regulations. In this connection we call your attention to the fact that the major element in the definition is that the employee's primary duty must be the making of sales as distinguished from making recurrent routine deliveries.

11. This is another case of an alleged outside salesman who is said to be engaged in selling cigars for a wholesale house. The factual statement in this case is even more meager and sketchy than in the preceding one. In addition to what is said above in No. 10, the preceding case, it should be pointed out that a hearing was held in Washington April 10, 1940, on the question as to whether or not amendments should be made to the definition of the term "outside salesman" and the other terms appearing in section 13 (a) (1) with respect to the wholesale distributive trades. No changes have yet been made in the regulations as a result of such hearing.

12. This item is not an actual case but a summary of the alleged position of the division with respect to the application of the act to the building industry. The position of the division is said to result in a "Chinese puzzle for the building industry." I believe this situation warrants careful consideration.

The opinion of the division is said to be to the effect that employees of a building contractor who are engaged in building a new building which will be used for the production of goods for commerce are not covered by the act but, on the other hand, such employees are under the act if they are engaged in remodeling or repairing a factory which is used to produce goods for commerce. So far, the interpretation of the division's position is correct, and I believe that this position will be supported by the courts. Perhaps the courts will go beyond past precedents and apply the act to employees engaged in the original construction of

the factory which, immediately upon completion, will begin to produce goods for commerce. The division does not, however, believe that the courts will so hold and, therefore, has given the industry the benefit of its best judgment in this matter. Perhaps the situation would be less of a "Chinese puzzle" if we disregarded judicial precedents and rendered opinions to the effect that all employees in the building construction industry are covered by the law.

The division is also criticized for advising certain employers, who have asked questions regarding the applicability of the act, that the courts may hold employees subject to the act where they travel from State to State in the performance of their duties. Our advice in this connection has been no more than advice. The decisions of the Supreme Court on the question as to whether employees traveling from State to State in the performance of their duties are engaged in interstate commerce are inconclusive.

It should be noted, however, that where the case is merely that of employees who are taken from one State to another to engage in original construction work in the latter State, and is not a case of employees who continuously travel from State to State, it is not true, as the report states, that the interpretations of the division place such employees under the act. It should also be remembered that some of the key men who are sent into other States may qualify for exemption under one of the definitions found in part 541.

13. In this case the problem of computing overtime is presented where truck drivers work from 10 to 50 hours a week for a constant weekly salary of $35. We have taken the position that where a salaried employee works a fluctuating number of hours, his regular rate of pay varies from week to week and must be computed each week by dividing the weekly salary by the total number of hours worked.

The employee is then entitled, for his overtime work, to a sum in addition to his fixed salary equivalent to one-half the regular rate of pay thus computed for the number of hours worked in excess of 42 in the week. The report seems to indicate that the employer, during the 50-hour weeks, will have to pay, in addition to the $35, a sum equal to $1.05 for 8 hours, whereas, in fact, the amount of additional compensation required is only 35 cents, one-half of 70 cents, for 8 hours, or a total of $2.80. The act does not prevent the payment of a basic weekly wage to the employees, but merely requires that additional compensation be paid such employees for the number of hours worked in excess of 42 in any workweek. The amount of such additional compensation due should be computed as indicated above.

14. In this case, entitled "The House That Jack Built," A is a company engaged in the manufacture of paper for interstate commerce. A buys pulp from B. B buys pulpwood from C. C cuts the pulpwood at a lumber camp and employs a cook and a barn boss (D and E) at the camp. G is said to be a wholesaler and sells food to the camp. I assume that all of these concerns are within the same State.

The first inquiry is as to whether or not D and E, in this situation, are subject to the provisions of the act. In this connection the first point to be made is that the act applies not only to those employed in producing goods for commerce but also to those engaged in a process or occupation necessary to such production. (See sec. 3 (j).) The second point is that goods are produced for commerce where the employer hopes, intends, or has reason to believe that such goods, or any unsegregated part thereof, either as produced or after subsequent processing, will move out of the State. (See pars. 2, 4, 5, and 9 of the enclosed copy of Interpretative Bulletin No. 5.)

We have taken the position that all employees employed in an establishment which produces goods for commerce are engaged in a process or occupation necessary to the production of goods for commerce unless the employer maintains the burden of showing as to particular employees that their functions are so definitely segregated that they do not in any way contribute to the production of goods which move into commerce. Ordinarily employees who are on the pay roll are necessary to the production of goods, for otherwise they would not be on the pay roll. Furthermore, the term "goods" is defined in section 8 (i) of the act to include articles or subjects of commerce of any character "or any part or ingredient thereof." Therefore, the pulpwood which is cut in the lumber camp and which becomes pulp and later the main ingredient of the paper which goes out of the State, falls within the statutory definition of the term "goods." The pulpwood is produced in the lumber camp and it is produced for commerce if the employer hopes, intends, or has reason to believe that the pulpwood will thereafter move out of the State, either as pulpwood or as an ingredient of the paper. It is, therefore, our opinion that the employees in the lumber camp, including the cook and the barn boss, are subject to the conditions mentioned above, engaged in processes or occupations necessary to the production of goods for commerce, within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

All the employees in the lumber camp are contributing to the production of the pulpwood. Since the pulpwood is produced only because there is an extrastate market for the resultant paper, it is only fair and reasonable that Congress extend the benefits of the law to such employees.

The second inquiry presented is as to whether C, the wholesaler, is covered by the act because he sells food which is cooked by D, for the purpose of feeding the men who cut the wood that is made into pulp that is made into paper that moves out of the State. Quite clearly the law does not apply merely because of this sequence of events and I do not suppose that anyone has seriously considered that the division or anyone else has contended that it does. The wholesaler, if covered at all, would be covered for other reasons. As you will observe by reading paragraphs 14 through 16 of Interpretative Bulletin No. 5, in our opinion wholesalers who make sales across State lines or who receive their goods from outside the State, are engaged in the stream of commerce and are therefore covered by the act.

15. The facts in the case put are not very clear. They permit of two different inferences as to the actual situation: (1) That the employee actually worked only 51 hours prior to the act and continued to do so after the act became effective; or (2) that the employee actually worked 56 hours prior to the act, in accordance with the union agreement, but had his hours reduced after the act became effective. Our inspector's calculations are correct only if case (1) reflects the actual situation. If an employee worked 51 hours a week and received therefor $25 weekly, the rate of pay at which he was and is actually employed is the rate arrived at by dividing $25 by 51 hours or 49 cents an hour. Time and one-half must be paid on such rate.

The fact that a union contract stipulates that the watchman is to work 56 hours for $25 is immaterial; the employee did not work 56 hours, and the computation of the regular rate of pay must be based upon actuality.

To permit an agreed number of hours to be taken as the basis for computing the regular rate of pay, where such agreed number of hours is in excess of the actual number of hours worked, is to permit a means whereby the overtime requirements of the act may be circumvented.

A different situation is presented if the employee did work 56 hours prior to the act for $25 and the employer, in order to meet the requirments of the act, reduced his workweek to 51 hours. In such case the employee's regular rate of pay actually was $0.446 per hour. All that the act required the employer to pay was an amount each week equal to $0.446 per hour for 44 hours and $0.669 per hour for the number of hours worked in excess of 44. By paying $25 for a regular workweek of 51 hours the employer paid more than the act required. In fact, he raised the employee's regular rate of pay from $0.446 per hour to $0.4589 per hour ([44 hours × $0.4589] + [7 hours × $0.6883] = $25). Since October 24, 1939, therefore, the employer is required to pay each week a sum equal to $0.4589 per hour for 42 hours and $0.6883 for the number of hours worked in excess of 42, or $25.46 for a regular workweek of 51 hours or approximately $25 for a regular workweek of 50⅓ hours.

To summarize, I trust that you will understand that under the Fair Labor Standards Act the Administrator is given power only in certain specific and limited instances to make binding rulings and regulations. In cases in which the act authorizes and directs the Administrator to promulgate rules and regulations, the rules and regulations have provided that any interested party may petition for a change in any particular provision which may appear to be erroneous. It is on the basis of such a petition that the hearing mentioned above was scheduled for April 10.

On the other hand, although the Administrator has no broad power under the act to issue binding interpretations or rulings, we have undertaken to furnish our best advice in the thousands of cases presented by employers and employees throughout the country. This service is not one which Congress required the division to perform. It has been our belief after due consideration that our inquirers and others interested in determining their rights and liabilities under the law without resorting to expensive litigation are entitled to have the best legal advice on their questions which we can possibly provide. With that thought in mind the division has gone to considerable effort to provide such advice.

I have gone to considerable pains in considering the various situations presented in the report of the committee in Minneapolis and St. Paul and hope that I have been able to explain that the cases summarized in the report are not typical nor do they necessarily have adverse effects upon employers, employees, or the employment situation. May I ask that, if possible, my letter be given as wide circulation in your community as the committee report you have been so kind as to send me.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator.

Aliens Seeking United States Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD an Associated Press article dated Minneapolis, Minn., May 29, 1940, entitled "Aliens Fearing War Call, Seek United States Citizenship," which article will no doubt throw light upon the question as to why so many aliens today are seeking United States citizenship, which heretofore they have failed to make application for.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALIENS, FEARING WAR CALL, SEEK UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

(By the Associated Press)

MINNEAPOLIS, May 29.—Fearful of a call to military service in homelands some of them haven't seen for 20 years, thousands of northwest citizens of European nations now at war are flocking to naturalization offices to get under Uncle Sam's protective wing.

Up until Tuesday Federal naturalization officials estimated that 7,000 persons of foreign birth have applied for American citizenship during the last few months. This is a 20- to 25-percent increase over applications a year ago.

The bulk of the applications, Twin Cities immigration officials said, have come from Scandinavian, British, Polish, and German nationals, although some 20 nationalities are represented. Many are from persons who have lived in the United States more than a decade.

Changing Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, as not infrequently happens, there comes a time when the thought contained in an old adage, for example, the one about not changing horses in the middle of the stream, cannot be safely followed.

A rider having started to cross, finding himself in the middle of the stream, on a horse that either could not or would not swim toward the desired shore would be justified not only in changing horses if another was available, but in doing a little swimming himself.

It is time we do a little thinking and, in order that we may intelligently decide whether we are to entrust the safety of our Nation, the lives of those near and dear to us, to the present "horse," we should take a look at the record of that "horse."

The following is a comparison, reprinted from the New York Sun of March 2, 1940, of the 7 pre-Roosevelt years with the 7 years under the New Deal. Read it.

	Average of 7 pre-New Deal years, 1926 to 1932, inclusive	Average of 7 New Deal years, 1933 to 1939, inclusive	Percent change
General:			
National income (1A)	$69,062,000,000	$59,783,000,000	−13
Number unemployed workers (2)	4,820,000	10,617,000	+120
Federal tax burden (3B)	$3,647,000,000	$4,331,000,000	+19
Cost of Federal Government (3B)	$3,944,000,000	$7,570,000,000	+92
Change in public debt in 7 years (3B)	−$1,029,000,000	+$20,985,000,000	-------
Change in per capita public debt (3B)	−$21.98	+$152.41	-------
Number of bank failures (6C)	1,128	613	−46
For the consumer:			
Wages and salaries (1)	$46,700,000,000	$37,300,000,000	−20
Interest received by individuals (1)	$5,200,000,000	$4,900,000,000	−6
Dividends received by individuals (1)	$4,860,000,000	$3,740,000,000	−23
For the farmer:			
Cash income from sales (4)	$9,043,000,000	$7,255,000,000	−20
Benefit payments from Federal Government (4)	----------	$442,000,000	-------
Total farm income (4)	$9,043,000,000	$7,697,000,000	−15
Cost of running Department of Agriculture (4)	$161,738,000	$831,455,000	+414
Value of agricultural exports (1)	$1,420,000,000	$738,000,000	−48
Value of agricultural imports (4)	$1,729,000,000	$1,074,000,000	−38
Commodity price index (5D)	$87.3	$77.7	−11
For labor:			
Weekly pay roll of factory workers (5)	$169,252,000	$148,334,000	−12
Total nonagricultural employment (5J)	33,822,000	32,135,000	−5
Number of strikes (5)	795	2,505	+215
Number of workers affected (5)	301,600	1,176,500	+291
For business and industry:			
Index of industrial production (6E)	98	93	−5
Average of 60 bond prices (7G)	93.8	85.4	−9
Index of 420 common stocks (7D)	122	87	−29
Amount of new capital issues (8)	$3,520,000,000	$629,000,000	−82
All exports, dollar value (1)	$3,990,000,000	$2,597,000,000	−35
All imports, dollar value (1)	$3,369,000,000	$2,134,000,000	−37
Dividends paid by corporations (10F)	$7,277,000,000	$5,961,000,000	−18
Residential building, index (6E)	79	32	−60
Private construction (1)	$6,410,000,000	$2,322,000,000	−64
Government construction, Federal, State, local (1H)	2,357,000,000	1,890,000,000	−20
Department-store sales (1)	3,931,494,000	3,256,389,000	−17
Cars of revenue freight loaded (9)	45,766,000	32,844,000	−28
For the Federal jobholder: Number employed in executive department (11)	558,300	771,830	+38

Sources: (1) Department of Commerce. (2) American Federation of Labor. (3) U. S. Treasury Department. (4) Department of Agriculture. (5) Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. (6) Federal Reserve System. (7) Standard Statistics. (8) Commercial and Financial Chronicle adjusted by the Federal Reserve to eliminate investment trusts and holding companies up to 1930. (9) Association of American Railroads. (10) Bureau of Internal Revenue. (11) U. S. Civil Service Commission.

NOTES.—(A) Figures for 1926, 1927, and 1928, unavailable at Department of Commerce, supplied by National Bureau of Economic Research. (B) Fiscal years. (C) Technically, bank suspensions. (D) 1926 average equals 100. (E) 1923–25 average equals 100. (F) Figures for 7-year periods unavailable, comparison is for 5-year periods. (G) Priced from average yields. (H) Excludes Work Projects Administration. (J) Excludes all work relief.

Do you want to ride a "horse" with that kind of a record for the next 4 years onto what may be the battlefields on foreign soil?

Do you want to trust to him the future of our Nation, the safety and the lives of those who are near and dear to you?

That is a question which you will be required to answer in November of 1940.

Is it not time that we get another "horse"? One with a better record? With not quite so many communistic and New Deal jockeys and trainers?

What Must California Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. CULBERT L. OLSON, GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to me to be able to include with my remarks the following radio address by the Governor of California:

WHAT MUST CALIFORNIA DO?

My fellow citizens, the sudden and horrible turns taken by the European war during the past few weeks, even the past few days, have served to arouse American citizens of all parties to a realization that the safety of our country, of democracy on this side of the Atlantic, may become involved. It has produced a determined resolve that the United States shall be prepared to defend against any potential invasion of the Western Hemisphere. This is the very minimum action that will give assurance that no foreign legions shall set foot on American shores.

Yesterday, as chairman of the delegation elected to the Democratic National Convention to be held in Chicago in July, I sent to President Roosevelt the following telegram unanimously adopted as the resolution of the delegation. I quote:

"The Democratic delegation from California extends heartiest commendation of your courageous and forthright message to Congress. Every resource of the Nation will be at your command in this emergency. Such is the way of democracy. California sends you a sincere expression of complete confidence and implicit faith in your continued leadership."

We believe the President spoke the sentiment and the will of the Nation in that message—the sentiment and will to keep us out of war but to amply prepare for our defense against any power which would make war upon us.

Already we feel the repercussions of the rest of the world's wars in their effects upon our economic affairs. Pacific coast shipping is slowing down. Ships that we need are being diverted to other purposes and other waters and other registries. Men are out of work.

Markets for farm products have been upset and restricted. This is especially true of the European markets for the highly specialized products of California's orchards, vineyards, and farms.

California has an enormous stake in the petroleum business. This, too, has been upset. If the war keeps on spreading, we shall hear even more insistent demand that we stop exporting our oil supplies which will be so precious if we ourselves are finally attacked.

The war cannot fail to affect our motion-picture industry, by restricting some of its foreign outlets, cutting others off entirely.

Thus, so far as California is concerned, the war may have severe deflationary effect; when we have great quantities of goods and services to dispose of.

On the other hand, we are, for the time being, at least, much favored by having a major share of the airplane industry. They doubtless will be called on to expand, to multiply their productive capacity several fold. We may thus anticipate a sharp increase in employment in this quarter, which will help to reduce the number of our unemployed to the extent at least that skilled workers can be found among our unemployed to meet the requirements of this industry.

If, indeed, our country is in danger of war being made upon us, everyone wants to help in placing us in a position to be invulnerable to attack from without or within the Nation's borders.

What can the individual American citizen do, or the community, or the State, that will really add to their effectiveness in a time of such national emergency?

To the President, and to the Congress, we can safely entrust the task of building our national defenses; that is, our coast defenses, our fighting forces, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and flying forces; our armaments, and the enormous stocks of materials required to meet modern warfare methods and cruel mechanisms for the destruction of life and property. All good citizens will support such plans.

But there is another type of war attack adopted by imperialistic powers to implement their ruthless invasions of the territory of other nations, which requires special types of defense to which we in California can and must make a great contribution.

I refer to the Trojan-horse methods of making war, or, as we now call them, "fifth column" activities, which have been brought to such high perfection and used so effectively by the Germans in their successive invasions of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Luxembourg, and Belgium. During the recent Spanish civil war, Franco's Gen. Emilio Mola, in 1936, broadcast that he had four columns marching on Madrid, and that he had a "fifth column" already there, working inside the enemy camp. The "fifth column," in other words, is the secret campaign of lies and rumor, of sabotage and spying, which might be carried on among our own people. A campaign designed to do far more than destroy war stores or blow up bridges. A campaign designed to confuse the people, to divide their loyalties and allegiances, to undermine their morale, to cripple their efforts for complete unity and effectiveness.

Whatever may be the origin of so-called "fifth column" activities in the European countries, to my way of thinking the only origin for the support of any secret "fifth column" activities in our country will be found in the distress, confusion, frustration, the loss of confidence and hope for a life worth while under the workings of our economic system as the reactionaries of today would have that system work. It is among that part of our population, as well as among those given to intolerance and racial hatreds, that our alien enemies could hope to secure support for their "fifth column" activities in this country.

It is in this sense that I believe that we in the United States should consider possible danger from "fifth column" activities. Their organizations can succeed only to the extent that they can discover, foment, and organize divisions among our own people, based upon their despair, discontent, and prejudices.

This is done, perhaps most easily and effectively, by demagogic appeals to emotional instability, to misunderstandings, to racial hatreds, religious bigotries and superstitions, and political differences. Such appeals are effective among those whom life has defeated or frustrated in their efforts to live decently and normally.

It requires no stretch of the imagination, therefore, to realize that if the "fifth column" is doing or can do any effective work in our country, it will do its most effective work among the great mass of unemployed men and women, and their families, among men and women who need work, who want work, who seek work, who will work, but who cannot find it. That is, steady work at wages sufficient to maintain them in health and decency.

It requires no stretch of the imagination to realize that among the unemployed we find most of our defeated, frustrated citizens, who are most likely to be discouraged with the "American way," most likely to respond to the cries and slogans of demagogues.

If, therefore, the "fifth column" threat is a real one, it is my firm conviction that the place to fight it most effectively is on the unemployment front. It is my conviction that California, as a State, can do more to maintain and defend our country and our liberties by solving the problem of unemployment than by any other single activity. But we cannot make this contribution by planning to continue the dole system for unemployment relief. We cannot adopt plans for handling the problem of unemployment based upon the idea that a glutted labor market is a good thing, and that doles should be dealt out only for the purpose of preventing hunger riots and social upheavals.

It is my conviction, on the other hand, that if we continue much longer with our present cash dole relief methods; that if we continue much longer in our failure to deal effectively and humanely with this problem of unemployment, our country and our liberties will be in far greater peril than from any combination of foreign foes.

We are told that it will take 10 years to modernize our weapons and build our war machine to the strength required to protect us from foreign invasion. But what can that avail us if, in the meantime, we disintegrate under the forces within our body politic that have produced ten to twelve millions of unemployed men and women?

As I see it, and as I should like every citizen of California to see it, the solution of our unemployment problem is just as much a national-defense measure as the provision of airplanes, tanks, guns, and ammunition. "Fifth column" activities, demagoguery, appeals to hatreds, and misunderstandings—none of these can hope to find response among contented, well-employed people.

It is with these ideas in my mind that I once more invite all thoughtful citizens to study the plans of this administration for attacking the problem of mass unemployment. They are based upon principles which are few and simple.

1. Man must live by his own work in useful employment.

2. Private enterprise, however encouraged by governmental policies, has failed to provide general employment, but has succeeded in developing labor-saving devices which, although progressive and desirable, have only contributed to the number of unemployed.

3. To the extent that private enterprise fails to provide employment it is the responsibility of government to do so; to borrow and to tax in order to raise the money with which to provide unemployment relief or to engage in directing economic activities giving productive work to the unemployed.

4. Since it is now manifest that the dole system is an utter failure, that it solves no problem but only raises new and more difficult problems, it becomes ever more apparent that our way out is by putting the unemployed to work on land, in factories, forests, and fisheries, producing the food, the clothing, and the shelter they must have, providing the well-being and security that are every man's right.

I submit that the very internal economic forces that have produced the phenomenon of widespread, long-drawn-out mass unemployment are a greater danger to our country, to our democracy, than is the danger from any combination of foreign foes.

War arouses deepest emotions, emotions which sometimes lead to the most illogical and uncontrolled behavior, behavior which contributes nothing to our security, but, on the contrary, may contribute to the possibility of our being drawn into war. I therefore urge all citizens to remain calm; grateful that we are not at war; reassured by the fact that our President is bending every effort to keep us out of this war; loyal to our country and our duties as American citizens, and secure in the knowledge that the Congress and President are taking the steps necessary to make our defenses impregnable to attack if we should finally become involved.

It is in calmness, not in excitement, that we can deal most effectively with our problems.

During the past 48 hours an earthquake, highly localized but of extraordinary severity, has brought death and ruin in the southern end of Imperial Valley. I know I speak for us all in expressing to the distressed people of this area the sympathy and the desire to help of every man, woman, and child in California.

Alert to the responsibilities falling upon the various State departments when catastrophe overtakes the people, we are gathering accurate information and already taking the steps necessary to give every assistance to these stricken people of which the State is capable.

The legislature is now in special session. Heretofore I have asked them to appropriate an extra one and one-half million dollars for emergency repairs of the extraordinary ruin caused by spring floods in the Sacramento River Valley and other sections of the State. I urge the prompt adoption of this measure so that we may be sure to have enough money left in the State's emergency fund to give practical help to the distressed people of Imperial County in this emergency.

I thank you and bid you goodnight.

The Alien Round-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of an editorial from the Washing-

ton Post of several days ago entitled "The Alien Round-Up," which relates to the registration and fingerprinting of aliens, which I have advocated consistently for more than 5 years past, and I am happy to learn that at last, even at a late hour, some of the editors of America are awakening to the fact that legislation of this sort is essential for the protection of our country.

There being no objection, the portion of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALIEN ROUND-UP

It is expected that a bill recommended by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee requiring the registration and fingerprinting of aliens will shortly pass the Senate. The House has already approved a measure providing for the registration and fingerprinting of new immigrants. So the enactment of some sort of legislation affecting the welfare of aliens appears to be virtually certain.

At present the Government has no accurate information about the alien population, because thousands of persons have entered the United States illegally. Some of these illegal entrants are criminals, or otherwise undesirable persons. Others are capable of becoming good citizens. The task of locating aliens who have violated our immigration laws will be far from easy, since they have the strongest possible incentive to escape official notice. Moreover, after they have been rounded up, the question will arise as to whether wholesale deportations should proceed or leniency be shown in exceptional cases.

Registration and fingerprinting of aliens will merely provide the authorities with needed information. The policies to be followed in the light of that information will then have to be determined. Indeed, it is likely that hitherto neglected problems will press for attention as facts about aliens accumulate.

The Government should, of course, have as complete a record as possible of alien residents. A system of registration, combined with a sure means of identification, such as fingerprinting, has long been needed for effective enforcement of the immigration laws. But until our eyes were opened to the importance of protecting the Nation against traitorous or subversive elements opposition to such proposals was exceedingly strong.

Objections to singling out aliens for special identification have been raised because the information thus gained may be used unfairly. President Roosevelt has given assurance that transfer of control over aliens to the Department of Justice will not deprive them of their civil liberties or otherwise impair their legal status. If that promise is faithfully kept, more good than harm may come from registration of aliens.

The Folly Plain Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE (TENN.) BANNER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 29, 1940:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 29, 1940]

THE FOLLY PLAIN NOW

It often occurs, and with nations and communities not less than with individuals, that the challenge of an exacting and serious situation is necessary to awaken realization of the folly of a course long adhered to.

The United States, it may be confidently asserted, as one of the accompaniments to the discussion and determination of a national-defense program, involving expenditures and commitments running into billions of dollars, will awaken to a new perception of the importance to the national credit of preserving, or approximating, a balanced Budget.

In the last 10 years about $30,000,000,000 has been added to the public debt; and the deficit habit finally was even officially pictured as a profitable investment.

Had not expenditures been thus lavishly made and regardless of the inadequacy of revenues Congress, in deciding how funds for imperative national defense may be secured, would not be faced by the question of whether they are to be obtained by imposing new taxes upon already heavy burdens, or fresh borrowings, thereby exceeding the $45,000,000,000 legal-debt limit, fixed over 20 years ago; or by absorbing a part of the stabilization fund in the Treasury.

The observations in this connection of the New York Times, which by no means can be classed as a captious critic of the national administration, are decidedly pertinent.

Says that newspaper:

"Now the grave error of the New Deal has been, not that it allowed the Budget to remain unbalanced for a few years when that may have been unavoidable, but that it never worked conscientiously and determinedly toward conserving the national resources, using that term in its broadest sense. It has never convinced the people that all the huge expenditures that it has made, totaling more than $58,000,000,000, have been necessary or wise. In the perspective of the situation of today the judgment must be that it has spent an appallingly large part of this sum in a frivolous, wasteful, and irresponsible manner. It has been spending not only far more than it has been raising through taxation, but far more than it would even be possible to raise by taxation without either seriously injuring business and reducing the national production or moving toward an iron governmental control. If we had watched our expenditures closely until now, we would have today far greater potential reserves to draw upon for increased defense. But we have already allowed the Budget to get out of hand, we have strained the national credit, we have built up a formidable army of pensioners and subsidy beneficiaries, we have formed demoralizing public spending habits. We have seriously impaired the resiliency that our Budget should have had to meet the critical situation today."

Congress Should Remain in Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to every Member of the House that opposition to final adjournment is increasing daily. Many Members feel as I do, that Congress should remain in session during these critical times.

If Members desire to get away for the national conventions, we could recess for that purpose.

This feeling that Congress should remain in session is not confined to the membership of the House. We see it expressed in the daily papers, we hear it over the radio, and letters are pouring in to the Members from every section of the country urging us not to adjourn.

I see an editorial in today's Washington Daily News headed "If They Vote To Go Home, Vote To Keep Them There."

Similar editorials are appearing in almost every paper that comes to hand.

The leading veterans' organizations of the country express the same sentiment. Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Otis N. Brown said in a recent interview that Congress should remain in session indefinitely.

This is not a diplomatic crisis—

Commander Brown said—

this is a national emergency. We may have to prove our ability to retain our sovereignty, protect our vital interests and maintain our American institutions against the impact of advancing world revolution. The appropriation of funds for the President's arms program is only the first step. Complete accomplishment of our purpose will require the development and integration of our industrial, financial, military, and social resources to the fullest extent. To that effort the American people will give undivided support. All departments of our constitutional government should continue to function without interruption. The Congress should remain in session.

The Disabled American Veterans of the World War have expressed the same view. On last Monday evening, June 10, Hon. Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion, in a Nation-wide broadcast urged Congress to remain in session, and appealed to the American people to join in that plea.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert Commander Kelly's address at this point.

IT'S TIME FOR SANE THINKING

Good evening, everybody: The chief question occupying the people of our Nation this evening is what to do about the war in Europe and the peace that must some day follow. None of us, I think, can prophesy with any great degree of certainty the ultimate outcome of the wars now raging. All of us, I think, are in agreement when we discuss the horrible rape of individual liberties and the destruction of small nations which have come from the spread of the totalitarian powers.

We have seen clearly what can happen when nations neglect their defenses, when pseudo liberality is encouraged, when the "fifth column" is tolerated. We know now what occurs when communism, nazi-ism, and fascism are placed at the controls.

The question is whether you and I are willing to accept our individual responsibilities in shaping the course the United States will follow. Nothing, I believe, is to be gained from taking a hysterical view of the situation. Keeping first things first we must root our course in sane thinking. The time for wishful thinking is past. Vain boasting about our undeveloped but potentially great military strength will avail us little. Loose talk about our neighbors will butter no parsnips.

Within the past few days I have addressed a written message to the more than 1,000,000 members of the American Legion. In it I have called their attention to the soundness of the position of the Legion. Every great danger now troubling the people of our country heretofore has been the occasion for discussion and action by the American Legion.

These dangers, as I see them, are wrapped in a now familiar package. They include the things in store for us if our Nation abandons its neutrality completely; the plight of our national defense unless there is complete unity in strengthening our Army, our Navy, and our air forces; the weakness arising from continued failure to accept the principle of universal service in time of war; what may come from continued complacence in handling the enemy within who never ceases to work for the spread of alien ideologies; how we will fare if there is any slackening of the individual effort to unite for the common defense to show the world that our Republic within a democracy can meet any emergency.

In my message to the Legionnaires, speaking as their national commander, I have presumed to speak with some degree of authority because consistently—in the past—the Legion called the turn and pointed the way of sanity for handling many of these problems now confronting the United States.

For 21 long years the Legion raised its voice to the highest pitch in the effort to rouse the Nation to the need for an adequate national defense. Few listened to us.

Since 1922 the Legion has had a definite program looking toward universal service. In the event this country ever becomes involved in another war our plan would deprofitize such a conflict, leaving special privilege for none, equal service for all.

Knowledge of the existence of subversive influences, apparently just now penetrating the public consciousness under the modern description of "fifth column" is neither new nor novel to the Legion. It is only lately we have had public acceptance of the dangers from such influences.

The definite complacence of America in a world rapidly becoming an armed camp with high-explosive potentialities has occasioned dismay in the Legion for many years. Few heeded our warnings.

The 1939 Chicago national convention of the American Legion demanded that Congress stay in session during the emergency. The emergency is even more grave now than it was at the time of the Chicago convention. In my message to the Legion I stressed the importance of having our Senators and Representatives stay in the Nation's Capital so long as national and international affairs are on a 24-hour basis. We are hopeful the country will join with us in asking Congress to remain where it can give constant attention to the needs of the hour.

In my belief the most menacing factor to the safety of the United States arises from within our borders rather than without. Our house must be set in order. But the neglect of years cannot be corrected in a few short minutes, hours, or days. What must be done will be done—if a determined and united Nation sets its will to the task.

Let us face the fact that communazi conspirators seeking to undermine and destroy our institutions are fanatics. The truth, as we know it, is not in them. Reasonable treatment has no effect upon them and but serves to embolden and encourage them in their efforts.

We have been told that far-reaching suppressive measures against flourishing domestic ideological conspiracies might injure innocent people. In my belief, the good of the whole Nation compels summary action to be taken by our properly constituted Federal, State, and local authorities to stamp out in their entirety the activities of these subverters. Such action is needed irrespective of what may happen to their fellow travelers or innocent bystanders. This is no time for quibbling. We must pull no punches.

Good, law-abiding American men and women who enjoy and cherish their civil liberties do not follow the policy of shouting about them. In many cases those who clamor the loudest about the dangers of losing such liberties bear the most watching. All too frequently what they fear most is the loss of their opportunity to work for the destruction of our form of government. There are more than 600 communazi organizations flourishing in the United States. Many of these are Trojan horse and "fifth column" groups. They have no rightful place here among us.

The second place where we are woefully lacking is in our national defense. For two decades national-defense preparedness has lagged. Within the past 2 weeks the first new United States battleship in 19 years has been launched. In every other element of preparedness we have been equally complacent.

We must appreciate that the hurried building of our defenses to the point needed may not make for the most efficiency. Errors will be made and the ball will be fumbled. But the characteristic of a great pitcher is that he pitches over his errors and goes on to win. I am confident we are a nation of thoroughbreds, neither to be upset nor deterred from our purpose by such mistakes.

There is no change in the official position of the American Legion with regard to the neutrality of the United States. We believe the protection—at all hazards—of the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere is our primary obligation. While our Nation is ill-equipped to provide even a minimum of protection for the Monroe Doctrine, it is idle to consider the feasibility of intervening in the great conflict across the Atlantic.

With what would we intervene? Though some progress has been made in giving educational orders for material and equipment, and in providing for the needs of an expanded air corps, we do not have on hand today the needed planes, weapons, and materials to train properly the extremely moderate armed forces we are able to put in the field.

How then would we make our potential strength felt, short of 2 or 3 years? Fast moving, aggressor nations have no intention of allowing us to select our own time and place for exerting the might of a rearmed America.

In my written message to the members of the Legion I have also told them the safety of our Nation transcends any political issue. I have cautioned them to avoid the danger of subjecting such safety to the fear generated through hysterical approach to the handling of our problems.

In my public utterances as national commander I have stressed the importance to American Legion organizations of assisting and working through recognized agencies of the Government. I have told them that only rarely when there is a collapse of recognized authority as in times of great natural disasters is it our job to do what we can independently.

In recent years many of our Legion posts have prepared disaster relief plans to become effective at the onset of such catastrophes. In other words, the machinery of Legion support for law and order is already established with a fair degree of efficiency. Posts without plans are being urged to form them now. Such plans should be integrated with existing Government authority in every community where there is a Legion post.

State departments of the Legion can well initiate and urge the adoption of State emergency councils. In several States this has been done already with the support and consent of the State Governors.

Official representatives of the national organization of the American Legion are now engaged in conferences and discussions with proper agencies of the Federal Government. These conferences look toward utilization of Legion organization and membership in the most effective manner possible in the event of any conceivable emergency developing. Such perfected plans will be ready for immediate use when conditions warrant their invoking.

The American Legion is working to make this a Nation geared to go. We recognize it as a blue-chip game in which we are engaged. We advise playing them close and playing the cards to win.

Our members regard this situation as another call from the Nation. It is not a call to the armed forces where once we served, though we will not shun such a call if it comes. Rather it is a call to develop sanity superseding hysteria; to remove all doubt about the strength of our national defense whatever the cost; to have all of us individually willing to bear the heavy price of the defense, which must be paid to assure peace for our people.

For 21 years the American Legion called the turn. It is confident its judgment in the present situation will coincide with the safety and well-being of our beloved Nation.

For God and country we have associated ourselves. We pledge again our loyalty to that creed. We extend the hope that America now is awake to the dangers we face. Resolutely we pledge our organization to work with those who are for the preservation of our national unity that thus we may safeguard the glory of our ideals, our principles, and our institutions.

Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanious consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's Washington News, entitled "If They Vote To Go Home, Vote To Keep Them There."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 12, 1940]

IF THEY VOTE TO GO HOME, VOTE TO KEEP THEM THERE

Within a few days Congress may be called upon to cast the most important vote of 20 years.

That will happen if administration leaders persist in their effort to force an adjournment.

Any Congressman who does vote to adjourn and go home should be commanded by his constituents to remain at home.

Any elected representative of the people who is so insensible of his constitutional obligations that he would voluntarily abandon his post at a time like this is, we believe, unfit for the responsibility of service in Congress.

The terrible conflict in Europe goes rapidly from bad to worse. Any day may bring the need for fateful decisions involving our Nation's peace and security. Borrowed billions have been laid on the line for rearmament. But to turn dollars into weapons in the quantities needed old industries will have to be invigorated and new ones created. Only Congress can do what is necessary to mobilize idle capital and manpower for this supreme task.

Overnight it may become not a matter for academic debate but an imperative necessity to order compulsory military training and conscript men for defense duty. Congress alone has that power and responsibility.

Our Government has operated in the red through 11 years of apparent peace and security. Confronted now with need for gigantic new defense expenditures, nothing substantial has been done to weed out old wastes, and the only tax proposal yet made won't even balance the nonmilitary outgo. Congress is the Nation's fiscal guardian.

Yet it is suggested that Congress pack up and go home. It is suggested that if an "emergency" should arise the President will summon Congress back to a special session—a procedure which requires several days in a period where there may be no day to spare. Incidentally, an adjournment and a special-session summons would mean that the lawmakers would be legally entitled to collect travel allowance, at 20 cents a mile, to their homes and back to Washington. No such allowances are legal if Congress merely recesses a few days at a time through the summer. We would accuse no Congressman of wanting to be a mileage patrioteer.

But we repeat that any who vote to go home at a time like this ought to be made to stay there—and very probably will be.

The Preparedness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday passed a bill increasing the national debt four billions of dollars, and provided a $1,000,000,000 tax per year. This for national defense. We were all for it with a few exceptions. We would be pleased if we could be assured that this will be used for national defense and not for New Deal activities. It is up to the administration to be honest with us who voted for it and the people who are to pay for it. We did not vote for defense to get us into a foreign war but to keep us out.

The burden now is on the people from the President down to keep cool and to begin to work out a program for American interests and keep out of foreign mix-ups. The more we interfere with foreign affairs the quicker we will become involved.

Let us be careful in furnishing material and aid, as the next thing to follow will be manpower. I am afraid that we have gone too far now to avoid it. One thing lacking in the bill—there should have been provided a tax on preparedness profits. No amendments could be offered, as we were working under a "gag" rule.

The President has now recognized the existence of a "fifth column" in this country. It is to be regretted that he did not realize this sooner. Our hope is now that it is not too late, for our country is only as strong as we can successfully deal with the enemies within our borders. The first order of business in the national-defense program should be to clean up within; let the team—the President and the Congress—go to work speedily on this job. Do not break up the team now. Let Congress remain in session and work together toward these ends.

On the preparedness program let the administration, from the President, be honest with the country and leave the production to men who understand production, quit meddling, for all the manufacturer needs is the orders, let them do the job. They can do it if left alone.

We are asking the people to buckle down and retrench. The administration should first set the example in reducing Government expenses. The President announced before the passage of the bill that he would retrench. Let him now make good that promise.

The National Guard and Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

LETTER FROM AN OFFICER OF THE NATIONAL GUARD IN IOWA

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith excerpts from a letter I have received from an officer of the National Guard in my district. He explains in detail his position on the matter of calling out the National Guard. This letter appealed to me to such a degree I felt obligated to place it in the RECORD, where many thousands could read it, and have a clearer picture of this very important matter. He states as follows:

I have no particular quarrel with what's going on in Washington, except that much of what is now being done should have been done a long time ago; and if attention had been given to the recommendations of people who know, it would have been done. The natural result, as always, will be that we shall pay a great deal more for our military defense than we should have had to pay if we had kept up to a reasonably efficient standard through the years. Up until now that has been the American way of doing things. There is another way to do them, however, and perhaps the realization that seems to be finally dawning on our people that we are in the arms competition, whether we like it or not, may lead us to a more sensible view of our entire defense scheme.

I have been identified with the armed forces of the United States in one capacity or another ever since I enlisted in 1917—part of the time as a Reserve officer but most of it as a National Guard man. I have the highest regard for the officers and men of the component of the Army of which I am a part. I know they have made tremendous progress over their condition in 1915 and prior thereto. I know that the officers of the guard today on the whole are professionally as well equipped as were the majority of the officers in the Regular Army in 1915 and 1916, but that doesn't alter the fact that any army of civilian soldiers earning their living outside of the military are being called upon under our present scheme of national defense to fulfill a mission as part of the initial protective force of the country that is practically impossible. It is not feasible during periods of training at home stations to attain the degree of efficiency and teamwork that is essential to the front-line troops who may be called upon to go up against a modern army. The alternative is that which is now being suggested—induction of the guard into Federal service. None of us would seriously oppose that course of action if we felt we were going to be called out for the duration of a major emergency, but to be called in to the field for a short period of time, 2, 3, or even 6 months, and then to be told that our services are no longer required—that we may go home and try, if you please, to earn a living again—will, in my judgment, finally destroy the National Guard as an institution.

Men with jobs will find them filled by others who will be naturally resentful of their return. Men with businesses will find them destroyed by competition during a time when they have been unable to give them personal attention and those with professions will find that their clients or patients have found others capable of meeting their requirements, and it will be next to impossible to reestablish those intimate personal contacts upon which relationship of doctor and patient, or lawyer and client depend. Knowing those things, men who have been called upon to make that kind of a sacrifice will seize upon the first opportunity to sever their connection with an institution that has been so destructive of their personal interests and it will be next to impossible to find others sufficiently foolish to subject themselves

to the possibility of a similar fate. These men do not lack in patriotism. Their membership in the guard should be sufficient evidence that they have it; but when that membership exacts of them sacrifices entirely out of proportion to those which other citizens similarly situated are called upon to make, the obvious injustice will have a ruinous effect so far as that branch of our national defense is concerned.

It is apparent also that many of the members of the National Guard hold positions in our industrial and business life that are in a sense key positions. They will be immediately removed from those positions and the result may conceivably be the crippling of businesses and industries that may be extremely important in the scheme of national defense.

There has been also evidence of a tendency to militarize the C. C. C. I thought a long time ago, and I believe told you, upon that occasion that I felt the establishment of a Civilian Conservation Corps apart from the Army was a great mistake, when the Army had within its organization elements which could be activated to do the business with less overhead. At the same time a certain amount of military training could have been given which would have resulted in the intervening years in the training of a substantial group of young men. That also has its weaknesses, for it trains the young men of poorer or at least lower-bracket-income families, and the burden of the defense of this country should not fall upon one group alone.

The answer it seems to me is to be found in the experience of other nations, who have had to meet similar situations, and they have adopted some form of universal military service. It seems to me that that is what we shall have to come to. We shall have to set up some sort of scheme that will require every young man to spend a year in the armed forces of the United States, after which he can be placed on a reserve status for a few years and then furloughed into the group that could afterward be called on with some confidence as a part of our reserve forces. At the same time that that is done, the pay status of the private soldier which will be drawn from this group should be absolutely changed. These young men should be paid sufficient money to enable them to buy cigarettes and some few luxuries, but nothing more than that; $3 to $5 a month ought to cover it, for the obligation of national defense is one that every citizen owes—not just a few—and the matter of compensation should be entirely secondary.

The plan that I suggest would not necessarily eliminate the guard as a part of our defense program, but it should be then relegated to a secondary role. It should be the reserve component, ready to function after the beginning of an emergency and after 2 or 3 months' intensive training. To the accomplishment of that mission, it is entirely adequate. To it could be sent those men who were called for universal service but who, because of dependency or otherwise, could not give an entire year in military service, in lieu of which they should be required to serve a 3- or 4-year enlistment in the guard. To it, also, could be furloughed those men who had completed their year's military service and from interest or otherwise wished to maintain a military connection. The details of the organization of the complex plan are not the proper subject of a discussion of this kind, but its adaptability should be readily apparent.

I know that the program I have suggested would meet with a great deal of resistance, at least in its inception, but it should be receiving serious consideration in anticipation of the future. It would enable the maintenance of a substantially larger army for the same expenditure of money, and at the same time provide us with what should be an adequate first line of defense and an adequate reserve force.

Please understand that the views I have here expressed are my own—not necessarily those of other officers of the guard, although I find many who agree. I don't know how much attention has been given to the subject along the line of this proposal. It seems to me that it should have thoughtful consideration.

Opportunism and the Debt Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of May 29, 1940:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 29, 1940]

OPPORTUNISM AND THE DEBT LIMIT

President Roosevent has endorsed a proposal of congressional leaders and Treasury Secretary Morgenthau to raise the $45,000,000,000 debt limit by $3,000,000,000 and levy between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000 in new taxes for defense. This recommendation may be greeted in many quarters with an approval engendered by current sentiment for adequate armament. The plan, however, has the stamp of a political opportunism that has consistently characterized this administration.

Only a few weeks ago Congress and the White House contemplated any extension of the national debt limit with many a qualm. It presented an embarrassing political hurdle, but the hurdle now has sagged perceptibly. During the last month new dealers and November-looking Congressmen have obviously felt that with the pressing demand for more adequate defense machinery, the country's reluctance to abandon the debt limit has been largely dissipated.

When Congress convened it was faced with an alternative: Either raise the debt limit or levy new taxes. There was still a third suggestion—to cut Budget costs. Consider what has happened. The House capitulated to the Senate's election-year nostrum that material appropriation cuts should not be made. Congress passed the enormous farm bill, appropriating $923,000,000, or $203,000,000 more than Budget estimates. The House has voted a giant relief bill of $1,111,754,916, acceding to the President's request to use $975,650,000 of the amount for W. P. A. in the first 8 months of the fiscal year beginning July 1. It is silly to suggest the Senate will pare this allotment. What is the result? Senate revenue experts figure the new Budget requirements will probably exceed the $45,000,000,000 debt limitation by about $1,000,000,000.

Not only was there no important decrease in expenses of government, but now the President urges that the debt restriction be hiked and new taxes be assessed, too. He attributes the need to defense. The defense bill bulks $3,000,000,000, yet the debt limit raise is fixed at $3,000,000,000 and new taxes set at almost $700,000,000.

Granted that it is imperative to bolster our defense arm; it should be needless to follow any such plan as Mr. Roosevelt champions if, in the face of a national safety emergency, Government were to set clamps on administration profligacy. Defense needs are being used as a barrage for blasting off debt restrictions.

Government's sudden lack of perturbation over dealing with the debt-limit problem is largely due to the national preoccupation with war fears. It is impossible to avoid the conviction politicians are riding defense sentiment. They have long intended to tear the lid off debt limitation and quite apparently consider defense spending offers an auspicious lever.

Expansion of national defense on a sound and extensive basis is a need beyond argument. But when such requirements arise, Government should recast its budgeting policies and apply brakes in other directions.

There has not been a semblance of economy in our prodigal subsidy systems; there has been no effort at curtailment of administrative and executive expenses. This administration has placed the country in the most precarious financial condition of its history, at a time when national safety may at any moment be critically threatened from without. Now Congress will be asked to toss the debt limit into discard, and the Government's fiscal condition suffers even more perilously.

It Is Time for Sober Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it will be best if we do some sound, sober thinking before we jump at conclusions. This thought is suggested by the many messages which come to me daily.

NEUTRALITY IS A MYTH

If you and your neighbor are fighting and I hand your neighbor a club, you know at once that I am not neutral and, if, because of the club, you are whipped, you are angry, resentful, and revengeful. At the first opportunity, you will endeavor to get even. If you win, you still are quite apt to see that I do not forget my part in the affair.

Such is the international situation.

SO WHAT, YOU ASK?

Here it is, Our sympathy is with France and England. How far do you want to go? Planes, ships, munitions, do I hear you say? Very well. If that is not sufficient, do you want to send the fathers, sons, and brothers? Do you wish Congress to declare war, which means conscriptions and, in the end, death to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, and

other millions crippled, gassed, maimed, shell-shocked, and insane? And, after that, a hundred or two hundred years of paying additional pensions? The problem is yours. So, when you write me, think it over before you compose your message.

ANOTHER THING

We are unprepared even to defend ourselves from foreign aggression; in danger of invasion. So said the President. If that be true, should we send our resources across the seas to fight the battle at a disadvantage? Or should we prepare here at home to meet any and all enemies?

NOW, WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

If you had to fight the town bully, would you call on him at his home, fight him in his own dooryard? Would you go to meet him down on the street corner? Or, if he was looking for trouble and for you and you knew he was coming, that the struggle was inevitable, would you hunt up a nice, big baseball club or take the neckyoke or pitchfork and meet him as he entered the door of your home?

WHY BE FOOLISH

Knowing that unreasoning war is sweeping the Eastern Hemisphere; that it may come to us, is it not just good, hard, common sense to quit our wasteful spending? Our foolish, impractical experiments? Conserve all our resources? Quit fighting business? Get rid of, by voting them out of office, those in this administration who, by their actions, during the major portion of the past 7 years, have shown themselves—and our present state of unpreparedness proves it—to be wholly unable to solve our problems and who are cheek by jowl altogether too friendly with Communist groups?

COOPERATION

France and England have lost hundreds of thousands of men on sea and land, blown by bombs or shells or crushed by tanks out of all resemblance to human beings. They lost because they permitted those who always wanted to work less and spend more to determine the Nation's course. Now, too late, they have discovered the error. Should we not profit by their example and oust those, and all the friends of those, who are interfering, by strikes, sit-downs, slow-downs, and just plain sabotage, with our preparedness program? Those who want to make over America?

The House last week started on the right road when it voted, two to one, to abolish the National Labor Relations Board which, for more than 2 years, I have been fighting. Let the Senate now do its duty and we shall be on the road toward industrial peace. This we must have, if we are to prepare for defense.

CONGRESS

In the last 2 years, the President twice called Congress back in special session, each time at a cost of at least a half million dollars. On neither occasion was there a real emergency.

Usually Congress stays in session until the latter part of August, this when the sun is shining and the seas are calm. Now the storm is raging all about us, yet the President, although he advised us that danger is knocking at our door, said he saw no good reason why Congress should continue in session. Sarcastically, he remarked that the situation did not require Congress to remain in session except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches.

The President is himself some fireside chatterer and he never has been noted for the accuracy of his statements. Nor is he distinguished for keeping his promises. Why should the people's representatives desert their post of duty and leave him to act as a dictator?

Secretary Ickes, his mouthpiece, asked whether he thought a Presidential campaign and election was necessary, in view of the present situation, replied, "Well, we might as well call it unanimous and save the money." Evidently Ickes thinks the dictatorship is here.

It will be my purpose to keep Congress in session and there is not the slightest chance that Ickes will be able to prevent an election in November, unless Congress is foolish enough to give the President the power to make him overnight a dictator, through the use of the Army.

Ickes has long been a spokesman of the New Deal. When any group of officeholders gets the idea that they can continue in office without being reelected, it is time to clean them out and it cannot be done too quickly.

Here you have my thought: Extend what help we lawfully can to France and England. By all means prevent our Nation becoming involved in the war. Clean up the mess we have here at home by insisting that an end be put to the worse than foolishness which has been carried on during the past 7 years. And, right now, wage a vigorous and a relentless war against those who propose, with or without force, to make America over. It is my purpose to do my utmost to keep us out of war and I will not support an effort to lead us into the present world war.

Glad to have your views but, before you write me, think and consider well the result of whatever course you may suggest.

An Opportunity To Render Aid to the Suffering Humanity of War-Ridden Continental Europe

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest humanitarian requests that has come from the White House in quite some time was the one enunciated this morning when the President asked for $50,000,000 so that food might be purchased to send to the refugees in Europe.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] has introduced a measure calling for $20,000,000 and this morning I am introducing a bill to encourage the exportation of surplus agricultural food products, to alleviate the suffering of war refugees and other purposes.

The bill provides:

That in order to encourage the exportation of surplus domestic agricultural food products the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to purchase, through such agencies under his control as he may designate, surplus domestic agricultural food products, and to grant such food products, together with any other agricultural food products acquired by the Secretary under any other provision of law and not otherwise disposed of, to foreign nations as provided in section 2.

SEC. 2. If any foreign nation shall, after the date of the enactment of this act, purchase agricultural food products in the United States for export, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, upon the request of such foreign nation, grant to it for export agricultural food products acquired as provided in section 1 having a market value equal to the amount so expended by such foreign nation.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

I have today introduced this bill, which I believe carries out to the fullest the American concepts of humanitarianism and our desire to do everything short of war to aid the Allies and the millions of unfortunate victims of the drive against civilization.

We have all bent our energies to furnishing the Allies with military necessities. My proposal takes into consideration that even armies, to make use of this military equipment, must be fed, and the hordes of unfortunates, who are being driven aimlessly out of reach of German guns, also need food.

Europe today is face to face with the greatest famine in world history. We have many needy within the confines of our country, but we have more than enough to feed them and to save war victims from starvation.

The bill I introduced todays aims to do just that. It proposes also to help solve our own economic disaster by providing that our surplus of foodstuffs may have a market and get to the hands and mouths of Europe's starving people.

It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase through such agencies under his control as he may designate, surplus domestic agricultural food products to match dollar for dollar purchases in this country by foreign nations of our exportable food products.

I am delighted to see that President Roosevelt today finally considered the vital need of this country doing something to avert this dreadful famine in Europe. I noticed in the morning papers that the President, in a letter to Vice President GARNER and Speaker BANKHEAD, suggested an appropriation to the relief bill of $50,000,000 for the proposal I outlined several days ago, and which previously had been proposed by a native son of New York State, Frank Gannett, of Rochester, candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination. Mr. Roosevelt did not, in my opinion, go far enough. Fifty million dollars at this time is a drop in the bucket. It is like offering a sandwich when meat and potatoes are needed to sustain body and soul together. I believe in order to really help the destitute in other lands, we should appropriate at least $500,000,000. Offhand, this seems to be a tremendous sum, but in reality it would not only save our farmers, but it would be a reduction in the amounts now appropriated for parity payments and crop control. In a world hungry because of war, with a nation blessed by productive capacities such as we have, it is foolhardy further to go along with the New Deal course of restriction of agricultural production.

I believe the situation is so grave that the Agriculture Committee of the House should consider this proposal at once so that we may help a starving Europe.

Anniversary Day Parade, 1940

REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the ability and power adequately and accurately to describe to you the scene that took place in the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens in New York City yesterday. Upward of 150,000 men, women, and children participated in the one hundred and eleventh annual Anniversary Day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union and the fiftieth anniversary of the Woodhaven Sunday School Union—a parade in honor of God and peace.

The Sunday School Unions, composed of churches of every Protestant denomination, was formed in Brooklyn over a century ago. The other unions in Queens County were formed about 50 years ago.

The first parade was held in 1829. It was originally a neighborhood event, and later grew to such size that it was returned to the neighborhoods.

The parade of 1940 was, significantly, one of the largest ever held, if not, in fact, the greatest in the long history of the parade. Concern over the world situation was believed to be the reason for the turn-out of participants and spectators. Particular emphasis was laid, both in the beautiful floats and banners, in proclaiming "Peace on Earth."

The parade has always been reviewed by men prominent in local and national affairs. Former United States Senator William M. Calder has traditionally held a luncheon for the reviewers at the famous Montauk Club in Brooklyn. This year his guests included Newbold Morris, president of the city council, representing the mayor; Borough President John Cashmore; Lt. Gov. Charles Poletti; Henry C. Turner, former president of the board of education and present grand master of the grand lodge of New York; and former Ambassador James W. Gerard. Other prominent officials reviewing the various parades include Supreme Court Justices Lewis L. Fawcett and Charles Lockwood, former Judge Edward Riegelmann, James W. Twomey, Helen A. Brana, Ernest C. Wagner, Faith Moore Andrews, Gen. Bryer A. Pendry, and others. In its long history the parade has been reviewed by Presidents of the United States, including President Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft.

This year, in Brooklyn, over 105,000 participated in the parade in 28 sections of the borough. William O. Prescott, president of the union, and Harold E. Meyer, chief marshal, directed the arrangements. Upward of 50,000 children participated in 11 parades throughout Queens. In Woodhaven arrangements were supervised by Charles J. Collins, grand marshal, and George F. Hora, president; and in Richmond Hill by Joseph H. Hall as grand marshal and George Walter as president.

The day is marked by the closing of the public schools in Brooklyn and Queens.

Mr. Speaker, I should, indeed, like to be able to describe in detail the vision of this parade. Beautiful floats and banners with messages of peace and good will; thousands of children, spick-and-span, on a holiday of holiness. The children's day in a troubled year—affording us an opportunity to recall those famous lines of Longfellow:

> Between the dark and the daylight,
> When the night is beginning to lower,
> Comes a pause in the day's occupations,
> That is known as the children's hour.

Mr. Speaker, this day was the children's hour—an inspiring sight to those privileged to review, and a most powerful force for good. So long as the unions preserve the tradition of Anniversary Day, America and democracy will be protected. May that be forever. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The League Against War and Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

LETTER FROM EDWIN S. SMITH

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Edwin S. Smith, of the National Labor Relations Board:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1940.

Hon. MARY T. NORTON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: I am writing to express to you my appreciation for the splendid fashion in which you answered the quite unfair charges that have been made about me in connection with my trip to Mexico in the summer of 1938.

I note that in your speech on page 7711 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 1940, you state:

"Mr. Smith is credited by the gentleman from Georgia with having been selected at Mexico City as secretary for the United States of the League Against War and Fascism. In point of fact, Mr. Smith was never a member of the League Against War and Fascism and was never selected in Mexico by anybody for any office."

While your statement is entirely correct, I think in view of a statement by Mr. Cox in the RECORD of June 7, 1940, a further explanation is due you. On page 7777, Mr. Cox says:

"Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker, the issue of September 12, 1938, in which the meeting of this so-called Congress of Workers to promote communism in the Western Hemisphere was reported. I quote from the Daily Worker: 'At the evening session a presiding committee was elected.'

"This is referring to the session of September 11, 1938, the Mexico City meeting 'a presiding committee was elected. President was Jouhaux; first vice president, Ramon Gonzales Pena, of Spain; second vice president, Eno Fimmen, of the International Transport Workers' Union; and the following secretaries: Meherally, India; Lin Lin, China; Edwin Smith, the United States; Casperson,

Sweden; Marcel Prenant, France; Allaga, Peru; Villasenor, Mexico; Milessi, Uruguay; and Nelken, Spain.'"

This refreshes my recollection about an incident which had entirely escaped my memory and which may be correctly reported by the Daily Worker.

My very definite recollection of the whole matter now is this: That on the occasion of the first meeting of the Congress Against War and Fascism, which was held in Mexico during the time that I was there, Leon Jouhaux, who is, as you know, the leader of the trade-union movement in France, was elected as presiding officer and named a presiding committee for the conference, on which my name was included without my consultation. I thought it undesirable to serve on this committee, and so promptly informed Mr. Villasenor, of Mexico, who was a member of the committee, and who used to be the counselor of the Mexican Embassy in Washington. I am sure my name was withdrawn. In any event, the committee, as the text of the newspaper account indicates, was simply a pro forma committee to preside over the conference. It had no relationship to any activities subsequent to the conference.

This was the only session of that conference that I attended, and, to the best of my belief, no organization of any kind was set up as a result of the deliberations of the conference. I presume that Mr. Cox based his charge that I was selected at Mexico City as secretary for the United States of the League Against War and Fascism on the basis of this clipping, which he exhibited in the course of the debate. The untruthfulness and maliciousness of such a proceeding is quite obvious.

The League Against War and Fascism, it has been stated by the Dies committee, was organized by the Communist Party. Whether or not this is so, I want to reiterate that I was never a member of the League Against War and Fascism and certainly was never elected by anybody as its secretary for the United States. I want to point out further that the League Against War and Fascism went out of existence almost a year before I went to Mexico City. This fact appears in the report of the Dies committee.

Again I want to thank you for your helpfulness and courtesy in this matter and to congratulate you most sincerely on the wisdom and courage which you displayed during the debate on the Smith amendments.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN S. SMITH.

Merchant Ships Essential to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in an address made by me on April 12, 1940, I pointed out that ships of our maritime competitors are being destroyed abroad, and that at the conclusion of the war we shall be met with the serious problem of finding sufficient ships upon the seas of the world to carry our commerce. The situation now is more serious than it was then.

But it is not alone as carriers of commerce that we need these ships. They are essential to our national defense. We are embarking upon a naval building program such as we have never seen before. Merchant ships are essential to that program. Without an adequate supply of auxiliaries the program is crippled from the start. It is imperative that we build merchant ships in larger numbers. The situation is so graphically and accurately presented in an editorial that appeared on June 4, 1940, in the New York Journal of Commerce, under the heading "The merchant marine in defense," that I submit it as a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

THE MERCHANT MARINE IN DEFENSE

While the new national defense program places the primary emphasis upon the provision of airplanes, mechanized Army equipment, and warships, an adequate and modern merchant marine is an integral and vital part of the Nation's defense. Ships are needed to bring needed imports, including strategic raw materials, to this country, to carry men and materials to any theater of a war in which we may become involved, and to supplement land transport facilities in coastal and intercoastal commerce. If our defense plans are to embrace the entire Western Hemisphere, this fact alone will make a vast expansion of the merchant fleet necessary. Since there may be heavy losses of merchant vessels through enemy attacks, in time of war, the size of the merchant marine required for defense is far larger than that needed for peacetime requirements.

The American merchant fleet today, inclusive of vessels engaged in intercoastal commerce and on the Great Lakes, consists of about 1,700 vessels with an aggregate of approximately 11,000,000 gross tons. Of these ships, about 1,500, with 8,500,000 tons, or almost 85 percent of the total, will be 20 years old or more within the next 3 years, showing that the obsolescence factor is very high. Only about 325 ships, aggregating some 2,250,000 tons, are engaged in foreign trade at present.

Our merchant-marine problem consists not only in increasing the supply of shipping but also in modernizing the fleet so that the ships available will meet every reasonable requirement that may arise. The Maritime Commission's present replacement program, under which 50 new ships are to be provided annually on the average over a period of 10 years, is clearly insufficient to attain this end. The Commission is now ahead of its schedule, having ordered 152 ships within the past 2 years, of which 46 have already been launched. However, a determined effort to replace vessels over 20 years old within a much shorter period should be made through a marked acceleration of the shipbuilding program.

In the meanwhile, Congress has paved the way for an immediate expansion of the available shipping supply by passing the Buck-Johnson resolution authorizing the sale or charter of ships over 20 years old in the Maritime Commission's laid-up fleet. All laid-up ships under 20 years of age have already been sold, but 116 vessels, of a total of almost 1,000,000 tons, remain. The Commission has invited bids for the reconditioning of 10 of these older vessels, and they should be in operating condition by midsummer. This reconditioning program should be expanded without delay, for there is no other way by which a large number of seaworthy vessels can be made available so soon and without overloading already crowded shipbuilding facilities. Great Britain has found that in time of war older ships play a valuable role, particularly on routes where the risk from mines and aerial attack is great.

By putting its laid-up ships into shape for immediate use and expanding its construction program forthwith the Maritime Commission can do much to assure an adequate and efficient merchant fleet, which is needed to supplement the other measures that are being taken to safeguard American national defense.

Beware of the "Sixth Column" Demand for United States Entry Into War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE KNOXVILLE JOURNAL

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Knoxville Journal of June 11, 1940:

[From the Knoxville Journal of June 11, 1940]

BEWARE OF "SIXTH COLUMN" DEMAND FOR UNITED STATES ENTRY INTO WAR

Don't be stampeded into war, America!

Like every other neutral in the world, we are living under the threat of a "fifth column," composed of native and imported enemies to democratic government.

And from day to day the evidence grows that at this critical period in our history we also must face new assaults from a "sixth column," composed of American citizens, some high placed, who are moving heaven and earth to thrust this country into the present conflict as a belligerent.

Over the week end indications of "sixth-column" activities and intent were typified in a statement, signed by 30 lawyers, professors, and businessmen, demanding that the United States instantly declare war on Germany.

Columnist Dorothy Thompson "seconded" their demand in a column suggesting the same action, and urging that our Navy be started to the North Sea immediately.

These are the beginnings of a deluge of public appeals and pronouncements designed to convince our citizens that we are helpless to keep out of the war; that like a leaf in the clutches of a raging stream we are being inexorably swept into the sea of conflict.

It is the part of clear-headed citizens to deny that this is so. It is their part to resist the idea with all their strength that the time has come when we have no choice—that we have to get in.

Nobody familiar with American public opinion would declare it to be neutral. Ninety-nine percent of it, conservatively, is pro-Ally.

But that is not an argument for declaring war on anybody. Rather it's the very best argument for our taking an opposite course that will contribute most toward ultimate victory for the Allied cause—and that contribution won't be made by going in but by staying out.

This is true for two reasons:

First, the help that the Allies need is not manpower. The Allied troops need arms. They need planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and supplies of all kinds. They need the very things which our industrial set-up is ideally geared to furnish, provided we are not forced to abandon supplying the Allies in order to equip an expeditionary force of our own.

In a nutshell, if the New Deal is able to bring itself to put politics out of the way for a time, to subdue its dislike for American business and industry, we can do more for the Allied cause in our present status of technical neutrality than we could possibly do as an unprepared and unarmed belligerent.

What this country should do, what it must do, is the thing that it can do—turn over to the Allies the full production resources of the Nation.

Nor is it necessary that United States industrial production of needed arms and war materials of all kind be held up until the Allies actually place orders for certain specific items. Let the Government immediately turn loose competent engineers on specifications for modern war supplies and equipment—materials that the Allies may or may not buy, but that we can use in our own defense program if they don't.

Get the orders moving. That is the main thing and the thing that counts. Speed in getting this process started is what is the prime necessity, and if the Allies are forced to wait till fall to get the products of our mills and factories then it is folly to talk of giving them help. By that time, one way or another, they won't need it.

In the second place, if, after we have turned over to the Allies, under provisions of our present Neutrality Act, all of the needed arms and supplies we can produce and still they lose, we will not be committed as a Nation to a lost cause; to the defense of the British and French Empires throughout the world. Instead, we will be able to concentrate solely upon completion of our own defensive preparations for whatever may come.

A declaration of war under existing circumstances is an emotional gesture; it's like cheering for an officer who, with bare fists, is trying to subdue a gangster, instead of passing him a club or a brick with which to end the fracas.

Instead of writing letters and passing resolutions to declare war, let our Government show the proper signs of leadership to the Nation's business and industry in mobilizing their resources for the aid of the Allies.

There is no need for new and modern war equipment that this Nation's industrial organization is not capable of producing quickly and in quantity.

The only thing that can stand in the way will be red tape, politics, and incompetency in the Government itself. If these can be overcome, American industry can be confidently expected to turn out the material and do it without delay; and there is no other contribution half as great that could be made to an Allied victory.

Finally, victory in the present war will have swung one way or the other long before we could make our power felt as a belligerent. The supplies which we can send today and in the coming months in an unceasing flow because of our nonbelligerent position would be completely cut off if we were preparing for our own participation.

The place for us to help the Allies win is from over here, without ourselves becoming active belligerents. Let every sensible citizen resist for himself and his fellow the inflammatory words of the new "sixth column"—the new war party of the United States.

Let every citizen hold fast to the conviction, founded in common sense, that we have no business in this war as a belligerent, and that we won't have to go in whether we want to or not—no matter who says we do.

The Campaign Fence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE (TENN.) BANNER

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Banner of June 10:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of June 10, 1940]

A Congressman receives his salary under the obligation to render a year's service. For Congress to turn its back upon important legislation vitally affecting domestic problems and matters, to fashion a new and important plan of new taxation to yield $1,000,000,000 a year with little more than a lick and a promise hastily fashioned, and to confine its serious effort to appropriations for the national defense, however important, then to hurry homeward to patch campaign fences is far from a creditable procedure.

The Congressman who concentrates his attention upon intelligent, vigilant, and patriotic public service seldom needs any fence fixing, for constituents, as a rule, are as quick to discover and reward ability and fidelity as to detect mediocrity and shirking.

As a matter of fact, the country is in such need of genuine statesmanship in Congress and is so anxious to see it in action that the man who displays it, certainly at this time when national attention is so intently fixed upon Washington and national affairs, may rely upon public appreciation and reward.

Sea Power Versus Air Power—No Longer is the "Right, Tight Little Island" Sheltered by Walls of Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

ARTICLE FROM CURRENT HISTORY BY COL. JOHN CALLAN O'LAUGHLIN

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in Current History for June 1940, entitled "Sea Power Versus Air Power," by Col. John Callan O'Laughlin, publisher of the Army and Navy Journal, who was First Assistant Secretary of State under President Theodore Roosevelt. He is the author of the book Imperiled America. A former newspaper man, he has been employed by the New York Herald, the Associated Press, the Chicago Tribune, and the Chicago Herald.

During the World War, as a representative of American newspapers, Colonel O'Laughlin took a Christmas ship laden with 6,000,000 gifts to war orphans in Europe. He was a delegate to the Progressive National Convention which nominated Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 and 1933–34 was assistant to the chairman of the Republican national committee.

Colonel O'Laughlin was aide to Major General Goethals, subsequently served in France with the intelligence section of the General Staff, and later was Secretary of the United States Inter-Allied Munitions Council.

The article reads as follows:

With true understanding of the purpose behind the Nazi invasions of Norway and the Low Countries, Winston Churchill grimly warned his people that deficiency in the air condemned them to difficulty, suffering, and danger.

No longer is the "right, tight little island" sheltered by the walls of steel that supplanted the oak of yesterday. Planes from southern Norway, unless intercepted, can soar over those walls and within an hour and a half drop their deadly load on Scottish ports. Planes from Holland also can soar over those walls, and within an hour be in a position to bomb the naval stations at Sheerness, Chatham, and Portsmouth, and the industrial centers nearby. They can interrupt Channel communications with France and imperil the sea route through the Straits of Dover over which passes much of the food and oil and exports of England.

Unless these air attacks are checked, the British Fleet will be forced to base in West English and Scottish ports, and to refit inadequately and slowly. Thus, the effectiveness of the British blockade fleet would be seriously weakened, communications with France would be hampered, and the life lines around the south of England and the north of Scotland would be badly snarled.

Germany's strategy and objectives are no sudden emanation from the brain of Hitler, but are the product of intense, technical thought applied to the lessons of 1914–18, and directed to a new utilization of air power. It was evident to the students in Berlin that, if German submarine operations had been conducted with more ruthlessness during the World War, victory would have been won despite the British Fleet. This conclusion weakened the old theory that annihilation of an enemy force was an essential preliminary to success. It also strengthened the principle that in the case of an insular power food transport should be denied and the support of the fleet on shore removed.

Lending themselves to these objectives were the submarine and the airplane, especially the latter, because it could strike the enemy

in all his activities—naval, maritime, and industrial. But the range of the bomber was limited, and bases for its service had to be acquired nearer to the enemy than Germany. The experience drawn from bombing attacks upon British bases in northern Scotland during the early months of the war confirmed this necessity. Hence the invasions of Norway and the Lowland countries in order that their territory might be used against England itself as well as fleet bases and channels of supply.

It is a bold and ingenious conception the Germans are seeking to execute, one that forebodes dark days for the British Empire. Prevented by the Treaty of Versailles from building a fleet comparable to that of Britain, the Reich deliberately accepted inferiority and allayed British fears by signing a treaty, limiting German building of all classes of ships to 35 percent of the British construction, submarines excepted.

Such surface vessels as Germany launched were designed for coast protection and operation in waters convenient for speedy retreat, for troop convoy to Norway and the Dutch coast, and for raiding, as in the case of the ill-fated *Graf Spee*. In other words, it was determined not to challenge England upon the surface of the seas but to rely upon the submarine, the raider, and the plane to destroy enemy shipping—especially upon the plane to attack the heart of the British home fleet.

This decision dismissed the possibility of a defeat at sea and placed reliance upon neighboring states rather than upon the sea for all vital imports. It contemplated also air offensives to harass enemy maritime traffic, to drive his sea forces from bases, keep them from German shores, and finally to gain a rapid decision by striking at the most sensitive and vulnerable points of England.

Operations in the war to date show how Germany has adhered to this program. Her submarines and planes torpedoed and bombed British shipping, and in the North Sea forced it to hug the Scottish coast; her planes bombed the Firth of Forth and Scapa Flow, compelling the British Fleet to take up a more distant blockade; and now she is acquiring air stations close to England herself.

Yet, until air attacks on English objectives are effective, England will be able to keep open the arteries of trade upon which her life depends. She will continue to exercise that slow, constricting pressure which sapped the strength and morale of the German people in the first World War. So far neither submarine nor plane nor mine has interrupted the traffic of the United Kingdom. Improved detection devices have resulted in the destruction of at least two-thirds of the underwater force with which the Reich started the war. Moreover, the convoy system has largely protected merchantmen; raiding has been proved disastrous, and new construction, plus acquisition of Danish and Norwegian freighters, has far exceeded the British losses at sea. In fact, more damage has been done to the British breakfast table and industry by the Russo-Finnish War and the Scandinavian invasion than by direct attacks upon shipping.

Before the World War, blockade was maintained just off hostile ports, and a passive "come to me" policy was observed by the blockader. This traditional procedure was changed by the submarine, which forced blockaders to a greater distance and a more active use of patrols. The blockade in the current war has required the Allies to lie at a great distance from shore-based aircraft, but this inherent disadvantage is compensated for by opening wide areas to reconnaissance planes which can radio enemy movements to superior surface force.

This change in blockading tactics explains the practical abandonment of the North Sea by the British Fleet and its refusal to enter the Baltic Sea. It accounts also for the partial blockade by the Allies of the Mediterranean accomplished by routing of shipping around Africa, and placing the fleets at Gibraltar, and near the Suez Canal.

Nevertheless, the blockade is effective in spite of distance. There is not a German ship loose upon the seas. Italy has been forced to rely upon her own shipping and the comparatively small bottom capacity of the United States and Mediterranean neutrals, to handle her trade, now severely reduced. Driven into home or neutral ports, the German merchant marine is useful solely for transport purposes, as in the Norwegian operations, and to a minor extent in the attacks against Holland and Belgium.

The control of the seas has another advantage than that of protecting home trade and banning imports to Germany. It is the ability to transport forces at will to threatened points, to remove them in case they are imperiled, and to supply and maintain them. This was demonstrated by the Allies in the Norwegian campaign. Here again, however, German planes placed a limit upon hitherto free movement. Protected by strong forces, troops were landed in central and northern Norway, and when threatened with disaster were brought back home or shipped to the Narvik sector.

These operations necessarily imposed long voyages in order that the transports might be outside the range of bombers. Movements had to follow the arc of a circle instead of direct procedure to the objective. They required launching of planes from ships, from hastily assembled rafts, and from inadequate air fields instead of from land airdromes which the Germans seized at Trondheim and more southern fields. They demanded constant watchfulness for bombing attack upon warships and transports, whose presence was signaled by submarines and by scouting planes.

In these operations came the first real test between the warship and the plane. But in spite of air deficiencies, both in number of machines and expert personnel and in operating facilities, fleet losses were remarkably few. As far as we know now, bombs can sink a submarine, a destroyer, and a light cruiser, and, if delivered in sufficient volume, can damage and even destroy a capital ship. They can also ruin instruments for gunnery precision on any ship, reducing the range and effectiveness of its fire. A board of British experts, after exhaustive investigation, reported before the war that "capital ships cannot be constructed so as to be indestructible by bombing from the air."

Yet, although the Germans have claimed to have sunk or damaged 11 battleships—which Winston Churchill sneeringly denied—so far we know that one of this type, the *Rodney*, a battleship, was only slightly damaged after a direct hit.

There are admissions that German bombs sank four Allied destroyers, and some submarines, and that German gunfire destroyed three British destroyers. German claims, as yet unverified, assert that Reich bombers accounted for three additional destroyers as well as five cruisers, a battleship, and an aircraft carrier. Allied gunfire riddled two German cruisers, and admiralty claims add five more cruisers and seven destroyers sunk from this cause.

From authenticated reports it is clear that the weapons we have known—the mine and the gun—have done the most damage, the bomb ranking third in destructiveness, and that the drawbacks of the plane are its low volume of fire, vulnerability, and dependence upon weather.

Nevertheless, waves of planes, as the Norwegian operations demonstrated, can cause terrible damage to an enemy, unless countered by defense plane and antiaircraft fire. It does not follow, however, that need of air strength lessens the need of gun power, nor that the costly battleship is an anachronism.

If that were true, Germany and Italy would not be building battleships, or the craft which complement them. In fact, nothing to date has established that the day of the floating fortress is over. The range of the airplane inhibits this. Future ships, of course, will be strengthened against air attack, decks will be reenforced, gunnery systems better guarded, and crews at antiaircraft batteries will be given greater protection. Just as defense eventually overcomes offense, so the battleship will develop. We have seen it in the past in the transformation of the wooden ship into iron and then into steel, and the transformation of the uncompartmented, thin-skinned underwater hull into the cellular and triple or quadruple skin hull of the modern battleship.

The submarine, which at the beginning of the World War seemed destined to drive shipping from the sea, has been brought within defined limits of service. So we may conclude that, while the air is affecting the design of warships and naval strategy and tactics, it has not usurped their function. Rather it is demonstrating that each has its own sphere of operation. Coordination of all three will be essential for victory in war.

Because the war will be decided on the battlefields neighboring the North Sea, one is apt to overlook the vast area in which the Allies are dominant. More than a third of Germany's merchant marine—309 vessels of 1,530,000 tons—is idle in neutral ports. Smaller and smaller is the percentage of Allied ships sunk by German submarine or mine, a contrast with the mounting casualties of the World War. From dominions and colonies and from far-off neutrals supplies of men and materials for the Allies flow without disturbance. Allied warships guard them. German planes cannot reach them. Here we have sea power supreme, and functioning with its age-long effectiveness.

If its home bases be protected, if that closer cooperation imperative with the air arm be achieved, sea power will exercise upon the struggle in progress the compelling influence it has exerted upon the wars of history.

Tax Burden on Business

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I did not have time in my remarks yesterday to include some of the tables that were given by the Guaranty Trust Co. in an article called Tax Burden on Business.

You will find in this article that 122 industrials paid 38 percent of their gross in taxes and 27 utilities paid 50 percent of their gross in taxes. You will find in this same article that 122 industrials paid 60 percent of their net income in taxes and 27 industrials paid 99 percent of their net income in taxes.

Also the Iron and Steel Institute report that if they could have used the money they paid in taxes they could have employed 92,000 more men last year than they did.

I draw this to the attention of the Members of the House because I think it is instructive and well worth while.

The article to which I have referred follows:

[From the Guaranty Survey, New York City, May 27, 1940]

THE TAX BURDEN ON BUSINESS

No one questions the desirability of taxation for the support of the essential functions of government, but taxes that bear so heavily on any group—workers, consumers, investors, or proprietors—that productive effort ceases to be worth while and the industrial machine slows down are inherently uneconomic. And the tax load has increased to a point where it represents one of the principal deterrents to business recovery and reemployment. Yet, present taxes, high as they are, fall far short of meeting the cost of Government. In the not distant future this Nation will probably be forced, in one way or another, to face the fact that it is living beyond its means and that retrenchment in nonessentials is not merely desirable but imperative, especially in view of the greatly enlarged expenditures for national defense that must be met.

The most striking feature of the corporation income statements for 1939 that have appeared since the beginning of this year is the evidence they give of the heavy and still rapidly increasing tax burden on business. An examination of the facts disclosed by these reports lends force to the contention that the tax load has increased to a point where it represents one of the principal deterrents to business recovery and reemployment. Yet the present taxes, high as they are, fall far short of meeting the cost of Government.

RELATIVE SIZE OF TAX PAYMENTS

The absolute magnitude of the tax payments by business enterprises, while impressive, conveys little meaning when considered alone. The real significance of the tax burden lies in its relations to other factors in business operations. In an effort to throw some light on these relations a study has been made by the Guaranty Trust Co. of the 1939 income statements of a large and representative group of industrial and public-utility corporations, not including railroads. The primary purpose of the investigation was to determine, first, the ratio of direct taxes paid by corporations to reported net income before tax deductions; second, the ratio of taxes to pay rolls; third, the average amount of tax payments per employee.

Direct taxes include Federal and State income taxes, franchise, capital-stock and property taxes, and social-security taxes paid by the companies. They do not include excise and sales taxes or social-security taxes collected from employees and remitted by the companies to the taxing authorities; that is, they include only those taxes presumably borne by the companies themselves and not those immediately passed on to other groups and individuals.

SIGNIFICANT TAX RATIOS

The inquiry reveals, first, that the ratios of total direct taxes to total net income before taxes for the groups of corporations last year were as follows:

	Percent
122 industrials	38
27 utilities	50
149 companies	43

Of the 122 industrials, 29 reported a ratio of 50 percent or more, and the same was true of 17 of the 27 utilities. Some of the outstanding companies reported the following ratios:

	Percent
Consolidation Coal Co	497
Ward Baking Co	85
Real Silk Hosiery Mills, Inc	74
McKeesport Tin Plate Corporation	73
Ohio Oil Co., Inc	72
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation	65
U. S. Steel Corporation	62
Mack Trucks, Inc	59
Western Union Telegraph Co	81
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	46

If the comparison is based on the amount of net income remaining after deductions for taxes, the ratios are, of course, much higher. On this basis, the figures are as follows:

	Percent
122 industrials	60
27 utilities	99
149 companies	75

The 29 industrials and 17 utilities that reported taxes equal to 50 percent or more of net income before taxes are thus seen to have paid out more to tax collectors than they had left for distribution to stockholders and reinvestment in the business.

The comparison of direct taxes with pay rolls shows the following ratios for the corporations for which the pertinent data are available:

	Percent
39 industrials	18
8 utilities	39
47 companies	23

The ratios for some of the individual companies were as follows:

	Percent
North American Aviation, Inc	35
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	28
Standard Oil Co. of Ohio	26
United States Steel Corporation	18
General Motors Corporation	20

Four of the eight utilities paid more than half as much to tax collectors as to their own employees. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its principal telephone subsidiaries, the largest private employer of labor in the country, reported a ratio of nearly 33 percent.

TAXES PER EMPLOYEE

Even more surprising, perhaps, are the facts disclosed as to the relation between taxes and number of employees. Direct taxes per employee were as follows:

49 industrials	$315
16 utilities	751
65 companies	424

Some of the individual companies reported the following figures:

Ohio Oil Co., Inc	$665
Commercial Credit Co	623
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	598
North American Aviation, Inc	568
Texas Corporation	507
General Foods Corporation	500
General Motors Corporation	344
U. S. Steel Corporation	299

Half of the utilities paid more than $1,000 per employee, while the American Telephone & Telegraph system paid $611.

The railroads were omitted from the study because they constitute a special group for which comprehensive data are readily available to the public. The ratios for class I railroads last year were as follows:

Taxes to net income before taxes	percent	79
Taxes to net income after taxes	do	374
Taxes to pay rolls	do	19
Taxes per employee		$360

The ratio of taxes to pay rolls and the amount of taxes per employee were somewhat higher than the general levels for industrial corporations but far below those for most of the utilities. These comparisons reflect the relatively unprofitable results of railway operation, which tend to raise the ratio of taxes to net income but probably reduce the ratio of taxes to pay rolls and to the number of employees.

The representative character of the foregoing figures is borne out by reports from other sources. The American Iron and Steel Institute reports that taxes paid by the steel industry last year absorbed more than one-half of the net profits remaining after all other expenses of operation had been met. They were equivalent to more than $332 per wage earner employed during the year, and if they had been paid out in wages, they would have increased the total pay rolls for the year by 22 percent. Expressed in another way, the tax payments represented a year's pay for 92,500 workers.

Comparisons between taxes on the one hand and employment and pay rolls on the other must be interpreted with care. They do not imply that the tax burden is directly shifted to employees or that amounts saved through tax reduction would be automatically added to pay rolls. The main purpose of the comparisons is to show the relative magnitude of the tax payments as an element of cost. A very significant relation does exist, however, between taxes and wage payments, as will be indicated presently.

The oil industry, besides paying direct taxes such as are levied on business concerns in general, bears a special burden in the form of heavy excise and sales taxes on its products. Taxes levied on the industry and its products last year, as the Skelly Oil Co. points out in its annual report, totaled more than one and one-third billion dollars. This is about a hundred million dollars in excess of the total value of all the crude oil produced in the United States during the year, and is equal to more than 10 percent of all taxes collected during the same period by the Federal, State, and local governments. Gasoline taxes alone amounted to more than a billion dollars and were equivalent to a sales tax of 41 percent.

DEPRESSING EFFECTS OF TAXES

Taxes on petroleum products, like sales and excise taxes on numerous other commodities, are ordinarily passed on to the consumer and do not represent a burden on the industry in the same sense as direct taxes on corporations. But taxes that raise the cost of goods to the consumer necessarily reduce demand and diminish the volume of business, and this affects the industry and its employees as well as its customers.

Conversely, direct taxes on corporations tend to affect not only the companies themselves but consumers and employees as well. When the taxes are light and the companies find it impossible or inadvisable to pass them on to others, they may be absorbed without appreciable harm. But heavy taxes are a vital factor in the cost of doing business and in many cases represent the difference between profitable and unprofitable operation. Consequently, they have profound effects on business policies and hence on the volume of production and employment.

UNECONOMIC TAXATION

The effort is sometimes made to belittle the adverse effects of taxes on the ground that they represent not a curtailment but merely a redistribution of purchasing power, since the revenue received by Government from tax levies is expended in one form or another. The only question to be considered, according to this view, is which type of expenditure is more worth while, that undertaken by Government with the proceeds of taxes or that pursued by individuals and private groups when the purchasing power is left in their possession.

Directly, the process of governmental taxing and spending does represent a redistribution, not a diminution, of aggregate purchasing power. The process, however, has indirect effects that may enormously outweigh the direct ones, either for good or evil. No one questions the desirability of taxation for the support of the essential functions of government, or even for worthy social objectives so long as the cost does not constitute a serious deterrent to business enterprise; but no social objective, however commendable in itself, can possibly compensate for the incalculable losses suffered by the public at large from taxes that bear so heavily on any economic group—workers, consumers, investors, or proprietors—that productive effort ceases to be worth while and the industrial machine slows down. Such taxes are inherently uneconomic, for they take vastly more from the public in lost income than they yield the State in revenue. By reducing the incentive to enterprise, they diminish aggregate production, income, and purchasing power to such an extent as to lower the standard of living of the entire population.

There is reason to fear that taxation in the United States is approaching, if it has not already reached, this uneconomic level. Federal, State, and local taxes are estimated at 20 percent of the national income, and the trend is still upward. In fact, taxes are now far less than sufficient to meet the current cost of government, which has been estimated at approximately 28 percent of the national income. If governmental expenditures continue at or near their present level, taxes must sooner or later be much higher than they are now; and the longer the balance is deferred, the greater the burden will eventually be. In the not distant future, the Nation will probably be forced, in one way or another, to face the fact that it is living beyond its means and that retrenchment in nonessentials is not merely desirable but imperative, especially in view of the greatly enlarged expenditures for national defense that must be met.

The Smith Amendments Would Destroy the Most Beneficial Labor Legislation That Congress Has Ever Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, due to meetings of the Committee on Rules and other matters which required my attention yesterday and today, I was deprived of the opportunity of obtaining time to register my protest against the efforts of the special interests to destroy this most beneficial labor, as well as industrial, legislation, namely the National Labor Relations Act, by the passage of the destructive Smith amendments.

The provisions in these amendments are about as fair and just as the methods that have been used and employed in making them in order for consideration by the adoption of one of the most unusual discriminatory rules ever forced by the enemies of labor out of the Rules Committee.

It is to be regretted that a few men—and I might as well name them—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], aided and supported by the voracious industrial interests, are wasting many days of our time—my time and your time—in an effort to emasculate or destroy this excellent piece of legislation that has taken the friends of labor years to enact into law.

NOTHING THE N. L. R. B. DOES IS EVER RIGHT TO ITS CRITICS

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] especially has persistently made most unfair attacks against the National Labor Relations Board, its decisions, rulings, and administrators, and even against some of its employees, just as he has against all other suggested legislation that is in the interest of the working men and women of America. He reminds me of the shrewd lawyer who, when the facts and evidence are against him, argue the law, and when facts, evidence, and the law are against him, finally attacks the judge in his do-or-die effort to sway the jury.

The allies of the gentleman from Georgia who are so industriously seeking to sabotage this most useful labor legislation are not unknown. They are the labor-hating American Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, who have their paid lobbyists always on the job in Washington. With an effort worthy of a better cause, these interests representing the Tom Girdlers of big business at first sought to prevent the passage of the act, and ever since have continuously attacked everybody and everything connected with it. The gentlemen in Congress who seek to destroy the law via the Smith amendments refuse to recognize or admit that the act was passed for the needed protection of labor, to give it certain imperative rights, chiefly among which is the right of collective bargaining, with a view to the elimination of strife and strikes and discord among capital and labor.

They willfully ignore the fact that the industrial barons of special privilege have persistently and consistently opposed the enactment and enforcement of this law in every way. They have worked overtime in trying to hamstring the operation of this Board and make its tasks as difficult as possible.

WORST ELEMENT OF EMPLOYERS ARE THE LEADING CRITICS

These malevolent, organized groups, under the leadership of Girdler, Weir, Pew, Willkie, and Hopson, have been advising not only their own members but everybody else to disregard this, the law of the land, and to disregard the rulings and orders of the Board, yes, even the orders of the courts themselves.

Not until the Supreme Court declared the National Labor Relations Act constitutional did these groups desist in their multiplicity of court actions, and in their effort to prevent the enforcement of this law.

Since that decision the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has no longer been able to charge that the act is unconstitutional, but he has at every opportunity that presented itself, as I have stated, assailed and attacked the members of the National Labor Relations Board as being unfair to the "poor" employers and even went further in assailing them as being communistically inclined. I say without fear of successful contradiction that they are no more communistically inclined than he is. In these unfair attacks, naturally, he has had the support and acclaim of the employers who, notwithstanding their ever-increasing profits, have been at all times and are now against the payment of a living wage to their employees. The gentleman from Georgia as well as the gentleman from Virginia should recognize the fact that the Senate will never approve the Smith bill which, as I have stated, will, if enacted, tend to destroy the effectiveness of the National Labor Relations Act and, therefore, as I have pointed out, the time of the House is being wasted.

THE SELFISH BIG INTERESTS HAVE ALWAYS OPPOSED LEGISLATION IN THE INTEREST OF THE WORKERS

The viciousness of this present attack against the National Labor Relations Board and the act itself is not anything new to you and me. The same interests that have from the beginning opposed this act are the self-same ones that have ever persistently opposed every effort that tended in the slightest degree to restrict or prevent unfair practices in the treatment of labor. When I first came to Congress fights were being made by the railroads against laws that would provide safety for both employees and the public. Every safety measure, even the provision to eliminate wooden passenger coaches, and every advance in safe operation and

administration was bitterly opposed by the railroads, and not always by methods that merited applause.

The workmen's compensation law, the 16-hour law for those engaged in train operation, the safety-coupler requirement, the automatic air control, safety provisions for grade crossings, were alike opposed bitterly, it being the claim of the carriers that such laws would prevent the proper and profitable operation of trains and be generally destructive of our rail-transportation system. Then, too, we all remember the strong opposition of the railroads and express companies to the parcel-post system.

The same applies to the steel industry, the packing industry, and the textile industry. It has been since I entered Congress that the steel and packing industries discontinued a 12-hour day; and only comparatively recently did the textile industry, as the result of operation of the very law now under attack, discontinue oppressive working conditions and child labor.

ASSOCIATED GAS AND ELECTRIC EXPLOITATION A PUBLIC SCANDAL

Those of you who were Members of the Seventy-fourth Congress remember the typical Hitler-like propaganda carried on against the then proposed regulatory power bill. You recall the effort on the part of the Senate committee to obtain service on the power representative—the man Hopson—for questioning; how he evaded service of that committee, and placed himself in more friendly hands, namely, into the custody of my predecessor, the Honorable John J. O'Connor, the then chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House, and thereby escaped interrogation by the Senate committee, who had more effectively investigated the matter and were in position to make a more particular and minute examination of the man Hopson. Yet the House committee was able to bring forth the disclosure that Hopson's own company had expended over $1,000,000 in an effort to defeat this much-needed regulatory legislation. In this connection you will recall the receiving of hundreds upon hundreds of fictitious telegrams, paid for, and sent at the instance of the power companies to mislead and browbeat Members of Congress. After 5 years the country has caught up with this gentleman. Today we find him indicted for fraud against the stockholders of his companies, and the amount of money involved is in excess of $20,000,000.

You also should remember the fight of Richard Whitney, president of the New York Stock Exchange, against my efforts to regulate the dishonest practices of stock exchanges. And what became of Whitney? Even after the enactment of the Securities and Exchange Act he did not stop his practices and landed in a prison cell.

It is also history how the industrialists of our country opposed the passage of the National Recovery Act—N. R. A.—and how they treacherously unloaded upon the President "One-man-decision" Johnson, who in a czarish manner turned the legislation to the aid of big business and to the detriment of small business and labor. Upon his failure to accord labor fair treatment the President was obliged to force him to relinquish his position, whereupon the big interests turned against the N. R. A., after the President had insisted upon a strict compliance with the law, which would prevent discrimination against the small-business man and labor.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT WAS A SPECIAL TARGET FOR REACTIONARY RICH

None of us who sponsored the Social Security Act, one of the most humane pieces of legislation that was ever enacted by any parliamentary body in any land, can ever forget the particularly wicked, vicious, vindictive, and absolutely uncalled-for attacks that the ever gluttonous, rapacious moneyed interests leveled at that wholesome proposal. This worthy act has to do with such worthy and social service as old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, unemployment compensation, and other forms of economic security for the needy and deserving. Yet it was assailed as though it were blasphemy against all well-to-do folks. Even after it was established—already over 46,000,000 social-security accounts have been opened—the fight to deceive even the aged beneficiaries and those workers who are contributing for the benefit of their old age, as to the purposes of the legislation, was continued and is even to this day.

And similar to this was the fight and protest of the rich and privileged industrialists against such similarly beneficent legislation as the Railroad Retirement Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and now the proposal to regulate chain stores and mail-order houses. You will also recall the strong opposition to the act outlawing "yellow dog" contracts and the Norris-LaGuardia Act covering the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. And so on. All this opposition, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, is now reechoed in opposition to the National Labor Relations Act, and by the same general predatory interests.

SWEATSHOP EMPLOYERS SURPRISED TO DISCOVER THEY MAKE MORE MONEY UNDER WAGE-HOUR ACT

One of the results of the Wage-Hour Act that sweatshop employers did not anticipate is that they actually are making more profits under the 30-cent-an-hour minimum wage as required by this legislation than when, as previously, they were paying as little as 3 cents an hour. This fact has been announced by Col. Philip B. Fleming, under whose efficient and sympathetic supervision the Wage-Hour Act is being administered.

Before the act was passed, Colonel Fleming points out, many manufacturers, particularly in the garment field, farmed out their work to be done by families in their homes. The pay then ran from 3 to 10 cents an hour.

After the passage of the wage-hour law, these employers dropped their homework systems and concentrated all production in factories. They found that efficiency shot up so much that they could pay the higher scale and boost their profits at the same time. Families benefited enormously, too. Previously, children pitched in with parents to do the homework, and all together earned enough to make but a bare subsistence. Now the father or son receive more wages than the entire family did before.

This is not the first instance, Mr. Speaker, that employers have learned to their surprise that it pays to treat labor fairly. When treated with respect and given a living wage, the average working man or woman becomes more efficient simply because he wants to be; he is more satisfied with his situation, and instead of holding back because of a grievance, he puts his shoulder to the wheel and tries to give of his best. It is merely human nature.

And I may say to the gentlemen from Georgia, Virginia, and North Carolina [Mr. Cox, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. BARDEN], and other reactionaries, who are wittingly or unwittingly serving or trying to serve these predatory interests, that every one of the social laws we have enacted here in the last 7 years has aided not only the workers but the commerce of the Nation. During the time these laws have been in effect income in the United States has more than doubled, in many instances trebled; the wealthy corporations and wealthy individuals have in many cases quadrupled their incomes, with corresponding increases in profits.

But notwithstanding this business improvement and these profits the greedy and avaricious interests persist in opposing in every way our further efforts to improve the status of all our worthy citizens, workers, farmers, and businessmen.

PROGRESSIVE LABOR LEGISLATION HAS BENEFITED INDUSTRY AND CAPITAL AS WELL AS WORKERS

And so, Mr. Speaker, I assert with confidence that there are few among us who would repeal these wholesome laws that we have enacted since I have been a Member of this body. I have named only a few of those beneficent laws, only those that readily come to mind. I have not mentioned the laws looking to safety of miners, seamen, and many others engaged in hazardous occupations. Nobody, aside from these barons of special privilege, these malefactors of great wealth, who can be restrained by only one method—law—would repeal these wise laws, because ultimately all fair-minded men

realize that they inure to the benefit of the whole Nation. They are the keystones upon which we have builded to make great America what she is. They are the keystones that make American citizens the coveted goal of so many in distant, distraught lands.

As I have implied, every attempt by such laws as we have enacted to improve the status of our wage earners has been met by the hue and cry that the efforts were unconstitutional, discriminatory, confiscatory, unworkable, and in many instances we have been told they were socialistic.

MESSRS. LEWIS AND GREEN SHOULD GET TOGETHER IN THE INTEREST OF ALL LABOR

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate because of the bitter fight between Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Lewis, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, that Mr. Green should permit himself to be influenced by the clever, shrewd officials of the various employers' associations and recommend the adoption of these amendments which will tend to the emasculation of the National Labor Relations Act for which all friendly labor leaders and those who have the interest of labor at heart have advocated and worked for these many years.

I recall the years of fighting for a law that estopped the use of the injunction processes against labor organizations which, by the adoption of these amendments, may be nullified. I feel that Mr. Green and some of the members of his board must be blind to the effect of these amendments or refuse to sense the dangerous stand they assume in recommending the amendment of a law that is proving fair to both employer and labor. As one who for 50 years, 34 years of which I have served in Congress, has espoused the cause of labor, I greatly deplore the labor strife between the two major labor organizations, and to me it is unthinkable that their own dispute should result in the leadership of one of the organizations in advocating amendments that will tend to weaken the effectiveness of the act. If beneficial labor laws continue to be scuttled and the officials of the American Federation of Labor are a party to such action, either because of inactivity or because of the aid and comfort that one of its officials lends to the enemies of labor, the time is not far distant when the demand will be made from within the organization for a change.

I am sure that if Mr. Green and Mr. Lewis would, with understanding of the trials and tribulations of the workers of America, as Gompers, Powderly, Mitchell, Stone, Sargeant, and other great American labor leaders understood, instead of fighting among themselves, submerge and subordinate their personal interests for the interests of the total wage earners, as other great labor leaders have done, their opposing forces, led by Girdler, Hopson, Pew, Weir, Willkie, and others, would not prevail, and could not successfully continue their dictatorial and oppressive activities either here or before the State legislatures.

AM NOT AFRAID OF THE THREATS OF BIG BUSINESS

I do fully appreciate that I will again be attacked by the advocates of national thuggery and the corporation-controlled press of the country for my stand for the workers on this question; but I have become callous and indifferent to their false and malicious attacks upon me, and, since they have been singularly unsuccessful in such past attacks, they will, I know, suffer a like fate now. Wall Street vipers have been on my trail all my official life, but they have not in the slightest degree unfavorably influenced my destiny.

For many years I have been an employer of labor, and I have always treated that labor fairly. I do not speak in connection with labor as a theorist; because, in addition to being an employer of labor I have been a laborer. I do not look at the problems of labor solely from a swivel chair. I have always advocated and practiced fairness in dealing with labor, because I have always found that, ultimately, such an advocacy and practice pays big dividends.

REGRET THAT ALL DEMOCRATS CANNOT GO ALONG WITH US FOR LABOR

Please notice that the majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and the majority of the members of the Smith committee, who forced this measure through the House to besmirch the administration and effect a nullification of the wage and hour law are Republicans. The head of the committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has never had anything in common with the cause of labor, his record clearly showing that practically always he has voted against every piece of labor legislation that has been proposed in this body.

In years to come the history of the carpetbaggers of the South will show that they sold out the stock and bond holders and their employees in the East and Northeast and moved to the South so that they would there be able to take unfair advantage of the cheapest labor in the United States—even child labor.

TAXES IN UNITED STATES ARE NOT NEARLY AS HIGH AS IN ENGLAND

It keeps the special interests to which I have referred earlier in my remarks busy finding obstructions for our efforts. When the matter of constitutionality is by orderly procedure adjudicated, and their views are wholly rejected, they set up a big bogeyman called overtaxation, ruinous taxation. They try to mislead the American people into believing that they will by excessive tax burdens be crushed when, as a matter of fact, the Federal Government does not, except in a few instances of minor importance, impose any tax except the income and surplus-profit taxes. Certainly thoughtful people will not blame the Federal Government for State-, county-, and city-imposed taxes.

In this connection let me give some figures I collected a few years ago when England was at peace and fairly prosperous concerning income taxes. And remember that since these figures were collected the income-tax rates of England have been about doubled. This is a comparison of United States and English income taxes as of a date I am, unfortunately, unable to give:

Income	British tax	United States tax
$1,500 (309 pounds)	$83.83	$0.00
$10,000 (2,058 pounds)	2,208.87	83.25
$20,000 (4,115 pounds)	5,462.64	588.75

NORTON BILL SHOULD BE ENACTED INSTEAD OF THE SMITH AMENDMENTS

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion allow me to reiterate that I feel that the attacks against the National Labor Relations Act are just as viciously unfair and ill-founded as have been the attacks leveled at the other remedial laws I have enumerated.

I feel that everybody who believes in fair play, in a chance for the workers to achieve livable wages under fair and uniform conditions, according to merit, will not favor this proposed substitute by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], which substitute is for the benefit of the predatory interests only, but will favor and vote for the regular committee bill, the Norton bill.

We Must Protect Our Country by Home Production of Strategic Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 I extended my remarks in the RECORD and included therein an analysis of H. R. 8206, which had been furnished me by W. J. Graham, president of the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association. I wish to insert a further analysis and argument of this meritorious proposal furnished me by W. C. Broadgate,

vice chairman of the Yavapai County Council of the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association and director, Yavapai Associates. Mr. Broadgate's presentation is as follows:

The purpose of H. R. 8206 is to set up a revolving fund out of current silver seigniorage with which to provide small-mine loans for the opening, reopening, examination, and sampling, and preliminary development of all classes of metallic and nonmetallic mineral deposits. H. R. 8206, as does H. R. 9996, extends the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make A and B loans on the same classes of properties.

The principal arguments for this legislation may be divided into the following four parts:

1. The discovery and examination of new sources of strategic and critical war minerals.
2. The discovery and development of new commercial ore bodies to replace those now being depleted.
3. The substitution of useful and productive work, which will add new wealth to the Nation's resources, for direct relief programs, making possible many thousands of permanent jobs and reducing relief expenditures.
4. Maintenance of present rates of industrial taxation in the mining States so that reduced mining activities will not throw additional burdens on other basic industries.

1. STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL WAR MINERALS

It is an unbelievable situation that the present R. F. C. loan authority is restricted to loans on gold, silver, and tin properties at a time in our political and economic history when such a vast diversity of metallic and nonmetallic minerals are necessary and may be more necessary in the near future in order to insure the very survival of this great Nation. Some of our economists and bankers cry that we have too much gold, too much silver; and yet of all the long list of important minerals of which our commercial production is deficient tin was the only one included in the act empowering class A and B Reconstruction Finance Corporation mine loans. Just consider the War Department's long list of these vitally necessary minerals:

Strategic minerals: Aluminum, antimony, chromium, manganese, ferrograde, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quicksilver, tin, tungsten.

Critical minerals: Asbestos, cadmium, cryolite, fluorspar, graphite, platinum, titanium, vanadium.

It is incredible that, in the face of this real urgency, we have authorized mine loans only for the two metals we are said to have enough of and for one which is difficult to produce commercially at present prices.

Congress not long ago authorized $100,000,000 for the purchase of strategic and critical war minerals, protected additionally by the "Buy American" clause, and has appropriated $10,000,000 of this, $350,000 of which went to the Bureau of Mines to investigate—not to produce from or develop—sources of these minerals. This action clearly showed its realization of the stringency. Unfortunately, the result of this program to date on domestic production has not been happy, as these Bureau of Mines activities in their very nature must be limited.

How much more sensible it would be to let thousands of claim owners all over the country devote their time to developing these much-needed resources on borrowed money, which will return to the Treasury, and with no liability on the part of the Government such as the last emergency war-minerals program entailed.

Most of the strategic and critical war minerals are of a character which are somewhat difficult to market commercially during normal times. Some of them may be of no commercial value excepting during an emergency and others are subject to great fluctuations in value which very easily might wipe out a private investment. There is always a great deal of interest in the exploitation of ordinary commercial minerals, but in the very nature of the case few claim owners or investors can afford to carry out much exploration work for these strategic and critical minerals. This, most surely, is one of the real reasons for their apparent scarcity.

The class C mine loans plan authorized under H. R. 8206 would do more to solve this important problem than any other step which could be taken by Congress. It covers the exploration of all metallic and nonmetallic minerals, and at the same time (as does H. R. 9996) enlarges the scope of the present R. F. C. mine-loan law to cover these same minerals. Not so extending the law is a gross oversight. If this step had been taken some years ago there is no doubt that the present emergency would not be so acute, if, indeed, it would exist at all. The class C mine loans (if administered as intended by the framers of the bill) will permit the search for the rarer and less commercial but vitally necessary war minerals to be carried out in a thorough and widespread manner by those who can, and should, do it—the claim owners themselves. With this legislation in force, and with the extensive selection of properties which then may be made under the Bureau of Mines program, it is certain that many new sources of these apparently deficient minerals will turn up, besides additional sources of the more common commercial minerals.

Further, adding to our present store of knowledge regarding thousands of potential mines, metallic and nonmetallic, all over the Nation will prove of incalculable value in the future.

One example among many may be noted. There is an undeniable lack of domestic, commercially workable, antimony deposits. Yet I have been informed of two likely prospects of good grade ore, the owners of which would begin to ship almost immediately could they avail themselves of one of these proposed class C loans followed, if required, by an R. F. C. class B loan. It is a crying shame that such deposits should not be made available at this time.

There must be scores of such cases throughout the country. Too much stress cannot be laid on the importance of H. R. 8206 from the strategic, critical, and essential war-minerals angle alone. The passage of this bill is completely justifiable on this basis, even if there were not other valid arguments for making this must legislation.

2. DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW ORE BODIES

It takes constant, careful investigation of thousands of mining prospects and the intelligent expenditure of money to find a few producing mines and develop their potentialities. This does not mean that, if a claim is turned down today for some good reason, it may not be valuable at a later date. Our experience has been that this sorting over and examination of mining claims must be repeated periodically due to constant changes in economic conditions, metallurgical practice, and varying demand for various metallic and nonmetallic minerals. Ore is properly defined as "mineral in place which may be mined at a profit." As our economic conditions shift, what is ore today may not have been ore yesterday. Consequently, many a mining claim which was partly developed a few decades ago and abandoned, either because the mineral was refractory to the then known methods of beneficiation; relatively inaccessible to markets; too low grade for market conditions at the time of original development; or containing minerals the worth and utilization of which was not appreciated at the time, can now be reopened and developed at a profit.

The above are the principal reasons for the present idleness of countless thousands of potentially valuable mining claims. These lead to a more immediate, physical reason. The mine may be filled with water, have its shafts or tunnels caved in and so be inaccessible for sampling—the information as to its ore content may well have become mere rumor rather than demonstrable engineering fact. Seldom can present-day private capital afford to venture the funds with which to do the preliminary work necessary in order to expose the ore bodies for sampling and determination of their value.

The R. F. C. class B mine loan rules state, "Loans will not be considered on mining properties the ore bodies of which are under water or, due to caving of the mine workings, are inaccessible for examination by any of this Corporation's engineers. Loans are not made for the purpose of making such ore bodies accessible." How, then, may these fallow ore bodies be made available? The proposed class C loans are for the purpose of making such ore bodies accessible. It is difficult to conceive of the millions of dollars of basic wealth in the form of necessary—yes, at the present time, vitally necessary—minerals of which we are being deprived because the framers of the original mine-loan measure were not sufficiently farsighted to realize the need for this third, preliminary class of loans and for providing wider authority and more liberal rules for loaning in the A and B classes.

Let me point out, in the language of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that "The class B loans are made available solely for the development of gold, silver, and tin ore bodies, and are not made for prospecting or grubstaking purposes." If this legislation passes, all types of ore bodies, metallic and nonmetallic, in all States of present condition and development, will be developed and the national economy will likewise directly and immediately benefit.

To take an example from one small part of the West it is interesting to note that, according to the county recorder of Yavapai County, Ariz., on the average more than 1,000 affidavits of labor and exemptions have been filed each year over the past several years. This probably means that more than 3,000 mining claims in this one county alone are awaiting the necessary capital for examination and development and a great variety of minerals is present in these claims. This is a conservative figure. At the present moment not a dozen sizeable mining properties are operating there and, with the exception of one, all of them are properties which at one time or another were abandoned for one or another of the reasons already discussed. Either portions of these mines luckily remained open for examination, or sufficient engineering information was still available, to indicate their worth under present conditions.

Now, it is absurd to suppose that of 3,000 mining claims idle in one area some considerable number do not justify the faith that has been shown by the owners in holding them—in some cases for a score or two of years—and frequently undergoing real hardships and financial deprivation in order to do so. This situation is not unique. It is duplicated throughout the other mining counties of Arizona and throughout the mining areas of the whole United States, which means literally from coast to coast.

Money for the small mine, once so plentiful, has become so hard to get that small investors do not dare to use their hard-raised funds for putting properties in shape for examination, although money is available for actual mining. Whether this financial stringency is due to restrictions in marketing securities, or to the investing public no longer having surplus funds, does not at the moment concern us—the fact remains that, when a group wishes to put up money for small mining activities they will seldom look at a mine or mining claim which must have work done on it before it can be examined and sampled. They are afraid of dispersing their energies and capital in presampling operations and being left without money with which to develop and mine. When mining capital was easier to get this condition was not acute.

The situation just explained leads to the apparent paradox that, with quantities of worthy idle mining claims awaiting exploration, and with private money looking for mines to develop, the one cannot readily be brought to the other.

The class C loan bridges the gap. It will make a vast outlet for private capital and will, in some cases, allow the placing of more of the class A and B mining loans, which miners presume were actually designed to help mining.

According to a recent statement by the R. F. C., out of the meager sum of $10,000,000 which has been the extent of Federal attempts to help the important mining industry, due to the legal restrictions of these loans, in over 7 years only a little over five millions has actually been disbursed, of which around two and one-half millions is already repaid. This should leave nearly seven and one-half millions available for new loans in the A and B classes. It is clear that these A and B mine loans are having a reasonable repayment experience and that the eventual losses will not be high. It must be remembered that these loans pay off in cash and not in securities, and that the indirect benefits, as will be hereafter shown, are many times any possible losses.

It has been stated that seven times as much money was lost in one great banking loan as has been loaned for the development of mines in 12 States and Alaska in more than 7 years. If this is true, the reluctance to consider mine loans a reasonable risk is difficult to understand. Obviously, there is something wrong, and the situation needs correcting. With countless mining properties idle, properties which are the future hope of the mining industry, and it is only through their development that the present level of mining can be maintained when inevitable depletion closes down our present mines—apparently the R. F. C. cannot find suitable placement for a mere $10,000,000 in an industry which in Arizona alone has grossed $90,000,000 yearly on an average for the past 16 years.

It has been stated that very few applications for the present loans now are coming in. This can partly be accounted for by the fact that most claim owners do not feel that the loan policy is sufficiently liberal and that they are pretty sure to be turned down. Besides, there are few mining claims in condition to qualify under the law and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rules which are based on that law. We know that there are plenty of mines awaiting development.

It cannot be reiterated too often that mines by their very nature are depletable assets. As each one is exhausted another as large, or several smaller ones, must be discovered and developed to take its place if the level of employment and the revenues to the States and the Nation are to be maintained. Only constant examination and development of idle claims will produce the necessary replacements.

Few people will deny the importance of mining as an industry, but its premier place in our economic system is sometimes overlooked. A few statistics from Arizona, a typical mining State, will indicate this importance, and similar figures could be obtained for other States. Largely due to few new mines coming into production, mining in this State has shown little growth since 1919. Up to 1937 it accounted for nearly two-thirds of the combined output of the State's basic industries. Due partly to its static condition and partly to the increased importance of agriculture to the State, this figure is now much less. It will interest you to know our gross mining income distribution, taking the 1937 figures, which closely approach the 16-year average, as an example:

Refining, freight, etc	$13,000,000
Pay roll	29,000,000
Production supplies	21,000,000
Taxes	12,000,000
Intangibles	11,000,000
Dividends and investment liquidation	4,000,000
Total	90,000,000

The effect of such a basic industry on other industries is of the greatest importance. The people dependent on mining are large consumers of agricultural products, meat, lumber, and other necessities of a more or less seasonal or perishable nature. As to the railroads, over a period of 27 years, 86.48 percent of all carload freight tonnage originating in Arizona was mining shipments, and during 1938 alone $6,000,000 were paid out in freight charges. The public utilities benefit greatly, directly or indirectly. Arizona mines accounted for 22 percent of power sales made by the Salt River Water Users Association in 1938. Had it not been for this mine market for power, the farmers of the Salt River Valley would have had to pay an additional $592,000 in that year for their irrigation water. Many other figures could be quoted, but it should be clear from these just given that our mining business is worth preserving by every possible means since, directly or indirectly, it benefits everyone.

3. THE LABOR SITUATION

The effects of employment in a basic industry such as mining cannot be too strongly stressed. The benefits of employing men with entirely new money, derived from wealth not previously in circulation and which has been dug from the earth, seem to be greater and more far-reaching than in any other industry.

It is notable that in such a mining State as Arizona, over half of the population, exclusive of Indians on reservations, is directly dependent upon the mining industry for support, according to a compilation made by the Arizona Department of Mineral Resources. These conclusions were based upon an economic survey made by Rolland A. Vandergrift and associates which showed that, for each miner employed, there were 14 persons, including the miner himself, dependent upon his production. As more than one-third of Arizona's mining labor is employed in mines classed as small mines, one can readily deduce that one-sixth of the State's population is supported by these lesser operations that we are asking aid for, and many of which may grow into major ones.

The effect of mine loans on employment may be clearly seen from the information contained in an editorial by Charles F. Willis which appeared in the Mining Journal, Phoenix, Ariz., late in 1939, entitled "An Amazing Revelation." The editor here points out how money spent for the development of new mines tends to create future prosperity to a much greater extent than the actual expenditure would indicate. Among other things it said, "John E. Norton, head of the Mine Loan Division of R. F. C., is authority for the statement that the total losses will possibly aggregate as much as $500,000. This looks like a lot of money being lost and gives those who do not think a thing through something to talk about." He goes on to say, "A careful survey was made of these properties and John E. Norton is again authority for the statement that 'as a result of the mining loans made to July 1, 1939, there will be created 2,400,000 man-days of work. This represents new jobs. This figure is based upon a conservative estimate of the life of each property from that date.'"

The editor states further, "It means that the Government created work for the future at a gross cost of 21 cents for each day of work that was made, and it paid full current wages doing it. Assuming that the miner gets $5 a day for the 2,400,000 man days of work, and that labor is about 35 percent of the cost of mining, the expenditure of $500,000 by the Government has created $36,000,000 in business, and, at our present rate, approximately $7,000,000 will come back to the Government and its subdivisions in taxes through one channel or other. Thus, the Government gets a profit of six and one-half millions on one-half million spent. Labor gets $12,000,000 in employment, and the railroads, business houses, manufacturers, farmers, cattle raisers, and hundreds of others share in another $24,000,000."

If the expenditure on mining development of the small sums so far loaned by the R. F. C. can have such a magnificent result, the operation of the class C loan plan, putting millions instead of thousands of dollars into productive use over a much wider area, should eliminate the necessity for the greatest portion of the direct relief money now being spent wherever there may be metallic or nonmetallic mining activities, if the plan is properly and liberally administered.

4. MAINTAINING TAXATION SCHEDULES

We must not overlook the fact that mining pays a large share of all taxes and in order to maintain the present rates of taxation it is necessary to keep this industry flourishing and to take every possible step to maintain and preferably increase its present gross income and profits. Taxes are not being reduced and there is little chance that they will be. The only way to keep unit taxes at their present level is to maintain or increase the present industrial income and, if possible, to increase the number of taxable properties and thus more generally distribute the burden.

Using Arizona again as an example of the typical mining State we find that mining pays a big proportion of its taxes, as is true in similar States. Analysis of the 1937 reports of the Arizona Tax Commission and the Arizona Unemployment Compensation Commission revealed the fact that in 1937, those engaged in mining paid nearly 35 percent of the total amount collected as sales taxes alone, not taking into consideration indirect contributions from industries catering to those engaged in mining. The figure for 1937 was $1,418,352.49 and the small mines' proportion of this was about half a million. Employing one-fifth of the labor in the State, mining paid more than one-third of the State sales tax and one-fourth of the ad-valorem taxes.

To put the tax statistics on such a basis that the mining industry's comparative burden may be seen at a glance, it should be scaled down to dollars paid per each $10,000 of gross income. In 1937, mining paid $147.90, agriculture $32.75, and livestock $33.07 per each $10,000. Although the production of Arizona's mines was nearly $1,000,000 less than it was in 1914, the amount of direct sales taxes paid by them was 285 percent higher and this represents only 37 percent of the revenues raised from mining taxation. Now, the reason for studying these typical figures is to show what an intolerable burden will be laid on our other basic industries, not to mention the public at large, if every possible step is not taken to prevent mining from dying out for lack of suitable development of properties which may replace those now being depleted.

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up briefly the above arguments:

1. It should now be clear to anyone that the Class C mine loans as proposed in H. R. 8206, are an imperative necessity if we are to locate and develop adequate sources of strategic and critical war minerals to supply us in an emergency, and that it would be nothing short of criminal not to utilize this logical way of finding and developing these vital minerals.

2. For the sake of maintaining our industrial economy we must find and develop mines to offset depletion of present ore bodies.

3. We believe that the Class C mine loans will be largely self-liquidating. Due to the method of repayment by a 15-percent gross royalty and the small size of the individual loans, the repayment experience should be very good. However, if these in reality were total grants rather than secured loans, the effect of them in increasing employment will be so great that if they are administered as the sponsors of the bill intend, it will not be too much to hope in view of Mr. Norton's figures that, for each $1,000,000 expended on these loans, three millions or more can eventually be cut from the general relief appropriations, thus making a tremendous saving to the taxpayers.

4. If present mining taxation burdens must eventually be thrown onto the other basic industries due to lack of new property developments, it is plain from the figures already given that these other industries, in States such as Arizona, can scarcely be expected to survive such an oppressive load.

Finally, I may say that there has probably never before been proposed to any Congress a measure which, with so sensible and painless a method of financing and small eventual cost, can bring such far-reaching benefits of a permanent nature to the people of the United States and our economic system.

The Party of the "Fifth Column"—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a large majority in the House passed a tax bill which will place an excessive burden upon all the taxpayers of the United States. This bill was passed, as someone said, to make the people "tax conscious," and I hope, dear folks, that you will become "tax conscious," for you are not only charged with these taxes but you are also paying interest on a national debt of over $50,000,000,000.

Now then, a large majority of the men you sent to Congress wants you to realize how incompetent the New Deal has been, how incompetent the President of the United States has been, and it is to make you conscious of this incompetence that the large majority of Democrats and Republicans joined in passing this tax bill. I hope that this measure will prove effective, and it should raise no question from either Democrats or Republicans, for both of them joined hands in this very laudable effort.

As you cogitate upon this and upon the consideration the men you elected to Congress have given to you in the protection of your rights and your liberties, I also want to call your attention to the national debt which is now over $50,000,000,000. Some day your great, great, great grandchildren will be laboring under the present national debt, and even at such distant time it will still remain unpaid. In other words, President Wilson's and President Roosevelt's administrations have shouldered a national debt or tax burden upon the people of this Nation that will, for the next 2 centuries, make slaves of the American people.

Increased taxation may be compared to borrowed money. A successful businessman operates his business on income established upon the earnings of his business. The Government operates upon taxes levied against the people, the taxpayers, of the Nation. The difference between the two is that the businessman earns his income, but the Government takes its income from the earnings of industry, business, and labor. When incompetent people engage in business, they first lose their own capital investment, and when this is gone, they borrow, if they can, from banks or other financial sources. When they can no longer borrow or when their credit is exhausted, they go bankrupt and are usually looked upon as failures in the community.

Your Government is no different from such individuals, for when it cannot operate within normal or reasonable income, and because of such incompetence resorts to the use of borrowed money, it is no better or more competent than any individual who is looked upon as a chronic failure in the community in which he lives. Indebtedness, or let me say, our national debt, therefore, may be looked upon as incontrovertible evidence of Government incompetence and unfamiliarity with principles that underlie sound business. The proof that the Wilson administration was incompetent was clearly shown in a national debt of $27,000,000,000. The best evidence that the Roosevelt administration is incompetent is in a national debt of $50,000,000,000. In other words, the Roosevelt administration is just about twice as incompetent as the Wilson administration. This is what the new dealers call liberalism, democracy, or the New Deal.

Such incompetence is, in a sense, an impeachment against those who are engaged in private industry which makes it nearly impossible for them to establish credit or public trust. It is no different in national affairs, because willful squandering of public wealth is an impeachment against the administration that should not go unchallenged by the people whose credit is destroyed. That is the people of this Nation, because money is borrowed upon the credit of the United States. When the same officials actively engage in forcing legislation through Congress, contrary to the Constitution of the United States, they have by such act become enemies of the United States and should be dealt with accordingly. When these same public officials engage in foreign intrigue which may lead this Nation into a conflict in which we have no interest but which may cost the lives of our young men, it becomes a duty of public officials to call the public's attention to this fact for it is our sons who must pay the price.

This in itself is a most real and glaring indictment against any administration, and it is for that reason I have now drafted impeachment charges to be preferred against the President of the United States if he in any sense places us in a position where an "incident" may involve us in the present war.

The people of this Nation should know that this war is fought to restore those in power who control money and credit. And that in itself is an offense against the United States, and those who engage in it are our enemies and should be treated as such.

I do not like to make a statement of this sort, but we have reached the point where someone must state the facts to the people of this Nation, and I have selected to do so. I hope the people will not think I am fooling, because I was never more serious in my life.

Congress has committed so many unconstitutional acts that the people should be up in arms today and demand that each and every Member rededicate himself to the fundamental principles of this Government as set forth in the Constitution. However, when Members of Congress forget their duty to the people to such extent that they resort to persecution of those whom they were elected to protect, it is high time for the people themselves to take a hand in this Government. When Members of Congress are so incompetent that they can find no sound procedure to establish a balance between income to maintenance costs, someone who understands sound business should replace them in Congress.

Members of Congress should realize that raising the debt limit and constant borrowing is not the answer to the deplorable condition in which our Government is now. As a matter of fact, it will only accelerate or hurry us toward eventual bankruptcy, repudiation of currency, and the national debt. Only a fool will attempt to borrow money in order to meet an increasing operative cost created by incompetent management, for the outcome of such procedure is so obvious that even Members of Congress should be able to understand it.

This is what should have been done—not yesterday, but 25 years ago: The State should have been called upon to assume its function so as to relieve the Government of the United States of administrative expenses and care for the States. The Federal operative cost should be reduced by drastic economical operation to the very lowest point for efficiency; and in such procedure lies the answer.

By drastic reduction in the Federal operative cost, the income which now prevails will not only be sufficient to care for such expenses but will, in addition to that, establish a surplus which may be used to retire obligations against the United States Government. This would be a sound procedure, because it would require no additional taxes. As a matter of fact, taxes could be reduced and Government income increased if we had people employed in the Federal Government who had the slightest conception of the principles which underlie sound business operation.

This in itself is a most real and glaring indictment against the administration and should not go unchallenged by Congress and by the people of this Nation. The people should demand that Congress prefer impeachment charges against anyone, no matter who he may be, who, through laxness, permits an incident to occur in order to arouse public sentiment for war.

I, of course, invite criticism of any statement I make, but such criticism should be based upon the authenticity of my remarks. If they are tabulated and documented, it serves no purpose to call me names, for such attitude proves the truth of my statements.

It requires no ability to prove the incompetence of this administration, because it is now admitted by the man on the street who at one time labored under the delusion that the President was a friend of the people of this Nation. The people I refer to are those whom the President so kindly described as the "ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed." These unfortunates are still in the same condition as they were when the President shed his hypocritical tears of agony for a people he cares as little about as he does for those who will not bow in admiration before him, saying, "Allah! Allah! Thou greatest of all rulers!"

The people of this Nation should be apprised of a fact that I believe very few of them realize. Say that I deposit $100 in the bank, in a savings or general account. The bank invests this money in bonds, negotiated by larger banks back east, so that my $100 reaches one of the larger banks, say in New York City. It is in these banks most of the Nation's wealth will be found. These banks, and the Federal Reserve banks, then control this money.

There is approximately seven and one-half billion dollars in circulation, of which several billions are on deposit in large centralized banks. The Federal Government now borrows, say $100,000,000 from the Federal Reserve banks, and for this it issues bonds to the bank which in turn extends credit to the communities, including mine, where the money is to be used. In addition to this security, of course, the Federal Reserve banks and other interests are now holding about $15,000,000,000 in gold certificates.

The fallacy of this transaction lies in the fact that our own Government, which represents "we, the people," borrows from the Federal Reserve banks money which belongs to us, because it is the money we place in the bank on deposit. There are only about seven and one-half billion dollars in circulation, yet we have borrowed seven times that amount from the Federal Reserve banks, and this now amounts to approximately $50,000,000,000, upon which we are paying interest to the national and international bankers.

There is $7,000,000,000 in circulation. Three percent interest amounts to $210,000,000, but remember: We have borrowed this amount seven times, so we are actually paying seven times $210,000,000, or $1,470,000,000 interest. And we are paying this amount in spite of the fact that there is only $7,000,000,000 of money in total circulation in the United States. This amounts to approximately 21 percent interest, which has accumulated by using the same money over and over again. This, of course, will eventually reach a point where the interest itself may be greater than the money in circulation, and then this question may be asked, "What are we going to do about it?"

What is to be done now?

It should be clear from this that we cannot go on and borrow as we have in the past, for our currency structure is bound to collapse and that is a danger far greater than most of us realize. When our currency structure collapses, it will mean that each and every one of our people will be bankrupt. They will be unable to buy food, for money will have no value, and we will then be confronted with the same situation the German people had to face when the international bankers withdrew the gold from Germany in order to bring about bankruptcy of her Government.

I, therefore, disapprove of the Army appropriation bill, for the simple reason that it is the wrong way to go about building up national defenses. The greatest national defense any nation can have is a sound currency structure, with all factories, industries, and business operating at full capacity and with everyone employed. We cannot expect to build up national defense on a dead or dying industrial structure. We cannot build up our national defenses on inflated currency and borrowed money. We can only build up our national defenses by rehabilitation of industries, drastic reduction in the Federal cost of operation and return to sound business operation in the Government.

It should be clear that a bankrupt Treasury and an army of unemployed are not conducive to the rehabilitation of industries or national defense. A business is healthy only when the treasury is sound, and that is as applicable to the Government as it is to any private industry.

When we have developed such healthy industrial condition we can, without endangering the national credit, appropriate such money as is needed for national defense. However, this should not be in spasmodic appropriations, but we should instead gradually build up the Army, Navy, and land fortifications so that we will be able to take care of ourselves no matter what may happen.

It should interest those who are now frantic about rearming or arming to know that the late Senator Copeland, of New York, introduced an amendment on the Senate floor to the Army appropriation bill for $25,000,000 in antiaircraft guns; and it may be of greater interest to know that the administration opposed this appropriation. Congress, however, appropriated $100,000,000 for the Army which it did not use. When General Craig appeared before the Senate committee hearings, when questioned on the hundred million dollar appropriation, he informed the committee that the President told him not to use it. This statement was off the record. Now the question which arises in my mind is what became of the $100,000,000 which was appropriated by Congress, and which the Army did not use?

To those who cannot understand why the Communists are not prosecuted and why these alien gentry are allowed to operate as a communistic party, it may be interesting to know that within the last 10 days the President entertained 70 members of the Youth Congress at a meeting in the White House. They were advised not to say that they were there. Some of them were alleged Communists and admittedly fellow travelers of the Communist Party. Is it now any wonder that we have communism in the United States, and is it any wonder that the Department of Justice and the F. B. I. are making little attempt to apprehend the Communists or deport those who have no business to remain within the United States.

Republican Trojan Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago one of my Michigan colleagues [Mr. ENGEL] talked about the Michigan cherry problem. In depicting the sad plight of the growers

he placed the blame unreservedly and entirely upon the Democratic administration and upon a law which as a matter of fact had nothing whatsoever to do with the difficulty.

Now comes my friend and colleague of Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], who makes a similar erroneous expression as regards the trade agreements. The statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has been completely refuted and it is my purpose at this time to place in the RECORD a statement which knocks into a cocked hat the expressions of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

REPUBLICAN TROJAN HORSES

Opponents of the trade agreements continue their methods of inflating, padding, deceptive diluting, blending, deliberate omissions to make a case against the program. They even take advantage of the present war situation, when countries are struggling for their existence, to paint the picture in the most unfavorable light.

My colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] had placed in the RECORD of June 10—the day Italy declared war on the Allies—some incomplete tables which involved practically all the schemes of deception suggested above. His was truly a Trojan horse of deception. His main scheme was a comparison of selected figures in an attempt to show that farmers were better off in 1932, at the bottom of the depression, than in 1939. I desire at this point to supplement his figures to indicate what has happened to American farmers during the 7 years of the New Deal.

	1932	1939
Farm cash income from marketings	$4,682,000,000	$7,711,000,000
Average farm price for all commodities, index (1909–14=100)	65	93
Average prices received by farmers for:		
Wheat (cents per bushel)	38.80	63.60
Corn (cents per bushel)	28.10	47.60
Beef cattle (dollars per 100 pounds)	4.25	7.03
Hogs (dollars per 100 pounds)	3.34	6.23
Butterfat (cents per pound)	17.90	23.90
Wool (cents per pound)	8.60	22.30
Cotton (cents per pound)	5.82	8.66
Tobacco (cents per pound)	9.30	13.60

In view of his use of the 1932 and 1939 figures, I want to call to the attention of American farmers just when they lost their foreign markets in agricultural products. A comparison of agricultural exports in 1929 and 1932 gives the following results:

Agricultural exports, 1929	$1,693,000,000
Agricultural exports, 1932	662,000,000
Loss in agricultural exports under Hawley-Smoot Act, annually	1,031,000,000

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] stressed the increase in so-called competitive agricultural imports from 1932, the low year of the Hoover depression, to 1939. By abstract figures he attempted to make it appear that farmers were better off in 1932 than in 1939. The imports of so-called competitive agricultural products in 1929, before the Hawley-Smoot Act, amounted to $1,017,000,000, in comparison with $526,000,000 in 1939, the year which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] considered so bad for American farmers. These figures indicate that American farmers were nearly a half billion dollars better off, as far as competitive agricultural imports were concerned in 1939 than in 1929.

As with other tables inserted in the RECORD with the inference that trade agreements are the cause of increased imports, and at the same time decreased exports, the import table inserted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] included a number of items, such as wool, flaxseed, and vegetable oils and fats, the duty of which have not been reduced in any trade agreement. This is a common scheme of the opponents of trade agreements in order to incite the farmers against the program. I do not believe farmers are going to be that gullible.

The caption, in his table "Cattle and beef," includes items more than half the value of which represented no reduction of duty. Likewise, more than half of the value figures of imports of cheese represented types which entered the United States at the Hawley-Smoot rates of duty so that no trade agreement could have encouraged these increases. There was no general reduction of duty on corn, only a preferential concession to Cuba. The figures on potatoes applied largely to a lower duty on seed potatoes made for the sole benefit of a great majority of American farmers.

These are a few common illustrations of how the opponents of trade agreements hope to win over the farmer vote. Even if the imports were bad in themselves, this sort of inflating, padding, and diluting by opponents does not make a better case for them against trade agreements. Farmers are better informed as to the reductions in duty which have been made in trade agreements. They will not be so easily misled. When this table is carefully examined, I think it can truly be said that it is a Hawley-Smoot Trojan horse, which will not take the farmers unaware.

Lions' International, With Its 140,000 Members, Offers Full Cooperation With Federal Government in Suppressing "Fifth Column" Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

LETTERS AND EDITORIALS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence and editorials, which are fully explanatory:

LIONS INTERNATIONAL,
Chicago, June 10, 1940.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Representative in Congress, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Following up my telephone conversation with you in Washington the other day, I am pleased to inform you that Lions International is working in direct cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the counteracting of "fifth column" activities, with particular reference to acts of sabotage and other subversive activities.

We have sent to the F. B. I. a list of our 3,700 citizenship and patriotism committees, which represents complete coverage of our 3,700 Lions Clubs. For the time being, the arrangement is that we will do all of the contact work with our clubs. Along this line, Melvin Jones has written two articles on the subject of the "fifth column," which appeared in our magazine, The Lion. We have just sent out a Socratic League program entitled "What Is To Be Done About Foreign Agents?", and our next mailing to our committee chairmen will include a list of all of the field offices of the F. B. I. to which complaints and information are to be transmitted. You will receive a copy of this mailing. Under date of May 28, we sent a letter to all our citizenship and patriotism committee chairmen requesting their cooperation in this work.

When I was in Washington, J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the F. B. I., arranged for me to have a conference with his assistant, Mr. Clegg, who received very enthusiastically the plan under which Lions International is working in cooperating with the Government in this patriotic work. Mr. Clegg made one particularly pertinent remark, and that was that just the other day he received information that the Communist Party in the United States had 140,000 known adherents. When he found out that our Lions International has 140,000 members, he said he felt considerably relieved, because he knew that the one more than offset the other.

Melvin Jones has asked me to send you his best wishes along with my own. I am sorry I could not see you personally in Washington, but perhaps we can work this out at a later date. In the meantime, if there is anything further we can send you

on this subject, please let us know. I will keep you posted as to further developments.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY KRUEGER,
Assistant Treasurer.

JUNE 12, 1940.

Mr. HENRY KRUEGER,
Assistant Treasurer, Lions International, McCormack Building, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. KRUEGER: I am deeply appreciative of your letter of June 10, which has come to my desk today.

I feel that the patriotic action of Lions International is highly commendable and deserving of congressional recognition and widespread notice. I shall, therefore, place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD our correspondence and include therewith the two excellent editorials written by Melvin Jones, secretary general, as published in the Lions magazine of the issues of May and June. Melvin is to be highly congratulated on his forceful writing.

I have been a member of the Lions International since 1924, and increasingly have I valued my membership in such a truly fine organization which stands for the best principles of militant Americanism.

With kindest regards, I am,

Faithfully yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

[From the Lion for May 1940]

THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

(By Melvin Jones)

It is ironic that the term "fifth column" which was first used, it is said, by the Communists to describe activities of their opponents, has come to designate the type of activity typical not only of Fascist and Nazi organizations, but of the very methods employed by the Communists themselves.

The term was apparently first used by Communists to designate those people in Madrid during its siege who were antagonistic to the Madrid regime; and active adherents of the Nationalist cause. It was also reputedly used by the Nationalist general Emilio Mola when he was asked by correspondents which of his four columns then driving toward Madrid would take that city. He is quoted as replying, "The 'fifth column,'" referring to the people living in the city who were Nationalist sympathizers and prepared to assist in accomplishing the surrender of the city to the besieging forces.

Notice that this original "fifth column" was not necessarily an armed unit, yet eventually became a powerful if not a deciding factor in the ultimate settlement of the conflict.

Since that occasion has not the term come to mean an advance post, composed of persons in sympathy with an outside force and working in collaboration with it?

Under this interpretation it can be assumed that it was a "fifth column" which awaited and welcomed foreign troops in several of the recent episodes throughout the world, and in at least one instance the "fifth column" had seized several important public buildings before the invading army had even reached the outskirts of the city which was its objective.

It is clear that in the view of the aggressive totalitarian states the "fifth column" has become just as essential a part of their army as any of the military units, and in a sense has become an active part of the military arm in these states.

The principal function of these advance units is to rise at the opportune moment and create disturbances, even to the point of armed rebellion. Sabotage, dissemination of propaganda, instigation to disorder and riots, alienation of the loyalty of a people from its duly elected government, even the maintenance of arms depots, are within the sphere of activities undertaken by the "fifth columns" of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism in countries throughout the world.

The purpose of all this subversive activity in countries with which the totalitarian states are legally at peace is quite simple. It is to disrupt national unity. Undoubtedly unity is the first requisite of safety in a nation. In our democracies we are apt to forget this important fact, and because of our great freedom of individual thought and action we are inclined to permit the spread of disunity without paying it particular attention.

As we all know, the club divided against itself never was much good to anyone, least of all to itself. A business without unity is soon no business at all. A nation without unity invites the covetous glance of aspiring world theorists.

In every one of the countries of lionism, subversive groups—Nazis, Fascists, and Communists—are organizing their "fifth columns." These groups certainly do not call themselves by any such self-descriptive title as that. Their camouflaged names are too numerous to mention, but it is their aims and their actions, not their names, we must be most concerned with. Their actions are aimed at creating disunity among us.

Our mission is first to be aware of these influences, and then to stop them by education and by exposing them at every opportunity. If we do not do this we are inviting trouble by our apathy and overconfidence. Every new organization that springs up within our range of activity should be investigated carefully.

Our democratic unity is our strength and it must be preserved. Even the most virulent of dictators hesitates to plan depredations against strongly united nations. It is our place, therefore, as Lions, to lead the way in demonstrating that democracy is our faith and that none of its detractors will ever prevail upon us to embrace their subversive opinions and still less countenance the "fifth columns" of aggressive totalitarian states, which lie in wait to exploit every sign of disunion. No foreign personage or organization must ever be able to say that his "fifth column" within our borders is the column which will accomplish our downfall.

Our faith in our democracy is great. Let our will to unity equal our faith.

[From the Lion for June 1940]

THE "FIFTH COLUMN"

(By Melvin Jones)

A young American of Polish descent, the man who broadcast news from Warsaw during the recent Polish campaign as warplanes laid desolate the city, addressed the Central Lions Club of Chicago some time ago. Among the most startling of his revelations was the exposure of the almost unbelievable ramifications of the Nazi espionage and spy system. One proof of the thoroughness of this system was his own case. He stayed at his job of broadcasting until Warsaw fell. The conquering Nazi offered him a job in Berlin. He refused it. Then began months of concentration camps, nerve-wracking semifreedom, and official surveillance as he sought to leave the country. Finally, reaching Italy, he was able to get passage for his home country, the United States.

Care was taken that only he and the United States State Department should know of his departure, for Nazi agents in Italy were checking closely on his movements. Yet 2 hours after he reached New York three Germans visited him in his hotel room, warned him not to speak of his experience nor to make any broadcasts, and took care to let him know that the addresses of his mother and sisters, still in Poland, were known to them.

His family is now in Sweden, in comparative safety, so he is free to speak.

The Nazi "fifth column" knows no boundaries.

Working even now in many countries, its fatal poison has eaten into the heart of sturdy nations like Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium with such effect that a swift attack caused the hollow shells to crumble, leaving millions of people defenseless, at the mercy of an invader of appalling ruthlessness.

Mieczyslaw M. Nowinski, writing recently in the American Mercury, threw further light on the completeness of Nazi infiltration into Poland before that country fell. The whereabouts and the number of Polish planes was known to the enemy. Secret army-transport schedules, mobilization, and concentration points, the location of munition dumps, and oil reserves all were accurately listed in the Nazi files.

When Polish soldiers took over large estates near the German border they found many equipped with cement gun emplacements, complete radio-transmission stations, landing fields for airplanes, and reserves of gasoline and oil. During the campaign numerous military trains, operating on the most secret of schedules, were blasted from the air before they started, or a few minutes afterwards.

The "fifth column" was thorough.

Long before totalitarian war comes to a country, the "fifth column" is there, an army of agents, secret and open, conspirators, spies, provocateurs, revolutionists, and propagandists. In our country, even now, these methods are being used, as the Dies committee in the United States has proved.

How do these agents work?

They work through discontented minorities, through commercial agents, through individual business contacts, through widespread anticapitalistic and antidemocratic propaganda, and through corrupt officials.

The "fifth column" uses threats and violence to induce compliance of individuals through terror. It also employs to the full the impressiveness of the armed might behind it, stressing the futility of opposition.

It points to the destruction and misery of countries which resist its fighting forces and paints pleasant pictures of the peaceful tranquillity in countries which submit to its will without a struggle.

All these are potent weapons which it is difficult for a defending nation to cope with, especially in peacetime.

As Lions we are all interested in doing what we can to protect our several nations' safety. It is well, therefore, for us to be alert to possible dangers. Authorities need and desire the alert cooperation of the private citizen. They must have information before investigations can be conducted.

A fine example of sensible cooperation that in no way could be termed "witch hunting" hysteria occurred in Canada recently. A Lion overhead a man caustically tell some children, "When Adolf Hitler comes over here you won't act like that." Although surprised, the Lion passed by and said nothing. A few days later a similar incident occurred, and the Lion reminded the man that Canada was at war with Hitler, and such remarks did not seem right. He was told, "You won't be so smart either when Adolf Hitler comes over here."

Somewhat worried, the Lion related the incident to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who made a quiet investigation. The man was discovered to be a Nazi agent and is now interned for the duration of the war. Without fuss or hysteria and with no element of persecution in his thoughts or action, this Lion has done his country a genuine service.

The Lions are a body of men whose influence and example will guide the conduct of many others. Quite a number of Lions and Lions Clubs have done fine work in cooperation with such bodies as the Dies committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States. Now that so many horrible examples of the treachery of the "fifth column" have been exposed to the eyes of the world, it is well to give serious, intelligent thought to our countries' internal safety.

It is well to know who are alien agents. Suspicion, however, can be a devilish poison. Let us keep tight rein on our suspicions, but let us also, as loyal citizens, familiarize ourselves with the danger and emulate the Canadian Lion who kept his eyes and ears open, defending his country even as he went about his common daily civilian tasks.

What use to have a strong defensive army, navy, and air force if the country it is protecting be crumbling from the honeycombing activities of a "fifth column"?

Let us keep our eyes open, our senses sharp. Our Nation's safety is important to us, isn't it?

The Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE (TENN.) BANNER

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Banner of June 6:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of June 6, 1940]

SHIRKING A DUTY

The measure laid before Congress by the administration outlining a plan for additional taxes wherewith to meet the necessarily and heavily enlarged appropriations for national defense was somewhat surprising in some of its provisions.

To begin with, the amount which it is proposed to raise annually over a period of 5 years, about $660,000,000, is far less than the sum now called for by the President for that purpose—about $5,000,000,000. The $3,000,000,000 of additional tax revenue now planned would be not much more than half of what is already proposed, and to a single Congress, and undoubtedly present appropriations are but a part, and probably a small one, of what will be called for in the next year or two. It would be far better if the sum to be annually raised by taxes was made really sufficient, and that a genuine, rather than fictitious, pay-as-you-go policy should be instituted.

The American people know that they must pay, and pay heavily, to make the defenses of the Nation prompt, certain, and adequate, and Congress would do well to take the people into its confidence and let them know the exact situation.

The disappointing feature of the proposed plan to raise additional revenue is that it merely calls upon those who are now paying taxes to pay more and does not call upon classes who are now exempt from taxation to pay anything. This is manifestly not just.

When it comes to income taxes, it is estimated that there are over 2,000,000 people whose incomes are from $1,000 to $2,000 annually. They are not paying a cent of income taxes under the present law, nor would they pay a thin dime under the plan that has been laid before Congress.

The sound principle to apply is that payment should be made according to ability to pay. The citizen whose income is only a few hundred dollars is not in a position to pay anything, but those whose incomes range from, say, $1,000 to about $2,000, assuredly should pay something. It is not just to the great body of citizens that so great an element of the population should be relieved from any direct income contribution toward the vast sums necessary for national defense.

Congress is making the plea that it has not time to revise the tax system and must hurry home. It is true that the inequalities and crudities in the tax system, taken as a whole, cannot be soundly revised in a few weeks; but it would take Congress no more time to enact a just income-tax law than to pass the partial and unjust one now proposed.

But Congress is still manifesting the hesitancy to enact a comprehensive, sound income-tax law, embracing the vast multitude now enjoying exemption, which that body has displayed for years. Too many of its Members are looking to November and are afraid to take any action that would be displeasing to the large element of their constituents who have escaped any payment of income taxes for years and would like to have that immunity continued.

The American people are ready to make even sacrificial contribution, if necessary, for the defense of the Nation; but these contributions should be distributed upon the principle that no class able to pay should be freed from obligation to contribute something.

It has long since been settled that taxation without representation is tyranny. It is equally true that taxation embodying discrimination is oppression.

Patriotism is in the saddle in Congress, but demogogy is at the stirrup of too many of its Members.

Dollars for Nonsense, and Information for Misinformation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, on June 11 I noticed two related articles—one appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3678, as an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. ROY WOODRUFF, and another on page 2 of the Washington Post for June 11. From the latter article I see that between January 1 and May 30, a matter of only 5 months, the Republican National Committee spent for propaganda $1,145,995; in the former article I see some more of the usual dribble of misleading statistics designed to prove that the trade-agreements program has been harmful to agriculture and that farmers were better off in 1932 than in 1939. I justly presume some of the money reported as spent by the Republicain National Committee was used to collect these data. If I were spending that much money, I would make sure of getting the whole story. I would want all the facts and finally I would want comparable statistics so the people could reach a fair and honest conclusion and be not misled or deluded.

In the first place, although it is true that the value of total agricultural exports was $662,300,000 in 1932 and $655,600,000 in 1939, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] points out, this 1-year comparison does not take into account the effect of the war on our 1939 agricultural exports nor what had happened in prior years. In 1936, for example, our agricultural exports were $709,500,000; in 1937, $797,500,000; in 1938, $827,500,000—or an average for the 4 years, 1936–39, under the trade-agreements program of $747,500,000, which is substantially over the 1932 figure, even including the war-depressed exports in 1939.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] next claims that "competitive" agricultural imports of $296,000,000 in 1932 and of $526,000,000 in 1939 meant a loss to the farmer of $230,000,000. By the same token the fall in these imports from $1,017,000,000 in 1929 meant a gain of $721,000,000 by 1932. Any such claim as this is, of course, pure folly. In 1929 the farmer received $11,221,000,000; in 1932, $4,682,000,000; and in 1939, $7,711,000,000—the farmer lost from 1929 to 1932 and he has gained since 1932.

In his final table the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] shows the quantity of imports in 1932 and in 1939 of certain agricultural products. Again it might be asked where is the harm to the farmers because of these imports—in 1932 he received an income of $4,682,000,000 and in 1939, $7,711,000,000, excluding Government payments. I am sure the farmer is interested to find out—as if he didn't know it already—that prices received by farmers were 43 percent higher in 1939 than in 1932 and that they averaged 63 percent higher during 1936–39 than in 1932.

Mr. Speaker, the spending of $220,000 per month by the Republican National Committee for statistical political prop-

aganda seems to be a pure waste of money. The spending of twice the amount per month will not change facts nor vary truth.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a well-considered editorial of April 30, 1940, on the Hull trade treaties by the Times, an unselfish and well-known Republican paper of Watertown, N. Y. That editorial demolishes and should annihilate forever all opposition to the fine trade-treaty work of Secretary Hull.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of April 30, 1940]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Let us hope that the Republican Party will not advance too far with any convention proposal to repeal the reciprocal-trade agreements or demand that they be subject to Senate ratification. The recent debate in Congress and the reaction which followed throughout the country demonstrated that the Republican position is as unsound as it is unpopular with the people. It is said that 90 percent of the press of the country favored Mr. Hull's trade agreements. It was regrettable indeed that Republican leadership fought the extension of the agreements and particularly regrettable that it sought to subject the agreements to Senate ratification. The latter proposal was especially short-sighted. If we had a plan of Senate ratification it would mean simply a return to the old logrolling, special-interest days, and the public is against this.

There are those in the forefront of Republican leadership who are smart enough to handle this matter without subjecting the party to handicap and attack by reason of such a shortsighted position. Let the Republican leaders who are now discussing the party platform study public opinion carefully throughout the country. Let there be a thorough analysis of just what the judgment of the people is on this subject. Mr. Hull and the Democratic leaders would have the jump on us from scratch if we went into contention and attacked the reciprocal-trade program.

The Republicans were the originators of this program. The proposed policy dates back more than 25 years. President Taft was first to put through a reciprocal-trade agreement. It was Republican policy for years, and some of the Democratic leaders now in Congress who are the strongest for trade agreements were fighting the Republicans bitterly on the issue many years ago.

We are no longer the isolated people we once were. We talk about international good will and friendly relationship after this war. It cannot come if we are going to be simply narrow Yankee traders who put up tariff barriers against those whom we naturally would seek to help for mutual welfare.

My Criticism of the Revenue Bill for 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the revenue bill of 1940 that passed the House of Representatives Tuesday, June 11, established a record for the brief time required for its passage. The brevity of time for its consideration was quite conspicuous, both before the committee and on the floor of the House. Inasmuch as I am not on the committee that had this measure under consideration, I can speak more fully with reference to the latter.

We were told Monday evening about 5 o'clock on the floor of the House that committee prints of the bill were just then available and, of course, we immediately started our study of the bill in preparation for its discussion Tuesday. We were told also that there would be 1 hour of debate on the rule and 6 hours of general debate on the bill itself—all of which would be had on Tuesday and that the bill itself would be put to a vote of the House before adjournment Tuesday evening. The rule was a closed rule, more so than almost any rule that has come before the House throughout the Seventy-sixth Congress. For example, the rule provided that "no amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means," and also "amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment."

In other words, we were placed entirely under the control of the administration-controlled Committee on Ways and Means. This situation is of particular importance in view of the provisions of the revenue bill itself.

The revenue bill provides for the raising of an estimated additional revenue in the sum of $1,004,000,000 per year for a period of 5 years. On that point there was very little disagreement in the entire House of Representatives. But the bill contained also a provision to increase the national indebtedness by $4,000,000,000 above the present limit of $45,000,000,000. It was provided furthermore that revenues derived from obligations issued from this authorization shall be available to meet any expenditures made after June 30, 1940, for the national defense or to reimburse the general fund of the Treasury therefor. This provision appears innocent enough until its real meaning is determined. The real issue so cleverly concealed in the bill is that all national defense expenditures shall come out of either the increased revenue from taxation or out of the $4,000,000,000 increase in our national indebtedness thereby relieving the Budget for Federal spending in every other department of government of even the slightest responsibility for the regular and ordinary expenditures for national defense. In other words, under the guise of providing for the national defense, the present national administration has slipped out from under the necessity of providing for the ordinary expenditures for national defense out of revenues heretofore chargeable with that responsibility and the wild nondefense spending can now proceed without incurring such deficits as have accumulated in recent years. This is important to the spenders in view of the fact that we are rapidly reaching the $45,000,000,000 debt limit.

It seems to me that honesty in dealing with the taxpayers would have required that both the $4,000,000,000 increase in our national debt and the $1,004,000,000 per annum additional revenue should have been restricted to those extraordinary expenditures for national defense above and beyond the amounts heretofore allotted to national defense from revenues other than those provided in this bill. If this bill had so provided, it would then have been necessary for this administration to curtail its extravagant expenditures in other fields and I am sure that that curtailment in such expenditures is more important today than any other problem facing our Nation in the building up of our national defenses. I am sure also that public opinion would have heartily endorsed such curtailment in the Federal Government's orgy of spending. Inasmuch as such a restriction would have curtailed expenditures for nondefense purposes by nearly $2,000,000,000 per year, and inasmuch as that would have been a painful restriction for the spenders, the opportunity to sidestep this responsibility under the guise of national defense and by means of clever manipulation of the rules of procedure in the House of Representatives was too great to expect the present national administration to deal honestly with the American public. While I marvel at the consistency of the present national administration in thus cleverly achieving its goal of increased profligate spending, I strongly condemn them not only for doing this under the guise of national defense but also for even desiring to continue their wild nondefense spending orgy in the face of our speeding to fiscal disaster.

I voted for the revenue bill notwithstanding these serious objections because I did not wish to impede the imperative augmentation of our national defenses. The fact that the augmentation of our national defenses is so imperative enabled the present national administration to force this bill to passage, including as it does an increase of funds made available for nondefense spending in the sum of approximately $2,000,000,000 per annum.

I cannot help but feel that such continued wild nondefense spending by the present national administration will be vigorously condemned by the American public when the foregoing facts become known to them.

Prophecy and Realism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

TWO EDITORIALS FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which is a plea for sane contemplation of our present situation in respect to the wars now raging and for a realistic view toward the future.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 11, 1940]

PROPHECY?

"Fenced by your careful fathers, ringed by your leaden seas,
Long did ye wake in quiet and long lie down at your ease * * *
But ye say. 'It will mar our comfort.' Ye say, 'will minish our trade.'
Do ye wait for the spattered shrapnel ere ye learn how a gun is laid?
For the low red glare to the southward when the raided coast towns burn?
(Light ye shall have on that lesson, but little time to learn.)"

This was not written 5 years ago, or 5 months ago, but in 1902, by an Englishman who more than any other typified the old England which is perhaps, although we hope not, gone forever.

The Empire honored him, but did not listen to him, and his words were embalmed in anthologies.

It may be too late for England to listen to the voice of Rudyard Kipling. But is it too late for us?

Not only have we our own wide coasts and borders and rich, far-flung territories to protect, but the President has given a blank check to Canada, stating that we will defend it from invasion, and has reaffirmed in addition our guardianship under the Monroe Doctrine of some 26,000 miles of South American coast line. A large order. If we are put to the test, it will take more than our own "leaden seas," and our warships that sail them, to bulwark us. It will take guns and planes and sweat and blood. In short, this a plea for realism.

Full-page newspaper advertisements appearing in many cities yesterday blazoned the line "Stop Hitler Now." They were signed by the "Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies," president of which is William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., great editor and great citizen.

The appeal, like the prohibition experiment, was "noble in purpose." Otherwise it was not so good. The committee, for whose personnel and high purpose we have the greatest respect, might better be called the "committee to get America into the war by the back door."

Some Americans with every right to an opinion honestly believe that we should now be in the war in Europe. This is not to debate that point. It is rather a plea for realism instead of emotion, and for consideration of the fact that all the armed democracies of Europe combined have not been able to stop Hitler's mechanized military might even with equipment 10 years ahead of anything we possess in quantity. "Stop Hitler Now"—what with? Our bare hands and the bared breasts of our youth?

Though the fact is not yet generally realized, Hitler has already determined the broad lines of our national life for at least another generation. Even with an ocean intervening, European totalitarianism has made obsolete our American way of life, temporarily at least; permanently, unless we modernize our thinking and our national planning. Our country at present is not, as Mr. White's committee states, "still the most powerful nation on earth." To continue to think in terms which ignore the realities is to invite the disaster which has befallen European democracy.

We do not agree, but we respect the right of opinion of those who believe that we should be fighting with the European democracies today. Time may alter the situation, but today it seems inescapable that the surest way to help our friends in the European democracies is first to demonstrate to the dictators that we can help ourselves. Our present job is production for war, not participation in it. We must neither meddle nor muddle. Safety for, and service to, democracy, like charity, must begin at home.

Mobilization of our national resources, our genius for mass production, and our manpower, to insure a safe haven for democracy in America, will be the surest means of guaranteeing its ultimate revival in Europe.

Our immediate task is to show that our democracy can profit by the mistakes of others, and that the fire of liberty will be kept burning here. Our job today is not to stop Hitler. Our job is to start thinking. Thinking in terms of service to our country rather than service from it. Thinking in terms of defense and self-protection rather than of comfort and personal privilege; thinking in terms of increased production rather than decreased working hours; thinking in terms of the sacrifices that democracy is worth in dollars of capital and man-hours of labor; thinking of two related sentences in Premier Reynaud's remarkable interview yesterday with William Philip Sims in which he said: "In recent years, especially, France has tended to speed social advances to the neglect of her national defenses." And, "the spirit which makes a people seek social progress in times of peace, also makes crusaders of them and their soldiers in times like these."

Let's have a truce on bluff and bluster. Let's avoid being edged, via the back door, into any fight until, if we ever must go in, we will be prepared to finish it.

And the foregoing expresses our sentiments about the belligerent tone that characterized the President's address last night at Charlottesville, Va.

This is no time to be talking loudly while carrying a feather duster.

Then today, Mr. Speaker, appears the following supplementary editorial:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 12, 1940]

SADDLES AND BRIDLES

Following up our remarks of yesterday—about how talking loudly while carrying a feather duster is hardly prudent in these tough times—we observe that our so-called first Army of 100,000 men will go through maneuvers this summer without a single combat plane, with only a handful of worn-out tanks.

For further comment we yield the floor to Representative Ross COLLINS (Democrat, Miss.) who for the last dozen years has probably devoted more time and intelligent attention to Army appropriations than any other Member of Congress:

"Goodness knows what we can do with World War left-overs in a war like the one now going on in Europe. The $200,000,000 worth of saddles and bridles that the War Department had left over are still in our midst and can only be used in a wild West show or a Fort Myer society circus—not in a modern war. * * *

"All that could be done with large numbers of mobilized men (at this time) would be to arm a few of them with out-of-date rifles. And, strange it it may seem to aging generals, the war going on in Europe has not been a rifle war.

"The cream of the crop of manpower would be called up and enlisted at the outbreak of the struggle and they would be the ones who would go into battle equipped the worst. It is an admitted fact that there exists a distinct lack of modern tanks, combat cars, and modern mechanized weapons.

"And after the flower of our youth had laid down their lives, and if the war lasted long enough, we might, ultimately get around to equipping our armed forces with something like what a sensible bandit would use to rob a filling station. * * *

"I think very little of an army implemented with rifles, no matter how well its blue uniforms fit and no matter how well it can execute the ceremonies of the parade ground. Ziegfeld could have taught an army like that much better than the ordinary Army officer, for he knew more about it.

"Further, I can't imagine anything more tragic than nicely trained marching men in front of machine-gun fire, much less 60-ton armored tanks, flame-throwing land battleships, and diving airplanes.

"China, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium were some of the nations that prepared for war according to the obsolete 1914 plans."

The Roosevelt "One-Horse" Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt came before Congress on May 16 with his first emergency-defense message, he assured this body and the millions of Americans who comprised his radio audience that where national defense is concerned, he and the Congress would work as a team. The stark crisis in international affairs, and the grave hazards to American security which the President emphasized on that occasion have become steadily darker and more grave.

But despite the fact, administration forces have driven for early adjournment of Congress. The date now fixed at which the administration will try to force adjournment is set at June 22.

When the President specifically promised teamwork, we all took the statement at face value. We naturally assumed that teamwork was to mean renouncement of politics and personal interests during a period of real, earnest cooperation all the way round. In view of developments, however, there must be a different definition of teamwork at the White House.

Teamwork, administration model, seems to place the peoples' Representatives in Congress somewhere below the status of water boy. Congress is supposed to appropriate billions of additional defense funds. It is supposed to find the means of raising vast new revenues. And it is expected to do these things at a nod from the President, without thought or study. And then, when it has rubber-stamped a slap-dash program, thrown together overnight by the Executive, it is supposed further to abdicate its responsibilities to the American people, delegate its constitutional duties and authorities in blank to the President, and go to the bench for the duration of the emergency.

That simply is not the American idea of teamwork, even after the large doses we have had of it for more than 7 years. And the few samples we have had of the results of such teamwork to date in this emergency are alarming the people to the point of demanding that there be no adjournment of Congress now.

Since his May 16 message, the President has already asked for additional money on two occasions. It was pointed out at the time of that message that his first request was hardly sufficient to begin the defense program he vaguely outlined. It can be pointed out now that he still has no more than made a beginning toward fulfilling our needs.

In this emergency the President certainly has no cause to fear Congress, or the people. We are certainly as anxious as he to make our defenses invulnerable, and we are ready and willing to pay for them no matter what the cost. But the people want to know, and they have the right to know, that the money is earmarked for specific purposes, and that it is actually buying full value in security. With no reflection on the administration whatsoever, the people can have this information and assurance only with Congress on the job. The President's reference to a prolonged session of Congress as nothing more than an extended opportunity for Members to make political speeches is not only politics in the Roosevelt manner, but it is grossly inaccurate and unfair, and a reflection upon the integrity and patriotism of the people's Representatives.

The Members of Congress are elected by the people, and assume responsibilities fully as important as those placed upon the President. The people not only have the right to expect their representatives to remain on the job, but it is the constitutional duty of Congress to discharge these responsibilities. It should be remembered that Congress is still an independent branch of the Government, accountable not to the President, but to the people.

The American people are solidly united in the desire to render every possible assistance to the Allies, short of sending armed forces into the war. But this fact alone should not lead the administration to ask this country to accept the President's course blindly, without question or examination. The people should be shown clearly the course the President is charting. They should understand the devices by which he is acting along this course. And above all, they should fully realize the inevitable consequences to which this course is leading us. Here again is a job for Congress, and to evade it is further to abdicate responsibilities to the country.

The people must be made to realize that the administration has already taken acts of actual hostility, such as the trade-in method of sending planes to the Allies. By this simple device of ostensibly turning over surplus supplies, or outmoded equipment to manufacturers for credits on future orders of new armaments, the Government appears to avoid direct sales to the Allies, which is admittedly an act of war. The people will realize that the trade-in system is the sheerest kind of subterfuge when they stop to think that the purpose is not at all to strengthen our own defenses.

It should be made perfectly clear to the country, also, that the administration deliberately moved to keep early information of the trade-in system from the people by forcing an extraordinary 3-day recess of the Senate exactly at the time when the plan was ready for adoption. Thus the plan was rushed into operation without study and approval of Congress, despite the fact that Congress alone has the authority under our Constitution to authorize hostile action against another nation.

Even with Congress in session, therefore, the Executive has committed us to a definite course of hostility without consulting the people's representatives. If this happens now, the people should properly wonder what might follow if Congress is sent to the side lines with no possible check at any point upon the administration.

There is definitely a right, honest, American way of committing hostile acts, as opposed to the evasions and deceptions of undeclared warfare as the totalitarian nations wage it. If we are to go into an actual state of hostility in our support of the Allies, the people will prefer that we do it at least in the American manner rather than to adopt the devious practices of the very dictators against whom we are pitting ourselves. We should certainly avoid the patent subterfuge of the trade-in plan, by which we can hope to fool nobody but ourselves for a short time. If we want to violate international law by selling war supplies to the Allies, let us at least do it frankly and directly.

The American people deserve the fullest and most complete account of developments in this serious crisis. They deserve to know exactly what course we shall pursue, and exactly where that course will lead us, so that they may be fully prepared for the inevitable consequences. Again, the only assurance that the people will have full access to this information is that their representatives stay on the job. The only assurance that the national will may be obeyed is that Congress remain ready to express it as our course develops.

If what we have seen to date is the administration's idea of teamwork, the people must insist that Congress stay on the field through the emergency. This certainly is no time for half of the team to be sitting on the bench.

An Appeal to Secretary Wallace in Behalf of Sugarcane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

LETTER OF HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN, OF LOUISIANA, TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have worked in close harmony with the sugarcane growers of Louisiana and I have constantly sought to help them. I have supported them fully in all matters of sugar legislation and I have many letters from them expressing appreciation of my services and cooperation. Although the President blocked our efforts to secure a larger sugar quota, I feel that every acre in cane should be carefully harvested in the present national emergency, and I am, therefore, making another appeal to the Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, to stop

plowing up cane. I attach hereto a copy of my appeal to Secretary Wallace:

JUNE 11, 1940.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the midst of our national-defense plans I again desire to bring to your attention the question of the sugar situation. All nations are necessarily having to give attention to supplies of food. The European nations at this time are carefully rationing food for their armies and for their civilian populations.

Mr. Secretary, I pray that we may not become involved in the war, but the spirit of America today is to be fully prepared in all of the essentials of war. I know that you are a part of that spirit and I am sure that it is your desire that agriculture shall contribute its part in our defense plans.

In Louisiana today we have a growing crop of sugarcane which was planted in the best of faith last fall when quota restrictions were suspended by the President. Under regulations which you have issued, I am informed that it will be necessary to plow up a considerable portion of the growing crop on which all of the expenses of planting and cultivation have already been incurred. I have never felt that it was wise to destroy any foodstuff which had been produced. But it is certainly most unwise during this emergency to do that. A portion of the crop has been plowed up, but let us save the balance.

I am informed that the freezes which occurred in January and February seriously affected the crop in Louisiana and that the yield per acre will be lower than it has been in some years past. It was first estimated that as much as 50,000 acres would have to be plowed up as a result of your regulation, but in view of the freeze damage the actual destruction of sound growing cane will probably be between 30,000 and 40,000 acres, I am informed. Assuming that the yield will be 1½ tons of sugar per acre, this will amount to destruction of 45,000 to 60,000 tons of food, on which all farming expenditures have been made except harvesting. As the United States consumes something over 500,000 tons of sugar each month, this may seem a very small amount, and yet it would become very important if war should come. Seventy percent of our sugar is brought from islands separated from the mainland. Hawaii contributes 938,000 tons and is 2,408 miles from the nearest port; Puerto Rico contributes 798,000 tons and is 1,112 miles from the nearest port; the Philippine Islands contribute 980,000 tons and are 7,164 miles from the nearest port. We hope, Mr. Secretary, that our commercial lanes to these islands will always remain open, but it is certainly within the realm of possibility that the sugar which we have been receiving from these islands might be suddenly cut off in the event of war. Certainly our chances of receiving that from the Philippine Islands would be greatly lessened. Even today we are voting a tax bill of billions of dollars for national defense, and it does seem to me to be wise to guard against every possibility of a food shortage. Even though 40,000 to 60,000 tons of sugar would last the United States only 3 or 4 days, it is just that much preparedness against a sugar shortage. Of course, I would like to see the quota removed entirely, but the thing that I am asking for in this message is the right to be given to the sugarcane growers of Louisiana to harvest a growing crop.

Mr. Secretary, as I interpret the Sugar Act of 1937, you have broad discretionary powers which permit you to estimate the number of acres which will be required to produce in any area the amount of sugar needed and to provide a normal carry-over at the end of the year. The law permits you to allow all of the sugarcane grown in Louisiana today to be harvested and made into sugar. No legislation is necessary to accomplish that.

I appeal to you to amend your regulations in view of the national emergency which has been brought about by war developments, and which is being recognized by the national administration and by Congress, through tremendous appropriations of money and a vast program of national defense. I think that it would not be inconsistent with your general policy, under the Sugar Act, but it would be consistent with the national policy of preparedness to give the southern cane growers the right to harvest all of the cane which they have planted. I think that you will find it possible under the broad administrative powers granted you to avoid this destruction of sugarcane in Louisiana. I therefore, Mr. Secretary, make this very earnest plea as a matter of national defense. I pray God that it may not happen, but in this mad world now who knows but what every pound of sugar might become very precious within the not far-distant future? Who knows but what the able-bodied young men, now giving their time to the production of sugar, may all too soon have to give their time to the defense of our Nation? Therefore, Mr. Secretary, it seems to me that we ought not to destroy any product at all which we have that might add so much to our vital national defense program. I sincerely trust that you will weigh this matter most carefully in the light of grave developments of the past few days. I would appreciate receiving word that you will take affirmative action right away so that no more cane will be plowed up.

Very sincerely yours,

A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Member of Congress.

Immediate Aid to the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

RESOLUTIONS URGING IMMEDIATE AID, INCLUDING ARMS AND MUNITIONS OF WAR, TO THE ALLIES, BY THE KEESLER-HAMRICK-GILLESPIE POST NO. 29, AMERICAN LEGION, GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions, prepared by a committee composed of A. H. Bell, J. T. Thomas, Jr., Earle Equen, Tom Flowers, and A. B. Carothers, and unanimously adopted by the Keesler-Hamrick-Gillespie Post, No. 29, American Legion, Greenwood, Miss., on June 6, 1940, urging immediate aid, including arms and munitions, to the Allies:

Whereas one of the fundamental purposes of the American Legion is to perpetuate and foster the democratic ideals of government that have been maintained by the United States of America during the entire period of its existence, for the promotion of which many sacrifices have been made and for the protection of which the members of this organization, as well as many other loyal citizens of our country, joined with England, France, and the other Allied Governments in the World War; and

Whereas the same forces which menaced the peace of the world in the years 1914 to 1918 have again risen in more barbaric and monstrous form, threatening to crush the civilization, not only of Europe but of the entire world, and since there is such a strong tie between the citizens of the United States and of England and France, not only by reason of former relationships as defenders of peace, but of similarity in forms of government and ideas of peace, it is impossible for this organization to remain inactive and silent while those countries are resisting to a bitter death the preservation of civil liberties, which, if maintained, will greatly benefit us; and

Whereas we believe if our former Allies lose this great world struggle, it will be necessary ultimately for us to fight the same forces that now oppose them, and without their aid; and

Whereas, in making such sacrifices, not only for their benefit, but for the entire civilized world, they should be assured not only of our sympathy, our admiration for their bravery and courage, but that every possible aid should be rendered them immediately by our Federal Government before it is too late, the kind of aid to be determined by those in national authority, but some substantial aid without delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kessler-Hamrick-Gillespie Post, No. 29, of the American Legion, Greenwood, Miss.:

SECTION 1. That this post of the American Legion definitely affirms its loyalty to the cause of good government which our former Allies are now so courageously defending, and that we condemn with all possible vigor the ferocious, monstrous, and barbaric attempts by Germany to destroy modern civilization, and decry its ruthless practice of destroying human lives.

SEC. 2. That we dedicate whatever resources we may have for their immediate aid and defense and express our unwillingness to sit idly by with a surplus of food and an inexhaustible supply of metals and ammunition that can be used by them in defending and establishing the peace of the world.

SEC. 3. That we pledge our cooperation to the United States Government and to our President and not only endorse his statement to Congress that we give the Allies first call upon anything or material we can produce but that we go further and urge that every weapon we possess which is not indispensable to preserve law and order within our own boundaries and not necessary for our immediate defense be made available to them, and that such other aid as in the wisdom of Congress, such as giving credit, furnishing food, medical supplies, and money, be extended and, if necessary, delivered.

SEC. 4. That our services be offered to crush the so-called "fifth column" in this country, as well as to stamp out all non-American, un-American, and disloyal persons and practices that may exist.

SEC. 5. That this resolution be published as an expression of this post not only as a means of promoting immediate aid to the Allies but of guaranteeing to those loyal Americans who did not return from the World War that the torch is still held high and that they are not forgotten even though a greater battle wages in Flanders Field.

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT E. AUSTIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT E. AUSTIN, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include therein an address by me on the occasion of the annual Flag Day Service of the Bridgeport Federation of Men's Bible Classes, on Sunday, June 9, 1940, at Bridgeport, Conn., as follows:

On this morning in June in the year of our Lord 1940, as we in America still mark time, the Bridgeport Federation of Men's Bible Classes is assembled here for the annual Flag Day Service. You have honored me with an invitation to address you on this occasion and I can think of no fitter subject today than Patriotism, a name given to an abstract state of mind, once universally possessed by all men and cherished. But the catastrophic storm of madness that descended last September upon Europe, threatening a civilization built up through the centuries, has changed our concepts of many things and the mean of patriotism is included among them. So rapid is the whirl of events that once a change is made it does not last until tomorrow. A Stalin came with his Communism, and a Hitler came with his Nazi-ism. It did not seem possible that these two clouds on the horizon could so grow that they would obscure the bright light of the sun and threaten a world of individual freedom and independence with the blackness of everlasting night. They would change entirely our carefully built up philosophy of government and forcibly drag us back through countless generations to that period when the citizen existed for, and at the will of, the state. Should they succeed would patriotism still exist? How could it exist in a people ruled by a ruthless despot, guided by his principle that might makes right? Can patriotism exist where human life is cheap and disregarded, where the finer things of man's existence are forgotten, where the visible triumphs of master minds in stone and bronze are pulverized into dust that conquering hordes may pass unhampered on their way? Can it exist in a people whose rules have raised false gods in place of the one God, the almighty and all-knowing Father of men? No, it cannot, for nationalism is not patriotism, and what we are witnessing abroad is nationalism extreme and at its worst. Patriotism belongs to a free and independent people. We have it here, and shall have it and will have it, please God, to the very end. So the patriotism we are to discuss this morning is the patriotism of America and Americans.

Patriotism has been defined as "love of country." That country, of course, must be worthy of love, must be dedicated to truth and honor, must be inspired to high destiny, must guarantee to its citizens their right to live their lives, with ideals, in liberty and independence, must enjoy the respect of sister nations and live with them in peace and fine understanding. Our country, the United States of America, meets every such challenge, and in so doing has won the love of its people, and all of its people from whatever nation they may have come here to live with us and to be of us—Americans all. This patriotism has inspired us in peace and war; the signers of the Declaration of Independence had it in their courageous hearts, the statesmen of early and later days were, because of it, capable of wise and constructive action, it guided Washington and Lincoln in their dark and trying hours; it kept alive the flickering flame of devotion at Valley Forge, it sailed the seas with our sailors in 1812, and sent a victorious army across the sea in '17 when once before the very existence of other democratic nations was threatened. All down through the history of our country patriotism has shown itself in deeds, not words, not in a lip service that was stilled when the crisis arose, not in showy waving of the flag and vain boasting when action was demanded—has shown itself in many a man, unheralded and unsung, when the odds were against him but who carried on to feed and clothe a family, proud to do his part even in a humble way to make his children better able than he to do for their country. "Sweet and fitting it is to die for one's country" wrote Virgil the Immortal, but just as much so is it to live for one's country.

American patriotism is not so difficult to analyze or to define. It is a belief, a subscription to principles, a defense against aggression, a theory of conduct, a method of living, an abiding faith in our country's destiny. It is a belief that the founders of our Republic were men divinely inspired when for instance they wrote in their Declaration of Independence that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Or when they wrote in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America, "We, the People of the United States, in order to make a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Consequently our patriotism is a belief in our constitutional form of government, a belief that carries with it an unalterable determination that no one man and no group of men shall ever change it, but that it shall be changed only by a vote of the people who have sworn to sustain it and who only can change it. Our patriotism is a belief, too, that the state is a creature of the people and that it never will be that the people exist for the state. The first is freedom, the second bondage. Our patriotism subscribes without reservation to the principles laid down in our Bill of Rights and in the defense of these principles pledges its life and its sacred honor.

In our flag there are 48 stars on a field of blue, no one larger than the others, all of equal size and shape. Patriotism interprets this as indicating the sovereignty of each State which cannot and shall not be transgressed. And this does not mean only by usurpation by a central government of a State's rights and prerogatives—it means by another State or group of States. Patriotism demands also a certain course of conduct. Every patriotic citizen must exercise his right of suffrage, thus participating in the responsibilities of government. The danger in the representative form of government lies in any apathy of the electorate which may be, and often is, seized upon by unscrupulous men to gain their selfish ends. Then comes the complaint from the previously apathetic that all elected officials are more or less dishonest, actuated only by political expediency, are mere self-seekers. There are such men it must be said, and this can happen in our elective system, but oftentimes sooner or later even these men respond to the inspiration of high office. Patriotism does not agree that a citizen's full duty has been performed for our country by the fulfillment of merely perfunctory duties. A receipted income-tax bill does not discharge him from all other obligations. One takes much from his country—patriotism gives more than it takes; it gives gladly and willingly, from first to last, and looks upon the giving as a privilege of citizenship and not a duty. In this are exhibited some of the traditions which have come down through the life of our Republic—of devoted effort, of toil, of sacrifice, of privation—that the young Nation might grow and prosper and, when grown, be strong and mighty, an inspiration to other and older nations that maybe had lost the light. Patriotism is an abiding faith in our country's high destiny, requiring a sublime confidence in the divinity of her mission. In spite of doubts that may arise, in spite of fears that she may fail, even in the presence of what appears a certain defeat—valiantly patriotism proclaims its faith, "My country, may she be always right—but right or wrong, my country," and in that faith she shall survive.

"But," someone says, "even you admitted when you began that in the madness of this maddened world concepts change overnight. Is patriotism the same today?" My answer is certainly "yes," for fundamentals never change, only the application of them. We must use our patriotism, which is the sacred possession of the American people, as a broad base and make specific manifestations in the unusual situations now created or about to be created through no acts of our own. We must first of all look facts in the face, size up the situation, realizing all the while that a job has to be done, and that job is to keep our United States a free and independent Republic presenting an unyielding front against any attack from without or from within. We know we have grown soft; that we have been living lives of comparative ease and security, even though it did not always seem so. We have put away from us any thought that at some time we should have to meet the harsher and the sterner things. In this job to be done our patriotism shows, and each one of us accepts the duty laid upon us whether we are to lead or be led, whether our rank is to be high or low. Unity, as an appeal, has been overworked, but I use it again in the sense of cooperation, each one doing his assigned task that the whole may be perfect. Now our present-day patriotism prepares us for sacrifice, and, when one is made, to prepare us for another. It makes us ready to endure even to the utmost of endurance and rejoice in our strength and will and purpose so to do. A situation confronts us, not of our making, a situation serious and menacing. Our country has had them before, perhaps of lesser magnitude. So sudden was its appearance and so horrifying its application that in the first moments many of us were appalled. But now that we have had an opportunity to think the thing through, now once again we are patriots. Our patriotism specifically applied steels us for action, makes calm and sober judgment guide our deliberations and decisions, throws panic and hysteria away, and with them any fear as to the outcome. It gives us a sublime confidence in our country and in our people. Without this any billions we might spend for defense may be of little avail. But

our patriotism and the fearlessness and confidence it engenders will strengthen the arms that may wield the mighty weapons if we ever need them to defend this country. Defend I say, for if war ever happens it will come to us, for we shall not go to it. For this purpose we shall arm, we shall prepare, just as speedily as the flying wheels of industry can obey the command of the vast army that we call labor, our army in the shops and factories as essential in an hour of need as is the one of soldiers and sailors in the field. With an unfaltering trust in the God of our fathers, and with that patriotism that inspired them, and now inspires us, our country will not be found wanting. Our softness will disappear in rugged strength, our days of ease will change to days of harsh endurance, our purpose will be as unshaken as are our mountains. In any days of darkness that may come we shall look forward to the everlasting light, our faith in the ultimate triumph of right shall be as our faith in the Almighty. Thus shall we show our patriotism, our love of country, our Americanism.

The Enemies Within the Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN A. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ROXBURY (N. Y.) TIMES

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Roxbury (N. Y.) Times of June 8, 1940:

[From the Roxbury (N. Y.) Times of June 8, 1940]

THE ENEMIES WITHIN THE GATES

Events in Europe have underlined and emphasized the urgent need for improving and expanding our national defenses, and making sure that the United States, its shores, and its traditional ways of life are rendered secure.

To do this most effectively our military experts are, of course, studying very closely the methods of the "total war" that has overrun so many helpless countries abroad—the modern form of war that, as one observer has commented, is fought "with the morals of the cave and the weapons of an exquisite civilization."

You need to know the danger that faces your country before you can guard against it successfully.

But there is one further step. The manner in which Norway and Poland and Belgium have been brought to their knees was not exclusively based upon military power. Before a blow was struck, security was undermined from within. The advice of Goethe "divide and command" was heeded with telling and destructive effect. The "fifth column" of traitors and imported agents did their destructive work before war even began.

To achieve this aim, certain principles need to be kept in mind:

(1) We must guard—not in a mood of hysteria, but through sound common sense—against the misguided groups and individuals in our own country who do not believe in private enterprise, and would sacrifice it for some other way of life. It is they who, by word or deed, would fill the role of "fifth columnists" in America if the opportunity were ever offered.

(2) We must not let the erroneous thinking of a second group muddle our thoughts on preparedness. This group does not recognize the inseparability of our various freedoms—freedom of speech, a government of representative democracy, and a business system of private enterprise—and its failure to appreciate this important truth is likely to be actually as dangerous as the attitude of the deliberate enemies of our way of life.

(3) We need, at a time when industrial efficiency is so vital to national defense, to guard against attempts to cripple and hobble our manufacturing enterprises. The La Follette bill recently introduced in Congress, a piece of legislation that would prevent manufacturers from guarding effectively against sabotage and subversive activities within America's plants, is a dangerous example of this type.

With these principles in mind, and with the courageous maintenance of national unity and individual patriotism, America can guard against the "enemies within the gates." Without this stand, America invites disaster.

The Legion Called the Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NATIONAL LEGIONNAIRE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the National Legionnaire, by National Commander Raymond J. Kelly, entitled "The Legion Called the Turn," on the subject of the hysteria which now seems to be in existence in the country, and on the subject of keeping the country out of war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Legionnaire for June 1940]

THE LEGION CALLED THE TURN

(By Raymond J. Kelly, National Commander)

The American Legion has a reassuring word for those among our fellow countrymen who during recent days have developed a definite hysteria, which if allowed to go unchecked, might derange the national mind.

The Legion presumes to speak with some degree of authority, because consistently in the past it called the turn and pointed the way of sanity for handling many of the problems now confronting the United States.

For 20 long years the Legion raised its voice to the highest pitch in the effort to arouse the Nation to the need for an adequate national defense. Few listened.

Since 1922 the Legion has had a definite program looking toward universal service. In the event this country again became involved in war our plan would deprofitize such a conflict, leaving special privilege for none, equal service for all. Few paid attention.

Knowledge of the existence of subversive influences, apparently just now penetrating the public consciousness under the modern description of "fifth column," is neither new nor novel to the Legion. Few were aroused to the danger.

The definite complacence of America in a world rapidly becoming an armed camp with high explosive potentialities has been reported by the Legion for many years. Few heeded the warning.

And so the Legion believes it is qualified from its record of service both in time of war and in 21 years of peace to counsel soberly and rationally the men and women of America.

In my belief the most menacing factor to the safety of the United States arises from within our borders rather than without. Our house must be set in order. But the neglect of years cannot be corrected in a few short minutes, hours, and days. What must be done we will do—if a determined and united America sets its will to the task.

In the first place, we should face the fact that Communazi conspirators seeking to undermine and to destroy our institutions are fanatics. The truth as we know it is not in them. Reasonable treatment has no effect upon them, and but serves to embolden and encourage their efforts.

We have been told that far-reaching suppressive measures against flourishing domestic ideological conspiracies might injure innocent people. In my belief the good of the whole Nation compels summary action to be taken by our properly constituted Federal, State, and local authorities to stamp out in their entirety the activities of these subverters, irrespective of what may happen to their fellow travelers or innocent bystanders. This is no time for quibbling. We must pull no punches.

In my public utterances I have stressed the importance of American Legion organizations assisting and working through recognized law-enforcement agencies. I see no reason for deviation from that policy at this time. Only rarely when there is complete collapse of recognized law-enforcement agencies, such as may happen in times of great disaster, is it our job to do what we can independently.

In recent years many of our Legion posts have prepared disaster-relief plans to become effective at the onset of such catastrophes. In other words, the machinery of Legion support for law and order is already set up with a fair degree of efficiency. And those posts without prepared plans of this kind now must form them immediately. Such plans should be integrated with existing authority in every community where there is a Legion post.

Legion support in the field should be given the attempt to secure increases and strengthening of constituted police powers. Regardless of the cost, and even if requiring new local taxes, the personnel of local police, sheriff's forces, and State police or highway-patrol organizations should be measurably increased. Better training and equipment should be provided. We should make our regular peacetime home defenses impregnable. The Legion should head up public demand for this to be done.

State departments of the Legion can well initiate and urge the adoption of State emergency council set-ups. In several States this has been done already.

National Legion officials are engaged now in conferences and discussions with the Federal Government looking toward utilization of Legion organization and membership in the most effective manner possible in event of any conceivable emergency developing. Such perfected plans will be ready for immediate use when conditions warrant their invoking.

Posts and members of the American Legion are well informed of local conditions. Information in their possession about dangerous subversion, which can be substantiated, should be turned over through official post channels to the proper authorities.

Good, law-abiding American men and women who enjoy and cherish their civil liberties do not follow the policy of shouting about them. In many cases those who clamor the loudest about the dangers of losing such liberties bear the most watching. All too frequently they fear the loss of their opportunity to work for the destruction of our form of government. There are no less than 600 Communazi organizations functioning in the United States. Many of these are Trojan horse front groups. Information about many of these subversive groups is available to posts through department and national headquarters.

Our posts and their membership should give the strongest support possible to the solving of complex problems now before the Nation in providing for a modern and adequate national defense.

For two decades our national defense lagged. We have been a complacent people. Only last week the first new United States battleship in 19 years was launched. We must appreciate that the hurried building up of such defenses may not make for the most efficient job possible. Errors will be made, and the ball will be fumbled. But the characteristic of a great pitcher is that he pitches over his errors and goes on to win. I am confident we are a Nation of thoroughbreds, not to be upset or deterred from our purpose by such mistakes.

There is no change in the official position of the American Legion in regard to the neutrality of the United States. The Legion believes in the protection at all hazards of the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere as our primary obligation. While we are ill-equipped to provide even a minimum of protection for the Monroe Doctrine, it is idle to consider the feasibility of intervening in the great conflict across the Atlantic. With what would we intervene? How would we make our potential strength felt, short of 2 or 3 years? Fast moving, aggressor nations have no intention of allowing us to select our own time and place for exerting the might of a rearmed America.

The safety of America transcends any political issue. And such safety should not be subjected to the fear developed through hysteria.

At the 1939 Chicago national convention of the American Legion we were recorded as urging the Congress to remain in session during the period of emergency. I believe there is every legitimate reason for our Representatives and Senators staying on the job in the Nation's Capital so long as national and international problems continue on a 24-hour basis. One million Legionnaires should raise their united voice in such a demand.

In the twenty-first year of the American Legion's existence, the Nation again calls. It is not a call to the armed forces of our country where once we served. Rather it is a call to develop sanity to supersede hysteria; to remove all doubt about the strength of our defenses; to have each of us individually willing to bear the heavy price of defense which must be paid to assure peace for our people. Midsummer madness, no! It's a blue chip game and we must play them close and play them to win.

For 20 years the Legion called the turn. It is confident its judgment for the future will likewise coincide with the safety and well-being for our country.

For God and country we have associated ourselves. We pledge again our loyalty to that creed.

Military and Naval Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, immediately following the editorial placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an extract from a radio address delivered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] on May 28, 1940, in reference to present and past military and naval expenditures.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been much said in the public press and over the radio about the present condition of the defenses of the United States. In my judgment, there has been gross exaggeration of our alleged deficiency. There has been gross underestimation of our defensive power. It is commonly charged that during the past 10 years we have expended $7,000,000,000 on defense, and the question is asked, Why has this not prepared us? A recent newspaper article which, judging by my mail, has had large circulation in effect charges that this $7,000,000,000 has been spent and has done no good. It has been so stated in recent radio speeches. I cannot take the time tonight to give you the whole picture. I can speak briefly of our first line of defense—the Navy.

Out of this $7,000,000,000, approximately four and one-half billion has been expended for the Navy. If those who make these wild charges had made any investigation whatsoever they would have discovered that approximately three billion of this four and one-half billion was the regular maintenance and upkeep money—wages, coal, fuel oil, etc.—appropriated in part each year for the regular expense of the Navy. One and one-half billion, in round figures, was for new construction. During the 10-year period just closed this money has been used for the purpose of increasing the number and power of our ships.

We have added a grand total of 138 ships to our Navy consisting of 4 aircraft carriers, 18 heavy cruisers, 9 light cruisers, 73 destroyers, 32 submarines, and 2 gunboats. In addition thereto, 7 auxiliary naval vessels, repair ships, etc., and in further addition thereto, two 35,000-ton battleships which will be completed and commissioned next month. In addition to this, there are 8 battleships under construction, including two 45,000-ton ships, 1 aircraft carrier, 6 light cruisers, 24 destroyers, 13 submarines, 12 auxiliary vessels, and others sufficient to make a grand total under construction of 77.

According to the latest figures available, the United States has a total of 369 ships in its Navy with 77 building. Great Britain has 328 with 81 building, France has 176 with 65 building, Italy has 315 with 55 building, Japan 254 with 22 building. The German Navy is weak. We have more battleships than any other nation in the world. We have more heavy cruisers than any nation in the world. We have more destroyers than any nation in the world. Let us not reach the conclusion either that our money has been wasted or that we are weak in sea power.

Americanism and Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK MIRROR OF JULY 2, 1939

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from a gentleman in New York City dated July 2, 1939, in which letter was enclosed an article clipped from the Sunday Mirror of July 2, 1939, entitled, "Test Shows Many Afraid to Display Americanism Sign." I ask that the article be printed along with the letter. I have purposely omitted the name of the author of the letter, in view of the fact that I have not secured his consent to publish his name. Anyway the article from the Sunday Mirror speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, July 2, 1939.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The attached news story from today's Mirror discloses that a Los Angeles manufacturer attempted, without success, to give away 20,000 Americanism signs reading, "No 'ism' but Americanism," and succeeded in disposing of 2 signs in all New York City. This incident only proves how right you really

are in your drive to educate the people to your program, which stands against all "isms" and for Americanism.

The incident also proves above the slightest doubt that your bill to stop immigration in the interest of national defense is 100 percent right. Keep up the work, and remember that there are many patriotic Americans here in Manhattan who haven't surrendered the fort nor hoisted the white flag, even though most of our business people, big and small, are "under the bed."

May God bless you and may you keep fighting for America.

Yours very sincerely.

[From the New York Sunday Mirror of July 2, 1939]

TEST SHOWS MANY AFRAID TO DISPLAY AMERICANISM SIGN

The insidious cross-currents of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism have become so threatening in New York City that thousands of Americans living here—particularly some businessmen—no longer dare proclaim their loyalty to the United States.

This has been revealed by the curious results of a survey just completed.

A Los Angeles manufacturer put out a small metal plate, suitable for display in store windows or on automobiles, which he thought would find a ready market in the various cities of the Nation. The sign reads: "No 'ism' but Americanism."

Frankly, his only thought in the beginning was to make money—a desire not unknown to the best American traditions. He figured that with so many aliens preaching hatred and alien doctrines, Americans would welcome a chance to proclaim their Americanism. He asked only 25 cents a plate and had fond hopes of returns from his enterprise and ingenuity.

His agents—they were often World War veterans working on commission—did pretty well in Los Angeles and other western and midcountry cities. But in New York City they sold none at all, a fact most interesting because of the amazing experiences which the veterans declared they encountered in their canvassing.

ASK FOR TEST

Two representatives of George Hope, the Los Angeles manufacturer, asked the Mirror to test the findings of the veterans.

They said that they, along with Hope, were Americans and were curious to know how New York stands in view of what is threatening the world.

"If you agree, Hope is willing to give away 20,000 signs in New York City without asking a single cent for them," they told the Mirror.

So a reporter was assigned, and he started out with the two representatives, Charles Jordan, 36, of 2190 East Twenty-first Street, Brooklyn, and James McDonald, 30, of Los Angeles.

A fairly representative area was selected for the test. Roughly, it covered Broadway between Sixtieth and Eighty-sixth Streets, Ninth Avenue between Forty-second and Fifty-seventh Streets, Fifty-seventh Street from Ninth Avenue to Third Avenue, Third Avenue between Fifty-seventh and Fourteenth Streets, all of Yorkville, and some outlying spots, such as Weehawken and other New Jersey points.

In that entire area only one storekeeper and a taxicab driver were willing to accept the signs, even though repeatedly assured there was absolutely no charge.

But the startling thing was the behavior and comment of businessmen approached. Not only did they refuse to accept the signs; many seemed actually frightened.

WOULD HURT TRADE

Here were some of their typical reasons for refusing the plates:

"If I were to place one of those signs in my window, my place would be picketed."

"It would hurt my business."

"Regardless of personal feelings, we're in business and can't afford to offend anybody."

"They'd blow my tires" (this from a cab driver asked to display the sign in his car).

"I don't want them to smash my windows. We do business with all nationalities."

As expected, the visitors met the most hostile reception in Yorkville, where some of the storekeepers threatened to "throw you fellows out if you don't leave quick."

One of the two who accepted the metal plates was Frank Weitz, of 2105 Mohican Avenue, a taxi driver with a stand at Eighty-sixth Street and Third Avenue.

"I'm glad to display the sign on my car, provided it doesn't cost me anything," he said.

A plate was accepted also by the American Legion Post, No. 1197, Private Chauffeurs of New York, at 1209 Second Avenue.

"We'd like to see anybody boycott us," said Commander Harry J. Rich.

The Next President and the National Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY GEN. CHARLES G. DAWES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by Gen. Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President of the United States, on the subject, The Next President and the National Budget, before the Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., April 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In properly fulfilling his functions as the head of the business organization of Government, and in undertaking his most important task of balancing the National Budget, the next President of the United States had best follow the only method whose effectiveness has been demonstrated by actual trial.

To explain and state this method is the purpose of this address.

In the year 1920, after 3 years of war-budget deficits amounting in the aggregate to $23,248,099,381, the United States, with war taxes still in effect, experienced a sudden and large fall in general prices, with corresponding losses in inventory values and an increase in unemployment.

A widespread public demand followed for reduction in Government expenditures and in the heavy taxation which was depressing business then, as our present rate of taxation is depressing it today.

In 1921 therefore, under the Harding administration, coincidentally with the institution of the Budget system, the President of the United States for the first time in our history created and operated by Executive order a system of Executive control and coordination over governmental departments and independent establishments. More Executive orders from the White House were issued in the first month after President Harding instituted this system than had been issued in the entire history of our Government up to that time. This control and coordinating system by Executive order was simply the system used in every successful private business enterprise.

Under this new system and Presidential leadership during the whole fiscal year of 1922, which commenced June 30, 1921, and ended June 30, 1922, the expenditures of Government, exclusive of debt reduction, were reduced from $5,115,927,689.50 in the fiscal year of 1921 to $3,372,607,899.84 in the fiscal year of 1922, or a reduction in expenditures of $1,743,319,789.46.

That part of the savings which was due to direct Executive pressure upon the spending authorities I estimate at $350,000,000, including $250,134,835 which, as the agent of the President and first Director of the Budget, I itemized and sent to Congress in response to a resolution calling for the figures.

Not only in the fiscal year of 1922 was the Budget balanced but the excess of ordinary Government receipts over ordinary Government expenditures was $736,496,251. Taxes were reduced and the Government debt was lowered by $1,014,068,845.

There was achieved by a President a complete victory in the desperate and underhanded fight made against the institution of an Executive and coordinating control system by the decentralized 43 departments and independent establishments of the United States. He not only established firmly a system regulating the business of Government in accordance with universally accepted business principles but demonstrated its effectiveness in his hands in reducing governmental expenditures.

This system was in operation for 11 years. On March 4, 1933, the present administration came into power, and only 3 months later, on June 10, 1933, an astonishing Executive order was issued by the President, abolishing the Federal Coordinating Service of the United States.

This Service, which had been set up under the Director of the Budget, was an essential part of the executive control system, without which there could be no proper supervision of corelated affairs of Government for the support of which money had been appropriated by Congress.

Since this coordinating system was simply the one which is in universal use in all successful private business enterprises, if the

administration was not satisfied with its functioning, it should not have abolished the system but changed its personnel.

This unfortunate action taken at the inception of the most gigantic peacetime governmental spending operation in history was one of the chief causes of the present condition of chaos in the business system of our Government.

This action fulfilled the prediction I made in 1921 in my report, as the first Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the President, which was transmitted by him to Congress: "If in the future there should at any time come into office an Executive indifferent to the operation of the Government as a business machine, there would, under the immutable laws of human nature, immediately spring up an effort on the part of the independent departments and establishments at first to curtail and restrict the activities of the coordinating agencies and then to wipe them out of existence."

For nearly 7 years now, since June 10, 1933, the business of the Government has been carried on not only without a coordinating control over routine business but without a proper system of Executive control, as was the case before Harding's administration.

The next President, if he is to save the Nation from bankruptcy and its people from ruin, must make the old fight over again, and this battle will be waged under desperate disadvantages. Against him will be arrayed the largest, strongest, and most formidably entrenched army of interested Government spenders, wasters, and patronage-dispensing politicians which the world has known.

When an executive is determined to reorganize a private enterprise on its way to bankruptcy and in the same condition as that which now exists in Government business, it is absolutely and fundamentally necessary that he convince his organization that he is in deadly earnest and will stand no nonsense from spending department heads like those who are now riding horseback throughout the demoralized and uncoordinated business system of the United States Government.

If the President is a fighter and without qualification pledges himself in his conscience and before his people, and before Congress, to fight for a balanced Budget, he should not fail. But it is no time for weakness and political trimming. He must be made of stern stuff.

The 10 Departments of this Government, as well as its great number of independent establishments, have been under practically independent operation for the last 7 years. They have run like units in any army which has no general staff or commander in chief. Concerned only with the interest of their own departments their heads are armed against invaders of their domains from any outside source no matter how authoritative. It is not the rank and file of governmental employees of whom I am speaking here. The rank and file are not threatened with loss of independent power. It is the heads of the departments and establishments who are responsible. They are skilled in specious excuses. They use, albeit with great politeness, the damnable devices of bureaucratic procrastination; they sound aloud their sycophantic praises of any feared higher power, but they can be made into team players and brought into the proper recognition of the superior lien of the plans of the Nation over the plans of their department only by sheer force, intelligently, persistently, and vigorously applied by one man, the President of the United States.

The President will make a fatal mistake if he relies on the Cabinet as an effective agency for imposing pressure for economy upon the business organization. The Cabinet is the body which most needs watching and more than any other body must itself at times be subjected to the strongest overriding Executive pressure. While the President cannot successfully exercise this power over the business organization without a proper internal business system at his command, the system, if it is not the conduit for a stern, intelligent and continued Executive pressure, is useless. Once since the junking in 1933 of the coordinating and Executive control system established in 1921, the present administration took the first step toward creating an internal system, based on correct business principles.

Donald Richberg was given by the President, as his representative, coordinating powers and business precedence over the Cabinet heads. But this plan passed out without any effective functioning.

Before outlining the method which was followed in 1921 to reduce Government expenditures and balance the Budget, let us compare the conditions which confronted the Harding administration in its first year with those which will confront the next President at the beginning of his service.

1. The business of our Government—the largest business in the world—was in a disgraceful condition of disorganization and chaos. Thus it is today.

2. For 132 years up to that time the departments and independent establishments of Government had been completely decentralized. They are operating today also without a central coordinating control.

3. The Government then had no proper machinery such as exists in every properly organized business, public or private, for ascertaining intelligently the difference between what the departments of Government want to spend and what they properly can get along on. The Government today has no such machinery.

4. No impartial appraisal of the actual necessity of a department demand was made. The appraisals were in general made by the spenders themselves. This is the case today.

5. Whatever was the public attitude of the heads of the departments and independent establishments, their pressure was always exerted along lines which tended to increase governmental expenditure, to prevent coordination, to decentralize the business of the Government, to increase independent powers, to discourage all teamwork except that designed to increase expenditures or to keep out interlopers who maintained that money could be saved for the Government by the adoption of a proper business system. This is the case today.

6. The administrative heads of the departments were selected, as a rule, with less reference to their business qualifications than to their qualifications as advisers to the President along other lines than governmental business administration. At the inception of their appointment they were introduced to a business with which they were generally unfamiliar, and were compelled to rely largely upon the advice of subordinates who were wedded to the theory of the right of independent operation of a department. As a rule, they became the earnest advocates of departmental plans which their inexperience in departmental business prevented them from fully comprehending in all their aspects. Being held to no effective responsibility by the President to operate their departments along a unified governmental policy, they became, in general, only a shelter and protection for the independent operation of the departments. This is the case today.

7. The departments and independent establishments as individual units were, in many cases, suffering from internal bureaucratic control and lack of proper internal coordination, as would be the case in any private corporation having a succession of executives selected often for political and not business considerations. Especially was this true in departments whose operations involve technical and specialized problems. This is the case today.

8. The monstrosities of the uncoordinated business system arising out of conflicting objectives, the lack of perspective, the duplication of work by the different departments, the wickedly unnecessary waste, may or may not have been seen by them; but no head of a subordinate department of Government was willing to give up any portion of his personal power or his appropriations to assist in their removal. This is the case today.

9. After appropriations were made, no departments tried to save money by operating on less than their appropriations, nor was any effort made to compel them to do so. In a private corporation this would be ridiculous, if it were not tragic. Appropriations were regarded always as indicating the minimum of expenditure, not the maximum, as in private enterprise. This is the case today.

As I now outline the following measures, which in the present unparalleled confusion of governmental business affairs the next President might adopt to balance the Budget, it should be kept firmly in mind that the plan of procedure recommended is simply that actualy carried out successfully by the President of the United States in 1921. This procedure is as follows:

First: The President, by Executive order, must enable the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to create an organization which will empower the Director as its head to assemble for the use of the President the impartial information necesary for the President to make the decisions incident to business policy, and when a decision is made by him will enable the Director to impose obedience directly on the body of the governmental business organization, and see that it is carried out. A corps of impartial investigators, by detail under Executive order from their former departmental positions to permanent service in the Budget Office, must be made responsible to the President, through the Director of the Budget. In the long run the Director of the Budget must get his impartial information about Government business from men of long experience in actual governmental business administration. The old Federal central coordinating service, operating under a chief coordinator in the Budget Office, must be immediately restored.

Second: The President must make it a condition in appointing any man to his Cabinet that the latter pledge his honor to him and to the people of the United States specifically to support him in his plan to reduce governmental expenditures and balance the Budget. A similar solemn commitment should be made by each head of an independent spending department at the time he receives his appointment.

The Cabinet, unless their eyes are fixed on an axe hung on the cabinet wall by the President, who has notified them upon their appointment that the penalty for disloyalty to him in his effort to balance the Budget is decapitation, will be obsessed under the laws of human nature with the idea that there are vested rights in each of them not subject to veto by a coordinating business control which operates in terms of a government determined to balance its budget.

The stronger the Cabinet the Presidents selects, if this preliminary cooperation is not pledged, the more impossible will it be for his administration to succeed in its most important task.

Third: At an extremely important public meeting of the business organization of Government, at which, as its head, the President presides, called the first month of his term of office, there should be present his agent, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the members of the Cabinet, and the heads of the independent establishments (who over that part of the business of the Government transacted in the departments or establishments rank as would

operating vice presidents in a private business corporation), and the chiefs of all the bureaus in the departments and establishments.

In presiding, the President will announce to the organization and to the country his Budget policy and serve notice that he has made the Director of the Budget his agent to transmit his orders in the operation of the Government's routine business under a proper business system and to see that they are executed. He must emphasize the powers of the Director as his agent to summon any officials, including Cabinet officers, for conference when necessary to enable him to enforce coordinating or other Executive orders.

At this public meeting the Bureau chiefs will be ordered to make within 30 days a report of what part each one can save of the unspent remainder of his current annual appropriation.

On June 23, 1921, at the first meeting ever held of the business organization of our Government, the bureau chiefs, at the request of the Director of the Budget, promised to the President a saving out of appropriations for the next fiscal year which began on June 30, 1921, only 7 days later, which promise they afterward itemized and fulfilled in the sum of $112,000,000.

Fourth: The fourth step, only to be taken during the first year of the administration, just as it was taken only during the first year of the creation of the system of executive control under Harding, is of commanding importance. The period immediately after the inauguration of the President on January 20, 1941, is crucial. With Government expenditures approximately $9,000,000,000 per year, he must attack them at once, and continually thereafter. The reduction in Government expenses for the first calendar year must be partially secured in the first 6 months during which the President will be the least equipped for the task. Unless he commandeers outside talent of the highest order, intelligently to assist in the task of applying effective pressure against the fortified inertia of departmental plans and prejudices during this period, the savings of his first calendar year will be unsatisfactory.

In 1921, 16 able business executives called by the President into the service of the Director of the Budget, at $1 per year, individually and separately went through the departments and establishments as investigators, and helped the Director of the Budget, and, through him, the President, in finding where the axe could be properly and effectively wielded on waste and extravagance.

The next President, to help him for his first year, must call in a larger number of such men than were called in 1921, for there are now in existence a larger number of departmental and independent establishments transacting an enormously greater volume of business.

For the President to make intelligent decisions in his first year as to where cuts in expenditure can be made it is absolutely necessary for him to have the help of investigators not under the control of the spending departments.

Considering the short time they have to do their work and the large scope of some of their investigations, these men may not find all existing administrative errors, but their temporary use is imperative. It is the only method by which there can be proper and impartial consideration given to the economy side of questions of expenditures during the first calendar year of the next administration. By the second year, the President and the Director of the Budget will have built up by Executive order a proper personnel from the body of the governmental business organization, detailed to service as investigators, or as members of the reestablished Federal coordinating boards, and responsible no longer to the department heads, but only to the President and his unifying system.

Proper business organization insures not an intermittent and outside control for economy and efficiency but a continuing and internal Executive control. Outside commission findings may occasionally stimulate efforts for economy and efficiency in routine functioning, but the permanent agency for the transmittal of Executive pressure upon the body of the business organization of government toward economy, which definitely fixes the responsibility for extravagance and failure, must be an internal one directly responsible to the President through the Director of the Budget.

Because under the English parliamentary system of government there is no chief executive, like our President, charged with responsibility for the routine administration of governmental business, it was necessary for Britain, after the Great War, to use the Geddes Committee, afterward called the "ax committee," to obtain information and formulate a repressive policy for dealing with the post-war financial crisis, which resembled that now confronting the United States. But this course is inadvisable in the United States. In fact, in 1931, 2 years before the present administration abolished our American Federal coordinating and control system, the Royal Commission on the Civil Service, acting upon the basis of a report made by me to the Prime Minister and Chancelor of the Exchequer and presented before the Commission by Sir Josiah Stamp, unanimously recommended to Parliament the adoption of our then American system.

Desperate business conditions are not properly met where there is any question of divided authority or divided leadership, as is so often the case with commissions. We are spending at the rate of around $9,000,000,000 per year. Unnecessary delays in this matter are enormously expensive. The fog banks of discussions, recriminations, and procrastinations which so often characterize committees or commissions acting either in a public or private capacity should be avoided.

The Budget can best be balanced in the way which any private organization, with its business in the demoralized condition of our present governmental business, would take as a matter of course. Mistake not, the Budget of the United States can be balanced.

To the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, for some years past the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has been extremely unfriendly in its editorial policy toward me. The directors of the editorial page of the Post-Dispatch entertain for me a cordial dislike—a feeling which I return in Scriptural measure, pressed down, and running over. But in the edition of June 11 the Post-Dispatch published a leading editorial upon the subject of our possible involvement in the war, and upon the recent policies of the administration which, to my mind, is so sane, so eloquent, so well-reasoned, and so patriotic, that I desire to afford to every Member of this body an opportunity to read it, in the hope that they may see fit to do so.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 11, 1940]

TO THE BRINK

President Roosevelt all but declared war yesterday.

He did not go all the way because, fortunately, this is still a democracy and, under our system, only the Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the people, can declare war.

But the President, with his immense power, can lead the Nation to the brink. This is what Roosevelt has done.

The President opened his speech with the words: "Every generation of young men and women in America has questions to ask the world."

While the country is still at least technically at peace, while the Bill of Rights is still functioning, we are going to take advantage of it and ask the President some questions.

But, first of all, we should like to draw a very brief contrast between Franklin Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Wilson led the United States into war in 1917 after a long period in which he did his agonizing best to keep us out of it. He led us into war only after a long series of overt acts by Germany against the United States—the sinking of our ships and the killing of our citizens.

This time there are no overt acts by Germany against the United States. Our ships are not being sunk. Our people are not being killed. Roosevelt, however, is doing his agonizing best to get us into the war. And he is doing so without the approval of public opinion. In contrast with the situation in 1917, we can now measure public opinion accurately. All the polls show that the people of the United States are overwhelmingly opposed to going to war.

Is this a democracy or isn't it? Are the people or their elected representatives to be consulted on a question of the utmost gravity—a question that involves the blood of American men—or not?

Is it not true that Roosevelt has proceeded along the very lines that Mussolini did, namely, to work up a war fever without permitting the Italian people to express their true convictions?

Is it not true that, for a year or more, Roosevelt has been so obsessed with foreign policy as to neglect domestic issues and, worse, as to neglect the proper economic and military preparation of our country for the trying times that may be ahead?

Mr. Roosevelt, of course, sincerely believes that the defeat of the Allies would endanger the United States, and this sentiment is shared by millions of his countrymen, including this newspaper, but what is the sensible thing to do under the circumstances? Is it to enter the war in Europe or is it to build up our own defenses in a rational way?

If we assume, for the sake of discussion, that this country is ready and willing to follow Roosevelt into a European war, with what will the country fight?

Will it fight with an army which is microscopic compared to the great legions of Germany, Italy, and France? Will it fight with its Navy and leave the Pacific bare to the marauding ships of Japan? Will it fight with its handful of antiaircraft guns, not sufficient in number to guard even one moderately sized city? Will it fight with its 300 B–18 bombers, of which General Arnold, chief of our air force, said to send them into battle would be suicide? Will it fight with its few so-called flying fortresses, which are now revealed to have three vital defects?

Obviously not. Far from being able to fight in Europe, the United States is actually unprepared to defend its own shores. And why, since this is the undeniable fact, does Roosevelt all but declare war on the dictators? His fifth cousin said: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." This Roosevelt speaks loudly and has nothing to back it up.

The President said yesterday that the material resources of the Nation would be offered to the Allies. What does he mean by this? By what authority does he make such a statement?

It is of a piece with the remainder of the President's speech—one of the most reckless speeches ever made by an American statesman. Is it not a fact that both Britain and France have billions of dollars earmarked for purchases in this country, and is it not also a fact that the things they need—modern airplanes and armored tanks—we haven't got either to sell or to give?

Has the President read the recently issued report of the Senate Naval Committee, which says that for the United States to go to war would mean a tragic sacrifice of the Nation's liberties and assets? Does he know that the committee, after carefully interviewing high-ranking officers of our armed forces, says that the United States is not prepared to give the Allies concrete help by intervening now, and will only jeopardize its own welfare by doing so?

The Naval Committee's report, printed in part on this page last Sunday, should be required reading for the President. It asks a question, too. It asks: "Why not face the basic military and economic fact that it is not within our power or means to create military or naval establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting their wars to this hemisphere?"

Mr. Roosevelt talks about the European shambles in terms of words like "justice," "freedom," "liberty." Those are precious words and those are precious things, but is it not true that the war in Europe is concerned about many other things besides abstract principles?

Is it not true that the war started in September of last year when Hitler invaded Poland and the declared reason for the entrance of France and Britain was to protect Poland. Was Poland a democracy? Ask the poor peasants of Poland, crushed under the heels of the Polish landlords, about that. Ask the Jews of Poland, who suffered the Polish brand of pogrom long before the Hitler brand was invented.

Justice, freedom, liberty, yes. These were the things we went to war for in 1917 and what happened? Instead of making the world safe for democracy, we ushered in the era of dictatorships, the age of the monstrous Hitler, the ghoulish Mussolini.

Is it not true that we are witnessing in Europe a tremendous convulsion of forces, of rival imperialisms, of have-not nations versus have nations, of age-old hatreds, of age-old quarrels? Is it not a radical oversimplification of a vast historical upheaval to describe it in the terms used by Mr. Roosevelt?

Mr. Roosevelt did his best to keep the war from happening. He failed. Now his job is to be President of the United States of America.

Commencement Exercises at Fisk University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM POWER MALONEY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address delivered by William Power Maloney at the commencement exercises held at Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., on June 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the only member of the Maloney family available at the moment, I have come to this commencement to congratulate the three young ladies who, by their splendid talents and high endeavor, have won the first of the Margaret Sarah McKim Maloney scholarships.

In addition to the cash endowment that makes possible these awards today, certain real-estate interests in New York City have been deeded to Fisk University and will, at the earliest possible moment, be sold, in order to swell this scholarship fund. So we hope that soon these scholarships may be of greater financial help to you, and even more worthy of your striving.

It is particularly fitting that these scholarships were founded at Fisk University, for Margaret Sarah McKim Maloney was the only grandchild of James Miller McKim, the great abolitionist and organizer of the underground railroad, who, with his wife Sarah, braved the threats of lynching to bring back John Brown's body from Harpers Ferry for burial in the Adirondacks.

The dear lady in whose memory these scholarships are given was never weary of helping. Everyone she helped became her friend, for she knew how to give as if she were receiving. Practiced by her, giving was a fine art which left fragrant memories.

In the happiness of those she helped she found content. And if anything could add to the eternal peace she now enjoys, it would be the knowledge that, though gone, she may still keep on helping. That she may long continue to help, the Margaret Sarah McKim Maloney scholarships were founded to aid and encourage you, the women of Fisk University, who today study music, art, and literature—things she herself once loved to learn.

Among you, bright-eyed, eager, talented young ladies, who love the things she did, Margaret Sarah McKim Maloney would be more than content to be held in friendly remembrance. So we who cherish her memory are, through these scholarships, confiding it to your care, in the sure belief that she will not be forgotten, for you are a remembering race.

America's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON TRANSCRIPT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Transcript entitled "America's Role."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Transcript]

AMERICA'S ROLE

America has a role to perform. It can be a great role in world history, or it can be a dark smear on its pages and a tragedy for all mankind.

The President spoke rightly that there can be no isolation for America. America must share in the responsibilities for the world's progress. We cannot, even if we would, isolate ourselves, economically, spiritually, intellectually, or morally. We can choose, however, the part we shall play. We can send or not send soldiers to Europe as we choose. But we cannot isolate ourselves nor fool ourselves that we can.

Let us first define our present responsibility, and having done so, let us be more specific as to a national and foreign policy for its execution. Agreement upon our responsibility and national policy then permits an intelligent judgment upon the question of aid to the Allies.

First, our responsibility is to preserve freedom for ourselves, our children, and such of the rest of the world as thinks as we do that only in a state of freedom can culture and civilization advance most rapidly. We have no responsibility and no desire to preserve the status quo of the European political and tariff boundaries which have met in head-on conflict with the rapid changes of the world's economic life. These changes are a part of the industrial revolution which is not yet finished. It has been the very resistance of the different European nations to these factors of change which caused the last World War, with its subsequent famine and pestilence, and brought Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini into power.

No. We have no desire to resist the inevitable conditions of economic change. But upon America more than upon any other nation on earth lies the responsibility of preserving the light of freedom. We, and the war-worn British Empire, are the only free nations left with sufficient natural resources, the industrial ingenuity, and capacity, and manpower to do the job. And after the war is over it will be our responsibility also to share in the effort and cost of reconstruction. Worse days of famine and pestilence are coming, and we must stand ready to feed the starving and combat disease.

And now, second, let America adopt a national and foreign policy upon which the Nation can agree and steadily pursue with a singleness of purpose. We must defend with our lives, at all costs and all sacrifice, the most strategically defendable area in which the light of freedom can be kept burning. The area within our national border is not successfully defendable from a strategic standpoint if beset by hostile forces on all sides. The Monroe Doctrine recognizes this fact. The most strategically defendable area is the continents and outlying islands enclosed by the two great oceans. No better natural barriers exist to aid in military defense. The policy must

be directed on the principle of guarding against attack from outside. It must not include suppression by force of the liberties of other nations by us. Such action would destroy, from within, the freedom it attempts to preserve against attack from without.

This is a gigantic task. But it is a task which can be done if we have the will, courage, fortitude, and singleness of purpose. Time is of the essence. There must be no waste motion. Economic policy must be directed toward this one aim. Diplomacy must be focused on this end. Military policy must be coordinated and concentrated on this single purpose. To straddle the fence, to divert energies to other fields by training an army to fight in Europe is to spread the results of our efforts so thin over several defense lines that none will be made impregnable. We have no trained and equipped army of sufficient size to be of present material aid. The people of this country, according to the latest Gallup poll, are 93 percent opposed to sending men to fight in Europe. We have time to build the defense of freedom on our continents, whereas we should have been fighting before this had we decided to defend freedom on a line along the Rhine.

Such a policy carries many implications. It means concentration of airplane production on types of planes suitable for continental defense. It means establishment of adequate naval air bases at suitable points. It means the construction of long-range submarines. It means an adequate intercontinental merchant marine. It means the training of men primarily for the air and naval services. It means the training of sufficient Army personnel and the production of sufficient Army equipment of a character necessary for operations within the freedom area if required. It means the training of an army of skilled labor in an extensive chain of training schools. It means a program of high taxes upon every American family. It means the elimination of many present Government expenses not a part of the defense program. It may later mean conscription both for industry and the armed forces. It means greater economic cooperation between North and South America. It means a new and definite policy for American diplomacy. It means the research for and commercial development of substitutes for vital raw materials necessary in wartime as are now imported from outside the freedom area.

It does not mean the formation of an army designed for fighting in Europe. It does not mean the building of tanks and other Army mechanical equipment in the quantity and of the type necessary for American participation in Europe. It does not mean conscription of men for the obsolete 1917 type of military training, but rather for the mechanical training necessary both for industry and the armed forces.

Forces hostile to freedom are on the march and in double-quick time. The success of these forces and the rapidity of their march alters entirely the situation as evaluated by us and by the American people a year ago. To the extent we can send materials to the Allies in Europe without weakening our defense preparation of the Western Hemisphere, we should do so. The labor and supplies for such materials have to be paid for by somebody. The Allies should pay for them so far as they have assets to do so. It may later become wise for us as a nation to give these materials, paying for the labor and supplies ourselves as a matter of our own defense cost. Experience has shown that credits for war materials have been the cause of later international difficulties.

But every drop of free American blood must be reserved for defense of the western area of freedom and only spilled in a cause disassociated from the tragic history of European politics. If we work hard and build our defense fast enough, we may still avoid actual warfare.

But the need of the hour now, above all else, is the consolidation of American public opinion upon an explicit, clear-cut, and more comprehensive national policy.

Purchase of Foreign Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT BY PERCY H. JOHNSTON

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article recently published which gives the views of Mr. Percy H. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, regarding the buying of foreign silver, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSTON URGES UNITED STATES BUY ARMS INSTEAD OF SILVER—STATE CHAMBER HEAD ASKS TOWNSEND BILL PASSAGE TO END METAL PURCHASES

Percy H. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urged yesterday that the United States stop buying foreign silver and spend the money thus saved on national defense. His recommendation was contained in a statement issued at the chamber's offices, 65 Liberty Street.

Mr. Johnston said continuation of the silver purchases in the present emergency would be a "tragic farce" and urged the immediate enactment of the amended Townsend silver bill, which has been passed by the Senate but held up in the House of Representatives.

"Every million dollars the Government spends in the purchase of foreign silver now means dollars gone that the Nation could have expended for airplanes or other vitally needed defense equipment," said Mr. Johnston.

"Since 1934 the Government has spent about $985,000,000 for the purchase of foreign silver for which it had no use. In the last fiscal year alone the Government paid foreign producers more than $150,000,000.

"The Nation needs every dollar it can save and raise for rearmament. President Roosevelt vetoed the rivers and harbors bill to save money for national defense. He can win further commendation by voicing his approval of the objective of the amended Townsend bill. A word from him to the leaders of the Senate and the House would insure speedy passage of the bill. A stroke of the President's pen then would save more millions of dollars for defense.

"Most of the 1,950,000,000 ounces of foreign silver which the Treasury has acquired since 1934 is now gathering dust in underground vaults. It could not be disposed of except at tremendous loss.

"Had the huge sum which it cost been expended wisely by the Government for airplanes, battleships, tanks, and other needed defense equipment, the Nation today would be far better prepared to meet the challenge which events in Europe now compel us to face."

Mr. Johnston is chairman of the Chemical Bank & Trust Co. and president of the New York Clearing House Association.

What Has the Democratic Party Done and What Does It Have To Offer the Negroes of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM J. THOMPKINS AT DOWNINGTOWN, PA.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Dr. William J. Thompkins, Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia, at the Community Day exercises of the Downingtown Industrial and Agricultural School, Downingtown, Pa., on May 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Waring, members of the faculty, student body, and friends, I have been invited here today to present for your consideration, in the form of a debate, the question of What Has the Democratic Party Done and What Does It Have To Offer the Negroes of America. My opponent, Judge Edward W. Henry, of Philadelphia, will discuss with you What Has Been Done by the Republican Party and What It Has To Offer the Negroes of America.

Before beginning this forensic, I should like to congratulate Dr. Waring, principal of this institution, for having made possible this engagement whereby parents and their children may have presented to them the merits and demerits of both of the major political parties.

I wish further to pause long enough to pay tribute to the Democratic United States Senator from this Keystone State, and to the citizens of Pennsylvania whose votes made it possible for a man of the stature of Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY to serve the citizens of this great Commonwealth and the citizens of this country in a manner that has surrounded him with glory and honor, and has made him one of America's most able statesmen.

In discussing what the Democratic Party has done for the Negro, I might just as well bring it home to you by telling you first what

the Democratic Party has done for the Negroes of Pennsylvania, and how your Democratic Senator has fitted into that program.

I will never forget listening to the fervent plea made by Senator GUFFEY before the Senate committee considering the antilynching bill in the Seventy-fourth Congress. I can see him now as he walked calmly up to the committee table and said:

"I am heartily in favor of the objects and necessities of this bill and if the bill has any defects, I am satisfied that this committee can remedy and make the proper changes in the bill, and I sincerely hope that the full committee will recommend this bill, so we can discuss the matter at length on the floor of the Senate, at which time I will take great pleasure in supporting and working for the bill."

In keeping with the above statement, Senator GUFFEY gave the antilynching bill his full support on the floor of the Senate, which fact may be attested to by Walter White, secretary of the N. A. A. C. P.

The record of your able Senator shows that the second day after the inauguration of the President, Senator GUFFEY requested that the brilliant editor of the Pittsburgh Courier be named as an assistant to the Attorney General, and you all know that President Roosevelt granted that request and named Robert L. Vann as assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

He has brought the benefits of all the New Deal social agencies to the front door of every home in Pennsylvania, and to the end that such may have been possible, he supported all of the New Deal legislation which gave to us such agencies as the Civilian Conservation Corps; the old-age pensions; the soil conservation; National Youth Administration; social-security legislation; minimum-wage laws, and so forth.

You are all aware that it was largely through the interest of Senator GUFFEY that millions of dollars have been spent in this great State, resulting in thousands of Pennsylvania citizens, both white and black, being put to work. You know of the project under the Commerce Department here in Pennsylvania, which gave employment to more than 700 Negro citizens; all of these things were accomplished through the efforts of your Democratic Senator, even though he had to fight the opposition in order to bring it to pass.

The comforts that the citizens of Pennsylvania have enjoyed during the past 7 years; the money they have earned, both Democrats and Republicans, is the result of the loyalty and devotion of Senator GUFFEY to the citizens of his State as their representative in the United States Congress. It is a tribute to the citizens of Pennsylvania, whose vote sent to the Senate a man of the intelligence, ability, statesmanship, and desire to serve whose name is JOSEPH F. GUFFEY. It is my hope that you will continue to send Senator GUFFEY to Washington as long as he is willing to make the sacrifice necessary for the proper service of his constituents.

Now, I have been asked to answer the question, What has the Democratic Party done for the Negro?

I always cherish the pleasure of an opportunity to speak in behalf of the New Deal and what it has done for the Negro people of America. I say "behalf" advisedly, because the New Deal needs no defense. The greatest defense that can be offered to those who grudingly attack the accomplishments of the New Deal is the New Deal program itself. So, in the language of Al Smith, "let's look at the record."

Whenever the ruler or supreme executive of a nation is confronted by a situation imperiling national stability and continuity, if he possesses power and is guided by wisdom, he will immediately employe every resource at his command to meet the danger.

If he is an executive charged with the responsibility of executing laws enacted by a parliamentary assemblage, operating within constitutional restraints, he will issue a call to the representatives of the people and request the necessary powers to meet the national emergency. This President Roosevelt did, and the Congress conferred upon him the necessary powers to meet the most wretched and deplorable national situation which had ever confronted a newly elected Executive in the history of our country.

Every department of our national life was out of order—industry, finance, business, and education—while the frightful visitor, Despair, was an unwelcome guest at the hearthstones of millions of American families. Unemployment, crime, and hoarding completed the "four horsemen of America" who were riding swiftly as President Hoover was leaving the White House.

Came then Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with bold heart and brilliant mind, trained in the craft of statesmanship and administrative leadership—with a character rooted and grounded in the finest traditions of American life; with an unflinching soul that had found itself in lonely hours of meditation and reflection, and which understood the realities of the situation.

Summoning to his aid the best brains of the country, regardless of party affiliations, the "four horsemen" were brought to a halt, and the people everywhere rejoiced in the feeling of a new hope—a hope well founded as time has proved. Negroes, like all other American citizens, possessed that hope, and Negroes, like all other American citizens, are confident that their faith and trust in our humanitarian President was not given in vain, for they, probably more than any other race, had felt the pains brought on by the do-nothing government of Republicanism; and they, like any other patient who is sick, know when they are obtaining relief.

When the bottom fell out of the American economy in 1929, the colored people of this Nation were among the first victims of the resultant depression. Hundreds of thousands were separated from their jobs and were without adequate resources to sustain life. Their living conditions, never at par, became more wretched as families were forced to double up in crowded and dilapidated quarters. Their morale was strained and their health impaired. The youth of the race seemed to have no future. The outlook was bleak.

There was no hope for amelioration of these conditions until President Roosevelt launched his vast program of social reform to lift the whole American people out of the mire of despair. This program, designed to aid that ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed third of the Nation has been of inestimable value to the Negro race, the masses of whom have been concentrated historically in the low-income group with only meager hope and encouragement for advancement. New work opportunities were created for these people in a variety of occupations through the Work Projects Administration. New homes have been and are being made available to them through the public housing program of the United States Housing Authority. Schools have been constructed and hospitals developed by grants from the Public Works Administration. The youth of the race has been inspired and trained by the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Thousands of workers in industry have been protected by the Social Security Act and the wage and hour law. Thousands of black farmers have participated in the agricultural and rehabilitation programs of the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Soil Conservation Administration. Light has penetrated many a dreary home and the tasks of home and farm have been eased by the cheaper electricity rates made possible by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Employment by the Work Projects Administration has meant more than jobs to thousands of young men and women of the Negro race. It has meant opportunity to engage in occupations for which they were trained in school and college. It has meant opportunity to develop themselves in their chosen occupations, to compete on equal terms with members of other races, and to gain administrative experience.

Last year an average of 300,000 Negro workers were employed by W. P. A. Representing 14 percent of the total W. P. A. workers, they received an estimated $15,000,000 in monthly wages. These workers were engaged in a variety of tasks ranging from professional service to unskilled labor. There were physicians, dentists, and teachers on projects; there were actors, artists, and writers; there were skilled mechanics, technicians, and scientists. In short, doors of employment which had been previously closed or nearly closed to Negroes were opened to a large number of colored persons in accordance with their need and talent.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Everywhere it is recognized that next to employment the most urgent problem facing the Negro is the problem of obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Not until the Government launched its public-housing program in 1934 was there any large-scale effort to provide decent housing for low-income families at rentals within their reach.

Today 8,000 Negro families are living in low-rent housing projects developed with Government aid. Under the present program of the United States Housing Authority plans have been formulated for the rehousing of about 45,000 additional Negro families. This figure represents one-third of all housing units for which loan contracts have already been approved by President Roosevelt upon recommendation of Administrator Nathan Straus.

Not only has the program built new homes for thousands of families who otherwise could not afford a decent place to live, but also it has created employment for technicians, building-trades workers, skilled and unskilled, and for "white collar" workers in the management and operation of projects. Protective clauses included in the buildings contracts of all U. S. H. A. aided projects have already enabled Negro building-trades workers to earn nearly two and a half million dollars in wages.

YOUTH PROGRAMS

Two agencies have been established to assist the youth of the Nation in attaining economic and social adjustment. These are the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

In December 1939 there were approximately 78,500 Negro young men and women employed on the student-aid and work programs of the N. Y. A., representing 11.1 percent of the total of 708,000 persons so employed. The N. Y. A. provides employment, gives scholarship grants, and training to persons between the ages of 16 and 25. The types of employment training cover a wide range of occupations.

Approximately 250,000 young colored men have participated in the rehabilitation and conservation programs of the C. C. C. since its establishment in 1933. During 1939 the sum of $700,000 was allotted monthly by colored C. C. C. boys to their parents and dependents back home.

PROGRAMS FOR FARMERS

The Negro farm population has been assisted by the programs of the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Soil Conservation Administration. Through F. S. A.,

Negro farmers have been rehoused in modern farmsteads, have been advanced rehabilitation loans, and have participated in rental cooperatives. Larger long-term loans were made available through F. C. A., which also stimulated the organization of credit unions. In June 1939, records of the F. C. A. showed that there were 48 credit unions organized among Negroes, with a total membership of 4,178.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The building of public facilities has been the basic programs of P. W. A. These structures include schools, hospitals, community centers, bridges, dams, and roads. More than 115,000 Negro children in 24 States are attending schools built during the past few years with the aid of P. W. A. funds. Allotments for the construction of these school buildings amounted to more than $34,000,000, excluding the $3,500,000 worth of allotments made to Howard University.

Hospital facilities for Negro patients have been increased by at least 7,242 beds through the aid of grants and loans by P. W. A. Community centers and other recreational facilities have been made available to colored people in many sections of the country through P. W. A. grants and loans.

OTHER AGENCIES

Other agencies which have contributed to the welfare and security of Negro workers include the Social Security Board, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corportation, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Wage and Hour Act.

The New Deal, more than any other administration, has realized that Negroes are American citizens, and as such have a right to participate in every phase of American Government from the humble position of charwoman to the stately position of Federal judge. For the first time in the history of this Government we have a Negro presiding over a Federal court—first Hon. William H. Hastie, now Judge Herman E. Moore.

I could go on to enumerate other benefits that have come to the Negro under the New Deal, for the ocean of its philanthropy knows no shore, but my time is limited. No one would dare stand before a colored audience and say that we should not have had a low-cost housing program; that there should have been no Works Progress Administration; that the National Youth Administration was a blunder; that the C. C. C. camps have been of no value to the Negro youth; that the grants from the P. W. A. for the construction of schools, hospitals, and additional buildings for our colleges were not necessary. What is it, then, that the New Deal has done that needs defense insofar as the Negro is concerned? Nothing.

The Negro is not going to be fooled or guided by Republicans into the belief that this administration is responsible for the present status of the antilynching bill, either. Everyone knows that for 25 years the Republican Party bluffed about the Dyer antilynching bill and it was never brought to discussion in the Senate, notwithstanding the Republicans had the House, the Senate, and even the Supreme Court, for more than half a century. At the first opportunity where voting cloture would have ultimately brought the antilynching bill to a successful end the Republicans declined to vote because they knew that the Democrats would have been given credit for the passage of the bill.

In the House of Representatives, where debate is limited, the Republicans had to join with the Democrats and vote passage of the bill because they had no shield to hide behind. But in the Senate, where debate is unlimited, and a two-thirds vote is required to limit debate, the Republicans joined with the southern filibusterers and defeated the motion to limit debate. The record shows that practically every Democrat, with the exception of the southerners, voted for cloture, but the Republicans refused.

The Democratic leadership did all within its power to break the filibuster by holding continuous sessions extending far into the night in an effort to wear the filibusterers out, but it didn't work. When this failed, the Democratic leadership cleared the way for a vote on the motion offered by a Democrat to limit the debate, and as I said, the Republicans joined with the southern Democratic filibusterers to defeat the motion, wherein if they had voted with the Democrats who favored the motion, debate would have been limited and the antilynching bill would now be on the statute books.

We are living in a day when actions speak louder than words. We are living in a day when Negroes are no longer gullible and know that actions speak louder than words when they read and learn and form their own opinions. They are able to judge for themselves who is right and who is wrong.

The thing for Negroes to do is to rally behind their friends and scorn their enemies—those who had an opportunity to do but did not. To turn against a man who has endeavored to be the President of all the American people and who has succeeded, would be nothing less than treason, and no Negro can afford to be guilty of such an offense.

There are two sides to this question: You either have to be "good God" or "good devil." You either go up with the crowd of new dealers, or down with the anti-new dealers.

I agree with what my opponent will say relative to Abraham Lincoln, and what the Republican Party did for Negroes under his administration; that was almost a century ago. The people of today do not want a "has been" or a "gonna be," but an "isser."

President Roosevelt is doing for the American people what the American people want done; that was shown by his overwhelming victory at the polls in 1936, and in the several primary elections that have been held instructing delegates to support him for a third term.

If the Republicans had a panacea for recovery, for Budget balancing, why didn't they tell Hoover; he wanted to know. In the closing days of his administration he tried in vain to obtain from his Republican stalwarts information that would help him relieve the distress and suffering of the American people. He finally turned to Roosevelt, and summoned him to the White House and requested this information.

What is it that the Republicans will do if reelected that they didn't do while they were in power and control of the Government? How will they balance the Budget? Will they do so by abolishing the C. C. C., which gives employment and training to the youth of our Nation? Will they abolish the Work Projects Administration, the Public Works Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the other Federal agencies inaugurated by President Roosevelt to preserve the Nation. God perish the thought.

The only question to be decided by the American people of which the Negro is a part is, Are you willing to return to the days of 1929 to 1932—the days of starvation—no homes, no food, no clothes, and no leadership; or will you continue on the upward trend with the New Deal administration of Roosevelt, that has brought this country out of the mire and mud of the depression years, into a land that has restored peace and contentment to millions of homes and families?

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering the bloom or blight
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light
Then it is the brave man chooses, while the coward stands aside
Doubting in his abject spirit 'till his Lord is crucified
And the multitude make virtue of the faith they had denied."

Airplanes for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the pen of Mr. John T. Flynn, under the caption of Plain Economics, dated New York, May 22, 1940, in reference to the question of 50,000 airplanes for United States defense purposes, which article interests itself largely in the cost of production, maintenance, and so forth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, May 22.—It is becoming increasingly obvious that some sort of immediate survey or study of our defense needs is essential. Otherwise we are apt to give the world a spectacle not of our strength but of our weakness.

As we begin to hear, from experts, the facts and figures about a 50,000-plane air force, it is difficult to believe that someone is not spoofing us. After all, a plane is a very tangible thing. It is not like a speech to Congress, something that can be knocked out in an hour or two on a typewriter.

Our plane factories have been straining every nerve to turn out the orders of England and France. Since January 1, they have delivered only $43,000,000 worth of planes, or less than $11,000,000 a month.

News writers and even editorial commentators keep on talking about a billion-dollar appropriation for 50,000 planes. They refuse to recognize that $3,000,000,000 is the lowest amount that many planes can be turned out for. Then the planes must be equipped with guns and instruments; airfields, hangars, supply stations, and repair plants must be built. That means, at the very lowest, another billion. That means $4,000,000,000, and this is on a basis of only about half the cost of our planes to the Allies.

Then the planes must have men to handle them. Capt. William Whiting, general inspector of aircraft for the eastern division of

the Navy, says that when this Government gets 10,000 planes they will have to have 20,000 pilots and 300,000 men for the ground crews.

How many men 50,000 planes would require I do not know. Certainly they would require 100,000 pilots, and it is fair to assume that they would demand at least twice as many men in the ground crews—100,000 pilots, 600,000 in the ground crews—700,000 men. What would it cost to support such a vast army of air men only? Does anyone suppose that would cost less than a billion dollars a year—not just a billion dollars for 1 year, but continuously?

Then there is the technique of producing 50,000 planes. That's over 4,000 a month. That means mass production on a large scale. And that, of course, means freezing the plane models. Now, suppose we had set out to produce 4,600 planes a month last year. Experts tell us that the planes of last year are already out of date. So vast a production program would leave no room for flexibility.

How much would the country have to spend on plants to build another $3,000,000,000 worth of planes in a year? Has anyone given a figure on that? Does anyone know? It would be a gigantic sum of money, and it could not, of course, all be amortized in the cost of 1 year's production.

In short, it begins to look as if we were talking about spending anywhere from five to seven billion dollars a year on this adventure. That is, if we are serious about building 50,000 planes.

Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very pertinent article printed into today's Washington Daily News, written by Raymond Clapper, entitled "No Deal With Japan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 13, 1940]

NO DEAL WITH JAPAN

(By Raymond Clapper)

CHICAGO, June 13.—Talk of the desirability of a deal with Japan is spreading through the Middle West, stimulated by the Chicago Tribune and followed up by other oracles. The idea is that to prevent the totalitarian powers from ganging up on us, we should detach Japan and make an ally of her. Then, if it became necessary to face Germany, we should have Japan a loyal friend at our back.

If we are taken in by that argument, we will have learned nothing from the disastrous experience of Britain. It amounts to a proposal for appeasement. The proposition is the product of fear.

Because we are afraid, we should try to appease Japan. How? By selling out now. By turning adrift to the tender mercies of the yellow race Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies, and all way stations.

In order to buy Japan's friendship and support, we would put the seal of our approval upon such a betrayal. We would scuttle on every international ideal. For our treachery we would gain nothing but a Munich, to last until the day when Japan wanted something else that had not been included in the bargain. Then Japan would take whatever it was that she wanted and pay no more heed to her deal with us than she paid to her treaty pledges when she went into Manchukuo, into China proper, or when she fortified the mandate islands in the Pacific.

If Japan is determined to extend her domination in the Far East, at least let it not be done with our approval, as part of a deal with us. Let us not be a party to it in a craven act that would instantly be a tip-off to the totalitarian powers that we had lost our nerve as completely as the British lost theirs in the early 1930's when Japan went into Manchukuo, or as the French lost theirs when they permitted Hitler to reoccupy the Rhineland.

Don't think that a deal with Japan would not be recognized as a tip-off to all Latin America, a tip-off that the third great democracy also was on the run. Are we to invite every Latin American country to begin saying to us, as the little nations of Europe did of Britain, that they cannot depend upon us? Are we to give them that encouragement to rush into deals with Hitler as the new rising force that is to replace the United States as the protector of the Western Hemisphere?

Of course, the idea of a deal with Japan is stated in neat, seemingly safe terms. So was Munich. Yet Munich turned the balance fatally against the Allies. Everything since has been inevitable sequel.

This is world revolution, not only war for conquest. It is a revolution to overthrow capitalist democracy everywhere, to overthrow the system set up through British leadership and to supplant the British domination and pattern with German domination and pattern.

Britain achieved a world-wide empire, shaped to the mechanics which best suited her. Germany aspired to replace that world domination with mechanics of her own. Italy and Japan are her left and right hands. The old Bolsheviks had an idea of world revolution, but they couldn't put it over. Hitler has a similar idea and he is on the way toward putting it over where the Communist world-wide revolution failed.

Note Mussolini's significant phrases in his declaration of war: "Blackshirts of the revolution * * * we take the field against the plutocratic and reactionary democracies * * *. This gigantic conflict is only a phase of the logical development of our revolution * * * it is a conflict between two ages, two ideas * * * an event of import for the centuries * * * proletarian, Fascist Italy."

This is not old-style nineteenth century imperialism any more than was the unsuccessful Communist try at a world revolution. Britain has been mistress of the world, why not Germany? Why not destruction of the old capitalist democratic governments? Once it sounded like ballyhoo. But Germany is sacrificing thousands of her lives to achieve it, and the great stakes are almost within her grasp.

When France and England have been crushed, only the United States and our system on the Western Hemisphere, plus what we may take over from the British Empire, will be left standing in the way.

In this situation we can trust nobody but ourselves. We can trust only our own force. We want none of the false sense of security that a deal with Japan would give us, a deal that might prove as treacherous as Munich. Japan is playing the same game as the other crowd and we should be foolish to deceive ourselves. We must make busy being the strong neighbor in the Western Hemisphere. No neighbor now is a good neighbor unless he is strong. We need guns, not treaties.

Seismology in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

PAPER BY EDWARD L. TROXELL

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, Admiral L. O. Colbert, the head of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, after conference with me and much correspondence, lent valuable assistance to the study of seismology in Connecticut. In that State there is a very serious problem resulting from certain geological faults, which situation has been covered in an excellent paper prepared by the superintendent of the Connecticut Geological and Natural History Survey, Prof. Edward L. Troxell, of Trinity College in Hartford, Conn.

Under date of April 4, correlating all available information, Professor Troxell delivered a paper entitled "Seismology in Connecticut." I ask unanimous consent that Professor Troxell's paper be inserted in the RECORD for the general benefit of all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEISMOLOGY IN CONNECTICUT

(By Edward L. Troxell)

Frequently we hear of a man taking out fire insurance and shortly thereafter his building burns down; suspicion is attached to such a remarkable coincidence. But have you heard the story of the man who took out earthquake insurance and then went to his friend and asked, confidentially, just how an earthquake might be started? Well, the fact is you cannot start an earthquake; you can't stop one; we can't even predict when they will come. We can, however, take precautions against loss and damage from them and that's very important.

Let us make clear just what an earthquake is. It's not a crack in the ground; it's not a building tumbling down, as many people think; it is rather, merely a trembling of the earth, a wave motion, a vibration. Of course all those other things may result from the earthquake; one result may be that the earth opens up; landslides may come; and rivers may be muddy for weeks afterward; so-called tidal waves may sweep across the ocean adding to the destruction already wrought.

While I have felt the tremor of an earthquake, I have never heard the sound that is reported by so many people. This sound is said to resemble that of an automobile crossing a bridge; or of a furnace exploding; it is also described as a rumbling or a low, growling noise. The cause of an earthquake may be many things: the explosion of powder or dynamite, the passing of a train or of a truck along the road. A volcanic outburst usually sets the earth a-trembling. The most conspicuous tremors, however, come from the breaking of the earth's crust and the break may occur many miles beneath the surface. Take a small stick in your hands and begin bending it; as you apply more and more force the stick bends and bends until at last with a snap it breaks and you feel the sting in your fingers; this sting is caused by the vibration and is analogous to the quake in the earth when the crust breaks, a quake or trembling that may go throughout the earth.

Very sensitive instruments are made today that are able to record even the slight tremors that come from some distant place, tremors so small that one would not notice them ordinarily. Moreover, these instruments are capable of recording the exact time of the disturbance, the intensity—how violent it is—and even the direction from which the tremor came. It is such an instrument, a seismograph, that we hope to have here at Hartford some day in the not-too-distant future, perhaps to be installed by our National Government, or perhaps as a gift from some generous and public-spirited donor. No seismograph exists in our whole State, although in neighboring States there are several of them. We have had the thing in mind for some time because the peculiar structure of the rocks at Trinity College and the nearness of the rock to the surface make the campus at Trinity a particularly fitting place to install a seismograph.

The purposes of having a seismograph here are manyfold. In a general way, it will fit into the broad plan of the Government in investigating earth disturbances; specifically it will enable us to learn more about earthquakes as a hazard for buildings, for dams, and like construction. It may throw light on peculiar recurrent vibrations such as those now noticed in Vermont, for which no explanation is at hand; it may tell us something about the "Moodus noises," so mingled with superstition in the past and continuing down to the present time. Insurance companies are paying more and more attention to the study of earthquakes because of the risks they have to take.

Many of my hearers might have the feeling that earthquakes are few and far between in Connecticut, and it is true that the severe shocks, which are strong enough for the average person to experience, number no more than ten or a dozen throughout the recorded history, but we know that there are a great many minor shocks, and it is these that have significance for the seismologist. If we were to recount the earthquakes of importance we would go back through 150 years or more. In 1755 a severe earthquake, rated IX, shocked practically all of New England. Six years later an earthquake with rating VIII was felt all the way from New York to Boston; it probably was one of the most severe in the region of Hartford.

From 1791 to 1805 the so-called Moodus noises were prevalent, and it is interesting that within the month we have been hearing of more disturbances in the town of East Haddam. In 1837 came an earthquake to Hartford with an intensity of V, and in 1840 there were disturbances in the region of New Haven, with a rating of VI. In 1908 fissures, cracks in the earth, opened up along the Housatonic River.

In 1925 there were again the strange noises in East Haddam, and a quake at Hartford rated at V. Following that, at various points of Connecticut, earthquakes have been experienced, three in 1929, two in 1931, one in 1934, two in 1935, and again a noticeable shock of mother earth in 1937.

If we but knew the truth there are probably earthquakes every day here at Hartford; most of them of course so gentle that they can be detected only on a sensitive instrument. As it happens our only knowledge of these quakes is brought to us from seismographs outside of Connecticut, for nowhere in our whole State is there an instrument in operation. Can you imagine a physician trying to get the temperature of his patient by guesswork without the use of a sensitive thermometer? That is the position in which we find ourselves at the present time in Connecticut. Even a single element, of the three usually installed in a seismological station, would give us the exact time of an earthquake and its intensity, factors so important in the study of earthwaves.

There has been no important shock in this section or, for that matter, in any part of the United States in the last 3 or 4 years. This, however, is not as reassuring as it might seem; it may be merely the calm before the storm. The theory of earthquakes presupposes a gathering of forces that eventually are released, the longer the period of gathering the greater the effect when the release comes. Stresses accumulate; then as time goes on the strains are set up and at least there must be a readjustment—that is when the trouble comes.

In examining the need for a seismograph here in Connecticut it is worth while noting what eminent authorities and prominent officials in our Government have said. Dr. N. H. Heck, Chief of the Division of Terrestrial Magnetism and Seismology, sums up the whole situation very well; he points out the difficulties, the expense involved, and the need for assistance in interpreting seismological records, and he concludes:

"I hope that in spite of this some kind of a solution of the problem may permit the operation of a seismograph in Connecticut. The geological conditions appear quite favorable."

He says further:

"Improvement of the location of epicenters of moderate earthquakes which occur all around you would be an important scientific contribution, and past history indicates that destructive earthquakes are not impossible."

Mr. J. M. Johnson, Acting Secretary of Commerce, made the following statement:

"It is considered that such a station would be an important link in the group of stations which are actively cooperating in the location and study of New England earthquakes."

Mr. Johnson made this statement after becoming "familiar with the facts (as he says) as to the need for such a station in Connecticut."

Our distinguished Trinity alumnus, Dr. William Bowie, sometime Chief of the Division of Geodesy in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, wrote to the president of the college:

"I should like to see such a station at Trinity. Seismology is a rapidly developing science and is of prime importance to research in the field of geology."

Admiral Leo Otis Colbert, Director of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, made this statement in 1938:

"In the colonial period there were severe earthquakes in the Connecticut River Valley and today there is considerable seismic activity in various parts of New England. As a result of this condition several institutions have established seismograph stations in that region and they are cooperating actively with Harvard University Seismograph Station, Harvard, Mass., in investigations of local earthquakes and with this Bureau in its general teleseismic work. There are no seismograph stations in Connecticut.

The records from a seismograph station in the vicinity of Hartford would be of considerable value if such records were made available at once to those institutions and organizations making intensive studies and investigations in seismology."

According to Senator DANAHER, Dr. Colbert "believes that the site for a seismograph at Trinity would be excellent and feels that the advantage, particularly with reference to possible building operations, would be very great and would fully justify a seismograph at Hartford."

Admiral Colbert further states that merely "* * * a single vertical component * * * with short period galvanometer and suitable recorder if placed in routine operation at Trinity College, would be a valuable contribution to seismological and allied investigations in New England."

As to practical value, in conference with Mr. T. Z. Franklin, of the Aetna Insurance Co., these data were brought out.

There is a long time value in the study of earthquakes; we know so little of what is actually going on and only in the more distant future will we be in a position to interpret the quakes, great or small, which we hardly realize are existing now. Putting it one way, we would be able to find out what we don't know, and that is indeed important.

Earthquake resistance is not expected or desired for all buildings alike, even in a single city; for example, on filled ground, gravel, etc., which is to be found in Hartford or Boston and other cities, we would want to build more securely. As I understand it, the companies would not want to sell insurance on buildings in certain parts of Boston at the present time. As it stands now, we have no data as to where, how great, the probable time an earthquake might come. We need to spot the foci, the centers; we want to discover the point from which most of our tremors originate.

It is Mr. Franklin's view that this information would be extremely valuable; the more we know the better off we are, especially as our knowledge applies to the risks we are taking from earthquakes on filled ground. That is where the principal value would come from a seismograph in Connecticut, in a large city like Hartford.

For the last 3 or 4 years there have been fewer quakes in the United States in general and in New England in particular. This may mean that there is an accumulation of stresses; that the forces are being built up; that in the elastic rocks which exist here in New England there has been no rupture yet, but that when one does occur it will be all the more severe.

So we see that, aside from the general interest and application of seismology, it has indeed a practical value. With precise information on the intensity, the frequency, the direction of earthquake waves, engineers can be advised on the constructing of buildings to make them quakeproof. It may be that we are not building strongly enough; on the other hand, through fear of these unseen forces, we may be taking precautions away beyond any possible requirement for quake resistance. What we need is more information.

Now, in the fraction of a minute remaining, let me express my gratitude to Dr. Ogilby, president of Trinity College; to Mr. James Goodwin, of Hartford; to Mr. T. Z. Franklin, of the Aetna Insurance Co.; to Senator DANAHER for help in our attempt to study earthquakes in Connecticut, and, of course, to WTHT for this opportunity to discuss our plans.

Stepping Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) ARGUS-LEADER

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of June 11, 1940, entitled "Stepping Toward War."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of June 11, 1940]

STEPPING TOWARD WAR

This is a momentous week in a tragic year. It is a week whose significance may be delineated more accurately and emphatically in history than contemporary observation permits.

But for the present we see Italy moving upon the field of battle and the President of the United States uttering an epochal pronouncement.

It was yesterday morning that Mussolini, the boss of Italy, decreed that Italians should throw their military might into the war on the side of Germany and against the Allies.

Counterbalancing that decision came the statement from President Roosevelt yesterday in which he said that the United States "will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this nation."

Clarification of the President's statement will be sought, no doubt, at once.

But there seems little occasion to question what he has in mind. Obviously he believes that the full force of American material resources should be thrown into the war on the side of the Allies.

In his address—and certainly every word and every phrase in it was carefully thought out—he included no modifications and provisions. He made the flat assertion that our material resources will be made available to the Allies.

This approaches a declaration of war against Italy and Germany. In fact, it can be so construed across the Atlantic and perhaps it will be.

If we are to throw our material resources into the battle on the side of the Allies—and that, by the way, is a matter for Congress, not the President, to decide—we will be a belligerent and certainly subject to treatment by Germany and Italy as a belligerent.

This would mean, of course, that it would be to the advantage of Germany and Italy to disrupt our industrial production, to sabotage our factories, to submarine our ships and, if possible, to drop bombs upon our sites of strategic importance.

If our material resources are to be employed as the President suggests, it means that we again have ventured into a war in Europe in defiance of the determined resolutions that were made in the wake of the first World War.

These features and the inherent meaning of the President's speech cannot be treated too lightly. And there should be no misunderstanding of the implications. If we are to take the step that places us in the war, let us at least know what we are doing. Let us enter the conflict with our eyes open.

The gravity of the situation is such that the suggestion of deluding the American people in respect to what this or that proposal may hold in prospect is decidedly out of place.

We earnestly hope that Congress discusses this subject with complete candor. Our present neutrality laws provide that supplies may be sold to belligerents on a cash-and-carry basis. The same law applies to all belligerents. If it is to be amended in the manner proposed by the President, then it no longer will be a neutrality law.

It will be equivalent to a declaration of war against Germany and Italy. In that event, Congress should have the courage and the honesty to let the people know exactly what is taking place.

Commander Kelly, of the American Legion, spoke last night immediately after the President. He advocated extreme preparedness and pointed out that this has been a part of the Legion's program for several years. He furthermore said that the Legion was opposed to participation in a war in Europe and believed in the concentration of our effort in defending the Western Hemisphere.

That attitude represents the opinion of many Americans, though there is a growing conviction that we should do just what the President suggested. Some such observers, however, have displayed a failure to appreciate the fact that the extension of broad material aid to the Allies means American participation in the war.

There is no purpose in underestimating the seriousness of the situation abroad. It is well that we realize that England and France are fighting against desperate odds. Though Italy is not regarded as a great military nation, she is throwing her strength into the battle at a crucial period. The situation in France is particularly critical, with the Germans making advances in the north and Italy now creating trouble in the southeast. England is conserving her resources for the expected assault upon her own territory.

In his conduct in this situation Mussolini has revealed himself as a creature quite suited in character, in spirit, and in type to be an associate of Hitler. In common with Hitler, he believes that might is right and that the sacrifice of the lives of innocent people is a mere trifle.

Americans face a momentous decision as the week's events draw to a climax. They are determining our course—whether we are to join with the Allies or whether we are to concentrate in the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Certainly there is no question where our sympathies lie, but a sympathetic interest and actual involvement are not the same.

But permit us to reiterate the fact that the adoption of President Roosevelt's recommendation of yesterday will classify us among the participants in the war.

To construe it differently is something other than straight thinking. And let us reflect deeply and ponder seriously before taking this course.

Preparedness Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY BASIL BREWER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dated New Bedford, Mass., May 31, 1940, prepared by Basil Brewer, publisher, entitled "Preparedness Platform, Standard-Times Mercury."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPAREDNESS PLATFORM, STANDARD-TIMES, MERCURY

MAY 31, 1940.

Abandon politics in preparedness program, from the President down.

Nullify pressure groups, labor and business.

Suppress "fifth column" and Trojan-horse groups.

Draft industry, labor, and men for training to whatever extent, and in whatever number, necessary.

Abandon hour restrictions wherever skilled labor shortage threatens to handicap production. Stop beating the old class hatred tom-toms. The welfare of all is threatened.

Shake up Army and Navy personnel, and smash red tape and cumbersome inspection technique, which throttles mass production of planes and other vital equipment. Tailor-made uniforms or equipment won't meet this crisis.

Stop "preparedness propaganda" from official Washington and substitute honest-to-God preparedness.

Cease discussion of preparedness plans and strategy with the openness of a dialogue in the Grand Central Station.

Let trained and known dollar-a-year men organize this gigantic preparedness program as efficiently and economically as the crisis permits.

Abandon "window dressing" civilian advisory boards and create a board with authority.

Build new airplane factories underground.

Build airports underground.

Build forts underground to defend our coasts and the Panama Canal.

Create mechanized divisions and equip them as rapidly as if we were now at war. Same for antiaircraft.

Divert relief money to the preparedness program as fast as this program relieves unemployment.

Pay no attention to the squawk of the ostrich-minded that this is making us military—if we don't have adequate defense quickly, we may not have anything to defend.

Cease guileless and misleading chatter about building 50,000 planes but get plane production now, and start now to train pilots and ground forces, in quantity, by draft if necessary.

Hold consultations with the other countries of this hemisphere on mutual defense now and make agreements, if possible, with them.

Get drastic efficiency into the whole program; sacrifice the democratic process as little as possible but as much as is necessary.

BASIL BREWER, *Publisher.*

Military Instruction and Training of Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL FERGUSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following bill, that provides for the training of American youth:

A bill (H. R. 10074) to establish schools and camps for the military instruction and training of civilians

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish and maintain schools for the military instruction and training of civilians who may be selected upon their own applications. The courses of instruction at such schools shall include training in the care and use of firearms, including target practice, vocational and mechanical training, and other subjects pertaining to basic military training. The location of the schools and the hours of instruction shall be so prescribed that the students may attend without changing their customary places of abode or giving up their ordinary means of livelihood. Such schools shall be established at any C. C. C. camp upon voluntary application of enrollees of the C. C. C. Any available buildings, property, or equipment of the camp may be used in such school.

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to detail officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, either active or retired, as instructors of the schools established under this section: *Provided*, That, in time of peace, retired officers, retired warrant officers, or retired enlisted men shall not be detailed on active duty under the provisions of this section without their consent. The Secretary of War is also authorized to call to active duty members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps as instructors under the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That, in time of peace, such personnel shall not be called to active duty without their consent. The Secretary of War is also authorized to employ, at such rates of compensation as he shall prescribe, civilian instructors, including members of the Army of the United States or National Guard who are not on active duty, and such compensation shall be in addition to any other pay or allowances provided by the United States for such members of the Army of the United States or National Guard who are not on active duty.

For the purpose of establishing and maintaining the schools provided by this section, the Secretary of War shall (a) provide suitable buildings or rooms for instruction and facilities for target practice; (b) furnish the necessary arms, ammunition, and equipment for all prescribed courses of instruction; (c) maintain the buildings, rooms, target ranges, and equipment; and (d) provide for the issue, care, and safekeeping of all property of the United States Government used in connection with these schools.

Upon the completion of the required course of instruction the student shall be awarded a certificate of proficiency, and a record of the names and addresses of each recipient of such certificate shall be kept in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of War.

Male citizens of the United States between the ages of 16 and 25 years may be voluntarily enrolled in the schools provided by this section. No obligation for military service shall result from such voluntary enrollment. Students enrolled under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to be in the military service and no right to pay, allowances, compensation, pension, medical attendance, or hospitalization shall accrue by reason of enrollment in or attendance at these schools.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to maintain, upon military reservations or elsewhere, camps for further military instruction and training of graduates of the basic schools provided by this act, of members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who have completed 1 year of service in that division, of persons who have attended one or more citizens' military training camps, and of honorably discharged enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to use for the purpose of maintaining said camps and imparting military instruction and training thereat, such arms, ammunition, accouterments, equipment, tentage, field equipage, and transportation belonging to the United States as he may deem necessary; to furnish at the expense of the United States uniforms, subsistence, and transportation within such limits of territory as the Secretary of War may prescribe, or in lieu of furnishing such transportation and subsistence to pay travel allowances at the rate of 5 cents per mile, or transportation in kind may be furnished and in addition thereto candidates may be paid a subsistence allowance at the rate of 1 cent per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp, and for return travel thereto, and to make the payment of travel allowances for the return journey in advance of the actual performance of same, and medical attendance and supplies to persons receiving instruction thereat; to provide the necessary buildings, water, fuel, light, and screening; to authorize expenditures for damages resulting from field exercises and other expenses incidental to the maintenance of said camps; and to sell to persons receiving instruction at said camps, for cash and at cost price, plus 10 percent, quartermaster and ordnance property, the amount of such property sold to any one person to be limited to that which is required for his personal equipment and all moneys arising from such sales shall remain available throughout the fiscal year following that in which the sales are made, for the purpose of that appropriation from which the property sold was authorized to be supplied at the time of the sale. The Secretary of War is authorized further to prescribe the courses of theoretical and practical instruction, including vocational and mechanical training, to be given at the camps authorized by this section; to fix the periods during which such camps shall be maintained; to prescribe rules and regulations for the government thereof; and to employ thereat officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, active or retired, and members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps: *Provided*, That retired and reserve personnel shall not be placed upon active duty for this purpose without their own consent except in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress.

Members of camps of instruction provided by this section shall be entitled to hospitalization, rehospitalization, medical and surgical care in hospitals and at their homes, pay and allowances, transportation, subsistence, and burial expenses as provided for members of Citizens' Military Training Camps by the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1507), and any amendment thereof.

Members of camps of instruction provided by this section shall receive an allowance of $5 per month while in attendance at such camps. Certificates of proficiency shall be issued to all qualified graduates of the camps provided by this section and a record of the names and addresses of all candidates to whom such certificates are issued shall be kept in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. The volunteer camps shall be established in every State in the Union where the Secretary of War determines there are sufficient numbers of enrollees to justify the establishment of such camps. These camps shall be apportioned among the various States and Territories on the basis of population.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to cooperate with any existing establishment of the Government or relief agencies in carrying out this training program.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of War shall submit annual estimates to the Congress for the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and authorization for the appropriation of such funds is hereby made.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has now approved all requests for funds of the Regular Military Establishments and Navy recommended by the President. I hope these requests will be adequate. This Nation wants to take every step necessary to prepare us for any eventuality. Under the Monroe Doctrine we have assumed the terrible responsibility of protecting the sovereignty of the American republics.

I feel, perhaps, our marines now fixed at 30,000 and our standing Army something over 400,000, as provided in recent legislation, is not yet big enough. We must, however, for the present, accept the request of our President and military leaders as the best professional informed advice we can get. Probably this is all the increase our regular armed forces can digest this year. It is my sincere conviction that in addition to the increased regular forces we must train a huge civilian force. The thoughts of this Nation have never been so shaken as they have with the death struggle of democracies in Europe. Every citizen now feels a love and devotion for his country as never before. Europe has shown us that the things we love and the country that we are blessed by living in may be snatched from us by hungry, wildcat dictator nations. We hear today more than ever before about compulsory military training. That may be just around the corner. We have always built our defenses on the theory that we could raise, train, and equip an army after we got into a war. Germany's demonstration in Europe has proven there is no time to provide defenses after a nation is in battle. To meet the threat of these dictator nations we must devise a method of training every able-bodied American youth that desires to receive training. Ninety-five percent of the boys enrolled in the C. C. C. camps, if afforded the opportunity, would volunteer to take military training in their recreation time, yet we do not afford them this opportunity. We train a small percentage of our youth in the college R. O. T. C. and in the citizens' military training camps in the summer, but only a

relative handful when we think of modern armies of millions of men.

The bill I have introduced today would provide military training for those boys between the ages of 16 and 25 in every community in which a sufficient group of boys signify the desire to take this training. Trained instructors would be provided to give these boys instructions in the handling of weapons. A man cannot learn to use a gun, or a rifle, or a machine gun, or an antiaircraft gun, or a tank overnight. These basic courses would be provided, as I say, in every community where such numbers of American youth volunteer to take this part-time training. The same thing would be true in the C. C. C. camps in every camp where sufficient numbers expressed the desire that the training be provided.

The only criticism I have received of this bill is from the military authorities who say that our officers already have their hands full; but when you think of all the retired Army officers, all the Reserve officers, all the National Guard officers who could devote part time to this schooling, I believe we could find sufficient officer personnel in addition to our regular forces to carry on this part-time training and instruction in the use of arms. These instructors, I am sure, would give up the necessary time in order to take a course preliminary to taking a position as instructor.

Now is the time when an overwhelming majority of the people want to have a part in getting this Nation prepared to defend itself. Let us give them this opportunity to take this training that would be afforded to every able-bodied group in the Nation or its Territories.

After they have completed the training course, I provide for the establishment of camps. In these camps they would get a more thorough training for 6 months or a year's time, not for pay but to provide themselves with the training necessary to defend this Nation. I provide only $5 per month in pay for those taking part in these camps. I also make the provision that none taking part in these camps will be required to join any established branches of the military. It is entirely a voluntary proposition. But when the day comes that this country is in peril, when it is necessary to draft the men and wealth of this Nation to defend it, we would have a list of physically fit boys with the fundamental training necessary to make them real defenders of this Nation. And another thing that is even more important—you cannot combat "fifth column" activities by negative action only. I believe we should have an adequate F. B. I., and we are going to have one. I think subversive activities should be stamped out in this country, and the aliens deported who advocate the overthrow of our Government. Yes; I believe the Communistic Party should be outlawed. But, on the other hand, we must offer something constructive to the youth of America. We must give them food for thought. We must make them realize that this country must be defended, or we will lose our freedom to a dictator system. There would be a vast difference in the mental attitude of a man trained in the use of a weapon, trained in Army life, when he is called on to join the Regular Army, and a man drafted from behind a soda fountain, from behind the dry-goods counter, from behind the bank cage, and pushed hurriedly through a training course in crowded training camps, in our time of need. The boy with training that felt at home with a weapon would be a much more valuable soldier in 3 months because he had given thought to becoming a soldier than a man taken cold from a profession or a job could possibly become in three or four times the same length of time.

When the defense bill of the Committee on Military Affairs was before the House I introduced an amendment to provide for the training of these civilians. I did not have adequate time in which to explain it. I do not believe Congress has yet done its duty if we do not make some provision for the training of a large number of civilians at this session. I hope the Military Affairs Committee will give this bill their serious consideration, and report it or a similar measure for passage before we adjourn.

Electric Power for National Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE JERSEY SHORE (PA.) HERALD

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Jersey Shore Herald, of Jersey Shore, Pa., regarding the fine work being done by the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. regarding national defense. This company is wide awake to the necessities and needs of the country it serves. It is looking after the national needs as well as the needs of the people. John S. Wise, Jr., president of the company, is a dynamo of energy, working in company with the board of directors and the managers of the various districts to give the best service and the most efficient service to all, with an eye for national service as well as local. The National Defense Power Committee will find the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. are prepared for future eventualities. If the Government has other sections of the country as well prepared to furnish electric energy, they will not go to the expense of the great superpower projects in connection with T. V. A., Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, or St. Lawrence waterway, at national public expense, but will rely more on private enterprise for aid and assistance in national needs in peacetime and during any eventualities that might occur.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Jersey Shore (Pa.) Herald of May 29, 1940]

PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT CO. PREPARED FOR DEFENSE NEEDS

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. is fully prepared to meet any extra demands for power that may be occasioned by speeded up national-defense measures, it was announced today by John S. Wise, Jr., president of the power company.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. has 18 major electric generating plants, of which 94 percent employ steam generation using anthracite coal for fuel. As the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. plants are scattered in various locations in the territory served by the company, the company is considered to be in a better position from the standpoint of national defense than would be the case were all of its power-generating facilities concentrated in one plant in one location. The company maintains a large stock of anthracite coal adequate to supply its steam electric-generating plants for a period of approximately 1 year. The power plants are connected together by high-voltage transmission lines, all of the plants feeding into a general power transmission system that covers the entire area in the 28 counties in eastern Pennsylvania served by the company. In this territory there are situated 10 third-class cities, 188 boroughs, 1 incorporated town, and 513 villages of over 100 population.

In October of 1939, President Roosevelt combined the National Defense Power Committee and the National Power Policy Committee into a new committee known as the National Power Policy Committee. Data which was prepared by the company, and sent in December of 1939 to the National Power Policy Committee, shows that Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. has an assured capacity in all of its electric facilities, which, after allowing for necessary reserves, provides an adequate margin over the present demands upon the company.

All of Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.'s electric-generating plants and its transmission lines are connected with or tied in to generating stations and transmission lines of six large neighboring power companies in this vicinity, namely, the Scranton Electric Co., Luzerne County Gas & Electric Corporation, Pennsylvania Water & Power Co., Metropolitan Edison Co., Philadelphia Electric Co., and Public Service Electric & Gas Co. of New Jersey. These seven large power systems, operated and connected through high-capacity transmission lines, form what might be termed a local grid system through which large amounts of power are transmitted back and forth between the various companies as needed. The effect of this interconnection of local grid system between the large neighboring public utility companies is to form a power pool under the operating plan of which surplus capacities are always available.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. not only has extra capacity immediately available, but, in addition, the company is at this time installing two high-pressure boilers and an additional turbo-generator in its plant at Harrisburg which, when completed early

next year, will provide an additional 21,000 kilowatts of power capacity, making the total available capacity of Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. 441,000 kilowatts, or about 588,000 horsepower. The available capacity, present and planned for the future, will be adequate to meet all 1941 power loads including estimated national-defense equipment.

Mr. Wise also announced that the company is completing engineering studies and plans for extensions and additions to its Hauto, Harwood, Pine Grove, and other power plants in the event that still further power might be needed because of any unforeseen development. The addition of power-generating machinery in these plants does not, under the methods contemplated, mean large additions to plant property or plant buildings. By means of higher pressure boilers and turbines, and use of present water and other facilities, generating capacity of the plants may be considered increased in present buildings in a comparatively short time. This will increase the company's capacity after 1941 by 93,000 kilowatts.

President Roosevelt, in his fireside chat on Sunday night, May 26, pointed out that the speeded up national-defense program could be cared for largely by private industry. The announcement just made by Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. is particularly timely.

Let Us Pass the Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

LETTER FROM NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor and I enthusiastically support the legislation proposed in S. 591 and asked for by the American Federation of Labor of my State.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Albany, N. Y., June 11, 1940.

To Members of the House of Representatives from the State of New York.

HONORABLE SIRS: As a last appeal, we again invoke your active interest in getting S. 591, housing bill, to a vote and its passage by the House of Representatives.

The extent of work opportunities that the defense program will provide for building-trades mechanics and laborers is negligible. Curtailment of the W. P. A. program and the lack of sufficient private enterprise to take up the slack will displace and leave unemployed additional hundreds of thousands of these workers.

Passage of S. 591 by the House of Representatives is therefore essential to a rounded program that will continue to assure a reasonable minimum of such employment opportunities. To make no such further provision at this critical stage would eliminate factors vital to the Nation's economic balance and to the success of its whole industrial program in furtherance of national defense and security.

Hence this further urgent appeal to you to do your utmost to bring about adoption by the House of Representatives of the pending housing bill, S. 591.

Respectfully yours,

NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
THOMAS J. LYONS,
President.
E. W. EDWARDS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON. U. S. GUYER, OF KANSAS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given to me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have the honor of including herein a splendid and informative address delivered by my colleague, the Honorable U. S. GUYER, from the Second District of Kansas, on the occasion of the Fifty-ninth Annual Commencement of Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on June 3, 1940. On this occasion, my colleague from Kansas [Mr. GUYER], was honored by having the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws conferred upon him.

The address is as follows:

President Gage, members of the class of 1940, my old college friends, ladies, and gentlemen, prefatory to anything I may say on the subject of my address, permit me a word to my old college friends of the olden golden days of long ago when all the world was young.

It has been a half century since I began my course at old Western. Fifty years is but a drop in the ocean of time, but these 50 years have seen startling changes. In Toledo the telephone was a dream unrealized, and the airplane a mythological joke about a fellow named Icarus. However, I might add that even without the telephone we had adequate conversation. But those 50 years seem very short to us boys and girls of old Toledo. Ffty years is an eternity when we peer into the unfathomed future, but it seems very short when we backward gaze. Today the deathless memories of those beloved years come back and hover on the far horizon of the yesterdays like the glamor that tangles in the western tree tops out yonder in the twilight after the sun has set. The busy, crowded intervening years have hurried on with incredible swiftness. The tragedy and heartbreak of it is that the old companions are not all here. Many have gone to that undiscovered country. To them we salute with all the love and affection of the homesick heart.

For lack of a better subject I have chosen Opportunity, suggested by the matchless sonnet of the late Senator John James Ingalls. I am not asking you to subscribe to its philosophy or to share my opinion of this much-debated child of Ingalls' poetic genius. Let us dismiss it with the many clever parodies which it has inspired while I declare that William Shakespeare did everything better than anyone else until Ingalls wrote Opportunity. It is the master sonnet of the English tongue and the stately march of its majestic music sets all the orchestras of the soul to singing:

"OPPORTUNITY

"Master of human destinies am I!
Fame, love, and fortune on my footsteps wait,
Cities and fields I walk; I penetrate
Deserts and seas remote, and passing by
Hovel and mart and palace, soon or late
I knock unbidden once at every gate!

"If sleeping, wake; if feasting, rise before
I turn away. It is the hour of fate,
And they who follow me reach every state
Mortals desire, and conquer every foe
Save death; but those who doubt or hesitate,
Condemned to failure, penury, and woe,
Seek me in vain and uselessly implore,
I answer not and I return no more."

Now a word personal to the members of this fine class. Comparisons are proverbially odious, but I will venture far enough to say that no doubt you are much brighter than we were 50 years ago. While I am sure much has been subtracted from the old curriculum of our day, I am just as sure that much has been added. Recently someone showed me a new volume of Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic War, and I am certain that the old warrior has added several chapters to that ancient political campaign document, for it was news to me. I fear the same thing has happened to geometry, for from casual observation I would make affidavit to the fact that several strange and new propositions have been added since I wrestled with it in the sacred precincts of old Drury Hall down at Toledo.

But there are certain fundamental facts and integrities that have not changed and will not change. Life's problems remain about the same in spite of time and its flight. The marvelous advance in science, industry, and machinery has not modified the great verities of life. Honor, honesty, and integrity are not subject to fluctuation or eclipse. Upon these eternal verities you must build even when thrust upon an age of doubt, of hopes and fears, an age that well may mark an epoch in the history of the human race.

I know just what the problem of the girl and the boy is, who come out of college this year. I, too, was catapulted from college into the depths of a so-called depression. That was in 1894. There did not seem to be a bright spot in all the sky. The highways were congested with what we termed "tramps" in those days. Those men were willing and did work for 25 cents per day and were mighty glad to get it. I speak, of course, of the farm where the worker got his board beside his munificent wages. You could buy a quarter section of as good raw land as ever the sun shone on for $300. But there was no market for it except for the few who knew the value of such land and who had the vision to see ahead a year or two when the sun of prosperity would shine again. All this was followed by the greatest era of agrarian prosperity and opulence ever recorded on this continent.

That era lasted from 1897 to 1914 and aided with its first harvest of gold from the Allies really reached until the full effects of the great war overwhelmed us along with the rest of the world. That generation of young people who met the issues of life from the

beginning of the century until this great depression began to take its toll in 1929 found it a golden age for youth.

It was during that period of peace and prosperity that the world made a great surge forward as triumphant as the depression has been devastating. In that golden era science, art, and industry made gigantic strides all alike glorious for youth and its dreams.

I have in mind an episode that vividly illustrates the rapidity with which the face of the whole industrial and mechanical world has changed as if overnight.

If you will forgive a personal reference, I recall a most dramatic story told to me over 40 years ago by my father, the Reverend Joseph Guyer, when I returned for the holiday vacation from the University of Kansas where I was pursuing my legal studies. In October an old friend had visited him in central Kansas. They were boyhood and manhood friends, preached in the same church for over a quarter of a century, and were born in the same year—1828. I remember how my father laughed at Milton Wright because the bishop said that his boys were going to perfect a flying machine that would fly; how the venerable bishop had described that old biplane; how the boys had built a slide on the side of a sand dune; how one of them would lie down on the lower part of the plane while the other pushed him off; and that when he reached the bottom of the slide he had gained sufficient momentum to keep the air, 25, 50, and sometimes a hundred feet. And then, with all the audacity and finality of one who has demonstrated a proposition in geometry, Milton Wright exclaimed:

"When Wilbur and Orville find an agent to drive that machine, they'll fly like birds."

That was where my father laughed. The whole world laughed. Flying had been the jest of the ages ever since Icarus blossomed out in Greek mythology. The highest expression of impossibility was: "You might just as well try to fly," an expression so deeply rooted that it still persists in our language.

You might just as well have told my father that October day long ago that they would invent a delicate little instrument that would reach out its invisible arm across the continents and from the voiceless silence of the air steal the music of a thousand orchestras and fling it back across the hemispheres to ravish the ear of the earth in palace and cottage and hovel as to tell him that men would fly. You might as well have told him that this marvelous little instrument would stretch out its magic wand and gather up the words of a hundred orators a thousand miles away to charm the people with their eloquence as to tell him that men would fly. You might as well have told him that there was at that moment a boy over at Amherst College, 23 years of age, who on the 4th of March, 1925, would stand on the historic old portico of the Capitol at Washington and whisper his message to every nook and corner of this mighty land of ours, as to tell him that men would fly.

I wonder what my father would have thought if, in a moment of prophetic vision, Milton Wright would have told him that, before a third of a century had fallen into the abyss of the past, a boy 5 and 20 years of age would in 33 hours wrap about his youthful brow the chaplet of immortal fame by conquering the old Atlantic by cheating its hungry billows, and landing safely in the field of Le Bourget in Paris?

What are we going to do next? They tell me, sir, that they are going to dig down into the dusty archives of dead and forgotten centuries and reproduce the voices of those whose tongues have been sealed by the silence of death for thousands of years. They tell me that they will reproduce the golden voice of Him who walked by the side of the tideless sea of Galilee; of Him who whispered to all the world, "Suffer little children to come unto me."

That they will tune in on the 18th of June in 1815 and, amid the thunders of Waterloo, they will hear the conqueror of Napoleon pray, as he looked at his watch: "Oh, for night or Blücher." That they will pick up the 19th of November in 1863 and, over yonder on the soil of old Gettysburg, made sacred by the blood of our fathers, will hear a heartbroken voice begin:

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Impossible, you say. Of course, it is impossible. That was precisely what my father told Milton Wright in October 1895, about the airplane. There is nothing impossible if the intellect of man centers upon it and thinks and dreams about it long enough.

For a thousand years before our fathers founded this blessed country of ours the great minds of the earth were centered upon one colossal question: "What are the rights of man?" How far can arbitrary power trample upon the rights of the individual? How far can the individual disregard the rights of society? Then, one day, a tall, tawny-haired son of old Virginia sat down at a colonial table and in 4 hours wrote all the conclusions of a thousand years of fighting and thinking into the Declaration of Independence, and that question was forever settled.

I repeat it, there is nothing impossible. If you have any respect for your reputation as a prophet, erase the word "impossible" from your vocabulary. There is nothing impossible for America so long as she is filled with youth that looks straight into the sun, that gazes across the far and radiant stretches of the sky, clear-eyed, clean-lived, lion-hearted, like that unconquerable Viking of the air, like that incomparable eaglet, unafraid.

I have spoken only of the enterprises of aviation and the radio. I might declare the same of the automobile industry and other new enterprises which started before the war of 1914 that have peopled our industrial centers with specialists in a dozen new industries that were born in the age of opportunity to which I have referred. These were the great creative victories of peace with its healthful prosperity and progress. Will such another age come again?

That is a vital question to this class of 1940. I answer in the affirmative. Since 1929 we have had a state of stagnation. The whole world was for a time staggered by the impact of this world-wide depression following the World War. In France and England it was comparatively over in about 5 years. On account of the application of new theories which either have functioned miserably or have not had time to properly develop, our depression has persisted until some people have concluded that it will always be with us.

But this is the theory of the defeatist and has no place in the horizon of the class of 1940. Energies that have been chained and dammed up for years will soon again be liberated as they were in the past, so that the present generation of students may have an open field for the exercise of the energies which the good God has given them for the benefit of mankind.

These energies, like electricity produced by some giant dynamo, are stored up for future use, and when once we make the proper connection with the forces and the material we shall experience the normal conditions which are the heritage of those who live in this opulent continent.

About 90 years ago the compilers of the Encyclopedia Britannica in making a survey of the earth with reference to just how many people could be supported on this North American Continent, working on the well-known theory that where a soil and climate will provide a livelihood for a certain number of people the people will in due time arrive, declared that the soil of this continent would support 2,600,000,000 people and that at the rate of German and English increase in population there would be on this continent that number in A D. 2400.

With such wealth under our feet what has not the youth of this favored land to look forward to? Do not judge the future of this country by what you have seen the past 10 years; for soon government will take its cold, clammy hand from paralyzed industry, and when once liberated, free enterprise will employ the idle people to produce for this ever-increasing population. This vast rich land was never patterned for an almshouse nor for a free-lunch counter.

All this country needs is an industry that can put the people back on the pay roll and it will blossom as the rose, but it never will until a revivified private industry has the opportunity to fill its pay rolls once more. Then agriculture, famishing for a market, will flourish again and every form of enterprise will prosper. Then it will not be a question of curtailing the output of agriculture but the task of feeding the world around us. Then the teacher, the physician, the lawyer, and the business executive will again come into his own.

There has not been a single giant enterprise established in the past decade. No recent new world-embracing invention has been developed. What a virgin field for the youth of today. What a world of radiant paths for the elastic steps of youth! The inventive mind of man has stored up unnumbered new prizes to challenge the mind of youth. Upon each one, giant industries will rise. Television and a dozen other half-solved problems clamor for solution.

So much concerning the material opportunities awaiting this new generation, eager with its infinite enthusiasm and ample ability.

What of the finer aspects of life, literature and art? The world was never so ripe for a renaissance of the finer decencies of life and letters. After a sort of revolt against civilization, a kind of drunken debauch which came in the wake of the Great War, we are ready for a forward surge in art and literature, in painting, sculpture, music, and poetry.

The post-war period, with its retrogression, produced little of which we could boast. Our best sellers could not go through the United States mail without violating the Federal statutes against obscenity. I have said that there had not been painted a picture since the war that had caught the gaze of the public eye for its beauty or thought, but I can say this no longer, for last week in the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States we unveiled Howard Chandler Christy's masterpiece, The Signing of the Constitution, which is the greatest historical painting of this continent—a great creative and constructive work. One might say the same thing about sculpture with the exception of Borglum's creation at Mount Rushmore, which rivals the massive grandeur of ancient Egypt.

While the world is famished for good music, one cannot turn on the radio without being feloniously assaulted by a nightmare of jazz.

What about drama? The cinema? The silver screen, or shall we just term it all "the movies?" Here we find sensuality enthroned; sex deified; vice and crime lionized. Literature, art, music, and the drama constitute the mirror which should reflect the soul life of the people, the stream upon whose bosom should be etched the intellectual and moral life of the Nation. We must not censure too much the stream if when we look upon its surface it sends back a picture black with diabolism and lechery.

Here is a fertile field for the young men and women of 1940. I believe there is a demand for better books, better music, and better art. The public, I believe, is surfeited with salacious literature and risqué dramas and movies. I am sure the public taste is improving for the finer things of life and is willing to pay for them.

Here, I believe, is the challenge of the educated, cultured youth of 1940. It is not a hopeless field, for I believe the people are awakening to the unenviable attitude of so many of their fellow Americans in regard to their conduct and the encouragement which has

been afforded to the baser and coarser products of what should be the finer arts of peace and sanity; a turning toward the God of our fathers who guided us alike in peace and war, in prosperity and in poverty. May that good God protect us alike from the flames of war and the no less consuming retrogression that follows in its wake.

Finally, I wish every member of this graduating class the highest happiness and the greatest prosperity which your efforts so richly deserve.

Plain Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John T. Flynn from the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, June 13.—One of the grave errors being made by statesmen all over the world today is in fighting the wrong enemy.

For the last 8 years England was busy fighting Russia. She did not expect an invasion by Russia. She feared the Russian social system. She feared it might succeed. And, if it did succeed, her Tory ministers feared communism would spread to England.

Therefore England's whole foreign policy was based on isolating Russia, injuring Russia, and, as part of that, making up to Germany in the expectation and hope that Germany would be the barrier against Russia. A strong Germany might ultimately make war upon and destroy Russia.

What these men did not see was that there was a more terrible threat to England's democracy in Germany's fascism than in Russia's communism, because it was more terribly efficient and, so far as the rights of capitalist property were concerned, just as deadly. Now England faces her real enemy—fascist Germany and fascist Italy.

Now we in America face an enemy. That enemy is fascism. Put a little differently, it is the force that is slowly sapping the underpinnings of our capitalist, democratic society. We can fight that enemy. Or we can run off on a fool's adventure fighting some other enemy. We are doing the latter.

Nothing can take our democracy from us save the collapse of our economic system. If that collapse comes again, wild-eyed leaders will arise—wild statesmen of all kinds. There will be red leaders who will want to overturn our democracy and plunge us into the arms of communism. But they will not be very strong.

There will be reactionary leaders of the Hitler or Huey Long type who will seek to set up dictatorial governments. Between them all will be the bewildered liberal groups—workers out of work, starving farmers and city dwellers on one side, and on the other shopkeepers, businessmen, "white collar" workers horrified at the threat to the economic system which they want to preserve. What will happen? It is easy to foresee.

The frightened, conservative groups will be far stronger, far more intelligent, far more influential than the radical group. They will have the funds, the organs of opinion, the radio, all the instrumentalities of society. They will throw that strength on the side of some disguised fascism which will crack all our democratic safeguards, all our cherished ways of life.

But none of this can happen unless we have an economic crisis. There is one sure way to produce that economic crisis. That is to go into this war. There is only one way to avoid it—to stay out of this war and correct the conditions which make 11,000,000 people idle.

We are not, however, bothering about this enemy today. Instead, we are fighting Hitler. We are directing our attack against the wrong enemy, as England did, and we shall pay the same price.

America, Awake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD copies of three editorials from the Darien Review, Darien, Conn., written by one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Alfred N. Phillips, Jr., of Connecticut. While these are not necessarily my own views, I am sure that the Members of the House would be interested in knowing the sentiments of a former distinguished Member of this body.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Darien (Conn.) Review of May 16, 1940]

AMERICA, AWAKE

To the Readers of the Darien Review:

In the 17 years during which the Review Corporation has published the Darien Review I, as president of this corporation, have purposely withheld endeavoring to impose my ideas upon the readers of the Darien Review because I feel that a newspaper has an obligation to the community in which it is published—this obligation transcending any personal connections and aspirations of the publisher, especially if he is in public life. Now, however, I believe that the situation which confronts us is so dangerous that I take this opportunity to appeal directly to every reader of this newspaper.

While in Washington, as Representative of this congressional district, I felt that it was my duty to do everything I could for a stronger national defense even in the face of hostile criticism and ridicule as a "militarist," as a "warmonger," and as a "red baiter." However, I believe events have unfortunately borne out the wisdom of my judgment. I cite the past only to point out the possibilty that present or future predictions may not be ill-founded.

I call upon the people of Darien and the people of the United States everywhere to awake. Immediately communicate with your Governor, with your representatives in the legislature, with your Representatives in the United States Congress and support the President to the end that we are prepared in a military sense. Just the other day, in conversation with a prominent and high-ranking soldier, I learned that we are sadly lacking not only in antiaircraft guns, in medium caliber artillery such as antitank guns and in small arms, but actually in uniforms. Our Navy has aked for money for various purposes, including the making and placing of protective steel nets across the entrances to such bodies of water as Narragansett Bay, but our Representatives in Washington, including Representative AUSTIN from this district, voted against it. Our Navy has repeatedly recommended the fortification of the island of Guam, in the Pacific, and testified that in the event of war with Japan, the Japanese Fleet would be held up 2 whole weeks because of Guam being a fortified spearhead against attack; and yet our Representatives in Washington, including Representative AUSTIN from this district, voted against this. Two weeks would have meant a great deal to the people of Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

The National Guard is not numerous enough, together with our small Regular Army, to give us sufficient men for defense. Even so, employers are grumbling about letting National Guard men have 3 weeks away from employment for military training this summer. Also, it has been repeatedly testified that our Navy cannot be divided—it is a one-ocean Navy, or else it can be successfully attacked; and yet there are those in Washington who are trying to keep down our naval appropriations to "save money."

If our National Guard is called out, as it will be this summer, for military maneuvers or otherwise, who will protect us at home? Who will protect our waterworks, our telephone exchanges, our power plants, our bridges, and the electrification system of our railroads in case of some quickly operated subversive attack? Why do we not immediately organize, equip, and train a home guard to substitute for the National Guard in emergency, this home guard to be composed of "modern minute men"—men too old or too young for immediate military service, but capable of home defense?

It was testified before the House Naval Affairs Committee in Washington, of which I was a member, that if two cities in the United States were bombed out of existence we would not be able to put any new airplanes in use because these two cities furnish practically all of the airplane engines in the United States, one of these cities being in Connecticut, the other in New Jersey. Why do we not decentralize the production of such necessary war equipment so that a thousand plants all over the United States make such parts, some plants duplicating the work of others, so that if one plant is blotted out of existence the other can carry on?

Let us awake and let us prepare. Democrats, appeal to your Democratic Party organization for preparedness and against those who would hold us back. Republicans, appeal to such outstanding candidates of yours as VANDENBERG, of Michigan, who right now is holding back military preparedness. Independents, let it be known that you will not stand for a further delay in adequate military preparedness which is endangering the very safety of your loved ones.

What protects America right now against hostile attack with our fleet in Hawaii (where it probably should be to protect our rubber and tin supply from the East Indies to the United States) and with no fleet on the eastern seaboard, and the Panama Canal easily destroyable, with no adequately equipped army to protect us against a "lightning stroke"? How do we know that the Germans haven't a huge fleet of Zeppelins ready to fly thousands of men over here for the invasion of America under the protection of a cloud of war planes?

Let us awake and let us prepare or we face the fate of the small neutral countries of Europe.

ALFRED N. PHILLIPS, JR.,
President, the Review Corporation.

[From the Darien (Conn.) Review of May 23, 1940]

AMERICA, AWAKE

To the Readers of the Darien Review:

Events have moved swiftly since my last week's message on national defense to the readers of the Darien Review. Since then both Houses of Congress have taken prompt action to appropriate more funds for national defense, this action being taken after the personal appearance of the President before a joint session of the Congress for the purpose of discussing the shocking state of our lack of military preparedness. Activities have been legion along the line of building up our sadly lacking defenses. But these are only "on paper," so far. Months of hard, intense work will be needed to consummate all of this.

In the State of Connecticut the Governor has recognized the seriousness of the situation by placing armed guards on 24-hour duty in our armories and in announcing the organization of a State guard—a home guard, just as suggested in last week's message to you—to complement the work of the National Guard and serve when the National Guard is in camp.

However, this is not enough in view of the critical situation in Europe as affects those whose political philosophies are more like ours. If they perish, we stand a chance of perishing, too. When the Chief of Staff of the United States Army testifies that there are only 441 antiaircraft guns in the whole United States (compared with some 700 in the London area alone), and that we haven't arms, ammunition, equipment, or uniforms for more than 75,000 men, and that it will take 2 years to build adequate seacoast guns and when such an expert on flying as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker says that we will need hundreds of thousands of trained men to carry out the aviation-defense program of the President—and we certainly need this program—then we are in a sad plight indeed.

Also, it is shocking to visualize our condition if the British Fleet is turned over to Germany, also realizing that our fleet is not large enough to defend both of our seacoasts at once.

Let us arm, let us arm, let us arm. Let us organize immediately for national defense, for home defense. Let us build up the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Aviation Corps. Let us fill up the Connecticut National Guard by draft if necessary, to needed strength. Let us organize an adequate home-defense corps.

Communicate with your Governor and your representatives in the legislature and the United States Congress, to aid in all of this.

Let us work 24 hours a day for preparedness, to the end that airplanes, battleships, and war machinery and war munitions are provided. And let us decentralize our manufacturing so that our means of defense cannot be easily blotted out.

Let us unite and immediately get ready to resist any and every kind of invasion, and thus avoid the destruction of our loved ones, our form of government, our religion.

ALFRED N. PHILLIPS, JR.,
President, the Review Corporation.

[From the Darien (Conn.) Review of May 29, 1940]

AMERICA, AWAKE—LET US HAVE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Events and information have amply demonstrated our serious lack of defense. Trained soldiers capable of meeting the onslaughts of trained European soldiers cannot be made overnight. Courage and initiative have their place. However, these must be coupled with military training to make a soldier not only capable of meeting a trained enemy but also able to defend himself in such a fashion that the enemy cannot take advantage of him because of his lack of knowledge.

It is splendid to have our National Guard—even a stronger National Guard. It is necessary to have a home guard for home defense when the National Guard is called out. However, if we add together the total number of those in the Regular Army and in the Regular Army Reserve, the National Guard, and the proposed home-defense units, we still are far short of the numbers needed for adequate national defense—trained national defense.

Therefore let us no longer delay, let us not temporize with our security, with our liberties, while civilization as we have known it in the world crashes like a bombed house over our heads.

Let us have universal military service immediately for all of those young men who have reached the age of 18 years.

Let us house these young men well. Let us feed these young men well. Let us train them adequately immediately to defend their mothers, their sisters, their homes, their liberties, and their religions against those who look with longing eyes gloatingly upon our huge silver hoard stored at West Point, our huge gold hoard stored in Kentucky, our Territories and our insular possessions—and who would destroy us if for no other reason than because we are the last bulwark of democracy and Christianity in this "new" barbaric world.

Let us arm, let us arm, let us arm. Let us organize immediately for national defense—for home defense. Let us build up the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Aviation Corps. Let us organize an adequate home-defense corps.

Let us have universal military service.

Communicate with your Governor and your representatives in the legislature and the United States Congress, to aid in all of this.

Let us work 24 hours a day for preparedness to the end that airplanes, battleships, and war machinery and war munitions are provided. And let us decentralize our manufacturing so that our means of defense cannot be easily blotted out.

Let us unite and immediately prepare to resist any and every kind of invasion and thus avoid the destruction of our loved ones, our form of government, our religion.

ALFRED N. PHILLIPS, Jr.,
President, the Review Corporation.

Deportation of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, not being a lawyer I cannot discuss the legal side of this, but I want to express the feeling of the man on the street or behind the plow, those good people who love liberty and never use it as a license.

Last fall I was in the Canal Zone and contacted about 40 officers of the Army, Navy, as well as of the air force, and every one of them asked the same question, "Why don't you in Congress get rid of the Communists?"

Why do not you get rid of Harry Bridges? An officer in the Army Intelligence Service said the Communists are Americas greatest threat. If our armed forces fear them how can anyone in this body defend them? The Secretary of Labor has refused to take action, as well as defended them, and we have had to listen to the chairlady of the committee defend Bridges on this floor. Bridges has called up the Secretary of Labor from California on the long-distance telephone as often as several times a week. If the administration had not defended this hell-raiser he would have been deported long ago. He is guilty of nearly all the crimes on the calendar. He should not be deported, but shot on American soil as a warning to all of his kind.

If They Vote To Go Home, Vote To Keep Them There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to place myself on formal record as being utterly opposed to the adjournment of the Congress, in line with the plans of Mr. Roosevelt and his leaders on both sides of the Capitol.

If there ever was a time for us to remain on the job to discharge our responsibilities, and to service the present needs of our country, it is now.

The people have a right to learn what is going on; they have a right to make their opinions known; and they have a right to expect that Congress will remain on the job to do every needed thing and to prepare for every development that can be reasonably anticipated.

If Mr. Roosevelt, through pressure on his New Deal majority, can force the adjournment of Congress the people will be thoroughly helpless and thoroughly out of touch with their Government, except through such communiques that Mr. Roosevelt may issue from time to time on the state of the Nation.

The people of this country are not willing to trade democratic processes for White House communiques, not yet, or ever. The country, in my opinion, is determined not to suspend our constitutional functions in favor of one-man rule.

To adjourn the Congress now would be to adjourn the right of the people to representation, in every matter touching the present crisis, in the only forum which is wholly theirs.

Protests from all over the country are deluging Washington against this administration's plan to adjourn this Congress. The editorial in the Washington Daily News of June 12 typifies what, I am confident, is the opinion of all of our people. Under leave to include it as a part of my own remarks, I append it here. It is as follows:

IF THEY VOTE TO GO HOME, VOTE TO KEEP THEM THERE

Within a few days Congress may be called upon to cast the most important vote of 20 years.

That will happen if administration leaders persist in their effort to force an adjournment.

Any Congressman who does vote to adjourn and go home should be commanded by his constituents to remain at home.

Any elected representative of the people who is so insensible of his Constitutional obligations that he would voluntarily abandon his post at a time like this is, we believe, unfit for the responsibility of service in Congress.

The terrible conflict in Europe goes rapidly from bad to worse. Any day may bring the need for fateful decisions involving our Nation's peace and security. Borrowed billions have been laid on the line for rearmament. But to turn dollars into weapons in the quantities needed, old industries will have to be invigorated and new ones created. Only Congress can do what is necessary to mobilize idle capital and manpower for this supreme task.

Overnight it may become not a matter for academic debate but an imperative necessity to order compulsory military training and conscript men for defense duty. Congress alone has that power and responsibility.

Our Government has operated in the red through 11 years of apparent peace and security. Confronted now with need for gigantic new defense expenditures, nothing substantial has been done to weed out old wastes, and the only tax proposal yet made won't even balance the nonmilitary outgo. Congress is the Nation's fiscal guardian.

Yet it is suggested that Congress pack up and go home. It is suggested that if an "emergency" should arise the President will summon Congress back to a special session—a procedure which requires several days in a period where there may be no day to spare. Incidentally, an adjournment and a special session summons would mean that the lawmakers would be legally entitled to collect travel allowance, at 20 cents a mile, to their homes and back to Washington. No such allowances are legal if Congress merely recesses a few days at a time through the summer. We would accuse no Congressman of wanting to be a mileage patrioteer.

But we repeat that any who votes to go home at a time like this ought to be made to stay there—and very probably will be.

International Intrigue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Members of Congress a clearer understanding of the insidiousness of the propaganda employed by the administration and others who are set on involving us in war, I quote a letter sent from the Polish Embassy in Washington to the Polish Minister in Warsaw. This letter is self-explanatory, and gives revealing facts that Members of Congress ought to know.

WASHINGTON, *January 12, 1939.*

[Confidential]

Embassy of the Republic of Poland in Washington.

Re internal political situation in United States of America (public opinion against Germany, the Jewish question).

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN WARSAW:

Public opinion in America nowadays expresses itself in an increasing hatred of everything Fascist, hatred of Chancelor Hitler, and, in fact, everything connected with national socialism. Above all, propaganda here is entirely in Jewish hands. Jews own practically 100 percent of the broadcasting stations, cinemas, press organs, and periodicals. Although American propaganda is somewhat roughshod, and paints Germany as black as possible—they certainly know how to exploit religious persecutions and concentration camps—yet, when bearing public ignorance in America in mind, their propaganda is so effective that people here have no real knowledge of the true state of affairs in Europe. Nowadays the majority of Americans regard Chancelor Hitler and national socialism as the greatest evil and the greatest danger that have befallen the world.

The whole situation in this country constitutes an excellent forum for all classes of public speakers and for refugees from Germany and Czechoslovakia who are not backward in inflaming American public opinion with a torrent of anti-German abuse and vilification. All these speakers extol American liberty and compare it with conditions in the totalitarian countries. It is interesting to observe that in this carefully thought-out campaign—which is primarily conducted against national socialism—no reference at all is made to Soviet Russia. If that country is mentioned, it is referred to in a friendly manner and people are given the impression that Soviet Russia is part of the democratic group of countries. Thanks to astute propaganda, public sympathy in United States of America is entirely on the side of "red" Spain.

Side by side with this propaganda an artificial war panic is also created. Americans are induced to believe that peace in Europe is hanging by a thread and that war is inevitable. No effort is spared to impress upon the American mind that in the event of a world war the United States of America must take an active part in a struggle for freedom and democracy.

President Roosevelt was first in the field to give expression to his hatred of fascism. He had a twofold purpose in mind: Firstly, he wanted to divert American public opinion from difficult and complicated domestic problems, particularly, however, from the struggle that was going on between capital and labor. Secondly, by creating war panic and rumors of a European crisis, he wanted to induce Americans to endorse his huge program of armaments, as that program was in excess of normal American requirements.

Commenting on Roosevelt's first purpose, I must say that conditions on the American labor market are constantly growing worse—unemployment today already totals 12,000,000. Federal and State administrative expenditure is increasing daily. The billions of dollars which the Treasury spends on relief work is the only factor which at present maintains a certain amount of peace and order in this country. So far there have been only the usual strikes and local unrest. But no one can say how long this state subsidy will continue. Public agitation and indignation, severe conflicts between private enterprise and enormous trusts on the one hand, and with labor circles on the other, have created many enemies for Roosevelt and caused him many sleepless nights. As to Roosevelt's second purpose, I can only add that, as an astute politician and expert on American mentality, he has succeeded in quickly and adroitly diverting public opinion from the true domestic situation and interesting that opinion in foreign policy.

The modus operandi was perfectly simple. All Roosevelt had to do was to stage correctly, on the one hand, the menace of world war brought about by Chancelor Hitler, while on the other hand, a bogey had to be found that would gabble about an attack on the United States of America by the totalitarian countries. The Munich Pact was indeed a godsend to President Roosevelt. He lost no opportunity in translating it as France's and England's capitulation to bellicose German militarism. As people say in this country, Hitler drew a gun on Chamberlain. In other words, France and England had no choice and had to conclude a most shameful peace.

Furthermore, the brutal treatment meted out to the Jews in Germany as well as the problem of the refugees are both factors which intensify the existing hatred of everything connected with German national socialism. In this campaign of hatred, individual Jewish intellectuals such as Bernard Baruch, Lehman, Governor of New York State, Felix Frankfurter, the newly appointed Supreme Court Judge, Morgenthau, the Financial Secretary, and other well-known personal friends of Roosevelt have taken a prominent part in this campaign of hatred. All of them want the President to become the protagonist of human liberty, religious freedom, and the right of free speech. They want the President to punish all anti-Semitic agitation. This particular group of people, who are all in highly placed American official positions and who are desirous of being representatives of true Americanism, and as champions of democracy are, in point of fact, linked with international Jewry by ties incapable of being torn asunder. For international Jewry—so intimately concerned with the interests of its own race—President Roosevelt's ideal role as a champion of human rights was indeed a godsend. In this way Jewry was able not only to establish a dangerous center in the New World for the dissemination of hatred and enmity, but it also succeeded in dividing the world into two warlike camps. The whole problem is being tackled in a most mysterious manner. Roosevelt has been given the power to enable him to enliven American foreign policy and at the same time to create huge reserves in armaments for a future war which the Jews are deliberately heading for.

It is easy for American domestic policy to divert public opinion in this country from an increasing anti-Semitic feeling. This is done by talking of the necessity for defending faith and individual liberty against the menace of fascism.

JERZY POTOCKI,
Ambassador of the Republic of Poland.

I now quote another letter so that the Members of Congress may be better informed as to the extent which this administration has implicated the United States in the present European war:

PARIS, *February —, 1939.*

[Strictly confidential]

Embassy of the Republic of Poland.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN WARSAW:

A week ago the Ambassador of the United States, W. Bullitt, returned to Paris after a leave lasting 3 months, which he spent in America. Since his arrival I have had two long conversations with

him, which enable me to inform you of his views with regard to the European situation and to give a survey of the policy in Washington.

1. There is no foreign policy in the United States aiming at taking any direct part in the development of conditions in Europe. Such a foreign policy would also be impossible, for it would not be sanctioned by public opinion, which in this respect has not altered its isolationist point of view. On the other hand, the American people show proof of an extraordinary strengthened interest in European affairs. Indeed, internal affairs are relegated to the background when compared with them and lose that attention which they formerly enjoyed. The international situation is considered by official circles to be extremely serious and threatened with the danger of an armed conflict. Those in authority are of the opinion that should it come to a war between Britain and France on the one hand and Germany and Italy on the other, in which Britain and France might suffer defeat, then the Germans might become a danger to the real interests of the United States on the American continent. For this reason the participation of the United States in the war on the side of France and Britain might be anticipated from the outset, but naturally only a certain time after the outbreak of war. Ambassador Bullitt expressed himself in these words:

"Should a war break out, we shall certainly not participate at the beginning, but we shall finish it."

In Ambassador Bullitt's opinion, the above-mentioned point of view of official Washington circles lacks all idealism, and results entirely from the necessity of defending the real interests of the United States, which in the case of a Franco-British defeat would simultaneously be seriously and directly threatened from the Pacific as well as from the Atlantic.

Ambassador Bullitt stated that the rumor that he had said to President Roosevelt that the frontier of the United States lay on the Rhine was false. On the other hand, he expressed his conviction that the President had most certainly said that he was sending airplanes to France, for the French Army was the first defense line of the United States. This, as a matter of fact, corresponded entirely with his own views.

2. Italian demands on France are absolutely devoid of any foundation and argument which might even justify them to some extent. France, therefore, cannot and may not make even apparent concessions. Any surrender on the part of France would mean the undermining of her prestige in Africa. For that reason every possible compromise at the cost of French interests must be avoided.

Speaking theoretically, the fear exists that Britain might possibly attempt with Berlin to force upon France, at a moment of tension, a compromise not reconcilable with her own interests. In such a case, France will be able to count upon the strong support of Washington. As far as Britain is concerned, the United States controls various and immensely important means of coercion. The mere threat to make use of them would suffice to cause Britain to withdraw from any policy of compromise at France's expense.

It is to be reckoned with that Britain's prestige has greatly suffered in the eyes of American public opinion through the events in the Far East and the results of the Munich Conference. On the other hand, American public opinion realizes how much Britain desires today collaboration with the United States, and its support.

Given these conditions, it must be assumed that Hitler and Mussolini would not allow Italian claims on France to be the reason for the commencement of an open conflict with Britain and France.

It is naturally a weak side of the United States that, although they have already now decided upon their standpoint in a possible case of conflict, nevertheless, at the same time they can take no active part in the positive solution of European problems as American opinion with its conception of isolation would not permit this.

3. The relation between leading American circles and Italy and Germany is negative, principally for the reason that although they are of the opinion that the recent successes of the Rome-Berlin axis, which undermine both the prestige and the authority of France and Britain as imperial powers, threaten almcst directly the real interests of the United States. Consequently the foreign policy of Washington will counteract any possible further development of the situation in this direction.

In their relations with Italy and Germany, the United States have at their disposal various means of coercion which are already being very seriously examined and organized. These means which are principally of an economic nature are such that they could be used without the slightest fear of any internal political resistance. Both for Rome and for Berlin they will undoubtedly be sufficiently effective and perceptible. Ambassador Bullitt is of opinion that any pressure exerted upon Italy and Germany by the United States on the one hand and by Britain on the other could in great measure prevent the outbreak of an armed conflict or avoid the development of the European situation in a direction which would be undesirable from the point of view of Washington.

Replying to my observation that from the present state of affairs it was not clear whether the United States would be prepared to fight Germany and Italy for the French colonies, or to fight for certain systems and ideologies. Ambassador Bullitt declared categorically that Washington's attitude would be solely determined by the real interests of the United States and not by ideological problems.

I must add that Ambassador Bullitt seems quite convinced of the ruthless resistance of France to the Italian demands, and consequently does not entertain any possibility of mediation on the part of Britain or perhaps of Britain and Germany, the aim of which would be a compromise at France's expense.

For the time being I should like to refrain from formulating my own opinion with respect to Ambassador Bullitt's statements. It is in fact my desire to obtain from him beforehand some additional explanations. One thing, however, seems certain to me, namely, that President Roosevelt's immediate policy will tend to support France's resistance, to stay the German-Italian pressure, and to weaken Britain's tendencies to compromise.

J. LUKASIEWICZ,
Ambassador of the Republic of Poland.

Memorandum by M. Jan Wszelaki, Polish Commercial Counselor, on a conversation with Mr. Joseph Kennedy, Ambassador of the United States of America, in London on June 16, 1939

[Strictly confidential]

Ambassador Kennedy, whom Ambassador Biddle had notified of my arrival in London, asked me to call on him. My visit lasted for three-quarters of an hour.

The following points are worthy of note:

1. The Ambassador began by asking me what the impression of Germany's economic situation was in Poland; he himself stressed the fact that he believed that Germany would be able for some time to go on ruining the world with expenditure on armaments and that she really seemed to have no alternative but war. In his opinion, any abandonment on the part of Germany of her line in politics, including her financial and economic policy, would be tantamount to a lost war for her. War, on the other hand, at least provided a certain possibility for Germany of enforcing her claims, and therefore, if pressed, she would not shrink from this eventuality. He commented somewhat scathingly on certain optimists who inclined toward the belief that Germany would be easily and rapidly conquered or who counted on a quick revolution in that country.

2. The Ambassador emphasized the fact that the western powers were being brought to the verge of bankruptcy if the present rate of armaments were to continue for any length of time. Even if there were no war during the current year, neither Great Britain nor the United States would discontinue or restrict their program of armaments. As a result, Great Britain had already privately provided for currency restrictions; it was already impossible to invest British capital abroad, or to transfer it to other countries, without permission of the Government. Each day was bringing fresh difficulties and limitations of this kind.

3. During the course of the conversation the Ambassador asked me about the situation in Poland and our requirements, which provided me with an opportunity of taking up the subject at greater length. The Ambassador said that we were the only people in eastern Europe whose armaments, and also whose military qualities, could be relied upon with absolute certainty. He mentioned his opinion that the Polish volunteers on the republican side in Spain had proved themselves superior as soldiers to all others on either side. He asked what we required from Britain in the way of material and financial assistance. I answered by giving an outline of the situation in general, repeating, to a certain degree, the introductory statement which Colonel Koc had made in front of the Englishmen the day before. I drew special attention to the cash credit. The Ambassador asked me how much cash we were demanding from the British. I answered by stating that we were informing them of our needs in this respect. The sum total of these needs, once they had been fixed by joint agreement, would then show the total cash required. The Ambassador agreed that the cash was the essential point and stated that if the British were going to limit their assistance in this respect at the present moment, they would have to provide 10 times the amount later on in order to obtain the same results. He added that he would see the Prime Minister and Lord Halifax and would insist on the necessity of aiding Poland immediately with cash.

4. In conclusion the Ambassador mentioned that his two sons, who had recently traveled all over Europe and had seen and learned a great many things, intended, after their return to the States, to deliver a series of lectures at Harvard University on the situation in Europe and in the various countries.

The Ambassador attaches great importance to these lectures since they would be largely responsible for the trend of American public opinion. "You cannot imagine," said the Ambassador, "to what an extent my eldest boy, who has recently been in Poland, is able to influence the President. I should say that the President believes him more than he does me. Perhaps because Joe pictures the situation with such conviction and enthusiasm."

I am to see the Ambassador again next week and meet his son.

JAN WSZELAKI,
Commercial Counselor.

Received:
Ambassador Raczynski.
Minister Koc.
Director of the Cabinet Lubienski.
Minister Arciszewski.

LEGATION OF THE POLISH REPUBLIC IN STOCKHOLM,
Stockholm, April 15, 1939.

TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, WARSAW:

In connection with the report of the 8th of April of the current year No. 19/3/4, the legation communicates that further information received on the subject of the sojourn of Minister Hudson on Stockholm proves that he has not met with great success in this territory.

It seems that Minister Hudson showed too little ability in the conducted conversations here and ever antagonized the native agricultural elements.

As I was informed by one of the prominent representatives of the financial world here, Hudson probed this country as to the attitude of the Swedes in case of war, suggesting the necessity of detaining all the exports of raw materials to the Germans.

The Swedes then gave him to understand that they wished to retain their neutrality, and in case of war the Baltic will be seized by the Germans, and as a consequence they will not be able to avoid supplying ore. The situation evidently would be different if the Baltic would be in control of the English.

During the conference with the press, Hudson, it seems, urgently insisted on the necessity of enlarging the English imports to Seecen, giving to understand that the outcome of the foreseen endeavors of the delegation of the agricultural spheres would not give results, English would have to consider the revision of the commercial treaty. That prospect, as my informer told me, does not, however, frighten the Swedes. According to him, that treaty is not very profitable, since it contains hard clauses for the Swedes in respect to coal which they could buy cheaper elsewhere.

However, Sweden can also learn something from the demands put on her by England. Sweden's constant efforts to persuade other countries to buy Swedish goods which she can sell them only with the help of treasury subsidies, institute by themselves a dangerous diversion from a healthy management. This subsidized export weighs constantly over negotiations for trade agreements and institute for the country accepting this export the starting point for ever-growing demands for increasing its exports to Sweden. At home one often forgets the harmful side of this subsidized policy. The last effort of England was originated to use to advantage her power as a great importer in order to provide for herself a wider market in Sweden.

Goteborgs Handels-och Sjofarts Tidning from the 12th of April comments on Cassel's articles and showed the deductions. The paper especially points out to the English that the majority of their imports from Sweden consist of important raw materials and semi-manufactured goods necessary for its industry, such as wood and paper pulp, and that they buy them because of necessity and not from good will. And what concerns the subsidized exports dairy products, especially butter, which the English, thanks to the subsidy, received at a price 60 percent lower than their Swedish consumers; so if the gift to the English hurts them nothing is easier than to decrease the passivity of the commercial balance of England by this import from Sweden.

The general who from the beginning fought those subsidies as harmful for the economy of Sweden and the difficult way of promoting agriculture and dairy production thinks that it would be to the advantage of Swedish economy if the subsidy for the export of butter were abolished, the prices for the domestic consumption lowered, and the production directed toward other channels.

G. POTWOROWAKI, *Consul.*

MSZ—P. II.
P. III.
R. E.
Embassy R. P., London.

I have placed these remarks in the RECORD in order to inform Members of Congress and the people of this Nation about actual facts as they exist between our Government and that of foreign nations. Surely no one reading these reports will, for one moment, absolve our own Government from intrigue, and certainly not excuse anyone from the Executive to those who represent this Government in its foreign relations. This has all been done without any knowledge of Congress, and after all it is the legislative branch which is responsible for the security of this Nation. The time has come when each and every man in the Congress of the United States must lay all political thoughts aside and join hands in order to keep us from becoming involved in the present European conflict, which this correspondence clearly shows is the policy upon which this administration has embarked.

I have more of these letters, and it is my firm opinion they should be printed so that this information may be available to every Member of this Congress of the United States.

Against Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, Congress must not adjourn. In my campaign for election to Congress in 1938 I made the statement on several occasions and from various platforms that the country was due for a great upheaval, and that catastrophe would face us before another election. My conclusions, then made as a result of careful previous study, have now been borne out, and we all know now just how serious a situation we face. We should not even think of adjourning. I knew when I came here that this Seventy-sixth Congress would be another very important 76 in our national history.

Some Members feel that they must get home to campaign and to build their political fences. I feel that the grateful and patriotic people back home will do our campaigning for us if we stay on the job here for them and take care of their problems as we should. Even if defeated, we should do this, because it is our pledged duty under our solemn oath of office.

Rather than to adjourn, let the 531 Members of Congress concentrate their efforts and ingenuity on our national problems and on the preservation of peace, and we can certainly feel then that we have done our duty.

I have received already in this morning's mail over 50 messages from citizens of our State demanding that we stay on the job here. Every mail brings another deluge. One woman writes as follows:

Note what you say about Congress adjourning the 22d. Pretty risky business to go away and leave one man in charge. He may have us in the midst of the war before we know it. Some people think that we are in duty bound to mix into it, but it must be they haven't sons who would have to give their sweet young lives.

A. M. K.

A telegram from a business group is very definite on the subject and reads as follows:

JUNE 12, 1940.

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Personal Delivery, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned think it most important that Congress remain in session during the much-talked-of crisis, if one actually exists. We also regard the defense program as urgent, and earnestly ask your support. It is our opinion that if this country faces a great emergency the blame rests directly upon a policy of meddling and of too intemperate talking. Let's set matters right in our own country before attempting world-wide reformation. We insist upon no foreign interference in this hemisphere. Why should we interfere in the affairs of Europe?

J. R. Bruce, president, Bruce Publishing Co.; Arthur Cullen, editor, Hardware Trade Magazine; H. S. McIntyre, secretary, Northwest Shoe Retailers' Association; L. F. Leland, president, Leland Publishing Co.; W. T. Coulter, secretary, National Merchants Association; Gordon Anderson, editor, Automotive Journal; W. J. Pierce, editor, Northwestern Druggist Magazine; Peters Sletterdahl, editor, Northwest Insurance Magazine; George Julsrud, president, Northwest Retail Dry Goods Association.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must not adjourn.

The Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Inglewood, Calif., in which said council, under unanimous agreement, places at the disposal of the proper authorities of the Government of the United States the resources, abilities, and personnel of the city of Inglewood in the development and maintenance of the national-defense program.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the City Council of the City of Inglewood is presently mindful of world conditions and is also mindful of the necessity for national defense as indicated by the President of the United States in recent statements; and

Whereas said council is of the opinion that each and every constituent unit of government should cooperate in the program of preparedness against any eventuality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Inglewood, Calif., as follows:

1. That said council does hereby endorse the program for the immediate strengthening of the defenses of this Nation;

2. That said council does hereby place at the disposal of the proper authorities of the Government of the United States the resources, abilities, and personnel of the city of Inglewood in the development and maintenance of such a program of national defense;

3. That to the end above stated the said council on behalf of said city invites the assistance and direction of the United States Government as to the particular methods to be used and the particular acts to be performed by said city and its personnel in such matters; and

4. That said city invites any authorized representative of the United States Government, from any of the recognized defense units of said Government, to at any time meet with the mayor and city council of said city for the purpose of developing and carrying forward any plan which will coordinate with the plans of the Government in the achieving of the objectives above referred to.

Reply to My Revilers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] indulged in smearing me by proxy and subtly attempted to fit me with the alleged crimes of people I do not know. In other words, he tried to fit me with a coat which, I believe, is a size which fits the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] himself better and is, therefore, also suitable to the N. S. A. N. L.

I replied to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] on May 6, not by personal attack upon him or upon the members of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League. I discussed, instead, the purpose of the league, which seems to be boycott and racial agitation to bring about hatreds toward those they designate as their enemies; a league which in reality expects that the majority of the American people must conform to the wishes of those who comprise the leadership of this un-American organization.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and his people have not at any time even attempted to disprove statements which I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am sure that, did I deviate from facts in one paragraph, such error on my part would be used to flay me and to tear my reputation asunder.

Why are the national press, the Communist press, the Jewish press, Jewish organizations, Jews in general, Jewish broadcasters, Jewish stooges, and Jewish Members of Congress employed in a campaign to slander me, a plain individual, Member of the lower House, and one of the common people? Is it not because my statements are true? Is it not because my statements have been based upon what the Jews say about themselves in their own books? Is it not because the data I use and the statements I make are based upon documented information taken from State papers and from World War intelligence reports? I know, from the information I have, that members of the "fifth column" who operated as enemies of the United States during the World War, had their offices in Wall Street. They were, indeed, the big-wigs among the international financial exploiters.

Can anyone be so naive as to believe that I would not be ridiculed, satirized, and condemned by my own statements were even one of them untrue? These international mud-slingers have not even pretended to meet me on common ground. They have been no fairer to me than they are to the average American who believes in the fundamental principles of our Republic. They do not deal intelligently with any subject, for they try instead to confuse the people by misquotation and deliberate false statements. In this they often go too far in their attacks, which is clearly proved by their apologies to me for statements made in The Voice, and for satisfaction in a suit against the author of a book which libeled other Members of Congress and myself.

The gentleman from Illinois bemoans the fact that I have written 420 columns in the RECORD. How terrible, indeed, when the New Deal has wasted billions of dollars without the slightest relief or reduction in the ranks of the unemployed. What a dreadful thing it is to inform our own people about actual facts. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and his masters now object to anyone who, in pursuance of obligated duty to the people of this Nation, apprises them of those who are now actively engaged in sabotage of industries and destruction of the Government of this Republic.

I regret that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and his people condone the activities of the "fifth column," and I particularly regret that the gentleman himself does not honor his obligation and inform the people of this Nation of the real facts.

My remarks have been inserted in the RECORD in order to protect innocent American Jews who are in no sense responsible for the activities of the international financiers who backed the World War, the communistic revolution in Russia, the communistic revolution in France, and who are now the sugar daddies of the "fifth column" in the United States, which is operating under the benevolent protection of the New Deal, its leaders, and other hidden rulers to whom I have often referred as the invisible Government of the United States.

My reason for informing the people about the actual situation which now confronts us in the United States is to protect the Jews who have dropped the hyphen and become, like the rest of us, plain American citizens. My remarks have been inserted in the RECORD to save the innocent when the American people finally discover the real identity of the "fifth column" and its financial sponsors.

I shall ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] or those who wrote his speech to answer the following question: Why do the international Jews label everyone who refuses to lick their boots anti-Semitic? Why not call them anti-Jew, and stop trying to fool the people by designating those who expose international intrigue as anti-Semitic, when they are, instead, pro-American, or let me say, just plain ordinary American citizens with our country's interest at heart. If the Jew discovers someone who does not like him, why not call him anti-Jew and be done with it? Such statement would be more proper and would certainly be much more appropriate than the pseudonyms now employed by the international financial Jewish organizations.

Do you not believe it would be ridiculous for a people who have, by hook or crook, obtained control of gold, money, and credit, to ask for help from those they have deprived of gold, sound money, and secured investments? Do you not believe it would be ridiculous for a people who are engaged in large-scale national and international banking, and who own or control our daily press, radio, movies, news service and distribution, newsstands and the major parts of major industries, to ask us, who have nothing, to help them and to protect them from being attacked or discovered by the very people who have been deprived of their property? Do you not believe it would be ridiculous for a people who control alcohol production, gambling, lending agencies, pawn shops, and all governments with the exception of Germany, Italy, and possibly Japan, to ask us, the American people, to help them and to sacrifice the lives of our young men in order to keep them in control, and to go to war with such nations as object to their domination? Do you not think it is ridiculous for a people who control national and world industries and whose people are fully employed in such industries and in the Government of the United States, to complain or to revile those who are trying to rehabilitate this Nation and return it to the principles of sound constitutional government?

A distinction must, however, be drawn, for I realize that there are people among us of Jewish descent or Jewish parentage who are unemployed, but it must be remembered that they are Americans as they are not in sympathy with the international Jew and his ambition. They are, therefore, treated by him as he treats other ordinary, plain American citizens, namely, with the utmost contempt and inconsideration.

Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], indirectly, by referring to others, attempts to implicate me in their presumed crimes in order to label me "Nazi." Mr. Speaker, on inquiry as to the meaning of the word "Nazi," I find it is an abbreviation for "national socialism," and it is socialism and its more streamlined brother, communism, that I opposed and condemned in 1938, and which I hold in utter contempt today.

The word "Nazi" is, therefore, not applicable to anyone who opposes communism or socialism. Neither is "Nazi" applicable to anyone who believes in the fundamental principles of this Republic.

I defy anyone to find one paragraph, sentence, or word in any of my remarks or any statements that I have ever made that are not in the strictest accord with the fundamental principles of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

I also defy anyone—and that goes for the Jewish Intelligence Service, too—to find where I have been connected in even the slightest degree with any foreign government service.

I came to this country from Norway in 1892. I served in the Merchant Marine, the Revenue Service, and volunteered with the Virginia Naval Reserves; was petty officer in charge of the U. S. S. *Siren* in 1899, and continued to serve in the Merchant Marine until 1907, when I took up the study of medicine at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Baltimore, Md. I have been connected with the Merchant Marine and United States naval forces for over 20 years, and in 1935, enlisted again by request, in order to help reorganize medical units for the thirteenth naval district. I was 59 years old at this, my last enlistment, and after having spent 14 days in a hospital following an operation, I, to comply with orders from the commanding officer of the thirteenth naval district, drove to Boise, Idaho, a distance of 526 miles, to organize a medical unit. I made that trip 5 days after being discharged from the hospital, and drove approximately 1,050 miles, in the middle of the winter, when the mountain passes and roads were covered with snow.

In 1936, I spent 2 months with the fleet on its battle-problem cruise. In 1937, I served in the United States Navy again, during two periods, for training and as chief medical officer aboard the U. S. S. 57, on a trip to Canada.

My service record is in the Bureau of Navigation, and anyone who so desires may, as far as I am concerned, examine that record.

I therefore challenge the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and any others who have accused me, to prove the statements which they have made in regard to my patriotism.

I admit that I am rabidly opposed to Marxian socialism, nazi-ism, and communism, and for that I apologize to no one.

It is unfortunate that Jewish commentators on the air and in the papers should see fit to use their positions to revile and abuse me, without ascertaining whether or not they are dealing with facts. Their attitude is incomprehensible to Jewish friends whom I have in my community, for they know that I have never looked upon them in any other manner than as Americans.

It was only after I came here and found that alien-minded international Jews, such as the Warburgs, dominate the Federal Government and occupy many major positions, especially in its departments, that I realized that we are as Jew-dominated as England and France, and as Germany was until 1933.

Here in the House, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] objects to remarks which I have inserted in the RECORD, but he has not been able to contradict any sentence in my remarks. Like the rest, he only resorts to name calling, which, if nothing else, but proves the truth of the statements that I have made. As a matter of fact, his objections are not to my remarks but to the space they occupy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that, Mr. Speaker, I contend, is a matter for the Joint Committee on Printing and for the House to decide.

The only issue taken with my remarks is in regard to the so-called House letter, and, Mr. Speaker, this letter may be found unsigned in the 1928 and 1929 volume on the Geneva hearings in the Senate of the United States, and it was, therefore, a Government record of 12 years ago. I shall, however, refer to this later.

I may also say at this point that I have not at any time attacked any Member of this House, indirectly or directly, by inference or otherwise, and it is not my desire to do so now, for I am only concerned in establishing my position as it is recorded in the service of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yesterday objected to the inclusion with my remarks of photostats of letters which bear the original signatures, and are therefore as authentic as photostatic letters used by the Government in its questioning of witnesses before the Dies committee. If photostats of letters can be used to investigate private American citizens, they certainly should occupy the same status in proving that Ambassadors Bullitt, Biddle, and Kennedy have been engaged in international intrigue calculated to involve this country in the present European war—intrigue which is today verified by statements in the Washington Times-Herald. If the Members of this House could read the information in this book, they would not only recommend impeachment of our foreign ambassadors, but they would question the intentions of the Executive himself.

Mr. Speaker, I have these records here in my hand, and I believe, although it will take a little space, that it is the duty of Congress to insert this information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the people of this Nation may be informed of the extent to which this administration has involved this Nation, without the consent or even the knowledge of the Congress of the United States.

Could the people be informed of the actual facts as they are set forth in this information that I have here on this table, no one in this country would consider our participation in any foreign war.

Mr. Speaker, the information contained here in this evidence which I have in my possession is substantiated—and I want to emphasize this—by the article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning.

THE NON-SECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE

The letter which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 2 from the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League infers that Mr. Pelley wrote a speech which I gave in New York, and which I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2707. I flatly deny this, and I defy anyone to find one sentence in that speech that is not based upon the very essence of the Constitution itself. It is these very principles that the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League and other international Jews disclaim, and because of their unwillingness to accept these principles that I enunciate they resort to mud slinging and other forms of character assassination.

In order to inform the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League and their sympathizers of the real organizers of the Nazi government, or the National Socialist Government of Germany, I shall again quote an authority whom I do not believe the league can deny, and that gentleman is Rabbi Judah L. Magnus, now president of the University of Jerusalem. On January 16, 1919, he said:

It was Friedrich Julius Stahl, a born Jew, who laid down the classical theory of the German Nationalstaat based upon conservative Christianity and the politics of power. It was Benjamin Disraeli who is the father of the latter-day "tory democracy" of England. Just so, when the Jew gives his thought, his devotion, his spirit to the cause of the workers and of the dispossessed, of the

disinherited of the world, the radical quality within him there, too, goes to the roots of things, and in Germany he becomes a Marx and a La Salle, a Haase, and an Eduard Bernstein. In Austria he becomes a Victor Adler and a Friedrich Adler; in Russia, a Trotzky.

Just take for the moment the present situation in Russia and in Germany. The revolution set creative forces free, and see what a large company of Jews was available for immediate service. Socialist revolutionaries and mensheviki and bolsheviki, majority and minority Socialists—whatever they be called; and I assume that it is not a question at all at this moment of agreeing or disagreeing with any one of them—Jews are to be found among the trusted leaders and the routine workers of all those revolutionary parties.

It should be evident from this that it was the Jews themselves who organized the Nazi, or National Socialist Government of Germany, and they now shout "Nazi" at me and at others who are opposed to socialism and communism and the very government that they themselves organized and established in Germany.

The letter from the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, which Mr. SABATH quotes, raises this point—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5467:

Now, the Jews can be termed internationalists because of their religion and because of their racial group. Jews in the United States, England, France, Germany, Spain, Africa, South America, Canada, etc., are all Jews, and all have the same religion. But have you ever heard of the Catholics, Mr. THORKELSON? The American, English, Spanish, Italian, etc., Catholics all have the same religion. And how about the Protestants? Haven't the American, British, German, etc., Protestants the same religion? If their religion stamps the Jews as internationalists, how about the Catholics and Protestants?

In replying to this paragraph let me point out that a Catholic who claims Spain as his country is a Spaniard, and I, while of Norwegian descent and a Lutheran, claiming the United States as my country, look upon myself as an American. Religion does not affect citizenship. But a Jew living in Spain or any other country, as the letter states, considers himself first a Jew. To prove this let me quote from another distinguished gentleman, former Justice Brandeis:

Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, or shade of belief, is necessarily a member. * * * Organize, organize, organize—until every Jew in America must stand up and be counted—counted with us—or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to dwell upon this letter from the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League to any great extent, for it is so illogical that little consideration should be given to any statements made in it. For instance, the writer makes this statement:

You state that ours is a democratic Republic. That means, if it means anything, that democracy and republicanism are the keystone of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more absurd than that statement, for the keystone of this Republic is based upon State representation in the Senate of the United States, and popular representation in this House of Representatives, and that is so set forth in the Constitution of the United States. In other words, the keystone of this Government of the United States is the Constitution—and not "democracy," which is communism, nor "republicanism," which is merely a political party and therefore immaterial to this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, while I was absent from the House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 3006, an article and two letters, one from Emanuel Chapman and one from the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League. Both letters are libelous, but, I may say, no more than one would expect from either Mr. Emanuel Chapman or the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League.

In his remarks the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] incriminates me by insinuating that I am a fellow traveler of those he has designated as criminals. How can he know my thoughts or my sympathies? He must, of course, rely upon what I say, and my remarks made before the Christian Mobilizers appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 2707.

In the early part of his remarks he refers to the so-called House letter, which I have already said is a part of the Geneva hearings of the Senate, published in its hearings in 1928 and 1929. The letter appears in the hearings without signature, but is a part of the permanent records of Congress.

In my remarks accompanying the letter, I said to disregard the name appended to it, and the addressee of the letter, and I requested the Members to read the substance matter because it is important. The officers mentioned in the letter were decorated by the British Government, and are so recorded in the Whittaker's Almanac of 1919 and 1920, a book which may be found in the Library of Congress. The Carnegie remarks to which the letter referred were published in a bock entitled "Triumphant Democracy." In this, Mr. Carnegie expressed the hope that the wound that was left bleeding when the United States was separated from the British Empire may again be healed, and so restore the Empire. The same opinion was also expressed by Cecil Rhodes. This proves the substance matter of the letter which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11, 1939, and it is that to which I referred when I advised the Members to read the report.

As to Colonel House, I can only refer the Members who are interested in his war activities to the book, Philip Dru, Administrator, and to his autobiography, which is an indictment in itself. They may also read Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution, and Propaganda for War. These and many other volumes give a picture of Mr. Edward Mandell House much more complete than I would attempt to set out in these remarks. In the Senate hearings, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, report 944, part 6, this statement was made:

The committee finds, on the basis of testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter VI, Relation of Export Trade to United States Foreign Policy, 1915–16, that the essential problem in the submarine controversy between the United States and Germany lay in the matter of the status of armed merchantmen.

The committee is of the opinion that the unofficial negotiations of Colonel House, by which this private person sought to bring the United States into the war on the Allied side, contributed to the abandonment of the sound position in regard to armed merchantmen proposed by Secretary Lansing in the modus vivendi. The committee is, however, at a loss to account for the abandonment of this suggestion by the State Department merely in the face of the British refusal to consider it. The committee takes note, however, of the fact that the modus vivendi would have resulted in an increase in the effectiveness of the general blockade of the British Isles and an increased damage, correspondingly, to the American export trade in war materials. The committee also notes that use of the retaliatory powers to embargo war exports granted the President by Congress in September 1916 was rendered impossible by the discovery that their exercise would probably do more damage to American industry than to Great Britain.

I may say that this report is revealing, for it shows clearly and concisely that it was the financial international bankers, the House of Morgan, if you please, who were the main instigators in committing the United States to war in 1917.

I can very well recall 1917, when anyone who was seen in company with a person bearing a German name was considered to be pro-German, and I hope that we will never again allow ourselves to be stampeded by any sort of propaganda to bring about such ridiculous hysteria.

I do not want to go into a lengthy discussion of the remarks which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3006, but I want to call his attention to this fact:

The Jewish international press and the international Jews in the United States were openly pro-German until 1917, and subrosa pro-German during the period in which we were at war with Germany. Proof of this I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 25, 1939, under the title, "Can the American People Be Fooled Again?" It was the House of Warburg and Mr. Shieff who furnished money to Lenin and Trotsky for the Communistic revolution in Russia, and it is these international bankers who are

actually responsible for the loss of life in Russia which resulted from that revolution, and for communism as it now prevails throughout the United States. This money was furnished from New York, from Wall Street, if you please, from the financial fathers of the Communists in the United States, and this money was distributed through the Rhenish-Westphalian Syndicate, a Warburg organization in Germany, through the German Reichsbank and other Jewish financial controlled banks; through the Nya-Banken in Stockholm, the Hambro Bank in Norway, and through Haparanda, on the border of Sweden and Finland. It was through this latter city that much of the arms passed that were used by Lenin and Trotsky.

It is this information that I have set forth in my remarks in the House and my sole purpose in so doing has been to bring the truth before the people, the people who, in spite of the vicious propaganda that is trying to poison their minds, still believe in the fundamental principles of this Republic. To anyone who reads my remarks, this has been obvious, for I have not at any time deviated one iota from the basic principles of this Republic as set forth in our fundamental laws.

This is the position I have taken, for in spite of what may be said about me, I am not antiracial, anti-Semitic, anti-Jew, Nazi, or Fascist, but I am instead a plain, ordinary American citizen who believes in the fundamental principles of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

To the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH OF JUNE 11, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have come to a realization that is now shared by a great many of us here and by a representative cross section of the press in this country, that Congress alone stands between this Nation and total war.

Let us not deceive the people further with false cries of neutrality. We are not neutral. We are merely nonbelligerent.

In connection with the hysteria that is creeping over our people and which has found expression even in the Congress, I wish to commend to the attention of every Member of this body, a great editorial from a great paper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I ask unanimous consent to conclude these remarks by extending that splendid editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 11, 1940]

TO THE BRINK

President Roosevelt all but declared war yesterday.

He did not go all the way because, fortunately, this is still a democracy and, under our system, only the Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the people, can declare war.

But the President, with his immense power, can lead the Nation to the brink. This is what Roosevelt has done.

The President opened his speech with the words: "Every generation of young men and women in America has questions to ask the world."

While the country is still at least technically at peace, while the Bill of Rights is still functioning, we are going to take advantage of it and ask the President some questions.

But, first of all, we should like to draw a very brief contrast between Franklin Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Wilson led the United States into war in 1917 after a long period in which he did his agonizing best to keep us out of it. He led us into war only after a long series of overt acts by Germany against the United States—the sinking of our ships and the killing of our citizens.

This time there are no overt acts by Germany against the United States. Our ships are not being sunk. Our people are not being killed. Roosevelt, however, is doing his agonizing best to get us into the war. And he is doing so without the approval of public opinion. In contrast with the situation in 1917, we can now measure public opinion accurately. All the polls show that the people of the United States are overwhelmingly opposed to going to war.

Is this a democracy or isn't it? Are the people or their elected representatives to be consulted on a question of the utmost gravity—a question that involves the blood of American men—or not?

Is it not true that Roosevelt has proceeded along the very lines that Mussolini did, namely, to work up a war fever without permitting the Italian people to express their true convictions?

Is it not true that for a year or more Roosevelt has been so obsessed with foreign policy as to neglect domestic issues, and, worse, as to neglect the proper economic and military preparation of our country for the trying times that may be ahead?

Mr. Roosevelt, of course, sincerely believes that the defeat of the Allies would endanger the United States, and this sentiment is shared by millions of his countrymen, including this newspaper, but what is the sensible thing to do under the circumstances? Is it to enter the war in Europe or is it to build up our own defenses in a rational way?

If we assume, for the sake of discussion, that this country is ready and willing to follow Roosevelt into a European war, with what will the country fight?

Will it fight with an army which is microscopic compared to the great legions of Germany, Italy, and France? Will it fight with its Navy and leave the Pacific bare to the marauding ships of Japan? Will it fight with its handful of antiaircraft guns, not sufficient in number to guard even one moderately sized city? Will it fight with its 300 B–18 bombers, of which General Arnold, Chief of our Air Force, said to send them into battle would be suicide? Will it fight with its few so-called flying fortresses, which are now revealed to have three vital defects?

Obviously not. Far from being able to fight in Europe, the United States is actually unprepared to defend its own shores. And why, since this is the undeniable fact, does Roosevelt all but declare war on the dictators? His fifth cousin said: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." This Roosevelt speaks loudly and has nothing to back it up.

The President said yesterday that the material resources of the Nation would be offered to the Allies. What does he mean by this? By what authority does he make such a statement?

It is of a piece with the remainder of the President's speech—one of the most reckless speeches ever made by an American statesman. Is it not a fact that both Britain and France have billions of dollars earmarked for purchases in this country, and is it not also a fact that the things they need—modern airplanes and armored tanks—we haven't got either to sell or to give?

Has the President read the recently issued report of the Senate Naval Committee, which says that for the United States to go to war would mean a tragic sacrifice of the Nation's liberties and assets? Does he know that the committee, after carefully interviewing high-ranking officers of our armed forces, says that the United States is not prepared to give the Allies concrete help by intervening now, and will only jeopardize its own welfare by doing so?

The Naval Committee's report, printed in part on this page last Sunday, should be required reading for the President. It asks a question, too. It asks: "Why not face the basic military and economic fact that it is not within our power or means to create military or naval establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting their wars to this hemisphere?"

Mr. Roosevelt talks about the European shambles in terms of words like justice, freedom, liberty. Those are precious words, and those are precious things; but is it not true that the war in Europe is concerned about many other things besides abstract principles?

Is it not true that the war started in September of last year when Hitler invaded Poland and the declared reason for the entrance of France and Britain was to protect Poland? Was Poland a democracy? Ask the poor peasants of Poland, crushed under the heels of the Polish landlords, about that. Ask the Jews of Poland, who suffered the Polish brand of pogrom long before the Hitler brand was invented.

Justice, freedom, liberty; yes. These were the things we went to war for in 1917, and what happened? Instead of making the world safe for democracy, we ushered in the era of dictatorships, the age of the monstrous Hitler, the ghoulish Mussolini.

Is it not true that we are witnessing in Europe a tremendous convulsion of forces, of rival imperialisms, of have-not nations versus have nations, of age-old hatreds, of age-old quarrels? Is it not a radical oversimplification of a vast historical upheaval to describe it in the terms used by Mr. Roosevelt?

Mr. Roosevelt did his best to keep the war from happening. He failed. Now his job is to be President of the United States of America.

The Two Altars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. NELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

A POEM FOR TODAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem by Ruth Yolande Shaw, in which is expressed a sentiment which, happily, prevailed during the last World War, when the people of the United States took off the blind bridles of religious, political, and racial-origin differences and joined hands and hearts in a common cause. Surely the period through which we are now passing calls for nothing less.

THE TWO ALTARS

Jack Smith belonged to the Y. M. C. A.
Pat Mehan to the K. of C.
Both marched away 'neath the flag one day
To fight for the land of the free.
Jack bowed his head as he said a prayer;
Pat knelt with his parish priest;
Then they stood up square to go "over there"
To grapple the Hunnish beast.

Now, their altar rails were not the same,
Tho' they messed in the same old shack
But, just the same, 'twas the same great names
They worshiped, both Pat and Jack.
While Jack stood up straight as he humbly prayed,
Pat knelt at a candled shrine,
But the same God heard each whispering word
That hearkens to your'n and mine.

They didn't agree, did Jack and Pat,
On methods of worship true;
But what of that! They went to mat
For the old red, white, and blue.
They knelt apart, but 'twas side by side
They fought for their homes and right,
And the blood-red tide of the Kaiser's pride,
They battled by day and night.

So "over the top" to the glory side
Where never is war nor tears,
Where the true and tried in God's love abide,
With nothing of doubts and fears.
And the God they met as they entered
Where the souls of men are free,
Was the God of Jack's Y. M. C. A.,
And the God of Pat's K. of C.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Santa Monica, Calif., and forwarded to me by Hon. Claude C. Crawford, mayor of Santa Monica, at the request of the council.

The resolution directs attention to the fact that the United States is in need of adequate defenses on land, at sea, and in the air, and petitions Congress to enact such laws as will provide adequate machinery for the protection of the American people from the activities of the borers from within—the "fifth columnists," the subversive organizations now permitted to operate with impunity—and also laws providing protection of all airports, airplane factories, harbors, and essential industries of all sorts.

Whereas peace-loving nations of the world, nations in which the ideals of democracy and of human rights are paramount, presently are the victims of the largest scale unwarranted aggressions in the history of humanity; and

Whereas all of those nations invaded and attacked have possessed resources greatly coveted by their enemies and all have been unprepared for war; and

Whereas the United States of America today stands in grave danger by reason of its great wealth in industry and natural resources, its wholly inadequate defenses on land, at sea, in the air, and against the enemy boring from within, and the inherent love of peace which is the American heritage;

Now, therefore, the city council of the city of Santa Monica resolves as follows:

That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to pass such laws and to make such appropriations as to give this Nation an army, a navy, and an air force second to none in the world.

That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to enact such laws as will provide adequate machinery for the protection of the American people from the activities of the borers from within, the "fifth columnists," the subversive organizations now permitted to operate with impunity.

That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to enact laws which will make the protection of all airports, airplane factories, harbors, and essential industries of all sorts a duty of the armed forces of the United States of America, for the reason that all of these facilities rank equally with fortresses and battleships in the protection of our Nation's shores.

That the commissioner of public safety of the city of Santa Monica be, and he hereby is, instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable LELAND M. FORD, the Representative from the Sixteenth Congressional District of the State of California, for submission of the same to the Congress of the United States.

That the commissioner of public safety, ex officio mayor of the city of Santa Monica, be, and he hereby is, authorized and instructed to certify to the adoption of this resolution, and the commissioner of public works of the city of Santa Monica be, and he hereby is, authorized and instructed to attest the same.

Time for Intelligent Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WORLD AFFAIRS FOR JUNE 1940

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June number of World Affairs, the organ of the American Peace Society:

[From World Affairs for June 1940]

TIME FOR INTELLIGENT ACTION

England and France entered upon this war to prevent Germany from annexing certain countries adjacent to their borders. They had been warned by Herr Hitler that these border countries could not work together; that, being democracies, they would waste their time talking while he would be doing business; and that, therefore, it would be easy for him to "get them one by one." The Fuehrer has now "got" Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg. The fate of France and England is now hanging in the balance.

When such professedly free, sovereign, independent peoples are being mowed down by the mechanized forces of stark aggression, not only America's prized principles—principles including freedom in the realms of speech, politics, and religion—but the physical foundations of this country's safety are threatened. The more the destruction, the more the threat. In other words, that life and death struggle in Europe is coming more and more to make of us parties in interest.

In the light of such a serious and changing situation, what should America do? In the first place, it surely would serve no useful purpose to lead Germany and Italy to believe now that we

are a timorous people torn by conflicting advice and fearful of responsibility; that we who dare still to believe in the possibilities of a warless world are stunned to silence and inaction; that we approve the part of the coward—"Doubting in his abject spirit, till his Lord is crucified."

This means that we cannot be justified playing the role of the priest and the Levite, passing by "on the other side." The perpetrators of "blitzkrieg" should not be allowed to destroy by mere physical force what we of the western world conceive to be fundamental human rights, rights struggled for and won in the name of freedom and democracy, we merely standing by the while. It is clear that a victory by ruthless aggression could only postpone, and that for a long time, the accomplishment of any just and lasting peace in the world.

Since the interests and ideals of America are being imperiled, since what we conceive to be right is endangered by what we believe to be wrong, world affairs must associate itself with those who believe that the United States should openly throw its economic and moral weight now on the side of the Allies. Nazi aggression should be halted. We are morally bound, therefore, to play an honorable and worthy part in that business. We have come face to face with the necessity of choosing between two evils, in which case it is our duty to choose the lesser, and to choose with an unfaltering unity and nobility of purpose.

The United States faces three immediate duties: One to itself, one to the civilian sufferers from war, and one to the Allied nations. This means that our country should spend every ounce of its energy to keep the devastations of war away from this hemisphere, which means, among other things, alas, that we as a people must turn realistically to increasing our defenses under the direction of our best minds, including our ablest masters of industry. It means also that every possible aid should be given through the American Red Cross or other accredited bodies to appropriate relief agencies abroad. Finally, again as a matter of mere morals, it means that the time has come for us to help to the utmost those directly engaged in stemming the tides of ruthlessness. Neutrality is no longer enough.

Faced with three such challenges, it is for our democracy to prove that it can be quick, resolute, and intelligent in action. It is our opportunity to express again the generous heart and spiritual substance of America, calmly but effectively.

Elimination of Poll Tax as a Voting Requirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE FOR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, straw votes and unofficial polls have been gaining both in popularity and in the precision with which they reflect public sentiment. The methods used in the Gallup poll have come to be accepted as infinitely superior to the antiquated method used in, say, the Literary Digest poll of 1936. I have been watching these straw votes with considerable interest to see how different methods are devised to get an expression from ever more representative sections of the American public. Of course, the ultimate object is to get down deep enough into the less articulate strata of the people to find out what the public is going to say on the next election day.

Recently a new method of sampling has been devised and I am convinced that it has certain points of superiority over any of the methods heretofore used. By this new method sample ballots are sent out, one to each organization of every character and description—to the Elks and Masons and other lodges; to church groups, Y. W. and Y. M. C. A.'s, and the like; to C. I. O., A. F. of L., and brotherhood locals, and various such organizations. The vote is taken at a regular meeting of the local organization and the record of the vote sent in to headquarters to be tabulated. The first such poll has just been completed, reaching something over four and one-half million votes.

Needless to say, I was highly pleased that they took for the first national poll of popular sentiment a bill I have sponsored in Congress. The question asked was "Are you in favor, or are you opposed, to passage of the Geyer bill to eliminate the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections?" The results were: 4,114,673 for, 236,422 against, and 252,627 answered "Do not know." In other words, 89 percent of all those voting voted in favor of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill. This poll was conducted by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the announcement by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, giving the results of this national poll of popular sentiment, together with a copy of the ballot used.

[National poll of popular sentiment, conducted by National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, New York City. For release Monday, June 10, 1940]

WASHINGTON, June 10.—The overwhelming sentiment of the country is in favor of the passage of the Geyer bill which would make poll taxes for Federal elections illegal, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights announced today.

In a poll conducted by the conference more than 4,000,000 votes were cast with an 89-percent plurality in favor of the passage of the act.

Under the title of "National Poll of Popular Sentiment," ballots were sent to organizations in 35 States with a request that the question on the ballot be discussed at a meeting and that the results be tabulated on a printed form and returned.

The vote was:

For passage	4,114,673
Against	236,422
Don't know	252,627
Total	4,603,722

Much of the sentiment represented in the 7 percent which voted against the passage of the bill was evidently due to a feeling that the Geyer bill was not in itself adequate as a solution of the franchise problems of the South.

In Washington the vote in the many organizations and churches receiving the ballot was practically unanimous. In a statement accompanying the ballot, Evelyn Christman, secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League said, "The National Women's Trade Union League opposes any tendency in this country to deprive the general public of participating in elections and the league does not believe such oppression should be encouraged in this Republic. A Government which most nearly represents the voice of all the people is the safest and best one." Among other Washington organizations participating in the vote were the School of Religion at Howard University and the First Friends Meeting.

Organizations throughout the 35 States involved in the poll included such groups as posts of the American Legion, Masons, churches, trade unions, lawyers, professional men, women's clubs, consumers' groups, Y. W. C. A., social workers, colleges, universities, and seminaries.

Participating groups were carefully chosen to reveal a truly representative opinion. Economic, social, and regional differences, as well as racial background, have been carefully balanced, and the result of the poll proves beyond doubt that the people of America are aware of the danger of keeping any group away from the polls, especially at this time, when the public must make decisions regarding the maintenance of American democratic institutions in the face of a world ablaze with war.

The southern vote, representing more than 700,000, was particularly emphatic in its approval of the Geyer bill and sharp in its condemnation of what one group called "attacks designed to keep most of the people away from the polls."

In a strongly worded statement Bishop J. C. Broomfield, of the Missouri Methodist Church, declared: "The payment of the poll tax by corrupt politicians and the securing of receipts for the distribution to those who would do as they are told is a stench in the nostrils of decent citizens."

Midwestern opinion, representing nearly 1,000,000 votes, is generally covered in the statement of Verna S. Ballard, of the First Friends Church of Indiana, who announced a unanimous vote, and by Savilla Simons, chairman of the American Association of Social Workers of Chicago, who, after the voting, said: "There is no question but that the membership is strongly opposed to poll taxes."

The El Paso, Tex., refinery workers stated in their ballot that "nearly all the members of this organization are barred from voting by the poll tax for the reason that their wages are too low to permit payment thereto."

The Poll of Popular Sentiment will survey opinion on current legislation and issues regularly, and believes it will be in a position to present the opinions of many millions of people hitherto never heard from in such sampling polls as the Gallup and Fortune magazine surveys.

[Return to National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, 305 Broadway, New York City. Dead line date for return, May 27, 1940]

BALLOT

National Poll of Popular Sentiment. Conducted by National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, 305 Broadway, Suite 309, New York City. On Geyer bill, H. R. 7534

Purpose: To eliminate the poll tax as a requirement for voting in a Federal election.

(After membership vote, please mark results in appropriate box:)

In favor of the passage of Geyer bill ☐
Opposed to the passage of Geyer bill ☐
Signature of officer
Office
Organization
Address
Number of members

Special comment: (If desired, comment may be made on the following: Size of the majority, differences on certain provisions, general attitude toward issue, and nature of interest.)

The purpose of this poll is to make known to State and national legislators, the press, and the public the opinions of the many millions of people organized in civic, religious, trade-union, fraternal, and cultural groups in the most direct, simple, and effective way. In addition, it provides an opportunity for the organizations participating in it to make a thoughtful study of pending legislation and current issues.

Grand Coulee Dam and the Columbia Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Coulee Dam, on the Columbia River in the eastern part of the State of Washington, is without doubt a project unequaled in its magnitude by anything that man has yet undertaken. The dam itself is rapidly nearing completion. The American people are just beginning to hear of it, and they are coming by the thousands to see it. Many unusual and great things have been done by this administration, but I doubt if any will stand out through the ages as will this great project.

In addition to the physical structure itself, which is an engineering feat unequaled in the history of the world in the construction of dams, there will be developed a volume of electrical energy at this one point greater than that found anywhere else in the world. This is not all, however; the completion of the project will bring into production 1,200,000 acres of the most fertile land on the North American continent. The senior Senator from the State of Washington, the Honorable HOMER T. BONE, and I, early in 1937, procured the enactment of legislation forbidding and prohibiting speculation in the lands to be developed, and thus insured the fact that this great new agricultural domain, when it comes into being, will be occupied by actual farm owners and not by tenants, sharecroppers, or employees.

Many articles have been written descriptive of this marvelous and unusual undertaking, and there was one that appeared on June 1 of this year in the Nation entitled "Miracle in Concrete." This article paints a very clear picture of this mighty undertaking and comes from the pen of Richard L. Neuberger, of the Portland Oregonian.

This great structure, and the future development of the lands that will make homes for thousands, has all been designed by the Bureau of Reclamation and has been built and is being constructed under their capable and exceptional engineering staff. It will be an enduring tribute and monument to the Chief of that Bureau, John C. Page, his staff, and particularly that great engineer, Frank A. Banks, who has been in charge of construction since its beginning 6 years ago.

It is a pleasure to me to give to my colleagues and others who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the splendid description of this exceptionally valuable and great accomplishment in making this a better Nation and world in which to live, as contrasted to what is occurring across the waters just at this time.

[From the Nation for June 1940]

MIRACLE IN CONCRETE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

GRAND COULEE, Wash., May 15.—The morning fog lifts like a curtain in the granite canyon of the Columbia River and reveals the most massive concrete escarpment in the world stretching from cliff to cliff. It is nearly a mile long and as thick as two city blocks at the base. Already it towers 30 stories above bedrock, and soon it will be higher. Its bulk is three times that of the Great Pyramid; it contains enough concrete to pave a roadway around the globe. Behind it there is filling up an enormous reservoir that will be almost as long as Lake Ontario.

This is the Grand Coulee Dam, started in 1934 and to be finished by the end of this year. To dedicate Grand Coulee is one of the President's principal ambitions. As far back as 1920, when he was a candidate for the vice-presidency, he said at Spokane, after his Pullman car had paralleled the route of Lewis and Clarke down the Columbia:

"Coming through today on the train has made me think pretty deeply. When you cross the Mountain States and that portion of the coast States that lies well back from the ocean, you are impressed by those great stretches of physical territory, just land; territory now practically unused but destined someday to contain the homes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens like us; a territory to be developed by the Nation and for the Nation. As we were coming down the river today, I could not help thinking, as everyone does, of all that water running down unchecked to the sea."

Grand Coulee Dam will irrigate and reclaim 1,200,000 acres of land. This is an area equal in size to the whole State of Delaware. It is not much less than the acreage of all the farms in New Jersey. Several months ago, in an address to the White House conference on children in a democracy, the President said:

"I have read a book; it is called the Grapes of Wrath, and there are 500,000 Americans who live in the covers of that book. I would like to see the Columbia Basin devoted to the care of the 500,000 people represented in the Grapes of Wrath.

"Up in the State of Washington we are spending a great many millions to harness the Columbia River for a great dam up there which will pump the water up on to a huge area of land capable of providing a living for 500,000 people, irrigated land, today a desert, which can be made a garden with the process of modern science."

Twenty-five years ago GEORGE W. NORRIS, Senator from Nebraska, stood beside a little creek cascading to the Columbia and asked a native of a nearby village why the power was not used. The reply came with finality: "Jim Hill owns all the power sites. We don't have much to say about 'em." No railway magnate owns all the power sites now. Soon, over the brink of the Grand Coulee spillway will crash a sheet of water with five times the volume and nearly three times the height of Niagara Falls. This shattering drop in the Nation's second largest river will generate annually 10,708,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power, an amount equal to one-fourth of all the hydroelectric power produced in the United States in 1938. So much "juice" will be turned out that the twin powerhouses, each as big as a skyscraper and packing more than twice the force of Muscle Shoals, will have to be run by remote control lest the operators be electrocuted.

Ranchers and settlers on the dry mesas are wiring their houses and cabins; they will be able to buy electricity for $2.50 a hundred kilowatt-hours. New industries, desperately needed in a frontier region that imports 75 percent of its manufactured goods, are also expected to take advantage of the lowest commercial power rates in America. Already aluminum and steel factories are being built along the Columbia near Bonneville. Seattle and Portland businessmen, who regularly denounce the President, admit that his dams are saving the Northwest and will give it an industrial foundation to replace the lumber industry.

Not all Grand Coulee's fabulous supply of power will brighten farmhouses and move the wheels of factories. Five of the eighteen generators will operate a dozen stupendous pumps, one of which could pump enough water for New York City. Each pump can lift 50 tons of water a second. And here is what the pumps will do. Grand Coulee Dam will raise the level of the Columbia River approximately 355 feet. The pumps will hoist part of the river another 250 feet, through great tunnels and conduits, from which it will flow into a deep chasm a mile wide and from 25 to 30 miles in length. This chasm, with walls as precipitous as the front of a safe, is the Grand Coulee of the Columbia River. It was carved ages ago when the river was diverted from its course by the Pleistocene ice sheet. The dam and pumps will duplicate the job the ice sheet did.

From the Grand Coulee the water will be coasted on to 1,200,000 acres of land which needs only irrigation to grow peas, beans, pears, prunes, potatoes, celery, onions, alfalfa, and the other crops that

mantle the green valleys of the Northwest. This land will not be monopolized by great corporate farms such as dominate agriculture in California, nor will it be scarred by the feudalism of tenant farming. It will be tilled by families working their own land. For Congress has passed a law limiting land ownership at Grand Coulee to 80 acres a family; a single man can retain only half that much. The considerable portion of the region now held by private owners and in old Northern Pacific land grants will have to be sold at the price fixed by Government appraisers. Any land held beyond the amount allowed will not be cut in on the irrigation system and will stay in its present virtually worthless condition.

The total cost of the Grand Coulee project will be $394,500,000. In this the principal elements are $99,960,000 for the spillway dam, $61,500,000 for the hydroelectric plant, $129,220,000 for the vast network of irrigation ditches and canals, $29,540,000 for the pumping system, and $11,330,000 for preparing the enormous reservoir in the prehistoric river bed. Other items on the expense side of the ledger are for preservation of the Chinook salmon runs and for transmission lines, field offices, and land surveys.

The surveys are under way now. Every foot of the 1,200,000 acres is being classified as to contour, value, ownership, soil content, and crop possibilities. It is the most extensive land survey ever undertaken. President Roosevelt has made up his mind that the Coulee area, which he considers a "Promised Land," shall not be colonized carelessly. The National Resources Committee is at work studying where schools, hospitals, sewer systems, railroad yards, and warehouses should be located. Twenty-five thousand families cultivating fertile soil can support a large urban population. The towns near Grand Coulee will expand; other towns will spring up. The Resources Committee is trying to find out the opportunities for people with special training and abilities—doctors, nurses, school teachers, printers, lawyers, ministers, electricians, mechanics. Perhaps in this modern Canaan in the Northwest some of the highly skilled refugees from Europe may get a chance to participate in American life.

Forty years ago some of the Coulee lands were homesteaded or bought from the railroad. That was before anyone realized that the rich alluvial plain left behind by the glacial sheets did not get enough rainfall. The settlers dry-farmed successfully for a few years. By that time they had used all the moisture held in the soil. Their land caked and hardened. Sagebrush encroached on the wheat. Many of the settlers moved on. Some lost their farms to banks and mortgage companies; others went to Seattle and Spokane to start over again, but still clung to their deeds and titles. These people are coming back now and forming irrigation districts which will buy water from the Federal Government. The votes creating the districts indicate that local sentiment is in favor of this program of small, owner-operated farms: at Wheeler 178 were for the district and 10 against; at Shragg 143 for and 9 against; at Drumheller 26 for and 11 against; at Pasco 228 for and 8 against.

The Grand Coulee project is one of the New Deal's principal political assets along the Pacific seaboard, and Republican approval of the undertaking now is not fooling many people. More than 20 years ago Rufus Woods of the Wenatchee World wrote an editorial proposing a mammoth dam to irrigate the arid land and develop the water power of the Columbia Basin. Three Republican Presidents gave lip-service to the idea—and did nothing. In this 1932 campaign Mr. Roosevelt said he would do something about the Columbia River region, and he kept his promise. Western voters know how to compare words with deeds. The State of Washington has not elected a Republican Governor, Senator, or Representative since Grand Coulee was begun.

The anti-New Deal San Francisco Argonaut says of Grand Coulee, "The Pacific coast may be confident that in the future it will have occasion to point with pride to a new 'land of plenty' here in its midst." Yet there are some questions, of course. What will the colossal dam do to the valuable and important salmon runs in the Columbia River? Is it logical for the Government to spend millions for this new farm area in the West while it spends other millions to restrict agricultural production elsewhere? The late Paul Y. Anderson asked the President this question in 1937 and received no conclusive answer. And what about the Dust Bowl nomads whom Roosevelt wants to settle at Grand Coulee? They are penniless. How can they get farm equipment, lumber, seeds, and other necessities?

The salmon are in jeopardy, of that there is no doubt, although all kinds of elaborate apparatus have been constructed for fish conservation. The Department of the Interior resolves the paradox of irrigation in one region and crop control in another with the statement that the most troublesome surpluses are in corn, cotton, and wheat, and that the Grand Coulee region will produce garden vegetables, fruits, and fodder. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has observed also that probably most of the crops will be consumed in the area rather than raised for the market. And the Government will stretch its credit resources to the limit in an effort to give the neediest migrants an opportunity to settle in new farm homes. Other reclamation projects have required that each colonist possess $2,000. At Grand Coulee this sum can be made up from F. S. A. loans, old equipment, automobiles, and furniture.

Despite all doubts and reservations, men of many faiths have stood on the granite crags above the huge dam and said, "This makes sense." The Pacific Northwest is the final frontier, the last refuge for people now living on exhausted soil in the Middle West, for men and women crowded in the tenements of the Atlantic coast. Maj. Roy Bessey, of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission, says that "with a reasonable development program, from 1,000,000 to 2,500,000 additional people could readily be absorbed in the region within a generation Migration toward the region during recent years seems to indicate that the population increase may approach the higher figure." Of no other part of continental United States may this be said, and Grand Coulee is the principal feature of "the reasonable development program." The Columbia has three times as much potential hydroelectric power as any other river in America. Above its swift reaches is a great sweep of land that needs only water to replace sagebrush with orchards. The river twists through the Cascade Range and into the core of the inland empire. With dams and locks it could become a navigable waterway instead of a rapid-studded chute. Why not develop all these resources for men and women who must find a place to go?

The late William E. Borah, for many years the most illustrious figure of the Columbia Basin, once said, "The Northwest cannot pay the freight both ways and continue to live and prosper." A colonial empire for the East, it ships out its raw materials and buys back finished products. Perhaps the biggest chunk of power in the world will help develop mills and factories so that the Northwest's raw materials can be processed there instead of being shipped across the country.

Dusk settles on the Columbia like a curtain dropping back. The tumbledown farmhouses which the settlers abandoned long ago lose shape in the twilight. But at the great dam 10,000 lights are turned on. Work goes forward night and day. This is a defense of democracy, too—as important as new destroyers and bombing planes. Perhaps this frowning wall of concrete will be the most enduring monument to Franklin Roosevelt's administration. That jackhammer man down in the chasm, wiping his forehead in the glare of the searchlights as he drills a tunnel through the cliffs for the water that will make a million acres bloom—perhaps he is doing more to protect America from foreign ideologies than the man who rivets a dreadnought's mast or prepares a torpedo for the open sea.

Roosevelt Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "President Goes to War." With total disregard of Congress and the American people the President commits this country to a policy of extending its material resources to certain European belligerents. Roosevelt, the dictator, tells the world what we will do.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1940]

PRESIDENT GOES TO WAR

Listening to their President on the most solemn day in our national life since 1917, the American people heard him come down to the point they were waiting for with this:

"We will pursue two obvious and simultaneous courses: We will extend to the opponents of force (France and Britain) the material resources of this Nation and, at the same time, we will harness and speed up the use of those resources in order that we ourselves in the Americas may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense."

That is a declaration of war, as war has been known for centuries—probably the strangest speech ever made to a class graduating from an American university. We shall use all the material force we possess to aid the war against Germany and Italy. We shall speed up our processes to increase that aid and, almost incidentally, provide for our own defense.

Getting down to what we think about it as we talk it over together, our judgment is that a majority of Americans will agree with what Mr. Roosevelt announces the country will do. And for two reasons: Most of us feel that the cause of the western nations against dictatorships, which have constantly attacked democracies and preached hatred of them, is our side. In the second place, many Americans, probably a majority, believe that by extending the utmost material help now we may keep out of this war ourselves—that is, not have to send our sons and brothers.

Many hearts echoed the emotional outburst of Mr. Roosevelt when, departing from his prepared speech, he said of Italy's joining the war: "The hand that held the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor."

Two speeches were made Monday which are alike in many ways—Benito Mussolini's and Franklin Roosevelt's. Mr. Roosevelt said we would do everything possible against Germany and Italy. Earlier Mussolini had said: "It is the conflict of poor numerous peoples who labor against starvers who ferociously cling to a monopoly of all riches and all gold on earth."

Listeners heard a Roman audience go into a frenzy of applause; listeners heard great applause at the University of Virginia.

Here is what makes us stop and think: Mussolini and Roosevelt talked alike. The longest established dictator in Europe saying what his nation would do; the head of a democracy saying what the United States would do. There is supposed to be a difference, but no difference appeared.

Mr. Roosevelt did not say: "This is what I shall set before Congress," but "This is what we will do."

Is the United States to save democracy by abandoning democracy without even an appeal to its elected representatives? President Roosevelt defied Germany and Italy. He announced a policy which, at any earlier time in American history, would have meant a declaration of war. But he did not say to the American people that it meant this. What he ought to have asked Congress to approve, he told the public we would do.

Any man or woman who sits down and thinks this over will see that we cannot go so far without committing ourselves to all the rest. If Mr. Roosevelt's pledge of the material resources of this Nation is not enough, we shall send the Navy, and if that is not enough, we shall send man power. The President promises all we are and have, to be spent by the Berles and Hopkinses and Perkinses, by the Army and Navy heads, by his own account, have been sound asleep on defense.

There is a check on this. Congress still has control when billions are asked. And it is time for Congress to wake up.

The emotional response to pledging the Nation to what many Americans—most Americans—see as the side of decency and liberty is not the calm, considered judgment of a people on whether they are ready on this June day to commit themselves to war. The President did not say "war," but every word he said implied war.

Applause was long and loud. Senate and House will meet in the atmosphere of hysteria. Presently they must go back to people who have been thinking about war, too, but have been working in field and shop and factory. They will answer then to the question:

"Did you commit your country to everything a dictator might ask, including the lives of our children?"

How fearful must be the boys who do the fighting and dying. How sad the mothers whose sons will be called to war. Why has hysteria gripped America?

DEMOCRATS BECOME THE WAR PARTY

Roosevelt's action has certainly stamped the Democrats as the war party. Added to his behavior is that of certain Oklahoma Democrats who shouted in favor of war, according to the following newspaper article:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of June 11, 1940]

ROOSEVELT, ALLIES BACKED—OKLAHOMA DEMOCRATS PLEDGE AID

OKLAHOMA CITY, June 10.—The State Democratic convention, nearing its scheduled harmonious close today, was jerked to attention by a resolution favoring aid to the Allies. A speaker demanded:

"We might just as well declare war; are you in favor of doing that?"

He was answered with cries of "Yes." The resolution was adopted by a 160–41 vote.

Greenland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC LEDGER

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the interest over the definition of the Western Hemisphere and the implications of the Monroe Doctrine insofar as Greenland is concerned, the following article from the Public Ledger of Philadelphia, Monday morning, September 11, 1916, may be of considerable interest to those who are following the entire subject:

DOES AMERICA ACT WISELY IN GIVING UP GREENLAND?—INSTEAD OF YIELDING OUR RIGHTS TO DENMARK, WE SHOULD HAVE BARGAINED TO TAKE OVER GREAT NORTHERN ISLAND

(By Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary)

In a sledge journey of some 600 miles from Etah, Admiral—then Commander—Peary determined the northern limit of Greenland at Cape Morris K. Jesup, the most northern known land in the world, in May 1900. He had twice previously crossed the northern part of Greenland in journeys of about 500 miles each way. Commander Peary determined the insularity of Greenland, and his various Greenland sledge journeys total between 3,000 and 4,000 miles. What the great Greenland explorer and finder of the North Pole has to say about the cession to Denmark of American rights of discovery in Greenland is of peculiar interest, in view of the action of the United States Senate last week.—Editor, Public Ledger.

TO THE EDITOR OF PUBLIC LEDGER:

SIR: I have been surprised at the extent of interest that has been shown in our rights in Greenland in connection with the proposed transfer of these rights as a part of the consideration for the Danish West Indies.

When the news of the proposed treaty was first made public the editorial comment of the press of the country referred to these rights as "extremely vague," "more or less visionary," and so on.

Later a different point of view has appeared in the great papers of the country, and letters to the papers and personal letters which I have indicate a strong sentimental feeling in the matter.

There appear to be two quite general impressions in regard to the treaty: First, that $25,000,000 is a large price for the islands, and, second, that our rights in Greenland may be too valuable to be thrown into the bargain as a make-weight.

That we want the islands and should have them if possible goes without saying.

As regards the price, I have not yet seen it noted that in 1867 Denmark asked $15,000,000 for these islands, and that a treaty was finally ratified on the basis of $7,500,000 for the two islands, St. Thomas and St. John.

As to "throwing in" our rights in Greenland, are our rights in Greenland too valuable for this?

Greenland is the largest island in the world. Its total length from Cape Farewell, its southern extremity in 60 degrees north latitude, to Cape Morris K. Jesup, its northern extremity in 83½ degrees north latitude, is in round numbers 1,500 miles, almost exactly the same as the length of the United States on the ninety-seventh meridian, from the mouth of the Rio Grande to where our northern boundary crosses the Red River of the north.

The greatest width of Greenland is about the same as the distance from New York to St. Louis.

In regard to its area, the figures of various authorities vary widely. It may be sufficient to say that as regards area, it can be grouped in size with the United States east of the Mississippi; Alaska, Mexico, Colombia, Persia, Portuguese West Africa, Turkey in Asia.

Its interior is covered with a great sheet of ice, rising to elevations of probably 10,000 feet in places, and several thousand feet in thickness.

The available ice-free land is a strip of varying width, along the coast, intersected by numerous deep fjords.

When one turns the pages of American Arctic exploration, Greenland is found more or less intimately associated during more than 60 years with all American expeditions except the Jeannette expedition.

Americans have lifted nearly all of its northwestern and northern coasts out of the Arctic night and fog and have twice crossed its northern part. American names stud its coasts, and the name of an American marks its northern extremity, the most northern known land in the world.

The following, from the records of the State Department, may be of interest:

WASHINGTON CITY, *April 24, 1868.*

SIR: When you did me the honor last summer to call my attention to the treaty negotiated by you with Denmark by which we acquired the important islands of St. Thomas and St. John, I ventured to suggest to you the propriety of obtaining from the same power Greenland, and probably Iceland, also. You thought the suggestion worthy of serious consideration, and requested me to communicate to you in writing my views and the facts on the subject, that they might be on the files of the Department and ready for use whenever the question might be considered hereafter by the Government.

* * * * * * *

The shores of Greenland, much more than those of any other country, are indented with deep bays, inlets, estuaries, and fjords, some of them possibly extending from the western to the eastern coast, presenting an immense shore line and furnishing most extensive and protected fishing grounds. These inlets are bordered by meadowlands, beech and willow, whence the name of Greenland. The population, neglected by Denmark, lives mainly by hunting, including furs and the fisheries.

Greenland has in vast quantities whale, walrus, seal and shark, cod, ivory cod, salmon, salmon trout, and herring, foxes, wolf, reindeer, bear, hare, myriads of birds, including the king duck, eider-duck, dorskin, petrel, gull, brent, burgomaster, geese, killiwoke, lolard, sea swallow, etc. Good coal is found on the western coast at various points, extending far north, most cheaply mined and close to good harbors.

* * * * * * *

The whale fisheries of Greenland, in 1864, were of the value of $400,000. The climate of South Greenland is one of "unusual healthfulness and clear atmosphere." The limits of summer are from May to September. All the shores and inlets of Greenland abound with animal life, such as fish, birds, etc. The rocks and geology of Greenland, as before stated, besides the valuable coal discovered, indicate vast mineral wealth. Kryolite, a most important mineral and of very rapidly increasing use and value, is found only in Greenland. One of the mines is 80 feet thick. This mineral is mined in large quantities, its rapid development being

due in great part to American enterprise. It is used in the manufacture of soap, soda, and soda salts, and yields a residue which has a great value as a flux in the treatment of difficult metallic ores. It also makes a fine glass, and has been employed in the manufacture of aluminum and its alloys, a most valuable metal, being very brilliant, one-third the weight of zinc, and one-fourth that of silver. The mines appear to be inexhaustible, and are of great and rapidly increasing value. Geologists all look for new and immense mineral developments in Greenland.

* * * * * * *

I have heretofore expressed the opinion that we should purchase Iceland and Greenland, but especially the latter. The reasons are political and commercial.

* * * * * * *

I have the honor to be your obedient servant.

R. J. WALKER.

Hon. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

Accompanying this letter are communications from Benjamin Pierce, superintendent of the United States Coast Survey, and Benjamin M. Pierce, mining engineer, containing interesting and some curious information in regard to Greenland and Iceland.

The following appears in the current number of the National Geographic Magazine in regard to the Seward treaty of 1867, it may be of interest:

"The first proposal to buy the Danish West Indies was made by Secretary of State Seward at Washington in January 1865. July 17, 1866, the United States offered $5,000,000 for the islands. In 1867 Denmark declined to sell them for that amount, but offered St. Thomas and St. John for $10,000,000, or $15,000,000 for the three. Mr. Seward replied by offering $7,500,000 for the group. Denmark made a counteroffer of St. Thomas and St. John for that price. Finally Secretary Seward accepted the proposal.

* * * * * * *

"Denmark ratified the treaty, but Senator Sumner, then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, held the bill unreported for more than 2 years. When he did report it, it was adversely."

Would some of the objections voiced in regard to the present treaty for the purchase of the Danish West Indies have been met if the treaty provisions as to Greenland had been reversed and the bargain should have taken the form of Denmark transferring to us her rights in Greenland and giving us the Danish West Indies and Greenland for $25,000,000?

Geographically Greenland belongs to North America and the Western Hemisphere, over which we have formally claimed a sphere of influence by our Monroe Doctrine.

Its possession by us would be in line with the Monroe Doctrine and would have eliminated one more possible source of future complications for us from European possession of territory in the Western Hemisphere.

Will turning Greenland over to Denmark now mean our repurchase of it later, or would obtaining it now have meant closing the incident and placing Greenland where it must ultimately belong?

Greenland is comparatively near to us. For years American ships have conveyed cryolite from the Ivigtut mines to Philadelphia. There is coal and cryolite, probably graphite and mica, possibly gold, in its rocks. Danish capital has apparently not been sufficient to exploit the country's resources.

With our unlimited means it may, like Alaska, prove a sound and most valuable business investment.

The abundance of native coal and the numerous glacial streams which come tumbling into the southern fjords from the great interior ice sheet represent enormous potential energy which might be translated into nitrate and electrical energy to make Greenland a powerhouse for the United States.

Greenland represents ice, coal, and power in inexhaustible quantities.

And stranger things have happened than that Greenland in our hands might furnish an important North Atlantic naval and aeronautical base.

A North Pacific naval base for the United States in the Aleutian Archipelago is a recognized possibility. Why not a similar base in the North Atlantic? Cape Farewell, in Greenland, is only little north of Sitka. It is in the same latitude as St. Petersburg, Christiana, Great Britain's naval base in the Orkneys, and the northern entrance to the North Sea, which Great Britain has patrolled with her warships incessantly now, summer and winter, for 2 years.

There are fjords in southern Greenland which would hold the entire Navy, with narrow, deep water, impregnable entrances.

Thirty hours' steaming due south from Cape Farewell by 35-knot warcraft would put them in the trans-Atlantic routes midway between New York and the British Channel.

With the rapid shrinking of distances in this age of speed and invention, Greenland may be of crucial importance to us in the future.

The present war has shown most strikingly how far flung may be the regions have a bearing on the struggle. Great Britain's coaling stations in the Falklands spelled destruction for Germany's squadron of commerce destroyers.

Russia's Arctic port of Archangel has been an invaluable gateway for her.

Greenland in our hands might be a valuable piece of our defensive armor. In the hands of hostile interests it would be a serious menace.

Great Britain's cession of Heligoland to Germany is a striking example of failure to see clearly into the future.

Spitzbergen, "no-man's land" for many years, has been found to be of rich mineralogical value, and previous to the war was a bone of contention among representatives of several nations.

Can we afford to turn down any possible opportunities even if we do not at present grasp their full value?

PEARY.

SOUTH HARPSWELL, MAINE, *September 8, 1916.*

Democratic State Convention in Oklahoma City, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ELMER THOMAS, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Democrats of Oklahoma held their annual State convention in Oklahoma City. The senior Senator from Oklahoma, my personal friend for many years, was the keynote speaker of that convention. That his address met with approval of an overwhelming majority of the Democrats in convention assembled is evidence of the fact that the resolutions adopted were very much in line with the splendid clear-cut progressive views expressed by the able and brilliant senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Feeling sure that the message of Senator THOMAS will be of unusual interest to the citizens not only of the State of Oklahoma but of the entire Nation I have secured permission to have same printed in whole in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I feel that this keynote address offers many practical suggestions that will be of assistance to the Democratic leaders of this country in preparing the platform of our party at the national convention in Chicago next month. The address delivered by Senator THOMAS follows:

I thank our efficient State chairman, France Paris, and the members of the State executive committee for permitting me to serve as the temporary chairman of this convention.

I congratulate and compliment our State Democratic organization, our several county organizations, and our many precinct organizations, present and past, for the great work they have done in keeping Oklahoma a Democratic State.

We rejoice that we have a Democratic State administration and that the line of Democratic Governors has not been broken since statehood.

Gov. Leon C. Phillips is giving the State a safe and economical administration, and for his success all Oklahomans are justly proud.

In the past our people have responded to the appeals of our Democratic leaders, and our Democratic officials have acted in what they thought was the best interests of the people.

To the extent that government has been managed and administered in the interest of the masses, democracy has thrived, prospered, and flourished. So long as the Democratic Party takes care of the people, just that long will the people take care of the Democratic Party.

I have just returned from the Nation's Capitol.

I bring greetings from the Democratic administration at Washington to the Democratic legion of Oklahoma.

The Members of our congressional delegation send their greetings, and ask to be remembered.

I am authorized to advise that, in the event their duties will permit, your Congressmen will be calling on you soon.

I bring you a message from the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and the message is as follows: I quote—

"I am happy to extend, through the courtesy of Senator THOMAS, my sincere good wishes to the Democrats of Oklahoma assembled in State convention.

"In the two preceding Presidential campaigns I appealed for your support and cooperation in bringing victory to the cause of Democratic principles and policies. Your response on both occasions was generous, whole-hearted, and effective. By this display of loyalty and devotion you have earned the gratitude of the Roosevelt administration and of the Democratic National Committee.

"We approach another Presidential election in a changed and disordered world. Eight years ago the issues and problems were primarily domestic. Now we face the ugly reality of a foreign war

that may have serious repercussions on the vital interests of America.

"There is one fact of significant importance which stands out as a result of these onrushing events. The leaders of the opposition party have lagged behind in their understanding of modern political problems. When last in power, the Republican leaders failed to foresee the gathering economic storm, failed to grasp its force and intensity, and then had nothing to offer in the way of constructive remedies. In recent months they have been equally wrong in gaging the course of developments abroad.

"The Democratic Party, entrusted with responsibility, has handled the affairs of the United States with vigor, foresight, and statesmanship. The Roosevelt administration has kept the peace, avoided the incidents which might lead to war, and made the Nation alert and awake to possible dangers. The economic structure has been strengthened and stabilized.

"This is the record on which we propose to go before the voters. Once again we are relying upon your loyal support. I am confident of the outcome. We must press our case with the honest conviction that another Democratic victory is the sure and safe course for America.

"JAMES A. FARLEY,
"Chairman, Democratic National Committee."

On my way to the airport on Friday last I called on the President of the United States. He authorized me to convey a message to this convention and to the people of Oklahoma:

First, that the Government is expanding and strengthening its Military Establishments—its Army, its Navy, and its Air Corps—not for probable war but for possible war.

Second, that the best way to prevent war is to be prepared for war.

And third, that during the present emergency, however long and whatever the outcome, so long as he is President, he proposes to protect the people—producers and consumers—from profiteers and from unreasonable price fluctuations.

Upon reaching this city I found the following letter awaiting me:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 4, 1940.

Honorable ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: When you address the Democratic State convention in Oklahoma City, please extend to all of the members my hearty felicitations and warmest personal greetings. Tell them for me that the paramount domestic issue this year is the retention of popular government. It is, therefore, up to the people everywhere to decide whether they want to return to 1929, when the United States went speculation mad with all of its attendant dislocations, or to continue to have their Government handled through the processes of democracy.

I trust that the convention will face this paramount issue squarely and that its deliberations will be fruitful of wise counsel and constructive action in the best interests of the party and the Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

This great Democratic convention is the official opening of the 1940 campaign.

The temporary chairman of a political convention is presumed to state the issue or issues to be considered and acted upon, first, by the convention and then later decided, if not finally settled, by the people themselves.

Later on this day this convention will set forth in resolution form its recommendations and demands and then will select delegates to represent the democracy of Oklahoma at the national convention where the party platform will be shaped and where our standard bearer will be nominated.

In this coming contest, in addition to county and State officials, the voters of Oklahoma will elect their representatives in the Seventy-seventh Congress and will assist in the election of a President of the United States.

Among Democrats there may be differences of opinion relative to party and governmental policies. There may be differences of opinion as to who shall fill our local, State, and congressional offices, but throughout the land there is little disagreement about who shall serve as the next President of the United States.

Our candidate needs no eulogy at my hands. He is known to one and all. He is loved, supported, and followed by the masses of the people in this and other lands.

He has defended, protected, and preserved our people and our institutions through the greatest depression in history.

In the great world contest of this hour—a contest of force against reason, a contest of war against peace, and a contest of dictators against democracy—our candidate stands foursquare for reason, peace, and democracy; and his name is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Delegates to this convention: A heavy responsibility rests upon you along with the other leaders of our country.

Today democracy, as a form of government, is challenged in many lands; hence, it remains for us here in the United States to do whatever may be necessary to insure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Today while the nations and peoples of the Eastern Hemisphere are at war, let us pause to rejoice that the United States and the nations and peoples of the Western World, under the leadership of President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, are at peace.

The record shows that during the Roosevelt administration our country has not only been at peace with all the world, but we have continuously sponsored movements in behalf of peace.

In some sections we have been criticized for not having the strongest navy, the strongest army, and the strongest air force in the world.

Because of this criticism and because the question of preparedness will be one, if not the major issue of the campaign, let me call your attention to the following facts:

When we entered the World War in 1917 our people were led to believe that it was a war to end war.

We were advised that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy.

When the war was over our people had reasons to believe that they could continue to be free to think, to speak, and to act, and that war, as a means of settling international disputes, was at an end.

At that time President Wilson, leader of the Democratic Party, proposed and suggested the League of Nations as a tribunal for the adjustment of international disputes.

Our people were against war, and believing that we were through with war, we refused to join the League of Nations.

Had the United States entered the League the present world conflict might have been avoided.

As further evidence that our people are against war, I remind you that during the Harding administration a disarmament conference was called and held in Washington.

This conference had for its purpose the stopping of all preparations for war.

Later, during the Coolidge administration, our people again initiated a world movement for peace and the result was the Kellogg Peace Pact wherein war as an element of national policy was renounced.

As further evidence that the American people have had enough of war, the appropriations for support of our Military Establishment decreased constantly from the end of the World War until a few years ago.

Recent developments show that while we were promoting peace other nations were secretly developing and building up vast war machines.

When we learned that Germany, Russia, Japan, and Italy were building armies and navies, we were forced to enter into the competition.

In 1935 our appropriations for support of our Military Establishment were less than $300,000,000.

The appropriations for the past year were about $1,000,000,000, while the appropriations already made for the coming year will amount to well over three and a half billion dollars.

Again we are criticized for having expended vast sums for military preparedness and now have little to show for such expenditures.

Let me assure you, my fellow Democrats, that this criticism is not well-founded.

The following are the facts:

While other nations conscript their youth and pay them practically nothing, we pay our soldiers the best salaries in the world.

We furnish our soldiers with the best clothing, the best housing, and the best subsistence possible to be procured. The high standard set for our soldiers is responsible for the heavy cost of our Military Establishment.

It is true that the Congress is the policy-making branch of our Government.

Likewise it is true that the Congress seeks to reflect and to enact into law the crystallized public sentiment of our people.

Because of the status of public sentiment, until recently the Congress would not have considered any substantial expansion of either our Army or our Navy. Until recently our people did not want a big army.

No doubt but you have heard it said that if nations would not prepare for war and instead would will for peace, then governments and peoples would be spared the expense of military preparedness, and at the same time would be immune from war.

The recent invasion, attack, and destruction of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Norway, Belgium, and Holland has destroyed this philosophy.

Heretofore, our people have felt secure in the belief that thousands of miles of water on our eastern and western coasts have afforded us a safe protection.

Now, when we consider the development of modern war machines we are forced to realize the possibility of attack and danger unless we are adequately prepared.

For years we have heard it said that planes could never become important factors in war, yet today we know that such statements are without foundation.

Now we know that the only limit to the speed of planes and the amount of weight that may be carried is the limitation of power.

Today in the European war vast planes with leakless gas containers, with pilots protected by armor, and equipped with cannon, dart through the air and flying fortresses carrying gigantic bombs are able to reach cities, industrial establishments, military and food supplies located many hundreds of miles away in the country of the enemy.

On the ground veritable battleships, called tanks, travel over almost any kind of land at the rate of 10 to 40 miles per hour.

Vast squadrons of planes are able to transport thousands of soldiers, fully armed and equipped, at speeds up to 250 miles per hour.

Heretofore our peace-loving people have felt themselves safe and secure, but now, with Germany and Italy on the east, and Russia and Japan on the west, our viewpoint has been changed.

The question may be asked, Why should America be attacked? Replying, I might ask, Why was Poland attacked? Why was Finland attacked? Why were Norway, Holland, and Belgium attacked? Why the wars now raging in Europe and the eastern world?

Let me remind you that America is the richest nation on the globe.

Our Treasury now holds almost twenty billions of gold. Likewise, our Treasury holds some three billions of silver.

During the centuries gold and silver have furnished the metallic base for the financial systems of the world; hence, our accumulated gold and silver present a sufficient prize for any nation or group of nations to make an attempt at capture.

I do not suggest that our country is either in immediate danger or that we are unprepared to meet possible emergencies.

While we do not have a military machine comparable to that of Germany, yet we are not wholly unprepared for war.

We now have 227,000 men in our Regular Army, and this number has just been increased to 280,000.

We now have 145,000 men in the Navy and this number has just been increased to 170,000.

We now have 25,000 marines and this number has just been increased to 34,000.

We now have 250,000 in the National Guard and this number has just been increased to 320,000.

In addition to the regulars, the Navy, and the guardsmen, we have over 100,000 Reserve Army officers and over 75,000 Reserve Navy officers and men.

We have over 150,000 reserves in the R. O. T. C. and over 35,000 reserves in the C. M. T. C., thus making a grand total of over 1,000,000 men who are now in the service or who may be called at a moment's notice.

For equipment we have over two and one-half million Enfield and Springfield rifles and over 40,000 of the new Garand semiautomatic rifles with an ample supply of ammunition.

We have on hand equipment to supply an Army of 1,000,000 men.

In addition to our Army we have, next to Great Britain, admittedly the strongest navy in the world.

Our Air Corps is being expanded as rapidly as is humanly possible, hence, all elements considered: First, our distance removed from Europe; second, our thousands of miles of shore line; and, third, the condition the belligerents will be in when the present war is over, I feel that our people, our property, and our national honor are as well protected as is possible under the processes necessary in a democracy.

Before passing from the question of war, possible war, and the necessity for preparedness, let me remind you that throughout all history wars have occurred with an amazing regularity.

At different periods of the past war lords have sought to conquer and to rule the world.

Only in a few instances have such efforts been even temporarily successful.

Over 2,000 years ago Alexander the Great, at the age of 33, conquered the world, and for the want of other worlds to conquer died an inglorious death—a slave to debauchery.

A few hundred years later Hannibal lived by the sword, destroyed peoples and nations, and then, in exile, died from self-inflicted poison.

Then came Caesar to conquer and to control with unlimited power the empire of the world.

Caesar was assassinated by Brutus.

Still later the world had to reckon with Napoleon.

During his life of 52 years he destroyed nations and conquered millions until he had the world at his feet. Later he was forced to abdicate, and in exile died on the lonely isle of St. Helena.

Thus it has always been with dictators.

History has no record where any dictator ever left a successor.

While the clouds are now black and low, they will clear away. I cannot believe that civilization will either commit suicide or be shackled into bondage.

The paramount issue in every campaign is the problem uppermost in the people's minds.

In this campaign the issues will be, first, military preparedness, and, second, the record of the party now in power.

Although we are approaching the national-convention dates, no one can now foretell the exact conditions which will confront our people in November.

Should the issues shift from the problems of today to the record of our party, then we are prepared to meet the enemy on any battlefield it may select.

Were it not for the wars abroad and the possible threat of war at home, the paramount issues would be, first, the elimination of unemployment, and, second, the regulation and control of monopolies.

Should the opposition decide to attack our record, we shall ask them if they are opposed to taking care of the unemployed until such time as those in distress may find jobs in private industry?

We shall ask them if they are against the old-age pension system, inaugurated for the first time under a Democratic administration?

We shall ask them if they are opposed to the National Youth program?

We shall ask them if they are opposed to the Civilian Conservation camps?

We shall ask them if they are opposed to our policies relating to the agricultural interests of the Nation.

We shall ask them if they are opposed to our policies regarding labor.

We shall ask them if they are opposed to our liberal treatment of the ex-service men.

We shall ask them if they are opposed to our policy of guaranteeing bank deposits; of rural electrification; of public works; of public housing; and of flood control.

To the critics of our record, we shall ask them if they are opposed to the masses of the people having a voice in government and if they favor the return of public affairs to the special, privileged, and monopolistic interests of the Nation.

The voters of Oklahoma and the Nation will answer these questions at the polls in November.

We do not enter this campaign upon the assumption that we have made no mistakes.

As evidence that our party has made mistakes, I recall the fact that in the election of 4 years ago we lost two States, the States of Maine and Vermont.

We expect to do better in this campaign.

It is obvious that all our national problems have not been solved; likewise, it is obvious that some of our suggested and tried solutions have not been perfect.

The greater our population, the more complicated our civilization, and the longer our State and Nation live, the more problems we will have to meet and solve.

In the place of developing a perfect system of government, no doubt our descendants will discover that where we had few problems to meet and solve, they will have hundreds if not thousands of problems for solution.

In conclusion, we should rejoice and give constant thanks that our people are at peace.

Today we hear no roar of cannon.

We hear no sirens advising of air attack.

We hear no swishing of shells and bombs.

We hear no wails of frightened and injured women and children, and we feel secure from attack.

I bring you assurance that the Democratic administration at Washington, above all things, desires to remain at peace with all the world.

At this moment the issue is Roosevelt, preparedness, and peace.

Who among the 130,000,000 of our people is best fitted and prepared to lead and guide us through these troubled times?

The States, east and west, north and south, have already given the answer, and the answer is, with one acclaim, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Flag Day in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, at this time in the world's history the symbols of nationalism are flaunted in defiance of peace and international good will. We in America, however, enjoy the blessings of life and liberty under the protection of a flag which symbolizes the highest achievement in democratic government.

SENSES ARE QUICKENED

Flag Day this year arouses our sense of patriotism and strengthens the bonds of unity for which our national emblem stands.

With the grave realization that the moral and human values which our flag represents are crumbling in other lands, we are more deeply determined that those values shall be preserved here.

Representing, as it does, the Thirteen Colonies grown into a Nation composed of 48 united States, we honor our flag—not as an empty symbol—but as a vital reality which heralds to the world our conviction and determination to preserve the democratic way of living, now being extinguished abroad.

WE REDEDICATE OURSELVES

With the loyalty of patriots we should mark this Flag Day above all others as a day of rededication to the principles for which it stands.

To our resolve that the protection of this banner of liberty shall not pass from our own land, we hopefully add the fervent prayer that the justice and freedom for which it stands shall not be blotted out in the other countries of the earth.

Is There No Constitutional Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, why must we in this body, made up largely of well-trained lawyers, be forced to vote for or against bills which are plainly unconstitutional, yet introduced in the name of a good and patriotic cause? Every Member of this body has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Is there no way that we can solve the serious problems facing us without flouting the supreme law of the land, or ignoring it and hypocritically throwing the responsibility into the lap of someone else? Twice recently my conscience and my oath of office have required me to vote against measures apparently wanted by many of my constituents. Perhaps those constituents had only the general idea of each bill, wishing the general purpose accomplished, without any way of knowing the actual wording or implication of either bill when put to a final vote.

The bill we have just passed, providing deportation of Harry Bridges, is one of the cases referred to. He may be an undesirable alien. I do know that he has caused great loss to my constituents by tying up shipping on the Pacific coast. For that reason alone many citizens of my State would be pleased to have him out of this country. Then, again, in these dangerous days of "enemies within the gates," of "boring from within," and of "fifth column" fears, it behooves us to protect our very national security. I detest and wish to avoid labor troubles which cause great loss to laborers, to employers, and to the public generally. I abhor and wish to safeguard against that treachery which plots against the security of our people while enjoying our hospitality. Can we not accomplish the necessary and desirable thing without applying a remedy more dangerous than the ailment?

The bill we passed here today is not the bill which was presented to the House by voting the rule. I voted for the rule to make consideration of this proposal possible. I hoped for some amendment which would make it possible for me to vote for final passage of the bill. The original bill was bad enough, being plainly unconstitutional, but the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and adopted was worse, being doubly unconstitutional. The substitute bill was the one that was passed, and it denies the use of the writ of habeas corpus.

The writ of habeas corpus shall never be denied except in case of war or of invasion.

Are we in war, or has this country been invaded?

For many years I attempted to teach constitutional government. How very many times students have heard these words:

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Or—

The writ of habeas corpus shall never be denied except in case of war or invasion.

The bill the House passed here today, in my solemn judgment, violates the Constitution of the United States in all three of these respects.

The situation in the world at large is very dark now. Must we get hysterical and reenact the frenzy of the first World War? We have, from the legislative angle, just about completed an enormous program of self-defense for the Nation. Have we not turned the alien problem over to the Department of Justice where it can be more logically handled than by the Department of Labor? Have we not greatly increased the appropriations and personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation? Can we not safely look to our courts to follow the law? If our present laws under the Constitution are not adequate, then we had better make them more nearly adequate—but under the Constitution.

Deportation of Bridges Would Be Blow to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW A. DUNN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, my reason for not supporting H. R. 9766, a bill to authorize the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges, is because, in my opinion, the measure is unfair, unjust, and undemocratic. Mr. Bridges had been accused of subversive activities; however, he was exonerated by the Department of Labor. There is no reason, therefore, why Congress should pass a law to deport him from this country. It is my opinion that if this bill is enacted into law it will be a severe blow to labor.

Keep War Out of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSH LEE, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last night I delivered an address to the graduates of National University. I ask leave to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chancellor and graduates of National University, you have finished a course of study which is based upon the theory that man has an inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as a matter of justice, but this theory of government is being challenged today by the barbaric theory that "might makes right." At this very hour, democracy is at death grips with despotism.

The invaded countries of Europe did not elect to get into war but they were not strong enough to repel invasion and war came to them.

Some people seem to think of the war today as a placid lake which we can get into or stay out of at will but it is much more like a raging fire that spreads and grows in fury as it spreads, coming closer to America every hour.

President Roosevelt realized at least 3 years ago that the United States should begin strengthening her national defenses. But there were certain self-styled champions of peace in this country who started shouting, "He is going to get us into war." This is the battle cry of the "fifth column" in the United States today. This is their slogan, and with it they have delayed America's national-defense program 3 years.

The war in Europe is not a static thing but it is a spreading conflagration.

What did Poland do to get into war? What did Norway do to get itself invaded? Did the Queen of Holland lead her country into war? Did King Leopold get Belgium into war?

The answer to these questions is obvious. The choice of getting into war or not getting into war was not left to these countries, nor will it be left to the United States.

Hitler decided only one question before he started his "blitzkrieg" rumbling toward Warsaw, and that question was whether or not he was able to take that country.

Today great danger threatens the United States. Weakness invites attack, and our defenses are not adequate.

Suppose the dictators should win a quick victory over the Allies, as they plan to. Even if we should be able to prevent the invasion of the United States, which is doubtful, we still would be at a great disadvantage in trying to maintain the Monroe Doctrine. Our Navy is not large enough to guard both the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The dictators have already penetrated Mexico and South America by means of the "fifth column." Brazil and Uruguay are honeycombed with their agents.

The State Department has been so concerned about Nazi activities in Uruguay that two United States warships have been ordered to South American waters. The news of a complete Nazi victory over the Allies would be the signal for a great uprising in these Latin-American countries. The dictators could move in immediately and establish their military bases in the Western Hemisphere.

In fact, they have already sent military supplies to South America, according to John G. Norris, who says, in an article in the Washington Post of June 6—I quote:

"* * * These sources revealed that Berlin is making deliveries of field guns, machine guns, and other military equipment to Brazil, despite the great demands of her own army."

Now couple this with the statement made yesterday by the President of Brazil which statement was interpreted as preliminary to the establishment of a totalitarian government for Brazil.

Then couple this with Hitler's plans, as reported by Herman Rauschning, who was a member of the Reichstag and a friend of Hitler, wherein he tells how in 1933 Hitler at his mountain hideout planned the conquest of South America by means of the infiltration of Nazi agents and quoted Hitler as saying, "We will make them a present of our philosophy."

Couple this with Mussolini's statements in his declaration-of-war speech, in which he said that the war was against those who—I quote: "Cling to monopoly of all riches and all gold on earth."

It is well known that the United States has over three-fifths of the gold supply of the entire world buried in Kentucky. These two gangster robbers who dream of world domination look with lustful eyes upon the resources and wealth of the Americas.

If the dictators are able to destroy the Allies this summer, how could the United States prevent them from establishing military bases in the countries to the south? Do you think that Hitler has not thought of that? If so, then you underestimate the master mind who planned and executed successfully the greatest and most diabolical schemes in military history.

There are those who rely upon the statement of Winston Churchill that the British will never surrender their navy, but when total war comes to England and Hitler tells the British Government that unless they surrender the navy he will annihilate the British people, who could blame the Britons then if they purchased immunity from that fate by the surrender of the navy?

The Nazis have superiority in the air; they have superiority on the land, but they smart under the fact that they do not have superiority on the sea. Therefore, they will stop at nothing in order to gain the British fleet.

Then again, some have said that the Nazis would be too exhausted after the war with the Allies to immediately move upon the Western Hemisphere. But why would the conquerers be exhausted? They would have under their power all the resources and men of western Europe. They would have all of the captured war equipment of 12 nations, besides their own.

Therefore, the totalitarian powers, flushed with victory and strengthened by acquisition, would not likely wait long enough to give the United States a chance to arm.

No, my young friends, I will not deceive you. Great danger threatens the United States today. The "fifth column" propagandists would lull the people of the United States to sleep with a sense of false security. The time has come to look with suspicion upon the patriotism of those who would discount the danger that threatens America.

When Paul Revere flashed through the countryside shouting "To arms! to arms! danger is coming," I am sure the "fifth columnists" of that day were quick to say, "There is no danger. That madcap has war hysteria. If he doesn't quiet down he is going to get us into war." But would he have been a patriot if he had not sounded the danger signal?

When the sexton flashed the gleam from the tower of the Old North Church, he flashed a gleam of warning to the people that danger was coming. No doubt there were those who said then, "Why, there's no danger. That old man's got war hysteria. Everybody go back to sleep."

The people who are now ridiculing the idea of invasion of America by the totalitarian powers are the very same ones who said only a year ago, "There isn't going to be any war." But can we rely upon the assurances of these false prophets?

You may be sure that if the Allies are destroyed before we get armed the dictators will be on American soil and bring with them total war.

There is only one chance for America to escape that fate, and that is for the dictators to be stopped in Europe or else be delayed long enough for America to arm.

Therefore, by furnishing materials to the Allies we can strengthen our own defense and give ourselves more time to prepare. We should send everything except men to help the Allies. We do not have enough tanks and planes and guns to fight the Natzis by ourselves, but what we have, added to what the Allies have, might turn the tide of battle now and save America from a baptism of blood.

If France and England are destroyed, then for the first time in our history the United States will stand alone without one single first-rate power as a friend, and surrounded by totalitarian powers, the mortal enemies of democracy.

Therefore we should redouble every effort to send the Allies materials.

The greatest battle of all history is now raging in France. It is a battle for humanity between democracy and despotism. Every time a gallant eagle of Britain falls with a broken wing there is one less champion of liberty in the world. Every time a French 75 is silenced there is one less gun to speak for democracy. Every time a gallant French soldier goes down in battle there is one soldier less between the Nazi "blitzkrieg" and the youth of America.

Every time Hitler's engines of war advance another mile they draw a mile closer to America.

It is heartbreaking to read of the gallant soldiers of France and England fighting without ammunition, surrounded on three sides, bombed from above, and courageously attacking mechanized monsters with nothing but bayonets.

If not in the interest of humanity, if not in the cause of democracy, then, in the name of self-interest, we must speed supplies to them.

The War Minister of France announced before the battle for Paris that 500 American planes would make sure that not a German would pass. But those American planes did not arrive and the Germans did pass.

If it is not already too late, we must try to make up for lost time. President Roosevelt, the skipper of our old ship of state, has placed his mouth to the speaking tube and called to the United States crew, "Full steam ahead!"

Young people, this is the greatest task which confronts you today. Its solution means the difference between war and peace for our country.

The blood of American youth is so much more precious than the material wealth of the United States that we should use all of that wealth, if necessary, to keep war out of America.

I thank you.

Housing and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the meeting of the executive representatives of the United States Housing Authority and over the Mutual Broadcasting System Thursday evening, June 13, 1940, at the Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are truly times that try men's souls.

A few thousand miles away men are dying in battle. Giant mechanical monsters are mowing down human beings like blades of grass. Death rains from the air. There used to be a saying that every time you take a breath somewhere in the world there is someone who is dying. Tonight, I am afraid, there are hundreds who are dying even as I speak these words.

Here in the Americas we are all agreed that there is only one thing to do—build our defenses. Without adequate defense we are helpless. Unless we buckle down to the task of building a mighty air force, a powerful mechanized army, and an invincible navy, we are inviting disaster.

But how many of us realize what a real defense program means? Are there not too many who still think of a defense program as something that can be brought into existence merely by voting more funds for the armed forces?

The Governments of Great Britain and France, I believe, made this mistake. From recent developments it seems that they very definitely failed to coordinate all the factors involved in defense, to muster up all the resources at their command. Germany, however, knew better. The might of the German war machine is based upon years of detailed planning, of careful—almost diabolical—coordination.

We Americans must learn the lesson of recent events. We must make full utilization of our national resources—our manpower, our machines, our wealth.

It is for this reason that I welcomed the opportunity to address this gathering of housing officials. I believe that adequate housing in the areas where defense industries are expanding or are soon to expand is essential to the success of our defense program.

Suppose we should have certain industries work overtime supplying machinery essential to the airplane industry. Suppose, then, that the men who work with these machines should grow careless, should misuse them, should fail to lubricate them properly, should overlook keeping them clean. The result would be a

sad falling off in efficiency. It would mean less output per hour worked and more expenditure per airplane produced.

Now, I have no fears whatsoever about the proper maintenance of the machinery necessary to our defense program. People understand the importance of machinery. Both labor and management will be on the alert to insure good maintenance.

But how about the maintenance of the men who work these machines?

I have fears on this point. Our Nation does not yet fully understand the importance of maintaining men in as good condition as machinery. There is a serious danger that we will not be quick enough to guarantee decent housing for the men who flock to the expanding defense industries.

But we cannot avoid understanding this fact sometime. If we wait, if we dilly-dally at this moment, it will be brought home to us later when we find workers in key-defense industries sharing beds on a three-men-a-day basis—as happened in many towns during the last war period. It will be brought home to us when we are able to look back after a year's effort and see how many skilled workers have given up their jobs in the defense industries because there was no place in town where they could get decent homes for their wives and children. It will be brought home to us when we have already wasted both time and money.

During the last war I had occasion to study the haphazard, unstudied methods used in facing the acute housing emergency. There was little appreciation beforehand of how critical the housing shortage would become. There was no experience upon which to rely. The result was row after row of cheap, flimsy barracks that were hardly worth a fraction of the money put into them. They didn't fully serve the purpose at the time. When the war was over, they soon deteriorated beyond all hope of decent use.

Today we are more fortunate. We already have the technique and the personnel needed to help us plan and put into effect a housing program to meet the needs of all the localities with expanding defense industries. We have the United States Housing Authority; we have the some 470 local housing authorities that have been set up throughout the Nation.

To those members of the local housing authorities who are here tonight I would like to say this: You are practical men. You have your fingers on the pulse of your local communities. You know how to get things done quickly, economically. It is you, therefore, who must shoulder the responsibility of coordinating housing with defense, of analyzing the needs of the defense workers in your community, and of preparing to meet their needs promptly with housing that will be more than temporary shacks.

To those citizens who, in following the progress of our national-defense program, tend to think in terms of planes and guns only, I would like to say this: Adequate defense means a mobilization of all our industrial forces. It means dozens of other things besides armaments. And high on the list of these other things are decent homes for Americans, homes worth fighting for, homes in which the defense industry worker or the sailor at his naval base can live a normal, healthy life.

Our country needs well-trained men and women. In response to that need our Government should make it possible that these men and women be decently housed.

Aids "Short of War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY BAINBRIDGE COLBY

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, today's Washington, D. C., Evening Star carries an article headed "Aids 'Short of War' may involve us, says Bainbridge Colby. Our conduct can readily be construed as acts of belligerency, he holds."

Why tie us up to a tottering empire? Why imperil our very national existence by stripping America of all its defenses to aid a national already beaten?

GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE DECLARED WAR ON GERMANY

Great Britain and France declared war on Germany. Let them find their way out. There is no obligation on our part to save them from a peril which they themselves invited by a declaration of war on a nation with which they were at peace.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Bainbridge Colby be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 14, 1940]

AIDS "SHORT OF WAR" MAY INVOLVE US, SAYS BAINBRIDGE COLBY—OUR CONDUCT CAN READILY BE CONSTRUED AS ACT OF BELLIGERENCY, HE HOLDS

President Roosevelt's declaration to use "methods short of war" in aiding the cause of democracy and his proposal to turn back surplus warplanes, guns, and ammunition to their manufacturers for resale to the Allies are here discussed by Bainbridge Colby, prominent lawyer and statesman, who served as Secretary of State in President Wilson's Cabinet.

(By Bainbridge Colby)

The question is asked me, How is our neutrality in the European conflict affected by the administration's decision to turn back to their manufacturers warplanes now in the use and possession of the Government for resale to the Allies?

We are told these planes are to be taken from various Naval Aviation Reserve squadrons; that they are in excess of our immediate requirements; that their loss to our armed strength will be made up by replacements soon to be ready.

Turning the planes back to the companies which made them, we are assured from Washington, will "technically avoid the implications of a government-to-government sale." We will thus avoid the consequences of selling planes direct to the Allied Governments, which might be regarded as an act of war, and can therefore persist in our pretension of neutrality, which but for this "subterfuge" might be gravely compromised.

The least said about neutrality in the light of this development, it seems to me, the better. American neutrality has become little more than a forgotten flag on a deserted fort.

AID NEEDED LONG AGO

The aid which it is proposed to rush to the Allies may be demanded by a sound view of our national interest. I do not dispute it. It should have been extended long ago. A large measure of earnest and enthusiastic popular support is behind it. It is impossible to ignore what has befallen the peoples of Europe who staked their national existence upon a strict maintenance of neutrality.

But this sleight of hand with Government property is not neutrality, whatever else it may be.

A neutral state "is bound not to supply armed forces to a belligerent, not to grant passage over its territory to such forces and not to sell them ships or munitions of war even when the sale takes place in the ordinary course of getting rid of superfluous or obsolete equipment." (John Bassett Moore's Digest of International Law (ed. 1906), vol. VII, p. 863.)

GRAVE OFFENSE

"It is a grave offense against the law of nations for a neutral government to sell a man-of-war to a belligerent," said Secretary of State Day in a communication to John Hay, then Ambassador to England, under date of June 25, 1898. In war as it is conducted today there is no distinction between a warship and a fighting or pursuit plane insofar as the duties of neutral nations are concerned. Nor will fraud and stratagem avail, as a United States court has held, to give to conduct which is essentially unneutral in purpose and intent the garb of neutrality.

There is no such thing as unneutral neutrality. Neutrality consists in abstinence from participation in any war to which the neutral nation is not a party, and an impartiality of conduct toward the belligerents without favoring either as against the other. The old distinctions between perfect, qualified, benevolent, or armed neutrality no longer possess legal significance or practical importance. The reciprocal rights and duties existing between the belligerents and neutrals as set forth in the Hague Regulations (1907) and in the Declaration of London (1909) constitute the accepted code of international law on the subject of neutrality. States are either belligerent or neutral. There is no middle ground—not even nonbelligerence.

MEASURES SHORT OF WAR

President Roosevelt contributed much to the prevalent loose thinking and confusion on the subject of our duties as a neutral by his unfortunate expression "measures short of war." Such measures have no place in a policy of neutrality. Measures short of war may easily carry us to war—bring or provoke a declaration of war by an angered or an aggrieved belligerent.

As a matter of fact, measures short of war have a definite and restricted meaning in international law. They include:

1. The laying of an embargo or the sequestration of the ships or goods of the offending nation.
2. Taking forcible possession of the thing in question.
3. The exercise of the right of retaliation.
4. Reprisals upon the possessions of the offending nation until satisfactory reparation for the injuries is made.

To use the expression, as the President does, to include any action, however hostile or hurtful, short of sending a military or naval expedition to the scene of conflict, is well calculated to involve us in war with all the consequences of belligerency.

The matter of the war planes and the specious method proposed for their transfer to the service of the Allies is a striking illustration of this danger. It is certainly not neutral conduct and might readily be construed as an act of war and treated as such.

If it happily proves to be a "measure short of war" as the President employs the phrase, it will be solely because present German policy does not elect to treat it as an abandonment of our neutral status.

Participation in War and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD sundry resolutions passed by the last national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the subject of keeping us out of war and national preparedness.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSING FOREIGN ENTANGLEMENTS AS CAUSE OF WAR

Whereas we, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, are fully aware that this year has been one of peril and despair for many nations and of threatened war and disaster for most nations; and

Whereas we, as citizens of the United States of America, in this the one hundred and sixty-third year of our independence, do realize and appreciate that our faith in liberty and justice are the principles and virtues for which our flag stands; and

Whereas we, as members of a patriotic veteran organization, are deeply grateful for the blessings of peace and freedom which we all enjoy in this great Nation of ours: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we go on record as being opposed to any foreign entanglements; and in case there are at present any such secret treaties or agreements now in effect, or later adopted, that the American people be immediately informed, and that we may maintain our present assurance and satisfaction of being a peaceful, free people in a secure democratic country under a just Government.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Be it resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we give unanimous endorsement to a strong national-defense program for the United States and one that will be capable of meeting on equal terms the armed forces of any other nation or combination of nations that may ever threaten the security of our shores or the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor such expenditures as may be necessary for the upbuilding of our national-defense system, including air forces and naval strength, to sufficient proportions to give the United States the balance of power in any dispute that may arise between our country and any other country that may be inclined to question America's position in the Western Hemisphere.

A PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Whereas the world is in a political and economic turmoil, with powerful nations prepared to take by force what they may want, in a world in which war has been present almost continuously during the 20 years since the World War, and when treaties and solemn compacts no longer bind their signatories; and

Whereas we view with approval the efforts of this Nation in the last year—

1. To maintain its peace and safety in a troubled world.
2. To build its Navy to a strength sufficient to protect our shores and our outlying bases against every possible aggressor.
3. To increase its strength in the air of the Navy and Army to a size to combat successfully the air fleets that could be brought against us.
4. To increase the Regular Army and the National Guard to provide an initial protective force of 400,000 to provide for our national protection without delay, and to equip those forces with the best and latest arms, transportation, and equipment.
5. To provide for the training of the Organized Reserves, the R. O. T. C., and the C. M. T. C., so as to produce a civilian army of maximum strength to support the initial force when necessary, and to plan for the manufacture and delivery of modern supplies when needed.

Whereas we as veterans oppose war here and elsewhere now and forever, but as veterans we recognize that preparedness for emergency is the only remaining means to maintain peace for our prosperous and glorious Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fortieth National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, approves and supports a program for national security adequate to preserve and defend the Republic of the United States of America from all enemies whomsoever.

ACTUAL NEUTRALITY FOR THE UNITED STATES

Whereas "power politics" have long been the most potent factor in the policies of the more powerful nations of Europe and Asia; and

Whereas recent developments in Europe have definitely established that economic prestige and power considerations are of much greater importance to, and a much greater motivating force in, the various countries in Europe and Asia than are any differences in their respective ideologies of government; and

Whereas the World War did not end all wars, did not advance the ideals of democracy, and did not restrain the spread of autocratic, dictatorial, and totalitarian forms of government, as per the hopes held out in the slogans used by American citizens during the period of the World War, as justification for our participation therein; and

Whereas our participation in the World War has so far cost the Nation more than $50,000,000,000, the lives of more than 130,000 of the youth of our Nation, more than 193,000 wounded, and service-connected disabilities for perhaps more than 500,000, of whom 340,000 are now receiving compensation, in addition to unmeasured misery for the surviving widows and orphans and parents of deceased World War veterans; and

Whereas our Nation's participation in any possible future world war would prove to be infinitely more devastating and costly, economically, financially, and in the lives and health of the youth and citizens of our Nation, than was so as to the last World War, with no resulting advantages for our country or for civilization generally which would justify such sacrifices on our part; and

Whereas it is believed that it would be infinitely better for the cause of civilization generally, and for the cause of our country and its people in particular, that the United States keep out of war: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby advocate the adoption and application of the following policies, designed to keep America out of war:

1. Adequate mechanized, motorized matériel and trained men for national defense.
2. Renounce war as an instrument of international policy.
3. Recognize the existence of war regardless of its formal declaration by any belligerent.
4. Advocate compliance with the provisions of the Kellogg Treaty.
5. Proclamation by the United States that it will not engage in any war of aggression.
6. Proclamation by the United States that it will support and defend the Monroe Doctrine.
7. Withdraw armed protection to American citizens, after a period of warning, during their continued travel or residence in any country at war or in any war danger zone.
8. Disclaim responsibility for the safety of American citizens in any country which is at war or in any war danger zone.
9. Continue compliance with the provisions of the so-called Johnson Act.
10. Prohibit the extension of credit or loans by the United States, or any of its citizens, to any country, or its citizens, which is engaged in war.
11. Permit sale of supplies to any nation at war only if paid for, and only if ownership thereof is transferred at our shore lines, without any protection or responsibility whatsoever by the United States Government as to same.
12. Prohibit any American merchant vessels from becoming armed.
13. Provide for the clear identification of all American merchant vessels during time of war between other nations.
14. Disclaim any responsibility for the protection of any American merchant vessels which carry any merchandise to any country at war or into any danger zone, but permit clearance of American vessels only if adequate private insurance is carried on such vessels and members of their crews, which travel into any danger zones.
15. Take the profits out of any possible future war by steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes.
16. Enact legislation to provide adequately for all disabled veterans, and the dependents of all deceased veterans, of all wars, past and future.
17. Conduct an educational program to show the costs of war.
18. Encourage peaceful international negotiations to adjust most irritating deficiencies, differences, and inequities among nations.

MOBILIZATION OF MONEY AND CREDIT DURING TIME OF WAR

Be it resolved, by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby reaffirm our support of proposed legislation to provide for the mobilization and drafting of money and credit during time of war, by

the issuance, as soon as feasible after the beginning of any war in which the United States might unfortunately become engaged, of non-tax-exempt, low-rate, interest-bearing, nonnegotiable, short-term Government bonds, to be purchased by all residents of the country in proportion to their respective wealth, on a graduated basis, as determined by valuation boards, with the specific provision that such bonds shall be redeemed by the Government as soon as possible out of the income derived from steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes to be imposed on a pay-as-you-go basis, as provided in part in S. 1650, introduced by Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma, and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

MOBILIZE INDUSTRY DURING TIME OF WAR

Be it resolved, by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the national defense committee and the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are hereby directed to make a careful study as to the need for additional legislation to provide for the effective and speedy mobilization of manpower, capital, transportation, communication, and matériel resources, in the event of war, and that upon the conclusion of such study, the national legislative committee is hereby authorized and directed to sponsor, support, and cooperate with others in securing the enactment of proposed legislation to provide for such objectives, to the end that the prospects for war might thereby be discouraged, and further, to the end that, if war should come, the United States would be the better prepared to terminate such war successfully as soon as possible.

TAX THE PROFITS OUT OF WAR

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars has consistently advocated that the most effective measures designed to keep America out of war are by: (1) an adequate national defense, (2) an actual neutrality, (3) government control of munitions, and (4) taxing the profits out of war; and

Whereas the only honest and effective means to take the profit out of war is to tax the profits out of war, by steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes; and,

Whereas other proposed wartime controls of prices, priorities, finance expansion, industry, labor and man-power could not be fully effective, even during time of war, without complete regimentation—whether it be called state socialism, communism, or fascism—which it might be impossible to discontinue after the termination of war, and which, if discontinued, would certainly be followed by demands for damages, with interest and profits for the use of conscripted property, thus guaranteeing war profits to all government contractors, and thus failing to take the profit out of war and out of war's aftermath; and

Whereas factual evidence has been presented definitely establishing that the prospects of huge war profits is an incentive to develop enthusiasm and fervor for war, and thereby furnishes a motive toward war, without adequate forethought as to the resulting sacrifices of the lives and limbs of the patriotic youth of our Nation who respond to the Nation's emergency call; and

Whereas the adoption of a law during time of peace which will tax the profits out of war by the imposition of steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes would make all American citizens desirous of avoiding war and, at the same time, by its implied promise that the profits of war would be made to pay for the burdens of war, would thereby help to increase the enthusiasm of all American citizens more effectively to cooperate in bringing about the termination of any war in which the Nation might become engaged just as speedily and as successfully as possible; and

Whereas on the basis of its previous advocacy of an effective law to tax the profits out of war, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was responsible for, and sponsored, the introduction jointly by 50 United States Senators of S. 1885 on March 21, 1939, and also sponsored 12 identical bills by as many Members of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby emphatically reaffirm our advocacy of proposed legislation to tax the profits out of war by steeply graduated personal and corporation income taxes, as proposed in S. 1885, now before the United States Senate of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and in several identical bills in the House of Representatives.

AN ADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars has during the past several years been vigorously advocating specific increases in trained men and modernized, mechanized, motorized matériel for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States and for the National Guard, the C. M. T. C., and the R. O. T. C., and the various Reserve Corps, by liberalized authorizations and appropriations to that end, with the conviction that effective preparedness for war is the best preparedness against war; and

Whereas the authorizations and appropriations for national-defense purposes have each year since 1933 substantially liberalized and added to, responsive to the specific suggestions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, so that appropriations for the United States armed forces for the current fiscal year are about four times as much as was appropriated for the year 1933 and greater than for any fiscal year during time of peace, for which the President and the Congress of the United States are deserving of the sincere gratitude of the American people; and

Whereas lack of adequate military training was the reason for the useless sacrifice of the lives of many of the youth of America during our Nation's participation in the World War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby reaffirm our advocacy of an expanded Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as well as an expanded National Guard, with C. M. T. C., R. O. T. C., and Reserve Corps, with scientifically developed and modernized, mechanized, motorized matériel and equipment, arms and ammunition, ships and airplanes, and other material, as may be considered desirable and feasible by our national committees on national defense and legislation.

TO INCREASE OUR NATIONAL SAFETY

Whereas the unsettled conditions and the constant threat of war throughout the world menace the safety of our country; and

Whereas it is our belief that the United States would be able to make more adequate provision for its national defense if it were in possession of certain strategic and important bases in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; and

Whereas Senate Joint Resolutions, Nos. 119, 120, 170, 171, 172, 173, and 174, presented to the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, by United States Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, present a logical plan of securing such bases by providing for negotiations by the President of the United States with a view of acquiring them by purchase: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Fortieth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the above-listed Senate joint resolutions be supported by our organization, and the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars be instructed to act accordingly.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS, RETIRED

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, retired, as carried by the United Press Association under a New York date line of May 20, 1940. This article relates to national defense, our foreign policy, and allied subjects.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United Press Association sent the following telegram to the press of the country. I was requested by their representative to give my convictions—following 47 years in the uniform at West Point and in the Army. My service included some of the later red Indian campaigns in the West, Santiago in Cuba, the Philippines, and France, where I had a line-of-battle command in all our major battles. I gave the following statement to the press representative, with permission to publish it if he felt it was couched in temperate language:

President Roosevelt's excellent address to Congress set forth our rearmament needs clearly.

I would also apply what Col. Charles A. Lindbergh said Sunday night in his recent remarks on the radio. Colonel Lindbergh thinks we should determine some matters of our foreign policy—to tell what is our policy and what we propose to defend before we can rearm. That is wise.

Among decisions on foreign policy which I think sound is that we should reacclaim that the people who live in the two American continents shall settle the future of the two Americas—the Monroe Doctrine.

I am convinced it is inevitable that the people who live in Europe will settle the future of Europe and that the people who live in northeastern Asia are going to settle the future of northeastern Asia.

Colonel Lindbergh emphasizes the great advantage of our insular and detached position and the advantage this gives us. I feel we should recognize that the war in Europe is Europe's war; that we should keep out of Europe's war and keep out of eastern Asia's war.

No nation can attack us by air without first setting up a great air base in North or South America. We should control from the

mid-Atlantic westward to the mid-Pacific—one-half of the circumference of the earth. I favor continuing the fortification of Johnson, Palmyra, and the Aleutian Islands—all in the eastern part of the Pacific.

After many years' residence in the Far East, I am convinced that Guam is indefensible, even if the colossal sum of $250,000,000 were spent on it. Guam is 3,000 miles west of our base at Hawaii and located in the midst of many Japanese islands. The claim is made that Guam aids our defense against Japan. How can this be when Guam is 1,500 miles farther from our west coast than Japan is?

If our fleet is kept alert watching the far-off Philippines and indefensible Guam, it cannot aid any South American nation if such a nation should be attacked. Admiral William D. Leahy gave the Naval Committee of the House last year a good defense line when he said that our normal defense line runs from the Aleutian Islands to the Hawaiian Islands to Samoa and to the Canal at Panama. The admiral said that our fleet is wholly inadequate to take a naval expedition to the Philippines; that it would be doubtful whether this could be done even with a three times increase in the fleet.

We have had a new war scare in the last few weeks—that is, a proposal by some that we should send our fleet out to the Netherland East Indies. This is a far-fetched proposal, indeed. The Netherland East Indies islands are 2,700 miles farther from us than is Japan. They are 2,700 miles out beyond Japan.

We get about 49 percent of our rubber from the Netherland East Indies and about the same percentage of our tin. The tin we buy from people in Europe and in England, where there are smelters for making tin. The rubber we get from agents who import it from the Netherland East Indies.

However, these agents, if they had to send out to Java for these necessary products, could easily send by way of the Atlantic Ocean. There is no need of sending across the Pacific by way of Japan.

Three important matters stand out as lessons from Britain's reverses in Norway and the fighting in the Low Countries and France. One is the increase in power of the air bomber to aid attacks on land. Its mobility and speed enable it to take the place of artillery in some battles.

Another lesson is the greater power of the air bombers over warships, especially in narrow seas.

The third, and most important, lesson for Britain is her need for a cabinet minister of defense. Such a cabinet officer would spend his whole time in studying and making personal inspections of defense matters.

Nineteen of the principal countries have a cabinet minister of defense. Such a minister would control, not merely coordinate, the army, navy, and air forces. A crucial need for our own defense is to have such a cabinet minister in charge of all three of the armed branches.

There seems to be some confusion of thought in this country and in Congress about several important defense matters. A cabinet minister of defense would be of great value in that he could give an impersonal and objective view of these problems.

"Employment Department"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE BY LEONARD LYONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one paragraph entitled "Employment Department" from a column written by Mr. Leonard Lyons under the caption of "The New Yorker."

This paragraph was taken from the column of Mr. Lyons published in the Washington Post, issue of Tuesday, June 11, 1940. I call particular attention to the fact that Mr. Menken was not able to carry on his work abroad, due to the fact that he was unable to secure a labor permit from the French and British Governments.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

The best news reels of the war were obtained for Paramount by Arthur Menken, son of S. Stanwood Menken. He photographed the evacuation of Norway, and that film now has become a historic document of warfare. Menken's work also was outstanding in Spain and in China, where he photographed the bombing of the *Panay*. But he no longer is working for Paramount because he was unable to secure a labor permit from the French and British Governments.

Trumbull Families of Connecticut and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM CONNECTICUT CIRCLE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article on the distinguished and famous and patriotic Trumbull families of Connecticut and the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Connecticut Circle for June 1940]

TRUMBULL FAMILIES OF CONNECTICUT AND THE UNITED STATES

(Compiled by Marjorie E. Case under the direction of James Brewster, librarian, Connecticut State Library.)

Perhaps no other family has contributed so much to Connecticut's official, military, and artistic life as the famous Trumbull family of Lebanon. The greatest member of that family was undoubtedly "Brother Jonathan," Governor from 1769 to 1784. The only Governor who was loyal to the American cause during the crucial Revolutionary period, he was much esteemed by George Washington. His store in Lebanon, once the headquarters for a large mercantile business, became the war office, the scene of many important conferences with revolutionary leaders, and is now the property of the Connecticut Society of Sons of the American Revolution.

The title of "His Excellency" was conferred upon Governor Jonathan by the general assembly in May 1777. It is said that between 1775 and 1785 he received only £300 for expenses—small wonder, then, that his formerly large estate was insolvent when he died. As evidence of his popular esteem, there were named for him during his lifetime at least two ships, and later a Connecticut town, a highway, and streets in several towns.

The Governor had four sons, each of whom became famous in his own right; Joseph (1737–78) was a member of the Continental Congress and was first commissary general of the Continental Army, 1775–77.

Jonathan (1740–1809) was an aide to Washington, a United States Senator, and Governor from 1797 to 1809. Trumbull County in Ohio, once part of Connecticut's western reserve, was named for him.

David (1752–1822) was his father's first assistant in business and at the war office. His son, Joseph (1782–1861), was the third Trumbull Governor of Connecticut, and also a Member of Congress.

John (1756–1843), the unexcelled painter of revolutionary scenes and personages, was the youngest son of Governor Jonathan.

No complete genealogy of the Trumbull family has ever been compiled, but a wealth of interesting data can be found in biographies and biographical sketches, official documents, and private papers, both published and unpublished. As far as can be determined from various sources, the immigrant progenitor of the Lebanon branch was one John Trumble, a copper, from Newcastle-on-Tyne in England, who was in Roxbury, Mass., 1639. His son, Joseph, removed to Suffield. The latter's son, Joseph, left Suffield for Lebanon, where his famous son, Jonathan, was born in 1710.

Other well-known descendents of the same John Trumble include: John (1750–1831), judge, poet, author of M'Fingal; Rev. Benjamin (1735–1820), historian, clergyman; the latter's grandson, Lyman (1813–96), United States Senator from Illinois, 1855–73. The fathers of this John and of Benjamin were first cousins of Governor Jonathan.

There is another Trumbull family whose members have contributed much to Connecticut. Another immigrant John Trumble, a mariner, came over from England and was at Cambridge in 1636, removing to Charlestown in 1655. A descendant, also named John, came to Norwich, Conn., more than a century later. His son, Gurdon, had three sons of more than usual intelligence:

James Hammond (1821–97) was a historian, bibliographer, and philologist of note; our first State librarian, 1854–55; secretary of state, 1861–66; librarian of the Watkinson Library, 1866–90. He edited the first three volumes of published colonial records of Connecticut. His daughter, Annie Eliot, of Hartford, is a writer.

Henry Clay (1830–1903) was a Civil War chaplain, author and editor. His son, Charles Gallaudet, is also an editor, residing in Philadelphia.

Gurdon (1841–1903) was an artist, his specialty being game fish.

Our recent Governor, John H. Trumbull, of Plainville, is descended from neither of the foregoing families, his own father, Hugh, having come from Ireland, although of Scotch ancestry. Ex-Governor Trumbull, known widely as the flying Governor, is

founder and president of the Trumbull Electric Manufacturing Co., at Plainville.

It would be interesting to be able to show that all these Trumbull families were related, but this seems to be impossible. Perhaps they were all descended from the Scotch border clan of Turnbull (pronounced Trumbull), of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries.

MARJORIE E. CASE.

Misconduct in the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of these debates before the House on the proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act presented by the Smith committee, it is unanimously conceded by all the majority members of the special committee that the present National Labor Relations Board should be abolished and a new Board substituted. Because of this unanimity no great effort has been made by any of the majority to point out, all and singular, the activities of the members of the Board that justify their removal. In order to remove any doubt as to the justification for this unanimity of opinion as to the desirability of eliminating the present Board, I think it proper at this time to point out some of the deeds of active misconduct, not only on the part of the Board but also on the part of a great number of the Board employees, which demand the creation of a new Board.

There can be no doubt as to the unfitness of the members of the present Board for their positions of trust. Their activities have been such as to shock the sensibilities of all fair-minded men. A brief statement of some of their more vicious practices is enough to convince any unbiased person that the total disregard for the democratic principles displayed by the members of the Board cannot longer be tolerated.

The Chairman of the Board, J. Warren Madden, engaged in one of the most despicable and reprehensible activities in the annals of governmental agencies. He sought to withhold the benefit of Government contracts and Government loans from certain companies alleged to be violators of the National Labor Relations Act, by attempting to blacklist those companies with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department and with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, both Government agencies. Chairman Madden's blacklist was not limited to companies adjudged guilty by the Board or the courts of violating the National Labor Relations Act; it also included companies merely charged with such violations. Nowhere in our system of jurisprudence can be found a principle that mere accusation is sufficient for the imposition of drastic penalties; yet the Board, through Chairman Madden, attempted to do just this thing.

Chairman Madden admitted that there was no statutory authority for this blacklist; it was a voluntary effort on his part to impose extra-statutory penalties on companies presumed violators of the act in order to exert pressure on these and other companies to maintain the labor relations with their employees that the Board thought desirable. It is a well-known principle of statutory construction that Statutes in derogation of the common law are to be strictly construed, that is, where statutes depart from the principles of common law all penalties and rights under those statutes are to be confined to those expressly set out in the statutes. Nothing appears in the National Labor Relations Act that would give the Board, or any of its members, any power to blacklist companies with governmental agencies as a means of correcting alleged unfair labor practices. As a matter of fact, attempts have been made on several occasions to write into the act a provision that violations of the act are to be considered by other governmental agencies in the awarding of Government contracts; on each such occasion Congress rejected the proposal by an overwhelming majority.

It is worthy of note that the Board's attempts to blacklist met with very little success; for instance, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War both flatly refused to cooperate with the Board with respect to these activities. They both stated that no provision of the National Labor Relations Act authorized such a penalty against employers, and since the powers of the Board are confined to the language of the act they would have no part in such unwarranted extra legal procedure. This strong repudiation in no way deterred the Board, however, from continuing its blacklisting efforts; it was not until the Comptroller General of the United States handed down an opinion stating that Government contracts could not be withheld from companies even though the Board's finding of guilt was affirmed by the courts that the Board desisted from this practice, and even as late as August of 1939 the Board entered into an understanding with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation whereby the Board would furnish information to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that would be used by it in its loan policies. The Board's determination to use extra legal means to enforce its policies appears unbounded.

One Board member, Edwin S. Smith, whose unsavory connections with Communists and radical labor leaders were vividly described to the Members of the House by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], so far forgot all the tenets of judicial conduct as to attempt to promote a boycott against a company whose wage policies did not meet with Mr. Smith's approval. Mr. Smith at first attempted to interject himself into the controversy between the company and its employees as a mediator, which, of course, is in direct violation of section 4 of the act. When he was informed that his services were not wanted in that capacity, Mr. Smith transferred his activities to another phase of the union campaign against the company—that of assisting the union in the promotion of a Nation-wide boycott against the company.

This boycott promotion was done by means of a letter to a friend and former employee of Mr. Smith who held an executive position with one of the large department stores of the United States. This letter contained language that directly invited this executive to use the buying power of that department store to influence the company to reach a settlement with its workers. Moreover, with this letter Mr. Smith enclosed a letter he had received from a union official, in which it was stated that the union planned to fight the company in every large city in the United States, and that it would appreciate any cooperation possible from large purchasers of the company's goods. Not only did Mr. Smith write such a letter, but on request from the department-store executive he served as an intermediary in the transmission of certain literature from the union to that executive. Included in this literature was a strong appeal to boycott that company's products.

It is significant that throughout these intermeddlings of Mr. Smith no charges of unfair labor practices had been brought against the company, and thus Mr. Smith was acting in a purely voluntary capacity without even a semblance of official authority. As a matter of fact, some 2 months after these activities, the union admitted to a Board employee that it had no basis for any charges of violations against the company. Subsequently, however, charges were filed with the Board, a hearing was held, the case transferred to the Board without any report of the trial examiner being rendered, and a decision issued by the Board finding the company guilty as charged. In spite of his previous activities on behalf of the union, Mr. Smith participated in the decision finding the company guilty, and apparently saw no impropriety in so doing. This man was entrusted by Congress with the duty of being a fair and impartial judge in the cases coming before him as a member of the Board; his actions in this case clearly show his disqualification for any such position.

All of the members of the Board and the Board's executive staff, including a special staff of some 8 or 10 attorneys,

engaged in a campaign, at Government expense, to prevent a threatened reduction in the Board's proposed appropriation and to oppose amendments to the act sponsored by the American Federation of Labor. The campaign was especially directed toward securing the opposition of member locals of the A. F. of L. to the policies of the Federation's executive council. The scope of this campaign was Nation-wide; the regional directors and field agents of the Board maintained a close contact with the various union leaders in their vicinity in order to secure the desired opposition, especially to amendments.

Pressure activities on the part of governmental agencies involving the expenditure of Government funds have been expressly forbidden by an act of Congress and constitute a violation of the United States Criminal Code. Aside from the clear illegality of these activities, the morality of soliciting prospective and, in some instances, current litigants to assist in such campaigns may well be questioned. The obligation implied in such solicitation is obvious; the Board would be compelled to return a quid pro quo in the way of favorable decisions to those unions assisting it. Whenever a judicial tribunal becomes obligated to a litigant in such a manner the efficacy of that tribunal is destroyed; other litigants are placed in the position where their cases are influenced not by the merits of the cause but by the obligations of the Board to those assisting it in its congressional campaigns. Thus, in order to destroy this emasculation of justice, it is necessary to replace these men with new judicial officers who are under no such self-imposed obligations.

The basic act under which the Board functions contains no provision allowing the Board itself to initiate unfair labor practice charges. These charges must be filed by the injured party before the machinery of the act is set in motion. The Board's own rules require the charges to be filed in writing.

Nevertheless, the Board has, on occasion, seen fit to stimulate litigation under circumstances amounting to entrapment in order to establish new doctrines by means of test cases.

Not only has the Board solicited such litigation, but, in at least one case, an important Board official, acting under the direct orders and with the approval of the full Board, conspired with high officials of the C. I. O., including its general counsel, as to the manner of presentation of a test case. This Board official suggested a plan of attack by which the company would be entrapped into an inadvertent violation of the Board's concept of the requirements of collective bargaining, inadvertent because prior to the conspiracy the Board had laid down no principle respecting collective bargaining that the company had not complied with. To further this plan, unusual steps were taken by Board employees prior to the filing of any charges by the union, such as the appointment of the trial examiner to hear the case and the preparation of the complaint. Note especially the preparation of the complaint, which theoretically is based upon the written charges; this shows clearly the active cooperation between the Board and the C. I. O. in this conspiracy.

As soon as the charges were filed, the Board acted with inordinate promptitude in expediting the machinery by which the case could be brought before itself for final determination. It went so far as to dispense with the formality of the trial examiner's intermediate report. Naturally, a finding of guilt by the Board was inevitable, and in this instance a mere formality. Fortunately, however, the Board over-reached itself in its selection of a trial examiner who it was sure would favor its cause, as that trial examiner became so enthusiastic to establish the case against the company that the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit found that his conduct was so prejudicial that it set aside a petition of the Board to enforce its order. Had it not been for the unbounded enthusiasm of the trial examiner, though, the Board might have succeeded in its nefarious purpose. American labor and industry cannot afford to have its rights in the hands of unprincipled men who would stoop to soliciting a test case in order to impose its concepts of labor philosophy on labor and industry; such actions are not to be tolerated and such men must be replaced with men of balanced judgment if our free government is to endure.

One other practice indulged in by the entire Board cannot be passed by without a reference being made to it. That practice is the inventing of remedies to meet situations not covered by the National Labor Relations Act. While pretending to pay homage to the will of Congress in its interpretation of the act, the Board has never been seriously handicapped, in its own estimation, in meeting situations that arose where no statutory authority could be found. Probably the most outstanding example of this practice is the case where the Board ordered the reinstatement with back pay of men who had never been employed by the respondent company. The act provides for the reinstatement with back pay of men discriminatorily discharged through unfair labor practices, but nowhere does it provide that the Board may order the original employment of men and grant them back pay from the time they were refused such employment.

The word "reinstatement" is explicit in the statute, yet Board Chairman Madden stated that the little prefix "re" could be disregarded in order to effectuate the Board's concept of the purposes of the act. In other words, according to Mr. Madden's view, any language in the act that disagreed with the Board's policy could be disregarded in order to allow the substitution of the Board's labor philosophy for that of the Congress. Inasmuch as the National Labor Relations Board is a creature of Congress, owing its existence and its support to Congress, for the Board to take the view expressed by Mr. Madden is tantamount to a repudiation of congressional control. So long as we believe that our Government is a government of laws and not of men, we cannot tolerate such an attitude. Those persons seeking to force such a concept upon us must of sheer necessity be removed from office.

It is true, of course, that the split in the labor movement has rendered doubly difficult the work of the National Labor Relations Board, and made extremely difficult the administration of the act in a field so utterly controversial that only the highest degree of judicial impartiality could have reasonably satisfied the contending factions. Not only did the Board fail to exercise the high degree of impartiality thus made essential, but in its decisions, policies, and interpretations of the act it went out of its way to favor one contending faction over another. For example, by manipulation of the "appropriate bargaining unit" in a manner calculated to ruin labor organizations by depriving them and their members of personal liberty and property rights, the Board has quite naturally aroused the bitterest criticism and evoked vociferous protests from the helpless victims of this unscrupulous form of gerrymandering. In other cases, too, the Board has tended to favor the industrial form of union organization over all others. Thus, instead of adopting the role of an impartial administrator of the act, the Board has sought to impose upon the labor movement its conception of the proper type of unionization. Is it any wonder, then, that the victims of the Board's philosophy have been unanimous in demanding the removal of the men responsible?

In the selection and direction of personnel, the Board has been guilty of extremes of indiscretion and inefficiency. Not only has the Board failed to establish satisfactory policies to govern the selection and supervision of its own employees, but internal dissension has been a striking characteristic of the Board itself. This dissension is not confined to matters of judgment and policy; it goes to the very root of administrative management and to the basic conception of fair play and judicial impartiality.

There can be no doubt that the storm center of the Board, so far as internal dissention and mismanagement is concerned, is the secretary's office. This office performs the functions of a clearing house for the Board. It has its finger in every situation that is in any way connected with the Board, from the appointment of personnel to the formulation of Board policy. The present secretary, Nathan Witt, has been severely criticized by the newest Board member, Dr. William M. Leiserson, for his irregularities in procedure, his incompetency, his bias and partiality, and his failure to seek

instructions from the Board on important matters. The criticisms made by this new Board member culminated in a formal motion being made on two occasions at meetings of the Board calling for the dismissal of the secretary and his satellites. Due to the favor in which the secretary finds himself with Board members Madden and Smith—or, perhaps, his domination of them—the motions for his dismissal were not carried. However, the fact that one of the Board members feels that the present secretary and his assistants should be dismissed forthwith is an indictment of the secretary's office in and of itself.

In addition to the secretary and his executive staff, special investigators under the control of the secretary have been the subject of severe criticisms. Their normal functions are the control and supervision of the Board's regional offices. These functions have been executed in such a manner as to arouse the ire and resentment of all those Board employees who have been exposed to their methods of operation. One regional director was so aroused that she sent a lengthy telegram to the Board Chairman, in which she charged that these investigators had acted in a manner similar to the Russian Ogpu. Another regional director told a sorry tale of the orders that he had received from a special investigator to place petitions of independent unions "in the ice box" and to make employers fear him. With this system of espionage prevalent, it is no wonder that the morale of the field employees has been subjected to severe stress and strain.

Exercising probably the most important judicial function of the National Labor Relations Board is the trial examiner's division. When cases pending before the Board reach the stage of public hearings on the merits, they are held, as a general rule, before one of these trial examiners, who acts as a judicial official of the Board. The trial examiner is charged with the duty of building up the record, ruling on motions, and, in general, being responsible for fair conduct of the hearing. This division has rendered itself, under the present Board and with its present personnel, especially vulnerable to criticism by its disregard of the functional separation of powers, which is the root and basis of our democratic system of judicial procedure. Frequently the concept of fair hearing developed by the judiciary and under the Constitution—presumably an essential even in quasi-judicial proceedings—has been ruthlessly cast aside and ignored. Trial examiners have conferred and consulted with regional directors of the Board, with Board attorneys engaged in prosecuting charges before them, and with the home office in order to obtain advice concerning rulings to be made and trial tactics to be followed in the presentation of the Board's cases.

The Chief Trial Examiner, while a regional director of the Board, accepted the appellation of "judge, jury, and prosecutor." Since assuming the office of Chief Trial Examiner, in a lecture to his subordinates he made the statement that the respondent employer has "two strikes" on him in every case before the Board.

Trial examiners, in writing their intermediate reports after hearings, have been known to go outside the record and to incorporate such off-the-record material in their reports. They have been assisted by attorneys from the so-called review division of the Board in the preparation of these intermediate reports. They have been known to change their reports in vital particulars on the advice of other trial examiners or at the instance or the chief trial examiner and his assistant. A number of these trial examiners have been severely castigated by the courts and Board decisions have been reversed as a result of their prejudiced, overbearing, and arrogant methods of operation. Certain of these trial examiners, during the course of hearings, have communicated with their superior in Washington and with great glee have announced that "the case is in the bag" or "this respondent is going to get the 'business' or the 'works,'" or "It is a nice question that can be decided, I think, in favor of the C. I. O. union," or "no examiner has an impartial mind." These are the agents of the Board before whom respondents and their counsel have appeared with the naive expectation that they will receive fair and impartial treatment. Is it any wonder that in their disillusionment organizations and individuals—employers and employees—have cried aloud for a change in the system that permits such evils?

Much has been said on the floor of this House concerning the Board's division of economic research and its evil genius, David J. Saposs; therefore, it is unnecessary for me to dwell at any great length upon them. Suffice it to say that this division, headed by the radical Saposs, not only reflects the extreme of the Board's class consciousness, but is actually beyond the scope of the Board's delegated authority. Not only has this division failed to justify its existence, legally or practically, but its activities and its radical personnel are entirely incompatible with the fundamental legal philosophy which forms the basis for our political structure. The "crusading" spirit of Saposs, who regards the relationship between employer and employee as a sanguinary war between capital and labor and as a bitter class conflict—doctrines which have found wide acceptance throughout the National Labor Relations Board—has no part in the American scheme of national existence.

A great deal has been said at various times, in the press, on the radio, and even on the floor of the House, concerning the Board's review division. The professsed justification for the existence of this division is the necessity of preparing cases for presentation to the members of the Board who would otherwise find it extremely difficult to obtain an understanding of the facts in the many and varied cases presented to them. After this presentation, which occurs through the medium of an interview with the members of the Board, the Board reaches its decision and the review attorney is directed to draft it. When the decision is approved by the Board members, it is issued as the Board's own ruling and decision.

The outstanding fault in this system lies in the youth and inexperience of the attorneys employed for this purpose. I might say parenthetically that according to testimony in the record, attorneys have been recommended and, obviously, accepted because they possess "the right viewpoint," "a strong social consciousness," and "a liberal viewpoint—I should say turned left."

These review attorneys have been guilty of many indiscretions and downright misconduct. They have had material in their possession to assist them in the preparation of the cases which was expressly prohibited to them even by order of the Board. These attorneys often used off-the-record material in preparing their cases, which material was procured without any notice of any kind being given to the parties in the case. A review attorney disregarded the instructions of the Board as to the manner of drafting the Board's decision and drafted it according to her own view as to how the case should be decided.

Many more instances of misconduct could be cited, such as the juggling of challenged ballots in an election case, the failure to use the entire formal record of a case, and the expression of opinions as to the credibility and materiality of evidence presented in the record. As an example of the last, one review attorney, in the notes that he used in reporting to the Board, characterized certain testimony favorable to the employer and to an independent union as "nuts" and "baloney."

I believe I have said enough, in view of other material on the review division that has been presented from time to time, to show that this "appellate court" of the Board has not functioned in the best interests of justice and fair play. The danger, as it appears to me, of these and other examples of misconduct on the part of Board employees is not only the fact of their commission, which shows an attitude that should not be found in a governmental agency but also the fact that even when these examples came to the attention of the proper officials no attempt was made to correct the abuses disclosed, nor was any attempt made to reprimand the guilty parties. This indicates a callousness on the part of the Board to the fundamental principles of our judicial system which cannot be disregarded.

A special investigator of the Board, in concert with a regional director, actively participated in the organization of the workers in the steel industry by the C. I. O. Closed conferences and intimate discussions concerning union policy in this organization drive were reported directly to the Board.

This employee also acted as a conduit between the Board and John L. Lewis for the transmission of information relative to Board cases and C. I. O. policies. Nothing could be more clear than the fact that this man's activities cemented the bond between the Board and the C. I. O., the bond which has been one of the main causes of industrial unrest.

To close my discussion of the Board's subordinate personnel, I should like to point out certain outstanding examples of bias, inefficiency, and incompetency which the Board has either made no attempt to correct or which attempt was made so belatedly that it was rendered nugatory. As an example, the Board was notified by its then secretary as early as 1937 of the pro-C. I. O. union and antiemployer attitude of one of its field examiners. Instead of dismissing this examiner forthwith, the Board transferred him to another regional office and gave him a raise in pay. It was not until the newest Board member, Dr. Leiserson, demanded a thorough investigation of the scandalous conditions in the Los Angeles regional office that this employee was dismissed. His dismissal did not occur until September of 1939.

Another example of Board mismanagement of personnel is the employment as a trial examiner of a man who, to the knowledge of Board Members Madden and Smith, had written a book on the C. I. O. This man had stated in a letter to the Board that a position "either with you or the C. I. O. would be equally desirable." Later the contents of the book, which was violently anti-A. F. L. and pro-C. I. O., came to the attention of Chairman Madden, and the trial examiner was reluctantly dismissed. However, in the interim he had sat as a judicial officer in some half-dozen cases.

A third example is that of a man who was employed as a per diem trial examiner even though the then secretary of the Board knew that the man had been attempting to obtain a position with the C. I. O. "at any price." Material found in the Board's personnel file on this man discloses a series of communications between John L. Lewis, head of the C. I. O., and this man, in which the latter begged Lewis to employ him "in any capacity." This man was finally dismissed, but only when the Board changed its policy of employing per diem trial examiners.

One of the outstanding examples of Board mismanagement of its personnel is the case of the regional director of the Cincinnati office, Philip G. Phillips. This regional director had communicated with the chief trial examiner and with the secretary concerning the setting of "phony" hearing dates in order to harass employers. He had threatened an employer with dire consequences because the employer had failed to agree with him, saying, "I tell you, Greenfield, I'll get you." This same regional director boasted to the Board's secretary of his friendship with certain newspapermen in Cincinnati, and how these newspapermen had killed news stories derogatory to the Board.

As a climax to the career of this man, I would like to say a brief word about one case in which he meddled so viciously that the Board was later forced to set aside its own decision. In the case the regional director had instructed the trial examiner how to rule on certain evidence presented as to the communistic background of an employee allegedly discharged for union activities. These instructions were the result of conferences with the chief trial examiner and with the secretary, and were given to the trial examiner sub rosa. As a result of these activities, the Board set aside its own decision but did not in any way discipline this regional director, although he himself testified that he deserved at least a reprimand.

A final example of Board mismanagement is that of a field examiner of the Board who, in investigating a case, had told witnesses, "Of course, you know that I am working for the C. I. O., and the C. I. O. will benefit you by back pay"; and, when an employee refused to swear a plant shut-down was a lockout, he had said, "By God, you swear it, and I'll prove it."

These statements and activities on the part of this employee were brought directly to Board Chairman Madden's attention, but nothing was done to this man except to transfer him to another regional office and to delay promotion for approximately a year. Subsequent to this incident, this same field examiner appeared in a case where the employees had sought to withdraw their charges and attempted to persuade them not to do so, saying that the Board could order reinstatement with back pay if the complaint could be established against the company.

These examples to which I have referred are by no means isolated ones, but are sufficient to point out the failure of the Board to adopt a proper personnel policy and to reprimand and discharge those employees who flagrantly violated all the canons of proper conduct. As the Board is charged with the responsibility of supervising its employees, the more so where their misconduct has been actively brought to its attention, the failure of the Board to act in these cases is conclusive proof of its unfitness to continue in office.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the most casual scrutiny of the Board's activities reveals capricious and arbitrary abuse of power by an administrative agency entrusted with a grave public function—the adjustment of industrial strife—so inherently essential to the welfare, both social and economic, of the entire body politic. These conditions can no longer be tolerated—this Board must be removed, and a body of fair-minded, conscientious, judicious men appointed in their stead.

Explanation of Amendments to National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Labor I believe it to be my responsibility to clarify the amendments adopted by the House to the National Labor Relations Act. I shall attempt to do so and hope my analysis will prove that the chairman of the committee and the Members who voted against the Smith amendments have kept faith with the working men and women of America regardless of whether or not they are members of the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., or any other labor organization.

There are important reasons why the Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act should not become law. Those amendments are not conducive to industrial peace; they are a backward step in legislation dealing with labor relations; they are not desired by the workers of the Nation. The searching and unanswerable criticism of the amendments by the minority of the special committee of the House, composed of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], is sound. The Smith amendments were also considered and rejected by the Labor Committee of the House, of which I have the honor to be chairman. That committee held long hearings on various proposals for amending the Wagner Act. We heard and appraised criticisms of the act and its administration. While we found that one or two of the Smith amendments were no more than restatements of the law or existing practice of the Board, we found that others were seriously detrimental to the principles of the act and to its effective administration. An amendment which but states the existing law is the one requiring that the findings of fact of the Board must be supported by substantial evidence in order to obtain the approval of the reviewing courts. This is law now.

The provisions in the Smith amendments for employer petitions for elections cover the same subject as a Board regulation long since promulgated. As this regulation does

not have the force of statutory law, the Labor Committee proposed an amendment covering employer petitions. There was also the problem of greater stabilization of contractual relations entered into between an employer and the certified representatives of his employees. While we found the actual practice of the Board to be not to disturb such relations for a year notwithstanding a claim of change of representatives, this was but a wise exercise of discretion on the part of the Board. My committee proposed an amendment to give this practice the force of law. There was also the admittedly troublesome problem of the appropriate bargaining unit, one which even Solomon in all his wisdom could not now solve to please all conflicting interests. The Labor Committee went so far, however, as to propose an amendment designed to insure the right of the members of craft unions to determine for themselves in all cases whether they desire the craft unit. This would relieve the Board of all discretion in the matter. The Labor Committee also proposed to enlarge the Board by increasing its membership from three to five, in order to bring to bear upon the problems connected with the administration and enforcement of the act two additional minds, while at the same time the Board would have the continuing benefit of the experience of the members who have with honor and ability engaged in the arduous labors of the past years.

The amendments of the Labor Committee would preserve the act. They were adopted by my committee with a sympathetic and studious approach to the requirements of intelligent labor legislation. We engaged in no vendetta against labor, labor's magna carta, or the Labor Board. The Smith amendments, however, still "as a whole strike in a destructive way at vital fundamental principles of the Labor Relations Act," as the president of the American Federation of Labor described them in the unabridged form in which they were originally introduced.

Unable to assail the good that has been done by the act, those who support the Smith amendments give no reasoned justification for them. They even say, for example, that the act is so framed that it is impossible to secure industrial peace, when industrial peace is here in greater measure than could have been expected in so short a time. They say we must provide for court review of Board orders, when Board orders are being reviewed every day by the courts. They are determined to strike a blow at this law and through it at the laboring man.

It is estimated that there are approximately 330,000 employers engaged in industries which would be subject to the National Labor Relations Act. But the statistics of the Board's operations show that in the fall of 1935, when the Board began to function, until the end of the last fiscal year, the Board has issued complaints against employers in only 1,150 of these cases. That is only three-tenths of 1 percent of the employers subject to the act. Only 667 of these cases had resulted in Board orders. The remainder of the thousands of cases closed by the Board were either settled, dismissed by the Board, or withdrawn. It is only a small group of employers, therefore, who have so acted as to necessitate formal orders of the Board. The Smith amendments, however, will deprive thousands of employees of all protection and critically weaken the safeguards afforded all other employees under the act. Let me demonstrate this statement.

One of the amendments redefines the term "agricultural labor" so as to exclude from the act workers engaged in the advance stages of processing and preparing for market agricultural commodities. The report of the majority of the Smith committee favoring this amendment frankly stated that it intended to reverse the Board's ruling in the North Whittier Heights Citrus Association case, which was approved by the courts for the simple reason that the company was not engaged in agriculture. It was engaged in industry. This company was a huge corporation, made up of some 200 citrus-fruit growers. There is no cogent reason why such workers should be denied the beneficent protection of the act. The circuit court of appeals stated in the decision referred to:

> In this status of this industry there would seem to be as much need for the remedial provisions of the Wagner Act, upon principle, as for any other industrial activity. (*North Whittier Heights Citrus Association* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 109 F. (2d) 76.)

The men involved in this case were members of the A. F. of L. They came to the Board and the courts for protection under the law. They received it. It is to be taken from them now. Can the American Federation of Labor support this amendment? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6, 1940, contains an interview with its president, in which he said, in part:

> Of course, there are some of the Smith amendments which the Federation of Labor does not approve. One is a provision that exempts agricultural workers from the terms of the National Labor Relations Act. * * * He said the Smith amendment on that score is too broad as it now stands.

The second Smith amendment I wish to discuss also shows the same determination to restrict the benefits of the Wagner Act to as few workers as possible. It precludes reinstatement of employees found to have engaged in "willful violence" in connection with labor disputes. What is the true significance of this proposal? Mr. Smith says that all he means to do by this amendment is to incorporate the language of the Fansteel case, as decided by the Supreme Court. I have already pointed out he desires in the so-called agricultural amendment to repeal a decision in order to narrow the area of the protection of the act. Here, however, he desires to incorporate a court decision, but this, too, would narrow the benefits of the act far beyond the terms of the Court decision. I support the view expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]. They point out in their minority report on the special committee investigation that this amendment goes far beyond the Fansteel decision as that decision has been construed by the courts themselves. This amendment would visit economic death upon every worker who during a strike engaged in any "willful violence," no matter how trivial, regardless of the circumstances, and notwithstanding he was unlawfully discharged. The employer would suffer no comparable penalty for his own lawlessness. The courts have already repudiated such injustices. (*Republic Steel Corporation* v. *Board*, 107 F. (2d) 472, certiorari denied April 8, 1940; *Board* v. *Stackpole Carbon Co.*, 105 F. (2d) 167, certiorari denied 308 U. S. 605). We should follow the courts in this respect and leave the question of reinstatement of employees to the exercise of a sound judgment based on the facts of each case.

I turn to the so-called free-speech amendment, which adds to the existing prohibition against interference, restraint, and coercion the following nullifying language:

> Nothing in this section or this act shall be construed or interpreted to prohibit any expressions of opinion with respect to any matter which may be of interest to employees or the general public, provided that such expressions of opinion are not accompanied by acts of coercion, intimidation, discrimination, or threats thereof.

The proponents of this amendment state that all they mean to do is to make the act consistent with the constitutional guarantee of free speech. If that were all they would not so strongly advocate it, because they know the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and cannot be overturned by Congress or the Board. There should also be some evidence that the Board has interfered with the right of free speech. There is none, notwithstanding Board orders have been reviewed by the courts more than a hundred times. The purpose and the necessary effect of this amendment is to encourage employers to interfere with the worker's exercise of the rights protected by the act. Coercion may exist though unaccompanied by "acts." The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals stated the following concerning "expressions of opinion" by employers:

> Surely, he (the employer) has the right to his views. And yet, the voice of authority may, by tone inflection, as well as by the substance of the words uttered, provoke fear and awe quite as readily as it may bespeak fatherly advice (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Falk Corporation*, 102 F. (2d) 383).

Since the employer is protected by the Constitution itself in his right to freedom of speech it is obvious this amendment also is sought merely to restrict the freedom of employees now guaranteed by the act. It is contrary to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and every previous statement of Federal policy on this subject. It would again open the door to company-dominated unions.

The Smith amendments further curtail the rights of labor by a 6 months' statute of limitations upon the filing of charges. In a recent case before the Board the intermediate report of the trial examiner shows that the officials of the company in 1937 engaged a "strong-arm squad" to slug, blackjack, tar and feather, and otherwise manhandle all union sympathizers who appeared on the scene. The connection of the company with these deeds was not brought to light until 1939, when certain of the hired thugs, disgruntled by their discharge by the company, told the full story of their activities. The Board has rendered a public service in bringing the facts to light. Under the Smith amendment the Board would have been powerless to expose these vicious labor practices. One of the leading victims of the strong-arm squad was an A. F. of L. organizer. This is but one illustration of the problem involved. There is no respectable precedent for a statute of limitations which kills important rights within 6 months. Other property rights are not extinguished in so short a time. No reason can be advanced for setting up a special rigid rule of this sort for labor.

Another proposal would restrict most unreasonably the benefits of the act by prohibiting back pay for a period longer than 1 year. The proponents of this amendment say it is to spur on the Board to greater speed in disposing of its cases. No one has as yet accused the Board of failing to work diligently in bringing its work up to date. It is succeeding in doing so. But after Board decision an employer can consume months and years in dilatory tactics in the courts. He is now discouraged from deterring the progress of a case any more than is necessary to a fair determination of the issues. If this amendment goes through, there will be no incentive to avoid stalling. There will be every incentive to take all cases into court and subject them to every known delaying device. Even if the courts finally decide that the worker was unlawfully discharged, he, the victim, will be compelled to bear the burden of his losses. This burden, in all reason and justice, must be borne by the one who causes it. Here again we see a definite blow at the workers. I predict great resentment among the rank and file of American labor if this unfair and unjust amendment becomes law.

Another amendment deals with the appropriate bargaining unit. Briefly, it provides that whenever it is proposed to include any craft in a larger bargaining unit, or any plant in a unit of several plants, or employees of one employer in a bargaining unit of several employers, an election must be held among the smaller group, which may only be included in the larger unit if a majority vote is to be included. This amendment is somewhat similar to the amendment proposed by the Labor Committee, which provided that whenever a majority of a craft group desired to be a separate bargaining unit it should have that privilege. There is one very important difference between these two proposals, however. Under the amendment as passed by the House, a separate election must be held, regardless of whether there is any showing of sentiment among the men in the smaller group favoring such a separate election. In other words, even though all the employees in a plant were perfectly satisfied to have an industrial unit, and even though there was no craft organization seeking to organize the craft employees in the plant, the Board would be required to hold separate elections among the crafts before the larger unit could be certified. It seems to me that this would be a serious waste of time in that sort of case. In addition, this amendment would require that the Board, without any craft representative claiming a specified group of employees, decide in the abstract the exact number of "crafts" in the plant and the precise boundaries of each craft. This is a problem that has vexed labor experts, and, indeed, the A. F. of L. itself, for years. It is placing an impossible burden on the Board to require it to answer these tremendously difficult jurisdictional questions in cases where the craft unions themselves are not interested in asserting their claims.

The amendments which I have discussed thus far all affect substantial rights. Except for the unit amendment, each of the amendments is demonstrably of a repressive and restrictive character. We find the same spirit and the same effect running through another series of the Smith amendments, those relating to procedural matters. These include a proposal that the courts, on reviewing Board findings of fact, may set them aside not only if unsupported by substantial evidence—the correct and traditional criterion—but also if clearly erroneous. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], an able lawyer, advocated this language but he admitted, "I do not know whether anyone is absolutely sure just what 'clearly erroneous' means." Little more need be said by me. Nevertheless, I call attention to the fact that this language has been taken out of the Walter-Logan bill by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. These new friends of labor in the House, however, insist upon restricting and confusing the fair terms of the present statute governing court review. They insist upon encouraging litigation over words of uncertain meaning; they insist upon gambling upon the result without knowing what they themselves mean by the amendment. They also propose that the proceedings of the Board be conducted "so far as practicable in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States." Though a laywoman and not a lawyer, I must say that if Congress desires to impose upon this agency technical rules of evidence, a step which I am advised is contrary to the whole modern trend even among the courts, and is inconsistent with the requirements of our laws and the decisions of the courts governing all other quasi-judicial agencies, then Congress should do so, and not leave the matter confused by the vague criterion, "so far as practicable." How this phrase is to be interpreted is another gamble. Here indeed would be a fertile field for lawyers, for conflicting court decisions, for delays and uncertainties, while the decisions of the Board and the rights and obligations involved therein awaited the result of the unending controversies over the question in each case whether the rules of evidence had been followed "so far as practicable." We must not do this thing. We have no reason to invite these troubles. There is no evil to remedy by going to evils we know not of. The Supreme Court has clearly held that the words of the act as now phrased:

> Free administrative boards from the compulsion of technical rules so that the mere admission of matter which would be deemed incompetent in judicial proceedings would not invalidate the administrative order. * * * But this assurance of a desirable flexibility in administrative procedure does not go so far as to justify orders without a basis in evidence having ration probative force (*Consolidated Edison Co. et al.* v. *Board, et al.*, 305 U. S. 197).

This is clearly a sufficient answer to this proposal. We must not write into law another field day for lawyers at the expense of labor and the public policy of the act. I question the wisdom also of throwing all Board decisions in representation cases, which involve no order against anyone, open to judicial review, permitting parties to these election cases to tie them up and thus delay interminably the collective-bargaining process. We deliberately rejected this proposal when the act was passed in 1935 because of the unfortunate experience encountered in the administration of Joint Resolution 44 by the predecessor Board. Is it wise, is it in the interest of labor, to rush into those evils now?

I add here also my protest against the punitive expedition against the Economics Division of the Board contained in the amendment which would prohibit the Board from employing individuals for statistical work. If the Board has found need for statistical or research work I know of no reason why Congress should refuse to permit that need to be supplied, unless it be for the reason which animates the Smith amendments as a whole, namely, to restrict and hamper the Board in every way possible short of frank repeal.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the amendments which would divide the functions of the Board between an administrator and the Board, and by thus dividing and confusing destroy completely the administrative process as it has been hereto-

fore developed by the Congress and approved by the courts with respect to a host of statutes. On the one hand, charged with sole responsibility for initiation of proceedings in unfair-practice cases would be a political appointee without a fixed term. This is a run-around for labor. On the other hand, there would be the Board with the power in such cases solely of deciding the case, but with its decisions still ineffective without court review and approval, although its staff had no part in its initiation or prosecution. Add to this that the Board would continue to handle representation or election cases. Our friends apparently require one Nation-wide organization, under the Board, in representation cases, and another such organization, under the administrator, for the initiation and prosecution of complaint cases. There is no logic or reason in this confusion and duplication. My strongest objection, however, is to the whole break-down of the structure of the Board, without precedent in our legislation governing the other great agencies. Notwithstanding a few instances of alleged improprieties recited by the Smith committee, a careful reading of the minority report of that committee will convince you, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is wholly unjustified. Mr. Green told the Smith committee January 25, 1940, when asked whether the A. F. of L. advocated a separation of functions of this sort,

> We have no recommendations along that line * * * because we think that will mean further delay and perhaps encourage more confusion.

Mr. Padway, counsel of the A. F. of L., before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, May 2, 1939, said,

> We do not subscribe to a plan, measure, or principle separating the judicial from the administrative functions of the Board.

It is in the interest of labor, and in the end it is in the interest of all, that the development and enforcement of the law of collective bargaining be continued with one agency responsible therefor, together with the courts' review of its decisions as now required. Congress must not destroy the great progress made by the Board and the courts in the development of the law of collective bargaining within the terms of the present statute by adding now new sources of confusion, delays, and uncertainties inherent in a division of responsibilities and counsels. The division of responsibility now existing between the Board and the courts is the exactly proper and traditional division. If it suffices for the safeguarding of other public and private rights, it should not be further subdivided with respect to the rights of labor.

Finally, there is the amendment to abolish the present Board. When we analyze all these amendments, as I have tried very briefly to do, it becomes very clear that the unseemly drive to abolish the Board falls into its place as but another part of the whole plan to undermine the act and the principles for which it stands. I cannot, in the brief space left to me, review the great accomplishments of the past 5 years—the successful defense of the act in all its parts against all legal attacks, the establishment of a new organization in a new field, the handling and disposition of many thousands of cases, mostly without even the initiation of formal adversary proceeding, the very superior record of the Board in the courts where the work has been more closely and impartially reviewed than by any other persons or groups, the fair and honest conduct of thousands of elections involving more than a million votes, the righting and remedying of injustices to employees in hundreds of cases involving thousands of employees, the amicable adjustment of thousands of cases, the great strides made in union membership and in stabilizing labor relations through collective trade agreements, the great reduction in industrial strife, both in numbers of strikes and their duration, the elimination of fear and the concurrent growth in freedom of self-organization. The task that was to be done was heavy. The obstacles were numerous and trying. All this must be conceded. The record of the Board cannot be challenged. It cannot be challenged by generalized criticisms emanating from a divided labor leadership contesting for advantage; nor by organized employer opposition that is but a continuation of the original opposition to the act itself; nor by occasional human errors among a developing staff working at times in an atmosphere of severe opposition and in a field heretofore too highly charged with emotion. This Board should not be abolished. As Dean Garrison told the Smith committee, the Board deserves public gratitude.

The important thing overlooked in criticism of the Board is the fact that it was writing labor law to set precedents. It was necessary therefore, to conform to strict interpretation of the act.

As I have said before, in presenting the committee bill to the House, there undoubtedly were mistakes of judgment on the part of overzealous investigators but those mistakes are usual in administering a new act. As I have also said many times, rather than adopt amendments which would destroy the act, there should be no amendments unless they are of a constructive nature. That was my reason for opposing the rule that was adopted substituting the Smith bill, which makes drastic changes in the fundamental principles of the act, for the bill reported by the Labor Committee. I believe that if the amendments proposed by the Committee on Labor had been adopted, all the criticism against the act would have been eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that in its wisdom the Senate Committee on Labor will carefully examine the provisions of the Smith bill, and that as a result of such examination the bill may be sent to conference, after due consideration by the Senate, where the friends of labor may amend the act if and where it is necessary.

Conservation—National Parks and National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the article entitled "How Much Conservation?" by Richard L. Neuberger, which is being published in the Saturday Evening Post in its issue of June 15, 1940.

The article is as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, June 15, 1940]

The American conservation movement is breached today by the angriest hostilities since the row between Gifford Pinchot and Secretary Richard A. Ballinger nearly tore apart the Department of the Interior 30 years ago. How far ought conservation to be carried? At what point does conservation stop and the arbitrary bottling up of land and resources begin?

A gray-bearded pioneer, John Heulsdonk, symbolized the dilemma as he faced Gov. Clarence D. Martin across a desk on the first day of this spring in the Washington State Capitol at Olympia, and demanded that the militia be called out to prevent the Federal Government from sweeping his backwoods farm into the new Olympic National Park. The frontier had to be guarded against waste and exploitation, John agreed, but what would happen to the people who depended upon the frontier for a living?

Scattered throughout the far West are eight or nine upland and mountain fastnesses as vast as whole New England States. These are our final wilderness strongholds. Should they be barricaded behind national-park boundaries and thus forever protected from the ax, the plow, the miner's drill, and the jackhammers and dynamite of the dam builders?

This question, at first glance so free of controversy, has precipitated wrathful demonstrations in the countryside and caustic words at Cabinet meetings. Conservationists themselves are sharply

divided. Some ask a corollary question: What will become of the John Heulsdonks—the men who cultivate stump ranches, graze cattle, fell America's trees, and dig in the hills for gold and silver and copper and manganese? The problem has been debated with vehemence by both Houses of Congress. It has plunged the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture into total war on each other. Over it old friendships have been sundered and strange alliances improvised. And it has stirred thousands of people and is an issue in this year's elections in the four largest Pacific-slope States—California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

Conservation has always been a vital reason for the establishment of national parks. Yet a greater factor has been the desire to set aside unique natural wonders. In this class have been the Yellowstone, the Sequoia trees, Crater Lake, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon, and many other marvels. Now the emphasis has shifted. Alarmed lumber and livestock communities maintain that parks are being promoted in their localities not so much because of rare or breathtaking landscapes, as to take rich accumulations of natural resources out of production. A lot of the park promoters admit the charge and defend it vigorously.

NATIONAL-PARK BATTLEFIELDS

As far as new national parks are concerned, conservation has developed into an end in itself rather than a means to protect scenic phenomena. Citizens in the timbered Pacific Northwest, for example, gloomily predict this fencing off of raw materials may extend to every forest vista in the region. What then, they ask, will keep the sawmills going?

Here is Secretary of the Interior Ickes telling a congressional committee why 898,000 acres of woodland along the western shore of Puget Sound should be stockaded back of the borders of the Olympic National Park: "If the exploiters are permitted to have their way with this Olympic Peninsula area, all that will be left will be the outraged squeal of future generations over the loss of another natural treasure." Listen as Willard G. Van Name, of the American Museum of Natural History, describes what will happen unless the recommendations of Mr. Ickes are accepted: "In this timber, if there is a stream through it, it may be made a reservoir. Everything can be changed and its natural beauty destroyed, and that is a fact that should be evident to almost anybody who travels around the country. These wonderful forests must be preserved."

But the Washington State Planning Council, itself composed of conservationists, sees dangerous consequences to the State in any preservation which "would lock up forever some 17,000,000,000 board-feet of standing timber, with all of its huge potentialities to labor, to support existing communities, and to furnish forest products demanded by the Nation." These forebodings have been reduced to statistics by Peter E. Terzick, a spokesman for the Oregon-Washington Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers: "There are at the present time 11,629 woodworkers depending upon timber from the Olympic Peninsula for their livelihood. They operate 49 sawmills, 43 shingle mills, 6 pulp mills, 4 plywood plants, 14 woodworking plants, and 95 logging camps. To lock up nearly a million acres of virgin timber on the peninsula would mean replacing the axes and saws which are the badge of these men with W. P. A. shovels within the next few years."

And so the issue is squarely joined. Should the American wilderness be sequestered in national parks or should it be open to development—and to possible looting? At stake are sprawling hinterlands totaling in size considerably more than the area of England. The intensity of the dispute matches the dimensions of the prize. When, several months ago, President Roosevelt signed the act creating the John Muir-Kings Canyon National Park in the high Sierras, he did so at the request of 152 organizations and many leading newspapers in California, and over the objection of 109 organizations and both branches of the California Legislature.

It was never in doubt that the Kings Canyon controversy centered exclusively on the raw materials in the region. "There are still some," maintained Congressman BERTRAND W. GEARHART as he introduced the bill for the park, "who say we should not lock up these mountain resources, that we should reserve them for commercial exploitation. I say the thought is abhorrent." The Legislature of California answered him with the protest that the park encompassed natural resources of soil, water, forests, minerals, forage, game animals, birds, and fish vital to the permanence and future growth and prosperity of the basic industries of the State.

All over the West this wrangle cuts across customary political and economic lines. The usual guideposts are of no value. GEARHART is a Republican and so are his adversaries in the California Legislature. Secretary Ickes, generalissimo of the third-term forces, stumped the State for the Kings Canyon Park and was zealously supported by the Los Angeles Times, the San Francisco Examiner, and other papers which claim one term was too many. The Santa Barbara County Chamber of Commerce lined up for the park and the Madera County Chamber of Commerce against it, the Central Grange for and the Poplar Grange against, the Lions Club of Riverdale for and the Lions Club of Lone Pine against, the Northwest Conservation League for and the Los Angeles Conservation Association against, the Native Daughters of the Golden West for and the Daughters of the American Revolution against.

As a general rule, enthusiasm for corralling frontier domain in new national parks is directly proportionate to the distance from the area involved. Thus, although the Portland Central Labor Council approved a park on the Olympic Peninsula, the Central Labor Council of Grays Harbor, at the edge of the peninsula's forests, looked on the proposition with dismay. Garden clubs in Seattle want a national park at Hells Canyon, where the Snake River has trenched more than a mile into the mountains separating Oregon and Idaho, but the men who graze sheep and cattle above the chasm are yelping a loud "No!"

The late Robert Marshall, of the American Wilderness Society, who was a 50-mile-a-day man in the woods, once summarized the attitude of the people who view this situation from a detached perspective. He conceded that fortifying 17,000,000,000 board feet of timber in the Olympic Park might knock 5,000 lumber workers out of their jobs. This he deplored, but wondered if it was vastly important compared to the total number of unemployed in the Nation. "The invention of one new machine," he insisted, "frequently does far more than this in bringing about unemployment." And he pointed out that the great trees on the Olympic Peninsula belong to the whole United States and not just the dwellers in that locality. Cut down by the logger's ax, their grandeur would be gone forever. They would merely be planks and kindling wood.

"The real issue," said Marshall, emphasizing an issue which exists in every Western State where some of the wilderness still survives, "seems to be whether the local objection to locking up commercial values outweighs the national gain of preserving this magnificent forest purely for its beauty."

Local objection on the Olympic Peninsula has been both vociferous and aggressive. John Heulsdonk went to the State capital carrying a sign which said, "Stalin took Finland. Hitler took Poland. Don't let Ickes take our homes away from us." John had lived in his home a long time—long enough to be the hero of the peninsula's most famous story.

When the Pacific Northwest was a new land, John had trudged up one of the narrow trails of the Hoh River Gorge. On his back was strapped a squat, unwieldly kitchen range. A trapper he met on the path looked at him and marveled.

"Say, stranger," he inquired, "ain't that stove kinda heavy to carry on your shoulders?"

"Oh, the stove ain't so bad," replied John. "Trouble is, the sack of flour I got inside the oven keeps shiftin' around."

After that John was known the length of the Olympics as "The Iron Man of the Hoh." He carved a ranch out of the wilderness, felling fir and hemlock giants that had been standing before Columbus sailed from Palos, and planting vegetables in the clearing. Friends of John settled around him and niched farms in the forest battlement too. W. B. Adams brought tobacco seedlings from his native Kentucky and made them grow. George Anderson and his brother Ted put fence posts around a chunk of meadowy bottom lands.

Now, with other ranchers from the Olympic fastnesses, they stood in the office of the Governor of Washington and asked for State troops to protect their farms. Otherwise the National Park Service would use the power of eminent domain to buy the farms at condemnation prices and send John Heulsdonk and his neighbors, like the Israelites of old, on a mass exodus in search of new homes somewhere else. An indignant school teacher on the peninsula compared their plight to that of Evangeline's people. The emergency was due to a decision by President Roosevelt to add 187,000 acres to a park already as large as Rhode Island. The homesteads of the settlers along the Hoh and Queets Rivers were included in the boundaries which had been marked out in the big, oval office at the White House, 3,000 miles away.

The Iron Man of the Hoh left the capitol building without getting the National Guard rescue detachment he had demanded. Governor Martin had also opposed the increase in the park, but he told the aged pioneer the State could do nothing about it and that, besides, "there has never been anyone more interested or more in love with the West than the President." The people of the West are now considering whether they want the President to demonstrate that affection with an assortment of enormous new national parks.

The 898,000 acres withdrawn amidst so much discord from development on the Olympic Peninsula constitute what has come to be known as a protection park. The term is now familiar along the Pacific seaboard. It refers to a park established principally to lock up an area's resources. Benjamin H. Kizer, the chairman of the Washington State Planning Council, is afraid this policy, applied to the Olympics, has created a "timber museum that will squeeze the counties of the peninsula, which have a rather precarious living at best."

RAINY-DAY RECREATION

National parks are intended primarily as recreational centers, and Kizer wonders how much recreation can take place in the heaviest rainfall in the United States, rainfall which averages 120 inches a year.

"You are lucky," he insists, pointing on the map to the long western slope of the Olympic Park, "if one time in four you can go through there without going through a terrible deluge of rain."

The year before the Olympic Park was set up only 5,880 people visited this area.

But the park in the Olympics is a fait accompli. It would require an act of Congress to constrict its boundaries. The great "rain forests" will never ride logging trains to the sawmills. John Heulsdonk and his neighbors will have to move on; condemnation suits for their land are about to be started. The question now asked in the far West is, "Where next?" Mount Olympus, the hub of the Olympic Park, is 7,954 feet in height. California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho are studded with peaks higher and more majestic. Why not surround them with parks, too? How can the process be logically stopped as long as there is scenery outside the parks more spectacular than that within?

"If we don't watch out," the editor of a country paper in Washington has warned, "this whole State, except the city limits of Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane, is going to be one big national park."

THE GRANDDADDY OF ALL PARKS

As if to embellish this prophecy, the grandfather of all national parks is now proposed along the Washington backbone of the Cascade Range. It would be 225 miles long and 4,760 square miles in area. These figures are respectively equal to the distance from New York to Boston and the area of the State of Connecticut. The park, occasionally alluded to as "the Polish Corridor," would practically cut Washington in half, leaving open only a narrow strip on the Columbia River. It would be almost five times as vast, for example, as the Grand Canyon of the Colorado National Park, and every highway and railroad line crossing the mountain passes which lead from the inland empire to the cities of Puget Sound would have to span its borders. It would take in Mount Baker, Mount St. Helens, Mount Adams, and the other volcanic cones of the range. Mount Rainier National Park would be assimilated by this stupendous new one.

The State planning council recently held public hearings in half a dozen Washington towns to sound out sentiment on the idea. Of 300 people who presented testimony, 2 favored the park. The council has accordingly recommended against the proposal, but is not especially sanguine about the effect of its recommendation. It recommended a 452,000-acre park in the Olympics and got a park just about twice that large. Its viewpoint was presented to the White House by Benjamin Kizer and George F. Yantis, who are not only conservationists but also new dealers, yet even this strategy failed.

No State from the Rocky Mountains westward is free of the national-park problem. It confronts all of them in one form or another, and always the fundamental issue is the penning up of raw materials. This applies to parks long established as well as those not yet authorized. Farmers in Idaho are now demanding that the headwaters of the Snake River, in the oldest park of all, Yellowstone, be diverted for irrigation. This would violate traditional national-park policy, but the farmers contend their land is drying up. They have been answered with the query that once park rules are breached for irrigation, why not for lumber and grazing and hydroelectric power?

The Idaho ranchers will not get water sluiced off the rivers and lakes in Yellowstone Park, but their plight has scared people in other parts of the West. Representative HORTON, of Wyoming, says he intends to sponsor a bill forbidding the Federal Government to create a new national park in a State except with the consent of that State's legislature. Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, believes "the further encroachment of the Park Service" would take out of taxation and development land resources which are essential to Oregon's economic stability. And Senator WORTH CLARK, of Idaho, says it would be fine to have a national park preserve the grandeur of Hells Canyon, the deepest abyss in North America, but not if it means shutting off a long stretch of the Snake River from storage for irrigating Idaho farms.

A fourth of all the revenue taken in by national forests from the sale or leasing of timber and other resources is returned to the counties in which the forests are located. Last year Grant County in Oregon, for example, received $49,500 from this source. Representative J. W. ROBINSON, of Utah, has just introduced legislation requiring that the Park Service, too, return 25 percent of its income to the States involved. However, tourists spend money, and Frank A. Kittredge, director of the national parks in the far West, has pointed out many times that the recreational use of land "has a financial value to those living in the region."

Underlying all this is a bitter struggle between two Government departments. The struggle is epitomized by a pending suggestion to turn the snowfields and green ridges of the Mount Hood National Forest, in Oregon, into the Mount Hood National Park. National forests are in the Department of Agriculture, national parks are in the Department of the Interior. The Forest Service controls more than 100,000 square miles of wilderness in the West, and the Park Service thinks it is better qualified to administer a lot of it. Wars have been fought over less land than this, and the two Departments are locked in combat right now.

Virtually all the new national parks are areas which have been wrested from Forest Service sovereignty. The Olympic and Kings Canyon Parks were once mainly national forests. Mount Baker, Mount Adams, Hells Canyon, and the Oregon ridge of the Cascades are national forests at present. Secretary of the Interior Ickes has accused forest rangers and supervisors of being a backwoods lobby that "foments local antagonism" whenever an extension of the Park Service is under consideration. Not long ago in Seattle, he said the enlarged park on the Olympic Peninsula had been resisted by men "in the Government service whose lives are supposed to be dedicated to the principle of the highest possible use of our forests."

To the Forest Service, Ickes attributes much of the regional hostility to new parks. "Ask any Congressman, regardless of party, which is the most powerful lobby, and his instant response will be, 'the forest lobby.'

"It is a pity that any branch of the Federal Government, for any reason, should oppose the acquisition by another of an area that cries aloud, for any disinterested ear to hear, for dedication as a national park in order that its beauties and its wonders may be preserved for all time, as only they can be preserved without risk of future exploitation."

The rumpus reaches high in both Departments. The House Committee on the Public Lands, studying the bill for the Kings Canyon Park, had before it an adverse estimate of the proposal by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace. "It is difficult to see," he wrote, "how a change from national-forest to national-park status would be productive of public benefits commensurate with the increased costs of administration or economic losses due to restrictions upon the use of water and other natural resources."

National forests, so expansive the West measures them by horizons rather than acres, are operated under a policy known as "multiple use." By this the Forest Service means that trees can be used for lumber, meadows for grazing, rivers for reclamation and power, and at the same time the wilderness is open to recreation. The Agriculture Department points with satisfaction to the San Bernardino National Forest in California, where, in 1938, a million people camped and picnicked while the forest was also used for mining, livestock, and water storage. The Forest Service refuses to concede that commercial use precludes preservation.

But, in the lexicon of the Interior Department, multiple use is defined as "multiple use up." The Park Service maintains that the activities which the Forest Service permits on the frontier "are all in the nature of private and individual privilege, as opposed to the general or public use." A tree cannot be used by a sawmill and still remain a tree. An upland wilderness grazed bare or a mountain river plugged by a dam is changed for generations to come, if not forever. Commercial use and preservation, in the opinion of the Department of the Interior, are mutually exclusive terms.

"The ultimate purpose of the National Forest Service," says Ickes, subtly jabbing at Mr. Wallace's Department, "is to grow and develop trees so that they may be available for use in the lumber industry of the country. But the objective of the National Park Service is to take out of any possible commercial use these outstanding areas and keep them and appropriate them to the enjoyment of the people."

Can policies so apparently opposite ever be reconciled? Ickes would like to find out by having the Forest Service moved to the Department of the Interior, where many of its functions might be consolidated with those of the National Park Bureau. This scheme has lurked in the background of the entire Government reorganization wrangle. A year ago the President hinted such a shift might take place—at least, with respect to timbered wilderness particularly adaptable to "recreation and permanent public use and conservation."

Immediately a terrific outcry went up from western Members of Congress who visioned huge sections of their States subject to national-park regulations. Forty percent of Idaho is mantled by national forests, and Senator CLARK of Idaho shuddered to think of the consequences if this area, as large as the whole State of Indiana, was summarily jerked out of commercial and economic use. Ickes said no such thing would happen, but Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, the Republican minority leader, has threatened fierce resistance should Mr. Roosevelt carry out his implied promise to transfer the Forest Service. National forests cover 22,000 square miles of Oregon.

"All but an insignificant minority of conservationists oppose taking the national forests out of their present location," Gifford Pinchot, the first Chief Forester, recently wrote his friend, Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS. "The Interior Department has no claim whatever upon the national forests. Ambition for power is no good reason for upsetting a lay-out that works superbly where it is. The people of the 11 Western States which include most of the national forests are overwhelmingly in favor of letting the Forest Service be."

In the face of this opposition, the President has hesitated, although he may yet transfer some or all of the forests to Ickes' jurisdiction. Each time a reorganization message from the White House is in the offing, partisans of the Park and Forest Services get ready for a show-down.

A trudge into the backwoods is sufficient to show that the wilderness folks themselves are partisans of the Forest Service. They want it to continue to administer the hinterlands. This may be

partially attributable to what Ickes calls "the forest lobby," but there is something more.

The Forest Service is one of the most decentralized agencies of the Federal Government. Many of its verdicts and policies stem from the grass roots rather than from a desk in Washington.

A ranger deep in the fastnesses can consummate a small timber sale on his own hook. When Mack Chetwood, cattle rancher at Halfway, Oreg., cowhide coat on his back, carbine at his saddle, needs additional range for his herd, the problem can be worked out by him and Bob Harper, the district forest ranger, without recourse to further authority.

Forest rangers participate in community life. They attend Grange meetings and stockmen's roast-beef dinners. They can shoe a farmer's horse and bandage a hiker's lacerated knee. In a lumber town in Idaho or a grazing hamlet in California, the ranger station is as much a part of the settlement as the general store.

The Park Service, on the other hand—like most Department of the Interior bureaus, efficient though they are—is highly centralized. Its men in the field are considerably more remote from the people. There is little local latitude in reaching decisions. A vote in almost any far western mountain valley or upland plateau would result in a preference for the Forest Service. Ranchers, loggers, lumbermen, and hunters sigh in relief, now that immediate threat of a transfer to the Interior Department has passed.

But still the question of what to do with the western wilderness is not settled, nor is it likely to be by any juggling of Federal bureaus. Essentially it is a problem in economics. Can the States on the Pacific slope maintain their present living standards if large sections of land are withdrawn from commercial development? Is a national-park defense cordon around expansive chunks of wilderness a menace, either now or in the future, to the jobs and incomes of the people who dwell nearby?

Complete studies are lacking, so the problem is largely analyzed in conjecturals. It also is confused by the fact that both parties to the argument use the same set of statistics.

Only about half the timber which originally stood in Oregon and Washington, the chief lumber-producing States, is still there. The ax, fire, and termites have done for the rest. This is serious. The two States are dependent on the lumber industry for 83 percent of the tonnage of their exports. Already ghost towns have appeared as the trees have disappeared. To retire great forest strongholds from production, says the antipark group, would disrupt the basic economy of the region. As it is, none too many groves are left.

"If you are going to go ahead and make a park practically out of the whole country, what will we have to live on?" Congressman MARTIN F. SMITH sarcastically inquired of his fellow new dealers as they enacted the Olympic Park bill. SMITH'S district includes the Grays Harbor sawmills and wood-pulp plants.

"Ha-ha!" exclaim the park promoters, waving the same sheaf of figures. "Half the timber is gone. The Forest Service has not succeeded in preserving it. Unless the Park Service locks it up, not a tree will remain. The forests of the West belong to the whole Nation. The owners reside in every State. To let two States chop down those forests would be to permit a minority of the stockholders to dispose of all the assets of the corporation."

LOCKING THE LARDER

Somewhere between these extremes the truth probably lurks. The Pacific Northwest, which contains the bulk of the frontier areas, imports 80 percent of its manufactured goods. It pays for this merchandise with raw materials—lumber, minerals, beef, wheat, apples, wool, and salmon. What will happen to the Northwest's balance of trade if forests and grazing lands are locked up, mineral deposits are sealed, and dams and commercial fishing are forbidden on mountain torrents that might irrigate orchards and spawn 40-pound Chinooks? This is the primary reason that agitation for new national parks in America comes almost exclusively from outside the localities involved. It also is why a number of United States Senators have announced they will not vote to lock up any more land areas in the West without the acquiescence of the commissioners or supervisors in whose counties the land is located.

Yet, on the other side of the dispute, park zealots point out that scenic values endure forever, while resources dumped into a truck or gondola car and shipped East provide only a fleeting gain. A forest cut down has little to offer the people of the next generation. Stumps are no attraction. A forest protected and preserved will draw tourists and campers indefinitely, and they will be buying gasoline and groceries in the neighboring communities long after the money paid for the lumber would be spent.

Perhaps a compromise can be worked out. Some conservationists want the wilderness locked up in parks large enough to guard the scenery, yet not so far-flung that they choke off logging camps and starve herds of sheep and cattle. This is the real argument for placing the Park and Forest Services under one authority, whether it be Agriculture or Interior or some other Government Department altogether. The rivalry between the two Departments, a rivalry more virulent in the field than it is at Washington, now makes compromise extremely difficult.

SCENERY VERSUS RESOURCES

Many westerners have reached the conclusion that the Department of the Interior proposes "protection parks" mainly to whittle away the domain of the Forest Service, and that the Agricultural Department resists bona fide scenic parks largely to harass the advance of the Park Service. Feelings in both Bureaus run high. Insults are exchanged constantly. When Agriculture must relinquish a frontier fastness to Interior, the change of jurisdiction occurs in the same emotional atmosphere as the surrender of a conquered garrison.

How much conservation and how much commercial use? Sooner or later there must be a solution—a solution which will permit neither the gutting of the hinterlands nor the economic destruction of hinterland towns. And in some of the hinterlands men and women are looking for such a solution.

Here is Wallowa County, in Oregon, its 7,814 inhabitants scattered over a wide expanse of valleys, tablelands, and mountain ranges. One side of the county forms the western rampart of Hells Canyon. This is a stirring spectacle. For 40 twisting miles the canyon averages 5,510 feet in depth. At one point it is 7,900 feet from rim to rapids. Dark walls frown down on the Snake River in grim and gloomy magnificence. More than a century ago Capt. Benjamin Bonneville, who trudged through the West in advance of the wagon trains, stood with his buckskin-clad followers on the heights above Hells Canyon and in his journal wrote:

"The grandeur and originality of the views presented on every side beggar both the pencil and the pen. Nothing we had ever gazed upon in any other region could for a moment compare in wild majesty and impressive sternness with the series of scenes which here at every turn astonished our senses and filled us with awe."

American scenery that is no match for Hells Canyon has been set aside in national parks. The people of Wallowa County would like to have their canyon set aside, too, but—and this they emphasize—their existence is completely dependent on the land resources of the county. One third of the county is range land, and it nourishes 125,000 sheep and 50,000 cattle. Every store in Enterprise, the county seat, might have to close if livestock were no longer shipped down the bumpy branch line to the Union Pacific division point at La Grande.

Wallowa County has no industries. Livestock, lumber, and a little wheat and fruit farming, more than half of it under irrigation, keep the people off relief. The Forest Service pays the county treasury an average of $10,636 a year as its share of grazing and timber fees. This money goes directly toward schools and roads.

What would happen if a Hells Canyon National Park was established? As long as it encompassed only the canyon proper people in Wallowa County think it would be fine. But they remember how the park on the Olympic Peninsula has been expanded nearly three times beyond original local recommendations. They claim that local advice was given scant consideration in the outlining of the park borders at Kings Canyon and ask what assurance they have that Hells Canyon would be dealt with differently. Park boundaries extending into the high pastures might wipe out the whole county as a going concern.

"Sure I'll boost for a park," says Ted Howard, a young cowpuncher whistling Clementine as he rides herd on the slopes back of Hells Canyon, "but first I wanta know if that park is gonna shut these steers out of their feed."

Al Ducket, who runs a garage at Imnaha Gorge, the last jumping-off place on the narrow road to Hells Canyon, knows that the canyon is full of water-power sites. He wonders if a park will prevent the sites from ever being developed.

"Nobody, company or Government, can build a dam in a national park, I hear," says he.

A school teacher in Enterprise is worried about losing the grazing and timber fees from the Forest Service. What will support the school district then? The young, bespectacled manager of the Enterprise Hotel says that the stockmen virtually keep the hotel in operation.

Grady Miller, sharp-jawed and lean, who has been a forest ranger in the Wallowa Mountains for 29 years, takes no sides, but says the Forest Service has marked off 128,000 acres as a primitive area, and this, at least, cannot be touched.

The park enthusiast of Wallowa County is Charley (Silvertip) Seeber, mountaineer and woodsman, who once hitchhiked from Portland to San Francisco by renting a sailor suit and telling drivers he was on his way back to his ship. "The canyon and the hills," insists Charley, "belong to all the citizens of the United States and not just a handful of ranchers and stockmen. I've been tryin' to tell the folks here in this county that the tourist trade will mean more to them some day than the stock business ever did; that is, if we get a national park like we ought to."

Charley Seeber is Wallowa County's most famous inhabitant, and his words carry weight, but the owner of a little restaurant in Enterprise where the steaks are 2 inches thick says he prefers a bird in the hand to two in the bush. "Charley may be right as rain," he admits, "but the stock business is here now and I'm paying expenses, and about that tourist trade I don't know. I'm for hanging on to what we got."

Each day at noon a train clatters out of Enterprise and begins the 80-mile trip down out of the mountains to the main line. It is a combination train with five or six cattle and box cars and an old coach on the end. The coach has red plush seats, carbon arc lamps, and a wood stove that looks like a coffee grinder.

"You know," philosophizes the overall-wearing brakeman as he comes back into the coach, "this national-park ruckus seems 'bout like this: It'd be dandy to have a lot of tourists on this run. That'd turn this car into a slick, new coach and there'd be half a dozen others like it. Only thing is, though, you gotta make sure them cattle cars up ahead stay on the train, too."

Strength of the United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY AND HIS REPLY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Secretary of the Navy, and his reply thereto:

MAY 20, 1940.

Hon. CHARLES EDISON,
The Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY EDISON: I am enclosing a part of a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of May 20. I am anxious to receive official information, if possible, as follows:

(1) The number of naval vessels, types, and tonnage constructed since March 4, 1933, and commissioned.

(2) The number, type, and tonnage now under construction.

(3) The number not under construction, but authorized by law, for the construction of which appropriations have been made, and the type and tonnage of same.

(4) The size of our Navy on March 4, 1933, giving types of vessels, total tonnage of each type, and if any of these vessels are now out of commission; and, if so, the number, tonnage of each type, and the reason. I assume the main reason is old age. I refer to this as an illustration.

(5) The number of vessels, and enlisted men in the Navy on March 4, 1933, and the number at the present time.

(6) The number of naval vessels, types, and tonnage constructed and commissioned between January 1, 1925, and March 4, 1933; the number, types, and tonnage under construction on the latter date.

(7) The number, types, and tonnage of naval vessels taken out of commission between the same dates as stated in inquiry No. 6.

(8) The same inquiry in relation to No. 6 and No. 7 with the exception that the period is between January 1, 1929, and March 4, 1933.

(9) If known, and if not, the approximate number of vessels, types, and tonnage of each to be constructed: (a) Between January 1, 1925, and March 3, 1933, and (b) January 1, 1929, and March 4, 1933, by Great Britain, Japan, France, Germany, and Italy (in particular), and any other countries that have engaged in naval construction during these periods.

(10) The same information as contained in inquiry No. 9, except that the period is between March 4, 1933, and the present date.

If there exists any reason why at this time any, or all, of the information sought should not be given, I will appreciate it if such information is given as is compatible with public interest.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, June 4, 1940.

Hon. J. W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Your letter of May 20, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, was forwarded to this office for reply.

Every effort has been made to expedite compilation of the data requested. The tables enclosed are numbered to coincide with questions noted in your letter:

(1) Questions No. 1 and No. 2 are answered on page 1.

(2) Question No. 3 may be answered by explaining that all vessels appropriated for are now under construction. The remaining vessels which have been authorized have not yet been appropriated for, with the exception of those included in the 1941 appropriation bill, not yet signed by the President.

(3) Question No. 4 is answered on page 2 and in column 4 of page 3.

(4) Question No. 5 is answered on page 4 and on page 5. (With regard to question No. 5, the true picture as to effective fighting ships' strength is better observed by referring to the marked column on page 5–A. This column shows 96 under-age combatant vessels in 1933, as against 157 under-age combatant vessels in 1940.)

(5) Question No. 6 is answered on page 6.

(6) Question No. 7 is answered on page 3.

(7) Question No. 8 is answered on page 7.

(8) Questions No. 9 and No. 10 are answered on pages 8 to 13, inclusive.

The data contained herein is nonconfidential and it is hoped will prove satisfactory for your needs.

Sincerely yours,
R. W. BERRY,
Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy, Press Relations Officer.

[Page 1]

(1) Naval vessels, types and tonnage completed since Mar. 4, 1933

[All data as of May 1, 1940]

Type	Number	Tonnage	Commissioned
Combatant:			
Battleships			
Aircraft carriers	4	68,800	4
Cruisers	17	165,825	17
Destroyers	70	110,360	73
Submarines	28	38,660	29
Gunboats	2	4,000	2
Total	121	387,645	[1] 125
Auxiliary:			
Oilers	3	24,000	3
Fleet tugs	3	3,450	3
Destroyer tenders	1	9,000	1
Total	7	36,450	7
Grand total	128	424,095	[1] 132

[1] Includes 4 vessels commissioned in advance of completion.

(2) Naval vessels, types and tonnage under construction

Type	Number	Tonnage
Combatant:		
Battleships	8	300,000
Aircraft carriers	1	19,800
Cruisers	6	44,000
Destroyers	27	43,750
Submarines	14	19,300
Total	56	426,850
Auxiliary:		
Destroyer tenders	1	9,000
Submarine tenders	1	9,000
Seaplane tenders (large)	2	16,600
Seaplane tenders (small)	4	6,400
Minesweepers	2	1,300
Mine layers	1	6,000
Repair ships	1	8,350
Total	12	56,650
Grand total	68	483,500

(3) There are no vessels for which appropriations have been made which are not under construction

[Page 2]

(4) Vessels, over-age, under-age, and out of commission, as of Mar. 4, 1933

Type	Under-age		Over-age		Total	
	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement
Battleships	14	438,200	1	26,100	15	464,300
Heavy cruisers	10	92,650	1	7,350	11	100,000
Light cruisers	10	70,500	------	----------	10	70,500
Aircraft carriers	3	77,500	------	----------	3	77,500
Destroyers	8	9,420	[1] 226	240,680	[1] 234	250,100
Submarines	51	51,290	31	16,500	82	67,790
Mine vessels	------	(2)	------	(2)	[3] 41	47,130
Patrol vessels	------	(2)	------	(2)	63	22,130
Auxiliary vessels	------	(2)	------	(2)	106	826,300
Unclassified vessels	------	(2)	------	(2)	27	114,469
Total	[4] 96	[4] 739,560	[4] 259	[4] 290,630	592	[5] 2,040,219

[1] Data includes 12 destroyers (13,920 tons) which were used as light mine layers.
[2] Over-age vessels of this type not defined by treaty.
[3] Data does not include 12 destroyers (13,920 tons) which were used as light mine layers.
[4] Totals given are for combatant vessels only.
[5] Total number and tonnage given in all cases. Included in this total are the following which were not in commission at the time:

	Ships	Tons
Destroyers (over-age)	129	129,640
Submarines (not over-age)	4	3,160
Submarines (over-age)	23	12,000
Mine vessels	11	18,570
Patrol vessels	19	6,040
Auxiliary vessels	42	370,630
Unclassified vessels	11	54,805
Total	239	594,845

All vessels shown above as being "out of commission" were placed in that status due to over-age and lack of funds necessary to maintain in commission. Auxiliary vessels out of commission are in that category due to lack of funds to maintain in commission and no necessity for operation due to reduction in operating force.

[Page 3]

(4) (7) (8) *Vessels placed out of commission and/or stricken from Navy Register during periods Jan. 1, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1933; Jan. 1, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933; and Mar. 4, 1933, to May 1, 1940*

Type	(7) In period Jan. 1, 1925-Mar. 4, 1933				(8) In period Jan. 1, 1929-Mar. 4, 1933				(4) In period Mar. 4, 1933-May 1, 1940			
	Placed out of commission		Stricken		Placed out of commission		Stricken		Placed out of commission		Stricken	
	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement	Number	Displacement
Battleships			1	21,825			1	21,825				
Heavy cruisers	2	30,276	9	116,800			9	116,800	1	7,350	1	7,350
Light cruisers			10	34,110			10	34,110				
Destroyers	38	37,582	57	67,760	37	36,397	57	69,194	47	53,510	48	46,290
Submarines	34	21,465	47	24,120	27	16,466	43	22,316	19	19,244	10	9,866
Aircraft tenders	1	12,470			1	12,470					1	12,470
Mine layers	1	5,300			1	5,300					2	7,650
Light mine layers	2	2,568	6	7,146	2	2,568	6	7,146			8	9,280
Mine sweepers			1	950					2	1,680	2	1,680
Eagles	8	3,720	28	14,000	4	1,720	28	14,000	4	1,720	15	6,450
Submarine chasers	3	231	11	847	3	231	3	231	3	225	11	825
Submarine rescue vessels									1	960		
Gunboats	2	2,535	4	2,513			1	1,280	1	1,160	1	1,160
River gunboats									3	710	2	360
Yachts			6	6,164			4	5,457	1	910	1	910
Destroyer tenders			1	6,525								
Submarine tenders	1	9,000	1	4,360	1	9,000					1	8,570
Seaplane tenders												
Store ships											1	14,260
Colliers	1	19,250	1	19,250			1	19,250			1	19,480
Oilers	1	14,500	1	6,160	1	14,500			3	16,600	1	5,850
Cargo			2	10,990							1	3,330
Hospital	1	9,450	1	5,920	1	9,450	1	5,920			1	9,450
Tugs	8	6,740	3	2,131	5	4,590	1	854	2	2,000	7	6,310
Auxiliary miscellaneous	1	11,450	3	20,186	1	11,450	1	1,115				
Unclassified	3	6,915	9	41,635			6	28,040	1	3,100	4	16,390
Total	107	193,452	203	413,822	84	124,142	172	347,538	88	109,169	119	187,931

[Page 4]

The following data on the strength of the Navy is:

1. Strength of Navy, officers and men separately—

	Officers	Enlisted Regular
On Mar. 31, 1933	[1] 9,315	80,952
June 30, 1940	[2] 10,812	139,250
July 1, 1940	[3] 10,644	

2. Same for Naval Reserve—

	Officers	Enlisted men
On Mar. 31, 1933	7,665	[4] 33,617
June 30, 1940	14,226	[5] 40,240

[1] Includes: Line 5,801; staff 2,053; chief warrant 1,176; warrant 285.
[2] Includes: Line 6,976; staff 2,200; chief warrant 969; warrant 667.
[3] Includes: Line 6,843; staff 2,169; chief warrant 965; warrant 667.
[4] Includes 10,696 men in Fleet Reserve.
[5] Includes 14,971 men in Fleet Reserve.

[Page 5]

Total under-age and over-age tonnage, as of May 1, 1940 (combatant vessels, minelayers, patrol boats, auxiliaries, and miscellaneous)

Type	Fit for service, including those under repair					
	In commission		Out of commission		Total	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Battleships:						
Not over-age	12	384,200			12	384,200
Over-age	3	80,100			3	80,100
Total, battleships	15	464,300			15	464,300

[Page 5]

Total under-age and over-age tonnage, as of May 1, 1940 (combatant vessels, minelayers, patrol boats, auxiliaries, and miscellaneous) Continued

Type	Fit for service, including those under repair					
	In commission		Out of commission		Total	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Heavy cruisers:						
Not over-age	18	171,200			18	171,200
Over-age						
Light cruisers:						
Not over-age	17	143,675			17	143,675
Over-age	2	14,100			2	14,100
Total, cruisers	37	328,975			37	328,975
Aircraft carriers:						
Not over-age	6	134,800			6	134,800
Over-age						
Total, aircraft carriers	6	134,800			6	134,800
Destroyers:						
Not over-age	72	112,110			72	112,110
Over-age	116	133,000	35	37,780	151	170,780
Total, destroyers	188	245,110	35	37,780	223	282,890
Submarines:						
Not over-age	30	44,185	1	1,475	31	45,660
Over-age	32	24,280	36	26,460	68	50,740
Submarines, mine-laying, not over-age	1	2,710			1	2,710
Total, submarines	63	71,175	37	27,935	100	99,110
Total	309	1,244,360	72	65,715	381	1,310,075
Mine layers					36	39,640
Patrol boats					33	14,855
Auxiliaries					122	471,270
Miscellaneous					23	77,221
Total					214	602,986
Grand total					595	1,913,061

[Page 5–A]

Vessels of U. S. Navy, Mar. 1, 1933–May 1940

Types	Replacement	Treaty	Number	Under age	Number	Over age	Number	Total	Number	Building	Number	Total
Battleships (BB):	*Years*											
1933	20	1922	14	438,200	1	26,100	15	464,300	0		15	464,300
1940	26	1936	12	384,200	3	80,100	15	464,300	8	300,000	23	764,300
Aircraft carriers (CV):												
1933	20	1922–30	3	77,500	0		3	77,500	1	14,500	4	92,000
1940	20	1936	6	134,800	0		6	134,800	1	19,800	7	154,600
Heavy cruisers (CA):												
1933	20	1930	10	92,650	1	7,350	11	100,000	6	59,150	17	159,150
1940	20	1936	18	171,200	0		18	171,200	0		18	171,200
Light Cruisers (CL):												
1933	20	1930	10	70,500	0		10	70,500	0		10	70,500
1940	20	1936	17	143,675	2	14,100	19	157,775	6	44,000	25	201,775
Destroyers (DD):												
1933 (aid down before 1921)	12	1930	8	9,420	226	240,680	234	250,100	8	11,075	242	261,175
1933 (after 1921)	16											
1940	16	1936	72	112,110	162	183,350	234	295,460	25	40,610	259	336,070
Submarines (SS):												
1933	13	1930	51	51,290	31	16,500	82	67,790	2	2,230	84	70,020
1940	13	1936	32	48,370	68	50,740	100	99,110	14	19,300	114	118,410
Total:												
1933			96	739,560	259	290,630	355	1,030,190	17	86,955	372	1,117,145
1940			157	994,355	235	328,290	392	1,322,645	54	423,710	446	1,746,355

[Page 6]

(6) Number, types, and tonnage completed between Jan. 1, 1925, and Mar. 4, 1933

Type	Number	Tonnage
Battleships		
Aircraft carriers	2	[1] 66,000
Heavy cruisers	9	82,850
Light cruisers	1	7,050
Destroyers		
Submarines	10	17,110
Submarine tenders	1	8,100
Total	23	181,110

[1] Converted battle cruisers, original contracts signed in April and May 1917.

Vessels under construction on Mar. 4, 1933

Type	Number	Tonnage
Battleships		
Aircraft carriers	1	14,500
Heavy cruisers	6	59,150
Light cruisers		
Destroyers	8	11,075
Submarines	2	2,230
Total	17	86,955

Vessels under construction on Mar. 4, 1933—Continued

[Page 7]

(8) Number, types, and tonnage completed between Jan. 1, 1929, and Mar. 4, 1933

Type	Number	Tonnage
Battleships		
Aircraft carriers		
Heavy cruisers	9	82,850
Light cruisers		
Destroyers		
Submarines	3	7,000
Total	12	89,850

[Page 8]

Japan

	Battleships		Aircraft carriers [1]		Heavy cruisers		Light cruisers		Destroyers		Submarines		Minelayers	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Jan. 1, 1925, to Mar. 3, 1933:														
Laid down			1	7,100	6	59,400	2	17,000	34	53,830	22	[2] 33,171	8	[2] 6,679
Completed			2	53,800	12	107,800	3	15,560	37	56,990	30	44,227	6	[2] 5,793
Jan. 1, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933:														
Laid down			1	7,100			2	17,000	15	23,840	9	14,369	4	[2] 2,464
Completed					7	69,400			16	27,200	12	20,269	6	[2] 5,793
Mar. 4, 1933, to May 1, 1940:														
Laid down	8	332,000	4	60,100			10	80,950	33	50,048	23	+28,900	5	+2,940
Completed			3	27,200			4	34,000	35	51,788	16	24,400	4	[2] 2,326

[1] Does not include 3 seaplane carriers totaling 27,000 tons completed from 1938 to May 1939. These were laid down from November 1934 to May 1937.
[2] Approximate.
NOTE.—Other minor craft and auxiliaries not included.

[Page 9]

Italy

	Battleships		Heavy cruisers		Light cruisers		Destroyers		Submarines	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Jan. 1, 1925, to Mar. 3, 1933:										
Laid down			7	70,000	10	58,740	33	44,627	54	44,655
Completed			6	60,000	4	20,276	36	45,868	30	25,755
Jan. 1, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933:										
Laid down			5	50,000	6	38,464	12	15,496	29	21,895
Completed			6	60,000	4	20,276	20	29,236	27	21,648
Mar. 4, 1933, to May 1, 1940:										
Laid down	4	140,000			16	72,092	52	50,964	60	50,679
Completed	2	70,000	1	10,000	8	54,212	56	56,760	74	57,524

Also 8 patrol gunboats, totaling 4,580 tons, completed from 1925 to 1927; 4 of these totaling 2,460 tons were laid down in 1925.

[Page 10]

France

	Battleships		Aircraft carriers[1]		Heavy cruisers		Light cruisers		Destroyers		Submarines		Minelayers		Gunboats	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage[2]	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage[2]	Number	Tonnage[2]	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Jan. 1 1925 to Mar. 3, 1933:																
Laid down	1	26,500	------	--------	6	60,000	4	27,582	38	78,614	6	58,363	1	4,773	7	13,783
Completed	------	--------	------	--------	6	60,000	4	28,243	45	79,579	50	47,642	1	4,773	6	11,814
Jan. 1, 1929 to Mar. 4, 1933:																
Laid down	1	26,500	------	--------	2	20,000	3	21,086	17	42,265	28	26,044	------	--------	7	13,783
Completed	------	--------	------	--------	4	40,000	1	6,496	21	42,727	38	37,232	------	--------	6	11,814
Mar. 4, 1933 to May 1, 1940:																
Laid down	5	166,500	2	36,000	------	--------	7	54,400	48	66,892	27	25,857	------	--------	27	19,956
Completed	2	53,000	1	22,146	1	10,000	6	45,600	27	44,251	27	26,261	------	--------	9	7,043

[1] Does not include 1 seaplane carrier of 10,000 tons laid down in 1927 and completed in 1932.
[2] Approximate.
Other minor craft and auxiliaries not included.

[Page 11]

Great Britain

	Battleships		Aircraft carriers		Heavy cruisers		Light cruisers		Destroyers		Submarines		Seaplane carriers		Minelayers		Escort vessels	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Jan. 1, 1925, to Mar. 3, 1933:																		
Laid down	------	--------	------	--------	10	95,620	6	26,895	35	47,934	22	29,329	------	--------	------	--------	12	8,370
Completed	2	67,850	------	--------	10	95,620	------	--------	36	49,494	23	30,744	1	4,800	1	6,740	12	8,370
Jan. 1, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933:																		
Laid down	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------	6	26,895	21	28,804	10	11,765	------	--------	------	--------	10	6,280
Completed	------	--------	------	--------	4	36,540	------	--------	33	45,184	18	25,210	------	--------	------	--------	10	6,280
Mar. 4, 1933, to May 1, 1940:																		
Laid down (estimated)	9	335,000	8	174,756	------	--------	35	[1] 257,010	107	[2] 170,930	37	38,645	------	--------	4	10,600	38	38,235
Completed	5	[3] 175,000	1	[4] 22,000	------	--------	22	[5] 157,405	78	120,020	30	31,965	------	--------	(?)	--------	18	[1] 20,085

[1] Not including new war construction (extent unknown).
[2] Including 6 Brazilian taken over by Great Britain.
[3] Reported.
[4] Possibly more.
[5] Probably several more completed.
Other auxiliaries and minor craft not included.
NOTE.—Due to war conditions information concerning recent completions and laying down is extremely incomplete.

[Page 12]

Germany

	Battleships		Aircraft carriers		Heavy cruisers		Light cruisers		Destroyers		Submarines		Torpedo boats	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
Jan. 1, 1925, to Mar. 3, 1933:														
Laid down	3	30,000	------	--------	------	--------	4	24,000	34	------	------	--------	------	--------
Completed	1	10,000	------	--------	------	--------	5	29,400	12	9,600	------	--------	------	--------
Jan. 1, 1929, to Mar. 3, 1933:														
Laid down	3	30,000	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------	------	--------
Completed	1	10,000	------	--------	------	--------	4	24,000	4	3,200	------	--------	------	--------
Mar. 3, 1933, to 1940:														
Laid down	6	192,000	2	38,500	5	50,000	5	38,000	30	51,354	147+	79,048+	30	18,000
Completed	5	107,000	------	--------	3	30,000	3	30,000	22	36,866	71	31,282	8	4,800

Other minor categories and auxiliaries not included.
Due to war conditions and policy of secrecy, data are probably incomplete, especially regarding submarines and small craft.

[Page 13]

NOTE.—Due to war conditions and foreign policies of military secrecy, information in these tables in many cases incomplete, especially during the past year.

Let Us Stay on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I have before me an editorial from today's Washington Daily News entitled "Congress Hearing From Home." The gist of the editorial is that President Roosevelt and administration leaders are retreating on their proposal that Congress quit and go home under the fire of an aroused populace.

I can vouch for the truth of this editorial, for during the past 24 hours I have received no less than a hundred letters and telegrams from my district urging Congress to remain in session for the duration of the war emergency. And other offices are being flooded with similar requests.

I made my position on this issue known in no uncertain terms when the suggestion for an early adjournment was first made by the President. More than 2 weeks ago I stated that we should stay on the job to make sure that no steps are taken to involve this country in the European war.

Recent developments, I believe, have made it more imperative than ever that Congress remain in session to serve as a check on the President's impulsiveness, which may yet lead us down the road to war.

I am prepared to stay in Washington all summer and fall, if necessary. For if ever there was a time when Congress should not adjourn that time is now. In fulfillment of what I construe to be my solemn obligation to the people who

elected me—the people who would have to fight and die in the event of war—I intend to vote against any motion of the misguided leadership for adjournment.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 14, 1940]

CONGRESS HEARING FROM HOME

We think the country will feel relieved at the evidence that administration leaders are backing down on congressional adjournment.

Speaker BANKHEAD now says it is impossible to get gone by June 22, the dead line originally set.

The drive to put that over was slowed up considerably when Treasury Secretary Morgenthau said he was willing to stay on the job if the Congressmen were. The next day came Mr. BANKHEAD'S statement.

What is happening is that Washington has been hearing from home about the preposterous, presumptuous, and dangerous idea of the legislative branch of our Government abdicating in a time of war crisis. The here's-your-hat-what's-your-hurry attitude of President Roosevelt and his asscciates helped wake up the people to the fact that something queer was going on.

So the grass roots began to register. And that's democracy functioning.

We hope those at home aren't lulled by the partial retreat and that they continue to express themselves in a loud, large, and positive way. The Bankhead statement doesn't exude any enthusiasm. It hath a half-hearted and begrudging sound. But it's a good sign, nevertheless—though no self-starter.

Congress should stay in session for the duration. If it fails to, those who vote to go home should be made to stay there the next time they come up for election.

The Smith Amendments to the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. FRIES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1940

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, reactionary forces, viciously opposed to labor legislation, have used every conceivable means and method known to enemies of labor in a nefarious attack—a veritable "blitzkrieg" program—against the National Labor Relations Board, with the sole purpose of scuttling the National Labor Relations Act and destroying the fundamental principles upon which the act rests.

Those who have constantly opposed the National Labor Relations Act since its inception, and its principles prior to that time, have used every ignoble means at their command to destroy not only the National Labor Relations Board but every person or group engaged at any time in fostering or attempting to preserve the National Labor Relations Act.

During this period of war hysteria the enemies of the common people find themselves, because of the hysteria and the consequent loose thinking on the part of those who are normally sound, armed in the proper atmosphere and thus encouraged, armed with adequate material and resources beneficial to their cause in opposing all humanitarian legislation.

Many Members of Congress expressed their dislike of the National Labor Relations Act in no uncertain manner but attempted in a flimsy fashion to defend their opposition to the National Labor Relations Act by stating they were friends of labor and merely desired to correct any irregularities which now existed in the National Labor Relations Act.

They would have the public believe labor is an enemy to society. In the name of patriotism and with loud shouting, they cry that labor must be chastened for the public good. Social unrest, lack of employment—undeniable creations of their own selfish and un-Christian greed—even the very war itself they lay at labor's door. They would make of labor a whipping boy for the sins of the world.

I absolutely fail to subscribe to this philosophy. Labor has always served its government in an honorable, courageous manner in every crisis since the beginning of this Government. Labor has on every occasion of national need come to the defense of even those who had denied them a few life-giving crumbs from their own rich and heavily laden tables—to the defense of those who had sweated them, beaten them, shot them, and starved them in an unceasing effort to bring them to heel for further profit for the privileged few.

The records of the last World War prove conclusively and beyond any doubt that labor and agriculture formed the backbone and guaranteed the success of our forces in the World War.

The United Mine Workers of America supplied the United States Army with 72,811 coal miners who belonged to its organization at the time of the World War, and of that group, 6,092 were killed in action.

I regret very much I am unable to furnish the United States Congress with a definite record as to the number of laboring men and farmers who served in the last World War, but I am confident that no one of the reactionary groups now mouthing patriotism and leveling the charge of traitor at organized labor can begin to show a similar number in their midst, or of their kind, who served their country in time of distress, and who will again serve their country in every time of its need.

Labor today is not asking for any special concession. It asks only fair consideration by the United States Congress of the problems in which it is so vitally concerned.

The method used by the reactionary forces to discredit the National Labor Relations Act is a disgrace to our Nation, a reflection upon the wisdom and ability of the United States Congress, and a menace to society.

At the time the National Labor Relations Act was being considered by the United States Congress, the reactionary forces of the country employed 58 lawyers of outstanding legal ability for the sole purpose of finding fault and picking sordid, pettifogging legal flaws in the National Labor Relations Act and propagandizing the country against the principles of justice involved in this meritorious piece of legislation. Their report to the people of the United States was calculated to subvert acceptance of the act and to the effect that the act was unconsitutional. Their advice to members of employer groups was to disregard the act, and they promised that employers so disregarding the act would be defended in the courts of the United States.

These efforts to discredit labor's Magna Carta were carried to the highest tribunal of the United States. But the Supreme Court on April 12, 1937—which was prior to the time the Court personnel was changed due to deaths and resignations of members of the Court and while it was still under the domination of reactionary forces—declared the National Labor Relations Act constitutional.

Immediately after the Court held the act constitutional the forces bitterly opposed to this legislation continued their slimy activities, and with the help of reactionary Members in the United States Congress threw filth after filth of their own making at the National Labor Relations Act, and finally established on the sewage heap they had created the Smith committee for the alleged purpose of investigating the activities of the National Labor Relations Board.

Anyone with ordinary reasoning power considers this behavior on the part of the United States Congress anything but friendly toward labor. The record of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the Smith committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Act, discloses that he has never voted for any legislation which had a scintilla of labor significance. It was readily understood by everyone in the United States that the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, could not hold hearings involving labor legislation in an unbiased manner.

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, had an unblemished record of hostility to the common man, but to further show his contempt for labor the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, hired as his chief counsel one of the most vicious enemies of labor in the United States. Herewith I present the

record of Mr. Edmund Toland, counsel, chief inquisitor and persecutor for the Smith committee:

EDMUND TOLAND

I. A. H. ARNER CO.

Toland has represented the A. H. Arner Co., which is a St. Louis labor-spy and strike-breaking detective agency, and also the Industrial Standard Service, another spy agency, in subpena matters before the La Follette committee. The A. H. Arner Co. was shown up as a detective spy agency in the Brown Shoe Co. case before the Labor Board, as having engaged in the most vicious strike-breaking activities.

II. GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER CO.

Toland has represented this company in preventing the Board from holding hearings.

The La Follette committee reports disclose the following facts regarding the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.:

(1) Assessments paid by Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. to Employers' Association at Akron for undercover and other activities (exhibit 1066, pt. 8, p. 3197):

1933	$7,376.92
1934	11,266.69
1935	13,988.31
1936	17,542.00

(2) Expenditures for munitions: 1936, $15,703.49; which included gas and gas equipment, guns and ammunition.

(3) Used the Corporations Auxiliary Cos. as its spy and espionage agency (pt. 4, p. 1412).

(4) Practically one-third of one of the volumes of the La Follette hearings is given over to the antiunion activities of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Volume 8.

Page 2949 of volume 8, it appears that in 1936 the Akron Employers' Association paid $21,000 to the Corporations Auxiliary Cos. for industrial espionage.

Page 2950 of volume 8, it appears that the Goodyear Corporation trained a flying squadron which was given an intensive training course in the use of tear gas and other ammunitions during the years 1935 and 1936.

(5) It should not be forgotten that Goodyear has one of its main plants in Gadsden, Ala., where a mob of supervisory employees of Goodyear broke into the union headquarters, beat up Dalrymple, president of the United Rubber Workers, and ran both him and his organizers out of town.

Gadsden, of course, also has the southern plant of Republic Steel Corporation.

(6) Goodyear is one of the main members of the National Association of Manufacturers and has contributed heavily to that organization.

III. WHEELING STEEL CORPORATION

Toland has represented the Wheeling Steel Corporation before the Labor Board as local counsel for Earl F. Reed who is the attorney for Ernest T. Weir.

A. The La Follette committee reports disclose the following with regard to the Wheeling Steel Corporation:

(1) Use of detective operatives for industrial espionage (pt. 1, 185 et seq.).

(2) Purchase of gas (pt. 7, pp. 2606, 2627).

(3) Use of strike guards for breaking of strikes (pt. 1, p. 270, et seq.).

(4) Paid $9,100 from 1933 to 1937 to N. A. M. as contributions and dues.

B. In the Labor Board proceeding the Wheeling Steel Corporation was charged and held to have violated the Labor Act because of unfair labor practices.

IV. H. J. HEINZ CO.

Toland has represented the H. J. Heinz Co. before the Labor Board and as local counsel with Earl F. Reed.

A. The La Follette committee reports disclose the following regarding the H. J. Heinz Co.:

(1) 1933 to 1937 company paid in dues and contributions to the N. A. M. $27,850.

(2) Its president, Howard Heinz, has contributed $5,000 to the American Liberty League and $5,876 to the Crusaders. Clifford Heinz, a director, has contributed $5,000 to the Crusaders.

(3) Howard Heinz is director of the Mellon National Bank and of the Pennsylvania Railroad, a heavy contributor to the N. A. M.

V. THE ELKLAND LEATHER CO., INC.

Toland has represented the Elkland Leather Co. in a case before the Labor Board.

A. The La Follette committee reports disclose that this company used the Burns Detective Agency for industrial espionage (pt. 8, p. 3073, La Follette reports).

B. In the Labor Board case the Board held that the company had promoted a company union in competition with the genuine union, incited citizens' action to violence, and intimidated the workers by shut-down and lock-out.

VI. AMERICAN POTASH & CHEMICAL CO.

Toland has represented the American Potash & Chemical Co.

A. The La Follette committee reports disclose that this company made contributions to the N. A. M. of $2,600.

B. The Labor Board in its case held this company to have practiced widespread unfair labor practices in having promoted a company union, restrained and coerced its workers, and discharged wholesale union employees.

VII. MATHIESON ALKALI WORKS, INC.

Toland has represented the Mathieson Alkali Works, Inc.

A. The La Follette committee reports disclose that this company paid to the N. A. M. by way of dues and contributions from 1933 to 1937 $13,500, one of the largest contributors to the N. A. M.

B. The Labor Board held in its case that the company had violated practically all of the provisions of the act. It dominated and promoted a company union, interfered with, restrained, and coerced its employees in complete violation of section 7 of the Labor Act, which provides for the rights of the workers to organize and bargain collectively.

Mr. Speaker, this record proves beyond any doubt that Mr. Toland's activities on behalf of groups hostile to organized labor were such they constituted a disgrace to our form of government and a menace to society.

And this man handed the knives to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and his cohorts with which to cut the heart out of the National Labor Relations Act.

Another procedure of the Smith committee which I would like to bring to the attention of the United States Congress is the very unusual manner, to say the least, in which the Smith committee handled the printing and distribution of hearings of the investigations of the Smith committee.

The United States Code, title 44, section 111, states that—

All printing, binding, and blank-book work for Congress, the Executive Office, the judiciary, and every executive department, independent office, and establishment of the Government shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except such classes of work as shall be deemed by the Joint Committee on Printing to be urgent or necessary to have done elsewhere than in the District of Columbia for the exclusive use of any field service outside of said District (Mar. 1, 1919, c. 86, 11, 40 Stat. 1270).

Nevertheless, in spite of this specific charge from the Congress that printing the work of the United States Congress be handled by the Government Printing Office, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, made a deal with Mr. David Lawrence, publisher of the reactionary United States News, vicious columnist, and calumniator of labor, to publish the hearings of the Smith investigating committee privately. Mr. Lawrence, through this deal, obtained the privilege of selling the daily transcripts and bound volumes of the Smith committee hearings for his own profit. A further highly unusual procedure in this unusual situation was that while Mr. Lawrence, as a matter of private enterprise, was printing and selling the hearings of the Smith committee to an interested audience, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, Member of Congress and chairman of the Smith committee, allowed Mr. Lawrence the use of his frank to send the daily transcripts of hearings to Members of Congress. There is a nigger in the woodpile here if, indeed, there is not something strictly and absolutely unlawful.

If there is any evil in the conduct of the National Labor Relations Board and the record does not show any, surely these amendments are not the way to correct them. This Board and the legislation which set up this Board compose an issue on which partisanship and selfish interests have led many to make statements that do not rest on facts. In some cases they are honest mistakes. More often the misstatements are part of a deliberate scheme to wreck the National Labor Relations Act, the fundamental protection of labor's rights. In the name of common justice these amendments should have been defeated. In the name of democracy these amendments should never have been brought to light. Nurtured in evil, they will bring evil with them.

It is not my desire to take into partisan consideration any person or any particular group in dealing with the problems which concern all of our people, but by the same token I deem it absolutely necessary and essential that legislation be considered on its merits for our people as a whole and not for the purpose of aiding one group at the expense of another. Too long has labor suffered at the hands of its enemies who, bitter in their opposition to labor's proper demands, were also strong in legislative halls.

Thousands of letters have come to my office from all classes of laboring groups and from manufacturers and employers of every description pleading with me that no amend-

ments to the National Labor Relations Act be considered at this time which would in any way weaken labor's Magna Carta—the National Labor Relations Act.

It is my prophecy that those who have voted for the labor-destroying Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act will live to see their evil chickens come home to roost. Among those who will bitterly regret the passage in the United States House of Representatives of the vicious Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act will be the supposed-to-be labor leaders who, in endorsing amendments which tore the heart out of labor's magna carta, betrayed the trust which had been placed in them by a helpless and confiding people.

Laboring people seek no special concessions from Congress, employers, or anyone else; but by the same token they do demand the right to work at a living wage so they may have the God-given right, belonging to all, of enjoying the necessities of life.

Labor believes that government was created for the protection of all of its people and not for any special or privileged groups. Labor believes that if the Government will protect its people the people will protect its Government.

Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, evidently the whole country is becoming aroused to the idea that Congress must not adjourn at this time. The people feel that our duty is to remain in continuous session owing to present world conditions.

This morning I received a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois calling upon this Congress to refrain from adjournment at this critical time. Such action, Mr. Speaker, on the part of that great body of Illinois representatives clearly indicates how our people are thinking. It emphasizes that it is the duty of Congress to "remain on the job and do our work." We are the duly elected representatives of the people and through us they expect and hope to find expression of their own views. They want the Congress to legislate and not delegate its powers to any one individual, regardless of potential emergencies.

Only this week the President in his speech at Charlottesville, Va., all but declared war. He promised everything but the kitchen sink. He forced us right up to the brink of the European holocaust. Such actions and utterances on the part of the President indicate that our post of duty is here in Washington. There is no question where American sympathy lies, but we must not allow our sympathetic interests and involvement in war to be one and the same.

I shall vote to keep Congress in session as long as an emergency exists.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas the rapidity of developments in the European war and the constantly changing international picture makes it imperative that the Congress of the United States remain in session in order to meet any eventualities that may arise in which this country may be vitally concerned or affected; and

Whereas the adjournment of Congress during this period of instability and surmise would seriously impair the proper functioning of our National Government should emergencies develop requiring legislative consideration and action; and

Whereas the people of this Nation, deeply concerned over the progress of current events, both in Europe and in America, are depending upon Congress to handle with facility and efficiency the problems which have accrued by reason of present world conditions: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, at the first special session thereof, That we respectfully and earnestly memorialize the present Congress of the United States to remain in session and to refrain from adjournment during this critical period for the reasons stated in the preamble hereof; and, be it further

Resolved, That suitably engrossed copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately by the secretary of state, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of said Congress from the State of Illinois.

Editorial of Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE LOS ANGELES NEWS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles News, embodying an editorial of Herbert Hoover previously published in Liberty magazine:

[From the Los Angeles News of June 8, 1940]

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Manchester Boddy)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—For nearly 8 years this column has differed with most of the opinions expressed by former President Herbert Hoover.

With respect to finding a solution to our economic, social, and political problems, he has advocated one course, we have supported another. We continue to believe that history will attest the soundness of the school of thought to which we subscribe, and prove conclusively the utter futility of attempting to turn back the forces of progress and reroute them through the worn-out, discredited broken-down machinery of the old era Mr. Hoover has so valiantly attempted to reestablish.

Today, however, this column considers it a public duty to reprint an editorial by Herbert Hoover. In our opinion it is the most valuable contribution that has yet been made to the thought of the Nation with respect to the position of the United States in the current World War.

Mr. Hoover's editorial was first the subject of a public address named "Nine horsemen." It was later amplified for publication. It is here republished by permission of Liberty magazine (copyright 1940 by Macfadden Publications, Inc.).

Herbert Hoover is profoundly right in his conclusion. It should give purpose and direction to the mighty surge of patriotic feeling that is rapidly sweeping the Nation into the civilization-destroying inferno of war.—M. B.

The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are on the march: War, Death, Famine, and Pestilence. Two-thirds of the people in the world are at war. But coming before these old destroyers of mankind are five new horsemen.

The new cavalry are:

Imperialism, the destroyer of the independence of nations.

Intolerance, the destroyer of minorities.

Stateism, the destroyer of personal liberty.

Atheism, the destroyer of faith.

Hate, the destroyer of the unity of mankind.

These are the horsemen of the advance, preparing the way for war and death. After war and death sweep famine and pestilence. And their camp follower is revolution.

Imperialism has already trampled down the independence of Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, and Denmark. We have witnessed attacks upon China, Finland, and Norway, unable to defend themselves. And now the invasion of Belgium and Holland. And there seems more to come.

We have seen intolerance destroy Jews, Christians, and racial minorities.

We have seen stateism, expressed by the despotisms of communism, fascism, nazi-ism, and socialism, destroy liberty in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, and in a half dozen other countries. We have seen its infiltration through the world—including the United States.

Atheism has greatly shattered religious worship in Russia and Germany and weakened beliefs in a score of others.

Hate has grown fiercely since before the first World War began, and its ravages are not alone between races but between classes and religious faiths.

And all the Nine Horsemen have new weapons of destruction. Imperialism has become more dreadful by threat of destruction from the air. Propaganda, the weapon of intolerance, of stateism, of atheism, of hate, is more potent through our rapidity of communication. It now moves through the air over all borders and

seas. It comes disguised in the home tongue. Hate has increased its voltage through cruelty of attack upon civilian men, women, and children by food blockade and death by the air. War is more destructive by our chemistry and by our machines. Famine is more terrible by the growth of great cities. Pestilence strikes right and left through the close net of our communications.

Only the Western Hemisphere is free of the full violence of these Horsemen. But they affect us. Our emotions are aroused. The attacks upon helpless small nations raise the indignation of all decent men and women. Our economic life is dislocated. The shadow of war hangs over all our decisions.

And from our emotions there are Americans who sincerely believe that we ourselves should go to war. They feel we should be willing to sacrifice our youth and our future to restore liberty against aggression, to assure the recognition of law and human rights.

Reason calls to us not to send our sons into this war. Reason dictates that if we join the military operations of this war, it means the abdication of the remaining seat of liberty in the world. Reason insists the Western Hemisphere should give sanctuary for peace in her flight from all the rest of the world. Reason is final in its demands that we prepare ourselves so that we may defend the Western Hemisphere.

To those who feel that we are not doing our part if we stay out, I may suggest that we look ahead to the end of this war—examine a possibly greater service to mankind. This war will end some time, either in victory or exhaustion. And in that relation we may well explore the grim work of the horsemen, Famine, Pestilence, and Hate.

Western Europe for a hundred years, even in peacetimes, has not produced sufficient food supplies for its own population. It has bought its food by the export of manufactured goods. But on top of this peacetime shortage of supplies, war at once diminishes the food production of every combatant nation. The imports of fodder are cut off or slackened, and the herds must be diminished. The drafting of manpower instantly diminishes the production of milk and of butter and of meat. The people eat into their animals, and when war ends their brood stock is depleted. Beyond this, planting of ground crops must be skipped. The harvesting is imperfect. And, above all, the nitrate fertilizers must be diverted to explosives.

It is true that each nation at modern war rations its population in hope of reducing its food consumption. Scarcity always raises prices, and the food goes to those who have the most money. Rationing does secure more equality in distribution and control of prices. It thrusts the hunger upon the civil population. Soldiers, munition workers, and Government officials are always well fed. The hunger in the people falls hardest upon the women and children. But rationing has little effect on the total consumption. War experience has proved that armies consume about twice as much food as the same men do when they are at peace. That is partly due to the greater physical need. It is partly due to the inevitable waste and destruction of food in camp, or by invasion, and at sea.

Beyond all this, the food production of the countries free of actual war is also demoralized, for the normal markets are interfered with by blockades and difficulties of credit to war purchasers. Prices are erratic, and the farmer is uncertain. Some countries are wholly isolated. Thus production diminishes among neutrals, especially at the beginning of war.

By the necessity of directing food supplies through the whole of the last war I watched these forces unfold with their millions of tragedies.

The food situation in the present war is already more desperate than at the same stage in the World War. Then, except for Belgium, there was no rationing of civil populations until the second or third year. In the present war every combatant country was on bread and meat cards within 90 days. In 1914 Russia was full of food; for years it has been in a state of semifamine. Moreover, today every neutral country in Europe, out of fear, has already mobilized almost its full manpower. The Balkan states, Holland, Belgium, Scandinavia, and Italy, will therefore also diminish in food production. The harvest of the Balkan states this year will be reduced. Denmark, now unable to import fodder, must needs kill many of her animals. Many of these smaller nations are already on rations. And in invaded countries there is already famine. It sweeps over Poland.

Out of all these forces, if this war is long continued, there is but one implacable end. That end is the greatest famine in history. And from lowered vitality by famine comes pestilence. There was a great famine at the end of the World War. The dramatic events of peacemaking obscured it. And as the people, after the armistice, were mostly fed by American action, there was no major tragedy to attract headlines.

During the 24 months after the armistice in 1918 we sent something over 80,000,000,000 pounds of concentrated foodstuffs from America to Europe. That was more food than we have exported to Europe in the whole of the last 10 years combined. And this food went not only to our Allies but to our former enemies. And of pestilence, an army of typhus came down from Russia on a front 1,000 miles long. At its height 1,000,000 cases raged, with a death rate of a quarter of those stricken. Americans fought that battle and won.

Without all this service, famine, pestilence, and their end in communism would have engulfed Europe. There would have been no peace of any sort.

After the Thirty Years' War a peace was made, and then it is said that one-half of the population proceeded to die from famine and pestilence.

There was no America then.

The conclusion of this observation is, Who will stop the famine after the present war?

And now let us examine the destroyer Hate. He will have something to do with the American people. In his modern visage he is probably the greatest of all destroyers.

Racial hates developed to an intensity and over more people in the World War than ever before. From the miseries which followed it came another unparalleled development. That was class hate. Both of them have played a great part in this cataclysm of today.

Hate becomes completely inflamed in modern war. Nowadays fighting quickly flashes from wars between soldiers to wars against civilians. It was not so long ago that wars were fought entirely between soldiers. They had elements of chivalry and sportsmanship. When such wars were over hates did not remain long in courageous men who fought against courageous men.

But where war is made against helpless civilians an implacable hate comes. Do we need be reminded of the 70 years of hate that survived in our country from Sherman's march to the sea?

As this war goes on, the blockade of food supplies, the attacks on civilians from the air will take more toll from women and children. As action between armies becomes more violent, the long lists of dead stream back from the front into the homes. From these wrongs and sufferings imperishable hates will sink into every household.

And do not let us think we had not in some lesser degree built up hates in the United States during the last war, although our losses had been much less bitter. We cannot forget the hideous attitudes toward loyal Americans of German descent.

Well do I remember that some days after the armistice I announced that the food blockade against Germany should be removed at once. That was imperative for reasons of humanity and for the self-interest of the Allies, that bolshevism could be stopped in starving Germany, and that peace could be made. Despite these obvious reasons the reaction in every part of the allied world and the United States was one of indignant opposition and denunciation of any mercy. It took us months to secure so simple an act.

In the end from this furnace fire of hate statesmen no longer are free agents. The bitterness makes sane peace almost impossible. Those of us who observed the making of the treaty of Versailles knew that the leaders there were consciously or unconsciously dominated by the fires of hate still burning. They had to get their acts approved at home. The sufferings of their people had been too great for rational action.

And one of the consequences of those hates was a treaty which sowed the dragon's teeth of the present war.

In the present war the forces making for hate are even more violent. If this war continues long enough these hates will sit again at the peace table. Unless there be some allaying force, some entry of reason and compassion, there will be a Carthaginian peace.

The conclusion of this observation is, "What powerful nation will still retain good will and reason?"

Hate, this sixth horseman, continues to ride after so-called peace is made. Famine and pestilence, together with the aftermaths of war's destruction—malnutrition, unemployment, and poverty—furnish the fuel to class hate. It is hungry people who revolt in violence. Civilians with filled stomachs do not face machine guns. Helpless, distraught, frustrated peoples accept the leadership of hate, who mobilizes them into revolution. The end is dictatorship, and the advance horsemen start on the march again.

Now America has a role to perform. It can be a great role in our history.

There is no such thing as isolation for the United States. The Monroe Doctrine itself is denial of that. And there can be no such thing as economic or intellectual or moral or spiritual isolation.

There can be no isolation from world effort to allay misery, to save human life, to bring peace, disarmament, reconstruction, and renewed hope from this catastrophe.

There can be military isolation. When I speak of joining in these wars I mean joining in the military side—sending our sons into it.

If we join in these wars we will start with the already great exhaustion of 10 years of our depression. Then we will further exhaust our already weakened economic strength. And that exhaustion will be in a far greater degree than in the few months we participated in the last war.

And when the war is over we shall need devote our remaining resources to support our wounded, our maimed, our orphaned, and our destitute. We shall need every resource to rebuild our farmers and workers from our own misery and impoverishment. And our sympathies will be justly limited to suffering at home.

If we join in this war the last great remaining reservoir of economic strength will have been exhausted. And hope of world recuperation will have been delayed while revolution marches unimpeded over the earth.

If we join in this war we ourselves will develop all the hates that are inevitable from war. We shall have lost the voice of reason in the making of the peace.

And, though we stay out, in our indignation at wrong and aggression we must not be led into blind hates against whole peoples. The great masses of the German people and the Russian people did not wish for the wars now going on. The vast majority of both

these nations are gentle, decent people who prayed for peace even as did you and I.

And ours is a doubly difficult position. In our emotions we have a different scene from Europe fighting race against race. We have the heritage of every European race. Our war hates are not alone against the enemy. They cruelly divide our own people, not alone for the war but long after.

But if we remain out of war we might, if we have the will to do so, use our unimpaired resources, our courage, our moral strength to do mankind infinite service.

By that service we could allay the destruction of war and the ravages of famine and pestilence. That service of compassion could go far to save civilization and restore hope to men. Free of hate, we could exert an insistent voice of reason in the making of peace.

And if we are again called upon for service we have to demand that reason and hope sit at the peace table. Reason and hope for the world call for the restoration of those nations who have lost their freedom.

TNT—The Monroe Doctrine Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 13, 1940:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 13, 1940]

TNT—THE MONROE DOCTRINE TODAY

Among Latin-American nations Brazil has long been regarded as the most friendly to the United States. Over the years her foreign policy has frequently been deliberately alined with our own. Hence the shock resulting from Tuesday's pro-Fascist speech at Rio of her Dictator-President, Getulio Vargas.

Defending "vigorous peoples," Vargas attacked the "sterile demagogy of political democracy." Since this may mean us, it again becomes necessary that we take another look at our political hand. Once more it looks as though loose talk in Washington may have gotten us into a tight spot abroad.

A few days ago a congressional resolution dramatized the Monroe Doctrine as a war issue in these words:

"The United States would not recognize any transfer and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

The resolution's threat, pointed at Germany, is substantially what Monroe said in different words back in 1823, when the target was France, Spain, and the Holy Alliance. "Not acquiesce in" are fighting words. Considering the amount of armament we have "on order" and the amount we have "on hand," fighting words do not appeal to us as much as preparedness actions.

Frankly, we think the whole subject of the Monroe Doctrine is loaded with political TNT; that it is a little known but widely misunderstood document that may very easily involve us in trouble more quickly than some of the more obvious threats. It is our baby. Latin America has never adopted it, seldom liked it, and has generally hated it. For us to assume that the nations south of the Rio Grande have changed their views overnight is at least naive.

There are many scars. Dollar diplomacy, 30 invasions by us into the internal affairs of nine supposedly sovereign and independent Latin American nations, the story of how we got the Panama Canal, the activities of our marines in Central America and the Carribbean—a long and often sordid tale of the build-up over a century of distrust and suspicion of "Yankee imperialism."

President Roosevelt, by his good-neighbor policy, has made a commendable effort to heal old wounds. But he was dealing with a Latin psychology and Latin suspicions. The best that has eventuated from conferences at Buenos Aires, Lima, and Panama, conferences designed to make the Monroe Doctrine a real Pan-American doctrine, has been an agreement to confer when danger threatens anywhere in this hemisphere—as would be the case in any atttempt, for instance, to transfer the Dutch West Indies from a conquered Holland to a conquering Germany.

But there is a tremendous gap between agreeing to confer and agreeing to act. Since by the congressional resolution we are committed to action, we may have assistance or we may have only conferees. As a result of talking first, Congress has saddled us with a responsibility that stretches from pole to pole, from ocean to ocean, and from hell to breakfast—without any assurance that President Vargas, or any of his fellow Latin-American dictators and presidents, includes us in his group of "vigorous peoples."

Question: Why should we be the I'll help-youse Happy Hooligan of the Americas? If the Monroe Doctrine idea—when the showdown comes—can't be turned into an iron-clad, mutually respected military alliance, then why should we stick our neck out way down south of the Equator?

Suggestion: Cut out the conversation and the resoluting. Call a conference, or page every nation in Latin America, and find how far, if at all, each of them is willing to go in a move for the joint protection of the Western Hemisphere—a move which would be the common task of all, not the self-imposed but deeply resented task of Uncle Sam?

Unnecessary To Violate Constitution in Order To Deport Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, if one-half of the charges made against Harry Bridges are true, he is undoubtedly an undesirable and should by all means be deported. I do not have the least sympathy for him, nor do I feel that the communication which he wrote is a proper answer to the charges. I cannot, however, approve of the method that his deportation is to be brought about as provided for in this bill. Never before in the history of our country has legislation similar to this been before the Congress.

Let no one be deceived, this is what is termed "popular legislation." Those who support the bill will be praised, those who oppose it charged with being friends of aliens who would destroy our form of government. I am going to take the unpopular course, not for the sake of Harry Bridges, because I join all in condemning subversive activities, but because the Constitution of the United States says in article I, section 9:

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

A legislative act which provides punishment without a judicial trial is a bill of attainder.

If we are to rely upon the decision of the Supreme Court in a case which originated in my own State, Missouri, following the Civil War, then this bill, if it ever becomes a law, will be held to be unconstitutional. Under an act passed by the Legislature of Missouri, ministers of the Gospel were denied the right to preach unless they took an oath they had not been connected with the Confederacy during the Civil War. Father Cummings, a Catholic priest, challenged the constitutionality of this law, and he was sustained by the United States Supreme Court, the Court holding it was a bill of attainder.

We have all taken an oath to support the Constitution. In my humble opinion, I would be violating that oath if I supported this legislation. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars investigating subversive activities. We have had sensational reports, but where is the legislation to cure the evils complained of, if it be necessary? If our laws dealing with aliens who do not like our form of government are not sufficient to deport them, why cannot general legislation be suggested in which we will find the remedy?

I am not one who has at any time attempted to use influence to keep aliens from being deported who have violated our laws, and I never will. Requests have come to me from time to time, but my answer has always been "No." It will be "No" in the future as it has in the past.

In my opinion, there is an issue here much more important than the deportation of Harry Bridges. On Wednesday, May 29, at the exercises at the unveiling of the painting depicting the signing of the Constitution of the United States, held in

this Capitol, the Speaker of this House, Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, made the following remarks:

In a few moments there will be disclosed for your observation and, I feel confident, for your hearty approval and admiration, a reproduction on canvas of possibly the most significant event in the political and governmental history of our Republic.

It has often occurred to me in looking over the other great historic paintings which adorn this rotunda and this Capitol that it is a rather singular thing, if, indeed, not a grievous omission, that up until this hour no provision has been made for the perpetuation in enduring form of that scene of such transcendent importance to our people, as well as to the people of the world.

It was the concluding episode of the determined purpose of our ancestors who participated in the struggle for our independence to write into one document their conception of the structure of a righteous and enduring form of government for a free people. With the addition of the first 10 amendments, commonly known as the Bill of Rights, there was established our fundamental law, upon which there has been builded not only the oldest but likewise the most powerful democracy on the face of the earth.

Possibly after a lapse of 150 years after the signing of this Constitution, no more appropriate time than this could have been selected for the dedication of a perpetual memorial to those men of genius and high resolve and profound philosophy who made possible our great experiment in human freedom. And such observation is based upon the fact that today we are confronted with the menace of diabolical doctrines and powers which threaten to destroy the very foundations of democratic institutions everywhere on the face of the earth.

In a moment as we look upon the faces of those great men, the signers of the Constitution, let us as a united people highly resolve that no sacrifice will be too great, no hardship too burdensome upon the part of this generation, to preserve for our posterity and for the world the priceless heritage they bequeathed, in perpetuity, to their descendants.

Let us swear by the memory of the founders that if constitutional and representative government shall succumb in all other parts of the world, it shall and will be preserved inviolate in the Western Hemisphere. God give us the spirit and the strength to secure that supreme objective. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask myself, are we preserving inviolate constitutional and representative government if we pass this legislation? The answer, in my humble judgment, is "no."

As chairman of the Select Committee on Government Organization, I introduced and handled on the floor of this House recently a resolution which placed the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization in the Department of Justice. That is where it belongs, and its transfer, which I recommended 7 years ago, has too long been delayed. Let those who are charged with considering legislation providing for the enforcement of our immigration laws secure immediately from the Attorney General his views on what general legislation is necessary to deal with cases of this character. Bring in that legislation and pass it, but make it apply not only to Harry Bridges but to all aliens.

I have nothing but contempt for those who come to this country and then object to our form of government. This is no place for them, but let us in an orderly manner, in keeping with the provisions of our Constitution, for which we all say we would willingly give our lives, take care of them, not by passing a resolution such as this dealing with one case, which the Supreme Court will, if it follows precedents, pronounce unconstitutional, but by general legislation.

We are told that if we can pass bills providing for aliens who entered this country illegally to remain here we can pass bills to deport them. How many who advocate the passage of this legislation have introduced and voted for such bills? I have not, and on every roll call you will find me recorded as opposed to legislation of this character. I maintain those who entered this country illegally in violation of our immigration laws should be deported, and I insist that those who entered legally who do not like our form of government or who have violated our laws involving moral turpitude should be deported.

In the last few months we have learned something which should put us on guard against subversive activities. If our laws are not adequate, then enact laws that are, but by all means preserve our civil liberties which the Constitution extends to us.

The fifth amendment to the Constitution reads:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Even the lowest alien, provided he entered this country legally, is entitled to the same protection as a native-born citizen under this amendment to our Constitution, which we all hold so sacred, but in this bill there is a denial of due process of law.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, deport Bridges if he has violated our laws. It can be done without violating our Constitution.

Divided Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to have printed in the RECORD the following column by Westbrook Pegler, first, because I resent as much as he does any attempt to induce Americans of whatever race or blood to give allegiance to a foreign power or dictator. Second, I think Mr. Pegler has made it plain that the vast majority of Americans of Italian descent are not only loyal citizens of the United States but are in danger of becoming the innocent victims of the operations of Fascist agents and of the resentment which they may bring upon others who have no sympathy with their purposes at all.

FAIR ENOUGH—INSIDIOUS PRESSURE

(By Westbrook Pegler)

A group of Fascist Italians in New York had the effrontery to profane the American Memorial Day rites with a rally of their own in favor of Mussolini, fascism, and Italy. The Italian consul general in New York attended, pursuant to the policy of the Italian consular service of subtly harassing and spying on Americans of Italian blood or birth and conducting or threatening to conduct boycotts against loyal American citizens and half-Americanized immigrants.

The account, which I have read in the World-Telegram, reports that Commendatore Pupino Carbonelli, described as a journalist, made an oration in which he said:

"Il Duce stands behind you, Italians of America and of the world. We must face the future united. Do not lose heart. Defend your American Constitution. Remain benevolently neutral. Be true to our idea."

Now, these remarks are typical of that insidious pressure by which true Americans of Italian blood or birth are imposed upon by outright Fascists or politically ambiguous individuals and by profiteering exploiters of the so-called Italo-American population who occupy the status of padrones in the American community.

Not forgetting that anyone who permits the Duce to stand behind him runs a grave risk of receiving a stiletto in the back, I will point out to this commendatore of Italy that Americans need no support, moral or otherwise, from Adolf Hitler's junior partner. Nobody has asked for Mussolini's help, the proffer of which by Signor Carbonelli is an affront to the loyalty of Americans. Just what Signor Carbonelli means by "Italians of America" I do not know, but he should be set straight on the fact that no Italian is an American, and vice versa. Italy is one nation and the United States is another, and it happens that during the last 4 years the Government of Italy has vilified the United States and the American people as a nation of gangsters.

Moreover, the Duce, who is so kind as to "stand behind" this element of the American community, has placed Italy in a military alliance with the nation which is now conducting a world revolution against the kind of government which is provided by the American Constitution.

Inasmuch as this Memorial Day rally was a Fascist occasion which paid only the most perfunctory and insincere respect to the Constitution, it is hard to believe that when Signor Carbonelli exhorted the meeting to "be true to our idea" he meant anything else than the Fascist idea, to which no American can be true. And the Italian consul general needs reminding, officially if he is insensitive

to hints, that Americans need no advice from him and will not thank him for interference in the affairs of American citizens, whatever their breed.

The Americans of Italian birth or blood have no reason to love Italy. One reason why they have had such a hard time in the United States is that in Italy they were kept in deep ignorance and horrible poverty. They were glad to escape and, although they have been exploited in the United States, it is also true that this exploitation was conducted by native Italian padrones who came along with them and established in the new land the system of extortion and terrorism which was a native Italian peculiarity or vice as characteristic as garlic. Racketeering, formerly known as blackhanding, is not a native American trait, but was imported from Sicily and Naples, and the present Government of Italy was founded on such terrorism and is today a racket or nationalized mafia.

Signor Carbonelli, the consul general, other consular officers, and half-Americanized publishers of Italian language newspapers in the United States are not serving Americanism, or the interests of immigrants and their sons, in preaching the tie to the homeland. The homeland treated these people abominably, and the noble Romans and the supercilious Italians of the north regarded and treated as untouchables the Neapolitans, Sicilians, and other swarthy Italians of the south who constituted the American immigration. Now, suddenly, Italy has a great love for these people, and agents of the Duce are attempting to organize them into a "fifth column" of traitors to the land which gave them refuge from the darkness and squalor of the "boot."

Findings of the Interfaith Conference on Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to be able to include with my remarks the findings of the Interfaith Conference on Unemployment, held in Washington, June 4–6, 1940. They are as follows:

The conference submits the following findings to the Industrial Division, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; the Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; the Social Justice Commission, Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the Social Justice Committee, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Unemployment is a dreadful scourge and a social sin. It is a major cause of war and poverty and an indictment of our society. Yet most of us have been indifferent and irresponsible in our attitudes toward this most critical problem.

The moral effects of the continued unemployment of 9,000,000 or more workers are evident. Enforced idleness demoralizes personality, makes it impossible for families to live normal, healthy lives, and prevents their participation in community life. These conditions must now become the common concern of the Nation. The religious bodies must supply the moral dynamic for changing them.

Unemployment must not be continually relieved—it must be abolished. It is the plain duty of the religious bodies to demand a thousand times more loudly than ever before that the necessary steps be taken to use our great resources and to work out procedures in accord with democratic principles.

Solutions cannot be found without individual and social sacrifice. The employed, the fortunate, must identify themselves with the unemployed, and be willing to make sacrifices in order to bring about the abolition of unemployment. Only high spiritual attitudes will bring justice. The moral will should be expressed effectively in terms of right social relations.

It is imperative that just social relations be attained, because economic desperation will lead many well-meaning citizens of all classes into great temptation. When people are confused and embittered, not knowing where to turn, they seek scapegoats, thus arousing race hatreds. People haunted by insecurity are most likely to become the easy prey of ruthless leaders, including would-be dictators who make large promises but take away liberties. In these times of emotional stress it is doubly necessary to emphasize democratic procedures and rights.

Whatever may be the needs of national defense, stimulation of industrial activity through the production of arms will not provide a permanent method of abolishing unemployment. This has been declared by the many speakers mentioning the subject at this conference. Indeed, some have warned that long and increasing production of armaments threatens the production of consumer's goods, and thereby lowers the general standard of living. It is clear that we must all search for sound methods that promise more constructive economic results. The religious bodies have a vital interest in what is socially constructive; in reconciliation and healing; in the arts of peace. Elimination of unemployment requires social thinking of a high order, and social collaboration to work out the plans and put them into effect.

To that end, there should be a continuing commission, composed of representatives of consumers, farmers, labor, finance, manufacturing, commerce, Government, education, religion. We hereby call upon the national organizations in these various fields to come together to form such a commission. For enforceable and coordinated action by the organized social forces of the country, governmental leadership is necessary. Government, we strongly recommend, should call these organizations together for devising cooperative, democratic measures to solve the unemployment problem.

Religious bodies dare not escape their responsibility to educate, with the aid of informed laymen, in regard to the moral and social aspects of such questions as have been here discussed, including the kind and degree of taxation; the relative emphasis upon voluntary and upon governmental leadership; the role of cooperatives for purchasing, credit, marketing; the possibility of setting up democratic economic planning; the importance of preserving religious and civil liberties; the need for new social inventions to deal with new conditions.

These questions should be taken up in religious assemblies, should be considered by the religious press and study courses. They all have religious aspects and implications, and require study in an atmosphere which religious bodies are peculiarly prepared to supply.

We recommend that these findings and a summary of the addresses and discussions of the conference be sent not only to the convening groups and their constituencies, but also to all other religious bodies of the Nation, with the request that they be given wide publicity.

We recommend that the findings and summary be also sent to the President, all Members of Congress, and to leaders of social agencies, voluntary and governmental.

H. R. 9766, As Amended—Deportation of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the special bill, H. R. 9766, for the deportation of Harry Bridges, is the first bill of its kind, we are advised, to be enacted by the House of Representatives in the 150 years of our national history. I joined with my colleagues from the State of Washington, Messrs. LEAVY, COFFEE, HILL, and MAGNUSON, in voting against it in its final form, as amended. We all voted for the rule to bring the bill before the House for consideration in the hope that it would be amended so that we could vote for it. This was not done. The nonpartisan character of the final vote is evidenced by the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], on the Republican side, were among those who also voted against the bill on final passage.

My colleague from the State of Washington, Judge LEAVY, pointed out some of the constitutional objections to this type of legislation. I agree with his conclusions. In my opinion, in addition to establishing a dangerous precedent of a most subversive character, the bill is unconstitutional on at least three grounds: First, it is in the nature of a bill of attainder and ex post facto law and as such violates the constitutional inhibition (*Cummings* v. *Missouri*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 323, 18 L. Ed. 356; *Ex parte Garland*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 387, 18 L. Ed. 366; *Drehman* v. *Stifle*, 75 U. S. (8 Wall.) 595, 601, 19 L. Ed. 508; *Pierce* v. *Carskadon*, 83 U. S. (16 Wall.) 234, 239, 21 L. Ed. 276). Second, it violates the fifth amendment to the Constitution which provides that "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Under the bill, as amended, a hearing is expressly denied. The Supreme Court of the United States has uniformly held in cases too numerous to require any citation of decision that an alien is entitled to due process under the fifth amendment. Third, the bill, as amended,

even denies resort to a writ of habeas corpus and clearly violates the provision in the Constitution which provides that "The writ of habeas corpus shall never be denied except in case of war or invasion." For these reasons, under my oath as a Member of this body, to support the Constitution, I cannot vote for legislation of this type.

I am not concerned with Harry Bridges as an individual and hold no brief for him. I am, however, very much concerned with the principle and constitutional questions involved. With the world aflame, we are properly appropriating billions of dollars for national defense to maintain and preserve our democracy and protect our democratic processes against attack by totalitarian powers. The destruction of the democratic processes, which we value and prize so highly and are determined to preserve at all costs, was wrought in Germany, Italy, and Russia by such inroads upon individual and fundamental rights as is made possible by this type of legislation. If it is right for one Congress to deport by special act—something never before done in our history—a labor leader, another Congress may decide to deport a leader of employers, ad libitum ad nauseam. These is no end to the extremes to which such legislation may be carried, once the precedent is established.

Instead let Congress enact general legislation, within the guaranties of the Constitution, applying to all aliens, including Harry Bridges, if our present laws are insufficient. Let Congress provide by general legislation for the deportation of all aliens who advocate or teach the doctrines of nazi-ism, fascism, or communism.

Although We Are Unprepared, Roosevelt Would Force Us Into the Second World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, although he cannot lawfully declare war, President Roosevelt is saying and doing many things which will make war unavoidable.

What makes his conduct the more reprehensible is that, because of the frightful waste of his administration and because of the industrial strife which his agencies and his friends and supporters have instigated and carried on during the past 3 years, we are ill prepared not only to fight a war on foreign soil but to defend ourselves here at home.

The situation is so well described in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 12 that I here insert it:

[From the Chicago Tribune of June 12, 1940]

FULL SPEED TOWARD WHAT GOAL?

Mr. Roosevelt's address at the University of Virginia might have been written jointly in their day by Blum, MacDonald, Baldwin, and Chamberlain.

M. Blum sent some of his country's best planes and guns to Spain, where they were irretrievably lost. He also insisted that France's armament industries be subjected to every annoyance that a meddlesome government could invent in the name of social advancement. The result was that Germany got far ahead of France in the preparation of war materials, with consequences now apparent. Mr. Roosevelt indicated at Charlottesville that these mistakes are to be repeated by us. We also are far behind in the armament race, but we are to send much of what we have to foreign soil and all the restrictions on industrial and agricultural production which have been devised in the last 7 years are to remain in force.

Like MacDonald, Mr. Roosevelt is eloquent in denunciation, and, like, MacDonald and Baldwin, he encourages the Nation to believe that its preparation is far more complete than in fact it is. The truth is that we have no army to send to Europe, and the military supplies we might send, aside from those which are already on order for the Allies, will leave our own country naked.

Like Chamberlain, Mr. Roosevelt speaks most provocatively as the strategic position becomes less favorable to intervention. After the Germans had been permitted to rearm and fortify the Rhineland, and after Munich, Mr. Chamberlain decided upon war. He chose to fight for Poland, though it was obvious that the Allies could not reenforce the Polish army or supply it. Similarly, with Paris in the gravest danger of capture, Mr. Roosevelt announces his determination to support France. Like Mr. Chamberlain, he has chosen the worst moment. Our contribution cannot become effective for many months, during which the strategic position may well become even more unfavorable as more and more of the French ports are seized.

Almost everyone in this country shares Mr. Roosevelt's profound dislike of the dictators and his hope that they will be defeated. It is highly improbable, however, that Mr. Roosevelt advanced the welfare of this country by his denunciations. All he can have accomplished, aside from promoting his political ambitions, is to invite revenge at a time when we are ill prepared for defense. Impulsiveness is not the most serviceable characteristic of a public official.

While he is edging the country toward war, Mr. Roosevelt continues to promote factionalism at home through his political activity and his "reforms." He is obviously responding to the war whoops arising along the eastern seaboard and he is not thinking beyond tomorrow. He does not ask what the United States is to gain from its participation; he does not reckon the cost in men, money, and social and economic disorganization. His state of mind is clearly revealed in his statement: "We will not slow down or detour. Signs and signals call for speed—full speed ahead."

If Mr. Roosevelt gets his way, that means full speed toward a war we are not prepared to fight; full speed toward the slaughter of a generation of young Americans; full speed toward dictatorship in this country. It would be instructive to know what kind of a peace Mr. Roosevelt thinks would follow another victory in Europe won by American arms. Evidently he hasn't thought of that. At any rate, he didn't say anything about it.

Having failed so completely and so miserably to solve a single major problem undertaken by him, during the 7 years he has been in office, and having created a condition where it will be extremely difficult for us to properly prepare and having saddled a burden upon our people which must be met by increased taxation upon everyone, the most patriotic thing any citizen can do is to work earnestly and effectively for the complete elimination of Roosevelt and his New Deal wrecking crew.

Politics or Patriotism—Which Are We Getting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS OF JUNE 11, 1940

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial published in the Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Mich., under date of June 11, 1940.

I think this editorial is especially pertinent at the present time. American citizens are vitally interested in the attitude of their Government with reference to national defense. I think that it is generally conceded that the rank and file of the American people are vitally interested in an adequate national defense in all our units: Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, but they have a right to know that the money which is appropriated by Congress for that purpose is so applied.

Judging from my correspondence from my constituents of the Sixth District of Michigan, I would say that very few people are in favor of America's participation in the European conflict.

With 10,000,000 men and women out of work, with a national debt of $45,000,000,000, with an added guaranteed indebtedness of six to eight billion dollars, with a peacetime annual deficit of three to four billion dollars, America has all the domestic problems she can safely handle without incurring new and foreign ones.

The propagandists are already loud and vociferous in their statements that we should enter this war to "save civilization." We heard much the same argument in 1917, when we were told that the United States should declare war to

"save the world for democracy." We lost thousands of fine American boys, spent billions of dollars, and then finally realized how futile our efforts were in establishing permanent peace in Europe with its ever-recurring and insistent wars.

The Detroit Free Press contained the following editorial under the caption "Politics or patriotism—which are we getting?" This editorial is sane, sensible, and thoroughly patriotic, and should be widely read. The editorial follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 11, 1940]

POLITICS OR PATRIOTISM—WHICH ARE WE GETTING?

If we are not at war we ought to quit pretending we are.

If we are at war we ought to quit pretending we are not.

Let us quit pretending about anything. This is no time for pretense.

No time for smartness, for glib airiness, for conjuring rabbits out of high hats, for cleverness of any kind whatsoever.

The issue is simple and should not be clouded.

The American people want preparedness as a preventive of war, not as provocation for one.

In the hullabaloo at Washington this single fundamental fact seems rapidly being forgotten.

President Roosevelt forgot all about it in his angry address at Charlottesville last night.

The people have consented without protest to the spending of many billions in the belief that they are investing their money in an insurance policy.

They have not agreed that it shall be tossed into a gigantic gamble on the turn of the dice in Europe.

The President has declared a state of something short of war existing. But there is no clear demarcation between the line of less than war and war itself.

All this is vastly disturbing to a public mind long inured to the modern technique of waging wars without taking the trouble to declare them.

As far as the Nazi high command is concerned nothing we can now do or say will affect their belief that we are their sworn enemies.

They have no moral niceties about such matters.

Our finely spun technicalities about being into it up to our necks but "short of war" interest them not at all.

They know no law but that of might and care nothing about hair-line definitions and shades of meaning.

It is as silly for us to think otherwise as it would be for a brave but defenseless poilu to argue his metaphysical rights as he is crushed under one of their tanks.

Berlin does not listen to Philadelphia lawyers.

As far as the Nazis are concerned, in their present military position, we are already at war with them and any formal declaration would be a "mere scrap of paper."

We may fool ourselves by pretending this is not so but we are not fooling Hitler and Goering.

For, if Germany should win, victory will be theirs before we could affect the scales one way or another even if we declared ourselves officially. Our military authorities agree that it will take us at least a year before we can be prepared to help with either men or equipment of any consequence. Before that time the decision will have come. If Germany cannot win by then, she cannot win at all. So say all the experts.

Therefore, facing the situation in the harsh realism of things as they are, we have but one course before us: To get this Nation on a sound foundation for national defense. And nothing else!

The people will not be satisfied with "guess and be damned" programs that are dazzling in conception but drab in conclusion.

Mr. Roosevelt asks for over a billion dollars and the Nation applauds. Two weeks later he askes for another billion, with a casual, "Oh, by the way," approach to the asking. The people agree to that. Nor do they flinch at the added tax burden of $650,000,000.

They are not afraid of realities. They are worried only over unrealities.

The national-debt limit of forty-five billion is to be upped to forty-eight billion. The President has asked for $4,500,000,000 for the ensuing year. But from nowhere—least of all from the White House—comes a clear, concise statement of how this burden is to be financed, how much is actually needed, and what it is going to be used for.

The "on hand or on order" technique of the fireside chat seems to prevail in all the financial statements that have been issued.

Mr. Roosevelt confesses very little interest in where and how the money is to be raised. He merely says the Government has to have it. No one has questioned that; but the people do want to know where seven billion in the past 7 years has already gone for the same purpose with very little to show for it. And where this is going.

Nor will their doubts and uncertainties be cleared up by cheerful bedtime fireside chats. Rich and poor alike must be called upon to make tremendous sacrifices, and the palliatives of platitudes will not soothe them in facing a drift into a war they do not want.

If it is legal and proper and in keeping with a sound preparedness program to order the Army and Navy to turn back to manufacturers what equipment we now have on hand as obsolete, for them in turn to sell to the Allies, what is to prevent the same tricky device being used when new guns, planes, and other essentials are delivered? "Obsolescence" can be an elastic word.

And, stripped of its camouflage, this latest move is as baldly an act of war as though we were to order the American Fleet into action.

Another thing: There is a growing belief that in some phases of the Washington situation there has been more politics than there has been patriotism.

Ironically enough, the finger of suspicion this time is not pointed by Wall Street "economic royalists" or rival politicians. The charges are made by some of the stanchest defenders and advocates of the New Deal philosophy.

Space will not permit the quoting of more than three, but they are typical and their "left-wing" fidelity need not be doubted.

First, there is John T. Flynn, long a special economic adviser to the New Deal and one of its most prolific apologists. He charges that Mr. Roosevelt is using the present emergency as a smoke screen to hide the failures of his program to put men back to work and to restore prosperity.

Second, there is the New Republic, which since 1933, has been the quasi-official organ of the so-called palace janissaries, the inner circle of ardent leftists within the White House. This publication makes no bones about the administration playing politics with one of the gravest situations that ever confronted our Nation. In the current issue it says:

"On the political side, the new dealers sought to make use of the defense issue to create a coalition Cabinet, with the single-hearted purpose of rendering their conservative opponents helpless in the coming campaign.

"Among certain liberal groups it was feared that Mr. Roosevelt, in proposing a coalition, was surrendering to the Republicans, offering to make terms with them. On excellent authority it can be said that this is untrue.

"The new dealers were trying to ensnare hostages. It was a skillful plan. The Republicans could not have attacked the New Deal if the heads of their party were in Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet.

"Col. Frank Knox, the first Republican leader interviewed by Mr. Roosevelt, is supposed to have accepted the plan, and may yet enter the Cabinet. However, coalition was killed by the acerb anti-third-term statement of former Governor Landon."

Third, there is Oswald Garrison Villard, dean of American liberals, for many years editor of the other left-wing weekly, the Nation, and now its contributing editor. He writes:

"The national fright over the success of the "blitzkrieg" has pulled the President out of a bad hole. War or no war, he had to have the right to get us further into debt, since it is entirely beyond him to put our industry fully to work. * * * Hitler has given him another breathing spell. * * *

"Of course, the new taxes will not produce one-sixth of the sum—$4,500,000,000—which the President has asked. It is only a clever joke—not a serious effort * * *."

These accusations should be met.

The President himself should accept them as a challenge.

They are not isolated instances.

The fate of this Nation may well depend upon their truth or falsity.

The people have a right to know if politics is being played with human misery, if politics is jeopardizing all that we have or ever hope to have, if politics has taken the place of patriotism.

This is what the accusations mean—if they mean anything.

The issue is not one of men, money, and machines.

It is one of morals.

Calvin Coolidge once remarked that every word a President says weighs a ton. He meant that, because of the tremendous power a President possesses, he should carefully weigh his words.

The people, loving Mr. Roosevelt as their friend and crusader, have smiled indulgently in the years past at some of his free vocal efforts and Puckish byplay. All in good fun, they said, each understanding the other.

Now there are these rumors, no longer passed along only by those who might be dismissed as reactionaries or disgruntled leaders of business. And from these reports stem the element of uncertainty which steals across our land. For Mr. Roosevelt still carries on in the same breezy insouciance that captivated most of us in his inaugural address when his happy courage gave a despairing people a great new hope.

In the present sorry situation, however, that happy-warrior role seems synthetic.

The people know of the disgraceful situation that exists in the office of the Secretary of War, a sore that has festered for years: The deadly personal feud between Secretary Woodring and his first assistant, Johnson—a chaotic condition allowed to continue for the sake of political expediency.

The people know that Charles Edison was promoted to the Secretaryship of the Navy only to give him a prestige that would aid him in his campaign for Governor of New Jersey, as a Charlie McCarthy for the notorious Boss Hague of that State. His resignation is dated June 24.

The Army and Navy are our sole defense.

Yet we see these vital Departments manhandled by misfits; and, in one of them, the personnel torn with openly declared enmities.

It is little wonder, then, that the people are willing to lend attentive ear to the steadily increasing barrage of reports that all is not well in Washington.

Only out of the deep wells of unsullied sincerity can be given the answer that will cleanse from their minds the miasma of doubts and fears which now inflicts them.

There is an explanation of the public's long complacency concerning oft-repeated charges of chicanery in high office.

There has been a Nation-wide moral let-down.

There was the bitter disillusionment of the World War, the hypocrisy and lawlessness that went with prohibition; the tragedy of the Harding scandals, the pain of which in the body politic was dulled by the narcotic of the "Coolidge prosperity"—which turned out to be a rubber check; there was the stodgy ineptitude of Hoover, who told them that poverty had been wiped from the face of the earth. And now this!

A corroding cynicism, born of the constant crash of hopes, had calloused the people to accept without ringing protests of righteous indignation many conditions they knew to be wrong.

But the Free Press believes that there is an awakening at hand, a revival of our national sense of honor.

Out of our new common danger there can come a strengthening of our moral fiber, a revitalization of the old ideals once vouchsafed us by a benign and patient Providence—if He will but again grant us the power to see.

Without this there can be no true patriotism. For patriotism is an unselfish love of country that has its roots deep in the instincts of the people. It knows no party, no creed, no sectionalism. In its spiritual essence it is the living soul of the Nation.

Only through the reawakening of this spirit can there come to us the cool, clear light of understanding—when we will know, deep within ourselves, that we are living a life and not playing like actors doing their parts upon a stage.

And reason, sound understanding, freed of all theatricalism, dictates that it is our duty to keep out of other people's wars.

Sane people first look after their own children before they do those of their neighbors. God helps those who help themselves.

We can best serve mankind by keeping alive on this soil the principles of human liberty that first found root here.

To "make the world safe for democracy" in the last war we nearly lost our own. We may not be so fortunate another time.

Logic demands that we build a national defense to preserve ourselves and our principles of government.

If we do this, we will be in better position to help in the restoration of a now mad world back to its sanity.

These are the reasons the people have willingly consented to the voting of all these billions to President Roosevelt—not for the purpose of becoming involved once more in the age-old conflicts of European power politics.

So let's quit pretending.

And woe unto them who play politics in this hour of the Nation's deepest need.

Dr. Robert Reiner Replies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], in addressing the House, made the following statement:

Since the Hitler regime came into power, however, the Board of Trade for German-American Commerce slowly changed its policy and since the last 3 or 4 years has become an organization absolutely controlled and financed by Germany, and one playing a very important role in the United States in distributing German propaganda and supervising espionage activities. * * * The president of the Board of Trade for German-American Commerce is Dr. Robert Reiner, of the Robert Reiner, Inc., who is very sympathetic toward the present German regime.

On the Sunday following the date of the address of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], his indictment of Dr. Reiner was referred to by a noted New York columnist, and shortly thereafter, in an address delivered on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] quoted what the columnist had written.

Dr. Robert Reiner formerly lived in the congressional district which I represent. While no longer a resident of the district, he is still the president of a large concern, Robert Reiner, Inc., located in the township of Weehawken. Dr. Reiner has forwarded me a letter totally and unequivocally denying the charges leveled against him in the utterances referred to, and expressing willingness and anxiety to have these charges investigated by Government officials.

Believing that Dr. Reiner is entitled to be heard, I include in these remarks the entire letter which he has addressed to me:

ROBERT REINER, INC.,
Weehawken, N. J., June 8, 1940.

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the May 14, 1940, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (pp. 6113, etc.) there appeared certain statements concerning the undersigned. In fairness to me, I ask that you give equal publicity to the following facts:

I am the president of Robert Reiner, Inc., and have been its president continuously since its organization in 1908. This company now is, and has since its incorporation, been engaged in the business of importing and manufacturing textile machinery. More than 90 percent of the employees of Robert Reiner, Inc., are American citizens.

I have been a resident of the United States of America since 1903 and have been a citizen since 1909.

I am proud to state that I always have been a loyal citizen in my community, and I challenge anyone to prove the contrary. Allegations by somebody who makes them innuendo and under the protection of his immunity are false and untrue. I have never been engaged, directly or indirectly, in any activities which may be referred to as un-American, and I would unconditionally welcome investigation by any Government agency as to my past and present activities.

May I add a few words about my connections with the board of trade for German-American Commerce, Inc., which the gentleman in question apparently used as reason for his unpardonable remarks?

I was elected president of this American corporation on March 29, 1939, and I, naturally, have accepted this honor, in the belief that the activities of chambers of commerce in general deserve high praise and that their purposes are nowhere better understood or better supported than in this country. I can state here definitely that during my activities for this corporation I have never encountered a discussion of any problem other than such incident to the promotion of more satisfactory commercial relations between our country and Germany.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT REINER.

P. S.—I hope to see you next week.

The National Defense and the Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the radio:

I would like to begin my remarks by reading a number of brief quotations that have recently come to my attention:

"The turn-over here (in Elizabeth, N. J.) is 360 percent per month—550 percent unskilled and 130 percent skilled labor; the men brought to Elizabeth have to pay such high rents. There are tenements available, but they are in such poor condition that they are practically uninhabitable. The company has built dormitories but they are overcrowded. It is taking on 100 men a day. In the next 3 months 8,000 men are needed * * * The company has stopped advertising for men because it cannot help them."

Also:

"The growing need for additional employees at this yard (the Navy Yard at Mare Island, Calif.) necessitates a solution of the housing problem in Vallejo. It is almost impossible for employees coming from other places to secure accommodations and men taken on often request their discharge as they are unable to obtain reasonably comfortable accommodations in Vallejo within their means * * *."

One more, this one dealing with the Washington Navy Yard:

"* * * unless prompt measures are taken to relieve the scarcity of housing, it will be impossible for the factory to increase

or even maintain its present force, as many of the new men who have come from a distance with the expectation of bringing their families to Washington later, have been unable to find accommodations and are unwilling to remain permanently without their families."

These quotations, ladies and gentlemen, are from an official Government's report describing housing conditions during the last World War.

And they tell only part of the story. They pass over the drain upon the worker's health resulting from substandard, overcrowded shelter. They say nothing about the relative ineffieciency of the worker on the job who spends half or two-thirds of every day in a dwelling that could not possibly meet factory inspection standards. They tell you nothing about the dissatisfaction and breakdown in morale produced by bad housing and high rents.

But will it be any better during the next few years? Will we be able to avoid similar conditions?

All I can say now is that it depends. It depends upon how promptly we take steps to meet our growing housing needs. There has been too much hindsight these days. There are too many who know what is the proper thing to do after the time for doing it is past. What we need today is foresight.

A little foresight will show us that as the national defense program continues, we will be confronted with housing conditions akin to those of the last period of world conflict.

First of all, there is nothing static about the defense program. A large number of major industries will have to expand, to expand rapidly. This will mean the more intensive use of old plants in the older industrial communities. Workers from neighboring towns—often from far-away localities—will be drawn to these communities in great numbers. In many cases new plants will be opened up in localities where they had not existed before. Workers will flock to these towns in still greater proportions. In either case, they will want to bring their wives and children along with them. Man is not a solitary animal. Even though offered a steady job at good pay, he will not want to break his family ties. Moreover, there will be new naval bases, new Army posts, new airfields. Each of these will draw to them large numbers of married enlisted men and married employees. It must be granted, therefore, that the need will be great.

Second, it would be a miracle if the private building industry were to meet the need. During a period of swift armament private building—especially home building—always declines. In 1914 and 1915, for instance, residential construction was at a fairly high level. But as the country became more and more adjusted to a war-time economy, construction fell rapidly. By 1918, it had fallen fully 50 percent.

The reasons for this decline are easy to appreciate. In a war-time economy building materials are needed for other purposes. Skilled labor is drawn to other industries. Interest rates and commodity prices usually rise. Private home building becomes more difficult than before, more expensive than before.

Moreover, there is reason to believe that housing may become more of a problem during the next year or so than it was during the first World War. During the 11 years, from 1905 to 1915, inclusive, there was not one year in which less than 400,000 new homes were built. But how about the last 10 or 11 years? How large a housing supply is there for us to rely on? During the past decade the average annual construction was only a little more than 200,000 new homes. In fact it was not until 1939 that the 400,000 mark was reached. Consequently, we are already in the midst of a housing shortage. During the last war it was a question of good conditions becoming bad. Today it is a question of bad conditions becoming worse.

There is only one remedy—public housing. The United States Housing Authority should be authorized to lend construction funds to the Army and Navy and to local housing authorities. It should be authorized to build housing projects itself.

Of course, there may be landlords who will want to benefit from an acutely intensified shortage, who will want to raise rents at the first opportunity to terrifying heights and grow rich on the plunder. A national defense public housing program, naturally, would relieve the shortage and eliminate the opportunities for rent profiteering. And for this reason there may be landlords who will object to a program of public housing for national defense. If there are, I would like to give them a word of warning. The only alternative to a defense housing program is rent control. In 1917 and 1918 rent-control legislation was enacted in many States and rent-adjustment boards were set up in more than 75 cities and towns. Public housing provides the only means whereby such drastic measures can be avoided.

In conclusion, let me remind you that this is the era of total wars, of wars in which every conceivable resource is used in making an attack and in which every part of the enemy's territory and every phase of the enemy's economy is regarded as an object for attack. On our part, therefore, we must declare a policy of total defense, a policy that will be successful because it eliminates every weak spot and every bottleneck. And unless we take the proper steps now, the housing of defense industry workers and of enlisted Army and Navy men may yet become one of our sorest weak spots and one of our most troublesome bottlenecks.

The Bill of Rights—My Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two prize-winning essays written by young men who reside in my district. They deal with a very timely subject—The Bill of Rights—My Protection. The essay contest is an annual affair conducted by the American Legion, Department of Ohio, as part of their Americanization program.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS—MY PROTECTION

(By David Garvin, Shaker Heights, Cleveland, Ohio)

When Thomas Jefferson received his first copy of the proposed Constitution he asked, "Where are the rights of the people?" His words were echoed by many of the ratifying conventions which submitted about 100 amendments for addition to the Constitution. Ten of these were adopted by Congress and ratified in 1791 by the State legislature. Now Jefferson could breathe easily, for here were the rights of the people.

Today I am able to write about this Bill of Rights because for 150 years this group of amendments has kept open the highway of personal freedom. I am not limited to the Bill of Rights. No; I may write or speak on any subject I choose and have no interference from my Government as long as I stay within the bounds of reason.

There are many churches in my town. The Government does not care at which I prefer to worship, nor does it impose upon me a tax to support the church it favors.

These rights retained by me are the true basis of democracy. These four—freedom of press, speech, assembly, and religion—are fundamental to unfettered individual expression. Without them we could be easily made into helpless mocking birds, echoing the beliefs of the groups in power, through the compulsion of censorship and the threat of imprisonment.

My rights of free expression are protected in two other ways. In colonial times, two practices were commonly used to curtail the opposition. First, soldiers were quartered in private homes, ostensibly to spread evenly the cost of maintaining order. In practice these soldiers served as spies, who by observing the actions of the people were able to knife any attempts to change the existing order. Even more unfair than this method was the use of writs of assistance to search a man's home in hope of finding cause for punishing him. These two dampers on my expression can never materialize here, for the founding fathers took care to forbid them in the Bill of Rights.

Legally I am as well protected. Never can I be called summarily before a court of justice—accused, tried, sentenced, and punished without chance for rebuttal. Wisely enough, I must be arraigned by a grand jury, and must (in either civil or criminal procedure) be tried by a panel of my fellow citizens. If they find the accusation of the grand jury to be true, still I have a last measure of mercy, for no punishment or fine may be imposed if it is out of keeping with my offense. I may not be imprisoned for life for stealing a loaf of bread, or shot for repeating a radio program. No, I am safe in the halls of justice. I have protectors on every hand.

Our Government is a multiple affair. Authority varying in degree and kind is delegated to different branches. One branch cannot become supreme and ride roughshod over the people, for one division is placed as a check against the others; by separation of the Federal and State powers; by reserving the undefined mandates to the people, and allowing the smaller units to maintain their own militias.

Truly, I am a fortunate person. I have the Bill of Rights for a keen sword to repel the attacks of all my foes.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS—MY PROTECTION

(By Richard Cheney, Willoughby, Ohio)

Nothing is more timely in this period of history than to consider anew the value and importance of the Bill of Rights, which is the backbone of the constitutional form of representative government that we call American democracy.

It is appropriate now, when the democratic forms of government are threatened by the dictatorships of Europe, to consider how our Nation is held together and governed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Our forefathers fought to make our country free from the tyrant's hands, so to insure lasting liberty and free speech. They achieved this conquest and had to set up a government of their own. The Bill of Rights was proposed as a part of the new Constitution. These inalienable rights gave each citizen of the United States certain privileges not granted by any other country. Let us examine the Bill of Rights more closely and see what human rights are safeguarded and guaranteed by this basic part of our Constitution.

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship whereby each individual has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and the freedom of assembly are granted each citizen of the United States, regardless of race, color, or creed, or whether he be rich or poor. Each citizen has the right to vote for whom he chooses, without any fear of being thrown into a concentration camp. Our homes are protected by law and cannot be searched without a Government warrant. Citizens have the privilege of holding a public or private meeting for free discussion on any problems or topic which confronts us and does not plot the overthrow of our form of government. The Bill of Rights protects all citizens from a one-man government and gives each citizen, whether rich or poor, a chance to be elected to public office. The Bill of Rights declares that all men are created equal, in the sense that each citizen has equal opportunities.

The present and future generations of citizens should try to make our Nation more wisely governed by electing the best and ablest representatives for positions of public office, whose leadership will express the basic spirit and principles of the Bill of Rights.

The best defense of American democracy is more democracy that expresses over wider areas these human rights and privileges guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Only in this way can the United States outride the storms of dictatorship and all other conflicting forms of government, and serve the highest welfare of each and every citizen of the United States, whether he be Jew or gentile, black or white, rich or poor. This will achieve the truly great democracy Abraham Lincoln had in mind and heart as "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is American democracy at its best, and this best is deeply rooted in the Bill of Rights as well as in the heart of every true and loyal citizen of the United States.

Political Issues of 1940, a Democratic Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have the immodest honor to insert herewith a radio address I delivered last evening over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network.

My fellow countrymen, it's amazing in our two-party system what one party can do to the other and for the other. Whatever Republicans present at Philadelphia to be the issues of 1940, you may rest assured that these issues have been defined for them by the Democratic Party. The Republicans must follow us Democrats even if they mean to displace us as national leaders. The report of their official program committee—Dynamic America—already makes this absolutely clear. So energetically have we Democrats acted, and along a front so wide, that by no stretch of appropriateness can persons, this campaign year, usurp the attention deserved only by events and principles of government.

Let us emphasize that thought, because too much of our political talk moves even in these perilous days at the level of gossip as to whether this man or that will be the nominee of that party or this. Any politician without principles is plainly pusillanimous, regardless of his party; and men with principles, of whatever party, differ less in performance than our purely partisan pride likes to admit. We need less gossip, then, concerning persons, and more and more of the philosophy of a government adequate to meet the challenges of this hour. Indeed, the difference between gossip and philosophy is just background, according to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. We Democrats have furnished the background. We Democrats have made government so serious a business that every leader, unless he be a pretender plainly nincompoop, must face now the logic of events rather than merely follow the graceful flow of traditional campaign oratory.

Those who say that the man, the candidate, is the all-important thing deserve to be told, in the spirit of a famous French maxim, to find the woman; and those who take that tack presently sink to a very low level of gossip, gossiping about the wife, or the husband, or the children of the candidate. My late friend, Clarence Darrow, told me of one such person who interrupted him at a public meeting early in the Roosevelt administration, muttering: "I don't like him." "Don't like whom?" "Don't like Roosevelt." "Why don't you like him?" "I just don't." "But you must have more reason than that." "Well, if I must, then I just don't care for him." "So I gather, but that's no better." "Sir, if you insist: I don't like her either."

I. A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF MAJOR ISSUES

The issues of the coming campaign transcend persons and encompass principles, and that regardless of any given "him" or "her." Let us concentrate then upon the definition of issues which Democratic action has presented—looking first as from an airplane at the background and foreground: geographically, administratively, economically, morally.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL ISSUE

We may indeed speak of our foreign problems as a geographical issue. It has now become clear to all—what has been clear enough to some of us right along—that the reason we are at peace, while other democracies fight for their lives, is chiefly an accident of geography. Now that at last we all see this, and begin also to see that geography itself is not what it used to be, the scales drop from our eyes as in a horrid dream. Through miracles of science and malevolence combined we behold Europeans and Asiatics alike as in a nightmarish mirage turned upside down and joggling our little globe with their lethal joustings until we are all groggy with anguish and sick with fear.

"This earth is not the steadfast place
We landsmen build upon;
From deep to deep she varies pace,
And while she comes is gone.
Beneath my feet I feel
Her smooth bulk heave and dip;
With velvet plunge and soft upreel
She swings and steadies to her keel
Like a gallant, gallant ship.

* * * * * * * *

"The star fleets tack and wheel and veer,
But on, but on does the old earth steer
As if her port she knew.
God, dear God! Does she know her port,
Though she goes so far about?
Or blind astray, does she make her sport
To brazen and chance it out?"

—William Vaughn Moody.

In this hideous mirage of churning events, whales and submarines are ambiguous as to each other, the buzzard soaring in the skies is equivocal as between a sailing bird and a bombing airplane, islands of our surrounding seas which yesterday belonged to fellow neutrals, today are occupied by belligerents, and tomorrow may bristle with enemies of our western way of life.

Isolation lost, however, not all is lost. Our disappearing isolation has been transformed through the wise leadership of Roosevelt and Hull into insulation with our neighbors, north, central, and south, insulation if only we have the courage and wisdom and speed to keep it so. Europe and Asia would not quarantine aggressors, as we urged them to do, until at last they could not quarantine their aggressors. Their failure leaves us under the necessity of quarantining this hemisphere against the unquarantined aggressors of Europe and Asia alike. This we now undertake without limit and with the utmost expedition. Fortunately against this hour of need, strategically for any future Armageddon, we Democrats have through patience and sagacity abolished dollar diplomacy with our neighbors, have thinned ancient animosities, have thickened cultural relations, have substantialized financial cooperation, and have arranged the machinery of consultation upon every issue as touching our continental security. With this all-American bulwark, which we shall maintain intact at any cost, our international policy now becomes this: to speak sincerely and to pack a bigger and bigger stick.

Upon the latter aspect of policy our parties are clearly united, the packing of a bigger and bigger stick for any international brigand who comes adventuring into this hemisphere. And it is doubtful whether the Republicans will maintain an issue as to our democratic policy of speaking our sympathies sincerely. We all know that Woodrow Wilson's injunction to stifle our sentiments did not keep us out of the first World War, for all the aspect of perfection which that injunction bore. We face the second World War under a more realistic leader. He has encouraged us to feel freely and to speak for ourselves, as he himself has spoken for us, the sympathies that burn in us for the conquered weak and the downtrodden just. What those sympathies are, Alfred Noyes has immortally expressed in his poem on Finland—or was it on Czechoslovakia, or on Poland, or on Norway, or on Belgium, or on the Netherlands, or on France?

"Far off between the mountains and the sea
In ancient days this word was sped:
'Tell them at home we held Thermopylae
According to their word and lie here dead.'

"Now from the north there comes a mightier cry—
'We fought and failed against titanic powers.
But ask mankind—whose is the victory
When every unchained heart on earth is ours?'"

If in the event this policy of sincerely voicing the sentiments of "unchained hearts" should fail, it will but show us that any and every policy of peace was foredoomed to failure. Meantime, how-

ever, the policy will have preserved against timid hypocrisy the integrity of our souls and have furthered a psychological preparation without which the military preparedness on which we now agree to engage would prove hollow and weak. I hope there is no issue here between the parties in 1940; for the policy of sincere speaking even to issues of life and death seems trebly due: due as final notice to the domineering, due as comfort to our cultural kinsmen stricken by ruthless might, due as honesty to ourselves for the toughening of our fibers.

So much, then, for the geographical issue. Let us turn now to problems domestic, and first to the important problem of administration.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUE

Administration is so important as a means that with its failure there fails all noble governmental ends altogether. It should not be thought strange, therefore, if we make it an issue. Emphasis upon intelligence, here and elsewhere, would not be thought strange in any other great country. But the Republicans thought our preoccupation with intelligence in government so strange when we first went into power that they actually tried to use it as an issue against us in 1936. But they had to get a "brain trust" of their own in order to use the issue intelligently. Theirs wasn't brainy enough to elect Mr. Landon; but it was trusted enough, I hope, to woo them from making a further issue of intelligence. At any rate this experience should be a warning to the Old Guard of Republicanism that if they come back to power this time, they will find Washington and the country geared above and against not only the old corruption of Harding days, but also above and beyond the old complacency of Coolidge days and the old lethargy of Hoover days. We have streamlined the Government and geared it to responsive and timely action. This National Government of ours must continue to function dynamically in a world of tempestuous action. With this conviction Dr. Frank's policy committee for the Republican National Committee seems largely to agree.

But are the Republican power boys themselves psychologically prepared to take over a government reorganized for efficiency and to operate it humanely?—they who fought as of something dire the imperative necessity of governmental reorganization? We will make that an issue before the American people. They claim to be better administrators than we Democrats. Of an old machine that all but ran itself. Perhaps. But we have had to invent administrative agency after administrative agency to take up the slack of their previous lethargy. They have laughed at our alphabets. But the necessity for these alphabetical agencies born of long Republican lethargy was no laughable matter. They laugh best who laugh last.

The Republicans are slow to discard the C. C. C., N. Y. A., S. E. C., P. W. A., A. A. A., F. D. I. C., and even the W. P. A. Indeed, they have accepted, albeit with some sweet carping, most of these agencies. To accept them and to run them are, however, two different things. The Frank committee was kind in general to our administrative agencies. But are Republican politicians sympathetic enough to man well what they were not solicitous enough to provide at all? Are they alert enough to run what they were not intelligent enough to invent? We will make that a campaign issue. The burden of proof is upon them, and their actions are against them.

Their voting in the House by a large majority for a measure calculated to hamstring all these administrative agencies—voting for the Logan-Walter bill—showed blindness for the administrative problem and equal blindness for our judicial system; for this bill proposed to entrust to the courts problems that will paralyze the courts and to deprive administrative agencies of powers which are administrative and are imperative if Government is to function promptly and humanely. Upon this point let me quote this pregnant remark from Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, once Republican candidate for the Presidency and now Chief Justice of the United States: "No more insidious assault could be made upon the independence and esteem of the judiciary than to burden it with the questions of administration—questions which lie close to the public impatience, and in regard to which the people are going to insist on having administration by officers directly accountable to them."

Further predictive of administrative blindness was their reluctance and even opposition to the Ramspeck bill which nevertheless passed the House and now awaits Senate action. This effort to extend Federal civil service to nearly all Federal employment yet outside it is the simplest test of political insight and probity, for the best political sense is to know what is politics and what is not. Administration is not politics; to make it so is reaction and to keep it so is spoils. That is an issue which a half century of civil service in our national life has dramatized; and the Republicans, when judged by their legislative actions rather than by platform promises, are offside on that issue. They say indeed that they are better administrators than are Democrats. They must prove it, and that in refutation of these three specific counts: (1) They have recently stood against the extension of civil service, the traditionally accepted administrative agency; (2) they have long shown themselves unable or unwilling to invent new administrative agencies adequate to our times; (3) they have opposed by action, even when approving by words, the free functioning of the administrative agencies which we Democrats have invented and established. If they are better administrators than we Democrats, then their ambition should be made of sterner stuff than this frustration, than this lethargy, than this contradiction.

THE ECONOMIC ISSUE

We come now to our fiscal policies, and particularly to the matter of the unbalanced Budget. By common admission that will be a major issue in 1940. It is an issue which we Democrats accept and which Republicans will press. We accept the issue, because we are proud of our record in this regard. How could we apologize for doing in peacetime for peace purposes what Republicans are now glad to do in wartime for purposes of war preparation? We can be proud of the courage we had to face the Budget in the light of the good which the debt has done. No modern man is afraid of debt as such; for modern civilization is essentially a debtor-creditor relation spelled out in a thousand different forms of human confidence. The issue, then, is not of debt as such, but of the satisfaction of the creditor, the soundness of the debtor, and, back of both, the value of the results which explain the debt.

We Democrats inherited a large debt and on top of it an unbalanced Budget. We have increased the debt for the same sound reason that the debt was contracted in the first place. It was a question under Hoover of unbalancing the Budget or of further unbalancing the Nation. Hoover wisely chose not to balance the Budget. Roosevelt wisely chose also to keep the Nation balanced through a wise budgetary tolerance. No patriot in power will balance the Budget until he can thereby balance what the Budget's about, all promises of candidates to the contrary notwithstanding. The total of our national indebtedness, private and public, is about the same as it was when the Democratic Party took over in 1933. This means that other indebtedness—private, State, county, and city—has decreased while and because Federal indebtedness has increased. This constancy of debt as a whole suggests that altogether we Americans are not more in debt than our economic structure requires.

Where the debt load should lie is primarily a question of who is best able to carry it. On this point, this all important point, there is not as much difference of opinion as the alarms of candidates tempt one to believe. The cities that could not carry their relief and other loads were and are glad to have the States that could carry the load take-over, and States as well as the cities that were at the breaking point were and are glad to have the Federal Government that could carry the load take-over. Moreover, private persons who are in debt to the Federal Government for farm and home loans, as well as the corporations who have borrowed, are singularly well pleased with the new location of their indebtedness. The reason is not far to seek. The time to pay is longer and the interest rates are lower. This matter of interest rates reflects the soundness of the lender and the security of the borrower. How great that soundness and that security together are may be guessed from the fact that the total cost of carrying the Federal debt of forty-odd billions is about the same as the cost of carrying the debt half that size when we Democrats assumed responsibility.

After those who feel alarmed have pointed with all the alarm they feel, the fact seems to be that our national debt is justified when judged from the standpoint of both the creditor and the debtor; and that double fact is so, specifically, because of the value of the expenditures for which the debt stands. The debt has been our Atlantic Ocean against domestic disaster. It stands for the conservation of our human resources and the definite improvement of our national resources. On the human side—the side of relief—the story of morale is reassuring. Through 10 years of the worst depression this Nation has known we come forth with our children better clothed, better fed, and better schooled than when we went in. We come forth with the security and comfort of our aged increased. We come forth with our large but diminishing army of unemployed better fed and housed than are the employed in half the great industrial nations of the world. We come forth with the health of our people equal to, if not better than in 1929. And best of all, because deepest of all to our American way of life, we come forth with our Bill of Rights, our freedoms of conscience and thought and speech and assembly, more fully safeguarded indeed than they were in the prosperous twenties.

I give you more substantial proof than all this, though proof that may at first strike you as curious. I only ask you to reflect upon its profound significance. At other times of depression radical movements have grown apace. The Socialist vote would heretofore under national hardships have increased by leaps and bounds, and of late years the communistic. It has not been so this time in America, and that in spite of the fact that it has been true in other comparable countries. The Communists grew so strong in France that they had to be forcibly suppressed, and it has become accepted that the Socialist Party will attain power intermittently in both France and England. But in America, during these years that try men's souls and should automatically produce radicals, the Socialist Party fell from a poll of 884,781 in 1932 to a vote of only 187,720 in 1936; and the communistic vote has been steadily negligible, reaching only 27,781 at its height in 1938. Even the Dies committee records Mr. Browder's estimate of the total membership of the Communist Party in America at only 100,000 who pay dues, and the Nazi movements, from Mr. Kuhn's statement, to have less than 20,000 actual members who pay dues.

The simple truth is that our two-party system seems more securely founded and accepted than ever before with the Communist Party never strong and the Socialist Party steadily weakening. This means that both laboring men and farmers know that in one old party, and believe that in the other, they will be allowed a fair voice with better prospects of justice than in any radical utopianism. A fiscal policy of our Government showing such psychological and substantial results as these is a movement in the deepest sense conservative, whatever the figures of the debt may be.

And speaking of figures, those that can be produced to dramatize the tangible results of Federal expenditures are more dramatic

than the heavily publicized debt figures themselves. If our human resources alone had been conserved, America might well stomach its large debt and go cheerfully on indefinitely paying the modest carrying charge of about one billion a year. But by no means is that all we have to show for the debt. When one travels over America, as I do constantly, seeing the forests cleared, the streams bridged, the fields terraced, the roads extended, the schoolhouses and courthouses built, the dams constructed—when he sees all this in every State and in almost every one of our more than 3,000 counties, he cannot but know that while our human resources are being conserved, our natural resources are being improved. The staggering national debt represents an even more staggering investment in our natural and human resources, an investment which future generations will bless as they enjoy.

Let me list a few of the things we have got for our money, tangible things for which the coming generations will praise our foresight: 80,000 miles of new highways built and 265,000 miles of city streets and country roads repaired; 9,600 new educational buildings; 770 new hospitals; 1,600 new courthouses; 1,500 new sewer systems; 2,400 new water systems; 282 new city electrical systems; 3,400 new playgrounds and athletic fields; 92,954 bridges built or reconstructed; 4 T. V. A. dams; 220,000 miles of rural electric lines; 1,200 new post offices, customhouses, and quarantine stations; 27,700 new low-rent dwelling units completed and 58,000 units under construction. The planting of 1,750,000,000 trees will provide beauty for our highways and protection for our soil during the fateful years ahead.

Yes, this issue of the national debt we Democrats gladly accept for 1940. We accept it confidently—knowing that the Republicans who began it with good reason cannot impeach us who carried it on with equal reason and with astonishing honesty; knowing, too, that their promises to balance the Budget will not turn into performance save under such conditions as will see the Budget balanced under us quite as soon; and knowing, finally, that while they talk theory about the Budget we shall point in 3,000 counties, 10,000 hamlets, and 50,000,000 lives to the concrete results of a policy at once profitable and just. We shall accept this issue of the debt not only with confidence based on concrete results but with the assurance born of a political inventiveness to match the necessity of the hour. For it is we who have popularized the broad fiscal theory upon which all subsequent administrations will proceed, the theory that the Federal Government must spend more and tax less when times are hard, but tax more and spend less when times are good. Through that formula America can make hard times less hard by a previously planned cushion of relief and public works, and will make good times more likely to be lasting through the safety valve for savings furnished by taxation and equalizing distribution of public revenue.

THE MORAL ISSUE

This brings us to a final matter, the moral question, which while all important should not be discussed save in connection with all else that matters. No honest man will boast of his honesty. Honesty must be taken for granted in an industrial society which rests on confidence. No kind man should boast of his humanity. Both should be taken for granted in a civilized society. But remembering the scandals of the Ohio gang under Harding, the blind Republican complacency under Coolidge, the cold lethargy to human needs of Republicans under Hoover, and remembering under each and all of them alike the Republican poverty for policy formation, we Democrats may be allowed to remark simply that with much money to spend or steal, we have spent it with not a single major scandal or suspicion of stealing; and with nearly all power we Democrats have won, through a reputation for considerateness, the Negro vote from solid Republicanism and have called down upon our head the almost reverent blessings of practically every minority group in America save the noisy Communists, the cruel Nazi, and the flatulent Fascists. We have treated aliens like the human beings they are, and shall continue to hold men innocent until proved guilty, vigilantes to the cowardly contrary nothwithstanding. This justice to the humble, justice touched with mercy, is something of which Democrats should not boast, but something which Republicans had best not fail to remark and ponder. Such is the stuff of which public morality is made: justice to the strong, mercy to the weak, honesty to all.

II. IMPLEMENTING THE ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

Under what Mr. Roosevelt has well called, "the integrity of the morals of democracy," let us summarize now the record of our Democratic years in office. This record is the over-all issue we present. We shall approach it by way of testing the practical fruitage of the two greatest moral maxims of our time. I refer to Grover Cleveland's famous conviction, "Public office is a public trust," and to Franklin Roosevelt's far-reaching conviction that "private office is also a public trust."

Insofar as the Republicans base their claims to national office primarily upon the illusion that they are better administrators than we Democrats, they seem to approve in theory our Democratic efforts to fulfill in practice Cleveland's fine dream, the separation of administration from politics. But in practice they tried to balk, and did at first balk, our efforts through the reorganization plan to extend civil service "upward, downward, outward." They have subsequently impeded but have not as yet been able to balk, our piecemeal achievement of that objective. The four reorganization plans of Mr. Roosevelt have been approved by Congress, and a civil-service bill, passed the House against Republican opposition now faces its prospect of passage in the Senate without their aid. This Ramspeck bill will practically complete universal acceptance through Federal employment of the merit principle. Supplementing and aiding these movements are the two Hatch bills, one already law and the other on the way, making a penal offense of the violation of public trust by political employees. It is doubtful whether a party in full power has ever before voluntarily relinquished such prima facie advantages for the sake of purer politics and sounder administration. And speaking of courage and honesty combined, when did you ever hear of any other political party than the Democratic perpetrating a heavy tax increase when it was up for reelection, as we are now doing?

But private office is also a public trust, under Roosevelt. Under the guidance of these twin moral insights of Cleveland and Roosevelt, Jimmy Walker's private bank account became of public concern to the Governor of New York, named Franklin Roosevelt, the dapper Mayor went to Europe for his health, and the Tammany tiger ceased to claw. What Richard Whitney did with "his own" in connection with the stock exchange became under national Democratic leadership, the same leadership, a matter of genuine public concern; and Whitney went to Sing Sing as the S. E. C. got going to prevent other Whitneys from sucking other suckers to death. Because the private office of the banker as well as of the broker has been made into a public trust, simple honest citizens like us can now know that our bank deposits are safe and that there is some assurance this side of the blue sky that the stocks which we may buy contain something more in them than the salesman's breath or our own romantic hope.

While this long-delayed application of public morals to private business required courage, to apply the same maxim to the farmer and the factory worker took more than courage. It required imagination of a high order and sympathy of the deepest sort. Moreover, it required statesmanship to see, as Roosevelt said in his first acceptance speech, that a balance of economic opportunity for all great producing groups at the level of parity is the minimum condition for our national health.

It is no mean achievement of the Democratic Party to have convinced the Republican Party at last, at long last, of this elementry fact—at least to have convinced the program committee under Dr. Frank's enlightened leadership. "Gross disparity of income," says that committee, "between groups equally important to the Nation's life, such as agriculture and industry, requires that Government pursue policies that will help soundly to correct such disparity."

Whatever issue Republicans may seek to make of our policy toward business, toward agriculture, or toward labor—all "groups equally important to the Nation's life"—those words of their own policy committee will come back to turn the elephant's roar into blessings for the humble Democratic donkey and into condemnation for any future Republican lethargy.

Roosevelt, finding the farmer's private office to be disregarded as a public trust, made it into a public trust. There the moral has been put to actual practice through Henry Wallace's national policy for conserving the farmer's soil, for lifting his standard of life toward parity, and for giving him the right to vote upon what is much more important than the question as to which city slicker should represent him in Congress.

Roosevelt, finding the industrial laborer's private office to be disregarded as a public trust, made it into a public trust. So the National Labor Relations Act, with the Labor Board to see to it that the act does not, like so many noble Republican principles, dissipate itself in idealistic inaction. So the right of the worker to vote upon who shall represent him in collective bargaining.

Even if our agricultural program, however, did not establish the elements of agrarian democracy, which it does; and even if the Labor Act, with its indispensable Board, did not establish the elements of industrial democracy, which it does—both programs constitute pioneer efforts to treat these indispensable services of millions of men as the public trusts which they actually are. Even if these initial efforts to extend representative government—to make democracy "democ"—were riddled with error, as, no doubt, they are touched with inadequacy, they would still furnish a brave beginning without which no perfected ending can even ensue. To have achieved national policies in these neglected fields at all, lifts labor and agriculture at last from the level of stepsons to that of genuine sons of Uncle Sam. Their common sonship makes possible their final access to rights rather than leaves to them, as of old, the mere acceptance of duties. Thus full citizenship comes of age to those who toil at their indispensable offices in field and factory. Such are some of the results of Roosevelt's maxim put to use, the maxim that "private office is a public trust."

Nor does this moral maxim stop with its benefits to agriculture and labor. It applies to motherhood, to childhood, to old age, for all these are private offices requiring consideration as public trusts for the good of the Nation. Moreover, the maxim applies to business in senses more constructive than the mere correction of commercial abuses. If private business is a public trust, as of course it is, then the buinessman, big and little alike, is entitled as an indispensable servant of the Republic to purchasers with enough buying power to give him the turn-over from which alone prosperity for him can come. To purge business of its monopolistic excesses, as well as of its criminal excrescences, is good; but to help the majority of our citizens who are laborers on farm and in factory to achieve adequate purchasing power is to treat

the private office of the businessman for the public trust which it actually is. Thus does justice pay dividends by making of our vast and several segments of life a seamless web. No war millionaires under Roosevelt, either. The private office of the munition makers is now in process of becoming a public trust.

Not only have we Democrats thus established new national policies for the several great producing groups of America, but we have centered these policies, as is appropriate for those who live in the light of destiny, in the moral sense of our democracy. Public and private offices are public trusts—this is a double formula which to observe transforms the mercenary motivation of a short-sighted individualism into a genuine philosophy of the common good. There is abroad once more in our land, thanks to the Democratic replenishment of these 8 years, the faith that citizenship is also a matter of morals, of duties as well as of rights. Debts which arise as a result of this new insight will themselves be taken as public trusts until they can be discharged from the earned income and morale of a national prosperity rising on the foundations of justice. This acceptance of all private offices as touched with public interest is the new imperative that is laid upon our democracy by the inexorable march of events at home and abroad. It is the final test of this Nation's fitness and of its capacity to survive.

I labor in the thought, you see, that my party, the Democratic Party, for all its fumblings and mistakes, has in 8 years of rebuilding itself, revivified also the Republican Party by furnishing it goals more generous than those to which its vision had sunk when dimmed by the corruption of Harding, by the complacency of Coolidge, by the lethargy of Hoover, and by the inventive infecundity of all that Old Guardism stands for. The larger issue, then, of 1940 is this: Shall this Nation continue, under whatever party leadership and into whatever time of testing we go, continue the energetic, the inventive, the liberal path pointed by our Democratic practice?

If under this general issue, the Republicans can make partisan profit by flicking the fly specks off our mistakes, let them do it. If they can politically advantage themselves by pecking at our peccadilloes, let them do it. If accepting our goals, they can so conceal their record in power as to convince the American people that they are better administrators of our program than we are, let them do it. I shall then smile at the American people for all its dear foibles and bequeath to the victorious Republicans this fond farewell from the Democratic Party—farewell; that is, until we meet again in 1944:

We've been the wings to bear you on your skyward journey—
The sword to cleave your bonds and set you free!
However you may conceal our sword and pinions, we shall not care,
Knowing we gave you wider skies to wander,
And of our love made freedom—not a snare!

Legion in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LECOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OTTUMWA (IOWA) COURIER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ottumwa Daily Courier, Ottumwa, Iowa, of June 10, 1940:

[From the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier of June 10, 1940]

LEGION IN SERVICE

The American Legion realizes that it has a chance now to serve its country more than ever before. It is the duty of all members—as Americans, in the first place—to be ever watchful of the spread of subversive elements and expose them whenever possible.

As the national commander of the Legion has said, the Nation again is calling in the twenty-first year of the Legion. It is not a call to the armed forces of the country where once Legionnaires served. Rather it is a call to develop sanity to supersede hysteria; to remove all doubt about the strength of national defenses; to have each legionnaire individually willing to bear the heavy price of defense which must be paid to assure peace for the people of this country.

The Legion believes in the protection at all hazards of the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere as the primary obligation of the United States. While ill-equipped to provide even a minimum of protection for the Monroe Doctrine, the Legion commander asserts it would be idle to consider the feasibility of intervening in the conflict abroad. With what would we intervene? How would we make our potential strength felt short of 2 or 3 years?

The safety of America transcends any political issue. Such safety should not be subjected to a fear developed through hysteria. The Legion believes it is qualified from its record of service both in time of war and in 21 years of peace to counsel soberly and rationally the men and women of America. We do, too. The Legion always has been able to call the turn; it can do it again.

Saving of United States Should Consume All Our Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK ENQUIRER OF JUNE 10, 1940

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Enquirer for June 10, 1940:

[From the New York Enquirer of June 10, 1940]

SAVING OF UNITED STATES SHOULD CONSUME ALL OUR EFFORTS

Entirely too much thought and effort is being given here to the problem of saving the Anglo-French Allies and entirely too little to the infinitely more important problem of saving the United States of America.

Every American is rightfully desirous of seeing the Nazi Reich laid low, but no American can in conscience desire to see Uncle Sam laid low in the process of bringing Adolf Hitler to justice. Little will it profit America to destroy Naziland and save Britain and France if in so doing this Republic is itself destroyed.

Whether we like it or not, the truth is that this Republic is now well on the way to destruction.

Congress and all others concerned should realize that this is no time for plunging and floundering and gambling in the field of foreign relationships. We need clear and loyal thinking and clear and loyal action.

OUR COUNTRY IN PERIL FROM WITHIN

Our country is in positive peril, not from without but from within.

If we stand firm at home and do our duty to the Republic, keeping it at peace and strictly neutral, no harm can befall us. This, however, is not a course which commends itself to those whose first love is not America but the empire from which America wrung her freedom eight score years ago. They want to see Britannia succored and rejuvenated by the blood of millions of slaughtered American boys and at the cost of our national existence.

Things more than ominous have taken place in our beloved land in recent days. A Washington dispatch June 6 revealed how swiftly the Republic is being conducted to disaster. It declared:

"State Department circles said the 'lid is now off,' and that this Government was prepared to give all possible aid to the Allies short of sending an expeditionary force to France."

Who has given our Government authority to extend such aid to the Anglo-French forces? Certainly not Congress, and certainly not the American people.

STEADILY STEPPING TOWARD WAR

This step means war and nothing but war. It means that without the permission of Congress, airplanes, rifles, artillery, tanks, warships, and other indispensable implements of national defense are to be handed over to Britain and France.

It means further that millions of American youths are marked for sacrifice on foreign soil.

The British and the French merit the warmest commendation for their unceasing loyalty to their own lands in all things. Who has ever heard of a member of the French or British Parliament advocating the stripping of his own country of its means of protection in order to bolster the defenses of foreign powers? Everyone who follows the debates in Congress knows that not one but many Members of both Houses are zealously advocating this very course for Uncle Sam.

WHOM CAN WE TRUST NOW?

When George Washington discovered the plot of Major General Arnold, leader of the British "fifth column" here in the War of Independence, he uttered these words of anguish:

"Whom can we trust now!"

These words of the Father of his Country have a particular appropriateness for and can be applied with telling effect to those so-called Americans who are working night and day to plunge our country into the present tournament of blood, death, and destruction now going on in Europe.

Whom can we trust now!

Not one of those who are openly clamoring or secretly plotting for war has the remotest intention of risking his own life or possessions in the death struggle wherein war would involve the Republic. They and their belongings are entirely too precious to be interfered with. The other fellows must do the bleeding and the paying.

It cannot be too often iterated that our entering the war would instantly result in the establishment of a dictatorship here whose tyrannous powers over the lives and liberties and belongings of our people would be all-embracing, a dictatorship that would inflict upon us at the very outset the exact evil against which we would have taken up arms abroad.

Another vital factor which should not be overlooked is the utter foolishness of reposing confidence in the fidelity of Britain and France as war allies of ours.

NOTHING TO LOSE BY REMAINING AT PEACE

At this very moment London and Paris are keenly suspicious of each other.

Most people never thought that the day would come when Hitler and Stalin would be allies. Yet that day has come.

And right now both England and France, despite their grandiose public beseechings of God to bless their cause, despite their perfervid avowals that they are fighting for liberty of mind and body despite the unspeakable doings of Stalin in Poland and Finland, are trying as hard as they possibly can to consummate an alliance with the tyrant of the Kremlin.

We have nothing to lose by remaining at peace. We have everything to gain by remaining at peace. Upon public action depends whether or not the war mongers in our midst will be able to involve us in war and destroy the Republic.

Americans would be false to their principles and ideals did they fail to abhor Hitlerism. They would be equally false to their principles and ideals did they allow their loathing for Hitlerism to result in the destruction of this Republic. The most deadly blow which the American people can deal Hitlerism is to prevent their country from being involved in war and subjected to certain dictatorship and certain ruin.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

The Preparedness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE FRANKLIN (PA.) NEWS-HERALD AND OIL CITY (PA.) BLIZZARD

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, now that the debt limit has been increased and we are going forward with the armament program, we must be careful to see that it will be carried out for the best interests of our country. The editorials from the News-Herald, Franklin, Pa., and the Oil City Blizzard, Oil City, Pa., are timely along this line, and I ask they be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Franklin (Pa.) News-Herald of June 12, 1940]

WE MUST FINANCE PREPAREDNESS

Financial preparedness is the basis upon which military strength must be built and maintained. Without measures of financial preparedness there can be no assured national security.

The national debt has reached such proportions that it threatens the welfare of every person in the United States. It must be kept in control by rigorous reduction in Federal expenditures for every purpose that cannot be affirmatively shown to be essential at a time when the whole country is asked to make new sacrifices for national defense.

There should be no tolerance of any attempt at evasion of such economies.

No opportunity should be open to transfer unnecessary expenses to new national debt voted for meeting the costs of national defense. The proceeds of new taxes to meet the costs of an enlarged program of national defense should be definitely and unequivocally assigned to speedy retirement of this additional debt. Discretion as to the application of these revenues should be left to no one.

Every measure of preparedness, whether financial or in any other field, should have as its purpose the rebuilding of belief in individual endeavor and thrift, of confidence that savings can be protected and will bring a just return, and of ability to make certain provision for individual security.

These are the elements which, with adequate national defense, will give a national security that cannot be shaken.

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Blizzard]

UNITED FOR DEFENSE

The present program of the United States for national defense envisions the largest peacetime military expenditures in our history. Over a period of a few years, spending for defense is to be progessively increased, and the total will run far into the billions.

There can be no question of our need for the world's greatest defense system. But it will be a disastrous mistake if we adopt a hysterical, "never mind the cost" attitude. Some of the billions for defense must be secured by reducing or eliminating the appropriations for other less important Government activities.

All the energies of this great country must be directed toward making it secure from invasion. To release those energies requires rededicating this Nation to the ideals envisioned by the founding fathers.

High-sounding phrases aren't enough. Preparation against the possibility of invasion is a grim and costly business. Never in the history of our country was it so important for government to cooperate with individual enterprise or for individual enterprise to cooperate with government. Never was it so important to eliminate waste in government, in individual enterprise, and in family life in order to perpetuate liberty and opportunity.

Arming for Peace in a World at War—Congress Should Keep at Its Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, America faces a crisis. We cannot escape our responsibilities as one of the family of nations. We cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. However, we must not overlook the fact that those of us here in the Congress have given a solemn oath that we will defend and protect our own country. Whatever we do must be done with that obligation uppermost. Unfortunately we are unprepared by reason of the dissipation of our finances and the failure to provide national defenses The Congress has very wisely, in my judgment, been given the power by the Constitution to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, to provide for organizing an army and disciplining the militia, to levy taxes, and to appropriate money, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution these powers. This is a constitutional function, vested in the Congress to provide for the national defense. It cannot be delegated. Under this power whatever is done to provide for the common defense of our country in this tragic hour must be done by the Congress. It cannot shirk its responsibilities. It should not desert its post of duty in a time such as this, when the very existence of our Nation may be at stake.

Fortunately the United States has a good Navy. However, in the event of war involving continental United States, or our outlying possessions, or the Monroe Doctrine, the Navy, excellent as it is, would face a heavy burden. Admiral Stark, speaking of the Navy, said that if the ships which we have under contemplation were completed within the next few years, taking into consideration the building programs of other nations, we probably could defend the Hawaiian Islands and Alaska, and the Canal and the coasts of the United States, the Gulf and the Caribbean, but that it would not be a tight defense.

The Washington Post, in an editorial today, gave a timely warning, saying:

OUR BIG JOB

Senator Wheeler's warning that he would break with the Democratic Party if it is "going to be a war party" came in the midst of a debate in which the President was severely criticized for provocative statements deemed likely to involve this country in war.

Certain extreme assertions made on the floor of the Senate should be discounted as intended for political effect. But no such charge

can be brought against Senator WHEELER, who but recently indicated his belief that President Roosevelt would be renominated and would accept the nomination.

Senator TYDINGS certainly has no personal axe to grind in warning the country that before we begin to talk about war, we should be equipped to go to war. "Our big job," he rightly says, "is to get ready for national defense." That is a simple statement of our major objective which some people seem in danger of forgetting.

Warnings from outstanding Democrats of the caliber of Messrs. WHEELER and TYDINGS cannot be lightly dismissed. To urge restraint in utterance at this time does not imply lack of sympathy with the nations fighting for preservation of their democratic institutions. Nor does it brand the critic of indiscreet utterances or acts as a short-sighted isolationist.

It merely shows an understanding of the dangerous folly of a type of loud speaking that provides an excuse for hostility toward us without in the least benefiting those whom we wish to aid.

I call attention to an editorial appearing in the Washington News of June 12, 1940, discussing the adjournment issue. The editorial follows:

IF THEY VOTE TO GO HOME, VOTE TO KEEP THEM THERE

Within a few days Congress may be called upon to cast the most important vote of 20 years.

That will happen if administration leaders persist in their effort to force an adjournment.

Any Congressman who does vote to adjourn and go home should be commanded by his constituents to remain at home.

Any elected representative of the people who is so insensible of his constitutional obligations that he would voluntarily abandon his post at a time like this is, we believe, unfit for the responsibility of service in Congress.

The terrible conflict in Europe goes rapidly from bad to worse. Any day may bring the need for fateful decisions involving our Nation's peace and security. Borrowed billions have been laid on the line for rearmament. But to turn dollars into weapons in the quantities needed, old industries will have to be invigorated and new ones created. Only Congress can do what is necessary to mobilize idle capital and manpower for this supreme task.

Overnight it may become not a matter for academic debate but an imperative necessity to order compulsory military training and conscript men for defense duty. Congress alone has that power and responsibility.

Our Government has operated in the red through 11 years of apparent peace and security. Confronted now with need for gigantic new defense expenditures, nothing substantial has been done to weed out old wastes, and the only tax proposal yet made won't even balance the nonmilitary outgo. Congress is the Nation's fiscal guardian.

Yet it is suggested that Congress pack up and go home. It is suggested that if an "emergency" should arise the President will summon Congress back to a special session—a procedure which requires several days in a period where there may be no day to spare. Incidentally, an adjournment and a special session summons would mean that the lawmakers would be legally entitled to collect travel allowance, at 20 cents a mile, to their homes and back to Washington. No such allowances are legal if Congress merely recesses a few days at a time through the summer. We would accuse no Congressman of wanting to be a mileage patrioteer.

But we repeat that any who votes to go home at a time like this ought to be made to stay there—and very probably will be.

The Christian Science Monitor, in its issue of June 12, had the following to say with respect to the duty of Congress in this emergency. The editorial reads:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY

A President of the United States usually finds it more comfortable to work without having Congress around. Hence, the view expressed by Mr. Roosevelt that the legislative Houses could suitably finish up their work within the next 2 weeks and adjourn represents a natural wish on his part.

Yet there are other and more compelling reasons why Congress ought to stay in session. The war emergency, it is true, calls for a great deal of freedom of Executive action—the Senate's 80-to-0 passage of the Army expansion bill indicates a disposition to grant this. But this same critical situation calls, too, for quick marshaling and formulation of public opinion on questions that may arise suddenly, as has the issue of immediate aid to the Allies. For this purpose and as a matter of maintaining national unity, Congress is a useful sounding board.

It may be admitted that some of the sound so generated will be of a partisan nature. A portion even of the demand for continuance in session may be discounted as opposition strategy. But after such allowances are made, it is to be remembered that several major pieces of legislation are yet in the course of passage, some of which require a good deal of discussion, and that since this is the second year of the Seventy-sixth Congress, these bills would expire and have to start all over from the beginning in the Congress which is to be elected this year.

Among such measures, the Ramspeck civil-service extension bill, the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, and the Logan-Walter bill on administrative law have passed the House of Representatives but not the Senate. On its part the Senate has passed the extension of the Hatch Act against pernicious politics, the equalization of tax payments by T. V. A., and the proposal to end purchases of foreign silver, but these await action by the House. In conference is the bill laboriously worked out to improve the situation of the railroads. While it may be assumed that the new tax bill, increase of the debt limit, and military, naval, and relief appropriations will be enacted, there is yet a body of domestic legislation deserving attention.

Members of the House and Senate are thinking partly, of course, of the exigencies of campaign year and of the importance of getting reelected. These considerations cannot wholly be brushed aside, but to their clamor there are two replies. One is that a great deal of time yet remains for campaigning, and would be available in recesses even if Congress should stay convened well into the summer. The other is that voters must appreciate the loyalty of a Congressman who stuck usefully to his post and would surely reward him as against a rival for his job.

Rather than seek a hasty adjournment for political convenience. Congress will do well to stay in session and to give the Nation the reassurance of its presence in Washington for any emergency.

Mr. Speaker, the unpreparedness of America today to face a military conflict is appalling. Fortunately, the Congress almost unanimously has realized this predicament and has authorized all expenditures recommended by the Chiefs of Staff of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps to remedy this defect. However, it will take much time to put such a program into effect. Our colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable Ross COLLINS, recently on the floor of the House called attention to our unpreparedness, saying:

Goodness knows what we can do with World War left-overs in a war like the one now going on in Europe. The $200,000,000 worth of saddles and bridles that the War Department had left over are still in our midst and can only be used in a wild-West show or a Fort Myer society circus—not in a modern war. * * *

All that could be done with large numbers of mobilized men at this time would be to arm a few of them with out-of-date rifles. And, strange as it may seem to aging generals, the war going on in Europe has not been a rifle war.

The cream of the crop of man power would be called up and enlisted at the outbreak of the struggle and they would be the ones who would go into battle equipped the worst. It is an admitted fact that there exists a distinct lack of modern tanks, combat cars, and modern mechanized weapons.

And after the flower of our youth had laid down their lives, and if the war lasted long enough, we might ultimately get around to equipping our armed forces with something like what a sensible bandit would use to rob a filling station. * * *

I think very little of an army implemented with rifles, no matter how well its blue uniforms fit and no matter how well it can execute the ceremonies of the parade ground. Ziegfeld could have taught an army like that much better than the ordinary Army officer, for he knew more about it.

Further, I can't imagine anything more tragic than nicely trained marching men in front of machine-gun fire, much less 60-ton armored tanks, flame-throwing land battleships, and diving airplanes.

China, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium were some of the nations that prepared for war according to the obsolete 1914 plans.

Mr. Speaker, last evening I discussed to some extent our national defense and a program of arming for peace in a world at war, over the Mutual Broadcasting System's coast-to-coast network. I ask permission, as a part of my remarks, to include that discussion. It follows:

ARMING FOR PEACE IN A WORLD AT WAR

Men and women of America, I am speaking to you from our Nation's Capital. The mantle of night has fallen over this beautiful city, one of the world's most lovely capitals. This is a hallowed place, rich in history and sacred memories. Down the old Potomac River a little way from here, on the slopes of Mt. Vernon, sleeps George Washington, the Father of our Country, who gave us our Nation a century and a half ago. Only a few squares from where I am now standing is reverently preserved the hallowed spot where the spirit of Abraham Lincoln took its leave of earth "with malice toward none, with charity for all," as that great soul paid the supreme sacrifice that our Nation might be preserved. Hard by is the old New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, with Lincoln's pew lovingly preserved just as he left it, to which Lincoln would steal away in the harrowing days of the Civil War to seek guidance from the Father of us all. It fell to the lot of these two stalwart Americans to guide this Nation through the anguish and trials of long and bitter wars. Had they failed there would be no Nation of free men here today.

Tonight all is quiet and peaceful here beside the Potomac, where these great men wrought, lived, and died. The brilliant neon lights flood the thoroughfares of the city. We are at peace. But out on the air waves encircling the earth come, by the

magic of radio, the tragic messages of the black-out of the capitals of Europe and the ravages of war, bringing death and destruction, an awesome thing as the "wreck of matter and crash of worlds." We who represent you here in the Congress cannot do aught but compare the peaceful scenes here and the tragedy of war over there. You and I cannot but ponder what is our duty to America in this world crisis. Our first duty is to our own country. We in the Congress have taken a solemn oath to preserve and defend it.

The great heart of America beats in sympathy for these suffering peoples of Europe. We want to help them. We want to and are giving them material aid in their great extremity so far as lies within our power without committing acts of war ourselves or stripping ourselves of our own defenses. We want the peace we enjoy to come again to the whole war-torn world. The United States is at peace with all the world. We Americans are a peace-loving nation. I pray God we may remain forever at peace. The Congress wants America to keep out of the war. Our fixed determination is to remain at peace with all the world. We know that we are best equipped to preserve our peace if we are adequately armed to defend it. George Washington, speaking to the Congress in 1790, said:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

With the ominous developments in Europe, with nation after nation being crushed into submission by the engines of war, we have been forced to make an appraisal of our own defenses. We in the Congress, for the time being, are the guardians of your peace. We have been aroused and shocked to learn that our armaments are wholly inadequate. The Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the Congress called before them the Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. This investigation disclosed that our National Guard is only partially equipped, we are lacking in modern rifles, large and motorized guns, tanks, and anti-tank guns, armored cars, and munitions of all types. We can only equip a force of 75,000 men in the Regular Army, which would be deficient in mobile guns. We have not built a 16-inch gun in 20 years and have just launched the first battleship in 19 years. We need air and naval bases and all types of modern aircraft. We have 2,700 airplanes in the Army, and 1,800 in the Navy. The Congress is now authorizing 10,000 and the President said we should have 50,000. Our air force is miserably weak, not only in aircraft but in our capacity to produce them. We are in no position, from a military standpoint, to become embroiled in a foreign war. Sound judgment dictates that we move cautiously and look well to our own defenses in this tragic hour of world crisis. It will require the courage, self-sacrifice, and unswerving loyalty of every American to meet the test that confronts us. The hour has come to prove that the American way is sound and not wanting and will save our democracy.

The European war has demonstrated the absolute need of modern implements of war, if we are to defend America. Fighting spirit and the will to do or die is not enough. The armored cars, monster tanks, and diving bombers, which wrought havoc in the Low Countries, leaving only death and desolation in their wake, have opened our eyes to our own lack of defenses against modern war engines of death.

We must defend on the sea and under it, on the land and over it. The Congress will appropriate all the money necessary for defense. Money alone will not provide our defenses. Our huge gold hoard is only a pile of idle metal, already spent. We must transform by machines and manpower our raw materials into guns, airplanes, ships, and tanks. This means complete mobilization of every resource of our Nation, manpower and property. You and I and every loyal American must join hands to do the job. Personal welfare must be subordinated to the welfare of our country. There must be teamwork. There will be no room here for dissension or partisan politics. The men and women engaged in this enterprise are working in the common defense of our country as much as those who man the guns on the battle front. Time is of the essence now. We must act today, not tomorrow or the next day. England and France debated and delayed. They quibbled while their enemies armed. Today they are paying the price in blood and treasure. They arrived "too late with too little." Let us profit by their experience.

National defense means far-flung national borders and out-lying possessions. It means the Monroe Doctrine and barring foreign footholds in the Western Hemisphere. We are arming for defense and peace in a world at war. We are not arming to fight an enemy but to defend against every enemy. We have no enemies, and if we keep our heads and mind our own business we will have no enemies. If Congress has its way, we will keep out of foreign entanglements. Our defenses must build barriers against invasion by any foreign foe.

There is an enemy, however, as dangerous to our security as any foreign foe which we must not overlook, a sinister foe already within our gates. We have seen nation after nation in the Old World crumple and succumb to the attacks of invading armies by reason of treachery and perfidy within their own ranks. This treason from within, inside jobs, termites undermining the foundations of government, has come to be known as the "fifth column" and Trojan horses. The Dies committee of the Congress has uncovered these traitors to our own country, entrenched within our own borders, boring from within. Many of them occupy key positions in our industries and shipping, even in our own Government itself.

In the event of war they will be under orders from abroad, amply financed, and ready to aid the enemy in wrecking our defense plans. They have even invaded the sacred precincts of our schools and youth organizations. The Congress is determined that, cost what it may, we will not be swerved from our course to run down and stamp out these subversive groups, who are spreading propaganda and the poison of disloyalty among our own citizens. All of us who love America should join hands in this common cause to completely eradicate this most dangerous element which threatens the very foundations of our Nation. The "fifth column" is organized, effective, and at work. It is your job and mine to organize our own forces and help destroy this "fifth column" by reporting any subversive activities to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This program to arm America for defense and peace will cost in the next fiscal year from five to six billion dollars. This will be only the first costs. The first essential in national defense is a sound financial program. Unfortunately we face these huge expenditures for national defense with an empty treasury. For 8 years we have been mortgaging the future and spending some $3,000,000,000 a year more than we received, a grand total of sixty-five billions. We have spent over six billions in the last 6 years for defense. We have not much to show for it. The Congress wants to know, and you who furnish the tax dollars are entitled to know where this money has gone. We want to be assured the huge funds now being appropriated for national defense will be spent for national defense and nothing else. This is the duty of the Congress. We have been a spendthrift Nation. We have wasted our substance, dissipated our reserves in times of peace. We have reached our debt limitation of forty-five billions. Now when a crisis overtakes us, which may endanger our very existence, we find our war chest empty. In this dilemma we are confronted with only three courses:

1. Embark on a course of inflation which means national bankruptcy.

2. Raise the debt limitation and borrow for defense, and pass the whole mess, plus the forty-five billion deficit, along to our children to pay; that, too, leads direct to the cemetery for defunct nations.

3. Revamp the whole tax structure, broadening the base, imposing additional taxes, capturing war profits; there must be no new crop of war millionaires coming out of this enterprise; and make drastic retrenchments in governmental expenditures for bureaus and projects which can be curtailed, and thus eliminate wasteful spending; this offers a way out.

Congress alone can enact this plan into law. It should keep in session until it has finished this task. It should not desert in time of trial. With Congress adjourned, only one man elected by the people is here in Washington to protect 133,000,000 Americans, you, my fellow countrymen. This is not a one-man Government. The Members of the Congress represent the people of their several districts as well as the Nation at large. There is an attempt to "shell shock" the Congress so it will sign some blank checks, delegate its legislative powers to the Executive, abdicate and go home.

The President said, May 16: "The Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned." A team can work only if pulling together. If one member of this team, the Congress, is unhitched and sent home, it leaves only a "one-horse team" on the job.

Here in Washington a "blitzkrieg" of jitters, "nerves," war hysteria, and propaganda is being waged against the Congress. The President says the Congress should adjourn. But this is no time to be rushed off our feet. Rather it is a time for calm judgment, clear thinking, and deliberate action to prepare the defenses of America for peace, not for war. We are not at war. With Congress in session we may not be stampeded into war through the back door. The President has asked Congress to grant him wartime powers to order the National Guard into service. He already has power to call out the guard for local service but not for foreign assignments. In peacetimes the National Guard should not become a part of the regular armed forces. It is a citizens' emergency force, men with families and responsibility. The Congress can grant this power when and if it becomes necessary. It would be a dangerous move to lodge such power in the hands of one man in times of peace, involving the welfare of 230,000 citizens and their families. If we must surrender our constitutional liberties of representative government in order to prepare for national defense, we are already defeated and there will be no need for defenses. The Congress in session can meet these problems as they arise.

Our goal is to protect America. To do so we must put America back to work on private pay rolls. We must put a stop to profligate spending and flirting with bankruptcy. The American people demand that we provide immediately strong modern defenses to repel any attack from any source, and that we keep out of war. For this I am sure we will all shoulder our full share of the burden in taxes within our abilities to pay.

Such a program gives rise to many problems. The Congress should stay at its post until the crisis is over. It cannot abdicate. No one under the law can lawfully assume its responsibilities. The President can only carry into effect such laws as the Congress enacts. The Congress alone has the power to legislate for the common defense, the President alone the power to enforce the laws the Congress makes. Such a course offers the best assurance that America will be preserved and will maintain peace with all the world.

God bless America!

Legion Editor Requests the Strange Story Behind the Group Now Trying To Put America Into the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Frank Miles, editor of the Iowa Legionnaire, is one of the country's great patriots, a splendid citizen, and a close personal friend of mine. I, therefore, call to the attention of the House the following newspaper article containing an Associated Press dispatch wherein Frank Miles asks those misguided patriots some very fair questions.

Frank Miles is an ex-soldier who knows what war means. It is not just a subject for parlor conversation and pink-tea patriotism with him. Hence, he rightfully inquires about the ages and motives of this group who are making an organized effort to put this country into war and from whose well-filled coffers flows an apparently abundant supply of money with which to buy full-page advertisements for war in the big eastern newspapers and with which to propagandize Congress in behalf of our entry into war. After the newspaper statement by Mr. Miles you will find the information concerning the ages of most of this group since I have had the Congressional Reference Library supply me with these data so these interesting questions can be fairly and fully answered. Still to be determined, of course, is the source of the vast sums of money which this committee, the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies, and other groups are getting and spending in this unholy program.

LEGION EDITOR ASKS QUESTIONS OF GROUP—EACH OF 30 WHO URGED UNITED STATES ENTRANCE INTO WAR WAS ASKED IF HE WOULD FIGHT

DES MOINES, Iowa, June 11.—Frank Miles, editor of the Iowa Legionnaire, has sent letters to the 30 American business and professional men who urged this country's entrance into the war on the side of the Allies, asking:

"What fighting did you do in the last war?"

Miles' letter continued, in part:

"Are you now of an age and of physical and mental fitness which would enable you to do military service?

"If you could not be in our armed forces, how many of your own sons would be?

"If we go to war now, what would you have our men fight with?

"Kindly reply by return mail."

The 30 educators, lawyers, writers, and businessmen advocated United States entrance in the war in a statement they issued Sunday night. The Iowa Legionnaire is the official publication of the State department of the American Legion.

THE STARTLING STORY OF THE "SAFE AGE" PATRIOTS

Mr. Speaker, from the Washington Post of June 10, page 2, I have secured the names and addresses of the 30 leaders who are now openly urging this country to send its boys to fight on foreign battlefields. Back of each man's name and address is his year of birth, insofar as these men were prominent enough to have their ages recorded in any of the standard books of reference available in the Congressional Library. These ages reveal the startlingly safe ages of these superpatriots. With due deference to maturity, it will be noticed that only one of the group was born during the current century—all the rest are presumably "too old to fight" but not too wise to urge young men to "make the sacrifice." Such shallow manifestations of good citizenship should be exposed, and I am grateful to Frank Miles for his courage in calling this to the attention of Americans generally.

It might well be added that every man on this list, if his sense of patriotism exceeds the point of trying to get other men to die for "their country" can, today, take a train for Canada and enlist in the Canadian Army—there are no statutes preventing this act on their parts. Or, if these superpatriots want to get out of the "swivel-chair classification" they can go to New York and volunteer as ambulance drivers for the American Red Cross, a most worthy occupation. In either event they would be in better taste than sitting in the safety of their own homes—protected by age classifications guaranteeing them immunity from the draft—and trying to force a peaceful Nation into a war for which it is unprepared and which is taking place 3,000 miles away on the age-old battlefields of a European continent soaked red with the perpetual wars of centuries.

Mr. Speaker, here is this strange list:

Stacey May, New York City (born 1896).

William H. Standley, New York City (1872).

Stringfellow Barr, president, St. Johns College (1897).

Herbert Agar, Louisville, Ky. (1897).

Frank R. Kent, Baltimore (1877).

Edward T. Gushee, Louisville, Ky. (age not available).

LeRoy Hodges, comptroller, State of Virginia (1888).

James F. Curtis, New York City attorney (1878).

Walter Mills, New York City, author of The Road to War (age not available).

J. Douglas Brown, Princeton University (1898).

George Watts Hill, Durham, N. C., big-business man (1901)—as the only member of the committee known to be born during the current century, he should start for Canada tomorrow.

Henry Wise Hobson, bishop of Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio (1891) (wonder if he has forgotten the fifth commandment).

Francis P. Miller, Fairfax, Va. (age not available).

Burke Baker, Houston, Tex. (age unknown).

John Balderston, author, Beverley Hills, Calif. (1889).

Richard F. Cleveland, Baltimore, Md. (age not available) (son of President Cleveland).

Edwin F. Gay, economist, Pasadena, Calif. (1867).

William H. Hessler, editor, Cincinnati, Ohio (age not available).

Calvin Hoover, college professor, Duke University (1897).

Edwin P. Hubble, astronomer, Santa Monica, Calif. (1889).

Edward R. Lewis, attorney, Chicago, Ill. (age not available).

George W. Martin, attorney, New York City (age not available).

L. Randolph Mason, attorney, New York City (1886).

Helen Hill Miller, secretary, National Policy Committee (age unknown).

George Fort Milton, editor, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1894).

Lewis Mumford, editor, Amenia, N. Y. (1895).

Winfield W. Reifler, college professor, Princeton University (1897).

Whitney H. Sheppardson, writer, New York City (1890).

William Waller, attorney, Nashville, Tenn. (age not available).

SAME UNIQUE AGE RATIO HOLDS FOR OTHER GROUPS URGING WAR

An analysis of the ages of the members of the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies, of which William Allen White of Kansas, born 1868, is chairman, and which has also had its hand in the business of carrying full-page advertisements urging citizens to write their Congressmen pro-war letters and adding to the war hysteria in this country, reveals the same unique age ratio; most of them were born well before 1900, most of them are too old to fight, all of them seem too cautious, because none of them is volunteering in Canada, where they could be used, nor volunteering to drive ambulances for the American Red Cross, where they could be effective. Gentlemen, it is time to call a halt to war mongering in America and to settle down to mending our own defenses and keeping America American. Frank Miles deserves the gratitude of the American people for his efforts to expose the background of the groups trying to disrupt the peace of America. Regardless of their noble intentions, these groups are rendering a great disservice to the peace and progress of our Nation.

My Criticism of the National Defense Revenue Bill for 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks my mail has shown an overwhelming and patriotic endorsement of the policy of paying for national defense through increased taxation, and also, my mail has shown a very much appreciated endorsement of the efforts of my committee to make our national defenses adequate for our needs. These letters have been most welcome and helpful.

My committee assignment in Congress is to the Committee on Military Affairs and my time is given over in great measure to the study of the needs of our national-defense structure and to the building up of our national defenses.

It is interesting to know that the materials, supplies, munitions, and armaments for which appropriations are now being made and contracts let, cannot possibly be brought into existence in time for use for many months and even some years ahead. Some of the simpler items may be available for use 1 year from now. But actual production of most of the items will require from 2 to 3 years. In other words, all planning in the field of national defense, as well as all planning for payment therefor, must be done far in advance of prospective needs.

In our great rush for preparedness we must not forget that a balanced domestic economy is the most important single factor for us to strive for. By now we are all well aware of the fact that a balanced domestic economy cannot be quickly attained without vigorous effort and genuine determination. Most certainly it cannot be attained unless the administration has the desire to attain it.

The profligate spending of the past 10 years by the Federal Government has placed our Nation in a very awkward position just at the time we are called upon to launch a far-reaching program of building up our national defenses. Even without the present need for huge expenditures for national defense our domestic economy has been so unstable as to speed us year by year to an all-time record national debt and to fiscal disaster. Now we find it necessary to undertake an additional burden which in and of itself will strain our Government to its utmost. We are therefore facing the greatest challenge of our national existence—a challenge that requires the curtailment of every possible nondefense expenditure and the increase of revenues for defense so that we may acquire adequate national defense without accelerating our mad rush to bankruptcy.

I have therefore looked upon the development of the revenue bill of 1940 with special interest. So far as it enables us to build our defenses without delay and without undue danger to our national economy the measure is entitled to wholehearted support. Just as certainly, however, this measure should be viewed critically regarding any portion of it that departs from sound economy. In my opinion, the study of the measure should have been most thorough and far-reaching notwithstanding the urgent need for speed in providing funds for national defense.

The revenue bill of 1940 that passed the House of Representatives Tuesday, June 11, established a record for the brief time required for its passage. The brevity of time for its consideration was quite conspicuous, both before the committee and on the floor of the House. Inasmuch as I am not on the committee that had this measure under consideration, I can speak more fully with reference to the brevity of time given to its consideration on the floor of the House.

We were told Monday evening about 5 o'clock that committee prints of the bill were just then available and, of course, we immediately started our study of the bill in preparation for its consideration the next day. We were told also that there would be 1 hour of debate on the rule and 6 hours of general debate on the bill itself—all of which would take place next day, and that the bill itself would be put to a vote of the House before adjournment Tuesday evening. The rule was a closed rule, more so than almost any rule that has come before the House throughout the Seventy-sixth Congress. For example, the rule provided that "no amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means" and also "amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of general debate but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment."

In other words, we were placed entirely under the control of the administration-controlled Committee on Ways and Means. This situation is of particular importance in view of the provisions of the revenue bill itself.

The revenue bill provides for the raising of an estimated additional revenue in the sum of $1,004,000,000 per year for a period of 5 years. On the raising of such revenue there was very little disagreement in the entire House of Representatives. But the bill contained also a provision to increase the national indebtedness by $4,000,000,000 above the present limit of $45,000,000,000. The bill provided furthermore that revenues derived from obligations issued from this authorization shall be available to meet any expenditures made after June 30, 1940, for the national defense. This provision appears innocent enough until its real meaning is determined. The real issue so cleverly concealed in the bill is that all national-defense expenditures shall come out of either the increased revenue from taxation or out of the $4,000,000,000 increase in our national indebtedness, thereby relieving the Budget for Federal spending in every other department of Government of even the slightest responsibility for the regular and ordinary expenditures for national defense. In other words, under the guise of providing for the national defense, the present national administration has slipped out from providing for the ordinary expenditures for national defense out of revenues heretofore chargeable with that responsibility, and the wild nondefense spending can now proceed without incurring such deficits as have accumulated in recent years. This is important to the spenders in view of the fact that the Federal Government is rapidly reaching the $45,000,000,000 debt limit.

It seems to me that honesty in dealing with the taxpayers would have required that the Government not dip into the $4,000,000,000 increase in our national debt and the $1,004,000,000 per annum additional revenue except for extraordinary expenditures for national defense. If this bill had so provided it would then have been necessary for this administration to curtail its extravagant expenditures in other fields, and I am sure that that curtailment in such expenditures is more important today than any other problem facing our Nation in the building up of our national defenses. I am sure also that public opinion would have heartily endorsed such curtailment in the Federal Government's orgy of spending. Inasmuch as such a restriction would have curtailed expenditures for nondefense purposes by nearly $2,000,000,000 per year, and inasmuch as that would have been a painful restriction for the spenders, the opportunity to side-step this restriction under the guise of national defense and by means of clever manipulation of the rules of procedure in the House of Representatives was too great to expect the present national administration to resist the temptation to blunder ahead to disaster in its spending program. I am amazed at the consistency of the present national administration in thus cleverly achieving its goal of increased profligate spending, and I strongly condemn the administration for doing this under the guise of national defense, and also for even desiring to continue its wild nondefense spending orgy in the face of our speeding to financial disaster.

I voted for the revenue bill notwithstanding these serious objections because I did not wish to impede the imperative augmentation of our national defenses. The fact that the augmentation of our national defenses is so imperative en-

abled the present national administration to force this bill to passage, including as it does, an increase of funds made available for nondefense spending in the sum of approximately $2,000,000,000 per annum.

I cannot help but feel that such continued wild nondefense spending by the present national administration will be vigorously condemned by the American public when the foregoing facts become known to them.

If Congress Votes To Go Home, the People Should Vote To Keep Them There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a very illuminating editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Times, of Indianapolis, Ind., on the 12th day of June 1940. I am in hearty accord with this editorial, and I am convinced it is far safer for the Congress to remain in session during these critical times. The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times of June 12, 1940]

IF THEY VOTE TO GO HOME, VOTE TO KEEP THEM THERE

Within a few days Congress may be called upon to cast the most important vote of 20 years.

That will happen if administration leaders persist in their effort to force an adjournment.

Any Congressman who does vote to adjourn and go home should be commanded by his constituents to remain at home.

Any elected representative of the people who is so insensible of his constitutional obligations that he would voluntarily abandon his post at a time like this is, we believe, unfit for the responsibility of service in Congress.

The terrible conflict in Europe goes rapidly from bad to worse. Any day may bring the need for fateful decisions involving our Nation's peace and security. Borrowed billions have been laid on the line for rearmament. But to turn dollars into weapons in the quantities needed, old industries will have to be invigorated and new ones created. Only Congress can do what is necessary to mobilize idle capital and manpower for this supreme task.

Overnight it may become, not a matter for academic debate, but an imperative necessity to order compulsory military training and conscript men for defense duty. Congress alone has that power and responsibility.

Our Government has operated in the red through 11 years of apparent peace and security. Confronted now with need for gigantic new defense expenditures, nothing substantial has been done to weed out old wastes, and the only tax proposal yet made won't even balance the nonmilitary outgo.

Congress is the Nation's fiscal guardian. Yet it is suggested that Congress pack up and go home. It is suggested that, if an "emergency" should arise, the President will summon Congress back to a special session—a procedure which requires several days in a period where there may be no day to spare.

We repeat that any who vote to go home at a time like this ought to be made to stay there—and very probably will be.

Second-Class Mail Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, as an extension of my remarks, I herewith include an article printed in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Philadelphia, Pa., under date of February 1, 1940, an article making an analysis relative to second-class mail. The article is as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 1, 1940]

TAKE SECOND-CLASS MAIL OFF THE DOLE

It is about time American taxpayers were relieved of footing the stupendous postage bills of magazines and newspapers.

The publishing business, generally speaking, is not a charitable institution. Its object is to make money. It can stand on its own feet and pay its own way.

But in Uncle Sam's mails it is on the dole—and has been there for 89 years.

The Inquirer believes newspapers and magazines have been on the postal relief rolls entirely too long and that they ought to get off.

Publishers would get sore if it were suggested that they ask the Federal Treasury for a straight hand-out of public cash to meet their pay rolls.

But they don't grow hot with indignation when the Post Office Department carries their thousands of tons of second-class mail on what amounts to a gigantic Government subsidy.

They publish self-righteous denunciations of tax-financed bounties for farmers, bounties for shippers, bounties for industrialists, bounties for this, that, and the other.

But all the time they are accepting, as a matter of course, a whopping bounty for themselves.

The brutal fact is that in the fiscal year ending last June 30 the United States Government had to pay out $87,264,126.47 more than it received to transport and deliver the second-class mail, in considerable part magazines and newspapers.

That the Post Office Department, according to Postmaster General Farley's annual report, wound up with a deficit of only $38,691,862.90 was no credit to the publishers. Postal revenue from first-class mail cut down the losses on the newspapers, magazines, and other matter.

If the publishers had paid their own way in the mails, not only would there have been no postal deficit: there would have been money left over to defray the cost of the Congressmen's free mailing privilege, free mail for the blind, and the postage of official Government agencies.

Of the more than $87,000,000 worth of red ink in second-class mail delivery, daily newspapers contributed $27,000,000; newspapers other than daily, $14,000,000; magazines of all kinds, $26,000,000; publications put out by religious, educational, and scientific organizations, $13,000,000; county newspapers delivered free within the county, $7,600,000.

It is an impressive list of postage chiselers.

Why don't they hold up their end of postal costs? Technically, the reason is amazingly simple. The average postal rate on second-class matter that costs the Government approximately 8.41 cents a pound to carry and deliver is only about 1.8 cents, or a deficiency of 6.6 cents per pound.

When it is remembered that this second-class mail runs to more than 1,300,000,000 pounds a year it can readily be understood that a loss of 6.6 cents a pound piles up an astronomical deficit.

And why isn't the newspaper and magazine per-pound postage rate high enough to let the mails break even? Because every time there is an attempt to raise the rates the publishers yell bloody murder, and go on the warpath for the Congressmen who would dare wipe out this second-class mail racket.

It all started back in 1851, in the days of President Fillmore, when Congress got the idea that a wider distribution of printed matter would be a good thing for the country. So the postal rate on newspapers and magazines was set attractively low.

The principle was excellent, at that time, and resulted in relatively huge national circulations of papers and magazines.

But now, with Congress trying to cut costs, and the people weighed down by taxes, deficit-producing postal rates are a costly and discriminatory burden.

The postage loss on second-class mail, figured down to a Philadelphia basis, means that Uncle Sam went in the hole to the extent of almost $8,500,000 on the more than 128,000,000 pounds of papers, magazines, and other publications that passed out of this city last year.

But Jim Farley's Department "takes it on the chin" in more ways than this. Some publishers, not content with the already starvation rates on second-class mail, pack their papers, magazines, or what have you in mail bags and ship them by freight to distant focal points for distribution.

This is cheaper than mailing the publications from Philadelphia, or wherever they originate, to remote destinations. It makes possible a considerable saving in the case of magazines having large and far-flung circulations.

But the mail bags, loaned by the Government to publishers for sending second-class matter by freight, wear out. New ones cost money—from 80 cents to around a dollar apiece. And who stands this loss? Uncle Sam, of course.

Why should the Government lend mail bags to publishers in order to "gyp" itself out of money both going and coming? That is only one more puzzle growing out of this second-class mail hocus-pocus.

If permitting the use of mail bags for the freight transport of publications is good business on the part of the Post Office Department, harassed by postal deficits, the fact is not easily perceptible. As for the ethics of it, there may be cause for eyebrow lifting.

The Inquirer believes that magazines and newspapers have no right whatsoever to foist their second-class postage costs upon the taxpayers and the users of first-class mail.

Publishers are not in business for their health. If they are making a profit, or trying to make a profit, they ought to show enough gumption to pay their own way to prevent the Treasury from sinking deeper in the red ink than it is now.

The Inquirer proposes that Congress, closing its ears to the "yaps" that are sure to arise, courageously set about boosting the rates on second-class mail to the point where magazines and newspapers will not be putting the Government and the taxpayers in the hole.

There has been too much of this craven failure of publishers to pay for the service the Post Office Department gives them. Let's have an end to it.

Congress Should Remain in Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM PAUL R. JARRATT

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 13, 1940.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, JR.,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The 1939 national convention of the American Legion in Chicago by resolution demanded that Congress stay in session "during the emergency." The emergency is even more grave now than it was at the time of the Chicago convention. Notwithstanding the political conventions we want Congress to say in session. The present situation requires the constant attention of Congress now.

PAUL R. JARRATT,
Commander, American Legion Post No. 5.

Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, OF MARYLAND

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting and timely address on the subject Military Preparedness for the Present and for the Future, delivered by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] over the National Broadcasting Co. network on Monday evening, June 10, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS FOR THE PRESENT AND FOR THE FUTURE

The devastating war now being waged in Europe, with its new weapons and methods, has finally brought the people of the United States to a full realization of the pitiful state of our own national defense, particularly on land.

Heretofore, it has always been assumed that, with a good navy, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans were ample barriers against attack. Few realized that oceans can be highways to invasion as well as barriers against attack; that rapid transportation and communication and modern ways and means of war have largely destroyed the former security we enjoyed, and that our natural ramparts of defense are no longer as efficacious as we had supposed.

Fortunately, some of us in Congress have not been blind to these changed and changing conditions. Considering that it takes 4 years to build a battleship and many years to train and equip men for efficient service in the air, Navy, and land forces, we have for some years been calling attention to the tragic state of our national defense.

The time to create a national defense is not when you need it, for usually then you cannot get it. The time to provide for it is when you do not need it, for then it cannot only be more efficiently constructed but more cheaply obtained, as well.

Millions of our people in the past 5 years have opposed the enlargement of our Navy and the modernization of our Army. They opposed nearly every measure calculated to increase the defensive preparedness of the United States. They supported bills in Congress to do away with military training in the land-grant colleges, they favored reduced appropriations, and further reduction of the numerical strength of our Army and Navy.

Against such well-intentioned opposition during the last 5 years it has been difficult to make progress in keeping our Army and Navy and air force at a proper strength, and trained and equipped to a high degree of efficiency.

Those who have consistently fought preparedness on land, sea, and in the air during the past 5 years must now realize what a tremendous disservice they have done to this country and to its poeple. In the light of the happenings abroad, they must know that wishing for peace does not secure it; that to be unprepared is to invite attack, as witness the conflicts in China, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Albania, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, and France and England, as well.

It is generally accepted now that the surest guaranty of peace is to be so well prepared that no nation will feel it desirable to attack us or engage us in war—that the surest way for a rich nation to invite attack is to be unprepared to resist such attack.

We have learned that lesson now temporarily. Have we learned it sufficiently well to make adequate preparedness a part of our future democratic governmental program as the years continue to unfold?

If the oceans are narrower today than they were, they will continually grow more and more narrow, in the face of new invention, of speed and equipment. It is my fervent wish that the present emergency, together with the relentless march of intervention, will cause all to make a firm resolve that never, never, never again shall this rich, great, and powerful United States of America be caught so pitifully unprepared to defend itself as we all know it is today.

If we can only learn this lesson once and for all, we are more likely to escape future wars than to be involved in them, and we can sleep at night knowing our country will be safe.

If we learn this lesson only temporarily, until the present emergency passes, and then forget it, some future emergency will catch us in the same deplorable state in which we find ourselves today.

We have a splendid navy. Fortunately that has been kept up. However, its entire air force needs rapid modernization in equipment and in enlargement of personnel.

Our Army, unfortunately, is one of the smallest on the face of the earth, and while its personnel is good, it is woefully weak in modern war equipment and auxiliary implements.

The Army staff is charged with the primary responsibility of having an Army adequate to defend these shores against any possible foe. The present size and equipment of our National Army is far below the margin of safety.

The Chief of Staff of the United States Army, Gen. George C. Marshall, is asking Congress to provide a Regular Army of 375,000 in place of an army of 210,000 men. This is a most modest request. The chief of staff feels that with such an army, efficiently trained and equipped with modern weapons, together with the 235,000 men of the National Guard, likewise better trained and splendidly equipped, which will give us a combined army strength of 610,000 men, the national defense of this country will be provided for sufficiently.

Of the 375,000 men in the enlarged Regular Army, 280,000 will be in the ground forces and 95,000 will be placed in the Air Corps. This new Regular Army would have 30 percent of its men in mobile combat forces within the United States. There would be 9 infantry divisions, 2 armored divisions, and 1 cavalry division, making 12 divisions in all in the United States proper. These 12 divisions would be arranged in 2 full Army corps, supported by auxiliary troops. There would be about 125,000 men in all.

A quarter of the new Regular Army would be allocated to the Air Corps, composed of 51 pursuit squadrons, 69 bombardment squadrons, 40 reconnaissance squadrons, and 23 transport squadrons, or a total of 183 squadrons.

The new plan provides that one-fifth of our Regular Army be stationed throughout our overseas possessions—in the Philippines, Guam, Hawaii, Alaska, the Panama Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico. Thus, 75,000 Regular Army troops would be stationed outside of the continental United States. About 7,500 men will be stationed at our harbor-defense garrisons and at our coast-defense batteries.

The remaining men of the new Regular Army, between 80,000 and 90,000, would be stationed in Army depots, arsenals, hospitals, military schools, and general service agencies.

This is the minimum Regular Army needed at this very moment. Even after the present emergency passes, it should not be reduced too quickly, and perhaps not at all, lest again we be caught in the same situation in which we find ourselves today.

The new Regular Army, besides placing 95,000 men in the Army Air Corps, would have 15,000 in armored units. There would be 73,000 men in the Infantry, 41,000 men in the Field Artillery, and 21,000 in the antiaircraft Service; 58,000 would be assigned to the Army Engineers, Signal Corps, and Coast Artillery. About 75,000 would be used in supply and auxiliary services and schools. Of those assigned to the Air Corps 8,000 would be pilots who would fly the warplanes. Personnel and facilities would be set up to train new Army pilots at the rate of 7,000 per year.

Supplementing this new Regular Army would be the 235,000 men in the National Guard. Its entire equipment must be overhauled

and modernized and filled out. Much additional training, particularly field maneuvers on a large scale, must be provided for the training of the National Guard in the future.

It is regrettable that it is going to take many months, and in some cases many years, before all of the men in the Army and National Guard are fully equipped with modern weapons and auxiliary devices, which a good army must have today to be able to resist attack successfully.

Why has not all this been done before, you ask? Perhaps the biggest reason was that the people of the United States would not support it before. They had been living with a false sense of security. It took the present grim realities to make them realize that a substantial increase in our standing Army was an imperative need.

There have been men in Congress and among our civilian population who have on one occasion after another tried to warn the people that the standing Army, both in numbers and equipment, was far below our needs. Most people did not bother their heads about it, even though in a democracy public sentiment really fashions most national policies.

The question now is, When the present emergency passes will they again sink into that previous attitude of indifference and sense of security and allow our Army to disintegrate and reach the low state of preparedness it is in today? That is what happened after the last World War. Let us hope that it will not happen again after the present war. Let us learn the lesson for all time that adequate defense is the surest guaranty against attack and against involvement in war.

The enlarged Regular Army and the National Guard are made up of voluntary enlistments. Thus, to increase our Army to its desired strength will require from 150,000 to 200,000 new enlistments. If these enlistments do not come voluntarily, it will be imperative that some democratic and equitable system be devised to furnish sufficient men to make up the forces to this minimum number.

The sooner these new enlistments are obtained, the better it will be for us all. It takes months and months to train a good soldier and a skilled aviator.

In addition to the above, I should like to see a plan to permit others who may desire it to receive military training. Military training is a healthful thing. It develops a strong body, a sense of obligation and responsibility to our Government, and an appreciation of what a great privilege it is to live in a country like the United States of America. In addition to the individual benefits, it would be a fine thing for the Nation's defense, too. A good deal of headway could be made if there were camps to which men could go who desire to receive this military training—camps such as were held at Plattsburg some 20 years ago.

In these camps muscles are hardened by training and exercise. Men are taught rudimentary military tactics, the use of arms, discipline, and the like. The strenuous life, lived in the open, would add to the physical prowess of the citizen and help the preparedness of the Nation at one and the same time. These voluntary camps, in my judgment, would attract many thousands of men who would like to help but who are not situated in some cases so they could join the Regular Army or National Guard.

As one who has participated in some of this training, I know it is of great benefit to everyone who takes it, if from no other standpoint than that of health.

Considerable numbers of people have written me advocating universal military training. My own opinion on this subject coincides with that of the Army heads. If we have a Regular Army and National Guard such as I have heretofore described, properly equipped and trained, numbering altogether 610,000 men, it would not be necessary for our national defense to superimpose universal training. It is felt that voluntary enlistments will give us the 610,000 men desired in these two organizations. Besides, universal military training would entail a terrific expense and a great additional tax burden on our country at a time when for 11 long years our National Government has been spending more than it has been receiving in taxes. Our average yearly deficit has been $2,650,000,000, or approximately $30,500,000,000 during the 11-year period.

I believe that with the Regular Army and National Guard brought up to the proposed strength, military training on the Plattsburg model could be more economically administered and would supplement largely any greater need for preparedness we might have. I am sure employers would cooperate with employees to permit this training where the employees themselves desired it.

The increase in the Regular Army and the National Guard together with the complete modernization of equipment of these forces is going to cost money—much money. There is no way this can be avoided. Our problem is to get the most out of the taxpayer's dollar for defense purposes. The plan outlined by General Marshall, and which I hope Congress will adopt in full, is designed to give the country the best standard defense possible for the least money. During the last 10 years we have spent an average of about $500,000,000 a year on our Army and National Guard. This was used for maintenance, training, equipment, and all expenses incident thereto. The new Army will cost at least twice that much a year, in all probability, as it will be equipped with tanks, armored cars, armored eairplanes, and other weapons. For a while it is going to cost more than twice as much as the old Army cost each year, for large sums are necessary for initial equipment, housing, etc.

It will nevertheless be a good insurance both for our security and our future welfare. Not to have this insurance is to be in the position of the owner of a house who has no adequate fire insurance on his home, when fires are breaking out all over the neighborhood. Our problem is to get this insurance on our national welfare without unavoidable delay.

May I be permitted to say a personal word? Your speaker was a soldier in the last war, serving with fighting troops in the American Expeditionary Force in France, in engagements where some of his friends and comrades made the supreme sacrifice or were severely wounded.

No one wants to avoid war more than one who has actually taken part in it or will have to take part in another. Such men want to see war honorably avoided if it can be done.

I deplore the idea that still exists in some quarters in our country, that our Nation ought to have no army or navy at all, or that it ought not to put itself in a state of adequate preparedness and should not even resist invasion if it comes. This is the surest way to really bring on an invasion of this country by acquisitive and aggressor nations for we are the richest and most desirable loot in all of Christendom.

China's policy of being unprepared was an inducement for Japan to attack China, which has cost the Chinese people already 3,000,000 lives among its men, women, and children, and only heaven can count the incidental suffering, destruction, and misery to the living.

If we really want to avoid war, we should have a powerful Navy, second to none on the sea, beneath the sea, and over the sea, and an Army at least the size of the one I have described, on the land and in the air. Then no one will want to attack us, for the price of that attack would be too costly, and they could not hope to achieve success in the face of such preparedness.

But we cannot have that insurance against war coming to our country so long as well-meaning but ill-advised persons continually preach, in the face of all the grim and sad facts of this hour, that we are in no danger of attack at all. We are vulnerable to attack, and in my judgment we would be attacked, under certain possibilities that may occur, if we had no Army or Navy to cause the aggressor to think twice before he struck.

To be unprepared is to invite attack. To be prepared is to prevent attack. To be unprepared is to threaten the stability of this Government, the overthrow of its institutions, the liberty and freedom of our country, and our everyday way of life. To be prepared is to preserve this form of government and its institutions, our freedom and liberty and our way of life, and to be able to hand them down to our children and our children's children.

We need less of the will for pacifism and more of the will to preserve this Nation. We need less of the spirit of indifference and more of the spirit of self-sacrifice for the common good. We need less of soft and indolent self-concern and more of the deep and abiding love of liberty, patriotic instincts, and the spirit of our forefathers. We need these things to be strong enough to escape the fate which already has encompassed nearly a dozen nations in the last 5 years.

Every city has its large police force to prevent crime within its borders. The Army is our national police force, to prevent international crime, the attempt by any aggressor nation to invade us and break the peaceful laws of our everyday lives.

The Army, our national police force, must be of such size and equipment that it is adequate to deal with these outside aggressors so that we may continue to dwell here in the security and safety to which we are entitled.

While we wish to avoid war in every honorable way, we should not shrink from it when our homes and way of life are threatened by invasion any more than we would shrink from dealing with one who attempted to force his way into our private homes and rob or destroy.

We are living in times that may change the whole course of human history. We all know what is taking place throughout the world today. We owe it to our ancestors, to ourselves, and to our children that these things shall not happen here, that this great country shall be preserved, and that we have the will to preserve it and hand it down to those who may come after us, no less secure, progressive, and fine than our forebears have preserved it and handed it down to us.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. SLATTERY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the civic, service, fraternal, labor, and religious organizations in Chicago on June 12, 1940, in celebration of All Chicago Flag Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I come to this great city here tonight to address a great audience of patriotic Americans. It is only to patriots that I speak. I come to speak in the same spirit in which you have come to honor the most glorious flag in all the world—the Stars and Stripes. No other emotion so fills our hearts as the inspiration that comes from looking upon that flag and appreciating what it means to have that flag wave over a land. For where that flag is there is liberty, freedom, human dignity, and supreme reverence for a sovereign God. In every one of its noble folds is written the epic of America's patriots who gave that flag ascendency over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

No other flag in all the world has so thrilled the oppressed, been so much an emblem of the emancipated, as has that flag. A little group of patriots, through almost a decade of unspeakable privation and pain, made that flag the flag of a new world and a new country. They put upon it the benediction of their blood. They bathed it in their tears. By the strength of their own brave hands they made it sacred and inviolate against monarch, dictator, or any other enemy. They made it a symbol of a new kind of life builded upon the stifled hopes of dead ages. They conceived a way of life for which there was no old pattern. It was a way strewn with many obstacles, following many devious and dangerous routes, and the road was long and arduous. But along that way could be heard the steady tread of brave and confident feet marching with a purpose and moved by an inspiration as divine as justice and as dignified as the soul of men.

Their sons and their sons' sons, their daughters and their daughters' daughters, good, God-blessed men and women in the nobility of their own lives, have nourished the sentiments epitomized in that flag. They have defended it against foreign danger and domestic strife. They have dimmed not one of its stars from its ancient luster of purity and perfection. They have erased not one of its bold stripes. No ignoble motto have they inscribed upon its azure blue not conceived upon the first flag by Betsy Ross and George Washington.

Its folds have been wrapped around the humble slave and lifted him to the dignity and the responsibility of citizenship. Its embrace has encompassed the oppressed Cuban and clothed him with the unalienable rights of liberty and freedom.

Its warm stripes and its glittering stars have been the glorious banner under which sons of America threw their bodies across the path of a ruthless military machine which sought then as its successor seeks now to defile democracy and conquer the world. Today the first impulse surging through the heart of every true American is the determination to preserve the liberty and freedom of the land for which the flag waves. If that flag falls it would carry down with it all that our heroic dead have saved from the wreckage of the past. Around it and upon its stained folds would crumble the majestic edifices of the most glorious civilization history records. Upon its tattered and frayed remnants would tumble the highest hopes man has ever dared to dream for mortal man. The last citadel of human dignity would be a broken ruin and the refuge of the world's oppressed would be but a desolate land upon which the sorrow of the mourning patriots would fall in a canopy of gloom.

The American people today face the greatest danger of all their history. If the issue of cruel war now raging with unspeakable terror upon the soil of France is against Great Britain and France and those associated with them and in favor of Hitler and Mussolini, the United States of America, for the first time in its whole history, faces a hostile world without a single first-class power for a friend.

Linked in a confederacy which aims at the greatest loot the world has ever known are a group of dictators who, in that unhappy event, would hold unquestioned sway over four of the five continents of the world and mastery over three-fifths of the world's people and three-fourths of the world's territory. Neither to the east nor to the west, to the north nor to the south could we grasp a strong hand as an ally, even to preserve sacred and inviolate our own soil. Nowhere could we hear even an echo of any appeal we might make to preserve a civilization which reverences God and respects man. In neither east nor west would there be a great nation upon whose comradeship we could call to preserve the institutions of free men out of which have been born democracies which have given to the world its greatest learning, its most beautiful culture, its greatest emphasis upon the divinity of the human soul.

Alone should we stand against powers who have defied the first two commandments, the first of which places in the heavens a supreme God and upon the earth Godlike men.

Alone should we stand as the champion of the rule of law, of right, as against force and might. Alone should we stand as the defenders of the forum of conscience, in which justice may speak and charity and mercy may be dispensed. Around us would stand borders of steel and the armed might of conquerors whose appetite for conquest would have been whetted upon the ruins of two of the world's mightiest empires and four great nations, which in 6 weeks of total war have been destroyed.

The doors of world trade should have been slammed shut in our faces by totalitarian masters who would tell the rest of the world who could and would buy the wheat, the hogs, the meat, the lard, the cotton, the fruit, and the other products of America's farms, which has heretofore been sold in the open markets of the world. Wheels would stop in every American factory which is accustomed to sell its output to any of the other four continents.

The standard of living would fall in every ordinary American home. First would go luxury, then leisure, then recreation, then decent hours, then fair wages from every ordinary workingman, while first profit and then cost would disappear from every average American farm. Meanwhile the galling burden of mounting taxes would bear yet harder and harder upon every home, every producer, every worker, and taxpayer to meet the incalculable weight of armaments which this Nation would have to bear to give any assurance of its own security in such a world, much less the safety of the 43,000 miles of the Western Hemisphere which is in the possible zone of attack.

Moneys, meager as they now are, spent upon public health, upon needed education, upon research against the ravages of disease and death, upon homes to house families in decent surroundings, upon the things of the mind and the spirit, no less real than the things we see, these moneys, I say, would go for battleships, tanks, guns, planes, ammunition, antiaircraft guns, coast defenses, Navy and Army air bases in the United States, in Iceland, in Greenland, in the Caribbean, in Central America, in South America, in the islands of the South Atlantic, the South Pacific, the North Pacific, Alaska. A navy would have to grow in the Atlantic which now needs no navy, because mastery of that ocean is in the hands of powers which have, for more than 100 years, exhibited no hostile attitude toward either our territory or our institutions, nor, indeed, to a Christian God.

An Army which now numbers less than 300,000 in active service will have to grow to indefinite millions which could only come from conscription, which would take a man from every home. An air force, now modest, according to the demands of the past, when no nation which was able to reach us threatened us on the East and we were the superior of any force which could be sent against us from the West, would grow by the tens of thousands, until bombers and pursuit planes, perched like sea gulls upon every mile of 43,000 miles of vulnerable coast line in the Western Hemisphere.

In the Senate a few days ago I declared that Hitler had long ago declared war upon the American institution. That statement was taken by some of my colleagues as extravagant hysteria. I leave to my fellow citizens, you here, to men and women, throughout this broad land, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the men of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps the question, has there been since the Nazi Government of Germany set in motion its relentless machine of conquest a steady infiltration of "fifth colmns" and Trojan horses in the United States and South America? Have some aliens violated the hospitality of our soil to spy upon us? Thank God not all from abroad have violated the hospitality of our soil to spy upon us.

Have agents recognizing a foreign master clothed in the raimant of a foreign power fomented strife amongst us, endeavored to break down our confidence in one another and in our institutions and stimulated dissention intended to weaken our productive power and our second lines of defense?

Has propaganda, wicked distorted truth, and honeyed lie with all the devilish subtlety of a Mephistopheles endeavored to break down our will to defend ourselves?

Have designs upon what we have in resource, in territory, in trade, been laid in the chanceries and war offices of the dictators?

Has total war been levied with indomitable and invincible will by the German Fuehrer against our way of life, and against the things we stand for which have been dearly bought by our forefathers?

To what do you attribute the action of the President in requesting, and the Congress in appropriating, nearly $5,000,000,000 in the last 3 weeks, the tightening of the belts of every one of our citizens to meet the sacrifice upon which alone we can build a national defense adequate to our security? Against whom are we arming to defend ourselves? Why have we already spent billions in the last 5 years to arm when before that we were joining other nations of the world in disarmament?

But if there was ever any doubt as to what was the issue of the war now being fought in Europe, that doubt was dispelled 2 days ago when the head of the Italian people announced to the world what was the issue of that struggle. You heard him over your radios, you read his statement in your papers when he said:

"The hour of destiny has arrived for our fatherland. We are going to war against the decrepit of democracies * * * to break the chains that tie us in the Mediterranean. It is to win. We salute the Fuehrer of Germany," he added, "Fascist Italy is on her feet and prepared to strike. This revolution," he continued, "asserts itself against those nations who control the riches of the earth and the gold. It is a struggle of one century against another. We take up arms to solve the problems of our continental frontiers and our maritime frontiers."

In another passage he said, "This gigantic struggle is only a phase in the development of our revolution. This asserts itself against the strangers, the richer nations. It is a struggle between young and progressive people as against the decadent people, the struggle of one century as against another century."

Tragic as was that announcement that the hand poised for months to strike chose to sink its dagger in a neighbor's back when she was being ravaged by another foe, that statement, I hope, will burn itself into the consciousness of every patriotic man, woman, and child in America. Who are the rich nations against whom Il Duce joins Fuehrer Hitler in war? Who are the nations possessing the world's storehouse of gold against which the confederacy of the dictators is formed? Who are the old states against whom the new contend? What is the old philosophy against which the new joins battle?

Clearer than even the German Fuehrer has stated it did Mussolini in that message declare upon what and whom this total war was being waged.

Can it be that the very boldness of the attack shall disarm us as it disarmed Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and Chamberlain? Shall the horrible example of every victim which now lies supine under their tanks and dive bombers and armored cars be not enough to arouse us? Have we not learned yet that a nation which in 1914 startled the world by scorning a solemn treaty as a scrap of paper cannot now under dictators who have drenched in blood every rung of their ladder to power be trusted when they say they want no more? Are our ears sealed and our brains dulled that we do not hear what they say to the wide world?

I speak to you as an American who loves every corner of our sacred soil, every stream, every hilltop and dale, every tree and blade of grass, every home upon this holy land. I speak to a citizenry which for weeks has been calling upon its Congress to awake to our danger and our defense. I speak for the mothers who close their eyes at night in prayer that the blood of their sons will never be spilled upon battlefield. I speak for loved ones who pray in every waking hour that they shall never have to clasp in sorrowful farewell a departing soldier. I speak for those long dead whose spirit cries out that we protect the land they long ago won. I speak for those who have the courage to see ugly realities and the confidence to act as Americans have always acted before it is tragically too late.

Tonight, as an American, I call out to you as Americans that America is not isolated from danger; that America is not indifferent to the issue of the war which rages in France tonight; that America's destiny is not unaffected by who emerges victor in that contest.

As an American, to you patriotic Americans I say that the best, the surest, and the safest way to keep the scourge of war from America's shores, to preserve peace and freedom here always, is for Americans to stand up like men, like men who won that freedom behind that flag, like men who carried that flag through every baptism of fire, like men who threw their arms around it and saved it from everyone who would defile one thread of its sacred folds and say to the world that America still believes in God, America still believes in democracy, America has not lost her moral sense and her virtue, that America will defend not only its soil but her way of life against all who would destroy it, and by all means short of war will now lend her aid to those who fight today to destroy those who would fling us back and would desecrate Old Glory and what it stands for.

Let Europe Pay War Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM SOCIAL JUSTICE

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, this is June 15, the due date for European war debts.

Yesterday the press reported that two of the debtors, Great Britain and France, have more than $7,000,000,000 on deposit here. They ought to pay, for we certainly need the money. We also need the West Indies, both British and French, for air and naval bases.

For many years the debtor nations, with the exception of Finland, made no effort whatever to pay their greatly reduced debts to us. During that time there were long periods when there was no imminent danger of war, and they could perfectly well have done so. In fact, it is notorious that Great Britain and France, especially, had very large deposits of gold in this country, and had vast holdings of American securities which could have been taken over by the Governments of those countries and the proceeds applied on the debts.

It may be argued at this moment, when Great Britain and France are in such a perilous position, that they probably cannot safely pay us in cash, which they need for the purchase of war supplies—although such supplies are really being purchased with our money. There is, however, no reason whatever why they cannot transfer to us their West Indian islands. This would have the double purpose of paying us something on the debts and further of obviating a very disagreeable and perhaps dangerous situation if they should attempt to transfer the islands to us at a time when they might be endeavoring to settle the war with Germany.

I ask unanimous consent that an article I have written on this subject, printed in Social Justice of April 29, 1940, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Social Justice of April 29, 1940]

LET EUROPE PAY WAR DEBTS—MINNESOTA SENATOR SUGGESTS CARIBBEAN ISLANDS AS PART PAYMENT BY ENGLAND AND FRANCE

(By United States Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, chairman, Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee)

Again the hue and cry is raised that the United States set itself up as the creditor of all Europe.

What of the fourteen and one-half billion Europe owes us today? Our 10,000,000 unemployed have a right to know how our efforts to finance Europe have dissipated the resources of their country. Our ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed have a right to ask why all these foreign loans to foreign nations.

WHY NOT FOOD AND JOBS FOR AMERICANS?

The transient farmer who moves his pitiful family about the country trying to find work; the men and boys, women and children forced onto the bread line, demand that their Government put their interest first. W. P. A. families have been thrown off relief, are forced to depend on the allotment of 1½ cents per meal per person from the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. They demand an answer of the Government whose money flows so readily to Europe.

This Government has waited and negotiated for 22 years, seeking a substantial payment from defaulting foreign countries already in debt to us. For 22 years the answer has been continued evasion and repeated attempts at cancelation.

Great Britain borrowed from the United States more than $4,000,000,000. Has Great Britain paid that debt? No.

France borrowed $3,404,818,945; Italy borrowed $1,648,034,050. Have they paid? No.

And 17 other countries received similar loans.

AMERICANS PAYING WAR-DEBT INTEREST

The interest the United States Government has asked on these loans is of great importance to the American people. In direct violation of an act of Congress, which provided that these loans to foreign countries were to be funded at 4⅛ percent interest, our "world savers" asked interest rates ranging from 3⅓ percent to one-half of 1 percent. From Great Britain, on whose Empire the sun never sets, an Empire which controls 57 percent of the gold production of the world, these statesmen asked 3³⁄₁₀ percent interest over a period of 62 years, while Americans still pay 4⅛ percent interest on these British war bonds.

From France they asked an average of 1⁶⁄₁₀ percent interest over 62 years. Poor France. The French Empire, strange to say, has 1,091,749 square miles more territory than the United States.

From Italy—whose country at this time knows no unemployment, and whose people enjoy an increasing standard of living—from that country the United States asks an average interest rate of less than one-eighth of 1 percent for the first 10 years and an average of four-tenths percent over 62 years, while the overburdened American taxpayer struggles to pay 4⅛ percent on these very bonds.

The American people have financed these empires. We have built them up with our own money: Mussolini's Italy, Chamberlain's England, and the French Empire.

HOW LONG SHALL EUROPE BE PREFERRED?

No American can borrow money from any bank or Government agency at one-eighth of 1 percent interest. The problem of home building at one-eighth of 1 percent would swell the chorus of the hammer and saw all over this great land. It would solve our housing problem overnight. But we don't lend to Americans at that rate of interest. Americans are out of luck. British and French are preferred; Americans come last.

How long, Uncle Sam, how long?

For 22 years these foreign countries, owing us billions of dollars, have branded Uncle Sam a Shylock. They have propagandized our people until some so-called Americans have become more pro-French, more pro-British, more pro-Italian than the British, French, and Italians themselves. Our people are blind to this daylight robbery by foreign countries at the expense of Americans.

There are some at present crusading for Europe when they should be trying to clothe our own destitute, cold, and hungry.

We have 8,000,000 sharecroppers in the South trying to wrest a bare living out of the soil. They live in absolute poverty. Of them Secretary Wallace once said: "I have never seen among the peasantry of Europe so abject as they which exist in the great cotton States." That is in America.

There is no evasion or cancelation for them. These families of the South are bodily removed from their dilapidated shelters in midwinter and turned out on the highways to find what they may in the bitter cold. They can't pay their debts. Groups now begging for funds for European empires never pass the hat nor donate a dollar to the peons and peasants and economic slaves in the United States of America.

This perverted sense of sympathy which places foreigners before Americans is ruining our country.

For Europe the cry is cancelation. The average American does not know that the United States has already canceled 20 percent of

the British debt, 50 percent of the French debt, and 75 percent of the Italian debt. Our poor tenant farmers and sharecroppers, our unemployed, need the immediate attention of Uncle Sam right here in the United States.

WAR-DEBT ISSUE DELIBERATELY CONFUSED

The issue of foreign war debts has been deliberately confused to befog the minds of the American people. If the farmer, the laborer, or millions of unemployed knew that they were to this day paying 4½-percent interest on old European war bonds they would rise and demand that this Government account for 22 years of un-American activity. They would tear this sham of cancelation propaganda from the eyes of the American public and demand payment from these foreign countries who have evaded their debts to the United States.

These were not only banker's loans, as I have heard collegiate debaters contend. Every American contributed to these loans through the Liberty bond issues. After the war these bonds were purchased from us, and if our Government is not repaid by these foreign countries, you and I will have to pay the war debts in taxes, and we are paying them, and we are paying them now.

If the average American knew that the United States would be out billions of dollars and more, even if these foreign countries paid every cent as required under the funding agreements, perhaps we would have enough Americanism left in us to demand to know why our Government funded and financed Europe.

IF WE CANCEL, WE PAY EUROPE'S BILL

Another evasion-of-debts propaganda is that we should "wipe the slate clean" and call our loans to these European empires our contribution to the last war. We sent our boys to die for them. We paid England and France for transporting our troops, and we paid for all supplies furnished our troops in France. In wiping out the debt, we would not only be paying our part of the World War but we would also be paying that of England, France, Italy, and 17 other foreign countries.

Our greatest debtors have made no attempt to pay. England was able to give Turkey an outright gift of $240,000,000 in October 1939. Since that time England and France made another $340,000,000 loan to bolster Turkish defense.

I do not question their political right to do that. I question their constant excuses of not being able to pay us.

CARIBBEAN ISLANDS FOR PART PAYMENT

Billions are being spent for United States defense. Military authorities readily agree that the Caribbean Islands would form our Maginot line, making the Canal Zone invulnerable and adding absolute protection to our entire coast line, east and west. In addition to increased appropriations for more locks at Panama, our Government should negotiate for the acquisition of the Caribbean Islands, which the British and French now hold. Let these islands be a part payment of their "dead-beat debts." Andrew Jackson, the great Democrat revered in history, advocated that policy when he said:

"It is a well-settled principle of the international code, that where one nation owes another a liquidated debt which it refuses to pay, the aggrieved party may seize the property belonging to the other, its citizens, or subjects, sufficient to pay the debt, without giving just cause for war."

America has carried Europe on its back these 22 years. The unemployed ask:

"How long, Uncle Sam, how long?"

Subversive Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, when the Senate votes on the joint resolution to deport Harry Bridges it will be making a decision, the effects of which will be felt for generations to come. In this proposal there is involved a principle of supreme importance. The matter is ably discussed in an editorial appearing in the Washington Post today. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTION

By a vote of 330 to 42, the House has approved a bill ordering the Attorney General to deport Harry R. Bridges, west coast labor leader. No charges were brought against Mr. Bridges other than general accusations that he is a "troublemaker" and an "undesirable" alien with communistic leanings.

Mr. Bridges has already been absolved of charges that he has been agitating for the overthrow of our form of government. After long and exhaustive open hearings, James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, concluded that Mr. Bridges was neither a member of nor affiliated with the Communist Party and that his activities as a labor leader were in accord with democratic principles.

Not only did the House ignore these official findings but the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization did not even accord the accused man a hearing before reporting favorably upon the bill for his deportation. In the course of the debate it was said that this is the first time a bill aimed exclusively at the punishment of one man has come before Congress. That is not surprising, since our Government is supposed to be one of laws.

What is almost past belief, however, is that a legislative body sworn to uphold democratic principles should be so misguided as to approve a measure subversive of the fundamental principles upon which our constitutional form of government rests.

There was difference of opinion among Members of the House as to whether the deportation bill could be regarded as a bill of attainder, banned under the Constitution of the United States. Legal hairsplitting on this issue can be left to the lawyers. But patriotic citizens will hope that if this bill is enacted the Supreme Court will quickly sweep aside the legal casuistry by which its supporters seek to deny law-abiding aliens rights guaranteed to them as persons under the Constitution.

The bill to deport Mr. Bridges is, in any case, an example of the kind of legislation the founding fathers sought to prohibit in banning bills of attainder. What Justice Story has to say on the subject is enlightening. Bills of attainder—that is, legislative acts which inflict punishment without judicial trial—"have been most usually passed," he says, "in times of rebellion or of gross subservience to the crown or of violent political excitements—periods in which all nations are most liable * * * to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others."

Those words have a prophetic ring, for the House, in its zeal to safeguard cherished institutions, has voted to trample upon individual rights and liberties. The fact that the prospective victim is an alien is no excuse for such conduct.

If emulation is the sincerest form of flattery, then Hitler and Mussolini should extract great satisfaction from the unprecedented action of the House, for the Congressmen who voted to deport Mr. Bridges, after he had been cleared of charges of being illegally in this country, are certainly following totalitarian methods of ridding the state of "undesirables."

A number of Congressmen maintained that they might deport an alien simply because they did not like the color of his eyes or his hair. If that view is accepted, how long will it be before Congress extends its purge to eliminate citizens who, for any reason, or for no reason, have become objectionable?

Much more than the wholly unimportant future of Harry Bridges is at stake in the present instance. His foes, as well as friends, can meet on common ground to oppose an action which is utterly repugnant to everything for which America is supposed to stand.

America and the World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

TWO EDITORIALS FROM LABOR, NATIONAL ORGAN OF THE RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS OF AMERICA

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials published in Labor, the national organ of the Railway Brotherhoods of America, in the issue of June 11, 1940. One is headed "Let's put an end to this hysteria," and the other is headed "God is not responsible."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor of June 11, 1940]

LET'S PUT AN END TO THIS HYSTERIA—AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST NOT BE STAMPEDED INTO MAKING DECISIONS WHICH VITALLY AFFECT THE REPUBLIC

In recent weeks someone has said: "Hysteria does not become a great people." Most of us will agree that Americans are a great people. Therefore, hysteria does not become us.

A considerable section of our population became hysterical after we entered the World War in 1917. Hundreds of innocent men and women were cruelly persecuted, while most of those who were

genuinely disloyal—of example, those who looted the Public Treasury or ballooned the cost of the necessaries of life to the point where ordinary citizens suffered grievously—went unwhipped of justice.

Another wave of hysteria is sweeping the country now. Some of those responsible for it wish to involve us in the European war; others hope to strip labor of its hard-won rights; many have lost their mental balance and are unable to face the barrage of truths and half truths to which they are subjected by press and radio.

In such an abnormal atmosphere there is danger that the American people may be stampeded into decisions which will cost them dearly. When the storm has passed, they may find that the democratic institutions they cherish have been seriously impaired. The workers will be among the chief victims of such a catastrophe.

It behooves us to display calm judgment and a capacity for vigorous and constructive action.

Above all, it is a time to think of America first. We must strengthen our defenses; we must punish disloyalty wherever it is found; and at the same time we must demonstrate our capacity to resist propaganda of every kind.

This isn't the first time America has faced a grave situation, and there is no reason to believe it will be the last. Anyone who suggests that America would be "easy pickings" for Hitler, or any other foe of democracy, simply doesn't know what he's talking about.

We have repeatedly demonstrated that we know how to fight. Our American youngsters have the same courage, intelligence, and love of country that animated their fathers when they crossed the ocean to save the day on the fields of Flanders. When the call comes those youngsters will give a good account of themselves.

But before we summon them to arms we should count the cost. If we enter the European war, we must go all the way. Those who say it will be sufficient to give money and supplies are either poorly advised or are seeking to deceive.

Our boys will follow our money and our supplies. Before the contest is ended, probably a quarter of a million of them will be dead and another half million physically and mentally shattered.

Are we prepared to make that sacrifice? We must have calm nerves and clear heads when we frame the answer to that momentous question. Therefore let's have an end to this hysteria and conduct ourselves in a manner "becoming a great people."

GOD IS NOT RESPONSIBLE

Lord Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States, suggests to a New York audience that Hitler's success may be "the scourge of God" to punish the democracies for their shortcomings. Why try to shift the responsibility to God?

All the evidence indicates that the financiers, the politicians, and the militarists of the democratic nations are responsible for the catastrophe. British and American bankers supplied Hitler with hundreds of millions of dollars, and were equally generous with Mussolini. The militarists permitted the dictator to build up a gigantic war machine right under their noses, and the politicians looked on complacently, many of them believing Hitler would turn his weapons against Russia.

While all this was going on, the representatives of capitalism in all the democracies were refusing to take effective steps to end unemployment and thus restore the physical strength and the morale of the men they now expect to do the fighting.

It's difficult to find the hand of God in any of this, but it's easy to detect the stupidity and greed of human beings who occupied positions of power.

Man and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered yesterday in Milwaukee, Wis., before the State Association of Life Underwriters, the subject of my talk being Man and Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are historic days. World history is being written daily. Out of the world's conflict there may emerge new concepts of man and government. It is well for us today to analyze this subject dispassionately—free from the emotions which may some day distort our judgment.

In discussing this subject, Man and Government—you will notice that I have put man ahead of government—I am reminded of the statement of our great American philosopher, Emerson. He said:

"The less government we have the better—the fewer laws and the less confided power. The antidote to this abuse of formal government is the influence of private character, the growth of the individual."

In these days of grave international crisis it is interesting to recall that the great German thinker, Goethe, said: "The best of all governments is that which teaches us to govern ourselves."

Burke, the great English statesman, said: "No government ought to exist for the purpose of checking the prosperity of its people or to allow such a principle in its policy."

Grover Cleveland said: "Though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people."

In these days when our republican form of government—a republic, not a democracy—is being tested in the crucible of history, in these days when other peoples who had forms of government which simulated our own have cast these forms into the discard and returned to a form of absolute monarchy, which we call dictatorship or the totalitarian state—in these days we who value our liberties, our privileges, and our great American values, we believe in building up the man, the individual, to become responsible, courageous, and duly and truly qualified with wisdom, Christlike faith, and charity.

Fronting the battle land of the future, we are asking ourselves, How can American citizenship thus equip itself?

May I be privileged to relate a personal incident that may bring a little light on this subject—this matter of each man putting on armor for the glorious struggle that is up ahead?

(The story before the Press Club—develop a sense of humor, not taking one's self too seriously, and getting perspective.)

Daniel Webster on one occasion said: "Nothing will ruin the country if the people themselves will undertake its safety, and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own." This statement of Webster's has special application to the present. In other lands the people have delegated away or permitted their rights to be taken away by other hands. It is well in America to see that we do not follow the same course.

It is particularly important in these trying times to see that war scares are not used as a pretext for unwarranted regimentation. We have permitted the fungus growth of bureaucracy—a growth which is un-American in its inception and in its operation. In the last years we have heard so much of inequality between folks, condemnation of those who know how to succeed, build, etc., with the result that initiative, invention, and confidence have gone out the window. On the other hand, we have reduced a large percentage of the middle class of this country to a mere subsistence level (take 70 percent of the farmers in the State of Wisconsin) and we have builded up a bureaucracy of a million men—creating a special class, if you please, and paying unto them large salaries that are paid for by the taxpayers of this country. Let me give you some figures and some information.

Summary of Federal employment and pay rolls, January 1940

Class	Employment, January 1940	Pay rolls, January 1940
Federal services:		
Executive	936,689	$143,963,368
Judicial	2,360	598,399
Legislative	5,889	1,297,362
Military	434,061	28,842,203
Construction projects:		
Financed by P. W. A	132,538	12,327,754
U. S. H. A. low-rent housing	32,313	2,987,099
Financed by R. F. C	2,260	227,685
Financed by regular Federal appropriations	238,921	26,116,976
Federal agency projects financed by Work Projects Administration	96,663	4,411,390
Projects operated by W. P. A	2,191,741	106,141,564
National Youth Administration:		
Out-of-school work program	322,367	5,815,229
Student work program	437,457	2,858,839
Civilian Conservation Corps	336,725	14,666,446

Whenever we have created a Government department, or a commission, or a bureau, like a fungus it starts to multiply itself to find new fields of activities, new necessities for an increased personnel and increased appropriations. Senator CLARK, speaking on the subject, said: "Few jobs once created are ever abolished, even when their activities are over; and when they are abolished, two or three new jobs are created in their places. Worse than this, these administrative agencies, each for itself, constantly reach out for new fields of authority over the lives and well-being of the ordinary citizen, each constantly strives for further delegation of legislative power and from every grant of regulatory, inquisitorial, or administrative authority to one of these agencies, there immediately ensues an appropriation for a force of administrators, collectors, experts, recorders, secretaries, and these in turn immediately begin to agitate for further extensions of activity and authority and appropriations."

President Coolidge said on one occasion: "Of all forms of government, those administered by bureaus, are about the least satisfactory. Unless bureaucracy is constantly resisted, it breaks down representative government and overwhelms democracy."

Take for instance the Department of Agriculture. It is a good example. In 1839 it began with a modest appropriation of $1,000 to collect agricultural statistics. Now the ordinary appropriation for its ordinary activities, exclusive of the A. A. A. or other emergency activities, runs close to $500,000,000 a year, comprising hundreds of divisions and bureaus within itself, including a huge staff of press

agents. In 1911 the total appropriation for agriculture amounted to only $19,916,000, but in 1931 it had grown to $296,865,000, and today as I said it is reaching close to a half billion dollars. The total number of employees in this Department was 77,111 on January 31 of this year.

The point I am making is that bureaucracy and the expenditures for Government have exceeded many times the growth of the Nation. In the first year of our Government we spent $4,269,000; in 1811 we spent $9,000,000; while a few years ago the travel expense alone of one bureau, the Resettlement Administration, amounted to five and one-half million dollars, and the bill of this same Bureau for telegraph and telephone tolls alone amounted to two and one-half million dollars.

All of you know that by reason of the depression, or recession, or panic, whatever you want to call it, a great horde of Government offices have been created on the theory that they were justified as emergency activity. Is there any talk, now that the claim is that the emergency is passing, that such offices shall be abolished? Not at all. Everywhere among the bureaucrats and those who want the votes of the bureaucrats the idea is to make these emergency bureaucrats into permanent bureaucrats. There is a lesson here. It is the lesson that we must not create war-scare emergency jobs in such a manner that they shackle us permanently.

Of course, there is no consideration to be given to the people's Treasury. Yes; these bureaus and departments are very jealous now of their field of activity. No one thinks of trying to reduce the cost. In fact, they want to retain all their functions and increase their power and personnel. You know that government now engages in hundreds of functions of business in competition with private enterprises in the field of manufacturing, merchandising, transportation, and agriculture. Of course, it is well that the Government constructs some of its own naval craft and has arsenals for the manufacture of munitions and arms. We can justify some of that, but in these other enterprises which compete with the taxpayer we find many, many examples of inexcusable waste of the taxpayers' money which cannot be justified on any ground.

Senator CLARK, speaking recently, said it was difficult to determine whether government was operating these enterprises at a profit or loss because of the lack of any uniform system of accounting and because in many instances they failed to take into account such items as insurance, depreciation, return on capital invested, etc. He said that each bureau uses whatever system of accounting it pleases and considers what elements of accounting it may desire to employ. He said that in the War Department alone there were at least a dozen different systems of accounting. Senator CLARK has been pressing for the consideration of a bill which requires uniform accounting, but he stated whenever he tried to get consideration of the bill the bureaucrats blocked it. In other words, your servants and mine, whom we pay, could bring sufficient pressure to block an efficient system of accounting to be put into effect in our business—the business of government. This bureaucracy, CLARK said, employs a powerful and active lobby supported by taxpayers' money.

Now, I have gone into this discussion with you people because you are interested as citizens of the greatest Nation on earth (which I am sure you desire to keep great not only for yourselves but for your children) and because you have seen some of the working of government.

You have seen in your insurance field how government can do that which will benefit or do that which can injure the great business of insurance. You have seen how in the last years, because government has failed to coordinate capital, labor, and the man of genius in a great enterprise, capital has gone lagging. There is no place to put it except in the deficit rathole built by Government. With what result? That the new birth of enterprise, the new birth of creative America has not come into being. There is no reason why with our great resources and manpower and capital, with our great consumer demand, that this country should not go places except for the lack in leadership and fear inspired by that lack of leadership. Furthermore, as I stated before, an inability in our leadership to harness labor and capital together, and an inability in leadership to foster invention, venture, and faith in our citizenship. Yes; even in our defense, we couldn't rely on Government to do the job. We had to call on private industry.

With reference to industry and defense, I personally am in favor of having the industrial mobilization plan centered in temporary emergency agencies. Such agencies would have the benefit of the business mind—the executive mind, recruited from successful private enterprise. Furthermore, after the emergency is over, if the powers were in a temporary agency, it would be far easier to demobilize. If the matter were left in the hands of existing bureaus or departments of the Government, demobilization would be impossible. We would have just another bureaucratic crowd who would want to stay on. It would mean an additional horde of swivel-chair job holders who would want to perpetuate both their jobs and the emergency. And there would be just another "pressure" group that Congress would be "pressured" with.

As everyone knows, this administration likes to see Government powers extended and overextended, not only temporarily but permanently. I feel that to place the industrial mobilization plan in the hands of existing departments might be dangerous and might bring us into the identical governmental rut that Europe has experienced. War scares must be met realistically. They must not be used as a pretext to make an unwarranted extension of bureaucracy or executive power.

Under no consideration should the Food Administration, if we have one, be placed in the Department of Agriculture. That Department is already overgrown and overinflated. It is unwieldy and top-heavy. In fact, that is one of the reasons why the President's reorganization plan recommended transfer of some of its agencies to other departments. Food administration must be placed in the hands of an independent organization—nonpolitical.

If there is ever a War Labor Administration, it should not be placed in the Department of Labor. Neither should the war trade-control rights be placed in the Department of State or in the Tariff Commission, except so far as diplomatic relations during war are involved. If we have to go into a great preparedness financing plan, this should not be placed in the R. F. C. It should be placed in the hands of a temporary agency free from political control and political red tape.

In times like this, when we must preserve our economic institutions in order to finance tremendous defense measures, it is particularly important that we do not attack any segment of our national economy. I mention this because the insurance companies of this Nation were subjected to a scathing, searching scrutiny only a few months ago.

It was with great relief on February 22 of this year that I heard the statement of the chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee with reference to the committee study of life insurance. At that time the committee chairman stated that nothing in the hearing and nothing in the testimony which had been developed was to be considered as a basis for the fears which have been disseminated that it is the purpose of the committee to nationalize or take over the insurance business. No constructive purpose could possibly be served by such a "blitzkrieg" against legitimate business.

I know that officials of your great business were not opposed to an investigation. I know, however, that you thought, as do most people, that such an investigation should not be a public trial or prosecution of the business. Such an investigation, in order to be effective, must have as its purpose a coordination of government with business, to the end that the practices of the companies and the laws of the States would be coordinated.

In Washington while that investigation was being conducted we heard a great deal about the powerful lobby which insurance companies were supposed to maintain. To my knowledge, no such powerful group existed. Similarly, I could not believe comments to the effect that insurance companies were opposed to the investigations because they did not want the details of their business made public. As far as I know, insurance companies have always spent substantial sums to inform their policyholders and the general public of the details of their business.

Furthermore, as far as I know, no insurance company of any consequence has been uncooperative with the S. E. C. to such an extent that it withheld necessary vital information.

When I read the report of the T. N. E. C. insurance investigations I was concerned with one major issue. I believe that issue serves a constructive purpose. I wanted to see that a clear, factual picture was obtained from the investigation. I believe that this picture should indicate the bearing of life insurance on the American system of economy. That, incidentally, was the objective originally stated by the chairman of the committee.

I know that every insurance company gave that objective its endorsement. It is more than unfortunate that such constructive purposes should have been lost in the shuffle of the investigation in a way which was extremely disturbing both to the policyholders and to some Members of Congress. I, for one, am not ready to accept the assumption that because a business is large it must necessarily have a rigorous control by the Federal Government. Nor do I believe that because a business is large its management must be investigated solely with a view to determining its shortcomings. In fact, the very sizable growth of any company evidences, to some degree, at least, public confidence in its integrity and its soundness.

We know that insurance companies grew in depressions when other forms of saving enterprises were curtailed. That must mean that the general public accepted the insurance company as a safe haven for money during the days of economic uncertainty.

My friends, like most of you, I am opposed to a concentration of economic power. I am opposed to a very limited control of assets. I am not convinced, however, that the insurance businesses of this Nation are guilty of such an undue concentration of economic power. As a matter of fact, there is considerable evidence to the effect that the increasing competition in the insurance business has resulted in a steady decentralization over the past few decades.

No, my friends, I cannot conclude that bigness necessarily means badness. I cannot conclude, without further evidence, that insurance companies have grown large by the use of monopolistic devices. Certainly I cannot conclude that they have grown large by throttling fair competition. There is much more evidence to indicate that they have grown large by doing a good job for the general public. The very fact that there is so much competition in the insurance business has served to prevent an undue centralization of assets. After all, we know that insurance holds the bulk of its reserves for the benefits of its policyholders, rather than for benefit of the manager.

We know that insurance does not seek economic power or control the ownership of American business. In fact, the objective is to make credit available to American business, or to the Government itself. In general, it appears as though insurance has prospered under State supervision. For the most part, I believe that such

State supervision is desirable. As far as I know, State supervision has not been arbitrary or dictatorial in its action.

They have no forced, untried, and untested reforms on legitimate business. Federal Government sometimes has. Of course, under State control it is possible for companies to experiment in a manner which would be impossible under a rigid, inflexible Federal regulation.

There is another reason for State rather than Federal control of insurance companies at this time. That reason is found in the fact that insurance companies which are regulated by the State are less susceptible to control or influence by subversive groups than they would be if they were strongly centralized. By this I do not mean, incidentally, that I favor State trade barriers, nor do I mean that insurance must be controlled by classes or factional groups. I merely question the desirability of strong Federal control at this time, particularly in view of the fact that State control has thus far apparently been satisfactory to the policyholders and to the management. There may be some value to a program of Federal control, but I believe that it should not be considered casually. Such a program might conceivably involve the savings of millions of policyholders and the protections of the life estates of millions of human lives, and virtually billions of dollars of property.

I do not believe that the insurance companies of the Nation need become unduly alarmed about the report of the Temporary Economic Committee. This committee has, after all, a very limited function. It is not a legislative committee. It could not under any circumstances present to the Senate a report for legislation to go upon the Senate Calendar for action. The committee has no jurisdiction whatever to report legislation. Whatever recommendations it makes must of necessity be referred to the standing committees of the Senate and House for their consideration.

Nor do I believe that insurance companies need become unduly alarmed about any intelligent defense financing. I do believe that they should rightly fear war-finance proposals, such as the Lee bill. This bill would require registration of every citizen's gross wealth and financial obligations, including life-insurance policies.

The life-insurance companies of the Nation may well be a financial life line in these chaotic days. Your industry has a tremendous stake in America's economic future. You have a right to demand sane, long-range economic planning from your legislators, common sense and honesty.

America faces a mobilization—a mobilization of what? First, her manpower, and at best it means creating in this country such a mechanized industrial unit for production that all the world would fear to tackle us. Today—but I hope not tomorrow—force, brute force, is the only language that is understood. Therefore, we have to follow the slogan of Teddy Roosevelt; we must now speak softly but carry a big stick, a stick that would be the wonder and the awe of the world.

And looming large in the picture of mobilization is the wealth of all of us centralized in our insurance companies, and this wealth now will be used to create this mechanized American unit. All America has to be synchronized in a production that will speak loudly to the rest of the world these words—hands off of the Western Hemisphere.

We in America did not want to go into this tremendous defense race, but Hitler's invasion of all the countries in Europe has made it imperative that we do so. And isn't it fortunate that at least 64,000,000 American citizens have placed their money in these big institutions that they own, so that this money can be made indirectly available for self-defense? This must not mean conscription of wealth. This means investing the money and the wealth that has been saved through these great agencies, in a great "production plant." The money will join with the great heart and soul of America in this enterprise. Men will forget their petty differences. Labor unions will temporarily forget their legal rights to limited hours. Young men will train to become the most proficient soldiers, sailors, and sky pilots in the world so that America can defend herself in any emergency. The farmers will produce more than ever so we will not only feed our own but feed the millions whom war has raped and scourged.

Yes, we have to grow "so big" that the world will not want to tackle us. Yes, we want to grow "so big" in heart that when we get through doing for undernourished, stricken humanity, the world will love us and be willing to give heed to our counsel.

This is going to cost us something, but if we are clean in our endeavors there will be compensations. In undertaking this great venture in preparedness, we are doing it not with the idea of chastising the world or telling the other nations what they shall think, and how they shall live and what they shall do, but with one great objective in mind, and that is to build ourselves so that we will be immune from attack, and so that a devastated world can look to us for succor.

Yes, my friends, man in this period must know his government, must have a part in his government, and must appreciate his government. But more than all else, man must dedicate himself—you and I—to preserve this Government. There was a time when our schools taught the youth of the land what a great place America was. I pray God they will again—for America is a great place.

I am speaking to leaders—men whose thoughts and actions determine the course of other men and women. In our lodges, in our churches, in our business life, we help shape the lives of others, and in so doing we help shape the destiny of America.

What way will America go tomorrow? What kind of government will we have in this land tomorrow? That depends upon all of us. We have to get rid of our smugness, our complacencies. We have to see this as a great adventurous age, and by that I do not mean military adventure—I mean an age to adventure in science and in learning, to live greatly in, to explore in scientific and industrial fields, and in the realm of the spirit. If we do that, we will light a flame within ourselves and within those we contact that will never go out, and America will be a better place to live in, because, we lived, in this day and generation.

Appraising America's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, under the title, "Appraising America's Strength."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is no need to remind you that we are today confronted with a grave menace to the free and peaceful mode of life which we have made for ourselves on this continent.

A century and a half ago our forefathers began here a brave experiment in liberty. Throughout the years that experiment has been validated over and over again. Democracy and freedom have, in this country, been repeatedly vindicated. In many tongues throughout many lands have reechoed the heroic achievements of men with the song of liberty on their lips and the fire of freedom in their hearts. The extraordinary achievements of ordinary men, driven by a lofty vision of their destiny, have inspired the lowly and the great wherever men have sought to liberate their spirits from the bondage of fear and oppression.

We now stand horrified at the immediate threat to the liberties of nations which, with us, have sought to establish the dignity and worth of the common man. We are consumed with apprehension lest we be the only democracy remaining to complete the death struggle with aggressors and despots. Lest we find ourselves standing at last alone in an ugly world.

But while we need a clear understanding of the gravity of our position in this harsh world we also need cool and balanced appraisal of the events which are transpiring and the task which we must perform to assure our own safety. We must not underestimate the strength of the forces of evil and destruction which have been let loose in the world or the action on our part necessary to meet them. And above all, we cannot afford to succumb to fear or risk the loss of effectiveness which comes from panic.

There is need for reassurance.

Recognizing that we, with all free men throughout the world, stand in peril of losing our liberties, we can now do with some ordinary, American self-confidence. America has been in danger before. There have been times when our very existence as a nation hung in the balance. It may be that we ought to have some good, old-fashioned Fourth of July speeches. We need to recall a little history and to remember the heroic deeds of our ancestors. The achievements of Washington and Jefferson, Lawrence and Perry, of Stonewall Jackson and Lee, and Lincoln and Grant. And the millions of common Americans, whose indomitable courage and love of liberty have carried America through every danger of the past and have met every challenge to the ideals of a free people.

Americans are not soft, and our country has not grown old and tired. The heirs and descendants of the pioneers are made of the same stuff, and can face dangers as great as those over which our forefathers so valiantly triumphed.

It is true that a mechanized army and a sky full of Stuka diving bombers cannot be stopped by an indomitable spirit alone. But we Americans have a vast reservoir of power to build ships and tanks and planes. And we are building them now. We gain confidence as we see how quickly our united effort to build up our military defenses is taking form, and how smoothly and efficiently the machinery of government and industry is already working to produce the materials necessary to our safety.

It will not take long. The magnificent and immediate response to the President's call for preparedness is the tangible and convincing answer to the dictator's taunt that democracy is a decadent form of government and an obsolescent political institution.

The heart of our defense program, let us constantly remember, is first and last a matter of working together, of standing together, and of sacrificing our own personal interests to promote the effective use of all our national powers. We are a great Nation and a rich Nation, with vast resources of material, of manpower, of machinery, and of organizing skill. Better than any nation on earth, we can afford the effort and the cost of every necessary action to defend ourselves both outside and inside our boundaries. We need only the will and the spirit of common sacrifice to bring our tremendous power into action.

America has that, too.

The country at this moment is geared high and driving hard as only a free and loyal people can drive when they sense danger to the foundations of their freedom.

Labor will do its part. Labor always does.

Labor believes in democracy, and it has never failed to exert itself completely to defend democracy. Twenty-three years ago this Nation was plunged into a titanic struggle to stem the tide of aggression then sweeping over Europe and threatening the foundations of liberal government everywhere.

That war was democracy's war and it was labor's war. The unselfish cooperation and loyalty of the Nation's workers was as important and as vital to the successful outcome of that war as the gallant heroism of the men who went over the top on the western front and met the enemy in the treacherous wilds of the Argonne.

The emergency which today confronts us finds labor again ready and willing to furnish the necessary manpower to build up and maintain our defenses. America knows it can count on labor—on the individual worker, doing his essential and vital bit to make the machines and supplies for the armed forces, and on the organizations of labor, steeped in the fundamental doctrines of the political philosophy of the American people.

And the country can count on American business. The great industrial plants of the Nation have been placed at the call of the Government. The great leaders of industry are at the people's service. The best organizing skill and the finest production management are being used to plan and promote the program which will make America the best armed and best equipped nation in this confused and disordered world. There is here the same splendid loyalty and patriotism that is found in the ranks of labor.

Neither labor nor business is trying to take advantage of the national emergency. There is no selfish attempt, on the one hand, to hold up the agencies of production by unreasonable wage demands nor, on the other hand, to reduce wages or introduce the stretch-out. Reason and patriotism brings a black-out of the bitterness of industrial strife when the national security is in peril.

The first elements of strength, therefore, the loyal and intelligent patriotism of labor and business, have already been shown to be intact. Now we must look beyond the immediate needs of the Army and Navy and begin to check up every aspect of American strength or weakness. Let us remember that the danger which thunders along the horizon of the world is the danger of total war, and to meet that danger we shall have to establish and maintain total preparedness.

To meet the challenge of dictatorships, America will need to understand their power. Especially do we need to understand Nazi power and Nazi resources. Unless we can match our own strength against the strength of the dictators at every point, we may find our defenses outflanked at some point of fatal weakness.

The strength of Germany is not only in the army and the air force. It is also on the home fronts. As nearly as we know, the German Government has not spent more than 20 percent of the whole productive capacity of the nation for military armament. The rest of the nation's economic power is used for building up the internal resources of Germany for fighting disease, for feeding the children, for clearing the slums, for putting German agriculture on a sound basis, for every kind of internal strength and economic power. If Germany fails to conquer the world, it will not be for lack of efficient and thrifty use of all her resources at points where they do her the most good.

We shall be deceived if we think Germany's financial position is weak—that it is liable to collapse. Germany has no financial position in a time like this. Having no financial position at all, the nation has none to maintain. In the Nazi economy only real things count. Nazi leaders realize that when it comes to the final test, nothing counts except material and human strength. Tanks and airplanes are only the cutting edge. Back of them are factories and farms, and back of everything are the people. How much skill, how much physical endurance, how much courage have the people on both sides of the great battle line in France, where the next thousand years of history may be decided this month?

As we turn now to the building of airplanes and guns, we must suffer no weak points behind the lines of our own military defenses. It is time to reinforce every fiber of our country and every sinew of our national strength.

The United States is not going to spend for military preparedness anything like 20 percent of the national income. We are probably not able to spend 10 percent the first year of our effort. We are so much richer than Germany that we do not need so large a proportion of our income for arms alone.

It is true that we have fallen behind in building battleships and airplanes, for the excellent reason that the American people had no reason to believe in advance of recent events that ships and planes in great numbers would ever be needed. But we have not neglected the more fundamental problems of our physical and human resources, on which all military strength, in the long run, must be founded. Here is the real foundation of national power. And for the work of upbuilding during these past years we can now be profoundly grateful.

We do not regret that during the past 7 years we have had 2,400,000 boys in our C. C. C. camps. These boys have sweated in the hot sun to plant nearly 2,000,000,000 trees, and in the searing breath of forest conflagrations to protect the wealth of our country. They have learned to drive trucks and to handle machinery. They have learned to live and work together and to respond to the discipline of camp life. They have a stake in the country because they have helped to protect and build it. In time of need some of them will fight; others will man the factories, where strong, keen men are needed. We do not regret that we have given these boys their chance to grow into strong, disciplined men with a devotion to their country which comes only from having had a part in building and preserving it.

Our only regret now is that we did not have twice as many C. C. C. camps.

Nor do we regret the N. Y. A. or the money invested in youth training. It is reassuring to think of the two and one-half million boys and girls who have obtained the education that they could not have had without the N. Y. A. Hundreds of thousands of young people would have sat at home in idleness and despair if the N. Y. A. had not given them a chance to stay in school. Other hundreds of thousands would still be without skills to work if the N. Y. A. had not given them a job where they could obtain training as mechanics, welders, machine tenders, photographers, and other skills which may now be used in the cause of freedom.

These great programs for building the strength of our Nation were not begun as military preparedness. They were as valuable in peace as they will be if we are engulfed in the madness of war. But the threat of war puts every part of the Nation to the test, whether it is an element of soundness or an element of weakness. Insofar as we have been able to build up our resources and our people in these past years, we have built strength into the body and bones of America; insofar as we have only partially done that work, we have failed to realize our full powers.

Today, in the pressure of world crisis, with the flames of war in the east and in the west, we must not hesitate or slip back. On the contrary, in these days, we must use every ounce of our strength. We cannot let any worker remain idle now. No young person can be told today that he is not needed. America needs all its people and all their labor and all their loyalty.

We have no regrets now because our Government has begun the work of curing the ills of American agriculture; no regrets because, after the great dust storms, the Government men moved in and began to save the land threatened by the marching desert; nor because the Soil Conservation Service has established full protection on more than 50,000,000 acres of land, so that neither wind nor water can carry it away. We do not regret that thousands of sharecroppers and tenant farmers have already been put on their feet and have started to build up their own stake in the country and to realize the personal privileges of living under democracy.

We have done much to build a sound foundation for American farming. We wish we could have invested more money and could have made faster progress. Certainly today we must not fall behind. On the contrary, we must speed our work of salvage and rebuilding.

We are not sorry that our Government has broken the log jam of high costs that kept American farmers from having electricity. We rejoice that today electric lines reach 1 farmhouse in 4, whereas only 1 farmer in 10 had electric power in 1934. It is comforting to know that the T. V. A. has worked out the manufacturing processes that will bring cheap phosphate fertilizer to every farm in America, and that hundreds of thousands of farmers are working with Government electricity and Government fertilizer to save their farms and their soil and to build a sound agriculture in America. We shall need a sound agriculture in the new world that may lie ahead of us.

It is also good to remember how the Government took action to save the farmers from losing their farms during the emergency of the depression. We all regret that the fundamental soundness of agriculture was so long neglected; that so many evils were allowed to develop; that American farmers by the millions were caught by soil erosion, by duststorms, by falling world markets, by technology. But who is there now who regrets the mighty efforts of the past years to eradicate these evils and to mitigate their effects?

With all the confusion and distress of the great depression, with all the casualties that were suffered and that still are to be seen along the roads where the migrants wander, still we know that our Government has made a heroic effort to restore the balance in agriculture, and we know that we cannot afford to slacken that effort at a time when agriculture becomes vital to the national security.

This is not the time to desert any individual or any county or any State that is in trouble. We look with mingled horror and pity at the long lines of homeless refugees lining the roads of Europe. We cannot afford to have refugees crowding our own roads, despairing of hope in democracy. We have no regrets for what we have already done to help the farmers of America. We regret only that we were unable to do more.

And who is there now who will regret the public works of the past 7 years? The T. V. A., which has built up the power resources

of a great inland valley, far from our coast lines, where we need to have a great nucleus of strength in case of emergency? Who regrets the money that we spent on flood-control works on the Ohio, on the Tennessee, on the Mississippi, on the Colorado, now when this country cannot risk the tragedy of further flood disasters and losses? And the great power dams on the Columbia? And the inland waterway of the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, which today carries twice the tonnage that it carried before our railroad systems were built? And who is not grateful for the water-supply systems and the sewer systems that we have built during these depression years to protect the people against typhoid fever and other diseases?

All these resources are now available for America's protection. We regret only that we do not have more. Now we must hasten these and all other lines of defense to make up as well as we can for lost time.

It is also good to remember how the Government took action to save the farmers from losing their farms during the emergency of the depression. We all regret that the fundamental soundness of agriculture was so long neglected, that so many evils were allowed to develop, that American farmers by the millions were caught by soil erosion, by dust storms, by falling world markets, by technology. But who is there now who regrets the mighty efforts of the past years to eradicate these evils and to mitigate their effects?

With all the confusion and distress of the great depression, with all the casualties that were suffered and that still are to be seen along the roads where the migrants wander, still we know that our Government has made a heroic effort to restore the balance in agriculture. And we know that we cannot afford to slacken that effort at a time when agriculture becomes vital to the national security.

This is not the time to desert any individual or any county or any State that is in trouble. We look with mingled horror and pity at the long lines of homeless refugees lining the roads of Europe. We cannot afford to have refugees crowding our own roads, despairing of hope in democracy. We have no regrets for what we have already done to help the farmers of America. We regret only that we were unable to do more.

And who is there now who will regret the public works of the past 7 years? The T. V. A. which has built up the power resources of a great inland valley, far from our coast lines, where we need to have a great nucleus of strength in case of emergency? Who regrets the money that we spent on flood-control works on the Ohio, on the Tennessee, on the Mississippi, on the Colorado, now when this country cannot risk the tragedy of further flood disasters and losses? And the great power dams on the Columbia? And the inland waterway of the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, which today carries twice the tonnage that it carried before our railroad systems were built. And who is not grateful for the water-supply systems and the sewer systems that we have built during these depression years, to protect the people against typhoid fever and other diseases?

All these resources are now available for America's protection. We regret only that we do not have more. Now we must hasten these and all other lines of defense, to make up as well as we can for lost time.

Then there are the $11,000,000,000 in the past 7 years used to keep millions of our fellow citizens employed. We will shortly now rely heavily upon the skills and morale and loyalty of those millions to whose rescue a liberal and humanitarian government came in the hour of depression. We are reassured with the knowledge that these same citizens will now come to the aid of their Government in its hour of need.

And what of the millions of dollars invested in highways and roads? We need vast fleets of mechanized and mobile units for the Military Establishment. But the efficiency and the patriotism of American industry will supply these needs far quicker than we could construct the highways over which they are to operate in their country's defense.

All the investments of the past 7 years in America now stand us in good stead. Ill prepared would we be to face the task we are now undertaking were it not for the great start we had made to make secure the underpinning of the Nation. We know that the foundation is firm.

Upon that solid foundation we now put forth a supreme effort to make our country impregnable. And Americans are meeting the challenge.

Men born free do not readily submit to chains. Indeed, they do not endure them at all. No price is too high, no sacrifice of money, effort, or life itself too great for the preservation of liberties once enjoyed.

America is equal to the test. We are demonstrating what an alert, vigilant, and aroused democracy can do when danger is sensed. We, too, can be relentlessly scientific and realistic about our safety when aggressors are on the march.

There is nothing soft or defeatist about the descendants of Old Hickory, or Daniel Boone, or George Rogers Clark, or General Custer, or Sam Houston, or Davy Crockett, or a long line of heroes from Valley Forge to the Argonne.

There are a hundred and thirty million people in the United States who know what it is worth to them to live in a country which, since its birth, has been the freest place under God's sun to live; who know what it means to be able to think freely, speak freely, write freely, and worship freely according to their conscience and their convictions; men and women and children, of all races and creeds, bound together by the indissoluble bonds of a common liberty and a common country and a common flag; a hundred and thirty million people who realize the incomparable privilege of living under a government which recognizes each and every single one of them as a human being, endowed with the inalienable rights of a individual, entitled to life and physical security and spiritual freedom; a government which recognizes the inviolability of the physical person, the sanctity of his intellectual being, and his individual right to pursue happiness for himself and his loved ones; a government which in times of distress will help him to do these things according to his own inclinations and desires.

When you have a people like that—a people who know why they are here, how they got here, what it cost in human sacrifice and bloodshed; when you have a people who freely acknowledge their debt to the past and firmly resolve to discharge their trusteeship for the future by the same unselfish sacrifice and loyalty—when you have such a people, aggressors will count well the cost of threatening the security and freedom of the proud Nation which claims their affection and their loyalty.

With such a nation and such a people, there will be no fear. A united and determined America faces the unknown future with confidence and courage. In that unity and in that confidence lies the assurance that democracy will prevail here; that our destiny is secure.

The Generation That Was Duped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, whenever anyone on the floor or the Senate or elsewhere states that America entered the World War because it was duped by propaganda, or that its motive was mercenary, I see red. A more sensible reaction is to offer argument and proof to the contrary.

Accordingly I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating discussion of this question from the pen of Walter Lippmann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENERATION THAT WAS DUPED

A few days after the Nazi invasion of western Europe, Mr. Ernest Lindley explained in a column why he, formerly a convinced isolationist, had come swiftly to the conclusion that "we have ample reason to oppose Hitlerized Germany" by giving assistance to the Allies. "My answer is, bluntly," he wrote, "that we have not prepared ourselves against the downfall of British sea power."

In making this statement, Mr. Lindley, who is 41 years old, went on to say that his generation, the World War generation, as he calls it, do not respond to the "moral" judgments of the older men, but only to concepts of national interest. Therefore, as long as the older men were complaining about aggression, lawlessness, faithlessness, oppression, Mr. Lindley was too realistic to be moved. But when he saw that Hitler might destroy or capture the British Fleet and obtain possession of its shipyards and its bases, Mr. Lindley understood the danger to this hemisphere, and instantly abandoned the isolationist doctrine which he had held until a few weeks ago.

The question I should like to put to Mr. Lindley, and also to discuss myself, is this: Why did he, and those of his generation who have thought as he does, fail to understand the American national interest until it was so nearly fatally imperiled by the Allied military disaster in Belgium and Flanders? They are, he has told us, too realistic and too sophisticated to be bamboozled by any idea which is not directly concerned with the physical security and economic well-being of the American people. For 20 years they have specialized in making themselves hard-boiled, buncombe-proof, unbamboozleable, antiseptic to flag waving, deaf to the bugles, so that they would never be deceived about the real national interest of this country. Yet after this careful education in realism, it was not until Hitler was at the Channel ports that Mr. Lindley discovered that we have a national interest in the maintenance of British sea power and that "we have not prepared ourselves against the downfall of British sea power."

Must he not confess, if he means to be candid, that what he thought was cold realism has proved to be a curtain which hid from him the truth, the very truth about our national interest, which he so confidently believed he was specially trained to discern? I am sure he will not wish to confuse the question by saying that he was misled into believing that the Allied defenses would stand better

than they have. That is not the point. If, as he now says, it is our national interest that British sea power should not fall, then it was also our national interest 2 months ago when the Allied defenses were still intact. Yet until those defenses were broken, Mr. Lindley did not tell his readers that the American national interest was involved. In other words, as a young realist he saw our national interest only when it was already very dangerously imperiled. Is it not evident that Mr. Lindley and those who think as he does have been somehow bamboozled while they supposed that they had learned to debunk all things?

What is it that has prevented the young realists from being realistic until it is very nearly too late? It is, I submit, that the post-war generation have been duped by a falsification of American history. They have been miseducated by a swarm of innocent but ignorant historians, by reckless demagogues, and by foreign interests, into believing that America entered the other war because the British propaganda, the loans of the bankers, the machinations of President Wilson's advisers, and a drummed-up patriotic ecstasy. They have been taught to believe that anyone who challenges this explanation of 1917 and insists that America was defending American vital interests is himself a victim or an agent of British propaganda.

Yet the history which Mr. Lindley's generation have been taught is false history. It is not true that America entered the World War because of the British propaganda or the British loans. America entered the World War because Germany's declaration of unlimited submarine warfare threatened to blockade and starve the Allies and to destroy British sea power. I venture to say this categorically and on the basis of direct personal knowledge of what determined President Wilson's decision.

In February 1917 I was an editor of the New Republic, a paper which has in recent years devoted many of its energies to proving to Mr. Lindley's generation that its founders were misguided fools. In February 1917 the editors of the New Republic knew at first hand what was in President Wilson's mind, and this is what they wrote in the issue of February 17, 1917, under the title "The Defense of the Atlantic World":

"The safety of the Atlantic highway is something for which America should fight. Why? Because on the two shores of the Atlantic Ocean there has grown up a profound web of interest which joins together the western world. Britain, France, Italy, even Spain, Belgium, Holland, the Scandinavian nations, and Pan America are in the main one community in their deepest needs and their deepest purposes. They have a common interest in the ocean which unites them. They are today more inextricably bound together than most even as yet realize. But if that community were destroyed, we should know what we had lost. We should understand then the meaning of the unfortified Canadian frontier, of the common protection given Latin America by the British and American fleets. And now that she (Germany) is seeking to cut the vital highways of our world, we can no longer stand by. We cannot betray the Atlantic community by submitting. If not civilization, at least our civilization, is at stake.

"A victory on the high seas would be a triumph of that class which aims to make Germany the leader of the east against the west, the leader ultimately of a German-Russian-Japanese coalition against the Atlantic world."

Mr. Lindley will remember that those words were written before our entrance into the other war, and in the light of what he realized just 2 weeks ago, I ask him which of the generations, the war or the post-war, saw the more realistically the vital interest of America in the maintenance of British sea power?

No doubt it will be said in retort that since President Wilson regarded the maintenance of British sea power as a vital American interest, he was obviously himself the victim of British propaganda. But those who say this are merely betraying their abysmal ignorance of American history.

Even they will agree, I think, that if there has ever been a true American who was not likely to be the victim of British propaganda, that man was Thomas Jefferson. He was the author of the Declaration of Independence. During his life he twice supported an American war against England. Along with Washington he provided the ideas and the very phrases which from the founding of the Republic have defined the separation of the American from the European political system.

In 1823 the victorious Holy Alliance was threatening to reconquer the Spanish colonies in this hemisphere which had recently proclaimed their independence. Simultaneously, to the west of us Russia was threatening to extend its power from Alaska down the Pacific coast. Then, as now, this hemisphere was threatened on both sides by a coalition of victorious imperial states, and it was under those conditions that President Monroe, acting through our Minister in London, entered into negotiations with Canning, the British foreign secretary. The negotiations began in August 1823, and the results reached Washington on October 9, 1923. They provided for some kind of joint American and British policy to forbid the Holy Alliance to enter this hemisphere.

President Monroe sent the documents to Jefferson, who studied them for a week and replied that while "America, North and South, have a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and particularly her own," there is "one nation" which "could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty." Supported by Jefferson's approval, President Monroe, in a message to Congress on December 2, 1823, proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine.

So I suggest to Mr. Lindley that in recognizing the American interest in British sea power, he is not the victim of British propaganda and of hysterical chatter. He is seeing what Wilson saw 25 years ago and what Jefferson and Madison and Monroe saw more than a hundred years ago, long, long before Lord Lothian came to Washington.

Graduation Exercises, George Washington University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY EUGENE M. LERNER

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered in Washington this week by Eugene M. Lerner, president of the class of 1940, in connection with the graduation exercises at the George Washington University. This speech, I believe, is typical of the reaction of American youth to the war some people are asking them to fight. Theirs is a patriotic desire, filled with the highest idealism and love of country, to save the democracy that they know our going to war would destroy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is time for the senior class to say goodbye. It is time for the class of 1940 to say farewell. We leave the George Washington University for a world at war, and what we young people are told about the war situation does not make for strong, forward, virile steps after we leave our university.

I know the class of 1940 in this university and all the other universities of the country love America and its democratic institutions as much as the older citizens of the Nation do, and we are disturbed, just as our professors and political leaders are, about the challenge of democratic institutions seen in the totalitarian states of Germany, Italy, and Russia.

This concern for our country was indicated in the petition against America's entry into the present European war signed by 1,400 Yale University students. A dean at Yale, in disagreement with the 1,400 signers, called them "confused," and urged upon the Nation's leaders a program which would make for eventual participation in Europe's latest struggle.

The horror expressed by our college leaders at student expression of this kind is not, in my opinion, well founded. For if these 1,400 students—as well as millions of others over the Nation—reach the conclusion that America must stay out of war, these conclusions have come from what was taught them in the classroom openly, freely, and certainly by patriotic faculty members. In our college life, we have been taught again and again—and we see with our own eyes—the failure of the World War and how it brought the bitterness of today rather than the democracy we were supposed to secure forever. We have been taught in every classroom that the World War was responsible for the tragic, inhumane depression period from 1929 to this day. Our professors have told us—and we need only to observe and we will see the truth of their teaching—that we are still economically unstable, still uncertain of our own future, still faced with tremendous problems that must be settled if we are to progress. Surely the logical conclusion based upon academic learning and the words of true American teachers is that America, especially because of its experience in the last war and its present instability, must stay out of the contemporary conflict.

We may cry out inside of us, passionately and righteously, against the slaughter and the inhumanity seen in Europe today; but we must remember that we can neither impress upon Europe or any continent of the world the principles we believe in, nor can we maintain those principles for ourselves if we enter this second horrible World War. If our professors and our political leaders refuse to consider what this war will do to our democratic system and our democratic faith, surely the class of 1940 must do so. All over the country, graduates are being told that it is their world. All of the graduates want to give to this world; all of us want to give to our friends, our community, and our country. I know I would be glad to give my life to rid the world forever of the horrors of totalitarianism. But it would be useless, for we can only give in

positive pursuits and not in death and killing. We can only give by using our reason and not in sacrificing everything in a moment of blinding passion. We can only give by thinking—always, always, thinking—of the future. We must always remember to love American democracy more than we hate anything. We can make no progress through intolerance, or murder, or hate, or war. If we love America, if we love its civilization, its dream for humanity, its opportunity for a final realization of those great hopes that have lived on in spite of Pharoahs, crucifixions, inquisitions, and totalitarian states, we will remember what we have learned and we will not risk our bitter experiences of the past 300 years and the greatness we can achieve on a gamble which military victories can never win.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 12.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 12, 1940]

THE ANSWER TO MR. ROOSEVELT

We strongly urge every reader to study carefully the remarkable article on national defense printed in the Mirror of Public Opinion today.

To those who may have been moved by the President's eloquent and bellicose address of Monday this article will provide an antidote of realism. The article, in fact, supplies the answer to Mr. Roosevelt's reckless speech, and to the pleas of the war hawks who openly urge that the United States plunge into the European inferno.

To readers who have not been swept off their feet by the crusading spirit of the Roosevelt harangue, the article offers reassurance that they are eminently right in opposing intervention, and provides an arsenal of facts for resisting the war pressure of the tense days that are ahead.

Representative Ross A. COLLINS, of Mississippi, from whose address in the House these extracts are taken, knows the United States Army's weaknesses perhaps better than any other civilian. He has been pounding away for 20 years to have them corrected. But, today, he finds that the Army is about as well equipped to withstand a new model "blitzkrieg" as were the forces of Poland or Holland.

Where does this leave Mr. Roosevelt with his tacit threat to Mussolini, as disclosed by the President himself in his speech Monday, that this country would get into the European war if Italy did? It leaves him with his bluff called, holding a pair of deuces against two dictators with a royal flush apiece.

Mr. COLLINS' analysis deals only with the Army, however, and the war hawks just now are talking chiefly about sending the Navy and the air force to Europe. All right; there is expert testimony on their status, too.

The Post-Dispatch has published in recent weeks three detailed articles on the capacities of our fighting forces' three major divisions. What does this analysis show?

First, the Navy: It is a first-rate navy, but its major policy is still fixed on the theory that battleships possess supremacy over the airplane. Even so, light is breaking. Ex-Secretary Edison confessed before a committee that today he would not think of building vessels like the 6 battleships under construction. As it is, every battleship now in service is more than 16 years old, and 10 are 20 years old or more. The age and slowness of auxiliary craft are acknowledged by Admiral Stark as "among the greatest deficiencies of our fleet." Reserve stocks of all kinds are dangerously low. Drydocks are inadequate in number. Submarine defenses are imperfect.

The darting, powerfully weaponed craft of Germany and Italy could work plenty of havoc on such a navy. Furthermore, as the Senate Naval Committee pointed out in a report reprinted in part on this page Sunday, if Germany can destroy British sea power, it can also overcome the American fleet if that fleet were operating far from its bases.

What about our aviation? The Army and Navy together have 2,707 fighting planes, of which 1,128 are obsolete or obsolescent. To send the celebrated B–18 bomber against modern equipment "would be suicide," says Major General Arnold. The flying fortresses, pride of the Air Corps, have three fatal defects, for they lack antileak tanks, armored pilot seats, and ordnance firing explosive shells. Neither Army nor Navy has a single reserve plane. The President demands 50,000 more planes, but it takes from 2 to 3 years to train a first-class combat pilot, and there is an average of fewer than 1,500 students in the Army and Navy flying schools.

What could such an air force as that do against the swarms of deadly modern planes possessed by Germany and Italy?

Before entering upon a crusade in Europe it would be well for war-minded citizens to ask what military resources we have to make such a crusade successful. It would take a year or more to manufacture the mechanical equipment the Army needs, Mr. COLLINS points out, and only then can the men be adequately trained in their use.

In short, this country is not now equipped to wage modern warfare. To suggest sending our young men, with little more than courage to defend them, against dive-bombers, 60-ton tanks, and flame throwers is the most vicious kind of loose thinking under the circumstances.

Americans, horrified by the tragic events abroad, can keep their emotions from carrying them to disaster if they consider the cold, hard facts.

Reclamation Needs of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM E. W. RISING AND ADDRESS BY H. W. MORRISON

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. E. W. Rising, together with an address by Mr. H. W. Morrison before the Idaho State Reclamation Association at its meeting at Twin Falls. Mr. Morrison has presented an excellent picture of some of the reclamation needs of Idaho and the lack of consideration these needs have too frequently received.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 11, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I present you with a copy of the address of Mr. H. W. Morrison, president of Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Projects, Inc., before the annual meeting of the Idaho State Reclamation Association on May 18, 1940. I am sure you will find this a most informative document regarding Idaho reclamation history and our future needs.

Mr. Morrison states in a concise manner the reasons why supplemental water is needed for a large proportion of Idaho lands—changing cycles, with period containing more dry years; deforestation of watersheds, permitting earlier run-off, with correspondingly longer period of irrigation from storage water, and raising of more root crops; need of more fall pasture, being among the reasons given.

* * * * * * *

I will consider it a particular favor if you will find time to read Mr. Morrison's address in full, and then I shall desire to discuss with you plans for future action.

Thanking you, I am,

Yours very truly,

E. W. RISING.

AN ADDRESS BY H. W. MORRISON BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE IDAHO STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, TWIN FALLS, IDAHO, MAY 18, 1940

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, it is my pleasure and privilege to meet here today with friends of Idaho reclamation.

I have been requested to tell you something of the proposed program of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc. Before outlining details thereof, permit me to briefly sketch the history of Federal participation in Idaho reclamation.

HISTORY OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION IN IDAHO

Surveys for our first Federal projects were undertaken following the enactment of the National Reclamation Act, in 1902 and 1903, and construction was started on the Minidoka Dam as the first unit of the Minidoka project in 1904. About the same time construction was undertaken on the Boise Diversion Dam, which is the intake

of the New York Canal, and was the forerunner of the taking over of the New York Canal from a private corporation and the inclusion of same as a Federal reclamation project.

The necessity for storage reservoirs in connection with the Minidoka project was early foreseen, which resulted in the construction of the original structure of Jackson Lake Dam, completed in 1907.

Construction of the Arrowrock Dam, providing storage for the Arrowrock division of the Boise project, was undertaken in 1912 and completed about 1916. During the same period the original structure at Jackson was enlarged and rebuilt, providing a large amount of additional storage for the Minidoka project and the Upper Snake River area.

Following this Black Canyon Dam, being the key unit of the Payette division of the Boise project, was completed in 1926.

The American Falls Dam, stabilizing the water supply for the Upper Snake River area and the Minidoka and Twin Falls projects, was completed in 1927.

Following completion of the Black Canyon Dam on the Payette division, it was promptly apparent that storage water was necessary to stabilize the power development at the Black Canyon Dam, which resulted in the construction of Deadwood Dam, completed in 1930.

With the completion in 1930 of the Deadwood Dam, we note that the active construction of additional storage reservoirs and the aggressive expansion of new acreage in Idaho came to a halt, with the exception of the construction of the Ashton Reservoir and the minor works in the Upper Snake, completed in 1938 and 1939, and which works were, comparatively speaking, of minor importance.

ECONOMIC RESULTS OF RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT

The growth of population in Idaho, so clearly presented in Mr. Strike's remarks last night, indicates an almost parallel ration between the yearly increase in new lands placed under cultivation. It is to be noted that the trend of increase, both in population and acreage under cultivation was rapid and consistent up to the decade ending in 1930, following which the growth in population leveled off in relation to the new acreage of cultivated land brought into production.

It is interesting to note that the reclamation development, following the construction of the major works previously cited, resulted in agricultural and dairying production having a cash income value to our farmers and water users in southern Idaho of approximately $75,000,000 per year, or approximately 75 percent of the total cash income value of $100,000,000 per year, which is about the average yearly production of agriculture in the entire State. Following, and parallel thereto, has been the consistent growth and increase in wealth and prosperity of our cities and industries.

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL WATER, A VITAL NECESSITY IN SOUTHWESTERN IDAHO

Following the completion of the Arrowrock storage on the Boise and the Deadwood storage on the Payette, subsequent dry years continued to emphasize the necessity for additional supplemental water to complete an adequate supply to existing lands under cultivation in the southwestern Idaho area.

At the time of completion of Arrowrock Dam it was thought that the water supply would be ample, but time has proved the opposite. Several unforeseen factors were responsible, including, perhaps, the changing cycle of long-range dry-year periods, the deforestation of watershed lands, and most important, perhaps, the gradual changing of crop plantings growing out of a more diversified and intensive cultivation of the area, resulting in the necessity of a larger duty of water for a given area. The effect of this transformation from one- or two-crop farming to wide diversification brought about a condition wherein the holders of original stream-flow rights were faced with the necessity of being served with supplemental water to take care of the maturing late fall crops. Early water-right users along the Payette and the Boise therefore found that their original holdings, based on priority, did not protect them fully, resulting in a general realization on the part of the major portion of our water users that substantial increases must be made in the amount of available storage water to provide properly for the full maturity of late fall crops.

Many of our people have recognized this increasingly vital necessity. Efforts were made in the Boise Valley area as far back as June 1927 looking to action to start a program to increase the water supply. This took the form of resolutions passed by the board of control of the Boise project to Congress and Dr. Mead, the then Commissioner of Reclamation, requesting immediate study and consideration of reservoir sites to expand the existing supply. This was followed year after year with a continuous effort on the part of the board of control of the Boise project, without positive and final results other than the very important work of sowing the seed, laying the foundation, and obtaining preliminary investigations and surveys to a certain extent—all of which is the procedure which has been necessary in the development of any of the major projects of the West.

Attorney Lampert, for the board of control of the Boise project, can cite an amazing amount of effort expended in attempts to alleviate the situation confronting Boise project water users.

IDAHO'S RECLAMATION PROGRESS IN THE PAST DECADE AS COMPARED TO SISTER STATES

To any of us who are familiar with the development of the Western States as a whole it should be immediately apparent that our sister States have succeeded in obtaining far larger appropriations for reclamation and other major development than has been the case in Idaho. Time does not permit the discussion of what is taking place in our sister States, except in a very general way, but I am sure you will grasp the point which I am emphasizing when I recall just a few of the projects of more recent origin, such as the—

Fort Peck project in Montana	$100,000,000
Central Valley project in California	170,000,000
Grand Coulee project in Washington	394,000,000
Deer Creek project in Utah	8,000,000
Conchas project in New Mexico	20,000,000

There have generally been three sources of funds available for this development, consisting of:

First. The funds made available through the Reclamation Service revolving fund, and additional appropriations made to the reclamation for expenditure on western projects.

Second. Certain moneys allocated through the Public Works Administration, popularly known as P. W. A., which agency is no longer existent.

Third. Funds allocated through the United States Army Engineer Corps to work, embracing the multiple development of flood control, power development, and irrigation.

As to the Reclamation Service funds, approximately $470,000,000 has been available through this channel for expenditure on western projects during the last 8 years. Idaho has received less than 2 percent of these available funds which have been handed out in such generous quantities to our sister States.

When it is considered that Idaho has failed to receive any major apportionment of funds directly for reclamation, has failed to receive any major projects of the P. W. A. in the sense of the large projects which have been developed by this agency in other States, and has had no major development by the Army engineers such as our sister States have had, it is readily apparent that we have definitely failed to receive our fair proportion.

FORMATION OF SOUTHWESTERN IDAHO WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT, INC.

While we have the State reclamation association and the Governor advisory committee functioning in Idaho at this time, it was generally felt that if we were to be competitive with the surrounding States in the obtainment of a fair share of the available funds for reclamation as a whole, it was vital that we have an aggressive promotional organization representing the southwestern Idaho area. This resulted in the formation of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., which is a nonprofit corporation, representing the area generally from Glenn's Ferry on the east to Council, Idaho, on the west, the purposes of which are:

First. To develop an adequate supplemental water supply for existing lands under cultivation in the Boise, Payette, and Weiser areas; and

Second. To provide long-range planning and the development of storage reservoirs and distribution systems necessary to bring about the full utilization of all the available waters from the Snake River below Milner, the Boise, the Salmon, the Payette, and the Weiser Rivers.

The organization has a directorate consisting of 80 prominent citizens throughout the area and is supported financially by the major industries of the area, some 600 business firms having subscribed to our budget, and with an individual membership in excess of 1,000 members.

We have established a resident vice president in Washington to coordinate the activities of our group as between Washington and the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation. We have been working effectively with the current Congress in an effort to bring about larger appropriations for the construction of these vitally needed facilities for the purpose of providing supplemental waters as outlined in our statement of purposes and for the appropriation of adequate funds to provide for surveys and investigations throughout the State to permit follow-up in the construction of vitally necessary irrigation development.

We maintain a year-round office and headquarters at Boise devoted to the purpose of "selling" our people and keeping them "sold" on our program. The southwestern Idaho organization believes it a vital necessity, if we are to be successful, to coordinate the demands and requirements of all of the various watersheds and irrigation districts in a unified program based on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number.

NECESSITY FOR UNIFICATION OF EFFORT OF VARIOUS COMMUNITIES IN THE STATE IF WE ARE TO ACCOMPLISH MAXIMUM RESULTS

Speaking for the southwestern Idaho organization, we desire to emphasize our readiness to cooperate with the upper Snake River area or any other area who are interested in reclamation development. We definitely want it understood that we in no way expect to induce the allocation of all available funds to the southwestern area. We believe, however, that it is vitally necessary, if the State is to receive the recognition as a whole to which it is entitled in the allocation of funds from Washington, that we must aggressively go after these funds; and this can only be done by promotional organizations.

We understand that the State reclamation association is a planning organization and must devote its efforts to the welfare of the State as a whole. This is proper procedure. However, we believe that if strong promotional organizations are established in each area which it is believed can be developed, we will be suc-

cessful in obtaining a far larger proportion of available funds for Idaho than could otherwise be obtained.

I would also like to suggest that there has been an overemphasis on the allocation of funds between our areas. By this I mean that we should not accept as a fair proportion for Idaho sufficient funds to undertake construction of only one project at a time. Adjacent States are receiving sufficient funds to construct two or more projects simultaneously; and when consideration is given to the remarks heretofore made about the vast sums being allocated to the majority of the Western States as compared to those received by Idaho, I feel that we are amply justified in insisting that the allocations to our State be sufficient to speed up our activities on a basis comparable to those elsewhere.

NECESSITY FOR PROVIDING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS

When we review the history of the development of the major projects in adjacent States, such as the Grand Coulee, Central Valley project in California, and elsewhere, we find that actual construction is preceded by many years of surveys and investigations and planning in an effort to obtain data which will permit determination of the lowest cost facilities.

In this connection I desire to emphasize the fact that adjacent States have been and are now making available substantial sums which can be used for matching like funds made available by the Federal Government in order to speed up this necessary preliminary survey and investigation work. Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that those States which have funds available for matching with the Bureau of Reclamation naturally receive the preference in the allocation of Federal money to this work.

It is therefore a vital necessity that the State of Idaho provide funds for matching, in order that we may obtain our fair pro rata of Federal funds to carry on and get the necessary answers as to the proper construction at as early a date as possible.

We match funds with the Federal Government in the construction of highways, and without such an arrangement Idaho's highway program would be severely retarded. In a limited sense, the principle here is the same, since the Federal Government will expend its funds in the survey and investigation of water-utilization possibilities in those States which indicate a willingness to cooperate by matching funds for that purpose. The State of Idaho spends two to four million dollars of its own money annually on the development of highways. When we consider that the farming and dairying industry of the State as a whole produces a cash income value of $1,000,000 annually, we can better appreciate how large a stake the State has in advancing the development of water facilities.

I therefore urgently request that this meeting today go on record by the passing of proper resolutions urging our next legislature to make an appropriation of not less than $50,000 for this purpose.

CLOSING REMARKS

In conclusion, permit me to say, my friends, that those of us who have studied the results brought about by the reclamation of arid lands in the West are convinced that the future development of Idaho and its economic growth will be directly in ratio to our success in developing the use of our water resources.

Aside from our supplemental water requirements, we have vast tracts of fertile soil, ideal climate for the growing of crops, and energetic and aggressive citizens. We have available large quantities of water throughout the State now running to waste.

Our population and our wealth can be doubled during the next decade through the increase in productivity of lands now under cultivation and the bringing of new lands, if we are willing to put forth the effort and the energy to bring this about through a united, aggressive, promotional effort.

Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY PROF. SIDNEY POST SIMPSON AT KNOX COLLEGE ALUMNI DINNER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Prof. Sidney Post Simpson, of Harvard Law School, at the Knox College alumni dinner, on June 11, 1940, on the occasion of receiving the Knox alumni achievement award.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, President Davidson, ladies, and gentlemen, this is indeed a great honor which you are conferring upon me. When I listened to my introduction I wondered who it was that the toastmaster was talking about. But I am glad that it was meant to be I, and I deeply appreciate this award.

My original intention, when I was notified of the award and was told that I was expected to speak, was to say something about those matters with which my 23 years since leaving Knox College have mainly been concerned—the law and education. Both are very important in a normal state of affairs. But this is not a normal state of affairs. And so I am going to talk about presently important things—things important now, and which, unless dealt with now and dealt with right, may well render things of true and permanent importance quite unimportant for a very long time to come. I am going to talk about our own country.

Some of you will think that this is a fairy story that I am about to tell. And so I will begin it like a fairy story. Once upon a time, in the year 1940, there was a very rich country. It was relatively free. It was relatively prosperous. It was devoted to the arts of peace. It had most of the gold in the world. It had most of the iron. It had most of the coal. It had most of the oil. It had grown rich, fat, and sure of its own external security. Many of its people were mainly absorbed with making money and with securing material comfort. But it had churches, schools, colleges like this one, and it cherished a tradition of the freedom and dignity of man, and the maintenance of certain elemental human decencies.

Three thousand miles away, across a great ocean, were some countries something like it—less rich, mostly less free, some smaller countries perhaps more free. But there were other countries, too, countries which had ordered the lives of their people on quite a different plan. For relative freedom they substituted organized constraint. For the arts of peace they substituted the art of war. In their relations with other countries they employed a diplomacy based on propaganda and an equal readiness to make or to break promises in order to reach a desired end. For the human decencies habitually observed in other countries they substituted different ways of doing things. One of them in particular was a very efficient country, and it devoted its efficiency to developing the art of war. It had an extremely ambitious leader. That leader, indeed, was so ambitious that most people in other countries could not comprehend his ambition, even though he had put it all in a book. They thought that he was looking for more ultimate comfort for his people, for more territory, for a more adequate share of the world's raw materials, for revenge on enemies. He was looking for these things. But he was also looking for more, and so were his people—and the mass of his people were squarely behind him, partly by reason of a new system of education and partly by reason of a drastic means of dealing with those who disagreed. He was even able to persuade the women of his people to accept a definitely inferior position in his country's scheme, and he was able to enlist the enthusiastic aid of many of his people in a cruel racial persecution. He and his people were looking for power. His and their desires for power were not limited, any more than were those of Alexander, or of the Caesars, or of Napoleon. To be sure, as I have said, most people in the other countries could not or would not understand this. But such was the fact. This country was seeking to dominate the world—not part of the world, but all of the world.

So this particular country set out on its career of world conquest. It was a comparatively small country, half the size of its great, rich, fat neighbor 3,000 miles across the sea. It had been crushed in a war not many years before. It had been bankrupt and unhappy. But when this leader came into power, he was able in 6 years to undertake this career of conquest, and in 1 more year he and his people dominated or were about to dominate a continent. One by one, the less powerful first, the countries nearest were reduced to submission, sometimes by deception, sometimes by force, sometimes without resistance.

In the meantime the great, rich, fat country across the sea attended to the arts of peace and sought to help its people be happy—and while it did not succeed perfectly, it had succeeded pretty well. But it did not realize that it was in any danger. It played games, especially a game called politics, and it got very soft and very defenseless. Then one day, after it saw one smaller country after another fall into the hands of a conqueror, it began to wake up. But then it was very nearly too late. Perhaps it was too late. The country was large, it was thought by its enemies—and not without reason—to be disunited, and it still wanted to play the game called politics. Its people used little words like "Republican" and "Democrat" and "New Deal' and "that man in the White House" and "third term" and "underprivileged" and "C. I. O." and "A. F. of L." and "American business" and "retention of social gains." It had forgotten to think in terms of big words like "our country" and "American ideals," and it did not like to think at all of two very big and terrible words, "war" and "invasion." And there seemed only one answer to what would happen.

Is there only one answer? That is the question that the United States must face today, and face without any delay. And I ask you to face it with me tonight, without fear, but without self-deception.

Let us examine first the basis of the policy of which we have heard so much—that the United States must keep out of war. It is based on the assumption of a fact. Unless that fact is true, that policy is mere words. The fact which that policy assumes is that there is no practical possibility of an invasion of the continental United States. Let us examine that supposed fact.

There are three questions which we must ask. First, is an invasion of the continental United States possible, as a technical military question? Second, if such an invasion is possible, is it likely to be attempted? Third, do we want to prevent it? Let us consider each of these questions.

The answer to the first question is clear. It is "Yes." An American invasion is now a military possibility. While the considerations that compel that answer are technical military considerations, they are not hard to understand. Let me direct your attention to four things, and you can draw your own conclusions. First, the German strategy beginning in Poland, then in Norway, then in Flanders, and most recently on the Somme, is a new kind of strategy. It is fundamentally based not on defeating the opposing armies directly but on attack of rear areas and on attempts to break down the morale of the civil population. It is not like the older strategy which primarily contemplated the occupation and holding of territory. It operates rather in terms of paralyzing the adversary's circulatory and nervous systems. Second, to carry out such a strategy, where the primary purpose is destruction rather than occupation, with occupation coming later when the opposing army is paralyzed or civil morale broken, does not require large bodies of troops.

Irretrievable destruction can be accomplished by comparatively small numbers of determined men, and these people I am talking about are very determined men. The parachute corps of the German Army has been recruited by volunteering. It is a suicide assignment, and it is known to be such. And yet it has been impossible to accept anywhere near all the men who have volunteered for that service. Third, in past wars the assumption has been that a military force must keep open a line of retreat. That assumption, with respect to the present Germany Army, can no longer be made. With their strategy, and with their troops, soldiers can be sent out to do their mission of destruction—and they need not return. Hitherto our considerations of the possible vulnerability of the United States to air attack, even taking into account the geographical location of our munition plants and our industries, the fact that they are all above ground, and the ease with which the complicated organization of our great cities could be disorganized, has proceeded on the theory that planes must get here and back. Leave out the "and back," and the picture is quite different. Fourth, the Atlantic Clipper is now flying, nonstop, from Horta in the Azores to New York. At the present time heavy bombers are being delivered in England by flying them from Newfoundland. And if any of you think that this indicates merely a threat to the eastern seaboard remember for a moment the large extent of German interpenetration in Mexico which has already been accomplished.

If an American invasion is militarily practicable, as it is, will it be attempted? Here again I want to call your attention to some concrete facts. One fact is the character of the ambition of Nazi Germany and its systematic refusal to be hampered by considerations of humaneness or honor. Another is the real and inescapable conflict of interest, both material and ideological, between the United States and an ambitious and expanding Germany. This, indeed, may very well be a case where not the country but the world cannot exist half slave and half free. Moreover, this country is a rich prize in its own right. And, especially at the present time in Rome, the prospect of an American conquest is being boasted of by responsible German officials and intervention in American affairs is being talked of by the Italians.

This brings us to the third question: Do we want to prevent an American invasion? I heard one man say in New York City the other day that he would rather have Hitler than Roosevelt. I do not think he really would, and I do not think he had the slightest idea of what that would actually mean. Be that as it may, in this place and with this audience, I think I need do no more than mention our country's historic devotion to the basic ideal of freedom, including the notion of equality between men and women of which this institution is a symbol, our American devotion to Christianity and religious freedom, and our American reluctance to become a subject race.

Thus, if you are willing to face the actual situation, the supposed fact which has been the basis for this talk about America's keeping out of the war is not a fact at all. The question is not whether we can keep America out of war, but whether we can keep war out of America. We have been hearing much talk in recent months about "not sending our boys to die in France." My friends, if I have to defend the United States—and I am, and for over 20 years have been, an officer in the Reserve Corps of the United States Army—I would far rather do it in France than in New York or California or Illinois. We do not want Chicago bombed like Paris. Of course, too, no one is suggesting that we should now send troops to France. We have not enough to send to do any good. Our whole Regular Army ready for active service in the continental United States is about one-fourth the size of what was the army of the Netherlands. The thing that would be helpful now is planes, guns, and financial assistance.

You will think that I have painted a dark picture. I have, because that is the picture. Some of you will think that I am an alarmist, because that is what you want to think. I am not an alarmist. I am a realist. In military operations—and this in essence is a military operation forced upon us through no fault of our own—one must consider not merely what the enemy is most likely to do, but what is the most dangerous thing that he can do, and then one must take sufficient and prompt steps to meet that most dangerous possibility. If these steps be taken, and taken in time, then that dangerous possibility either will not happen or it may be defeated.

The most dangerous present possibility is some such form of invasion as I have suggested. But there are other possibilities equally dangerous even if less immediate. We have no idea yet what will be the situation of the British Navy, nor have we had time to consider yet what would happen if the British Government moved to Canada. We do not know what disposition will be made, in the event of a German victory in Europe, of the other British and French possessions near us. Developments of this nature may change things—and not for the better. Moreover, the present South American situation is ominous, as is that in Mexico, and the situation in the Far East is loaded with dynamite.

Some of my friends on the eastern seaboard have said to me that the Middle West is not interested in these things. I have never believed it, and I do not believe it now. We middle westerners can be depended upon when our country is in danger.

What can we do? We can do three things—each of us can do three things—

1. We can use all the power each of us has to make effective present efforts to send immediate aid to the Allies. This European battle may well be simply a desperate delaying action by our own outpost, and it may be that the outpost is doomed. That outpost will fight to the last. If you need evidence, look at the amazing gallantry of the recent retreat from Flanders and the present defense on the Somme. The outpost may win. If so, the United States will never be assailed. But even if the outpost does not win, its present fight is giving us time—and we desperately need time. So we must help the Allies to hold on as long as they possibly can.

2. We must give every support in the power of each of us to the President's preparedness program. There are people who have hindered it; there are people who have delayed it; there are people who have argued about it. Some of these people have done this in partisan terms. But this is not a partisan problem. This is an American problem. We can also support efforts for compulsory military service in time to do some good. I don't want the soldiers in my outfit to die without having a chance.

3. We can stop talking and thinking in political terms. I am by inheritance a Republican. I voted against Roosevelt in 1932 and again in 1936. But I have very great difficulty in understanding some of the reactions—and they are not Republican alone—to the present efforts of the President of the United States to secure the powers necessary to make possible the defense of our country. I must suppose that these reactions derive from ignorance. If they do not derive from ignorance, they are very close to treason. This is no time to snipe at the Commander in Chief.

We must realize now that this is a really critical situation, that time is of the essence, that the next 6 months, or even less, may well be decisive, that a real and visible national unity is immediately essential. It will be a very tough job to win this fight. The way the game is being played now we have a beautiful chance of losing. We can still win if we act quickly enough. Let us act, and act now.

It's Time for Sane Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF RAYMOND J. KELLY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the attitude of the American Legion in respect to the emergency of the moment is of interest to the Nation and to the membership of the House of Representatives. War, and all of its terrible consequences, to the Legionnaire is not just a theory but a stern and ugly reality. He knows the horrors of war.

On Monday evening, June 10, 1940, Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion, delivered a most timely address over the radio facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. from Chicago, Ill., an address in which the considered opinion of the more than 1,000,000 members of this great patriotic fraternity in reference to the war overseas and our relation to it was revealed to the country.

Among those that have risen to national leadership in the American Legion, no one is held in greater respect nor warmer affection than is the one whose voice was heard by the American people on the occasion to which I have just referred. Because of the esteem in which his every expression is received, I am happy indeed to be able to offer the text of his address for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings.

The unanimous consent of the membership having been indicated, Mr. Kelly's address follows:

Good evening, everybody: The chief question occupying the people of our Nation this evening its what to do about the war in Europe, and the peace that must some day follow. None of us, I think, can prophesy with any great degree of certainty the ultimate outcome of the wars now raging. All of us, I think, are in agreement when we discuss the horrible rape of individual liberties and the destruction of small nations which have come from the spread of the totalitarian powers.

We have seen clearly what can happen when nations neglect their defenses, when pseudo-liberality is encouraged, when the "fifth column" is tolerated. We know now what occurs when communism, nazi-ism, and fascism are placed at the controls.

The question is whether you and I are willing to accept our individual responsibilities in shaping the course the United States will follow. Nothing, I believe, is to be gained from taking a hysterical view of the situation. Keeping first things first we must root our course in sane thinking. The time for wishful thinking is past. Vain boasting about our undeveloped but potentially great military strength will avail us little. Loose talk about our neighbors will butter no parsnips.

Within the past few days I have addressed a written message to the more than 1,000,000 members of the American Legion. In it I have called their attention to the soundness of the position of the Legion. Every great danger now troubling the people of our country heretofore has been the occasion for discussion and action by the American Legion.

These dangers, as I see them, are wrapped in a now familiar package. They include the things in store for us if our Nation abandons its neutrality completely; the plight of our national defense unless there is complete unity in strengthening our Army, our Navy, and our air forces; the weakness arising from continued failure to accept the principle of universal service in time of war; what may come from continued complacence in handling the enemy within who never ceases to work for the spread of alien ideologies; how we will fare if there is any slackening of the individual effort to unite for the common defense to show the world that our Republic within a democracy can meet any emergency.

In my message to the legionnaires, speaking as their national commander, I have presumed to speak with some degree of authority because consistently, in the past, the Legion called the turn and pointed the way of sanity for handling many of these problems now confronting the United States.

For 21 long years the Legion raised its voice to the highest pitch in the effort to rouse the Nation to the need for an adequate national defense. Few listened to us.

Since 1922, the Legion has had a definite program looking toward universal service. In the event this country ever becomes involved in another war our plan would deprofitize such a conflict, leaving special privilege for none, equal service for all.

Knowledge of the existence of subversive influences, apparently just now penetrating the public consciousness under the modern description of "fifth column" is neither new nor novel to the Legion. It is only lately we have had public acceptance of the dangers from such influences.

The definite complacence of America in a world rapidly becoming an armed camp with high explosive potentialities has occasioned dismay in the Legion for many years. Few heeded our warnings.

The 1939 Chicago National Convention of the American Legion demanded that Congress stay in session during the emergency. The emergency is even more grave now than it was at the time of the Chicago convention. In my message to the Legion, I stressed the importance of having our Senators and Representatives stay in the Nation's Capital so long as national and international affairs are on a 24-hour basis. We are hopeful the country will join with us in asking Congress to remain where it can give constant attention to the needs of the hour.

In my belief, the most menacing factor to the safety of the United States arises from within our borders rather than without. Our house must be set in order. But the neglect of years cannot be corrected in a few short minutes, hours, or days. What must be done will be done—if a determined and united Nation sets its will to the task.

Let us face the fact that "communazi" conspirators seeking to undermine and destroy our institutions are fanatics. The truth as we know it is not in them. Reasonable treatment has no effect upon them and but serves to embolden and encourage them in their efforts.

We have been told that far-reaching suppressive measures against flourishing domestic ideological conspiracies might injure innocent people. In my belief the good of the whole Nation compels summary action to be taken by our properly constituted Federal, State, and local authorities to stamp out in their entirety the activities of these subverters. Such action is needed irrespective of what may happen to their fellow travelers or innocent bystanders. This is no time for quibbling. We must pull no punches.

Good, law-abiding American men and women who enjoy and cherish their civil liberties do not follow the policy of shouting about them. In many cases those who clamor the loudest about the dangers of losing such liberties bear the most watching. All too frequently what they fear most is the loss of their opportunity to work for the destruction of our form of government. There are more than 600 "communazi" organizations flourishing in the United States. Many of these are Trojan horse and "fifth column" groups. They have no rightful place here among us.

The second place where we are woefully lacking is in our national defense. For two decades national-defense preparedness has lagged. Within the past 2 weeks the first new United States battleship in 19 years has been launched. In every other element of preparedness we have been equally complacent.

We must appreciate that the hurried building of our defenses to the point needed may not make for the most efficiency. Errors will be made and the ball will be fumbled. But the characteristic of a great pitcher is that he pitches over his errors and goes on to win. I am confident we are a nation of thoroughbreds, neither to be upset nor deterred from our purpose by such mistakes.

There is no change in the official position of the American Legion with regard to the neutrality of the United States. We believe the protection—at all hazards—of the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere is our primary obligation. While our Nation is ill-equipped to provide even a minimum of protection for the Monroe Doctrine, it is idle to consider the feasibility of intervening in the great conflict across the Atlantic.

With what would we intervene? Though some progress has been made in giving educational orders for matériel and equipment, and in providing for the needs of an expanded air corps, we do not have on hand today the needed planes, weapons, and materials to train properly the extremely moderate armed forces we are able to put in the field.

How, then, would we make our potential strength felt, short of two or three years? Fast-moving aggressor nations have no intention of allowing us to select our own time and place for exerting the might of a rearmed America.

In my written message to the members of the Legion, I have also told them the safety of our Nation transcends any political issue. I have cautioned them to avoid the danger of subjecting such safety to the fear generated through hysterical approach to the handling of our problems.

In my public utterances as national commander, I have stressed the importance to American Legion organizations of assisting and working through recognized agencies of the Government. I have told them that only rarely when there is a collapse of recognized authority as in times of great natural disasters is it our job to do what we can independently.

In recent years many of our Legion posts have prepared disaster-relief plans to become effective at the onset of such catastrophes. In other words, the machinery of Legion support for law and order is already established with a fair degree of efficiency. Posts without plans are being urged to form them now. Such plans should be integrated with existing Government authority in every community where there is a Legion post.

State departments of the Legion can well initiate and urge the adoption of State emergency councils. In several States this has been done already with the support and consent of the State Governors.

Official representatives of the national organization of the American Legion are now engaged in conferences and discussions with proper agencies of the Federal Government. These conferences look toward utilization of Legion organization and membership in the most effective manner possible in the event of any conceivable emergency developing. Such perfected plans will be ready for immediate use when conditions warrant their invoking.

The American Legion is working to make this a nation geared to go. We recognize it as a blue-chip game in which we are engaged. We advise playing them close and playing the cards to win.

Our members regard this situation as another call from the Nation. It is not a call to the armed forces where once we served, though we will not shun such a call if it comes. Rather it is a call to develop sanity superseding hysteria; to remove all doubt about the strength of our national defense whatever the cost; to have all of us individually willing to bear the heavy price of the defense which must be paid to assure peace for our people.

For 21 years the American Legion called the turn. It is confident its judgment in the present situation will coincide with the safety and well-being of our beloved Nation.

For God and country we have associated ourselves. We pledge again our loyalty to that creed. We extend the hope that America now is awake to the dangers we face. Resolutely we pledge our organization to work with those who are for the preservation of our national unity that thus we may safeguard the glory of our ideals, our principles, and our institutions.

This Is America's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

OPEN LETTER FROM MAURICE LÉON TO WENDELL L. WILLKIE AND HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter addressed by Hon. Maurice Léon to Hon. Wendell L. Willkie and myself, jointly, on the subject This Is America's War.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS AMERICA'S WAR—AN OPEN LETTER

WENDELL L. WILLKIE, Esq.
Hon. CLAUDE D. PEPPER.

DEAR SIRS: I am addressing this open letter to you jointly because at this critical juncture in our country's history your leadership has been expressed in terms calling for prompt action in defense of all that America stands for against the menace which has now reached the valleys of Picardy and which aims at nothing less than the enslavement of the world.

Because of your stand, you are entitled to be looked upon as Americans first, as being able to work together in a national crisis without thought of partisan advantage or expediency.

Because of the events which have justified your stand, the number of Americans who believe that this horrible war forced on the world by Hitler and his cohorts is America's war is growing daily by leaps and bounds.

In the pages that follow, you will see that it is America's war not only because Hitler and his forces mean to crush all that America stands for, but because the door was opened and kept open to them by acts and omissions of those in authority at Washington which culminated in a deadlock between the President and the Senate.

In the archives of the Department of State, there is the treaty known as Document No. 63, Senate, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, which is appended hereto as Document 7, and the significance of which only becomes plain after reading documents numbered 1 to 6.

This treaty was never passed upon by the Senate.

I submit that as a starting point to a policy at once clear-sighted and virile, it should be resubmitted and ratified.

America has her share in the mistakes which have brought the free peoples of the world to Armageddon. These mistakes should be faced in good faith, without flinching. I know of no other guide to safety for us, for without self-respect there is no safety.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE LÉON.

IRVINGTON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y., *June 10, 1940.*

THE UNITED STATES AND THE RHINE FRONTIER

INTRODUCTION

In his foreword to André Tardieu's book The Truth About the Treaty (Bobbs-Merrill, 1921), Edward M. House, writing on March 3, 1921, states concerning Mr. Tardieu:

"He was in all truth the one nearly indispensable man at the conference.

"Therefore, if one would know of those fateful days in Paris when the allies of France had gathered from the ends of the earth to have their reckoning with the Central Powers, it would be well to read The Truth About the Treaty, for here it is told by him who knows."

This foreword is followed by an introduction written by Mr. Clémenceau, France's war Premier, and head of the French delegation at the peace conference, which begins as follows:

"It was near your heart, in face of the virulent attacks on our peace treaty, to set up the truth in print."

Thus the man who next to President Wilson was the most important member of the American delegation and the man who headed the French delegation of which André Tardieu was the chief member next to Mr. Clémenceau, both vouch for the facts given in this book.

Chapter VI of this book, under the title "Treaties of Guarantee," begins on page 202 as follows:

"It was on March 14, 1919, that Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson proposed to M. Clémenceau, in place of the inter-Allied occupation of an independent Rhineland, the undertaking by Great Britain and the United States to come immediately to the assistance of France in case the latter should be the object of an unprovoked aggression by Germany."

Concerning President Wilson's part in this matter, Mr. Tardieu states, at page 205:

"On March 28 he put this solution into concrete form and handed the head of the French Government the following: 'In a separate treaty with the United States, a pledge by the United States, subject to the approval of the Executive Council of the League of Nations, to come immediately to the assistance of France as soon as any unprovoked movement of aggression against her is made by Germany.'

"This formula, approved by Mr. Lloyd George, became the basis of the negotiation."

A treaty was signed, on the part of the United States of America, by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and Robert Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States; and on the part of the French Republic, by Georges Clémenceau, President of the Council of Ministers, Minister of War, and Stephen Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs. This treaty, signed June 28, 1919, specifically provides in article IV:

"The present treaty will be submitted to the Senate of the United States at the same time as the Treaty of Versailles is submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification."

It was transmitted to the Senate July 29, 1919, with a message from the President of the United States in which he refers to the fact that he had transmitted the treaty of peace 2 weeks previously.

President Wilson's message will be scanned in vain for the remotest revelation of the fact that this treaty had been offered by him to France as a substitute for the permanent security of the Rhine frontier and had been accepted by France in exchange for her agreement to limit the occupation of the Rhine bridgeheads to 15 years.

Article I of this treaty specifically refers to the provisions of the treaty of peace forbidding military occupation or fortification of the left bank of the Rhine by Germany and providing that violation by Germany of these provisions should constitute "a hostile act against the powers signatory of the present treaty and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world."

The separate treaty then specifies that should these provisions constitute "inadequate security and protection to France, the United States of America shall be bound to come immediately to her assistance in the event of any unprovoked movement of aggression against her being made by Germany."

This meant, in plain terms, that should Germany violate the provisions of the treaty of peace under which the left bank of the Rhine was demilitarized, this would constitute an act of aggression, and the United States would be bound to come to the aid of France in meeting this act of aggression.

This treaty, Senate Document No. 63 in the Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, was not ratified. The Senate had no opportunity to learn the facts bearing on its offer to France and acceptance by France until long after it had been withdrawn from its consideration by President Wilson at the same time that he withdrew the treaty of peace. His message merely gave "high obligations of gratitude and tested friendship" as the reason for making the treaty.

As shown by Mr. Tardieu in his book, Marshal Foch had taken the definite position in November 1918 that nothing short of the Rhine frontier would secure peace, and he had been unswerving in maintaining that position.

The story of the struggle to defeat the measure which the Allied Commander in Chief, whose greatness was not confined to mastery on the battlefield, regarded as indispensable to peace, is best told in contemporary documents which are appended to this memorandum, of which the following is a list:

Document 1: Conclusion of Marshal Foch's memorandum of January 10, 1919.

Document 2: Proposal of the French Government to the heads of the Allied and associated Governments (March 12, 1919).

Document 3: Note of the French Government handed to the heads of the Allied Governments (March 17, 1919).

Document 4: Text of offer made March 28, 1919, by President Wilson to Prime Minister Clémenceau as a substitute for Rhine frontier.

Document 5: Conclusion of statement made by Marshal Foch on March 31, 1919, before the heads of the Allied Governments and the commanders in chief of the Allied Armies.

Document 6: Message of President Wilson of July 29, 1919, transmitting agreement between the United States and France, signed June 28, 1919, to secure to France the immediate aid of the United States in case of an unprovoked movement of aggression against her on the part of Germany.

Document 7: Agreement of assistance to France in the event of unprovoked aggression by Germany.

The maxim "Verba volant scripta manent" (words fly away, writings remain) applies here. I am not here questioning President Wilson's motives. He died a broken man because by his failure he had assumed a responsibility before the conscience of mankind greater than could be borne by a mere mortal, to recall a prophecy made in the early stages of the Peace Conference. President Wilson should have given the Senate the facts which led to his offer of the Treaty of Assistance to France and its acceptance. Without those facts, the Senate had no opportunity to judge of the character of the obligation which the only officer of the Government of the United States having power to conduct its foreign relations, had assumed on behalf of the people of the United States, subject only to ratification by the Senate. By withholding the facts from the Senate, President Wilson withheld them also from the people of the United States, which to this day is largely unaware that the Govern-

ment of France when it was in a position to hold the permanent security of the Rhine frontier, gave up that security in reliance on and in exchange for the undertaking contained in the Treaty of Assistance

The French Government must, of course, be taken to have known that President Wilson's treaty without ratification by the Senate would not legally bind the United States. But the facts completely dispose of the idea so widely prevalent among our people that the present European situation was Europe's own doing and solely the result of European action with which we had nothing at all to do. The fact that the surrender of the Rhine bridgeheads which made German aggression possible was actually effected in reliance on an obligation undertaken on our behalf, by our Chief Executive, who alone had the power to enter into it, subject to subsequent ratification by the Senate, shows conclusively that we had our part in bringing about the present tragic situation; and this having been shown it should follow that we should take our share in a war which is ours in more senses than one.

—

DOCUMENT 1.—CONCLUSION OF MEMORANDUM DELIVERED JANUARY 10, 1919, BY MARSHAL FOCH TO THE COMMANDERS IN CHIEF OF THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED ARMIES, BASED UPON MARSHAL FOCH'S MEMORANDUM TO PRIME MINISTER CLEMENCEAU OF NOVEMBER 1918

Marshal von Moltke placed the military frontier of Germany at the Rhine and at the end of one of his papers writes: "There can be no doubt about the ordinary strength of our theater of operations on the Rhine. One thing only could endanger it—a premature offensive by us on the left bank with insufficient forces." And elsewhere he states: "The main line of defense of Prussia against France is the Rhine with its fortresses. This line is so strong that it is far from requiring all the forces of the monarchy."

Today this situation is reversed in favor of the coalition. The coalition cannot renounce its advantages, cannot relinquish its buckler of defense in that region—the Rhine—without seriously compromising its future. The "Wacht am Rhein" must be its slogan.

Henceforth the Rhine must be the western frontier of the German peoples. Germany must be deprived of all access to or military utilization of it, that is to say, of all territorial sovereignty on the left bank of this river—in a word, of every facility to reach by sudden invasion, as in 1914, Belgium and Luxemburg, the shores of the North Sea and threaten England; to move around France's natural defenses, the Rhine and the Meuse; to conquer her northern regions and approach that of Paris.

This is, for the present and the near future, a guarantee indispensable for the maintenance of peace, because:

1. Of Germany's material and moral situation.

2. Of her numerical superiority over the democratic countries of western Europe.

The Rhine, a military frontier indispensable for the maintenance of peace, which is the aim of the coalition, offers no territorial advantage to any country. There is no question indeed of annexing the left bank of the Rhine, of increasing the territory of France or of Belgium but simply one of maintaining on the Rhine the common barrier of security essential to the society of democratic nations. There is no question of entrusting the guardianship of this common barrier to any one power, but of assuring by the moral and material support of all the democratic powers the defense of their lives and futures by forbidding Germany, once for all, to carry war and her spirit of domination across the river.

Of course it will be the function of the peace treaty to fix the status of the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhine not included within the French and Belgian frontiers.

But this arrangement, whatever it be, must take into consideration the military necessity set forth above and therefore—

1. Absolutely forbid to Germany all military access to, or political propaganda in, the Rhenish territories of the left bank, perhaps even protecting this territory by a neutral zone on the right bank.

2. Assure the military occupation of the Rhenish territories of the left bank by Allied forces.

3. Guarantee to the Rhenish territories of the left bank the outlet necessary to their economic activities by bringing them into a customs union with the other western states.

On these conditions, and in accordance with the universally accepted principle of the liberty of peoples, it is possible to conceive the establishment, on the left bank of the Rhine, of new autonomous states, governing themselves subject to the above reservations, an arrangement which, with the aid of a strong natural frontier, the Rhine will alone be capable of assuring peace to western Europe.

—

DOCUMENT 2.—PROPOSAL OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT TO THE HEADS OF THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED GOVERNMENTS (MARCH 12, 1919)

WESTERN FRONTIER OF GERMANY

1. In the general interest of peace and to assure the effective working of the constituent clause of the League of Nations, the western frontier of Germany is fixed at the Rhine. Consequently Germany renounces all sovereignty over, as well as any customs union with, the territories of the former German Empire on the left bank of the Rhine.

2. The line of the Rhine to be occupied under a mandate of the League of Nations by an inter-Allied military force.

The extent and conditions of occupation in German territory of the bridgeheads of Kehl, Mannheim, Mayence, Coblenz, Cologne, and Dusseldorf, necessary to the security of inter-Allied forces, to be fixed by the final treaty of peace. Until the signature of the said treaty the conditions of occupation established by the armistice of November 11, 1918, to remain in force.

In a zone of 50 kilometers east of her western frontier Germany shall not maintain nor erect fortifications.

3. The territories of the left bank of the Rhine (except Alsace-Lorraine) to constitute one or several independent States under the protection of the League of Nations. Their eastern and southern frontiers to be fixed by the peace treaty. Germany undertakes to do nothing which could hinder the aforesaid state or states in the fulfillment of the duties or the exercise of the rights devolving upon them from the causes or the conditions of their creation.

4. Within 1 month after the signature of the present preliminaries of peace, the general conditions of evacuation of the higher German and Prussian civil officials at present on duty on the left bank of the Rhine, to be settled by a special agreement between the signatory powers and the German Government.

5. Within 2 months from the signature of the present preliminaries of peace, a special agreement between the signatory powers and the German Government to determine, under the guaranty of the League of Nations, the general conditions of liquidation of the German economic interests on the left bank of the Rhine.

6. The German Government undertakes to furnish every year to the independent state or states, which may be created on the left bank of the Rhine, the amount of coal necessary for their industries. This amount shall be credited to Germany in the general reparations account.

—

DOCUMENT 3.—NOTE OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT HANDED TO THE HEADS OF THE ALLIED GOVERNMENTS[1] (MARCH 17, 1919)

I. RÉSUMÉ OF THE FRENCH PROPOSAL OF FEBRUARY 25, 1919

(1) The military occupation of the Rhine by an interallied force (with this immediate and lasting result, separation of the left bank from the German Reich and Zollverein) is, in the present state of international relations, a vital necessity for France and of common interest to the Allies. A detailed memorandum has proved this assertion.

The object is to prevent the renewal of that which we have undergone twice in 50 years, and for that to deprive Germany of her essential means of attack (the left bank, the railroads, and the bridges of the Rhine).

As a guaranty of this, the military occupation of the Rhine border is indispensable to France, with a far smaller population than Germany, deprived of Russia's alliance, and without good natural frontiers.

On the other hand the overseas democracies cannot fight in Europe if the French ports and railroads are not substantially protected. The last war demonstrated how serious for them is this danger, which might completely deprive them of a European battlefield.

(2) The limitation of the military forces of Germany is not a sufficient guaranty against this danger until experience has proved the method efficacious, and especially so long as Germany has at her disposal more than 3,000,000 men who are trained to war, because they fought in war. The total suppression of the German fleet was not sufficient reason for the naval countries to disarm their own fleets. On land, France, too, has need of physical guaranty.

The League of Nations is also not a sufficient guaranty. The present draft of its clauses makes final victory almost certain. But the League is too slow moving a mechanism to prevent territorial invasion at the beginning of a war. Here also, therefore, a physical guaranty is necessary.

This physical guaranty is the military occupation of the Rhine and the control of its bridge traffic.

(3) The objections presented do not modify this conclusion.

It is feared on the left bank that there may be a movement for union with Germany. But the left bank is different from the rest of Germany. It fears Bolshevism and war taxes. It is conscious of its economic independence. It has no liking for Prussian officials forced upon it by the empire. Separatist tendencies are already making themselves felt despite the strict reserve we have maintained.

A nationalist irritation in Germany is foreseen. Defeat has aroused this sentiment. The question resolves itself into protecting ourselves against its possible consequences.

It is thought that the proposed solution may be suspected of imperialism. But it is not a question of annexation, it is a question of creating under the safeguard of the League of Nations an independent state in accordance with the interests of the inhabitants and with the aspirations of a very large number of them. This is not a Bismarckian solution.

Anxiety is expressed concerning the effect upon British and American opinion. But the whole lesson of the war is that the Rhine is the military frontier not only of France and Belgium but of the overseas democracies as well, "the frontier of freedom," as President Wilson expressed it. These democracies will understand

[1] Including the United States of America.

this as they understood the necessity of conscription during the war, as British democracy understands today the channel tunnel.

The danger is pointed out of the indefinite duration of the occupation. But as the entire organization of the left bank is to be in the hands of the League of Nations, the latter will always have the right to alter it.

Therefore, the physical guaranty which will make impossible a renewal of the 1914 situation remains of vital necessity to France in the present state of international relations.

II. EXAMINATION OF THE SUGGESTION PRESENTED BY OUR ALLIES

(1) The suggestion presented on March 14 that Great Britain and the United States should pledge themselves in case of aggression by Germany to bring their military forces to the aid of France without delay is a recognition that France needs a special guaranty; but in place of the physical guaranty demanded by France it substitutes a political guaranty designed to curtail by a definite pledge the time which would elapse between the menace of war and the joint action of the Allied forces.

The French Government fully appreciates the great value of such a guaranty, which would profoundly change the international situation, but this guaranty to be effective must be supplemented and defined.

(2) In the first place there will always be, on account of distance, a period in which France attacked will have to defend herself single-handed without her overseas Allies; she must be able to do this under fairer conditions than in the past.

On the other hand, it is important there should be no doubt about the substance and scope of the pledge—that is as to the obligations imposed upon Germany, the methods of their enforcements, the nature of the act which shall constitute a menace of war, the right of France to defend herself against it, and the importance of the military aid to be furnished by Great Britain and the United States.

(3) In other words, before we can consider giving up the first guarantee (a material guarantee founded on space) it is essential that the second guarantee (founded on time, that is on the speedy aid of our Allies) lend itself to no uncertainty and that it be supplemented by some of the other safeguards contained in the first guarantee.

It is really not possible for France to give up a certain safeguard for the sake of expectations.

III. POSSIBLE BASES OF AGREEMENT

Wishing to respond to the suggestion which has been made to it, the French Government thinks it its duty to set out in detail the general bases upon which agreement might be reached, these bases being the minimum guarantees indispensable to France.

It should be agreed, in the first place, that:

In case Germany, in violation of the peace conditions imposed upon her by the allied and associated governments, should commit an act of aggression against France, Great Britain, and the United States would bring to France the aid of their military forces.

Therefore:

(1) The date and the conditions of evacuation of the bridgeheads on the right bank, and of the territories on the left bank of the Rhine, to be fixed by the peace treaty (as one of the guarantees to be taken for the execution of the financial clauses).[2]

(2) Germany to maintain neither military force nor military organization on the left bank of the Rhine nor within 50 kilometers east of the river. The German Army to be forbidden to maneuver there. Recruiting to be forbidden there—even appeals for volunteers. Fortifications to be demolished there. No new fortifications to be erected there. No war material to be manufactured there. (Certain of these clauses already figure in the preliminary peace proposals; but in the present hypothesis it would be necessary to strengthen them.)

(3) Great Britain, the United States, and France to have the right to satisfy themselves by means of a permanent Commission of Inspection that the conditions imposed upon Germany are complied with. (For without this right the preceding clause would be worthless.)

(4) Great Britain, the United States, and France to agree to consider as an act of aggression any entry or attempted entry of all or any part of the German Army into the zone fixed in paragraph 2.

(5) Furthermore, Great Britain and France to recognize the right of France to occupy the line of the Rhine with five bridgeheads of a radius of 20 kilometers in case Germany, in the opinion of the Commission of Inspection, should violate the terms of paragraph 2 or any one of the military, aerial, and naval clauses of the peace preliminaries. (In fact, if France gives up after 30 years' permanent occupation she must at least, in case of danger of war resulting from Germany's violation of her pledges, be able to advance her troops to the only good defensive position; that is, to the Rhine.)

(6) Great Britain and the United States to recognize to France her frontier of 1814 and, by way of reparation, the right of occupation without annexation of that part of the coal basin of the Saar not included within this frontier.

P. S.—It goes without saying that by act of aggression against France the French Government also means any aggression against Belgium.

[2] In other words, an occupation for 30 years.

DOCUMENT 4.—TEXT OF OFFER MADE MARCH 28, 1919, BY PRESIDENT WILSON TO PRIME MINISTER CLEMENCEAU AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR RHINE FRONTIER

In a separate treaty with the United States, a pledge by the United States, subject to the approval of the executive council of the League of Nations, to come immediately to the assistance of France as soon as any unprovoked movement of aggression against her is made by Germany.

—

DOCUMENT 5.—CONCLUSION OF STATEMENT MADE BY MARSHAL FOCH ON MARCH 31, 1919, BEFORE THE HEADS OF THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED GOVERNMENTS AND THE COMMANDERS IN CHIEF OF THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED ARMIES

To sum up, unless we hold the Rhine permanently, no neutrality, no disarmament, no written clause of any kind, can prevent Germany from seizing the Rhine and debouching from it at an advantage.

The Rhine remains today the barrier essential to the safety of the peoples of western Europe, and therefore of civilization.

In the circumstances, it seems difficult to refuse to the nations in the forefront of battle—France and Belgium—the protection they deem indispensable to enable them to live and fight until their allies arrive. * * *

Whether the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhine remain German or not, the political frontier between the western European nations and Germany is the Rhine.

I urge with all my strength upon the allied and associated governments, which in the most critical hours of the war entrusted to me the conduct of their armies and the future of our common cause, to consider that the future can only be permanently assured—tomorrow as it was yesterday—by the military frontier of the Rhine and its occupation by the Allies. This essential position must therefore be held.

—

DOCUMENT 6.—ASSISTANCE TO FRANCE IN THE EVENT OF UNPROVOKED AGGRESSION BY GERMANY

Message from the President of the United States transmitting an agreement between the United States and France which was signed at Versailles, June 28, 1919, to secure the Republic of France the immediate aid of the United States in case of unprovoked movement of aggression against her on the part of Germany

July 29, 1919—Read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed

MESSAGE OF TRANSMITTAL

Gentlemen of the Senate: I take pleasure in laying before you a treaty with the Republic of France, the object of which is to secure that Republic of the immediate aid of the United States of America in case of any unprovoked movement of aggression against her on the part of Germany. I earnestly hope that this treaty will meet with your cordial approval and will receive an early ratification at your hands, along with the treaty of peace with Germany. Now that you have had an opportunity to examine the great document I presented to you 2 weeks ago, it seems opportune to lay before you this treaty which is meant to be in effect a part of it.

It was signed on the same day with the treaty of peace and is intended as a temporary supplement to it. It is believed that the treaty of peace with Germany itself provides adequate protection to France against aggression from her recent enemy on the east; but the years immediately ahead of us contain many incalculable possibilities. The Covenant of the League of Nations provides for military action for the protection of its members only upon advice of the Council of the League—advice given, it is to be presumed, only upon deliberation and acted upon by each of the governments of the member states only if its own judgment justifies such action. The object of the special treaty with France which I now submit to you is to provide for immediate military assistance to France by the United States in case of any unprovoked movement of aggression against her by Germany without waiting for the advice of the Council of the League of Nations that such action be taken. It is to be an arrangement, not independent of the League of Nations, but under it.

It is, therefore, expressly provided that this treaty shall be made the subject of consideration at the same time with the treaty of peace with Germany; that this special arrangement shall receive the approval of the Council of the League; and that this special provision for the safety of France shall remain in force only until, upon the application of one of the parties to it, the Council of the League, acting, if necessary, by a majority vote, shall agree that the provisions of the Covenant of the League afford her sufficient protection.

I was moved to sign this treaty by considerations which will, I hope, seem as persuasive and as irresistible to you as they seemed to me. We are bound to France by ties of friendship which we have always regarded, and shall always regard, as peculiarly sacred. She assisted us to win our freedom as a nation. It is seriously to be doubted whether we could have won it without her gallant and timely aid. We have recently had the privilege of assisting in driving enemies, who were also enemies of the world, from her soil; but that does not pay our debt to her. Nothing can pay such a debt. She now desires that we should promise to lend our great force to keep her safe against the power she has had most reason to fear. Another great nation volunteers the same promise. It is

one of the fine reversals of history that that other nation should be the very power from whom France fought to set us free. A new day has dawned. Old antagonisms are forgotten. The common cause of freedom and enlightenment has created new comradeships and a new perception of what it is wise and necessary for great nations to do to free the world of intolerable fear. Two governments who wish to be members of the League of Nations ask leave of the Council of the League to be permitted to go to the assistance of a friend whose situation has been found to be one of peculiar peril, without awaiting the advice of the League to act.

It is by taking such pledges as this that we prove ourselves faithful to the utmost to the high obligations of gratitude and tested friendship. Such an act as this seems to me one of the proofs that we are a people that sees the true heart of duty and prefers honor to its own separate course of peace.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 29, 1919.*

DOCUMENT 7.—ASSISTANCE TO FRANCE IN THE EVENT OF UNPROVOKED AGGRESSION BY GERMANY

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE SIGNED AT VERSAILLES JUNE 28, 1919

Whereas the United States of America and the French Republic are equally animated by the desire to maintain the peace of the world, so happily restored by the treaty of peace signed at Versailles the 28th day of June 1919, putting an end to the war begun by the aggression of the German Empire and ended by the defeat of that power; and

Whereas the United States of America and the French Republic are fully persuaded that an unprovoked movement of aggression by Germany against France would not only violate both the letter and the spirit of the Treaty of Versailles, to which the United States of America and the French Republic are parties, thus exposing France anew to the intolerable burdens of an unprovoked war, but that such aggression on the part of Germany would be and is so regarded by the Treaty of Versailles as a hostile act against all the powers signatory to that treaty and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world by involving inevitably and directly the states of Europe and indirectly, as experience has amply and unfortunately demonstrated, the world at large; and

Whereas the United States of America and the French Republic fear that the stipulations relating to the left bank of the Rhine contained in said Treaty of Versailles may not at first provide adequate security and protection to France on the one hand and the United States of America as one of the signatories of the Treaty of Versailles on the other;

Therefore, the United States of America and the French Republic having decided to conclude a treaty to effect these necessary purposes, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, and Robert Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States, specially authorized thereto by the President of the United States, and Georges Clemenceau, president of the Council, Minister of War, and Stephen Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, specially authorized thereto by Raymond Poincaré, President of the French Republic, have agreed upon the following articles:

Article I

In case the following stipulations relating to the left bank of the Rhine contained in the treaty of peace with Germany signed at Versailles the 28th day of June 1919 by the United States of America, the French Republic, and the British Empire among other powers:

"ARTICLE 42. Germany is forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right bank to the west of a line drawn 50 kilometers to the east of the Rhine.

"ARTICLE 43. In the area defined above the maintenance and assembly of armed forces, either permanently or temporarily, and military maneuvers of any kind, as well as the upkeep of all permanent works for mobilization are in the same way forbidden.

"ARTICLE 44. In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of articles 42 and 43, she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the powers signatory of the present treaty and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world."

may not at first provide adequate security and protection to France, the United States of America shall be bound to come immediately to her assistance in the event of any unprovoked movement of aggression against her being made by Germany.

Article II

The present treaty, in similar terms with the treaty of even date for the same purpose concluded between Great Britain and the French Republic, a copy of which treaty is annexed hereto, will only come into force when the latter is ratified.

Article III

The present treaty must be submitted to the Council of the League of Nations, and must be recognized by the Council, acting if need be by a majority, as an engagement which is consistent with the Covenant of the League. It will continue in force until on the application of one of the parties to it the Council, acting if need be by a majority, agrees that the League itself affords sufficient protection.

Article IV

The present treaty will be submitted to the Senate of the United States at the same time as the Treaty of Versailles is submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. It will be submitted before ratification to the French Chambers of Deputies (aux Chambres françaises) for approval. The ratifications thereof will be exchanged on the deposit of ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles at Paris or as soon thereafter as shall be possible.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries, to wit: On the part of the United States of America, Woodrow Wilson, President, and Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, of the United States; and on the part of the French Republic, Georges Clemenceau, President of the Council of Ministers, Minister of War, and Stephen Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, have signed the above articles both in the English and French languages, and they have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate at the city of Versailles, on the 28th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1919, and the one hundred and forty-third of the Independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL] WOODROW WILSON.
[SEAL] ROBERT LANSING.
[SEAL] G. CLEMENCEAU.
[SEAL] S. PICHON.

Tribute From Son to Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

REMARKS OF BRUCE GREEN, OF ARLINGTON, VA.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, tomorrow the Nation will celebrate Father's Day.

No more beautiful tribute from a son to a father has come to my attention than that paid by Mr. Bruce Green, of Arlington, Va., to his father, Harry K. Green, past master, Columbia Lodge 285, A. F. and A. M.; past district deputy grand master of district 54; and past grand master of the Grand Lodge of Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this tribute in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Most worshipful grand master and brethren, amidst such an outstanding array of Masonic dignitaries, who have gathered at this grand annual conclave to foster the welfare of our fraternity, I feel somewhat restrained to attempt to fulfill the assignment which has devolved upon my head at the instance of the master of my lodge.

I see many craftsmen in this vast assembly that are far more capable of delivering a commemorative address than I could ever hope to be. I see brethren here that have held this august body spellbound with eloquence on many occasions, and it is, therefore, with a sense of genuine humility that I rise today to extol a name that I hold near and dear to my heart—a name which reverberates with kindness, affability, and good deeds; a name which is a symbol of service to his fellow men—that distinguished craftsman, that God-fearing gentleman, that crusader of right, your bicentennial grand master and my affectionate father, most worshipful brother, Harry K. Green.

Along life's highway other men have had fathers who have possibly attained greater heights of distinction and wealth than mine, as such are measured in the affairs of men, yet I have never known a son that could claim a father who was a more earnest warrior in the field of right, who labored more devotedly in the interest of his family and his fellow men, or who had a larger soul than my father, whose portrait is being unveiled today.

He has been the beacon light for good that has spread its refulgent rays of companionship, wise counsel, good cheer, and God-like pervading influence, which have surrounded all the years of my life. As far back as I can recall, I can see his friends, too numerous to mention, seeking his good offices when misfortune would overtake them—men who had lost their jobs, women who had been widowed by the death of their loved ones, all finding their way to our home in Arlington County, there to receive his kind word of admonition and seek his judgment in their hour of trial and distress. His kindness has extended, not alone to Masonic brethren and their families, but to black and white alike of almost every creed and denomination. He has truly lived to help his fellow beings.

Father's life is filled with many beautiful characteristics, and, as I look down memory lane into the years of long ago, I can see a multitude of instances that would be well worthy of laudation, but the limitation of time allotted for these ceremonies makes it necessary to pass over most of them and direct my remarks to the fortitude of his existence.

There he sits, my brethren, somewhat broken in body, his hands ancylosed and distorted in appearance, his motivating power impaired to the point of excruciating pain at every step, yet, withal, he clings to the faith of his childhood, manifests the courage of a saint, relies upon the wisdom of the Master Builder, bears the pain it is his lot to bear and carries on, as he has for many years, his laudable efforts in life with a greater perspective and a more propitious outlook than those of us who are well and able-bodied.

A recapitulation of the beauties of his life discloses the presence of four outstanding tenets—rectitude, loyalty, kindness, and service, and it appears to me that the Great Ambassador of Good impregnated his being with the rich influences so essential to the fulfillment of his mission in life.

Around his head he placed an invisible garland of lilies symbolic of the probity of his life; about his shoulders he bedecked the cloak of loyalty to his friends and his beliefs; in his heart he implanted a seed of kindness which has fructified with luxuriant splendor since his childhood days of yore; and about his soul he draped a tapestry taken from the walls of the spacious temple of the spirit world and embroidered thereon in golden letters, the word "service." Service to the God he worships. Service to the family that is proud to bear his name. Service to his friends and neighbors. Service to his State and Nation.

And in conclusion, brethren, may I make a personal reference by way of a poem which I read some years ago. Its author is unknown, but it expresses in beautiful language the feeling which permeates my heart.

"Always my counselor, always my friend,
Always with patience his help would he lend
Always at hand when life's problems I met
Throughout all the world my best friend yet,
Always consistent, understanding my mould,
'Midst all my sorrows as true as gold.

"Always the first to wish me luck,
Always the first to praise my pluck,
Always at hand to give me a tip,
Usually saying, 'Keep a stiff upper lip.'
Always at hand whether rain or shine,
The same old sport, this Daddy of mine."

It is with genuine pride and deep emotion that I present to this grand body on behalf of Columbia Lodge, the portrait of the man I proudly call "Dad."

Condemnation of Italy's Entrance Into War by Italian Club of Tampa, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE AND AN EDITORIAL FROM TAMPA (FLA.) TRIBUNE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article appearing in the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of June 13 giving the encouraging news that the Italian Club of Tampa, which is a large and responsible club, unequivocally denounces the conduct of Mussolini in entering the war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of June 13, 1940]

ITALIAN CLUB CONDEMNS ACTS OF MUSSOLINI—PRAISES PRINCIPLES EXPRESSED BY ROOSEVELT

Directors of L'Unione Italiana, the Italian club of Tampa, adopted resolutions yesterday, strongly condemning the entrance of Italy into the war against the Allies, heartily praising and endorsing the principles expressed by President Roosevelt, and offering to defend American democracy.

"As we always have been in the past," the resolution said, "we are now and always shall be at the disposal of the Government of the United States, ready, under any emergency or circumstances, to defend with our utmost loyalty and vigor those principles and ideals, regardless of sacrifice."

SENTIMENT OF ALL

The directors pointed out that they expressed the sentiments of all of the club's 3,500 members, 90 percent of whom are citizens of the United States.

The resolutions said the action of the Italian Government was contrary to the ideals of the organization, which never had been in sympathy with totalitarian government and was contrary to general sentiment in Italy, long recognized as a natural enemy of Germans and Austrians.

They emphasized that the club had always expressed disapproval of the Mussolini government, had never received its delegates or representatives here, and took no part in any events according them recognition.

Members of the club, the resolutions added, are "lovers and defenders of principles of the Constitution of the United States," and are now reaffirming their allegiance.

TEXT OF RESOLUTIONS

The full text of the resolutions follows:

"Whereas, the Italian Nation under the government of Benito Mussolini, has entered the existing war in Europe as a belligerent on the side of Germany and against France and Great Britain;

"Whereas, the said action of the Italian Government is contrary to the sentiments and principles of the membership of L'Unione and of the ideals which this institution represents;

"Whereas, the L'Unione society has never been in sympathy with the totalitarian government of Benito Mussolini which governs Italy, and, in fact, has always expressed its disapproval of same to the extent of not receiving delegates and representatives of said government which have visited this city, abstaining from taking part in any event or occasion which signified attention, recognition or courtesies to the delegates of representatives of said totalitarian government;

"Whereas, we believe that the general sentiment of the people of Italy is not favorable to Germany, because it cannot be forgotten that for the past 2,000 years both the Germans and the Austrians have been natural enemies of the Italian people who have received from him only antagonism and harm;

"Whereas, our membership are lovers of democracy and defenders of the principles and ideals embodied in the Constitution of the United States, of which we are loyal and sincere citizens, which ideals and principles we have always propagated, encouraged, and defended under all circumstances and which we will continue to encourage, propagate, and defend no matter what conditions or situations may arise;

"Whereas the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has lately expressed the sentiments of the Government and the people of the United States relative to that declaration of war by Italy against France and Great Britain in favor of Germany and indicated the line of conduct to be followed by the Government and the Nation to better promote and defend the great principles of democracy, liberty, and justice of the Constitution of the United States;

"The board of directors of L'Unione Italiana gathered in representation of all its members, solemnly and sincerely resolved:

"1. To strongly condemn the action of Benito Mussolini's government of Italy in joining Germany in the European conflict in a declaration of war against France and Great Britain;

"2. To express our antagonism against the totalitarian system of government or any other that is contrary to the principles of true democracy as practiced and sustained in the United States;

"3. To heartily praise and endorse the principles, expressions, and suggestions made by the President of the United States in his speech relative to the said declaration of war;

"4. To once more, as we have done many times before, express and reaffirm our sentiments and principles of true democracy and our loyalty to and true faith in the ideals embodied in the Constitution of the United States;

"5. To declare that, as we always have been in the past, we are now and always shall be at the disposal of the Government of the United States ready, under any emergency or circumstance, to defend with our utmost loyalty and vigor those principles and ideals, regardless of sacrifice."

IF WE HAD FOLLOWED WILSON

In a thoughtful article in the New York Times, Edwin L. James recurs to the League of Nations, and our refusal to join in it and support it. He discusses the possibility that had the United States fulfilled Woodrow Wilson's plan and purpose, upheld the League, and made it function effectively there would have been no conquering Hitler, no European-grabbing Reich, "no blitzkrieg."

"Who can say," asks James, "that if Washington had insisted on the virile League Wilson planned, if Washington had made it necessary for other nations to go to Geneva to do international business with us, if the League had had put back of it the force Wilson intended, it would have sunk to such low degree? The statement that anyhow the League would not have worked is a statement which cannot be proved."

And he continues:

"Look at the United States today after 20 years of that proud isolation to conserve which we deserted the international effort of two decades ago to prevent just what has happened today. We planned to be safe in our isolation, but today we are planning to spend billions of dollars to prepare ourselves to protect the Nation. And there are very good chances that if that protecting has to be done, we shall have to face the peril alone. And what peril is it? It is exactly the peril of brute aggression which the League was shaped to prevent.

"The oceans have become highways instead of barriers and that this is true is shown by the fact that the potential dangers which now excite us exist, both of them, on the other side of the two oceans which were to have been our safe protectors.

"Can it not be argued that if there had been in existence for the past 20 years the kind of organization Wilson intended that the perils to our national interests would not have grown to their present importance? Whatever may be the truth of the matter, it must

be admitted that the United States did just about nothing to prevent the dangers we now face. For our present position we must blame ourselves first of all.

"A good case can be made for the argument that with a virile League Hitler would never have come into power in Germany. It can be argued that the support which a democratic Germany might have received from Geneva would have prevented his rise. But suppose for argument's sake that he had come to power. Does anyone imagine that if Germany had faced a united League the Fuehrer would have been able to do what he has done? Would he have been able to pick his weaker victims off 1 by 1 and would he be fighting today just 2 nations if he had been faced by 50?"

There will be no League, no proposal for a League, if Germany wins this war. The only League of Nations will be a League of Nations subjugated and controlled by Hitler. For this sad situation, if it comes, the United States, or rather the small group of petty partisans who prevented our participation in that original League, must take much of the blame.

We went into a victorious fight to save democracy and insure the peace of the world, and we forthwith threw away the fruits of that victory and, with them, the prospects of understanding and harmony among nations.

When we left the League powerless, we invited the dictatorships and hastened their coming.

Was not the far-seeing wisdom of Woodrow Wilson, discarded at the time, after all the salvation of democracy, peace, and civilization?

Reply to Address by Colonel Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEY PITTMAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. KEY PITTMAN, OF NEVADA

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I broadcast last evening, June 16, 1940, over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., from 9:45 to 10 o'clock, in reply to the address of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, broadcast over the same network the previous night.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL LINDBERGH'S MISCONCEPTION OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Fellow citizens, Colonel Lindbergh, in his speech last night, said: "We cannot continue for long to follow the course our Government has taken without becoming involved with Germany." The only possible justification for such a statement was his pronouncement that "There are many perfectly sincere men and women who believe that we can send weapons to kill people in Europe without becoming involved with these people."

Colonel Lindbergh evidently desires and intends to stop the purchase of materials in this country by Great Britain and France. He does not deny that this is absolutely in accordance with the customs of international law and nations since the beginning of time. He believes, however, apparently, that this will lead us into war. How absurd!

Well, suppose it does. Who would institute and conduct the war? Not the United States, but Germany. Hitler is too wise to undertake so futile an undertaking. It is significant that when the United States had its markets open to Germany for all the materials, arms, and instruments of war that have built up Hitler's brutal machine, there was no such argument by Colonel Lindbergh. It must be admitted that the purchase of these materials is legal.

Then what is Colonel Lindbergh's objection? It is plain and simple: That such legal actions will involve us in war with Germany. It appears that Colonel Lindbergh, who has resided long in Great Britain as its guest, through fear of incensing Hitler, would deprive the people of Great Britain and France of the weapons necessary to protect their lives against airplanes and tanks which, with our other materials, were supplied to Germany.

Colonel Lindbergh in his address quoted the policies of the pioneers of the West with regard to the use of guns. He evidently was not informed entirely as to the courage and spirit of those early pioneers. They never refused to give a gun even to a stranger whose life was threatened by a bandit. Selfishness and cowardice were not so marked with the early pioneers.

Colonel Lindbergh's advisers are expert upon the subject of political propaganda. Colonel Lindbergh should have sought other advice with regard to military matters. He attempts to excite and intimidate the citizens of the United States through fear of Hitler. He tells them with the authority of a Pershing that if they get into war with Germany that they have to undertake the impossible task of transporting millions of men from the United States to fight in Germany. He informs our people that this war would last for generations. What a brutal and unfounded assertion! The United States has no desire to conquer Germany. We simply intend to prevent Hitler from conquering any country on the Western Hemisphere. Instead of the United States undertaking the practically impossible feat of conveying an invading army to Germany, that necessity will be placed upon Hitler, if and when he ever attempts to invade the Western Hemisphere.

Colonel Lindbergh, in his love for the people of the United States, criticizes our condition of unpreparedness, and proposes immediate and extraordinary preparedness for national defense. When did this patriotic spirit animate him? Did anyone ever hear of it until recently? Are we to prepare to that extent unless there be a threat to our national safety? Who threatens our national safety?

Colonel Lindbergh's address plainly indicates that it is Hitler with his inordinate ambition and his unlimited intent for conquest. Would it be to the welfare of the United States if Hitler were stopped in Europe? If he were stopped, there would be no threat against the United States. If the opening of our markets to Great Britain and France for arms, ammunition, and implements of war would stop Hitler, would Colonel Lindbergh favor it?

Even if it would anger Hitler, even if Hitler should conquer Europe, as suggested by Colonel Lindbergh, would his anger toward us in any way actuate his course of conquest? Is it possible that if we refused to do the legal, humane thing toward Great Britain and France—if we stultified ourselves by praising the brutal and atheistic Government of Hitler—that it would in any way alter his course toward us, if it were in his power to conquer us? Oh, certainly not.

Witness the peaceful, friendly attitude of Holland and Belgium.

It is strange the motives that actuate man. Maybe Colonel Lindbergh still trusts Hitler with regard to the policy of appeasement indulged in by Chamberlain and apparently advanced by Colonel Lindbergh. Who is Colonel Lindbergh fighting in the United States. Certainly not Congress, for Congress even today is criticized for surrendering the freedom of the seas that they might keep out of war.

Has Colonel Lindbergh unwittingly been led into an attack on the President of the United States? Has the cunning incitement of his ambition blinded him as to the safety of his country. Is the "fifth column" behind Colonel Lindbergh, without his knowledge, in attempting to defeat the present leaders of our country?

Has Colonel Lindbergh failed to read his written speech, or, if he did, to understand that there is an apparent attack upon the patriotism of the Chief Executive of this country? I doubt if he has realized it.

The President, in his last public proclamation in answer to Premier Reynaud of France, stated emphatically that nothing he had said should be considered a commitment to enter the war.

Colonel Lindbergh is a young man, subject to flattery, as all of us are, and through flattery are often deceived. Colonel Lindbergh is a courageous man. No one doubts his patriotism. But he is a young man inexperienced and totally unfamiliar with our country, its statesmanship, and its military matters.

Our Government has an exceedingly serious responsibility imposed upon it. If Colonel Lindbergh desires to help in our national defense, let him throw aside all of his false political advisers, and volunteer in the United States Government as an expert in aviation.

Let Colonel Lindbergh cease efforts to create unfounded war fear and lack of confidence in our Government. Let Colonel Lindbergh and his advisers know that when one fools with politics in a national emergency he is fooling with disaster.

Let the people of the United States understand once and for all that there is no immediate danger of attack on this country, that there is future danger of Hitler's involving this country in a serious war, that this country is able, and intends to make any preparation that may be necessary to successfully defend this hemisphere against any invasion by Hitler, or by any other militaristic conquerors.

Our Drift Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY COLONEL LINDBERGH

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, on June 15, 1940, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh delivered another great speech on our foreign relations.

The Colonel delivered the three other speeches on foreign affairs on September 16, 1939, October 14, 1939, and May 20,

1940, all of which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this session.

Charles A. Lindbergh is a great son of a great father.

I ask the honor of placing his last speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 16, 1940]

LINDBERGH CALLS ON AMERICANS TO CURB WAR FEVER—CHARGES FUTURE OF NATION IS PERILED BY MINORITY

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 15.—The text of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh's address on Our Drift Toward War follows:

"I have asked to speak to you again tonight because I believe that we in America are drifting toward a position of far greater seriousness to our future than even this present war. There is an attempt to becloud the issue that confronts us. It is not alone an issue of building an adequate defense for our country. That must and can be done. Our people are solidly behind an adequate military preparedness, and no one believes in it more than I.

"But we must not confuse the question of national defense with the question of entering a European war. And it is just as important not to confuse this present war with the type of war we would have to wage if we fought against Germany. Arming for the defense of America is comparable with normal life, commerce, and culture. It is an integral part of the destiny of our Nation. But arming to attack the continent of Europe would necessitate that the lives and thoughts of every man, woman, and child in this country be directed toward war for the next generation, probably for the next several generations.

"WARNS OF WAR TRAP

"We cannot continue for long to follow the course our Government has taken without becoming involved in war with Germany. There are some who already advocate our entry into such a war. There are many perfectly sincere men and women who believe that we can send weapons to kill people in Europe without becoming involved in war with these people. Still others believe that by gestures and applause we can assist France and England to win without danger to our own country.

"In addition to these, however, there are men among us of less honesty who advocate stepping closer and closer to war, knowing well that a point exists beyond which there can be no turning back. They have baited the trap of war with requests for modest assistance. This latter group is meeting with success at the moment.

"There is a saying that grew in the old West to the effect that a man who enjoys life should never touch his gun unless he means business; that he should never draw unless he is ready to shoot, and that he should never shoot unless he is ready to kill. Those old pioneers of ours knew from long experience that there can be no successful dabbling with death.

"WISDOM OF WEST GONE

"But the red-blooded wisdom of the old West is gone from American politics today. Our present danger results from making gestures with an empty gun after we have already lost the draw. Fortunately, the wide wall of the Atlantic stands between us and the shooting that is going on.

"This dabbling we have been doing in European affairs can lead only to failure in the future as it has in the past. It is not a policy that we can continue to follow and remain a great nation.

"Let us look at our position today. Our leaders have lost the influence we could have exerted as the world's greatest neutral nation. The driblets of munitions we have sold to England and France have had a negligible effect on the trend of the war, and we have not sufficient military strength available to change that trend. We demand that foreign nations refrain from interfering in our hemisphere, yet we constantly interfere in theirs. And while we have been taking an ineffective part in the war abroad, we have inexcusably neglected our defenses at home.

"NO HOME-DEFENSE PLAN

"In fact, we have let our own affairs drift along until we have not even a plan of defense for the continent of North America. We have been doing to England and France what they did to Abyssinia, to Czechoslovakia, to Poland, to Finland, and to Norway—we have encouraged them to hope for help we cannot send.

"Yet with these examples before us, we still continue in this course—the same course that led England to failure abroad and weakness at home, a course that will lead us also to a disastrous and unsuccessful war if we persist in following it.

"When the subject of our participation in war is discussed, most people visualize the war that is now going on in Europe. They think of sending more arms and possibly some soldiers. There is still very little understanding of what our entrance into European war would mean. When we talk of such a war, we must realize that we are considering the greatest struggle the world has yet known—a conflict between hemispheres, one half of the white race against the other half.

"Before allowing ourselves to become further involved, we should consider the conditions which may exist by the time we are ready for military action. If we enter a war at all, we should prepare to meet the worst conditions rather than the best.

"NEED MONTHS TO PREPARE

"It is useless to talk of sending American troops to Europe now, for we would need months of preparation before we could train and equip even a small army, and small efforts do not effect great movements—witness Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

"We must face the fact, regardless of how disagreeable it is to us, that before we can take effective action in a European war the German armies may have brought all Europe under their control. In that case Europe will be dominated by the strongest military nation the world has ever known, controlling a population far larger than our own. If we decide to enter war, we must be prepared to attack that nation. We must prepare to invade a continent which it controls.

"No people ever had a greater decision to make. We hold our children's future in our hands as we deliberate, for if we turn to war, the battles will be hard fought and the outcome is not likely to be decided in our lifetime. This is a question of mortgaging the lives of our children and our grandchildren. Every family in the land would have its wounded and its dead.

"WAR MEANS DICTATORSHIP

"We start at a disadvantage because we are not a military nation. Ours is not a land of guns and marching men. If we decide to fight, then the United States must prepare for war for many years to come, and on a scale unprecedented in all history. In that case we must turn to a dictatorial government, for there is no military efficiency to be lost.

"We should start to build an army of several million men. We will need several hundred thousand airplanes before the battling is over. And we must have a navy large enough to transport this force across the sea. This war we are asked to enter would not be a repetition of the last war. It would be more comparable to the struggle which took place between Athens and Sparta, or Rome and Carthage. It would involve the destiny of America and of western civilization as far into the future as we can see.

"HALT 'EMPTY GUN' GESTURES

"But whatever our decision may be in regard to Europe, we must start now to build our own defenses. We must stop these gestures with an empty gun. In this we are a united Nation. The only question that arises concerns how our defense can best be built.

"We must first construct a clear-cut plan of defense, and have the cooperation of all American countries in carrying it out. We must insist upon military bases being placed wherever they are needed for our safety, regardless of who owns the territory involved. We must be willing to do more than pay taxes and make appropriations. Military strength cannot be purchased by money alone. Strength is a thing of spirit, of preparation, and of sacrifice extending over years of time.

"The men of our country must be willing to give a year of their lives to military training—more if necessary. And our capitalists as well as our soldiers should be willing to serve without personal profit. We must have a nation ready to give whatever is required for its future welfare, and leaders who are more interested in their country than in their own advancement.

"WE HAVE DEFENSE ADVANTAGE

"With an adequate defense no foreign army can invade us. Our advantage in defending America is as great as our disadvantage would be in attacking Europe. From a military geographical standpoint, we are the most fortunate country in the world. There is no other nation in this hemisphere strong enough to even consider attacking us, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans separate us from the warring armies of Europe and Asia.

"If the British Navy could not support an invasion of Norway against the German air force, there is little reason for us to worry about an invasion of America as long as our air force is adequately maintained. As far as invasion by air is concerned, it is impossible for any existing air force to attack effectively across the ocean. In the Arctic regions the severe climate and ruggedness of terrain counteract the vulnerability of shorter distances between land.

"NATION AT CROSSROADS

"With our geographical position, nothing but the gross neglect of our military forces, or quarreling between American countries themselves, could make possible an invasion by foreign armies. America stands today where the road divides, at the signpost of war and peace.

"Now that we have become one of the world's greatest nations, shall we throw away the independent American destiny which our forefathers gave their lives to win? Shall we submerge our future in the endless wars of the old world? Or shall we build our own defenses and leave European war to European countries?

"Shall we continue this suicidal conflict between western nations and white races, or shall we learn from history as well as from modern Europe that a civilization cannot be preserved by conflict among its own peoples, regardless of how different their ideologies may be?

"A FLOOD OF PROPAGANDA

"You men and women of America who believe that our destiny lies in building strength at home and not in war abroad—to you I say that we must act now to stop this trend toward war.

"An organized minority in this country is flooding our Congress and our press with propaganda for war. They are spending large sums of money in advertisements. They are telegraphing, writing, and talking every hour of the day, pushing us closer and closer to the edge. Some are even now demanding a declaration of war.

"If you believe that we should not enter a European war, you must support those of us who oppose such action. We cannot stop this trend alone. Some of your Representatives in Washington are already considering a declaration of war, but they are responsible to you for the action they take. Let them know how you feel about this. Speak to your friends and organize in your community. Nothing but a determined effort on the part of every one of us will prevent the disaster toward which our Nation is now heading."

Imports of Agricultural Products Less in 1938 and 1939 Than in 1929

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a number of statements purporting to show that agricultural imports have been unusually high in recent years are being distributed. As a matter of fact such imports have been lower in recent years, and this is brought out in a table comparing figures for the past 2 years with those of 1929.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a table showing the imports, for examination of specific duties for the years 1929 and the years 1938 and 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Imports for consumption of specified commodities, 1929, 1838, and 1939

Commodities	Unit	Year ended December 31—		
		1929	1938	1939 [1]
		Thous.	*Thous.*	*Thous.*
Meat products (including canned beef)	Pound	192,801	148,149	150,794
Mutton and lamb, fresh	Pound	3,965	12	124
Milk, fresh, skimmed, and buttermilk	Gallon	4,246	6	22
Milk, dried and malted	Pound	3,622	81	2,465
Cheese	Pound	76,354	54,432	59,071
Casein or lactarene	Pound	27,369	417	15,832
Cattle hides	Pound	265,579	59,693	134,107
Sheep and lamb skins	Pound	64,513	32,649	63,776
Hay	Ton [2]	35	19	48
Wheat byproduct feeds	Ton [2]	306	58	459
Chickpeas, dried	Pound	52,539	7,728	8,332
Potatoes, white or Irish	Pound	244,962	45,820	93,859
Potato starch	Pound	28,282	6,746	10,984
Tomatoes, canned	Pound	162,273	62,520	55,400
Apples	Bushel	268	26	46
Cherries, natural, sulfured, or in brine	Pound	22,916	1,546	1,574
Brazil or cream nuts	Pound	32,689	28,647	32,500
Filberts	Pound	12,770	2,357	3,629
Pecans	Pound	407	147	214
Maple sugar	Pound	12,249	3,946	9,622
Wool, unmanufactured:				
Free in bond for use in carpets, etc	Pound	158,217	70,021	143,406
Dutiable wool	Pound	117,878	34,253	102,565
Cotton, raw (478 pounds)	Bale	467	193	148
Tobacco leaf	Pound	73,734	60,841	62,223
Flaxseed	Bushel	23,848	15,364	16,028
Castor beans	Pound	175,392	114,076	162,611
Raw sugar (including beet)	Ton [2]	4,382	2,975	2,903
Tung oil	Pound	119,678	107,456	78,718
Coconut oil	Pound	411,980	363,941	336,796
Total value:				
All supplementary agricultural imports [3]	Dollars	1,016,664	476,645	526,094
All complementary agricultural imports [3]	Dollars	1,201,048	478,875	591,661
All agricultural imports	Dollars	2,217,712	955,520	1,117,755

[1] Preliminary.

[2] 2,000 pounds.

[3] In the classification of agricultural imports into supplementary and complementary groups, all those similar to agricultural commodities commercially produced in the United States and all others that are interchangeable in use to any significant extent with agricultural commodities commercially produced in the United States are considered supplementary. The remaining agricultural imports are considered complementary.

Endorses President for Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

OKLAHOMA DEMOCRATS IN STATE CONVENTION ALSO COMMEND STATE DELEGATION IN CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this week Democrats of Oklahoma held their annual convention at Oklahoma City. Every county in the State was well represented. It was a great, harmonious convention. The senior Senator from Oklahoma, ELMER THOMAS, delivered the keynote address. The resolutions presented and unanimously adopted were sane, sensible, progressive, and very much to the point.

Feeling that the resolutions in question will be of special interest to the citizens not only of Oklahoma but of the entire country, I am taking the liberty of submitting same for the RECORD. I am indebted to one of my distinguished constituents, my personal friend, Judge Bert B. Barefoot, chairman of the resolutions committee, for sending a copy of the resolutions. They are as follows:

The democracy of Oklahoma takes great pride in the accomplishments of her representatives in Washington, particularly during the period since the return of the Government to the people on March 4, 1933.

Our present representatives in Congress, Senators ELMER THOMAS and JOSH LEE, as well as our Congressmen, WESLEY E. DISNEY, LYLE BOREN, JACK NICHOLS, WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, MIKE MONRONEY, JED JOHNSON, SAM C. MASSINGALE, PHIL FERGUSON, and WILL ROGERS, have stood foursquare for the great humanitarian policies of our party and have particularly supported our peerless leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his program of conservation of the human and material resources of the Nation.

These gentlemen today occupy places high up in the ranks of those who are directing our governmental policies and have marked out a course of leadership that has drawn unprecedented prestige to the statesmanship of Oklahoma's sons. It would take too much time to call the roll here of these men and their splendid accomplishments. Suffice to say that theirs is a record of which every Oklahoman may take pardonable pride.

At this time of uncertainty, when new problems are daily demanding attention, we think it wise that our national representatives remain in attendance at Washington upon their official duties, and we commend them for their policy of remaining on the job to be of all possible assistance to the other branches of Government in promoting a national-defense program to the end that our Nation may be prepared to defend itself regardless of who may undertake to attack us.

Following his administration this country had 12 years of Republican rule. Its battle cry was "Hands off big business—it knows best." The result was that labor lost all it had ever gained; agriculture was on the verge of bankruptcy; from twenty to thirty million farmers were removed from the purchasing class; banks were failing, business was at a standstill, and 14,000,000 men were walking the highways and byways of this country unable to secure employment for the support of themselves and their families. On that day in March 1933 came to the White House Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Democrat. His first step was to come to the assistance of the businessman and the banker. With the reformation of the banking laws the banks were reopened, and back of them was the confidence of the people of this Republic. Hardly a dollar has been lost to the bank depositors during his administration. For years after his inauguration he was praised by all business, and not until he was a candidate for a second term did they oppose him. His second step was the assistance of the laboring people of this country. His devotion to this task throughout his entire administration has given to them a magna carta such as they had never had before. Next to agricuture. His devotion to their cause has been a noble effort to place agriculture on a par with industry and finance and to bring to the American farmer restoration of prosperity. Time forbids the mention of all the accomplishments of his administration, but we shall recall: The Federal Deposit insurance law, the creation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the T. V. A., the Rural Electrification Administration, the Wagner Labor Act, the

Civilian Conservation Corps, the N. Y. A., and the social-security program. These laws have become a permanent part of our Nation and Government.

The people will not give up the man who conceived and brought into effect the laws above mentioned until these further rights are established in this Nation: The right to a job; the right to security in times of private employment and in old age; the right to a decent home; the right to an education; the right to bargain collectively with the boss; the right to enough to eat; the right to adequate pay; the right to sell the products of the farmer's toil at a fair price; the right to security of savings; the right to security of home and family; the right to a fair share of the Nation's resources and to protection against their exploitation.

In his fight to preserve the fundamental principles established by Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson he, like they, has been attacked by many conscientiously, by others as the organized forces of greed. He has been referred to as a dictator, as an underminer of American institutions, and as an inciter of class hatred, and as one who would seek the destruction of the courts, and a desire to lead us into war. His answer to these are his acts, which reveal a determination for the preservation of democracy in America. His love for peace, his love for humanity, his knowledge and understanding of the great questions which confront the people of this Nation in this great hour of peril and distress has established him as the greatest leader that has ever occupied the White House.

His 8 years' experience with questions of national and international problems, his gifted qualifications, his service to this Republic at this time, has become a national and international necessity. He is a man of the common people, and whom they gladly hear. They want him, not as a partisan, but as a patriot; not to solely occupy high office, but to lead and direct; and in God's good time, in the council of peace, to help assuage the sorrows and right the wrongs of a distorted world.

It is with this knowledge that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of this Nation are demanding his return to the White House, not for a third term, but as the greatest and grandest leader this Nation has ever had. In common with this overwhelming majority, the Democrats of Oklahoma, this day in convention assembled, do hereby instruct our delegates to the National Democratic Convention, to be held in the city of Chicago on the 15th day of July 1940, to cast their votes for the nomination of the greatest living Democrat, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as the Democratic candidate for President of the United States; and in the event he refuses the nomination, that the delegates be then instructed, under the unit rule, to so cast their votes for someone in favor of the policies of the present administration as they deem to the best interest of the Nation, the State, and the Democratic Party.

Effect of the Poll Tax Upon Voting in Mississippi Primaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, following up my remarks last week, I present herewith primary figures for three different election years in Mississippi to show that the poll tax cuts down primary votes as well as election votes. Particularly noteworthy are the facts that:

First. Total votes cast in the average Mississippi primary were 22,199, less than one-fourth of the 106,000 votes cast in the average election in a non-poll-tax district.

Second. Average votes for a successful primary candidate were 13,382. Yet 292 district representatives from non-poll-tax States each received more than three times this number of votes in the 1938 off-year election.

Third. The district with the greatest population (half again as large as normal) averaged the fewest votes both in primary and election. Total primary votes averaged even less than election votes, as in two out of three years the candidate was nominated without opposition and no one came to the polls; and yet in the last election he received only 2,172 votes, fewer than any other candidate in the entire country. In 2 counties in the district, with over 79,000 people, only 163 votes were cast—one-fifth of 1 percent. In the non-poll-tax areas of the country over a third of the population votes—more than 70 times as many as in this Mississippi district.

Fourth. Of the native whites of voting age, 70 percent are disfranchised by the poll tax from even voting in the Democratic primaries.

Mississippi Democratic primaries

District	Population, 1930		Votes cast and percent of 1930 population voting compared with elections and with other States												Vote for winner of election			
			Total primary vote				Vote for successful primary candidate				Total election vote							
			1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average	1934	1936	1938	Average
No. 1	241,605	Number of votes	22,140	24,100	17,072	21,104	14,628	14,392	10,823	13,281	6,825	19,600	4,384	10,270	[1] 6,825	19,208	[1] 4,384	10,139
		Percent of population voting.	9.16	9.99	7.06	8.74	6.06	5.93	4.48	5.49	2.83	8.12	1.82	4.25	[1] 2.83	7.95	[1] 1.82	4.20
No. 2	219,661	Number of votes	18,989	(2)	11,136	10,042	11,384	(2)	9,304	6,896	5,721	13,782	4,134	7,879	[1] 5,721	13,632	[1] 4,134	7,829
		Percent of population voting.	8.65	-------	5.07	4.57	5.18	-------	4.25	3.14	2.61	6.28	1.89	3.59	[1] 2.61	6.22	[1] 1.89	3.57
No. 3	420,969	Number of votes	(2)	19,277	(2)	6,426	(2)	12,889	(2)	4,296	3,586	16,095	[3] 2,172	7,284	[1] 3,586	15,688	[1] 2,172	7,149
		Percent of population voting.	-------	4.57	-------	1.52	-------	3.06	-------	1.02	0.856	3.82	0.515	1.73	0.856	3.72	0.515	1.69
No. 4	184,266	Number of votes	24,856	22,304	12,313	19,824	12,977	13,648	8,895	11,840	8,051	14,446	3,502	8,666	[1] 8,051	14,444	[1] 3,502	8,666
		Percent of population voting.	13.50	12.10	6.67	10.76	7.04	7.40	4.82	6.43	4.38	7.85	1.90	4.71	[1] 4.38	7.85	[1] 1.90	[1] 4.71
No. 5	244,562	Number of votes	32,373	30,863	21,939	28,392	20,482	17,344	18,184	18,670	9,412	26,301	11,540	15,751	[1] 9,412	26,150	[1] 11,540	12,967
		Percent of population voting	13.21	12.62	8.97	11.60	8.38	7.08	7.43	7.64	3.85	10.74	4.72	6.44	[1] 3.85	10.68	[1] 4.72	5.30
No. 6	284,457	Number of votes	31,495	37,859	24,733	31,362	13,242	25,510	18,084	18,945	9,002	25,385	4,873	13,087	[1] 9,002	[1] 25,385	[1] 4,873	[1] 13,087
		Percent of population voting	11.12	13.30	8.67	11.01	4.65	8.96	6.35	6.65	3.16	8.90	1.71	4.60	[1] 3.16	[1] 8.90	[1] 1.71	[1] 4.60
No. 7	414,301	Number of votes	41,642	41,914	29,495	37,684	21,847	21,129	16,251	19,742	14,730	32,832	4,834	17,465	[1] 14,730	32,004	[1] 4,834	17,189
		Percent of population voting.	10.06	10.12	7.12	9.10	5.28	5.11	3.92	4.77	3.56	7.95	1.17	4.22	[1] 3.56	7.74	[1] 1.17	4.15
Total	2,009,821	Number of votes	171,495	176,317	116,688	154,833	94,560	104,912	81,541	93,671	57,327	148,441	35,439	80,402	[1] 57,327	146,511	[1] 35,439	79,759
Average district.	287,117	ditto	24,499	25,188	16,670	22,199	13,509	14,987	11,649	13,382	8,190	21,206	5,063	11,486	[1] 8,190	20,930	[1] 5,063	11,394
		Percent of population voting.	8.53	8.78	5.80	7.78	4.72	5.10	4.06	4.72	2.85	7.39	1.77	4.04	[1] 2.85	7.30	[1] 1.77	4.02
All citizens over 21.	1,028,248	Percent voting	16.69	17.16	11.34	15.06	9.21	10.20	7.94	9.12	5.58	14.44	3.45	7.82	[1] 5.58	14.26	[1] 3.45	7.76
Total white population.	996,856	ditto	17.20	17.70	11.70	15.53	9.50	10.52	8.19	9.40	5.76	14.90	3.56	8.06	[1] 5.76	14.70	[1] 3.56	8.00
Native whites over 21.	513,512	ditto	33.38	34.36	22.70	30.16	18.43	20.41	15.89	18.24	10.17	28.89	6.91	15.65	[1] 10.17	28.55	[1] 6.91	15.64
Relative participation in primaries and elections based on total election vote as 100 percent.			299.0	119.0	329.0	192.2	165.0	70.7	230.0	116.4	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.8	100.0	99.2

[1] Same as total vote. No opposition.
[2] No opposition.
[3] In counties of Quitman and Washington in this district with population of 79,614 tota lelection vote was 163, or 0.2043 percent (one-fifth of 1 percent).

Mississippi Democratic primaries—Continued

TOTAL ELECTION VOTE

	Population	1934	1936	1938	Average
8 poll-tax States:					
Number	22,020,944	1,300,299	2,527,432	1,173,271	1,667,001
Percent		5.90	11.50	5.32	7.55
40 poll-tax-free States:					
Number	100,754,102	31,461,841	41,576,899	35,111,029	36,049,923
Percent		31.24	41.30	34.80	35.79

	1934	1936	1938	Total contests without dissenting vote	Percent of total (21) contests
Primaries with no dissenting vote	1	1	1	3	14.3
Elections with no dissenting vote	7	1	7	15	71.4

Source: Primary votes: Mississippi Blue Book, 1935-37, 1937-39. Election votes: Congressional Directories, 1936, 1938, 1940. Population figures: U. S. Census, 1930.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Nation-wide campaign to help the Allies in every manner short of war, we should face the facts.

War Department figures, as of May 1, 1940, reveal that more critical items of equipment were abandoned by the British in their retreat from Flanders than are now possessed by the United States Army.

That being the case, how in Heaven's name are we to help the Allies without impairing our own defense?

This Congress recently authorized an increase to 400,000 men in our Regular Army. These men must be equipped, as must be 280,000 National Guardsmen.

It might be of passing interest to note here that the Chief of Staff of our Army recently testified before a House committee that there is not a sufficient supply of cloth in the United States to uniform such an army, let alone equipping it with critical items of equipment.

The exact status of critical items of equipment for the preparedness military program of this Nation—official War Department figures as of May 1, 1940—is shown in the following table:

Actually on hand May 1, 1940

Ordnance:	
Small arms and miscellaneous:	
Semiautomatic rifle, cal. .30	38,000
37-mm. antitank gun	228
60-mm. mortar	3
81-mm. mortar	183
Machine gun, .50 cal	319
Machine gun, .30 cal. (light)	86
Automatic rifle, cal. .30	0
Artillery:	
75-mm. gun (modern)	141
75-mm. howitzer (field)	60
105-mm. howitzer	0
155-mm. howitzer (high-speed)	436
155-mm. gun (modern)	4
155-mm. gun (high-speed)	88
8-inch howitzer	0
Combat vehicles:	
Scout car	485
Combat car	114
Light tank	10
Medium tank	18
Antiaircraft equipment:	
3-inch gun, AA	448
90-mm. gun, AA	0
Director	168
Height finder	142
Sound locator	194
37-mm. gun, AA	15
Ordnance—Continued.	
Antiaircraft equipment—Continued.	
Cal. .50 machine gun, AA	1,014
Detector, AA	0
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile, AA	285

Under order May 1, 1940

Item	Number	Date of delivery
Ordnance:		
Small arms and miscellaneous:		
Semiautomatic rifle, caliber .30	131,789	June 1942.
37-mm. antitank gun	744	Do.
60-mm. mortar	1,840	April 1941.
81-mm. mortar	479	November 1940.
Machine gun, .50 calber	367	April 1941.
Machine gun, .30 caliber (light)	960	July 1941.
Automatic rifle, caliber .30	6,558	December 1940.
Artillery:		
75-mm. gun (modern)	459	June 1941.
75-mm. howitzer (field)	96	May 1941.
105-mm. howitzer	60	October 1941.
155-mm. howitzer (high-speed)	295	March 1941.
155-mm. gun (modern)	36	April 1942.
155-mm. gun (high-speed)	56	August 1940.
8-inch howitzer	0	
Combat vehicles:		
Scout car	0	
Combat car	34	December 1940.
Light tank	392	June 1941.
Medium tank	126	August 1941.
Antiaircraft equipment:		
3-inch gun, antiaircraft	52	September 1940.
90-mm. gun, antiaircraft	114	September 1941.
Director	39	September 1940.
Height finder	58	January 1942.
Sound locator	321	August 1941.
37-mm. gun, antiaircraft	584	Do.
Caliber .50 machine gun, antiaircraft	126	August 1940.
Detector, antiaircraft	18	August 1941.
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile, antiaircraft	294	January 1941.

The National-Defense Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be unanimous agreement in this country that we should spend for national defense and preparedness as much as may be necessary and adequate to meet the world situation properly. One reservation, however, is made. From the letters I am receiving daily I am convinced that more thought and attention should be given to how we are going to spend the money which we Members of Congress are being asked to appropriate. There seems to be some doubt as to the wisdom of the policy that has been pursued in the expenditure of over $7,000,000,000 during the last few years for that purpose. I have a letter from Mr. Walter H. Wheeler, an outstanding engineer of my city, which points out in one respect just how

waste enters the picture and which expresses very succinctly the idea I am making this morning. I read:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 15, 1940.*

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I note the War and Navy Departments are proposing to let negotiated contracts for new construction.

The excuse offered is to save time by letting contracts before plans are drawn or completed.

I want to protest with all the vigor at my command against this practice. There never was a construction done on which time and money would not have been saved had the plans been fully completed before the construction was started. There is absolutely no excuse for adopting this half-baked method, and there is every opportunity for irregularities, excessive costs, and poorly considered construction.

With all the idle engineers there are in this country who would be glad to prepare plans for the Government, there is not the slightest excuse for this procedure.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER H. WHEELER.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Wheeler is correct in his statement, and I protest against this and all other wasteful methods, and in the name of good government and of our thousands of idle engineers I call on the Government to cease and desist from this policy.

The Cummings Sugar Bill (H. R. 9654) To Extend to December 31, 1941, the Provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, vitally important to our State of Colorado, and to 16 other States producing beet sugar, is the bill (H. R. 9654) to extend to December 31, 1941, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937. Tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, this bill will be brought before the House under a special rule.

There are 70,000 sugar-beet growers in 17 States, and the production of beets requires the employment of 100,000 field workers annually. Ninety-four beet-sugar factories give employment to about 10,000 men—no women or children are employed—on an annual average throughout every year. In addition, there are thousands of men in coal mines and limestone quarries, part of whose employment is directly dependent on this beet-sugar industry. In 1939 every acre of beets grown in the United States resulted in $35 of revenue for the railroads. Moreover, there are many hundreds engaged in the fattening of cattle and sheep on beet pulp—and others in stockyards whose continued employment is dependent upon the passage of this bill. An instance of the importance of these feeding activities is the fact that the byproducts of 13 of the 18 beet-sugar factories in Colorado are used to feed 22 percent of all the lambs and 11 percent of all cattle dry-lot fed in the United States.

As in some other States, raising and processing of sugar beets, with the numerous dependent industries, constitute one of the most important bases of the economic structure of Colorado.

Failure to enact this legislation at this session would deal a disastrous blow to the welfare of several States. On behalf of the delegation from Colorado I earnestly request all our friends be present tomorrow in order to help adopt the rule and insure passage of H. R. 9654.

Location of the 94 beet-sugar factories in 17 States is shown on the following tabulation:

Location of beet-sugar factories—94 factories in 17 States—number of factories

California	10
Alvarado, Betteravia, Clarksburg, Dyer, Hamilton City, Manteca, Oxnard, Spreckels, Tracy, Woodland.	
Colorado	18
Brighton, Brush, Delta, Eaton, Fort Collins, Fort Lupton, Fort Morgan, Grand Junction, Greeley, Johnstown, Longmont, Loveland, Ovid, Rocky Ford, Sterling, Sugar City, Swink, Windsor.	
Idaho	9
Blackfoot, Burley, Idaho Falls, Preston, Rigby, Rupert, Shelley, Sugar City, Twin Falls.	
Indiana	1
Decatur.	
Iowa	1
Mason City.	
Kansas	1
Garden City.	
Michigan	16
Alma, Bay City (2), Blissfield, Caro, Carrollton, Croswell, Holland, Lansing, Menominee, Mount Clemens, Mount Pleasant, Owosso, St. Louis, Sebewaing, West Bay City.	
Minnesota	2
Chaska, East Grand Forks.	
Montana	5
Billings, Chinook, Hardin, Missoula, Sidney.	
Nebraska	7
Bayard, Gering, Grand Island, Lyman, Minatare, Mitchell, Scottsbluff.	
Ohio	5
Findlay, Fremont, Ottawa, Paulding, Toledo.	
Oregon	1
Nyssa.	
South Dakota	1
Belle Fourche.	
Utah	8
Brigham City, Centerfield, Garland, Layton, Lewiston, Ogden, Spanish Fork, West Jordan.	
Washington	2
Bellingham, Toppenish.	
Wisconsin	2
Green Bay, Janesville.	
Wyoming	5
Lovell, Sheridan, Torrington, Wheatland, Worland.	
Total	94

Total beet-sugar factories: 94 in 17 States.

List corrected to June 14, 1940.

Foreign Situation and Possibility of Formation of Third Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, June 15, I had the privilege of delivering an address over a Nation-wide hook-up from the Mutual Broadcasting Co.'s studio, Station WOL, in Washington. Since I dealt with a subject of widespread interest and importance, I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A THIRD PARTY MAY BE THE ANSWER

I thank the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee for this opportunity.

If the $14,000,000,000 investment represented in the war debts had been invested in antiaircraft guns and pursuit planes, our

democracy would be safe from every potential invader today, which proves conclusively that the place to save our democracy is not on the Rhine or the English Channel but right here on our own liberty-inspired soil. The suggestion of the Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee that these debts be liquidated by the cession of certain strategically valuable territory in the Western Hemisphere now held by England and France is both sound and reasonable. Desperately, we need an air base in Newfoundland to protect the North Atlantic; desperately, we need Bermuda as the first line of defense on the Atlantic coast; and certain French and English territory in the West Indies would serve us a good purpose in the defense of Panama.

On this particular anniversary of their due date there is not much point, however, in quibbling about the unpaid war debts of England and France except firmly to resolve that the United States shall never finance another war in Europe. Such a stand is merely ordinary, good, common sense, and yet the temptation today to repeat our error of 25 years ago is very real indeed.

Tonight the French and the English with tears in their voices are pleading for our help. It is not easy to refuse old friends with their backs to the wall, fighting a losing war even though stupid statesmanship largely determined their unfortunate plight.

EASY TO GET INTO WAR

It would be easy for America to get into this war. Cunning British diplomacy which began with the colorful visit of the King and Queen of England to the White House, the clever use of propaganda on the screen and in the press appealing to our emotions, and the economic temptation to American capitalists to take the short cut to prosperity via war are powerful influences urging us in; and it will take all the common sense and sound judgment which we can muster to escape. It is hard to subject ourselves to the discipline which impartial neutrality prescribes as prudent; and, yet, if we but weigh the matter and count the costs, we must shrink from that raging holocaust as we would shrink from the dripping jaws of a prehistoric monster.

COST OF AMERICAN WAR IN EUROPE STAGGERING

It would cost the United States the lives of 5,000,000 men and $100,000,000,000 of borrowed money for this Republic to defeat Germany in Europe, and our economic system would be thrown so completely out of gear by such an ill-advised adventure that it could never be righted under our present form of government. The day we enter this war we pass from a democracy to a dictatorship from which we have small chance to emerge. We would like to help the Allies determine the real-estate boundaries of Europe, but in doing that our own boundaries will disappear. We would like to preserve the so-called democracies over there, imperfect as they are, but in accomplishing that more or less worthy objective, the greatest and best democracy of all human history must give up its life. Our resolve to remain a neutral requires no apology, for it is based upon the highest ethical and humanitarian conceptions and considerations. To go in is to betray civilization, democracy, and decency and not to preserve them.

AMERICAN INTERVENTION WOULD BE FUTILE

If our entrance into the war on the side of the Allies would assure an Allied victory, and if an Allied victory would assure a just, lasting, and equitable peace, if it would assure a substitution of cooperation for force in the family of nations, and if it would assure a spiritual awakening to replace the damnable materialistic philosophy spreading throughout Europe today, America might be justified in intervening; but none of these things can be assured. Unfortunately they are not even remotely likely.

Each and every one of the belligerents has spurned the conference table. Each has hissed words of hate and violence at the other, boasting that he is waging a war to the finish in which quarter will neither be asked nor given. Each of them is bent upon utterly crushing the other. There is no thought of negotiated or equitable peace by either side. The odds against establishing world peace by American success on European battlefields are tremendous, while a program to achieve world peace by American precept is bound in the end to succeed. National defense does not consist alone of ships and men. That they are vital goes without saying, but the most important defense abides in the morale, the enlightenment, and the happiness of American citizens and our domestic problems should be solved as the very essence of a good national defense.

AN IMPORTANT LESSON

In recent weeks we have seen two great nations rich in manpower and rich in natural resources badly defeated on the field of battle by another power comparatively inferior in these essentials, but far superior in the modern armaments of war. Unless we grasp the lesson of these significant disclosures we shall also perish. The undisputed fact that we are the richest Nation on earth in natural resources adds to our dangers; nor will our superiority in the field of industry and science and the ready alertness and superb courage of our manpower alone save us. These things are not enough in themselves. We must also have military power, and at once, and time is the essence of its success.

MONROE DOCTRINE LOADED WITH DYNAMITE

The Monroe Doctrine entails a tremendous responsibility upon the United States and in itself is the greatest threat to our peace with which we must contend. Under it, we assume the obligation of protecting the territory of every government in the Western Hemisphere against all political penetration from Europe regardless of the wishes or conduct of such American governments. Canada, without any consideration whatsoever of us, has recently declared war on two powerful European governments and the United States is bound to fight to protect this warring neighbor should her war in Europe spread to Canadian territory. This illustrates the dangers to which the Monroe Doctrine exposes us.

Since one nation alone can plunge the world into war, the outlook for world peace is exceedingly discouraging and difficult; but the darker the prospect, the greater the effort to achieve peace should be. This Nation cannot by itself insure world peace, since world peace depends upon the cooperation of all nations; but it can and must insure its own peace if it would live.

MAKE THE UNITED STATES IMPREGNABLE

In spite of the dismal outlook abroad, America can be made impregnable against any known method of warfare and against any known force or combination of forces now existing and that, indeed, is heartening. San Francisco Harbor has been declared absolutely impregnable by the greatest military experts of the day. No enemy would be so foolish as to launch an attack upon it. Naval and military experts repeatedly have been assigned the problem of theoretically overcoming its defenses and all have failed. What has been done for that harbor can be done for every mile of our coast.

PEACE COSTS MONEY

There are some things which money will not buy, but peace is not one of them. If our billions for defense be spent wisely, peace will be assured. The time to provide a defense is before we need a defense—before we face the crisis of war—for then likely we will never be called upon to defend ourselves. Modern war symbolized by the "blitzkrieg" strikes suddenly and will give us no opportunity to gird our loins after it once begins. I do not believe that America is likely to be invaded soon, neither do I believe that assurance can be given that we will not be attacked, since we hold out the richest loot in all the world to tempt the covetous and predacious conqueror whose vaulting ambitions appear to reach the stars. If Hitler wins this war his foreign policy must determine the extent and nature of our defenses. It will suffice to say that they must be strong enough to convince every potential enemy that it will not pay him to invade our territory. If we keep out of war, but prepare for war on whatever gigantic scale is made necessary by the threat of potential foes, we will preserve our democracy and the lives of our youth and become a powerful and constructive influence for righteousness and justice in the family of nations. There is no other course, regardless of the evil propaganda to the contrary.

FOREIGN POLICIES VITAL

Foreign policies are the most vital functions of government and they must be formulated by the rule of reason and not by the rule of hate or favoritism. We can hardly censure belligerents for making a desperate effort to drag us into the conflict on their side. That should be perfectly understandable. Neither can we condemn belligerents from clothing themselves in the pure white robes of lofty ideals and grandiose moral aims. Why should they not place their bloody struggle upon the highest pedestal of purity within the grasp of their own fevered imagination? We can sympathize with their purpose in selling the idea that their war is a holy war in defense of civilization and democracy and decency, but why should a people at peace swallow that propaganda without misgivings and doubt?

NO ONE FIGHTS OUR WARS

France and England are either fighting our war, or they are not fighting our war. Our peace and liberty are either dependent upon an allied victory, or they are not. If it is our war, we belong over there fighting and dying side by side with the patriots of France and England. If we are justified in aiding the Allies, we ought to do it like men, with men, openly and aboveboard, not like some whimpering, craven creature lacking the courage of his convictions. No one other than ourselves is deceived by such a contemptuous policy. Hundreds of letters reach my desk urging credit, ships, planes, treasure, guns—everything except men for the Allies. What an utterly contemptible cowardly suggestion. Of course, many who advocate such a despicable policy are not sincere. They know that men must follow treasure. They know that we must be edged into war an inch at a time. If it is our war, every resource and every man at our command should be in France. But it is not our war by any stretch of the imagination, and therefore, and for that reason only, we ought to keep completely out of it, and maintain a strict neutrality instead of becoming a nonbelligerent.

Measures short of war are ignoble and unworthy of a great power. Imagine a Washington, a Jackson, a Cleveland, a Theodore Roosevelt talking about such sissy things as "steps just short of war" or of being a nonbelligerent. You cannot get halfway into a war and not slide all the way in. Italy tried that and now she is an active belligerent.

NONBELLIGERENCY UNLAWFUL

I am awed by the bold, reckless, idealistic spirit of the President, which fired him with sufficient enthusiasm to change the status of his country overnight from a neutral to a nonbelligerent. However, I cannot approve this ill-advised and extremely dangerous

action. His strategy was neither sanctioned by the laws of this Republic nor supported by the approval of its citizens. Congress has the sole constitutional power to declare war, but of what avail when the President, who directs and administers the foreign policy of this Government, has converted the United States from a neutral into a nonbelligerent without the authority of Congress. A formal declaration of war is no longer deemed essential.

TWO THINGS ARE KEEPING US OUT

I am forced to believe against my will that the two considerations which are keeping the administration out of the European War are, first, the election to be held in November and, second, the pitiable state of our implements of war. Perhaps it is a good thing for us that we do not have 50,000 airplanes and 10,000 tanks today and that this is an election year, otherwise we might be in the European war right now as an active belligerent instead of being in it as a nonbelligerent.

ISOLATE WAR—NOT IDEALS

The President holds up to utter scorn anyone who dares to think in terms of the United States minding its own business. He calls that isolation. Perhaps he is justified in his bitterness if he speaks of the isolation of ideas, but every sincere Christian believes in world-wide brotherhood and cooperation with all of his heart. No one wants to make a jail out of this country. No one wants an isolation of spiritual things. No one wants to withhold one single, solitary beneficial thing, spiritual or material, from the rest of the world. And no one wants to keep one good thing out of this country. However, many patriotic Americans want to keep Europe's wars out, and for that we are contemptuously sneered at as isolationists. Fate has bestowed natural advantages upon the United States which are not lessened by Presidential sneers. Geography has separated us from the aggressors of Asia by 5,000 miles and from the aggressors of Europe by 3,000 miles. It will be a long time before Omaha will need to buy gas masks for its children or enforce the black-out, as was hinted in the President's recent address to Congress. Our citizens, mentally and physically, are far above the average. In science and art we excel. Our economy is practically self-contained. Our situation, natural, economic, and political, is not remotely approached by any nation on earth.

AN INTERVENTIONIST WILL NOT DO

The most important election ever to be held in the history of the world will occur in the United States of America in November. In a few days the Republicans will name their candidate at Philadelphia, and a little later the Democrats will meet in Chicago to name their candidate. I am not indulging in threats or idle talk or personal opinion, but unless one or the other of these great parties names a candidate who is not an interventionist, the millions of peace-loving people of this Nation will form a third party that will nominate such a candidate. A fair open referendum on the question of peace versus intervention must be had in November for it is the overshadowing political issue of the generation. Each of these conventions will adopt party planks in their platforms which will pay lip service to peace, but will not be worth the paper upon which they are written. The past record of the candidate and his known predilections are all that will count in November. Pledges made by candidates with fingers crossed will not fool the people this time. The political party that nominates an interventionist in the approaching conventions will go down to ignominious defeat. The mothers and fathers of America, the youth of America who have no desire to die in the war of imperialism abroad, the patriots who served in the last war and who have no flag other than the Stars and Stripes to serve, the members of organized labor who would be regimented like cattle should a European war come, are in a majority in America, and they will rise in their wrath against any interventionist or anyone suspected of being an interventionist who dares to run for President in 1940. The politicians of the two great parties do have a monopoly on convention delegates, but thank God they have no monopoly on the votes of the people, and the people will not remain inarticulate in this momentous crisis. Naturally, I hope and pray that the Democratic Party will be the peace party. Naturally, I pray that it will name a candidate in whose hands the peace of this Republic will not be in doubt, but if the Democratic Party fails to do its duty and makes the mistake of nominating an interventionist for the office of President, so far as I am concerned, my country will come before my party.

WEAKLINGS GO TO WAR

It is easy to get into war, just as it is easy to indulge in any other evil thing. To keep out of war is a nobler and more difficult task. The road to war is served well by weaklings, while the road to peace requires strong, courageous men. A third-rate statesman can involve his country in war, while a navigator of the first magnitude is required to steer the ship of state safely through the dangerous shoals into the deep, calm, tranquil waters of peace. We need to be strong in spirit, strong in patriotism, strong in our love of freedom, strong in the machinery of war; and we need to be so strong in our moral fiber that we will be able to put the evil temptation of intervention and European meddling—the curse of this administration—behind us forever.

In spite of all the evidence to the contrary, I still believe in the philosophy that man, with God's help, will yet succeed in his efforts to become master of his own destiny. I refuse to subscribe to the doctrine that man in the end will deliberately destroy himself. When war becomes sufficiently destructive, mankind must adopt peace for self-preservation, if for no better reason; and we must proceed on the basis that when humanity really wants peace, humanity will have peace.

The So-Called Dempsey Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT BY HENRY H. COLLINS, JR.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made before the Senate Immigration Committee in the hearings on H. R. 4860 by Henry H. Collins, Jr. Mr. Collins is chairman of the legislative committee of the Descendants of the American Revolution, and his statement is a very concise and impressive argument against the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I should like briefly on behalf of our other chapters and the national organization to supplement the testimony previously given before your committee by the president of our local chapter, Mr. Hunt. The descendants of the American Revolution is an organization devoted to carrying out in practice today those principles for which our forefathers fought 165 years ago. For this reason we are wholeheartedly opposed to this present bill (H. R. 4860).

Among those principles were hospitality to immigrants who joined with citizens in settling the country, and freedom of speech for immigrant and citizen alike. Remember the language of the first amendment: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." The term used is "people" not citizens.

The Dempsey bill violates both of these principles. It divides the residents of this country into two classes (1) aliens and (2) citizens, and it denies to the first of these classes the right of free speech. Since the Constitution guarantees free speech to citizens and aliens alike it is clear, either that the bill is unconstitutional, or else that a fundamental right that today would be taken from the alien might tomorrow be withdrawn from the citizen.

Objection is often made to allowing strangers within our gates to advocate changes in the structure of the house that shelters them; but the visitor of yesterday is the resident of today and the citizen of tomorrow, and from the beginning of our country's history citizen and alien alike have joined to advocate those changes in our Government which have made it the more perfect instrument it is today.

Others have cited the gagged mouths and minds that must result from invoking a cloture on civic thought and making belief in an improvement in our form of government a basis for deportation. The reorganization bill, woman suffrage, the child-labor amendment in our day, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the very Constitution itself in the days of our forefathers—belief in or advocacy of any one of these would have been punishable by deportation had the Dempsey bill been then in effect. How many of our grandfathers and grandmothers would have been sent back under its provisions to the lands of terror and tyranny from which they had fled to our shores? Two of mine would, or I would not now be eligible for membership in this organization which I represent.

It is sometimes said that those who advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence should be punished. But Justice Brandeis, I believe, set it forth that unless this advocacy constituted a "clear and present" danger to organized society, it was neither treasonable nor contrary to the Bill of Rights. Indeed, common sense informs us that it is far better to have dissident groups working in the open, where their views, if erroneous, may be combated and corrected in the full light of publicity and criticism, than to have them thrust underground into illegality. Once forced into hiding and secrecy, the most fantastic theories will luxuriate and gain converts in the dark atmosphere of conspiracy—theories that exposed to the open view and study of mankind might soon wither and lose all public support.

Surely no one in this room thinks that, in spite of recent military adventures, the Government of the German Reich is more stable than our own. Yet in Germany no criticism of the form of government is tolerated—an outward uniformity of opinion prevails under the swish of the rubber hose and the shadow of the executioner's axe. But everyone knows that the core of the Fascist state is rotten, and that dissension, intrigue have already nourished a hydra of underground opposition.

In our country, on the other hand, one would think that nothing but criticism of the Government was allowed. On any newsstand three journals attack the Government where one supports it and all forms of minority opinion are allowed to wield such influence as their ideas can command. Yet who would say

that contrasted with that of Germany our Government is not infinitely more stable, rooted as it is in the masses of the American people, and with its various branches flourishing or withering under the alternate sunshine or storms of the public will.

Finally, let us remember that we make a mistake in ever singling out one group of our people as culprits. Aliens found, founded, and built up this country. Von Steuben, Pulaski, and Lafayette fought for its independence. We, descendants of the Revolution in which they strove, cannot go back on the memory of their comrades-in-arms. Let us therefore defeat this bill so that we may still say, as does the bronze invitation on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The Fight for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS M. BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY PRESTON DELANO AT HOT SPRINGS, VA.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I was much encouraged by reading a speech delivered by the Comptroller of the Currency which shows that the banking system of the United States is in very sound condition. The speech was delivered before the District of Columbia Bankers' Association on June 7, 1940. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a very different world from the one we lived in when we met here a year ago, and somehow it seems quite futile to engage in any extended discussion of matters which so interested us on the occasion of that last meeting. The year has brought us face to face with realities, sharp and terrible realities, which have shocked us beyond measure and rudely aroused us from that comfortable sense of security in which we took our ease. The issue which is faced today by the free peoples of the world far overshadows most of our domestic problems. It so dwarfs our petty quarrels and rivalries that one has no patience with those who would sap our strength in such unimportant sham battles.

The great issue is, of course, whether we are to have a free economy, whether personal initiative and personal liberty are still to play their primary roles in the development of civilization. In the face of such a challenge there is little else that matters. The ordinary business of living must go on—the office of the Comptroller of the Currency must continue its job of chartering and supervising the national and district banks, but underlying this routine is our deep concern for the preservation of the American way of life. It has been said that in order to successfully resist those forces which seek to regiment the world—those forces which seek to deny man his rights of assembly, free speech, free press, and private property, it may be necessary to give up all, or almost all, of these precious things; in other words, that we may have to regiment ourselves in order to successfully resist regimentation.

It is at this last barricade that democracy must show its strength. We can, and we must prove that a free economy, working with all those rights which are inherent in the word "liberty," can successfully gird itself to resist the onslaught of a perfectly organized tyranny. If we fail, all the years since Magna Carta have been lost and we are no longer free men.

For a democracy and free economy successfully to do this job, its members must all willingly and gladly do their share. Whether engaged in industry, agriculture, in banking, or in any of the other multifarious activities which make up our economy, we must be certain that our obligations to the general welfare—or to society, if you please—are fully and generously discharged. In other words, each integral part of this vast machine must do its work well, not only for its own advantage but also for the sake of preserving its liberty and that of its fellows.

I think I may say that the men who are responsible for the destinies of the 5,200 national banks appreciate the importance of this cause, and, for their part, are ready to take up the challenge. The national banking system has never been stronger. The resources of its banks now total more than $35,000,000,000. Its assets are in the best condition in its history and there is liquidity to meet any emergency or to provide for any necessary expansion. The last 10 years have tested the mettle of bank management, largely eliminated the unfit, and left us a veteran and seasoned personnel capable of meeting any crisis. There may be a grave trial ahead of us. There may be suffering and distress, but I feel certain that the bankers of the United States are ready, as once before in a dark hour their forefathers were ready, to pledge to the service of this Republic their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Let's Stop This Insane Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, June 16, entitled "Let's Stop This Insane Business."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 16, 1940]

LET'S STOP THIS INSANE BUSINESS

Has Roosevelt half declared war? The answer, we think, is yes; and this country is in danger of going all the way unless Congress, heeding the voice of the people, calls a halt to his present course.

In violation of The Hague treaties on neutrality and international usage, the administration has already made existing supplies of the American Army available for use by the Allies.

By a careful reading of the news and the articles of the columnists who have access to White House sources, we can discover the other steps by which the administration will, if the course of the war and public opinion permit, lead us closer and closer to open participation in the hostilities.

Already New York shipping heads are conferring with official Washington over proposals to repeal the Cash and Carry Act so as to allow American ships to carry war supplies abroad. They are quoted as saying that "President Roosevelt's pledge of aid would be pointless unless vessels were available to transport the goods."

The significance of this should be fully weighed by everyone who is interested in keeping this country out of the war. The administration is discussing the possibility of allowing American merchantmen to try to run the submarine and air blockade of allied ports, when to do so would obviously be an act of war.

Such a course makes no sense whatever except as a palpable invitation to the inevitable sinkings which would become the pretext of our declaring war on Germany.

Another version of this proposal is that the American Navy be used to convoy supply ships to Britain and France. Still another form is the ingenious suggestion, made by a columnist close to President Roosevelt, that the United States might send clothing, food, and other nonmilitary necessities in unconvoyed ships bearing the insignia of the Red Cross, with the warning that the torpedoing or bombing of any of them would bring us into the war as an acknowledged belligerent.

Accompanying each such tendentious action would be a new fusillade of denunciations of Germany and Italy by ranking members of the administration, such as the statement of Secretary Wallace yesterday that Hitler is "determined to subjugate the world," and that the Germans look upon this hemisphere as their "eventual happy hunting ground."

Whether Adolf Hitler's ambition includes the hope of dominating the Western Hemisphere remains to be seen, but in any event it is—as Landon points out—the part of strength and courage to "tread softly until the big job of preparedness is well under way."

The decisive battles in Europe will be fought—if indeed they have not already been fought—before America will be in position to rush to Europe enough planes and tanks and antiaircraft artillery to decide the issue.

Premier Reynaud says that France must have thousands of tanks and clouds of planes instantly. America simply does not have them to send.

Our job is national self-defense. We must lose no time in preparing to defend democracy on these shores. We will be better able to summon the stern consecration which this task requires if we frankly recognize our limitations with respect to the struggle abroad.

The American people are unanimous in supporting the Allies by "methods short of war," but they do not interpret this familiar phrase to include methods which deliberately violate the accepted rules of neutrality and place this country in the same relative

position to the Allies that Italy occupied toward Germany before it formally entered the war.

Let us not deceive ourselves and let us not permit Roosevelt to deceive us. As long ago as last January, Major Eliot said that there is "a good deal of loose talk going around about eventual American participation in the present war by all means short of the actual dispatch of an expeditionary Army to France; that is, by naval, aerial, economic, and financial means. I call this sort of thing 'loose talk,' because it is plain that unless its originators are either ignorant or dishonest, they have failed to think their proposition through."

Major Eliot then proceeded, in a devastating analysis, to knock the loose talk into a cocked hat. He showed that, so far as naval participation goes, it is both "useless and dangerous" to talk about naval help for the Allies unless we and the Allies are prepared to abandon the Pacific to Japan. Furthermore, Eliot questioned the value of this naval help, as well he might, in view of the subsequent fact that the British Navy in the present war failed in the one vital arena where it might have been expected to function effectively—the German invasion of Norway.

As for supplying an air force, Eliot pointed out that we would also have to establish our own air bases, as for "obvious technical reasons" we could not use British and French bases even if they had bases to spare. Our air force would be subject to the British and French high command, unless we also sent an expeditionary force, which Eliot says we would do, just as we did in 1917. Eliot said:

"We might remind ourselves that our history and national character do not incline us toward half measures, do not indicate that we are likely to make half a war. We might, therefore, usefully reflect not only upon the nature of the propositions now being bruited about, but also on the certainty that unless we wish to get into this war all the way we will do well to avoid taking the first steps in that direction."

Trading on the deep sympathy which Americans instinctively feel for the French and British, and for the ideals of justice and liberty which we passionately adhere to, our reckless, jingoistic President has already taken the first steps which Eliot warned against last January.

Roosevelt has put us halfway into this war without the consent of Congress, without the consent of the American people, despite the fact that he knows the American people—as shown by the Fortune and Gallup polls—do not want to enter this war. He has put us halfway in even though we are not prepared to furnish the aid which the Allies really need—tanks and modern airplanes. Potent as Roosevelt's oratory is, it cannot prevail against 80-ton tanks and giant bombing planes.

And oratory is about all Roosevelt has got. Let us quit this insane half-war stuff and buckle down to the job of defending our own undefended country.

Our Course Is Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of June 11, 1940. As is well known, Col. Frank Knox, who was the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate in 1936, is the editor of the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of June 11, 1940]

OUR COURSE IS CLEAR

When the Italian dictator, from the balcony of his Roman palace, announced Italy's fateful decision to enter the war against France and England, the last frail hope of circumscribing the conflict to western Europe vanished. That hope began to fade when Stalin attacked the Finns; it grew less when Hitler invaded Denmark and Norway. Then came the Low Countries—Holland and Belgium—with their ghastly lesson of what "total war" really meant. And now Italy's entrance completes the bloody prelude to world war on a scale we have never known.

Virtually all of Europe is now involved, from the Arctic North to the Mediterranean. Soon the flames will leap that intervening sea to sear and torture Africa. Wherever British drums may roll out their summons or French bugles call to the colors men will turn from peace to war—Egypt, India, South Africa, Morocco, Tunisia, Australia, New Zealand, the Dutch East Indies, French Indo-China. Everywhere the tocsin sounds for a struggle for survival, which has already cost hundreds of thousands of lives and which will cost millions.

We have said "everywhere." Not quite everywhere. Save for Canada, the Western Hemisphere is as yet at peace. It is a precarious peace. In stern reality only a seeming peace. For this New World of ours knows Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin for the enemies they are of everything we cherish, just as they are the foes of those they now threaten by the force of arms. We know our freedoms, and our institutions that make those freedoms possible, cannot survive in a world where the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, and the Stalins rule.

Loving peace, and with no national aspirations that clash with others' rights, we have, as a people, been slow to believe that our institutions, or our security, were really threatened. It seemed simply incredible that the madness that had engulfed western Europe in a holocaust of flaming, ruthless, blinding hate could cross the ocean and encompass us in its deadly flames. We comforted ourselves with the earnest hope that the fire in Europe would burn itself out before our national house itself caught fire.

Unless we be fools we will no longer build on such vain hopes. How vain they are we are told by Mussolini himself, for he said as he led his Fascist legions into battle:

"We shall take the field against the plutocratic and reactionary democracies of the west, who have at all times obstructed the march of the Italian people."

The "democracies of the west." Can there still be men so blind, so fatuous, so fearful, that they will not include the greatest democracy of the west within the scope of the objectives of the Berlin-Rome axis? If there be such, their numbers are negligible, and they must be thrust aside by men of sterner stuff who know a challenge when they hear it, and are not afraid to meet it when it means defense of things that are far more precious than life itself.

The American people, not forgetting their heritage come down from the battlefields whereon our liberties were won, will, with one accord, lift up their hearts and voices with the President of of the United States as he prays to Almighty God for "those beyond the seas who are maintaining with magnificent valor their battle for freedom."

And with the President, in a spirit of national unity which the grave danger of the hour creates, we will join in the pledge he gave the world yesterday to "pursue two obvious and simultaneous courses; we will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation and, at the same time, we will harness and speed up the use of those resources in order that we ourselves in the Americas may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense."

This is the voice of America, speaking through Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It will ring through the land, stilling the puny voices of partisanship, silencing the quibblings of critics, rousing the patriotism and the united cooperation of every American who worthily enjoys the privilege of citizenship.

Here is no qualified declaration; here is no limited pledge of assistance to those who are fighting the battle of freedom. All that we have that they need to win that fight will be given. And we ourselves will swiftly prepare for any emergency and every defense.

This is the kind of leadership the hour demands.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of June 16, 1940, entitled "The Tax Bill Made Better But Still Not the Best."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 16, 1940]

THE TAX BILL MADE BETTER BUT STILL NOT BEST

True to expectation, the Senate Finance Committee has tacked onto the revenue bill to raise additional funds for national defense the Byrd amendment calling for a 10-percent cut in all items of

nonmilitary expenditure. In a surprise move the committee also incorporated in its draft the provisions of Senator TOWNSEND'S useful bill to forbid further purchases of foreign silver.

Both amendments are to be regarded with the highest favor. If accepted by both the Senate and the House—and sentiment in its favor seems to be dominant in both Chambers—the Byrd amendment will release an added half billion dollars of revenues for use in the purchase or maintenance of the armaments for which some $4,600,000,000 in appropriations are about to be made. Such a saving is an essential step in any program of financial preparedness. When the Nation is confronted with the necessity of spending three billion a year more than it had planned to spend for defense, it is foolhardy to carry on with other outlays as if nothing had happened.

The Townsend plan to stop the buying of foreign silver serves the same general purpose of financial preparedness. Our purchases of silver abroad have represented little more than a subsidy to exports. The silver we have been getting in return for goods is worthless to us, and to continue to exchange American products for worthless silver at a time like this is to tilt at windmills. Our situation is far too serious for such dissipation of our resources. The Senate has already recognized the force of these considerations by adopting the Townsend bill, but the House has refused to consider it, basing its refusal on the ground that because the bill served certain revenue purposes it could not constitutionally originate in the Senate. Its incorporation in the tax bill meets this technical objection, and it may be hoped that the House will have the good sense to accept it, now that the way to consideration in that Chamber has been opened.

These two changes aside, the Finance Committee accepted the bill largely as it came from the House. Contrary to its usual practice, it did not revise the tax schedules in any extensive way. It eliminated the provision for increased levies on tobacco and substituted a graduated tax on admissions to bring in an equivalent amount, a change which, on the whole, seems advisable. But there was no real effort to revise the House bill in a way that would have enlarged the yield of the new imposts. Senator BYRD'S plan for a retroactive application of the 10-percent supertax—which the Senate euphemistically called a defense tax—seems not to have been considered at all. This is to be regretted. The revenue bill as it came from the House did not go far enough. Even with the Byrd economy amendment it does not go far enough. To insure real financial preparedness it will be necessary to secure additional revenue and to work toward still more decisive economies.

It may have been the Finance Committee's intention to let these more decisive steps await the formation of a fundamental tax and expenditure program, such as Senator BYRD has called for. If so, the preparation of such a program ought to be initiated at once. The more quickly we come to grips with the fundamental job of paying for our security the more secure we shall be.

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening Col. Charles A. Lindbergh delivered over a national hook-up a defense talk that will long stand as a most timely and thoughtful contribution to American statesmanship. Would that we had more men of his high type in public life.

Colonel Lindbergh comes from a fine American family, and in his veins flow the best blood in all the world. For 10 years his distinguished father served with fidelity and distinction in this body as a Representative from the State of Minnesota. Colonel Lindbergh inherited from his able father great qualities of courage, loyalty, and sanity. One of the replies made to his talk on the following evening was an insult to our intelligence. Unlike Colonel Lindbergh's talk, which was calm, sound, constructive, and deliberate, the reply was abusive, shallow, and altogether partisan. [Applause.]

I have asked to speak to you again tonight because I believe that we, in America, are drifting toward a position of far greater seriousness to our future than even this present war. There is an attempt to becloud the issue that confronts us. It is not alone an issue of building an adequate defense for our country. That must and can be done. Our people are solidly behind an adequate military preparedness, and no one believes in it more than I.

But we must not confuse the question of national defense with the question of entering a European war, and it is just as important not to confuse this present war with the type of war we would have to wage if we fought against Germany. Arming for the defense of America is compatible with normal life, commerce, and culture. It is an integral part of the destiny of our Nation. But arming to attack the Continent of Europe would necessitate that the lives and thoughts of every man, woman, and child in this country be directed toward war for the next generation—probably for the next several generations.

TRAP OF WAR BAITED

We cannot continue for long to follow the course our Government has taken without becoming involved in war with Germany. There are some who already advocate our entry into such a war. There are many perfectly sincere men and women who believe that we can send weapons to kill people in Europe without becoming involved in war with those people. Still others believe that by gestures and applause we can assist France and England to win without danger to our own country.

In addition to these, however, there are men among us of less honesty who advocate stepping closer and closer to war, knowing well that a point exists beyond which there can be no turning back. They have baited the trap of war with requests for modest assistance. This latter group is meeting with success at the moment.

NO DABBLING WITH DEATH

There is a saying that grew in the old West to the effect that a man who enjoys life should never touch his gun unless he means business; that he should never draw unless he is ready to shoot, and that he should never shoot unless he is ready to kill.

Those old pioneers of ours knew from long experience that there can be no successful dabbling with death. But the red-blooded wisdom of the old West is gone from American politics today. Our present danger results from making gestures with an empty gun after we have already lost the draw. Fortunately the wide wall of the Atlantic stands between us and the shooting that is going on.

This dabbling we have been doing in European affairs can lead only to failure in the future, as it has in the past. It is not a policy that we can continue to follow and remain a great nation.

INFLUENCE OF LEADERS LOST

Let us look at our position today. Our leaders have lost the influence we could have exerted as the world's greatest neutral nation. The driblets of munitions we have sold to England and France have had a negligible effect on the trend of the war, and we have not sufficient military strength available to change that trend. We demand that foreign nations refrain from interfering in our hemisphere, yet we constantly interfere in theirs. And while we have been taking an ineffective part in the war abroad, we have inexcusably neglected our defenses at home. In fact, we have let our own affairs drift along until we have not even a plan of defense for the Continent of North America. We have been doing to England and France what they did to Abyssinia, to Czechoslovakia, to Poland, to Finland, and to Norway—we have encouraged them to hope for help we cannot send.

Yet with these examples before us, we still continue in this course, the same course that led England to failure abroad and weakness at home; a course that will lead us, also, to a disastrous and unsuccessful war if we persist in following it.

CONFLICT OF HEMISPHERES

When the subject of our participation in war is discussed, most people visualize the war that is now going on in Europe. They think of sending more arms, and possibly some soldiers. There is still very little understanding of what our entrance into European war would mean. When we talk of such a war, we must realize that we are considering the greatest struggle the world has yet known—a conflict between hemispheres, one-half of the white race against the other half.

Before allowing ourselves to become further involved, we should consider the conditions which may exist by the time we are ready for military action. If we enter war at all, we should prepare to meet the worst conditions rather than the best.

It is useless to talk of sending American troops to Europe now, for we would need months of preparation before we could train and equip even a small army, and small efforts do not effect great movements—witness Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

START AT DISADVANTAGE

We must face the fact, regardless of how disagreeable it is to us, that before we can take effective action in an European war the German armies may have brought all Europe under their control. In that case Europe will be dominated by the strongest military nation the world has ever known, controlling a population far larger than our own. If we decide to enter war, we must be prepared to attack that nation. We must prepare to invade a continent which it controls.

No people ever had a greater decision to make. We hold our children's future in our hands as we deliberate, for if we turn to war the battles will be hard fought and the outcome is not likely to be decided in our lifetime. This is a question of mortgaging the lives of our children and our grandchildren. Every family in the land would have its wounded and its dead.

We start at a disadvantage because we are not a military nation. Ours is not a land of guns and marching men. If we decide to fight then the United States must prepare for war for many years to come, and on a scale unprecedented in all history. In that case we must turn to a dictatorial government, for there is no military efficiency to be lost. We should start to build an army of several million men. We will need several hundred thousand airplanes before the battling is over. And we must have a navy large enough to transport this force across the sea.

DEFENSE PLAN FIRST NEED

This war we are asked to enter would not be a repetition of the last war. It would be more comparable to the struggle which took place between Athens and Sparta, or Rome and Carthage. It would involve the destiny of America and of western civilization as far into the future as we can see.

But whatever our decision may be in regard to Europe, we must start now to build our own defenses. We must stop these gestures with an empty gun. In this, we are a united Nation. The only question that arises concerns how our defense can best be built. We must first construct a clear-cut plan of defense, and have the cooperation of all American countries in carrying it out.

We must insist upon military bases being placed wherever they are needed for our safety, regardless of who owns the territory involved. We must be willing to do more than pay taxes and make appropriations. Military strength cannot be purchased by money alone. Strength is a thing of spirit, of preparation, and of sacrifice extending over years of time.

The men of our country must be willing to give a year of their lives to military training—more if necessary. And our capitalists as well as our soldiers should be willing to serve without personal profit. We must have a Nation ready to give whatever is required for its future welfare and leaders who are more interested in their country than in their own advancement.

OUR ADVANTAGE IN DEFENSE

With an adequate defense, no foreign army can invade us. Our advantage in defending America is as great as our disadvantage would be in attacking Europe. From a military geographical standpoint, we are the most fortunate country in the world. There is no other nation in this hemisphere strong enough to even consider attacking us, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans separate us from the warring armies of Europe and Asia.

If the British Navy could not support an invasion of Norway against the German air force, there is little reason for us to worry about an invasion of America as long as our own air force is adequately maintained.

As far as invasion by air is concerned, it is impossible for any existing air force to attack effectively across the ocean. In the Arctic regions the severe climate and ruggedness of terrain counteract the vulnerability of shorter distances between land. With our geographical position, nothing but the gross neglect of our military forces or quarreling between American countries themselves could make possible an invasion by foreign armies.

AMERICA AT CROSSROADS

America stands today where the road divides, at the signpost of war and peace. Now that we have become one of the world's greatest nations, shall we throw away the independent American destiny which our forefathers gave their lives to win? Shall we submerge our future in the endless wars of the Old World? Or shall we build our own defenses and leave European war to European countries?

Shall we continue this suicidal conflict between western nations and white races, or shall we learn from history as well as from modern Europe that a civilization cannot be preserved by conflict among its own peoples, regardless of how different their ideologies may be?

"ORGANIZED MINORITY" HIT

You men and women of America who believe that our destiny lies in building strength at home and not in war abroad—to you I say that we must act now to stop this trend toward war. An organized minority in this country is flooding our Congress and our press with propaganda for war. They are spending large sums of money in advertisements. They are telegraphing, writing, and talking every hour of the day, pushing us closer and closer to the edge. Some are even now demanding a declaration of war.

If you believe that we should not enter a European war, you must support those of us who oppose such action. We cannot stop this trend alone. Some of your representatives in Washington are already considering a declaration of war, but they are responsible to you for the action they take. Let them know how you feel about this. Speak to your friends and organize in your community. Nothing but a determined effort on the part of every one of us will prevent the disaster toward which our Nation is now heading.

The American Flag in Every Home, Proposed by Oregon Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, last week we celebrated the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the making of our national flag, the Stars and Stripes. At this time, when the whole world is in a shambles by reason of the devastation of war and when the loyalty of certain active groups in almost every nation is being questioned, it is particularly appropriate that we renew our allegiance to our own country and to the flag which is the symbol of the liberties we cherish in America and which were purchased at a great cost through sacrifice and life itself. We have been aroused by the knowledge that there are within our own household subversive groups who are pledged to undermine the foundations of the structure of American liberty. With every resource of our Nation being called into use in arming America for defense in a world at war it behooves us to make certain that no fifth columns are permitted to function here. It is time that every American renew his allegiance by putting into effect the American Creed, written by Wm. Tyler Page, former Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, in 1917 and accepted by the House on behalf of the people April 3, 1918:

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

I am particularly proud of my fellow Americans in Oregon, members of Federal Post No. 7, American Legion, who have initiated a movement to put an American flag in every home. Their patriotic effort at this particular time is worthy of our highest commendation. The Christian Science Monitor, under date of June 14, 1940, had this to say with reference to the Oregon plan, which I ask leave to include as a part of my remarks:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 14, 1940]

AMERICAN FLAG IN EVERY HOME PROPOSED BY OREGON VETERANS

PORTLAND, Oreg.—As an ever-present symbol of gratitude for Americans' blessings, as a reminder of the solidarity and unity on which the Nation was founded, Federal Post, No. 7, American Legion, proposes to make the American flag an active member of every household—and office staff—throughout the land.

The particular flag the post would popularize as a household fixture is an ultra-brilliant banner of silk, about 7 by 9 inches in measurement, mounted on a shiny brass staff that stands about 18 inches high. The brass staff is mounted on a three-tiered circular base of rich brown wood.

On the center tier of the wooden base is a copper plaque which says, in bold black letters, "God Bless America," and, in smaller letters, "The flag of the three Americans: you, me, and the other fellow."

DRAWS WIDE ATTENTION

Presentation of the little flags to several persons in Portland has already drawn widespread attention to the Post's purpose.

"We have already started our campaign here, and from the several hundred already placed the reaction has been gratifying and enthusiastic. We are hoping it may spread to a wide area—even nationally," says C. J. Womack, campaign manager for Federal Post.

A flag has been received by the Christian Science Monitor from the Legion as an expression of appreciation for a special edition relating to democracy last year.

"We believe if these flags can be widely distributed a very wholesome effect may accrue in greater loyalty and cooperation," says Mr. Womack, "and should have a tendency as well to discourage subversive thinking which seems to have taken root in some localities. The display of these flags in thousands of places is bound to create much favorable thinking and discussion, and will present the thought of solidarity and unity which now appear to be lacking to some extent."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

The purposes of the flag campaign are set forth vividly in a declaration from the Post itself, which says:

To a fellow American: We are confident of the destiny of America and should all be willing to do our individual part toward realizing it and protecting our country's ideals.

"What if the little raindrops should say,
So small a drop as I,
Can ne'er refresh a drooping earth,
I'll tarry in the sky."

Americanism is an individual problem and calls for individual cooperation. The spirit of America is one of confidence and courage.

The basis of our Constitution is the Golden Rule, the honesty, wisdom, and fair dealing of the average man. There was no fear in the minds of our forefathers. Our present doubts, malicious class hatreds, fears of "isms" and dictators is not American, but we must be alert. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." America lives in our hearts—in our mutual confidence that tolerance, justice, equality, freedom, and the courage to maintain them are unconquerable and always shall be.

CAUSE FOR GRATITUDE

We are grateful regardless of our ancestry, our church, our politics, our wealth, or our lack of wealth. We meet on a common ground as Americans, and we are grateful that the American spirit is one of peaceful compromise, of give and take, of live and let live.

Let us revive the inspiration of those first Americans who risked their lives, their property, and pledged their sacred honor that we might enjoy America. The destiny in which they were so confident has proved to be the greatest in the history of mankind. Our destiny will have an equally glorious future for our children to enjoy.

Let us all devote our talents and resources to the reawakening and strengthening of the ties that make America the great country that it is—the land of freedom.

The display of this miniature flag in your home or office is a silent expression of your love for America and its ideals, its kindly cooperation and good will to all, and it will serve as a constant reminder of the blessings America holds for us all.

Tribute to Senator Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] at Sedalia, Mo., on the evening of June 15, at a public reception in honor of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I greatly appreciate the invitation to attend this Democratic meeting at Sedalia with my friend HARRY TRUMAN. I fully understand that you have a political campaign under way in Missouri. I have no desire as an outsider to unduly inject myself into it. Certainly, nothing I say should be construed to reflect upon either of the candidates opposing Senator TRUMAN. I not only have no desire to do so but I know it would be improper for me to attempt to do so.

However, for the last 6 years, I have known Senator TRUMAN intimately as a member of the body to which we both belong. I do think that I can with propriety tell the Democrats of Missouri the position he occupies in that body and the attitude of the other Members toward him.

First, let me say that there has been no more loyal supporter or better friend of President Roosevelt in the United States Senate than HARRY TRUMAN. He has never been known to fail when his help was needed. Those of us in the Senate who have presented the program and the proposals of the President always knew that HARRY TRUMAN could be relied upon.

I need not tell you that HARRY TRUMAN is not an orator. He can demonstrate that for himself. However, he has so gained the confidence and respect of the Members of the Senate that when he speaks his words are listened to and respected even though he speaks quietly.

It seems to me it should be of particular interest to the people of Missouri to know of the peculiar way in which HARRY TRUMAN will fit into the solution of the very serious problems of the next few years. World conditions make necessary the launching of an urgent defense program. That defense program has the support of everyone. We will need men in the Senate whose experience peculiarly fits them for the consideration of these problems. No man in the Senate today has experience which will better fit him for the handling of these problems than does HARRY TRUMAN. To my mind there are three most important elements involved in the success of the program. Senator TRUMAN has detailed knowledge concerning each of them.

First, the problem of military preparedness itself. Senator TRUMAN'S experience as an actual combat officer in France during the World War and his close contact with the United States Army since that time fit him probably better than anyone else in the Senate to deal with this problem. It is fortunate, also, that he is a member of the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which has direct charge of appropriations along this line.

Second, the development of the airplane and aviation is of extreme importance. Since coming to the Senate HARRY TRUMAN has specialized upon that problem and is one of the Senate's outstanding authorities upon it.

Third, the problem of transportation. If we are to succeed in our defense, mobility is of supreme importance. Our railroads and our other means of transportation must be placed in a position as near perfection as possible. As a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce HARRY TRUMAN, next to the chairman of that committee, has a wider knowledge of the transportation problems of the country than any other Member of our body.

We face a time of severe crisis when the problems will be difficult of solution. I think the people of Missouri should be grateful that they have two great Senators representing them in Washington. I do not think at this time they would care to make a change.

Hon. Jonathan Bourne, Jr., Thinks Congress Lax

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Jonathan Bourne, Jr., Senator from Oregon from 1907 to 1913, still living here in Washington, was born in Massachusetts more than 85 years ago, a member of a family distinguished for ability. He went to Oregon more than 60 years ago and had much influence on the political history of that State. He was elected Senator from Oregon in 1906, during the pivotal struggle resulting in the national provision for popular election of United States Senators. What is known as the Oregon system of popular government was adopted largely due to his influence and political power. The system provided for the initiative, the referendum, and recall, and direct election of United States Senators. As an observer and participant in those events in the far-off past, I feel safe in asserting that, without the influence of former Senator Bourne, the Oregon system of popular government would not have been adopted and made an integral part of the law of Oregon.

When a Member of the Senate, Senator Bourne continued his advocacy of popular government and expressions of his fear of bureaucracy. His address on the subject, which was made in 1916 and widely distributed, was reprinted in the RECORD by Senator Frederick Steiwer, of Oregon, on April 2, 1935.

Recent events have called forth from him another statement on this subject in a letter to the New York Herald Tribune. I now ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, including this letter of June 4 and ask that the letter, together with my remarks, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 6, 1940]

THINKS CONGRESS LAX—EX-SENATOR BOURNE CONDEMNS SURRENDER OF POWERS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Some 30 years ago, while a Member of the United States Senate, I was impressed by the slowly but steadily growing power of the executive branch of the Government, and took frequent occasion to voice the opinion that in accordance with the manifest intent of the framers of our Constitution, Congress should be the dominant branch. In the passing of time and the parade of events, I have seen no reason to change that view. On the contrary, recent trends in governmental affairs not only confirm my earlier judgment but convince me of the importance of a close adherence to the spirit of our system of three-branch Government.

If we have not a dictatorship, in effect, already, all that is lacking is the enactment of demanded legislation and adjournment of Congress, a procedure which would complete the transformation for all practical purposes.

In 1932, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was a candidate for President and was warning the American people of the dangers inherent in the growing bureaucracy and assuring them that no one man was wise enough or good enough to govern a nation, I heartily agreed with him and threw my small influence to the aid of his election. I stand today by the principles I advocated in 1912 and 1932.

The Constitution, which every Member of either House of Congress took an oath to support, imposes upon the legislative branch certain specific duties coincident with powers conferred. If Congress has forfeited a large measure of the respect of the American people, the reason can be found in its own loss of self-respect as evidenced by its shirking of duty and abdication of power. Every such abdication is one more acknowledgment of both individual and collective incapacity and an added blow at the foundations of popular government.

How absurd to grow hysterical over the possibility of a "fifth column" threatening our material resources necessary to national defense and shut our eyes to the plainly evident, aggressive, and persistent effort to transform our Republic by destroying the absolutely essential system of checks and balances.

The strength of character that could exact a Magna Carta from King John at Runnymede came down through generations to a band of valiant leaders who challenged King George at Independence Hall. Humiliating, indeed, must it be, if the virile blood of such an ancestry has been so thinned by habitual indifference that no effective effort will be made to preserve the liberties so hardly won. Too long, I fear, our public schools have neglected the teaching of that inspiring poem in which we were told that not high-raised battlements (nor submarines nor airplanes) constitute a state, but "men, high-minded men, who know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain."

The history that is being written in blood on the battlefields of Europe is of far less consequence to us than the history that is being written in ink in the Halls of Congress. The next few weeks may transform the map of Europe—and the Government of these United States.

JONATHAN BOURNE, JR.

Bonuses to Law Violators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I am wholeheartedly opposed to the passage of this bill, S. 3237, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a premium to a selected list of sugar-plantation exploiters of children who knowingly violated our law in their exploitation of American child life.

It seems almost unbelievable that at a time when we are laying onerous taxes on the law-abiding citizens of our country to pay for much-needed national defense, the Congress should even consider the passage of S. 3237. In substance, the bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a sum of money, probably in excess of a million dollars, to these sugar planters who knowingly and brazenly violated the provisions of our protective laws in order to secure a few extra pennies in profit.

The inconsistency of this action is found in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, wherein a dispatch states that the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor has just instituted a suit in the State of Louisiana to enforce the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and has just announced that it has secured a permanent injunction against a New Orleans cannery operator who is in violation.

Surely we cannot expect the citizenry of our country to comply with our laws, when we find large financial interests not only brazenly violating the law but then prevailing upon the Congress of the United States to authorize or direct the payment of large sums of money to several sugar-producing exploiters of labor. And when I say large sums of money, I mean large sums. The Department of Agriculture cites one case wherein $250,000 will be split between 2 violators. In another case $220,000 will be paid to one violator. And in some 39 cases in Louisiana, a total of almost three-quarter million dollars alone will be paid. For what? For exploiting child labor.

Similar happenings have taken place to a lesser extent in the sugar-beet area. These cases are now being investigated, I understand.

It is true that these gentlemen, if the House should pass this bill this afternoon, will repay to the Treasury of the United States a sum estimated to be something like $15,000.

Of course, the sugar planters have collected millions of dollars from the Treasury in sugar benefits, yet they are not satisfied.

In order that there may be no doubt of the accuracy of these statements, I made a direct inquiry of the officials of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture. The following correspondence is self-explanatory:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SUGAR DIVISION,
Washington, June 10, 1940.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CONNERY: I enclose a table prepared after our phone conversation last Saturday, June 8, 1940, which I hope will give you the facts you need in your analysis of S. 3237. I also enclose a letter which was written in response to your letter of June 7, 1940, prior to our phone conversation.

Sincerely yours,

JOSHUA BERNHARDT, *Chief.*

Sugarcane and sugar-beet producers involved in investigation of alleged noncompliance with the child-labor provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, classified according to amount of conditional payments

Payment intervals and area	Number of producers involved	Amount of payments
Mainland cane area:		
Under $500	1	$248.24
$500–$1,000	4	2,685.55
$1,000–$2,500	12	18,951.86
$2,500–$5,000	5	16,528.34
$5,000–$10,000	7	54,763.79
$10,000–$25,000	5	80,364.17
$25,000–$50,000	3	90,267.82
$50,000–$175,000	2	250,544.27
Total [1]	39	514,354.04
Domestic beet area;		
Under $100	5	441.70
$100–$150	11	1,305.73
$150–$200	5	863.67
$200–$300	6	1,438.05
$300–$400	4	1,382.35
$400–$500	2	871.32
Total [2]	33	6,302.82

[1] In addition to the foregoing, a payment of about $220,000 has been deferred in one case on the 1938 crop as an "offset" pending final determination with respect to a disputed minor instance of alleged noncompliance in the 1937 crop.

[2] Data on the amount of conditional payments are not available in Washington for approximately 150 additional possible noncompliance cases in sugar-beet areas, since their payment records are in the field offices.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SUGAR DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1940.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CONNERY: In the absence of Mr. Laguardia from the city, I wish to acknowledge your letter of May 25, 1940, regarding S. 3237, now pending before the House.

We are glad to enclose for your information a copy of this Department's letter of March 19, 1940, to the Honorable E. D. SMITH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This report on S. 3236 and S. 3237 was formally transmitted through the Bureau of the Budget.

Transcripts of the stenographic record of hearings held in October and November 1939, by a board of officials of this Department on cases alleged noncompliance with section 301 (a) of the Sugar Act of 1937 are in this Department and are available for reference at any time. A typical transcript contains over 40 pages of testimony, with exhibits in addition, and in many cases supplementary briefs have been filed by interested parties. If it is inconvenient for you to visit the Department to consult these transcripts, we would be glad to bring up to you a few of the transcripts. However, you will readily appreciate that since these cases are under

review by the Department and no decision has yet been handed down by the Board or by the Secretary on these cases, it would not be proper for the Department to list the individuals involved under the governmental procedure generally applicable to such cases.

The statistical data which you requested are as follows:

LOUISIANA SUGARCANE PROGRAM

Number of producers involved

1937	25
1938	37
1939	15

SUGAR-BEET PROGRAM

Field investigations are being conducted at this time with respect to the beet program. No payments have been held up with respect to 1937 or 1938 crops because of noncompliance with section 301 (a) of the Sugar Act. However, subsequent investigation may develop such cases in which case the names of the producers involved will be placed on the refund register in connection with future payments.

Accurate data on the total amount of money withheld from producers pending the clearing up of these cases cannot be determined at this time, but an effort will be made to obtain this figure for you as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOSHUA BERNHARDT, *Chief.*

The following is the text of Secretary Wallace's report to Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, containing the Department's views on S. 3236 and S. 3237, introduced in the Senate by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, on February 1, 1940.

MARCH 19, 1940.

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 3236 and S. 3237, introduced in the Senate by Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, on February 1, 1940. These bills, which are alternative measures, would amend section 301 (a) of the Sugar Act of 1937, which provides, as one of the conditions of payments to growers, "That no child under the age of 14 years shall have been employed or permitted to work on the farm, whether for gain to such child or any other person, in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of a crop of sugar beets or sugarcane with respect to which application for payment is made, except a member of the immediately family of a person who was the legal owner of not less than 40 percent of the crop at the time such work was performed; and that no child between the ages of 14 and 16 years shall have been employed or permitted to do such work, whether for gain to such child or any other person, for a longer period than 8 hours in any one day, except a member of the immediate family of a person who was the legal owner of not less than 40 percent of the crop at the time such work was performed."

In administering the act a number of cases have been found in which children under age were employed or permitted to work on farms, although the producers apparently did not know that the children were under age and used reasonable precautions to ascertain the facts. In the opinion of the Department, the law now requires that payment be denied to such a case, although the producer has met all other conditions for payment provided in the act. These conditions require the payment of wages determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable; the carrying out of soil practices which the Secretary prescribes for preserving and improving the fertility of the soil; the holding of sugarcane or sugarbeet marketings within the limitations of the proportionate share for the farm; and, in the case of producers who are also processors, the payment of prices for sugarcane and sugar beets which the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable. Producers who have met these conditions of the act undoubtedly suffer a hardship by reason of the withholding of payments because of inadvertent child-labor violations.

In view of the foregoing, the Department has no objection to a suitable clarification of section 301 (a) of the Sugar Act of 1937. However, it is the view of the Department that S. 3236 and S. 3237 are subject to a number of objections as now worded.

S. 3236 provides for only a nominal penalty of $5 for each violation, which amount is not regarded as sufficient to achieve the purpose sought by the child-labor provision of the present act. It is believed that the minimum penalty for each violation should be $10. Furthermore, it might be argued, in a case where two or more children worked on a farm during the same day, that only a single penalty could be imposed under the wording of S. 3236. It is believed that a separate penalty should clearly be applicable for each child in such a case.

S. 3237, if enacted, would make it virtually impossible, in our opinion, to carry out the intent of Congress to prevent the employment of children on sugar-beet and sugarcane farms. It would leave to administrative discretion the definition of employment by the producer and the determination of responsibility of overseers and contractors. In an industry where overseers and contractors are used to a large extent, this would constitute a serious administrative problem and might cause considerable delay in making payments. It would prove very difficult for local officials administering the program in the field to determine whether the child was employed "without the knowledge or consent of the producer." It would also be difficult to determine whether "such producer in good faith attempted to comply with the provisions * * *." The bill also provides that a producer unacquainted with the provisions of the legislation should not be deemed out of compliance. It would be an almost impossible administrative job to determine this fact.

The Department, therefore, recommends that the first section of S. 3237 be changed to read as follows:

"That subsection (a) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The Secretary is authorized to make payments, notwithstanding a failure to comply with the conditions provided in this subsection, but the payments made with respect to any crop shall be subject to a deduction of $10 for each child for each day, or a portion of a day, during which such child was employed or permitted to work contrary to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, in the 1937, 1938, and 1939 crops.'"

Pursuant to the provisions of Budget Bureau Circular 344, this matter was referred to the Bureau of the Budget, and under date of March 15, 1940, the Department of Agriculture was advised by the Assistant Director thereof that there would be no objection on the part of that office to the submission of this report to Congress.

Sincerely,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SUGAR DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1940.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. CONNERY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CONNERY: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of June 7, 1940, with reference to S. 3237.

You quote the following sentence from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, dated March 19, 1940, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture: "S. 3237, if enacted, would make it virtually impossible, in our opinion, to carry out the intent of Congress to prevent the employment of children on sugar-beet and sugarcane farms." You have evidently assumed that the text of bill S. 3237, now pending before the House, is the same as that to which the foregoing objection was made. The fact, however, is that the bill as passed by the Senate and now pending before the House incorporates the Department's recommendations given in the letter of March 19, 1940, of the Secretary.

You refer to our asking the Congress "to make of themselves a hypocritical body by asking for an extension of the present Sugar Act." We do not understand the statement. The fact is that the House Committee on Agriculture almost unanimously recommended the continuing resolution for 1 year. (See Rept. No. 2080.)

You also refer to "violators" in 1937, 1938, and 1939, whose cases are still under review. The fact is that the investigations were made in 1939 and covered retroactively all crops to that date. In some cases the 1938 crop payment, instead of being paid in 1939, as would normally be the case, was deferred pending the outcome of the investigation with respect to the alleged noncompliance in the 1937 crop, in accordance with the usual "offset" policy of the Department.

Please be assured of our appreciation of your interest in the problems involved in administering the Sugar Act and of our willingness to assist you by giving you all information which it is permissible for us to give you. In this connection, as we have stated previously, transcripts of the stenographic record of the hearings held in October and November 1939 by a board of officials of this Department of the cases of alleged noncompliance are available for your reference at any time. The opinion of the Solicitor of this Department on the matter (dated December 21, 1939) has also been made public.

Sincerely yours,

JOSHUA BERNHARDT, *Chief.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1939.

Memorandum for Dr. Bernhardt, Chief, Sugar Division.

DEAR DR. BERNHARDT: Reference is made to your memorandum requesting the opinion of this office as to which, if any, of the following classes of cases may be paid under the Sugar Act of 1937, assuming that all other conditions for payment have been met:

(1) The producer employed adults only and took reasonable precautions to prevent the employment of children, but the adults brought along children under the age specified in the act to assist with the work, without the knowledge or consent of the producer;

(2) The producer or his agent employed children to work on the farm without any knowledge that they were under age and only after investigation leading to the reasonable conclusion that the children were not under age; and

(3) The producer employed children for a negligible amount of work without any knowledge of the provision of the act in question and discontinued the practice when informed of the provision of the act.

Subsection (a) of section 301 of the act provides as a condition for payment:

"(a) That no child under the age of 14 years shall have been employed or permitted to work on the farm, whether for gain to such child or any other person, in the production, cultivation, or

harvesting of a crop of sugar beets or sugarcane with respect to which application for payment is made, except a member of the immediate family of a person who was the legal owner of not less than 40 percent of the crop at the time such work was performed; and that no child between the ages of 14 and 16 years shall have been employed or permitted to do such work, whether for gain to such child or any other person, for a longer period than 8 hours in any 1 day, except a member of the immediate family of a person who was the legal owner of not less than 40 percent of the crop at the time such work was performed."

The words "employed or permitted to work" in the foregoing provision of the act appear to have the ordinary meaning and significance which they bear in common usage. The term "employ," according to Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, means "to engage, have, or keep for or in service or duty; procure or retain the services of; set or keep at work; furnish work or occupation for; as, to employ an agent." As stated in *United States* v. *Morris* (39 U. S. 464, 475):

"To be 'employed' in anything means not only the act of doing it, but also to be engaged to do it; to be under contract or orders to do it."

The term "permit," as defined in Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, means "(1) To allow by tacit consent or by not hindering; take no steps to prevent; consent tacitly to; suffer; as, to permit oneself to be wronged. (2) To grant leave to by express consent or authorization; empower expressly; * * *." When used in a statute, the courts have held that the word necessarily implies knowledge. *Armstrong's Administrator* v. *Sumne & Ratterman Co.* (278 S. W. (Ky.) 111); *La Belle* v. *Powers Mercantile Co.* (114 N. W. (Minn.) 1131); *Gregory* v. *United States* (10 Fed. Cas. 1195); *MacFarlane* v. *Mosier and Summers* (79 Misc. Rep. 460, 141 N. Y. S. 143). Thus in a case involving a question of violation of a statute providing that no child under a specified age should be "employed, permitted, or suffered to work" in any gainful occupation, the court said:

"It cannot be said, however, that the proprietor has 'permitted or suffered a child to work' in his business when he has no knowledge that the child is engaged in his service. The words 'suffer' and 'permit' necessarily imply knowledge." *Clover Creamery Co.* v. *Kanode* (129 S. E. (Va.) 222, 223).

It is, therefore, the opinion of this office that the cases referred to in paragraph (1) of your request are eligible for payment under the act. The children obviously were not employed by the producer, nor were they "permitted to work" within the meaning of the provision of the act in question.

The principle that ignorance of the law excuses no one (ignorantia legis neminem excusat) is generally recognized and is applicable to the cases referred to in paragraph (3) of your request. In *Barlow* v. *United States* (7 Peters 404, 411) the Court said:

"It is a common maxim, familiar to all minds, that ignorance of the law will not excuse any person, either civilly or criminally; * * *."

It follows that ignorance of the law does not excuse an applicant for the payment under the act from meeting the conditions upon which those payments are authorized. Accordingly, it is the opinion of this office that the cases referred to in paragraph (3) of your request are not eligible to receive payments under the act.

Although there are two possible views with respect to the cases referred to in paragraph (2) of your request, it is the opinion of this office that, for the reasons set out below, the producers are not eligible for payments under the act.

It may be contended, for example, that, although the language of the provision in question is clear, there is doubt as to whether Congress intended that payments should be denied in cases where children were employed or permitted to work on the farm without any knowledge on the part of the producer that the children were under age and after reasonable efforts on the part of the producer to ascertain that fact. In other words, it may be contended that there is ambiguity as to the scope and meaning of the statute, and that such ambiguity necessarily calls for the applications of the rules of statutory construction. Thus, it may be argued, on the basis of the legislative history of the present act and its predecessor, the Jones-Costigan amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, that it was the general spirit and purpose of the provision to prevent the exploitation of children for the strenuous work in the sugar beet and sugarcane fields, and that the provision was not intended to apply to cases of accidental violation. This view would have the support of decisions holding that, in construing or considering the application of a statute, it is permissible to look to the general spirit and purpose as well as to the strict letter of the law; that the strict letter of the law must yield to its evident spirit and purpose when necessary to give effect to the intent of Congress; that unjust or absurd consequences are, if possible, to be avoided; that general terms should be limited in their application so as not to lead to oppression, injustice, or absurd consequences; that it will always be presumed that the legislature intended exceptions to its language which would avoid results of this character; that the reason of the law should prevail over its letter; and that constructions of statutes are to be made according to the intention of the makers, and sometimes are to be expounded against the letter to preserve the intent. (See *Fleischmann Construction Co.* v. *United States*, 270 U. S. 349, 360; *Holy Trinity Church* v. *United States*, 143 U. S. 457, 458–459[1]; *McKee* v. *United States*, 164 U. S. 287, 293; *Lineberger* v. *Rouss*, 76 U. S. 468, 475; *United States* v. *Kirby*, 7 Wall. 482, 486; and *Mankel* v. *United States*, 19 Ct. Cls. 295, 300).

It is the opinion of this office, however, that the provision of the act in question is clear and unambiguous and that the statute must be interpreted as written. It is a well-settled rule of statutory interpretation that "where a law is expressed in plain and unambiguous terms, whether those terms are general or limited, the legislature should be intended to mean what they have plainly expressed, and consequently no room is left for construction." (*Lake County* v. *Rollins*, 130 U. S. 670–71). As was stated by Mr. Justice Brown in *Hamilton* v. *Rathbone* (175 U. S. 414, 421):

"Indeed, the cases are so numerous in this court, to the effect that the province of construction lies wholly within the domain of ambiguity, that an extended review of them is quite unnecessary."

The cases cited in the second preceding paragraph, holding that a statute should be interpreted and construed according to its evident spirit and purpose, that unjust or absurd consequences are to be avoided, if possible, that general terms should be so limited in their application as not to lead to oppression, injustice, or absurd consequences, etc., are cases in which there was ambiguity as to the meaning of the statute. These are principles of statutory construction which are applicable only to ambiguous statutes. If, therefore, the language of the statute is clear and unambiguous and the intention plain, it is the duty of the court to expound the statute as it stands, even if the consequence is a hardship or injustice. *Folsom* v. *United States*, 160 U. S. 121, 127.

There is, undoubtedly, hardship involved in denial of payments in the cases to which you refer. There are a number of conditions in the act which must be met in order for the producer to be eligible for payments thereunder. These conditions require the payment of wages determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable; the carrying out of soil practices which the Secretary prescribes for preserving and improving the fertility of the soil; the holding of sugarcane or sugar beet marketings within the limitations of the proportionate share for the farm; and, in the case of producers who are also processors, the payment of prices for sugar beets and sugarcane which the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable. Compliance with all of these conditions involves an outlay of money substantially in excess of that necessary to produce an ordinary crop. Therefore, producers who have met the other conditions of the act with respect to payments will undoubtedly suffer a hardship if payments are denied because of accidental child-labor violations. But the rule applicable to these cases is stated in *Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co.* v. *United States*, 181 U. S. 584, 589, as follows:

"Yet this apparent hardship will not authorize us to do violence to the clear language of the statute. If the law afford him an imperfect relief, his remedy is by application to Congress for additional legislation, and not to the judicial power for a strained interpretation of the law already in force."

If a child, who is, in fact, under 14 years of age, is "employed or permitted to work" by the producer or his agent, or if a child, who is, in fact, between the ages of 14 and 16, is "employed or permitted to do such work * * * for a longer period than 8 hours in any one day" by the producer or his agent, then, under the clear language of subsection (a) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1937,

---

[1] The Court held that an act of Congress "to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in the United States, its Territories and the District of Columbia," did not apply to a contract between an alien residing outside the United States and the Church of the Holy Trinity, an incorporated religious society, under which the alien was to remove to the city of New York and enter into the service of the church as rector and minister. Speaking for a unanimous Court, Mr. Justice Brewer said: "It must be conceded that the act of the corporation is within the letter of this section, for the relation of rector to his church is one of service, and implies labor on the one side with compensation on the other. Not only are the general words labor and service both used, but also, as it were to guard against any narrow interpretation and emphasize a breadth of meaning, to them is added 'of any kind'; and, further, as noticed by the circuit judge in his opinion, the fifth section, which makes specific exceptions, among them professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, and domestic servants, strengthens the idea that every other kind of labor and service was intended to be reached by the first section. While there is great force to this reasoning, we cannot think Congress intended to denounce with penalties a transaction like that in the present case. It is a familiar rule that a thing may be within the letter of the statute and yet not within the statute, because not within its spirit, nor within the intention of its makers. This has often been asserted, and the reports are full of cases illustrating its application. This is not the substitution of the will of the judge for that of the legislator, for frequently words of general meaning are used in a statute, words broad enough to include an act in question, and yet a consideration of the whole legislation, or of the circumstances surrounding its enactment, or of the absurd results which follow from giving such broad meaning to the words, makes it unreasonable to believe that the legislator intended to include the particular act" (pp. 458–459).

previously quoted, payment to the producer must be denied. The fact that the producer or his agent was ignorant of the child's true age, or reasonably believed the child's age to be over 14 or over 16, as the case may be, would not justify the making of payment to such producer, in our judgment.

It is, therefore, the opinion of this office that the cases referred to in paragraph 2 of your request are ineligible to receive payments under the act.

Very truly yours,

MASTIN G. WHITE,
Solicitor.

Mr. Speaker, these same gentlemen, who admit they have violated the child-labor provisions of the Sugar Act, have exploited American child life, and now hope to prevail upon the Congress of the United States to exploit the Treasury of the United States. I regret to say they seek also to deprive American citizens, paid decent wages in our American sugar refineries, of employment opportunities which they so badly need. But at the same time these exploiters of child life demand for themselves the payment of continued benefits at the expense of our taxpayers.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House of Representatives, in its wisdom, will reject this unusual procedure, will defeat this measure, and will permit the Treasury of the United States to invest this million or more dollars in much needed national defense. I sincerely feel that a vote for this bill would be an endorsement of child labor in this country, and this body should never acquiesce in such endorsement.

Bridges Deportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The editorial follows:

By a vote of 330 to 42 the House has approved a bill ordering the Attorney General to deport Harry R. Bridges, west coast labor leader. No charges were brought against Mr. Bridges other than general accusations that he is a "troublemaker," and an "undesirable" alien with communistic leanings.

Mr. Bridges has already been absolved of charges that he has been agitating for the overthrow of our form of government. After long and exhaustive open hearings James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, concluded that Mr. Bridges was neither a member of, nor affiliated with, the Communist Party and that his activities as a labor leader were in accord with democratic principles.

Not only did the House ignore these official findings but the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization did not even accord the accused man a hearing before reporting favorably upon the bill for his deportation. In the course of the debate it was said that this is the first time a bill aimed exclusively at the punishment of one man has come before Congress. That is not surprising, since our Government is supposed to be one of laws.

What is almost past belief, however, is that a legislative body sworn to uphold democratic principles should be so misguided as to approve a measure subversive of the fundamental principles upon which our constitutional form of government rests.

There was difference of opinion among Members of the House as to whether the deportation bill could be regarded as a bill of attainder, banned under the Constitution of the United States. Legal hairsplitting on this issue can be left to the lawyers. But patriotic citizens will hope that if this bill is enacted, the Supreme Court will quickly sweep aside the legal casuistry by which its supporters seek to deny law-abiding aliens rights guaranteed to them as "persons" under the Constitution.

The bill to deport Mr. Bridges is, in any case, an example of the kind of legislation the founding fathers sought to prohibit in banning bills of attainder. What Justice Story has to say on the subject is enlightening. Bills of attainder (i. e., legislative acts which inflict punishment without judicial trial) "have been most usually passed," he says, "in times of rebellion or of gross subservience to the Crown or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable * * * to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others."

Those words have a prophetic ring. For the House, in its zeal to safeguard cherished institutions, has voted to trample upon individual rights and liberties. The fact that the prospective victim is an alien is no excuse for such conduct.

If emulation is the sincerest form of flattery, then Hitler and Mussolini should extract great satisfaction from the unprecedented action of the House. For the Congressmen who voted to deport Mr. Bridges, after he had been cleared of charges of being illegally in this country, are certainly following totalitarian methods of ridding the state of "undesirables."

A number of Congressmen maintained that they might deport an alien simply because they did not like the color of his eyes or his hair. If that view is accepted, how long will it be before Congress extends its purge to eliminate citizens who, for any reason or for no reason, have become objectionable?

Much more than the wholly unimportant future of Harry Bridges is at stake in the present instance. His foes as well as his friends can meet on common ground to oppose an action which is utterly repugnant to everything for which America is supposed to stand.

The Undeveloped Strength of American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT H. JACKSON

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a most remarkable address delivered by the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, Attorney General of the United States, on June 14, 1940, at Charlottesville, Va., before the Institute of Public Affairs.

This address is entitled "The Undeveloped Strength of American Democracy," and it summarizes our growth through the years as a nation, then analyzes present-day conditions in a masterful way, and then it goes on to point out with courage, clearness, and vision the road we must travel in order to maintain our cherished democracy and continue to set an example to the rest of the world that is so rapidly losing its liberty and democracy. The address follows:

In a world that is moving so fast, prophecy is dangerous, and it is too early to draw more than tentative and contingent inferences as to the future. But prudence requires us to consider the possibility that after this war our Nation will find itself in a reordered and less friendly environment. Unless we are to adopt a policy of nonresistance and comfort ourselves with the theory that virtue is its own reward, we cannot ignore the possibility that some decisive test of military strength may be forced upon us. Or we may face a long period of narrowing encirclement, accompanied by steady reduction of our friendly buffer states. In that event our trial, instead of being one of sudden striking power in war, may be a test of sustained staying power in peace. In either case the United States will run great risks if it cannot muster its maximum collective strength to meet any supreme challenge to its survival.

In appraising any country's strength for the long pull, it is folly to measure military strength merely by such factors as numbers of tanks, speed of airplanes, or naval-power ratings. The potency of weapons still depends ultimately upon the judgment, the courage, and the devotion of the men who wield them. And the economic machine which supplies an army and the social system which backs its morale are most vital parts of any defense system.

The characteristic strength of the totalitarian systems is that they overcame an inferiority of resources by a better utilization of them. They hurl themselves with great impact because they are so closely organized. Their effective power is great because they have eliminated lost motion, debating time, and friction by meshing their political system, their military power, their cultural institutions, and their economic system into one total machine. Quick decision, an external appearance of unity because dissent is suppressed, and rapid execution of orders is a characteristic strength of dictatorship. Its characteristic weakness is the slowly disappearing individual initiative which results from ruthless suppressions and regimentation.

The characteristic weakness of a democracy in contrast, however, shows up at the very beginning. It is confusion of tongues, conflict in objectives and methods, and lack of unity. Even if freedom

does develop men of greater individual initiative and strength, if they forever pull in opposite directions there is no collective strength. Two strong men who cancel each other are not equal to two dumb men who pull together. It is only after a free government has time to collect itself, to let events lead to a voluntary unification of purposes and opinions, that democracy can put forth its latent power. In speed it is always doomed to defeat—in endurance it has generally won.

But it is plain that the democracies of the world need something more than victory if they are to survive. Only 20 years ago they had victory in full measure. In 2 decades the fruits of victory have vanished. It is not a happy prospect if all the sacrifice of a World War will buy peace for only part of a generation. This failure to keep advantages so lately won gives dictators and their American sycophants an opportunity to revive the old monarchical sneers at democracy—Napoleon's wisecrack about "government by chatter" and the philosophy that democracy is a "cult of incompetence."

The question that concerns America is not whether our democracy has been inefficient, wasteful, and negligent, but whether it must continue to be so. The power—at least on a sudden trial—of totalitarianism lies in the pattern of its organization. Can we, without sacrificing our essentially democratic qualities, achieve a pattern of organization that will get from free men and free enterprise an efficiency roughly equivalent to that which totalitarians achieve by compulsion?

I am one who believes that our representative democracy can be made vastly more efficient than it is without sacrificing its essential and basic liberties. I also believe that the only way we can remain democratic is to achieve a greater effectiveness. Moreover, I believe we have laid some solid foundation for such a program in the last 3 years.

II

This faith forces me to take issue with those who now are proclaiming that government has become too big, too powerful, and too concentrated, and who now are proposing a program of reducing governmental ability to control and regulate the business enterprises which flourish under its protection.

In some quarters it is claimed that the strengthening of our economy cannot be helped by governmental action at all, but that it must be done only on the initiative of those in private industry. For generations we have proceeded on the assumption that the energies of a free people could be divided into thousands of self-directed ventures, and that somehow these would add up to a public good. No large business enterprise can succeed if it is not well planned, but there are those who insist that our total economy must be allowed to run with no planning for the good of the whole. It is precisely this anarchy among the democracies which has been their weakness.

Certainly democracy must utilize the profit motive to produce initiative for private enterprise. But it cannot accept a doctrine that anything is allowable if only it produces someone a profit. For example, we cannot tolerate even a profitable traffic in scrap iron or oil or machine tools to arm a potential enemy. We cannot safely allow private enterprise for profit's sake to centralize essential industries into targets for potential enemies such as the rubber industry at Akron, an automobile industry in Detroit, a steel industry at Pittsburgh, or a brass industry at Bridgeport. The private-profit opportunity must yield to a defense motive, and, as Dorothy Thompson and Henry Luce have pointed out, the tendency of private business to do whatever is profitable has been affirmatively counted on by Hitler as a weakness of democracy.

It seems, therefore, to me elementary that if democracy is to rearm and at the same time is to avoid the depression of its basic standards of living, it must consciously, to a much greater degree than heretofore, plan its economic order. It must eliminate unnecessary luxuries—and among them the luxury of friction, unnecessary service, and ineptitude. It must keep the profit motive as a reward for service to society.

Business itself cannot perfect this organization, because no private enterprise can be entrusted with the power to coerce minorities. And in any more effective organization of industry, some dissenting minorities must be brought into line, some conduct which interferes with the accomplishment of the objective must be punished, and some freedoms prevented. These powers can only be left to a democratically chosen government.

If we are to strengthen the organization of democracy, it seems obvious that we in America can do so only through the Federal Government. Forty-eight separate State organizations—no one of which is an economic unit, each of which is more or less in competition with every other—cannot be the means to a strengthened American organization.

The strongest opposition to this necessary centralization of governmental power is proceeding largely from those who have been assiduously piling private corporation on top of private corporation to build Nation-wide empires of concentrated wealth within our democracy. If capital is to collectivize itself into great integrated industries and into great holding-company systems, and if labor is to join itself into powerful Nation-wide organizations, then, clearly, government, if it is to govern effectively, must be bigger than any of the governed. I do not propose any degree of governmental concentration that is not made necessary by the concentrations in the economy which underlies the Government. But the greatest power in any country must be its government, and no people can ever present a united front unless the government is greater than any of its parts.

III

How are we to preserve liberty if we strengthen authority, you may rightly ask? How shall we reconcile greater power with our freedoms?

The essence of democracy, it seems to me, is not the absence of effective government. The essence of democracy is the control of government by the consent and will of the governed as expressed by its majorities. In order to preserve the reality of that consent and to provide it a basis for intelligent decision, a minority must continue to have the right to struggle to become a majority, to offer its ideas in competition, to debate, to question the government, to propagandize through speech and print, and the right to assemble and petition government. And our machinery for the registration of the consent, that is, our elections, must always remain free, and the results must be accepted. All of this takes time. All of it produces an impression of a divided people. All of it emphasizes our differences of opinion and objectives and all of its steps are capable of abuse both at the hands of temporary majorities and at the hands of extreme and intemperate minorities. But it is an indispensable condition of free government that the process of opinion making remain free and uncontrolled by either public government or private power. Hence we cannot really strengthen the hand of government unless we preserve these liberties which give it vitality. Any plan which strikes at these freedoms would not strengthen democracy but would abandon it.

Where then can we strengthen democracy? Once a decision is democratically arrived at, I see no reason why it would not be consistent with democracy to provide means to execute that decision with as much expedition and efficiency as the decision of a dictator. After we have preserved the democratic way in which opinion may form and Congress and the President settle its policy, I do not see the wisdom of allowing a multitude of ways in which private vested interest may stall its execution.

A deadly and endless legalism has been the weapon by which private interests have kept the power of a democratic leadership tied up. The Democratic Gulliver has been tied to the ground with legal red tape in the hands of a multitude of minor private interests. Witness the efforts of a sovereign democracy to fix utility rates. The most conspicuous example of legalism is the Kansas City Stockyard case, in which the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized by statute to fix the rates of commission men. He did so in 1933. For 7 years since the case has been in the courts, four times heard in district court, and four times argued in the Supreme Court, and never yet has there been a decision by that Court in anything except questions of how to proceed. And the case is on its way there again. The way we lawyers stall everything while we debate how to proceed reminds me of the old verse:

"The centipede was happy, quite,
Until the frog for fun
Said, 'Pray which foot comes after which,'
Which wrought his mind to such a pitch
He lay distracted in the ditch,
Considering how to run."

So the Government is always thrown into the ditch by lawyers asking which foot comes after which—only they don't ask it for fun.

We started out on a plan of national industrial recovery and it took 2 years of litigation to find out it was all legally wrong.

We started out to aid agriculture and, after 3 years, learned that, too, was all legally wrong.

We passed a law to enable debt-ridden tax districts to reorganize their debt, as private corporations have long been allowed to do. It took a few years' litigation to learn it was all legally wrong and a few years more to learn it was all legally right.

We began in 1935 to organize the demoralized bituminous-coal industry, and only last month got a final decision sustaining constitutional power to do so.

I could go on indefinitely to recite the steps by which a whole recovery and reform program, supported by the people at the polls as no other program ever was, has been battered to pieces or delayed for years by legal proceedings. And this at a period when Hitler was teaching the bitter lesson of the value of time.

I am not proposing that we deny "due process of law" to persons or to property. That too is an essential of government by law. But we cannot afford to stall the administration of important policies while private interests obtain "undue process of law."

IV

I do not think there is present need to add to the constitutional powers of the Federal Government. Reasonably interpreted there is at present adequate constitutional power, at least until administrative and legislative experience catches up with the concept embodied in recent court decisions. In 1933 we were not a Nation—that is judicially speaking—we were 48 nations and our Federal power has been interpreted away until the Constitution was but little stronger than the old Articles of Confederation which our forefathers found inadequate a century and a half ago. The restoration of Federal power is a subject on which I speak with some assurance for it has been my special task.

Our representative democracy has been made a nation in the last 4 years. If it is able to organize its economy to support its defense today, it is in no small measure due to the greater liberty of action won in little-publicized court decisions too

technical perhaps for complete public understanding. The National Government has won its long fight to free itself of unwarranted limitations which gave an unwholesome dominance to the vested private interest as against the public welfare.

Let us hastily review the implications of these steps.

1. We have replaced the old doctrine of dual federalism with the doctrine of cooperative federalism. This was accomplished by the unemployment compensation decision. The old school insisted that the Federal Government and State governments could not enter into a combination by which the Federal Government furnished the protection of its taxing power and the State the advantages of its local administration in carrying out a common purpose to relieve unemployment. Counsel for the old order correctly anticipated the effect of the contentions of the Government when he exclaimed to the Court: "If this is constitutional, then no more will the clash of sovereignties ring out." But the Court didn't seem to think there was any purpose in having a clash of sovereignties ringing out, and it expressly approved the practice of a new cooperative federalism. Also, after it had once refused to do so, it finally approved the municipal bankruptcy law by which the Federal Government extended the aid of Federal courts and of the Federal bankruptcy power to debt-ridden municipalities, a relief which had long been extended to private corporations. But the old school thought its aid should not be extended to subdivisions of the States, for it held that State and Nation were sentenced to perpetual antagonism. By grants in aid to financially weak localities it has been possible to keep our economic and social system on a fairly uniform policy and capacity to handle problems of relief, unemployment, health, and social service. Thus we have today the greatest degree of power in the history of the country to cooperate and are carrying out the greatest practical plans of cooperation between municipality, State, and Nation. This is of great significance in any plan for strengthening our defenses and unifying our efforts.

2. We have also sustained the right to develop in peacetime American defense resources without waiting for war. You remember the wartime development of Muscle Shoals and the building of Wilson Dam, one of the country's great power projects, to aid production of adequate war materials. When peace came, a long struggle of private interests to obtain possession of this power development began. When this administration began its public-power program, private-power interests, although purchasing power from that source, denied the right of the Government to sell power created at Wilson Dam direct to consumers. They lost, but returned to the attack, because under the Tennessee Valley Authority other hydropower developments had been built, but not in wartime, and the utilities challenged the right of the Government to make these projects self-sustaining in whole or in part by selling the resulting power to the public. Here again they were defeated, and the Federal power sustained. Today this Nation may develop its power resources and may extend its system of flood control. It is not obliged to wait until war is upon us to exercise war powers to create an adequate source of cheap energy for Federal defense or industrial purposes. No person who is anxious about American defense today can doubt the importance of the victory over the private interests that sought to deny the right of the Government to develop and place in use America's water-power resources.

3. We have restored the taxing power of the Federal Government, on which had been engrafted special privileges of an insidious kind. Property made a long and successful fight to prevent progressive income taxation. Finally the people adopted the sixteenth amendment to assure the Nation power to tax income "from whatever source derived." But in spite of this constitutional mandate, the courts held that public officers of the States were immune from the Federal tax and Federal officers were immune from the State tax and Federal judges were immune from both taxes.

The immunity of public officers did not have great economic importance, but it was the mask behind whose principles the whole tax exemption to interest on public bonds lurked. Back of the politicians' immunity was the immunity of the millionaire. Vast amounts of wealth took shelter in tax-exempt securities, and is still permitted to escape all burdens of protecting itself. We have struck down the tax immunity to public officers and to judges, and the court has announced the principle that a tax on income is not a tax on the source of that income. The way is thereby opened for a defense program to tax vast reservoirs of hitherto untaxed wealth. It only awaits the action of Congress.

4. The power over interstate commerce has been restored and invigorated. This is one of the most litigated clauses of the Constitution and it was expansive when it denied State power and terribly feeble when the Nation tried to rely on it. But through a series of recent constitutional victories we today have established Federal authority to organize a demoralized industry, like bituminous coal, or to protect agriculture from the depressing effects of marketing surpluses. And the protection of interstate commerce includes the power to prevent labor disputes growing out of unfair labor practices, and includes the right to prescribe wages and hours, and to use the interstate-commerce power to discourage evils like prison-made goods or child labor or other menaces to public health or social well-being. This power is also now held to authorize regulation of aggregations of capital such as the public-utility holding companies which contended that they were constitutionally immune from regulation by both State and Nation.

5. The general welfare as an object for constitutional taxation may be said to have been discovered within the last 4 years, so far as the Supreme Court is concerned. In our constitutional taxing power the forefathers joined together the common defense and the general welfare, but a selfish generation had put them asunder. The philosophy had grown up that the Federal Government had nothing to do with the welfare of the people—except, of course, it could adopt such measures as subsidies and tariffs to aid industries. As late as 1936 the Supreme Court remarked that it had never been obliged to settle the meaning of the general-welfare clause. One of the reasons was that it had been so little used. It was in the Social Security cases that we won from the Court its first interpretation which gave a broad sweep to the general-welfare power and held that this Nation may bring to each fireside and workbench protection against the insecurities that seem inherent in our industrial order.

These are things which make us intellectually and politically a different Nation in 1940 than we were in 1936. These new powers bring with them new responsibilities, but they also bring to the American people of 1940 new possibilities for a program of democracy. The past 7 years have witnessed a struggle to reeducate our people in their concept of our representative democracy. In 1932 the predominant belief was that our democracy was identical with the status quo—a strange amalgam of legalism and money power. Anything which would disturb the privileges of property, the advantages of the vested interest, or which would place new social burdens—or even burdens of government upon them—was antidemocratic and generally unconstitutional. Those who were comfortably established in the existing order sincerely believed that—many of them still do.

That false concept of our democracy has passed away except in a few dark corners. Democratic government is designed, not to prevent change, but to bring about change in orderly and considered fashion. Its purpose is not to entrench an existing policy, but to call it up at periodic elections for reconsideration. Its intent is to prevent violent and revolutionary changes by keeping open a peaceful way to make constant readjustments within the constitutional area, in the rules, the relationships, and the institutions of our social order. This was certainly the teaching of the great philosopher of democracy in whose shadow we meet tonight.

We have restored the vitality of a free government on which a narrow legalism was inflicting a kind of rigor mortis. Now we think of our democracy as a living and dynamic force. The bitter fight to give it virility to combat economic demoralization at home gives it strength to organize against any threat from abroad.

The lines of future liberal policy are clear. We must move at accelerated pace, not merely in equipping naval and military and air power. We must also evolve a greatly improved pattern for economic organization to support both our social system and our military establishments. We must conserve our resources, eliminate our endless wastes and duplications, and bring our scattered and often conflicting energies to the support of common objectives. We have won for peacetime programs powers that in 1917 were felt could be used only in war emergency. Now democracy may under its great charter, not by disregarding it, proceed to place its house in order.

And this task is one that can be accomplished neither by reactionaries nor by revolutionists. It is a task for men who realize and are glad that they live in a changing world, but who believe that there is in us enough intelligence to plan our destiny and enough self-sacrifice to achieve it.

Patriotism or Unionism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention, and the attention of the country, to the following interesting little threat which appeared in the June 15, 1940, edition of the United Mine Workers Journal:

GO TO IT, HENRY

Henry Ford says his company can produce a thousand airplanes a day. All right, Hank. Your employees will be organized and unionized long before you start making a thousand airplanes a day.

We all know that the United Mine Workers is the parent of John L. Lewis' pet child, the C. I. O., which we know has carried on a relentless war with Mr. Henry Ford and all other automobile companies and many others who now are, or are expected to be, vital cogs in our national-defense machinery.

Apparently now Mr. Lewis intends to subordinate the entire question of national defense to his greedy desire for more

power for his union. Mr. Lewis has been continually aided and abetted in his desire for a greater strangle hold on American labor by policies of this administration.

If we are to rapidly repair our defective defense machinery in this country, we must all look to the larger industrial units, of which Mr. Henry Ford is in the foremost ranks.

Are we to understand, Mr. Speaker, that we can have adequate national defense in this country only when and if Mr. John L. Lewis and his demands have been satisfied? Or, perhaps, it is to such threats as this that Mr. Ford recently referred to when he said his company could—within a comparatively short time—easily turn out 1,000 airplanes a day if he were unhampered by Government or other interference.

Roosevelt "Hates War," But Is Doing His Best To Get Us Into It—And Get Us Into It Unprepared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has no right to declare war. Nevertheless he is saying and doing things which lead directly to war.

His pledge at Charlottesville to "extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation," his message to the French that, as long as they continued to fight, materials and supplies would be sent them from the United States "in ever-increasing quantities and kinds" lead to false hopes which are cruel.

Just such statements as these from England and France to Poland, Norway, and Belgium led those countries to resist when resistance was hopeless.

The President has no authority to make any such commitments as he made to France, and no one knows it better than he.

Moreover, the Allies are purchasing and hauling away in their own ships all the materials and supplies which we have been able to furnish.

If the President means to increase our production and use our own ships, then he knows that our ships will be bombed and torpedoed and America will be in the war. He knows, too, that America is unprepared to carry on such a war successfully.

What, then, is his purpose? Does he mean to involve us in a war which inevitably we will lose? Or, if we are to win, must tax our resources and be carried on for years? Is that his purpose?

To win that war does he intend drafting every man and woman for service to the Nation? Or does he intend to draft for the front-line trenches the American farmer boys, the clerks, the professional men, and leave his communistic friends in essential industries in positions where they can sabotage any effective war program?

Knowing that Congress has not the slightest notion of declaring war, the President would do well if he would cease to head the war party in the United States.

The Republican Party stands for peace—for America first, last, and always. Roosevelt is driving toward war, using the war hysteria in an effort to continue himself in power. The new dealers, to perpetuate themselves in power, are trying to draft him, although he is an active candidate for a third term. Draft Roosevelt and he will draft you.

Here is an editorial which concisely states the situation:

[From the Sturgis (Mich.) Daily Journal of June 15, 1940]

OUR NEW "WAR" PARTY

(An editorial)

It should be apparent now to everyone that President Roosevelt is the acknowledged leader of the forces that are striving to involve the United States in the European war. The new dealers have adopted war as their baby. Ever since the President made his provocative quarantine speech in Chicago more than a year ago, the war urge has been the most consistent policy that he has had.

If the country can avoid a formal declaration of war against Germany and Italy until next November, the issue for the Presidential election will be clear cut. President Roosevelt, if nominated for a third term, will head the war party. The Republican candidate, whoever he may be, will be the antiwar candidate. If the people of this country are in favor of again sending millions of American boys to European battlefields they will vote for the war candidate, Mr. Roosevelt. If they are opposed to sending our manpower abroad, they will vote for the antiwar candidate.

Two things can happen in the meantime to upset the above premise. President Roosevelt may force the country into the war before the election can be held, or the German-Italian alliance may win such a decisive victory that the war will be ended before the warmongers can get us into it.

President Roosevelt has assured the country that he "hates war." He has taken a curious way of demonstrating his convictions on the subject. In a similar situation Woodrow Wilson won the close election of 1916 because he took the credit of "keeping us out of war." By the following April he had us in it up to our necks.

Roosevelt insists that he "hates war," but continues to use his influence in every way possible to foment the war spirit. Why? Does anyone doubt that the master politician is fully aware of the new implements of personal power that a subservient Congress would turn over to him to do with as he pleases? If he can succeed in forcing us into the war this summer the election might as well be canceled. Any President, under a wartime dictatorship, can obtain his own reelection.

On his record Roosevelt would make the worst war President the United States ever had. He has most of the instincts and ambitions of a Hitler without any of the German dictator's abilities.

There is one statement in this with which I cannot agree. In the next to the last paragraph we find this sentence:

If he (meaning the President) can succeed in forcing us into the war this summer the election might as well be canceled.

I do agree that, as stated in the editorial:

On his record Roosevelt would make the worst war President the United States ever had. He has most of the instincts and ambitions of a Hitler without any of the German dictator's abilities.

But if Roosevelt gets us into this war before November—and he will if he can—on his shoulders will rest the responsibility for the death of hundreds of thousands of our boys; on his conscience will be the thought that once again the hospitals and the asylums will be filled with the wrecks of humanity, sacrificed on the altar of his ambition.

The American people, knowing those things, if he forces us into this war, will, in my judgment, send him out of office as the betrayer of their confidence.

If you want to keep this country out of war, your boys out of the first-line trenches, begin now and work unceasingly to defeat this war party, headed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Extension of Sugar Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

RESOLUTION BY THE LEGISLATURE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana:

Whereas, under the Sugar Act of 1937, the growing of sugarcane and the marketing of sugar produced therefrom is so restricted that discrimination results against Louisiana in favor of foreign growers and markets; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Louisiana believes that the continental United States should be preferred in the distribution and allocation of the United States sugar market over foreign countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (a majority of the members of both houses concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to vote against any extension of the Sugar Act of 1937; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded immediately to both Houses of the Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from Louisiana.

The Bridges Deportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES, AND THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, because of the time limitation upon the debate prior to the passage of the Harry Bridges deportation bill on June 13 many Members who voted against this extreme and unwise measure were not heard in the debate. Under leave granted, I am including in this extension of remarks editorials from the New York Times, the St. Louis Star-Times, and the Washington Post as being fairly representative of thoughtful opinion upon the action of the House, which I fervently hope will not mark the beginning of a stampede born of hysteria and unreasoning fear and prejudice, to emulate the tactics of the totalitarian governments, in derogation of principles so fundamental in our democracy, and as inimical to the spirit, if not the letter, of our Bill of Rights.

[From the New York Times of June 15, 1940]

A BILL AIMED AT ONE MAN

By the overwhelming vote of 330 to 42 the House has passed a bill the sole declared purpose of which is to deport the labor leader Harry Bridges to Australia. No doubt the House is justified in its suspicion that Mr. Bridges has harmed the shipping industry on the west coast, and it seems probable that on net balance he has done an ill service to labor. But none of this justifies the legislative method used. Wholly apart from the question of whether this particular bill is constitutional, it is difficult to think of a more dangerous precedent than the passage of a measure designed to punish a specific individual by name, and not for the violation of some clearly defined law of general applicability. Democracy is not to be defended by imitating the arbitrary legislative devices of despotism.

[From the Washington Post of June 15, 1940]

SUBVERSIVE ACTION

By a vote of 330 to 42 the House has approved a bill ordering the Attorney General to deport Harry R. Bridges, west coast labor leader. No charges were brought against Mr. Bridges other than general accusations that he is a troublemaker, and an undesirable alien with communistic leanings.

Mr. Bridges has already been absolved of charges that he has been agitating for the overthrow of our form of government. After long and exhaustive open hearings James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, concluded that Mr. Bridges was neither a member of, nor affiliated with, the Communist Party and that his activities as a labor leader were in accord with democratic principles.

Not only did the House ignore these official findings but the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization did not even accord the accused man a hearing before reporting favorably upon the bill for his deportation. In the course of the debate it was said that this is the first time a bill aimed exclusively at the punishment of one man has come before Congress. That is not surprising, since our Government is supposed to be one of laws.

What is almost past belief, however, is that a legislative body sworn to uphold democratic principles should be so misguided as to approve a measure subversive of the faundamental principles upon which our constitutional form of government rests.

There was difference of opinion among Members of the House as to whether the deportation bill could be regarded as a bill of attainder, banned under the Constitution of the United States. Legal hairsplitting on this issue can be left to the lawyers. But patriotic citizens will hope that if this bill is enacted, the Supreme Court will quickly sweep aside the legal casuistry by which its supporters seek to deny law-abiding aliens rights guaranteed to them as "persons" under the Constitution.

The bill to deport Mr. Bridges is, in any case, an example of the kind of legislation the founding fathers sought to prohibit in banning bills of attainder. What Justice Story has to say on the subject is enlightening. Bills of attainder, i. e., legislative acts which inflict punishment without judicial trial, "have been most usually passed," he says, "in times of rebellion or of gross subservience to the Crown or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable * * * to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others."

Those words have a prophetic ring. For the House, in its zeal to safeguard cherished institutions, has voted to trample upon individual rights and liberties. The fact that the prospective victim is an alien is no excuse for such conduct.

If emulation is the sincerest form of flattery, then Hitler and Mussolini should extract great satisfaction from the unprecedented action of the House. For the Congressmen who voted to deport Mr. Bridges, after he had been cleared of charges of being illegally in this country, are certainly following totalitarian methods of ridding the state of "undesirables."

A number of Congressmen maintained that they might deport an alien simply because they did not like the color of his eyes or his hair. If that view is accepted, how long will it be before Congress extends its purge to eliminate citizens who, for any reason or for no reason, have become objectionable?

Much more than the wholly unimportant future of Harry Bridges is at stake in the present instance. His foes as well as friends can meet on common ground to oppose an action which is utterly repugnant to everything for which America is supposed to stand.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

RAILROADING BRIDGES

Passage by the House of Representatives yesterday of the bill to deport Harry Bridges, C. I. O. leader on the Pacific coast, was an affront to the Constitution, to the dignity of Congress, and to thousands of organized workers who have endorsed and followed Bridges for many years.

It is utterly ignominious and discriminatory for Congressmen to draft special legislation against one man. This Nation has deported men when their presence breached some principle of national policy that could be encompassed in a general law. If aliens, for instance, could be shown to be members of organizations that advocate the violent overthrow of the American form of government, it has been deemed proper to deport them.

But James Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, spent a whole summer investigating charges of communism against Bridges and reported that there was no adequate evidence to support them. So what does the House do? Since there is no law under which Bridges can be driven from the country, and since there is apparently no principle affecting his case around which a special law could be drafted, it simply votes to deport Harry Bridges.

The House, in its "blitzkrieg" against organized labor at this session, has conducted operations on many fronts—the Smith amendments to the Wagner Labor Act, the strangulation of the Economics Division of the National Labor Relations Board, and now a "bum's rush" against a man labor regards to be one of its most effective leaders.

The issue is not Bridges. His methods may or may not have been bad. What matters is that one of the two great legislative branches of the United States can prostitute legislation by divorcing it from broad principle and reduce it to the unabashed "railroading" of one man. It remains for the Senate to kill the Bridges bill and to read the House a lesson in the American way.

Sacrificing for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

Our effort to build our defenses, if vigorously and intelligently handled, should create much employment and even some kind of an industrial boom. The appropriations we have asked for defense seem tremendous but, if they are really to prove sufficient and effective, we ain't seen nothin' yet. We haven't even made a good start. It has been estimated by the best informed authority that if the

World War had extended through 1919, our expenditures for that year would have been $35,000,000,000.

Germany has shattered all military records of conquest. Before she could do that, she had throughout years to shatter all records for work and sacrifice. War, whether offensive or defensive, is now largely a matter of industrial production of arms—Spartan discipline and sacrifice to the single purpose of military efficiency—defensive or offensive, as the case may be.

Mr. William Green has bravely said for labor that there will be no strikes and that this is a time for service but, fairly paraphrased, he added—but not of sacrifice by any changes of wages and hours. In his Charlottesville speech the President promised preparation but not to the restriction of any "social gains"—meaning continuation of Federal hand-outs which have been far greater than enough to have made this Nation powerful beyond the dreams and courage of any possible assailant.

We are to arm, but nobody is to sacrifice anything. This has been so well expressed by one of my favorite columnists, H. I. Phillips, in the New York Sun, that I asked for and received permission to quote it in full. This may look like a dead-beating stunt on a day's work, but I couldn't have done it half so well—and it needed to be done.

"We must be strong as Ajax, with arms and ships galore,
All on the pleasant hours of 8 a. m. to 4.
"We must be proof from blitzkrieg, as proof as proof can be
Without the slightest hardship—or much economy.
"We must build fleets of airplanes—fleets wonderful and vast * * *
Without a single lapse to the hard work of the past.
"We've got a job colossal, we must prepare for strife * * *
And all without affecting our present way of life!
"The ruthless war in Europe has made our crisis plain * * *
So forward! But it mustn't efface a social gain!
"We see the danger clearly, prepare at any price * * *
But, mind you, not a person must make a sacrifice!
"Grim war may near our seacoast, and from it we'll not flinch * * *
Assuming, in preparing, no one will feel the pinch!
"The world is deep in carnage; prepare now for all frays—
All on the present hours—and maybe with a raise!
"The flames are sweeping closer—get ready's what it means
And all in cozy houses and shiny limousines!
"The world we know seems dying—disaster sweeps this way,
Prepare at once! (Of course, with N. L. R. B.'s o. k.)
"We're hedged about by dangers—prepare to meet each blow
But do not let it lessen the comforts that we know!
"Preparedness is vital—so meet your Nation's call * * *
But do not let it tighten your belts, my boys, at all!"

If we start in this spirit, we shall finish in the soup. This is not time to turn the hands of the clock back on proved and proper advances in social justice. But it is high time to overhaul the whole spending structure. It was conceived in the theory of pump-priming—that spending of itself is a virtue. It therefore moved toward its objectives not with an idea of spending just as little as was absolutely necessary to accomplish a certain purpose, but on the contrary idea of spending as much as could be wrangled from Congress and poured out on the country.

If we prepare properly, there will be no lack of spending to surpass by far even this idea of magnificent sacrifice. A husky part of the cost of the defense program should be financed out of economies in the pump-priming and boondoggling programs. It will provide just as much "recovery and relief."

White-Fringed Beetle Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, when the Department of Agriculture conference report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture was before the House some weeks ago, the House refused to recede and concur in the amendment making available $600,000 for the extermination of the white-fringed beetle.

The conferees are still considering this and other amendments still in disagreement. There may be a chance for the House to act again on the amendment, which would probably protect the whole United States against the further invasion of the white-fringed beetle.

For this reason, and because of my conviction that the adverse vote of the House was due to the fact that so many of the Members did not fully appreciate the significance of the issue, I am emboldened to present the facts with regard to this menace and to invite the reconsideration of this problem by my colleagues.

Many of you talked with me after you had cast the adverse vote, and told me that your reason was that you had never seen a white-fringed beetle, had never heard of one in your State, and that you thought the danger was so remote as not to warrant so large an appropriation.

I have never seen a white-fringed beetle. Not one of them has ever been in my district. But I have enough confidence in the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of our Department of Agriculture to rely upon the testimony of the experts who have made this Bureau so highly esteemed. They say that the white-fringed beetle is worse than any one of the other six of the well-known pests which have attacked agricultural products, and worse than all six of them combined. They say that there is a chance to exterminate—not merely control—the white-fringed beetle. They say that the invasion of the United States by this pest has just begun, and that it can be stopped now before it spreads to the rest of the United States.

The white-fringed beetle destroys all vegetation. The boll weevil simply punctures the cotton boll. The corn borer simply perforates the ears. The pink bollworm simply kills the bolls of cotton in which it hatches. But the white-fringed beetle eats the whole plant—root, stalk, branch, and leaf.

One beetle lays from 600 to 3,000 eggs. Under favorable conditions each egg hatches in about 2 weeks. The little larvae immediately enter the soil, feeding more or less actively on plant roots until they complete their growth. So the longer we postpone intensive action against this pest, the greater the problem will become—it is increasing by arithmetical progression.

Bearing these preliminary observations in mind, I most cordially invite your attention to the following statement with respect to the white-fringed beetle, its economic importance, and methods of control or extermination. It was prepared by Mr. B. M. Gaddis, in charge of Domestic Plant Quarantines, for Dr. Strong.

STATUS OF FUNDS TO COMBAT THE WHITE-FRINGED BEETLE

At the present time funds are available from allotments from the act making appropriations for the control and eradication of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases to enable carrying out of control measures through June 30, 1940. The Budget estimate for white-fringed beetle suppression for the fiscal year, starting July 1, 1940, was rejected by the House of Representatives, restored by the Senate, was in disagreement, in the conference between the two branches of Congress, and the House, on May 14, upheld its first action. This action leaves no funds in sight for white-fringed beetle control work after July 1, 1940. The appropriation for emergency and incipient outbreaks of insect pests is not sufficient to carry on white-fringed beetle control measures during the fiscal year beginning July 1, next.

OBJECTIVES OF CONTROL PROGRAMS AND RESULTS

In view of the limited distribution of the white-fringed beetle, which is known to occur in a total area of approximately 71,000 acres along the Gulf Coast area of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and because of its known destructive nature, Federal and State agencies, responsible for pest control activities, determined that it was necessary to undertake control and to prevent the spread of the pest for the purpose of protecting the agricultural resources of the country. At a public hearing held in New Orleans on September 15, 1938, to consider the advisability of enacting a Federal quarantine on account of the white-fringed beetle, State officials, nurserymen, cattlemen, farmers, and other affected individuals unanimously favored establishment of such a quarantine, as well as application of the most intensive type of suppressive measures to combat and, if possible, to eliminate the pest.

Federal and State quarantines have been enacted and are being enforced. Control measures have been conducted in full and active cooperation with the affected States since July 1927. The objectives of such measures are to prevent the spread of the pest to noninfested areas, and to control and, if possible, eradicate it in infested areas to prevent a continued and increasingly serious annual loss to agricultural crops, and to avoid the necessity of the continued annual expenditures necessary to control the pest if crops are to be raised on an economic basis in areas where the pest exists and in areas to which it may otherwise spread.

Since the establishment of the quarantines and the operation of control measures, the spread of the pest is believed to have been

checked. Loss and damage to crops in all infested areas has been reduced to a marked degree by the drastic reduction of beetle population. That a continuance of the program may result in ultimate elimination of the pest is indicated by the fact that in five isolated areas of infestation, not a single white-fringed beetle, in a viable stage, has been found since the application of control measures during 1939. The effect of discontinuance of suppressive and regulatory measures would undoubtedly result in a multiplicity of quarantines by States, which would seriously hamper, if not actually embargo, normal commerce of affected materials.

Further information relative to the type of control measures in effect, as well as information concerning the life history and habits of the pest, follows:

GENERAL INFORMATION RE DISTRIBUTION AND ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE WHITE-FRINGED BEETLE

Two species of the white-fringed beetle, Pantomorus leucoloma, Boh., and P. peregrinus, Buch., have in recent years caused considerable damage to crops in some localities of southern Alabama, northwestern Florida, southeastern Louisiana, and southern Mississippi. At the close of the calendar year 1939, the known infested area totaled approximately 71,000 acres in the four affected States. The two species are similar in appearance and habits. They are destructive in both larval and adult stages to a wide range of crops, the most serious injury being caused by the feeding of the larvae on plant roots. Among the crops most severely damaged are corn, cotton, potatoes, peanuts, and other legumes. However, in the absence of favored-host plants, the insects feed upon and cause economic damage to practically all types of succulent vegetation.

The destructive nature of the pest is indicated by the fact that more than 1,200 acres of heavily infested farm lands have been left out of production during the past 2 years in the vicinity of Florala, Ala., because even after two to five plantings, in a given season, crops could not be produced in sufficient quantity to justify harvesting.

While the climatic limitations of the pest are not fully known, it is believed to be capable of establishment in any part of the United States. Larvae have been found in the ground at a depth of 26 inches, indicating probable survival even in northern areas.

Life history: Both species of the white-fringed beetle pass the winter chiefly as larvae in the soil. The larvae are white, grublike worms, about half an inch long when full grown. Most of them become mature in May or June. They pupate in cells in the soil and the adults begin to emerge in late May or early June, the main emergence being between mid-June and late July. The adult beetles are unable to fly and are all females. Individuals have been known to live for almost 6 months, although most of them probably survive a much shorter time under natural conditions. They lay their eggs in small masses which are difficult to find, usually at or just below the surface of the soil in contact with bits of old-plant stem, sticks, or pebbles. A single beetle ordinarily lays 600 or 700 eggs, though individuals have been known to lay over 3,000. In warm weather with plenty of moisture the eggs hatch in about 2 weeks and the little larvae immediately enter the soil where they remain, feeding more or less actively on plant roots until they complete their growth. There is normally one generation a year.

Control measures: Since 1937 the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of the United States Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the affected States, has conducted suppressive measures against the white-fringed beetle in all infested areas.

The types of control measures used are based on information obtained from field observation of the life history and habits of the pest and other studies, which show that the pest cannot fly, that it requires green food in order to survive and lay eggs in any appreciable numbers, that its egg-laying capacity is greatly reduced by elimination of favored host plants, and that it is readily killed when exposed to the direct rays of the sun. It is also very susceptible to insecticides such as calcium arsenate and cryolite when applied to host plants. Based on such information, the following suppressive measures are used:

(1) Clean cultivation of infested fields to eliminate all vegetation during the period of adult activity.

(2) Use of an oil-base sodium-arsenite herbicide to eliminate host vegetation on waste and abandoned areas, on railroad yards, and in the vicinity of processing plants and other places from which there is danger of artificial spread of the pest unless it is suppressed.

(3) Use of insecticides such as calcium arsenate and cryolite to destroy adult beetles.

(4) Use of soil fumigants to destroy larvae.

(5) Modification of farm practices in cooperation with farmers to allow more effective use of insecticides by eliminating, insofar as practicable, the planting of certain leguminous crops, especially the interplanting of such crops with corn.

One or more of these suppressive measures, or a combination of them, are applied on all known infested acreage. As a result of such control, there has been a drastic reduction in population of the pest throughout all the infested areas, and the beetle has apparently been eradicated from several of the more isolated areas.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this information and in the hope that this infestation may be completely eradicated, or at least that its spread may be stopped and not continue until it covers the entire United States, I sincerely hope that you may see your way clear to vote for the appropriation, approved by the Budget, earnestly advocated by the Senate conferees, and unopposed by the House conferees, if the issue is again presented for a vote in the House.

Bridges Deportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

LETTER BY HON. ABE MURDOCK, OF UTAH

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah:

JUNE 15, 1940.

Mr. M. E. PETERSON,
The Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR SIR: I welcome this opportunity to make a statement regarding my vote on the Bridges deportation bill. Fortunately, just before I dictated this statement, I read the splendid editorial contained in the Deseret News of June 12, from which I quote: "Granting that there are sinister subversive elements seeking the overthrow of our institutions, and that these should be unceremoniously rooted out, yet to make any person the object of our wrath, boycott, or contempt, or to ostracize him or her socially simply because of accident of birth, flies in the face of all that we cherish as basic and fundamental in American citizenship." It was in a very similar spirit to that exhibited in your editorial that I cast my vote on the Bridges bill.

I hold no brief for Harry Bridges or any other alien. On coming to Congress, I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution provides, emphatically, that Congress shall pass no bill of attainder; that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, except in case of war or invasion. The Supreme Court, since John Marshall's day, has held that these constitutional provisions apply to aliens as well as citizens, if they are within the territorial limits of the United States. The question presented to Congress by the Bridges deportation bill was not whether Bridges should stay in the United States, but whether Congress should absolutely disregard the Constitution in an effort to get rid of an alien. Let us admit that he is an undesirable alien. Let us admit that it is for the best interests of the United States to get rid of him. Can we afford, even to accomplish this purpose, to sacrifice and disregard the Constitution? This was the question presented to me in the light of my constitutional oath. I knew what the popular vote was—that was so obvious that a child could see it. The easy thing to do was to vote "aye." If the only test to be applied was, which vote on the bill will get me the most votes on election day, without any hesitancy I would have voted "aye." In 8 years I have never applied this test. I have never voted for any bill simply because it was popular to do so. I have never refrained from voting "no" on a bill simply because it was unpopular to do so. To me, the Bridges deportation bill was purely and simply a bill of attainder. To have voted for a bill of attainder knowingly, would have violated the constitutional oath that I solemnly took. Besides being a bill of attainder, it denied the constitutional right of due process of law. As amended in the House, it suspends the writ of habeas corpus. The question was, and the question still is, Is Congress under any conditions justified in tearing down, destroying, or burning up the great temple of liberty, justice, and freedom—our Federal Constitution, simply to eliminate from within it rats or termites? My answer is emphatically "No." I accord to every man respect for his opinion and the assumption that he is acting in good faith in expressing it. I ask the same concession for myself.

If the Bridges deportation bill is not a bill of attainder, if it does not deny due process of law, if it does not suspend the writ of habeas corpus, then, as a lawyer and a Member of Congress, I have made a mistake. If it is a bill of attainder, if it does deny due process, if it does suspend the writ of habeas corpus, then to vote for it would have been a violation of my constitutional oath, even through such a vote might have been approved by a majority of the good people of Utah. In our 150 years of national history and experience it has no precedent. It is a throw-back to the old alien and sedition laws condemned early in our national life; but

in its disregard for the Constitution it is even worse than any of them.

If our present laws with reference to undesirable aliens are not adequate and sufficient—and I do not say that they are—why not, under the Constitution, pass general legislation to exclude such aliens without sacrificing the great democratic principles which are the very foundation of democracy? Democracy is a process, not an end. In the Bridges deportation bill we lose sight of the democratic process to accomplish an end. In other words, we are in reverse.

If supporting the Constitution and maintaining my oath inviolate, as I understand it, causes me to lose every vote in the State of Utah or to be condemned by every person in the State, I must accept the result, but I will do so with a clear conscience. In casting my vote in support of the Constitution, as I understand it, I was joined by many outstanding constitutional lawyers of the House, by men who are famous for their conservatism—Republicans and Democrats alike.

Even in facing a crisis as the Nation now does, we cannot afford to forget the Constitution, which is the foundation of our liberty, justice, and freedom. Some people may be stampeded to do so, but I must refuse, having full confidence that if and when the matter ever reaches the courts, my position will be fully vindicated.

ABE MURDOCK.

Providing Money for the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. PAT HARRISON, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered last evening over the Columbia Broadcasting System by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] on the subject, Providing Money for the National Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When any problem arises which threatens our national safety or well-being, citizens of this country have a peculiar gift for dropping their domestic differences and presenting instantly a united front to any common enemy. In that light, this Congress has acted speedily and wisely to meet the dangers indirectly hurled at the Nation's tranquillity and security by the incessant rumble of the war machine over Europe.

In view of world events, we have moved promptly. Billions have been provided, and billions more are likely to be provided to carry on in this great world crisis. We have adopted a program of "full speed ahead," by expanding every phase of our national defense. The harnessing of our vast resources is under way and I know we stand as a united people, firm and ready to meet any challenge the future might hold. While the war clouds roll steadily onward over Europe and the impact of the conflict is brought more forcibly to our attention daily, I am convinced that this Nation—calm, determined, and courageous—is prepared to go the limit in girding itself to cope with any eventuality which might arise from the hostilities beyond the seas. The strongest national defense possible in this emergency is our objective; that objective we shall attain.

Shortly after the emergency national defense appropriations had been recommended by the President, I gave assurance to the country that the Congress would under no circumstances permit those plans to be handicapped or retarded by failure to provide the necessary funds to finance that program. While tax bills are never attractive subjects, I am sure this Congress has the support of the American people in the passage of a tax bill at this time. In this crisis, the American people have responded magnificently. From coast to coast, from border to border, our citizenship has patriotically voiced its eagerness to meet the issue unflinchingly, and has shown its willingness to assume the tax burden that the defense expenditures will necessitate.

We must all tighten our belts; we must be resolved to face sacrifices. The end of expenditures for national defense is not in sight; therefore, the need for additional taxation later to underwrite those expenditures must be expected.

We do not want war. We all despise war. As for myself, I am unalterably opposed to ever again sending the flower of this country's manhood across the seas. But we shall be ready to defend that which is ours. If that tragic day should ever come, we shall be prepared. Weapons of aggression must be met with equally efficient methods of protection. Our traditions and heritage are too sacred, our liberty and freedom too precious, and our rich and productive country too valuable to permit the taking of any chances under present world conditions. The destruction of a single one of our prosperous coastal cities would entail a loss far greater than the entire cost of a completely adequate defense program.

I want to emphasize that the steps taken by Congress in appropriating billions for the defense and in the House passing a tax bill to finance emergency expenditures is a convincing demonstration that action in a democracy can be as speedy and as impressive as that in a dictatorship. It conclusively demonstrates that a democracy can function effectively in the face of an emergency.

Our defense program has already required and will continue to require the appropriation of large sums of money. In addition, large sums must be available for immediate use. The element of speed in the undertaking and completion of this program is of great importance. Any substantial delay may seriously threaten our national security.

And while we strengthen our own security through immediate expenditures for national-defense expansion, and while industry is being synchronized and men and machines coordinated, other machinery has been put in motion which is speeding, and will continue to speed, our surplus guns, planes, and ammunition to the armies of those countries which love liberty and freedom and despise tyranny.

In normal times our average annual expenditures for national defense are about $700,000,000. Due to the unsettled world conditions, the Budget for the fiscal year 1940 increased the defense expenditures to approximately $1,360,000,000. For defense expenditures during the fiscal year 1941 the Budget submitted to Congress last January requested $1,940,000,000. Since that time the President has submitted requests for additional defense funds of $1,310,000,000, making the total of requests for defense expenditures for the fiscal year 1941, $3,250,000,000.

In response to these requests, there has been included in appropriation bills for direct appropriations and contract authorizations for 1941, for national defense, $4,090,000,000.

More than one-fourth of this huge sum, or about $1,115,000,000, will be used to purchase the most up-to-date airplanes, both bombers and fighters; part of it will go for the construction of warships and submarines, the purchase of new air bases, and the improvement of all air and naval bases now in use. Part of it will be used to procure antiaircraft guns and heavy artillery. Some of it will be expended for tanks, armored cars, and ammunition; and some of it will go for the enlargement and training of our armed forces.

There are, of course, several methods of financing these enormous expenditures necessary to provide for national defense. One is merely to pass legislation increasing the national-debt limit.

Another is to meet this unforeseen expenditure solely through the levying of increased taxes. The third—and the one which in my opinion is the wisest course to follow in this emergency—is a combination of an increase in the limitation of the national debt and the imposition of the necessary taxes to finance those bonds to be issued by the Government under the increased debt limitation. The American people have not hesitated in expressing their willingness to shoulder the burden of increased taxes to accomplish that purpose.

Two weeks ago the Ways and Means Committee of the House began consideration of a tax bill to provide the additional revenue necessary to finance this program. By intensive effort that committee was able to report a well-designed and equitable tax plan on Monday, last. On Tuesday the House debated and passed the measure by the overwhelming vote of 396 to 6. The membership of the House, and particularly of the Committee on Ways and Means, is to be congratulated upon this splendid work.

I believe the plan devised by the House bill and which, at the instance of the Finance Committee of the Senate, I reported to the Senate yesterday, and which will be brought up for consideration in the Senate tomorrow, is the most satisfactory means by which the necessary funds can be secured without unduly burdening business or causing any great hardship.

The bill would give the Treasury authority to issue $4,000,000,000 of short-term public-debt obligations, designated "National Defense Series," with maturing dates of not more than 5 years. To insure the retirement of these obligations, we have increased taxes, so that we will be able to secure in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000 annually. Most of this sum will be earmarked as a special fund for the retirement of these obligations. If the special fund is not large enough to retire the obligations, we have made further increases in taxes to be paid into the general fund, which may be also utilized for this purpose. In other words, 5 years after these national-defense obligations are issued, they will be liquidated and paid.

The bill separates the taxes into two special classes—those of a temporary nature which expire at the end of 5 years, and those of a permanent nature.

Of the changes which are of a permanent nature, the principal ones include the reduction of the personal exemptions from $1,000 to $800, in the case of a single person, and from $2,500 to $2,000, in the case of a married person. This will permit a large number of our citizens an opportunity to contribute toward building up a fund for the national defense of our country, and will make them aware that they are playing an important role in this national

crisis. Surtaxes also have been increased on incomes in excess of $6,000 and not in excess of $100,000. At that point, our surtax rate reaches 58 percent. The rates on incomes above $100,000 have not been increased as the surtaxes in these upper brackets are at the present time very high, reaching a top of 75 percent. However, the tax actually payable by the people in these higher brackets is materially increased through the increase in surtaxes in the middle brackets and the lowering of the exemptions.

Our corporations have also been required to bear a tax increase over that provided by existing law. The top corporate tax rate is now 18 percent. This has now been increased by 1 percent, and when the temporary 10 percent supertax or defense tax effective only for 5 years is added, the corporate rate will reach a maximum of 20.9 percent. Here it should be pointed out that the supertax is 10 percent of the tax, not 10 percent of the net income. The permanent taxes are estimated to yield approximately $322,000,000 annually. Added to this, we have imposed temporary increases which will yield six hundred and eighty-two millions annually.

These temporary taxes are set aside in a special fund for national defense. By subjecting all of our internal revenue taxes, with minor exceptions, to the increases, we have been able to spread the burden as fairly and equitably as the circumstances will permit at this time.

The bill, for the first time, requires a single person with a gross income of $800 or more, or a married person with a gross income of $2,000 or more, to file an income-tax return. This will add greatly to the number of returns already filed. At the present time there are approximately seven and one-half million returns filed, and this will add another 8,000,000. It is believed that this requirement will add considerably to the revenue, and enable the Government to secure taxes from many people, who through ignorance or otherwise, have failed to pay taxes in the past.

In the case of the income tax, a temporary defense tax of 10 percent is imposed upon the amount of tax payable to the Government. The simplicity of such a tax must appeal to all of us. Thus, if I owe $100 to the Government, I will be required to pay $110, or $10 additional. This plan has been invoked in some of our States to raise money for emergency purposes, and is the plan whereby the Canadians impose their surtax. That is, the surtax in Canada is simply a certain percent of their normal tax.

This 10 percent increase has also been applied to the capital-stock and excess-profits taxes, the estate and gift taxes, and many other miscellaneous taxes, such as the taxes on toilet preparations, radios, mechanical refrigerators, deeds, and playing cards. Certain types of excise taxes have been singled out for greater increase. The tax on gasoline, wine, whisky, and beer has been increased.

We have not increased any social-security taxes.

Anyone who examines the list of increased taxes must realize we have tried to spread the burden as far as possible over our internal-revenue system. It is not expected that these increased taxes will add to the present administrative costs. The Treasury Department believes, and we believe, that the pending tax bill meets the test of a satisfactory revenue measure. It involves no serious administrative difficulties. It produces substantial additional revenue amounting in the total to approximately $1,000,000,000 annually, and distributes the tax burden among practically all of our people.

Too frequent changes in tax structure is not the best policy for business or the Government, but in such times as these, with uncertainties throughout the world, such dislocations, and conditions economically unstable everywhere, we cannot estimate with certainty as to revenue receipts or necessities for enlarged expenditures. We who drafted the present tax bill were forced, because of the exigencies and circumstances of the hour, to do our job with greater speed than we would have ordinarily employed. Undoubtedly there are some problems incident to taxation at this time that must be given further study, in order to find a proper solution, so as to be embodied in future legislation. The House, through the Ways and Means Committee, has promised a comprehensive study and recommendation to the next Congress as to excess-profits taxes and amortization allowances. With that I am in thorough accord, and I am sure every member of the Finance Committee of the Senate holds to the same view. The problem of an excess-profits tax or a tax on production of articles essential to the national defense must be thoroughly studied, with a view to speedy legislation in January.

The defense of our country must not afford opportunities for profiteering. There must be no war millionaires.

Our present situation arises from the patriotic desire of all Americans to become prepared in the event of war. Patriotic Americans, whether rich or poor, must enlist in this program for the country's safety, and they must be content with normal returns on their investments. Such a reasonable law will be passed after it has been carefully studied and expertly prepared and tested. There must be no loopholes, and it must become retroactive to meet this situation.

Coupled with this billion-dollar increased tax bill, the Senate may adopt an amendment, sponsored by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, calling for a 10-percent reduction in the aggregate on appropriations for the fiscal year 1941 passed by this Congress, excluding those required for national defense, the discretion being placed with the President as to where the reductions can more rationally be made without interfering with the orderly functions of the Government.

I believe the tax bill will be passed promptly by the Senate. The enactment of appropriation bills, which are companion pieces of legislation to the tax bill, is under way. The defense program has been given vigorous impetus. Every legislative effort calculated to expedite its rapid completion has been made or is now in its final processes.

We shall show to the world, and particularly to those who would do us harm, that the American people can act with all possible speed and efficiency to cope with any problem which a threat to our national security might raise.

This country's greatness and its future lie in the people themselves. Their resolute will for security should be a warning to all transgressors.

Backing Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

ADDRESS BY COL. HANFORD MACNIDER

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a notable address delivered by my distinguished constituent Col. Hanford MacNider, of Mason City, Iowa, on the occasion of an enthusiastic mass meeting held by the Young Republican League in Des Moines, Iowa, June 12, 1940.

Colonel MacNider, or "Jack," as his many friends affectionately call him, is not only Iowa's favorite son in the forthcoming contest to nominate a Republican candidate for President; he is the choice of countless friends throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

The problems of this hour demand the services of a Chief Executive who can be depended upon to keep faith with the people; who possesses ability and courage; and who, schooled in the best traditions of American life, will think and act American.

A distinguished soldier in the World War, later Assistant Secretary of War, past national commander of the American Legion, Minister to Canada—he knows the problems of war.

A successful farmer, enterprising manufacturer, and esteemed civic leader—he knows the problems of peace.

Small wonder that his virile personality is being acclaimed from coast to coast and from border to border. In emergency and normalcy he has the sinews and good sense required of the responsible leader of a mighty nation. Speed the day when such a man is chosen to execute the will of the American people.

His address follows:

You young Republicans who form the spearhead, the shock troops of your party's campaigns, are having some very interesting lessons in tactics in these exciting days. The British and French fighting with their backs against the wall could explain to you, if they had time, that a sure way to court disaster is to let a "new deal" get into your system of government or at your defenses. The soldiers of France are today going to their deaths by thousands because French politicians persuaded that unfortunate nation to espouse the doctrines of Russia. While Frenchmen ceased to work in the curious name of social reform, and left their work benches at the call of radical agitators, the preparation for the overthrow of their country went on unabated in Germany and in Italy. And the great British Empire is in very serious trouble because its politicians refused to heed dangers apparent everywhere. If these nations cease to be free, it will not be because the people are no longer brave and capable but because their leadership has failed them. Is it not time that we take stock of our own leadership? To what has it led us?

While the "blitzkrieg" of Herr Hitler goes blasting away at what most of us consider civilization in Europe, the American people have been subjected to an amazing barrage of attacks upon our sense of security and peace of mind right here at home.

As we watched the unhappy headlines or listened anxiously to the news over the air, there came bursting out upon us a panicky home-front bulletin right out of the blue. The President was before the Congress making his unhappy confession that he, the sentry, entrusted with our safety, had been asleep at his post; that we had no

competent defenses; that grave danger was upon us. He proceeded on the air waves to drop bombs all over America. He even dropped a few on us—to dynamite the notoriously hard-to-frighten Middle West.

Then came the usual New Deal prescription for salvation. Let's spend a billion dollars. He wasn't quite sure how, but if any man could do it, he was the fellow. Otherwise the bogeyman would get us. A billion dollars would scare him off. Mr. Roosevelt had something there. A billion dollars still scares a few of us. I know it scares me. Thus ended the first episode.

After a shocked and angered Nation had stewed over that for a few days, and some of the more emotional brethren had panicked themselves into suggestions that we give up the ghost as a republic, came a second pronouncement from the New Deal throne.

We were gathered in around the fireside, and calmed and cheered with the news that after all we did have some defenses of a sort—not real ones, of course, but on order, coming up. Now, it seemed that we had the best one-ocean Navy in our history, a perky little Army with some promised guns, a fine land air force with actually a few hundred modern planes. The back-door gang hadn't been interested in that kind of spending up to now. Give him some new blank checks, and he'd put them right at it. The seven-odd billion which the President had been given for defense hadn't gone down the rat hole; it was the rest of the sixty billion that had disappeared somewhere—perhaps someone had come up out of those rat holes and got it.

You suspect, and I suspect, where an awful lot of it went. The gang will all be in Chicago in July. The Hague machine of New Jersey, the Kelly-Nash organization of Chicago, Pendergast "sprung" for the occasion from Leavenworth, Tammany in stripes, Guffey of Pennsylvania, the Olson fellow travelers from California, together with pettier bandits from all over the Union. They'll all be there with bands and rejoicing. They are the third-term movement. And for terms without end as long as gates are ajar in the Federal Treasury.

Then came another message slipped quietly to the Congress to be read this time by a droning clerk, although it was even more devastating than the first. The President had miscalculated. He must have another billion. Sandwiched in between such stupendous figures was the demand that Congress abdicate again—in the early New Deal manner. The President wanted the National Guard for active service to preserve our neutrality. There was a suggestion that the Congress run along home.

It wasn't hard to understand what one might want with a billion dollars. To spend that much money would be fun for any of us. But it isn't fun for our citizen soldiery to be dragged out and made Federal troops in time of peace. That National Guard should not be made a plaything for men who want to create political situations. Its purpose is and always has been the protection of the American home.

Of course, the Guard should have proper training. If that is the purpose of this extraordinary request, let the President say so. We are always ready to believe the best. But the youngsters who have patiotically given up their vacations and their leisure to prepare themselves for our defense in case of disaster should not be expected to give up everything while the rest of us stay at home, if we are not at war.

Or are we at war?

Has the President by any chance committed us to something we haven't been told about as yet? Does he seriously believe that we are in imminent danger of invasion? If he does, why doesn't he tell us where from? Certainly he won't be giving anything away to whoever may be planning such an expedition. Why this "blitzkrieg" of fear he's putting down upon us? I think I know why, and so do you. It's to capitalize European disaster to bring a perpetuation of Franklin Roosevelt upon America.

Most of you heard or read the President's address in Virginia Monday evening. He bluntly announced that the Neutrality Act had been repealed, not in the American way by the Congress, although it was in session, but by him in the way of a dictator. Small wonder, as he said, that the young people of America were wondering again what was to happen to the country they had known.

This might be a proper time to review a little history which you younger Republicans won't remember quite so vividly as those of us who went to the last conflict. Do you recall the steps taken by a Democratic administration preliminary to our participation in the first World War? First, the National Guard was called into active service. We were not at war, yet we were marched and countermarched from home to border and back. Historians tell us now that we had already been committed to the wars overseas.

Just the other day Mr. Roosevelt measured for us by exact hours and minutes the flight of bombers from Mexico to our homes. Now he, in turn, asks the Congress for the right to summon the same National Guard into active service. Then, as now, a Democratic president was running for re-election on his foreign policy. The cry was that he had "kept us out of war." This time the President assures your counterparts, the young Democrats, that they know better than to believe that he would take us to war. But do we? That time the Democratic nominee was elected by a very narrow margin on his promise to maintain peace. A month after he took office he was marching us to the war overseas. Mr. Roosevelt was a member of that administration.

As I look back upon that experience and the course which we are being pushed along now, some oft repeated words of this administration keep echoing in my ears. They are ominous and I don't like them. "We planned it that way."

There is one thing about which there is no dispute. The President has confessed to his neglect of our national protection. We want that remedied at once. We won't quarrel over any extra speed he can put into it. We'll admit with him that he has failed in his duty, but we'll stand for no further failure in the correction of that situation.

Those of us who served overseas and know something of war, not from Cook's tour of naval bases and rear areas but from actual combat experience, came home demanding of deaf ears a proper national defense. We wanted a regular army, swift on its feet and able to meet all emergencies. We asked for a navy second to none. We were called militarists, warmongers, and worse, but we were right. Warmongers are always those who haven't gone to war. The President is wont to say he knows war and hates war. Now it turns out he didn't know one when he saw it. That's why we're late and pitifully unprepared.

Let's have a national defense that can't be questioned. Complete, definite, impregnable defense. Let's cut to the bone every spendthrift activity of this spendthrift administration that we may be able to pay for it and still have credit as a nation. Good credit is the first bulwark of any sound national defense. Ours must be maintained or all talk of protection is useless. I question Mr. Roosevelt's ability to maintain it. And I question it upon his record. We shall have to change administrations to do it.

There is no doubt about the present temper of the American people. They will make such sacrifices as are necessary to safeguard this continent. There is little they would deny those who are battling against totalitarianism overseas. They want to see all dictators whipped and liquidated, and that goes for all dictatorships, here and abroad, which destroy the liberties of men.

There are a lot of hysterical people about who are already crying that we must send American boys into the shambles abroad. You'll find these are folks who have never been to war, who know nothing of war and its tragic uselessness. The role of great war lord apparently appeals to Mr. Roosevelt. This situation may well prove too much for one so anxious for the pages of history. The kind and generous move on our part is to remove that temptation from him and at the same time save ourselves.

There is no need for partisanship in our physical program of preparedness. But there must be a decision by the American people as to what leadership they believe will carry it to success. We still have our choice of how we shall give our effort. Shall we do it as a free people in the free American way, or shall we in order to defeat totalitarianism go totalitarian ourselves? Shall we defeat ourselves before we start? We know the free American system works. It built the greatest Nation in history. We know New Deal regimentation doesn't work. It has defeated 7 years of our effort for recovery.

Does anyone believe this administration capable or willing to proceed any other way? Their first effort—their continued effort has been to regiment us—farmer, business, labor, unemployed, all have been marched in lockstep to the commands of the New Deal drillmasters. If they win this time their dreams will have come true. Nothing will stop them. The next logical step would be a request for the immediate passage of the mobilization legislation, ready and waiting for the psychological moment. We would be clamped into a strait jacket from which under their kind of leadership we would never escape as a free people. They have failed in every peacetime effort. Shall we hand such incompetents or worse the guardianship of our safety in time of our greatest emergency? If we are unprepared to meet it, whose fault is it, but that of Mr. Roosevelt, who under the Constitution is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. For 7 years he had relentlessly pursued a program to break down the best defenses of our Nation. He has spent $60,000,000,000, doubled our national debt, and impaired our national credit. He has crippled industry by excessive and punitive regulation and taxation. He has made it practically impossible for new industries to become established or older industries to expand.

He has destroyed every incentive that would have built up our abilities to be ready for trouble.

He has weakened our national fiber and destroyed in men their stamina and courage, made them dependent upon the state.

He has built up an ugly and un-American class consciousness and disrupted our American team play.

He has ridiculed our attempts to run down elements striving to destroy our form of government, coddled and encouraged Communist-saturated organizations, called the Dies committee names, while his lieutenants have attempted to hamper its activities and stop its appropriations.

Now he warns us of the "fifth columns." Well, he knows who they are. It will mean severing a good many close ties, but if he means it, he will clean out his own official bureaucratic army. Then and then only will we know that he wants to defend America.

If you were to hire a man to run your business would you pick one who has never run a business in his life? Would you pick one who has proven himself helpless to proceed with ordinary American business sense, whose associates and privy counselors execute a pincers movement on him every time he even tends that way? Do you remember the War Resources Board which he disbanded only last November? They had been chosen from American industry to

give us suggestions as to our preparedness. We don't know yet what they recommended. Did they suggest a little more money for defense and a little less for squirrel cages?

Would you rehire a man who had broken every promise he made to you when he first asked for a job? Shall I repeat those promises? An immediate reduction of Government expenditures of not less than 25 percent, a Budget annually balanced, a sound currency, and the immediate removal of government from all fields of private enterprise. But more important still, is that the type of man you want to entrust with the future of this Nation, with the lives of your sons and daughters?

Is there or is there not a deliberate campaign under way to stampede the American people into a complete break-down of our traditional policies, precedents, and procedure necessary to maintain our form of government? Has someone planned it this way? Are we being taken for a runaway buggy ride—another romantic rendezvous with destiny—to give the New Deal permanent control of America? Are we being deliberately confused and bewildered to insure a third term for the first man in our history to demand it? Well, if he's not trying to break down that precedent, let him say so. Then until November when we'll reestablish American government, we could still think of this as America.

Yes, you have the right to ask "What is the answer? What can we do to meet these hypothetical attacks from without and these very definite ones from within"?

The answer is that we can stand up like Americans again, and quit cowering in the back of the cage like a bunch of experimental guinea pigs. We can proceed to build up our American defenses with the same vigor which made ours the greatest Nation on earth. Once we start acting like Americans again, no man, crazed and drunk with power though he may be, would think of attacking us.

Our job right now, as Americans and Republicans, is to select and elect a man we can trust on a platform we know will be kept.

I believe America is ready to go American again. Once that happens, there will be no difficulty in defending America from enemies without and from within.

Agriculture Speaks on Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

LETTER FROM THE CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Alex Johnson, secretary of the California Farm Bureau Federation:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., June 12, 1940.

To Members of the California Congressional Delegation:

GENTLEMEN: I am addressing this letter to you jointly to call your attention to a situation which, while not peculiar to California, is possibly of as great importance to California farmers as to farmers of any other State.

The President of the United States has addressed the Congress on the need for a national defense program, and the Congress has seen the necessity for action and has provided tremendous appropriations to be used in this emergency.

We now read daily of preparations on a large scale for warships, airplanes, guns, ammunition, and the training of men to use these munitions of war.

We read nothing of any food-conservation plan in the national defense program.

Men can work in shifts for 24 hours a day for 7 days a week in the manufacture of war materials, but we have to wait on the seasons—and the seasons are not always favorable—for the production of food.

In the war of 1914–18 we had to resort to heroic measures to produce food as a war contribution. After the war we began to try to readjust ourselves to a peacetime normal production, and with very inadequate and painful results.

Today there is no plan for conserving food, and as against that we have lost our foreign markets for much of our usual exports, and growers are working on plans to adjust supply to demand to avoid financial collapse.

Using dried fruit as an illustration, if you will refer to the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' mimeograph of October 13, 1939, entitled "Fruits—The World War and the 1939 European War," you will note that in its statistical tables on the production and exports of dried fruits, the last complete year, 1938, shows that the percentage of the production of dried fruits moving into export for that year was:

DRIED FRUIT

	Percent
Apricots	63
Apples	82
Peaches	19
Pears	68
Prunes	45
Raisins	26

Groups of producers of these dried fruits have been meeting to discuss their problem as affected by loss of exports and have been working on the development of programs calculated to balance supply against estimated demand, and in the case of raisins and prunes specific proposals have been developed contemplating the dropping on the ground of that portion of the crop considered as surplus. If it is necessary for the growers to meet this situation to their own advantage, some such program appears to be inevitable. We use this as an illustration of many problems covering different crops.

Are we to face a world situation such as exists today with on the one hand a speed-up of munitions of war and on the other a curtailment of food supplies?

May I urge your consideration of this problem? It appears to me that adequate funds should be placed at the disposal of the administration with which to encourage the harvesting and preparation for market of all crops now growing. That the Government would assure producers that it would be in the market to purchase all the crop not needed for the domestic market at a price to at least repay the growers for producing such crops.

Any plan to accumulate supplies of foodstuffs during an emergency period should give consideration to the disposal of such supplies when the need for the same disappears. If the European war should be terminated in a short time, the food so accumulated would still be needed to feed the starving people in the areas devastated by war. However, at the close of the last war, supplies were dumped back on the market, regardless of the consequence of such action on the producers. Plans for disposal should be carefully considered in advance.

At a time when national defense calls for so much preparation, may I suggest the desirability of the avoidance of conditions contributing to unrest. One great cause of unrest is unemployment. If farmers can be encouraged to harvest all crops, the additional work will make for more employment in the ranks of unskilled workers. If farmers can be assured of a reasonable price for these products, they can pay a satisfactory scale of wages to those employed. This, incidentally, would have its effect on the amount otherwise needed for unemployment relief.

Everything seems to point to the need of a food-conservation plan in the national-defense program.

Everything I see indicates the need for quick action as the harvest time is rapidly approaching and plans must be well considered and effectively executed.

It is possible that the machinery you have already created by legislation is adequate, and the only need is for funds to enable the machine to operate. If such is the case an estimate of the needs of the situation should be made and sufficient funds should be appropriated.

Yours very truly,

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
By ALEX JOHNSON,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Johnson's letter calls attention to a condition that demands the utmost consideration from the Congress. We must not overlook the welfare of the American farmer during the present national emergency.

Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. BRUCE BARTON, OF NEW YORK

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by my colleague, Hon. BRUCE BARTON, on

Saturday evening, June 15, over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting Co.:

Some people write and ask their Congressmen these days, "Why haven't you denounced the dictators? Why is your voice not raised in shouts of defiance against the forces of evil?"

Speaking as one Member of the House who has done very little denouncing, I can report that in the short time since I came to Congress I have cast my vote for something like $6,000,000,000 worth of national defense. The fact that we have only a few hundred planes, and that our tanks and guns are still in the blueprint stage is not the fault of the Congress, and I am not interested now in assessing blame. This is not a partisan speech.

The point I want to make is that these are days when words are useless, or worse than useless. Only production counts.

If words could win, then the vituperation that Secretary Ickes fired at Hitler last year would have blown him to pieces. If calling names did any good, then Mussolini would have crawled into his hole and died of shame after hearing the President's Charlottesville speech.

Hitler and Mussolini care nothing for words. They know that words are uttered by politicians trying to get themselves reelected.

But Hitler can hear the motor of a bombing plane; he can understand the language of a battleship; he is very good at arithmetic; he knows the difference between a hundred planes and thousands.

A former Roosevelt gave us a foreign policy. Said President Theodore: "Speak softly and carry a big stick."

In recent years we have revised that policy. Our new version has been: "Forget the big stick of national defense. Broadcast loudly, denounce everybody, and then don't follow through."

We write notes in all directions and lecture everybody. In a period of a few weeks last year Secretary Ickes was lecturing Germany; Ambassador Grew was lecturing Japan; and Steve Early, the President's secretary, was lecturing Russia.

And what did all our harsh words accomplish? Did we help the Jews in Germany? Did we help Czechoslovakia, or Poland, or China, or Norway, or Denmark? We merely succeeded in gaining the thinly veiled contempt of the world.

There seems to be some peculiarity about the English language that makes the people who speak it believe that words can dispel actualities and well-chosen phrases erase facts. The French people and the German people use words frequently; but rarely, if ever, do they attempt to make words obliterate a reality.

Letters and telegrams are coming into Washington from many Americans insisting that the United States declare war upon Germany at once. They do not say how we are to fight or with what we are to fight. It seems to be their feeling that the mere declaration will have some power to efface the military gains of Germany and to destroy its military might.

Mr. Chamberlain did something of the same sort in September of 1939. It was then that he said that, because the words of Hitler could not be trusted, "England was going to the assistance of Poland." He did not say how England was going to assist Poland or where or with what. England was merely declaring something which turned out to be war. England was, in effect, passing a resolution but the words bore no relation to the existent facts nor to those which could be easily forecast.

Poland was ruined almost before Mr. Chamberlain had ceased talking, and the war which Mr. Chamberlain declared in words is being fought with men and materials of which Germany has the tragic advantage in both.

Our American belief in words has caused us to talk of 50,000 fighting aircraft until we almost believe that we have them. It has caused us to talk and toss appropriations of billions of dollars around until we are beginning to act as though the goods were on hand or on order when they are neither.

Perhaps the simplest procedure consistent with the idea that strong words can win a war would be to pass a law: Be it enacted that the German Armies are immediately to withdraw from France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, and all territories which they did not occupy prior to January 1, 1937.

Why bother about the machinery for enforcement of this law? Why bother with what we will do about the status quo ante once the war is resolved? If words can take care of one, words can take care of the other and we have plenty of words. Are we not the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world? Let the dictators tremble and cease their depredations. If not, we should give them a severe talking to. This is the way people talk who believe in words.

I was one of the Members of Congress who voted against lifting the embargo and was widely criticized by citizens of high intelligence and patriotism, including many of my close friends. Only history will show whether that was or was not a wise vote. I knew well enough it was a bad political vote; I was not thinking of politics. I was thinking of the people of England and France as well as our own people. I believed then and I believe now that our administration, through Ambassador Bullitt, had encouraged the Allies to take on a war for which they had no plans, no preparation, no adequate equipment, and no leadership. I believed then and I believe now that the repeal of the embargo would be and has been interpreted by them as a first step on our part toward war and a guaranty of our eventual participation not only with munitions and money but with men. I believed then and still believe that the only chance for the Allies was to continue to seek peace and accept it even at a sacrifice of national pride, until they had time to get themselves prepared. I believed then, and the present tragic state of Europe is evidence, that if they fought Hitler unprepared they had every chance of losing their freedom, their empires, and the civilization of Europe, if not of the world.

People denounced this as the attitude of a coward. They think a politician is very brave when he makes violent speeches. No courage is required to stand in a safe air-cooled radio station and denounce a dictator 3,000 miles away. They derided the idea that the repeal of the embargo was a first step to war. The same people, less than 10 months later, are writing to demand that we vote for war.

They said that the mere changing of our law would stop Hitler. But Hitler knew exactly how unprepared and weak we were. Every nation in Europe knew how unprepared we were. The President knew it. Everybody knew it except the people of the United States. The people thought we were a big, strong Nation, so strong that our words could stop a war.

Our critics denied that the three steps to war are munitions, money, and men. They denied that we would ever be called on for money. "The Allies have plenty of money," they said. Now they are demanding the repeal of the Johnson Act and the Neutrality Act. But the fact is that the Allies do have plenty of money. They have billions in this country. Their expenditures up to the present have been trivial. How much do you think Great Britain, including Canada, spent for munitions in the United States during the 4 months of January–April 1940, inclusive—the 4 months in which we were appropriating billions? I have before me the report of the National Munitions Control Board for the 4 months of January–April. This Board is required by law to give a license for every bit of munitions delivered to the agents of any foreign power. In those 4 months the licenses granted for shipments to England and Canada together amounted to a total of only a little more than $31,000,000.

The year 1939 was a year when everybody in Europe expected war, and in September it came. There was no embargo for the first 9 months, and none after it was repealed. The English had 10 months out of the 12 months to buy the planes, munitions, and war materials that they said they so much needed. How much did they buy? The fourth annual report of the National Munitions Control Board shows licenses issued for munition shipments to Great Britain in 1939 totaling $20,991,125.05. About enough to keep the war going for 15 minutes.

The Control Board's figures for May and June of this year, not yet completed, will show greatly increased purchases, running into the tens of millions. But the decisions of England came 8 months too late.

It is neither money nor credit that the Allies need. They have plenty of both. Credit will not help them any more than words.

Other critics write demanding that we send our men. But we have no guns, no uniforms, no tanks, no surgical supplies. To send our boys against Hitler today would be like sending a baby into the ring to fight Joe Louis.

It is easy to make speeches; it is easy to vote away the money of the American people. But neither words nor money are the present need. That need, as I said before, is production.

I hate all dictators.

I have agreed with the President that any and all materials we can send, including planes, without jeopardizing our national defense, should be dispatched at once. I have voted for every single item of national defense.

But the point I am emphasizing is that we are not prepared today to fight even a fourth-class war. I cannot yet see any circumstances under which I would vote to have this country, unprepared and unequipped, go into a foreign war. Our present job is not denunciation but production. The less we talk and the harder we work the better Hitler will understand. Distrust inflammatory speeches, my friends, and do everything you can to hurry the making of planes and more planes, ships and more ships, guns and more guns. The less Hitler hears from our politicians and the more he hears from our factories the better. Weapons are the only language he can understand.

Lessons From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the

Honorable Louis Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of War, before the Harvard Business School Alumni Association, Eliot House, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., Friday, June 14, 1940:

LESSONS FROM ABROAD

Alumni of the Harvard School of Business Administration, I bring you greetings from your 46 Army alumni on duty in Washington, 11 of whom are serving on my own immediate staff. I am delighted to report that it is the consensus of opinion among Army leaders that the Government's policy in educating officers at this distinguished institution is indeed sound. The investment has brought rich dividends in national defense. The system will be continued.

The policy of sending officers to the Harvard School of Business Administration was inaugurated in 1924. Its purpose was to build up within the supply branches of the Army a pool of officers with special training in industrial methods and relations. In the last 15 years 110 Army officers have been graduated from the school.

Many of these officers, in turn, have served as instructors to their colleagues in the supply arms and services. They are the nucleus of the faculty at the Army Industrial College. In this school 50 to 60 officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are annually assigned for a course of study to prepare them to deal with industry in the procurement of war supplies. This college follows not only the Harvard Business School approach to industrial problems, but also has the advantage of lectures and critcism from the Harvard faculty. Your school, in turn, has been influenced by the industrial-college curriculum. I am gratified to note that your far-seeing Dean Donham is taking steps to modify some of your courses to embody aspects of national defense as they affect business.

The principal duty of your Army alumni is to work on plans that will utilize to best advantage in an emergency the industrial resources of America. As far back as 1920, the importance of such planning was recognized by the Congress when it directed the Assistant Secretary of War to do the job. Studies were begun at once. Tentative plans were drawn up. Army graduates of the Harvard School of Business Administration and the Army Industrial College were put to work to edit, revise, and keep the plans up to date. Slowly there evolved a comprehensive plan designed to avoid the pitfalls of the past and prepare for the contingencies of the morrow.

Every year the plans have been subjected to the scrutiny of industrialists, labor leaders, college teachers, magazine writers, and Regular and Reserve officers of the Army and Navy, both of the line and staff. All comments, favorable and unfavorable, have been taken at face value. Time and again, the plans have been amended and have shaped themselves to changing conditions. They may not be perfect, but what human plan is? At any rate, all of the plans have been predicated on sound principles of business and government consistent with American traditions.

Let us analyze some of these principles. First, is an insistence upon the American way of doing things. Cooperation, not coercion, is the byword. While the right to self-preservation, inherent in all government, includes the power to compel obedience to the sovereign will, we always recognized that the resort to force in any form is a clear implication that methods have proved faulty. The power to compel existed in 1917–18, but it was used most sparingly. Industry cooperated then. Industry is cooperating now. There is no reason to feel that the cordial relationship built up between industry and the armed forces in the intervening years, especially with the aid of your Army alumni, who learned here the language and the psychology of business, would be destroyed in an emergency. The Army has full faith in industry's eagerness and readiness to cooperate in national defense. It has stricken out the possibility of compulsion except for most extreme cases.

The second principle is to disturb the peace economy as little as possible. We can meet the needs of a wartime program without extensive curtailment of all activities not immediately related to the production of munitions. Our plans consider not only Army and Navy needs but also those of the civilian behind the lines whose morale must be maintained. They do not propose wholesale sudden changes in our national economy. The 10,000 plants which will be called upon to carry the principal load of producing difficult military items have known for several years what is expected of them. There would be few surprises and sudden changes in their assignments. The transition from peace to war production industry will be able to make without explosive changes in its machinery and in its plants.

A third principle is to minimize additions to existing machinery of government. Every plan is predicated on the idea that existing Government agencies must be utilized to their fullest potentialities. Duplication is waste and waste is the enemy of efficient organization.

There are other principles which we followed in planning. The important point to note is that we have planned ahead of time. The European democracies did not. Germany did. When the war broke out England and France were not mobilized on the industrial front. Hitler's factories were. Let us hope that if an emergency is forced upon us we will be ready on the production line.

There is our most important lesson from abroad. A nation must have plans of campaign not only on the military but on the industrial front and they must be consistent with the temperament and the institutions of the country. We have a plan. May we never have to use it, but until an M day comes we must keep up our studies and our investigations with a view toward improving it. When the guns begin to shoot is a poor time for revision. Now is the time to declare a "blitzkrieg" on all bottle necks in the production of munitions and break them before any emergency is upon us. An America prepared on the industrial front will do more to discourage attack against us than perhaps any other single factor in our preparedness program.

England and France were not prepared to produce planes in quantity. Germany was. And in that fact alone we find the principal reason for heartbreaking defeats to one side and astounding victories for the other. In the field of aviation, both on the firing and on the assembly line, America has a very important lesson to learn from recent developments in Europe. Of its portents we have been forewarned for many years.

Thirty years ago James Allen, the chief signal officer of the Army, issued this warning to the American people:

"Military aviation is a subject which we must seriously consider whether we wish it or not, and the sooner this fact is accepted the better it will be for national defense."

In 1910 there were few, indeed, to heed such warning. Today there are none to question the influence of air power on national security.

As far back as 1917 many of the earlier war birds saw the future of aviation in its present development. They looked to a day when America would have an Air Corps second to none, backed by a strong civilian industry, capable of giving our armed forces what they need, when they need it, and in the full quantity desired. Today we are determined to achieve that very objective.

During the World War we gave a demonstration of what we can do on short notice. We began with 55 planes and ended with 22,000. We started with practically no engine capacity and wound up with 33,000. We entered the war with 35 pilots and had 35,000 pilots at the Armistice.

These developments were not accomplished without headaches and heartaches and many bitter disappointments. The American industrialist of that era was perhaps a bit overconfident about his capabilities. He felt that there was no job under the sun that he could not do and do efficiently in record time. All he asked for was money and a green light to go ahead.

In 1917 he got both. The staggering sum for those days—$640,000,000—was appropriated for the development of aircraft. Industry promised planes in short order. The American people began to look to the skies for prompt deliveries. The fighting men at the front prepared to receive them in great numbers. Tragic disillusionment followed. Days, weeks, months, and almost a full year went by before the appropriations were translated into fighting planes, trained pilots, engines, and accessories. It was only in the last months of the war that our aviation industry and our Air Service came to play an important role in battle.

On the other hand, that World War accomplishment should not be taken too lightly. To expand for an annual production of 50 planes per year to that of 23,000 is no mean achievement. What industry did in 1917–18 it can do now, and in much better time.

In 1917 the aircraft industry was in its youthful, struggling stage. Since then great progress has been made in plant expansion, in the training of skilled workmen, and in experiment and research. Despite the fact that the aircraft industry in this country in the intervening years has produced only about 46,000 airplanes, I, for one, am unwilling to say that the great aeronautical industry, supported by the ardent desire and enthusiastic effort of all our people and with the safety of our Nation at stake, cannot fill, in the immediate future, the order of the President of the United States. It may be tripling or quadrupling present capacity, but it can be done.

How to get up speed is largely a matter for the industry itself to work out, but I hasten to assure you that our Government is eager and ready to cooperate. Yes, it will take more machinery, more floor space, more skilled and semiskilled labor, but it will also take greater freedom in the negotiation of contracts between the armed forces and industry and more flexibility in the expenditure of funds. In the latter essentials toward speed-up, the Government itself must lead the way, and I assure you that we in the War Department will do all in our power to simplify and accelerate procurement procedure.

The chief impetus to speed-up must come from the continuous use of the tools and machinery already available in our factories. There are limits to the endurance of human beings but machines do not wear out readily. We must prepare to put on two shifts and even three shifts a day to the full 24-hour maximum and 7 days a week, 365 days a year.

Many of you read in public print a few days ago that Mr. Henry Ford stated he could produce 1,000 airplanes a day. Is that fantastic? Bear this in mind: In 1918 one airplane company had contracted with our Government to deliver 100 airplanes a day—100 planes a day 22 years ago. But, he added, it would be necessary, of course, to put airplane production on a standardized basis and employ automobile production methods. Obviously, if we are to produce airplanes in any such quantity, it is necessary for us to standardize our types and depart from the old system of hand-made aircraft. Standardization implies, of course, a freezing of design which

may retard development but the point here is capacity to produce in mass; and no one familiar with the industrial history of our country would interpose a doubt about our possibilities in the aviation field.

It is no criticism to say that in the past airplanes have been largely hand-made. The orders which the civil air lines, the military services, and the flying public gave to the aircraft industry were not sufficient in number to make it profitable for the aircraft industry to tool up for automobile or mass-production methods. A production of 50,000 airplanes per annum will still be a small quantity as compared to the annual automobile requirements of this country. But, the leaders of the industry tell me that 50,000 planes will permit them to tool efficiently and economically for quantity production. And that is all that is required.

In Germany today, airplane production has passed the mark of 4,000 per month. Within the next 3 months it hopes to achieve a figure of 6,000 per month. Think of that—72,000 planes a year. Will any intelligent patriotic American tell me that we, in the United States, cannot equal Germany's effort? We have raw materials readily at hand far in excess of those obtainable by Germany. We have quantities of the critical items constituent to aircraft and engines in excess of those which Germany has been able to command. I believe that we have the skill in our workmen, the intelligence in our engineers and sufficient in quantity of both to attain a production exceeding Germany's maximum effort. Again, I repeat, we can reach the capacity demanded by the President and, moreover, we must do it.

Let me issue this warning. It is my firm conviction, after serious thought and study of what has taken place abroad in recent times, that if we cannot do it, the safety of this country indeed is in jeopardy. Airplanes have proven themselves engines of destruction far beyond expectation. Air forces have proven themselves in recent months to be controlling factors in the fortunes of war; and the fortunes of war, at the present stage in civilization, determine the freedom of nations.

The airplane is playing a dominant role on the battle front. Less than 2 years ago at Munich the full potentialities of air power were merely talked about. In Poland, less than a year ago, it became a deadly factor on the battlefield. In Norway, a few months ago, it came face to face with land and sea opposition and won a smashing victory over both. Today, on the Western Front, Germany's mighty air armada is pounding allied defenses and spreading havoc in all directions.

Air power may control our destiny. We must build our planes and train our men accordingly.

The training program that we expect to establish may be worthy of special consideration at this time. At present we are preparing to train 2,400 pilots in 2 years. This may not appear to be a very large figure but in all fairness it should be said that it is a fourfold expansion of the training program prior to 1939. The new program which we are planning today aims to reach an annual productive capacity of 7,000 pilots a year.

How shall we attain this objective?

1. We expect to expand the existing civilian schools to their full capacity and double their number.

2. We want to establish additional training centers similar to the one now at Randolph Field for basic and advanced flying training.

3. We hope to enlist approximately 12,000 cadets. This project involves the examination probably of 60,000 to 75,000 prospective candidates.

4. We intend to add and train 7,000 enlisted men to maintain the planes at the new Army training centers.

Finally we will be on the market for 800 primary-training planes, 800 basic-training planes, and 600 advance-training planes.

The training for the pilots will be divided into four phases and will cover a period of 36 weeks, as follows:

Ten weeks elementary training at civilian flying schools;

Ten weeks at the basic course;

Ten weeks for advanced training; and

Five weeks for specialized courses, leaving 1 week for travel between the various schools.

Concurrently with the training of military pilots, schools for bombardiers and navigators to the number of 3,600 will be maintained. Bombardiers will be salvaged from pilot training for one reason or another. It is generally expected that of the 5,000 candidates normally eliminated, 3,600 will voluntarily sign up for the bombardier's or navigator's course. These bombardiers and navigators will receive 10 weeks' instruction. Present plans are to commission them as second lieutenants after their classmates have received their commissions as pilots.

Classes entering the civilian elementary schools on May 18, 1940, we increased from 396 to 466. The class to enter on June 26 will be 605. The class to enter August 3 will go up to 900, and the complete military pilot training as outlined will begin with this class. The plan necessarily will require increases in instructors at both the civilian and military schools. It will require very little new construction for the training centers, as it is planned to use stations now occupied by units which will be moved to stations in the field. The high physical and mental standards required of flying cadets will, in the early stages, not be lowered. Traveling examining boards will visit all sections of the United States to examine applicants.

This program, of course, will cost money, and, based on our own history, more than any previous military expansion. It must be remembered, however, that, compared to other countries, we have only begun to build up our sinews of men and supplies.

What is an appropriation of approximately $4,000,000,000 to our American economy, which is running above $70,000,000,000 today? Contrast it, for instance, with what Germany is spending on its munitions. It is estimated that before 1939, 80 percent of her $40,000,000,000 economy went into the production of munitions.

Since then she has added the munitions of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, and their productive facilities, including such extensive works as the Skoda in Czechoslovakia.

Preparedness is the most important challenge to America today. We must achieve it at whatever cost is necessary. Extensive as our program may be today, it might become but a drop in the bucket with what we may have to pay if we do not utilize our brains, our energy, and our resources toward getting ready now.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the airplane, with its promise of greater happiness and enjoyment to civilization, has now become perverted principally to a machine of destruction. There is nothing we can do about it, however, but to be prepared to meet its challenge, if ever it comes, with equal power of resistance.

Despite the emphasis I have just placed on aviation, I do not desire to give you the impression that it, and it alone, can achieve victory. We must not neglect any phase of our defense. We must strengthen ourselves on land, on sea, and in the air. We must get the best of weapons and equipment and train our men to use them to the best advantage.

In the last analysis, there is no substitute for the trained leader who can get the most out of his men and machines. Germany had a large number of highly disciplined men trained to handle their weapons and equipment under any and all circumstances. The Allies did not; and there is another reason for the difference in results.

We must not be led to believe that planes in mass or tanks in volume of their own accord will spell victory in battle. The men at the controls dominate the employment of the machines, and we must have enough of them among our professional Regular Army men fully trained for any emergency.

I have talked of lessons from abroad and I trust that the laboratory will always remain abroad—3,000 miles away. I hope no Harvard men nor any other American men will ever be called upon to take up arms in defense of our country, but if such a contingency arises, I know you will respond with characteristic patriotism.

For myself, I pray that the alumni and the undergraduates of Harvard and of all other colleges be saved for service for the betterment of American life and the perpetuation of American ideals under conditions of peace and prosperity.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT, KY.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following resolution of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky., proffering to the United States of America any and all municipal properties and facilities of and in the city of Newport, Ky., to further the defense and rearmament plan instituted and adopted by the Federal Government:

Resolution proffering to the United States of America any and all municipal properties and facilities of and in the city of Newport, Ky., to further the defense and rearmament plan instituted and adopted by said Federal Government

Whereas it is the sense of the officers, officials, and employees of the city of Newport, Ky., and of the residents and inhabitants of said municipality, that full and complete cooperation and accord be tendered those responsible for our national defense and rearmament; and

Whereas it is deemed that an international and national emergency exists, which threatens the home and fireside of every American citizen, as well as the democratic American ideals brought into being, fostered, and maintained by our forefathers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newport, Ky.—

SECTION 1. That any and all properties and facilities of and in the city of Newport, Ky., be, and they are hereby, unreservedly proffered and tendered to the United States of America for such use or

uses as may be consistent with the national defense and rearmament plan instituted and adopted by our said Federal Government.

SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be forthwith mailed by the city clerk of the city of Newport, Ky., to the United States Senators from Kentucky, Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY and Hon. A. B. CHANDLER, and to the Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District, Hon. BRENT SPENCE, at Washington, D. C.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force from the earliest date provided by law and from and after the publication hereof.

Adopted this the 7th day of June 1940.

EARL DIETZ,
Mayor Pro Tempore.

Attest:

A. C. JOSEPH, *City Clerk.*

The American Alien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY FRANCIS BIDDLE, SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, broadcast over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co., station WRC, from Washington, D. C., Sunday, June 16, 1940:

I am glad to have this opportunity tonight of speaking directly to my fellow Americans, to those who are citizens of the United States because they inherited that right by birth, or who have become citizens of this country by their own free choice. And I want to speak to people of other nationalities who are living among us, whom for lack of a better word we call aliens. I shall call them American aliens, foreigners who are making their homes here, but who are potential Americans.

Under our Constitution and laws the control of naturalization and immigration to this country is vested in the United States Government. Until recently those duties have been under the direction of the Department of Labor—probably because immigrants to this country were considered largely in relation to labor problems. The first great masses of people who came here from overseas were manual workers. They helped to build our highways, our railroads, and our cities.

For some time, as you know, President Roosevelt has been sending to Congress various plans calling for the reorganization of different branches of the Government. On May 22 he submitted a plan transferring to the Department of Justice the Immigration and Naturalization Services, including the border patrol. In a message explaining this transfer he said (I quote):

"The startling sequence of international events which has occurred * * * has necessitated a review of the measures required for the Nation's safety. * * * I am convinced that under existing conditions the immigration and naturalization activities can best contribute to the national well-being only if they are closely integrated with the activities of the Department of Justice."

This order of transfer was duly approved by Congress and took effect on June 14. The Attorney General of the United States has directed me to coordinate this work with other services of the Department of Justice—primarily the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Liberties Bureau, and the recently organized Neutrality Unit. Lemuel B. Schofield, a major of infantry during the World War, and former Assistant District Attorney and Director of Public Safety in Philadelphia, has been appointed as a Special Assistant to the Attorney General to be administrative head of immigration and naturalization.

The Federal laws against espionage and sabotage apply alike to aliens and citizens. The Department of Justice is charged with the duty of detecting and apprehending all violators of those laws, whether citizens or aliens, and of prosecuting violators. In the case of a citizen, arrest and prosecution are the remedies. When aliens abuse our hospitality, there is a further remedy—deportation. The reorganization plan will enable the Government to deal more effectively and more promptly with alien violators of our laws because it will integrate all activities dealing with aliens in the Department of Justice, whose duty it is to enforce the law. The work of the border patrol, the immigrant inspectors, and the naturalization officers will be brought together but not merged, with the two Department of Justice units concerned with subversive activities—the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Neutrality Unit—which enforce the law and deal with lawbreakers, and with the Civil Liberties Division, which sees to it that the rights of individuals are not violated.

In the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization Service the policies of the Department of Justice will be dominated by two major objectives—the vigorous and effective enforcement of our laws and the full protection of the civil rights of all persons in the United States. Both these objectives were clearly recognized by the President. He said of this plan (I quote):

"While it is designed to afford more effective control over aliens, this proposal does not reflect any intention to deprive them of their civil liberties or otherwise to impair their legal status. This reorganization will enable the Government to deal quickly with those aliens who conduct themselves in a manner that conflicts with the public interest."

The tragedy to western civilization through which we have been living during these last terrible days has made us alive to the threat of espionage and treason within our democracy—a feared danger which we cannot see, but which we must be alert to discover and destroy before it is too late. The individual citizen, of course, feels powerless to combat this subversive evil, and the fear of "fifth column" activities has naturally made some sections of our population hysterical.

One form that this hysteria has taken is the wholesale denunciation of all aliens living in America—a confession of fear and weakness that sees a spy behind every foreign accent. Where individuals have taken the law into their own hands there have been instances of mob violence. A religious sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses, have been repeatedly set upon and beaten. They had committed no crime; but the mob adjudged they had, and meted out mob punishment. The Attorney General has ordered an immediate investigation of these outrages.

There is no cause for mass hysteria, no justification for mob violence. As a peaceful Nation we have, perhaps, been slow to realize the danger. But today we are all of us alive to the immediate threat. The Department of Justice is well equipped to recognize the real danger spots and to deal with them vigorously. With the cooperation of the American people the Justice Department will root out espionage and sabotage wherever it threatens. The people must be alert and watchful, and above all cool and sane. Since mob violence will make the Government's task infinitely more difficult, it will not be tolerated. We shall not defeat the Nazi evil by emulating its methods. As Thomas Jefferson said:

"I have ever deemed it more honorable and profitable too, to set a good example than to follow a bad one."

We are equipped to meet all dangers that come from within. Our laws are adequate to cope with those dangers, and if there is any point at which they prove inadequate we shall ask the Congress to strengthen them. For the enforcement of those laws the Federal Bureau of Investigation has a competent group of trained men. It has the cooperation of State and local police agencies throughout the country. In adequate laws and competent, loyal officers to administer them the American people place their reliance.

This transfer of immigration and naturalization activities to the Department of Justice has raised the question in the minds of a good many noncitizens as to whether it was effected with a view of making far more drastic the regulations governing their status in the United States. I have in mind particularly those refugees who have sought shelter with us from the horror of war and persecution in their own countries. Our policy must, of course, be worked out to fit the needs of a rapidly changing world, but I want to assure you that we shall not abandon the fundamental principles of American democracy which include a generous and just treatment to innocent sufferers from any country who have sought refuge with us.

The "footprints of the Trojan horse" are first found in the treacherous propaganda which leads to the ruthless persecution of minorities, and thereafter their purpose is to make us break down our American democratic insistence on freedom of speech, religious worship, and freedom of assembly by stirring up religious and racial hatred within the United States. Let me speak one familiar word of warning to all Americans. Remember, "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Do not let the subtle propaganda of race hatred turn you against any group in this country as a group. Remember that internal dissension is what the would-be "fifth column" hopes for. It weakens our inner strength.

Let me, in closing, return once more to what I said at the beginning. I do not like the sound of the word "alien." It is like a brand on the law-abiding foreigners who have come to America as the land of justice and opportunity for all. I prefer to think of them as American aliens, those people who have lived here in peace, whose children, born on our soil, are American citizens today. There is no necessary relationship between the length of time a man has been here and his loyalty to American institutions. A survey made recently in one of our States showed that 70 percent of the people belonging to families headed by aliens were American citizens. As one writer has put it, "Ellis Island is beginning to share honors with Plymouth Rock."

These American aliens have helped with their strength to build the physical and spiritual greatness of our Nation. They have shared with us the good and bad days of prosperity and poverty. The old people may speak only the language of their fatherland, they feel and dream our American aspirations. They are the

Slavic-Americans who have created our empire of steel—rail and bridge and skyscraper, the Scandinavian-Americans whose industry and honesty have built up the great Northwest, the German-Americans whose ancient gentle culture still preserved here on our shores, the Italian-American stonemason, skilled artisan, artist—and those Italian-Americans, who, with torn hearts, have recently had courage to denounce the acts of a totalitarian dictatorship which they hate; the countless other races who have become a very part of it. It was of them, and others like them, that President Wilson said on May 10, 1915, in the early stages of the other Great War, when feelings were running high in this country, as they now are, addressing 5,000 of them who had been newly naturalized:

"This is the only country in the world which experiences this constant and repeated rebirth. * * * This country is constantly drinking strength out of new sources by the voluntary association with it of great bodies of strong men and forward looking women out of other lands. And so by the gift of the free will of independent people it is constantly being renewed from generation to generation by the same process from which it was originally created. It is as if humanity had determined to see to it that this great Nation, founded for the benefit of humanity, should not lack for the allegiance of the people of the world * * *."

The Department of Justice is dedicated to its name—to the task of justice. It is here to see that the rights of free speech, free worship, free assembly are not violated. It is here to apprehend those who would undermine our national life and security and destroy those rights. It is your safeguard of democracy.

Let's Keep Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY EDDIE RICKENBACKER

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker published in the June number of the American Legion magazine entitled "Let's Keep Out."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Legion Magazine for June 1940]

LET'S KEEP OUT

(By Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker)

With Denmark and Norway drawn into the spreading European war, which, as I write, seems also likely to engulf Belgium, Holland, Sweden, as well as other countries, there looms before us Americans the greatest question we, as a people, have faced since 1917.

Shall we go in?

Taking into account every known angle of the confused and complex situation in which the world finds itself today, we must still refuse, as we refused last September, to be dragged into this war—unless our national safety is imperiled.

Only 23 years ago we Americans entered the World War with a profound conviction that we were fighting for the preservation of democracy.

The close of the World War and subsequent events during these past 23 years have brought about the disillusionment and realization that the winner and the loser of such a conflict must suffer the consequences alike.

Our penalty, the same as that of other nations, was the complete disruption of our economic machinery, bringing about 10 years of depression—correctly named but grossly misunderstood.

There are millions still unemployed; billions of dollars are being paid in additional taxes; hospitals are still filled with thousands of veterans, wrecked mentally and physically, all of them once the flower of American manhood, someone's father, brother, or sweetheart, but each one of them some mother's son.

The cost to the world approximated $250,000,000,000. With this staggering sum we could have built homes, costing $2,500 each, on 5-acre plots of ground costing $100 an acre.

We could have equipped each of those homes with a thousand dollars worth of furniture and given such a home to every family in Russia, Italy, France, Belgium, Germany, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, England, Australia, Holland, and the United States of America.

In those lands we could have given to every community of 40,000 people or more a $2,000,000 library, a $3,000,000 hospital, and a $10,000,000 university.

And if we could have invested the balance that would have been left in a way that would have brought a rate of 5 percent annually, there would have been sufficient to pay an annual salary, of $1,000 each, to 125,000 school teachers and 125,000 nurses.

The cost to these United States—direct and indirect, continued up to date—has totaled approximately $47,000,000,000.

If we had placed this staggering sum into peacetime circulation we would not now have millions of unemployed, plus the direct loss of 50,000 men, and approximately 250,000 casualties.

Well could we rid ourselves, with this vast sum, of the slums of our great cities—the misery and poverty that go with them.

Well could we multiply our opportunities of education and culture, through additional, better, and larger institutions of learning.

Well could we afford, not one, but several airports in every large city.

Well could we rid ourselves of the inadequate highways, narrow streets, and the constant congestion in every city, large or small.

Well could we multiply our airways, expediting the transportation of mail, people, and merchandise to and from every hamlet in this country.

Well may we remember the forgotten statistics of the World War. Seventy-four million men mobilized; 10,000,000 killed; 3,000,000 maimed; 19,000,000 wounded; 10,000,000 disabled or incapacitated for the balance of their lives; 9,000,000 orphans; 5,000,000 widows.

In view of these startling facts, who could wish for our participation in another World War.

Certainly, it could not be the mothers with babes in their arms—nor the fathers, wrinkled and withered with age. Certainly, it could not be the middle-aged men and women with their vivid memories of 1914 to 1918. No; but it can be the lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of our youth, coupled with the selfishness and greed of a few.

Let us not permit our boys and girls to be regimented into uniforms, carrying wooden guns, almost from the time they leave the cradle, but preserve for them the game of marbles on the street corner.

Preserve for them the baseball game on the commons after school hours.

Preserve for them the opportunity for developing model airplanes and other happy pursuits.

Then, and then alone, need we never fear for men and women of character to carry on.

Let us realize a few more pertinent facts that have been forgotten or smothered by insidious propaganda, from those people in the old world and their agents in our land. There is no difference in the lack of reason for the war of today in the old world, than that which caused wars of past centuries.

The same selfish reasons of greed and hate are responsible for the present catastrophe. These same reasons—selfishness, hate, and greed—can well be responsible for our being involved again, in a war of destruction of property and mankind.

Certainly I feel no ill will toward the people of any of the belligerent countries, and my heart bleeds with sympathy for all of them. But this can be no justification to me for our involvement again, with its horrible consequences of the probable loss of millions of our young men and billions of our wealth.

In view of my record during the World War, such a statement may well be questioned.

But it was the very nature of my experiences that has brought to me the realization that American soldiers and billions of American dollars have no place on foreign soil. However, should this country ever be threatened with invasion by a foreign nation, or nations, I shall gladly offer my services, my two sons, and any worldly goods I may possess, to protect and guard our institutions.

It must further be remembered that, if this Nation becomes involved in the present European conflict, we should go into it with the full understanding that to be of any benefit it will mean keeping a standing army in the Old World for the next hundred years, as a military police force, to prevent a repetition of the 1914–18 war and the present one.

I am convinced, with this further understanding, that the people of the United States would never consent to such an additional penalty for their participation.

I am not a pacifist in any sense of the word. I believe in preparedness to insure against foreign invasion, by having, primarily, a peacetime aviation industry, developed through peacetime service, that will give us an adequate military aviation reserve, for defensive purposes only.

Regardless of who proves to be the victor in the present war overseas—remember always, both victor and vanquished will have completed their economic ruin for years to come. Consequently, we need never fear an early attack on our shores. In the meantime, it behooves the United States to establish her home defense.

With a strong navy and an air force of 50,000 pilots and 100,000 planes, no foreign government dare even think in terms of war against us, and if they should be so foolish, our people need have no fear of invasion.

With the moral fabric of the people of the Old World having collapsed, there can be only one result from this present conflict at its conclusion—no matter who wins.

With millions of the flower of their lands having been blown to bits or wrecked for life, with billions of dollars worth of their property having been destroyed, revolution and revolution alone will follow.

Wars are the stamping grounds for revolutions, and revolutions are the stamping grounds of communism. Let us guard against

that happening here. With the vast improvement in destructive weapons, men, women, and children are being, and will be, destroyed 10 times as fast as during the World War. We, in America, in view of these prospects, may well recognize that our frontiers lie in the western hemisphere.

Let us develop our social, political, and commercial intercourse between our neighbors of the 21 republics to the south of us, for the best interest of all concerned.

Let us guard against our economic structure being keyed up through promises of false prosperity.

Let us recognize that selfishness, greed, and hate might well develop an unsound economic structure—the collapse of which no democracy can survive.

Let those who profit through the development of such unsound economic structures, and at the expense of other people's misery and mistakes—be they capitalists, politicians, or wage earners—bear in mind, that they are in a minority.

Let us maintain a sense of balance, in thought and activity, even though it may mean for the moment, less in worldly belongings.

Or, even let us keep in mind that we can well afford, through the maintenance of our absolute neutrality, to suffer even the consequences of lowering our standard of living, for a short period of time, to prevent happening here what is happening in the Old World.

Let us realize that the obligation of our leadership, be it capitalistic, political, or social rests heavily on our shoulders in these trying times.

We, who live in the land of abundance and liberty, should be willing, through peacetime service and accomplishment, to maintain these liberties and independence—to prevent bankruptcy and starvation here.

Today this country stands united, with few exceptions, in the major issue that is before us, namely—

KEEP US OUT OF THIS WAR

Our true obligation is not only the destiny of our own children, but all the children of America, who will be set back a hundred years in their opportunities, as well as the growth of American life, if we participate in this war in Europe.

And we of the general public have a right to call upon our statesmen—regardless of party or creed—to hold this country resolute to the one great issue, of keeping us out of this war.

Some ask, "Why this war of words and nerves?" as compared with the war of 1914–18. It must be remembered that for years prior to 1914 both sides knew whose side who was on, with very few exceptions. In other words, both sides had their duplicate ducks in a row. That was not true in September 1939 and it is not true today but it probably will be soon. The war may well see mankind and property destroyed on a scale unknown in history.

For years past the totalitarian states have thought only in terms of building up their military and economic reserves to be prepared for the day.

This is evidenced by the fact that all belligerents are limiting their purchases throughout the world to a degree that makes them insignificant by comparison with the squandering of billions during 1914–16 for military supplies.

How fortunate are we that this is true, for it has prevented the mushrooming of our industries and commerce on a foundation of stilts and sand.

Blessed are we that this Nation still has most of the generation of industrialists, financial and business men living and in business, who suffered the penalty of greed and selfishness during the early days of the last war.

They have not forgotten the price they paid during 1920–21, and particularly from 1929 to date for that greed and selfishness.

This fact, I implore the leaders of this Nation—financial, industrial, and commercial, as well as political—to well remember. It is the most practical asset we have in keeping out of this war.

Fortunate are we to have most of that generation of mothers, wives, sweethearts, and sisters still with us who suffered the heartaches and headaches of seeing their men—the flower of youth—torn from their bosoms—never expecting to see them again.

May I implore them to remember those deadly days of 1916, 1917, and 1918? Here, too, we have a great asset—an emotional asset—of untold value that must help to keep us out of this war.

To you leaders of finance and industry, well may you remember that this country's national debt was only $1,000,000,000 at the start of the World War, and well may you remember that today we have a national debt of approximately $50,000,000,000.

The war of 1914–18 cost this Nation $47,000,000,000, and due to the improved deadliness of methods and weapons since the World War, the rapidity of destruction of both mankind and property will be many times greater—meaning that should this Nation be forced into this war it would cost us another $100,000,000,000.

This will leave us with a national debt of $150,000,000,000 when peace is declared, all of which means the dollar will be worth very little and the clothes on your back may be your only assets.

Particularly will this be true in view of the fact that all the belligerents were financially stable at the start of the World War, whereas by comparison they are bankrupt today.

Bear in mind when peace is declared (and that day is as sure as death and taxes), with forty to fifty millions of men being thrown back into productive effort, and their countries' treasuries and pantries being empty, men will become serfs and slaves for the sake of three meals a day, and a place to rest their weary bodies at night.

This will mean one simple fact—that their ability to produce commodities and products for export at prices so low it will eliminate the possibility of this Nation having even a semblance of our present export trade left.

It will bring about a depression in this country that will jar our teeth loose and make the depression of 1929 to date a mimic affair by comparison.

Who dare say with a debt of $150,000,000,000 that the youth of this Nation will accept such obligations in the future for the mistakes of the past?

Inflation, and inflation alone, will follow as it did in Germany during those disastrous years from 1921 to 1926.

We have heard some of our experts—in spite of the facts—still belittle the deadliness and the possibilities of aviation in wartime. The facts should make all of us cringe with horror, even though this new weapon of destruction has only been experimented with to date.

Realize, that, in spite of the Polish air force, which was considered relatively good, the superior air force of Germany was able to ruin it within 48 hours, after hostilities started in the undeclared war.

Wave after wave of German bombers destroyed airdromes, hangars, and reserves, and blotted out the eyes of their Army in the trenches. Then it was a simple matter for the Germans to cut the arteries of supplies and communications behind the armies at the front by destroying highways, railroads, and bridges, shutting off reserve troops—ammunition, food, and medical supplies for those at the front. Warsaw and many other cities have been ruined for years to come.

Witness what has happened to that gallant little nation of Finland by those hordes of Russian eagles. Cities were wiped out for all time to come and today, what was a little land of happy people is a nation of misery.

When war in the air is started in reality between the major belligerents, I doubt whether you and I, who have seen Paris, Berlin, London, and many other centers of interest and culture in the Old World, will be able to recognize them the next time we see them.

The startling fact is, that even though this new weapon has been used only experimentally as a feeler of each other's defenses, that so many of those trying have reached their objectives.

With waves of 100 to 200 bombers protected by high-speed pursuit planes attacking their objectives every hour of the day and night, the carnage and destruction will be horrible.

With high explosive bombs, incendiary bombs, and gas bombs being dropped on those large centers by the hundreds of thousands, those cities may well be destroyed and burnt up.

With the destruction of the water system of large cities, the heat, light, power, gas, and sewerage systems, disease and pestilence will cause plagues beyond our imagination.

With thousands of planes and pilots on both sides by comparison with a few hundred during the World War, and three or four times as deadly and effective—with hundreds of thousands of anti-aircraft guns by comparison with a few hundred and many times more accurate than those used during the World War, the mortality rate in aerial warfare will be terrific.

And in my opinion, within 90 days after warfare in the air truly starts, the reserve of planes and pilots on both sides will be exhaused, meaning that the belligerents, whose productive capacity of planes and, primarily, of pilots is the best, eventually will be the victor.

But, in the meantime, they will revert to the trench and dugout warfare resulting in a war of attrition.

So I say to you, no matter what the price may be that this Nation has to pay to stay out of this war, it can never be too big, because no matter how large it may be, in economic, social, and political warfare, to say nothing of our so-called national honor, it would be only an infinitesimal part of the price we would have to pay if we should participate.

In closing, may I utter this fervent prayer?—that this generation, in its wisdom and mature consideration of this question of absolute neutrality, will prevent posterity or future generations, from condemning or indicting us, as having legalized wholesale slaughter, murdered the flower of our youth, and massacred democracy.

False Hopes Are Cruel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of the Allies who are fighting so valiantly, false hopes may well cause

the death of many of their brave soldiers and citizens and the destruction of their cities and countrysides. False hopes already created may have already done so. From our own standpoint the creation of these false hopes and their subsequent unfulfillment can only cause a great animosity toward us on the part of the Allies who see that these glittering generalities, which high officials of our Government have uttered, are totally devoid of content and meaning. We cannot justly criticize France and Great Britain for resenting the fact that they may have been pawns in the third-term "blitzkrieg." We cannot criticize our friends across the seas if they bitterly resent the public and private pronouncements by our Chief Executive of a policy of redoubled help which his own inefficiency has rendered physically impossible of execution at this time.

The editorial from the Washington Post, June 17, 1940, follows:

FALSE HOPES ARE CRUEL

The administration's policy regarding the war in Europe was clarified in some degree by President Roosevelt's reply to Premier Reynaud of France. At Charlottesville the President had pledged the United States to "extend to the opponents of force the material resources of his Nation." His message to M. Reynaud was even more emphatic in promising aid to the Allies. But he also pointed out that his statement carried "no implication of military commitments."

Two purposes appear to have inspired this safeguarding clause. No doubt the President wished to allay the fears of critics who believe that he is leading the United States close to the brink of war. And he probably wished to warn the French against expecting unlimited aid from the United States. It is questionable, however, whether his message accomplished either purpose.

Taken as a whole, the cable to M. Reynaud gives assurance to the French that, as long as they continue to fight, "materials and supplies will be sent them from the United States in ever increasing quantities and kinds." Actually the President has no authority to make such commitments. American ships are forbidden by the Neutrality Act to carry supplies to belligerents. Should Allied shipping prove inadequate to the task of transporting American war supplies abroad, the President's pledge would break down.

It is well to remember that the Allies are now purchasing and hauling away in their own ships all the supplies obtained from the United States. When and if their cash is exhausted this supply of American equipment will be cut off, unless Congress modifies the Johnson Act. President Roosevelt's message to the French premier might easily be interpreted as a pledge to grant the Allies credit when and if they need it. Here again his promise appears to have outrun his authority.

Loose assertions of this sort do not serve the interests of either the United States or the Allies. On the one hand, they encourage opposition to the American policy of permitting the Allies to obtain valuable war materials here. The American people are overwhelmingly in sympathy with the allied cause. But they are also overwhelmingly opposed to participation in the war. There is real danger that vague commitments on the part of the President, which seems to ignore this other facet of American policy, may retard the program of aiding the Allies within the framework of legislation now on the books or on the way toward approval.

Last week former Governor Landon criticized the implication in Mr. Roosevelt's Charlottesville speech that recent events have brought this country nearer to a state of belligerency. "It would be cruel, indeed," he said, "to arouse false hopes in nations that are fighting for their existence." On Saturday night Colonel Lindbergh sharpened the point by saying: "We have been doing to England and France what they did to Abyssinia, to Czechoslovakia, to Poland, to Finland, and to Norway. We have encouraged them to hope for help we cannot send."

The plain truth, of course, is in accord with Mr. Landon's statement that "Congress has not the slightest notion of declaring war." Natural sympathy, as the Republican leader says, is wholly with the Allies. Public opinion also favors "going the limit for national defense." But it would be very misleading to conclude from this conjunction that any sizable or important element is actively favoring American entry into the war.

The last Gallup poll on the subject, released the end of May, showed a 13-to-1 majority against this course. If there has been any pronounced change in the attitude then revealed it has not reflected itself in any clear-cut congressional action. Opinion in that body certainly favors all aid to the Allies which is not fundamentally inconsistent with maintenance of neutrality. But more than that cannot be claimed.

The Allies' predicament today stems from overindulgence in false hopes. Certainly the United States cannot ease the distress of other democratic countries by extending the fog of illusions. It is time to look realities in the face. And that requires a clearer distinction than has yet been drawn between the material aid we are able to give the Allies and any thought of American participation in the war.

Congress Should Stay On the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D. WINTER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, there perhaps has never been a more critical time in the life of our Nation than the present. With civilization in the Old World tottering on the brink of destruction, with war hysteria rapidly engulfing the New World, and with our own Nation suffering with a bad case of the "jitters," we, who have been chosen to represent the people of this Nation, should keep our feet firmly on the ground and not lose sight of the fact that our responsibility at this time is just as great as that of the President's; that the fate of many lives and the future security of this Nation rests in our hands, and depends almost entirely on the action this Congress takes; and we should remain in session and refuse to further abdicate our constitutional rights and obligations to the Chief Executive. And I, for one, consider the President's statement that the situation did not require Congress to remain in session except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches as a direct insult to the constituents whom I represent.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents do not want Congress to stay in session for the "laudable goal of making speeches," but they insist that Congress stay in session for the sacred purpose of keeping the United States out of war and for the further purpose of preventing the New Deal dictator, who has arrogated to himself nearly all the prerogatives of the Congress, from playing politics with our national-defense program.

The President's desire to have Congress adjourn can mean only that having obtained all the authority and money he thinks he needs he should not be hampered or bothered with the legislative branch of the Government, the direct representatives of the people of the Nation, interfering with his hope to gain a free hand to use his almost unlimited emergency powers as he alone sees fit and, incidentally, to obtain such political advantage as may be had by getting rid of Congress.

Freed of congressional restraint, there is hardly anything the President cannot do, short of declaring war, under the vast emergency powers already given him. Few persons realize how far-reaching is the authority now held by the President. Early in the Roosevelt administration Congress began delegating emergency powers to the Chief Executive, not one of which has ever been relinquished.

The President now wants Congress to delegate to him the power to mobilize the National Guard, if the present Congress is not in session, and in his opinion an emergency exists. Article I, section 8, clause 15, of the Constitution of the United States specifically states that—

> The Congress shall have the power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion.

If an emergency now exists which is so great that it has caused the President to feel that Congress should surrender to him its constitutional power and authority to call our reserve forces to the colors, why does the President desire that Congress adjourn?

Could it be a desire to capitalize on the effects of the war in an effort to cover up the failure of the New Deal to solve our acute domestic problems, or does the Chief Executive feel that the people of the Nation, who sent us here and are paying our salaries, are not entitled to have their representatives on the job to question his wisdom should the occasion demand.

Why, in the face of the present war crisis, fancied or real, should Congress adjourn? The answer is plain. Regardless of the President's desire, Congress should not adjourn until the emergency has passed. Congress is more than ever before needed on the job, and adjournment now would mean that Congress could not again meet until the next regular session of the Seventy-seventh Congress unless the Chief Executive saw fit to call the Seventy-sixth Congress into extraordinary session. And, in the light of the President's attitude on adjournment and his disposition to ignore Congress whenever possible, we cannot expect to be called into extraordinary session except to authorize some new legislation which the President might personally seek or unless it becomes necessary to consider a war resolution.

Practically every Congressman's mail is heavy with demands from the people back home, to whom we are responsible, to remain in session and do all in our power to keep the United States out of war, and how can we do this job by adjourning and deserting our posts merely to bow to the will of the Chief Executive?

Adjournment by Congress at this critical time can only be regarded by our constituents as a false betrayal of the responsibility and trust placed in us by the American people. Only a few weeks ago, in his message to Congress on national defense, the President stated that Congress and the Chief Executive constituted a team pulling together for the security of America. With unforeseen emergencies certain to arise from the war in Europe to which our Government must of necessity instantly adjust itself that team should not be unhitched and the congressional half turned into the pasture of adjournment.

Harrison-Colmer Bill Should Pass Before Congress Adjourns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, World War developments should not cause us to overlook domestic problems. There is much talk about adjournment or recess of Congress. I am opposed to such procedure. I think the administration needs the advice and help of Congress in the development of a national-defense program. Congress also needs to give attention to many domestic conditions that require action at this session.

Pending before the House and the Senate are the Harrison bill (S. 1717) and its companion bill in the House, the Colmer bill (H. R. 4833). Let me urge Members of Congress to study these measures. They are fully explained in the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman COLMER, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 27, 1939. In connection with these remarks there is a table showing numerous congressional districts to be interested in these bills. A study of these tables, prepared by Paul W. Nelson, County Auditor of Lake County, Two Harbors, Minn., will show exactly the way the bills would operate if enacted into law.

REASONS FOR RELIEF

The traditional policy of the United States Government is to pay no taxes on lands it acquires for its own use. Such land is removed from the local tax rolls, and the revenue lost to the local municipalities. This rule applies to lands bought by the United States Forest Service. For years the United States Forest Service has been acquiring large acreages of land all over the United States wherever a national forest was located.

In my district there are two national forests, and without going into details, let me say that this policy of the Government has almost ruined several municipalities. The more land the United States Forest Service buys, the less revenue the municipalities have to carry on local government. All school officials will show that this Government policy makes it difficult for them to carry on educational work. Other municipal officials who have to administer local government, including the building and upkeep of roads, tell the same story. It can probably be called humor, for the United States Government gets the use and benefit of these very roads.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The Harrison-Colmer bills are intended to adopt a new policy on the part of our Government. They substitute for the old policy, that the Government pays no taxes, a new program which requires the Government to contribute to the local municipalities certain payments to replace the taxes that have been lost. It is high time that we recognize this new principle. There is no valid reason why the Government should not make contributions. Briefly, this legislation requires that the Government pay a sum equal to 3 percent of the purchase price of the land acquired by the Government. This would bring revenue to the local treasuries to replace that lost when the Forest Service took land off the tax rolls.

From time to time Members of Congress from different sections have introduced legislation along similar lines. Their bills would accomplish the same results as the Harrison-Colmer bills. All of us should support the bill that has had study by the United States Forest Service and to which the least objections can be made. I support the Harrison-Colmer bill for that reason.

Responsibility for the failure of this legislation will rest squarely upon the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration. The administration is in control, both in the House and in the Senate. They have the votes to pass the bill. There is no excuse for the long delay. I hope that before adjournment the administration will get a different viewpoint and help us to obtain needed relief for various counties and districts, including our northern Minnesota municipalities.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WEST VIRGINIAN

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, as an extension of my remarks, I herewith include an article printed in the West Virginian, of Fairmont, W. Va., under date of June 14, 1940:

OUR FLAG

(By Harry E. Leeper)

"The oppressed of the earth to that standard shall fly
Wherever its folds shall be spread;
And the exile shall feel 'tis his own native sky,
Where its stars shall float over his head;
And those stars shall increase till the fullness of time
Its millions of cycles has run;
Till the world shall have welcomed its mission sublime,
And the nations of earth shall be one."

—George Washington Cutter.

In this time of world-shaking events it is the patriotic duty of every American citizen to uphold to the fullest extent the American ideals of democracy. Our flag is the symbol of national unity, "One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The following tribute by an eminent West Virginian, Benjamin Butcher of Wood County, epitomizes what every real American thinks of his flag, his symbol of democracy:

"There floats over your head the American flag, your flag and my flag, our country's flag—that flag that stands for liberty everywhere, for every home and fireside in the land. It is the most beautiful flag ever fashioned by mortal hands. Its stripes—red as patriot blood could paint them, white as woman's tears could wash them; its field as blue as Heaven's own arch that bends above us, and set with its galaxy of brilliant stars, one single star that glitters to the sovereignty of each State in this Union and 48 stars glittering all together for the glory of this Republic, and I wouldn't trade it for all the flags of all the monarchies that ever existed since the world began."

It is the duty of every American citizen to respect his flag and the ideals which it symbolizes. And if necessary defend it with his life.

How England Has Scrapped Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK, JUNE 1, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial published in the Gaelic American, of New York City, under the title, "How England Has Scrapped Treaties." I commend this editorial to the Members of the present Congress in view of the hysteria now spreading throughout the country, that we ought strip our national defense by giving unlimited aid to the Allies, so-called, especially Great Britain, now that France has surrendered in the present European war.

[From the Gaelic American, New York, June 1, 1940]

HOW ENGLAND HAS SCRAPPED TREATIES

A great deal has been said and written recently on broken treaties between nations. The breaking of treaties is, however, nothing new, as the world is strewn with their corpses. The breaking of the Washington Naval Treaty, the scrapping of the Nine-Power Treaty by Japan, and the violation of the Balfour Declaration have been denounced in all the moods and tenses. As long as human nature is what it is treaties will be regarded as mere scraps of paper. It is a truism that treaties are made with the intention of repudiating them when the opportunity presents itself.

America, before she became a world power, had at various times accused England of her disregard of solemn treaties between the infant republic and the monarchy. Because of her disregard of treaties, England has been called "perfidious Albion." She never kept any treaty longer than it was to her advantage to ignore or denounce it. Her various treaties with the Irish were regarded by her as mere scraps of paper.

Americans are pretty well informed on England's disregard of treaties. She broke so many solemn agreements between herself and the United States when she found it to her advantage to violate the signed pact that the Americans regard her with suspicion. John Bigelow's Breaches of Anglo-American Treaties, published in 1917, refers as follows to treaty violations by England:

During the 130 years between 1783 and 1913, about 30 separate and distinct compacts that may be considered as treaties were concluded between the two powers (United States and England). Of these 30 treaties, the following 8 (about 1 in 4) were violated by Great Britain, several of them in more than one particular:

1. Definite Treaty of Peace, 1784.
2. Jay Treaty, 1795.
3. Treaty of Ghent, 1815.
4. Rush Bagot Agreement, 1818.
5. Convention respecting fisheries, 1819.
6. Convention for Indemnity, 1823.
7. Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, 1850.
8. Treaty of Washington, 1871.

England has always been notorious for her evasion of treaties. President Buchanan, in 1857, in his first message to Congress, said:

It has been our misfortune almost always to have some irritating, if not dangerous, outstanding question with Great Britain.

Since the origin of the Government we have been employed in negotiating treaties with that power and afterwards in discussing their true intent and meaning.

To quote again from John Bigelow's book, he refers as follows to England's way of reading her own meaning into treaties:

"With no other nation have we had so much trouble in understanding our treaty stipulations as we have had with Great Britain. It is an old strategem of diplomacy for a powerful state, negotiating with a comparatively weak one, to make the terms equivocal, and when the convention is ratified, to impose its own construction of it upon the other party."

In one of the debates over the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Senator Mason, of Virginia, said (February 20, 1856):

"I think whoever has read this correspondence (relative to the interpretation of the treaty) will have been struck with the fact that so far as it was conducted on the part of the American Government, plain, ordinary, explicit terms were used to express an explicit and plain meaning; and that the meaning of the American Government cannot be misunderstood, whereas on the part of the Minister who conducted the correspondence on the part of the British Government (Lord Clarendon) if you attempt to get at the meaning of England, you will fall and find yourself involved in a maze of confused sentences, indeterminate and vague expressions, in which there is no distinct assertion of title drawn from any distinct source."

A recent striking example of the scrapping of treaties, was the tearing of the infamous Versailles Pact. England, when it suits her purpose, dilates on the sacredness of treaties in spite of her long and bad record in this respect. This widespread disregard of treaties should be a warning, if warning is needed, to keep the American people from making treaties with the Old World nations who have no regard for solemn contracts, oral or written. Washington's warning against foreign alliances is as applicable today as in the early years of the Republic when its population was scattered and did not exceed 3,000,000 souls. America has become a giant among nations by her almost scrupulous observance of keeping aloof from foreign entanglements.

Adjournment of Congress Now Tantamount to Repudiation of Oath To Faithfully Discharge Our Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there is no sane reason why this Congress should adjourn now and go home.

When we came to Congress each of us raised our hands and swore that we would "well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter."

What official duties await any of us back home in our respective districts?

Our duty to the people who elected us is here in the National Capital—the opinion of the Chief Executive to the contrary notwithstanding.

There is nothing in the Constitution or in our oath of office which provides that Congress should lease to the President its duties during an emergency.

Processes for the reconvening of a Congress should be considered. If this Congress adjourns sine die, as the President has been urging, there is no way under the sun for us to reconvene except on the call of the President. He and he alone has the power to convene Congress, except on the date specified in the Constitution. If we adjourn, only a Presidential order can call us back before January. No matter how great the emergency, we could not of our own will reassemble.

The President's insistence on adjournment of Congress at this grave moment in the history of the world is comparable to the quarterback on a football team telling the center to pass him the ball and then ordering the guards, tackles, ends and center to leave the field and sit in the bleachers while he alone attempted to carry the ball unassisted.

Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal doctors have been pretty lucky in taking the public pulse in the past but they missed their diagnosis when they thought the country would take kindly to the idea of giving vast powers to the President and then having him send Congress home. The country does not agree with Mr. Roosevelt on his idea to adjourn Congress.

THE LEGION SPEAKS

I have just received a telegram from an American Legion post in my district which shows how the veterans of the last war feel about this Congress shirking its duties now and leaving Washington with national affairs shifted to the shoulders of one man, the President. With your consent I read it into the RECORD. It follows:

POST RAY I. BOOTH 101, AMERICAN LEGION,
Greenville, Mich., June 13, 1940.

Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Washington, D. C.

My post of the American Legion earnestly requests that Congress remain in session during present critical emergency.

WALTER K. WARD,
Commander.

From a farm couple in my district I have received a letter which shows how seriously the farm folk of this country are thinking about this crisis and the possibility of Congress abandoning its duties. Their letter follows:

ELSIE, MICH., *June 10, 1940.*

Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: These are days when cool heads and steady hands are needed in Washington.

My idea is that one of the best ways to spend money for national defense is to keep Congress in session.

We of the Eighth District depend upon and trust you and others like you in this most critical time.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ALTON FIZZELL.

WHAT ABOUT WAR PROFITEERING?

Appropriating huge sums of money, hiking the debt limit $4,000,000,000, and increasing taxes for an indefinite program labeled "national defense" without any well-drawn defense plan presented to explain what we are going to defend, is not the end of the duty now resting upon Congress.

We should stay here to see that these funds are used for the kind of defenses the people want. We should demand a well-formed national-defense program and appropriate the money for it as that program is formulated, and then at the same time levy taxes to carry out that defense so that our people will know what defense their money is going into.

Much has been said about war profiteering but what has this Congress done to prevent profiteering in the huge appropriations that have been made? We have only scratched the surface.

Who knows whether our laws are sufficient to cope with the much discussed "fifth column" in the United States, in a time of emergency? Congress should stay here and be prepared to instantly grapple with that threat, which we admit exists here.

These are "blitzkrieg" days. World situations are changing so rapidly the President should not gamble on having time to assemble Congress in event of emergency. Days would be involved in calling this body back together. Hours and minutes are what count in situations such as this.

To adjourn Congress now would be tantamount to a repudiation of our oath of office to faithfully discharge our duties.

Surveying the letters I have received from my district—and I have not had a letter urging adjournment of Congress—I find that the people of my district want us to stay on the job here. We begged the people to send us to Washington in November 1938. Why leave now when there is work to be done?

Typical of the expressions I have received from my district is an editorial in my home-town newspaper, the Saginaw Daily News. I appreciate the unanimous consent which the House has given me to present it here that you may know the sentiment in the territory I represent.

LET CONGRESS STAY

There is understood to be more than a smattering of Republican sentiment for Congress to stay in session—at least over the summer. The idea has its merits.

Still a great number of politically minded Congressmen want to go home and strengthen their relations with the voters. According to the Capitol's usually reliable gages of sentiment, this number forms a majority.

It is too bad the legislators can't forget about campaigning this once and go on sawing wood. It is too bad that party conventions and elections can't be held with Congress in Washington. It is too bad that the people themselves can't do without baby kissing and oratory this year and be trusted to elect the right men for the right jobs.

There are a great number of arguments why Congress should stay where it is. A new tax bill should be passed to pay for increased military expenditures. The old bugbear against new taxes in an election year is off. It may be more unpopular not to levy taxes in this case.

Definite provision should be made for the Alaskan and Pan-American highways. These are defense measures which should not wait, not even for a few months.

The European situation cannot be predicted 24 hours in advance. The rise of any morning's sun may look upon a completely unforeseen set of circumstances. Congress should be around to look after the interests of the people. Its presence should have a steadying and reassuring influence on the executive department in the days ahead.

"Fifth Column" Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the news dispatches of June 2, 1940, from the city of New York reporting the program of the Communist Party Convention is enough to give pause to every thoughtful American in these trying days. At this Communist convention, Earl Russell Browder, America's No. 1 link with Soviet Russia, was nominated to the position as Communist candidate for President of the United States.

These proceedings of this convention were broadcast over radio network throughout the width and breadth of the Nation and the public heard the applause when the name of this man Browder, a convict with a 4-year sentence for un-American activity, was placed in this position. A stranger attending would have thought that he was in Moscow in the heart of "red" Russia as he stood on the floor of the convention and heard the shouts of support.

America's "fifth column"—the bund and the Communist—is active, defiant, and arrogant. Any doubt regarding this was removed by listening to the speech of this arch-Communist Earl Browder and to the thunderous applause which greeted his every treasonable word.

The "fifth column" is even more dangerous here in America than it is in Europe. Why do I say this? The German Bund works now under cover—since Germany is engaged in war. The Communists work as a national political organization, with an actual balloting strength in 1936 of 80,000 votes. It claims to have 10 times this many supporters in America today as 2 years ago.

Communists and Nazis in America are spies for their respective governments just as they were spies in France, Holland, Norway, Finland, Belgium, and England. This spying in America must stop.

Congress has taken some steps to stop this alien activity, but Congress has not yet gone far enough. We have transferred, at the request of the President, the Bureau of Immigration from the Labor Department to the Department of Justice. This was desirable and should help in this fight. The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARTIN DIES, of the Dies un-American activities committee, has urged the formation of a "fifth column" council, such a committee to be made up of level-headed, fair-minded men, lest there be persecutions instead of prosecution. The registration and fingerprinting of every alien in America is an absolute essential to safety. This important work should be handled carefully and methodically under skillful direction. It should be left to one of the greatest men in his specialty in America, J. Edgar Hoover.

At the present time the Federal Bureau of Investigation has a force of only 150 men to stamp out communism and nazi-ism among 130,000,000 people. The number of complaints reaching the Department of Justice concerning un-American activity has increased to an astounding extent. Last week, May 28, 1940, 147 complaints from New York City alone reached the F B. I., and a large number have been sent in from the Fourth Congressional District. Several thousand complaints from all parts of the country are now reaching Washington. More men should be provided to enforce our laws against un-American activity.

In this trying time, with the world literally on fire, we have no time to waste upon those who seek to undermine our institutions. Any political party having such motives should be stamped out promptly and without hesitation. Its members must be taught either to support our Government or to leave our land.

Letters of the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

LETTERS FROM THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters written by the Secretary of Agriculture to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]:

MAY 3, 1940.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Hon. MARVIN JONES has called to my attention H. Res. 472, which you introduced in the House of Representatives April 25, and has requested that I furnish you the information you are seeking. This I am glad to do.

Before answering in detail the questions you have raised, let me say that the anniversary farm dinners did not originate with this Department, and this Department had no official connection with them, and that Department funds were not expended in promoting or conducting the dinners. There was widespread interest among farmers in this celebration, and some of them who had been elected committeemen in the Triple A program quite naturally assisted in making arrangements, but they did this entirely unofficially and not as a part of their Triple A duties.

Now let me answer your questions specifically.

1. The Department of Agriculture did not nor did any officer, agent, or employee authorize, incur, or pay any expenditure in connection with the farm anniversary dinners, Friday, March 8, 1940.

2. No instructions went out prior to the 9th day of March 1940 from the Department of Agriculture nor from any official agent or employee of the Department directing anyone to hold these meetings. It was generally understood among officials in contact with the field employees that these widely publicized dinners were events with which the Department employees could take no official part. No instructions were issued because it was felt unnecessary in view of the fact that the departmental policy has always been clear on such matters.

3. No compensation was paid to county agents, county committeemen, or any persons connected with the agricultural program for assisting in arranging for the meetings commemorating this anniversary.

4, 5, and 6. I find that no official instruction went to Allegan County, Mich., with reference to arrangements for community meetings commemorating this anniversary. In reference to your constituent's letter, which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, we have communicated with the agricultural conservation program committee, Allegan County, and have learned that the matter of dinners was mentioned briefly and entirely incidentally during a meeting of township and county committeemen called to transact regular administrative business early in March.

I quote from a statement supplied the Agricultural Adjustment Administration by Clarence Swanebeck of the Michigan State A. A. A. office:

"Concerning the charge that committeemen in Allegan County spent a day canvassing the territory in regard to the A. A. A. anniversary dinner, while they were being paid $4 per day to work on the program: They had a meeting about March 1 in this county but didn't have all the men in; talked on 403's. (Form NCR 403 is officially titled 'Farm Plan for Participation in the 1940 Program,' and is the basis for eligibility of farmers to receive payments.) They had 5,861 403's to be completed as of March 1, and on March 1 they called all these community committeemen in. They took up the minutes of the meeting, parity payments, everything that a farm reporter could take up. They don't know exactly how many were in at this meeting, but there were not anywhere near 72 committeemen.

"At this meeting they had a farmer, Walter Whiteman, Fennville, Route 2, Republican by politics, and chairman of the dinner committee, appear at 10 a. m. Mr. Whiteman left at 10: 25. Took about 25 minutes of the time telling about what he was planning to do about the dinners in that county.

"They went on with the regular work the rest of the day. These men went out and worked on 403's; 72 committeemen, total of all committeemen in the county. Not all of them were at the meeting, as the county committee had to contact them to see if they were willing to work. They were paid in that county only for work on the 403's. The latter part of February and until after the dinner on March 8, just getting a nice start on 403's; about 10 percent done at the time of the meeting.

"If there is anything else we can give you, let us know. Some dinners were held: Pot-luck gatherings and church suppers at 50 cents."

7. The Department of Agriculture sent no instructions to employees or anyone else indicating that action should be taken in the celebration of the seventh anniversary of the program's success.

I hope I have allayed your fears that the Department of Agriculture engaged in any improper activity in regard to these dinners. While they were nonpartisan in character we considered them outside the official sphere of the Department. So far as I can learn, this policy was not violated.

As to the Triple A farmer committeemen, it must be borne in mind that they are not employees of the Department of Agriculture, but are elected by their neighbors to administer the program locally. They work only part time and their pay comes from the farmer payments allotted to their respective counties. I am sure that many of them assisted in promoting and arranging these dinners. They would be more than human, and certainly poor citizens, if they stood idly by without taking part in the debates which are raging over farm policies. These committeemen are independent and nonpartisan. We have no right, and we have never attempted to dictate to them what they should think or do on matters which clearly are their personal affairs as individual citizens.

Sincerely,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: This is in reply to your letters of May 4 and May 8, 1940, in which you requested information on administrative expenditures of Allegan County, Mich., for the past 3 months, in connection with farmers' anniversary dinners held on March 8, 1940, and the attendance of farmers at the St. Paul, Minn., mass meeting on April 27, 1940. I have also House Resolution 486, which you submitted on May 8, 1940, to direct me to furnish the House of Representatives similar information.

Your only point about the meeting for which committeemen received $4.50 for attendance appears to be that the purpose of the meeting was to promote the anniversary dinners. In my letter of May 3, 1940, I showed that the purpose of this meeting was not to promote the anniversary dinners but that the purpose was to provide community committeemen with information necessary for their administrative functions in carrying out the farm program authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and related legislation. You were informed in that letter that about 25 minutes out of the whole day at that meeting was taken by Mr. Walter Whiteman to tell his plans about the dinners in Allegan County.

With regard to your question as to whether it is political activity for persons administering the farm program to promote a dinner to hear an official speak in favor of the farm program, it would appear that a reasoned consideration of the question would provide an obvious, negative answer. I do not believe that you can find any peacetime laws or regulations in the United States which would so narrow our traditions of free speech and free assembly as to deny that type of activity to farmers engaged part time in the administration of the farm program. Committeemen, who as farm leaders, may naturally have assisted, entirely in unofficial capacities, in the preparation for dinners, were merely exercising their rights as free American citizens.

No farmer in Allegan County, Mich., or any other county in the United States earned any compensation from funds appropriated to administer the farm program for attendance at any of the anniversary dinners. No farmer became entitled to $4.50 per day at any stage of attending any of the dinners nor, since urging attendance at the meetings was not an official function, at any stage of advocating attendance at them. Attendance at the dinners or advocating attendance had no effect whatsoever upon the compensation of any committeemen.

You state that the person who wrote you said he and others were offered 2 days' pay to attend the St. Paul mass meeting. No one was authorized to offer any pay or any money out of funds avail-

able for the farm program or the Department of Agriculture to any committeemen or other persons to attend the meeting, and to the best of our knowledge no payments of funds whatsoever have been or will be made to any committeemen or other persons from any Department funds for their attendance at the St. Paul meeting. The Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has been informed specifically that as complete a check as possible has been made on funds paid to committeemen in Allegan County, Mich., for the month of April, and that no payments have been paid or certified to persons for any days spent attending the St. Paul meeting or otherwise not working on the farm program. If any payment has been claimed and certified for any such purpose in any county of the United States, the error or violation of regulations will be corrected without delay according to the procedure in regular use to detect and correct errors or violations of regulations in the payment of funds for administrative work.

Since no committeemen or other persons were paid from funds available for the farm program to attend the St. Paul meeting, and since the meeting did not involve the administrative work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration or any other agency of the Department of Agriculture, there is no way in which I could obtain any official information about the number of men or number of local committeemen from any particular area who attended the meeting. However, I can and will furnish you with the names of all persons who did or will receive pay for work on the Farm Program on April 26 and 27, 1940, in Allegan County, Mich., as soon as they can be obtained.

In order to provide you with specific information about amounts paid, persons to whom such amounts have been paid, and purposes for which such amounts have been paid out of any funds appropriated for the Department of Agriculture and used for administrative expenses in Allegan County, Mich., between March 1, 1940, and April 30, 1940, I have asked the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to obtain an itemized statement from the Michigan Agricultural Conservation Committee. This information will be obtained as soon as possible and will be transmitted to you immediately.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE,
Secretary.

America Awakens to Its Air-Force Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS OF JUNE 17, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent and thought-provoking article from the Washington Daily News of June 17, 1940, which is authored by Charles T. Lucey and Lee G. Miller:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 17, 1940]

HOW SAFE ARE WE?—UNITED STATES AT LAST AWAKENING TO AIR-FORCE WEAKNESS

(By Charles T. Lucey and Lee G. Miller)

The air arm of American defense has come a long way—principally on paper—since President Roosevelt told Congress on January 12, 1939, that "no responsible officer" advocated building our air forces up to equality with "certain other nations."

The war changed the President's views. On May 16 of this year he told Congress: "I should like to see this Nation geared up to the ability to turn out at least 50,000 planes a year. Furthermore, I believe that this Nation should plan at this time a program that would provide us with 50,000 military and naval planes."

Currently Congress is voting money hand over fist in an effort to get going toward this objective. But what does our air defense amount to, as of today?

The Army and Navy have fewer than 5,000 airplanes of all kinds, old and new, trainers and transports, as well as fighters and bombers. (And many of these are being turned back to the manufacturers for sale to the Allies.)

They have no planes embodying the new lessons of the European war.

Listen to Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Corps: "A year ago we believed that some of our airplanes had ample performance as compared with airplanes in the rest of the world. Everything went along beautifully until the Germans went into Poland."

LESSONS WE LEARNED

Then it developed that the Army was asleep at the switch in regard to three fundamentals of modern air war:

1. Leakproof gasoline tanks.
2. Shell-firing guns.
3. Armor to protect airplane crews.

General Arnold admitted that the Army had experimented years ago with self-sealing fuel tanks, and had given up due to weight and lack of knowledge of materials at that time.

Only about half a dozen of the Army's planes could be modernized in these respects, he said.

To fly one of the Army's B–18 bombers against modern planes "would be suicide," he testified at Senate hearings. The Army has about 300 B–18's.

That is a dismal picture. But there are encouraging factors.

While General Arnold admits that "we were on the wrong tack so far as our gadgets were concerned," he insists that our "individual airplanes still stand out so far as performance is concerned." Unquestionably the Army's fifty-odd flying fortresses are formidable ships as they stand. And the combat planes now on order will have the new German innovations.

The Allies' eagerness to buy Army and Navy planes is evidence that the existing models are by no means valueless.

OUR BEST DEVICE

In at least one "gadget," our military aviators are confident they have the world beaten. That is the secret bomb sight, reputedly a marvel of precision which permits accurate bombing from great heights. Not even the Allies have been permitted so far to buy this instrument or even inspect it.

The basic index of American air power is the skyrocketing capacity of the aircraft factories. The President says it has risen from about 6,000 a year to "more than double that number." And further great expansion is in prospect.

Manufacturers of airplane engines appear to be keeping pace; a current capacity of 16,000 engines a year is claimed for them, and a capacity of 25,000 1,000-horsepower engines is forecast within a year.

Compare those figures to our performance in the World War, when we delivered to Europe only 1,216 planes, despite enormous expenditures.

To accelerate the further expansion of airplane factories is one of the first tasks of the new Defense Advisory Commission, particularly of Member William S. Knudsen. The principal bottleneck is in machine tools, a problem with which Mr. Knudsen is now grappling.

The magnitude of the President's goal of 50,000 planes a year is attested by this fact: The American aircraft industry, in its entire 30-year history, has built only about 46,000 airplanes, and only about 12,000 of these in the last 10 years.

FIFTY THOUSAND IN 3 YEARS?

It took Germany about 5 years to achieve her estimated capacity of 36,000 planes a year. Nevertheless, Col. John H. Jouett, president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, thinks this country could achieve a 50,000-plane capacity within 3 years.

Then there is the matter of training pilots and ground personnel. Today the Navy and Marine Corps have 2,623 pilots, and the Army at last report had 2,941. Total, 5,564.

Under new legislation enlarging air-training facilities, the Navy hopes within a year to be turning out pilots at a rate of 6,600 a year. Similarly, the Army's program calls for producing 7,000 pilots a year.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority will cooperate by providing primary training for 50,000 civilians in the coming year. (Incidentally, there are in the country today only about 43,000 citizen pilots, good, bad, and indifferent.)

The production of military pilots is a long and expensive process. Ordinarily 9 months of basic training is provided before an Army pilot gets tactical training with a combat unit. And most of the would-be flyers are weeded out at the start or along the way.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, says that 75,000 young men will have to be "processed" in order to produce 7,000 trained pilots.

Pilots are only a fraction of the manpower required by aviation. The Army figures that every plane demands roughly 10 men to maintain it. Capt. Kenneth Whiting, United States Navy, says the Navy needs between 20 and 40 men for each plane, depending on the type.

Taking 30 as the Navy average, that would mean 300,000 men to maintain the 10,000 planes which is the Navy's eventual goal.

If the Army got 40,000 planes eventually, these would require 400,000 men.

Total, Army and Navy, 700,000 men. That is almost twice the combined personnel of the whole Army and Navy today.

Enlisted personnel as well as flying officers have to be thoroughly trained, of course. Skilled airplane mechanics cannot be conjured out of a hat. In the last year the Army Air Corps has expanded its enlisted personnel from 18,000 to 43,000, and General Arnold says they have not all been "absorbed" yet.

A year hence, if present programs go through, the Army expects to have something like 7,900 airplanes on hand or on order, and the Navy nearly 6,000. (From these figures must be deducted the planes turned back to the builders for resale to France and England.)

By that time, planes and pilots should be rolling out of the factories and training schools at a greatly advanced rate.

RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT

In the meantime, aeronautical research, in which Germany stole a march on us, is being speeded up. A great new laboratory is being built in California for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, to supplement the N. A. C. A.'s big research station at Langley Field, Va. Also legislation now pending carries funds for an $8,000,000 engine laboratory.

In short, America is out to buy air power in enormous quantities. Whether it will get enough of it before an occasion for its use in action arises is another question.

Whether it will use it in the right way is also a question. Maj. Al. Williams insists that effective air power is impossible unless a separate aviation department is created, entirely apart from the War and Navy Departments. There is considerable support for this among service air officers—but they do not admit it publicly since the high commands are opposed.

The War Department position is that its G. H. Q. air force, to which the bulk of the Army's combat planes are attached, provides mobile striking power under a single though not independent command.

National Defense Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

STATEMENT BY UNITED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, INC.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, United Government Employees, Inc., an organization of Government workers, of which Edgar G. Brown is president, has issued a statement which, in part, is as follows:

The 15,000,000 Negroes in the United States appeal to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to reject the action of the conferees who agreed to strike out the Schwartz amendment inserted on the floor of the Senate, Tuesday, June 11, in the National Defense Act, H. R. 10055, of $2,000,000,000 guaranteeing "that no person shall be excluded from enlisting in any branch of the Military Establishment on account of race, creed, or color."

Does the United States Congress in 1940 agree to taxation without representation for loyal, patriotic Negro American citizens who have never been "fifth columnists" in the 150 years of the history of our liberty, independence, and devotion to democratic institutions?

The Negro press on national defense last week said:

(a) The Afro-American:

"CAN DEMOCRACY BE MADE TO WORK?

"It seems nonsensical, ironic, and almost unbelievable that any group of people should be compelled to fight for the privilege of dying for their country, but such is the inconsistency of prejudice which we will not try to understand.

"The A. F. R. O. has fought for that privilege for our group simply because we know that there is but one medium of exchange with which liberty, freedom, honor, and glory can be purchased, and that is blood. The terms have always been thus. The road to Utopia has always been fought for, inch by inch, with one generation dying that the next might lead a fuller life.

"Which all brings us to the matter of national defense and the race problem."

(b) The Norfolk Journal and Guide:

"THE WORLD CRISIS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

"The black man, whose blood has been loyally shed in every war in which our country has engaged, is denied enlistment in the Air Corps and Marine Corps; in the medical, dental, and nursing units; and in the Navy and Coast Guard.

"The latter within the past few weeks has bestirred itself in seeking colored enlistments, and the Navy in recent years has permitted increasing colored enlistments, but chiefly, or solely, as messmen.

"The color basis so sharply defined in the Navy has shut tight to colored Americans enrollment in the Naval Academy, and permitted only one to graduate from the Military Academy in a great many years.

"The number of colored males in the United States between 20 and 45 years of age, from available figures, is 2,340,758. The number now in the military services is only 4,451. In the Regular Army there are only five commissioned officers and 11 warrant officers. The number in the Navy, chiefly stewards and messmen, is unknown—but it is not great."

(c) The Washington Tribune:

"DEMOCRACY AT HOME

"Now is the time to read the record of loyal devotion to flag and country. We have fought the white man's battles at home and abroad, from Lexington to the Argonne. No colored man has ever been a traitor. As the Government moves to recall aliens from the District and Federal employment, America needs to be reminded of the colored man's service to his country."

(d) The Chicago Defender:

"DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL

"War has come a step closer to our doorstep. President Roosevelt has increased the ante from three to five million. The hysterical cry that we are in danger grows louder. Some people are agitated to a degree reached before only in 1917.

"We believe in the defense of America—our home and our country. The war record of black America is proof that we believe in defense. But our war record is also proof that we believe in the democracy we never have enjoyed."

(e) The Philadelphia Independent:

"AMERICA'S HANDCUFFS

"America has placed a pair of handcuffs upon Negroes that will make them easy prey for 'fifth columnists' if Hitler ever gets as far as this western continent.

"This is no idle threat. Discrimination, more vicious and harrowing than any programs instituted upon the Jews by Germany, is crushing out the patriotic hope of countless Negro youths.

"Army jim-crowism, Navy jim-crowism, governmental pussyfooting and silent approval of this stand are snapping iron bracelets upon the wrists of Negroes that won't soon be removed unless something drastic is done about it.

"Local Negro boys and Negro boys in nearby and faraway States have repeatedly applied for admission into the Army, Navy, and other branches of this Nation's military units. Various subterfuges have been used to refuse them in some instances and in others they have been told outright that Negroes were not being recruited."

(f) The Kansas City Call:

"DEMOCRACY IN 1940

"Are the three Negro regiments to be sabotaged as only menials, the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth Infantry? The weak spot in America's armor race prejudice is the 'damned' spot on American democracy."

(g) The Pittsburgh Courier:

"MR. PRESIDENT, WE ARE WAITING

"Inquiries are coming into our office in every mail, asking us what progress we are making in our effort to have our citizens integrated into our national defense. It is but natural that these inquiries come. The country is at fever heat over the war situation in Europe and, judging from reports coming from our National Capital, the Congress itself is getting a little warm.

"We do not know what progress we are making. We have been turned down by the committees of Congress, and no one has suggested that Negroes be integrated into the present preparedness program."

(h) The Cleveland Call and Post:

"WHERE DO WE STAND AS AMERICA PREPARES FOR WAR?

"From the halls of Congress these days we hear nothing but of war preparations. Each succeeding week reveals new appropriations, each dollar earmarked for national defense and actual war."

While all this is going on, hundreds of Government operators are scurrying about the Nation tracking down "fifth columnists," and persons whose loyalty is questioned.

The Negro, America's "tenth citizen," witnesses this with awe and suspicion. For, while Congress rushes ahead with its spending program, and American industry gears itself for war-material production, and millions of workers find the employment window again open, the Negro stands at the end of the line as the "forgotten man."

Despite this Nation's experiences of the last World War with traitors and spies, there is little evidence now that it has learned any lesson from them. The only racial group upon which there was no odium of suspicion during the years of 1917, 1918, and 1919, was the Negro. The most loyal soldiers in the United States Army were the black boys who were called from 400,000 Negro homes to the Nation's colors.

The Nation's reward to these Negro soldiers who served so valiantly has been discrimination, segregation, lynching, denial of the right to vote, and industrial peonage. So, as America contemplates another war, the Negro citizens are asking the all-important question: What will be our position in America's preparedness program, and what will be our fate when war comes?

Not only is the Negro being completely ignored now, as this Nation organizes its factories and mills for war, but we are also being ignored as this Nation organizes its manpower for combat. The "No Negroes Wanted" sign appears at every Government recruiting office unless we are willing to sign up for scullion work. With appeals being made for thousands of airplane pilots, not a single Negro is being accepted.

The Negro soldiers in the Regular United States Army, are scattered at various camps and very few of them are doing any real military work. The fine fighters of the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Regiments, are now little more than servants for white soldiers.

In his official history of the American Negro in the World War, Emmett J. Scott, on page 468, quotes a white man as follows: "No other race under the sun would endure what the Negro does, except the Negro."

So, as this Nation feverishly prepares for another war, the Negro, just as he was in 1917, is being completely left out of the equation. Wanting and willing to go and help in any way we can, loyal and true, able and capable, we languish on the side lines.

UNITED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, INC.

Mississippi for Roosevelt and Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALL DOXEY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MISSISSIPPI DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, at the Democratic convention recently held in Mississippi resolutions were adopted endorsing President Roosevelt and instructing the State delegation to vote for him for President for a third term.

Resolutions were also adopted endorsing PAT HARRISON, the senior Senator from Mississippi, for Vice President.

The resolutions are as follows:

Resolutions endorsing President Roosevelt and instructing the State delegation to vote for him for a third term.

Whereas the Democratic administration, under the progressive and inspiring leadership of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has for the past 8 years convincingly made democracy the agency for achieving and furthering the sacred objectives recited in the preamble of our Constitution, "To form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," and

Whereas the most far-reaching program of legislation in our history has been enacted into law under the wise direction of President Roosevelt, and his two terms in the White House have demonstrated beyond contradiction that he possesses to an unusual degree, the statesmanlike qualities of wisdom, courage, and judgment and the undeniable ability to deal sincerely, honestly, realistically, and soundly with economic, social, and foreign problems; and

Whereas President Roosevelt, with rare acumen, foresight, and perseverance, has forged a remarkable record in administering the affairs of our country under most trying circumstances and has sought to lead it into a new era of justice, liberty, and social enlightenment through reforms in the governmental system designed to guarantee the right of the people to jobs, the right to security in private employment and in old age, the right to a decent home, the right to adequate pay, the right to security of savings, the right of security of home and family, the right of collective bargaining, the right to an education, the right to sell agricultural products at a fair price, the right to a fair share of the Nation's resources, and the right to protection against exploitation; and

Whereas President Roosevelt has consistently and conscientiously favored measures to protect the neutrality, the safety, and the integrity of our country and at the same time keep us out of war and in furtherance of that objective obtained passage in Congress last fall after the outbreak of war of a new neutrality act which repealed the embargo provisions of an act of 1925 and enabled the Government to definitely keep American citizens and American ships away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict; and

Whereas President Roosevelt, with the European hostilities now reaching catastrophic proportions, has developed, with the cooperation of the Congress, a long-range program for an expansion of this country's armaments in strengthening our defenses and is pursuing a foreign policy dedicated to peace, but which at the same time seeks to secure protection against potential developments and dangers of the future and the establishment of a defense which will be an expression of the vital forces of the Nation and of its resolute will to meet whatever challenge the future may hold; and

Whereas Franklin D. Roosevelt, by reasons of his background, training, experience, and ability, is the best qualified American to deal with national and international problems in this dark hour and lead this Nation during these critical times; and

Whereas it would be dangerous and unwise to place the leadership in other hands until the present challenge to democracy is past and world peace is restored; and

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt has distinguished himself as one of the six great American Presidents of all times and today is in a better position than any other American to successfully cope with the problems and the crisis of our times and can better continue and complete the New Deal program for the economic happiness and welfare of the American people: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the democracy of Mississippi in convention assembled this the 11th day of June 1940, That its delegation to the National Democratic Convention in Chicago, July 15, be, and is hereby, instructed to vote for the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt on the first ballot and on any succeeding ballots or until he is nominated, or as long as his name is before the convention for nomination.

RESOLUTIONS ENDORSING PAT HARRISON FOR VICE PRESIDENT

That we regard as most satisfactory the services rendered, and especially do we appreciate the services rendered by our senior Senator, Hon. PAT HARRISON, in the Senate, and we feel that all Mississippians, regardless of any so-called factional minds are profoundly gratified because of the wide influence of this gifted son of Mississippi and we point with pride to the splendid record and universally acknowledged leadership of Senator HARRISON in the promulgation and realization of the ideals of democracy and the enactment of the same in beneficial statutory provisions under the most superb Democratic administration of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and we do hereby present Senator HARRISON unto the forthcoming National Democratic Convention as a trained statesman and man worthy and capacitated to hold the office of Vice President of the United States.

Congress Must Remain in Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WICHITA (KANS.) BEACON

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of June 14, 1940, relative to the joint responsibility of the legislative branch and the executive branch in safeguarding the vital interests of the Nation. The Congress must be constantly at hand during these days when the world is in flames to meet situations which change almost with the hour.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of June 14, 1940]

CONGRESS MUST REMAIN IN SESSION

The next 90 days will be of paramount importance in the United States in charting the steps to be taken by this Government, not alone in its rearmament program, which must be pushed with all possible speed, but in correlating its foreign policy with the fast-changing scene of Europe.

For that reason it is absolutely necessary that Congress remain in session, regardless of political conventions or political campaigns, until the present emergency has passed and the necessary legislation has been enacted. In these days of "blitzkrieg" warfare it would be the height of folly to adjourn the legislative branch of the Federal Government and then wait when some sudden crisis has arisen, until the Senators and Representatives from the 48 States are called and can be reassembled in Washington.

This is not a question of political advantage or disadvantage. It may be a handicap to some Members of Congress who are up for reelection this year to stay at their posts in Washington—although it would appear that the best campaigning possible would be to do a good job of representing the voters in the solution of the serious problems of the day. It is not a question of confidence or lack of confidence in the President.

This country was designed to operate under a government where the executive and legislative branches share in the responsibility. Right now every man and woman should be concerned in the national security and welfare above everything else. Let the party conventions be held. Let the political campaign proceed. Let the established and recognized institutions and practices of this democratic government function in the same orderly fashion they have functioned for a century and a half. Now is the time above all others that we should preserve the American way of life in every particular. But don't let any partisanship interfere with that greater duty of citizenship.

The Bituminous Coal Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

ADDRESS BY HOWARD W. VESEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the unforgettable days of the N. R. A., much strife and resentment was created among the consumers of coal of our Nation because of a virtual trust price-fixing.

Again the people are aroused because of the further governmental interference in private industry.

I submit a very able address delivered by Mr. Howard W. Vesey as to future probable results from the furtherance of the Bituminous Coal Act.

Following is the address of Mr. Vesey:

On April 26, 1941, the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 will automatically pass into the limbo of discarded experimental legislation. Prior to that date the Congress of the United States will have to decide whether or not the bituminous-coal industry is to be made the subject of a further experimentation in collectivism or is to be freed from the shackles of strict regulation and supervision by the Federal Government.

No thinking person can object to the motives which inspired this legislation. Furthermore, I do not believe anyone will question the sincerity of those who sponsored it. Designed to benefit both labor and management, the result was a compromise of doubtful value to either group. So far, at least, neither group has received any benefit whatsoever from it. Instead of aiding both producer and laborer by reversing the downward spiral, it has, if anything, accentuated the very evil which it was intended to eradicate, namely, cutthroat price competition.

This is clearly shown by the losses suffered since the act went into effect in 1937. According to the reports of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, which was the administrative agency under the act until its abolishment by the President on July 1, 1939, the industry lost $37,000,000 in 1937 and $60,000,000 in 1938. We have no figures for 1939, but responsible members of the industry have estimated that the losses for 1939 will approximate $100,000,000. Whether or not this trend will continue in 1940 is a matter of speculation in view of the present European war. These mounting losses become all the more significant when it is remembered that 1937, 1938, and 1939 were good years for practically all other industries. These figures speak for themselves. They need no elaboration. Suffice it to say, unless this trend is stopped by removing the cause, the bituminous-coal industry is doomed to bankruptcy.

In spite of the fact that over three-fourths of the life of the act has already passed, no legal minimum prices have been established. Indeed, there is grave doubt in the minds of many men that effective legal minimum prices will ever be established. On the other hand, there are those who still cling to the hope that minimum prices will be established and that they will remain in effect long enough to enable producers to get back at least some part of the $20,000,000 which the Government has exacted from them in taxes and district board assessments. Although I sympathize fully with the aims and aspirations of this latter group, I do not believe this act can ever be made to work. Furthermore, I firmly believe that if minimum prices are established they will wreck this industry.

I am opposed to the act for two principal reasons: First, because Government price fixing is uneconomic and unsound; and, secondly, because it is un-American.

Government price fixing has always failed. It has in every case disrupted the particular industry and reduced it to a position where it could no longer compete on an economical basis. The losses to the industry so regulated have in every case been tremendous. In fact, the history of these various price-fixing failures in the past is almost an exact parallel to the history of the bituminous-coal industry during the past 3 years. Let us, therefore, examine for a moment both the act and the industry and see if we can determine why the price fixing of bituminous coal by Government is doomed to failure.

In the first place, the act does not strike at the fundamental evil. I believe that everyone will agree that the primary curse in the bituminous-coal industry is overproduction. It is indeed a deplorable fact that any person or combination of persons can tap one of our greatest natural resources by opening a new mine and thus add to the oversupply of bituminous coal. It is this oversupply which produces the intense price competition that has forced prices down to the point where they no longer return even the cost of production. However, no attempt has been made in this act to cure this situation. All that is provided for in the act is the regulation of the resulting evil, the low price levels, and not the cure thereof. Hence, I submit, it should be obvious to anyone that in every district where a price level is established by law that will return costs or more production in that district will be expanded until that price level is broken down and destroyed. Thus, instead of correcting the evil you merely provide for a fuller growth.

In the second place, the act, by providing for the establishment of fixed minimum prices, accentuates cutthroat price competition. I mean simply this, that the threat of fixed prices causes every producer to fight to obtain customers regardless of price on the theory that they will continue to purchase his coal after prices are established. The evidence introduced at the various hearings which have been held by the National Bituminous Coal Commission and the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior has conclusively proved this fact. This evidence shows that under the threat of fixed prices the price for industrial slack coal has dropped in certain sections to as low as 25 cents per ton. For the past 3 years this threat has hung over the bituminous coal industry. Why, then, should we be startled at the tremendous losses that this industry has suffered under this act? Is it any wonder that they have increased each year until today they have reached such mountainous proportions that the industry is on the very verge of complete bankruptcy? Gentlemen, this situation has got to be corrected and corrected in a hurry. We are not talking about a small, insignificant industry. We are talking about the third largest industry in the United States, an industry that is the bulwark not only of many of our other major industries, as, for example, the railroads, but of our entire economic system. Its welfare, therefore, demands the consideration of everyone, regardless of his walk of life.

Even if price fixing by government had proven to be economically sound, I submit the method employed in this act will not work. Briefly, the method prescribed in the act is the fixing of prices for every kind, quality, and size of bituminous coal produced at every mine for shipment into every consuming market at levels which will return for each producing district the weighted average cost of production for the price area in which it is located. Complicated as that statement is, it is not half as complicated as the contradictory provisions of the act.

I think I can best illustrate the point which I wish to make by giving a concrete illustration. The entire Appalachian field has been divided into eight districts, which are included in price area No. 1. The weighted average cost of production in this price area has been determined by the Commission to be $2.128. The weighted average cost of production in each of the eight districts ranges from a high of $3.654 for district No. 5 to a low of $1.837 for district No. 3. Thus, the Division is immediately confronted with the problem of either following the act and establishing prices which will realze the price-area cost and thus put the mines in the high-cost districts out of business, or violating the act and establishing prices which will realize the costs of the high-cost districts in order to preserve weak, antiquated, and uneconomic mines. Which course will the Division follow? That is the burning question in the mind of every producer of bituminous coal today. I submit to you that the result will be the same regardless of which course is taken. That result will be chaos in the bituminous-coal industry—upset production, disruption of normal distribution, increased costs of production, and inordinate increases in the fuel costs to consumers.

The above is only one of many illustrations that could be given of the unsoundness of this act, which establishes a price-fixing plan that defies almost every known sound economic theory.

No nation can prosper when its government attempts to strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. The denial of the very laws of nature inherent in this act would prevent the achievement of any lasting good.

Flexibility of prices has been one of the few assets of the coal industry. In contravention of the spirit of the laws which it has recently been passing, Congress has attempted in this act to eliminate competition within the coal industry. Should high prices result from the operation of this scheme of price-fixing, the large consumers of coal will undoubtedly take drastic measures to prevent the losses entailed thereby. In many cases they will lease or buy mines, operate such mines, and remove themselves permanently from the potential consuming market of coal producers. Thus, under the guise of an act to aid the coal industry, Congress is in effect fostering the extension of monopolies at the expense of the independent coal operators.

In the final analysis it will be the consumer who will be forced to bear the cost of the inefficient and out-moded methods of production which are fostered under the act. In spite of the fact that the trend in recent years in production costs is downward due to mechanization, the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior, the final authority below the courts of law, refuses even to consider 1938 and 1939 costs in establishing prices. Only the costs in 1937 are being considered. Why? Because they result in higher prices, thus enabling a greater number of the high-cost mines to survive. Who will benefit? Only the gas and oil companies—the suppliers of competing fuels. Who loses? The miners, the producers, and the consumers of bituminous coal.

For the past 7 years the Federal Government has been experimenting with the bituminous-coal industry. For the past 38

months it has virtually placed it in handcuffs. Instead of aiding the industry in solving its problem it has not only saddled it with a tremendous expense but it has virtually prohibited it from helping itself. For example, this act prohibits the making of contracts for a period of longer than 30 days. Thus, at the end of every 30 days, what would otherwise be long-term contract business, is the subject of the most intense competitive bidding. By thus placing the industry upon a spot-order or day-to-day basis, this act has almost deprived it of what little stability carried through the depression.

I said in the beginning the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 is un-American. I make this statement because it is but another experiment in collectivism. I say "another" because, as you all know, the experiment is not new. In various forms and degrees it has been tried before by nomad and savage tribes, by the Spartans under Lycurgus, by the Romans under Diocletian, by the English under the Tudors and Stuarts, by the French under Colbert during the reign of Louis XIV, and today by the Russians under Stalin. As stated by one of our outstanding modern writers on administrative law, "There seems to be a relentless cycle in these experiments, as if a 'vision splendid' attempts from time to time to find embodiment in our crude human institutions. On each occasion in the past the experiment has run its course and the vision has 'died away and faded into the light of common day.' Its going has left a trail of disappointment in the shortcomings of the human race and a conviction that mankind is not yet ready for realization of the dream."

The misery and grief which has flowed from each of these experiments is known to all of you. The story has been written so indelibly in the sands of time that one would think we again would not be led astray. But, like all evolutions, failure has not stopped it. It has only retarded it for a short time. The vision seems to sleep for a little while, a century or two, and then bursts forth again radiant with the hope that the world is ready to receive it. But on each occasion it has been the tool of those who lust for power, and thus, consciously or unconsciously, to grind down rather than uplift common man.

In its most extreme form, the vision contemplates a state which not merely regulates but actually conducts all human activities—at least in their economic aspects. In a less extreme garb it would invest the State with actually conducting only a limited number of activities and, in addition, with the responsibility of determining what hours a man shall work, what wages he shall receive, how much he shall produce, at what price he shall sell his products and in what markets, and what business practices he shall pursue. This is the form in which it appears in the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, except that the labor provisions were stricken out by the Supreme Court in the Carter Coal Co. case in 1936. Opposed to this theory of government is the theory which would confine the authority of the State within definite and fixed bounds. This theory found fruition in the Constitution of the United States of America. For over 150 years we have been following this theory but of late we have begun to drift toward the "vision splendid" of collectivism. Will it work? Or is the bituminous-coal industry doomed to all the disappointment which flows from an upset production, a diversion of normal distribution, and a definite trend away from bituminous coal? The past 38 months would seem to indicate the answer.

If I am correct in this assumption, then every member of the Virginia Coal Merchants Association and every other retail coal merchant in the United States ought to thank God that he does not come under, but is only affected by, this experiment. I doubt if we are ready for it. I do not believe the science of government has advanced as yet to the point where it can stand the strain of such complex and multitudinous duties. In short, I do not believe the members of the bituminous coal industry are prepared to accept such control over their daily lives. However, if I am wrong and we are today prepared to give up another portion of our individual liberties and to greatly extend the power of the Federal Government, I trust we shall have the intelligence to admit errors when we see them and try to correct them expeditiously.

In conclusion, let me say that I have attempted to tell you the story of an industry in handcuffs—the story of an industry that is foundering, due, in large part, to an unwise and uneconomical law. My criticism goes to the act itself and not to those who are presently charged with its administration. Indeed, in my humble opinion, the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior is to be complimented for their excellent efforts to administer a badly drawn and unworkable law.

My Reply to Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include this address which I delivered over an N. B. C. network on Sunday, June 16, 1940, at 7:45 eastern standard time, entitled "My Reply to Walter Winchell."

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, and my friends in Montana, I have requested and I have been granted this time in order to reply to Mr. Walter Winchell's broadcast of last Sunday. I appreciate the courtesy of the National Broadcasting Co. in giving me this opportunity to present my side to you.

In order that Mr. Winchell and the radio audience may know something about me, I shall give a brief résumé of my background.

I came to the United States from Norway in 1892, and I have served in the United States Navy, Naval Reserves, Revenue Service, and merchant marine, for over 20 years. I was in the Virginia Naval Reserves in 1898, and was petty officer in charge of the U. S. S. *Siren* in 1899 and 1900.

I am a navigator, master of oceangoing ships, and licensed pilot of aircraft. I am a doctor of medicine, a surgeon, and former professor of anatomy and instructor in surgery. I am also a surgeon in the United States Naval Reserves with the rank of lieutenant commander. I was with the Pacific Fleet in 1936 and again in the service twice in 1937.

In his broadcast last Sunday, Walter Winchell inferred that I had not adhered to my obligation and that I was a Nazi sympathizer, two unequivocally false accusations that Mr. Winchell cannot nor can anyone else substantiate. I have, as he stated, taken an oath to preserve, to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that is precisely what I have done.

I am one of those who firmly believes in the fundamental principles of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, and I maintain that anyone who engages in or approves by coercion or otherwise, changes or subversion of its meaning, is an enemy of the people. In this, I include even the President, Members of Congress, and Justices of the Supreme Court, when they sanction legislation or acts which may or will deprive the people of their constitutional rights and liberties. It should be clear from this that I am opposed to all forms of subversive activities, whether they be socialism, nazi-ism, fascism, bolshevism, or communism.

However, I realize that the greatest danger which confronts us today comes from those who wield the power of gold money and credit and use this to build an empire for themselves on the ruins of our liberties. It was that power that promoted the World War, and it is that power that is largely instrumental and responsible for the present war in Europe. Can the American people be fooled again? I don't think so.

It is this power which I have criticized and denounced, and it is because of my exposé of them that I have been maligned not only in the communistic papers but by certain other periodicals of the press as well. These attacks upon me have come because I have exposed the manner in which international gold money and credit is manipulated by the very money changers whom the President claimed he drove out of the temple.

My accusers, who have engaged in a campaign of vilification, have done so in order to discredit the statements which I have made.

In this campaign of defamation, they have not at any time been able to successfully contradict or controvert any of these statements, but they have instead resorted to the cheap expedient of name-calling, which in itself is the clearest evidence that my statements are based upon facts.

For example, in my speech on Gold and Its Power, April 23, 1940, I said that foreign governments own nearly $8,000,000,000 of American private stocks and bonds, which when converted into the present international dollar, would amount to over $13,000,000,000 of the gold in our Treasury. I further said that interests outside of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve banks held over $16,000,000,000 of gold certificates, and that we, the people in the United States, who have earned and are the true owners of this valuable metal, own but a very small part of the gold now held in the Treasury of the United States. What does it mean? It means that private interests, or interests outside of the United States are holding gold liabilities against our Treasury amounting to over $29,000,000,000.

Not one person contradicted this statement, and I challenge anyone to contradict that statement today. I have made many statements of this sort, and I have challenged criticism of them. Yet not one "peep" from my accusers.

Other information which I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is based upon books written by the persons whose principles I have criticized; from material which I have obtained from documents in the Library of Congress; and from intelligence reports of the World War, describing and naming those who were then actually engaged in seditious activities against the United States when we were at war with Germany.

In addition to this exposé, I have also placed information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the German-American Bund activities, an investigation conducted by the Department of Justice. This was written up in 14 volumes, a summary of which I inserted in the RECORD on July 19, 1939.

To carry out my program of informing the public, I inserted, on August 1, 1939, a brief quotation taken from Senate Document No. 14, a report on communism by the United Mine Workers of America. This report was given to Congress, and in the few

paragraphs which I shall quote you will find the history of communism in America to date:

"The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of the Nation.

"The Communist regime at Moscow, bent on world conquest, is promoting and directing one of the best organized and most far-reaching campaigns in America with which any country has ever been confronted. The Communist organization on the American continent is composed of approximately one million members, adherents and sympathizers, scattered in every State and province of the United States and Canada, and who are actively or tacitly promoting the scheme to import bolshevism and sovietism to this side of the Atlantic.

"The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States and converting the country into a vassal colony of the Communist International at Moscow."

This report was given to Congress in 1924. Compare these predictions with what is happening in the United States today.

I have opposed and criticized Congress for having unconstitutionally transferred much of its power to the executive department. My reason for objecting to that is because I oppose dictatorship in any form and dictatorship in general, foreign or domestic. Dictators can be established by force, as in Russia, Italy, and Germany. Dictators can also be established by laws which transfer power from the people to one man or one department. This is what is happening in the United States today as a result of unconstitutional legislation enacted by majorities in your own Congress.

I am opposed to this unconstitutional legislation which has established a Federal monopoly, ownership, and control of industries far greater than any private monopoly of the past. The Government has no constitutional right to engage in competition with private business. I am opposed to the importation of farm products which is now destroying the agricultural structure of our Nation. It is my firm conviction that our farmers should at least have the right to supply our home markets and our own people with food for our own tables.

I am opposed to war, and I condemn the warmongers and the effort which is being made to arouse fear of invasion. No power now engaged in the war will be able to invade any nation when the war is over.

This is my reply to Walter Winchell and to my defamers:

I believe in the principles that have made this Republic great, and my record stands by itself, squarely upon the Constitution of the United States.

Communist Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. VREELAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK (N. J.) STAR-LEDGER

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing in these days of "fifth column" and subversive activities that the press, and particularly the Newark Star-Ledger from my own district, has sufficient courage to expose some of the un-American groups which are now carrying on under innocent-sounding names.

The following is an editorial of June 15:

COMMUNIST TRAITORS

It seems that the followers of the Communist Party line in this community resent the fact that we have stated that they are giving aid and comfort to Hitler's fifth column in the United States.

These left-wingers, denying that they are in fact Communists and operating under a variety of innocent-sounding organization names, contend that we misjudge them. They say they are patriotic Americans who would die to defend their country if it were attacked, but oppose aggression and want our country to spend its money on peaceful objectives instead of preparedness.

That sounds pretty, perhaps, but we don't believe it is sincere.

Thursday night the Essex County Council of the American Youth Congress staged a "peace rally" at the Newark City Hall. Speakers were profuse in their promises to defend America "if it were attacked," but consider what they did:

They listened to and applauded an Englishman, Anthony Scott, a man young enough to be doing something useful to defend his native land, now in the midst of a bitter war. This brave Englishman in the course of his oratorial contribution to the "defense" of his homeland gave unstintedly of his larynx when he said: "Britain and France are accomplices in destroying the peace of the world."

To be sure, this "loyal" Englishman was impartial as between his own country and our country in handing out compliments. Concerning America, he had this to say:

"The United States has become drunk with the idea of empire, to make New York and Chicago people rich."

After witnessing the treasonable performance at city hall Thursday night, we cannot believe the Communists who disguise themselves as peace advocates when they protest they would defend America if invaded. We believe they would be no more loyal than the Englishman who prefers stabbing his government in the back to defending it.

The American Youth Congress which staged this disgraceful rally is affiliated with the Peace Action Committee, which, in turn, derives its motive power from followers of the Communist Party line. These organizations, because they devote so much studied effort to disguising themselves in innocent-sounding names and innocent-sounding jargon, succeed in sucking in some well-meaning people. Their true motives should, however, be obvious to intelligent people.

We are proud to record the fact that this traitorous gathering adopted a resolution censuring the Star-Ledger as an enemy of peace. We do not favor a Hitler peace or a Stalin peace. We are proud to be placed in the same company with the embattled peoples of France and England, and the liberty-loving people of America. We are especially proud that we have become equally disturbing to the Communists and the German-American Bund. The Bund attacked us in a hit-run libel suit and the Communists fittingly are adopting poisonous resolutions.

All of that is flattering acknowledgment of the fact that in these critical times this New Jersey newspaper is earnestly trying to do its American duty.

While Rome Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star for today:

[From the Washington Star of June 17, 1940]

WHILE ROME BURNS—

The great weakness of the European democracies, as shown by the present desperate plight in which they find themselves, has been their inability to function quickly and effectively in an emergency. No one in America can doubt that this is true, but there is a serious question whether we have taken to heart the lesson that should be learned from the tragic blunders of Britain and France. If we have not profited by their mistakes—and an answer to that vital question may be given by the House this week—then the outlook for America is indeed dark.

During the next few days the House will be called upon to consider a recommendation by its Committee on Military Affairs with respect to the President's request for authority, in the absence of Congress, to call a portion of the National Guard to active service should an emergency arise to warrant such action. A majority of the committee has proposed that this authority be granted subject to a limitation which would deny the President the power to use the guard anywhere except in the continental United States, the Panama Canal Zone, and our insular possessions—a limitation which brought forth a vigorous protest from seven minority members of the committee.

The real consideration which inspired the majority Members to impose this restriction is not known. It may have resulted from a lack of confidence in the President's discretion, or, more probably, it may have reflected a surrender to the vociferous but unthinking outcry from certain groups against sending American boys to fight on foreign soil. But whatever the cause, the imposition of such a limitation in view of present world conditions is lamentably short-sighted.

As the minority members pointed out, at any hour it may become necessary for the United States to give military assistance to any one of several countries in this hemisphere in order to prevent disloyal elements in league with the totalitarian powers from seizing

he reins of a neighboring government. In such an operation, time would be a most important element and our Regular Army forces, mall and widely scattered as they are, might well be incapable of lealing with such an emergency. But the majority of the House committee, for reasons which defy comprehension, would not permit the National Guard to be used on such a mission until Congress, assuming it to be in recess or adjournment, could reassemble and grant the specific authority. Meanwhile, of course, hostile forces might obtain a foothold in this hemisphere from which they could not be dislodged without great difficulty, but rather than delegate a wholly reasonable power to the President the majority members of the House committee presumably prefer to gamble that potential enemies will be considerate enough to strike only when Congress is in session.

When the House takes up the recommendation of its committee, the Nation will join with the minority members in asking whether Congress, like Nero, proposes to fiddle while our Rome is burning. In the Star's opinion the calling up of the National Guard would be at best but a first step in preparing to resist the danger which confronts us. But, as a preliminary step, it should be taken, and a refusal by the House to grant in full the President's request could only be interpreted as confirming the contention that democracies cannot or will not function with that degree of effectiveness which a real emergency requires.

National Defense at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD K. CLAYPOOL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. CLAYPOOL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Louis Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of War, before the National Association of Purchasing Agents and the civic bodies of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 4, 1940:

Friends of national defense, there is a symbolic significance to our meeting at this critical moment in our Nation's history here in the city of Cincinnati today. It goes back almost 2,500 years to the Roman warrior, Lucius Quintius Cincinnatus, who preferred the plough to the sword but who in every grave emergency was ready to forego his normal peaceful pursuits to devote himself to the service of his country.

The symbol of Cincinnatus appealed to the veterans of the Revolutionary War whose leaders bound themselves together as Sons of Cincinnati. It appealed to the founding fathers of this community on the banks of the Ohio, who perpetuated the name of the organization by conferring it upon this city. It should appeal to all of us today as a reminder of our duty to our country in time of need.

National defense is at the crossroads. It is heading in the right direction. The road is long and the going may be rough. We must travel it at the maximum speed compatible with safety and efficiency and we must see to it that it remains true to the course of adequate preparedness. We must assure ourselves that at the end we will find an America ready to meet any military crisis; an America so well prepared on land, on sea, and in the air that no prudent enemy will be tempted to attack us, and that no reckless foe will be in a position to defeat us. And when that job is done, you and I, and every patriotic American, will be ready in the spirit of Cincinnatus, to go back to the plough or to the loom, the spindle or the lathe, and to resume his accustomed role in the life of his community.

In the meantime, we must put our national defense on a stand-by basis, ready for any grave emergency. We must be realists. We must listen to the truth whether it is pleasant or not. We must face the world as it is, whether we like it or not.

In the past, many Americans hailed the harbinger of disagreeable news with skepticism. For instance, in November 1938, before a Boston audience, I suggested that "to meet the tremendous pace that the rest of the world is setting we must double, yes, treble, and perhaps even quadruple, our present air force with the best airplanes that can possibly be produced." I had hardly finished the sentence when many arose to scoff at my suggestion as that of an alarmist. Be that as it may, we have neither the time nor the desire now for recriminations over spilt milk. Let us forget our differences of yesterday and work together today, united in the interest of national security. Let us give up all thought of individual gain and think only of national interest. We are all members of our great all-American team. Let us play the game along national lines with the same kind of spirit and energy that Bill McKechnie's men are displaying in their determined and courageous fight for a second National League pennant.

Since 1938 we have made some progress in our quest for adequate national defense; not enough, to be sure, especially in the light of happenings of the past few weeks, but of sufficient importance to indicate that we are headed in the right direction. In 1938 we are working toward a very limited objective of 2,520 planes by June 1940. In 1939 we embarked on a well-rounded program of 5,500 planes by June 1941. Toward that objective we had been moving according to schedule when the war in Europe spread in its present fury. As a result we now will have to add bombers, pilots, production facilities, and the other elements that contribute toward a well-balanced aviation program. We shall proceed to do so without hysteria and without lost motion. The experience gained in production and in training in the last year will help us immeasurably in the required expansion.

Our ultimate objectives we shall not achieve in a day, or in a month, or even in a year. I doubt if they will be fully realized in less than 2 years; and 2 years is indeed a long time, especially in an era of "blitzkriegen." That is the situation, however, and we must face it frankly and honestly, and then proceed with our characteristic American energy to attain the desired goal of national defense with a minimum of delay. In the last year we laid the foundations. Today we are ready to start on the superstructure, and we have the advantages of the battlefield laboratories of Europe to guide us in our plans.

Not only in the air but on the ground have we been laying a solid foundation for national defense upon which the larger edifice now contemplated by the President can be built with greater assurance. In the last year, we have made many advances all along our munitions front. Let me cite a few.

At the time of Munich, we had hardly enough Garand rifles for a division. Today, distribution to the Regular Army has been completed. Thousands have been issued to the National Guard and full delivery is expected by June 1941.

In 1938, we did not have enough gas masks to take care of our existing forces. Today, in spite of increases in personnel we have them in sufficient quantities for the Regular Army and enough under manufacture for early delivery for the National Guard.

In 1938, the Medical Department could not have met the requirements of supplies and equipment for an initial protective force. Today, it has completed its combat equipment for an army of approximately one-half million men.

I give you these examples not to imply that we are fully prepared anywhere in the munitions field. On the contrary, let me say unequivocally that we are not completely ready anywhere on our supply front. We lack trucks to meet the needs of the Regular Army. The National Guard has not been fully equipped with modernized artillery. Our quota of antiaircraft guns is not yet available. There are many weaknesses up and down the line. I merely point to a few of our achievements to indicate that a start already has been made. Our plans are sound. Our designs are satisfactory. Given the necessary time and funds, desired results will follow.

Our objective is critical items such as tanks, fieldpieces, and others of a noncommercial nature on hand to take care not only of the Regulars and the National Guardsmen but of all of those who will respond to the call of their country in the early months of a grave crisis. With the appropriations called for by the President, and now made available by Congress, we must translate money into supplies and equipment as rapidly as possible. By December 31, 1941, we expect to have practically all the critical items we need for approximately 1,000,000 men. Today, we have not enough of such items to take care of even the one-half million men in our Regular Army and National Guard.

Our plans for our Army envisage its possible use for the following purposes:

First, to provide garrisons in our overseas possessions to protect our naval installations—in the Panama Canal Zone, in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and in similar localities. For this purpose our General Staff has estimated a need for 70,000 soldiers. Today, we have approximately 65,000 in our overseas garrisons, but we are working toward the 70,000 goal.

Second, to protect America against raids. This means a force available on short notice sufficient to thwart any threat that may develop against the Panama Canal or the continental limits of the United States.

Third, to provide a basic force which can be expanded to meet the full needs of any grave emergency. This means, in turn, organizations reasonably manned and fully trained and equipped; officers, fully qualified and experienced, and enlisted men—every one of whom is potential noncommissioned or commissioned officer material.

The importance of having available a coterie of the latter in our Regular Army is patent to all of you. In training, they are indispensable. In battle, they may become the leaders of our platoons or our companies. All of you who served overseas are familiar with examples of sergeants and corporals who had to take over command of companies when the officers were put out of action. You, in Cincinnati, undoubtedly recall the example of one of your own men, Corp. John H. Morgan, of Company D, Ninth

Infantry, Second Division, winner of the Distinguished Service Cross, whose citation reads as follows:

"All of his superiors having been killed by a nest of machine guns, Corporal Morgan took command of his platoon, and in an extremely difficult attack wiped out a nest of five machine guns."

The Morgans in the ranks are often called upon to command. We look to our peacetime military organizations to inculcate in them the spirit of loyalty and leadership that prepares them for such contingencies.

The framework for our present peacetime Army was laid down in 1920, at a time of relative peace in the world. The Congress, after extensive hearings, enacted the present National Defense Act. This basic law authorized 280,000 men in the Regular Army; and this is our objective today.

When the Low Countries were invaded we had a Regular Army of but 227,000 enlisted men. This force we hope to expand to maximum authorized strength. Completely equipped and properly trained, it constitutes a minimum requirement for national security. We must strive to reach the 280,000 figure for the Regular Army without delay.

Consider for a moment the figure of 280,000 Regular Army men as an objective. Note the extent of its modesty. Today there are 13 nations in the world with larger standing armies. Add our present National Guard of 235,000 and we would have an available M-day force of 515,000. Together with their officers, they represent at most 550,000, or a rank of but eighteenth among the land forces which other countries have available for possible M day.

At the time of the Munich appeasement our Army, including all trained reserves, gave us a standing of thirteenth among the nations of the world. Among those that preceded us were Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, and Belgium. Today, despite the fact that these four nations have been eliminated as military powers, we have slipped to seventeenth. Certainly no one can say that the War Department, in looking toward a force of approximately 515,000 enlisted men in both Regular Army and National Guard at this time, has set more than a minimum goal.

The President's program is a modest one. It does not promise to whip a large army into shape overnight. It does not assure us an immediate reserve of munitions to take care of the men called to arms in the first 6 months of a major emergency. It merely provides for reasonable preparedness in the disturbed world of today to be achieved with the aid and hearty cooperation of industry with a minimum of delay.

These munitions will cost money. They are, indeed, expensive. But remember, our military forces are a necessity, not a luxury. Nor is the reason for the cost difficult to ascertain. Man for man, item for item, the cost to America is greater than in any other country. Our soldiers are better paid, better fed, better clothed, and should be better equipped than those of any other army in the world; and who of you would have it otherwise?

Totalitarian governments pay their bills by fiat. They conscript their labor. They confiscate capital. Our Government pays in good American dollars for value received. Our labor is free to move about and it has the right to bargain. Our capitalist system encourages private industry and individual enterprise. Of course, we pay more for those American rights and privileges and who of you would have it otherwise?

The realization of the President's program will present many problems to industry which it will meet, I am confident, with enthusiasm and with energy. The load itself does not constitute a major problem. It will not displace normal production to any material degree. Conversion of the entire output of great industrial plants is not yet involved. The difficulty is not in the load but in the nature of the load. For one thing, it makes special demands for skill that are hard to fill.

In modern battle we demand not only a disciplined fighter, but a skilled mechanic. He must have a firm grasp of the powers and capabilities of his weapons as well as the strength and the courage to use them intelligently and efficiently. Guns, tanks, planes, and the other numerous battle accessories today call for craftsmen skilled in handling machines, as well as fighters bred in discipline. Any ordinary chauffeur can drive a car, but the pilot of a heavy tank who must traverse varied terrain, climb over steep hills, drive through thick forests, wade across deep gullies, and speed along wide open fields while planes from above and artillery from the flank shower him with a deadly spray, must indeed be a mechanic in arms; and behind the pilot are the army maintenance men who must keep the wheels rolling.

This is only one side of the demand for skill. Behind our planes, our tanks, our trucks, and all of our modern, delicate engines of war is the manual dexterity of our industrial mechanic. For the production of our war equipment and our munitions in our civilian factories we must look to deft hands. Where and how are we going to obtain this skill?

Here in Cincinnati we should experience little difficulty. You have done an admirable job in developing skilled labor. Since 1828, your Mechanics Institute has been helping to meet the need for trade and technical education in Cincinnati. Since 1906, you have provided the so-called cooperative education system of training for young engineers which is known throughout America. This plan for which the practical facilities of industry, as well as the theoretical courses of the educational institutions, are used cooperatively, has been continued for more than 30 years in Cincinnati. From here it has spread to many parts of the country.

Your vocational high-school system, called the occupationally segregated vocational-school system, or the Cincinnati plan, has attracted the attention of industrialists, educators, and labor leaders everywhere.

Your program of trade and industrial education with its unique emphasis on separate trade high schools for various industries has paid you dividends in developing special skills. Your schools for automotive, building, electrical, printing, mechanical, and tailoring trades have prepared young men for jobs in peace and in war.

Cincinnati has always believed that any type of training or education needed by a worker to make him a better worker, capable of turning out a better product, is a matter of public interest, definitely related to the economic power of your city and deserving of public support.

Your trade and industrial educational facilities have brought your community many industrial advantages. May they be used always in the construction of useful instruments toward peace.

When I first accepted the invitation to speak before you today I had hoped to devote my remarks to what the Army and Cincinnati have done for each other in time of peace. With that in mind, I sought data on the work of our Army engineers in the Cincinnati district. I learned of the splendid progress that has been made here on two of the country's greatest river-control projects.

First, the great canalization project of the main Ohio River with its 9-foot channel extending over a length of 981 miles by the construction of 47 locks and dams;

Second, the flood-control project, which provides for 78 reservoirs and local-protection works at 129 cities and towns.

Both of these projects are moving along in a satisfactory manner and are bringing blessings to you in Cincinnati and the Ohio Valley.

The Army, as you in the Ohio Valley so well know, is a factor in peace as well as in war. Would that we could use it always merely for the promotion and the development of such projects as those along the Ohio.

Its principal job, however, is to be ready for a grave emergency in which men must face battle; and it is toward the development of a strong army, capable of taking its place in battle, if need be, that we must now exert our principal energies. It is for that reason that I have devoted myself principally to the preparedness phase of our Army's activities.

In adequate defense we have our greatest protection against the scourges of war which today are destroying the old world. America has been and still is the abiding place for the civilization of the world. We must keep it so.

Kansas—The Natural Spot for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

STATEMENT BY THE KANSAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement prepared by the Kansas Industrial Development Commission in regard to the natural advantages of the State of Kansas in any program of national defense. Kansas, in a spirit of patriotic devotion, offers its abundant resources toward the program of national defense.

The statement is as follows:

Of the 48 States, Kansas is the natural choice for the location of national-defense supply and equipment factories. In Kansas, these plants will be (1) safely inland, (2) close to ample raw materials, (3) served by modern transportation, (4) in the midst of adequate loyal labor, and (5) near abundant basic food stuffs. Only Kansas offers all these advantages—because Kansas is:

1. Exactly in the geographical center of the Nation.

2. First in volcanic ash production. First in deposits of native chalk. Second in grain sorghums. Third in salt production. Third in chat production. Third in zinc output. Eighth in mineral production. Tenth in cement output.

3. Served by 9,000 miles of railroads. Served by over 9,000 miles of State highways bisected by the largest number of United States highways.

4. Supplied with an abundance of loyal, intelligent, American-born labor. First in per capita wealth. First in college students per 1,000 persons. Fourth in percentage of high-school students.

5. First in wheat, wheat storage, and flour milling. First in the shipment of eggs. Second in alfalfa. Second in creameries. Fourth in meat packing. Fifth in dressed poultry shipped.

In addition to these outstanding, definite advantages, Kansas also has a sound, cooperative, business-like administration of State government. And this State government pledges itself to cooperate fully in whatever measures are necessary to assure the continued security of the United States.

Proposed Aviation Base at Tchfuncta Park, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 21 of the Legislature of Louisiana, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Civil Aeronautics Authority to establish an aviation base at or near the Tchfuncta Park, St. Tammany Parish, La.

Whereas the United States, in its defense program, is seeking to establish aviation bases in various sections of the country, and

Whereas certain lands belonging to the Department of Conservation of the State of Louisiana, and being situated north of Highway No. 190 near the Tchfuncta Park, St. Tammany Parish, La., would be an ideal location, and

Whereas the said lands could be easily cleared for such purpose, and there is presently located upon said lands certain buildings that would be suitable to such an aviation base, and

Whereas such a location would, being in the Ozone Belt, be an ideal location from the standpoint of health, and could be used as a defense point from attacks through the Gulf of Mexico: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That we do respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States, now in session, and the Civil Aeronautics Authority that the proper authorities vested with the selection of air bases in the national-defense program be requested to make said location one of its air bases; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Louisiana senatorial and the congressional Representatives in Washington, and to the press.

America and Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR JOHNSON

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the able Assistant Secretary of War, the Honorable Louis Johnson, last night delivered a very patriotic and timely address in Fairmont, W. Va., at the dedication of the Fairmont Hospital. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, on other occasions that I have been privileged to speak in Fairmont I have greeted you as West Virginians, as worthy sons and daughters of a mighty State which rightly takes pride in its individual identity within our indivisible Union. Tonight I salute you in terms of your broader identity, as American citizens who stand firmly united beneath the one flag that symbolizes our common democracy, a Nation of free men and women determined to maintain for themselves and posterity the principles of liberty and justice upon which this Government was founded, and upon which it stands securely tonight. Thank God, that is the spirit that moves America, from ocean to ocean and border to border, in this hour of stress and danger.

In union we have ever found our greatest strength. As a people who love peace and hate war we have always been prone to forget the needs of an adequate national defense. Because we covet no other peoples' riches; because we are inspired by no dreams of world domain, we have felt secure behind the formidable barriers of vast seas to the east and west of us, while safely flanked on the north and south by none but friendly nations. We have preferred to tread the path of democracy, seeking to fashion our individual destiny as free men endowed with the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have taken pride in the achievements of our individual States, in the friendly rivalry between our home communities. But never have we failed when emergency has crossed the horizon of our hemisphere to rise as a united people to defend and hold secure those rights and privileges which we cherish as Americans.

So we stand tonight, as a people keenly aware of the danger that confronts us, as a people with but a single thought—to keep the legions of aggression and the mailed fist of the conqueror from our shores. State lines have vanished overnight; individualism is submerged for the moment in the will of a united people to guard the common welfare and the national security upon which the whole principle of individual rights and progress depend. So, with deep personal pride in this State which is my home, which has given me opportunity and contentment and the love of a happy family, I greet you in the spirit of the times, as fellow Americans.

The purpose that brings us together tonight seems to me to be typically American. We have assembled to dedicate an institution devoted not to the destruction of life but to its preservation; not to the intensification of human suffering and misery but to their alleviation. We are here to dedicate this hospital, a place where men and women and children beset by illness and racked by pain shall have the finest care that science, knowledge, and sympathy can marshal to relieve their suffering and return them to sound health and active productivity again. Here we find all of the finest motives and ideals of our American concept to make life better, not worse; to improve, not to destroy; to give life, not to take it away.

As we think of these things my mind goes back in history to the year 1888, back to another great humanitarian event which took place in the midst of another dark period in world affairs, back to the words of Louis Pasteur, one of the greatest scientists and benefactors of humanity in all the ages. In that year already the alliances were being fashioned and the foundations laid for the Great World War. But even as aggressors prepared to unleash the devastation of force and conquest upon civilization, in Paris men assembled to found the Pasteur Institute. In a brief address on that occasion Pasteur caught a vision of things to come and drew an everlasting parallel when he said:

"Two opposing laws seem to me now in contest. The one, a law of blood and death, opening out each day new modes of destruction forcing nations to be always ready for battle. The other, a law of peace, work, and health, whose only aim is to deliver man from the calamities which beset him. The one seeks violent conquests; the other, the relief of mankind; the one places a single life above all victories, the other sacrifices thousands of lives to the ambition of a single individual. Which of these two laws will prevail, God alone knows. But of this we may be sure: That science, in obeying the law of humanity, will always labor to enlarge the frontiers of life."

How like the situation that confronts us, our Nation, today. Those same two opposing forces are in contest, one still seeking violent conquests and the other the relief of mankind. Each day witnesses the unfolding of new forces of destruction, and not thousands but millions of lives are being sacrificed to the ambition of a single individual. But of this we in this generation may be sure: If we remain steadfast to the principles of freedom and justice upon which we have built the citadel of our Nation, if we maintain ourselves in sufficient strength to discourage aggression and to put it down if aggression is brought against us, we shall live to see the frontiers of life enlarged in a world of peace and progress.

We, in America, did not bring upon ourselves the emergency which now confronts us. Neither by act, word, nor deed have we invited threats from over the seas to our peace and our way of life. Your Government did everything within its power to discourage and prevent the war that is now making a shambles of much of Europe and that threatens to reverse the onward course of civilization by centuries. Your Government long ago warned that we must prepare to defend this hemisphere against the tyrants of aggression and conquest by force. But your Government's voice was as that of one crying in the wilderness. Some who heard refused to believe the truth, while others believed but were afraid to admit it even to their inner conscience. And now we face not prediction or theory but stark realism.

It contributes nothing to the need of the hour to say, "I told you so." It contributes nothing to getting done the job that must be done to indulge ourselves with wishful regrets. It certainly contributes nothing to our future security to go into national hysteria. It contributes nothing to the unity of mind which we need so badly for either party to blame the other for our state of preparedness, or the lack of it, according to the opinion you may hold on that point. If we are to meet and overcome the problems which are

before us, we must be as realistic as the emergency itself and unswerving in our faith in America.

To be realistic the people must be informed, and in that belief the War Department has adhered strictly to the policy of telling you the truth about the state of our national defense. Sometimes the truth is not pleasant. The plain truth is that our national defense is neither as bad as some individuals have pictured it nor as good as it should be in the presence of modern methods of warfare. I wish that I could report that our needs will be met within this year, but in good conscience I cannot do so. At least another year must elapse after this one ends before we can truthfully say that our national defense is adequate, and we will be ready then only if we build intensely, work intensely, accumulate intensely, and maintain the intensified kind of teamwork that wins.

On the brighter side of the picture, let it be said that we are not the push-over that recent hysteria has led many of our people to believe. We are infinitely stronger today than we were a decade ago, and stronger than we were a year ago. We have a stronger Navy, a stronger Army, and a stronger Air Corps. Furthermore, while the oceans are not the formidable barrier that they once were, they are still something more of a hop than rivers or a channel 24 to 100 miles wide. But there is scant comfort to be gained from these facts. To be lulled back into a state of contented ignorance by such thoughts would be national suicide.

Methods of warfare have changed and are continuing to change with a rapidity and completeness that stuns the imagination. What seemed to be impossible yesterday is an accomplished fact today; and that which may seem fantastic today may well become a comparatively simple operation tomorrow. No longer can we afford to wait and build our preparedness in the light of war experience, expecting thereby to have the advantage of building only the best and most modern. We must build to meet the needs of the hour; and if what we have built is made obsolete by new weapons and new methods, we must build to meet those advances. Even further than that, we must use our inventive genius, which has never been lacking in the past, to build better and better than anyone else. And when we have reached the pace of national security against aggression from overseas, we must hold that pace and never again permit ourselves to be found in the condition we face tonight.

The day when we could put guns into the hands of citizen soldiers, teach them the manual of arms, and send them out to match their spirit and brawn against that of an enemy has passed. Wars today are fought more with spirit and brains. Soldiers must be trained as specialists who understand intricate and technical mechanical equipment, and they cannot be taught these things in a matter of days or even months. They must be prepared to strike with the power and speed of lightning, because that is the way wars hit now. Our men must know not only the tactics of modern warfare but also how to operate tanks, how to handle airplanes, and how to fire modern weapons accurately. In other words, they must not only be soldiers but also competent engineers.

The need of our Nation today is more ships, more guns, more airplanes, more munitions, more men, and more experience. We need ships enough to protect us not only on one ocean but on both oceans; ships enough to defend not only the shores of these United States and their possessions but also to keep an aggressor from establishing bases and beachheads in this hemisphere. We need enough airplanes, guns, munitions, and men in the Army to carry out the same broad hemisphere-defense program. In none of these categories are we sufficiently prepared and in each the deficiencies must be filled if we are to be secure in our own part of the world.

Our standing Army and National Guard combined represent a strength of less than 500,000 men. As I speak to you tonight, we do not have enough vital equipment to supply even this force, not to mention the vast amount we would need if this or another emergency should bring us to M day. No army can fight without adequate equipment and a continuous supply as the emergency proceeds. Because we had time after we entered the last war to prepare the full might of America for a knock-out blow we must not tamper with the dangerous idea that we would be so favored again. We must be ready for instantaneous action. We are bending every effort to put our present forces in readiness, but I cannot tell you, in all honesty, that this will be accomplished before the end of next year. Thus, I have tried to give you the other side, the darker side, of the picture. It is not a pleasant story, but it should be told and you have a right to know it.

Who is to blame for this state of unpreparedness? Again, I say that if we are to be realistic in approaching and overcoming this vital problem we must be bluntly frank. The truth is that we are all responsible. This is no time for anyone to be passing the buck. Let us retrace for a moment the history of the last 22 years. When the World War ended we had the most powerful military machine in the history of the world. Industry was geared to wartime production and supplies were rolling out in unlimited quantity. Our Army approached 5,000,000 men, most of them fully trained, and at least half of them battle-seasoned troops. Our Navy, built or building, was the most powerful on the high seas. But what happened?

The symphony of guns came to a sudden end, the victory was won, and within a matter of hours we turned to thoughts of peace and progress in our more normal American way. No enemy loomed over the horizon, none seemed capable of marching against us. Our men were demobilized quickly, industry turned to the herculean task of readjusting itself to the peacetime tempo, and we literally gave away enormous quantities of munitions and critical supplies. Then came the Washington Arms Conference, a venture noble in conception but deadly in its results to our national defense. Within a very few years our Army slipped from first place down to eighteenth place among the nations—smaller even than that of tiny Greece.

The Washington conference, by sinking American battleships while others sank blueprints, dropped our Navy from first to second place. And still the public cry for greater and greater economies at the expense of national defense became louder and louder.

Let no one misconstrue my intentions. I do not seek to foist the blame for unpreparedness upon other administrations of another party. Neither do I seek to raise political implications. I desire only to face the truth honestly, to bring home the point that the people themselves demanded that these things be done, and in response to that demand the Government did them. War was a thing of the past, national defense was expensive—as ever it will be—and as a whole people we quickly forgot the lesson we thought we had learned as a result of the World War.

The Congress had mapped out a program in 1920 which if it had been carried out would have maintained us in a state of reasonable preparedness. But it was not carried out. A number of times your Government attempted to arouse the people to the fact that wars were still possible, that our own country was not without danger, and an attempt was made to restore our defense to a reasonable state of efficiency. A previous administration, for instance, sought to bring our cruiser strength up to a level which would still have been below that of two other nations. Washington literally swarmed with lobbies of well-intentioned but utterly uninformed men and women who fought even that modest program with every power at their command. In the end a number of ships were built, but less than the strength that had been urged by the qualified men in the Navy Department who knew the risk we were running.

When the present administration came into office a start was made toward reconstructing the national defense, but who will deny with a clear conscience that the people even then were ready for it. Already the rumblings of the present war in Europe could be heard in the distance. We began to build up the Navy, increase the strength of the Army, and construct a substantial Air Corps, but still the people were not ready for the tremendous building program that eventually was to be the price for years of negligence and chance taking. Yes; even as late as last September, when the European war became a reality, the recommendations of your national-defense departments in Washington were called fantastic. And now, as ever it must be, the time has come to pay the piper.

Every thinking man and woman in America tonight is asking, "Is there yet time?" I answer, "Yes." There is yet time if every one of us puts a stout shoulder to the wheel, puts an end to name calling, bickering, and buck passing, and gets down to work. The job before us is the defense of our country, our homes, our future, our liberties, and the right of our children to inherit the blessings of a free America, as we inherited them from our fathers. America's first line of defense is the unity of our people. As a united people we can and will do the job.

In preparedness we shall find our surest security against war. If the going is hard and the burden heavy, let us remember that the sacrifices called for and the cost that must be paid are but a pittance as compared to the stake that might be the forfeit for temporizing and hesitating in this critical hour. Let us build our defenses so strong that aggressors will think long before attacking us, and if any should dare, let us be prepared to teach them a lesson so stern that for generations to come future tyrants will hold the might of America in awe and fear. We covet no people's land or resources. Let none dare covet ours.

Floyd B. Olson Memorial Exercises, Minneapolis, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a superb speech delivered last night by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] at the Floyd B. Olson memorial exercises held in Minneapolis, Minn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not often that a whole region joins in paying tribute to a man—but then it is not often that a region produces a leader like Floyd B. Olson. He was close to the earth—though he towered up 6 feet tall. He was a natural leader and a fearless fighter. Wherever

a battle was raging over some public issue you found him giving the last ounce of his strength and energy to the cause he thought right. He was an unswerving believer in the principles of democracy and the right of ordinary citizens. I consider it a privilege to join with you in honoring a Minnesotan who, if death had not robbed us of him, would today be playing the significant role in national affairs that he played for so many years in the affairs of this State.

In this hour of peril the Nation needs a voice like Floyd Olson's, a voice lifted to counteract the hysterical Wall Street and British propaganda that is being hurled at us from all directions to get this country into war. At a time when the waves raised by the tragic explosion of the European Continent are reaching and threatening to engulf us we need a man able to maintain, and anxious to fight for, his basic ideals of civil liberties, human freedom, and economic progress even in time of crisis.

Olson lived through the last European war, when university professors were fired without a hearing on faked charges of being pro-German, when your own Senator SHIPSTEAD's house was painted yellow, when labor leaders were framed on charges of sabotage, when the accident of having been born abroad made men the subject of suspicion and persecution. To his everlasting credit let it not be forgotten that Floyd Olson stood firm against such hysteria and helped to rebuild the spirit of tolerance and fair play after that hysteria subsided.

Governor Olson was a forceful speaker and a great Governor. He recognized the difference between the stump speeches of a campaign and the speeches made by him as Governor of all the people. He carried his points by the force of his intellect and not by the heat of his utterance. In his position as chief executive he was calm, cool, and deliberate. Constantly he cautioned his real friends, the worker and the farmer, against those inflammatory tactics which destroy thought and boomerang in the end against the users. In times of great stress he never tried to get legislation passed by exciting the public mind.

Today as never before in the history of our country we need cool and analytical men of Olson's character, men who do not resort to the crude vocabulary of melodrama in discussing public affairs. We must guard against the incendiary word as we guard against the incendiary bomb; they are equally destructive of democracy. A few days ago the Philadelphia Record, recognized as one of the leading administration papers in this country, made the sensational statement that we are now in the European war. Under the heading "We're In" there appeared words such as these: "Make no mistake about it. The action of President Roosevelt and the Navy Department in deciding to send bombing planes and guns to the Allies puts us into the war on the side of England and France.

"We can't get half into the war and stay half out.

"We must recognize that Hitler and the German Nation already look upon our arming of the Allies as an act of war; that in German minds we are now a German foe as much as France or the British Empire.

"We're in."

If we are in this war, we are in it without the approval of the American people. At no time have the American people given a mandate to the President or to the Congress to lead us into war. We are still a democracy and we should find out by democratic process if the American people want war. It has been said that we will give the Allies all aid short of war. But what is short of war? Can we drive an automobile 80 miles an hour down a road toward a precipice, keep feeding the engine gas and suddenly stop short of the precipice? Are we to strip the United States of its planes, destroyers, and battleships one by one as those of the Allies are brought down or sunk and leave our country denuded of its already too few weapons?

These are large questions, and they must be calmly and thoroughly debated. The right answer cannot be found by a stampede of Congress. The answer can be found only by calm and cool deliberation.

A distinguished Senator the other day made an impassioned plea—he waved the "bloody shirt"—and all but demanded a declaration of war now. He closed by saying: "Wake up, Americans, wake up!" I repeat what he said, but for quite a different reason.

I say to you mothers of America, to the youth of the country, to the businessmen, and to the workers, wake up, or you'll find yourselves in war.

Your boys killed and maimed upon the battlefields of France; your hospitals and insane asylums filled; the debts of the country increased beyond all comprehension; and your American way of life gone forever. And for what?

At nearby Fort Snelling, in your State, stands one of the largest veterans' hospitals in the United States. There, row on row, floor on floor, lie the helpless wrecks of what were not so many years ago fine, healthy, young men. At St. Cloud is another institution housing those unfortunates who, though living in body, are dead in mind. Twenty years ago these men were the flower of Minnesota manhood, like the boys who are today in the university or in Carlton or in St. Olafs; they were the hope of their generation. But today they are the living testimonials of the last bloody war in Europe. Knowing these things—what do you think Floyd Olson would have said were he standing before you today aware of the forces at work to bring us again into the middle of Europe's turmoil?

Many people believe that the defeat of the Allies would mean an economic catastrophe for the United States. Undoubtedly the United States would be forced to readjust its foreign markets. But I would rather give up billions of dollars' worth of trade than the lives of millions of American boys. We are the richest nation in the world; we can tighten up our belts; we can work a little harder; some of those who want to get us into war might eat a little less and still preserve democracy—and the lives of our boys.

If we concentrate on solving our own economic problems at home and put $30,000,000,000 of idle capital to work, we will more than compensate for any possible loss in foreign trade.

If we should rush headlong into the European war, we would simply leave exposed our own domestic economy. Is not the sensible thing under the circumstances to build up our economy and at the same time build up our own defenses in a rational way?

If the people of this country want to go into another European war to save the world for democracy, with what will the country fight?

Our bare hands against the armored tanks and diving bombers of Mr. Hitler?

Will it fight with an Army of less than 300,000 men against the millions of trained mechanized forces of Germany?

Will it fight with its Navy and leave the Pacific bare to be attacked by Japan—an axis power who hates us?

Theodore Roosevelt said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." What are we doing?

The truth is, we are not prepared to carry on a war across the seas; nor is any other country equipped to invade the United States.

Gen. George C. Marshall recently testified before a congressional committee that "we do not visualize any invasion of this country. An air raid or something of that sort is possible, but, frankly, at the present time we do not find it in the offing."

No one person and no one party is to blame for our lack of defensive weapons. It was during a Republican administration that we destroyed our ships, and it was during another Republican administration that we did little or nothing to build them up. The truth is, the American people are not militaristically inclined. We have not wanted to spend money on armaments; but today, whether we like it or not, whether we want to spend the money or not, we must spend to modernize our defenses. But we must at the same time keep out of this European war. You must watch closely the actions of your Government to see that nothing is done which is going to lead American boys to slaughter upon foreign soil.

Have you read the recently issued report of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee? This report, prepared by a group of hard-headed realists who deal daily with the problem of building battleships and destroyers and guns, says that for the United States to go to war would mean a tragic sacrifice of the Nation's liberties and assets. Do you know that this committee, after listening to the testimony of the highest-ranking officers of our armed forces in secret session, says that the United States is not prepared to give any nation concrete help by intervening now, and that we will only jeopardize our own welfare by doing so?

Do you know that this Naval Committee report asks a question? It asks—I quote: "Why not face the basic military and economic fact that it is not within our power or means to create military or naval establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting their wars to this hemisphere?"

The propagandists talk about the European shambles in words such as justice, freedom, and liberty. Those are precious words, and those are precious things, but I ask, Is it not true that the war in Europe is concerned with many other things besides abstract principles?

Let us first determine whether this is the same old ghastly European struggle over the balance of power; of age-old hatreds and age-old quarrels, or whether it truly is a war for civilization. Let us determine whether it is a fight for world markets; for oil wells and gold mines; or for democracy and Christianity. These are the real questions. They are being obscured by the bombardment of propaganda.

Who is better qualified to tell us whether we have a place in this war than our American Ambassador to Great Britain, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy? I will read to you what he frankly said only a few months ago:

"There is no place in this fight for us. It's going to be bad enough as it is. As you love America, don't let anything that comes out of any country in the world make you believe you can make a situation one whit better by getting into the war. * * * There is no reason—economic, financial, or social—to justify the United States entering the war."

Let us find out what Ambassador Kennedy meant when he said this was not our war. Let us get at the private papers, the secret correspondence that will answer these questions. But don't let us take as answers the nervous reactions and emotions of amateur strategists or frightened bankers.

Let us weigh our decision in the light of the lessons of the past. The first World War was followed by starvation and revolution in Europe. Then came international money lending on a huge scale and the biggest speculative boom the world has ever seen. Panic followed. Germany collapsed as the money lending ceased. Out of the debris and ruins rose Adolf Hitler. When he finally came into office he did not lack for friends in England or the United States. Many were the reactionary statesmen and international bankers who regarded him as a stabilizing force.

The same men who have been so tragically wrong in handling their own affairs now want the United States to make good their errors by an outpouring of our blood and treasure.

Let me call your attention to a statement made in the Senate the other day. A Senator was referring to one of the most active propaganda agencies in the United States—the Committee to

Defend America by Aiding the Allies. They are placing full-page advertisements in all the leading papers of the country. Here is what the Senator said:

"Let us see the background of this committee * * * let us see who started it * * * 18 prominent bankers met secretly on the 29th day of April in New York to set up this committee."

Note that—"they met secretly." The Senator said the meeting was called by the former legal adviser of the British Embassy in the last World War, and among those who attended the secret meeting was Thomas W. Lamont, leading partner in the House of Morgan. Also there was Frank Polk, of the Morgan law firm. In other words, the same group of millionaires who helped drag us into the last war are back at the same old stand with the same old slogans endeavoring to get us into the present war. Of course, the last time they did not start out by saying we should send troops abroad—they merely started out by making loans abroad. The country should know where this propaganda is coming from and who the individuals are behind it.

Americans—don't let your boys be sacrificed for the sake of the British pound or the Wall Street dollar.

We in America today face an enemy. That enemy is the force that is slowly sapping the strength of our economic and financial system. Let it collapse, as it surely will if we are engulfed in another war, and democracy and liberty are gone. Wild-eyed leaders will arise, promising Utopia and bread. Reactionary leaders will also arise and promise more. Between them our people will be bedeviled. In the end some sort of disguised fascism will crack all of our democratic safeguards.

There is one sure way to produce that collapse—go into war. There is only one way to avoid it—stay out of war and correct the conditions that make 10,000,000 men idle and jobless. Seven years ago we started out in pursuit of this enemy. Three years ago we were talking about the ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. What has become of them? They are still with us, but our thoughts are being turned to Europe, when we ought to be thinking today of making democracy work in America. That is the best way to preserve democracy at home and to help democracies abroad.

There are no victors in warfare, only famine and death. Starvation will engulf Europe—starvation and the revolution of oppressed minorities who cannot be kept forever under the conqueror's heel.

These are the realities of war, not the birth of a brave, new world. In Germany a soldier's mother is notified of her son's death these days by this cryptic telegram, "Your son will not come home. Heil Hitler." Let us not pave the way for American mothers to receive a telegram which also says, "Your son will not come home. Hail democracy."

Tonight I have dwelt at some length on the question of the war because I feel that is exactly what Governor Olson would have done were he alive. We who knew Governor Olson know how today he would be fighting to keep us out of war. I can see him standing here, with his great physique and magnificent voice. I can see him carefully recounting the facts about the hundreds of thousands of killed and maimed boys that fell in the last war.

I can hear him pointing out to the Northwest the dreadful cost in human lives, not to mention the billions of dollars spent in explosives on the battlefields of Europe. I can hear him distinguish between the farmers and workers whose toil will be exacted and whose backs will be bowed under the war debts and higher costs of living, and between these clippers of coupons and great banking houses whose income and investments will be enhanced by war making. And finally, I can hear Floyd Olson warning the Democratic and Republican Parties that a new and great liberal antiwar party will be created unless they bind themselves in unmistakable terms to a program of keeping the United States out of the European war.

To What Is This a Commencement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS AT MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, to the graduating class of Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., on Sunday evening, June 16, on which occasion an honorary degree was conferred upon Justice Douglas.

I commend this patriotic address to those who are deeply concerned with all the problems of these uncertain hours.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the minds of thousands of college men and women who join in this 1940 commencement there is a single question: To what is this a commencement? While generations of graduates have asked that question, on only few occasions has the question burned as strongly as it does now.

The class of 1940 sees its world overrun by relentless force. It sees freedom snuffed out by sheer might. And it has the uneasy feeling that these events threaten our own way of life. As a result, the vast majority of young men and women of 1940 are searching more than ever for the part they may play in constructive service in the democratic cause.

But on many a campus there is doubt and confusion—doubt and confusion bred by a minority whose words and deeds have preached a doctrine of disbelief.

There are a few who seem unaffected by the issue now at stake overseas. There are a few who are cynical and suspicious of the democratic system. They call it archaic, decadent, and degenerate. To them it is a futile, fumbling process which does not meet the requirements of this age. But they fail to realize that democracy is a way of life, not an empty phrase to be renounced under the pressure of opportunism.

In a world where the kind of democracy we Americans have struggled to preserve is being threatened, disbelief or complacency must not be an American attribute.

These preachers of the philosphy of disbelief are easy prey to the foreign agencies of force and hate. Disbelief in our free institutions, disbelief in the adequacy of our democratic system to meet the needs of all our people is fatal. Indeed that disbelief or complacency is itself the most potent ally which any foreign ideology can obtain.

In view of current events abroad, the task which lies ahead for you is clear and well defined.

As you take on your responsibilities of American citizenship you will find fault with the way in which this democratic system has been managed by the generations which have preceded. And those who follow you will doubtless criticize and strive to undo much which you will do. They, like you, will not agree with Walt Whitman that "there will never be any more perfection than there is now."

Dissatisfactions of youth have potential constructive qualities. The boundless energies, the broad vision and idealism, and the great creative capacity of youth are foremost national assets. Those qualities alone make for a reappraisal by each generation of the work of the earlier one. And kaleidoscopic change makes that reappraisal and reorientation necessary.

But as you appraise the old and seek to fashion the new, let the thrust of your reasoning go deep; let your perception and analysis be keen. It is easy to be deluded by the seeming efficiency of the new foreign systems. But that mirage is no excuse for following little men on white horses.

It is almost effortless to be critical. But disagreement with some of the imperfections of the democratic system is no reason for failing to support it in these times.

Our right to criticize is one of the sacred constitutional privileges of the system we cherish. But even that is a hard-won privilege. It has not always existed. It has recently disappeared in other nations. Its exercise entails certain moral responsibilities. Those moral responsibilities are to create by words and action a deep and abiding confidence in our free institutions. The enlistment of the full energy and ability of your generation in that endeavor will be sufficient answer to those who may use the selfsame privileges for an ignoble purpose.

To preserve liberties it is first essential to preserve the system which makes liberties possible. That cannot be left to chance or the law of averages. It must be underwritten by the firm resolves and the energies of the entire people. It cannot be entrusted to the purveyors of a philosophy of defeatism. That philosophy is itself one of the most virulent poisons in modern social thought.

It is essential to understand the origin of much of this flabby, cynical attitude. The easy days of recent decades created a false sense of security and an indolence of mind and spirit. It also produced in some a scoffing indifference and a lack of faith, and in others a sheer materialistic philosophy.

Those forces weakened the democratic process. Those who succumbed to those influences did not assume responsibility for the continuing vitality and successful functioning of that process. Men and women of your training and capacity withdrew from active participation in it to sow seeds of doubt, distrust, and disillusionment. Or they devoted themselves exclusively to the pursuit of private gain without saving any of their creative powers for the city, State, or Nation or for society.

But rights are founded on responsibilities. The rights of a free people cannot survive persistent indifference or neglect of the duties of a free people. Civilization under a democracy is not the result of wishful thinking or exhortation. It is the product of a morale and zeal, of character and strength generated by united, coordinated, and continuous effort in all walks of life and conditioned by basic human and spiritual values.

In perilous days such as these, vitality of the democratic ideal calls for a supreme effort—spiritual as well as physical. The opportunity of a free people to govern themselves is dependent solely on their capacity to do so.

As our civilization becomes more complicated it entails increasing effort and attention. As stated by Mr. Justice Holmes at the turn of this century:

"When it is said that we are too much occupied with the means of living to live, I answer that the chief worth of civilization is just that it makes the means of living more complex; that it calls for great and combined intellectual efforts, instead of simple, uncoordinated ones, in order that the crowd may be fed and clothed and housed and moved from place to place. * * * More complex and intense intellectual efforts mean a fuller and richer life. They mean more life."

Those who measure the abundancy of life by the amount and quality of creative effort which life demands will envy you your opportunity. That opportunity is not merely to provide temporary protection and shelter for the institution of a free people against current assaults by foreign ideologies. In its broad aspects it entails such a practical demonstration of the efficacy of the democratic system under our constitutional form of government that those foreign ideologies cannot possibly withstand the competition.

Today the continued existence of free institutions is at stake on a world scale. Religious freedom, freedom of speech, political and economic democracy, due process of law, equal protection of the laws, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press—these are the very ingredients of our democratic system; they are part of the warp and woof of our constitutional government. They were won by our forefathers after bitter struggles and tremendous sacrifices. The history of their acquisition as part of our rich inheritance is written in blood as well as ink.

They come down to you not as interesting historic relics but as vital instruments for fulfillment today, as well as yesterday, of the deep desires and urgings of a free people. They assure that human and spiritual values will not be sacrificed in coordinating a nation's energies and resources to satisfy a nation's needs. These are the principles on which our representative government was founded; they have guided it throughout the years as its course has been charted; they have conditioned and influenced the thoughts and actions of all our statesmen for 150 years.

These are times when final choices must be made. Events will not defer to indecision or faltering action. Nor is there any place now for grandstand citizenship. That era has passed. And it takes more than resolution to create an invincibility in the democratic system. Faith and a grim resolve alone will not carry the day.

A tough fiber is necessary. Active, continuous contribution in the daily tasks of all walks of life is also necessary. Self-discipline of a free people based upon knowledge of what is at stake, self-sacrifice for the good of the whole, efficient performance of each daily job, however humble it may be, continuous propagation of the democratic faith—these will produce a greater national strength than any foreign dictatorship can create in its slaves.

By making those contributions, whether in business or the professions, in clubs or in bureaus, in hamlets or in capitals, you will have become active participants in a gigantic enterprise to save and protect human decency and spiritual values against the advent of barbarism and a dark age.

Those who say that it makes no difference to us whether democracy abroad is crushed overlook the virulent quality of the disease which has affected the world. That disease is not a localized infection, it is in the blood stream of the world organism. Because we are part of that organism we are tremendously affected. The further that virulent infection spreads, the closer it comes to our own vitals. The more the resistance to it is broken down the greater the risk of the ultimate triumph of disease.

The groups through which you move, the communities in which you live, the organizations of which you are a part need not merely discerning analysis of the defects, maladjustments, and deficiencies of the past. They need also the benefit of directive influences, constructive statesmanship, and concrete suggestions and actions for realization of the full economic and social benefits of the democratic system.

You are among those who can supply that intellectual leadership. The necessity of supplying it will keep you close to the actualities of life and will make you attentive to the practical requirements of democracy in action. Your undertaking to assume that position of leadership will release enormous constructive energies. It will supply cohesion throughout this republic. It will give direction to the efforts of multitudes. It will create a potent common idealism that will make penetration from within woefully futile. It will also create a tolerance which is the basic quality of all our free institutions.

Your training, background, and perception qualify you for a preeminent role of intellectual leadership. The Nation can ill afford to have you refuse or neglect it. The mere necessities of earning a living, the satisfaction of your personal needs, must not stand in the way. If the energies diverted by an early generation to sheer pursuit of pleasure are harnessed by you in propagation of the democratic faith through words and deeds, any achievement is possible.

Full utilization of the resources, the manpower, the intellect, and the spiritual reserves of this free people will make the decline or subjugation of the democratic faith impossible. But to attain that goal awakening of the responsibilities of citizenship is essential. With that awakening and with a united endeavor on a real partnership basis, we would have such a regeneration of the democratic faith that foreign ideologies would be relegated to psychiatric wards. Without that regeneration implements of war may be feeble defenses, indeed.

To those who fashioned this country democracy was the meat and drink of life. In more recent decades too many have assumed that democracy was merely something to be inherited. They have forgotten that democracy must be practiced vigorously. Each generation must earn the right fully to enjoy it. You who are graduated today must dedicate yourselves to a regeneration of this democratic faith. You go out to preserve it or you perish as free men and women. The most important continuous contribution which you can now make is the propagation of that faith.

May your rich heritage of civil liberties be utilized in that cause.

The Nation does not doubt your enlightened resolution, your ability to perform this task. It has great hope, great faith in your generation.

And when the history of this age is written may it be said that from the charred ruins of the philosophy of force and hate there emerged on this continent with your help a world leadership in the cause of free people.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT NEWS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have pronted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very significant editorial from the Detroit News of June 12 entitled "Whoa, Mr. President! Not So Fast, Please!"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News of June 12, 1940]

WHOA, MR. PRESIDENT! NOT SO FAST, PLEASE!

The eastern press, some sections of which already are advocating war, is saying that the President in his Charlottesville address at last rose to the occasion.

In our opinion, he rose considerably above the occasion and went far beyond the constitutional prerogatives of an American President.

The Constitution gives Congress sole power to declare war. President Roosevelt at Charlottesville himself declared war, or sought to declare war insofar as he could by committing this country to acts of war.

He said, as the Chief of State, "We will extend to the opponents of force (the Allies) the material resources of this Nation."

In so saying, he ripped away the thin disguise that had veiled his move, also without Congress' assent, to make Army supplies available to the Allies. In that, he had adopted the subterfuge of returning munitions to the manufacturers as "surplus" or "obsolescent." His promise that now "we" will extend aid identifies this aid as proceeding openly from the Government of the United States.

Under the Hague treaties on neutrality and by international usage such aid extended to a belligerent is an act of war. The President's acknowledgment of it has made this country a party to the war on the Allied side. Only action by Congress, which will be difficult, now can alter that.

Otherwise the country surely must be, if Germany wins, a party also to the peace and a fit subject for demands by the victor.

That means, barring action by Congress to restore neutrality, that the country already is in a position where it dare not let the Allies lose. It is committed to the war, and by a declaration, not of Congress but of the Chief Executive.

We do not believe the American people's support, to now, of the President's foreign policies contemplated any such usurpation of authority over the Nation's destiny. The people, of course, sympathize with the Allies and, on sympathetic grounds, overwhelmingly desire the defeat of Germany. But we do not believe they are ready to go to war, as the present policy says they must, to prevent an Allied defeat.

We hope the people will not mistake that clear meaning of the President's statement. He said, it is true, that simultaneously with the aid the Government will extend the Allies, the policy will be pressed of building up American defense against the possibility of German victory. Thus, by implication, there will be no military action by the United States, except in defense of our own hemisphere.

But let us look at that proposition clearly. Once committed to the war as a nonbelligerent against Germany, would the United States wait, before giving military aid abroad, until its Allies were utterly defeated and impotent? We think not. The present course, if the war lasts that long, will take the United States into it within a period of months.

That unspoken promise was to be found in what the President himself said at Charlottesville of the consequences for this country of a German victory, leaving it "a lone island in a world dominated by the philosophy of force." The philosophy of force in truth has dominated the world of nations since the beginning

of history—but let that pass and consider the President's prediction that in such a world the lot of Americans would be "a hopeless nightmare of a people without freedom, a people lodged in prison, handcuffed, hungry, etc."

If that is but half true, what are we waiting for? A President seeing such a fate in store for his country could not honorably delay long in sending to Congress, constitutionally, the message that will set our young men to fighting against it.

If the people agree to that prospect, well and good. But if it is not their sober and solemn conviction that the outcome of German victory would be as bad for America—for a well-armed and alert America—as their President's emotionally impulsive oratory has pictured it, let them speak up now before it is too late.

Let them call on Congress to restore American neutrality, so that aid extended the Allies will be confined to private sources and means countenanced by international law.

Harry Bridges

REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague the gentleman from California, Mr. LELAND M. FORD, called attention to some of the nefarious work of Harry Bridges on the Pacific coast, stating that 14 ships were tied up in San Pedro Harbor by reason of the work there of Harry Bridges at the present time. Subsequent to that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect, and who is chairman of the committee on which I have the honor to serve, read a telegram from the Los Angeles Steamship Association stating that the tie-up was due to a jurisdictional dispute between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. I shall place in the RECORD a letter from the A. F. of L., over the signature of George Meany, secretary-treasurer, showing that it is not a jurisdictional dispute; that there is no difficulty whatsoever between the employer and employees; and that the entire matter is a C. I. O., Harry Bridges, high-binding effort to sabotage valid contracts and satisfactory relations existing between the Consolidated Steel Corporation and A. F. of L. organizations. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the letter to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1940.

Hon. HARRY N. ROUTZOHN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUTZOHN: In response to your inquiry, I am submitting to you from our official reports the record in connection with the C. I. O. picket line at the Consolidated Steel Corporation plant at Long Beach, Calif., where four Maritime Commission ships are being built. This record given to you can be verified by Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles; Mayor Gentry, of Long Beach; and by Chief of Police William C. Wright, of Long Beach.

The Consolidated Steel Corporation is the largest steel fabricating plant in California. It erects steel for buildings, for oil-field work, and builds bridges throughout the States west of the Rocky Mountains. For several years it has had an agreement with the A. F. of L. Structural Iron Workers' Union which provided that all of its erecting work would be done by members of that organization.

When the Consolidated Steel Corporation entered into contracts with the Maritime Commission for the building of ships the A. F. of L. representatives of the workers involved started negotiations with the company with the idea in mind of securing the same type of agreement for the unions whose members would be employed in the shipyard. As a result, on May 13, 1940, a collective-bargaining agreement, the negotiating of which had been going on for several months, was formally signed by the Consolidated Steel Corporation; the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor; the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor; the Central Labor Council, the Building Trades Council, and the Metal Trades Council, of the city of Los Angeles, and by the national representatives of all of the A. F. of L. unions whose members would be employed. This agreement is what is known as a union-shop agreement.

Immediately after this collective-bargaining agreement had been signed a C. I. O. committee visited Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, and indicated to him that serious consequences would follow unless this collective-bargaining contract with the Consolidated Steel Corporation was canceled, A. F. of L. members thrown out of the Consolidated Steel Corporation's employment, and none but C. I. O. members employed.

The following day, at a conference between Mayor Bowron and Mayor Gentry held in Long Beach, a committee from the C. I. O. threatened that unless A. F. of L. members were thrown out of work and C. I. O. members employed in their places there would be riot and bloodshed and the probable tie-up of the entire port of Los Angeles.

The C. I. O. water-front unions in California, which have been incidentally under the complete direction of an Australian by the name of Bridges for some time, began to stir up sentiment by means of a radio broadcast for a picket line to be thrown around the Consolidated yard in Long Beach for the purpose of preventing A. F. of L. workmen from going to work and carrying out their part of the collective-bargaining agreement heretofore mentioned.

There are three ship-repair yards on the San Pedro side of the harbor, which employ C. I. O. workmen. The C. I. O. broadcasters advised their men employed in these yards to refuse to go to work at the regular starting time in order that they might assist in picketing the Consolidated yard, and carry out the C. I. O. purpose of preventing the A. F. of L. workmen from going to work. These instructions from the radio broadcasters representing the C. I. O. were carried out and the picket line designed to prevent our members from going to work rapidly increased until over 1,500 pickets were in front of the Consolidated yard. However, the police kept an open passage through the yard gate and our members were able to report for work, although compelled to assemble at the Labor Temple in Long Beach and to be conveyed by bus to the plant in order to do so.

There is no question of jurisdiction involved in this situation. The American Federation of Labor, through its representative organizations, has negotiated this contract with the employer and is carrying out this contract by erecting ships according to its terms. The C. I. O. has no men in this plant. In fact, they do not seem to have anything in this plant except a desire to compel both workers and employer to carry out their activities under the domination of Mr. Bridges. Their action in picketing the Consolidated yard in Long Beach, Calif., is just about as justifiable as Hitler's invasion of Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

Despite all their efforts, however, the American Federation of Labor is carrying out its contract with the Consolidated Steel Corporation and the Maritime Commission ships are being built according to schedule. However, the failure of the C. I. O. to be successful in this effort has led them to establish picket lines in front of any shop in this locality where an A. F. of L. man is employed irrespective of whether or not the C. I. O. has any grievance in the plant. This picketing has brought about other picketing in retaliation against C. I. O. plants in San Pedro and Long Beach.

Our latest information is that a conciliator endeavored to effect an adjustment in this area between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. by an agreement between both organizations that the picketing of the other's plants should immediately cease. The C. I. O. and A. F. of L. both agreed to this, but last evening we were informed that the C. I. O. has repudiated this agreement and is now again picketing A. F. of L. shops on the San Pedro side of the harbor with the object of driving all A. F. of L. members from that city.

The picketing still continues at the Consolidated plant but despite this the full force of employees has gone to work daily and as mentioned heretofore there has been no interference with the progress schedule of maritime ship construction in the Consolidated Steel Corporation's yard.

Trusting that the information contained in this letter presents a full answer to your inquiry, I am,

Very truly yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
Secretary-Treasurer, American Federation of Labor.

Rebuilding America—Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address

which I delivered over a Nation-wide radio hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co. here in Washington this afternoon.

Ladies and gentleman of the radio audience, I am addressing my remarks today to the farmers of America. In the beginning I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. and associated radio stations, for giving me this opportunity to speak for a few minutes to the tillers of the soil, the farmers of the Nation, who constitute our first line of defense, and form the bulwark of our American institutions—the men and women whose toil feeds and clothes the world, who labor the longest hours, pay the highest taxes, endure the most hardships, and receive the smallest compensation per hour of any laborers in America—who fight the country's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace.

We are in the midst of a great movement to build up our national defenses. If we desire to make our country strong, impregnable, invincible by any force which the nations of the world might send against us, the best thing we can do is to promote the prosperity and improve the living conditions of the people in the rural districts; and the greatest movement that has yet been instituted toward that end is that of rural electrification—taking to the farmers of this Nation the benefits of electricity, the world's greatest national resource outside of the soil from which we live, and supplying it to them at rates they can afford to pay—rates based upon the actual cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

Speaking of national defense, let me disabuse your minds of any idea that Congress is preparing to plunge this country into the European war. Practically all of us sympathize with the Allies in their present struggle, and everything has been done to aid them that could be done under the circumstances, within the bounds of international law—everything short of war. But that does not mean that we are preparing to plunge into the conflict ourselves. We don't know what the future might bring, but a careful survey of the present Congress indicates that the Members of the House of Representatives are unanimously opposed to plunging this country into the European war. And I might add that they are opposed to a final adjournment of Congress at this time. A majority of the Members feel as I do that we ought to remain in session during this crisis.

But we are building up the defenses of the Nation as rapidly as possible, in order to make our country so strong that no foreign power, or combination of foreign powers, would dare attack us—now or in the years to come.

But I want to talk to you for a few minutes about the war that never ends—the unceasing war the farmers have to wage against all enemies, from the vicissitudes of the weather to the fluctuations of the stock market.

The farmers of this country have had imposed upon them by a former administration tariffs, or indirect taxes, that levied a tax upon everything they had to buy from the cradle to the grave; the farmers pay the highest transportation rates known, and the highest rate of taxes according to the incomes they earn. They have paid the highest interest rates, and up to the time this administration came into power, nine out of ten of them were denied the use of any electricity at all.

Seven years ago I began the drive to electrify the farm homes of America; to provide the farmers with electricity to light their homes, operate their radios, their water pumps, their washing machines, their electric irons, their refrigerators, their feed grinders, and all those other appliances that go to make farm life more pleasant and more attractive, lighten the farmer's burdens, and lift from the shoulders of the farm women the loads of drudgery under which they have struggled throughout the centuries. In this battle I have had the support of the liberal-minded Members of the House and Senate, as well as that of the administration itself, and our success has exceeded even our fondest expectations.

Yet we have just begun; this battle must be carried on until we electrify every farm home in America at reasonable rates, or at rates based upon the actual cost of generation, transmission, and distribution. My goal is to get this power to every farmer at the standard T. V. A. rates, or at the rates now charged the farmers in the Tennessee Valley area, which are as follows:

The first 50 kilowatt-hours a month, 3 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 150 kilowatt-hours a month, 2 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 200 kilowatt-hours a month, 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month, 4 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Now let me repeat those rates, so that you can take them down:

The first 50 kilowatt-hours, 3 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 150 kilowatt-hours, 2 cents a kilowatt-hour.
Next 200 kilowatt-hours, 1 cent a kilowatt hour.
Next 1,000 kilowatt-hours, 4 mills a kilowatt hour.

I know it will be pointed out that the farmers in the T. V. A. area are being charged 4 cents instead of 3 cents for the first 50 kilowatt-hours and 3 cents instead of 2 cents for the next 50 kilowatt-hours a month. But that extra 1 cent on the first 100 kilowatt-hours a month goes to pay for his lines. When they are paid out that extra 1 cent on the first 100 kilowatt-hours will be taken off.

Two years ago I went on the floor of the House and demanded that $100,000,000 be provided for rural electrification for the next fiscal year. Many Members felt that the amount was too large, but when these funds were made available the demand was so great that they were soon exhausted. By that time I was like the Chinaman who saw the bear trailing him through the snow in Alaska. He said, "Ah, you lika my tracks, I make you some more." The farmers liked this procedure so well that at this session of Congress I secured an extra $60,000,000, which, added to the $40,000,000 already provided, will give us $100,000,000 for rural electrification during the coming fiscal year. Now, don't any of you city folks who are listening get excited. This money will all be paid back.

I have also secured the adoption of a provision in the relief bill, or the lending-spending bill, to permit cooperative power associations to use W. P. A. labor in building their rural lines, in order to reduce the cost and enable them to build additional miles of lines through the sparsely settled areas and to reach every home in the territory covered by one of these cooperative associations.

I hope each and every cooperative power association throughout the country will take advantage of this provision and help us to electrify every farm home in America. We are also making a drive to provide cooperative cold-storage units for the rural communities throughout the Nation in order to enable farmers to save their meats, vegetables, poultry, eggs, milk, etc., and have them fresh at all times of the year, thereby saving millions of pounds of food that is now going to waste every year.

We are rebuilding the farm communities of our country. The trek from the farm to the cities is on the wane. The movement is now back to the farm. The deserted village is coming back.

Under this program farmers in the rural communities may enjoy all the comforts and conveniences of city life without the noise, the jams, the city taxes, and other annoyances or inconveniences.

Your Congressman can aid you greatly in working out this program if he is in sympathy with rural electrification. If he is not in sympathy with it, you can easily find it out. He that is not with us is against us; any man who throws cold water on this program is opposed to it at heart.

I repeat, this is the greatest movement for the benefit of the American farmers that has yet been instituted, and I hope that everyone, in Congress or out of Congress, who is in sympathy with it will snap into it and help us to rebuild the farming sections of America and make this the richest, the brightest, the most prosperous, the strongest, and most contented Nation this world has ever seen.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. SCRUGHAM

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the amazing collapse of the democratic governments of Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France within the past few weeks, and the perilous position of the far-flung British Empire, should focus the attention of every citizen on the critical situation confronting our own country.

Following the complacent and somewhat egotistical spirit of the military leaders of England, France, and our own country, we have lived for more than 20 years in a literal fool's paradise insofar as the problem of national defense is concerned. The day is now here when the best thought and energy of the leadership of America must be devoted to an effective campaign for domestic rearmament. This program is now in its formative stage and has the following objectives:

First. To increase domestic production for military and civilian needs.

Second. To develop and study transportation of all kinds.

Third. To study the availability of all kinds of military supplies.

Fourth. To coordinate efforts of producers and to allocate raw materials available to manufacturers according to priority of need.

Fifth. To establish harmonious relations between consumers, industrialists, and labor.

Sixth. To make places for those persons, especially veterans of the last war, who through physical infirmity or otherwise cannot take active parts in the above-mentioned lines of endeavor.

At the outset it must be clearly understood that the Nation is in the throes of what may be termed a "transition economy." Old motivations of individual initiative and of profit and loss are being changed. The entire Nation is beginning to operate under a coordinated economy vaguely similar to the Fascist states of Europe. For example, automobile manufacturers may not bring out new-model cars but will devote their available personnel and machinery to the manufacture of tanks and airplanes regardless of profit. Steel works will

concentrate on the production of parts for warships, armor plate, and so forth, instead of seeking new business elsewhere. Miners will seek to produce strategic minerals such as tungsten, manganese, mercury, and antimony instead of the usual production of gold, silver, and copper, and so forth. Sooner or later this transition economy will affect nearly every business in the United States.

The President has already appointed a National Defense Commission to study and report on the rearmament problems, and Congress has made ample appropriations to put their recommendations in effect.

Of most direct interest to the State of Nevada is one of the projects to utilize the services of war veterans and others who do not fit into the general plan for industrial mobilization. On the extreme southern end of the State lies an area of some 3,800 acres situated in the Colorado River bottom lands. Water for irrigation is readily available by pumping, and adequate funds are carried in the 1941 Interior appropriation bill to fully finance the project. A law has been passed by Congress to permit the lease or sale of 5-acre tracts thereon for home, camp, health, recreational, convalescent, or business sites. The climate is similar to that of Indio, Calif., and a number of date trees planted some 10 years ago are in thriving condition. The soil is generally coarse and sandy and will probably require humus and fertilizers for best results. It is expected that detailed plans for opening the project for settlement will be made within the next 60 days. At the present time further studies are being made by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, together with the Veterans' Administration, looking to the most advantageous uses of the land. Persons who take up the tracts offered under the project are expected to have some outside sources of income, such as a pension or wages from nearby employment. For such persons the project offers extraordinary attraction.

The Nazi "Fifth Column" in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of addressing the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights at its seventh annual national convention at the Hotel Astor in New York. It is one of our foremost organizations devoted to real Americanism and to the defense of our democratic traditions against the onslaught of the "fifth column."

I shall take the liberty of giving excerpts from the remarks I addressed to the delegates, feeling that they may be of interest, in view of recent developments:

[Excerpts from address delivered by Representative SAMUEL DICKSTEIN at the Seventh Annual Convention of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, June 2, 1940]

The most active and dangerous elements of the "fifth column" in the United States are not aliens, but citizens, many of them in high places. These are the people to be feared, not the alien who, for the most part, is a law-abiding, hard-working victim of European oppression.

Long before the present hue and cry about the "fifth column" here, I pointed out its dangers and asked that some preventive action be taken. Time and again I warned the people of the United States not to allow their democratic system to be taken advantage of by groups and individuals, seeking its overthrow.

But I also wish to take my stand now against the hysterical rabble rousing of certain influential individuals—found even in the United States Senate and House of Representatives—who are banking on the confusion in which the American people have been thrown by the fear of nazi-ism, to push what I will not hesitate to call their own totalitarian measures across.

The civil liberties of aliens must be protected with as much vigor as those of citizens. Thomas Jefferson, condemning the pernicious alien and sedition laws of his day, wrote:

"The friendless alien has indeed been selected as the safest subject of a first experiment but the citizen will soon follow."

We have no right to condemn an alien as such. Some aliens are of course intriguing against our Government just as some citizens are. But let us not lump the innocent with the guilty in a manner reminiscent of the worst practices of a dictatorship. We in America still believe in the dignity of man—of every man, be he citizen or alien. * * *

Let us not fall prey to the sinister designs of "fifth column" elements who are chuckling as they see the American people beguiled into acceding to measures destroying civil liberties—measures which would have been recognized as Nazi-inspired at some other period.

The "fifth columnists" to be feared and denounced are not merely the alien groups, who can be easily identified and guarded against, but rather those influential individuals pretending to be 200-percent Americans who are actually the American counterpart of the Quislings and the Moseleys.

In line with Senator NORRIS, I do not feel that transferring the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice was the wisest thing to do. Although the F. B. I. and the Justice Department are doing a magnificent job and deserve wide support, it is not as fitted to handle the immigrant and set him on the right path as the Department of Labor. Inasmuch as the transfer has been approved, however, I will not say more than to express the hope that alien regulation does not lead to alien persecution.

On the other hand, alien regulation may lead to the ferreting out of the spies deliberately planted here by Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Soviet Russia, whose agents, aided by native Fascist groups, form the "fifth column" in the United States.

In the past few years seamen on German ships have arrived here with orders to "jump ship" and "disappear" somewhere in the United States, where they can carry on their propaganda and, if necessary, sabotage. I have documentary evidence proving that German seamen, deliberately sent here and illegally in this country, are part of the Nazi network of spies and saboteurs.

I accuse the German diplomatic staff here of carrying on propaganda against our Government while taking advantage of their diplomatic immunity. * * * Nazi propaganda and "fifth column" activity are linked to the German consulates in the United States.

The Dies committee has not performed the things expected by Congress. It has spent large sums of money merely to scratch the surface of subversive activity. * * * It has recommended no effective laws to combat the "fifth column" menace.

I would also like to quote a few passages from the speech delivered by the chairman of the executive committee of the league:

At present some of these Nazi-inspired "Americans" are on trial for alleged attempts to organize a revolt against our Government, a putsch, a la Hitler. Their plans, as brought out, were typically Hitlerian. There are numerous others, leaders of native organizations who boast of their plans of forceful capture of the Government by their uniformed gangs a la Mussolini's black-shirted or Hitler's brown-shirted brigands.

These native traitors serve as the carriers of the Nazi infection to the American people. They spew their poisonous propaganda from street corners, in halls, in parks, from some church pulpits, through the radio, and serve as termites to undermine our American institutions.

In spite of the obvious inhuman barbarism of the Nazi military machine, which overruns and destroys neighboring countries, imprisons, robs, and murders innumerable thousands of innocent, inoffensive human beings, and drives the German, as well as all other peoples it can reach, back to the Dark Ages, these Nazi agents and Nazi apologists continue to preach to the American people nazi-ism and totalitarianism. By means of every brazen lie and subterfuge which only a degenerate Nazi mind could invent, they seek to influence the American people to exchange their heritage of freedom for the yoke of the Nazi Fuehrer.

These traitors serve Hitler not only by attacking our own free institutions with "arguments" supplied by the Nazi propaganda machine, but also by attacking all of Hitler's opponents. Especially do they concentrate now on attacking the Allies as "warmongers" who forced the innocent Nazis into this war. The devil himself could not have invented a more diabolical joke. They apparently hope that no one will notice that every attack on the Allies is a direct service to the Nazis.

The combination of spies, Nazi agents, saboteurs, and our native traitors form the Nazi "fifth column" in the United States. The Nazi military machine used such columns successfully in subjugating, disorganizing, and conquering neighboring countries. They are attempting to do the same here in our country.

During the last year, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League has done much to help investigate, uncover, and expose the Nazi "fifth column" in the United States. This Nazi-inspired army of traitors consists of the various hate groups engaged in subversive activities and in plotting against the freedom, safety, and security of our country. That we struck a vulnerable point in the enemy's ranks, is attested to by the fact that the spokesmen of the Nazi-inspired groups from the petty fuehrer's of the "mobilizers" to the Nazi

spokesmen in the Halls of Congress are singling out our league for their most vicious attacks.

In every one of these groups we found Nazis and Nazi agents among the leaders. Whether the poisonous propaganda was distributed on street corners, or from church pulpits, by means of mimeographed circulars, or through the pages of newspapers, whether the plots were to organize street fights or to manufacture bombs in an effort to overthrow our Government by violence, everywhere we found the hands of the Nazis or their agents as organizers, leaders, and plotters. The Nazi octopus which has spread its tentacles all over our country, has a firm grip on the entire "fifth column" in all its foreign or native battalions.

In Poland, in Norway, in Denmark, in Holland, and in Belgium the Nazi and native traitors were considered harmless cranks and were permitted to carry on their nefarious plots. Millions of innocent people are now paying with their lives for underestimating the potential danger of tolerating such traitors.

We must not repeat that mistake. We must take the proper and timely precautions so that it shall not happen here.

In this fateful hour, when a new barbarism rages in Europe, and dark storm clouds spread and threaten to engulf the entire civilized world, in this hour of great and ever-growing danger to all people who love liberty and cherish freedom, we must rededicate ourselves to the fight against this new monster-Nazi barbarism. We must redouble our efforts to uncover, unmask, and expose the Nazi-inspired, imported, and native traitors in our own country who seek to destroy our democracy. We must counteract their poisonous propaganda irrespective of whether they masquerade in red, brown, black, silver, white, or dirty shirts, and regardless of whether they spew their poison from soap boxes on street corners, from church pulpits, or from the exalted seats of legislatures.

To this goal—the preservation and defense of our freedom and of our democracy, we, like the founders of our Republic, pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The publication of the league, the Anti-Nazi Bulletin, in its convention issue, contained many articles of interest to all Americans. I cannot resist quoting a few words from the article on Nazi propaganda by Jay Field, who writes:

The truth, like spring sunlight, will make the creatures of fascism crawl back into the woodwork.

Finally, may I quote the text of a message to the American people, signed by consular representatives of countries invaded by Nazi Germany, which was read to the assembled delegates:

A MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Yesterday we lived in peace, as free citizens of free independent nations. Today we are enslaved by a huge war machine. Our countries have been ravished; our homes destroyed. All we have left are homeless, hungry people—and the will to live as free men again.

Too long we permitted traitors to use our democratic freedom in order to help the Nazi invaders bring about its downfall. We were warned, yet the measures we took were not sufficient to hold back the enemy. Part of our armies were forced to fight against the "fifth column" in our very midst.

We who cherish the ideals of democracy, and hope once more to be free and independent, send this message to the people of the United States:

Only by constant vigilance can you hope to save those things which are dear to you. Only by unceasing care and determination to keep your democracy dynamic and alert to the perils of enemies within and without, can you preserve your liberties. Thereby the tradition of American democracy will remain an inspiration to an embattled world.

(Signed by consulates of invaded nations.)

America's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the radio:

The grave situation which confronts the American people today is not of our making, nevertheless it is here, very real and menacing. The time has come to face the facts as they are, unflinchingly, with courage, and with intelligence. Only cowards will wince and only the ostrich-like will bury their heads in the sand and refuse to meet the issues. How we deport ourselves now will determine not only the future of this country but perhaps of the whole world. If we think like men of action and act like men of thought, we are not too late. If, on the other hand, we vacillate and wobble in indecision we are sealing the fate of free people for generations to come. This is a time provided by God to try the souls of men. This is a test of our competency as a democratic nation. The results will decide whether we have a right to survive as a free people. The problems are baffling and only a great people of tremendous capacity and vitality can solve them. Democracy as an exterior form cannot pull us through the troubled days which lie ahead unless we, as a people, prove ourselves capable of assuming the responsibilities which are inherent in this world situation. The time has come to chart a careful and clearly defined course. No longer can we speed ahead all sail and no rudder, nor can we formulate a program or fix a goal unless we understand our problems.

The struggles raging throughout the world today are not wholly the results of ancient blood feuds or of traditional national hatreds. They are the clash of ideologies as far opposite as the two poles. Two separate and distinct philosophies of life are engaged in a death struggle for supremacy. If the forces of atheism and dictatorship conquer the Allied democracies, the whole world will be changed. We Americans are accustomed to living in a world of comparative law and order. Our economy has been adjusted to that kind of world. Our political structure is in tune with it and above all, our safety depends on it. We have enjoyed high standards of living in America because our substance has not been wasted on vast armament programs. This has been possible because the British Navy has been a mighty guaranty of peace in the Atlantic Ocean and because the balance of power in Europe has held in check the forces of aggression. These defenses are being smashed before our very eyes. The power in Europe is unbalanced and weighs heavily in favor of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

If my premise is correct, what are we to do about it? First of all we must prepare for the worst, and inaugurate a defense program which will make us so formidable that none of these modern Genghis Khans will dare trifle with us. I am not going to spend much time on this phase of our policy because the American people almost unanimously support our defense program. I say almost unanimously because the Communists', the pro-Nazis', and the Fascists' "fifth columnists" are all opposing it with every subtle and devious method created by the cunning minds of men. Their anti-defense propaganda is a dish prepared by rogues for fools to gulp. A defenseless America is a temptation and an invitation. A powerful America is a grim and potent warning.

Secondly, we should recognize the fact that the Allies are fighting today for everything which we hold dear—yes; they are fighting our battles, and if they lose some day we may be forced to stand alone against the mechanized columns of Mr. Hitler. Ninety-nine percent of the American people will be jubilant if the Allies are victorious. Our fears will disappear, our huge defense program will be unnecessary, and our future as a free people will be assured for years to come. What we fear is a German victory. If that is true, and it is, then it falls logically that we should do everything within our power to prevent it. We should aid the Allies with all of our economic resources—without, of course, impairing our own safety—and with all our moral support. When I speak these words I am not motivated by stick-candy sentimentalism nor by any moral persuasion that we will be engaged in a struggle to save democracy. Both may be true, but I wish to place my argument on a real and factual basis, and so I repeat that for purely selfish reasons we should aid the Allies with all our economic might. By aiding the Allies we are helping ourselves. We will be enlisting economic legions for our own defense. We will be taking decisive steps to guarantee not only our own security but that of our children. We will be assisting in maintaining an orderly world, fit to live in. Lending the Allies our economic resources today may save men from dying on the battlefields of tomorrow.

Some of you may challenge me at this point by stating that this policy is unneutral. I am not neutral and neither are you. I am no more neutral with regard to this struggle than I would be in the case of an armed thug attacking a peaceful citizen or of a burglar threatening my neighbor's life. The word "neutral" is derived from neuter and neuter means nothing—neither one thing nor another. Can our great freedom-loving America be neuter—nothing—where a struggle is in progress between right and wrong? I do not think so. Great Britain and France were relatively indifferent toward the fate of Manchuria. This indifference encouraged the invasion of Ethiopia, then Austria. Their indecision encouraged the ravishment of the Sudetenland, Albania, and Czechoslovakia. Their neutrality, now referred to as appeasement, was an open invitation to the dictators to invade Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. The fates of Finland, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, and Belgium are the direct result of this neuter policy of being neither one thing nor another, and oh! what a price the democracies are paying for this folly. Peaceful nations, whose only guilt was that of economic success and prosperity, have fallen like ripe plums into the laps of the conquerors. No; being a neutral is not the answer to the challenge which confronts us. Such an attitude will merely encourage further aggression.

Some of you may argue that this war is none of our business. My answer is that this war is very much our business. I am

advocating an honest policy of defense and if that is not our business, pray tell me what is. Many people fail to realize that aggression breeds aggression. Having adopted a policy of conquest, Hitler cannot stop for long. Ruthlessly he will impose his economic and political principles on other peoples. He will be forced to do so in order to survive. You call this war none of our business? Let me read a pamphlet distributed by Nazi agents in Veracruz, Mexico, several days ago. I quote, "Long live Mexico, free, great, and powerful, with her states of Texas, California, Arizona, and Colorado. Long live the German people and welcome to Mussolini's fascists." There is the implied promise to Mexico that if she will cooperate with Nazi Germany against the United States, Texas, California, Arizona, and Colorado will be returned to her. Germany is already promising Mexico four American States as a reward for belligerency against us.

This war none of our business? When Nazi agents work daily to establish governments in South America which will be unfriendly to the United States! This war none of our business? Think of Canada, a belligerent nation. As Hitler subjugates the British Isles, he will turn his attention to our northern neighbor. It is a large prize with territory exceeding our own and with only 10,000,000 people to develop its vast resources. Today, we enjoy 3,000 miles of common frontier with Canada. There is not a single fortification along this entire line. If Mr. Hitler establishes himself as our neighbor on the north, this 3,000 miles of common boundary will literally bristle with armaments and fortifications. The cost will be terrific and the threat to our safety constant.

This war none of our business? Consider, if you will, the loss of profitable trade which we have already suffered: Norway and Denmark, $56,000,000; Czechoslovakia, $65,000,000; the Netherlands, $97,000,000; Belgium, $65,000,000. Thousands of men and women were employed gainfully in producing these goods. The economic impact of these losses will soon be felt.

This war none of our business? When you say that consider our status if Germany is victorious. We will be living in a constant state of imminent warfare, preparing feverishly for any eventuality, weakening our economic structure in a mad race to keep abreast of the dictators, burdening our people with an onerous tax load, and all of this when our trade is shrinking, rendering us less able to pay the bill. Visualize America if the Allies are defeated, alone and friendless. We will stand as the last bulwark of democracy struggling to exist against frightful odds. Does anyone honestly believe that we can remain an isle of progress and plenty in a sea of chaos and destruction? If we refuse to aid the Allies now the isolationists in America will have their day. America will be so isolated that she may disappear forever as a land of opportunity. Remember that when the torch of liberty is snuffed out anywhere in the world it burns dimmer here at home.

Let us consider another phase of this subject in a cold-blooded and selfish attitude. The more we aid the Allies, the more rapidly we develop our productive capacity, which some day will be used to provide armaments for our own defense. We must expand our productive capacity. Today, by their purchases, the Allies are assisting us in developing these facilities. The Allies are actually paying a bill which we would have to assume ourselves otherwise. It is distasteful for me personally to regard this situation from an entirely selfish viewpoint, but I am trying to present it to you as a real and factual proposition.

In order to strengthen our first line of defense, which is the allied cause, I am advocating the following steps:

1. Offer England and France the much-needed repair facilities in American dockyards so that if their own bases are destroyed the Allies can still wage naval and economic warfare on a world-wide scale.

2. Supply France and Britain with all the planes we can manufacture. More immediately, we should provide such planes as our Army and Navy can spare at the moment. This, of course, with the understanding that they will be immediately replaced as our production facilities are increased.

3. To cooperate in every possible way in the continuing Allied economic and financial blockade of the totalitarian states.

4. To repeal the existing restrictive provisions of the neutrality law which prevent us from aiding the Allies despite the overwhelming sentiments of our people.

5. Rush all surplus foodstuffs, medical supplies, clothing, cotton goods to the women and children who are innocent victims of this war. Not only is that a humanitarian gesture, worthy of our people, but it will relieve the Allied governments of the expense of providing these necessities, thereby releasing additional sums for much needed armaments.

The foregoing program is not neutral. It is not intended to be. It is nonbelligerent, however, and that is as it should be. Not once have I suggested sending armed forces to Europe. I am as much opposed to that as you are. The steps which I have just outlined, if immediately enacted, will preclude the possibility of this Nation becoming engaged in actual warfare. If the Allies, with our help, can hold the invaders at bay, it will not be necessary for us to fight for years to come, even in our own defense. The program which I have outlined is decisive and affirmative. That is as it should be. It is the only attitude which men like Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin respect. It is said freely in the German and Italian press that the American people are impotent and frightened. We are brushed aside as a negligible factor until all the rest of the world has been subdued and the triumphant forces of the predatory powers can be concentrated on our destruction. America is neither helpless nor frightened. She is rapidly becoming aroused from her sleepy indifference. The events of the past month have violated her sense of justice. She is determined now to preserve her heritage and to play her part in bringing order to a troubled world.

The Bridges Deportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ARTICLE BY CHARLES G. ROSS

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Ross, from yesterday's issue of the Washington Evening Star:

[From the Washington Star of June 17, 1940]

BRIDGES BILL EXAMPLE OF HYSTERIA—"LEGISLATIVE LYNCHING" SEEN MORE HARMFUL THAN ANY ALIEN

(By Charles G. Ross)

Talk about mass hysteria. The august House of Representatives of the United States gave a prize exhibition of it last week when it did something never before done in the history of the country: Passed a bill for the deportation of a single alien, one Harry R. Bridges. The vote, believe it or not, was 330 in favor of the bill, and only 42 against.

The names of the 42 deserve to be printed on a special roll of honor. At the risk of seeming invidious, I list here, to show the quality of the opposition, the four Republicans, out of those voting, who refused to be swept off their feet:

BRUCE BARTON of New York.

ROBERT LUCE, of Massachusetts.

WILLIAM J. MILLER, of Connecticut, who lost both his legs as an aviator in the World War.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York.

It may be that Bridges, the west coast labor leader, ought to be sent back to his native Australia. It may be that his presence in the United States, as stated in the 5-line resolution of the House, is "hurtful." That isn't the point. The point is that the House has engaged in what one of its Members called a "legislative lynching." And it has done this at a time when there is special need for safeguarding our democratic processes.

The action of the House—this singling out of one individual, by name, to be kicked out of the country and, incidentally, to be martyrized—would be sheerly absurd if it were not for its dangerous implications. If Bridges is deported under the procedure laid down by the House, a precedent will have been set up for the expulsion of any alien whom a temporary majority in Congress, for whatever reason, may not like. For Bridges has not been convicted of violating any law, nor is it charged in the resolution that he has violated any. It is merely stated that Bridges is a man "whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful." Under that doctrine Congress can expel an alien because it objects to his race, his religion, or the color of his hair. It is not hard to imagine a state of hysteria that would bring a flood of bills for the deportation of particular individuals.

BRIDGES ALREADY CLEARED

Congress may or may not have the technical constitutional right to order the deportation of Bridges. The point is debatable. It was contended in the House that the Bridges resolution is a bill of attainder, which the Constitution specifically forbids. A bill of attainder is a legislative act which provides punishment without a judicial trial. By those supporting expulsion it was argued that deportation is not "punishment"; that Congress, moreover, has absolute control over the exclusion and ejection of aliens.

But whatever the technical power of Congress, the expulsion bill, as was eloquently pointed out in the House by Representative MILLER and others, violates both the spirit of the Bill of Rights and the national policy which accords the equal protection of the laws to aliens. Passage of the bill would be far more subversive of the Constitution than anything that Bridges has ever done or could conceivably do.

Bridges has been put through the whole prescribed process for the expulsion of undesirable aliens. He was arrested last year on a Department of Labor warrant charging that he was subject to deporta-

tion because of membership in an organization preaching the overthrow of the Government by force and violence—the Communist Party. Hearings were held for 11 weeks by a trial examiner, Dean James M. Landis, of the Harvard Law School, and on December 28 he reported his conclusions that "the evidence does not permit the finding that Harry R. Bridges is either a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with that party."

BRIDGES DENIED HEARING

Determined to get Bridges out of the country despite this clear ruling that he was not deportable under the laws, the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization brought in an arbitrary act authorizing the deportation of Bridges, and this was amended on the floor to direct the deportation. Bridges was denied a hearing before the committee. He is now denied the right to be heard on a writ of habeas corpus, or to be heard in any other way, but if the House bill goes through, he must be taken forthwith by the Attorney General and forthwith deported to Australia.

Not only does the Bridges bill strike at the Bill of Rights, it is also a shocking confession of legislative inadequacy. If the House thinks that Bridges ought to be deported, the way to get at him is to pass a general law covering his case; then Bridges would have his day in court and the issues raised by the expulsion law would be fought out in court.

The short cut chosen by the House, if not a bill of attainder, is at least a flagrant perversion of the legislative process.

It is earnestly to be hoped that good sense and regard for the Constitution will cause the Senate to block the writing of a vicious and dangerous precedent.

Weekly Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN A. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ONEONTA (N. Y.) NEWS

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oneonta (N. Y.) News of June 14, 1940:

[From the Oneonta (N. Y.) News of June 14, 1940]

WEEKLY REPORTS

We have not the slightest doubt that President Roosevelt has been truly sincere in his efforts to bring about a normal situation in America.

But these are times when the best of men are in a quandary as to what is the correct thing to do. There never were times like these before. The severest depression in our history, topped by a new World War—having just gone over the $8,000,000,000 mark in national debt to buy back our prosperity and being faced with added billions for a belated and convulsive move for armament makes a situation that frankly we doubt if any man can handle.

We are definitely against this giving the President or any other individual a blank check for him to fill out for any amount and for any purpose he sees fit. We have seen to it that the "honeymoon" of the New Deal was financed as they wanted it but now they must settle down to household budgets the same as anyone else.

Seven years ago this country hired Mr. Roosevelt because he talked somewhat reasonable and he had a refreshing point of view. One of these views was that the national debt at that time was unnecessarily and stupidly far beyond what it should be and that he would take such immediate steps as to reduce this debt and balance the Budget.

We do not doubt his sincerity of purpose but with the national debt being increased many times greater during his 7 years of administration to the point of its being the greatest in the history of this country and with unemployment as large as it ever was we feel Mr. Roosevelt has clearly demonstrated he is not capable of solving our problems alone. And we repeat—nor is any other individual.

From time to time we speak of Congressman HALL in this column. For a young man new to national political life we believe ED HALL is doing a superb job.

Last week he proposed a bill that would require the President of the United States and his administration to give a weekly accounting on every step they take with regard to national defense.

"Congress has a right to know," he declared. "The people have a right to know. There is no reason why the general information about the progress of the defense program should be withheld."

The Chief Executive's report, Mr. HALL told the House, should contain the number of contracts entered into by the Government each week, the number of airplanes completed and those under construction, the number of men under pilot training, the status of shipbuilding, and the "weekly progress of all land, sea, and air force development."

This makes sense. Business today is no longer on a "let's spend regardless" basis as it was in 1929. We have learned to budget ourselves and operate on a week-to-week schedule. So should the Government.

Congressman HALL'S proposal should be adopted, and if it is, you will find the end of reckless spending and the beginning of a "pay as you go" era.

But one of the most serious elements we have confronting us is that this is an election year and politics will keep many good ideas and many good men from functioning for the good of America. Mr. Roosevelt is asking Americans to forget partisanship this year—to forget political affiliations for the common good of all in this critical year. He has plenty of opportunity to set an example to his fellow men. Odd as it may seem, with a very poor record of results, Mr. Roosevelt will unquestionably run for a third term. But his chances of reelection do not depend on the opposing candidate but on how Mr. Roosevelt handles himself from now to next November.

Colonel Lindbergh on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE B. CROWE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I note with great interest, in these distressed times over world conditions, that numerous Members are rising from their places and introducing into the Appendix of the RECORD newspaper clippings, speeches, and other material bearing on the present world conditions. Accordingly, I am introducing a clipping taken from the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Change of Heart," and it has to do with the position of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh and his frequent radio addresses.

I notice that others in his party, such as party national leader, Gov. Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas, Wendell Willkie, and others, do not share the views of Colonel Lindbergh by any manner or means. Colonel Lindbergh, too, appears to have been on all sides of the question. At first he, like many others, said, "Who is our enemy?" and "Who are we preparing to resist?" Sufficient, however, is the clipping from the Star which I am introducing, since it shows plainly the various positions that Colonel Lindbergh has taken, and it shows that he has been wrong most of the time, if not all of the time.

The editorial follows:

CHANGE OF HEART

Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, who took it upon himself a few weeks ago to assure the Nation that "no one wishes to attack us and no one is in a position to do so," appears to have changed his mind on that score. For if we are in no danger of attack he could hardly consider it necessary, "whatever our decision may be in regard to Europe," to "start now to build up our defenses," to ask that the "men of our country give a year of their lives to military training," to "insist upon military bases wherever they are needed for our safety—regardless of who owns the territory involved."

If there is need—and the Star holds that there has long been obvious and urgent need—for defense measures, there is danger of attack upon our national interests. Those interests extend far beyond our own soil, reaching in multiple and complex forms to every corner of the globe. And if those interests are not only in danger of attack but are actually being attacked today, which is the case, the ignoble and myopic surrender of our world interests to Hitler and company without taking such steps as we can to preserve them is intolerable.

It is this perverse insistence by Colonel Lindbergh that the present death grapple in Europe and Africa is outside our field of interest that outweighs what merit resides in his belated recognition of the need for arming ourselves against direct attack on this hemisphere.

Colonel Lindbergh holds that it should be no concern of ours whether Germany and Italy or England and France win this war. He says, as Hitler said a few days ago, that if we demand that foreign nations refrain from interfering in this hemisphere, we should not interfere in theirs. And he asserts that the policy of placing our industrial strength at the disposal of the democracies is a baiting of the trap of war by interventionists who seek by indirection to embroil us in the present phase of the battle and put our troops in France.

This is undiluted distortion of the actual truth.

Such help as we have given to the Allies, Colonel Lindbergh to the contrary notwithstanding, is an integral part of our effort to defend ourselves. The Star believes, because a triumphant Germany under Hitler would be the greatest menace which this country could conceivably face in the world today, that if we were possessed of an Army and Navy adequate to prevent that menace from ever materializing, we should before this have declared war upon Hitler and brought about his defeat while Allies stood at our side. Lacking such an Army and Navy, aid to the Allies was belatedly extended, to the end that the danger which Colonel Lindbergh partially recognizes might be arrested if possible, and, if worse comes to worse, at least postponed as long as possible. Capitulation of France now may mean that this aid came too late and in insufficient quantities and kinds. We must now proceed even faster to bring our own defenses to the necessary strength and efficiency.

During discussion of the repeal of the arms embargo 8 months ago, when Germany was armed to the teeth offensively and defensively and the Allies had nothing to attack with, Colonel Lindbergh said that he, for one, was in favor of supplying European nations with all the defensive weapons that we could spare. On Saturday, when it became clear that France and England were fighting a purely defensive battle with their very existence at stake, he would withhold any assistance—defensive or otherwise—from them.

Colonel Lindbergh has the right to change his mind and heart, but it is highly unfortunate that his public expressions tend to discredit the defense program which depends so much on unity of thought and action.

Public Sentiment Opposed to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, showing how public sentiment changes from time to time are the hundreds of letters being received in this week's mail, which, almost without exception, take a definite and outspoken stand against any sort of involvement in the European struggle. Letters last week showed a strong trend toward aid to the Allies, and toward measures short of war.

In the three messages quoted below from residents of Minnesota, the general sentiment of this week's letters are clearly expressed, and I am glad to present this information for the benefit of those who are charged with the responsibility of charting the course of national destiny.

Let the public speak, and let those in authority hear the people's voices. Read these letters:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 16, 1940.*

JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The morning papers state that President Roosevelt has acted again without consent of Congress and promised "redoubled aid" to the Allies, at the same time hinting that Congress should make military commitments.

This seems to be the old policy of the President making war, and Congress only declaring it.

The Gallup poll shows that more than 80 percent of the people are against the President's evident policy, and I can assure you that the percentage is even higher in Minnesota.

I don't believe in government by letter writers—this is the first I have written to a Congressman—but if it will help to force the President to do what the people want to do, I intend to write lots of letters.

I hope you will stand firm against any involvement in Europe, although we are told there is a great war hysteria in the East.

Sincerely,

GEORGE K. PRITCHARD.

ST. LOUIS PARK, MINN., *June 15, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Congressman, Third District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote against any participation in Europe, either war or methods short of war.

We are in favor of taking the advice of Charles A. Lindbergh. Please think of America first.

Yours truly,

KENYON A. GABRIEL.
LENORA GABRIEL.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 15, 1940.*

Congressman JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
Third District Representative, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We demand a true representation of the folks at home. We want no war. America's defense and our problems come first. Just heard Colonel Lindbergh's address over the air, which expresses our sentiments exactly. The President and many of the Congressmen are more pro-Allies than American, which causes us to wonder, Are we again subjects of the Empire Great Britain? Less aid to the Allies, please, and more aid to America, especially for defense!

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. RODINE.

Fathers' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the world's fair on June 16, 1940:

For many years now Mothers' Day has been celebrated throughout the United States as a day of devotion to the mothers of the Nation, and a day on which mother, and what it means to be a mother, is graphically portrayed to the people of this country as an appropriate gesture of loyalty and devotion.

A few years ago, unofficially, the third Sunday in June came to be celebrated as Fathers' Day. Fathers' Day was founded in 1910 by Mrs. John Bruce Dodd, of Spokane, Wash., and has grown to great prominence since. Mrs. Dodd was inspired by the devotion of her own father to his family of small children who were left motherless at an early age. It is now proposed that Fathers' Day be equally officially celebrated just as Mothers' Day has become celebrated.

A word or two will not be inappropriate to be said in connection therewith. Love of one's parents is the most natural feeling which is instilled in us by our divine Creator.

Our ancient Bible among its Ten Commandments says "Honor thy father and mother." And all of us, particularly those who had the benefit and privilege of religious training and a proper home atmosphere in which our youth was spent, remember how reverence and love of one's parents was ever present in every task which we were called upon to perform as children.

There is really no reason why one's mother should be singled out as against one's father. Both are equally important in the scheme of things. To create a proper home atmosphere, both parents are of equal importance. In a home a father and mother cooperate in the bringing up of a family. It is so much more appropriate that when mother is honored, father should likewise receive his share of a child's devotion.

By setting aside a definite date at which children of this Nation will honor their fathers, it will instill great love and affection for both parents and will make the home ever presided over by a father and mother, the real center of the children's universe.

It is such a fine feeling to remember one's parents with tokens of devotion. If one could have his way, he would wish every day in the calendar be celebrated as mother's and father's day. But, of course, the humdrum of daily activities, and the hustle and bustle of everyday life we cannot very well at all times show this transcendent devotion to our parents, which we would like to. So, we are confined to have a day on the calendar set aside for this special purpose, and it will be a wonderful reminder of the unity of a family, and the love and devotion which we owe to both parents, if along with Mother's Day, we were to celebrate each year a father's day as well.

In these days of stirring Americanism where patriotic virtues are being proclaimed to the world, all of our citizens are unani-

mous in doing everything in their power to uphold our democracy and freedom. This democracy should be defended, not only by the expenditure of money for military and naval preparedness, but also by stressing the importance of the home as the fountain of American liberty. The American home is the finest product of the American way of life, a life free from dictatorships, oppression, and from the denial of human life.

Who among us does not remember that distant day when as a child he was in awe and dread of his father, the head of the family and the fountain of wisdom and greatness. Father would solve all our problems for us, tell us what was right, and make our path easy. Father helped us play games, he took us to the baseball field and to prize fights, and if we think back he always was "a regular fellow." And if we are still young enough to have a father, aren't we delighted to live in his shadow and enjoy his companionship as long as the years allow it?

And so through the ages, we will never forget the memories of our childhood, and by having a day definitely set aside to honor father we will recall with a pang and a little palpitation of the heart the days of our youth and the place which father occupied in our little universe, not so many years ago.

We must not forget that father gave us the foundation of our moral life, taught us what was right or wrong, showed us how to avoid the pitfalls of daily life, and gave us encouragement to bear the misfortunes which would come in our path. If we were able to grow up into useful citizens, and are able to take our place in the world, it is due to the fact that father straightened out our little difficulties in early life, and gave us the chance to become grown-up citizens and useful members of society.

And so, if a day is set aside to celebrate as Father's Day, we shall ever be grateful to the man whose hard work, devotion to duty, and ability to understand our problems made us what we are today.

Father's Day should be made into an official holiday. In laying a wreath at the foot of the statue of George Washington, the father of our country, let us remember all the fathers of our Nation.

I have introduced a resolution in Congress to make Father's Day a national holiday. I hope Congress will see fit to pass this resolution so that it will become a law in the near future.

Congress Should Stay on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE JOPLIN (MO.) NEWS-HERALD

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Joplin (Mo.) News-Herald:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY ON THE JOB

To most people it will seem mysterious that Congress should be in a hurry to adjourn. The only practical argument seems to be that the Congressmen themselves want to get home so they can campaign for reelection. That might be a sufficient reason in ordinary times, but these are not ordinary times.

Consider our triune form of government—judicial, executive, and legislative. The United States Supreme Court adjourns for the summer and no one thinks anything about it. Judicial processes are naturally and properly slower than executive and legislative processes. Even in legislative processes, deliberation is expected as indicating reasonable study before statutory enactments.

But in extraordinary times it may be necessary to enact statutes much more quickly than is possible if the Congress of the Nation has first to be called into session. It no longer requires several weeks for Representatives of western States to get to Washington, but it still is true that several days must elapse between the issuance of a call for Congress to meet and the actual opening of the session.

Keep in mind that it is not just the matter of enacting laws. Upon Congress is placed the responsibility for declaring war. Also, there are many questions as to actions and decisions short of a declaration of war that properly should be put up to Congress and not left solely upon the shoulders of the President.

If you were the President of the United States, wouldn't you want Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to stay on the job in a critical time like the world is experiencing just now? Would you want to accept the full responsibility for decisions and actions that quite possibly might lead this Nation into the World War that is in progress?

It is not enough, as someone has said, for Congress merely to gayly appropriate any number of billions of dollars and then go home. It should stay on the job to see to it that the expenditure of these billions is started in proper fashion, to see to it that there is a minimum of waste, to see to it that various important legislation that cannot be completed by the proposed date of adjournment is completed, to see to it that the best brains of Congress are immediately available to the President if the world crisis increases, so far as America is concerned.

There is no reason why this question of congressional adjournment should be a political question.

The Members of Congress are the employees of the people. They are each paid $10,000 a year for their services. Surely, if there is any probability that their services will be needed—if there is even a possibility of it—they should be in Washington, on the job, and ready to deliver that service. The excuse that they want to get home and campaign for reelection is about as petty and paltry and disgraceful an excuse as could be presented, under the circumstances.

The Farmer, the Consumer, and Ice Cream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY ROBERT C. HIBBEN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ICE CREAM MANUFACTURERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the many discussions of the economic ills of agriculture, we discuss corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and other commodities, but slight attention is paid to dairy products, which is the largest of all agricultural commodities.

The following address of Mr. Hibben should prove of interest to Members of Congress. Mr. Hibben was guest speaker on the National Farm and Home Hour, June 15, 1940, sponsored by the National Grange:

In the early nineteenth century, charming Dolly Madison amazed and delighted official Washington by serving ice cream at a White House reception—its first recorded White House appearance.

Today, ice cream has become so universal a food in this country that commentators (in noting any national characteristic) often say "Why, it's as American as ice cream."

Every year the total production of more than 1,000,000 cows goes to supply the cream and milk solids which are the major ingredients of ice cream. Annually we in America eat some 1,200,000,000 quarts of ice cream.

If it were possible to pile quart on quart this gigantic mass of ice cream would occupy 1⅔ acres of ground, and reach into the sky as high as the Washington Monument, here in the heart of the Nation's Capital.

Seventy-five percent of the annual output of ice cream comes during the 5 warm months when milk production is at its heaviest. The enormous value to the dairy farm of this outlet for its peak production is at once apparent. Ice-cream manufacture in America has been rightly called the balance wheel of the dairy industry.

From the farm point of view, ice-cream manufacture holds many other important aspects. The industry uses more strawberries and peaches than any other except the canning industry. Over nine and one-half million quarts of strawberries are purchased yearly for use in ice cream, exclusive of those made into toppings and sirups for use at the retail fountains.

Cherries, raspberries, pineapples, and many other fruits are in heavy demand. Pecan, walnut, and other nut growers look to the ice-cream market for the disposition of a large percentage of their annual crops.

Of beet and cane sugar, some million and one-half pounds are required annually for sweetening ice cream, again touching agricultural enterprise.

Add to these major ingredients the flavors, confections, etc., which are utilized in special ice creams, and an idea may be gained of the economic affect of ice-cream manufacturing on the multiple enterprises which go to make up our economic life.

In so closely knitted an economic fabric industry and production problems are interrelated and mutually dependent. Benefit or disadvantage to the ice-cream industry has a kindred effect upon the dairy farmer. For example, trade barriers which prevent the free flow of cream in interstate commerce narrow the farmers' potential market by increasing the cost of the products manufactured from such cream. This in turn deters sales increases in the

consumer market. A vicious circle is thus formed—with neither industry nor farmer able to go forward toward economic stability.

Discriminatory legislation pointed at motortruck transportation is another striking example touching the dairy farmer. Any regulation adversely affecting truck travel taps the pipe line of the farm-to-market movement of milk and the life line of the ice-cream industry's distribution.

It is to the interest, therefore, both of the ice-cream manufacturer and the dairy farmer, to be awake to these and other regulatory tendencies. By intelligent action, there may be assured the safeguard of those vital factors, essential to the common future, in which both have so great a stake.

There is no mystery about the manufacture of ice cream. In common with bread baking, canning, and many other home-food preparations of our grandmother's day, the making of ice cream has moved from the kitchen to the modern, sanitary plant. The recipes grandmother used have been adapted for large-scale production. Just as much cream, in some cases more, goes into ice cream today, as in that cranked in the old freezer on the back porch. In addition, more milk solids are used, which give ice cream an even higher food value.

The modern ice-cream plant is a triumph of sanitary and refrigerating engineering. From the time of the receipt of the raw products until its consumption, this food is not touched by human hands, but is processed through an elaborate arrangement of equipment which marks the acme of efficiency and sanitation.

The finished ice cream comes to you as a safe, wholesome dairy food, rich in those vital elements which make milk essential for the human race. In fact, ice cream contains more milk solids than an equal volume of milk. These important minerals and vitamins of milk are present, unimpaired, in ice cream, which has the additional advantage of universal popularity.

Ice cream is good, and good for you, an unbeatable combination. Young and old, sick and well, enjoy its appealing taste, delight in its refreshing coolness.

This month of June has been designated "Dairy Month" to accent the importance of dairy products in the Nation's health. Butter, cheese, ice cream, milk are spotlighted to focus attention upon the entire dairy industry as an economic force in our national life. Dr. McCollum, famous nutrition expert of Johns Hopkins, says: "The people who have achieved, who have become large, strong, vigorous people, are the people who have used liberal amounts of milk and its products." Here, indeed, is a challenge to every homemaker to see that the daily family dietary contains sufficient of these dairy foods to safeguard the vitality and promote the well-being of those nearest and dearest to her.

One glass of milk daily in addition to that now taken or one more dish of ice cream or one extra cheese sandwich on buttered bread—what a change would take place; not only would health be improved but that problem of overproduction of milk, which so harasses the dairy farmer today, would be near solution. June Dairy Month is a reminder for each of us to help ourselves more liberally to milk, ice cream, cheese, and butter for our health's sake and to help at the same time the dairy farmer, now in the midst of peak milk production.

If the habits thus acquired persist throughout the year, so much the better for us all.

Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

STATEMENT OF CHESTERFIELD MONTHLY MEETING OF FRIENDS AT CHESTERHILL, OHIO

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1939, the Chesterfield monthly meeting of Friends was held at Chesterhill, Ohio. At that meeting, these substantial and loyal Americans issued a statement, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

Since the establishment of this meeting in 1834 Chesterfield monthly meeting of Friends (Quakers) held at Chesterhill, Ohio, has maintained its adherence to the principles of peace. These principles have characterized the Society of Friends over a period of 2½ centuries.

While others may believe differently, we desire to reaffirm our belief that: War is a sin against God, war is in conflict with the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and that hatred and carnage have no place with those who are trying to follow the teachings of the Gospel.

Our belief in His teaching urges us to maintain the stand for peace. While "we utterly deny all outward wars and strife and fightings with outward weapons for any end or under any pretense whatever," we do firmly believe that it is our Christian duty to participate in constructive efforts to "overcome evil with good."

Airports and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Louis Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of War, at the inauguration of an air line at Clarksburg, W. Va., Sunday, June 16, 1940:

Fellow citizens, today, in Clarksburg, we forge another link in our great chain of national airways. To our city this airport means the reduction of the distance to our State Capitol at Charleston from hours to minutes; and to our National Capital at Washington, from a day or a night to but a few hours. Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, Philadelphia and New York are comparatively within the limits of this county. All of America is but around the corner.

To commercial aviation this new airport means that thousands of men, women, and children can traverse our free skies with greater safety and with increased assurance. It means that thousands of tons of mail and other valuable cargoes can be delivered with added facility to their destinations. It means a step forward in the American field of transportation.

Yesterday, the comfort and the capacity of our public roads paved the way toward automobile progress. Today, the convenience and the availability of public airports will confer a similar blessing on the development of aviation, and coupled with increased production and training facilities, they will combine to give us the air power we need for the defense of our country.

The President of the United States recently indicated 50,000 as an annual aircraft production capacity vital to our national security. While we naturally visualize this increase as pertaining solely to military aircraft, we must not overlook the great value of commercial aviation to the realization of this objective. In all phases of the development of national air defense, commercial aviation plays an important role.

In this field, the United States is supreme. Our air transportation system carries more passengers and mail longer distances with greater safety than that of any other nation in the world.

As a result, the birthplace of our modern airplane is no longer a small shed in the corner of a vacant lot, but a vast industrial plant covering hundreds of acres in which thousands of skilled workers ply their trades. Likewise, the aviator of today no longer depends on the cow pasture of yesterday, but has at his disposal over 2,400 improved landing areas within the United States.

It is largely due to commercial aviation that there are today over 14,000 licensed airplanes and 31,000 licensed pilots in this country. It is through its efforts and those of the Civil Aeronautics Authority that over 10,000 names will be added to this list within the next 2 months.

These mark but the beginnings. An enormous task lies ahead of us. Our industrial plants must be enlarged manyfold. Workers skilled in the art of aircraft production must be counted in the hundreds of thousands. Our airports must be multiplied in number and expanded in capacity.

We must qualify thousands of eager young men as pilots where we now have hundreds. We must teach them not only to fly but to do battle in the air, for the civilian pilot is but the foundation for a military aviator. Long and strenuous hours of training lie ahead.

From a military standpoint, the civilian pilot has completed his basic education and is ready for college. He has proved his ability to fly. This greatly simplifies the problem and materially reduces the time required to convert him into a military aviator.

We are fortunate indeed to have this reservoir of proven men available. In the realization of our air program, commercial training facilities will be developed and utilized to the fullest possible extent. Without their invaluable assistance our task would be impossible.

In our consideration of military aviation we must not overlook the importance of the airplane utilized purely as a means of transportation. Just as the Navy has its auxiliary ships, so modern air force has its transport planes. Today expeditionary forces speed through the air over all terrain barriers and land deep in the enemy territory. Ammunition and supplies reach them from the skies. Reinforcements are rushed to inaccessible points by man-made birds. Even the sick and wounded are evacuated through the clouds.

We are not lacking in this new field of military strategy. In event of an emergency we can convert great numbers of our air merchant fleet to this purpose. With our experience and facilities we should be able not only to adopt the new tactics but to beat any nation on earth at this game. Commercial aviation may well prove a direct and major asset to our national air defense.

The necessity for a strong and highly efficient air force is no longer a matter of debate. Recent events abroad have demonstrated its value in unmistakable terms. The Allied armies in Norway were rendered helpless by its absence. Without its assistance the astounding German advance through Flanders would have been impossible. Without the intervention of the British air force in Belgium the Germans would not have been robbed of the full fruits of their victory. The conclusion is inescapable that a nation weak in air power, indeed, is impotent.

But an air force itself, in turn, is impotent without adequate landing fields. When Germany overnight grabbed every important airport in Norway she insured success in that sector. By the same act she placed England under a handicap that entailed certain defeat. Conversely, as the "blitzkreig" rolled through Belgium nearer to the airports of Great Britain, the English air power increased and the German thrust was parried in great measure.

The lesson is obvious. The development of airports throughout the United States involves more than the convenience and safety of our national airways. It materially contributes to the preservation of our national existence.

Therefore, today in Clarksburg, we do more than provide increased transportation facilities to our community and to our State. Today we forge another link in the armor that will protect our beloved land against any would-be aggressor. May that armor become so strong that no marauding nation will ever dare threaten to penetrate it.

Fight the "Fifth Column" Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ARTICLE BY REV. REMBERT GILMAN SMITH

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Rembert Gilman Smith:

FIGHT THE "FIFTH COLUMN" HERE

(By Rembert Gilman Smith)

During the Spanish civil war, the term "the fifth column" originated. Franco was advancing on the city of Santander with four columns of soldiers. He had a fifth column inside the city, the aid of which enabled him to capture the city. This method is as old as the fall of Troy, made possible because the Trojans, making light of the warnings of Cassandra, let the Trojan horse into the city, from the belly of which the Greeks descended, and opened the gates to the Greek army.

Four columns now threaten the United States from without. They are composed of Nazis, Communists, Fascists, and Anarchists. They expect to get valuable help from the "fifth column" within.

Who are in it or likely soon to be? Those who have accepted, or are about to accept, any one of the four doctrines—nazi-ism, communism, fascism, or anarchism. Some of these avow their enmity to Americanism, some conceal it, and some even pretend to be patriotic. These pretenders are the direct spiritual descendants of Benedict Arnold.

While they wait hopefully for the arrival of the enemy at our gates they are busy within. They resist with all possible dastardly means those who seek to inform and arouse the people. All individuals and organizations at work to expose them, and their allies without, are smeared by them. They try to choke their bugles with mud, and to drown them in a sea of it.

In the "fifth column" are some from every class—preachers, bishops, teachers, politicians, lawyers, judges, doctors, merchants, farmers, laborers, capitalists, editors, reporters, college and university students, technicians, youth groups. Every racial bloc has some. They are in secret or proclaimed despair of our constitutional, representative democracy, and are turning their devotions toward substitutes for it, such as are now found in Germany, Russia, Italy, or some other land of recently reborn slavery.

The most dangerous regiment in the "fifth column" now, when the air is full of war, and of rumors of war, is composed of the slacker pacifists, who fill the land with propaganda against all war, including war for defense. Many academic dreamers and woolly minded preachers have been zealously and insidiously seeking to weaken the patriotism of the youth. They claim to be Christian, but they are in rebellion against Jesus Christ, who commanded His followers, "Sell your cloaks and buy swords." They have had such success as that an alarmingly large number of young men in this Nation declare that they will not fight to defend native land. What abject and awful degeneracy!

In the "fifth column" are found millions of the indifferent and the selfish. Preoccupied with ambition, money getting, pleasure seeking, they shut their eyes and ears to the realities of these perilous times. They are in the "fifth column" on account of their ignorance, indolence, and criminal neglect of patriotic duties. They are like the people of ancient Meroz, cursed because "they came not up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord, against the mighty."

How many are in the "fifth column"? An accurate estimate is impossible, but it is certain that they are numerous and powerful enough to be dangerous. Let no undue sense of security rest upon the probability that the "fifth column" is now a minority group. Active, unscrupulous, and cruel minorities, aided by stupid, supine, or cowardly majorities, have already massacred civilization over vast areas. They now boast that they will bring chaos to us.

Fight the "fifth column" with all lawful weapons, and at once.

Participation in the European War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY PROF. PHILIP C. JESSUP

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there appeared in the Hartford Courant on June 15, 1940, a letter from Prof. Philip C. Jessup entitled "This War Is Not Yet 'Our War.'"

Dr. Jessup is professor of international law at Columbia University, but is a resident of Norfolk, Conn. His many contributions to current problems justify the importance which has been attached to his recent letter appearing in the Hartford Courant, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant of June 15, 1940]

THIS WAR IS NOT YET "OUR WAR"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

The United States is still, thank God, a democracy and therefore a citizen can still express his opinions, even though he be damned as "an imbecile or a traitor" by those who disagree with him.

Disagreement and name-calling are still our privileges, but they are privileges which are coasting rapidly over the brink into war. Once we are at war, it will make no difference (if I may take a humble personal example) that I am a veteran of the A. E. F., that my ancestors came here from England some three centuries ago; my freedom and yours will be surrendered to government.

"Let us not deceive ourselves," wrote Maj. George Fielding Eliot in The Ramparts We Watch in 1938. "Let us not say, these powers that we propose to grant to a single man will be politely handed back when the war is over, as a matter of course. They may be, and they may not be. The risk that they may not, or that the reclaiming of them might plunge this Nation into the horrors of civil strife to which foreign war would seem but a pleasant dream, is far too great to be taken if it need not be taken."

NEED IT BE TAKEN?

Does it need to be taken? Must we risk that freedom now because there is no alternative but war? The comforting theory is being widely circulated that though we are in great danger from the Nazis, we do not need to fight for our freedom; the Allies will do the fighting for us, equipped with such cast-off equipment as we can spare.

It is hard to believe that the American people will accept the idea that our frontier is really on the Somme, or the Seine, or

the Loire, and that French and British troops on those rivers of France are really fighting our fight, and accept at the same time the hypocritical or cowardly conclusion that all we need to contribute is the sale of guns and planes. Suppose the Germans had crossed the Atlantic, with remnants of Allied troops fleeing before them; suppose the Germans landed in Canada where the Canadian troops, supporting the French and British were being driven back across the boundary into Maine or New York. Then it would really be our fight. Would we still say we would not risk a single soldier, but would give the Allies our spare weapons?

IF OR WHEN IT IS OUR FIGHT

If or when it is our fight we will fight with everything we have, manpower included. The American people don't believe it is our fight in Europe today though their sympathies, like mine, are overwhelmingly with the Allies and against the Nazi-Fascist gang. That is why the politicians do not dare advocate our going to war, but assure the people we will not send another army to France as we did in 1917.

It was not long ago—do you remember?—when we were arguing the repeal of the arms embargo and we were told that the Allies did not need men: so there was no question of our sending the boys to fight in Europe once more. Who believes today that the Allies do not need men? If we follow the lead of those who tell us we must now cast our lot with the Allies, we shall continue to coast faster and faster into war, and war means fighting the enemy with all you've got, which includes men, and still more men.

Even in 1917 we said at first we would send only a "token regiment," or at most a division. Thirty distinguished citizens, whose honesty I admire as much as I disagree with their views, published in the New York Times on June 10, a plea that we declare war now on Germany but even they are apparently afraid to tell the American people that fighting a war means using men as well as material. Don't dodge the issue by saying we could not get men there in time; they said that in 1917, too.

SENTIMENT VERSUS SELF-INTEREST

And let's not confuse sentiment with self-interest. Of course our sentiments are with the Allies, as they were with the Ethiopians and the Austrians and the Czechs and the Poles, and as they are with the Chinese. Looking further back in history, we will find they were with the Japanese against the Russians 35 years ago and with the Boers against the English some 40 years ago. Nations don't fight because of sentimental attachments. England and France did not fight for China, or for Ethiopia, or for Austria, or for Czechoslovakia. Harold Nicholson, a brilliant and patriotic Englishman, recently wrote a book called Why Britain Is At War. In it he said that a Briton before he fights must have both a sense of personal outrage and a sense of personal danger. We have the sense of outrage; the question is about the danger.

WE FIGHT TO DEFEND OURSELVES

There is always a danger when a strong nation goes on the warpath. Many Americans for years have preached the danger from Japan and have urged us to make war on Japan. We don't, as a people, rise to these cries of distant danger; we don't fight what are called preventive wars. We fight to defend ourselves, our country, and our free institutions, and we are united on the proposition that that includes fighting in defense of the Monroe Doctrine—defending this hemisphere against an invasion by a hostile nation. We would fight, not by selling old equipment, but with every man we have, to prevent Germany or Japan from taking the French or British or Dutch possessions in this hemisphere or from taking any part of Central or South America.

THOSE "IFS"

If we are going to war now—and it means war if you accept the idea that "the frontier of our national interest is now on the Somme"—we are counting on a lot of "ifs":

"If" the French and English are defeated;

"If" all we have been told for years about German lack of materials and their inability to hold out long is untrue and the defeat of the Allies can be accomplished this summer.

"If" the British and French surrender their fleets instead of bringing them to Canada and other outlying parts of the Empire as Prime Minister Churchill recently indicated would be done.

"If" Hitler, immediately after defeating the Allies in Europe, does not mind leaving a fundamentally hostile Russia on his flank while he turns to the gigantic task of conquering the Western Hemisphere.

"If" Hitler does not prefer first to consolidate his gains in Europe plus rounding out his empire in the Near East and Africa.

"If" Hitler makes an alliance with Japan and the Japanese attack us at the same time across the Pacific.

"If" Hitler remains in power indefinitely after the German people learn the cost of the war he promised them would never come.

"If" Mussolini can hold his people in a war which seems all wrong to a vast number of Italians.

"If" the South Americans with our help cannot control their "fifth columns."

These are "ifs," not certainties. Are we going to pour out American lives on the chances that the "if" will come true?

The full-page advertisement spread over newspapers "from coast to coast" by a committee of representative Americans, tries to make some of these "ifs" ridiculous by asking whether the Nazis will "considerately wait until we are ready to fight them." Nobody is fool enough to suggest that they would wait for that reason but the "ifs" don't rest on any such silly basis.

"MAKE OUR DEFENSE SURE"

Preparations for defense, yes, by the billions, by sacrifice and devotion and nonpartisanship of every citizen of the United States. Ours will not be the position of the little countries which hoped that the war would not strike them and therefore went under, partly because they were small, partly because they were not farsighted. We will strain every nerve to make our defense sure, but it will be a defense on lines of our own choosing, the lines of the Western Hemisphere.

I was only a private in the American Expeditionary Force and make no claim to being a military strategist but it makes sense to me when I read Major Eliot's description of national defense based upon protection of this hemisphere and its adjacent seas. "The necessity is," he writes, "that we shall make up our minds that whatever betide, we send no more great armies to fight in a European war." Don't be misled by labels. This is still a European war and not a World War. It may become a "world" war and if it does we shall be in it, fighting from the position of our own natural advantages and not across the seas. But whatever the outcome of this war, it has brought home to us the concern we have with the rest of the world. One of the things the war has killed is the blind isolationism of 1920.

GET THE ISSUE IN THE OPEN

Let's get the issue out into the open so that the American people can register their will while there is still time. Let's keep our sympathies—we couldn't scrap them if we would. Let those individuals whose sympathies drive them to such gallant sacrifice (and all honor to them) as to enlist in the allied armies, fight under Allied flags, as they are free to do. Let the Allies buy in our markets as they are privileged to do under our laws. But let's be honest with them and with ourselves.

Say that we do not think it is "our" war and therefore we are not coming in. If we change our minds, we will do it deliberately, with full understanding of the consequences, and if that time comes we will fight with all our resources, men as well as machines. Say to the Nazis and the Fascists and the Japanese that we will declare war and fight at the first sign of invasion of this hemisphere, whether it be Brazil, Greenland, Canada, or Bermuda, or, if you will, Hawaii. Say to our President, our Senators, and our Congressmen that we are ready for any sacrifice necessary to our defense program but that we expect them to preserve our freedom, our democracy, against foreign invaders and against "fifth columns," and also against another danger just as great, the danger of hysterical fears which undermine democracy within and which may send us coasting into a foreign war, from which we can still be saved by a cool head.

PHILIP C. JESSUP.

NORFOLK.

The March of Economic Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

PROCEEDINGS OF TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Twenty-fifth Annual Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, excerpts from the address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America on May 18, 1940, a statement of the committee on political action of the same organization, and the complete address of Secretary Ickes on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at the New York World's Fair on May 18, 1940.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Resolution adopted by the Twenty-fifth Annual Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America]

We must defend and extend the New Deal program. That program can be defended and extended only under a national leader-

ship whose attachment to it and to the people has been tried and tested beyond question. On the record, there is one man in public life today who has preeminently demonstrated that he possesses these qualities of leadership. With the world aflame abroad, we cannot afford to lose the leadership of President Roosevelt, who, as no other man in our generation, inspires devotion among our people.

Therefore, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America calls upon the Democratic Party, in this time of national and world crisis, to draft President Franklin D. Roosevelt as its nominee for the office of President. It calls upon Franklin D. Roosevelt, putting aside all questions of personal desire, after 7 years of ceaseless and exacting service, to accept that candidacy. And we individually and collectively pledge to him our unswerving support in the fulfillment of the great tasks before us.

[From address by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America on May 18, 1940]

And so we say to Franklin Delano Roosevelt: We the people of the United States have twice elected you President of the United States. We have followed and supported your leadership in your efforts to strengthen and revitalize our democracy. You have served us well, but your work is not done. We consider your continuance in office for another 4 years necessary to give a free people national unity at a time of grave crisis—necessary to give hope and courage to those offering their last full measure of devotion to preserve freedom in a civilized world. At such a time, Mr. President, we must hold you to your promise not to let the people down. We propose to nominate you, we propose to elect you, and we, the people, command you to serve as our President.

STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTION

[Adopted by the Twenty-fifth Annual Convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America]

During the past 8 years the working men and women of America, and with them all progressive Americans, have made notable gains in their struggle to strengthen our political and economic democracy. We meet today upon the threshold of a political contest which will determine whether the gains of these years shall be preserved and extended or dissipated and lost. Organized labor has learned from its experience since 1929 that the preservation and improvement of its working conditions and living standards, the solution of the pressing problem of unemployment, the defense of its civil rights and liberties, and the very existence of our American democracy depend upon the character, the program, and the policies of our National Government and the man who heads it. Therefore, organized labor is intensely concerned with the coming political contest whose outcome so vitally affects its own welfare and that of the whole Nation.

The membership of the Amalgamated is fully alive to the decisive importance of this issue and has registered its decision with this convention in no uncertain terms. Many resolutions dealing with the coming national elections have been submitted to this convention by local unions and joint boards representing every important center of our organization. These resolutions, without exception, call upon the Democratic Party to draft, and the Nation to return to office, our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the light of this unanimity of opinion among our membership, the decision to be taken by this convention is clear. It remains for us to formulate the basis upon which this decision rests.

Let us, therefore, briefly review the situation in which the Nation found itself 8 years ago and the progress which has been made since that time under the leadership of President Roosevelt, and then attempt to indicate the choice which now lies before us.

Eight years ago the Nation was in the grip of the worst economic crisis of our history. Fifteen million men and women, able and willing to work, were unemployed. Without means, public or private, to support themselves and their families, indignation and desperation expressed themselves in public demonstrations and hunger marches. The plight of other groups of our people was equally desperate. Farmers were driven from their land, our old people were without security, and our young people without opportunity or hope for the future.

The National Government was worse than impotent in the face of this crisis. It disclaimed responsibility for starvation. Under the hypocritical slogan of rugged individualism, it refused to lift a finger to alleviate the misery and suffering which swept the land. As a result, in March 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt took office, we were perilously close to complete and irretrievable national disaster.

It has been the genius of President Roosevelt to give wise, clear-visioned, and steadfast leadership to our people. It was he who, in the black days of 1933, formulated their largely inarticulate demands and aspirations into a positive program of Government to provide relief from starvation, increase employment, halt the descending business spiral, restore the national credit, increase purchasing power, and lay the basis for a more equitable distribution of the national income; not only did he formulate that program but he welded the labor and progressive groups of the nation into execution in the face of the relentless and unprincipled reactionary opposition which soon developed.

As workers and as citizens alike, we recount with pride those major New Deal achievements which met the burning needs of our people in the hour of crisis.

The Wagner Act: It has written the basic right of workers to organize into the law of the land; it has made possible the greatest advance in labor organization in our history.

The Fair Labor Standards Act: It has established the important principle that it is the duty of government to protect workers from the most extreme forms of exploitation. It has helped protect organized labor from sweatshop competition by fixing minimum wages and maximum hours. It has contributed to an increase in the national-purchasing power.

The Social Security Act: It, for the first time, recognized Federal responsibility to protect the workers of the country against the perils of old age and unemployment, and to alleviate the haunting fear, born of insecurity, which has gripped the heart of every working man and woman since the advent of our industrial system.

W. P. A. and P. W. A.: Those measures give legislative recognition to the responsiblity of our national Government to provide for the unemployed. They substitute the dignity of honest and useful work for the degrading dole. They have preserved the health and skill of millions of unemployed workers, have helped support the wage structure of the Nature and made an essential contribution to the national purchasing power.

The Walsh-Healey Act: It has insured minimum prevailing wages to hundreds of thousands of workers in factories which are the beneficiaries of Government contracts.

The housing program: A series of measures has saved a million home owners from eviction, enabled 500,000 American families to become home owners and now undertakes to replace slum dwellings with decent housing within the reach of all workers.

The farm program: It has saved millions of farmers and farm workers from ruin, almost doubled farm income, and by increasing farm purchasing power has restored the farmer as a customer for the products of our factories.

The practical realization of all these social and economic objectives of the New Deal has been made possible only by the fearless fight which it waged in the courts to uphold the right of the workers, the farmers, the aged, and the oppressed to the equal protection of the law of the land. Not since Lincoln called for the overruling of the Dred Scott decision has any statesman had the courage shown by President Roosevelt in calling upon the courts to remove the barriers which the courts had erected to the accomplishment of necessary social and economic reforms. And had it not been for that fearless courage, the workers would not now have the protection of the Wagner Act and the wage and hour law, and the aged and the unemployed would not now have the protection of the Social Security Act.

Many of the legislative advances won by the New Deal, such as social security, wage and hour legislation, and the guaranty of the right to organize, had long been a part of the political program of progressive labor organizations like our own. For many years before 1932 we had sought political leadership and a political instrumentality through which we could realize that program. Not only did we find such leadership under President Roosevelt, but the program realized under him has given a tremendous impetus to the organization of labor itself, so that today labor represents an important force in our national life, arming all progressives with a mighty weapon for further advances.

The achievements which we here recount are the fruit of long and bitter struggle. In the early months of President Roosevelt's first administration, reaction, cowed by the narrowness of its escape from complete disaster, offered no effective resistance to the initial measures of the New Deal program. But it soon rallied its forces and began the counterattack. That attack has continued with relentless and increasing vigor. The true measure of the President's leadership is to be found in the fact that not only has he held his ground under the onslaught but has continued steadfastly to move forward, when some of those around him wavered, faltered, and deserted, giving up the battle as lost.

When we recount the achievements which have been won under the President's leadership we do not minimize the tasks which lie ahead. Progress has been made. Much remains to be done. We still face the crucial question of unemployment. If we would solve it we must further increase the purchasing power of those of our people who are without the means to satisfy their needs. The working conditions and living standards of our workers must be improved. They must be provided with decent housing, given further protection against unemployment, and increased security in old age. Their right to organize must be fully guaranteed and enforced everywhere. Their civil and political rights and liberties must be protected and extended.

We do not let impatience to achieve our full program blind us to the giant strides which have been made. At the same time we must not let satisfaction with our progress lull us into security or relax our vigilance.

Events abroad daily teach us that our liberties as a free people cannot be made secure unless we find the way to give full employment to our rich resources of men, land, and machines, and assure our people the possibility of realizing their demands for a secure and decent life. We are mindful of President Roosevelt's warning that "the social and economic forces which have

been mismanaged abroad, until they resulted in revolution, dictatorship, and war, are the same as those which we are here struggling to adjust peacefully at home."

In this critical hour, when half the people of the world are locked in terrible wars which threaten to destroy the values which we identify as the civilized way of life, we in America can best make our contribution to the Nation and to the world by demonstrating for all to see that the problems which beset us are susceptible of a peaceful and a democratic solution.

If we are to achieve this high purpose, it is essential that we continue along the path which we have taken these last 8 years. We must defend and extend the New Deal program which holds the only hope of fulfillment of that purpose. That program can be defended and extended only under a national leadership whose attachment to it and to the people has been tried and tested beyond question. On the record there is one man in public life today who has preeminently demonstrated that he possesses these qualities of leadership.

Finally, with the world aflame abroad, we cannot afford to lose the leadership of President Roosevelt, who, as no other man in our generation, inspires devotion among our people. His humble and selfless allegiance to the preservation of the principles of peace and freedom is too rare and precious a quality to be denied to his country in this time of need.

In a dangerous world he has expressed the heart and soul of all that is valuable and decent in the civilization which the centuries have built up. The road which he traveled has sought to preserve intact our traditional loyalties to the ideals of freedom, democracy, peace, and international good faith.

Therefore, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, assembled in this thirteenth biennial convention, calls upon the Democratic Party in this time of national and world crisis to draft President Franklin D. Roosevelt as its nominee for the office of President. It calls upon Franklin D. Roosevelt, putting aside all questions of personal desire, after 7 years of ceaseless and exacting service, to accept that candidacy. And we individually and collectively pledge to him our unswerving support in the fulfillment of the great tasks before us.

LABOR'S STAKE IN FREE GOVERNMENT

[Address by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, delivered on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at the New York World's Fair, Saturday, May 18, 1940, broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. blue network]

Friends and fellow workers, I am glad to participate today with members and friends of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in this celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary. You who are members and we who are friends should be very proud of our association with an organization which has not only vindicated the dignity of labor in its struggle to bargain collectively but which has also demonstrated the capacity of organized labor to be a moving force in promoting industrial efficiency and in maintaining a socially just democratic society.

I have always been sympathetic with and interested in the trade-union movement. To me it is a truism that organized labor, effectively and intelligently led, as your phase of it has been, not only gives strength to the workers but to the Nation as a whole.

Shortly after the Women's Trade Union League was organized in Chicago in 1904, under the brilliant leadership of Mary McDowell and Margaret Dreier Robins, I volunteered my services when it decided to go to the legislature with a bill limiting the hours of labor of women in industry. It was not an easy fight. The manufacturers' associations were fighting us, the lawyers were fighting us, and there was a troublesome decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois that seemed to say that our bill was unconstitutional. Fortunately, however, about that time a distinguished lawyer from Boston, Louis D. Brandeis, appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States to defend the State of Oregon in a similar case. He spoke with an eloquence and social consciousness which caused even the Supreme Court of the United States to forget its old precedents. That gave us the strength to press our 10-hour law through the Illinois Legislature and to defend it successfully before the Illinois Supreme Court. Other States soon followed the trail that Oregon and Illinois had blazed, first with 10-hour laws and then with lower limitations.

I am also proud to recall that my association with the Amalgamated really antedates its actual birth by several years. That association dates back to the clothing-workers strike in Chicago in 1910, known as the Hart, Schaffner & Marx strike.

My friends of the Women's Trade Union League also threw themselves heart and soul into that fight. So did Hull House, that living monument to the greatest woman of her generation, Jane Addams. Pickets came not only from the ranks of the workers and sympathetic trade-unionists but from Hull House, the University of Chicage, and the North Shore. My wife was one of those who took her place in the picket line, while her mother sat in the police station signing the bonds of all arrested strikers and pickets.

The police were needlessly rough with the picketing strikers, but they were careful to be duly respectful to those of us who were lending a helping hand. However, they made an extraordinary slip. They arrested Ellen Gates Starr, co-founder with Jane Addams of Hull House. I undertook to defend her, and much to the distress of the authorities, I insisted that her case be tried even after the strike had been settled and other arrested pickets had been released. Despite the sworn testimony of three hefty policemen that they had arrested Miss Starr, who was a frail little lady, because she had put them in physical fear, she was triumphantly acquitted by judge and jury.

I do not want to give you the impression that the strike was won for the union by its friends outside of the union. On the contrary, the so-called respectable element in Chicago, by and large, was alarmed at the efforts of the garment workers to assert the right to organize and bargain collectively for the improvement of their working conditions. It was bruited about that many of the workers, including their leaders—the "ring-leaders" as they were contemptuously called—were immigrants who had no understanding of American institutions.

From my associations at Hull House with Jane Addams I knew too much about the immigrants—those huddled masses, yearning to be free—to be taken in by the horrendous reports about their "un-American" activities. But I must confess that when I first undertook to help the strikers—some of them boys still in their 'teens—I feared that, however good their intentions may have been, they had been rash, impulsive, and headstrong.

But when the first excitement of the strike subsided and employers and workers gathered around the table to discuss their common problems, my smug complacency was jolted. I found that I had more to learn from these boys than they had to learn from me. Even Jane Addams, Raymond Robins, and Margaret Dreier Robins, who had known the strikers much better than I, glowed with relieved satisfaction as accounts of the progress of the negotiations came in. The employers who had come to the conference table reluctantly, expecting an unpleasant ordeal with arrogant trouble-makers presenting exaggerated claims, reported back a rare and inspiring experience.

Fortunately some of the members of Hart, Schaffner & Marx were socially minded to a degree taht was unusual in those days for a typical employer. They were willing to put their own cards on the table and to listen to the case of their employees. They found that the strike leaders whom they had suspected, resented, and distrusted as young hotheads, had a keen and amazingly broad understanding of their common problems and a social vision and idealism which revealed a rare and abiding faith in the democratic way of life. So impressed were the employers by the case presented that they were willing to set up an impartial board on which both industry and labor should be represented and which should be presided over by that rare personality, James Mullenbach, once a coal miner and Protestant preacher, and then the head of the Chicago municipal lodging house.

The reports which came back from those conferences to us invariably singled out for especial praise one young man, slight of stature, and with gleaming black eyes from which flashed intellectual integrity, indomitable courage, and irresistible idealism. He was, we were told, wise beyond his years and a man destined to be a leader among men. He displayed a rare ability to understand the problems and difficulties of those with whom he had to negotiate and in return he expected an equal readiness on their part to understand the problems and difficulties of the workers.

That young man was Sidney Hillman. He has traveled far since those days, but he has never disappointed those who have put their trust in him.

As president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Sidney Hillman has applied himself wholeheartedly and without stint for more than a quarter of a century to the advancement of the interests of American labor.

As president of the Amalgamated, Sidney Hillman has been no partisan politician, but he has eloquently and effectively asserted labor's need for legal recognition and protection. Although he has served the Amalgamated well and faithfully, he has also recognized that labor's strength lies in labor's unity; in labor's willingness to work together to promote the interest of the common man and woman.

No one has worked more ably and assiduously than Sidney Hillman to bring about the enactment into Federal law of fair labor standards for the protection of those workers, organized or unorganized, who are least able to protect themselves.

The Amalgamated may be proud of its leadership, and its leadership may be no less proud of the Amalgamated.

For successive terms the Amalgamated has maintained a continuity of effective and responsible leadership. You have been too wise and too regardful of your own best interests not to retain as your leaders those best qualified to serve you without paying any attention to the length of that service. And it is not without significance that there are few labor organizations more democratic than the Amalgamated.

I believe that it is as much the essence of democracy that people should have the right freely to continue a leadership which they desire as it is that they should have the right freely to discontinue a leadership which they spurn. Modern democracy is not a play where each member of the cast takes his turn at enacting the star role. In the dangerous world in which we live democracy cannot afford to deny itself the most effective leadership available. This is indeed a time to recall the salutary and

truly sage advice of George Washington that there is "no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who in some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

We are not living in an era of peace or tranquillity. We are passing through one of the most fateful periods in the history of mankind. At home our domestic economy is adjusting itself to profound social and economic changes. Abroad, brute force and strident ambition march mercilessly against peaceful nations. Dictatorships are on the march to enslave the spirit of free democracy and we have been brought up against the realization that the world cannot exist half Fascist and half free.

However high or low our station, each and every one of us is deeply, anxiously concerned about our country's and our children's future, about their safety, their peace, their welfare in the years which lie just ahead of us.

There is no blinking the facts which President Roosevelt reemphasized in his message last January when he said that "the social and economic forces which have been mismanaged abroad until they have resulted in revolution, dictatorship, and war are the same as those which we are here struggling to adjust peacefully at home" * * * and "dictatorships—and the philosophy of force which justifies and accompanies dictatorships—have originated in almost every case in the necessity for drastic action to improve internal conditions where democratic action for one reason or another has failed to respond to new modern needs and modern conditions."

We have reached a fork on the way of industrial progress. We cannot, if we would, go back to the economic habits of our fathers before the power age. America must choose. On the one hand is the path which we elected to take in 1932 under the leadership of President Roosevelt—the path which calls for the strengthening and revitalizing of the processes of democracy so that, through them, we may meet the exigent social and economic problems of our time. On the other hand is the primrose path which we chose in 1920—the path which we blindly trod for 12 long years—dodging, concealing, forgetting, and ignoring the pressing social and economic problems of our time—and finding ourselves at the end facing chaos. If we again choose the primrose path we may not be so fortunate, when chaos comes, as to have a President with the self-restraint and wisdom of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to save us from abandoning liberty for the illusion of security.

During the last 7 years, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, we have made more peaceful adjustments to profound social and economic changes than in any period of our history. In the interest of free enterprise and of free labor we have challenged the right of a few to control and exploit the lives, the property, and the labor of the many. We have taken effective measures to protect labor's right to organize and to bargain collectively, and labor's right to obtain a fair wage for a fair day's work. We have taken effective measures to help the farmers to obtain a fair price for their products and to conserve their precious and irreplaceable soil. We have taken effective measures to protect the savings of investors and bank depositors. We have given work to the unemployed. We have initiated a low-cost housing program. We have made a start at providing social security against old age and unemployment.

These things, and many others, we have done to strengthen and revitalize our democratic way of life. Much has been accomplished; much is yet to be accomplished. And in doing and planning all of this we have given the common man a real stake in the preservation of our democratic way of life. In doing all of this we may have trod on a few arrogant vested interests, but let no man say that what we have done has not strengthened our national unity. Let no man say that we have destroyed hope, confidence, or enterprise. The hope, the confidence, the enterprise of the American people lies not in the luxuries of the few but in the opportunities of the many.

If American democracy is to survive, the social and economic gains of the New Deal must become a part of the American heritage. The unemployed are not going to be left uncared for. The industrial workers are going to be organized and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; they are not going to be content with company unions organized for them by Ernest Weir or Tom Girdler. The social security now afforded against old age and unemployment is not going to be scrapped, but is going to be extended upward and downward, and also outward into the field of health insurance. The Securities and Exchange Commission is going to continue to protect our people's savings from the arbitrary control of private economic power.

This does not mean that New Deal reforms are safe from attack. This does not mean that the administration of New Deal reforms can be safely entrusted to men who were openly hostile, or coldly indifferent, when President Roosevelt and his liberal followers were struggling to write them into the law of the land. It is not unfair to ask who are the men, who having worked night and day to accomplish these great reforms, have come to the conclusion that they could be improved or better administered by others who derive their support from those who bitterly opposed or grudgingly accepted them.

At this critical stage we can afford neither the luxury of a reaction nor the stress and strain of the counterreaction, if not counterrevolution, which would inevitably follow such reaction. The continuance of the Roosevelt administration is necessary to permit the New Deal's concept of social and economic justice to become an accepted part of our American system. Far-sighted men of affairs realize that it is better for business to adjust itself to the new order than to fight to upset it. They know that such a fight would stir up bitter resentment and social discontent and, at best, could be only temporarily successful. They realize that this is no time to turn back the clock. They do not want again to be chargeable with the appalling consequences which would almost inevitably follow a relapse into the primrose path. They look across to war-darkened Europe where the ruling classes thought that it cost too much to buy time, and they say that it is much more important that everyone should have enough than that those who have more than enough should have still more.

As all of us look across at tragic Europe, and shudder at the barbaric attacks against religion, freedom, and international good faith, we thank God that we have a President who was the first among us to see what was happening there, and seeing, has stirred us to the need of national defense and national unity.

There has been no man in our time in whom our people have placed their faith as they have placed it in President Roosevelt. There is no man whose word carries courage, conviction, and hope around the world as does President Roosevelt's. The inspiration of his leadership to those about to die for democracy was eloquently told by Dorothy Thompson in her column from Paris last Wednesday.

Nor has there been any time since the founding of the Republic that America has needed such leadership as President Roosevelt has given us to hold America—the whole of America, without regard to faith, race, or wealth—united in the face of great danger.

Today, despite the shoutings of politicians and the clamors of newspapers which no more represent the people or realize what they are thinking about than they did in 1936, there is more political unity in America than at any time in the past. There can be no question of partisanship in a year when our need for strong and experienced and trusted leadership is so great, when the lack of continuing such leadership may mean irrevocable disaster.

It is the people who are calling President Roosevelt. It is the people who are looking to President Roosevelt for continued leadership and will not be denied, because they have the right—the right of a democracy—to choose their Commander in Chief. It is the people, regardless of party, and not the politicians, who constitute the movement to continue President Roosevelt at the helm of the ship of state. The politicians, some of them belatedly, may think that they are doing the leading, but, regardless of their place in the procession, they are only following the people. The surprising thing about this popular movement toward the goal of national unity is that it is being joined daily by many people, rich and poor, Republican and Democrat, who opposed the President in years past and who still differ with him on many points of domestic policy. As these people express it, Roosevelt, at the present juncture of affairs, is the greatest unifying force of the Nation today and the unifying force which he represents is the country's greatest need today as we see the uncertainties and perhaps even the terrors of a social revolution that is shaking the world.

There is no higher law than the law of self-preservation. This law became part of the consciousness of man while he still dwelt in dark caves. This law is just as compelling today as it was in the beginning. It is this law that is bringing together, at a time of grave crisis, men who never before have seen alike on a political issue.

We know that President Roosevelt is not seeking another 4 years. We know that after 7 exacting and exhausting years in office it is his desire to retire to the quiet of his home on the Hudson—a desire that his true friends would be eager to see gratified, if it were not for the imperative need that the Nation—and humanity—has of him.

At this turning point in our country's history, President Roosevelt is in exactly the same position as was George Washington when the country confronted a similar crisis 150 years ago.

Washington, after 7 exacting years as the Commander in Chief of the American forces in the War for Independence, and after 6 years of patient struggle to establish an enduring Federal Union, was about the present age of President Roosevelt. He desired to retire to his Mount Vernon home, leaving the management of the affairs of State to other and younger hands. Yet, although independence had been won and the Union established, the people looked to him for the leadership necessary to make national unity a living reality. Washington was a faithful soldier in the cause of democracy, and he did not let down those who had fought democracy's battle with him.

And so we say to Franklin Delano Roosevelt: We, the people of the United States have twice elected you President of the United States. We have followed and supported your leadership in your efforts to strengthen and revitalize our democracy. You have served us well, but your work is not done. We consider your continuance in office for another 4 years necessary to give a free people national unity at a time of grave crisis—necessary to give hope and courage to those offering their last full measure of devotion to preserve freedom in a civilized world. At such a time, Mr. President, we must hold you to your promise not to let the people down. We propose to nominate you, we propose to elect you, and we, the people, command you to serve as our President.

Training of Civilian Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House one of the finest steps toward national defense that has been taken by the Federal Government. I refer to the initiation of a program for the training of civilian pilots who, in the event of attack by a foreign power, would be equipped to aid in the defense of their shores. The program, sponsored by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, will return to the taxpayers of this country incalculable interest on their investment.

The C. A. A., through the Junior Board of Commerce of the District of Columbia, has chosen Columbus University Junior College as the local institution for conducting a ground-school course in aviation. I heartily commend both the Junior Board of Commerce and the Government agency for their splendid selection. Columbus University Junior College is rounding out only its second year. Yet its achievements in the field of education have become so notable that the Federal Government already recognizes its high standing in the academic field.

At this point I should like to pay public tribute to the guiding genius of Columbus University, a man who raised the university's law school to the third highest ranking law school in the country in point of enrollment. I refer to Dean John R. Fitzpatrick, whose zeal and organizational ability are largely responsible for the high standing of Columbus University today. It was through the efforts of Dean Fitzpatrick that the junior college was established 2 years ago. The school has offered educational opportunities to adults who otherwise would be denied the privilege of higher education. Now, through the recognition and aid of the Federal Government, an aviation department has been established in the junior college.

I appeal with all the sincerity at my command to the young men and women of Washington to take advantage of the ground-school course in aviation which the Federal Government is conducting at Columbus University Junior College. The course starts July 1 and will be given at evening sessions 5 nights a week. The cost of the course to the student is so negligible that it could hardly be an excuse for missing it. Heretofore, ground-school courses in aviation were usually reserved to men and women with college degrees. This course at Columbus University is for noncollege students, male and female, although college graduates are not barred.

There are many incentives and many laudable reasons why the youth of Washington should take an active interest in this course. In the first place I believe it is the solemn duty of every young man and woman to contribute his or her share toward the defense of the country. Especially is this true in these days of world-wide conflict and uncertainty. These are days when the incredible is happening right under our own eyes. This is an era when greater and greater emphasis should be placed on the importance of national preparedness. I know of no better way of preparing our country for the allegedly impossible than by this civilian pilot training which the Government is offering at Columbus University.

Disregarding, for the moment, the preparedness features of this ground-school course in aviation, one is forced to admit that the course is well worth the time and energy from the standpoint of self development and interest in the industry of aviation which is here to stay. It is, and will continue to be, an integral part of our industrial life. This industry is developing so fast, in fact, that within a few years airplanes will be as common as automobiles. In short, Washington men and women now have an opportunity of getting a first-class education in one of our most important industries under the sponsorship of the Federal Government.

The Government, I believe, has made the ground-school course at Columbus University very attractive. It is offering scholarships to the highest standing students who complete the course successfully. These scholarships enable the students to take flight-training courses without a penny of cost to them. The C. A. A. pays for these flight scholarships. This point alone should be sufficient to attract hundreds of young men and women to this course.

Multimillion Dollar War Propaganda Budget Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, in the accompanying article from yesterday's Washington Daily News, John T. Flynn discusses some very significant aspects of work now being done in this country by un-American agents. Mr. Flynn calls the attention of this country to the fact that agents who are trying to get us into the European War are in many ways fully as dangerous as agents who are trying to undermine our defenses at home. My Flynn calls for a rallying of pro-American forces to build an impregnable defense establishment to protect American interests at home.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 17, 1940]

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, June 17.—There is a point in the current excitement about the war which is a little puzzling. Last December—4 months after this war started—Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, American Ambassador to London, made the following statement:

"There is no place in this fight for us. It's going to be bad enough as it is. As you love America, don't let anything that comes out of any country in the world make you believe you can make a situation one whit better by getting into the war. There is no reason—economic, financial, or social—to justify the United States entering the war."

The war had started. But Mr. Kennedy, in full possession of this reason, warned against getting involved in the war. Poland had been devastated. Ships had been sunk. Finland had been raped by Russia. Warsaw had been destroyed. We all knew what Germany would do in France if she got the chance. Yet we were all resolved to stay out of the war. But now the hysteria is sweeping us in. What has happened?

In the United States Senate the other day someone recalled the statement of Lord Northcliffe about the last war. "England," said Northcliffe, "spent $150,000,000 for propaganda purposes in the United States during the war, and I consider that money spent to greater advantage than any equal amount during the entire conflict."

It is reported that the British Government has appropriated to spend here this time $165,000,000. We may be sure the sum is very great and that it is being spent intelligently. Can it be that this hysteria which is now raging in America is one fruit of the well-expended propaganda money for foreign countries?

There are, of course, powerful English instrumentalities at work to excite us into the war. That is quite natural. England is in a desperate position. She would be less than human if she did not try to get us in. There are also powerful German groups who want to keep us out and for exactly the same reason. Neither of them is thinking about America. Each is plotting to aid its own side. But there are Americans here—real Americans—who are thinking about America, her interests, her destiny, her democracy, her recovery, all of which would probably be destroyed by entering this war. Apparently it is quite proper for an English propagandist to work here to get us into a war. But an American who wants to keep out is a "fifth columnist."

Is it not time that we began to have a look at the sources, the means responsible for the amazing panic which has raged in this country in the last few weeks? We have investigated a good many trivial things these last few years. Here is the most serious thing in this world which, before it is done, may involve the lives of hundreds of thousands of our young men, the health of many more and the democratic security of us all. At this moment it is at the mercy of propagandists, foreign forces and agents trying to get us involved in war. And the Government is interested only in the agents who are trying to keep us out and gives no attention whatever to those who are trying to get us in.

If They Vote to Go Home, Vote to Keep Them There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States feel that Congress should remain in session so as to be able to immediately legislate concerning any matter which may develop in these turbulent times. They do not agree with the President that Congress should adjourn and leave matters in his hands. They have had over 7 years' experience with his leadership and actions and they do not want to leave important decisions affecting both our national-defense program and our foreign policies in his hands. In this connection I call attention to the following editorial appearing in the Indianapolis Times on June 12, 1940:

[From the Indianapolis Times of June 12, 1940]

IF THEY VOTE TO GO HOME, VOTE TO KEEP THEM THERE

Within a few days Congress may be called upon to cast the most important vote of 20 years.

That will happen if administration leaders persist in their effort to force an adjournment.

Any Congressman who does vote to adjourn and go home should be commanded by his constituents to remain at home.

Any elected representative of the people who is so insensible of his constitutional obligations that he would voluntarily abandon his post at a time like this is, we believe, unfit for the responsibility of service in Congress.

The terrible conflict in Europe goes rapidly from bad to worse. Any day may bring the need for fateful decisions involving our Nation's peace and security. Borrowed billions have been laid on the line for rearmament. But to turn dollars into weapons in the quantities needed, old industries will have to be invigorated and new ones created. Only Congress can do what is necessary to mobilize idle capital and manpower for this supreme task.

Overnight it may become not a matter for academic debate but an imperative necessity to order compulsory military training and conscript men for defense duty. Congress alone has that power and responsibility.

Our Government has operated in the red through 11 years of apparent peace and security. Confronted now with need for gigantic new defense expenditures, nothing substantial has been done to weed out old wastes, and the only tax proposal yet made won't even balance the nonmilitary outgo.

Congress is the Nation's fiscal guardian. Yet it is suggested that Congress pack up and go home. It is suggested that if an "emergency" should arise the President will summon Congress back to a special session—a procedure which requires several days in a period where there may be no day to spare.

We repeat that any who votes to go home at a time like this ought to be made to stay there—and very probably will be.

It is the duty of the elected representatives of the people to assume the full responsibility of their office. Blanket power should not be granted to any individual, especially with conditions as they are, and Congress should remain on the job, ready to promptly perform any duty which is required. If the administration, in its desire to leave all matters in the President's hands, presents a resolution to adjourn it should be overwhelmingly defeated.

Today I received the following telegram from the Service Club, of Indianapolis, Ind.:

The Service Club of Indianapolis believes it is imperative that the Congress of the United States shall now remain in session and determine step by step the conduct of the United States in world affairs. We each of us expect that the Congress and its Senators and Representatives will individually discharge their obligations. We insist that they delegate none of their responsibilities whatever to the Executive or any other department of the Government. As the Members of Congress believe in democracy we urge them to perform the duties which the Constitution places solely on them and to refuse to transfer any such power either to the Chief Executive or elsewhere.

Congress should not delegate its powers. We should not let the war situation completely overshadow our domestic problems. Congress should exert its energy to a solution of our problems.

Three Viewpoints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM GRIFFIN, OF THE NEW YORK ENQUIRER

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial by William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, is good reading for he expresses the sentiments of 90 percent of the American people.

Would to God we had a press in the United States unhampered and untied to the international troublemakers, the people who have been responsible and are now using every means at their command to involve this country in war.

Would to God that we could get rid of this internationalistic administration, whose departments and bureaus are under the control of those who do not subscribe to those principles which were set forth in the document we are supposed to follow—a document which protects the majority of our people from minority usurpation.

I hope the people will wake up before it is too late, because the majority in Congress seems to be in a trance.

[From the New York Enquirer of June 10, 1940]

SAVING OF UNITED STATES SHOULD CONSUME ALL OUR EFFORTS

Entirely too much thought and effort is being given here to the problem of saving the Anglo-French Allies and entirely too little to the infinitely more important problem of saving the United States of America.

Every American is rightfully desirous of seeing the Nazi Reich laid low, but no American can in conscience desire to see Uncle Sam laid low in the process of bringing Adolf Hitler to justice. Little will it profit America to destroy Nazi land and save Britain and France if in so doing this Republic is itself destroyed.

Whether we like it or not, the truth is that this Republic is now well on the way to destruction.

Congress and all others concerned should realize that this is no time for plunging and floundering and gambling in the field of foreign relationships. We need clear and loyal thinking and clear and loyal action.

Our country is in positive peril, not from without but from within.

If we stand firm at home and do our duty to the Republic, keeping it at peace and strictly neutral, no harm can befall us. This, however, is not a course which commends itself to those whose first love is not America but the empire from which America wrung her freedom eight score years ago. They want to see Britannia succored and rejuvenated by the blood of millions of slaughtered American boys and at the cost of our national existence.

Things more than ominous have taken place in our beloved land in recent days. A Washington despatch June 6 revealed how swiftly the Republic is being conducted to disaster. It declared:

"State Department circles said the 'lid is now off,' and that this Government was prepared to give all possible aid to the Allies short of sending an expeditionary force to France."

Who has given our Government authority to extend such aid to the Anglo-French forces? Certainly not Congress, and certainly not the American people.

This step means war and nothing but war. It means that, without the permission of Congress, airplanes, rifles, artillery, tanks, warships, and other indispensable implements of national defense are to be handed over to Britain and France.

It means further that millions of American youths are marked for sacrifice on foreign soil.

The British and the French merit the warmest commendation for their unceasing loyalty to their own lands in all things. Who has ever heard of a member of the French or British Parliament advocating the stripping of his own country of its means of protection in order to bolster the defenses of foreign powers? Everyone who follows the debates in Congress knows that not one but many Members of both Houses are zealously advocating this very course for Uncle Sam.

When George Washington discovered the plot of Major General Arnold, leader of the British "fifth column" here in the War of Independence, he uttered these words of anguish:

"Whom can we trust now?"

These words of the Father of his Country have a particular appropriateness for, and can be applied with telling effect to, those so-called Americans who are working night and day to plunge our country into the present tournament of blood, death, and destruction now going on in Europe.

Whom can we trust now?

Not one of those who is openly clamoring or secretly plotting for war has the remotest intention of risking his own life or possessions in the death struggle wherein war would involve the Republic. They and their belonging are entirely too precious to be interfered with. The other fellows must do the bleeding and the paying.

It cannot be too often iterated that our entering the war would instantly result in the establishment of a dictatorship here whose tyrannous powers over the lives and liberties and belongings of our people will be all-embracing, a dictatorship that would inflict upon us at the very outset the exact evil against which we would have taken up arms abroad.

Another vital factor which should not be overlooked is the utter foolishness of reposing confidence in the fidelity of Britain and France as war Allies of ours.

At this very moment London and Paris are keenly suspicious of each other.

Most people never thought that the day would come when Hitler and Stalin would be allies. Yet that day has come.

And right now both England and France, despite their grandiose public beseechings of God to bless their cause, despite their perfervid avowals that they are fighting for liberty of mind and body despite the unspeakable doings of Stalin in Poland and Finland, are trying as hard as they possibly can to consummate an alliance with the tyrant of the Kremlin.

We have nothing to lose by remaining at peace. We have everything to gain by remaining at peace. Upon public action depends whether or not the war mongers in our midst will be able to involve us in war and destroy the Republic.

Americans would be false to their principles and ideals did they fail to abhor Hitlerism. They would be equally false to their principles and ideals did they allow their loathing for Hitlerism to result in the destruction of this Republic. The most deadly blow which the American people can deal Hitlerism is to prevent their country from being involved in war and subjected to certain dictatorship and certain ruin.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

Mr. Speaker, let us now contrast the article I have just quoted, and which represents the viewpoint of a real American, with an article which expresses the viewpoint of England—the internationalistic viewpoint.

Lord Lothian has been traveling throughout the United States ever since he arrived here, lecturing, coercing, trying to create a sentiment which would favor our engaging in a perfectly foolish, stupid, and senseless war, which no one is responsible for except Great Britain herself and those who advised her that we would be in the war.

Would it not be a fine predicament were we foolish enough to turn our fleet over to any power, no matter whether it be Great Britain or anyone else? We have turned our airplanes over and are in a sense left utterly defenseless today should anything happen. As a matter of fact, should England herself decide that someone in the United States has not kept his promise to her, she could invade us from the north and use the equipment that we have given her for conquest against us. There is nothing extraordinary about that, for Great Britain has broken more treaties and produced more scraps from them than any other power in the history of the world. She has shown less consideration for defenseless nations than any other world power. All her possessions have been gained by conquest—taken from a people who not only lacked modern weapons but did not even have, in many instances, more than a blowgun or bow and arrow for protection. She sacrificed 150,000 of her colonials in her Gallipoli campaign without losing any of her own people. Surely she has shown no consideration for anyone, yet here this traveling propagandist for the British Empire advises us, in a subtle manner, to be sure, to give England our fleet.

[From the New York Enquirer, June 10, 1940]

LOTHIAN HINTS UNITED STATES GIVE WARSHIPS TO BRITAIN

PITTSBURGH, June 9.—Great Britain, ruler of the seas for centuries, is in need of naval destroyers as well as airplanes for its fight against Germany, Lord Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States, declared.

"We need ships—naval destroyers—as much as we need planes," Lord Lothian said in an interview here while en route to Washington, Pa., to address the graduating class of Washington and Jefferson College.

"We need guns, too—antiaircraft and machine guns. We lost almost all of our equipment in Flanders and the Germans now have seized many of the French manufacturing plants in the north around Lille.

"That is why anything the United States can give us now may mean the difference between our winning or losing this war."

Speaking before the one hundred and thirty-ninth graduating class of Washington and Jefferson College, the British Ambassador expressed the belief that only the formation, in some form, of a United States of Europe would bring lasting peace to the war-torn Old World.

"If Europe could only conquer war and find a basis for unity within itself, the whole world would have taken an immense step forward," he said.

In conclusion, let me quote a noted British writer, Hilaire Belloc, from the same issue of the New York Enquirer:

HILAIRE BELLOC, NOTED BRITISH AUTHOR, REVEALS HOW AMERICA WAS DRAWN INTO WAR IN 1917

WASHINGTON, June 9.—A book by Hilaire Belloc, noted British author, historian, and lecturer, published in 1925, and which dwells on the methods used by warmongers to induce the United States to enter the World War in 1917, is said to be enjoying a brisk "revival sale" throughout the capital and in other principal cities, where people are interested in the peculiar parallels to the present propaganda methods presented in the book.

Belloc wrote in his book, 7 years after the end of the World War of 1914–18:

"The most comic part of the affair was the attitude toward America. We dared not insult America, for we were naturally as keen on getting American help as is a drowning man on catching a deck chair. * * *

"In their ignorance many people came to believe that it was the duty of the Americans to come over and help, and, what was more astonishing still, it was represented to them as a matter of life and death, not to us, but to themselves. The Americans were told (Heaven knows whether any of them believed it!) that if the Germans, Austrians, Bohemians, Slovenes, Croats, Bulgarians, Turks, etc., won in their push against the English, French, and Italians, that if the half-baked won against the baked, the next thing would be a sailing of the conquerors over the sea for the rude domination of Scranton, Pa. Fiddlesticks-ends!

"But people did really talk like that. They shook their fingers at the United States and said: 'It will be your turn next!'"

These articles in the New York Enquirer express exactly what is happening in the United States today. We are being treated with the same coercion by the English and by the English Internationalistic Government.

There is much to be said about this, but space forbids incorporation of all this information within the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, my entire interest in inserting this is to provide the people of this Nation with facts based upon statements by those who call the American people sheep.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

RESOLUTION OF LODGE NO. 2, SCANDINAVIAN FRATERNITY OF AMERICA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution

adopted at the annual convention of District Lodge No. 2, Scandinavian Fraternity of America:

Resolved, That we, the officers, delegates, and members of District Lodge No. 2, S. F. of A., in convention assembled, reaffirm our love for and our belief in the Constitution of the United States, and our appreciation for the rights and privileges enjoyed under an orderly democratic form of government.

That we, as loyal citizens of the United States, believe in adequate national defense, planned speedily and economically.

That we deplore the plight of our kindred in the Scandinavian countries and that we pledge our support and assistance to relieve their sufferings.

MANCHESTER, N. H., May 26, 1940.

HAROLD K. ANDERSON,
AGNES WIDEMAN,
GUNHILD MCCUSKER,
Committee on Resolutions.

Attest:

ADOLPH JOHNSON,
District Secretary.

My Answer to Unfair and Uncalled for Newspaper Attacks—Sufferers of Atavism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under the rules I would be privileged to address the House of Representatives for 1 hour, to defend my character and dignity against imputations emanating from blatant New Orleans newspapers. In order not to interfere with the legislative program I shall be content to place these remarks in the RECORD. Primarily, to support this statement I quote from editorial of the New Orleans Item, titled "That Lost Drydock."

Higgins industries launches the first of several torpedo boats for Uncle Sam's Navy. We ought to be building and launching lots of bigger ones at the Algiers Navy Yard—and still bigger fighting and commercial ships in a great shipyard here in New Orleans.

But the same day the Higgins craft takes to the water the Navy starts New Orleans' big naval drydock on its way to far-off Hawaii. That terribly upsets the balance. The association of commerce and other Orleans interests have long been struggling to keep this great dock here and get it into operation. But there it gaily goes on its way across the Pacific.

And while this departure was incubating our congressional delegation has mostly been heeling around down here at home to save the plundering statehouse machine.

Our people should get it at last into their heads that our naval drydocks will go to Hawaii, and our navy yard will gather moss, and no commercial shipyard will rise in New Orleans until we get a couple of Senators and eight Representatives in Washington who have the energy, intelligence, and address, to make the administration and the Federal departments give due consideration to the just demands of New Orleans in such matters as this.

The Algiers yard goes on rusting in Congressman FERNANDEZ' district. To get respectful treatment for it is a job calling for strong character, exceptional address, dogged persistence, and a willingness to be disagreeable, also for the talent to attract congressional allies in such efforts, and to get the ears of the President and those who run the executive department.

It long ago became apparent that Mr. FERNANDEZ by no means fills this bill. Even if he and his colleagues had not been ward-heeling down here for the corrupt statehouse machine, instead of concentrating their time to saving this naval dredge, and getting the navy yard reopened, it would have made no difference. For Mr. FERNANDEZ simply lacks the qualifications required of a man who handles assignments of that sort.

Editorial from the New Orleans States:

Yesterday saw the great naval drydock that for years has been at the Algiers Naval Station started on a trip to Honolulu. This dims the hopes of Orleanians that the naval station, giving employment to many, would be reopened some time in the near future. This station, if in operation, would do much toward relieving the unemployment situation in New Orleans and aid our merchants and businessmen on the road to greater prosperity. New Orleans should never have lost the Algiers Naval Station. Our Congressmen and Senators have been derelict in their duty in allowing this great port to be discriminated against as it has by the Navy Department in closing of the Algiers yard.

While New Orleans is fighting for industrial independence "Bathtub" JOE FERNANDEZ, Member of the House of Representatives, and Senator ALLEN J. "Little Bull" ELLENDER spent most of their time in Louisiana doing all in their power to perpetuate the rule of a crooked political machine over this State. They should have been in Washington, fighting to keep the drydock here and to reopen the Algiers Navy Yard, instead of going around the State, one stirring up race issues and the other raising his voice in defense of a machine that has brought disgrace upon Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I want to categorically deal with these outbursts from newsprint species of atavism. For the benefit of those of my constituents who read this, I want them to know what atavism is. I assume the gentlemen of the House know, but I primarily want my folks back home, whose education is somewhat limited like myself, to understand what I am trying to express here. Atavism is the recurrence of any peculiarity or disease from which an ancestor in remote generations has suffered. Of course in the instance of these newspapers the "recurrence" does not generate back so long, as I just want to deal with my career, in face of this unjust castigation by some so-called learned college and university graduates, who get paid to push a pen behind an editor's desk and try to mold public opinion. O Mr. Speaker, I recognize the set-up in this country, and the essentiality of freedom of the press. I think that every Member of the House concurs in that recognition. I simply want to vindicate myself, and use this means at this time to do so, as I have offered myself for reelection in the primary to be held in Louisiana on September 10, this year. These newspapers have always in the past, it seems, been motivated by atavism. They always fought the man who was for labor—the man who was for the masses. Yet, these same newspapers, through paid advertisement in their columns, profited by what the same men—who produced more for the common people and masses in Louisiana, who gave them more benefits, who opened the way for new industry and increased business in Louisiana—were directly and indirectly responsible for.

Mr. Speaker, if what was printed in the editorial of the Item were not so serious, it would be laughable. To say that such printed comment by a newspaper subject to atavism is enshrouded in doubt and qualified with "if" is only corroborating the exhibition I have made. I maintain and hold that I do enjoy my prerogative as a free American citizen to mingle among my friends and common people and people in all walks and classes of life in my district during the year and around election time. Politics is my business. But I maintain and hold that my action has been legal, and nothing I did or will do could stop any citizen from exercising his right to vote in a Louisiana primary as he or she saw fit. I have the right, Mr. Speaker, to have a reasonable discussion with my folks and give "sales talks" if I desire. Oh, but the insinuations of an abusive press would try to impress decent people's minds with other feed, just as if they were issuing fodder to cattle.

In the editorial of the States is reflected the pen of an editor who is trying to kindle some of his own political aspirations or ambition. Of course, that is his God-given right, but to abuse, or try to abuse, Members of Congress is just a little side line with another press that suffers with atavism. They say in this editorial that I spent most of my time in Louisiana doing all in my power to perpetuate the rule of a "crooked political machine" over Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, do you or any gentleman of this House believe that the machine itself as a whole was filled with corruption? I am not here to defend any man but myself, and it is my name that has been impugned. But I will say this: Many of the men and women in that organization were honest, industrious, and good citizens. If they were not, collapse would have occurred sooner. Out of elected officials in the Long organization in Louisiana, only one was indicted. He was an ex-Governor. A few holding appointive jobs were charged and indicted and convicted. Most of the men indicted, and some of whom were convicted,

were businessmen having dealings with the regime. However, I do not intend to prolong any Louisiana political strife, but am simply citing these facts in defense of my action.

Mr. Speaker, this is a free country. A fellow has the right to choose whom he wishes to support. All of my loyal friends held jobs under the State regime. I wanted to do what I could to save their jobs. I would do it again. A dog is known for his faithfulness to mankind. These men of whom I speak were kind to me when they did not have State jobs. They supported me for office in the past; and lots of them are loyal yet to me, even though they face the loss of their jobs under the new administration.

The Editorial of the States asks "What other benefits has 'Bath Tub' JOE FERNANDEZ lost for the people of his district besides the Algiers Naval Dock?" My answer is "None." I challenge those newspapers, sufferers of atavism, to show what benefits I lost during by absence from Washington, in an effort to help my people and their cause. I say my people, for my people did by a majority express themselves the same as I did. Nothing arose in this great Chamber during my absence that was lost to the great State of Louisiana.

Yes; it is true the floating drydock at the Algiers Naval Station was moved. But did that occur during my absence? Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate how a suffering press will deliberately try to fool the people, I want to point out that the President of the United States, on September 11, 1939, in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, ordered the removal of this drydock to the Hawaiian Islands Naval Base at Honolulu, notwithstanding my repeated appeals to the President and the Navy Department. The President exercised his temporary emergency powers to transfer the dock on the same day he decreed a limited emergency existed in this country, September 11, 1939. I am prone to recognize the necessity of strengthening our naval base in the Pacific at Honolulu. I am sure that the people of New Orleans will understand this movement of the drydock by the President as one for their ultimate protection and general welfare, as an instrument of national defense. Howbeit, I want at this time to insert in the RECORD communications between the President of the United States and myself on the subject:

JUNE 9, 1938.

Hon. F. D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On April 26, 1938, you approved the Naval Supply Act for the year July 1, 1938–June 30, 1939. On page 16 thereof, under Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, is this proviso:

"* * * and including such sum as may be necessary incident to the utilization of the naval station, New Orleans, La., for vessels to be placed and maintained in a decommissioned status. * * *"

That proviso was included, at my instance, through cooperation of the members of the Appropriations Committee, and was retained in the act without a single objection on the part of the committee of which I am a member.

Congressman MALONEY and myself, from New Orleans, about a week ago contacted your secretary, Mr. McIntyre, in an effort to arrange an appointment with you, when we would be enabled to make our appeal to you in person so that funds for this purpose may not be withheld during the next fiscal year; and in order that this important project of the Navy may be reopened on this small scale, with the vision of enlarging it suitably from time to time, for reasons that in these troublesome times must be obvious to you.

The appointment sought has not yet been granted, and I find it essential to embark for New Orleans tonight on urgent matters. I had hoped, in vain, that Mr. MALONEY and myself would have earned this engagement prior to this time. Mr. President, the station at Algiers, New Orleans, is located in the district which I represent. I quote from letter of January 24, 1938, from Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Naval Operations:

"* * * relative to reopening of the New Orleans Navy Yard, the revised estimates now are:

1. Reopening of yard for maintenance and recommissioning of from 10 to 20 destroyers	$1,258,405
2. Increase in annual maintenance	356,463

"It is estimated that civilian personnel will total about 80 men."

I now quote from the unanimously adopted report of the House of Representatives (No. 1699, of January 17, 1938) on H. R. 8993, the Naval Supply Act of 1938:

"It is the thought of the committee that if the decommissioned vessels be added to at the establishments where they are now maintained, congestion would ensue and delay might result in getting them promptly in readiness in event of emergency. For that reason New Orleans, with its unused facilities and fresh water, which lessens the amount of deterioration, would seem to be ideally suited for the accommodation of vessels hereafter decommissioned. The policy would occasion added expense to this and other appropriations, but possibly not to an extent which would outweigh the advantages that would ensue, should an emergency arise, from being in a position to recondition and recommission more expeditiously vessels which would be in immediate demand, than would be practicable under present practice."

I do not want to throw suspicion on any of our neighbors, for I believe in your good neighborly policy. However, we must face factual possibilities. It is a fact that this country did war with Mexico at one time. That may be healed or not healed, all dependent on the feelings of the other country. That we have no control over the politics or policies of Mexico, or other countries—I am speaking of Mexico, however—is evident by the fact of recent expropriation of the oil industry by that country. In that light that we do not control Mexico's policy or politics, isn't it possible that some European or Asiatic nation may find a suitable base there, based possibly upon some financial or reciprocal arrangement, thereby endangering our country if that nation be antagonistic in policy or character towards the United States? In such event, wouldn't it be most wise—just on the strength of that possibility, as well as other considerations—to let this money go for the reopening of the navy station at New Orleans?

Mr. President, I regret Mr. MALONEY's and my efforts have so far been in vain, to see you, and that response was not had from the White House ere this time. I want you to know that I supported your administration every time except to restore Federal employees' salaries and veterans' benefits, and which was passed by Congress overriding your veto. I am disappointed in the sense that I had expected this appointment, particularly as a few attempts in past years proved unsuccessful, too.

Before closing, I want to direct your attention to the further possibility of expanding the naval station at New Orleans for ship construction—possibly light cruisers—either or both of Navy and Merchant Marine.

I commend these thoughts and facts to you for your earnest and wise consideration, hoping that the outcome will coincide with the wish of Congress, at this time, insofar as the proviso in the Naval Supply Act of 1938 applies.

In esteem, I beg to remain,
Respectfully,

J. O. FERNANDEZ.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 10, 1938.

Hon. J. O. FERNANDEZ,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FERNANDEZ: Your letter of June 9 has been brought to my attention and I have read it with a great deal of interest.

Personally, I should have liked to have talked this matter over with you, but it frankly has been impossible for me to see everyone I should during these last couple of weeks.

The matter you refer to is being looked into at my direction. I think it is only fair to state frankly to you, however, that all the recommendations made to me—and we have gone into it very thoroughly—oppose any attempt to locate the construction yard at New Orleans.

I will be glad to go into this in detail with you at the first opportunity.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *September 4, 1939.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Kindly refer to my letter of June 9, 1938, and your acknowledgment of June 10, concerning my request and suggestion, as well as continued efforts, for the reopening of the United States Naval Station at Algiers, New Orleans, La.

I now believe that, in face of the European trend, the importance of this unit at New Orleans should not any longer be discounted or minimized.

Therefore, again, Mr. President, I implore that your Executive offices be used toward the attainment of this goal.

At the present time the Algiers Naval Station is under the supervision of the Louisiana National Youth Administration, which conducts an N. Y. A. training youth center there, which, of course, I understand, is subject to an occupational right by the United States Navy Department.

May I anticipate your wise consideration in this matter in connection with an expansive and necessary naval program?

In highest esteem, I remain,
Respectfully,

J. O. FERNANDEZ.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 14, 1939.

Hon. J. O. FERNANDEZ, M. C.,
3501 St. Claude Avenue, New Orleans, La.

MY DEAR MR. FERNANDEZ: In reply to your letter of September 4, 1939, I have given consideration to your request for the reopening of the United States Naval Station at Algiers, New Orleans, La.

The major part of the Algiers Naval Station is, as you know, occupied and operated at the present by the National Youth Administration under a revocable permit from the Navy Department. In large measure the Navy Department was motivated in its granting of this permit by the belief that the general condition of the plant would be benefited by occupation; long years of inactivity result in deterioration and I feel that the present use of the station should prove a useful step in preparing the station for reoccupancy by the Navy should necessity arise. Indirectly in this respect the Navy Department has made possible the expenditure of considerable sums in the New Orleans area for the dual purpose of furthering the projects of the N. Y. A. and some reconditioning of the naval station.

The prospective usefulness of marine facilities will always depend on the character and extent of operations in the vicinity and until such time as the national policy calls for naval operations in the vicinity of the Mississippi Delta, no expanded naval activities can very well be undertaken at New Orleans. At a time like this all of our available appropriations must be extended for the strengthening of the essential parts of the national defense, and at the moment those essential parts are the operating forces of our Fleet and the shore facilities to build them and keep them operating.

It may very well be that the United States may be forced to still further expansion of its naval activities and you may be assured that New Orleans will always be given full and careful consideration in studying our national-defense needs.

I regret that I cannot offer you concrete encouragement in this instance, but I wish to reemphasize the fact that the naval policy has already benefited New Orleans to some extent and I wish to reassure you that New Orleans will receive fair consideration in future studies.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 3, 1939.

Hon. J. O. FERNANDEZ,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERNANDEZ: I have your letter of October 31, 1939, relative to the removal of the floating drydock from the Naval Station, New Orleans, La.

The present limited emergency has dictated a redistribution of the units of the fleet and the assignment of certain vessels to the Naval Station, Pearl Harbor. The existing docking facilities at that station are entirely inadequate to take care of these additional vessels and it becomes imperative, in the interests of national defense, that this deficiency be made good at the earliest practicable date. Under present conditions the floating drydock at New Orleans serves no useful purpose to the Navy. On the contrary, the maintenance and guarding of the dock constitute an unproductive financial burden. As you are aware, the dock is not now equipped to accommodate vessels as the blocking has been removed. In the absence of any governmental vessels to be docked, there is no prospect that the dock would be placed in active service if it were left at New Orleans.

While it is to be regretted that circumstances make necessary the removal of the dock, I believe you will agree with me that the interests of the national defense are paramount in this case.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

My activity in behalf of the Algiers Naval Station dates back to my first tenure in office as a Member of Congress 10 years ago. I regret exceedingly the President did not view our local situation the same as I did, notwithstanding my own efforts, character of address, and the efforts of all labor and civic units of New Orleans, and the efforts of the newspapers themselves.

In order that a correct appraisal of the situation may be advanced, I wish to have inserted now the history of the naval station, New Orleans, known as the Algiers Naval Station, as furnished me by the Navy Department:

NAVAL STATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The naval station, New Orleans, was originally established in 1849 by the purchase of a tract of land consisting of water frontage on the Mississippi River, in the town of Algiers, 384 feet along the fiver front and extending inland 5,880 feet. No acitve use was made of this reservation until 1889, when a commission was appointed pursuant to an act of Congress, approved September 7, 1889, to determine upon a site on the Gulf of Mexico or its tributaries for a navy yard. The senior member of this board was Commodore William P. McCann. This board selected New Orleans as the most desirable location on the Gulf of Mexico for a navy yard. Its primary functions were determined to be the maintenance and repair of the naval-defense forces of the Mississippi River as formulated by the Board of Engineers on fortifications and other defenses of 1885. At this time the naval-defense force was to consist of 2 floating batteries and 12 torpedo boats, reinforced by submarine mines.

Pursuant to the recommendations of the McCann board, additional land was purchased in 1894, 1901, and 1904, augmenting the original purchase of 1849 and making the present area 214.76 acres, the total cost of which has been $148,002.

Active construction work was started in 1901 and consisted of a group of industrial buildings, storehouses, and quarters. The floating dock which is now located at the station was constructed in 1901 and put in operation in the latter part of 1901. The first ship to be docked was the collier *Sterling* of 5,663 tons. The battleship *Illinois* of 11,565 tons was docked on January 6, 1902.

The station was closed in 1911. In 1913 a board was appointed to inspect the station and report on the advisibility of its being reopened. This board reported against the reopening of the station but recommended that it be kept in its then present condition until other activities elsewhere could be developed and that the drydock be maintained for the continued docking of vessels.

In 1915 after the outbreak of the World War the station was opened and activities started leading to its emergency use. Following the declaration of war on April 6, 1917, these activities were greatly expanded, resulting in the establishment of an emergency naval hospital and training camp at the station.

The station continued in a more or less active status until July 27, 1921, when by General Order No. 63, it was placed on an inoperative basis. The equipment and appurtenances were not removed, only the stores being shipped away or sold. On February 7, 1923, the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans leased the water-front area with wharves, buildings, railroads, and other structures and agreed to keep and maintain the premises and superstructures thereon in a like state of repair.

No ships have been built at the station for the Navy.

The station plant is equipped with the necessary facilities for minor ship repair work, including shops of capacity for routine repairs upon ships which can be handled by the floating dock. The station plant consists of industrial buildings, all of brick and steel construction, and are in a generally good structural condition. The water front consists of 4,400 feet of wharves, of timber and steel construction, with 30 to 35 feet of water alongside. The station is protected from high water of the Mississippi River by a levee extending the full length of the property. A railroad track system connecting with the Southern Pacific Railroad serves the entire station and there are complete installations of service systems for water, electricity, compressed air, telephone, sewer, heating, and roadways.

Ships docked in the floating drydock since 1903 have been as follows:

1903	26
1904	19
1905	18
1906	12
1907	5
1908	4
1909	12
1917	17
1918	74
1919	77
1920	42
1921	19
1922	1
1923	12
1924	14
1925	10
1926	13
1927	13
1928	11
1929	13
1930	12
1931	8
1932	5

The dock was placed out of commission in the latter part of 1933.

The character of ships docked at New Orleans from 1903 to 1932 consisted of submarine chasers, light cruisers, gunboats, merchant ships, eagle boats, Army dredging equipment, station craft, and barges of the Mississippi Warrior Service. Most of the vessels docked were commercial ships, barges, and station craft.

The average number of civilian employees for the various years is as follows:

1901	6
1903	71
1907	450
1910	497
1911	191
1912–14	7
1915	242
1916	332
1917	1,205
1918	1,641
1919	1,317
1920	1,237
1924	80
1925	71
1926	54
1927	78
1928	126
1929	74
1930	130
1931	106

1932	34
1933	16
1934	11
1935	78
1936	23
1937	17

Briefly, the construction commenced in 1901. The station was closed in 1911. This station was only reopened at the outbreak of the World War in 1915, leading to its emergency use. Following our entry into that war its activities were greatly expanded for reasons obvious to everyone. Oh, yes, President Roosevelt was an Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the World War. He was familiar with the need, if any, of a naval base at New Orleans. Of course, since the last World War methods of warfare have changed, and I do not question the ingenuity of the President in having the drydock removed, but I regret it, as I wanted to see it retained for future use. We observe that this station was closed or placed in an inoperative status on July 27, 1921, by General Order No. 63. I was not in Congress in 1921, Mr. Speaker. No ships were ever constructed at this station for the Navy, but repairs were made to naval vessels—the battleship *Illinois*, January 6, 1902.

Yes, we see the station inoperative on July 27, 1921, and on February 7, 1923, the dock board leased the water-front area with wharves, buildings, railroads, and structures thereon. I was not a Member of Congress until 1931 and 1932, 10 to 11 years after this station was actually closed. When this station was closed there was a gentleman from New Orleans, under a Republican regime, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Ernest Lee Jahncke, a Republican at that time. New Orleans at that time had two Congressmen and an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and still that power was unable to frustrate or prevent this closure. What am I to do?

The Item's editor says in his write-up March 20, 1940:

The Algiers Yard goes on rusting in Congressman FERNANDEZ's district—to get respectful treatment for it is a job calling for strong character, exceptional address, dogged persistence, and a willingness to be disagreeable, also for the talent to attract congressional allies in such efforts, and to get the ears of the President and those who run the executive department.

That is a reflection on me, Mr. Speaker, by the bold imputation that I am incompetent. After this summary of quotations from the RECORD, backed by my volume of papers of my activity on this matter, I hope the lack of veracity and lack of respect for a true factual situation on the part of this newspaper editor and publisher, another sufferer of avatism, is demonstrated. Mr. Speaker, I now insert a reprint from the Sunday Item-Tribune of September 10, 1939.

[From the New Orleans Item-Tribune of September 10, 1939]

ALGIERS NAVAL STATION BOOMS WITH PEACE ACTIVITY—TWELVE HUNDRED YOUTHS ARE LEARNING WAY TO ECONOMIC SECURITY—NAVY WILL FIND PLACE IN SHAPE IF CALL TO HELP BOLSTER FORCES COMES; FERNANDEZ HAS WAGED HARD FIGHT TO HAVE YARD REOPENED; SARRE AND N. Y. A. BOYS DOING FINE WORK

While the controversy goes on as to whether the United States naval station in Algiers will be reopened as such, because of the war situation, the activities in that $8,000,000 plant are almost as great as during wartime, but they are N. Y. A. activities.

It may be that the new war threats will call for the reopening of the naval station by the Government, as happened during the World War; but if so, the Navy will find their place shipshape.

Twelve hundred youths from families on relief in New Orleans have been a peacetime substitute "navy," learning various trades in the shops of the decommissioned station, at the same time putting the place in apple pie order.

FERNANDEZ FIGHT

Congressman J. O. FERNANDEZ has been one of the longest and hardest fighters in the move to reopen the naval station, but it was also through him that the permission came to allot the station to the National Youth Administration.

Mr. FERNANDEZ has recently urged President Roosevelt to carry out the plan of re-establishing the Naval station, but in the meantime, A. J. Sarre, State administrator for N. Y. A., has been the admiral at the helm.

Following a formal permit prepared by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy in October of last year the Navy Department on December 30 turned over to the National Youth Administration for Louisiana custody of practically all the properties now standing on the approximately one square mile of territory in Algiers known as the Algiers Naval Station.

Yes; that was a fairly good write-up, Mr. Speaker. The New Orleans Item had some good reason for that, I suppose. I did not ask them for it. Lest we forget the truth. Alas! The New Orleans Item has reformed—or has it? I remember the Item has always flirted with the old regular organization in New Orleans when it did not suffer attacks of atavism. For instance, it flirted with the old Martin Behrman regime. The late Martin Behrman was a long-time mayor of New Orleans. Between its reform fights it again flirted with the Walmsley regime and was benefited again as official mouthpiece for city proceedings in its Tribune. It also benefited from paid political advertisements. For the benefit of my friends back home, who may not know, advertising rates for political ads are the highest that are paid to a newspaper. Now read this: this same item decried the State machine, yet this same Item obtained forced subscriptions through that political organization. Of course, all employees of the State machine were forced to subscribe, not 1 subscription for 6 months or 3 months, but 3, 4, 5, and 6, and sometimes 12, according to salary received. Those poor persons earning 30 cents an hour did not want 1 subscription; no, they did not want one, did not care for the Item-Tribune if it were given to them, but were made to purchase 3 and 4 subscriptions each. Many of them in my own ward, the ninth, complained to me about it, and in some instances, I can prove, actually gave them the money to pay for their subscriptions in order that their families might not be deprived of the necessities of life, which they could not purchase when being compelled to subscribe to a newspaper they did not care for. O Mr. Speaker, the Times-Picayune, a contemporary of the Item-Tribune, did have a front-page box about this, but the Item denied it, saying it was a contest. But I stand ready to submit proof in sworn form, if necessary, to corroborate my charge that the New Orleans Item used the organization to force men to take newspaper subscriptions.

In closing I want to deal a little with a few of my accomplishments in the way of actual physical improvements I was responsible for obtaining in my district in New Orleans, contrasted with the loss of the floating dock at the Algiers Naval Station. Here is the record and score:

Lost: The floating drydock. But I promise to fight for renewal during an emergency, as well as for the complete restoration of this yard, and possibility of making a naval air base there:

Won: A new lighthouse supply depot—completed—my bill in Congress authorized this building.

A new Federal building at New Orleans, being completed. As a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee, wrote into the deficiency bill the funds to construct the building. Notwithstanding the opposition of certain business interests of New Orleans.

A Coast Guard station on Lake Pontchartrain. My bill passed Congress authorizing this station. It is hoped the people will vote the constitutional amendment again this November. You will recall it was defeated last election.

Surrender of the title of Bayou St. John to the city of New Orleans—my bill—resulting in local improvement of this section.

Surrender of the land fronting the United States jail to permit strengthening of the levee at that point, Esplanade Avenue and river, and shifting of the railroad tracks, street, and so forth—my bill.

A new post-office building at Arabi—completed—near the great American Sugar Refinery, Ford Motor Car Co., and oil plant.

A $300,000 customs appraisals stores building, money appropriated for, and Treasury Department considering a further budget request for, $300,000 additional for larger building.

My work on having the United States Department of Agriculture declare muskrat trappers, farmers, and placing a project in St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes, rehabilitating some three or four hundred families—spending nearly $1,000,000.

These are some citations of physical improvements, and do not include, for instance, the new post-office building to be erected in Algiers, funds for which I hope to receive in one of the deficiency bills this Congress. Also does not include other services and accomplishments obtained in my public service for the people of my district and our State. I am therefore proud of my record of accomplishments for my people.

Farmers and City Workers Should Unite on Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, cane-sugar refineries are located, with a few minor exceptions, in the great seaports of the United States. Obviously Iowa has no cane-sugar refinery. As a consequence, it has no direct economic interest in the decision by Congress regarding the refined-sugar quotas. But the people of Iowa, I believe, favor the restoration of the refined-sugar quotas on Hawaii and Puerto Rico. The reason for this is that Iowans recognize the general principle that there must be a fair balance between industry on the one hand and agriculture on the other if there is to be a strong and well-knit nation.

Iowa is the very heart of American agriculture. For years it has battled for the defense of the American farmer, and it rejoices that this battle has been won in large part. The Nation recognizes today that a prosperous American agriculture is necessary to insure a prosperous American industry, and, conversely, a prosperous American industry is necessary to insure a prosperous American agriculture. The people in the great refining States of Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and so on, know that their factories cannot sell goods unless the farmer has the money to buy them. And Iowa cannot sell its meat and grains unless the city people are employed. What the Cummings bill would do, unless it is amended, is to definitely create unemployment in those great industrial cities. It would wipe out the buying power of thousands of well-paid American workmen whose wives spend millions of dollars a year for farm products.

But going beyond this, the Cummings bill in its present form is bitterly opposed by millions of people in the industrial States. American organized labor is against it 100 percent. I do not see why any American farmer at this time would want to crush the feeling of good will and cooperation which now exists between the city and the farmer. In these perilous times the various sections of this Nation must be united in a common front.

Now, it has been stated by some people that all of this might be true, but sugar refining is an industry, and Congress should not include a sugar industry in a sugar-farm bill. At the outset, I want to make it perfectly clear that, although the Sugar Act affects some 85,000 mainland farmers, the production of sugar in Hawaii and Puerto Rico is not a farm pursuit at all. Anyone who has seen a sugar plantation in Hawaii or Puerto Rico knows that tropical raw-sugar production is an industrial rather than an agricultural operation. The tropical-sugar refining industry is corporate big business. The Serralles and Roig families in Puerto Rico, who want to expand their refining at the expense of the home industry, have combined assets estimated at $10,000,000.

But even if tropical sugar were produced on small farms of 2 or 3 acres, this would not alter the key fact that Congress could not, even if it wanted to, separate the continental refiners from a general sugar bill. The quota system controls the amount of refined sugar which can be made by the mainland cane-sugar refining industry. The Sugar Act prohibits the refiners from purchasing any more sugar than is allowed by law. If there were no prohibition on the business of the refiners through quotas, there wouldn't be any quota system. And if the refining industry did not pay into the Treasury some $47,000,000 a year as a manufacturers' sales tax, there wouldn't be any funds out of which the enormous subsidies could be paid to the tropical refiners. And mind you, the Roig and Serralles families in Puerto Rico have received some $2,000,000 in cash since the Sugar Acts went into effect.

Congress, in 1934 and in 1936, and again in 1937, recognized that quotas on raw sugar made it necessary to provide quotas on refined sugar. Congress in 1940 will again recognize that fact. I am glad that Congress has the opportunity, in a so-called farm bill, to protect the interests of the workers in the industrial States. The sugar bill gives Congress the opportunity to give specific effect to a salutary general principle, that is that in every instance a balance should be maintained between the interests of American agriculture on the one hand and American industry and labor on the other.

Youth Opportunities in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia of June 14, 1940:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of June 14, 1940]

AVIATION: "BEST BET" FOR BOYS

(By W. Laurence LePage, president of Platt-LePage Aircraft Co. and aviation writer)

In this day, when the airplane has become a terrible weapon of destruction, it is both difficult and discouraging to attempt to speak constructively on the outlook for youth in aviation. When we think of 45,000 pilots in 2 years, 100,000 mechanics to keep 50,000 military planes in the air, and other gigantic plans to create a military machine, then the outlook is discouraging.

But this is a passing phase in history. In time aviation will again assume its true role as a peaceful tool of civilization and young men and women will devote their lives to an industry which has proved its inestimable value in our industrial and social life.

Basically, the aircraft industry means either transportation or manufacturing. In both spheres opportunities exist identical with those in other industries, with one exception—vision and enthusiasm commensurate with an industry as young and far-reaching are essential if one is to stay in the race.

The idea that taking up aviation as one's life work only entails going to a flying school and learning to be a pilot, or a mechanic's school and learning to adjust and repair planes and engines, is a short-sighted one which has brought disappointment and discouragement to many young people.

Cut a cross section through manufacturing, transportation, banking, insurance, accounting, advertising, writing, and so on, and you will get an idea of the infinite kinds of work open to you in the aviation industry.

Salaries and wages are the same or higher than those paid in other industries but the standards are harder to measure up to.

Why are standards so high? Because the business is new, because vision was necessary to bring it to its present high state of development, and because even greater vision will be needed to keep up the pace. Also, since an error in aviation work is likely to have more far-reaching results, only the most competent are acceptable and only those who can maintain the standards can keep up with the pace.

It is perhaps for this reason that the industry is, for the most part, made up of young men, men who have been keyed up to

the pitch by aspirations of their youth and who have never allowed themselves to fall into careless habits.

Those who expected a recital of specific jobs available and advice on how to get them, are probably disappointed. But I have covered the things that really matter, the qualities which make the aviation industry the finest bet for youth on the horizon today.

Who Receives Nation's Wealth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE HAVERHILL (MASS.) SUNDAY RECORD

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Haverhill Sunday Record:

[From the Haverhill Sunday Record of June 16, 1940]

WHO RECEIVES NATION'S WEALTH?—LABOR 65 PERCENT AND CAPITAL 35

(By F. G. R. Gordon)

For 50 years the Socialist leaders of this Nation have been circulating false propaganda about wealth production.

They have said a thousand times over that the workers receive barely 20 percent of the total wealth produced by the joint efforts of capital, labor, and brains.

Most important of these forces for wealth production are the men of brains. They are the men who invent machinery, organize the forces of production, direct the machinery of production. Labor today works 4 hours a day less than our fathers worked; they receive in wages three times as much as their fathers received. Why?

Because brains have organized, invented, and directed both capital and labor, making both far more efficient and vastly increasing wealth production under normal economic conditions.

Let's deal in facts. Facts show the truth. Facts are gathered by the census takers once in every 10 years. Their reports show the facts.

Here they are:

The official reports of the Federal Government relating to the great manufacturing industry of the Nation prove beyond any doubt by anybody anywhere that the Socialists and other radical leaders have for years, in speeches, editorials, and general propaganda, uttered the most monstrous lies about the division between capital and labor. Here are are solid facts as shown by the only method and the only body of men engaged in the business of stating the facts:

WHERE THE MONEY COMES, AND GOES, FROM ALL MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS

Operating statement, 1929 to 1935, inclusive; 7 years of business (the latest full reports available)

Income:	
Manufacturing goods sold and produced in 7 years	$316,205,286,000
Bad debts amounted to	1,974,152,000
Leaving a net return from sales of	314,231,134,000
Dividends from other corporations amounting to	2,896,041,000
Received from interest, rents, and other income	13,582,785,000
Which gave a total income of	330,709,960,000
Paid out:	
Paid out for materials, fuel, transportation and other supplies	235,873,586,000
Set aside for repairs, wearing out of machinery	12,080,750,000
Paid interest for borrowed money, rents, etc.	6,172,632,000
Government taxes amounted to	6,490,598,000
Left for employees, management, and owners	70,092,394,000
Paid in salaries and wages	56,534,150,000
Management of the corporation for services	6,209,576,000
Leaving for stockholders net earnings of	7,348,666,000
Cash dividends paid to stockholders of	14,904,602,000
Leaving a deficit draft on capital and surplus of	7,555,934,000

The above table prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board, from governmental reports.

We must take into consideration that 1929 was a fairly normal, prosperous year; the other 6 years are depression years. The years from 1925 to and including 1928 would have made a far better showing for capital, management, and labor.

However, these facts confirm the statistics in National Income of the United States, 1929–1935, issued by the Federal Government. They show for the entire 7 years, that for every $1 the several million stockholders received, the workers received $7.

On page 26, national income paid out for all industries shows that out of a total of $78,632,000,000, there was paid to employees the sum of $51,487,000,000 for 1929 or 65.5 percent of the total. In item 7 it states: "Other income for labor, $937,000,000, this added to the $51,487,000,000 makes a total labor fund received by labor of $52,424,000,000."

On page 22 of this United States Government volume we find the following table:

TABLE 1.—*National income paid out and produced, 1929*

Income produced	$81,034,000,000
Business savings	2,402,000,000
Corporation savings	1,423,000,000
Business savings of entrepreneurs	979,000,000
Income paid out	78,632,000,000

All this confirms the above reports so far as percentages go. I took the manufacturing industries for details because the Socialists and other radicals generally take this great industry in an attempt to show the "robbery of labor."

In the above statistics I have said not a word as to any bonus, or pensions, or free service to the workers and their families, which amounts to more than a billion dollars annually and may be twice this sum.

THE RAILROADS

The railroads of this Nation, if built in 1940, would cost $26,000,000,000. This is based on wages and cost for materials. They are worth today not less than $24,000,000,000.

They are capitalized at $18,679,706,928 for 1929. From 1920 to 1929 new stock issued for class I railroads amounted to $8,502,673,410. This means that this sum was plowed back into the railways to improve their condition. Thus the real worth of this great railway plant today is around $7,000,000,000 more than its official capitalization.

WAGES FOR RAILROAD LABOR

In 1916 the average wage paid the 1,647,097 railway employees was $891.61 a year; in 1929 wages had increased to $1,743.95, and today the average is $1,831 per employee per year.

Besides the wages, the employees are given free transportation, and after a few years of service the families are also given free transportation. In addition to this, millions are paid for pensions. The average dividends paid by the railways in the last 19 years ran from 6 percent to less than 2 percent.

In 1929 the railways had an income of $4,638,377,000 and the total paid out that year amounted to $4,245,451,000. Out of this sum there were paid to salaried employees $820,605,000; total paid to wage earners $2,246,607,000 and there were paid in dividends $399,092,000. In other words, while $3,124,741,000 was paid to employees only $399,092,000 was paid in dividends. Labor received $10 for every $1 that went for dividends.

Thus in this giant industry we see that labor, salaried, and wage earners combined, received about 83 percent, and if we include Pullman employees, out of the railroad dollar received nearly 85 percent.

LION'S SHARE OF WEALTH PRODUCTION

Aside from calamity howling Socialists, Communists paint a doleful picture of the "poverty and misery" of the working classes. They pick out one class in a hundred and offer this as a general condition of the working class in this, our richest Nation on earth, with starving millions.

They don't offer any proof, because proof is lacking. They issue statements that are entirely wrong, or at best half truths.

In Socialism Made Plain, written by Allen L. Benson, Socialist candidate by the Socialist Party for President in 1916, he makes the statement on page 86:

"The wage earner now creates $6 worth of goods to get $1 in wages, the rest being wasted by capitalist employer in competition, or pocketed in the form of profits."

There isn't an iota of proof for any such statement. Mr. Benson didn't gather the census facts. He merely took a half truth and made it into a monstrous lie. Back in 1848, Karl Marx and Frederick Engles published the Communist Manifesto, an appeal to the workers of all the world. It has in the main been the Scientific Socialist handbook for the Socialists of the entire world; it has been translated into 67 different languages and has had the widest circulation of any book on socialism.

Says the Manifesto, page 21, published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago: "But not only has the capitalist forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class, the proletarians."

Speaking of modern capitalism, the Manifesto says: "Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of the oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which

it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty capitalist, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a capitalist. The modern laborer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth."

Then the Manifesto goes on to assert that under modern capitalism the workers receive "only a bare subsistence wage," to keep him for all time as a laborer.

On page 34 Marx declares that they, the Socialists, "intended to do away with private property." And he further states that private property is already done away with; that nine-tenths of the population have no property, and then he adds this:

"In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

The above then, is exactly what socialism is as preached and advocated by Socialist leaders all over the world.

Then Marx lays down a sort of platform:

"Abolition of property in land.

"Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels."

None of the things predicted by Marx have happened. The rise of the workers in all nations had been the outstanding fact that the blue books of every nation prove.

Our last census, that of 1930, shows that out of 29,000,000 families over 14,000,000 owned their homes; that out of 110,000,000 insurance policies more than 65,000,000 represented the working and middle class. Shows that the building and loan cooperatives in 1929 had 12,111,209 members, with total assets of $8,695,154,000. Does that look like a propertyless class? In the mutual savings banks, the kind that are known as "the workingman's banks," there were a total of 13,526,425 depositors with deposits of $10,163,740,000, moreover, the total deposits of $41,094,000,000 in all savings. No further proof is needed to show the absurdity of the Socialist propaganda. The middle class is not disappearing, the working class is not being pauperized; the rich may be growing richer, but the poor are growing better off.

THE FARMERS

The average value of the American farm in 1850 was $2,738. Eighty years later the average value of the American farm was $9,103. This means all farm property and includes stock. The total value of all farm property in 1930 was $57,245,544,000. In 1930 there were 2,149,276 farms owned free and clear; and 1,217,234 mortgaged farms. The value of the average mortgaged farm was for 1930, $8,895 and the value of the average mortgage was $3,521; in other words, the mortgaged farmer is not a propertyless man; he owns in farm values alone over $5,000, average.

Just around one-half of the mortgaged farms are owned by other farmers. In the town I was brought up in, one rich farmer owned 40 percent of all the mortgages on the farms of that town, Landaff, N. H. The number of tenant farmers has increased from 2,664,365 in 1930, to 2,865,155, but this was a 5-year depression period. The tenant farmer is not a propertyless class either; a lot of them are, but at least 34 percent have some property. They often have several thousands of dollars in machinery, stock, tools, and so on.

In the six New England States census for 1935 there were a total of 12,210 tenant farmers out of a total of 158,241 farms; in Mississippi for the same year out of a total of 311,683 there were 217,564 tenant farmers; Mississippi had three times as many tenant farmers as the six New England States and New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey combined.

FARMERS CAPITALISTS AND WORKERS

The great farming industry, like every other business, cannot be separated into capitalists and workers. Most farmers are workers, and half of them can justly be termed as capitalists; perhaps I should say middle-class capitalists. No one knows what percentage of the total wealth of the Nation is possessed by the farmers; it is, however, at least 25 percent, and it may be as high as 35 percent.

To illustrate: My brother began work at $15 a month and "found." When he was 21 he had $600 saved and invested this in buying a half interest in a farm that was worth $4,000. In a few years he owned the farm and had 20 cows and other stock. When he retired from farming he was worth six to eight thousand dollars; but he had earned it. He invested a part of this in the American Locomotive Co., and, of course, had an income from dividends. Would the Socialists confiscate his wealth in stocks?

Another farmer living a half mile away worked all his life but was a spender; when he quit farming he was worth not more than $150. That wasn't worth confiscation. But, how would a Socialist administration treat both these men? Both men had about same education; one was a thrifty man; the other was a spender. Would the Socialists confiscate the stock in the locomotive company? Would it tax all farmers who had "made good" in order to give the spending farmer as good an "abundant life" as the saving farmer? That would mean confiscation and yet it is "scientific socialism," according to Karl Marx and 99 percent of the Socialist leaders of the world.

New Deal Is Not Democratic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE CARBON COUNTY NEWS

Mr. THROKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have included two editorials from the Carbon County News, Red Lodge, Mont. These two articles express the sentiments of many of the people throughout the United States and are somewhat along the lines of my remarks on June 10. In these remarks I suggested that the real Democrats and the real Republicans join this year and form one new Republican Party, of sound Americans, to return this Government to those principles upon which it was created. It should be evident that we cannot continue as we are, but must, instead, repeal all the extra powers given to the President of the United States, for they are not only dangerous but will lead this Nation into dictatorial control. If the people have any interest in the safety and security of their country, they should express themselves now, before Congress abandons all of its power and gives it to the most incompetent administration in the history of the United States.

The editorials follow:

[From the Carbon County (Mont.) News of June 14, 1940]

NEW DEAL IS NOT DEMOCRATIC

[Excerpts from an address by Mrs. Sarah Shields Jobe, of Hope, Hempstead County, Ark., before the Republican Central Committee at Little Rock, Ark., May 10, 1940. Mrs. Jobe is the widow of a former Democratic State Senator and has been chairman of the Women's Democratic organization in her county. She is a graduate of Vanderbilt University and a lawyer.]

This is the first Republican meeting or convention that I have ever attended. During most of my life I have been actively identified with the Democratic Party. I have served as county chairman of the Women's Democratic organization in my home county of Hempstead. I have done a great deal of other Democratic Party work.

Some of us who are Democrats have been slow to realize that the New Deal is not democratic but, on the contrary, seeks to destroy everything for which the Democratic Party has stood. I do not feel that I could be a good Democrat and vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt for a third term, nor do I feel that I could afford to stultify my conscience by voting for any set of candidates in the coming November election who are committed to or endorsed by the New Deal wrecking crew.

I have been saddened because of the desertion and betrayal of the Democratic Party by the New Dealers. We women of America are conservative at heart. We want security. We want freedom. We want government under our Constitution.

We women of America refuse to be hypnotized by "radio droolings" from Washington. We have the courage which American women have always exhibited in the history of this Republic to face the plain facts as they exist. No one free of bias can longer deny that Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal scorn our Constitution; that Mr. Roosevelt and his hordes of political overlords are contemptuous of States' rights; that the New Deal has carried this Nation dangerously close to communism, nazi-ism, and a dictatorship by Presidential decree. No President in history has been so impatient of the wise restraints of power placed upon him under our Constitution as President Roosevelt. This menace to a government of free men and women is a bigger problem than food and shelter.

Every dime the Government spends belongs to the people; and we women of America purpose in our hearts that we will not surrender, at any price, to dictatorship and the "isms" of Europe, which today are producing so much havoc and destruction to mankind. Certainly yonder in Europe is an example of what the ultimate result will be when democratic forms of government have been replaced by dictators—dictators drugged with lust for power and conquest, and utterly unfeeling as to the helplessness of the subjects under their iron hands. When we view these conditions and take stock

of what is happening to this country and what may happen, should the New Deal be continued in office, we then realize how important it is to put our allegiance to this American form of government ahead of mere party politics. I intend in every way possible, to the extent of my energies, to do everything in my power to mobilize our women voters against any further continuation of the New Deal or any of its offspring.

I am proud to stand before you as a constitutional Democrat—unafraid. God grant that millions more will stand with me.

THE PEOPLE'S DOUBT

In all former wars the President of the United States has commanded the confidence of the people.

If the people lack confidence in their present President it is not their fault. They still have confidence in the United States and are determined to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

As foreign war developments give warning that the United States must be adequately armed to defend this hemisphere, if necessary, it is unfortunate that the utterly improvident management of national affairs during the last 7 years has destroyed the confidence of the people. An administration that has piled up the peacetime debt by a sum nearly equal to the cost of American participation in the World War is now faced with need for the billions that have been wasted.

The people approve of immediate increase of preparedness for defensive war. They will take the risk of seeing additional billions unwisely spent, in the hope that in spite of an incompetent administration the country will be better armed. With deep misgivings they watch the course of the administration in handling foreign relations; but, whatever may come, they hope that the defensive strength of the United States will be increased.

Next to the ardent hope that war may be averted entirely is the hope that the people may in November place direction of their Government in safe and prudent hands.

WHY ROOSEVELT WON'T DO

President Roosevelt is not qualified to lead the Nation in war or in preparations for a possible war, because—

He is temperamentally unfitted for such responsibility.

He is incapable of delegating authority or sharing credit.

He places in position of command anonymous theorists, accountable only to the Executive.

He is inclined to make unconsidered judgments for spectacular effect.

He has no respect for campaign promises or party pledges.

He has brought the Nation to the brink of bankruptcy through mismanagement of Federal finances.

He is responsible for paralyzing private investment.

He has instituted bureaucratic control of business that has prevented industrial recovery and reemployment.

He has distributed billions in subsidies in vain attempts to circumvent natural economic laws.

He has created destructive class antagonisms through general indictments for crimes of the few.

He has more than doubled the cost of government.

He has established a chronic budget deficit of nearly $4,000,000,000 a year.

He has expended $7,000,000,000 for national defense and the Nation is almost wholly unprepared.

He now proposes with the expenditure of a few more billions to make the Nation secure.

He must be fully aware that the sum asked for defense is but a drop in the bucket; many billions will be required if the Army and Navy are to be thoroughly equipped.

He conceals the fact, but must assuredly know, that he is heading the Nation into a Federal Budget of $15,000,000,000 or more.

On the day that Franklin D. Roosevelt transferred the Immigration Service to the Department of Justice, the Dies committee denounced the Department of Justice for failing to act against criminal aliens.

Ten millions unemployed in the United States—more than are engaged in war in Europe.

Now that there's need of billions for defense, some of the billions squandered by the New Deal would come in handy.

Mr. Speaker, it is really refreshing to know that we have one or two independent papers, whose editors are not afraid to express their opinions. If the people of this Nation could be served by a free press, free from the antagonistic monetary influences, we could get somewhere and straighten this Nation out; but under the prevailing conditions, with a controlled and dominated press, the most vital information does not reach the American people.

Guarding American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, there are certain practical decisions which the American people and this Government must make if we are to escape being sucked into this maelstrom that threatens the extension of world civilization. With the world in flames and the evils of darkness spreading its tentacles almost into every land, it is my judgment our first duty is to recognize that power that has been able to combat the evils of darkness since the dawn of history and second duty is to effect a program of armed preparedness on land, sea, and air, so complete in every detail as not only to insure protection for our institutions of home, school, and church, which we hold so dear, but to place our country in a position to exercise its proper place of leadership and authority in a world of civilization.

Before the end of the week this Congress will have appropriated over $5,000,000,000 for defense; however, we must not neglect to recognize mankind stands today between two ages. It cannot be denied we are in the group of an immeasurable cosmic change. No nation and no section of the earth will be able to exist outside the orbit of the new age, be it good or bad; therefore, through preparedness we hope to find ourselves in the final form of the new world economy, thereby preventing this great land of ours from becoming a victim of circumstances, as so many great empires of the past have fallen into oblivion.

Believing as I do in the indestructibility of the two great forces of human life, I cannot surrender to despair even in face of the present apparent progress of triumph of brute force. The free peoples of this earth may suffer temporarily, but the spirit of freedom is endless and it will outlast machineries of tyranny. For a number of years the soul of our great America and of the other free peoples, has been lulled by material prosperity, losing sight of that force of destruction that has always been in combat with the good. But I am happy the great soul of America is once more awakening and girding itself for freedom as it has done so often in the heroic past. At any cost we will be free, and we will help to reestablish a just peace and a triumphant freedom throughout our world. We base our hope and our faith upon this immortal truth:

> Truth forever on the scaffold,
> Wrong forever on the throne—
> Yet that scaffold sways the future,
> And, behind the dim unknown,
> Standeth God within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above his own.

While various nations of the world were pursuing a policy of disarmament, and pledging their word each to the other that they would never again engage in war, then we followed a reasonable course in not building up a large army and navy. But today, when we see again the violation of sacred treaties, the invasion of innocent countries, and the wholesale slaughter of armies which are not adequately supplied with implements of war, then I say we must profit by these examples, and act quickly to provide proper protection for our people and beloved country.

Of course, we all cherish peace and I so well proved my position on this subject by introducing a resolution in 1937 advocating world peace, but the evils of darkness have come upon a portion of the world to such an extent in different forms of destruction such as the "fifth column," wholesale murder, the Trojan horse, deliberately planned propaganda and forces undertaking to abolish free institutions of home,

school, and church, and making man a slave to State, that it would be folly for us not to build up our defense to safeguard our country from attacks of aggression. With an adequate defense no foreign army can invade us. Now that we have become one of the world's greatest nations, shall we throw away the independent American destiny which our forefathers gave their lives to win or shall we stop and read the sign that is plainly visible?

Preparedness is going to cost us something, but if we are clean in our endeavors there will be compensations. In undertaking this great venture in preparedness, we are doing it not with the idea of chastising the world or telling the other nations what they shall think and how they shall live and what they shall do, but with one great objective in mind, and that is to build ourselves so that we will be immune from attack.

My friends, man in this period must know his Government, must have a part in his Government, and must appreciate his Government. But, more than that, man must dedicate himself to preserve this Government. There was a time when our schools taught the youth of the land what a great place America was. I pray they will again—for America is a great country.

I am speaking to leaders—men whose thoughts and actions determine the course of other men and women. In our lodges, in our churches, in our business life we help shape the lives of others, and in so doing we help shape the destiny of America.

What is America's destiny? That depends upon all of us. It is necessary for us to see this is a great adventurous age, and by that I do not mean military adventure—I mean an age of adventure in science and in learning, to live nobly, to explore in scientific and industrial fields and in the realm of the spirit. If we do that, we will light a flame within ourselves and within those we contact that will never go out, and America will be a better place to live because we lived in this day and generation.

It has been suggested lately that Congress should adjourn very shortly; frankly, this suggestion amazes me, and I believe it amazes the good people who sent me here to represent them and those good people who sent my colleagues here.

The Congress of the United States, and more particularly this House of Representatives, is the truest barometer of what the people of this country feel and desire. Sent here by vote of the people, its Members constantly in touch with their constituents through a mass of correspondence and personal contacts, and constantly attuned to their wishes, the House of Representatives is in truth and in fact the voice of the people of this great Nation. Then shall this voice be silenced because it is a hot summer or because political parties are to have conventions? I say to you that there was never a time in the history of our country when sane, practical, level-headed leadership was more needed than today, when sparks from a flaming Europe threaten to fire our free and peace-loving Nation. Then are the people, whose servants we most surely are, to be deprived of leadership so that any individual or any political group can better win or hold political power?

Under no condition would I vote to adjourn Congress in this time of crisis so that I might go home. What political party gains advantage in any political contest is not as important as the security of our country, our people, our form of government, and our way of life.

To reduce this issue to very simple terms, we are hired by our constituents to serve them here in Congress, to work for their welfare. And, this is a big job today, a full-time job and one that will take every ounce of energy, caution, and good common sense that we can muster individually and collectively. So I say let us stay on the job as long as we are needed, and if we are needed only to watch and wait, to urge caution in international relations and to speed those important domestic undertakings we have so recently launched, then let us remain in session and assist the Government in expediting any additional defense measures which may become necessary. But let us not abandon the people we represent to the mass of conflicting propaganda, arguments, and appeals with which they are beseiged, while we go blithely forth not knowing what tomorrow will bring.

"ISM" IN AMERICA—NO IDLE DREAM

Deliberately planned propaganda has been and is now being spread throughout the length and breadth of our country in an effort to entice, mislead, and weaken our hopes in the face of danger, as other nations have been weakened. New forces are attempting to weave into the fiber of our institutions; therefore, it is not enough to strengthen our army, air, and naval forces, but the Federal Government must enforce the law against all subversive activities, and keep disruptive elements that are working within under control.

On the floor of this House since I have been a Member, I have heard it repeated over and again that groups unfriendly to our way of life were working direct in contact with foreign elements that stand for the destruction of our free democracy and even to the extent of destroying our churches; so we must prepare not only against aggression from without but from within.

CANDIDATE FOR REELECTION

Mr. Speaker, since I am a candidate for reelection, I shall devote the remainder of my remarks to my work in part as a Member of Congress, as it is the custom and common practice for national Representatives to make frequent reports to their constituents; therefore, to them I am reporting, as in reality I am only an employee not trying to unseat any public official, but only asking to be retained in the position my people so generously gave me.

VETERAN LEGISLATION

I have no hesitancy in stating I have given veterans and their widows throughout my district preference wherever I knew of said cases, as I am convinced that the veterans will never receive too much from the Government they tendered their lives to defend and protect; hence I shall continue to support all measures proposed and sponsored by the veterans of our country. As a member of the War Claims Committee I have supported every veteran claim and wherever a doubt existed as to the merit of the bill, I have given the doubt in favor of the veteran.

FLOOD CONTROL

The delta lands of northeast Louisiana are subject to overflow, therefore, knowing the question of flood control to be a paramount one in the minds of the people, I am exceedingly happy I was successful in having enacted into law a number of bills introduced by me dealing with flood protection; therefore, the Assistant to the Chief of Army Engineers advised me a survey is presently being made of each river of my district and that said report would be available on or about December 1, 1940, so it will be my aim in the next session of Congress to secure the necessary appropriation to carry out the recommendation of the engineers toward drainage of the delta lands of my district.

FARM LEGISLATION

For the farmers of this Nation, I have had one objective in mind and that has been to secure for them a net profit for their labors; therefore, I hold the least recognition that should be given our farmers is cost of production and proof of this contention can be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to my efforts in behalf of our farmers. I acknowledge I have helped to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars for our farmers in an effort to increase buying power, but I believe the salvation and cure of our great agricultural problem can be found in my remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives, March 21, 1940.

LABOR

Having been reared a laboring man, I have consistently supported all legislation that tends to help the man and woman who lives by daily toil, as a result of said position, I now enjoy and have enjoyed the recognition and endorsement of the American Federation of Labor.

MAIL SERVICE IMPROVEMENT

I have obtained new rural routes, additional city delivery service, and rural route extensions, new post office buildings, better post office quarters, increased employee remuneration in a number of offices, and additional clerks. Also new equipment in several offices to meet the needs of the growing communities. And as a member of the Civil Service Committee I have worked for better legislation for all Government employees.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

I have worked consistently for an adequate old-age pension, as I felt and feel now our aged are entitled to this consideration, as we find throughout the country the aged needy only receive in certain cases a mere pittance, and I contend we must amend our social-security law.

CONCLUSION

I have given personal attention to every letter that was addressed to me upon the date of its arrival and at all times maintained the interest of my people at heart. Further, recognizing the fundamental hope of a happy people rests in our institutions, I never lost sight of a single moment to support all legislation and work for its passage in recognition of this objective, and I now pledge to my people the continuation of this service if reelected; therefore, I humbly acknowledge my indebtedness and gratitude to my many friends that have been so generous and kind to me.

Buck Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ALEXANDRIA (LA.) DAILY TOWN TALK

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Alexandria Daily Town Talk of Alexandria, La., carried an editorial in its June 5 issue which I think is very timely and I present it herewith:

BUCK UP, AMERICA

The people of the United States seem to be suffering from a sort of mental shell shock as the tragedy of Europe unrolls swiftly before their eyes.

There is greater panic in certain American circles than even in England and France, which lie directly under the guns of the Nazi invader. It is not fear—it is simply shock at seeing the anchors of civilization tossed overboard, one by one. It is horror at seeing an orderly world descend to chaos.

There are signs that this panic has already passed its climax, as it should. Up to now the whole thing has had the aspect of a too hectic melodrama. Now it is beginning to be real and already there are signs of that calm that comes with reality.

It is certainly true that the British and French, whose way of life is so much like our own, are fighting a desperate fight for existence. None would dispute the gravity of the situation as it affects the future of the free political and economic life we love.

But at least our own course is clarifying, and as our task becomes clearer we begin to bend to it and we find relief in action. Our own defenses have lagged. No nation has had to arm itself for fear of us. Now, in a world which has forsaken order and justice and peace we must prepare to defend by force what we have failed to defend by negotiation.

Very well. Is there any reason why we cannot defend ourselves? There are no supermen who have overrun half of Europe. They are men. They have succeeded up to this point because they have converted all life into a military machine.

Have the Germans built tanks? So can we. Have the Japanese built big ships? So can we. American planes and pilots have never feared to take the air with any others.

Hitler himself in Mein Kampf, wrote: "The gigantic American State Colossus, with its enormous wealth of virgin soil, is more difficult to attack than the wedged-in German Reich."

It is true that the Reich is less "wedged in" than it was when Hitler wrote. It is true that we are badly unprepared in material and training. But we have had our lesson.

Calmly, steadily, wisely, we now prepare such military machinery as will enable us to defend our own. We have no illusions about untrained volunteers. The day of "one good American boy can lick three furriners" is gone. But one good American boy with equal weapons is still as good a boy as lives on this earth.

With calm confidence and reliance on our own emerging strength, America goes forward unflinching and unafraid to meet whatever the world has in store.

One Man's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson from the Washington Daily News for June 17, 1940:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 17, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This talk about using the Navy to convoy shipments of munitions is incredible lunacy. Munitions are direct contraband. At international law and under invariable American policy, a ship known to be carrying such stuff through an actual blockade is subject not only to search and seizure but to sinking.

What is going to happen when a German submarine or airplane has blatantly advertised to it by the mere presence of an American naval convoy, off a blockaded English coast, that merchant ships are loaded with direct and unconditional contraband? It is going to exercise a clear, immemorial right of the sea and try to sink it. If any nonbelligerent naval vessel attempts to intervene, it is committing an act of war. So the German attacks the American—and we are at war—not for vindicating a right but for violating one.

There is no longer any question that Mr. Roosevelt is exercising no effort whatever to keep us out of war. It may not be so fair to say that it is his purpose to exert every effort within his supposedly limited powers to get us into war. But at least this statement is incontestable—every act of his in the past 3 years is consistent with such a purpose and no act is inconsistent therewith.

This column claims to be no "inside news" or tipster oracle. Such designations give me a pain. The working press in Washington, just the plain efficient reporters, are the most efficient in the world. The claim to get more necessarily involves a confession of special hand-outs for a price, publicity favoritism—which is a sell-out of the public. Or it involves subterranean methods depending on the disloyalty of public servants, which stinks from every point from which wind blows. So I hesitate to hand out the kind of "inside" dope which follows, but you can rely on it.

As predicted by this column for 2 years, Mr. Roosevelt has at last "reluctantly decided" to attempt to hurdle the third-term barrier. He will be nominated by acclamation. He has asked Mr. Farley to manage his campaign and the dope is that Mr. Farley has refused.

Mr. Roosevelt knows and has long known that this unprecedented feat of political legerdemain would be impossible without war hysteria. Therefore, we have war hysteria and I would like to have somebody show me an incident in his recent conduct that did not tend to create it.

It is shooting craps with the country's destiny and the lives and fortunes of our people for the pride of a single man. This pressing of our country to the edge of the abyss is the craziest diplomacy in the history of nations.

Apart from emotion, there are three compelling reasons why we should now stay out of war. (1) We not only have nothing to put in but, due to criminal neglects, we are defenseless on our own shores. (2) Our great need is time to prepare our defense and, on all the facts and the opinion of all competent experts, we could have from 18 months to 3 years if we do not invite every danger we fear and rush headlong into a situation we are now totally unable to handle. (3) If we say out of this thing and become strong, we shall have a voice in the outcome. If we go in, by our present weakness foredoomed to defeat, we shall just be another Hitler trophy—"voe victis"—woe to the vanquished.

In the post-World War "Cordon Sanitaire," France incited the little countries to threaten Germany on her promise of help—and then neglected to remain able to help. On the same formula, Britain encouraged Poland to resist on England's guaranty of assistance and was wholly unable to help. Similarly, for domestic politics, we are holding out false hopes to England and France and have incited them to war.

All those small nations are gone—nine of them. France and England are responsible. France also is gone. England is going. We are repeating the same ghastly international immorality and suicide. For God's sake let's keep out—at least long enough to get ready to get in.

A Pilot's Advice

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I also, with my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. KNUTSON, want to say a few words in behalf of Colonel Lindbergh in order to refute the attack made upon him by the gentleman who spoke for the New Deal and war, Sunday night.

I grant that the Administration has been able to organize a large and expensive war propaganda machine to confuse the public and to bring about fear of invasion and war. The Administration mouthpiece who denounced Colonel Lindbergh Sunday evening, and accused him of associating with false political advisers, are unjust both to his associates and to Colonel Lindbergh, who has proved that he has the best interests of this country at heart.

Why is Colonel Lindbergh criticized? A year and a half ago, he said that Germany had the best air force. Today, we know he was right, so that was the truth. On June 15, Colonel Lindbergh gave very constructive and sound advice on staying out of war, which the Administration criticizes and scorns.

If the administration speakers are so anxious to go to war, why in the love of Heaven do they not resign from the Senate and from Congress and go to war? They should have sense enough to know that the American people do not want to go, and also, they should be intelligent enough to know the background of this propaganda which is purely internationalistic and English.

Let us look at this for just a moment. Publicity costs money. And propaganda for war is a most costly publicity, which, if the people could know the truth, is charged up to the taxpayers of the United States by those who own and control gold money and credit.

The propaganda for war is launched by the highest officials in the administration at graduation exercises—a place where the speakers should talk on life, instead of death; talk on construction, instead of destruction.

The national press should never be used as an agency to promote war, as was done in 1917 and is being repeated today.

Lindbergh in his broadcast on June 15 gave very sound advice when he suggested that we stay out of war and attend to our own business. No one can read his address, as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 17, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], without giving Colonel Lindbergh credit for a true appraisal of international affairs. One needs but to contrast the address delivered by Colonel Lindbergh and the address delivered by his critic to realize that it is his critic who does not know what he is talking about. Or if he does know, he is only expressing the real wish of the administration—which is war. This is clearly evident from the action the administration has taken, and it is exactly in line with the prediction that I made when the arms embargo was repealed in 1939. I said then that the repeal of the arms embargo should not in any sense be considered an act of neutrality, but should instead be looked upon as a tentative alliance with England to participate in the present war, and that statement is proven today by the administration itself.

I wrote the history of what has happened today into the RECORD during the special session last fall. I was not fooled then, and I am not fooled today.

What have we to show for the $7,000,000,000 that has been appropriated for the Army and Navy during the past 7 years? We have absolutely nothing to show for this seven thousand million dollars—an amount of money which should have given us a first-class Navy and Army. Now what became of this $7,000,000,000? What became of the $100,000,000 that was appropriated, and to which Senator Copeland added $25,000,000 for antiaircraft defense? The administration opposed the $25,000,000 for antiaircraft guns, and told General Craig, according to his own statement, not to use the $100,000,000. What became of that $100,000,000?

Who knows anything about our foreign policy? And how can anyone be familiar with a policy that the Executive has projected to the Maginot Line? To read his own remarks, one would think that we had undertaken policing of the world, a grandiose dream of administration leaders which displayed nothing so much as complete ignorance of the foreign situation. The great trouble with the administration is that it has no foreign policy, except that written at 10 Downing Street. It was to fulfill the promises in that policy that we were called back last fall, to repeal the arms embargo and go through the farce of enacting neutrality legislation to exempt the President from all responsibility of any acts that he might commit under that act.

In other words, the Neutrality Act is nothing but a law to relieve the President of responsibility, should he permit an "incident" to occur that might jeopardize our peace. If this should happen, however—if one of our ships should be sunk—the charge for such neglect should be placed where it rightfully belongs, namely, on the Chief Executive. We have no business to have a fleet in Europe. Our war ships belong on our own coast. Our own nationals have had plenty of time to return to the United States, and those who remain in Europe have done so at their own risk. If an "incident" should occur in which one of our ships is sunk while jolly-sailing in European waters, inviting trouble, impeachment proceedings should be filed against those responsible for such incidents, no matter whether it be the Chief Executive or any other public official.

The administration, if it understands the fundamental laws of this Nation, knows that the people are the power and that Congress was elected by them to legislate and regulate the affairs of this Nation. That duty was never supposed to be transferred from the legislative to the executive department. The reason for that was that the people 152 years ago realized that the power of this Government should be in their hands and in the hands of the people they elected to represent them. And I may say that they recognized, in addition to that, that when such duty is transferred to one man, their own rights are jeopardized and finally lost.

That is precisely the condition that exists here today. The administration's mouthpieces, dupes, and pawns "boo" when this statement is made, but they will cringe and creep when the people of this Nation awaken to the real truth.

Our foreign policy, like our domestic policy, is completely confused, and the New Deal administration is in a state of pandemonium. The administration leaders have run hither and thither, and have worn themselves out until they are now on the verge of collapse. The whole New Deal structure is built upon an emergency platform, constructed by the help of an acquiescent and supine majority in Congress which has overlooked the fact that they were elected to build a house on constitutional rock instead of a skyscraper on their emergency platform.

The administration talks about war and the administration's mouthpieces shout for war. Under the direction of whom? Under the direction of those who pay for the war propaganda in the press, in the movies, over the radio, and for the well-prepared and finished printed matter that costs thousands and thousands of dollars. All of this propaganda is nothing but pure, unadulterated lies, which the American people should resent.

Anyone who will give this subject just a little thought will admit that it costs money to produce moving pictures to bring about war hysteria. It costs money to pay for radio time. It costs more money to pay the traveling expenses of paid propagandists speaking from public platforms and at public or pretended charitable or philanthropic meetings. Do not, however, forget that the purpose of all of these in some manner, shape, or form is to confuse you, Mr. Citizen, to make you believe and to convince you that you should immediately start out to kill others and get yourself murdered in order to save and perpetuate those who are paying for this propaganda machine.

Who are they?

They are the same people who promoted the World War by propaganda. They are the people who own the iron, coal, steel, and war manufacturing industries, the people who own the world gold and control money and credit. This should be clear to you, for no one else could meet the expenses of this propaganda machine except the money changers and the money barons of the world. And it is from that source that we get our news today.

Mr. Fritz Thyssen, who is now in the United States, is one of the very people who was interested in the coal, iron, steel, and arms manufacture in the Saarbrucken Basin. The Thyssen family was associated with the Vendels, the Krupps, the House of Rothschild, and other French and English interests, and these families not only prolonged the World War in order to make more money, but are the actual personalities who were largely instrumental in bringing about the World War. And now the gentleman is here advising the United States to do as we did in 1917.

Those who are interested in this information should read my remarks in the RECORD of September 25, 1939, entitled, "Can the American People Be Fooled Again?"

I may say, in addition, that it is Mr. Fritz Thyssen himself and other international bankers who have armed Germany and made it possible for Mr. Hitler to do exactly as he is doing today. Mr. Thyssen now calls Hitler crazy, but I wonder who is crazy? It certainly would be us, if we listen to such warmongers and war promoters as Mr. Thyssen and Lord Lothian and the others who are now traveling throughout the country disseminating propaganda calculated to involve us in the present European conflict.

England has appropriated $165,000,000 for propaganda in the United States, $15,000,000 more to involve us in this war than she appropriated to involve us in the World War, and at that time there were 10,000 persons employed by Great Britain to convince us that we should fight for Albion.

The total of all these sums reaches into many millions. Now, let us use our heads. The American people have no money to pay for publicity to express their views against war. They have not the money to buy control of the Nation's press, movies, and broadcasting stations to express opposition to war. The people have not the money to travel and to lecture in competition with those who are backed by the international war machine.

It is for the lack of money that your and my people are sending letters to us, appealing to us to remain in Washington to counteract the administration's insane desire to lead this country into war. What Congress really should do is repeal the emergency powers given to the President, so that it would be safe for us to go home.

We are in no position to give aid to England. We have nothing to give, for she has already received our airplanes and many of our ocean-going ships. The population of England and France is more than 600,000,000 people. If they cannot defend themselves, it certainly would be foolish for us to try, particularly from a distance of 3,000 miles.

Great Britain has plenty of credit, for the Bank of England owns or controls over $13,000,000,000 of gold now in the Treasury of the United States. The grand scheme, however, is to save this money for the British Empire at the expense of the American taxpayers. Those who believe we should give further aid should bear this in mind in the next letter to their Congressmen.

We have given the English the shirt off our back, and in return we have received criticism and abuse. The English call us Uncle Shylock, but the fact remains that they have never paid even the interest on their obligation to us or any part of the principal.

More About Radio in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

LETTERS FROM KALTENBORN TO MUNDT AND MUNDT TO KALTENBORN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since June 4, when I put in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning with page 3546, a discussion of some pertinent questions which now face radio executives in America in view of the part which radio is now playing in conveying war news and comments thereon to the American public, I have had considerable correspondence on this subject from many people interested in or supported by radio, as well as from many radio listeners. Some Members will recall that starting with page 3644, I reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Harry C. Butcher, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, on the perplexing problem of the responsibilities which a free and uncensored radio system must accept in order to best contribute to the public welfare of a free people.

In addition to that letter from Mr. Butcher, I have had other communications from him and other officials and individuals which leads me to feel that a large part of the radio industry is alert to the growing importance of maintaining radio on a high plane of impartiality and of protecting, through self-discipline and self-established restraints, the unique privileges which American radio enjoys in this world of Government-dominated or owned radio broadcasting. American radio leads the world in its service to the public and in the caliber of its programs. It is with the devout hope that a careless disregard for the high responsibilities which repose upon the radio industry may not destroy the freedom of the air which has so largely contributed to the eminence of American radio that I continue to interest myself in this subject.

LETTERS FROM KALTENBORN TO MUNDT AND MUNDT TO KALTENBORN

Included in the correspondence which has come to me as a result of my study and statements in this connection is the following letter from Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, which I am reprinting as a part of these remarks together with a copy of my reply to him. I want to add that I have confirmed the accuracy of Mr. Kaltenborn's statements with regard to his transfer from Columbia to N. B. C. and that no stigma of any kind should attach itself to Mr. Kaltenborn by virtue of this transfer since it was occasioned by the decision of his sponsors to place an advertising contract with another broadcasting system. This confirmation came to me in a letter from the Leo Burnett Co., of Chicago, which handles the advertising for Mr. Kaltenborn's sponsor, and says in part:

> We moved the Pure Oil broadcasts over to the National Broadcasting Co. on May 14 due to the fact that their station set-up would give us greatly improved coverage of the territory served by the Pure Oil Co. and also due to the fact that NBC offered us a much better time period. * * * We agree with you that at times Mr. Kaltenborn has allowed his feelings to carry him away and that he has been indiscreet on occasions. We feel, however, that this fault is far overbalanced by the service he has rendered the listening public in his keen and masterly analysis of the news.

An examination of the mail he receives indicates that the vast majority of his listeners agree with him absolutely and approve his stand. * * * However, in deference to the feelings of the articulate minority, we have admonished Mr. Kaltenborn to exercise more restraint in his broadcasts and he has agreed to do so.

(Signed) P. C. HARPER.
For LEO BURNETT CO., INC.

Mr. Speaker, I now offer for the record Mr. Kaltenborn's letter to me in toto and the full text of my reply to him:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 12, 1940.*

The Honorable KARL MUNDT,
Member of Congress for South Dakota,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know that you have long been interested in the proper development of American radio. I, naturally, share that interest, since I have analyzed news on the air for the past 18 years. I was the first man to perform that service for the American public and have carried on this work without interruption and, I believe I can honestly say, with steadily increasing success, if we measure success in terms of public confidence and recognition. In view of your distinguished position and achievements, I know that you would not voluntarily do me an injustice. Yet you have done just that, inadvertently, to be sure. You appear to have given credence to an unfounded report that I was dismissed by the Columbia Broadcasting System because I excited people's emotions concerning the war. This is absolutely untrue. I was not dismissed by Columbia. What happened was this: My commercial sponsor, the Pure Oil Co., was unable to secure a satisfactory quarter-hour three times a week on the Columbia network for my broadcasts. The hour they had—6:30 p. m.—brought my program into their main selling area at 5:30 p. m., which was too early, and during the daylight-saving period at 4:30 p. m., which was unacceptable to any sponsor appealing primarily to a male audience. For this reason my sponsor asked permission to negotiate with the National Broadcasting Co. for a more favorable period. I granted that permission, and the negotiations succeeded. When I announced the transfer of my program to the officials of the Columbia network, they were extremely disappointed and asked me if there was no possible way in which the situation could be readjusted so that they might be able to retain my services.

I have in my possession letters from the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System and various other officials, expressing the highest appreciation of my services to that organization and expressing the greatest regret at losing my services. Under these circumstances, I feel sure that you will not wish to do me the disservice of suggesting publicly or privately that my separation from the Columbia Broadcasting System arose from any fault of my own. You can understand that my professional reputation is an extremely valuable financial asset, and I should be obliged to take whatever action lay in my power to prevent its deliberate undermining.

I will, therefore, very much appreciate your advising me from whom you secured the information that Columbia discontinued my broadcasts because of their character.

As a public man, you know that anyone who speaks about the war these days is bound to be misquoted and misunderstood. I receive an overwhelmingly favorable response to my comments. I am keenly conscious of my responsibility to public opinion, and am making every effort to remain sane, balanced, and objective in the face of a situation which is inevitably charged with high emotional content. That is why I am constantly getting such comments as have just been published by W. D. Jamieson, the former Iowa Congressman, in his largely circulated publication, The Window Seat. In the June 5 issue of this publication, he says: "Don't get all worked up. I refuse to listen to the newsflash details of this terrible war, or to read the pages on pages about it in the papers. If we listen to 2 or 3 good commentators, like Kaltenborn, we can keep up fairly well with what's going on without getting all unstrung."

The next time I come to Washington, I am going to take the privilege of calling on you, and hope that you will be able to spare me a few minutes for a general discussion of those radio problems with which we are both intimately concerned. But in the meantime, may I have your reaction to the contents of this letter?

With all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

H. V. KALTENBORN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1940.

Mr. H. V. KALTENBORN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. KALTENBORN: I am glad to have your letter of June 12 setting forth the reasons for your transfer from the Columbia Broadcasting System to N. B. C.; the same mail bringing me your letter brought me a letter from the Leo Burnett Co., of Chicago, conveying the same information and I am happy to be set right concerning the reasons for your transfer. I am enclosing herewith a copy of my letter to the Burnett Co. However, I shall not send the Burnett Co. a copy of my reply to you.

I want to assure you, Mr. Kaltenborn, that I am most eager not to do you an injustice. While both the Columbia Broadcasting System, in speaking with me over the telephone, and the Burnett Co., by letter under date of June 12, commented upon certain indiscretions and emotional excesses appearing in your radio reporting, I am also sure that both organizations realize, as I do myself, that you have many splendid talents and virtues as a news commentator. It was with the sincere hope that your occasional excitable and exciting excesses—that those of other radio commentators—would not cause the presently existing murmurs asking for more control of radio broadcasting of war news to mount to a demand which would further restrict free radio in America that I got into this matter in the first place. In other words, I am fighting in radio's corner. But like a drop of ink in a glass of water, these emotional excesses which do at times occur form the dark cloud which is likely to color the whole situation unless you and other commentators and radio itself hold them in check. These times are far too trying and momentous, and with this I am sure you will agree, to permit emotionalism to replace clear-headedness and hysteria to color sound judgment on decisions which mean war or peace for America. We must meet these problems deliberately and thoughtfully—it is no time to engage in histrionics, however innocently conceived, in presenting factual matter to the public. It is far better to err on the side of underplaying emotionalism, now, than to err on the side of excitable excesses.

You indicate that when you are next in Washington you may call my office for an appointment. I shall be delighted to have you do so and shall enjoy discussing this whole problem with you. At that time, I shall also be glad to let you see some of the correspondence I have had on this subject, including the letter from the Burnett Co., Columbia, and other communications. I have met you on different occasions, have addressed numerous conventions at which you have also spoken, and have a high personal regard for your integrity, intelligence, and patriotic sincerity. I realize, too, the manifold difficulties your work involves in controlling your emotions and in preventing the sympathies which we all hold at this dark hour from speaking more loudly over the air than the facts themselves.

In my opinion, if we are to succeed in maintaining American radio on its present very fine and serviceable basis of private ownership and sponsorship with no more Government restrictions than positively necessary to prevent it from exercising monopolistic practices, it is essential that radio itself and those whom it supports must exercise self-restraints and self-control which will keep it from developing into a detriment to the public interests. By and large, it is today doing that; by and large, you are today helping it to maintain its high reputation. But it is the exceptions which must give us all concern.

I feel that sponsored programs, professional commentators, speakers working for pay, and salaried reporters should not permit their personal prejudices, their individual opinions, their political philosophies, and their viewpoints to color the programs in which they participate. To follow this practice would be to permit the opinion backed by the biggest purse to propagandize the Nation. It would enable radio to utilize the special claims it exercises to preferential air waves (by grace of Government permit) as a device for molding public opinion along the lines which these broadcasting companies prefer or which are designated by organizations or individuals having big sums to spend for controlling public opinion. That would, in my opinion, be using free speech to circumvent free thinking.

Please believe me, sir, I am not contending that radio makes a practice of using its unique Government concession to color public opinion on governmental or international issues. It is the exception, again, which worries me and many of my colleagues with whom I have discussed these matters. The normal practice of restricting opinionated programs on governmental issues to free time with the laudable policy of permitting all sides to share alike in the free time to voice their position is Americanism in action. I favor it. I want to see it preserved. I do not want to see it perverted by too many programs in which paid time—by commercial sponsors or by sustaining programs by the chains themselves—are devoted to an effort to mold public opinion on national issues. I shall be glad to have your reaction to my philosophy of the true function of radio as outlined in this paragraph and in the foregoing. I dare to hope you will agree with me. But, in all events, I shall appreciate your reaction as it is a problem being increasingly discussed in informal talk on Capitol Hill. If I am wrong, I want to be set right and work for a free radio in America as it should be.

Finally, I am sincerely sorry if anything I have said or written has in any way injured your professional reputation or private feelings. My concern is with the problem we confront, not the personalities involved. I am sure you are steadily trying to keep within the confines of good taste and good judgment. I am confident that you would not wittingly contribute to the confusion and hysteria of these most significant days. If you feel that in any way I have injured you, I shall be glad upon your request to publish in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your letter of June 12 and a copy of this reply. I shall look forward to your visit in my office when you are in Washington.

Cordially yours,

KARL MUNDT.

RADIO'S RESPONSIBILITIES EXPAND WITH RADIO'S PRIVILEGES

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are aware of the severe charges recently leveled at the American radio industry by certain Government officials charging it with monopolistic practices and other unfair policies. Personally, I am unwilling to subscribe to these charges on the basis of available evidence. I think that the record of American radio, taken as a whole, is highly commendable. Great public service is rendered the public by radio through its practice of making available to speakers of opposing sides on controversial issues like periods of free time to present their arguments. To my knowledge radio has not yet been guilty of using its monopoly of favorite air waves and its protective licenses and permits to sponsor one set of protagonists against another or to freeze out opposing viewpoints. It is my sincere hope that radio will never permit itself to become guilty of such prejudicial practices because to my mind that would be a big step backward through providing potent arguments for more Government control or supervision and for substituting bureaucratic control—never very satisfactory and seldom very equitable—for self-restraint and fair-play codes which radio can much better provide for itself by a faithful recognition of the responsibilities which always attach themselves to such special privileges as radio presently enjoys.

With the hope that radio may redouble its efforts to avoid justifiable criticism and that it may reexamine its practices to the end that the best public interests may always be served, I summarize herewith some considerations which I believe radio executives should carefully ponder and not lightly shunt aside on the basis that at this time no great complaint is evident in demands for legislative reforms or executive restraints. The time to eliminate a widespread public demand for governmental correctives is before the complaint is crystallized—once the crusade is on and a chorus of demands for Government action is apparent, it is frequently too late to stem the tide and all too often the alleged correctives go too far and impose new vices more pernicious than those they would eradicate. No business enterprise is ever so strong or so safe that it can afford to discard substantial segments of its goodwill by turning a deaf ear to sincere critics and trusting to time alone to quiet valid criticisms. For that reason, I list the following factors for whatever value they may have in stimulating thought leading to the preservation of free radio in America and the nipping in the bud of any proposals that Government action be utilized to eradicate such minor deficiencies as radio may now be heir to. American radio is good and it is getting better. It is entitled to a fair chance to demonstrate that its self-imposed regulations are adequate to serve the public interest and to protect the functions of democratic government in this great Republic.

A SUMMARY OF FACTORS FOR RADIO EXECUTIVES TO CONSIDER

First. Ninety percent of present-day radio programs are free from substantial criticism by the public. That in itself is a high tribute to American radio. The 10 percent of radio programs which cause concern are the opinionated observations of speakers who are either on the pay roll of the radio companies themselves or who speak for hire for commercial sponsors. Radio cannot afford to ignore the significance as molders of public opinion which these opinionated observers have and the delicate problem growing out of them concerning how far radio or commercial sponsors should go in employing speakers for hire to shape public opinion.

Second. Radio executives should study the advisability of setting up self-imposed regulations whereby sponsored programs by commercial groups, professional commentators, speakers working for pay and salaried reporters on sustaining programs, should not permit their personal prejudices, their individual opinions, their political philosophies, and their own viewpoints to color the programs in which they participate. To expand this type opinionated program to its full extent would be to permit the opinion backed by the biggest purse to propagandize America and dominate the air waves. Carried to its ultimate degree, a billion-dollar sponsor could purchase time enough and sponsor speakers and commentators enough to superimpose its philosophy or policies upon an entire people. Thus such free speech on the air could be used to circumvent the free thinking of a nation.

Third. Radio's current policy of permitting conflicting sides of controversial questions to have equal opportunity with free radio time to present its arguments is Americanism in action. It is the essence of democracy and is highly commendable. But if speakers on commercial programs and those speaking on the sustaining programs of the big radio chains themselves attempt to influence public opinion and present lopsided arguments on public questions they can well destroy and nullify the great democratic value of the prevailing policy of giving free time to all sides of a controversial question, because the professional commentators and speakers are on the air so much more frequently than the laymen.

Fourth. Radio should recognize a responsibility for not permitting itself to be for sale to the highest bidder on controversial questions, which is not shared by the newspaper business. The difference is clear-cut and obvious. As many newspapers can present themselves for public approval in any State or community as the public will support, they seek and secure no governmental license and obtain no governmental monopoly of favored channels of presentation. Thus editors have an independence which radio systems cannot rightfully exercise because radio by its very nature is more monopolistic than are the newspapers. Too many radio stations find too few choice air waves to share for day and night broadcasting. Therefore the Government licenses some and must refuse concessions to others. While no legitimate complaint can attach to this necessity, it does impose upon those radio units favored by Government permit to own an air wave the obligation not to exercise that concession to plump for one opinion or to play down another.

Fifth. Excesses and abuses in the realm of these opinionated programs by speakers for hire are the danger zone around free radio in America. Government regulation could correct the abuses but I hope it will never have to come to that. In my opinion such coercion is unnecessary. Radio deserves the opportunity to eliminate these abuses for itself where they occur and to guard against their extension. To say they never occur, is to blink at the facts; to say they are the prevailing practice, is to exaggerate the exception. Between the extremes of too many, too highly opinionated commercial or sustaining programs, and a ban against all interpretative speakers and personal commentators there is surely a happy compromise at which point such speakers for hire can be selected who will exercise good taste and opinions balanced by open-minded recognition that others equally wise may hold differing viewpoints. Such speakers can be secured, I believe, who will stress the factual over the prejudicial elements of news and who will avoid taking sides on issues of political importance or governmental significance at times and on points which comprise periods of our national history when the general public is seeking to formulate clear-headed and far-reaching decisions which may determine our national destiny for many years to come.

FOR FREE RADIO, FREE SPEECH, FREE PRESS, AND FREE DECISION

Mr. Speaker, the question of the part which a free radio should appropriately play in molding public opinion by use of commercial programs and professional speakers on sustaining programs is not solely a question of what part radio should play in conveying and interpreting war news. It is a permanent American question which prevails in wartimes and peace, in election years and in off-election years. It is perhaps well that the exigencies of war and an election call this problem to our attention most vigorously at this time because a careful study of its factors now, and studious attention toward its solution, may help eliminate flagrant excesses and develop self-controls by radio itself which will go far toward retaining free radio as an integral part of our great American system of free speech, free press, and decision.

The American Alien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY SOLICITOR GENERAL FRANCIS BIDDLE

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, last Sunday evening Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, delivered over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. an address explanatory of the Department of Justice program for administration and enforcement of our immigration and naturalization laws, the laws against espionage and sabotage, and the laws for the protection of civil liberties. This address, entitled "The American Alien," is a valuable and timely contribution in view of present conditions in America. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to have this opportunity tonight of speaking directly to my fellow Americans, to those who are citizens of the United States because they inherited that right by birth, or who have become citizens of this country by their own free choice. And I want to speak to people of other nationalities who are living among us, whom for lack of a better word we call aliens. I shall call them American-aliens, foreigners who are making their homes here but who are potential Americans.

Under our Constitution and laws the control of naturalization and immigration to this country is vested in the United States Government. Until recently those duties have been under the direction of the Department of Labor, probably because immigrants to this country were considered largely in relation to labor problems. The first great masses of people who came here from overseas were manual workers. They helped to build our highways, our railroads, and our cities.

For some time, as you know, President Roosevelt has been sending to Congress various plans calling for the reorganization of different branches of the Government. On May 22 he submitted a plan transferring to the Department of Justice the Immigration and Naturalization Services, including the Border Patrol. In a message explaining this transfer he said—I quote:

"The startling sequence of international events which has occurred * * * has necessitated a review of the measures required for the Nation's safety * * * I am convinced that under existing conditions the immigration and naturalization activities can best contribute to the national well-being only if they are closely integrated with the activities of the Department of Justice."

This order of transfer was duly approved by Congress and took effect on June 14. The Attorney General of the United States has directed me to coordinate this work with other services of the Department of Justice—primarily the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Liberties Bureau, and the recently organized Neutrality Unit. Lemuel B. Schofield, a major of Infantry during the World War and former assistant district attorney and director of public safety in Philadelphia, has been appointed as a special assistant to the Attorney General to be Administrative Head of Immigration and Naturalization.

The Federal laws against espionage and sabotage apply alike to aliens and citizens. The Department of Justice is charged with the duty of detecting and apprehending all violators of those laws, whether citizens or aliens, and of prosecuting violators. In the case of a citizen arrest and prosecution are the remedies. When aliens abuse our hospitality there is a further remedy—deportation. The reorganization plan will enable the Government to deal more effectively and more promptly with alien violators of our laws because it will integrate all activities dealing with aliens in the Department of Justice, whose duty it is to enforce the law. The work of the border patrol, the immigrant inspectors, and the naturalization officers will be brought together but not merged with the two Department of Justice units concerned with subversive activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Neutrality Unit, which enforce the law and deal with lawbreakers, and with the Civil Liberties Division, which sees to it that the rights of individuals are not violated.

In the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the policies of the Department of Justice will be dominated by two major objectives: The vigorous and effective enforcement of our laws and the full protection of the civil rights of all persons in the United States. Both these objectives were clearly recognized by the President. He said of this plan—I quote:

"While it is designed to afford more effective control over aliens, this proposal does not reflect any intention to deprive them of their civil liberties or otherwise to impair their legal status. This reorganization will enable the Government to deal quickly with those aliens who conduct themselves in a manner that conflicts with the public interest."

The tragedy to western civilization through which we have been living during these last terrible days has made us alive to the threat of espionage and treason within our democracy—a feared danger which we cannot see but which we must be alert to discover and destroy before it is too late. The individual citizen, of course, feels powerless to combat this subversive evil, and the fear of "fifth column" activities has naturally made some sections of our population hysterical.

One form that this hysteria has taken is the wholesale denunciation of all aliens living in America—a confession of fear and weakness that sees a spy behind every foreign accent. Where individuals have taken the law into their own hands, there have been instances of mob violence. A religious sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses have been repeatedly set upon and beaten. They had committed no crime, but the mob adjudged they had and meted out mob punishment. The Attorney General has ordered an immediate investigation of these outrages.

There is no cause for mass hysteria, no justification for mob violence. As a peaceful Nation we have, perhaps, been slow to realize the danger. But today we are all of us alive to the immediate threat. The Department of Justice is well equipped to recognize the real danger spots and to deal with them vigorously. With the cooperation of the American people the Justice Department will root out espionage and sabotage wherever it threatens. The people must be alert and watchful, and above all cool and sane. Since mob violence will make the Government's task infinitely more difficult, it will not be tolerated. We shall not defeat the Nazi evil by emulating its methods. As Thomas Jefferson said:

"I have ever deemed it more honorable and profitable too, to set a good example than to follow a bad one."

We are equipped to meet all dangers that come from within. Our laws are adequate to cope with those dangers, and if there is any point at which they prove inadequate, we shall ask the Congress to strengthen them. For the enforcement of those laws, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has a competent group of trained men. It has the cooperation of State and local police agencies throughout the country. In adequate laws and competent loyal officials to administer them, the American people place their reliance.

This transfer of immigration and naturalization activities to the Department of Justice has raised the question in the minds of a good many noncitizens as to whether it was effected with a view to making far more drastic the regulations governing their status in the United States. I have in mind particularly those refugees who have sought shelter with us from the horror of war and persecution in their own countries. Our policy must, of course, be worked out to fit the needs of a rapidly changing world, but I want to assure you that we shall not abandon the fundamental principles of American democracy which include a generous and just treatment to innocent sufferers from any country, who have sought refuge with us.

The footprints of the Trojan horse are first found in the treacherous propaganda which leads to the ruthless persecution of minorities, and thereafter their purpose is to make us break down our American democratic insistence on freedom of speech, religious worship, and freedom of assembly by stirring up religious and racial hatred within the United States. Let me speak one familiar word of warning to all Americans. Remember, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Do not let the subtle propaganda of race hatred turn you against any group in this country as a group. Remember that internal dissension is what the would-be "fifth column" hopes for. It weakens our inner strength.

Let me in closing return once more to what I said at the beginning. I do not like the sound of the word "alien." It is like a brand on the law-abiding foreigners who have come to America as the land of justice and opportunity for all. I prefer to think of them as American-aliens, those people who have lived here in peace, whose children, born on our soil, are American citizens today. There is no necessary relationship between the length of time a man has been here and his loyalty to American institutions. A survey made recently in one of our States showed that 70 percent of the people belonging to families headed by aliens were American citizens. As one writer has put it, "Ellis Island is beginning to share honors with Plymouth Rock." These American aliens have helped with their strength to build the physical and spiritual greatness of our Nation. They have shared with us the good and bad days of prosperity and poverty. The old people may speak only the language of their fatherland; they feel and dream our American aspirations.

There are the Slavic-Americans who have created our empire of steel—rail and bridge and skyscraper; the Scandinavian-Americans whose industry and honesty have built up the great Northwest; the German-Americans whose ancient gentle culture is still preserved here on our shores; the Italian-American stonemason, skilled artisan, artist—and those Italian-Americans who, with torn hearts, have recently had courage to denounce the acts of a totalitarian dictatorship which they hate; the countless other races who have become a

very part of it. It was of them, and others like them, that President Wilson said, on May 10, 1915, in the early stages of the other Great War, when feelings were running high in this country, as they now are, addressing 5,000 of them who had been newly naturalized:

"This is the only country in the world which experiences this constant and repeated rebirth. * * * This country is constantly drinking strength out of new sources by the voluntary association with it of great bodies of strong men and forward-looking women out of other lands. And so by the gift of the free will of independent people it is constantly being renewed from generation to generation by the same process from which it was originally created. It is as if humanity had determined to see to it that this great Nation, founded for the benefit of humanity, should not lack for the allegiance of the people of the world * * *."

The Department of Justice is dedicated to its name—to the task of justice. It is here to see that the rights of free speech, free worship, free assembly are not violated. It is here to apprehend those who would undermine our national life and security and destroy those rights. It is your safeguard of democracy.

And They Were Unprepared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of June 22, 1940, entitled "And They Were Unprepared."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of June 22, 1940]

AND THEY WERE UNPREPARED

We trust history to erase or disregard the fact that there was a moment when the thought of having to stand alone in its own hemisphere against the European aggressor made the great American democracy seem to be afraid. Alcibiades explained it when he complained of his Greeks—who were often scared, but never afraid—that he could not get them to act until he had made their flesh to creep. That is a weakness of democracies still. Their emotions are quick, but their minds are dilatory. They trifle with time and are never ready.

For how long did England and France watch the Germans at the work of building the most frightful war machine of all time? They knew well enough what it was for. They could have stopped it. Their resources were in every way superior. At least they could have prepared the invincible defense. But they were unwilling to forego in time their customary ways and comforts, unable to forget their internal disputes, incapable of bringing their lives, their powers and intelligence under discipline of a single grim purpose, as they saw the Germans doing. So it was that when the terror struck, they were not ready, and began calling to the great young democracy across the Atlantic to save them, or, if not to save them, who had been saved once before, to save civilization.

And what had this romantic democracy been doing? It had been indulging its moral passions. Conscious of having in its hands the balance of all power in the potential sense, with two-thirds of the world's gold in its vaults, with an unlimited surplus of essential resources, it had been saying to the aggressor, "You and who else?" It had been pursuing the phantasy that, merely by threatening to put its weight in his path, it could stop him.

The origin and growth of that phantasy may be said to date from the President's quarantine speech in Chicago, in October 1937. He said: "Let no one imagine that America will escape, that it may expect mercy, that the Western Hemisphere will not be attacked." And what he proposed was that the peace-loving nations should "quarantine the aggressor."

No one asked how or with what means. Had we not our mobilization-day plan in the files of the War Department, an army of 4,000,000 men on paper, and a law all written and ready to be passed, turning the economy of the entire country from peace to war overnight?

Whether the Germans knew that or not, they went on building their war machine.

Nothing came of the quarantine idea. The next shape of the phantasy received from the President was, "Methods short of war, but more effective than mere words." What methods? What measures?

Anyhow the Germans went on building their machine.

Then the President began to say that the old 1937 neutrality law, forbidding the sale of arms and munitions to belligerents, was the reason why he had been unable to awe the aggressor. He wanted it repealed, and in place of it a law that would give him almost unlimited discretion to employ the economic power of the country in foreign wars. The Congress, after a very bitter fight, refused to give him such a law. It was then that the controversy arose over whether he had said to Members of Congress, in a confidential White House interview, that our first line of defense was in France, or what exactly he did say to make them think he said that. Yet suppose he did say it, and suppose he had been right. What were we going to put there? A typewritten statistical statement of our potential power? Another warning to the aggressor of what we could do?

The Germans went on building their machine; and when of a sudden they released it fully and went crashing through Holland and Belgium with it, the President announced that we were "shocked and angered." We were. Rising in millions of American hearts that day was the passion to put forth the arm of the most powerful democracy and smite that aggressor. Yet again, with what? With shock and anger. Shock is sensation and anger is emotion, and neither one has ever yet shot a bombing plane down.

It was then, and as if for the first time, that a country hitherto boasting of its offensive power looked to its weapons. That was the moment we spoke of in the beginning—the moment of panic. Its weapons were not fit. They were not fit for self-defense even. If its entire military strength had been there to meet the aggressor, it could not have saved Holland, to say nothing of civilization. What would happen, therefore, if the Germans should suddenly win, capture the British and French navies, and then turn their frightful machine against us? Could we defend ourselves?

The truth, or quite enough of it, concerning our state of military and industrial unpreparedness now is notorious. Such sayings as that in these days of "swift and shocking developments" a nation must "look to its defenses in the light of new factors," or that the Administration had not at its disposal the means necessary to prepare an adequate national defense—for that matter, a hemisphere defense according to its own thesis—are but suavities and gloze. The Administration did know. Its files are heavy with neglected information. Our foremost authority in industrial preparedness is Bernard M. Baruch, who, as chairman of the War Industries Board, commanded the country's economic exertions in the World War 22 years ago. Ceaselessly for 3 years he importuned the Government and the President personally with oral statements and written memoranda on the necessity to prepare and organize industry for national defense and on the rise and character of the German menace. After the appeasement of Hitler at Munich, he returned from Europe and stood on the White House steps saying, "The condition of American defense is unknown only to Americans. Every foreign power knows what we are doing and exactly what we lack." And to the Government he addressed another memorandum, saying, "I do not know whether the special machinery that is necessary for making power has been bought. That should be top priority. Next should be the shortage in antiaircraft and antitank guns and semi-automatic shoulder rifles, with a reserve of special machinery. Then airplanes and more airplanes."

And as for means, there was a dispensation of chance such as will never occur again. For his recovery program the President received from Congress billions to spend in whatever way he would. Under the National Industrial Recovery Act alone, to begin with, he got $3,300,000,000. The Congress did not say what he should do with the money; it did suggest to him, among other things, naval construction, aircraft, and mechanization of the Army.

What did he do with it? In the next fiscal year total emergency expenditures under the recovery program were four billions; and of this four billions, less than sixty-one millions were spent for national defense. Billions out of that first free purse and billions since for relief, for social security, for the more abundant life and to make work—save the word!—at a time when in Germany every ounce of human labor was employed and people were on short rations in order to build a war machine with which to destroy the soft-living democracies.

That is not all. Besides the free billions that might have been spent in works of preparedness, Congress has directly appropriated for national defense in the last 7 years the enormous total of seven billions. Seven years was Germany building her war machine. In those 7 years, with the money that we might have spent under the recovery program for national defense, plus the seven billions appropriated for that purpose, we could have made this continent impregnable. What have we got? A first-class Navy, yet one not large enough to defend both coasts at once or to defend the line of neutrality we have cast upon inter-American waters; hardly more than the fine nucleus of an adequate air force; an Army waiting for guns and instruments, with fewer tanks to its name than the number in one German division.

So it is that in a time of the world without reason, no law extant but the law of force, the richest and most powerful democracy in it, this Cathay that has been sending insulting messages to Genghis Khan, is unprepared to fight.

But we are going to be prepared. The first thing shall be unity of mind about it. In unity of mind we adjourn politics. To adjourn politics means that we shall say of what might have been, "What's over the dam is forgotten." To speak of it further would be partisan. Then we are going to begin. There is nothing the Germans know that we don't know; nothing they can do but we can do it more so. Mechanization? We are the famous mechanizers. We are going to defend this hemisphere. We are going to have a power of defense that will enable us to attack an aggressor on his way hither. We are going to have an air armada of 50,000 planes, and bases everywhere, and the personnel and everything.

When? As soon as possible. We are going to "speed up to a 24-hour basis all the existing Army and Navy contracts" without saying why they were not speeded up before. We are going to resurrect the old spirit of industry and embrace it and then require of it, says the President, "the ability to turn out quickly infinitely greater supplies." Infinitely greater.

And toward all this going to be and going to do and infinitely greaterness an immediate appropriation of how much money?

Roughly, one and one-half billions.

Less than one-half the size of the first free purse for the recovery program.

Less than 2½ percent of the national income, whereas Germany, to build her war machine, had been spending at least one-third of her national income for 7 years.

We mention the sum, and scale it thus only as a measure of discrepancy. Money will not buy preparedness. The price of defense is sacrifice.

Regard the German machine. Money did not build it. Nor did credit. It represents grueling work, heroic privation, and what people did without, including butter. They could have butter, or they could have guns; not both. It is a monstrous thing, and yet so it was done. And so only may the power of defense be achieved. It is evident that even yet we are wishfully thinking. We think we can prepare our defense by passing an appropriation. But what is it we are willing to consume less of in order to produce armaments? By how much are we willing to lengthen the hours of labor? How much profit, income, comfort, and pleasure are we willing to surrender? To work harder or to consume less—it is one or the other. In the heroic mood we should do both.

The difference between a totalitarian state and a democracy is that in one the people are commanded to do it, and in the other they must be persuaded. In England and France they could be neither commanded nor persuaded enough.

We have the billions, and they are nothing. We have the resources. We have the labor. What has been wanting is grim leadership calling to the grim spirit in us to rise again.

How Strong Is Our Fighting Spirit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in this morning's edition of the Washington Times-Herald is an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop which contains a suggestion so sensible and so novel in the interest of national defense that I think it should be called to the attention of the country. It is a suggestion no less revolutionary than raising the armed forces of the United States by taking all the columnists and newspapermen and advertising men and other publicists who have been trying to steam up a war for the United States and volunteering for purposes of publicity or propaganda service in that war, and inducting them into the service, and then transferring them to the Infantry.

I quote one paragraph from Mr. Waldrop's article:

There is a mutter in the War Department that the fastest way to build up the Army is not with recruiting stations and placards, but by accepting all the volunteers for propaganda and intelligence duty at headquarters (certain offices are overrun with advertising and newspapermen eager to take such assignments) and then transfer the patriots to the Infantry after they are sworn in.

Why are the first volunteer enlistments so far out of balance with population?

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Waldrop's article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 19, 1940]

HOW STRONG IS OUR FIGHTING SPIRIT?—HERE'S A LITTLE EVIDENCE FROM THE RECRUITING OFFICE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Deep down in his heart every American today has a chill, hard knot, signifying:

When war comes, what happens to me?

Let's not fool ourselves. Every man is thinking about how he will have to give up what he has been doing, forget what he had been planning, and take up a course of living contrary to all his instincts. Every woman is thinking of what women always think about as war approaches.

Whether more of the people are phrasing the question "When war comes?" or "If war comes?" Nobody really knows.

But when, as, and if war comes, how will the American people behave?

It is no good to talk about our great, martial past, or to say we are all patriotic, tough, and determined to defend ourselves to the last. The French have a great martial past, too. They have been patriotic, tough, and determined, too. Also, they were unprepared, physically.

The United States has not been in a really rough war for 75 years. Is it prepared for war, spiritually?

The Spanish fandango was a fandango. The World War, for us, was more of an ether jag than a war. True, we spent better than a million dollars an hour from April 1917 to April 1919, and billions more after the shooting was over in one way or another, as a part of the same old war.

But the A. E. F. lost only 50,280 men in battle. Another 57,460 died of disease. Accidents, suicides, and the like accounted for 7,920 more, to roll up a total of 115,660 dead American soldiers in that venture. In an ordinary year about 35,000 Americans are killed in traffic accidents.

Yet how did we behave about the last war? Our revulsion hardly needs recalling. It is a grim truth that the War Department is more than a little anxious to know how the present-day America is going to accept the new order after 20 years of pacifism and ease.

Unpleasant as it may be to say, we must face the fact that we are an unknown factor as a fighting nation. The General Staff has been having a very painful debate on the subject. It would like to know how fast the young men of this great business Nation would spring to arms if there were any overnight demand. Some of the generals have a strong contempt for the "undisciplined, uneducated sprats," and say that out of our 130,000,000 people a call for volunteers would bring out a bare 300,000 willing to die.

And they estimate it would take 9 months to get the 300,000 up to fighting pitch.

Even the most optimistic say 500,000 would be a top limit on volunteers.

Well, it is embarrasing to bring these matters into public discussion, but they have to be discussed in public for they are the test of the Nation's fitness to preserve itself. The Army has not only been talking but it has also been making a few trial runs. On May 1 it set out to enlist 15,000 volunteers before July 1. Enlistments were called for in each of the 9 geographical divisions of the country designated as "corps areas."

Here is the register of success from each corps-area headquarters, with 12 days to go in the drive.

First Corps Area (Boston)	387
Second Corps Area (New York City)	364
Third Corps Area (Baltimore)	986
Fourth Corps Area (Atlanta)	1,670
Fifth Corps Area (Columbus, Ohio)	1,361
Sixth Corps Area (Chicago)	1,158
Seventh Corps Area (Omaha)	649
Eighth Corps Area (San Antonio)	1,780
Ninth Corps Area (San Francisco)	596
Total	8,951

Most of the War Department agrees this is a better total than had been expected. But it is obvious that the rush to arms is not in balance with population and nothing to be overly proud of as a show of martial spirit.

There is a mutter in the War Department that the fastest way to build up the Army is not with recruiting stations and placards, but by accepting all the volunteers for propaganda and intelligence duty at headquarters (certain offices are overrun with advertising and newspapermen eager to take such assignments) and then transfer the patriots to the infantry after they are sworn in.

Why are the first volunteer enlistments so far out of balance with population?

Are the early birds in the desk-defending "intelligence reserve" less than Nathan Hales?

Maybe it is too early in the progress of affairs to form a judgment. But sooner or later we are going to have a judgment thrust upon us, if, as, or when, we go to war.

A Voice From the Pacific Coast in Favor of My Peace Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were privileged to serve in Congress with John S. McGroarty will always remember his fine altruism. It is impossible for those who know Mr. McGroarty to speak of him in anything but superlative terms. In his overflow of love for humanity the poet laureate of California—so designated by official action of the State legislature—is one of the finest characters that ever graced this planet.

He is a Democrat from the topmost hair of his head to the soles of his feet. When years ago I first proposed an amendment to the Constitution permitting the people to vote on proposals to send our boys into overseas wars he was one of the first of the distinguished men of America to approve that democratic principle. He took his stand by my side and he never has faltered or wavered in giving me the encouragement and inspiration that come so abundantly from a right-thinking and gifted mind.

To him it has always been one of the anomalies of our so-called democracy that while the citizen can vote on the election of a constable or a dog catcher he is denied a vote on the most tragic of all questions. The question as to whether the flower of our youth shall be hurled into the hell of an overseas war.

This great Californian, upon whom the honors of two hemispheres have been heaped, who was made a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope Pius XI, who has touched the hearts of millions by the uplifting messages of his golden tongue and pen, is still urging my peace measure for adoption as a fit climax and cap sheaf of the Bill of Rights. With many persons contending that the time will come when we must send our soldiers overseas, and with many more taking the opposite view, he sees no reason why in a democratic form of government, dedicated to rule by the people, the question should not be submitted to the citizens for their decision under constitutional processes.

Mr. McGroarty edits a very interesting department in the Sunday magazine of the Los Angeles Times, a newspaper with which he has been connected for 38 years. In the issue of that magazine for June 9, 1940, he discussed the international situation, and I quote from his remarks, as follows:

If there were ever a time when voters in the United States should exercise the most anxious care as to the selection of Members of the next Congress it is now in this year of our Lord, 1940. The reason for so saying is that the same dark shadow of war that darkened our skies in 1914 raises its black pall again on our horizon.

IS HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF?

At the present hour the same state of affairs exists that prevailed during the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Wilson had decided in his own mind that the United States would enter the combat against Germany. Propaganda was rampant and of such weight that the minds of the American people became wildly inflamed. When this propaganda was fully aflame, Wilson asked Congress for a declaration of war against Germany. His demand was granted by Congress almost unanimously. The result of the entry of the United States into the World War is still apparent. One hundred thousand of the flower of American youth sleep the sleep of death under little white crosses in France and Flanders. Government hospitals are crowded with the living wrecks of that useless and misguided carnage. Billions of dollars loaned to the Allies remain unpaid. An economic disaster followed which still leaves our country in a deplorable financial condition. But great as all these economic disasters have proved to be the moral disaster is still greater.

HOW DO YOU STAND ON THE LUDLOW BILL?

With the increasing ramifications and complexities of the present situation, every voter in the United States should put to each aspirant to the Congress of the United States one question above all others, namely, how do you stand on the Ludlow bill, defeated in the last Congress but still pending?

The Ludlow bill, introduced and sponsored by Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW of Indiana, if enacted into law would take the power of waging war overseas out of the hands of both the Executive and the Congress, and would leave the decision entirely with the people themselves. This country could never again engage in war except in its own defense, unless the people themselves, by their votes, sanctioned and authorized the movement.

Ourself, we had the great honor and privilege of voting in favor of the Ludlow bill when it came up for passage in the House of Representatives. Although the measure was defeated it had strong backing. A few additional votes would have passed it.

It is an entirely logical and constitutional measure. If this Republic be a government of and by the people, and for the people, surely it is the people themselves directly, and not even through their chosen representatives, who should have the responsibility of declaring war.

One Way to Deal With French Possessions in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of June 18 entitled "One Way to Deal With French Possessions in the Caribbean."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of June 18, 1940]

ONE WAY TO DEAL WITH FRENCH POSSESSIONS IN THE CARIBBEAN

Apparently Germany intends to impose upon stricken France terms that approximate unconditional surrender. Equally plain is it that France can do no otherwise than accept. That means that French possessions in the Western Hemisphere will fall under the direct, or indirect, but nonetheless effective, control of Germany.

This presents to the United States, not a question of policy, but an actual condition that must be met—and met at once.

Shall we permit the practical transfer of political and military control over islands in the Caribbean Sea to pass from French into German hands?

The Monroe Doctrine, about the only clearly defined foreign policy we have, negatives such a change.

The safety of the Panama Canal, the uninterrupted operation of which is vital to our national defense, forbids it.

Congressional action, not 10 days ago, specifically declares against such a change in sovereignty.

It is clear that we must act—and act promptly.

How shall we act?

The safety of the Western World from invasion by European or Asiatic powers is not the safety of the United States alone. There are 20 other nations whose safety is just as much involved as is the security of this country. Prevention of any attempt by predatory nations to gain bases for military operations on this side of the Atlantic is of as grave concern to the nations of Central and South America as it is to us. Our defense to be effective must be hemispheric.

If this is true—and no one denies it—why, then, should not the measures we take for the common safety of the Americas be representative of the 21 nations that comprise the Americas?

This would mean that the United States, acting as a sort of trustee for the whole western world, would take over French possessions and set up a government for them with, say, three or five of the American governments given representation.

Such a device would certainly avoid any possibility of the charge that we were acting selfishly, with imperialistic designs in the matter. And if Germany thought to challenge such action she

would have to defy, not the United States alone, but the entire western world. This she might be loath to do.

Practically, as the most powerful of the American nations, we would have to supply the most, if not all, of the military means to make the trusteeship a reality, but we would surround our action with moral justification in the eyes of the world.

Furthermore, in the new world created by new and undreamed-of dangers, we, here in the Americas, must begin to think hemispherically.

Our danger is a common danger, and our defense must be a mutual defense. In what better way could be begun this new mode of thought than meeting the first tangible danger by common action?

Broadcasts as Aid in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its widespread interest, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, June 9, 1940, entitled "Urge Broadcasts as Aid in Defense."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 18, 1940]

URGE BROADCASTS AS AID IN DEFENSE—FOES OF CONGRESS MOVE TO END FUND FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS; CITE NEW NEED FOR DATA—COST HELD WELL REPAID—OFFICE OF EDUCATION PROJECT IS UPHELD AS MEDIUM FOR COMBATING "FIFTH COLUMN"

WASHINGTON, June 8.—Educational and military authorities interested in the psychological preparation of the Nation for defense against subversive propaganda are preparing to take up the cudgels on behalf of the radio activities of the Office of Education, which are threatened with stopping as a result of the elimination by the House of a $40,000 appropriation which had been approved by the Budget Bureau.

The Senate voted a mere prohibition of the buying by Government agencies of radio time, which the Office of Education has never done. The fate of the fund rests on the conference between the two Houses.

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah came to the defense of the radio project in a statement today.

"Democracy assumes that the people as a whole through their representatives can make wise decisions," he said. "This makes it necessary for the people to have access to and familiarity with the facts in order to make wise decisions.

HAILS SPREAD OF SERVICE

"Radio is an additional and new medium for bringing facts swiftly to the attention of all citizens of a democracy. The national, State, and local educational forces of our Nation and the broadcasting industry deserve praise for the wider and improved use of radio for education.

"One of the most helpful evidences of this has been the cooperation brought about through the radio division of the United States Office of Education by producing cooperative programs such as 'The World is Yours,' 'Democracy in Action,' and 'Gallant American Women'

"In this present hour of world crisis these educational channels can render splendid service in helping to maintain free interchange of ideas. This process is the fundamental strength of our country."

The National Association of Broadcasters was a leader in directing public attention to the fact that Congress had put a tentative end to a program which, in the interest of public enlightenment, had been for 5 years dramatizing the fundamentals of American democracy for millions of listeners. The bill not only eliminated the appropriation with which the educational radio project was to be continued but it added a clause forbidding W. P. A. to carry out radio projects.

FEDERAL COST IS MINOR

Since the National Broadcasting Co and the Columbia Broadcasting System and their affiliates have been contributing, according to the Office of Education, $5 to every $1 spent by the Government, and such bodies as the Rockefeller Institution and the Smithsonian Institution had also advanced funds, the effect of the elimination of the Educational Radio Project appropriation is far wider than it might appear.

A description of some of the programs the Office of Education has presented over the radio is as follows:

Brave New World, which told the story of Latin America; Let Freedom Ring, a new series which dramatizes and explains the Bill of Rights, trial by jury, freedom of speech, of the press, and of religious, racial equality, etc.; The World Is Yours, which described the opening of the far West, American inventors; Whistler, the artist and the man; Wilkes, an American who discovered a continent; the natives of Hawaii, etc.

If democracy is to defend itself and to be made worth defending against totalitarian propaganda, it is declared by supporters of the project, it must be expounded to the people.

Presentation on the air as a live broadcast is only one phase of the use of Office of Education programs. Hundreds of performances of the dramatizations are given by schools, colleges, and civic groups, and over local stations. This is made possible by the script-exchange feature of the project. Scripts are lent for local, noncommercial use, and recordings are made available at low cost.

For instance, using the subject City Government Is a Business—Make It Your Business, 15 original radio dramatizations on municipal government have been made available free to local school and civic groups. As a result thousands of letters have come in asking for further information on the general subject and suggestions for reading.

LARGE RESULTS AT SMALL COST

The Radio Division of the Office of Education has probably been one of the most economical agencies in the history of government.

Listeners are reached, it is estimated, at a rate of about 16,000 to each nominal cost of $10.

There are actually three educational radio services operating within the Federal Government, one of the others being in the Department of Agriculture, and the third an integral part of the Interior Department. The latter service has produced many radio programs similar in tone to those of the Office of Education, which operates through the Federal Security Agency.

The Interior Department organization is preparing to release a new series, in collaboration with a number of other Government agencies, which, as part of the national-defense program, will inform Americans on the diversity and extent of our natural resources.

Still another educational project, the United States Film Service, which produced several highly praised documentary films, is suspended, and may never be revived.

Advocates of the film and radio services insist that it is a poor time to eliminate or curtail such agencies, when "fifth columnists" and other subversive groups are becoming increasingly active. Sound publicity for America to Americans, they declare, is now more important than ever.

Scroll of Merit Awarded to Theodore Granik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, June 16, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce awarded a Scroll of Merit to Mr. Theodore Granik, director of the "American Forum of the Air," heard over the Mutual Broadcasting System each Sunday evening. This was notable and deserved recognition of the efforts of a young man who has contributed greatly to the development of interesting and educational radio forums. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a press statement issued by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on June 17, 1940, together with the text of the Scroll of Merit awarded to Mr. Granik. I also ask that Mr. Granik's remarks in accepting the award be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BESTOWS AWARD TO GRANIK AND AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Delegates of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce from all sections of the country now in convention here attended last night's (Sunday) broadcast of the American Forum of the Air held in the Willard Hotel and awarded the forum's director, Theodore Granik, a scroll of merit "as the outstanding person in this field who has rendered most conspicuous service in the furtherance and betterment of American ideals and democracy."

The award was made during the broadcast discussion of the topic How Can Young America Aid National Defense?—the Junior Chamber's convention theme—heard over the coast-to-coast network of the Mutual Broadcasting System. Among those participating in the Forum of the Air broadcast were Perry Pipkin, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, who made the award; Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, and defense coordinator of the Department of Justice; Robert Hinckley, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority; Brig. Gen. George V. Strong, chief of war plans of the United States Army; and Rear Admiral E. J. King, member of the General Board of the United States Navy.

Following are the texts of Mr. Pipkin's address of award and Mr. Granik's reply:

"The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, to further the principle—individual expression and unified action make democracy work—salutes the American Forum of the Air, a public-service feature presented each Sunday night by radio station WOL in cooperation with WOR, over the coast-to-coast network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, which was originated and is directed by Theodore Granik, distinguished attorney and pioneer in the field of educational radio discussion.

"Mr. Granik, one of the earliest pioneers in the presentation of radio forums, has devoted more than 12 years of continued and conscientious efforts in the interest of education, and has given unstintingly of his time without compensation to make possible the discussion and better understanding of the many vital problems affecting the lives of the citizenry of America.

"As chairman and director of these radio programs as well as of the American Forum, a nationally syndicated newspaper feature more recently founded by him, he is greatly contributing to the cause of liberal thought and free speech, in presenting the pros and cons of controversial timely topics of the day by outstanding leaders in the fields of labor, business, science, education, government, national and international affairs.

"He has succeeded in making his radio and newspaper forums a balanced and unbiased indicator of American public opinion by giving every citizen a true opportunity to judge fairly the views of those who make and mold our laws and public policy.

"It is a real pleasure and a distinct privilege to express the sincere thanks and gratitude of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce to Theodore Granik for making possible these great contributions to American freedom of discussion, especially at a time when our precious liberties are threatened by the onrushing forces of ruthless dictators in other parts of the world. We award this scroll of merit to him as the outstanding person in this field who has rendered most conspicuous service in the furtherance and betterment of American ideals and democracy."

Mr. Granik's reply:

"Thank you, Mr. Pipkin. I am deeply grateful to your organization and to each of your members for their kindness in awarding this scroll to me.

"As I was listening to your generous remarks more than 12 years passed in review. Back in 1928 I conceived the idea of a series of programs entitled "Law for the Layman," presenting from the New York studios of WOR members of the bench and bar in discussions on legal aspects of our citizens' daily lives. The splendid public reaction developed my thought that the public would be interested in hearing the discussion of both sides of timely topics of the day. Alfred J. McCosker, president of WOR, immediately recognizing the significance and importance of this type of informative program, and the WOR Forum Hour came into being. Each week I was privileged to present outstanding men and women in public life in debates on controversial issues affecting America's welfare.

"In 1937 my legal activities took me to Washington. This was shortly after the formation of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and I discussed with William B. Dolph, general manager of WOL in Washington, the idea of expanding the local WOR forum into a national program. He also recognized the value, the need, and the importance of presenting this type of discussion to the American people. Thus the American Forum of the Air came into existence. I am proud to say that it has become a national institution. We have presented the views of outstanding leaders in Government and Congress, as well as of other national figures—of those who make and mold our laws and public policy—so that our people may better understand all phases of the vital questions being debated in our legislative halls and better enjoy the American right of voicing their own opinions to their representatives, a true symbol of America's democratic traditions.

"The response from our listeners in all parts of the country has been most encouraging and complimentary, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many thousands who write to us each week. I am also grateful to the newspapers throughout the country for devoting column after column in reporting these broadcasts. And, of course, our deepest gratitude to our speakers, all busy in the affairs of our Nation, who devote so much of their time and energy to bring you their important messages."

A Tip to the Politicians—Delegates to the National Conventions, Please Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today in order that I may give a tip to the politicians. It is a free tip and a valuable tip. Delegates to the Republican and Democratic National Conventions please take notice. The tip I offer tells you how to win the 1940 national election.

Naturally, being a Democrat, I would prefer that the Democratic National Convention would accept my tip, as my proposal is the very essence of democracy and it would fit perfectly into the platform of the party whose father was the author of the Bill of Rights. However, my proposal also is Americanism in its finest form and flower and if both political platforms choose to adopt it I will be happier still.

The 1940 national election will be won or lost on the issue of our foreign relations. Be not deceived about that. The party that adopts the best antiwar plank will win.

The people of the United States are grimly determined, first, that we shall build up our national defenses to the highest point of perfection so that there will be no doubt of our ability under any and all circumstances to defend ourselves and to perform our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, and second, that we shall stay out of wars that are being waged, and that will be waged, overseas.

The sort of foreign-relations plank that will carry the national election will contain two substantive declarations, as follows:

First. For the strongest possible national defense.

Second. For a referendum by the people on participation in overseas wars.

Not one of these declarations alone, but both of them, will be required to insure carrying the election. For instance, let us suppose that one political party declares for the strongest possible national defense, and stops there, while the other declares for the strongest national defense, plus a referendum on overseas wars.

The party that declares for the strongest national defense, plus a referendum on foreign wars, will sweep the country.

I would propose as a referendum plank the resolution adopted by the Young Democrats of America, 5,000,000 strong, at their national convention held at Indianapolis in 1937 with a slight change, to cover our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, the text reading as follows:

Resolved, That we favor a Nation-wide referendum before declaration of war, except in the case of invasion of the United States or some other country in the Western Hemisphere, or internal rebellion.

Correspondence coming to me from all over the country and five Gallup polls have shown an overwhelming majority in favor of my proposal, which is convincing evidence that this is the platform declaration on foreign affairs that the people want and that they will support in the election next November. The people have never had a chance to vote on the question of sending our boys into war overseas. The plank I propose would promise to give them that right. It would receive widespread popular support. The politicians may not accept this tip but it is a good tip and it comes from the grass roots of America.

The Monroe Doctrine and House Joint Resolution 556

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed to reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine by enacting House Joint Resolution 556 into law. Let us look at the terms of the resolution and at the text of the so-called Monroe Doctrine.

The resolution provides, first, that the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and second, that if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall in addition to other measures immediately consult with the other American republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests.

Now, the text of the original Monroe Doctrine, which I am inserting in the following remarks, contains what seems to me to be three distinct propositions which we should take cognizance of at the present time.

NO COLONIZATION OF AMERICAN CONTINENTS

The colonization of the American continents by any European powers is interdicted in the following language:

> In the discussion to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

NO EXTENSION OF ANOTHER POLITICAL SYSTEM TO OUR HEMISPHERE

President Monroe was particularly emphatic in his opposition to the extension of another political system to our hemisphere. He stated:

> We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere.

Further in his remarks President Monroe said:

> It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference.

NONINTERFERENCE IN EUROPEAN INTERNAL AFFAIRS

An important part of the Monroe Doctrine lays down the rule that we will not interfere in the internal affairs of the European powers. The following language of President Monroe is unequivocal:

> In the wars of European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense.

Further we find this statement:

> Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power; submitting to injuries from none.

TEXT OF THE ORIGINAL MONROE DOCTRINE

In The Monroe Doctrine: An Interpretation by Albert Bushnell Hart, the following is given as the text of the original Monroe Doctrine:

TEXT OF THE ORIGINAL MONROE DOCTRINE

The form of statement made by Monroe, after taking the counsel of his Cabinet and a few other statesmen, appears in two separated passages of the annual message, the wording of which is as follows, in its precise sequence:

"At the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government, made through the Minister of the Emperor residing here, a full power and instructions have been transmitted to the Minister of the United States at St. Petersburg to arrange, by amicable negotiation, the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the northwest coast of this continent. A similar proposal has been made by His Imperial Majesty to the Government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The Government of the United States has been desirous, by this friendly proceeding, of manifesting the great value which they have invariably attached to the friendship of the Emperor, and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with his Government.

"In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. * * *

"It was stated at the commencement of the last session that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the result has been, so far, very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe with which we have so much intercourse, and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense.

"With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted.

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

"In the war between these new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.

The late events in Spain and Portugal show that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the allied powers should have thought it proper, on any principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed, by force, in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote, and surely none more so than the United States.

"Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the Government de facto as the legitimate Government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting, in all instances, the just claims of every power; submitting to injuries from none.

"But in regard to these continents, circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference.

"If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course."

Conservation as a Foundation of Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY GIFFORD PINCHOT AT EIGHTH AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, on Conservation as a Foundation of Permanent Peace. The address was delivered before the Eighth American Scientific Congress in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thirty-two years ago there was held in the city of Washington a conference which was the first of its kind. It was the first not only in America but in the world. It was also the first conference in the history of this country of the Governors of all the States and Territories with the President of the United States. Since it included also the Congress, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, scientific experts, representatives of national associations, and outstanding citizens, it was one of the most distinguished gatherings ever brought together in this country.

But no one of these was the essential reason for its epoch-making importance. The reason why the meeting of the Governors with President Theodore Roosevelt in the White House in May 1908 may well be regarded by future historians as a turning point in human history, the reason why it exerted and continues to exert a vital influence on the United States, on the other nations of the Americas, and on the nations of the whole world, is this: It was called to introduce, and it did introduce, to mankind the newly formulated policy of the conservation of natural resources.

Even at that time the profound significance of conservation was beginning to make itself felt. In announcing his intention to call the conference, the President said: "The conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. * * * It (the conference) ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider."

In his opening address to the conference the President made this striking statement:

"So vital is this question that for the first time in our history the chief executive officers of the States separately, and of the States together forming the Nation, have met to consider it. It is the chief material problem that confronts us, second only—and second always—to the great fundamental questions of morality. * * *

"This conference on the conservation of natural resources is, in effect, a meeting of the representatives of all the people of the United States called to consider the weightiest problem now before the Nation."

This conference set forth in impressive fashion, and it was the first national meeting in any country to set forth the idea that the protection, preservation, and wise use of the natural resources of the earth is not a series of separate and independent tasks but one single problem. As the President said, "The various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as parts of one coherent plan."

The conference asserted that the conservation of natural resources is the one most fundamentally important problem of all. It drove home the basic truth that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is absolutely indispensable to the permanent prosperity of the human race.

It spread far and wide the new proposition that the purpose of the conservation of natural resources is the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time.

And it taught the people of the United States, and other peoples, the new meaning of the word "conservation," which in its present application to natural resources was then generally unknown.

By defining, describing, and making known the new word and the new policy, by endowing it with the approval and support of the leaders of all the States, of the great industries, and of the Nation itself, the Governors' conference put conservation in a firm place in the knowledge and the thinking of the people. From that moment conservation became an inseparable part of the national policy of the United States.

It is worth mention that this brilliant example of national foresight occurred, not in a time of scarcity, not in a depression, but in a time of general abundance and well-being. The unanimous declaration of the Governors ended with this discerning admonition: "Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity."

You may find it difficult today, when conservation is accepted almost as widely as the Ten Commandments, to realize that only a generation ago there was no such thing as the conservation policy. The very word "conservation," as we use it today, had no existence. But that is the truth.

The conception which we know as conservation originated and was formulated in the United States Forest Service in the early winter of 1907. Conservation grew out of forestry. It was a contribution from the foresters of America to the permanent policy and the democratic principles of their country.

Like many another child of flesh or brain, conservation was born without a name. But it had to be given a name before it could be introduced to the people.

After discussion among perhaps half a dozen men, the name "conservation" was tentatively decided on. Thereupon it was submitted to and approved by Theodore Roosevelt, and the infant was christened accordingly. We know the growing youngster, 33 years old but growing still, by that same name today.

The hold conservation has gained in these 33 years upon the civilized peoples of the world is little less than amazing. Today the soundness of the conservation policy is everywhere accepted as a matter of course.

The Conference of Governors recommended and was followed by the appointment of conservation commissions by a majority of the States, and of the National Conservation Commission, which latter in January of 1909 submitted to the President the first national inventory of natural resources ever made. In February of the same year the North American Conservation Conference, the first international conference to consider the policy of conservation, met in Washington at the invitation of President Theodore Roosevelt.

In his address at the opening of the conference in the White House, the President made this highly significant statement:

"In international relations the great feature of the growth of the last century has been the gradual recognition of the fact that instead of its being normally to the interest of one nation to see another depressed, it is normally to the interest of each nation to see the others elevated. * * *

"I believe that the movement that you this day initiate is one of the utmost importance to this hemisphere and may become of the utmost importance to the world at large."

The North American Conservation Conference declared that the movement for the conservation of natural resources on the continent of North America "is of such a nature and of such general importance that it should become world-wide in its scope." Therefore it suggested to the President "that all nations should be invited to join together in conference on the subject of world resources and their inventory, conservation, and wise utilization."

What the conference thus recommended was, however, already under way. The President had foreseen that the North American conference would be the precursor of a world conference. Accordingly, to quote Elihu Root, then Secretary of State: "By an aide-memoire in January last (1909), the principal governments were informally sounded to ascertain whether they would look with favor upon an invitation to send delegates to such a conference. The responses have so far been uniformly favorable, and the conference of Washington has suggested to the President that a similar general conference be called by him. The President feels, therefore, that it is timely to initiate the suggested world conference for the conservation of natural resources by a formal invitation."

Secretary Root continued: "As was said in the preliminary aide-memoire 'the people of the whole world are interested in the natural resources of the whole world, benefited by their conservation, and injured by their destruction. The people of every country are interested in the supply of food and of material for manufacture in every other country, not only because these are interchangeable through processes of trade but because a knowledge of the total supply is necessary to the intelligent treatment of each nation's share of the supply * * *.'

"Reading the lessons of the past aright it would be for such a conference to look beyond the present to the future."

These statements make it evident that the President and the men in whose minds the plan for a world inventory was born regarded the proposed conference only as a first step. They believed that international cooperation between nations for the conservation of natural resources and for fair access to necessary raw materials would greatly reduce the danger of war and work powerfully for permanent peace. Such a result was a definite part of their plan.

With the concurrence of the Netherlands, invitations were sent to 58 nations to meet at the Peace Palace in The Hague in September 1909. Thirty of the nations, including Great Britain, France, Germany, Canada, and Mexico, had already accepted when President Taft, who succeeded Theodore Roosevelt on March 4, 1909, killed the plan.

Two attempts have been made to revive it. At the end of the World War President Wilson, at the suggestion of Colonel House, took steps toward securing world-wide cooperation in the conservation and distribution of natural resources. Unfortunately nothing came of it.

During President Hoover's administration a group of nearly 200 leading citizens from all parts of this country urged him in a public petition to take action along the same general line. Again nothing came of it.

But these checks notwithstanding, the conservation problem remains the fundamental human problem. Without natural resources no human life is possible. Without abundant natural resources civilized life can neither be developed nor maintained.

To the human race land is the basic natural resource. The demand for new territory, made by one nation against another, is a demand for additional natural resources. And I need not point out to you how many times this demand has plunged the nations into war.

In view of the foregoing, I have a definite plan to suggest—a plan for permanent peace through international cooperation in the conservation and distribution of natural resources.

THE PROPOSAL

National life everywhere is built on the foundation of natural resources. Throughout human history the exhaustion of these resources and the need for new supplies have been among the greatest causes of war.

A just and permanent world peace is vital to the best interests of all nations. When the terms which will end the present war are considered, the neutral nations should be in position to assist in finding the way to such a peace. That being so, it would be wise to prepare in time.

The proposal is that the nations of the Americas prepare now for an endeavor to bring all nations together, at the right moment, in a common effort for conserving the natural resources of the earth, and for assuring to each nation access to the raw materials it needs, without recourse to war.

In all countries some natural resources are being depleted or destroyed. Needless waste or destruction of necessary resources anywhere threatens or will threaten, sooner or later, the welfare and security of peoples everywhere. Conservation is clearly a world necessity, not only for enduring prosperity but also for permanent peace.

No nation is self-sufficient in essential raw materials. The welfare of every nation depends on access to natural resources which it lacks. Fair access to natural resources from other nations is, therefore, an indispensable condition of permanent peace.

War is still an instrument of national policy for the safeguarding of natural resources or for securing them from other nations. Hence international cooperation in conserving, utilizing, and distributing natural resources to the mutual advantage of all nations might well remove one of the most dangerous of all obstacles to a just and permanent world peace.

The conservation of natural resources and fair access to needed raw materials are steps toward the common good to which all nations must in principle agree. Since the American nations are less dependent on imported natural resources than European nations, and since they are already engaged in broadening international trade through negotiated agreements, their initiative to such ends would be natural and appropriate.

The problem of permanent peace includes, of course, great factors which the foregoing proposal does not cover. But it does cover that factor which is certainly, in the long run, the most potent of them all.

FACTS REQUIRED

If the foregoing proposal is adopted, facts in support of it will be needed, and a plan for assembling them. The formulation of a general policy and a specific program of action would follow.

Facts for each nation separately, for groups of nations, and for the whole world might well be assembled under the general classes of forests, waters, lands, minerals, and wildlife. In very brief outline they should include:

As to conservation—resources in existence, consumption, probable duration, waste, conservation if any, necessary reserves, and available surplus.

As to fair access—present interdependence of nations in natural resources (raw materials), with the origin, destination, and quantities of imports and exports; present barriers to fair access; and sources of pressure upon nations to acquire natural resources.

A WAY TO ASSEMBLE THE FACTS

The information just outlined undoubtedly exists in sufficient detail for the present purpose, and can be put together without original investigation. It could well be done through a commission appointed for that purpose representing all of the American nations.

The gathering of information through the creation of such a commission might, I believe, properly be recommended by the Eighth American Scientific Congress to the Governments of the American Nations.

Formulation by the commission of a plan and of recommendations to the American governments for a general policy and a specific program of action, including the presentation of the plan when prepared to neutral and belligerent nations, would follow.

Such a commission would be of immense and lasting value to the American nations. It could not but advance their interests, both individual and mutual, in addition to opening a road toward a workable basis for permanent peace.

Finally, the situation in Europe and in Asia suggests that action for the purpose outlined above was never more necessary that at present.

Keeping America Out of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the next 30 days in American life, perhaps the next 10 days, are likely to be the most important in the history of our Republic. You and I are faced with the most trying decisions which can be made by a free people. It is about these decisions and the part you can and should play in shaping our national destiny that I am going to talk to you tonight.

War hysteria has gripped America. This great God-fearing land of peace and plenty today finds itself in the shadow of the European war. Once again we hear the blood-stained slogans of the last war echo throughout the land. Appeals are being made for another "war to make the world safe for democracy" and for another "war to end war" by the same groups who so skillfully used these slogans 20 years ago to plunge this country into that struggle of death. The time is almost here when these immortal words of George Washington take on added significance:

> Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

So I say to you, while men still dare to call out for peace, it is time that you and I seriously consider the path we are traveling, analyze the goal we are approaching, and ask ourselves whether we really want to spill the blood of millions of American boys on foreign battlefields.

If we enter this European war it will be a total war. Wealth as well as men will be conscripted. There will be no bonds at high rates of interest; no high-salaried civilian jobs or occupations; no boom for agricultural prices; no $2 wheat and $20 hogs. In the industrial-mobilization plan—already prepared and in the President's files—the Government has seen to all that. This war would be a total war, I repeat. Sons would be drafted, taken from home, shop, and farm, forced to give their lives in bloody battle; dictatorial powers would be given to the President, enabling him to tax and seize the lifetime savings of the family. There would be no war millionaires this time; no fantastic high wages for industry. No, this conflict would not be a war to end war; it would be a war to end democracy in America and a war to end our system of private ownership which has made America the greatest country in the world.

If the war propagandists succeed in pushing America into this war the result will be just as Winston Churchill said it would be, when he was installed as the present-day dictator of England. He said:

> I have nothing to offer you except blood, tears, toil, and sweat.

My friends, if America goes to war, if we again sacrifice our boys on the bloody altar of the heathen god of Mars, it will be because America goes to the war, for war will avoid an adequately prepared America. It is now time to

think clearly of ourselves and our own future. It is now time to face the facts squarely. It is now time to point out definitely that a million dead American boys in new European war graves cannot defend America as well as a million well-equipped Americans at home, prepared to protect this country against any foreign enemy.

And now, let us do some clear thinking, you and I. If we do this, I am sure we can all agree that the best defense for America lies in an impregnable, modern military establishment equipped to resist the methods and machinery of modern warfare, and not in sending expeditionary forces overseas. We must tighten our belts, improve our Government's financial structure, and prepare ourselves to the teeth, rather than take part in offensive battles overseas.

My friends, I am an American and my interest is in making democracy safe for the world by preserving it in the United States. I detest alike the un-American doctrines of nazi-ism, fascism, communism, and imperialism. It happens that I am the only Member of Congress of Luxemburger descent. The homeland of my ancestors has been overrun by the hobnailed boots and the giant tanks of the Nazi armies. My sympathies overflow for the victims of aggression. But I am an American first, and I must not and I will not allow my personal sympathies or my ancestral background to force me to plunge America into the torture and torment of war. To my mind, the most dangerous "fifth column" agents in America today are those war salesmen who, because of national sympathies or financial interests, or even misguided idealism, would push this country into a foreign war. No, these individuals will not join any foreign legion. No, they will not now volunteer to drive a war ambulance. No, they will not immediately give their fortunes to the Red Cross. But they want you to give up your savings, your liberty, and do the fighting and dying overseas.

Modern warfare has added to the protective value of our oceans. Today, a modern invader with any hope of success, would have to ship more mechanical equipment to this country than could be carried in all the ships of Europe and the very difficulty of supplying these huge machines with fuel would stall an army. The need of a 3,000-mile supply line would defeat any invader, for American ingenuity can break such a line and make a modern Gibraltar out of this whole continent if we will devote ourselves to the task of preparedness. By the same token, an American Army which today fights 3,000 miles away from home is gambling the destiny of its people against almost hopeless odds.

An amazing thing has happened in America. An organization called A Committee to Defend America by Helping the Allies has been formed, and it consciously or unconsciously is promoting the move toward war in this country. In recent weeks this group has spent thousands upon thousands of dollars in its drive toward war, by putting full-page advertisements in most of the big city papers of America. These advertisements urged all readers to write the President, their Senators and Congressmen to take every step to aid the Allies. Many stimulated letters and telegrams have come to Washington, and our peace today is far less secure than it was. To these advertisements have been added an expensive direct mail campaign, movie shorts, and numerous radio broadcasts urging intervention in behalf of the Allies. We have now reached the position where the next step is war itself.

Fellow Americans, the next few statements are the most important words I have ever spoken. Whether you act—or you fail to act—they may prove the most important words you have ever heard. They point out what you can do to keep this country out of war; they indicate what I sincerely believe you must do if the drift toward war is to be stopped short of sending your sons to the slaughter beds of Europe. If you want peace, you must fight for it here at home as hard as soldiers fight in war. You and millions of peace-loving citizens like you, must start an avalanche of letters, telegrams, postcards, and petitions to Washington if America is to remain at peace.

War propagandists are using every means and vast sums of money to stimulate the demand for war. Those of us fighting to retain our peace do not have the help of heavy contributions of money from people with business interests in Europe; we do not have the help of certain eastern newspapers which have connections abroad and which clamor for war; ours is simply a sincere fight to keep America out of war. Its success or failure depends on each of you.

Every thinking observer now realizes the President's policies, intentionally, ignorantly, or ill-advisedly, have put us on the road to war. There is still time to turn back—there is still time to prevent the final death-dealing step. That is why I am talking to you tonight.

I want every boy who hears me, especially you between the ages of 17 and 35, who will be the first to sacrifice your lives, to write the President, your Senators and Representative, right now, that you do not want to go to war. Girls, you who listen, immediately write to your elected officials in Washington, telling them that you do not want your sweetheart or brother to go to war and become a forgotten white cross on another foreign battlefield. You, fathers, whose sons would be the pawns of battle, you have a sacred duty to perform. Write to the President, your Senators, and your Representative, urging them to take no further steps into this war. You, mothers, whose boys mean more to you than life itself, I plead with you to force your elected officials to take a public stand against our entrance into war.

It is reported there are some Congressmen who would declare war tomorrow. Is yours among them? Has he declared himself? Has he openly pledged not to vote to send your loved ones overseas to die? No one should be permitted to take an "on the fence" or "off the record" stand on this all-important issue. Not only must you, yourselves, each of you, write the President and your Senators and Congressman, but you must get others to do the same; and they, in turn, must get still others to swell the tidal wave of telegrams and letters to Washington right now, before it is too late. And do not stop there. Think of the mothers and fathers of Europe, each of whom would give 10 years of his or her life to undo the havoc wrought by war now that it is too late. Will you here in America give the next 10 days of your life fighting for peace before the fateful words "too late" have closed the opportunity forever? You must write post cards, letters, or send telegrams tonight; you have neighbors you can get to do the same; you can circulate petitions in every city in the land; you can ask your preacher or your priest to plead for peace in church; you can write the editor of your daily newspaper your demands for peace; you can write every radio speaker or news commentator your desire for peace and your criticism of those who would lead us to war. You can keep America at peace, or you can permit America to drift into the bloodiest war of history. The time to act is now; and write every day until the fight for peace is won.

My friends, I have given you the facts. I have done all that I can do. We can have peace or we can go to war. What you do may well determine the results. My concluding prayer is that you will act before it is forever too late.

Vindication of Senator Holt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE FROM WHEELING INTELLIGENCER

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief article from the Wheeling

Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., written by Charles Brooks Smith.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling Intelligencer of June 18, 1940]

SENATOR HOLT VINDICATED

(By Charles Brooks Smith)

Congress in the relief bill, it is apparent, made a sincere effort to meet many criticisms, and correct many faults of the operations of W. P. A. in the past. No member of the Congress was more interested and pleased in noting these changes than West Virginia's young Senator, RUSH HOLT. He advocated many of them long ago, as far back as 1936 and, by so doing, incurred the hate of the politicians who had their hooks into the W. P. A. pie up to their funny bone. It is another in the long train of Holt vindications. By next January when he says au revoir but not good-bye—as he sees it—to the Senate, he will be about as near 100 percent vindicated as any Member that ever underwent this depressing circumstance.

The Position of American Agriculture on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2D

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of policy formulated by the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation to serve as the basis for planks to be recommended to the national party conventions. I make this request at the suggestion of Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Events of recent years, and especially of recent months, have focused our attention on the problems of national unity and national strength. National strength in the aggregate is the strength of the various groups which comprise the Nation. We emphasize especially the importance of a strong and unified agriculture for the tasks which lie ahead. Agriculture is more than the source of our food and fiber stores, however important these may be. It is an economic democracy vigorously loyal to the principles of political democracy. It is the great source of the youth upon which we depend to man and guide our democracy in generations to come.

Mistakes of the past with respect to agriculture must not be repeated. The last war left us with a heavy legacy of ruined land and ruined lives, and an overexpanded and overcapitalized plant. Farm prices soared for a short period in the late war and post-war years, and then collapsed. Industrial prices and wages remained high, and two decades of disparity for agriculture followed. The resultant disparity must be corrected and must not be permitted to happen again. Whatever the needs of this country, or the world, there will be no bottlenecks in the production of American farm products. The American farmer has not been practicing what some have termed scarcity economics. Food and fiber have been available in recent years in greater quantities than before the depression. He will continue to make these supplies available in abundance at fair prices. In return, the farmer expects protection from rash expansion of farm acreages and ruthless exploitation of soil resources. He also expects protection from the especially disorganizing effects which a disorganized world must have on his industry. We consider the present agricultural program, modified as may be necessary by events that cannot now be foreseen, to be the best hope of the farmer for the protection he has earned.

DEMOCRACY

In a world torn by strife where in many nations freedom has ceased to exist and tyranny rules instead, we should give serious thought to plans for safeguarding our democratic form of Government. Through smugness we must not lose the freedom our forefathers won. We still cherish that freedom even though it has become commonplace. As a nation we are confronted by grave problems, economic within and war without. Economic chaos is bound to follow this war. It is important to all the world that we be a stable, prosperous, self-governing democracy.

Our forefathers fought and died for the democratic ideals that have been preserved for us in our generation. The question now before us is whether we today are willing to labor, and to make sacrifices for the institutions that make up our Christian democracy.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We recognize the importance of national defense—national defense which will maintain a nation of free institutions and free men. In a world where it is evident that such defense can be accomplished only by strength of arms however much we deplore it we support all essential steps for putting our armed forces on a strong footing. The task of rearming must be carried on with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of waste and bureaucratic red tape.

TAXATION

National defense and national security are creating new problems in taxation and fiscal policy. The issues here must be met honestly and squarely. We do not question the financial stability of the National Government and we support the lifting of the debt limit to meet the extra demands of the present crisis. Long-run financial stability and a balanced Budget require that national income be raised to accord with the full productive capacity of the Nation, and a high agricultural income based on parity is an essential factor in achieving the goal. Increased taxes will be necessary, and in formulating a complete tax program for defense and domestic needs we demand adherence to the following principles:

1. That taxes be framed so as to bring back into production resources of men and materials which are and have long been idle.
2. That new taxes be levied strictly on the basis of ability to pay. Honesty requires that we accept taxes on personal and corporate income as the main sources of revenue. Evasion and leakages in these taxes should be rigorously checked.
3. That profiteering either by industry, labor, or agriculture be rigorously checked by means of an excess war-profit tax.
4. That steps be taken, so long as consumption remains far below normal, to avoid, so far as possible, taxes which depress unnecessarily our consuming power and thereby reduce national income and increase the problems of post-war readjustment.

WORLD RECONSTRUCTION

The stake of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of a peaceful world order is fully apparent. At all times it must be our declared policy to protect and develop free institutions on this hemisphere. If the opportunity for world reconstruction with well-intentioned foreign governments presents itself, we commend a policy of full cooperation and believe that we should bring to the task the financial and moral resources of this country.

EFFECT OF THE WAR ON AGRICULTURE

The present war, and also large expenditures on our own defense, and peace settlements the nature of which cannot be foreseen, will all have a profound effect on our agriculture. It may be that some domestic outlets will improve temporarily, but we must expect that both our domestic and foreign markets will suffer violent disturbance. Perhaps some of our present foreign markets will be lost forever. We insist upon the following measures to meet this situation:

1. The use of loan and storage operations and marketing agreements to cushion the shock of these disturbances as they affect producers of distressed commodities.
2. The continuation, perfecting and as may be necessary, the great expansion of present machinery for moving surpluses into domestic and foreign consumption.
3. Use of all reasonable safeguards against speculation in agricultural land with its attendant, disastrous effects on farm debt and family ownership and tenure.
4. Discourage bringing of new lands into production or breaking up of range lands where nothing can result save the eventual distress of the individuals concerned and the wastage of the lands involved.
5. Preparation for the sudden withdrawal of war demand or armament expenditures with measures which will cushion the shock of depression and restore the flow of peacetime purchasing power of all kinds.

EMERGENCY RESERVES

Hundreds of thousands of homeless and starving people are now cut off from their normal supplies of food and clothing; American farmers, who have hitherto supplied these people are now faced with disastrously low prices for the farm commodities that are dependent upon these markets; they are also faced, if the experience of the past is repeated, with enlarged demands in the post-war period and the prospect of inflated prices leading to disruptive expansion of farm plant; and as a nation we should now avoid wastage or loss in all essential food supplies and positive steps should be taken to store our surpluses against the time when they may be urgently needed either for our own use or for a hungry world.

Immediate steps should therefore be taken by the Federal Government to (1) make available to the Red Cross or other agencies funds for the purchase of such food and fiber supplies as can now be used to relieve distress in war areas, and (2) within the framework of the present agricultural program to take steps to acquire in volume such stocks of meat and dairy products and tree and

field crops, both in raw and processed form, as will prevent demoralization of domestic markets and constitute a full reserve against any world need which we may be called upon to meet.

For the carrying out of the above policy we now urge appropriation of $100,000,000 to be used by the American Red Cross for present distribution of food and fiber to victims of war, and that complete provision be made as necessary for acquisition of raw or processed farm crops for storage against future needs.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Agriculture will meet all of the demands placed upon it by the national emergency; there can be no question about that. Agricultural production is now at higher levels than during the 1920's. But war and preparation for war will solve none of the problems of agriculture. Its position as a small-scale family enterprise, comprising some 6,000,000 individual units in a world of industrial giants and controlled prices, remains the same. As an export industry, the problems of agriculture will be intensified. Recognizing this, we consider it necessary:

1. To maintain intact the present farm program and its machinery for voluntary collaboration in production and surplus control between the farmer and the Government against the time when it will be needed more than ever.

2. To accept the principle of full parity income for all agricultural producers.

3. To place the financing of the agricultural program on a permanent and constructive footing by providing a source of tax revenues which will permanently equalize, as between agriculture and industry, the systems of price control and the tariff protection enjoyed by the latter. Rural poverty can never be a source of national strength.

CONSERVATION

Our national soil-conservation program should be coordinated and integrated with a much broader program, including forest and grazing conservation, wildlife conservation, the protection of our water resources, and increased emphasis upon the acquisition of submarginal land for national forests and recreational areas and more effective control of fire and disease in our forests. We strongly oppose the transfer of the Forest Service, in whole or in part, from the United States Department of Agriculture; the forest-conservation and grazing programs should be administered by the Department of Agriculture.

DISTRIBUTION COSTS

High and inflexible costs of distribution have lowered substantially the farmer's share in the consumer's food dollar over the past quarter century. Consumers have been paying more while the producer has been receiving less. Some increase in distribution costs is inevitable. However, outmoded and congested market facilities, racketeering, absence of consumer standards, and excessive duplication of retail facilities have been at least as important. We demand a vigorous program under Federal sponsorship for modernizing and coordinating terminal-market facilities in the large cities, a constant search for increased efficiency in all market channels between producer and consumer, prosecution of all who seek unlawfully to prey upon commerce in farm products, and prompt extension of consumer grades and standards for foods and textiles. We are opposed to efforts to burden chain stores and other mass distributors with discriminatory laws and taxes.

ILLEGAL RESTRAINTS

We insist upon the continuation and extension of the machinery which has been set up in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice for vigorous prosecution of monopolistic restrictions, collusive practices, misuse of patent privileges, and other toll gates and restraints on the free flow of trade. We ask that all measures within the Federal power be used to check and discourage the development of regional, State, and local trade barriers within the great free-trade area of this Nation.

FARM CREDIT

The need for adequate farm credit is vital to agriculture and a necessary adjunct to the program of national recovery. The farm-credit system should be strengthened, interest rates made as low as possible commensurate with the cost of money, cooperative features of the farm-credit system strengthened and farm-loan associations rehabilitated. Farmer ownership and control should be assured and the control of the Farm Credit Administration should be under an independent bipartisan board. Independent owner operation of our farms must continue to be the basic goal of farm-credit policy.

FARM SECURITY

The position of the especially disadvantaged and underprivileged members of the farm community must continue to receive attention. The work of the Farm Security Administration in the rehabilitation of farm families, aiding tenants to become owners, and in coping with the problems of dispossessed and migrant groups should be continued.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The task of the future will be one of assuming leadership, already manifested in the negotiation of the reciprocal-trade agreements, for the reconstruction and restoration of world trade. We insist that, if the opportunity arises, this leadership be assumed and pressed vigorously. In the meantime, we must be prepared to recognize changed conditions in international trade and be prepared to meet these new conditions. We draw attention to our large stock of gold and ample credit resources and invite consideration of measures by which these can be used to aid in the reestablishment of world trade.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation legislation should be limited to such laws as will maintain a highly efficient, economical system of transportation, under private ownership, with only such regulation as may be necessary to assure the public of fair and reasonable rates and a maximum of safety. No law or regulation should be permitted to restrict the inherent or natural advantages of any particular type of transportation where such advantages are reflected to the shipping public in rates and services.

RESEARCH

Recognizing the fact that agriculture is made up of more than 6,000,000 individual, relatively small farms, and is therefore unable to carry on extensive research on an individual farm basis, we insist on continuing support to research by Government agencies in all phases of agriculture. We believe that Federal money for farm research should be spent on a larger scale than has to date been contemplated. We consider research to be complementary to and not a substitute for the farm program.

COORDINATION

In the interest of greater economy, a higher degree of efficiency, the removal of duplication of effort, better understanding and permanency, we recommend such modifications of law or laws as seems necessary to provide for placing the full administrative responsibility of all lines of cooperative farm credit and all types of agricultural commodity programs under the direction of two independent Federal boards properly correlated with the Department of Agriculture.

We view with deep concern the growing tendency of governmental agencies to set up special field personnel to contact farmers every time a new program is to be developed or a new job is to be done. The extension service of our land-grant colleges has definitely proven itself the best qualified agency to carry out the educational work in connection with Federal programs affecting rural people.

We urge that the extension service in the States and counties be utilized as the educational and coordinating agency to contact and assist farmers in planning and carrying out all agricultural programs, exclusive of their regulatory and enforcement aspects, in cooperation with farmer representatives, and that adequate funds be transferred to the extension service in States and counties to provide the necessary personnel for such service.

MONEY

In monetary and banking policy we recognize the uncertainties which now rule in the world and their inevitable effect upon domestic problems. Faced with this situation, we consider it necessary that the President and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System be equipped with broad powers for the management of a properly coordinated monetary and banking policy. These powers, in conjunction with the taxation and expenditure policies of the Government, should be directed toward the achievement of the following objectives: The full utilization of our human and material resources, a stable price level with a dollar of constant debt-paying ability, and an equitable relationship between all parts of the price level. We favor a thorough study by Congress to develop such additional legislation as may be necessary to establish a strong and effective monetary and banking authority to achieve these objectives.

AGRICULTURE, LABOR, AND INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT

Agriculture, industrial management, and labor must recognize their common task in producing the abundance of useful goods and services which constitute prosperity. Agriculture in both good times and bad has continued to produce in abundance without regard for price. This is in sharp contrast with other groups, many of which have maintained price at the expense of production. This contrast in practice has resulted in a lack of balance or parity relationship between groups. These price disparities must be overcome. Agriculture challenges industry and labor to join with it in a national program to achieve this goal.

RED CROSS FUNDS

Our hearts go out in sympathy to the millions of homeless and destitute refugees in Europe, the innocent victims of cruel, ruthless aggression. We urge that every possible assistance be extended to them. We strongly favor an immediate appropriation by Congress of $100,000,000 to the American Red Cross to provide food and other needed relief to these unfortunate people.

Is Our Position Clear?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I think no editorial page in the country has contributed more largely to a belief abroad in an ultimate readiness on the part of the United States in certain events to pitch itself into Europe's war than has the Washington Post.

It is something more than heartening to observe, the last two mornings, from the same editorial page, a complete sobering-up process that is being enjoyed or suffered in that office. An editorial under the heading "Is our position clear?", appearing this morning, is deserving of printing in the RECORD; and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 19, 1940]

IS OUR POSITION CLEAR?

Great Britain now faces the terrible choice of fighting Germany and Italy practically alone, or of making peace with Hitler. The London government will have to make decisions of the most vital moment to the British Isles as well as to the Empire. And those decisions must be made under circumstances that have changed with revolutionary swiftness since Britain declared war on Germany last September.

In this critical period the British are asking, as the French asked in the last hours before their appeal for a cessation of hostilities, what help they can expect from the United States. Their final decision is certain to be influenced by the American response. Therefore our Government has a grave responsibility to inform the British precisely where we stand.

That obligation has become the greater because of the interpretation which the French Government put upon President Roosevelt's message to former Premier Reynaud last week. Following an emergency meeting at Bordeaux, the French Cabinet issued a communiqué in which it said:

"The Government of the United States declares itself resolved to pursue to the utmost the policy of direct assistance to the Allies, which it has recently adopted, and will even develop it to the full extent of its resources, to the exclusion, for the moment, of participation in the conflict. It is for Congress to take such a decision under the terms of the American Constitution."

This statement mistakenly assumes that a Presidential declaration constitutes a governmental decision. It indicates a French belief that the United States has completely abandoned its neutral status and is close to a declaration of war on Germany. Are the British now making their decisions under a similar false assumption? That question should give the White House the utmost concern.

The Government of Great Britain knows, as that of France knew, that in the struggle against Nazi aggression it has the full sympathy of the American people. Mr. Winston Churchill knows that, on orders from the British Government, American industry is turning out valuable military equipment for its defense. Moreover, the United States is trading in some military supplies so that they may be sold by private corporations to British purchasing agents. This policy of giving indirect aid to the British has overwhelming popular support, and such cash sales are likely to be increased as the production of airplane factories and munitions plants is stepped up.

The British people must not be misled, however, into assuming from this that the United States is likely to enter the war. The resolve of the American people to avoid participation in this struggle is exceedingly strong. Even if it were less so, the self-imposed task of defending all the Western Hemisphere would necessitate a cautious policy with regard to involvement in the European conflict, and that is particularly true at a time when our preparations for national defense are just getting under way.

The question is whether or not the actualities of American policy in this critical period have been made clear at London. It seems indisputable that President Roosevelt gave France a misleading impression of the policy Congress has endorsed. It is clear that the French did not attempt to direct their course on the basis of the assurances they believed our Government had given them. But that does not minimize the necessity of correcting an interpretation that does not square with the facts.

It is well to remember, at this juncture, the criticisms and bitterness aroused in Europe when Congress refused to underwrite President Wilson's policy with regard to American membership in the League of Nations.

Unemployment

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today an address by Mr. J. H. Harnly before the Rotary Club at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles on the matter of unemployment. This group of men, who were too proud to accept relief, worked out their problem in a very satisfactory manner with reference to sustaining themselves and with reference to their employment. I believe they are leading the way and can show many cities how the unemployed can be taken care of without going on direct taxation. I suggest you read it. Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. President, members of the Rotary Club, guests, and visitors, the world's greatest teacher, Jesus, the Christ, in an executive conference with his disciples, closed by saying: "I have yet many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now, howbeit when He the Spirit of Truth is come He will lead you into all truth—know the truth, and the truth will make you free."

I take it that it is a Rotary cardinal principle to exchange experiences incident to your various occupations that you may be of better and greater service in both private and public life relative to true freedom, and my authority for addressing you is to share my unique experiences with you relative to the general welfare.

A real cleavage in the successful revolutionary party for American independence became apparent during the formation and adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and has stupidly persisted with ever-increasing insolence in a joint subversive front of modern political shysters that again threatens us with both State and National disaster. So I come to you as an advocate of sane jurisprudence and economy—the historic "Square deal and fair play" for traditional American free enterprise, ingenuity and integrity.

President Washington's first executive duty was to organize the democratic procedure of the federated States, under their National Constitution, into a functioning republic, and, he had the invaluable wisdom to appoint both the conservative but liberal minded federalist, Alexander Hamilton, and the liberal but conservative minded antifederalist, Thomas Jefferson, to his Council of State. The first United States Congress had the further wisdom to petition the preeminent Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, to prepare a revenue-producing treatise, involving protected free American enterprise and labor, relative to the collective financing of both public and private affairs consistent with the general welfare of progressive, free Americans in establishing their national independence against arrogant European exploitation. During the same formative period the diplomatic country gentleman, Thomas Jefferson, eminent Secretary of State, successfully wrestled with the complicated questions of international relations.

No economist or publicist has been able to improve Hamilton's invaluable thesis on protected American industry and free enterprise relative to both public and private collective finance, but the master minds of Clay, Webster, and Sumner consistently defended it in the Senate, and ex-President John Quincy Adams, in the House of Representatives, against the subversive endeavors of Aaron Burr, father of Tammany Hall, and the "Little Magician," Martin Van Buren, and their political spoilsmen. One hundred years ago Negro slavery was the subversive issue that brought the union of States to the brink of disaster and temporary disunion, but inspired patriotic moral rearmament and forced a coalition of Hamiltonian conservatives, Jeffersonian liberals, Jacksonian commoners, and Whig progressives for the support of the Republican Commoner, Abraham Lincoln, and the preservation of the Union and the conservation of American free enterprise. President Lincoln abolished the institution of slavery, but our economy of production and distribution is again in jeopardy and free enterprise terrorized by political paternalism and sophisticated exploitation,

but again a Lincolnian coalition of free Americans is forming the vanguard for economic freedom and progressive enterprise through collective self-employment and coordinated work with free comprehensive industry.

The thesis of our self-employment is the free coordination of collective jobless labor with American enterprise and comprehensive industry for abundant surplus production, and relative bountiful distribution in kind, as the only logical solution for unemployed employables. The employable active members to care for the unemployable associate members in return for commensurate headquarters, utilities and gasoline through public funds. This facilitates economic freedom of distribution with liberty of production, relative to the commonwealth and general welfare of our citizens compatible with free American enterprise and labor.

Intelligent administration of collectively owned self-help industrial enterprise involving buildings and equipment, cash and contributary assets, goodwill and pay jobs, and compensation in kind for work-hour production, anticipates bountiful distribution of bread, milk, vegetables, and fruit; clothing and fuel; shelter and meals. That is certainly the economic solution for unemployment and rehabilitation. This has been thoroughly demonstrated through 8 years of successful achievement by the Unemployment Citizens' League of Santa Monica, sponsoring work-hour production and distribution in kind to all comers regardless of age, creed, race, or citizenship, and has never been without plentiful work for all jobless employables or unemployables, transients or indigents. This is a monumental rebuke to bureaucratic, politically subversive paternalism, costing California millions of dollars every month and the taxpayers for the Nation billions of dollars every year, most of which is worse than wasted in the midst of plenty to do through intelligent cooperation and coordinated work with free American enterprise and industry.

Individually we were jobless, without work, economic liabilities. Collectively we have coordinated, abundant work, are an economic asset, potent, helpful, independent, commending coordination with industrial enterprise, commercial ingenuity and professional and civic integrity, which propels our world of culture and affairs, the inevitable factors and invaluable benefactors in our united endeavor to achieve economic social security.

Eight years ago a few of us were gathering vegetables and fruit left in the fields and orchards because it did not pay the owners to save and market them, and in July 1932 we organized and secured an abandoned lumber yard and its office and buildings for our collective self-help endeavors, and comprehensive coordination with free private enterprise and industry. Public-spirited bakeries exchanged their surplus bread for the coordinated labor of the self-help league—two to five thousand loaves every week, 600,000 loaves from the Continental Bakery alone in 8 years.

The dairies exchange milk and its products—the Edgemar Farm Dairy 100,000 gallons of milk in less than 8 years. The gardens and markets exchange, vegetables; the orchards and packing houses, fruit; and the ranchers, potatoes. A grand total of over 7,000,000 pounds of bread, milk, potatoes, vegetables, melons, and fruit have been brought into our lumber-yard headquarters through coordinated, collective labor since July 1932, and distributed to more than 5,000 active and associate members and their 10,000 dependents, hundreds of them over 70 years of age, while State and national maladministration through cash doles and bonuses is supporting younger employables in arrogant idleness and political insolence, threatening both private and public affairs with bankruptcy and anarchy. You Rotarians with more or less patronizing courtesy are listening to this 74-year-old educator, professional accountant, auditor, and publicist, relative to the achievements of the self-employed in California As publicity director I interested the New Republic in publishing an article relative to the Santa Monica Cooperative last January 15, which was rewritten for the February Readers Digest. We also have a comprehensive write-up in the book published by the University Press at Berkeley, and another by Ed Ainsworth in the magazine section of the Sunday Times. These can be seen in your public library, but what is still better you can visit our headquarters and observe our practical achievement for yourself. But as a Hamiltonian conservative and loose-construction constitutionalist, as a Jeffersonian liberal and strict constructionist, as a Jacksonian commoner and Lincoln unionist, I certainly am more concerned about your collective attitude toward our accumulative social and economic problem than you can possibly be about mine.

But let me continue with my coordinated, cooperative thesis. The wardrobes of the independent who have, supply their partly worn shoes, hats, and clothing for our dependents who have not—their buildings, shelter, and utilities, gas, light, and water. It is coordinated enterprise that educates our children, pensions the aged, and cares for the indigent. It builds our roads, gives us fire, police, and sanitary protection, and maintains our beneficent institutions as collective self-help blazes the economic way to rehabilitation in every community of the American Commonwealth.

Bountiful production for the favored few anticipates coordinated, balanced production and distribution for all. The jobless who can and ought to work are our greatest potential resource, and local self-help industry the logical solution for reemployment and rehabilitation—blazing the economic, Santa Monica way, in the economy of God for the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world. Our creed is service; our faith work. Let the 100,000 employables on cash relief in California do what the 100 unemployables but experienced leaders of the Unemployment Cooperative Distribution Association of Los Angeles County are doing to keep off relief, and the accumulative failure of subversive paternalism will end, saving you Rotarian and other taxpayers of California millions of dollars every month.

Our necessary cash is derived from taking down trees and selling wood, wrecking buildings and selling salvaged lumber and kindling, gathering and selling junk and old papers, doing odd jobs, and in many other minor ways. This enabled us to erect seven buildings and purchase thousands of dollars worth of equipment, which we hold in trust for succeeding followers of our local cooperative, and we object to having our unequaled, economic, free enterprise, and achievement subverted into a vicious economy of production-for-use State socialism by political racketeers. We have sleeping quarters for 60 people and serve more than 5,000 meals a month—hundreds to transients sent to us by our city.

We publicly invite judicious investigation by boards of supervisors, chambers of commerce, and public-spirited civic and service groups so that intelligent, patriotic pressure can be brought upon the State administration and legislature to stop supporting employables in idleness, and adopt our alternative to county, State, and national bankruptcy, coordinated work in the midst of plenty to do.

The United States, under judicial constitutional procedure, has become the foremost government of the world by successfully mastering subversive tendencies through four well-defined periods of our national development: From Washington to Jackson, Federal; from Jackson to Lincoln, anti-Federal, ending in temporary disunion; from Lincoln to McKinley, national; and from McKinley to F. D. Roosevelt, international, and again involving temporary maladjustment.

And since the subversive forces, inspired by the sophisticated Howard Scott, the academic Norman Thomas, and the Communist Earl Browder, are presenting a united front, it behooves the progressive, patriotic, true Americans in every religious, every social, every fraternal, every cultural, commercial, and civic public-spirited organization to unite and overpower the premeditated maladministration of public affairs. The economic and civic integrity of our Commonwealth is in jeopardy as long as there are employable persons politically subverted by a cash dole or bonus. Finally, the logical cure for unemployment and poverty is work in the midst of plenty to do through collective coordination with American free enterprise.

Public Opinion on Peace and War

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the momentous issues of war and peace again confront the Nation. In the face of conflicting evidence, of contradictory reports, and inspired releases, the thoughtful American is at a distinct disadvantage. He is at a particular disadvantage in attempting to appraise the significance of the public-opinion polls conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion and Fortune Magazine, for these polls take root in the magic of statistics.

Eight years ago statisticians predicted the downfall of the Literary Digest Presidential poll. Their predictions were drowned out by the inspired releases which emanated from the editors of the Literary Digest. In glowing words the Literary Digest editors described the uncanny accuracy of their polls. The Literary Digest is no more, but this same uncritical self-appraisal of public-opinion polls has built up a psychology of success which makes it almost impossible to dispute the claims of Gallup and Fortune concerning the accuracy of their polls. Anyone who has the courage to question these claims is at once branded as an obstructer of progress. The word of the day is "believe."

The more thoughtful have reason to ask questions. Only recently newspapers carried accounts of the difficulty which attended the enumeration of various citizens. The census, which is older than any living American, experienced difficulty in attempting to obtain complete cooperation from the public. Such difficulties do not seem to attend the efforts of Dr. Gallup's interviewers, for, according to his statements, representatives of his for 4 years were able to secure the most sacred opinions from a cross section of the public. In the face of such contradictions, a complete examination of the

accuracy of public-opinion polls is necessary. Such an examination is imperative in view of the wide acceptance of these polls not only by the public but by legislators who quote them as authority.

During the next few weeks we shall learn whether party-nominating conventions are poll controlled or people controlled. Will they be the victims of the polls or the representatives of the people?

There are things in the Presidential campaign which cause the intelligent American voter to entertain some doubts as to the ability of democracy to select its leader. The preposterous claims to strength of certain inexperienced, and entirely untested, prospective candidates could not have been advanced a few years ago without immediately reacting unfavorably because of public ridicule. Now, those claims are kept before the people through the published polls. Since a claim to consideration for the Presidency is something which concerns us all, why not provide by legislation that the Congress, through a committee, be given an opportunity to learn just how those polls were taken and what is back of the claims to popular support of each candidate. The most astonishing thing in the whole situation is the fact that serious commentators quote the polls just as if they were quoting elections in which the universality and privacy of the ballot had been used to indicate public choice of candidates.

No one expects to curb advertising. No one expects through legislation to control the credulity of the reading public, and nothing can take the place of the final ballot at the general election. An editorial in one of the leading papers, recently, commenting on polls of public opinion said that the pollers who have given such positive results must either stand up and accuse the Republican convention of being flagrantly unresponsive to the will of the people, or that they must confess that their methods or calculations were wrong. I have pointed out in several speeches that there is no way of being certain of the accuracy of the polls but that the public welfare demands that their methods be studied and their records be opened to the Congress, just as the records of the utilities are open to the S. E. C. and the records of the railroads open to the I. C. C., on the assumption that the public has a stake in their operations.

At the present moment when public opinion is of the utmost importance and when feelings are rising almost to a frenzy, it is more urgent than it has ever been that the Congress should investigate and understand this new agency for creating public opinion. We must know what is the majority and what is the minority, speaking about war and defense policies. We shall probably learn it without the intervention of advertising agencies, but the agencies and the public ought now to unite in an effort to have the records opened to those Members of this Congress who are vitally concerned with public opinion in regard to the most important matters which have ever been before the citizens of this democracy.

I have pending before this House a resolution providing for a joint committee to investigate the conducting of polls purporting to measure public opinion with respect to questions or issues of national legislative concern, or national elections. I am assured by those who are in the polling business that they have no objections to such an investigation. It hardly seems necessary again to urge its immediate importance. I recently contributed to a symposium on this subject a brief statement on the band-wagon vote. I ask permission to incorporate my article from the Public Opinion Quarterly in my remarks to be printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

WHAT ABOUT THE BAND-WAGON VOTE?

Nation-wide polls, especially those taken by an advertising firm having Nation-wide newspaper connections, are a matter of national concern. Such polls have become a strong influence in connection with legislation and with candidacies. They are recognized as a potent, if not the most powerful, agency now used to influence public opinion. They have been copied locally by newspapers and propaganda groups. Certain polls are widely quoted in legislative bodies where their validity and correctness of interpretation are assumed. It now appears to be the duty of legislative bodies to appraise and understand the methods used in polling public opinion, to measure the actual and potential results, and to consider the possible dangers of an uncontrolled, private manipulation of public opinion for financial profit. It is claimed that the polls represent a cross section of the voters and that the results are subjected to scientific handling, so that deductions are a trustworthy guide to public opinion. I have been led to believe that public opinion is, very naturally, influenced by these polls, and that they create opinion rather than measure it. The fairness of the polls may be open to question, regardless of the integrity and ability of the pollers. The selection of the questions, the way in which they are formulated, and the approach to the individual may be used to create a certain reaction in the person polled. I am convinced that voters like to climb onto the band wagon and that polls greatly increase the band-wagon vote.

I am aware that this may not seem to reflect most creditably upon the intelligence of those who are, en masse, the bulwark of our democracy; but we can improve conditions only by first facing the facts. I know there are sturdy characters among us, men and women who form their own opinions and fight for them to the last ditch, voting regardless of results. I fear their total number is a small percentage, not sufficient to change the result in a closely contested election.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Since I have been a Member of the Congress I have had several bills pending on the subject of straw ballots. In the days of the Literary Digest, I believed I had very startling evidence of collusion between the Digest poll takers and those interested in the results, so my early legislation was aimed at forbidding the use of the mails to those taking straw ballots. My recent effort has been a joint resolution creating a committee of five Senators and five Representatives "to investigate the conducting of polls purporting to measure public opinion with respect to questions or issues which have or may have a bearing upon any election held to fill any office under the Government of the United States, with special reference to the manner of framing questions contained in ballots or inquiries, the methods of selecting persons to whom ballots or inquiries are sent, and the reasons for conducting such polls."

The Rules Committee recently granted me a hearing upon this resolution, but, to date, the appointment of a committee has not been authorized. I am aware that congressional investigations become obnoxious when overdone, and that Members of Congress very easily tire of them and are loath to provide organization and funds for another investigation which may drag on endlessly. It has been my understanding that some of the polling firms would very much welcome an opportunity to tell a congressional committee about their business and their methods. I believe the public would be better satisfied if this could be done.

VOTING FOR THE WINNER

I recall an incident occurring in the election of 1916 which well illustrates the influence of the band-wagon vote-for-the-winner theory. It happened in Portland, Oreg., where nearly 40 percent of the voting strength of the State lies, in the presidential election when the candidates were Hughes and Wilson. Voting had been light during the morning of election day. At 2 o'clock the Oregon Journal, a paper which had waged an apparently successful campaign for Wilson, came out with banner headlines, "Hughes elected." A subheading ran something like this: "Hughes carries Atlantic border." The time was then 5 o'clock in New York City from whence the news had come. Immediately Wilson supporters who had not yet voted in Portland thought, "Well, what's the use? Hughes is surely elected." Thousands did not vote at all, others switched their votes to Hughes, who carried the State by a margin of about 6,000 votes. Thus the Portland Journal, having waged a strong campaign for Wilson, inadvertently defeated him, in Oregon, in the closing hours of the campaign by a headline transmitting news from New York City.

The Literary Digest poll in 1924 undoubtedly gave Coolidge a million votes he would not have received had it not been for an opinion-molding poll, one which created a belief in the minds of many voters that Coolidge was a sure winner. In 1928 the effect was not quite as marked, but the Literary Digest poll unquestionably added to Hoover's majority. In 1936 the Literary Digest sang its swan song, and was so inaccurate that it committed suicide. Unquestionably many of the polls taken today are just as inaccurate in measuring public opinion. Someone may raise the question, "If polls are so influential in the matter of public opinion, why, then, did not the Literary Digest poll of 1936 defeat Roosevelt?" Eighty percent of the press had filled their columns for weeks with reasons why Roosevelt should not and would not be reelected. Radio voices had predicted his defeat. Why, then, did he win? The answer is that Roosevelt in 1936 was just unbeatable, and that he was elected by the grateful masses, who are never polled.

YOU CAN'T BEAT HIM

I have found from actual experience reaching over a half century of public life that the strongest argument I can make and that my friends can make for me is that I am sure to win. "You can't beat him." That makes more votes, brings more sentiment and support on election day than any other argument which can be put forth. It has been said, and I think truly, that one-fifth of

all the voters try to pick a winner. It is said that another one-fifth pick their man on name familiarity. Think of the last time you stood in a voting booth, pencil in hand, scanning a long list of names. Did your pencil just automatically make a cross opposite the name of the candidate you thought would win, or the name with which you were most familiar?

I have seen public opinion in small towns changed at the last minute by polls taken in cigar stores, pool rooms, and barber shops. If a candidate is unscrupulously inclined, and has plenty of money, he can have friends take polls of picked sections and groups of people, then have his own organization manipulate the results and draw the desired conclusions from them. By giving the whole proceeding an air of respectability, authenticity, and fair dealing, he can influence the results of an entire election. The candidate whose name is omitted from the poll finds himself in a very dangerous position. Such treatment is tantamount to a widespread belief that his candidacy is negligible.

Americans have come to feel that they must protect the sacredness of the ballot. This is one of our traditions, and we have enacted into law the necessary means of protection. We must also take steps to overcome the effects of powerful subsidized propaganda which is now a controlling factor in election of candidates and in legislation on measures of momentous public concern.

Keynote Address Before Mississippi State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. G. GARLAND LYELL, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address delivered by Hon. G. Garland Lyell, of Jackson, Miss., before the Mississippi State Democratic convention, Jackson, Miss., June 11, 1940, to wit:

This is no time for words unless they are translated into action. The laws of God and man have been and are being ignored and flaunted by dictators of European warring nations and the "fifth columns" here and abroad. These dictators are never so pleased as when violating their solemn treaties and pledged words and when raining their hell of shot and shell and poison gas upon God-fearing and God-loving helpless men, women, and children. The sacrifice of the blood of these innocent victims but whets the appetites of these inhuman and fiendish tigers to shed all the blood of all worth-while humanity to further satiate their thirst for more blood and still more blood. Their only god is hate and their only desire is to continue to rape, murder, and to destroy all that we have been taught to believe and know to be sacred in the sight of good men and a just God. The churches and temples of the Almighty have been profaned and destroyed while his prayerful worshippers upon bended knee cry out in their anguish: "My God! My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

The only regret and disappointment these inhuman fiends have is that they have not been able as yet to extend their withering "blitzkrieg" beyond wrecked and ruined European homes, schools, churches, and orphanages and hospitals, beyond the battlements of heaven itself and blast Almighty God himself from his throne and let Hitler rule as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and let the deadly bombing planes fly through the heavens to destroy the angelic hosts and banish forever peace on earth and good will to men. Mankind is being crucified by these arch fiends and murderers. Every home of the humblest followers of the lowly Nazarene is being converted into a never-ending Gethsemane where murderous tanks, shot and shell, gas and incendiary bombs blast and destroy innocent babes, no longer lulled to peaceful sleep by holy lullabies of their mother's love, but their little bodies shattered and blasted from the arms and heart of that mother who gave them birth.

Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland have been engulfed in the flaming jaws of the most bestial Moloch of all time and eternity, and fair France and God-fearing, law-respecting England are being blasted and blighted by murder from the skies and upon many battlefields as they strive to resist dictators whose only god is an armed and murderous might that feeds upon the pure blood of the children of God, and whose pincer-like jaws have closed upon millions whose innocent blood will never satiate a thirst for gore that is confined to people across the seas. Those man-eating sharks are just as thirsty for the blood of Americans.

Now what are we going to do about it?

What is our duty to the Americas; and to make sure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth?

Abraham Lincoln, who uttered those immortal words, also said: "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then find the way."

This situation in world affairs challenges the heart and soul of the United States and of every loyal and patriotic American. We should not tolerate for long any "fifth column" or anyone who is disloyal or not loyal. He who is not for us is against us, and hell is too cool a place for such traitors. We have not imposed upon any minority. There is no Sudetenland in the United States. We will not stand up against a wall and put to death by firing squad, or private assassination, anyone who does no violence by word or deed to our beloved America in which he lives and which supports him and gives him a chance in this land of equality of opportunity. But, by the gods, no unpatriotic citizen of this democratic America can be guilty of treason and sedition and go unpunished. No one crying for free speech may use that speech to undermine our institutions and laws and give comfort to an enemy, domestic or foreign. The only red in our flag is that of pure patriotic undefiled Americanism.

"Flag of the free heart's hope and home,
By angel hands to valour given,
Thy stars have lit the welkin dome,
And all their hues were born in heaven!
Forever wave that standard sheet,
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us?"

No flag of a "fifth column," or other enemy within our gates, shall be permitted to prostitute that color by flaunting in the air of this land of the free and home of the brave, a flag that would seek to supplant the Stars and Stripes; to supplant patriotism by Hitlerism, fascism, communism, or any other "ism" that would overturn our form of government and give aid and comfort to our enemies. There is no middle ground, no neutral zone, no room in this country for anything but 100-percent Americanism.

The Supreme Court of the United States has recently decided that the regulation of Minersville, Pa., school board requiring school children to salute the United States flag was constitutional.

We may safely trust the sound sense and judgment of true Americans to prevent undue excitement and alarm over present conditions in our own country, but the man who cannot see and observe these vicious forces at work in the United States is blind and dumb. It is the duty of every patriotic American to keep his eyes and ears open to see and hear any threat of danger from such sources. These pernicious influences are not only secretly at work but they are out in the open. It may be too late to save America if such people are permitted to form their "fifth columns" and regiment them to carry on war against our institutions within our own gates. They not only plot and plan behind closed doors to overthrow this Government, but they come out in the open. America must wake up and stay awake.

We must remember that the emblem of this Republic is an eagle and not an ostrich hiding its head in the sands. From the deepest valleys to the loftiest crags, we should see and know what is going on in this Republic. Only a few days ago in New York City the Communist Party held its national convention. Its general secretary, Earl Browder, was lavish in his praise of Soviet Russia as the "only one really neutral great power" in the world today, and that it was the protector of weak nations; he said it was a "beacon light" of the working class. Browder asked: "Who are the 'fifth columns' in the United States?" He shouted in answer to his own question, "Martin Dies, the Roosevelt administration, and the Republican Party leadership."

The platform adopted by the Communists at the New York convention promised opposition to all war loans and credits to the warring imperialist powers; to stop the sale and shipment of armaments and munitions to the belligerents; and to resist the militarization and armaments program of the administration and Congress. Twenty-two thousand Communists in Madison Square Garden at the end of a boisterous session adopted a platform that is an insult to Americanism, if not treasonable. With red faces they waved their red flags and wound up by nominating for President of the United States Earl Browder, who is out on bail pending an appeal from his conviction and 4-year sentence for passport fraud. The Vice Presidential candidate, a fit running mate for him, is an Alabama Negro named James William Ford.

What a stench in the nostrils of decent, patriotic Americans is the poison gas turned loose at that Communist convention.

The pure and wholesome atmosphere of this democracy should not be contaminated with such foul and deadly gases.

Let us remember that in the American melting pot and in the birth and perpetuity of America many patriotic people of foreign birth have played a splendid part. We owe a debt of gratitude to all persons, whether foreign-born or native-born Americans, who have contributed in a proper way to carrying out and exemplifying to the world the principles of true Americanism. But that person, whether native or foreign born, who lives within the confines of this Republic and does not conform to and support its institutions,

its laws, and the principles upon which it is founded is, in the last analysis, a contemptible ingrate and a dangerous traitor.

Since the outbreak of the war, boundary lines have oscillated upon the map, always extending the territory engulfed by the war machine of the dictator. As the ruthless invaders have blasted their way into these innocent victim countries, they have been welcomed with open arms by perfidious traitors heading "fifth columns" in such countries.

America is aroused. On Thursday, May 17, a special defense message was delivered by that patriotic American, Franklin D. Roosevelt, now President of the United States, and who will become, almost by acclamation, the next President of the United States. President Roosevelt said to the Congress of the United States:

"These are ominous days—days whose swift and shocking developments force every neutral nation to look to its defenses in the light of new factors. The brutal force of modern offensive war has been loosed in all its horror.

"New powers of destruction, incredibly swift and deadly, have been developed, and those who wield them are ruthless and daring.

"No old defense is so strong that it requires no further strengthening and no attack is so unlikely or impossible that it may be ignored.

"Let us examine, without self-deception, the dangers which confront us. Let us measure our strength and our defense without self-delusion.

"The clear fact is that the American people must recast their thinking about national protection.

"Motorized armies can now sweep through enemy territories at the rate of 200 miles a day.

"Parachute troops are dropped from airplanes in large numbers behind enemy lines. Troops are landed from planes in open fields, on wide highways, and at local civil airports.

"We have seen the treacherous use of the 'fifth column' by which persons supposed to be peaceful visitors were actually a part of an enemy unit of occupation. Lightning attacks capable of destroying airplane factories and munitions works hundreds of miles behind the lines are part of the new technique of modern war.

"The element of surprise which has ever been an important tactic in warfare has become the more dangerous because of the amazing speed with which modern equipment can reach and attack the enemy country.

"There are some who say that democracy cannot cope with the new techniques of government developed in recent years by a few countries—by a few countries which deny the freedom which we maintain are essential to our democratic way of life. This I reject.

"I know that our trained officers and men know more about fighting and the weapons and equipment needed for fighting than any of us laymen, and I have confidence in them.

"I know that to cope with present dangers we must be strong in heart and hand; strong in our faith; strong in faith in our way of living.

"I, too, pray for peace, that the ways of aggression and force may be banished from the earth; but I am determined to face the fact realistically that this Nation requires a toughness of moral and physical fiber. Those qualities, I am convinced, the American people hold to a high degree.

"Our task is plain. The road we must take is clearly indicated. Our defenses must be invulnerable, our security absolute. But our defense as it was yesterday, or even as it is today, does not provide security against potential developments and dangers of the future.

"Defense cannot be static. Defense must grow and change from day to day. Defense must be dynamic and flexible, an expression of the vital forces of the Nation and of its resolute will to meet whatever challenge the future may hold. For these reasons, I need hardly assure you that after the adjournment of this session of Congress I will not hesitate to call the Congress into special session if at any time the situation of the national defense requires it. The Congress and the Chief Executive constitute a team where the defense of the land is concerned.

"Our ideal, our objective, is still peace—peace at home and peace abroad. Nevertheless, we stand ready not only to spend millions for defense but to give our service and even our lives for the maintenance of our American liberties.

"Our security is not a matter of weapons alone. The arm that wields them must be strong; the eye that guides them clear; the will that directs them indomitable.

"These are the characteristics of a free people, a people devoted to the institutions they themselves have built, a people willing to defend a way of life that is precious to them all, a people who put their faith in God."

The Governors of our sovereign States have spoken in unmistakable fashion. On June 3 at Duluth, Minn., 19 chief executives attending the National Governors' Convention overturned a 32-year-old tradition of not announcing any conclusions as a result of their discussions and approved a statement to the effect that "since there exists in the world today a crisis brought on by ruthless and unprovoked aggression which respects neither the territorial integrity, the sovereign rights, nor the peaceful intentions of neutral states and seems to threaten the very existence of democracy itself, and since it has been clearly and unmistakably demonstrated time after time within recent weeks that such aggression undertakes and respects only force, and that nations unprepared and consequently unable to defend themselves are speedily and without warning overrun, subjugated, and destroyed, and, since the Governors assembled in this conference are not only the civil administrators of the several States but are commanders in chief of the National Guards and have a grave responsibility for the effectiveness of this and other important units of our national defense.

"It is therefore the consensus of opinion of this conference, in view of the situation confronting our common country, that all necessary steps should be taken immediately to provide adequately and effectively for the defense of these United States, and each State pledges her resources, agricultural, industrial, and military, to that end."

In a matchless address delivered on May 13 to the American Society of International Law at its thirty-fourth annual meeting in Washington City, our great Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, urged a faith in international law and a return to national morality and respect for law. May I quote parts of that profound and patriotic utterance:

"It is no exaggeration to say that never before, in the entire history of the human race, has the problem of the preservation and development of order under law presented itself with such urgent acuteness. Never before has it been so fraught with import for the future of mankind.

"The concept and the structure of a law of nations rose and evolved out of a spirit of protest against the ravages of international anarchy. In the ancient world and during the Dark Ages of the modern world, there widely prevailed a concept that each nation was a law unto itself, the sole arbiter of its international conduct, fully entitled, if it possessed sufficient strength, to engage in aggression and aggrandizement, to destroy by armed force the independence of other nations and to subjugate other peoples. Force reigned supreme; human liberty, national independence, confidence in safety and security on the part of nations and individuals were in constant jeopardy.

"Today mankind is the unhappy victim of another challenge of this sort—a powerful challenge which threatens to wipe out the achievements of centuries in the development of international law and to destroy the very foundations of orderly international relationships. In the face of this challenge, it is of the utmost importance that every citizen visualize clearly the cardinal features of international law and of order based on law, as well as the conditions which would prevail if they were destroyed.

"The specter of a new descent into the conditions of international anarchy which characterized the Dark Ages looms on the horizon today. I am profoundly convinced that it menaces the civilized existence of mankind, of every nation, and of every individual. Every nation and every individual should be actively on guard.

"Our own Nation—powerful as it is and determined as it is to remain at peace, to preserve its cherished institutions and to promote the welfare of its citizens—is not secure against that menace. We cannot shut it out by attempting to isolate and insulate ourselves. We cannot be certain of safety and security when a large part of the world outside our borders is dominated by the forces of international lawlessness.

"We cannot close our eyes to what is going on elsewhere in the world and delude ourselves with the mere hope that somehow—somehow—all wars will pass us by. Never in our national history has there been a more desperate need for a clear understanding by every responsible citizen of our country of what is taking place in the world and of how it affects us. Such understanding is essential to a wise charting and application of our national policies. Under our system of government, it is the most effective safeguard for the maintenance and promotion of the national interest.

"The world today is torn by conflicts, the outcome of which will affect the lives of the future generations in all countries. The world today is threatened with an orgy of destruction—not only of life and property, but of religion, of morality, of the very basis of civilized society. The spread of international anarchy not only undermines law, justice, and morality among nations, but also inevitably impairs, within nations, these essential foundations of civilized existence.

"In the fact of existing conditions, we have no choice but to expand our program of armament construction to a degree necessary to provide fully adequate means of defending this country's security and its rightful interests. But if mankind is to avoid a long-continuing period of chaos and retrogression, it can only be through the firm establishment of order under law. Never before has there been a greater need for our people to place the support of a wholly united public opinion behind our Nation's efforts to exert the great weight of its moral influence in favor of a revindication and revitalization of the basic principles of order under law, which alone can give lasting insurance of safety, security, and peace.

"Upon those of us who devote their lives to the improvement and application of international law there devolves today a special duty. It is our task to help our fellow citizens to a better realization of the crucial importance which preservation of international law and of order based on law has for them and for their country. It is our task to make the immense significance of international law a living reality in the mind and heart of every American.

"While doing this, we should constantly and persistently search for ways and means of strengthening the structure of international law and of making more effective the translation of its principles into firmly established international practice. We

should spare no effort to demonstrate that the spirit which has made possible, over the centuries, immense forward strides in the development of international law still lives.

"Stunned by the cruel events which unfold all around them, millions of men and women have become a prey to doubt, hopelessness, and despair. It is all the more necessary for us, who believe in the eternal vitality of international law and of international morality, to hold fast to the conviction that law and morality will triumph over the forces of lawlessness and chaos which have again risen to challenge the very concept of order under law—just as they have in the past triumphed over similar challenges. I am certain of that triumph. I am certain that we and others who hold our beliefs will not falter in that faith or fail to do everything possible to restore and extend the full sway of effective international law over relations among nations."

The duties and responsibilities of all patriotic Mississippians and of this Mississippi Democratic convention are obvious. You may be relied upon at all times safely to measure up to that duty and responsibility. Your unselfish patriotism and love of your State and Nation bring you here today from every county of our beloved Commonwealth. You will adopt appropriate resolutions at this convention, that will reflect your loyalty to democratic principles and to the Democratic Party, but above and beyond all that they will give to this Nation and to the world your patriotic challenge and your love and devotion to this Republic and to our great American Government. Your resolutions will reflect love of country and a pure patriotism that should motivate the private and official life and conduct of every loyal American. You may be relied upon to choose loyal and patriotic Mississippians to represent this State at the National Democratic Convention. And you and other patriots from other States will draft a platform that will be pure and patriotic in word and in ideals. It will pledge anew the loyalty of the Democratic Party to this Nation, and it will invite the active cooperation and best thought of all other loyal Americans, whether Democrats or not.

The national convention will wisely resolve and wisely choose its leaders. Only one question appears to be decided. And that is who will be the Democratic nominee for the Vice Presidency. With one voice and with one mind and in perfect accord this convention and the Democratic National Convention will select as the stalwart champion of Democratic principles, ideals, and exalted patriotism and the voters of this country will in due course elect for another 4-year term, that great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

With his knowledge of world affairs, and his grasp of all problems at home and abroad, he will lead this great Nation as the triumphant and everlasting pure democracy that will continue through the ages to serve its people and show forth to the world a government of law and order and a service and blessing to humanity.

The record of the present Democratic administration is familiar to all.

We may safely rely upon the correction for the future of any mistakes that may have been made, and to continue those policies which have stood the test of operative experience.

One thing we do know is that the State of Mississippi has wielded a powerful influence in national affairs and has received more benefit than at any other period of its history.

Patriotic Republicans will rally to the support of proper measures for the good of the Nation and for protecting it against those persons and influences that would cause its downfall.

We are a government of parties, but in this great emergency party lines will be largely forgotten in rallying to the support of President Roosevelt, who will most assuredly be renominated and elected.

Let us reconsecrate ourselves for the discharge of the duties that lie before us. Let pure patriotism and unselfish ambition characterize our daily lives. With undying faith in our country and in our God this Nation shall not perish from this earth.

Yesterday bloodthirsty Mussolini joined the murderous Hitler in the welter of blood, and the night grows blacker still. But let us hope and pray and remember it is always blackest before the dawn of a brighter and better day.

"God give us men: a time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinion and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo; Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting Justice sleeps."

See to it that none but true, patriotic, and loyal Americans be in positions of trust and confidence. Banish selfishness and profiteering; let labor and capital each try to outdo the other in patriotic service. Then indeed will this Nation show forth to the world a patriotism pure and undefiled "that will gird this Commonwealth with the resistless splendor of the moral law, the invulnerable panoply of States, the celestial secret of a great nation and a happy people."

"The Lord of Hosts is with us. The God of Jacob is our refuge."

Finland Pays—Heroic Nation Cradles Freedom and Keeps Its Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Joint Resolution 561, authorizing the postponement of the amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, and May 23, 1932. A similar Senate resolution has now passed both Houses of the Congress and has been signed by the President. The purpose of this resolution was to recognize the fine spirit and integrity of Finland in being the only one of our World War debtor nations to keep its word. Owing to the stress confronting Finland at the present time, due to the recent war forced upon it, it seemed proper out of a spirit of fair play that the United States should at least postpone these payments to a time that they might be met more advantageously by Finland. However, on June 15, 1940, the Minister of Finland delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury a check for $159,398, being full payment of the installment due on its war debt. I took occasion to say in this House recently that when the annals of our times shall have been written there will be no more heart-gripping record than that of heroic little Finland, fighting against overpowering odds in defense of her firesides and civilization—fighting to hold back the hordes of barbarism threatening to engulf her. It may be said Finland lost the contest, but she won the enduring gratitude, admiration, and respect of the civilized world. From all the pages of history we find no record surpassing the outstanding heroism, courage, and indomitable defense of home of the fighting men and women of Finland. Civilization for all time is enriched by Finland's unsurpassed accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1940, Hjalmar J. Procope, Minister of Finland, said, at Richmond, Va.:

> Finland still has its greatest heritage—freedom and independence. The same Finland, within new borders, has retained its democratic spirit * * * and all have turned their attention to vital reconstruction.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following recital of the history of Finland and the crisis through which it has recently passed, and its program of reconstruction:

FINLAND—ITS HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT—WAR AND THE PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

Finland has just suffered one of the greatest crises in her existence. But after 3 months of aggression by Communist Russia, Finland remains an independent state, economically and politically free, despite the compulsory peace through which Finland had to cede one-tenth of her territory.

The Finns have been compelled many times in their history to repulse enemy invasion. Since Finland's creation as an independent state in 1917 and her war of independence in 1918, she lived in peace until the Russian aggression of November 30, 1939. The facts concerning this attack are therefore of great importance to all those interested in Finland, and in the question of whether or not a small democratic nation has a right to existence and independence among the larger nations of the world.

It was hoped in the beginning that the case of Finland would prove a test case; that Finland could, with the aid of other democracies, repel the aggression.

But though the Finnish Army was not defeated and though the Finnish soldiers defended their land valiantly, still they could not withstand the ever-increasing hordes of Russians storming over the border. Guns, munitions, and planes were lacking. And though offers of help were forthcoming, there was no way in which armed forces could be made available to Finland. Hence, a compulsory peace had to be made, with Finland ceding to Russia approximately 10 percent of her land, where some 11 percent of the population lived, where the lost capital in forests, industrial, railway, and public properties amounts to more than $360,000,000. It had cost Finland $200,000,000 to fight her short war, and more than

$40,000,000 in damage was done by Russian air raiders and bombardments.

At the time the war broke, the Finns were enjoying a period of prosperity. They were building a durable, equable economy. During 1939, until September, when the European war began, Finland's exports were higher than ever before. There was practically no unemployment, no poverty, and very few large fortunes. Finland had achieved a workable and working democratic system, which, even after the ordeal of the war and in spite of all the losses inflicted by the peace, she will maintain. She will maintain her traditional policy of an independent nation among other free nations of the world.

PART II. FINLAND'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH RUSSIA

The Finns are a people distinctly different from, and have neither national nor racial affinity with, the Russians. They are Scandinavian in character.

Until the nineteenth century the country was part of the Kingdom of Sweden. Political and social rights and privileges enjoyed by the people of Sweden were equally enjoyed by the people of Finland; the Kings of Sweden were also the Kings of Finland, and the two peoples built up in northern Europe a civilization second to none in the world.

During the seven centuries in which Finland and Sweden were united there were many wars with Russia. Because of Finland's geographic position, she often became the battleground. Until the nineteenth century the enemy was always thrown back.

In 1807, when the Swedes and Finns refused to join Napoleon's continental blockade of England, Napoleon, Emperor of France, and Alexander I, Czar of Russia, agreed upon a major invasion of Finland. The record of this invasion and of the menace which Russia subsequently became, is amply put forward in a League of Nations report: [1]

"The Finns had been obliged to wage ceaseless warfare against their eastern neighbors, but it was only in the sixteenth century that Russia, expanding toward the west, became a constant menace to the Swedo-Finnish Kingdom. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, the struggle against Russia was crowned with success, and in 1617, under the Treaty of Stolbova, eastern frontiers of Finland were fixed which were almost identical with those of today except in the north near the Arctic Ocean. Little by little, however, the Swedo-Finnish Kingdom, weakened by the successive wars of the eighteenth century, lost its military importance, and, during the Napoleonic wars, Finland, already partly annexed by her eastern neighbors, was invaded by Russian armies and attached to Russia by the Treaty of Hamina of 1809.

"Czar Alexander I convened the Finnish States-General at Porvoo, where he solemnly declared that Finland would be administered in conformity with the Swedish Constitution, thus conferring on Finland complete internal autonomy. The Czar assumed the title of Grand Duke of Finland.

"In 1811, the territory formerly annexed to Russia was restored to Finland. All that Finland had in common with Russia was her sovereign and her foreign policy. In other matters the administration of the country was completely independent. Finland had her own army, currency, customs, etc.

"With a few exceptions, the autonomy of Finland was respected by the Russian sovereigns up to the end of the nineteenth century. Under Czar Nicholas II, however, Russian oppression began to be felt. In 1899, an illegal manifesto issued by Nicholas II reserved to the sovereign the right to demand the application of common laws to Russia and Finland without hearing the States-General. After that the National Army was disbanded and an attempt was made to incorporate Finns in the Russian Army. It was hoped to Russify officials, and the press was submitted to a severe censorship.

"The reverses suffered by the Russians in their war with Japan caused a temporary weakening of the Russian autocratic system. The Czar retreated; the illegal measures were repealed and, in 1906, parliamentary reform of a distinctly democratic nature was introduced.

"The old Diet consisting of four orders was replaced by a chamber of representatives elected by equal universal suffrage based on proportional representation. Women also were entitled to vote.

"But, from 1908 onward, a new wave of oppression, more severe than the first, broke over the country. Several Finnish officials who were regarded as dangerous were deported to Siberia. At this moment the patriots known as the Militante (Activists) began to work conscientiously for the liberation of their country.

"The collapse of Russia at the end of the World War brought the liberation of Finland into the realm of possibilities. On December 6, 1917, the Finnish Parliament issued a declaration of independence. After this declaration, however, the country still had to be cleared of the numerous Russian garrisons which occupied it as conquered territory, and a Communist revolt which broke out in January 1918 had to be suppressed. It was only in 1918 that the legal government became master of the situation.

"In 1920, a treaty of peace was concluded at Tartto with the U. S. S. R., which ceded to Finland, beyond her former northern frontiers, the territory of Petsamo."

From 1920 forward Finland lived in peace and progress until the 1939 invasion.

[1] Special supplement to the Monthly Report of the League of Nations, December 1939.

PART III. FINLAND'S PROGRESS

The story of Finland during this last 20 years is inspiring. Faced with rugged, difficult terrain, and with few other raw materials than wood, the people were able to erect a small empire of industry and agriculture as solidly founded as any other in the world.

The country was economically sound. Wise legislation and a rising export trade, coupled with scientific advancement, had developed her resources considerably.

Before the World War, Finland had rather large trade with Russia. In 1918, the Russian market disappeared and Finland sought new markets. So she developed important markets in Great Britain, United States, Italy, Germany, South America, and other countries. By 1939 Finland was buying 15 percent more than she was selling to the United States.

Finland was among the first nations to enter into a trade agreement with the United States under the Hull reciprocal-trade agreements. The Finnish-American agreement, signed on May 18, 1936, resulted in an increase in both exports and imports, with the flow of United States commodities to Finland showing the larger increase.

Agriculture

In 1930 almost 60 percent of the entire population of Finland was occupied by agriculture. Since that time industry was increased and has absorbed slightly more of the population. During the last 20 years the Finnish people cleared 1,536,000 acres of land for cultivation, an area equal to twice that of the State of Rhode Island. In the last 8 years, some 500,000 acres have been cleared, equal approximately to the cultivated area ceded to Russia by the recent Moscow treaty.

Industry

Finland has been rapidly developing copper and nickel mines, and her large forestry resources—the largest of any European country—provided the basis for industrial and commercial development. During recent years as much as 85 percent of her total exports have been composed of forest products, particularly pulp paper, some timber, and plywood. In 1937, Finland was the fourth largest producer of chemical pulp. The paper industry was also rapidly expanding and has become an important part of the Finnish economy. Other branches of Finnish industry were also well developed, particularly mechanical and textile manufacturing.[2]

PART IV. FINLAND, THE DEMOCRACY

Built up largely on the same principles as the Constitution of the United States, with the legislative, executive, and judicial branches each independent of the other, the Government of Finland is purely democratic. Its constitution is the only one adopted in Europe since the World War that is still in effect.

In the Finnish Parliament 7 parties are represented. Its 200 members are elected by universal suffrage, which was introduced in 1906, when women were given the right to vote and to sit in Parliament. The press is entirely free, and Finland has more newspapers and periodicals per capita for its population than any other country in the world.

Approximately 60 percent of all the people are farmers, and every man can own his own land if he so desires. Only 6.5 percent of the total land area is owned by corporations or companies, as against 52.1 percent privately owned, 39.7 percent owned by the state, and 1.7 percent by communities.

Industrial workers have an 8-hour day and holidays with pay for all up to a maximum—after 10 years' service—of 1 month. Children under 14 do not work, and only 6 hours of work in a day are permitted between the ages of 14 and 16. Finnish workers more often than not have their own home or garden plot, and there is no slum problem. Factories and mills are among the most up to date of any in the world, keeping well abreast or ahead of all technological advances.

Unemployment has been practically unknown in Finland for years, as it was at the time of the Russian invasion, and this was not attributable to a munitions economy such as existed in so many nations of Europe. The Finns are probably the healthiest in Europe, as attested by the highly developed athletic competition throughout the country and their victories in Olympic games

As a consequence of compulsory education there is no more literate race anywhere, and among persons over 15 years of age more than 99 percent can read and write. Even the poorest child can take advantage of higher education, with three large universities open to all citizens.

Already before the separation from Russia cultural development flourished. Finland's scientists, poets, artists, architects, and sculp-

[2] According to the report of the League of Nations. The report further states:

"Generally speaking, Finnish industry is highly dynamic and in a state of rapid quantitative and qualitative expansion. The index of Finnish industrial production (on the basis of 1929=100) was 156 in 1938, as compared with an average of 112 for the whole world. Moreover, since 1929 the process of rationalization has progressed more rapidly in Finland than in any other country for which such information is available. During the decade 1929–38, the physical output per working-hour increased by about 50 percent. The same tendency to expand is shown by the growth of the merchant marine, the tonnage of which increased from some 300,000 tons in 1929 to 580,000 tons in 1938.

tors have achieved world-wide fame. The name Sibelius is known wherever music is played. In Paris, London, and New York Finnish art and architecture are known and admired. In the different branches of science Finns have gained wide recognition. There can be no better evidence of the freedom of man which existed in free Finland.

PART V. PRELUDE TO WAR

Since the country became independent, Finland's only aim in her foreign policy had been to live in peace and peaceful cooperation with other nations. She never joined any bloc of large European powers, but followed, like other Scandinavian states, a policy of strict neutrality. She had taken nothing from anybody and did not threaten anyone.

With respect to Russia, she always tried to maintain normal and peaceful relations.

In 1932 a nonaggression pact had been concluded between Finland and Russia, in which it was agreed that all disputes which might arise between Finland and Russia, and which could not be settled through the usual diplomatic channels, should be submitted to a mixed conciliation commission composed of four members—two representing each country. All differences were to be settled between themselves, and by peaceful means. In 1934 this nonaggression pact was reaffirmed, to remain in force until 1945.

Delegations were sent to Russia from time to time to lay a foundation for better trade relations. In recent years Finland's trade with Russia was slightly over 1 percent of its total.

Russian-Finnish relations were as quiet as could have been expected after the outbreak of the European war in September, and Russia had declared she would respect Finland's neutrality the same as that of other states. However, early in October 1939 the Finnish Minister in Moscow received word from Mr. Molotov, Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that Mr. Molotov wished to see a special representative from the Government of Finland for an exchange of views "to negotiate on various questions of political and economic character."

In view of developments which had recently taken place in Russian relations with other small states adjacent to Russia, the seriousness of the Russian attitude toward Finland was obvious. Poland had been divided between two totalitarian states. Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had been compelled to allow Soviet military garrisons at important strategic points within their countries and to accept treaties of mutual assistance further impairing their independence of action.

The Finnish Cabinet empowered former Prime Minister Dr. J. K. Paasikivi to act as the Government's special representative, and the invitation to Russia was accepted.

In announcing that the delegation would go to Moscow, the Finnish Foreign Minister said, in part:

"We stand by northern neutrality and our unconditional neutrality, which has been repeatedly affirmed. We threaten none, take no advantage, and will not adhere to any great power or group. Our sole desire is to live in peace with all and to remain outside conflict."

The first conference of the delegates was held at the Kremlin on October 12. In addition to Dr. Paasikivi, the Finnish delegation included Colonel Paasonen, formerly military attaché in Moscow, and M. Nykopp, of the Finnish Foreign Office. Stalin, and Molotov led the Russian delegation.

It became obvious at once that Communist Russia was trying to establish control over Finland and sought vital territorial surrender; territory involving main highroads into Finland. During the previous winter the Russians had proposed an exchange of certain islands on the Gulf of Finland, and the Finnish Government was willing to agree to this. But in that first meeting the Russians brought out a map on which a new frontier had been drawn across the Karelian Isthmus, a frontier involving more than the mere security of Leningrad, upon which the demands were predicated. They demanded also the ceding of a military base on the Hanko Peninsula at the entrance to the Gulf of Finland, and territory on the Arctic coast.

It was obvious that these proposals meant the mutilation of Finnish independence. They were based upon a pretense that the 180,000,000 people of Russia feared aggression from the 4,000,000 people of Finland, and that in order to guard against such aggression it was necessary to undermine Finnish sovereignty. The high-handed nature of the demands in themselves was contradictory of any fear of Finland on the part of the Soviet.

On October 10, President Roosevelt called attention to the friendship between the United States and Finland in a letter to the President of the Soviet Union, and added:

"The President expresses the earnest hope that the Soviet Union will make no demands on Finland which are inconsistent with the maintenance and development of amicable relations between the two countries and the independence of each."

In its report to the League of Nations, the Finnish Government explained:

"A large country is protected by its very size. To require a small state to renounce its means of defense is tantamount to destroying that state's liberty. By giving up its means of defense the small state falls under the domination of the great power by which the demands were presented, or becomes a battlefield of great powers. The U. S. S. R. is not exposed to any danger of indirect aggression by great powers through Finnish territory. The most effective way of guaranteeing it against such dangers for all time is to allow the Finnish people the possibility of insuring—as it is firmly determined to do—the application of its policy of neutrality by effective defense designed to maintain the independence of its country, and not to deprive it of that possibility."

The Finnish Government thereupon agreed to make specific concessions which, it believed, would achieve any possible protective objectives of the Soviet Union.

These were immediately rejected. The Russian proposals became adamant demands, and after a series of conferences a deadlock was reached by November 13.

For a few days all was quiet. Then a campaign of abuse of Finland was commenced in the Russian press and over the radio. This campaign had the twin objectives of molding an anti-Finnish sentiment among the Russian people and undermining Finnish morale at home. It charged that the Finnish ruling classes did not desire an agreement, while the working classes, on the other hand, were most anxious to secure friendly relations with the Communists. This allegation had its answer in the unity of the Finnish people during the time of the negotiations and during the war.

Still seeking a peaceful solution, the Finnish Government moved to avoid border incidents by shifting its artillery back from the Finnish-Russian frontier, beyond range of Russian territory. Despite this it was announced in Russia on November 26 that Finnish artillery had fired on Soviet territory, killing and wounding several soldiers. And at midnight of November 29 came the beginning of the end of peace.

Molotov, in a radio speech to the Russian people, accused the Finns of the border incident which the Finnish Government had offered to submit to a neutral commission. The gist of his speech was:

1. He accused the Finnish Government of "irreconcilable hostility" toward Russia, despite repeated offers on the part of Finland for peaceful arbitration.

2. He denounced the nonaggression pact between Finland and Russia.

3. He broke off diplomatic relations.

4. He warned the Red Army and Navy of millions to be prepared for aggression from the Finnish Army of a few hundred thousand.

With this broadcast the Finnish Government and the Finnish people became finally aware that it was not peace but aggression and the seizure of territory that the Soviet sought.

Meanwhile, when the crisis had reached the breaking point, on this same momentous evening of November 29, the Government of the United States moved to preserve peace. The American Minister in Helsinki, Mr. Arthur Schoenfeld, and the American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, Mr. Walter Thurston, expressed to the respective Governments the willingness of the United States to extend its good offices for the settlement of the controversial questions between Finland and the Soviet.

The Finnish Foreign Minister immediately notified the American Minister of Finland's readiness to accept the offer. Russia did not accept. Its only answer was the armed attack upon Finland.

Even then, while the Finnish Government and the American Government still sought peace, the Communist troops were on the move. Russian bombers were being loaded while Molotov spoke, and "red" pilots had received their instructions. Three hours after the United States Minister had visited the Finnish Foreign Office in Helsinki, Russian artillery began to bombard Finnish territory. At dawn on November 30 the Soviet air force attacked Finland, brutally bombing and machine gunning 14 Finnish towns and localities and ruthlessly killing civilians, including women and children.

Further evidence of the real goal of the Russians came the day after hostilities began, when the U. S. S. R. broadcast the announcement that it had set up a new democratic government for all Finland in the village of Terijoki in Finnish territory on the Isthmus of Karelia, near the Finnish-Soviet frontier. This government was composed of Soviet citizens and mercenaries of the Comintern who had once been residents in Finland but had departed years before to ally themselves with the Communists.

This, then, was the first step toward the sovietizing of Finland. The actual objectives of Stalin and Molotov were bared at last.

PART VI. THE WAR

The Finnish report to the League of Nations states:

"On November 30 Soviet airplanes appeared above Helsinki about 9 a. m. and bombarded the city and the neighboring airdrome. The attack was repeated the same day about 2:30 p. m., and on this occasion dozens of civilians, chiefly women and children, were killed. The following day there was further bombardment of several towns and other centers of population; there were several dozen casualties and much damage was done. The sole purpose of these air attacks was, without doubt, to annihilate the civil population and cause material damage. It may perhaps be suggested that the bombs fell accidentally on objectives other than those aimed at. But low-flying airplanes were seen to turn the fire of their machine guns directly against private houses, schools, and women and children rushing to take shelter. The land and naval forces have shown the same cruelty and the same flagrant disregard for the elementary laws of warfare; they have spared neither women, children, nor even shipwrecked civilians."

With bombs dropping about the cities and with people lying dead and wounded in her streets, Finland tried once more to set up a conference between the two governments.

By radio, the Finnish Government expressed its willingness to accede to all Russian demands and requests which were not inconsistent with Finland's policy of strict neutrality, which did not threaten her national defenses, and which would not affect her freedom and independence as a sovereign state.

This availed nothing. Seeing that war was inevitable, the Finnish Parliament on December 1 set itself to carry on the defense of the nation. The cabinet resigned to make way for a coalition war cabinet, which reflected the unity of the Finnish people by including all parties from the social democrats to the conservatives.

On December 2, in a broadcast to the United States, Finnish Foreign Minister Väinö Tanner expressed the hope that Finland "which wishes to carry out the work of peace, might, as soon as possible, see her relations with the Soviet Union become once again peaceful." He declared:

"The Finnish Government will not refuse to take part in negotiations for the restoration of peace. Nevertheless, anyone who believes that the Finnish people can be bought by threat of force and the terror launched to make concessions that will amount, in reality, to the loss of their independence, is mistaken."

On February 1, President Kyösti Kallio voiced another offer to conclude "an honorable peace with Soviet Russia and end this barbaric senseless attack."

In the meantime, outraged governments the world over were expressing deep sympathy for the plight of the Finns. President Franklin D. Roosevelt was one of the first. He indicted Soviet Russia's aggression, declaring:

"The news of the Soviet naval and military bombings within Finnish territory has come as a profound shock to the Government and people of the United States. Despite efforts made to solve the dispute by peaceful methods to which no reasonable objection could be offered, one power has chosen to resort to force of arms. It is tragic to see the policy of force spreading, and to realize that wanton disregard for law is still on the march.

"All peace-loving people in those nations that are still hoping for the continuance of relations throughout the world on the basis of law and order will unanimously condemn this new resort to military force as the arbiter of international differences. To the great misfortune of the world, the present trend to force makes insecure the independent existence of small nations in every continent and jeopardize the rights of mankind to self-government. The people and Government of Finland have a long honorable and wholly peaceful record which has won for them the respect and fond regard of the people and Government of the United States."

All the civilized world joined President Roosevelt in condemning the Communist aggression, and with the beginning of the raids upon civilians from the air protests of the inhumanities became universal. In the meantime, all the women members of the Finnish Parliament appealed to the women of the world for support. The appeal spoke of the incessant bombing outrages, and said, in part:

"The people of Finland have always dreamt of living in peace and working industriously in the conditions provided by niggardly nature. Love of battle and conquest have never been implanted in our children either in homes or schools, only the defense of the liberty of their country has been regarded as a sacred duty. As far as we have been able with our small resources, we have endeavored to maintain peaceful and friendly relations with our neighbors. In spite of this Finnish homes have been made to go through a terrible nightmare during these last few winter months. Innumerable homes have been destroyed by air raids, hundreds of thousands of people have been forced to leave their homes, members of families have been scattered far and wide. Day and night mothers with new-born infants, old people, and invalids have had to be ready to seek protection in snowdrifts and woods from barbaric air attacks. Every Sunday not only those brave soldiers who have been killed in action, but also women and children, the victims of bombing raids, are laid to rest in our cemeteries throughout the country."

On December 20 former President Herbert Hoover said:

"The forces of primitive savagery have been unloosened upon the world. The Finns are the victims of today. Every decent person in the world is praying to God tonight that these brave people shall yet be saved from this tide. For the world today witnesses one of those heroic stands for freedom of men that comes but few times in the centuries. It is a star illuminating the no man's land of civilization. Its glow will light the minds of men and give hope to liberty for centuries to come."

Millions of persons throughout the world contributed to help Finland defend its borders and to aid its suffering people. In the United States, the Finnish Relief Fund, the American Red Cross, and Fighting Funds for Finland gave valuable aid, with organized labor, the churches, and virtually all segments of American life rallying to the cause of the Finns.

On February 11, President Roosevelt again spoke in support of Finland, asserting: "American sympathy is 98 percent with the Finns in their effort to stave off invasion of their own soil. That American sympathy by now is axiomatic."

Pointing out that the Russian Soviet is a dictatorship while Finland is a republic which could not have "any ulterior designs on the integrity or the safety of the Soviet Union," President Roosevelt added:

"It (Russia) has allied itself with another dictatorship, and it has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable, possible harm to the Soviet Union, a small nation that seeks only to live at peace as a democracy and a liberal forward-looking democracy at that."

PART VII. THE PEACE

During the course of the war, the Finns won victories, but they also suffered tremendous losses owing to the overwhelming number of the attacking army and their inexhaustible supply of war materials.

More than 17,000 young people gave their lives. Forty thousand more were wounded. Women, children, and the aged were killed and wounded in Russian bombings behind the lines. The Russians lost perhaps as much as 10 times as many men, but after having hammered the Finnish lines for more than 3 months, having lost all these men, the Russian troops still advanced only a few miles. In most cases they got no farther than the distance from Washington to Baltimore, or about 40 miles. But the Russians always had fresh troops to put in, modern war materials to furnish them with. The Finns had to fight without being relieved.

The Finnish Army was never defeated; nor did the morale of the civilian population break. The conclusion of the peace and Finland's acceptance of the Russian conditions were not brought about by a break-down either of the inner or the outer front. There was no military catastrophe, but finally the physical strain upon the troops at the front seemed too heavy and no help was in sight. England and France promised their help in the form of troops, but how could they reach Finland? Petsamo, the Finnish port in the north, was far away and occupied by Russian troops. Sweden and Norway, through which the shortest way to send help would be, considered their policy of neutrality would not permit them to allow the transfer of troops. Thus, was Finland driven to a hard peace.

Finland lost all the Karelian Isthmus; the ancient city of Vipuri, which always was a stronghold against the east; all the shores of Lake Ladoga; and a great district on the northeastern frontier; a part of the Arctic coast; and many islands in the Gulf of Finland. One of the most serious losses was the port of Hanko in the southwest, which Finland was compelled to lease to Russia for a period of 30 years.

However, in contrast to the three Baltic states south of the Gulf of Finland, Finland has not granted Russia the right of maintaining garrisons in other parts of the country; nor has she made with the Soviet any treaty of mutual assistance or surrendered any other political prerogatives. Refusing to link her national policies to those of the Soviet, Finland is a free and independent state. She is determined to maintain and protect this position.

On March 20 H. J. Procopé, Minister of Finland to the United States, told a group in Richmond, Va.:

"Finland has just fought another war and has, in the words of my President, signed a compulsary peace. But this does not spell the end of Finland. We have lost land and lives as well, but we still have our greatest heritage—freedom and independence. We still have our forests, our soil, our water power in our streams, and, mostly, our industrial equipment; and the same Finland, within new borders, has retained its democratic spirit. The Finns, the peasants, the workmen, the intellectuals, all who built our nation, who fought to protect it through many generations, who so valiantly held their own in this war against one of the world's largest nations—they all have turned their attention to vital reconstruction. They know how to rebuild as well as build a nation."

As yet, the cost of the compulsory peace has not been completely calculated. Thousands upon thousands of civilians who were forced from their homes during the war were stripped of their possessions. Four hundred and fifty thousand people were moved from ceded areas. Ten percent of the cultivated land of Finland was handed over to Russia. Ten percent of industry and 16 percent of railways were lost. The value of growing forests, industrial enterprises, and railways, and houses has been placed at 18,000,000,000 marks, or $360,000,000. Many hospitals, churches, schools, the Technical University of Helsinki and the age-old castle of Turku, were all destroyed.

It will never be possible to accurately estimate the cost to Finland of the cessation of her industry during the period of the war; of the mobilization and demobilization of her entire population; of her lame and crippled and wounded soldiers, who will remain partially or completely out of actual production during the rest of this generation. All these things are the cost of Finland's war.

From this tremendous toll comes the three phases of rehabilitation: (1) the repairing of damage: (2) the rehibilitation of industry to compensate for losses; and (3) the resettlement of 500,000 persons forced from their homes in the ceded areas.

While this rebuilding process will demand sacrifices from the entire population and, probably, a lower standard of living for a period, Finland remains confident that with adequate help from other democratic nations the rehabilitation will be accomplished and Finland will resume its economic progress.

Finland faced great hardships when she won her independence from the Soviet 20 years ago. She was forced to seek heavy foreign loans which reached their peak in 1931 and amounted to between two hundred and twenty-five and two hundred and fifty million dollars. Between 1932 and 1937 Finland redeemed foreign bonds to an amount exceeding $125,000,000, and at the outbreak of the war her total debts to foreign countries were exceeded by deposits abroad. Her post-war debt to the United States of $110,000,000 has

been reduced to approximately $15,000,000 at the outbreak of the war.

PART VIII. THE FUTURE

As the peace came, Finland turned to restoration and rehabilitation.

Field Marshall Mannerheim told his valiant soldiers:

"Our fate is hard now that we are compelled to give up to an alien race, a race with a life philosophy and moral values different from ours, the ground which for centuries we have cultivated in labor and sweat.

"Yet we must put our shoulders to the wheel in order that we may prepare on the soil left to us a home for those rendered homeless and an improved livelihood for all, and as before we must be ready to defend our diminished fatherland with the same fire with which we defended our undivided fatherland."

He continued:

"We did not want war. We asked peace, work, and progress, but we were forced into a struggle in which you have done great deeds which will shine for centuries in the pages of history.

"More than 15,000 of you who took the field will never again see your homes, and how many are those who have lost forever their ability to work?

"But you have also dealt hard blows, and if 200,000 of our enemies now lie on the snowdrifts gazing with broken eyes at our starry sky, the fault is not yours. You did not hate them or wish them evil; you merely followed the stern law or war, kill or be killed."

President Roosevelt, on March 13, added to his statement of December 1, indicting Russia, this conviction:

"The people of Finland, by their unexcelled valor and strong resistance in the face of overwhelming armed forces, have won the moral right to live in everlasting peace and independence in the land they have so bravely defended * * * the people and Government of Finland have again increased the respect and warm regard in which they are held by the people and Government of the United States, even though it is clear that by virtue of an attack by a neighbor many times stronger, they have been compelled to yield territory, and to accept a material weakening of their own future defense of their independence.

"The ending of this war does not yet clarify the inherent right of small nations to the maintenance of their integrity against attack by superior force."

Foreign Minister Tanner said:

"* * * peace imposes a heavy burden on this country. Only with great hesitation has the government consented to it.

"The decision was all the more difficult to reach in that no one could foresee what the near future would bring.

"In this case it will become evident only at a later stage as is the case of all great political decisions, whether the decision was right or wrong."

But with the peace, hard as it is, comes reconstruction. Mr. Tanner continues:

"You know how hard it is to leave a place you love—so hard, that you can never feel the same toward a new place. The only consolation for those who lost everything is their knowledge that they still belong to the same nation as their brother Finns.

"The government has declared in a proclamation that the care of those citizens will be one of its first and most important duties. Although the war has destroyed property worth hundreds of millions of dollars and although under the peace treaty we lose enormous areas and plants, our irreparable loss is the loss of that human material which cannot be replaced. For those who remain we shall try to build up a new life. We shall try by domestic works to reform and settle to win again in our reduced territory the areas we have lost.

"And as we trusted in the sympathy and the help of the civilized world when we took up the battle for our existence, we do so again now that we embark on the reconstruction and resettlement of our country."

"Learn by Our Folly," British Paper Urges the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the heading "'Learn by Our Folly,' British Paper Urges the United States."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LEARN BY OUR FOLLY," BRITISH PAPER URGES UNITED STATES

(By the Associated Press)

LONDON, June 17.—Lord Beaverbrook's Daily Express—advising Americans editorially to "learn by our folly" and "don't be English"—admonished the United States yesterday not to believe "that 3,000 miles of Atlantic can save you."

The editorial mouthpiece of Britain's minister for aircraft production called upon the United States to ignore "soft words of reassurance that come from Germany."

"Prepare to meet your foes," the editorial added. "Make big sacrifices now in order to build up your own forces. Squash your saboteurs, your "fifth column" traitors who work quietly behind the scenes to prevent you from spending your great wealth to be prepared."

The newspaper warned the American Nation to "watch the Nazi propagandists who settle in the small countries near you ready for a stab in your side or your back, as we in this country suffer by the presence of such Nazis in Eire."

"There is no time for subtlety now. We give you advice from the bitterness of our own lessons."

Reciprocal-Trade Agreements and Their Relationship to the Export Market for Industrial Products and Protection to American Industry and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, while the new European war is progressing and threatening to destroy much of the products of modern civilization and causing such anguish to all of us, and while obviously every citizen of this Nation hopes and prays for an early peace, we must be realistic enough to thoughtfully survey and continue our study of all of the more important economic problems which continue to concern us and which at the conclusion of the war will undoubtedly stand out as of supreme importance and which at that time will demand the best thought of all of us.

In this connection I know of no subject more important to keep constantly in mind than the multitude of problems which center around the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program which is so important a feature of the present national administration. Indeed, so important is the subject that the administration was willing to resort to absolutely every conceivable device in order to secure the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, thus extending its operation for another 3-year period. It is because of this continued attitude on the part of the administration that I address myself to some of the more important problems which it seems to me merit continued thoughtful study.

First of all, of course, we must all recognize that as a result of the European war the negotiations of new reciprocal-trade agreements in the immediate future no longer worries us. In other words, while the present situation continues, there can be no thought of trade agreements with such countries as Norway, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, and Italy in northern and western Europe. The Belgian agreement cannot be revised as intended to any advantage; while there would not seem to be any practical basis for attempting to launch agreements with the 8 or 10 smaller Baltic and Balkan countries or Russia. The same would appear to be largely true so far as countries in South America, Africa, and Asia are concerned, as well as other small scattered areas. In other words, so far as reciprocal-trade agreements are concerned, the war has probably forced a much-needed and much-desired vacation. But this does not mean that we can

safely forget the subject and go to sleep at the post. There is all the more reason why we must continue our study and be prepared for vastly more difficult periods which undoubtedly are not far ahead of us.

I propose to give only passing or very brief consideration to the significance of reciprocal-trade agreements from the standpoint of the foreign market for the products of American agriculture and industry. I am satisfied from a study of literally all data available and of reports which have been made that foreign concessions made to the United States in all reciprocal-trade agreements thus far negotiated had substantially no important value. In many cases concessions made were merely restoring conditions which had prevailed earlier. In other words, some countries prior to the agreements had advanced tariff rates, narrowed quotas, and so forth, and then agreed to return at least partly to the previous arrangement. In many other cases, what were called foreign concessions to us were mere gestures which did not and could not result in any important benefit to us because these same foreign countries in many cases proceeded at once to "cover their tactics" by introducing some other devices to accomplish the same purpose which they previously had in mind.

At the present time our foreign market depends almost wholly on the purchasing power of the people in foreign countries and their need for commodities which we have available and are able to supply them. In other words, if they have the money to buy and hold the commodities and are willing to pay our prices, they proceed and we have a certain quantity of exports as a result. It is quite true that some of our low-unit cost products, resulting from mass production, great efficiency, and technical advancement, have found and will continue to find the foreign market until other foreign countries through the same processes of perfection are able to undersell us because of their lower wage rates, longer hours, and other advantages which they may have. In the meantime, no important measurable advantages have come from the trade-agreements program.

So far as agricultural products are concerned—and manufactured products made from agricultural raw materials—the same applies as that just stated with reference to other industrial products. If foreign people need what we have and if they have the money to buy or the purchasing power, they will proceed to take whatever part of our supplies are available provided our prices are not out of line with prices for the same commodities produced in other areas.

Probably it is not necessary to go further at this time in our discussion of the futile attempts which have been made to secure special advantages in foreign markets, except to say that practically all foreign countries now have surrounded themselves with such a multitude of quota-control devices, licenses, permits, and so forth, and with exchange-control devices, including blocked exchanges, and so forth, and with other trading forms such as compensating agreements, barter arrangements, and Government purchasing agencies, that there is no good reason to believe that the people of foreign countries, largely bankrupt, will be in position to greatly increase their purchases in this country, except requirements for military operations, or unless we furnish them the money with which they are buying, and that, of course, we should not do unless we literally want to give away our products.

My purpose is to make a somewhat more detailed reference to the import side of the problem. There are three or four outstanding problems which must receive consideration before any attempt can be made to analyze or to review such problems which may concern individual industries or groups of labor.

It must now be perfectly clear that the administration has in mind one fundamental purpose and that purpose is to secretly proceed with a complete general tariff revision downward. Already reductions in rate of duty have been granted to all countries—not merely to those with whom agreements have been negotiated—in the case of well over a thousand different agricultural and industrial products. The clear-cut purpose of the administration is to write a complete revised Tariff Act with lower rates of duty in the case of practically every commodity. There is, of course, much pretense that the rate is being carefully studied in each case. But this is being done in a secret manner and the public is not being permitted to come into the discussion or review the results, and the general purpose of the administration is to make the study and then reduce the rate of duty. In other words, set up the facts and figures in such a way as to justify downward tariff revision. Every individual industry, therefore, and every group of wage earners in American factories and group of operators on American farms should have clearly in mind this first broad general purpose—to reduce all rates of duty as rapidly as possible and as much as possible to all countries without regard to any concessions secured from abroad.

And it is further clear and may as well be stated that the general desire is to make a 50-percent reduction all along the line. It is true that in a few cases the first reduction is less than a full 50-percent, but when the administration returns to the same commodity and makes a second reduction, it necessarily follows that the sum total of reductions made are the full 50 percent. So then we have before us as the first proposition that we face a general downward tariff revision as nearly as possible 50 percent all along the line.

The second proposition is that, taking all agriculture and all industry, the reductions already made have not resulted in widespread disaster to American economic conditions, although numerous individual cases can be cited where very definite injury has already resulted. The reason no widespread injury has resulted to American economy is that wars now raging over large parts of Asia and Africa as well as Europe have turned the attention of all of the more important agricultural and industrial countries away from the American market. On the one hand, literally tens of millions of workers have been called into military operations. On the other hand, millions are engaged in making machines and materials for destruction. In every war, in fact, foreign economic life is in a chaotic condition, and as a result we have been temporarily protected against injury from our own unwise conduct.

It has been said that literally tens of thousands of workers formerly engaged in making lenses and other delicate glass products and other tens of thousands engaged in making watches, clocks, and so forth, for peacetime use are now giving all of their work to the making of precision instruments for military purposes such as compasses, range finders, speedometers, altimeters, binoculars, and a dozen other products. I could cite a hundred other illustrations, but this will suffice to illustrate the point in mind. In other words, merely because the American market is not being flooded with the products of foreign countries does not mean that concessions made in rates of duty have not been unwise. We are living in a fool's paradise thinking that the whole tariff structure can be literally torn to pieces without grave injury to American standards of living, wages for American industry, and markets for American agriculture.

The third major proposition I desire to call attention to is the fact that even though wars are bitterly fought and tremendously destructive, and even though the number of killed and wounded may number a million or two, peace will ultimately and abruptly return to the world. We all hope for this and we feel confident that it will not come until the major contestants have largely exhausted their military resources. Then, again, literally tens of millions of workers will return to the farms, the forests, the fisheries, the factories; the outside world will be largely bankrupt. These tens of millions will have become accustomed to long hours of labor with very low wages or no wages at all other than the fact that the government feeds and clothes and shelters them. In the meantime, too, foreign countries are being equipped with the very latest and most modern machine tools, power machinery, and all of the improvements of modern times. In the great iron and steel industries, in the great textile industries, in the great glass, china, and

porcelain industries; indeed in all of the great industries of modern times, whether foods, fibers, leather products, or other industrial fields, foreigners are speeding up the installation of the most efficient technical and scientific and mechanical means of production. Thus, with the close of the war, with the most perfect and efficient equipment, with millions of laborers demanding an opportunity to work, and with long hours and meager wages, we must be prepared for a competition from abroad which will be so violent as to have a very early repercussion in the United States.

Here we shall stand a relatively rich country with extremely high standards of living, accustomed to all of the necessities, comforts, and luxuries, but with extremely high costs of production and with high prices and with a world seeking an outlet for their products. In this position we stand with the national administration systematically cutting away the American protective system built up over a century.

I have now briefly discussed three major general considerations. Permit me to turn my attention for a moment to consideration of some of the more important repercussions which we must be prepared to meet. On the one hand, it is perfectly clear that our great volume of war-stimulated exports to the warring nations and to others engaged in preparedness will collapse. On the other hand, it is apparent that we shall face an effort on the part of untold millions of foreign workers trying to dispose of their products in this market. How shall we meet this new situation?

The present administration says we shall meet it by further reducing our tariffs. In other words, that we shall meet it by lowering the flood gates and letting the products come into the American market. It is difficult to see how that line of reasoning could possibly be constructive or helpful to America. First, what effect would it have upon agricultural products. Obviously, if great quantities of farm products are poured into the American market from foreign sources, they will have the effect of depressing prices and displacing the products of our own farms. If farmers think they have had a difficult time during the last decade of world-wide economic depression, they have in prospect ahead of them something so much more serious that it hardly lends itself to description.

Then what about labor in industry? Of course the rabble rouser and free trader immediately say, Let the manufacturers reduce their profits and lower prices to meet the new competition. But manufacturers have been making relatively very little in the way of profits. Indeed, over the last decade profits have been so small and so few and far between that there is no possible way to meet the new competition even if the payment of all dividends were abandoned for a period of years. In the meantime, the national administration piles debt upon debt and deficit upon deficit so that taxes are increased daily. Considering the increasing cost of production and related difficulties daily imposed upon industry, it must be perfectly clear that industrial management cannot face this situation by cutting profits or by attempts to save a few dollars in overhead. Fixed charges already have a strangle hold on many industries.

But if this flood of competition cannot be met by industrial management from savings in overhead items including profits, how then is it to be met?

It would seem that there are only two major alternatives. On the one hand, if domestic prices are held at a level sufficient to cover cost of production, the volume of imports will increase by leaps and bounds because of the lower costs and prices of foreign products, and this means only one thing—it means unemployment in the United States. Then, this alone might create all sorts of serious problems for the National Government and the States and bring about conditions even more serious than those witnessed during the last decade.

But industrial management has had an experience with unemployment and the Nation has had an experience with this same problem, and it is quite conceivable that new approaches would be found more desirable than merely closing factories in order to live on the lower cost and lower price imported products. The other approach would apparently be lowering the standards of living of American wage earners. Obviously, this would start with the 10,000,000 wage earners in American factories. Longer hours, lower wages, and poorer living and working conditions would all stare us in the face. Is American industry and American labor prepared to meet this challenge?

It is well enough to shrug one's shoulders and say that however difficult it might be, we none the less would be forced to meet this foreign competition. The administration still pretends that this could be done in the face of a 50-percent widespread reduction in tariff protection. But longer hours, lower wages, and all of the accompanying distress means something even more than has already been noted. When the great body of wage earners from factories find themselves with longer hours and lower wages, their purchasing power is reduced to the point where all wage earners in every other walk of life are forced to take a similar treatment. The millions of workers in stores, in transportation, in offices, and in all other walks of life must, therefore, be prepared to follow the fate of the 10,000,000 producers of products in American factories.

And the farmers of the United States will find find that they in turn, from this approach to the subject, will face the same disaster. If the 75 percent of the people who do not live on farms are forced to longer hours, lower wages, and other equally unsatisfactory conditions, the American market for American farm products will be destroyed. Prices for farm products will follow the collapse in prices for industrial prices and the wages paid to industrial workers.

It is not my purpose to merely draw a pessimistic picture of possible dangers ahead. It is my purpose to appeal to industrial management and wage earners in the factories of America as well as the farmers and to all other people engaged in all other enterprises to commence to make a realistic study of this situation. Surely, all thinking people must realize that when the millions now engaged in world wars have returned to peace pursuits in a bankrupt condition, they will offer to the one outstanding relatively prosperous nation of the world such a flood of products produced at such low costs as to merit consideration on our part. Surely, whatever administration is placed in control in Washington must be mindful of the necessity for protecting the American market. In the past this protection has largely taken the form of the American tariff system. The present administration says that this tariff system is to be thrown away. It is my judgment that this is one of the most serious mistakes in the whole New Deal program.

In concluding, I think it should be stated that there need be no fear of panic if proper steps are taken during the summer and at the time of the general election early in November. Fortunately, trade agreements do not automatically come into existence. Furthermore, they are not permanent laws which cannot be gotten rid of. All that it is necessary to do at this time is to resolve to get rid of the present administration and the present program. If this is done in November, then a new administration can within a very few months cancel the outstanding trade agreements or make such modifications as time justifies. Beyond that, they can proceed to correct such errors as do exist in the tariff structure by a proper revision to fit American conditions and world conditions which we know will exist at the conclusion of the disastrous wars now raging.

Earlier in this statement I said that because of chaotic world conditions American industry has not yet been seriously damaged. Indeed, because of this fact, the administration has been disposed to ridicule all opposition and ask, "What are you crying about?" "Show us the injury," and so forth. The truth is that, if time permitted, I could very readily give ample illustration of serious injuries already resulting from the program. I am going to take time only to call attention to a small number of illustrations.

The trade agreements with the United Kingdom became effective January 1, 1939. There were only a few months during which results could be measured before the outbreak of the world war. However, we may reasonably compare imports of a few specific commodities with imports during the same months of the preceding years. Thus, taking the first 3 months of 1939, we find imports of 32,422 pounds of worsteds under 4 ounces. This contrasts with an average of 17,240 pounds during the first 3 months of each of the 3 preceding years—1936, 1937, 1938. In other words, imports approximately doubled. And imports have continued since that time. Thus, during the first 3 months of 1940—even though wars were already raging—imports climbed up to 39,065 pounds.

Take the next item on which tariff concessions were made: Worsted over 4 ounces. Average imports during the first 3 months of 1936, 1937, 1938 amounted to 231,119 pounds. In contrast, imports during the first 3 months of 1939 more than doubled, to 549,201 pounds. And the increase continued down through the first 3 months of 1940.

Take the next item: Woolens over 4 ounces. Average imports during the first 3 months of the preceding 3 years were 979,337 pounds. During the same 3-month period of 1939 imports were up fully 50 percent, to 1,358,901 pounds, and this increase continued through the first 3 months of 1940.

I do not wish to load this statement with details with reference to numerous industries. I could cite the experience of the zinc producers, the tens of thousands of workers who produce this important raw material in the mines of America; or I could cite you the experience of the workers in the lace factories, who make the very delicate products so well known in this country, which come from the lace-making industries. Indeed, I could cite you scores of other illustrations. I cite you only this one to show you the character of the problem confronting America, and this pertains to American industry. And this means not merely the industrialist, but the wage earners, and in turn wage earners in all other walks of life, and in turn the operators of our farms and the workers employed by our farm operators.

In conclusion may I not merely call to your attention the application of the signal adopted by the railroads of America at every dangerous crossing, "Stop, Look, and Listen." We must not permit this subject to be carelessly waved aside on the claim that there are more pressing problems now before us. Preparedness is as important in this field as military preparedness. Unless we are prepared on a broad comprehensive front to deal with the problems of America as they arise, we shall face disasters that will shake the very foundations of our economic structure. It will lower the level of the American standard of living to that of the low-wage, low-cost-production countries that will invade our markets. The administration's proposal for a giant cartel is an admission that the trade-agreement program has failed.

Now Comes Hemisphere Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, after pig killing, cattle shooting, plowing under crops, the famous Potato Control Act, now the processing taxes, happily interred by action of the then constituted Supreme Court; then the Bankhead Cotton Control Act that has prostrated the cotton business of the South and encouraged the planting in many new areas in South America and Asia. Then came destructive, so-called reciprocal-trade agreements that curtailed acreage in the United States and opened our markets to low-cost areas in other lands. The ever-normal granary and other catch phrases. Many new bureaus, tens of thousands of new Federal employees to harass and regiment the American farmer. As the many schemes unfold themselves and, one after another, prove failures, one is constrained to remember the remark of Abraham Lincoln when, after the late Alexander Stephens, on meeting him to discuss terms of surrender, shed a long, old-fashioned comforter, several coats, and finally got down to hardpan, Lincoln said, "Did you ever see so many shucks on such a little nubbin?" Mr. Speaker, may we not have an American policy for American farmers? Put their own interests first and an end to these abortive attempts to regulate a score of other countries' interests to the detriment of ours.

TABLE I.—*Losses to farmers during recent years due to socialistic Agricultural Adjustment Administration production control and due to trade agreements*

States	Cash income received by all farmers			Farmers' loss in 1939
	In 1936	In 1937	In 1939	
Alabama	$129,000,000		$85,000,000	$44,000,000
Arizona		$59,000,000	56,000,000	3,000,000
Arkansas		147,000,000	126,000,000	21,000,000
California		688,000,000	553,000,000	135,000,000
Colorado		146,000,000	124,000,000	22,000,000
Connecticut		56,000,000	51,000,000	5,000,000
Delaware	20,000,000		17,000,000	3,000,000
Florida		130,000,000	118,000,000	12,000,000
Georgia	167,000,000		126,000,000	41,000,000
Idaho		106,000,000	88,000,000	18,000,000
Illinois		522,000,000	485,000,000	37,000,000
Indiana		290,000,000	260,000,000	30,000,000
Iowa	560,000,000		590,000,000	
Kansas		310,000,000	241,000,000	69,000,000
Kentucky		167,000,000	139,000,000	28,000,000
Louisiana	130,000,000		113,000,000	17,000,000
Maine		62,000,000	51,000,000	11,000,000
Maryland		75,000,000	65,000,000	10,000,000
Massachusetts		76,000,000	73,000,000	2,000,000
Michigan		246,000,000	216,000,000	30,000,000
Minnesota		362,000,000	333,000,000	29,000,000
Mississippi	190,000,000		133,000,000	57,000,000
Missouri		260,000,000	248,000,000	12,000,000
Montana		85,000,000	84,000,000	1,000,000
Nebraska	278,000,000		219,000,000	59,000,000
Nevada		14,000,000	13,000,000	1,000,000
New Hampshire	22,400,000		20,500,000	1,900,000
New Jersey		100,000,000	99,000,000	1,000,000
New Mexico		52,500,000	52,300,000	200,000
New York		324,000,000	309,000,000	15,000,000
North Carolina		264,000,000	217,000,000	47,000,000
North Dakota		104,200,000	108,800,000	
Ohio		360,000,000	314,000,000	46,000,000
Oklahoma		185,000,000	167,000,000	18,000,000
Oregon		120,000,000	102,000,000	18,000,000
Pennsylvania		286,000,000	264,000,000	22,000,000
Rhode Island		10,200,000	9,900,000	300,000
South Carolina		109,000,000	94,000,000	15,000,000
South Dakota	112,000,000		101,000,000	11,000,000
Tennessee		137,000,000	115,000,000	12,000,000
Texas		599,000,000	442,000,000	157,000,000
Utah		49,000,000	44,000,000	45,000,000
Vermont		38,400,000	40,100,000	
Virginia		130,000,000	113,000,000	17,000,000
Washington State		164,000,000	140,000,000	24,000,000
West Virginia		44,000,000	39,000,000	5,000,000
Wisconsin		325,000,000	266,000,000	59,000,000
Wyoming		49,000,000	45,000,000	4,000,000

Source of statistics: The American Good Government Review, a nonpartisan, patriotic publication of the American Good Government Society of Washington, D. C. Data based upon U. S. Dept. of Agriculture's "Crops and Markets," vol. 17, No. 1. Income figures are for all crops, livestock, and livestock products sold, but do not include Government payments to farmers.

TABLE II.—*Farmers lose on most crops under more Agricultural Adjustment Administration socialism and more reciprocal-trade agreements*

Crops, livestock, and livestock products	Cash income received by all United States farmers		Farmers' loss in 1939
	In 1937	In 1939	
Meat animals	$2,329,000,000	$2,262,000,000	$67,000,000
Poultry and eggs	832,000,000	722,000,000	110,000,000
Dairy products	1,532,000,000	1,354,000,000	178,000,000
Wool	117,000,000	85,000,000	32,000,000
Other livestock items	56,000,000	49,000,000	7,000,000
Corn	224,000,000	326,000,000	

TABLE II.—*Farmers lose on most crops under more Agricultural Adjustment Administration socialism and more reciprocal-trade agreements*—Continued

Crops, livestock, and livestock products	Cash income received by all United States farmers		Farmers' loss in 1939
	In 1937	In 1939	
Wheat	$605,000,000	$397,000,000	$208,000,000
Oats	67,000,000	45,000,000	22,000,000
Barley	43,000,000	37,000,000	6,000,000
Rye	20,000,000	9,000,000	11,000,000
Buckwheat	1,950,000	1,370,000	580,000
Flaxseed	13,000,000	24,000,000	----------
Rice	33,000,000	33,000,000	----------
Grain sorghums	8,300,000	5,500,000	2,800,000
Cotton lint	770,000,000	525,000,000	245,000,000
Cottonseed	113,000,000	83,000,000	30,000,000
Tobacco	321,000,000	264,000,000	57,000,000
Dry edible beans	48,000,000	37,000,000	11,000,000
Potatoes	184,000,000	157,000,000	27,000,000
Sweetpotatoes	24,000,000	21,000,000	3,000,000
Truck crops	389,000,000	367,000,000	22,000,000
Citrus fruits	148,000,000	100,000,000	48,000,000
Apples	110,000,000	98,000,000	12,000,000
Peaches	50,000,000	41,000,000	9,000,000
Pears	16,900,000	15,400,000	1,500,000
Cherries	12,400,000	9,100,000	3,300,000
Grapes	55,000,000	38,000,000	17,000,000
Strawberries	43,000,000	39,000,000	4,000,000
Cranberries	7,600,000	6,900,000	700,000
Tree nuts	21,100,000	18,900,000	2,200,000
Miscellaneous berries	13,600,000	11,000,000	2,600,000
Other fruit items	42,000,000	37,000,000	5,000,000
Sugarcane for sugar	17,400,000	16,500,000	900,000
Sugar beets	51,800,000	50,500,000	1,300,000
Sugarcane sirup	6,571,000	6,497,000	74,000
Sorgo sirup	3,900,000	3,400,000	500,000
Maple sugar and sirup	4,000,000	4,000,000	----------
Hay	96,000,000	65,000,000	31,000,000
Clover seed (red and alsike)	11,000,000	15,000,000	----------
Sweetclover seed	2,160,000	2,030,000	130,000
Lespedeza seed	4,000,000	5,600,000	----------
Alfalfa seed	12,160,000	11,980,000	180,000
Timothy seed	2,700,000	2,000,000	700,000
Soybeans	30,800,000	49,700,000	----------
Cowpeas	5,800,000	5,700,000	100,000
Peanuts	38,000,000	34,000,000	4,000,000
Hops	6,400,000	8,800,000	----------
Miscellaneous	202,000,000	211,000,000	----------

Source of statistics: The American Good Government Review, published by the American Good Government Society, a nonpartisan, patriotic organization, of Washington, D. C. Two middle columns derived from U. S. Department of Agriculture's Crops and Markets, vol. 17, No. 1. Data are totals received in all 48 States by farmers for the items listed, but do not include Government payments to farmers.

Loyalty of Americans of Italian Ancestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN AND AN ADDRESS BY HON. A. A. BERLE, JR.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and editorial from the Baltimore Sun and an address by the Assistant Secretary of State:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 18, 1940]

ITALIANS IN UNITED STATES WILL BE LOYAL, NEW YORK MAYOR SAYS—LAGUARDIA ASSERTS THEY ARE OPPOSED TO "CRUEL PHILOSOPHIES"—A. A. BERLE ASKS THEM TO MAKE POSITION CLEAR TO OUTSIDE WORLD

In a fiery speech constantly punctuated with applause and yells of approval, Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, last night told more than 600 Baltimore Italian-Americans that citizens of their common ancestry as loyal Americans are united in opposition to the "cruel philosophies of totalitarian states."

"Nothing must take place in this country," he said in his address in the Lord Baltimore Hotel sponsored by Italian-American business and professional men, "that would have even the remotest semblance of division.

WANTS NO DOUBT

"I want to appeal to the whole country that there be not one scintilla of doubt against any citizen of Italian blood."

Preceding the mayor, A. A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, asked for the help of "all Americans of Italian ancestry in the United States * * * in making it clear to every outside element in the world that Americans are undividedly loyal to the United States."

He asked that Americans demonstrate that "this loyalty does not differ in the least because the names may be Italian or English, or German or Irish, or French or Polish, or Scandinavian. * * * I am glad to salute this group of Americans of Italian ancestry and name as one of the bulwarks of the essential unity of the United States, which no power on earth can tear apart."

SAYS FRENCH SPIRIT LIVES

Referring briefly to the defeat of the French armies, Mayor LaGuardia said the "territory of a happy country may have been conquered, but the spirit of the French people has not and never will be conquered.

"No one can tell me that the Italian people will forget 'Ave Maria' to say 'Ave Hitler.' No one can tell me that the Italian people, with music in their hearts and beauty in their souls, were ever made to goosestep in back of any dictator."

CITES ITALIAN SETTLERS

"The blood and sweat of the Italian people helped build this country," the New York mayor said, pounding a table, "and we want everyone to know that we are one family together with our sister republics in this hemisphere, and that we all say 'hands off' to all dictators.

"I know that the honor and safety and security of American people are safe in the hands of President Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Mayor LaGuardia was introduced by Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, whose district includes the city's "Little Italy." The visiting executive was welcomed to the State by Governor O'Conor, and to the city by Mayor Jackson and Richard C. O'Connell, president of the city council.

WANT TO BE LOYAL

"It is not necessary," Mayor LaGuardia said, "for descendants of Italians to proclaim their loyalty to our country. We are loyal to this country because we want to be loyal. We are part of every bit of growth and development of this great Republic.

"I know I speak for every one of you, for we have contributed our share in making this country the greatest country on the face of the earth. In a speech the other day I said that I could vouch for 99.99 percent of the Italians in New York. And that one one-hundredth of 1 percent we have indexed and cataloged.

REALIZES RESPONSIBILITIES

"We are in the midst of a great world crisis. We realize fully the responsibilities that it brings to us. What I know of European conditions I learned first as a representative of this country in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. And I learned a lot about Italians when we were fighting a common enemy more than 20 years ago. Today it is the same enemy, the enemy of progress and freedom and liberty."

Turning toward the Assistant Secretary of State and Mrs. Berle, Mayor LaGuardia remarked that her forefathers came over on the *Mayflower* and that Mr. Berle came over on the *Half Moon*.

"But our people," the diminutive mayor said, to the immense delight of the audience, "came over on the *Santa Maria*."

CITES RAILROAD TIES

"We took a great part in the making of America," he continued. "Travel over the great railroads across the western plains and look at the ties. Every one of them was put down with the sweat and blood of Italian citizens. Go to the coal mines, and you will find that the fuel is brought from the bowels of the earth by Italians. * * *

"Look at the beautiful landscaping of flowers, and it was done by some Italian. Go to the Capitol and look at the fresco in the rotunda. An Italian did the work. Listen to the United States Marine Band, and you will hear musicians who came from the island of Sicily.

"These hard-working immigrants gave their all to the building of this country. They belonged here. Yes; they were exploited. They suffered hardships. Why? Because here in this country they saw possibility and hope for their children—you and me—who now take part in the Government itself.

"* * * I don't believe there is any division of thought by clear-thinking people in the world on the division of Europe. No one can accept the cruelty of this philosophy that invades happy homes. * * * The Italian people haven't changed in the last 20 years. They still have the love of life, love of home, love of family.* * *"

WARNS OF DIVISION

He warned the Italians in this country that there should be no semblage of division of loyalty lest the "cruel leaders of Europe have misapprehensions."

"What makes the Germans strong?" he asked. "Is it tanks? No. Airplanes? No. It is the unity of the German people. There is a policy of hatred by destroying minorities, by murdering objectors, by destroying peace-loving men and women.

"In this country we have mutual respect for one another, but in moments of crisis, such as now, we must marshal all forces; we must subordinate private opinion for the good of the country.

CAN MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS

"That is where you and I can make contributions not only to our own country, but perhaps another contribution. Perhaps it will be our lot to demonstrate that a great race that has contributed so much in beauty and in art and inspired self-government and liberty, that has put its blood into America, can be free men and women and live in peace and harmony to enjoy the blessings of peace and liberty.

"Here is the land that bears the name of one Italian navigator. whose symbol is Columbia, named for another. America stands as the hope of the entire world, come what may."

PRAISES ITALIANS HERE

After praising the part Italians have played in Maryland, Governor O'Conor warned that this is no time "for division of opinion based upon any other foundation than the country's best good.

"My 20 years of experience in the public life of this State with Italian-Americans has given me the opportunity to know of their devotion to this country and their adherence to its ideals and principles. I can vouch for their complete and undivided loyalty and support in any cause affecting the interests of this Nation."

PASS RESOLUTION

By acclamation the audience passed a resolution introduced by Dr. Frank C. Marino and seconded by Vincent L. Palmisano, which said in part:

"*Resolved,* That we, the Italian-American men and women of Baltimore, pledge our full strength and cooperation in the fulfillment of a proper and adequate national-defense program; and we urge all people in the United States who have found a new way of living under the American system of government and who are now a part of the industrial, commercial, agricultural, financial, and general economic and social life of the United States, to proclaim and reaffirm allegiance to our flag, and to cooperate loyally with the President and Congress of the United States in upholding the Constitution under which we are governed and under which the ideals of life and liberty are guaranteed and protected."

ADDRESS BY HON. A. A. BERLE, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, AT THE DINNER OF THE ITALIAN BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL MEN'S COMMITTEE, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 17, 1940

The great glory of the United States has been its ability to make a Nation out of many elements. To do this, we have followed a course entirely different from those which once were customary in great countries. We have not suppressed the different inheritances of different races; rather, we have gloried in them. We have not asked immigrants coming to our shores to forget the cultural traditions of the countries from which they came. Instead, we have asked that they bring into this country the best of their inheritance. As a result we do not have here, and God willing, we shall never have race enmities, race hatreds, or race groups. We are all Americans, whatever our ancestry.

One of the groups on which the United States has come to rely with particular affection and respect is the group of Americans who are sprung from Italian stock. They figure today in many of the most important posts in our national life. Some of the most important positions of public honor and trust are held by these men, as is witnessed by the presence here of Congressman D'ALESANDRO, and of Mayor LaGuardia; of Mayor Rossi, in San Francisco, and Mayor Maestri, in New Orleans. They stand high on our university faculties, and in the life of our business communities.

The United States now has to face a new technique of international friction. Attempts are sometimes made to develop, within this country, race groups and race hatreds. With it usually goes the attempt to mobilize groups of people for foreign political purposes. I need hardly tell you that activity of that kind when it proceeds from foreign sources or follows foreign guidance, is directly opposed to the American ideal. You know, better than I, that if anyone tried to get up a race group here to act on orders from overseas, he would not be serving the interests of any American.

I want to ask your help, and the help of all Americans of Italian ancestry in the United States, and indeed the help of all groups who have, and are proud of, a common-race background. I want you to help in making it clear to every outside element in the world that Americans are undividedly loyal to the United States; and that this loyalty does not differ in the least because the names may be Italian, or English, or German, or Irish, or French, or Polish, or Scandinavian.

We in this country know that these groups are loyal Americans. We know they came here to become Americans; and we are proud of the things they have done. In this country we need no assurances of loyalty.

It is perfectly clear that anyone who thinks Americans can be detached from America, or tricked into "fifth columns" because they are supposed to have some particular race background, does not know America.

The United States exists because wave after wave of immigration came to settle the country. They had been caught in a system overseas which forced them to hate each other; here they are friends. Abroad, their blood and their children's blood had been spilled in fighting each other, from generation to generation; here the children intermarry, and families live side by side in decent human peace. On the American seal it is written, "Out of many we are one." Mayor LaGuardia, one of the great leaders in the country, is to speak to you tonight, and particularly to Americans of Italian background. In his presence I am glad to salute this group of Americans, of Italian ancestry and name, as one of the bulwarks of the etssential unity of the United States, which no power on earth can tear apart.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 19, 1940]

MR. LAGUARDIA RESTATES THE IDEA OF AMERICA

Mayor LaGuardia put the American idea into about as few words as has often been managed at the Italian dinner Monday evening. Guests of the evening included the Assistant Secretary of State, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., and Mrs. Berle. Mrs. Berle's people (the Bishops) came over on Captain Jones' *Mayflower*, the mayor insisted, Mr. Berle's, on Captain Hudson's *Half Moon*—"but our people came over on (Captain Columbus') *Santa Maria*."

There are, to be sure, differences in the dates when various groups of pioneers first reached these shores. The Italians were among the first and among the last; the Dutch and the English got here about the same time, the English in the largest numbers. The Germans began coming in numbers in the first quarter of the nineteenth century in as fine a single contribution as we have had from any source. The Irish began to arrive at about the same time, and the Scandinavians, Poles, Lithuanians, and a dozen others have come in more recent times.

Moreover, individuals of all races have come before and after the major migrations from their original homes. And, individual or mass migrants, they and their children are now all as American as the Cabots and O'Raffertys, of Boston; or the Carrolls and LaGuardias, of New York and Baltimore. What Baltimore Americans of Italian extraction proclaim at a formal dinner they have already proclaimed in our industry, our business, our art, and our culture. We have known these things all along; but it does us good to be reminded all over again in darkening times.

Lindbergh and the Post-Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, since wide circulation has been given to an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 11, and because of the high standing throughout this country enjoyed by this great newspaper, I believe that it is timely as well as relevant, since the Post-Dispatch editorial "To the Brink" has by leave been reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to present to the Congress and the country at large, through this medium, another expression of representative public opinion in these times of stress presented by another great St. Louis newspaper, the St. Louis Star-Times. As between these two editorial opinions there lies a choice to be made by the people of this country in the light of the course of events. The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

LINDBERGH AND THE POST-DISPATCH

This Nation of some 131,000,000 people is facing perhaps the greatest crisis encountered in the century and a half of its existence. The fact that the crisis is approaching down the street instead of being right on top of us does not lessen its magnitude or ominous character.

To prepare to meet that crisis by combat or to turn it aside by preparations so adequate as to discourage would-be aggressors is the task before the Nation today. To meet that task the duly elected President of the United States, in consultation with diplomatic, military, naval, and civilian advisers, has charted a course.

In the main the rank and file of the people and the leading business and political leaders of the Nation, regardless of party, are behind President Roosevelt's leadership during this period of peril.

But a few powerful obstructionist forces have arisen to question the correctness of the President's policies and to discredit his leadership. Among them are Col. Charles Augustus Lindbergh and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Air-Mail Pilot Lindbergh's feat in successfully spanning the Atlantic has made him a top man in the news and insures readers and listeners for his every word. But this feat does not necessarily qualify him as an expert in foreign relations, preparation for war, or, in fact, anything except long-distance piloting of an airplane.

Yet because of his publicity value and access to a microphone, he can indulge in a series of public pronouncements to the general effect that President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Chief of Staff General Marshall, Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Stark, and countless other Presidential advisers do not know what they are talking about and that he knows all the right answers, one of which is that it makes no difference to the United States whether Hitler or the Allies win in Europe.

The position of the Post-Dispatch is still more extraordinary. Here is a newspaper which blandly assumes that its impassioned assaults on Mr. Roosevelt's Charlottesville speech last week represent public opinion in this region. The President took us "to the brink," it says. The President "exposed his hand," it goes on 3 days later, citing the response the first editorial evoked, and "the people * * * are answering him through the Post-Dispatch."

A modest claim, indeed. There appears in the Post-Dispatch no slight doubt of its own omniscient wisdom in correctly interpreting the President's mind. There appears no doubt of its wisdom in deciding that this country need not feel apprehension about the conquest of Europe by Nazi arms and the explosive revolutionary doctrines of Hitler. There appears, even, no glimmering suspicion that an eight-to-one favorable response from some of its own readers might not represent a fair cross section of opinion in this region about Mr. Roosevelt's policy.

To propagate its opposition to the President, the Post-Dispatch goes beyond the normal processes of a newspaper. It has furnished all Members of Congress with copies of its editorial efforts. It attempts to create, in effect, a second editorial voice through the use of radio—reading over its own station the text or sections of its utterances—a practice, which, to say the least, is unusual.

The Post-Dispatch, in seeking to sustain its suspicions of the President, even accuses Mr. Roosevelt of aping Mussolini, working up "a war fever without permitting the * * * people to express their true convictions." Yet at the same time it is using every instrument at its command—freely and openly, without let or hindrance, under the guaranties of the Constitution—to express its own convictions and to allow readers to express their convictions. A more extreme distortion of the President's actions would be impossible.

What are the facts about the Charlottesville speech which has caused the Post-Dispatch to assail Mr. Roosevelt with such language as "reckless, jingoistic President," "insane half-war stuff," and "oratory is about all Roosevelt has got"?

The speech was made, quite evidently, in the knowledge that the French Army was at the point of capitulation. Mr. Roosevelt, unable to speak openly of this fact, did the next best thing—promised the Allies economic assistance in language so clear and forthright that, if there was any hope of salvaging their defenses, the French Government would be encouraged to go on.

This was not a change of front. It was a reassertion of the policy of economic aid which he repeatedly has championed ever since war broke out, which has been overwhelmingly endorsed by public opinion in every scientific sampling poll, which was implicitly ratified by Congress when it repealed the arms embargo for the specific purpose of letting Britain and France tap the resources of American production.

The Star-Times believes that Mr. Roosevelt was right in this Charlottesville speech and that, in advocating aid to the democratic powers, he has continually been right.

The isolationists—that band of Senators and journalists who have obstructed and largely frustrated his efforts—are themselves the real menace to our peace and security. If ever this Nation is forced into war with Nazi Germany, it will be their responsibility.

They made us move hesitantly, half-heartedly, while Hitler built his military machine and then overran Europe. They played on the people's hatred of war to weaken the President's leadership and make it more difficult for him to buttress the Allies with our economic strength.

And now, when the fateful future is upon us, when the world is cracking, when only Britain stands between Hitler and the Western Hemisphere, they rage and fume that the President is taking us "to the brink." Anyone but a fool senses the tremendous changes we shall have to accept to cope with a totalitarian Europe. But our isolation mongers tell us still that we need not fear the Fuehrer, and heap upon the President—our responsible leader—abuse and mockery.

This is the dreadful self-deception, the underestimation of Hitler, through which Chamberlain and Daladier betrayed European democracy. This, if it should be believed by the people, is the American Munich.

Happily, there is little evidence that it is believed. The Star-Times is persuaded that the Post-Dispatch is not, as it claims to be, a chosen instrument through which the people of this region will obstruct the President. The Star-Times believes that the great majority of the people, along with this newspaper, support Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy.

Our America and Our Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, with France finally compelled to surrender after making a valiant fight against great odds, and with the United States pledged by President Roosevelt to support the Allied cause to the fullest possible extent, the position of this country has been made even more hazardous by the occurrence of the past few days. However universal may be the sympathies of the American people toward Great Britain and France in the war now being fought against Germany and Italy, I find from receiving word from my people that they do not approve the idea that President Roosevelt should be vested with authority to plunge the United States into that conflict. It has been the hope of a vast majority of Americans that this country could remain neutral and would not be involved in European affairs.

We Americans are devoted to the ideals of peace. This is our America, our democracy, ours to govern, ours to advance, ours to perfect, and ours to make more glorious. Every American has a solemn and lofty duty laid upon him—a duty in proportion to his ability, his resources, and his intellect. This is our America. If it is to remain our America we must stamp out the "fifth column" and all the other foreign "isms" which seek to undermine things American. We must not tolerate the espionage or sabotage of foreign agents, nor the treachery of any domestic group.

We do not want war. We have never drawn the sword except to vindicate the violation of sacred rights. We want to lead our own life and attain our national destiny without foreign aggression or involvement. Neither do we covet the territory nor the riches of any other land. We do not want entangling alliances with foreign nations. Neither do we propose to be the victim of foreign aggression or conquest. We do not want a foot of foreign territory, not a mile of any country under the sun, but, by the same token, we will not give up a single inch of American territory to any aggressor on the face of the earth.

The American people and the American Government want peace. We pray that the United States may not be dragged into a war anywhere on the globe. Our flag is the flag of peace, freedom, and international good will. It is the emblem of a free, liberty-loving, and peace-loving people. There cannot be peace except in armed defense. We shall arm, not for war, but for peace. Let us say to any power on earth who challenges our security or threatens our safety, "We want no war with you, but if you challenge our institutions or attack our territory we shall resist on the sea and under the sea, on the land and above the land, with a navy, with an army, and with an air force unconquerable and irresistible."

The Constitution gives Congress the sole power to declare war, but the Chief Executive, so disposed, is in a position to make a dangerous approach to such declaration, as was done by President Roosevelt in his speech at Charlottesville, Va., a few days ago. The President, who has requested for himself nearly all of the prerogatives of Congress short of declaring war, who already has asked authority to mobilize the National Guard and the Army and Navy Reserves, would have Congress immediately adjourn.

I am of the firm conviction that with the European situation as it now is and as it is likely to be during the next few weeks, it seems important that every Congressman should stay on the job, through the entire summer if necessary, instead of leaving one man in charge. It is my firm convic-

tion that it is the duty of Congress to remain in session during this crisis so as to be in instant readiness to perform the duties placed upon it by the Constitution. Any other course would be a serious neglect of the Nation's vital interests.

I Love America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. ARNAUD C. MARTS, PRESIDENT OF BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following baccalaureate address to the 1940 graduating class of Bucknell University by Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, president of Bucknell:

Members of the class of 1940, you have had to listen to me many times since that September evening in 1936 when I first faced you in the Vaughan Literature Auditorium. You were the first freshman class I welcomed on arrival, and I can still recall your vibrant, eager, almost electric expectancy as you poised that evening on the threshold of your college experiences. Now, this morning we approach the parting of the ways. A perfect flood of ideas wells up within me on this occasion, things that I might say at this moment of parting. Most of them I must leave unsaid, for the time is short. The next few moments seem very sacred to me, and I shall choose my thoughts and my words most carefully. You may be sure that what I shall say to you now will be said in the full consciousness that this is my last opportunity to make any contribution to your Bucknell education.

You entered Bucknell at a time when you and we believed that this generation of civilized mankind, would live together in peace and decency, and that you could devote yourselves to the arts of peace. Now, as you leave, you find yourselves in a world of awful war.

I shall not harrow your emotions by describing this shameful tragedy which the greed of a relatively few men has brought crashing down on the heads of hundreds of millions of men and women who wanted to live in peace and brotherhood. We can only say with Caesar as he stood on a battlefield where 80,000 dead lay, after his battle with Pompey. Caesar had not wanted that battle, but had been forced to it by Pompey. "Alas," said Caesar, as he surveyed the awful shambles, "he would have it so."

Certain men, whose coarseness of spirit we simply cannot comprehend, "would have it so" with our bright world. We must face it as it is, and rededicate our whole strength and ardor to making it a better world in our day. It is not the first time in the history of the race that brave men and women have had to face the collapse of their dreams. Let us repeat those magnificent words uttered by Horace centuries ago, "Though the great world be overthrown, let us still be undismayed." Abraham Lincoln said, at a time of great danger, "This, too, will pass."

Robert Brown sang of the same eternal hope and faith in these words:

> "If I stoop
> Into a dark tremendous sea of cloud,
> It is but for a time; I press God's lamp
> Close to my breast; its splendor soon or late
> Will pierce the gloom; I shall emerge some day."

As I come to these final words to you, I choose to speak to you of a strong, eternal inner strength which will enable you to withstand and prevail. I have called this message "The Fifth Column," because the term has come to signify a mysterious weakness and treachery from within.

The term first came into use 3 years ago when General Franco was marching on Madrid. He is reported to have said, "My army consists of four columns marching upon the city from four directions, and a fifth column of internal weakness which will betray and crumple the city from within."

What has the "fifth column" to do with what I want to say to you? Simply this: There is a "fifth column" which can betray an individual, just as surely as there is one which can betray a nation. The individual's "fifth column" is his lack of a great and eternal faith, his cynicism toward moral issues, his confusion regarding everlasting values, his moral and spiritual flabbiness.

It is no picnic or circus that lies ahead of us. Neither is there any reason for panic or fright. It is to be one of the most challenging eras in the history of the human race. All of us are beginning to comprehend this dimly, "as through a glass darkly," and are beginning to take inventory of our spiritual resources for this titanic struggle ahead. It is to be an elemental contest in the long run, an endurance test which, after machines have done their horrible worst, will be decided in the end by the sheer strength of moral character, unselfish courage, and of a sublime faith in life's noblest values.

In this time of inventory and testing, our people are yearning and hungering for these basic virtues. All over the land men and women, one by one, are tearing away the shams, rejecting falsehoods, casting aside the tinsel and crying in their souls, "Give us truth and sincerity and honor." We must destroy this "fifth column" of inner weakness before it destroys us.

During all our 4 years together my chief concern about you has been at this point, because I am well acquainted with the world which you are now entering, and know all too well the weaknesses and cynicisms that are sapping the strength and thwarting the lives of millions who are living without strong faith and high idealism. I have seen cynicism weaken the past two generations of American youth. I have seen cynicism and cruel faithlessness utterly destroy the youth of two great nations. I have tried to save you from this cynicism and flabbiness and failure by upholding before you, as strongly as I knew how, high idealism and an unshakable faith in a better world.

During your lifetime you have been subjected to a bombardment of bitter cynicism which utterly befuddled many youths of your generation. Some of our most brilliant novelists of the present day have made cynicism their profession, a highly paid vocation of bitter words and half truths and scornful judgments. For pay, they have sold a whole generation of youth down the river into a slavery of bitterness, cynicism, and confusion.

Now, under the shock of today's tragedies, this shallow mood is challenged, and many of the bright young scoffers are changing their tune.

One of them, now the honored Librarian of Congress, recently made public confession of the cynical tricks they had played on the lives of your generation of youth in these words: "The post-war writers, of whom I was one, who educated a generation to suspect the tags, the slogans, and even the words, left that generation defenseless before an aggressor whose whole strength consists in destroying respect for law, respect for morality, respect for the Word."

Many of the Nation's teachers joined in this cult of cynicism also. Their original purpose was probably a sound educational one—to break down the smug satisfaction most young students have in a very little knowledge, and to make an honest doubt the cornerstone of a wider knowledge. But too many of our teachers in America in recent years (not at Bucknell, I am proud to say) have used all of their zeal in tearing down immature faiths and have shown no zeal or capacity to inspire their students to reconstruct a mature and genuine faith in the great values which have been proved over and over again in the past 10,000 years of the race's quest for truth and stability.

Dorothy Thompson has recently written: "Our universities have been given over for years now to a philosophy of historic relativism, under which there are no absolute standards for anything. It takes a very strong human being to live in a world where there is no right or wrong, no God in the sky, no rules that everybody must obey, but where everything is relative. Most people completely lose their bearings in such a universe."

Walter Lippmann has added, "This tragic ordeal has come about because men thought it clever to be cynical, and enlightened to be unbelieving, and sensible to be soft."

You have probably not been aware of it, but my whole purpose in trying to serve Bucknell has been to help you at this point of your greatest need and maximum danger. I have done all I have known how to do as your leader, by word and by example, to give you faith in life's noblest and eternal values, to save you from the mass betrayal of cynicism, cheapness, and softness. Now, at the end, I cannot let you face this world without once more giving you my last solemn testament that there are a few great faiths worthy of your everlasting trust:

First. The first great faith, in which you can believe with all your hearts, is American democracy. Modern cynicism has made it extremely unpopular to express a love for America. One who does may be called a Babbitt, or a Rotarian, or a Hundred Percenter. It has been part of the pattern of our recent superficial living to laugh at those who profess a love for America. How often have you heard someone say, "Maybe the Russians have something," or "I guess we need a Mussolini here," or "I'd like to see Hitler turned loose in New York."

At a recent meeting in Indiana of representatives of over 200 colleges and universities, one college president made this report: "There are plenty of people in the schools of America who believe America is not worth saving."

As for me, if America is not worth saving, then there is no known society worth saving. What has communism done for Russia that we should feel anything but abhorrence for it? What has national socialism done for Germany that we should have any feeling except loathing for it? As I look at the tragedies in other lands brought by these weird experiments, I feel toward America as did the man who landed in Baltimore recently after a year in Germany and fell to his knees and kissed the dirt of this Nation.

You members of the class of 1940 have never seen America at its best. About the time you were born, the real America of long, happy tradition underwent a change, from which it has not yet recovered. It has been a sick America during all your lifetime, to date. The pre-World War America of personal integrity, of social modesty and dignity, of humanitarian zeal, of happy family life, of quiet enthusiasm for cultural and intellectual values, of simple religious faith, of ambition and confidence in the future—this was the true America which you have never known. One form of national illness in the 1920's brought on another form of national illness in the 1930's, and in your 20 years of life you have not yet experienced a well America. Some day you will, I hope and believe. But even with our national illness and our obvious shortcomings, America represents the highest stage of human and social happiness on this planet, worthy of our love and faith and loyalty. America sick is a nobler land than any well nation that I know. Here in our Nation lies the very hope of civilization itself. Do not let a "fifth column" of doubt about America betray you into withholding your uttermost devotion to it.

When I came to Bucknell 4½ years ago there were many needs clamoring for action. It was obvious that I would have to ask many friends for many gifts for many purposes. The very first thing I asked for was an American flag that I could stand on the platform on occasions like this. An alumnus of Bucknell responded to my request and bought this beautiful flag—the finest he could find. It was the first gift to Bucknell under my leadership.

When Old Main was rebuilt I instructed the architect to provide a place for the flag over the center of Roberts Hall. On the first day we moved into the Roberts Hall I took an American flag in my hands, climbed the ladder up through the trap-door which leads onto the roof, and personally broke out the flag on the halyard, and gave instructions that the flag should fly there every clear day.

I love America.

The second eternal faith which you can embrace with all your hearts is a faith in a living and loving God, Creator and Father of a moral universe.

"What!" you cry. "Believe in a living and loving God in this day; Creator of a moral universe; believe in that, now?" Yes, believe in that now, more firmly and unshakably than ever before. If this present world tragedy can teach us anything at all, it is to put more faith rather than less in the great God of a moral universe.

Perhaps I am not talking about the same kind of God of whom you are thinking. Some are saying, "There just can't be a living God, or He would stop this war." Others' idea of God is someone to pray to to stop a headache. Still others plead to God to save them from the sorrow of the death of a loved one. Some ask God to send rain when their cornfields need it, or to send the sun on spring festival and homecoming days. Some want God to help them in examinations. The little 6-year-old boy ended his evening bedside prayer with this petition, "Now, God, please bring me my pajamas which are hanging in the clothes closet."

I am not asking you to have faith in that kind of a God. The God in whom I ask you to believe is not a nursemaid, nor a substitute for an aspirin tablet, nor a rain maker, nor a tutor, nor a professional hostess whose duty is to make the customers feel happy all the time.

I do ask you to put your eternal faith in a majestic God, who is operating this world on moral laws which are just as exacting and precise and observable as are the physical laws on which the universe operates on schedule time day after day, year after year, century after century, age after age, without deviation and without default. The same great Mind that created these precise physical laws created equally precise moral laws. The very core of the moral law is "Love thy neighbor as thyself." It is as silly of us to disobey that basic moral law as it would be to disobey the basic physical law of gravity.

Don't lose your faith in God, because when men disobey His great majestic rules of the universe they bring suffering upon themselves. That would be a queer perversion of logic. On the other hand, can you imagine the grace and beauty of this human world if all men would obey this law of neighborly love simultaneously?

Put your faith in Him openly against the cynics. Bow your head to His will; submit your life to His law of unselfishness; worship Him on Sunday and every day; believe evermore in His plan for brotherhood. Soon you will feel a new zest, a new power, a new sense of dignity, of values, of eagerness to live and lift and serve. For you will be hooking up your life to the cosmic high-tension lines of the universe, through which flow the everlasting powers of creative life itself. There can be no "fifth column" of doubt, of cynicism, of befuddlement in the heart and mind of a person who has made dynamic contact with the living and loving God. That person knows the meaning of life. The lives of millions of people, including my own, have been transformed, quickened, electrified by making this contact with the eternal God of majesty, of moral law, and of tender love.

If there are any among you who sincerely want to make contact with such a God and cannot seem to do it, if you will get in touch with me I will try to help you.

Third. You may have faith that there is a right and a wrong in human affairs, and that in the long run the right will prevail. Civilization is a constant contest between right and wrong; a see-saw battle in which first one then the other triumphs for the time being. Evil is enthroned now, to be sure, for its brief day of glory. I may never see the world forces of right prevail again in my lifetime, but you will in yours. "God does not pay every Saturday night," goes a French proverb. But He pays eventually, in His own time and in His own coin.

This evil is now enthroned, but it has millions of unwilling subjects. I predict a most uncomfortable reign for it, and I prophesy that you, in your day, will see right enthroned again—provided you will banish any "fifth column" of doubt that there is no difference between right and wrong.

Recently we have seen a befuddled young king make a most difficult moral decision at a time of terrific stress. When the country his father had defended was invaded, he asked help from his neighbors. Eighteen days later, when 300,000 of his neighbors had responded and were fighting on his soil, he laid down his arms and left them alone to their fate. It is not for us to judge him; history will do that over the long, impersonal perspective of time. But we can learn a lesson from his tragedy. His real tragedy was at a moment 4 years before, during days of peace and relative tranquillity, when he canceled the treaty his rugged father had written in blood with his democratic neighbors. This young king could not see any difference between democracy and despotism, between decency and evil, between a right and a wrong. This confusion of moral values in time of peace became a "fifth column" of weakness which betrayed him in time of stress.

You will not be called on to make any such decision as he had to make. But your decisions will mean as much to your own happiness and usefulness as his did to him. Whenever you rationalize as right what you know to be wrong, whenever you surrender your decency and your honesty because someone has discovered smooth ways in which you can be indecent and dishonest, you are creating within your personality a "fifth column" that will eventually betray you.

The historian Froude has described a group of men and women—the Calvinists of the past three centuries, who had abiding faith in the right as they understood it, and whose strong convictions laid the foundations of our civilization on this continent—in these words: "When all else has failed; when patriotism has covered its face; when human courage has broken down; when intellect has yielded; when emotion and sentiment have dreamt themselves into forgetfulness that there is any difference between lies and truth, the form of belief called Calvinism has borne ever an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to melt before enervating temptation."

Never have we so desperately needed a generation of intelligent young men and women with an undying faith in right versus wrong as we now need you. And never has a generation of youth so much needed, for its own soul's good, to gamble its all that there is a difference between right and wrong; and that it will rather be ground to powder like flint than to lower its high ideals of right. There is a black and there is a white in human conduct. There is a wrong and there is a right. When everything is gray, neither wrong nor right, the "fifth column" has moved in and will betray you. I hope and believe that you will put your faith in the right as you understand it, and gamble your life on it, win or lose.

Fourth. Put you faith also in these arts of peace which you have learned at Bucknell, these enthusiasms for wholesome, creative expressions such as music, literature, sport, science, art, and the like which enrich and ennoble human life. Keep these interests and cultivate them as your hobbies. There may be hard external times ahead, but no matter—if you can carry these cultural nourishments in your minds and souls. "Man shall not live by bread alone." You know how to fill your knapsacks with food that will never perish, except by your own neglect.

"If, between dawn and darkness, you can find
Somewhere, some secret loveliness to lie
Cool on the heart, some attribute of sky,
Hushing the vicious wheeling of the mind;
Some attribute of earth—a willow-frond,
Lifted by wind; three snow-white birches bowed
Over a pool; a shell, a stone, a cloud—
You will have found the rainbow's pot of gold;
Wise men, since earth was very young, would give
Kingdoms for such. Nothing betrays them—cold,
Nor heat, nor storm. Possess them while you live;
Then, dying, test them from the closer range,
Change within substance defying change."

—*John Williams Andrews.*

Finally, have faith in your children. In the years ahead many of you will become mothers and fathers of little children, whose minds and souls will be innocent of the failures and sins and shallowness of our day. Keep cynicism and falsehood and selfish flabbiness away from their tiny, sweet worlds. Breathe into their souls from their first instants of awarness these great truths and loves and faiths by which men become free and noble and happy. Twenty years from now begin to send us a generation of Bucknellians prepared in spirit and in character to become builders of the city of light. Together, you as parents, we as teachers, can create such a generation ready to live like intelligent and unselfish brothers under the fatherhood of a living God.

It is queer how many ways there are to describe the Bucknell way of life. This talk has just been another way of saying, "Be true to the Bucknell way of life." It also has been just another way of saying, "Be true to the Christian way of life." For faith in high

idealism and integrity and brotherhood are precisely the values for which Jesus lived and taught and died. A great man of another desperate day was often discouraged, but his courage was renewed time after time until final victory by his loyalty to Christ. Said he, "Again and again I have been tempted to give up the struggle, but always the figure of that Strange Man hanging on the Cross sent me back to my work again."

"O Risen Christ,
By the power of Thine empty tomb,
We beseech Thee,
Out of this death bring life,
Out of this jungle-promise, philtres of love,
And simples of healing, and garlands."
—Florence Converse.

And now your Bucknell education is over. Tomorrow I shall hand you your diplomas. In the years to come you will think of your experiences and of your friends here with appreciation and tenderness and affection. If you should include me in your memories, please do not think only of me as the president under whom this or that building was erected, or this or that accreditment of Bucknell was obtained, or this or that move in behalf of faculty or of students was taken. Think of me, rather, if you can do so sincerely, as your friend who gave what he possessed of strength and devotion, in a day of cynicism and of false and shoddy values, to keep you from being betrayed. That is why I have carried on with you and for you in these grueling 4 years. If memories of Bucknell cause a flicker of quickening of strong faith and high idealism as you think of me, I shall be fully repaid.

Now you cease to be college students, and you take your places as colleagues with the rest of us who are battling for the eternal values of human civilization. It's going to be a grand battle. I congratulate you on the privilege of living in this hour, when we are to drop all the trappings of sham and pretense and oppose courage and honor and character and faith in their sheerest, elemental form to the naked forces of falsehood and cruelty and despotism. Great days lie ahead for moral heroes. May each Bucknellian of the class of 1940 be a moral hero.

The National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the members of the South Carolina Bankers Association at its fortieth annual convention at Myrtle Beach, June 3, 1940.

It would appear that this resolution is in line with the President's program, and I am sure will meet with the hearty approval of Members of Congress, in that we are very anxious to do everything possible to carry out the defense program as suggested by the President in such manner as to be able to get prompt and efficient results in building up our defense so as to be able to defend and preserve our country and a democracy for which our forefathers fought, which has been serving the purpose of our people all of these years against the invasion of any foreign foe.

The resolution follows:

Whereas our country is faced with the gravest necessity to quickly build up its defenses and to avoid, by unity of purpose, the inefficiencies of past performances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the South Carolina Bankers' Association, affirm our belief—

That the defense program should be carried forward under practical labor conditions and efficient management by leaders and directors of ability and experience in their fields, appointed without regard for party or sectional lines and unhampered by burdensome regulations and conditions of labor employment;

That selfish local beneficiary measures and all ideas and actions for political or section gain must be abandoned in the interest of this most pressing program;

That the public is reconciled to the large expenditures in prospect and requires only that waste and extravagance be avoided;

That, accordingly, the tax burden should be fixed without political fear; and, finally,

That our citizens are of one mind in the matter of national defense, understanding the problem of their representatives and ready to make the necessary sacrifices, but watchful to see that the program is not jeopardized by political appointments; be it further

Resolved, That bankers, businessmen, and farmers should write their Congressmen assuring support of action taken along these lines, and that copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Washington.

A Job for Government—Training Skilled Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the entire country factories engaged in producing the goods that America needs are clamoring for skilled workers. From every personnel executive comes the cry for trained men, men equipped to handle the machines necessary to give America the thousands of products which make our material civilization possible. With the outbreak of Europe's "total" war has come a startling recognition in our own country that we must repair our defenses promptly. The emphasis given to mechanized military forces by the Nazi drive into France has already been reflected in our industrial centers. And as the Nation faces the gigantic task of defensive rearmament, the need for trained and skilled workers is imperatively demanding attention.

Twenty years ago Congress enacted legislation providing for Federal assistance to public-trades schools established in every section of the country. Under this program, when a community established a school for the training of mechanics and apprentices, meeting the standards set by law for teaching, hours of study, and type of curriculum, the Federal Government lent its financial assistance. Thousands of foresighted educators in America who had urged the development of an intensive industrial training program cheered this legislation enthusiastically. They saw it as the beginning of a long-range program to make industrial education respectable. For years teachers had been speaking of the nobility of labor, but in practice the high schools of the Nation, with virtually no exceptions, have emphasized and glorified academic training designed to enlist its graduates in college courses. Few and far between were those teachers who truly believed in the value of an industrial training. For the most part only those boys who were regarded as scholastically inept were urged to enroll in mechanical courses.

With this atmosphere prevalent, industrial training was doomed from the start. When State after State enacted legislation providing that every high-school teacher must have a college diploma, the death knell of the trade schools was sounded. For no matter what the reason may be, very few of the teachers available for work in trade schools could produce these precious diplomas. They were for the most part journeymen mechanics skilled in their trades, most of them thoroughly capable of teaching the work they knew without the blessing of the diploma. But this adverse legislation led to an almost complete breakdown of trade education. The high schools began to offer what was little more than elementary manual training, using this as a relatively small part of a larger program based upon other subjects.

To meet their needs thousands of plants installed company schools to train the men their industries required. Private trade schools sprang up, and for those who already had jobs furnishing a backbone of economic sufficiency, correspondence schools came into existence on a large scale to supplement daytime work.

Today we have recognized the failure of our systems. Neither the company schools, the private schools, nor the few

public trade schools which have survived the academic invasion have proved capable of furnishing the men America needs today.

Here is one of the most startling commentaries on the present American scene which faces us. Thousands of young men emerge each year from high school utterly unable to find jobs. Yet simultaneously there are thousands of jobs requiring skilled men going unfilled. These are not positions which offer little pay for long hours. On the contrary, they are opportunities which offer good pay even at the very outset of employment, with prospects for substantial increases as skills become certain and fixed.

Here is a challenge to government which should not go unanswered. The New Deal has spent millions of dollars in its effort to assist youth. It has created a National Youth Administration, a Civilian Conservation Corps. Yet neither of these costly enterprises offers any training which will enable their beneficiaries to establish themselves on the day when this assistance ceases. Turn that money into the establishment of trade schools where young men can learn a livelihood. Turn that money into the task of making industrial training the noble expression which orators are constantly praising.

Let the diploma from the trade school become as cherished as the high-school diploma which offers no specific training. No one for a moment means to suggest that today's high-school training is worthless. It has unquestionable values. Yet there is a place in our country for a different kind of training sponsored by public funds. We have seen the need for encouraging this type of education. Now is the opportunity for all of us to cooperate in establishing it.

Gonzaga High School Graduation Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, OF NEW YORK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made on Monday evening, June 17, to the graduating class of Gonzaga High School at Memorial Constitution Hall:

Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests, parents, friends, and members of the graduating class, this is one of the great days in the lives of you boys of the graduating class and one that will always be remembered, especially your close associations with each other, the trials and troubles of your studies, and your social gatherings. All will be fond memories in later days.

No doubt many of you boys will continue to study elsewhere in institutions of higher education. Some of you will seek employment, as conditions may be such that will necessitate your so doing.

You can make your life path easy or you can make it hard. It all depends upon you yourself. You can make your life a success or a failure. That also depends upon you.

You should never go out with defeat in your mind, but always with the idea of succeeding, because if you feel at the start that you are going to fail, you are defeated before you have started.

You must never feel you have superior knowledge to others or that you are more important. If you do, you will find that a handicap in life.

Mark Twain, the great American humorist, told the following story concerning himself: When he was 16 years of age, he thought his father was one of the most ignorant men with whom he had come in contact. Five years later, when Mark reached the age of 21, he was astounded and surprised that his father had become so intelligent within a period of 5 years.

Eliminate selfishness and greed from your everyday life and in so doing you will find comfort as the years go on.

Be honest, be tolerant, be fair and just, as you are living in a country where there are great opportunities for anyone who is ambitious or desirous of making a success of his life.

This country is made up of people from all parts of the world and under our Constitution there is no discrimination against nationality, creed, or race. I doubt if there is another country in the world where the freedom of religion is so recognized as in our United States, and I hope it will continue. However, we have in some of our higher institutions of education men who are trying to instill nonreligious ideas in the minds of the youth. God forbid the day that religion would be destroyed, because if that day ever comes, civilization would be lost.

Let me say to you graduates that if you are true to your God and church, you are bound to be true to yourself and to your country.

It is only a matter of a few years when the youth of today will be the men of tomorrow, taking over the reins and management of this Government. For that reason, no matter what university or college you may attend, bear in mind your early religious instructions and training. By so doing you will not only save yourself, but help save this Government under which you live, and contribute a great deal to civilization.

Never let intolerance or hatred enter your life. Always remember that you owe a duty to your fellowman, and no matter what your position in life may be, if you perform it honestly and to the best of your ability, you are making your contribution to the country and to the world as a whole.

The ordinary or common laborer toiling in the street is making his contribution just as much as the President of a bank or railroad, as his work is necessary if we are to continue the progress that civilization has made.

Some years ago I heard a small boy recite the following piece:

"You needn't laugh because I'm small.
Being big, sir, isn't all.
I'm just as much a man as any man,
If I do everything I can."

When you leave this school today it is almost like a step into a new world, and do not forget the teachers of this school who have given unselfishly so much of their time and energy to prepare you for this great day.

Also your parents. How they have looked forward to this important event in your life. Some of them have, no doubt, made a great sacrifice in order that you might attend this fine school and be one of Gonzaga's graduates today.

Some of you may go far in this world, but no matter what heights you reach never forget your father and mother who always have your interest and welfare at heart.

I wish to take this opportunity of thanking Father Wiesel for his kindness in inviting me to speak on this occasion. I also wish to congratulate Father Garner and the faculty for the fine work they are doing with the boys of Gonzaga.

In conclusion, may God guide you boys of the graduating class to a nobler and better life. I personally wish each one of you every success and happiness in the future.

Action, Not Words, Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., for June 18:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 18, 1940]

ACTION, NOT WORDS, NEEDED

Of those well-meaning and patriotic citizens who are clamoring for a declaration of war by the United States, two questions may well be asked: What do we do after that, and What do we do it with? Until some satisfactory answers to both these queries are furnished, all talk of declaring war on Hitler or Mussolini is just so much froth.

Perhaps it can be contended that an American declaration would hearten England. But it could scarcely tell the British more than they already know. They understand that they have our full sympathy and that we are taking every possible step to help them secure the implements of war. Even the President, of whose affection for the democracies and hatred of the dictatorships there can be no doubt, has said that we are doing all we can.

As for Hitler and Mussolini—who imagines that they would be disturbed by having the United States declare war on them? They have lived long enough to pay no attention to words which cannot be translated into immediate and effective action. They heard

Premier Chamberlain say that Great Britain would come to the rescue of Poland—and nothing happened to hinder them in their vicious plans. They heard themselves berated by Mr. Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, and various other American public officials—and what did they care or have to fear?

So it is today. A formal declaration of war by the United States could effect scarcely any change in our status. The people do not want to send their sons to fight overseas and the military equipment we have is not substantial enough to make even a sizable dent in the situation.

All the world knows—few better than Hitler—that America is unprepared for war. Our wise course is to remedy that condition with the utmost speed. Let our munition plants do our talking for us. Or, as BRUCE BARTON has so wisely said: "Distrust the speeches of politicians and do everything you can to hurry the making of planes and more planes, ships and more ships, guns and more guns. The less Hitler hears from our politicians, and the more he hears from our factories, the better. Weapons are the only language he can understand."

The Bituminous Coal Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

BROOKINGS INSTITUTION REPORT

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been attempting to explain to the Members of this House the futility of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937. The House of Representatives demonstrated its attitude about 6 weeks ago when it cut the appropriation for the Bituminous Coal Division for the next fiscal year. Unfortunately—especially in this time of emergency—the Senate restored the funds. Over $2,000,000 which could well be spent on airplanes, tanks, and antiaircraft guns are about to be poured down the sink of futility for another year.

Recently I have been greatly encouraged to see my views upheld by the Brookings Institution. My contentions are upheld in the following report which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on June 17. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this report for the information of the Members of this House.

[From the Chicago Tribune of June 17, 1940]

FEDERAL PRICE-CONTROL EVILS ARE DISCLOSED—POLICY IS ASSAILED IN NEW STUDY

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 16.—The Brookings Institution, asserting that there was a trend toward Government regulation of industrial prices and production, said today that "the more widely such policies are followed the less is the net benefit" to owners and employees and "the larger is the cost to the community as a whole." The conclusions were reached in a study of the relationship of government to economic life made by the private research organization.

Citing regulation of the bituminous-coal industry as an attempt to protect the domestic market of an industry "which finds the demand for its products declining," the report said:

"Short-run gains to coal workers and operators appear possible, but it is improbable that there will be any long-run gains. The use of substitutes is likely to increase, while higher wages may further stimulate mechanization of the industry and force diminution of direct employment.

OUTPUT CONTROL REQUIRED

"Consumers may pay permanently higher prices for the product. More significant, however, is the possibility that Government price regulation in such a highly competitive industry cannot be made effective without Government control of output."

The study also reached these conclusions:

1. That preparation for war "inevitably means greatly augmented Government control of economic life."

2. That Government controls over public utilities should be modified "so that utilities will find less to be gained through efforts to obtain favorable valuation and rate actions by regulatory commissions and more to be gained by exploring possibilities of reduced rates and expanded service."

STATES OTHER OBJECTIONS

3. That the "exercise of managerial powers by the Interstate Commerce Commission in determining railroad charges is producing a situation in which neither private management nor public authority can be held clearly accountable for the financial solvency and general operating effectiveness of the regulated enterprises."

Growth of governmental power and responsibilities, the report contended, has taken place "in such piecemeal fashion that its full import has not been grasped," and as a result "there has been a development of Government functions which might not have been approved in its entirety had it been presented as a general program."

New Deal and a Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

LETTER FROM ALBERT E. POTTS, PASTOR, PLYMOUTH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent, published in the Herald's Open Forum on June 17, 1940:

EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

For 7 years the New Deal has deluded the American people, demoralized American democracy, discouraged American business, and disorganized American industry. If the New Deal is granted 4 more years of power, the United States will be delivered, lock, stock, and barrel, into some form of Marxism. I make that as a prophecy. Please make a note of it.

The New Deal has deluded the American people into believing that a government is the people's beneficent benefactor and an inexhaustible giver-out of jobs, doles, and pensions. The New Deal has deluded the American people into believing that hard work and thrift are out of date and quite unnecessary practices for all those who wish to attain the abundant life. The New Deal delusion is that governmental regulation alone will achieve the abundant life for each individual. While the New Deal has been preaching such puffle to the American people, Hitler and Mussolini were telling their people "that they have many lean years ahead, and that they must sacrifice and work hard if they wish to achieve the abundant life." The New Deal has made it just about impossible for any American leader to preach such plain truth.

The New Deal has demoralized American democracy by preaching to the American people an utterly un-American class-war propaganda. Millions of American people have been so deeply influenced by the New Deal preachments of class-war propaganda that they now suspect every successful business and professional man of being their social enemy. At this very moment the New Deal's most effective argument against certain Presidential possibilities is that they are successful businessmen.

The New Deal has discouraged and disorganized American business and industry: First, by direct governmental competition; second, by unfair restrictions and regulations; third, by excessive taxation.

Thus has Government expanded while business and industry have declined. As business and industry decline, fewer and fewer people keep their jobs. As the army of the unemployed is increased, the Government must dish out more doles, jobs, and pensions. The more that Government dishes out to the people, the more money it demands from business and industry. Like a parasite, the New Deal destroys the life on which it feeds.

Further, during the reign of the New Deal, hundreds and hundreds of subversive organizations, mostly affiliated with Moscow, have been undermining American democracy: First, by their preachments of class war propaganda; second, by piloting our national-preparedness policies. These subversive organizations, with serpent-like cunning, wormed their way into virtually all of our social institutions, but especially into our Protestant pulpits and into our schools of higher education. With satanic skill they brought their propaganda to bear upon our institutions that form public sentiment and succeeded in divesting the American people of their patriotism and also of their fighting spirit, even the spirit to fight to protect our own national wealth. Thus through a so-called peace program the United States has been disarmed of spiritual preparedness and military preparedness. While all this went on in the United States, Hitler and Mussolini were molding their people into loyal units and into perfect fighting machines.

Now, after 7 years, the New Deal proposes to do something about it, and it starts to clamp down on these subversive elements. What a laugh that is! Now they can all fold up and go back to Moscow and Berlin, because the damage that they set out to do is all accomplished.

For 7 years the New Deal has watched Hitler and Mussolini make elaborate preparations to loot the world of its wealth. It has heard them boast of what they intended to do. But all that the New Deal did about it was to prepare speeches against what it was pleased to call the aggressors. Before the head of any government makes a public speech about "quarantining" an aggressor nation that is armed to the teeth, he should make sure that he is backed up by a people with a fighting spirit, and with the biggest and best army and navy in the world.

Now, to cap it all, the New Deal has the gall to demand a third term.

Adding insult to injury, the New Deal turns to successful businessmen, whom for years it pictured as public enemies, and demands that they by their willing cooperation virtually endorse New Deal policies, and take hold of the situation and by working with a deluded and suspicious people, and a demoralized democracy, and a crippled industry, immediately make up for 7 years of New Deal folly.

Well, all that I can say is, that never in all the history of the world has any people ever had to put up with a more screwy mess than this mess which the New Deal has dished up to us.

It is high time that the American people snapped out of the hypnotic spell that the New Deal has cast over them and elected someone to take charge of our national affairs who will shoot off something besides his mouth.

ALBERT E. POTTS,
Pastor, Plymouth Congregational Church.

Protect America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE J. M'LEOD, OF MICHIGAN, JUNE 18, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. CLARENCE J. MCLEOD, of Michigan, made over the National Broadcasting Co. red network, June 18, 1940:

To their consternation the people of America have awakened to the fact, and it is a fact, that our democracy is imperiled. Modern wars are waged in two ways simultaneously. We know now that the enemy strikes not only with military forces at the border, but that he likewise strikes inside the border with vast and highly trained "fifth columnists."

No nation alert to its own well-being can neglect either of these attacking forces. Thank God the Nation is finally alert and is preparing to meet any enemy which may attack us on any of our four borders. We must not, however, neglect to prepare to put down with every force at our disposal those who, within the Nation, would sacrifice it. The resolution which I am sponsoring is one means by which we can subdue those elements within our population which would lay bare our breast for the stroke of enemies without.

It will do us little good to build up our armed forces to reasonable strength after years of neglect if we continue to permit saboteurs, "fifth columnists," and other subversive elements so to weaken our moral fiber as to bring about our disintegration at the moment of trial.

I believe that we have been following a clear, constructive course in the United States, with the exception of the past few years, and the great Nation we have today is a result of carrying on under the Constitution the wonderfully laid plans of our country's fathers. It was federation and unity of purpose that carried the original Thirteen Colonies through the Revolutionary War. It was to preserve this unity, this federation of States, that the Civil War was fought. This unity must ever be protected.

But now we are warned, and in no uncertain terms, that the even tenor of our national way may be seriously disturbed. Always a law-abiding, law-respecting people, with implicit faith in the Constitution as the basis of all our laws, we now find demand, by a fast-growing sinister minority, for unhampered privilege and affirmation to undermine our democratic freedom. No one will deny that so far we have acquiesced.

"It is among the evils, and perhaps not the smallest, of democratic government, that the people must feel before they will see. When this happens they are aroused to action." Those are the words of our first President. He foresaw at that time the many difficulties that would beset the Republic and the anxious moments that our people would undergo until "roused to action."

There have been many trying periods in the history of America. There were the dark days between the Declaration of Independence and the ratification of the Constitution when even the most ardent patriot was pessimistic that there would ever be a United States of America. Likewise, during the War of the Rebellion there were months when the most enthusiastic champions of the Union were doubtful whether the United States could be preserved. During these struggles we cannot be unmindful of the aid and comfort rendered the enemies from behind the lines. Washington had his Tories, and Lincoln had his Knights of the Golden Circle.

Several weeks ago I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution which provided that any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow by force of the form of government of the United States as established by the Constitution should not be recognized as a political entity. The resolution further provides that the Congress recommend that the several State legislatures enact legislation prohibiting the recognition of any such organization or party on the official ballot for the election to any office within the State and for the choice of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors and for the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress. This resolution is known as House Concurrent Resolution No. 55.

By enacting this resolution into law, we will have taken the first definite step to prevent the boring from within which is slowly but surely freezing the very arteries of pure democracy. I contend further that by stamping out the subversive groups and movements which are boring from within we will have accomplished the first and most important step for our national defense. I am happy to say, at this time, that the resolution is gaining support each day, and I hope that before the close of this session of Congress it will have become a law

Today, when a large part of the world is again convulsed in one of history's cyclonic episodes which is imprinting an ineffable stain upon the vaunted civilization of our 20 Christian centuries, a person who tells America to waken, that the undermining of democracy is in progress, can no longer be called an alarmist. On the other hand, the person who today still refuses to listen to facts and listlessly scoffs at the un-American progress and entrenchment about us, is nothing less than a traitor.

In the European conflict it has been shown that enemies within the overrun countries have been as dangerous and as damaging as the actual armed forces of the invaders. The "fifth column" in Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France give adequate testimony to the effectiveness of traitors in causing the complete breakdown of all internal defense, leading to ultimate annihilation. We need no more pointed examples to show us that the real enemies of our country are to be found within our own borders. "Fifth column" and streamlined Trojan-horse tactics are by no means unknown to us in this country, as we find damaging European ideologies have sprung up and flourished under the cloak of democracy, with little or no protest from the majority of our people. We must recognize these forces for what they are and take steps now to frustrate their contemptuous plans.

We are indeed blind if the brutal lesson of the past weeks in Europe has been lost on us. Our security as a nation and as a people, together with our American way of living, may well suffer a similar fate unless we stir ourselves to take preventive measures. The strength of America lies in our adherence to the principles which have built America, the principles which have made America great. They are worth protecting.

Each edition of the press and each news broadcast is stressing more graphically than I can hope to, the effectiveness of the "fifth column" movements that were originally introduced into unsuspecting nations under the cloak of political world theories. We observe the manner in which the Nazis have operated in Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, and find it well nigh incredible that they were able to enlist the support and sympathy of some of the citizens of those countries to the end of having them become a party to the destruction of their own lands. Yes; it is difficult to believe, but it is tragically true.

The Communist Party of the United States has taken exactly the same position as that taken by the Norwegian Communist Party, and the same position as that taken by the Finnish Communist Party—all acting on the party line as Trojan-horse traitors for Stalin. Is it any wonder that at the beginning of the present conflict the French Government jailed its Communist Deputies? The present debacle in which France now finds herself is in no small measure attributable to the militant and aggressive group of Communists who dominated and virtually controlled the popular front. By their ability to elect members to the Chamber of Deputies, they were powerful in preventing the adoption of adequate national-defense measures. In the face of an immediate foreign invasion, the French Communists and their allies threatened a general strike which would have paralyzed their country. Don't tell me these stooges of Stalin had the interests of France at heart.

Please keep in mind that this is the same so-called political party that is represented on the American ballot.

The last 48 tragic hours which have brought the international structure of the world tumbling down, make imperative a readjustment of American thinking.

Congress would be derelict in its duty, would be almost guilty of treason were it to adjourn and leave the Nation's Capitol at this time. We must face the reality of a chaotic condition brought about by barbarous war—war such as has never before been seen in the world—war of a type, which until the last 2 months was inconceivable.

New forces, new events, new methods have been let loose. What do they mean to the United States? What do they portend for our national welfare—what can be done, what must be done if this Nation is to survive in this new kind of polity?

The immediate job before Congress is dual in nature. First, we must make our borders absolutely impregnable to any attack from without. Second, we must wipe out the nests of infection from which subversive elements are spreading poison among the 130,000,000 loyal, but often too acquiescent citizens. We must erect on every hand every conceivable barricade to stop the forces working for internal disintegration.

We may as well face the fact—the truth, that your National Government has been no more alert to the developing of modern war methods than desolated France, imperiled and dismayed England, destroyed Holland, and betrayed Belgium. Your leaders, just as the leaders of these devastated countries, have never advanced beyond the World War days of 1914 in their military thinking. These European leaders have betrayed their own people. They have sent their youth forth to war without any realization of what they would encounter. Those innocent lives were sacrificed horribly to a stupid and apathetic leadership.

The warning is clear. Your national leadership is just as guilty as was the leadership of those once great nations which now are in ruins. Faced with this cataclysmic situation Congress is told by the President to adjourn—to go home. I cannot conceive this to be the method by which we can overcome years of neglect and failure.

We are either for America or against America. There can be no divided allegiance when our country and our American institutions are concerned. If we are for America we must be strong and courageous enough to declare that no longer will we coddle or tolerate dangerous wildcat doctrine spreaders who would destroy the form of Government which affords them protection. No longer can we let the word "liberalism" include that kind of free speech, and be the subterfuge for slander, degradation, and the destruction of America.

Those who proclaim their patriotism so loudly and so often have now the opportunity to demonstrate their love of country by putting their every effort into a concentrated drive against these poisonous groups. We are matching wits with the cleverest, most unscrupulous group of madmen history has ever known. There is no lie too vile, no means too low, no treachery too base, no crime too great, nor a wrong too grievous for these forces of hate to use in destroying us from within.

No longer can we carry on as just passive, silent, inactive, or perhaps just happy-go-lucky Americans. There are responsibilities facing us which we cannot shirk. If we are Americans and 100 percent for America, we will not want to shirk these responsibilities; rather, we will protect and pass on our heritage for generations to come. On the other hand, if we refuse our responsibility and prefer to live in an ultra-liberal state, letting this land of ours be known to all the world as the clearing house for all crack-pot ideas and the experimental ground for all oppressive doctrines, by reason of misuse and misinterpretation of free speech—let us say so.

It is not enough that we say we are opposed to the doctrine and philosophy of communism, nazi-ism, and fascism—we must resolve to do something about it. My resolution, if approved, would be a message to every nation that the United States of America is not a stooge Nation for destructive "fifth column" movements. Let them know, once and for all, that our domestic freedoms cannot be violated with impunity.

It would be nothing short of criminal to underestimate the gravity of the danger we are facing. The task before us is to awaken a love of country in each and every man, woman, and child in our land.

The moment demands an energetic application of all the fundamental precepts of Americanism. The responsibility of preserving and protecting our American ideals rests equally upon each of us. Our people must be rallied for united action against the forces that would destroy us.

It is by no means inevitable that we in America should suffer the treacherous betrayals that have occurred in other lands. The sleeping conscience of America must awaken, and, once awakened, must act. This is our common task, this is a job for every individual American.

In closing, let me say America must be made aware of the fundamental truth, that the condition upon which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance. Eternal vigilance is the price we must pay for liberty.

Charles Plumley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for many years during the summer months my family and I have had the honor of being vacation constituents of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. His district comprises the entire Green Mountain State. He serves it well.

It gave me keen pleasure to read in the Bennington (Vt.) Banner several days ago the following editorial which gives deserved recognition to my August Congressman, also June and July.

Congressman CHARLIE PLUMLEY getting degrees from three colleges looks to be receiving more than a proper share in the allotment but it may be remembered by some of the folks that Mr. PLUMLEY made a record as a college president before he made a still more notable record in Congress. Thirty years ago PLUMLEY had a job with a big rubber company out at Akron in its legal department and would undoubtedly have more money today if he had stayed in Akron and grown up with the country. He didn't do it. Norwich University, a little college in PLUMLEY's home town of Northfield, was in trouble and needed a new president to lift it out of an old rut, and invited PLUMLEY to come back home and see what he could do. He accepted the call, and in less than two decades, doubled the size and quadrupled the service of Norwich, built up its endowment to two millions. Then he resigned and was elected to Congress, where he has proved to be one of its most useful Members and ranks with the leaders. We suspect that Mr. PLUMLEY's degree from Boston University was earned fully as much by his service as a college president as by his career in Congress.

Farmers Union of Sheyenne, N. Dak., Favors Defense of Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

RESOLUTION FROM FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 69

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union, Local No. 69, of Sheyenne, N. Dak., passed the following resolution on June 14, 1940, and have asked that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States of America is dedicated to the historical Monroe Doctrine, we, the members of Farmers Union, Local No. 69, of Eddy County, N. Dak., in meeting are in favor of defense of the Western Hemisphere, but opposed to engaging in foreign war or sending our boys to foreign battlefields: Therefore be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent the North Dakota Union Farmer and to Congressmen LEMKE and BURDICK, Senators NYE and FRAZIER, and to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.

(Signed) CHAS. RIGGLE,
Secretary.

SHEYENNE, N. DAK., *June 14, 1940.*

Harvard Report on W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

HARVARD REPORT ON W. P. A.

Harvard University sends us a report on one of the most intensive studies ever made of W. P. A. If you want to know more about it than we have room to tell you here, order from your bookseller Applicants for Work Relief, by Dr. Elizabeth W. Gilboy (Harvard University Press).

Is W. P. A. a shovel-leaning gang of loafers?

The Harvard report says that the majority of persons applying for work relief are hard-working people who were well able to

support themselves before depression unemployment set in and that most of them had put off seeking work relief until their little savings were gone. Many even went heavily into debt before seeking relief.

"The majority were responsible citizens who lost their jobs as a result of economic circumstances before which they were powerless," says the Harvard report.

Harvard did not set out to prove that W. P. A. was a good thing. Harvard sought facts. So before any of us resume throwing about loose criticism of W. P. A., maybe we had better read the book by a committee that knows what it is talking about.

Discrimination Against Veterans by Work Projects Administration of Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

RESOLUTION FROM LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNCIL, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RESOLUTION

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 1, 1940.*

Whereas the Work Projects Administration by Federal law gives veterans preference in assignment and retention in employment, subject to the requirement that all persons assigned to work on projects shall be qualified by occupational training, experience, and ability to perform satisfactorily the duties required, preference in employment or retaining in employment on projects, and

Whereas preference shall be given in the following order: Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War, and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) who are in need and who are American citizens, and

Whereas the Work Projects Administration of southern California has ignored all rules, regulations, and laws hereinto before referred to and have consistently violated administrative bulletin No. 214–D pertaining thereto: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Council, American Legion, Department of California go on record as opposing this policy of discrimination against veterans of the World War, United Spanish War veterans, and other American citizens, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need and that a copy of this resolution be sent to F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of Work Projects; Hon. Culbert Olson, Governor of the State of California; and all Members of Congress from southern California, requesting that a thorough investigation be made by the Congress of the United States, with a view of remedying this condition in southern California.

IRWIN W. MINGER, *Adjutant.*

This resolution adopted and passed at regular business meeting of the Los Angeles County Council, American Legion, June 7, 1940.

Time Essential for Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK O. HORTON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press carries a full-page advertisement, "Stop Hitler Now."

WISHFUL THINKING—GRIM REALITY

We yield first place to no man in grieving over the fact that we are unprepared and unable to do anything effective in turning the tide of battle over there.

We take second place to no man in our determination that American boys shall not be sent to their slaughter over there.

We are adamant in our determination to keep out of this thing until we are fit and to prevent further acts of war on the part of this administration, tending to drag us into a war for which we are utterly unprepared in both material and leadership and which could only end in disaster for us.

The future happiness and civilization of the world depends upon our ability to stave off war until we are prepared. And when we are prepared we must be so everlastingly fit that our protest will be more effective than an army.

There need be no war once we are prepared, but there will be a war and we will be in it over our heads before we are ready, if bluff and bluster and "two-bit" promises of aid, which cannot be effective, continue.

If this was our war, and perhaps it was, then that fact should have been discovered years ago when Hitler first rose to power and started arming Germany.

Then was the time to stop Hitler.

We did nothing about it, although fully advised, day by day, of what was going on. That part of the world, which was even more vitally concerned than we, did very little about it until too late.

It would be suicidal for one to step into the ring with Joe Louis unless one was terribly and completely fit. It would be nothing short of wholesale murder to get into this war at this time.

Daily this administration, without the consent of Congress, is taking additional steps toward war, committing acts of war, which will certainly drag us into this thing.

Only today, by administrative ruling, American pilots were told to fly planes into Canada. Canada is at war. Our Neutrality Act says to all the world, "Come and get it." The same act prohibits delivery.

This world can be saved, but only by America and only then by sparring for time so that we can arm to the teeth and prepare in such a manner as to command the respect of the world and make good our demands.

Time To Pipe Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BUFFALO COURIER-EXPRESS OF JUNE 18, 1940

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Courier Express of June 18, 1940. It strikes me that this newspaper is bringing to our attention in a timely manner pertinent facts in Time to Pipe Down.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express of June 18, 1940]

TIME TO PIPE DOWN

Careless thinkers of the Nation have been enjoying themselves immensely of late in an emotional jag. Too many of us have let our sympathies and perhaps our fears and certainly our dislikes—not to say hatreds—get the best of us.

But it is time to pipe down on that talk of "getting into this war."

Some of the Members of Congress have put responsibility on the press and the columnists. Perhaps some newspapers and certainly some columnists are not without fault. But they cannot at their best—or their worst—equal the JOSH LEES and the CLAUDE PEPPERS who speak from the floors of the National Legislative Halls. However, that is neither here nor there.

The fact of the matter is that we are about as near to getting into this war and still "keep short of war" as we can get. There is great need of watching our step if we are to avoid crossing the line. The practice of putting chips on our shoulders when we lack muscles in our arms is not without danger.

How illy we are prepared to make war—for others or for ourselves—is shown by our incapacity to provide the Allies with the implements of war as now waged. True, we have immense manpower. In the first World War, the number subject to draft reached 25,000,000. Today it is estimated that they might total 35,000,000. But in this war men are incidental to machines. As

Mr. Lindley says in his column on this page, a tin hat is no protection from a bomb dropped from the skies, a bayonet cannot stop a tank, bullets are not caught in bare hands. Without adequate mechanization, any army we might send overseas would merely be sent to defenseless slaughter.

Our boasted proficiency in manufacture cannot create all the needed implements of war in a few months, not in a year, probably not in several years. Germany worked with diabolical intelligence and with supreme and concentrated purpose for not less than 6 years to build the war machine with which it has made a shambles of much of continental Europe and with which it purposes to make itself Europe's dominant nation—if it stops there. Every other national activity was subordinated to this purpose. That activity was carried on with immense sacrifices imposed upon its people and at an unknown but surely a tremendous cost.

Many here feel that defeat of the Allies would be a calamity to democracy in general and particularly a menace to the United States. The response of Congress to President Roosevelt's request for funds for defense shows the Government is in accord with that thought. But if it has taken Germany some 6 years of concentrated effort to build and equip its astoundingly powerful war machine, it is folly to assume that a nation not noted for its concentration can do better. We agree with Mr. Landon that, "In this situation we should * * * not risk getting into a war for which we lack both essential equipment and trained men."

Common sense at this point demands that we give full heed to realities. Among those realities is a realization that the five billion for which Mr. Roosevelt has so far asked is but a drop in the bucket of total cost. Let us incidentally ask ourselves how that cost is to be met unless there is a readiness to make whatever sacrifices may be needed, even in fields where notice has already been given that sacrifices will not be willingly granted.

We wish we could feel that moral force is still a power in this troubled world, strong enough to compel a return to peaceful relations between nations. But apparently we are in a period of physical force which will end only when the world again learns through experience its folly, its futility, and its wickedness. Not having the courage to use needed force in its assigned job of policing the world, the League of Nations had recourse to moral pressures. The League is now dead. Moral force did not make effective the Kellogg Pact, in which 57 nations agreed to outlaw war as a means of settling their differences. It did not deter Japan from its theft of Manchuria, nor from its later and present intent to take China from its ancient holders. It caused no hesitation on the part of Italy when the latter decided to take unto itself the country of an almost primitive people with whom it had no quarrel. Nor Germany when it raped central Europe; or when it later violated the neutrality of Norway and Holland and Belgium. Nor Russia when it participated in the destruction of Poland; nor when it ended the independence of Finland as it now evidently intends to end the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

A part of the world is war mad. Because that is so, it forces preparation for war on others. If a highwayman on the street demands our possessions, we do not argue the morality of his act with him; we hope that the club we have is as big as his own. There is a highwayman abroad in the world today. That is why we say it is time to pipe down on the talk of "getting into this war" further than we already are in when we haven't a club; time to concentrate on the job of fashioning that club; time for plain horse sense to take the place of emotion in our thinking.

Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I cannot bring myself to vote for the Bloom resolution, as it destroys the utility of the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution cloaks it with a rigidity that takes away the power grown into this magnificent doctrine over the last 116 and more years. This resolution is an unfortunate manifestation of defeatism, as it restricts the doctrine's significance through partial legislative definition.

The weight of our Monroe Doctrine is well known by every leader of world powers. They know of its history of interpretation to meet the then existing American needs. They know that it has continuously been interpreted by our State Department down the years, for the protection of America. To put it in a strait jacket now, as does the Bloom resolution, is an act of weakness which says in substance to the dictator nations: "We have lost faith in our splendid age-old pronouncement." I am not prepared to do that. I honor that pronouncement and as we are protected in the folds of the Stars and Stripes, so has the Monroe Doctrine protected the Americas for more than a hundred years under the wise interpretations of former executive departments.

I refuse by my vote to give up any right to interpret that doctrine as the occasion presents itself. Why retreat from interpreting this time-honored doctrine in face of totalitarianism? Why yield up these sovereign powers?

It is too bad in this time of stress for America that our Government should admit any weakness in our time-tried doctrine and definitely limit its most material scope of service, when we need it. I can imagine weakness in leaders, but a weakness in the Monroe Doctrine is almost as incomprehensible as lack of faith in the Almighty.

The Prevailing Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years we have seen the long, hard battle of the laboring classes crowned with victory on many fronts. This victory was signalized and secured by the enactment of progressive legislation by the Federal Government which not only recognizes but defines and protects the rights of the laboring people of this Nation.

But while we have made great progress even to the point of regulating the hours of toil and the rates of pay for millions of workers, we have failed in a large measure to apply the medicine which we expect others to take. This is more than amply demonstrated by the failure of the Government to pay the prevailing wage on many of its building programs throughout the country. The Government pays the prevailing wage on much of its work, but in my district, and I am sure in yours, there are many instances where skilled workmen and artisans are compelled to work on Government jobs for a mere subsistence wage.

In my district, for example, additions were made to the Veterans' Administration Facility; to the Army post, and to several other branches of the Government located there. These jobs required the services of great numbers of carpenters, painters, plumbers, masons, and other skilled workmen. Not one of them was paid the prevailing wage for that type of work, while across the street artisans doing exactly the same kind of work for private contractors, were receiving the wages commensurate with their skill and experience. There can be no legitimate excuse for such a condition.

If skilled workers are to be employed by the Government they should be paid the prevailing wage. If the Government can afford to build then it can afford to pay wages in the same manner as the private citizen who happens to build a house or a garage. By failing to pay the prevailing wage rates and by expanding the construction program all the time the Government is actually tearing the foundation from under the wage scales for tradesmen and skilled workers and encouraging others to follow suit in depressing the wages of workers everywhere in the construction field.

On many occasions I have pleaded with various branches of the Government to pay the prevailing wage on construction jobs requiring skilled tradesmen. Many of you have had the same experience but to no avail. It is high time for Congress to take a hand and specify that the prevailing wage be paid on all Government construction for skilled workmen. As the matter stands now the Government is

excusing itself for paying subsistence wages on the grounds that the funds used for the construction where such wages are paid are W. P. A. or emergency funds. Again I say, if the Government can afford to build it can afford to pay the prevailing wage.

We are about to embark on a widespread construction program in the name of national defense. This program will require thousands of skilled workmen and artisans. If we see to it that they receive wages commensurate with their skill and experience we will be serving the twofold purpose of building our defenses and at the same time aiding in a program of complete economic recovery. If, however, we are going to extend the subsistence wage scales, then we can expect a complete break-down of all the gains and progress made by skilled labor during the past century. Boasting that we have recognized and fortified the rights of labor means very little indeed, if we permit the Federal Government of which we are an integral part, to drive down the scale of wages and encourage private contractors to follow our example.

List of Editorials Favoring Termination of Foreign Silver Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of certain editorials relating to the Senate vote, May 9, 1940, approving my bill, S. 785, to terminate the purchase of foreign silver.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Editorials favoring enactment of S. 785, a bill to terminate the purchase of foreign silver

Newspaper	City	Date	Title of editorial
The Gazette	St. Joseph, Mo.	May 18	Quitting a Folly.
The Courier	Camden, N. J.	May 14	The Senate Vote on Silver.
The Star-Times	St. Louis, Mo.	May 13	Catching Up With Silver.
The News	Hillsdale, Mich.	May 15	Silver Buying.
Rocky Mountain News.	Denver, Colo.	do	The Silver Bill.
The World	Aberdeen, Wash.	May 11	Foreign Silver.
Times Recorder	Zanesville, Ohio	May 13	Sanity on Silver.
The Courant	Hartford, Conn.	do	The Silver Folly.
Democrat-Chronicle	Rochester, N. Y.	May 21	Silver and Sanity.
The Press	Utica, N. Y.	do	Against Silver Buying.
Press-Herald	Portland, Maine	May 14	The Silver Bill.
Star-Beacon	Ashtabula, Ohio	May 22	For Sense on Silver.
Evening Journal	Wilmington, Del.	May 17	Senate and Silver.
Times-News	Hendersonville, N. C.	do	Foreign Silver.
Evening Forum	Fargo, N. Dak.	May 18	To End The Silver Folly.
The News	Cumberland, Md.	May 17	A Foolish Law That Should Be Repealed.
The Press	Grand Rapids, Mich.	May 18	Domestic Issues.
The Sun	Winchester, Ky.	May 20	Against Buying Foreign Silver.
The Star	Kansas City, Mo.	May 21	Inside the Silver Lining.
The Post	Birmingham, Ala.	May 11	The Silver Bill.
Evening Forum	Fargo, N. Dak.	May 17	Time To Halt It.
Age Herald	Birmingham, Ala.	May 13	Curbing Silver Buying.
Press	Fort Worth, Tex.	May 11	The Silver Bill.
Morning Tribune	Minneapolis, Minn.	May 15	How To Let Go.
Free Press	Detroit, Mich.	May 13	A Bear by the Tail.
The Times	Duquesne, Pa.	May 10	Buying Foreign Silver at Fancy Prices.
The Star	Portsmouth, Va.	May 15	The Silver Issue Again.
The Times	New York City	May 10	To End the Silver Folly.
Ledger Dispatch	Norfolk, Va.	May 13	The Silver Folly.
The News	Buffalo, N. Y.	do	End Silver Purchase.
The Tribune	Albert Lea, Minn.	May 15	How To Let Go.
The Call	Paterson, N. J.	do	Silver Vote a Good Sign.
The News	San Francisco, Calif.	May 10	The Silver Bill.
Times Tribune	Minneapolis, Minn.	May 13	Swearing Off.
Leader	Manchester, N. H.	May 14	Ending the Silver Folly.
The Post	Camden, N. J.	do	The Senate Vote on Silver.
World-Telegram	New York City	May 10	The Silver Bill.
Post-Dispatch	St. Louis, Mo.	May 15	False Prophecies on the Silver Policy.
The Gazette	Tifton, Ga.	May 10	Passage of the Silver Bill.
Journal	Elizabeth, N. J.	May 11	End the Silver Folly.
Virginian Pilot	Norfolk, Va.	May 12	Sanity on the Silver Policy.

Editorials favoring enactment of S. 785, a bill to terminate the purchase of foreign silver—Continued

Newspaper	City	Date	Title of editorial
Globe-Democrat	St. Louis, Mo.	May 13	Congress and the Silver Jag.
Press Telegram	Long Beach, Calif.	May 10	No More Foreign Silver.
The Post	Morgantown, W. Va.	May 13	Further Delay Indefensible.
Do	Washington, D. C.	May 26	Threadbare Pretext.
American Banker	New York City	May 13	Townsend Resolution To Cease Silver Purchases May Be Held Up in the House.
Herald-Post	El Paso, Tex.	May 10	The Silver Bill.
The Journal	Dayton, Ohio	May 13	Buying Foreign Silver.
Morning Press	Bloomsburg, Pa.	May 14	To End the Silver Folly.
The Chronicle	Milford, Del.	May 10	Buying Foreign Silver.
News Republican	Boone, Iowa	May 13	Senate Votes Down Silver Buying.
The Times	Los Angeles, Calif.	May 10	Thumbs Down on Silver.
The Post	Washington, D. C.	May 13	Senate and Silver.
Evening Star	do	May 8	Foreign Silver.
The Dispatch	Columbus, Ohio	May 13	Domestic Problems Vital.
Wall Street Journal	New York City	do	A Shadow Across a Cradle.
The News	Newark, N. J.	May 11	Silver Vote a Good Sign.
The Bulletin	Norwich, Conn.	May 10	Stopping Foreign Silver.
The News	Lynchburg, Va.	May 11	Place to Start.
The Express	Easton, Pa.	do	Senate on Silver Act.
The Free Press	Detroit, Mich.	do	Senate to the Rescue.
Telegraph Herald	Dubuque, Iowa	May 12	Silver Subsidy Again.
The News	Greenville, S. C.	May 11	Specious Silver Argument.
The Journal	Antigo, Wis.	May 10	Take Back Your Gold.
The Northern Virginian Daily.	Strasburg, Va.	May 11	The Silver Issue Again.
Beacon-Journal	Akron, Ohio	do	To End the Silver Folly.
The Star	Rockford, Ill.	do	Horse Sense Wins.
The News	Lynchburg, Va.	May 10	Pass the Townsend Bill.
The Times	Indianapolis, Ind.	do	The Silver Bill.
Post-Dispatch	St. Louis, Mo.	May 11	Time to End the Silver Buying Folly.
The News	Wilmington, Del.	do	Up to the House.
The Star	Kansas City, Mo.	May 27	Rights of the House.
The Record	Philadelphia, Pa.	May 11	The Senate Vote on Silver.
The News	Chicago, Ill.	do	Fighting the Silver Fraud.
The Commercial	Pine Bluff, Ark.	May 14	Silver Buying Halt.
The News	Indianapolis, Ind.	May 13	Silver Buying.
The Register	New Haven, Conn.	May 10	The Silver Folly.
The Knickerbocker News.	Albany, N. Y.	May 16	Silver and Sanity.
Financial Journal	Philadelphia, Pa.	May 24	May "Bury" Townsend Silver Bill.
Transcript	Boston, Mass.	May 27	Silver Bill Is Blocked.
The Sun	New York City	May 25	End the Silver Folly.
The Journal	Milwaukee, Wis.	do	Silver Subsidy Goes On.
The Courier News	Plainfield, N. J.	May 23	Silver and Sanity.
The Journal	Providence, R. I.	May 27	Plague of Silver.
The Radii	Canajoharie, N. Y.	May 23	Senate to the Rescue.
The Register	New Haven, Conn.	May 26	Silver and Defense.

Proposed Amendment to the Sugar Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 9654

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposed amendment to H. R. 9654:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 9654

Add two new sections reading as follows:

"SEC. 4. Subsection (b) of section 207 of the Sugar Act of 1937 (relating to direct-consumption sugar from Puerto Rico) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: This subsection is hereby extended so that not more than 126,033 short tons, raw value, of the quota for Puerto Rico for any calendar year may be filled by direct-consumption sugar: *Provided, however*, That the amount of said quota which may be filled by direct-consumption sugar for the calendar year 1940 shall not be less than the quantity of direct-consumption sugar from Puerto Rico actually brought into the continental United States, for consumption therein, after December 31, 1939, and up to and including the date of the enactment of this amendatory sentence.'

"SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Sugar Act of 1937 (relating to direct-consumption sugar from Hawaii) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'This

subsection is hereby extended so that not more than 29,616 short tons, raw value, of the quota for Hawaii for any calendar year may be filled by direct-consumption sugar: *Provided, however,* That the amount of said quota which may be filled by direct-consumption sugar for the calendar year 1940 shall not be less than the quantity of direct-consumption sugar from Hawaii actually brought into the continental United States, for consumption therein, after December 31, 1939, and up to and including the date of the enactment of this amendatory sentence.' "

Preservation of the Democratic Process in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY MR. BRENDAN BROWN TO NEW YORK EDUCATIONAL GUILD

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the address delivered by Dr. Brendan Brown, professor of law, Catholic University, at the breakfast of the New York Educational Guild, at the Capitol Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., on June 9, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator and Mrs. Mead, and members of the New York Educational Guild, I deeply appreciate the opportunity which you, through your president, Mr. Peter Connolly, have given me to address you this morning. I am pleased to be here, in the midst of such a distinguished and representative audience. Mr. Connolly has not placed the slightest limitation on the choice of a subject. Many problems confront us as a nation at this hour, clamoring for solution. But perhaps none is more crucial than the future preservation of the democratic process in the United States. For this, the greatest need is an adequately enlightened public opinion in the realm of the philosophy of the State. In this connection, the responsibility of educational leadership taken in its broadest sense to include all those who participate in the molding of public opinion, directly or indirectly, has assumed new proportions in virtue of unforeseen challenges to our traditional starting points. Misleading notions of democracy were not fatal to our democratic system of government in other periods of our history, but today clear and correct convictions as to its substance and form, its structure and function, and its adaptability to changing epochs of civilization alone can insure its survival.

The tempo of foreign events in particular necessitates a reexamination of the proper place which the democratic process should occupy in the expanding panorama of America's future. I need not remind you that astounding political and military upheavals in areas of the earth which formerly shared leadership with us in carrying forward the torch of civilization have precipitated problems which eclipse in magnitude and difficulty those produced by the economic disaster of the late twenties. American democracy is being called on again to undergo an internal renewal of spiritual forces, a resurrection which will give it "courage to run risks for justice, without which nothing great can be done."

Unfortunately philosophical error crept into the conception of democracy, not only abroad in nations which continued the formalisms of democracy but even in this country. Certain schools of political thought abroad, springing from an inner conflict of moral ultimates, identified democracy with mere parliamentarianism, with individual rights detached from social duties, particularly economic obligations, and with the subjectivism of the popular will, even though that will should run counter to the natural law. Under such erroneous conceptions of democracy it was possible for so-called democratic nations to treat lightly economic injustices to countries which were too weak to make effective their international rights through force. It was possible for such democratic nations to disregard war debts, to renege on territorial promises to former allies, and to dally with communism under the mistaken notion that it was the friend of democracy.

False conceptions of democracy created the mirage that representative government was to be merely negative, divorced from the morality of the common good. The creeping paralysis of the democratic process was aided and abetted by the corollary that democracy was not to be militant. It was not to be militarily prepared to defend itself. It was to have no capacity for national discipline because class strata and the notion of plurality were thought to have the greatest value in a democracy.

In the United States, the limitations of many of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and first third of the twentieth century theories of democracy, in the field of economics, were revealed when they were put to the practical tests imposed by unpredictable social factors. The deficiencies of these doctrines resulted from an inadequate comprehension of the ideal order. Confused thought had equated functional democracy to the level of sheer formalism. There was an identification of the accidental and formal with the material. The methods of democracy, such as constitutions, conventions, the electoral process, and the like, originally efficient means for achieving the moral objectives of individual and social well-being and happiness, tended to become ends in themselves. As their true purpose ceased to be understood, they moved in the direction of emptiness and sterility. The error in theory was verified by experience. The penalty was economic collapse and utter financial depression.

American democracy survived this economic ordeal, first, because its basic economic truths—namely, social justice and emphasis upon the citizen's social duties, as distinguished from his economic rights—were restored, and, secondly, an overriding destiny, which thus far has always been kind to the people of this country in their hour of trial, brought forward great and constructive leadership. We are all familiar with the history of the last few years. The legislative process worked ceaselessly for the temporal happiness of all. A great moral change came over the whole Nation in the matter of social security. The economic heresies which democracy once tolerated were banished.

But in the arena of international politics there was no corresponding revival of an ideal moral order, which is the vitalizing power behind true democracy. There was no superethical force able to impose duties of justice upon the nations, which for the most part thought in terms of materialistic rights. In that same decisive stage of the early thirties, when American democracy was passing through its crisis of life and death, the whole international order was at the cross roads. Outside of America, some of the great nations managed to cling to the outward trappings of democracy, but they became blinded to their military responsibilities and in some respects to its full moral significance. Other countries continued or embraced a state philosophy which contradicted and scoffed at both the forms of democracy and its abiding moral values. Inspired by anti-Christian faiths which generated an emotional physical and intellectual drive which culminated in fanaticism, these nations launched ruthlessly upon a policy of oriental deification of race and state. But it was only at the eleventh hour that the peoples in the democratic group were ready to attest their faith in the essentials of their way of life and society by the supreme sacrifice of war.

Our democratic process is now challenged as never before. But our willingness to rearm is evidence of an intention to make an issue of two opposing notions concerning the destiny of man and his relation to the State, the family, and the church. There is no question but that we shall succeed in building a wall of steel around the United States, if that is necessary to insure our plan of life. We have the resources, the ingenuity, the leadership, and the vision to make effective our will to freedom. The greatest challenge to American democracy is not from the materialistic direction, but from the intellectual.

In this coming emergency, the public is entitled to a thorough discussion of the notion of democracy. It must be clearly pointed out that democracy can mean and has meant different things. This is necessary to put the conflict abroad in its true and correct perspective. It is essential if we are to avoid intolerance and bigotry on a large scale, for the gradual delimitation of civil liberties, if required for the protection of the common good, will afford great emotional temptations to let loose the specter of persecution. Not until we emphasize in our governmental ideal the elements of the value of the human soul, the searching after the dictates of the divine will, a recognition of an equilibrium between the worth of the individual and the necessities of the social authority, notions which have been cognized by reason and elevated to a position of the first rank by the teachings of Christianity—not until we emphasize these things shall we be able to make wise decisions in the days which are ahead.

We are fortunate to have at this time the same leadership which saved democracy after financial demoralization. We have the assurance that the social advances which revived democracy has sponsored in recent years will be preserved. Everything possible to avoid consequences of the abrogation of international law has been attempted under American leadership. The Pope, as the moral leader of most of Christendom, has been invited to cooperate actively in the cause of peace. Precautions are being taken to prevent damage by boring from within by the "fifth column." The Federal Bureau of Investigation is being greatly enlarged for this purpose. All this has been done in the interests of peace.

Certainly true democracy seeks not to foist its ideals upon others with a sword. It postulates tolerance. It does not accede to the thesis of death or conversion. It does not seek empire under false pretenses. These are its ideals, however much there may have been deviation in practice from these principles even in our own history. Hence, if rearmament for peace is translated into rearmament for war, by collision of political philosophies in the international order, coinciding with a desire for mastery over parts of this

hemisphere, we can be reasonably sure that our militant democracy did not hasten the impact.

There can be no doubt that faith in brute force for the settlement of international disputes in the supreme court of war will not be permanent. But it is natural that we are disillusioned by events abroad. We realize now that most of the world's progress in recent years has been in the development of the material sciences. It was hardly in the adoption of true international ideals and in their effectuation. It was not in the domain of inhibition and control.

We cannot be sure that the New World order which must arise from the ashes of the present debacle will be any more enduring than the last. But we do know that it is the duty of this country to exemplify a mode of government and a plan of life, individual and national, which will embody the wisdom of the great philosophical and moral teachers contributing to the great unbroken ethical tradition of a law of God and nature, and to be prepared by all means short of force to convince the nations of the eternal need of benefiting from that wisdom. From it we learn that democracy is not entirely a form, a process, or a function of politically organized society. It is also basically a moral starting point. A democratic formalism with its electoral and constitutional techniques, however, responding to the demands of national discipline and operating as a means for the achievement of those ideals of humanity which constitute an important part of the universal scheme of the cosmos, tends toward perfection.

Shall We Recruit Americans or Un-Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a number of timely speeches on subjects of vital interest to this Nation by gentlemen who have been recognized before me. We have also just heard the suggestion made by the majority leader that we have several subjects of vital importance to the Nation up for consideration this afternoon and he, therefore, suggested that Members desist from making further speeches at this time on other matters, however timely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the majority leader and am very glad to cooperate now as at all times. We must, of course, realize that a great deal of this preceding time today has been consumed by Members making eloquent speeches in acknowledgment of the services, and in admiration for the sterling character, of one of the most dearly beloved and most valuable Members of this body. Today, the esteemed gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable EDWARD T. TAYLOR, is celebrating his eighty-second birthday anniversary. He is a true, loyal American patriot. He is dearly beloved by every Member of this House in which he has served with great distinction for 32 consecutive years. The Honorable EDWARD T. TAYLOR exemplifies real Americanism, therefore, I do not wish to detract from any of those speeches by taking the floor at this time on a matter which deals with un-Americanism.

However, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I want to call your attention to a matter which is of great importance to this Nation in this hour of international crisis.

We have read in the paper this morning that the President is considering the necessity, or, at least, the advisability, of universal conscription of the manpower, even the womanpower, of this Nation. We learn that this body may shortly be asked to consider the necessity for requiring compulsory military training for the youth of this land.

Yesterday on the floor of this House we heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] make the assertion:

> With the help of this administration we will bring you in a bill, first, that will outlaw the German-American Bund, the Communist Party, and other organizations which the committee has found to be agents of foreign governments. [Applause.] That is the first thing we can do. [Applause.] The next thing we can do is to prevent the admission of foreign agents under the guise of refugees.

Every man in this House agrees with those sentiments, and I say to you the sooner we call a halt to all of these un-American activities the sooner this country will be safe from within and the sooner we can safely and surely proceed with the repairment of our woefully inadequate military and naval defense to guard our shores against invasion from without. I say to you it is about time America awakens to the peril from within.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] called your attention to the recent effort made to blow up an ammunition train in the railroad tunnel between Port Huron, Mich., and Sarnia, Ontario. The gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] has previously called your attention to repeated acts of sabotage in the aircraft industries in his great State.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I view with alarm the following article which appeared in the official publication of the Communist Party of the United States, the Daily Worker, printed in New York City last Monday, June 17, and which I hope the membership will read carefully:

> [From Daily Worker, New York, June 17, 1940]
>
> RECRUITING RACE BETWEEN WATER-FRONT AND INDUSTRIAL SECTIONS IS EXTENDED
>
> The recruiting contest between the industrial and water-front sections has been extended for another 3 months, it was announced yesterday following a joint executive committee conference.
>
> Continuation of the Socialist competition for increased recruiting into the Communist Party followed a successful contest between the two sections during the recently concluded 3 months' peace and socialism recruiting drive.
>
> One of the points of that competition had been a plan to hold a joint conference immediately after the drive to insure continuation of the recruiting campaign and to work out further measures for joint aid and cooperation between the two sections.
>
> The waterfront section had led the whole State in recruiting, while the industrial section was outstanding in the number brought into the Communist Party.
>
> The conference, after a careful appraisal of the recruiting activity in the past 3 months, decided to extend the competition from June 15 to September 15, with the waterfront section pledging to increase its membership by 35 percent and the industrial section pledging to bring in 300 new members into the party.
>
> RECRUITING AGAINST WAR
>
> The joint statement, setting forth the mutual responsibilities of both groups for the building of the Communist Party, stressed the importance of this work and the tremendous possibilities for recruiting as part of the fight against the involvement of the United States in the imperialist war.
>
> Meanwhile, spurred by the successful competition between the water-front and industrial sections, the Williamsburgh section issued a challenge to both groups for continued and increased recruiting. The challenge was accepted by both sections, and details for the 3-sided contest will be worked out.
>
> The competition and plans for continued recruiting it was noted by all three sections, assumes greater significances because of the usual decline following a drive. It indicates, it was pointed out, that the party organizations are taking seriously the need for consistent and steady recruiting at all times.
>
> The joint statement of the water-front and industrial sections pointed out that the competition, "far from dividing us, has brought us closer together because of our common objectives. The exchange of experiences was an important factor in the improved recruiting," the statement continued.
>
> "We have learned not only that the workers are against the imperialist war, against America's entry into that war, but that they are ready to face the fact that to fight for socialism is the best way to fight against the imperialist war."

Mr. Speaker, on May 13 I called your attention to the prevalence of communism in the merchant marine of this Nation. Since that time I have received many letters of commendation, but at the same time have received many letters denying the presence of communism in the American merchant marine; and, yet, we find this article in the official publication of the Communist Party of the United States bragging about "a recruiting contest between the industrial and water-front sections" of the Communist Party in and around New York City.

Mr. Speaker, we note the Communists now are crying for the prevention of war and particularly against American involvement in this present war in Europe. No one in this House is anxious for us to get in this war, and every man and woman in this House is doing their utmost to keep us out of this war, but, in doing so, I doubt that our aims are as one with the Communist Party. We seek to uphold American traditions and the American way of life. And we note that the Communists' aim, as expressed in the last paragraph noted above, seems to be for the establishment of

socialism in this country. God forbid! Communism, nazi-ism, and fascism are the illegitimate offspring of Marxian socialism.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was one of eight Members of this body who voted against the so-called Bloom bill which, for the first time in the history of this country, sought to write into the law of this land the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine has been universally recognized for over 120 years. It has never been successfully challenged, and I believe it never will be successfully challenged as long as there is a drop of red blood in these United States. However, this war hysteria has not yet gripped me as, apparently, it has some, with the spirit of "shouting loudly from the housetops while carrying a little dead twig." I much prefer the slogan of the great Theodore Roosevelt: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." An adequate defense will do far more to uphold the Monroe Doctrine than all the laws or resolutions ever enacted by this body.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel if we are going to preserve all that is dear to us in this Nation, it is time we substitute action for words. It is time we recruit Americans to "patriotize" America. It is time we stop recruiting Communists to Sovietize America.

National-Defense Program and Henry Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in the news of today we note that announcement has been made in connection with the building of airplane motors by the Ford Motor Co. This is a source of satisfaction to everyone who believes that a national-defense program should be formulated and kept under way without regard to partisan politics. Men like Henry Ford will have to be employed by the Government if a national-defense program is to succeed. This is a matter where mere theorists and inexperienced officials and impractical visionaries cannot fill the bill. What is needed in a national-defense program is action and not talk.

Some days ago I called attention to the statement made by Henry Ford to the effect that his plant could turn out 1,000 airplanes a day if not hampered with red tape from Washington officials. I called this matter to the attention of the House because I felt that Henry Ford should be given an opportunity to serve his Government in this national crisis. The remarks I made regarding his offer apply to all other people who know how to carry to completion a national-defense program.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I think that the news item which indicates that a contract has been made with Mr. Ford for the production of airplanes by him will soon become a reality.

Let us hope that those in authority will devote the same energy and will acquire services of men of high caliber in the production of other equipment needed in our national-defense program.

In connection with the building of airplanes and the training of airplane pilots, I note that one Washington columnist today says that aircraft engines, and also other parts, can be produced with great rapidity with equipment which is already ready for operation. He then goes on to point out that the only thing that is causing delay is the fact that additional appropriations are needed for this purpose and that up to date the administration authorities have not authorized such appropriations. Then, further comment is made that unless Congress, before adjournment, provides an additional sum of money for the manufacture of airplanes and the development of this line of national defense, that no real progress will be made in accordance with public declarations by the administration officials. The program calling for 50,000 airplanes and necessary pilots to man them must be gotten under way. All of this leads me to suggest that now is not the time to adjourn Congress. We ought to check up and find out who is responsible for this delay in getting our national defense under way. We ought to know if the money which is now being appropriated is to be used to pay for some of the New Deal experiments rather than for the protection of the United States. If taxes are being levied on the theory that they are for national-defense purposes, they ought to be used for those purposes, and the American people ought not be misled. If the Budget is in such a deplorable condition that additonal taxes are needed in order to prevent repudiation of debts already contracted, then the American people should be advised.

We face a real crisis in the history of our country; and, in my opinion, national defense is of paramount consideration, and the ablest men in the United States should be called upon to contribute thereto.

Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on tax legislation delivered by me in the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, June 2, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WILEY. Congress and the people of this country are awake to the fact that the days of American ease are vanishing. This Nation must equip itself so it can meet any emergency. Let us be realistic. That means taxation. We can't borrow forever. The bill for defense preparations must be paid. This is no time for political evasion. This is a time for realistically meeting the issue.

Any tax that is imposed should be based primarily upon the ability to pay. That's the basic philosophy of the income tax. One of the first things we have to consider is the matter of adjusting the income-tax rate. I believe there are three feasible suggestions which are now being considered by Washington officials:

1. The first suggestion which has been made is to broaden the base so that the income tax starts on single folks having over $500 income and on married folks having over $1,000 income.

2. The second suggestion is an income tax of 5 percent on all incomes over $500, payable at the source, just the way the social-security tax is collected.

3. The third suggestion is an additional 5-percent tax on all incomes without exemptions. This could be collected, or part of it could, in the same manner that the social-security tax is collected. It has been estimated that this tax would produce approximately $2,000,000,000. It would apply both to individuals and unincorporated business income.

The extra tax on corporate income should be such as the Treasury should determine to be sound and equitable.

In considering these tax proposals we must realize that our first job is to get preparedness. Our preparedness must not be obstructed by absence of financial resources.

The problem is bigger than simply raising the money. We have to see what effect a tax has on production, accumulation of capital, utilization of capital, savings, and so forth. It, therefore, appears, as I see it, that we'll probably have to have a combination of increased taxation and borrowing, because increased taxation won't start coming in until some time in the future.

Another reason why we shall need this combination is, that to finance military construction, it will require enormous sums of money, and if it is to be raised solely by taxation we may put a burden on industry which may be a destructive burden and interfere with our getting military preparedness as quickly as possible. That's our first objective.

I agree with those who say that the time is not far distant when we shall have to analyze our whole tax problem. There may have to be a restatement of that problem in terms such as we have never known them before. However, this is no reason why we should go off "half cocked" on this measure.

There is no time now to revamp the whole system of taxation; therefore, we will have to put a tax through known as a defense tax or a preparedness tax.

I know that with our tremendous assets and our particularly large amount of idle money, we would have no trouble to finance a loaning program (and that's what some folks want to do—just borrow), but up ahead there is a day of reckoning, and we may as well face the issue squarely now; and raise part of the load by direct taxation.

Closely allied to this tax program is the idea that the people must get 100-percent value in their preparedness program. By so doing, by saving excess costs, we will cut down the cost of preparedness. We want to find men who know how to cut costs for the Nation instead of increasing costs.

The ancient Greeks at Thermopylae swore to transmit to their children the freedom of Greece unimpaired. We have to choose now between leaving our children an America unimpaired, fully equipped to meet any emergency, but with an increased debt; or an America with less debt and possibly without her freedoms. This day demands that we choose what course we will pursue.

This taxation problem has many angles to it. If we were to attempt to finance the program by taxation, it would throw the burden on our standard of living and would delay the process of the absorption of the unemployed. By borrowing part of the costs, the burden would be thrown on capital rather than on the standard of living. As the program progresses and conditions change, we might raise more of the money by taxation, especially if the unemployed were absorbed.

Special taxes, called sometimes excise taxes and luxury taxes or war taxes, should be considered by experts and applied so that the tax would release commodities and types of labor and types of equipment for the program.

There is no need to get hysterical about the situation. This preparedness program should have a desirable effect in diminishing unemployment relief. In other words, a good deal of W. P. A. help could be turned into preparedness use. Likewise C. C. C. and many of the men released from the public-works program ought to be absorbed in the defense program.

There is no fear or hysteria here in relation to this preparedness program, and with spiritual guidance and direction we are going to keep out of this war.

Lord Lothian Against Lord Lothian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EXCERPTS FROM WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF BRITISH AMBASSADOR

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some pertinent paragraphs from the writings and speeches of Lord Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States.

Philipp Henry Kerr, Marquess of Lothian, who also bears the titles of Lord Newbattle, Earl of Ancrue, and Viscount of Drien, is in many respects a typical member of the British ruling class. The aristocratic standing which he derives from ancient lineage is buttressed by the possession of estates covering some 28,000 acres. To the shrewd, practical intelligence which often characterizes men of his class, he adds two qualities which doubtless account for his appointment as His Brittanic Majesty's Ambassador to the United States. He is persuasively literate in speech and writing, and his mind is pliant and adaptable to changing circumstances.

Lord Lothian's career has been well-calculated to develop these special gifts. As Philipp Kerr, he was from 1910 to 1916 editor of the Round Table, an influential journal of British opinion. From 1916 to 1921 he was private secretary to the Honorable David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain during the later years of the first World War and the earlier post-war period. In this capacity he was on the inside of the peace conference which framed the Treaty of Versailles, of unhappy memory, and he is supposed to have been the author of the Covering Note of July 16, 1919, which laid on Germany the sole guilt of the war of 1914–18. We shall see that he later recanted this thesis.

ELOQUENT APOLOGIST FOR THE GERMAN POINT OF VIEW

Indeed, in later years, especially after coming into his title and taking his seat in the House of Lords, Lothian demonstrated his mental pliancy by becoming an assiduous and eloquent apologist for the German point of view. After the National Socialist Party and Adolf Hitler came to power, Lothian specifically defended the steps taken by the Nazis to undo the evil work of Versailles, and persuasively urged that British policy should conform with German ideas for the reconstruction of Europe. The writings and speeches of Lord Lothian during this period reveal that he believed—

That Germany was badly treated at Versailles; that French efforts to keep Germany in vassalage were cruel and unwise; that Britain and the United States share the guilt of France in this respect; that these three are responsible for the triumph of national socialism;

That national socialism has been good for Germany;

That Germany was justified in rearming;

That there were too many small nations in post-Versailles Europe and that hegemony in southeastern Europe naturally belongs to Germany;

That the German demands for reunion with Austria, the Suedetenland, and Memel, and for possession of Danzig were justified;

That Britain belongs in a world system not in the European system, that accordingly Britain should not make commitments in Europe, should not try to dominate Europe, should not go to war over any European issue; and

BRITISH MEDDLING IN EUROPE

That one of the prime causes of the war danger which then overhung Europe—and has since taken such tragic reality—was British meddling in eastern Europe.

No one reading the noble lord's words can doubt that he spoke his sincere convictions. The discrepancy between his own view and those which, as British Ambassador, he is now daily urging upon the American Government and people, cannot but recall Talleyrand's famous definition of an Ambassador's duty—"to lie for his country." Today Ambassador Lothian must try to persuade Americans that Hitler is a monster, nazi-ism an unmitigated evil, and the German people essentially barbarous; that Germany breaks treaties in mere cynical wantonness; that the reunion with Germany of territories inhabited by Germans which were cut off from the body of Germany at Versailles is a crime against democracy, that the German war with Poland made it Britain's sacred duty to war on Germany, and that, in fact, the preservation of civilization, as we have known it, requires that American might, money, and men shall be freely offered to Britain to save her from defeat in that war which Lord Lothian, before he became Ambassador, warned his countrymen to shun.

The subjoined excerpts from the writings and speeches of the British Ambassador to this country are spread on this RECORD to show that Lord Lothian approved those ideas. Of the two souls in his lordly bosom one was evidently very friendly to Germany.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REARMED GERMANY JUSTIFIED

FROM THE WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN, AMBASSADOR OF GREAT BRITAIN TO THE UNITED STATES

[From The Place of Britain in the Collective System, an address given at Chatham House on June 5, 1934, reported in International Affairs, vol. XIII, London, 1934, pp. 622 seq.]

The long latent crisis has now been precipitated because the Germans, having been promised equality in December 1932 and having found that for one reason or other equality was delayed and was apparently to be indefinitely postponed, refused to remain defenseless any longer, left the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations in October last, and have now begun to try to recover equality by rearming.

It is a dangerous crisis. The French, realizing that it is impossible to get Great Britain to guarantee stability in a rearmed Europe, are

vigorously trying to strengthen their old system of security by military preponderance behind the Treaty of Versailles with the assistance of Russia, and, in a measure, of Italy. Failing that, they have been toying once more with the idea of a preventive war.

* * * * * * *

We shall never make any progress toward an effective collective system until we separate the world system of peace from the European, and recognize that our place is in the world system rather than the European system.

* * * * * * *

If this is so, the sooner we make it clear that we reject any kind of automatic commitment the sooner will Europe make its own regional system.

* * * * * * *

My own view is that, if only we do not interfere, Europe will rapidly establish a regional security system of its own, which may well prevent war and lead both to appeasement and to some measure of limitation of armaments in a system of balance before many years are past.

GERMANY AND EQUALITY

[From Pacifism Is Not Enough, the Burge Memorial Lecture, delivered at Oxford, 1935]

By the end of the century Germany was no longer content with a purely European position. Her union had led to immense economic development. She had become interested in world trade. She became dissatisfied at finding that world politics were being decided by Britain and Japan, Britain and France, or the United States, without bringing Germany into consultation. Hence, the launching of the German navy bills by the Kaiser. These bills were not intended to give Germany supremacy, but, as their preamble stated, to insure that no decision should be made without taking Germany's wishes into account. Germany, in the old phrase, demanded her "place in the sun," a phrase which, translated into post-war parlance, is the word "equality." There was nothing wicked about this desire.

* * * * * * *

Wilson, in introducing the covenant to the peace conference, sadly expressed the hope that one of the central functions of the League would be to bring about peaceful revision of injustices which war passion made unavoidable at the time.

But the League has never been able to do this, either under article XIX or article XI or article XV. Reparations have disappeared—but through the pressure of facts, not of agreement. The unilateral disarmament of Germany has disappeared, not by agreement, despite 3 years of discussion, but by unilateral action. The only important agreed relaxation has been the evacuation of the Rhineland 5 years before the appointed day. It has never been possible seriously to discuss the Polish-German frontiers, the question whether Austria was to have a free choice as to her own destiny, the duration of the unilateral demilitarization of Germany's western frontiers, the colonial question, the Hungarian frontiers. If there is to be real peace, agreed solutions for some of these questions are essential.

[From "Germany and France," in the Times (London), January 31, 1935]

The Treaty of Versailles imposed two things upon her (Germany). First, a great reduction in territory, a loss of colonies, and heavy reparations. Second, defenselessness against her neighbors through the unilateral disarmament clauses of part V of the treaty. Since 1918 this inequality for Germany has, in fact, been France's security.

* * * * * * *

It is, then, inequality that Germany is absolutely determined to get rid of today. It involved liability to the Ruhr invasion and to incidents like the present Memel situation. It meant that, in practice, the neighbors of Germany could consult about European problems, while Germany was kept outside the door, and then ask her to sign on the dotted line. They could afford to do this because Germany, normally one of the great powers of the world, could not, in the last resort, resist. National socialism, which among many other things is a movement of individual and national self-respect, came into being largely to end the abasement of Germany.

[From "Germany and France—the British Task," in the Times (London), February 1, 1935]

What is the way out? The central fact in Europe today is that Germany does not want war and is prepared to renounce it absolutely as a method of settling her disputes with her neighbors, provided she is given real equality, because it is only equality which will enable her to test whether the pacific method of dealing with disputes can reasonably succeed.

* * * * * * *

He (Hitler) goes further and says that he will sign pacts of nonaggression with all Germany's neighbors to prove the sincerity of his desire for peace, and that in armaments he asks for no more than equality for Germany, and will accept international inspection if everybody else accepts it, too.

I have not the slightest doubt that this attitude is perfectly sincere. Hitler's Germany does not want war.

* * * * * * *

War comes far more frequently from inability to change out-of-date political arrangements in time than from direct aggression.

* * * * * * *

Take again national socialism itself. National socialism is the outcome of a 4 years' war, the Ruhr, inflation, and two revolutions in 20 years.

* * * * * * *

It (national socialism) has been strong enough to give Germany unity where it was terribly divided, to produce a stable government in place of weak and unstable government, and to restore to Germany national self-respect and international standing. One thing, too, about it is not generally understood. It is not imperialist in the old sense of the word.

CRAMPED NATIONS AND RAW MATERIAL SOURCES

[From "'Open Door' in All Colonies." Speech at a conference held for the formation of a Council of Action for Peace and Reconstruction, in Lancashire. Reported in The Times (London), September 30, 1935]

"After the war we cramped the nations, many of them with rapidly expanding populations, into countries that were narrow, unproductive, and with few natural resources. Italy perhaps is the most conspicuous of those countries, Japan is another, and Germany will be tomorrow, and there will probably be others. It is no use pretending that the tremendous problems of the sudden stoppage of world movement do not exist. They are there, and unless we handle them firmly and wisely and in time they will explode in world war, whatever sanctions we create.

* * * * * * *

"Sir Samuel Hoare opened the door a little way when he proposed the question of access to raw materials for all nations, but that does not go nearly far enough. We have to go much further in dealing with both Italy and Germany if we are to have lasting peace. The real questions are a substantial reduction in the tariffs and embargoes which create unemployment everywhere, so as to make possible a development of international trade; the collective reconsideration of the problem of migration; the revision of the war-time mandates, and collective consideration whether there could not be an open door in the colonial territories of all nations.

LORD LOTHIAN AGAINST ENGLISH INTERVENTION IN EUROPE

[From Germany and the Rhineland, address given at Chatham House on April 2, 1936; special supplement to International Affairs, London, April 1936, pp. 45 et seq.]

It was inevitable that the signature of the recent Franco-Soviet military convention, together with the Czechoslovak-Soviet convention, should reawaken in Germany all the old fears of encirclement—the fear that Germany might have to fight simultaneously a fully mobilized Russian army and a fully mobilized French army. The signature of that convention, inevitably as I think, made Germany feel that she could no longer keep open the back door through which France had made the Ruhr invasion. A very distinguished British general, Sir Iam Hamilton, wrote to the Times only a few days ago and said that Germany, from a military point of view, had escaped from a military embrace only just in time.

* * * * * * *

In the long run Austria must be the judge of her own future. We cannot and certainly will not go to war to perpetuate a system in which Austria is governed by a combination of Mussolini and the Pope. If Danzig, which is a German city, wants to rejoin Germany now that Poland has got Gdynia, it is not worth a war to prevent it. It would be wise for Poland to make some permanent arrangement for enabling Germany to have access to East Prussia while she has access to Gdynia. Something has got to be done about Memel.

* * * * * * *

We would not go to war about those questions in eastern Europe concerning which the rest of Europe wants to build a sort of armed collective security system in order to maintain the status quo there.

* * * * * * *

I do not believe that we are prepared to go to war for questions in eastern Europe, and therefore the sooner we make that clear to Europe the better for us, for Europe, and for peace. Otherwise war will come and we shall be dragged into it exactly as we were in 1914. That is the real danger.

* * * * * * *

I am inclined to think that Europe will never make peace within herself until we leave her to do her own work. I am not sure that Europe might not come to peace if it were made quite clear that no group in Europe could hope for a military alliance with us, that we were not concerned in that aspect of the European game at all.

* * * * * * *

The United States has made up her mind, once and for all, that her intervention in Europe in 1917 was a waste of effort, that somehow or other Europe must solve her own problems and that she is not going to be associated, in any way, with European commitments.

ECONOMIC INJUSTICE TO GERMANY

[From "England and Germany," published in "The Nineteenth Century and After," vol. CXXI, January–June 1937, pp. 577 et seq.]

In practice the high hopes raised by those ideas (democracy and the League of Nations) were gradually nullified by three things. The first was that, as was almost inevitable at the end

of 4 years' war-time propaganda, the terms imposed upon Germany and her associates were too severe. They did not conform to that justice which must be the basis for lasting order and peace. Some penalty for defeat was inevitable. But some of the new national frontiers, especially in eastern Europe, did not conform to majority lines. A fantastic burden of reparations was placed upon Germany. Her colonies, conquered during the war, were not restored. Germany was permanently disarmed and her western frontier was permanently demilitarized, while her late enemies were left in possession of their full rights both to arm and to organize their defense.

* * * * * * *

The second main reason for the failure of the settlement of 1919 was an almost total disregard of economics. Just as the Vienna Congress in 1815 ignored nationality which eventually blew their settlement to pieces, so the Paris Conference ignored the effect on the world of the increase in the number of sovereign states in Europe, each with full power to put tariffs round themselves, and of war debts and reparations. It has been the division of the world into watertight economic compartments burdened by heavy international debt obligations, both public and private, which has been the main cause of the high tariffs, quotas, and exchange restrictions which have produced the chronic unemployment, the social distress, the revolutionary movements, either from the right or from the left, the overthrow of democracy, and the return to authoritarian government, in so many countries, since 1920.

* * * * * * *

The third and perhaps most serious tragedy since 1920 has been the failure of the League of Nations.

* * * * * * *

There are a great many people in England who think that the easiest solution of the economic problem for Germany would be special economic arrangements in central Europe. Germany and the smaller countries to the east and south are largely economically correlative, and the present excessive economic subdivision of eastern Europe cannot be permanent.

* * * * * * *

If Germany and her eastern neighbors would create an association on the British or American model, the main economic problem of the day would be far on the way to solution. Germany would have an economic zone not unlike that of the other great powers. She would, too, move toward the Anglo-American group. Encirclement would end. The security both of Germany and France would be assured. The colonial question would be soluble.

[From Preventing a World War, speech at the Reform Club, Manchester; reported in the Times, London, February 24, 1937]

By far the most serious problem which confronts the statesmanship of the world today is to find the method whereby a local war or crisis of power politics does not inexorably spread until it becomes another universal war—by far the greatest calamity that can befall mankind. If you cannot prevent a war, it is far better to isolate it than to spread it into a world war, which is precisely what the system of collective security, if adopted, is bound to do.

* * * * * * *

If the theory of collective security got us into another European war, what should we be fighting for? We should be fighting to maintain the anarchy of Europe, which is Europe's fundamental bane. I do not think that is a cause which was worth 1,000,000 British lives.

* * * * * * *

In great measure it (fascism) was rebellion against the discriminations of the Treaty of Versailles and the economic barriers which since the war had shut all nations, except Russia, the United States, and ourselves, who had immense areas under our control, from the markets of the rest of the world and especially from colonial markets.

STATUS QUO IMPOSSIBLE

[From speech in the House of Lords, March 2, 1937, Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords, vol. 104, London, 1937, pp. 392 et seq.]

I venture to think that if Europe could become normal the chances of world war would be extremely small. It is Europe which is the main focus, the main center from which the threat of war throughout the world now springs, and the fundamental reason for that is not the ambition or the malignity of any particular race or people, it is the fact that today it is divided into 26 sovereign states.

* * * * * * *

It seems to me that the recent argument for collective security—that is the argument that the nations who are satisfied with the status quo, the nations which want to prevent any alterations, should enter into something like a military alliance in order that they may be overwhelmingly and collectively stronger than any nation that seeks to alter the status quo—is nothing else than the modernization of what in my view has been the fatal policy which has been maintained by the French Government ever since 1920 * * * a policy, I may add, for which we and the United States of America must bear our full share of blame.

* * * * * * *

This new alliance system, now ennobled by the phrase "collective security," began with the military alliances between France and the Little Entente and Poland. It has now been extended to Russia by the treaty of mutual assistance between France and Russia, a treaty which has its duplicate or its parallel in the treaty between Czechoslovakia and Russia. That is one side of the alliance system. Inevitably, as has always happened in the past and as under any system in which alliances are involved between sovereign states always will happen in the future, that system has begun to produce an alliance system on the other side. It produced what is called the Rome-Berlin axis, it produced the anti-Comintern agreement between Germany and Japan.

* * * * * * *

There are people, old diplomats, high officials, public men, who seem to be convinced that because Germany is largely isolated, with a population of not more than 70,000,000 people, because it has a totalitarian government—that government itself the product of the policy of its neighbors, including ourselves, in great measure—with a country to the east whose armaments are at least three times as great as those of Germany, that Germany is considering an attack on the peace of Europe and the liberty of its neighbors. I confess that when you consider that Germany occupies the most dangerous position in Europe, that she has no natural frontiers, that modern air services mean that she is more liable to be destroyed than any other nation, infinitely more liable than ourselves, I think the German fear is to a large extent a bogey. I do not say that Germany is easy to deal with—I do not think she is—but that we should drift into a policy which, in effect, says that the only way of dealing with Germany is to surround her in such a way, both economically and politically, that an internal explosion is inevitable, is to condemn ourselves and the world to world war. It is the most fatal policy of all.

* * * * * * *

The question is whether you cannot apply the system which we have adopted with considerable success in the case of Spain to Europe and if necessary to the Far East—noncommitment to either side, and nonintervention.

* * * * * * *

What matters is that we should not be drawn into any form of alliance system or counteralliance system. I venture to think that if we withdrew from Europe it is the best contribution we can possibly make to the peace of Europe today.

* * * * * * *

Democracy itself will not be able to stand another world war. To fight it you will have to abandon your parliamentary system and the financial needs could not be met by ordinary democratic methods.

GERMANY NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR FIRST WORLD WAR

[From Germany and the Peace of Europe; address given at Chatham House on June 29, 1937; printed in International Affairs, vol. XVI, London, 1937, pp. 870, et seq.]

Now, the Versailles settlement was based on the theory of the sole responsibility of Germany for the Great War. I do not think anybody who has made a serious study of pre-war history, or even the events which immediately preceded the war, can hold that view today.

* * * * * * *

On the strength of it Germany was deprived of one-seventh of her European territory; she was deprived of her colonies; she was unilaterally disarmed; and she was compelled to demilitarize the Rhineland, which meant, in effect, that at any time a French army could march into the vital Rhineland region and reduce Germany to paralysis. In addition, there was placed upon her a burden of reparations for which I do not suppose today there is a single advocate; impossible reparations leading in their turn to impossible claims for war debts.

* * * * * * *

In 1922 there took place the invasion of the Ruhr, declared by the British Government at the time to be contrary to the Treaty of Versailles and an illegal act. * * * Yet the invasion of the Ruhr resulted in the increase in inflation which had been begun by the excessive demand for reparations, and which finally wiped out the whole middle class in Germany and produced the national socialist party.

* * * * * * *

In January 1933 Germany was promised equality in a regime of security. But after many negotiations to this end, Sir John Simon, after consultation with his French friends, who were terrified by the advent of Hitler to power, announced at Geneva in october 1933 that, in effect, no practical steps in the direction of conceding equality to Germany could be taken for 4 more years, and M. Paul Boncour added in his speech that, even at the end of 4 years, it would be necessary to take the political situation into account. That statement was taken by Germany as a default on our promises, and as conclusive proof that the League was completely dominated by the victors of Versailles. So she left the League; and I have no doubt that if we had been treated in the same way we should have taken the same action. The episode led, nonetheless, to tragic results. On the one hand, it led to the unlimited rearmament by Germany and, on the other, to the conviction that what counts in international affairs is not the force of your case, but the strength of your armaments. If any nation has had that conviction borne in on her it has been Germany, by everything that has happened to her from 1918 to 1933. She received nothing substantial in response to reason. She only began to recover her position in the world when she had begun

to acquire the strength which enabled her to take her natural rights by unilateral action in defiance of the treaties.

* * * * * * *

I think it must be admitted that national socialism has done a great deal for Germany. It has undoubtedly cleaned up Germany in the ordinary moral sense of the word. The defeatism, the corruption, so manifest a characteristic in the days after the war, has disappeared, at any rate, from public view. It has given discipline and order and a sense of purpose to the great majority of young people who in earlier days did not know where to go or what they were living for.

* * * * * * *

Now, how is one to deal with a Germany which, in my view, has claims against the rest of the world on grounds of justice?

Let me deal first with Eastern Europe. Speaking very broadly, the German thesis of today is that she is entitled to self-determination in Central Europe. The war was fought for self-determination, and at the end of the war not only were certain groups of Germans, like the Austrians, forbidden to unite with Germany, but considerable numbers of Germans just outside the German frontiers were united with other countries. The Polish Corridor, though then largely peopled by Germans, was created, and severed Germany's connection with East Prussia. Cities like Danzig, which had always been German since the beginning of history, were cut away from Germany. Now, if the principle of self-determination were applied on behalf of Germany in the way in which it was applied against her, it would mean the reentry of Austria into Germany, the union of the Sudetendeutsch, Danzig, and possibly Memel with Germany, and certain adjustments with Poland in Silesia and the corridor.

EUROPE SHOULD SETTLE DOWN UNDER GERMAN LEADERSHIP

Then on the economic side there is a certain natural balance between the various countries of southeastern Europe and Germany. If political antagonism could be eliminated, economic arrangements could be made between the various states which would give to all of them a higher standard of living and far greater economic stability. And, provided it was done by agreement, I cannot see that vast Russia to the east or the satisfied colonial powers to the west ought to object. On the contrary, their greatest need is that central Europe should settle down, and that is only possible, in my view, under German leadership.

* * * * * * *

The colonial question is now very important, not only as a symbol of the restoration of German self-respect and the withdrawal of accusations that she was unfit to have colonies, but as a vital element in her own economic system if she is to attain the standard of living which the rest of us think necessary for a civilized country.

* * * * * * *

Admittedly, I think, the present regime in Germany has been created by the policy of her neighbors, and mainly by the policy of keeping Germany down and encircled, which has been relentlessly pursued by France since 1920. But when I say French policy, I do not mean to hold France alone responsible for that policy, because I think the United States and Great Britain are equally responsible.

[From a letter in the Times (London) September 17, 1937]

I do not remember that Great Britain felt particularly squeamish when it declared recently that an alteration in circumstances had made it impossible for it to fulfill its obligations under its debt settlement with the United States.

* * * * * * *

The League has failed to bring peace to Europe not because it was not strong enough, but because it utterly failed to give justice and equality to republican Germany or to compel M. Barthou to accept Herr Hitler's offers to limit Germany's armaments at a point below that of her neighbors.

THE BASIS OF A LASTING PEACE

[From The Issues in British Foreign Policy, an address given at Chatham House on March 24, 1938. Published in International Affairs, vol. XVII, London, 1938, pp. 360 et seq.]

I have felt for the last 3 years that the most imperative thing was to go and to have a real talk with the Germans as to what the basis of a lasting peace should be. Perhaps it was because I felt that they had legitimate grievances which had to be removed before there could be peace. But I felt also that the time to negotiate with Germany was when Hitler was offering to be content with an army of two hundred or three hundred thousand men or an air force half that of France or one-third of the neighboring air forces, whichever was the smaller. That was the time to negotiate. But what stood in the way? That Great Britain was committed to the support of the reign of law and the sanctity of the Paris system of treaties through the League of Nations.

* * * * * * *

And now Hitler, by methods which we cannot help deploring because of the shock they give elsewhere, has at last realized the dream of the German people—the dream they have dreamed for 300 years—to be a united people, as Italy is a united people, and France is a united people, and England is a united people, and every other race in Europe is a united people except the Germans.

* * * * * * *

If another war comes and the history of it is ever written, the dispassionate historian a hundred years hence will say not that Germany alone was responsible for it, even if she strikes the first blow, but that those who mismanaged the world between 1918 and 1937 had a large share of responsibility for it.

[From America After Munich, published in The Observer, February 26, 1939]

On the one hand we have the title to Mr. Quincy Howe's now famous book, England Expects Every American To Do His Duty. This represents the inveterate suspicion in the United States that every British proposal is designed to induce the United States to underwrite British interests—a suspicion which rests on the fact that Anglo-American cooperation obviously operates to the benefit of the British Commonwealth and not so obviously to the benefit of the United States.

A Eulogy to John A. Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN B. BARNARD, OF PUEBLO, COLO., AT THE FUNERAL SERVICES HELD IN PUEBLO, DECEMBER 28, 1939, FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MARTIN, THE REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday afternoon, December 28, 1939, funeral services were held in the municipal auditorium in Pueblo, Colo., for the Honorable JOHN ANDREW MARTIN, the Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Third Congressional District of Colorado. In JOHN MARTIN'S home city no church or edifice other than the municipal auditorium was sufficiently large to accommodate the thousands of John's friends from all parts of Colorado who sought by their presence to pay to the memory of their beloved Congressman their tribute of respect, admiration, and affection.

At these services an eminent lawyer and old-time friend, Mr. John B. Barnard, of Pueblo, delivered the following:

A EULOGY TO JOHN A. MARTIN

Were a secular text to be selected for this eulogy to JOHN A. MARTIN, which can only be inadequate, I should choose one from the public utterances of Abraham Lincoln. Speaking on the anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the Great Emancipator said of him: "As well attempt to augment the brilliance of the sun or the luster of the stars as to try to add to the glory of the name of Washington. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on."

JOHN MARTIN'S life has been lived. He has carved his name in high and commanding letters in the hall of fame. Nothing I will or can say here may add to or detract from the honor, respect, and love for him which are in the hearts of countless thousands of his neighbors and countrymen. Many of them are with him today for the last time. He has walked in the paths of the mighty as one of them, and he has sat in the seats of the lowly as one of them. The great and the humble, the rich and the poor, men and women in all walks of life, who have known this great friend of ours, have always respected, admired, and loved him; they deeply mourn his passing; and they will forever cherish his memory.

On April 10, 1868, JOHN ANDREW MARTIN was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, the son of Hugh Martin and Ann Bohen Martin. On September 6, 1902, at Wellington, Kans., he was married to Rose May Chitwood, with whom he spent almost a half century of loving and understanding companionship. In addition to his widow, of his immediate family, he is survived by his daughter, Stella Martin Spencer, and his granddaughter, Sally Spencer, of La Junta, Colo.; by three brothers, Tom E. Martin, of Pueblo, Edward Martin, of Hutchinson, Kans., and Hugh Martin, of Dacoma, Okla.; and by one sister, Anna Carlile, of Cincinnati, Ohio. No word which we can say will be effective to assuage their grief. May God grant that it be some comfort to them to know that all of us here, and thousands who are not here, share their sorrow; and that we, as they, mourn the passing of a great and righteous man.

JOHN MARTIN'S life has seen him engaged in many and varied activities. His early years were spent on a farm near Turon, in western Kansas. From there he came to Colorado, and his first task was to help to build the Colorado Midland Railroad through the giant Rockies. He was next employed as a locomotive fireman

by the Santa Fe; and while so engaged, he read law with such good purpose that in 1896 he was admitted to the bar of Colorado and, with the exception of the periods spent in the Congress of the United States, has continuously practiced his profession since that time. No abler advocate of right and justice ever stood before the bar.

In 1901 he was elected a representative to the general assembly of the State from Pueblo County and served as such for one term. In 1908 he was elected to the Congress of the United States and served until 1913, at which time he returned to the practice of law in Pueblo. In 1932 he was again elected to Congress. By tremendous votes of confidence he was returned in 1934, 1936, and 1938; and only recently he announced that it would be impossible for him again to serve his district in the lower House. He desired to return to private life to pass his sunset years. He wanted to live again in a house by the side of the road, and there, beyond the strain and stress of public life, as he always lived, remain, a friend to man. He was bodily weary with the weight of his years and his labors; but his spirit was as young and flaming as it was in the days of his youth.

Men, all men, have virtues and frailties; so with JOHN A. MARTIN. His many virtues so overwhelmingly outnumbered his few faults, that the latter have been written upon the sands, and the winds of eternity have blown them afar. But his virtues as a husband, a father, a soldier, a statesman, an American are carved in the everlasting granite of remembrance, which no shifting sand may ever efface or despoil.

Perhaps the highest quality he possessed, one which endeared him to so many people, was his rugged, sterling honesty. Numbers of people differed with him in his policies and beliefs; but no single one of them ever expressed or held any doubt but that he was honest in thought in arriving at his convictions. He invariably followed the honest dictates of his own conscience, regardless of personal fortune or public opinion.

Love of his country with him was a fetish. When America submitted to the inevitable and entered the World War as a belligerent, JOHN MARTIN immediately sought enlistment. Over the age of active service, the head and support of his family, he was declined enrollment. Undaunted in his determination to serve, he recruited, by his own efforts, a battalion of National Guardsmen in Pueblo, entered the army as a private, later was elevated to the rank of major, and was placed in command of the battalion he recruited. Many of the men who served under him are here today. It was a source of the keenest regret to him that the inflexible rules which govern the movement of men at arms of our Nation did not permit him to lead his men into action in France. More than life, he cherished his military service.

Returning from the army to civilian life, he again took up the practice of the law. To the end that the flame of patriotism, kindled in the hearts of men by the war, should continue to burn brightly, he enthusiastically joined with others who had served in the armed forces, in the organization of Pueblo Post No. 2, of the American Legion, later was its commander, and served as a member of the National Americanism Commission of that organization.

His patriotic service to his country did not end with his discharge from the Army. After the war was over there came into existence in this country groups and organizations whose creed was the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States of America. To them the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were mere scraps of paper. They planned to destroy, by force, all of the traditions and institutions which succeeding generations have builded upon those immortal documents. These insidious, traitorous groups and individuals met one of their most implacable, most courageous foes in JOHN A. MARTIN. In his office, on the streets, in the halls of Congress, wherever he appeared and spoke, his clarion voice he raised in defense of Americanism and in defiance of its enemies.

He climaxed years of battle against anti-American doctrines when, on Washington's birthday this year, he arose in the Chamber of the House and, his white hair shining and his gray eyes flashing fire, he delivered a philippic which should take its merited rank with the great utterances of great Americans. No eulogy to JOHN MARTIN would be complete without quoting from this soul-stirring address to the Congress. He said, in part, speaking of a meeting of a certain hyphenated group:

"Every man in that mass meeting who was in sympathy with it is a traitor to American democracy and government, whether he is still an unnaturalized alien or was born on American soil."

Again:

"'My fellow Christian Americans' are the words taken by the press from the lips of the fuehrer in America of a pagan dictatorship which has denied God, suppressed the Bible, persecuted Christianity, and reviled the founder of the Christian religion as 'a dirty Jew pig.'"

And closing he cried:

"Shades of Washington, must such things be tolerated in the name of liberty on the free soil of America? God save America from Nazi Christian Americanism!"

His clarion voice is stilled. He has gone to meet Almighty God there to account for his stewardship. And when the life of this crusading Christian is reviewed in the Great Beyond, JOHN MARTIN will hear the gentle voice of the Saviour saying: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joys of the Lord."

Three score years and ten have passed since April 10, 1868, and today we gather here to bid farewell to him who was born on that day and has lived so full a life among us. God rest your soul, our friend. In Valhalla, which we all shall some day reach, we shall again clasp your hand and call you friend and comrade. From your failing hands you have thrown the torch; we have caught it; we shall hold it high; we shall not break faith with you.

Good-bye, JOHN MARTIN.

1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

POEM BY GEORGE YOUNG, JR.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the authority granted me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a poem entitled "1940," written by George Young, Jr., of Ithaca, N. Y., which is not only timely but also realistic:

1940

You tell me that "this war is none of ours,
But just the fruit of ancient hates and greeds,
A conflict in th' economies of powers,
A sample of men's thoughtless futile deeds."

My God! Since when should we sit still
To see the soul ripped from a quivering land,
Watch faithless tyrant with the lust to kill
Let loose his crazy brutal murd'ring band?

Since when have we no care if freedom die,
If truth and justice perish from the earth,
If, trampled in the mud, before us lie
Those things we hold of best and dearest worth?

What if, by cunning calculated stealth
Our precious skins are kept, awhile, intact,
What if we keep our modicum of wealth
And liberty has ceased to be a fact?

Does doom of Czech and Finn and Norse and Pole
Hold nothing of a lesson for our sloth,
No blistering searing message to our soul
Except to keep our ease and freedom both?

Does Belgium's ever desolated land,
Peace-loving Holland's senseless cruel fate
In naked forces' brutalizing hand,
Not tell us rise before it is too late?

Where lies security beyond the seas
Patrolled by Britain's hard-pressed ships and men?
If France's grim resistance break or cease,
Where is our fancied isolation then?

Where is the spirit of our fathers now—
That we should sit all safe, secure behind
Defense, the grief of which we nothing know,
And hold ourselves of some superior kind?

Oh thoughtless generation bred in ease,
Secure in all—your persons, speech, and thought,
Your liberties did not grow upon the trees
But dearly, by your fathers, they were bought.

The Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ADDRESS BY CLIFTON FADIMAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Clifton Fadiman, delivered at the war-relief rally of the District of Columbia Red Cross Chapter on June 16, in this city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, fifteen hundred and thirty years ago, in 410 A. D., Alaric the Goth sacked Rome. Three years later a Christian bishop named Augustine, destined to become a saint, quietly sat down to write his masterpiece, The City of God. The Italian peninsula shook under the feet of savage invaders; the Roman order collapsed; Europe was delivered into the hands of the barbarians; and St. Augustine, in his ears the noise of the falling cities of men, continued to write his The City of God. The names of the führers of the Goths and the Vandals are remembered only dimly, but wherever civilized men gather to study the way in which they became civilized men the name of St. Augustine is revered. And yet he wrote his great book in a time like ours, a time of gathering darkness, a time in which the Christian virtues of peace and the Hellenic virtues of intelligence were being trodden underfoot by the demon apostles of force.

You and I are not saints nor bishops nor great writers. We are just men and women, Americans, as it happens, in the year 1940, rather confused, perhaps a little frightened, perhaps even a little hysterical. For Alaric is again at the gates, but this time the gates guard not the Eternal City; they guard the very citadel of civilization itself. Hitler says his Reich will last for a thousand years. He is wrong; but the darkness into which he and men like him can plunge the world may very well last for a thousand years; and perhaps that darkness is the Reich he means.

And so, hoping that we may never have to use those arms, we are arming ourselves—for we can do no other—against that darkness. As you and I prepare to serve in any way that may be demanded of us, I ask only that we keep in mind one thing: That we remember always and forever why we are arming; that we remember always that, though we may have to use force to combat force, we must never allow our own hearts to surrender to the weapons our hands may have to wield. It is such humane organizations as the Red Cross that help us to remember this.

We are not angels; France and England are not the homes of angels; yet, on the whole, it must be said—and in my opinion this is one of the very few wars of which it may be said—that one side is fighting not only to preserve itself but to preserve that reverence for the individual man, woman, and child upon which our western culture is founded. Not that they have always shown that reverence, but they have shown more of it than have their enemies who openly substitute for it a contempt for those things that make one human soul different from another.

Let us by all means throw ourselves into the task of grim and dreadful preparation, but let us not forget that the purpose of this preparation is to keep alive and extend a way of life which, with all its imperfections, holds out a vital hope for men and women, instead of condemning them to the corpse-like security of slavery.

This meeting is being held to aid the victims of totalitarian aggression; but what we give, aids ourselves no less than it does them. It is not that we buy an easy conscience with what we send to the terrified and despairing refugees. It is that such gestures of love force us, if they are made from the heart, to examine what it is these refugees are fleeing from, force us to swear in our souls that in the future no one shall flee from it again.

In the last war, the most terrible fighting occurred at Verdun. Two million men were engaged, one million killed, among whom—no one knows—may have been a twentieth century St. Augustine. For days, for weeks, in shallow shell pits, in water-filled holes, the French soldiers, unrelieved, held their ground in the face of the most terrible bombardment human ears, up to that time, had ever heard. Why did they not turn and flee, knowing, if they did not, they would almost surely die?

A great French writer of our time, Jules Romains, in his recent novel, Verdun, has tried to answer this question. One of his young heroes, named Jerphanion, after 3 weeks of the horror of Verdun, is given leave. He goes back to Paris, the city of light, man's most beautiful invention, and he sits down at a cafe table with his friend Jallez, who has not seen active service, and together they look out at the Cathedral of Notre Dame with its gargoyles and its dreaming spires, and Jersphanion tries to explain how Verdun managed to hold out. He tells Jallez that it isn't the fact that there was no alternative that kept the men going; it was some private thought that each individual soldier had, some fixed idea, the secret of which was known to him alone, some magic formula, which was really his deepest faith. May I read you just a few sentences from what I consider one of the most magnificent passages in modern literature? At one end of the trench, perhaps, there is, writes Romains, the soldier with a taste for serious reading and an equipment of large-hearted ideals, the kind of a man who says to himself: "This is the war what will end war. We are bringing peace to the whole world. Thanks to our sacrifice, our children will be spared knowledge of such horrors." Standing next to him in the same trench will be some fellow who thinks: "This is the end of the world. We're all in for it. What does it matter if I get killed a little sooner or a little later?" Another there may be who believes in a coming reign of justice, who is still convinced that victory for the democracies will mean freedom for the oppressed everywhere in the world, the end of the domination of money and social iniquity, who would be willing even to die if only he could be sure that his death would mean greater happiness for men yet unborn. Then there's the sentimentalist, for whom nothing counts but personal relationships, whose world is made up of just a few dear friends, who argues: "Most of my pals are dead. If they all go, what is there left to live for?"

Close beside him is another in whom the war has waked a deep-seated strain of pessimism, who thinks sincerely: "The universe is a foul absurdity. It was always pretty obvious, but the war has proved it beyond the shadow of a doubt. Why cling to a foul absurdity?"

There is the fanatical Catholic who thinks: "This is God's punishment wrought on a corrupt and faithless generation. If God has decided that I, too, must pay the penalty, even for the faults of others, who am I to question His will?" There is the gentle Catholic who carries tucked away in his pack a tiny edition of Imitation of Christ, who, when night falls, says his prayers in his shell hole, very quietly, so that no one shall notice him, and murmurs: "Let me suffer, as You suffered, Jesus mine. Why should I be spared, since You suffered a thousand deaths hanging on Your cross? Give me strength that I may be not too unworthy of You." Finally, there is the man—and Jerphanion made a gesture toward Norte Dame, which was now immediately opposite them, across the river, its pinnacles just touched by the fading day—who says, "All that matters to me in this world is the language of France, the cathedrals of our French countryside, the quays of the Seine, landscapes that can be found nowhere else in the world, a way of life that is unique. If all that is to be taken away, life has no longer any point. If, by dying, I can insure that all these things will live on after men, then death is right and proper." Picture to yourself trench after trench filled with men thinking such thoughts, and you will find the answer to your question. That is why Verdun still stands.

My fellow Americans, this comfortable hall, filled with well-dressed men and women, is a trench, a trench now beginning to lengthen around the whole world. The Red Cross is in that trench and you and I are in that trench, and each of us has his own private Notre Dame, his own personal city of God, whose beautiful towers he will not willingly see crash to ruin. The life of the mind and of the free spirit, all that we have been taught to love, and that all men of good will have been taught to love—all that—is our Verdun. And Verdun must not fall.

Lt. Col. Carl Byoir First "Fifth Columnist" for Hitler in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MIAMI (FLA.) TRIBUNE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House, May 27, June 4, and June 11, I made charges which were supported by sworn testimony to the effect that Lt. Col. Carl Byoir, of the United States Army, Specialist Reserve, was the first propaganda agent that was hired by the German Government after Hitler came into power January 30, 1933.

The following charges, supported by sworn testimony, are very serious in their nature:

First. That the German consul in New York, soon after Hitler went into power in 1933, hired Lt. Col. Carl Byoir, who was then a lieutenant colonel, to disseminate Nazi propaganda in America, and paid him a very large sum of money in cash for that purpose.

Second. That soon thereafter Lt. Col. Carl Byoir commenced to send out Nazi propaganda on a large scale and received two and three thousand dollars a month therefor without a written contract.

Third. That on October 1, 1933, Lt. Col. Carl Byoir entered into an 18-month contract that was approved by Hitler's Minister of Propaganda for $6,000 a month.

Fourth. That a congressional committee unanimously reported, after investigating this contract, that it was for the purpose of getting Lt. Col. Carl Byoir to disseminate Nazi propaganda in this country.

Fifth. That George Sylvester Viereck, noted conspirator against this country in the first World War, was a silent

partner of Lt. Col. Carl Byoir and that he, George Sylvester Viereck, went to Germany and personally conferred with Hitler in order to get a contract for Lt. Col. Carl Byoir to represent the Nazi Government in this country. Viereck is now registered by the Department of State here as a representative of German interests.

There were other charges and plenty of proof to support them, and for that reason I cannot understand why the Secretary of War does not immediately dismiss this man from the United States service and take such further action as the facts warrant.

"FIFTH COLUMNISTS" IN OUR ARMY

It is now generally known that Hitler had in mind getting as many of his "fifth columnists" in our Army and Navy as possible. There is plenty of sworn testimony to the effect that "fifth columnists" were smuggled into this country during the time that Lt. Col. Carl Byoir was personally very active in Hitler's behalf and many, many aliens swore falsely in order to become privates in National Guard units in New York City and in other places. The set-up looked good for Hitler, having at least one man in a very high branch of the service, Lt. Col. Carl Byoir, and many men in the ranks of the National Guard.

In addition, Lt. Col. Carl Byoir is reputed to represent the biggest interests in this Nation; in fact, he says himself he represents American industry with assets of fourteen and one-half billion dollars. If he does, and they are the same type concerns that he is generally known to represent, he has been in a position to exert considerable influence in the hiring of alien personnel by these concerns in every State, county, city, and community in our land.

I wonder how many of these alien employees were slipped into our country and who are now known to be "fifth columnists" were placed in employment by the clients of Lt. Col. Carl Byoir?

CONCLUSION

I repeat that I cannot understand why the Secretary of War does not immediately dismiss from the service this man, Lt. Col. Carl Byoir, whom we know to have been the first Hitler agent in our great country. The facts are undisputed.

I am inserting herewith an editorial which is self-explanatory:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Tribune of June 14, 1940]

LET ONLY AMERICANS STAND GUARD—GEORGE WASHINGTON

George Washington, plagued with treachery, gave utterance to the words at the head of this article, and well would it be if Americans today would wake up to a realization of the terrible duplicity of the enemies in our midst.

"I do not believe there is any doubt," said Representative PATMAN, "that Carl Byoir was hired to establish here in the United States the greatest espionage spy system ever organized on the face of the earth." The office of Carl Byoir is at the same address as the Board of Trade of German Commerce, Inc., in New York City.

I was in Habana for 10 months, working on the Post, under lease at that time and operated by Carl Byoir. He was the publicity man for President Machado, one of the bloodiest murderers that ever occupied the President's palace on that island.

Machado was guilty of a thousand murders. Anyone who fell under the baleful eye of Machado was turned over to the care and liquidation of his secret police. This body of fiends were Machado's executioners.

Carl Byoir was at that time Machado's publicity man, and I know from conversation with his employees that he and they had entree to the presence of Machado at any hour of the day or night, and in preference to anyone else.

The Cubans hated the very guts of Carl Byoir, and, as a result of this hatred, we worked for weeks, every night, with armed police on the roof and in the lobby of the Post building and on the roofs of buildings across the street. Threats were constantly made to throw "pineapples" (bombs) in on us.

Machado, it was bruited about the city, gave Byoir $50,000 with which to make an American broadcast to "keep Americans quiet." Intelligent Cubans declared Byoir spent $25,000 for a partial broadcast and put the other $25,000 in his pocket.

One afternoon, while Byoir was paying a visit to the Post plant, a gang of Cubans made a rush for him, but he succeeded in reaching the office of the manager, John Montgomery, of Coral Gables, owner of the Riviera at that time and now at the head of the Tropical News of Miami Beach. Police were quickly called and responded readily, armed with rifles.

Carl Byoir slipped out of Habana the next morning by plane for Mexico City and did not return to Habana for quite a while. He lived, under guard, at the Sevilla Biltmore; occasionally his limousine rushed up before the Post building, Byoir hopped out and hurried up stairs. About 10 minutes later he would rush out, hop into his car, and the chauffeur would rush him back to his hotel.

When his lease expired Byoir pulled stakes and got out of Habana. The next thing I knew of he was in Miami on the pay roll of that industrial brigand—Doherty—eulogized by Miami newspapers as a wonderful asset to this region.

Carl Byoir was heartily detested by American printers employed on the Habana Post.

The American Farmer Deserves a Square Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to remind my colleagues in the House of the importance of agriculture to this country, nor that the American farmer is looked upon from all over the world as the essential power behind the machinery which moves to feed the world. Too long we have been depending on him without giving fair attention to the consideration that he so justly deserves. It is not enough to smugly remark that we have made expansive legislative effort to help the farmer in an effort to guarantee him just reward for his efforts. In the past few years he has been experimented with by an administration which has promised much to the farmer, planned for him, tried to tell him how to farm and how not to farm, and, in general, so confused the issue that the result has been more a program of political appeasement than a direct method of guaranteeing to the American farmer the one thing which he asks—a protected market for agricultural products as a profitable reward for his efforts.

Coming from the State of Indiana in the heart of the agricultural area, I know the American farmer intimately. I know his hardships, his problems, his spirit to carry on in the face of adversity, and his grateful acceptance of the smile of Providence in times of bountiful production. He works with Nature, and not against her; he plans accordingly and asks no quarter; he only asks from his Government—to which no one is more loyal than he—that it take sufficient interest in him to guarantee to him that the market into which the product of his labor goes will be guarded and protected against infringement from inferior products produced abroad under the privations of a low standard of living. If the American Government will protect the agricultural market the American farmer will protect himself and his Government.

I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

Those words, spoken in 1932 by Franklin D. Roosevelt, candidate for President, expressed a highly commendable promise to the American farmer. But the words of the candidate were forgotten in the actions of the President. And the record tells the story.

In the past 7 years the administration, which went into power with the promise to protect the American farmer's market, has negotiated 22 trade agreements with foreign nations and brought about the reduction of tariff duties on 163 competitive farm products. Such action could guarantee only one thing—the glutting of American markets with inferior products produced under low standards of living in foreign countries, and the resultant depression of domestic prices. In that period United States farm exports declined 9.2 percent and competitive farm imports increased 30 percent.

What this method of allegedly "protecting the American farmer's market" has actually meant to the farmer is well

represented in the following chart compiled to cover only a few of the many products affected by a reduction of import duties ranging from 25 to 50 percent.

[1933-39, Department of Commerce Reports]

Product	Imports (7-year total)	Gain to foreign farmers	Loss to American farmers [1]
Cattle ---- head	2,568,610	$66,079,238	$99,079,238
Corn ---- bushels	165,063,882	94,703,172	126,237,882
Oats ---- do	20,327,193	6,307,511	8,407,511
Dairy products ---- pounds	518,067,547	97,760,243	130,313,000
Beef, pork, poultry ---- do	885,993,786	163,974,550	219,974,550
Eggs and poultry products ---- value		17,610,216	26,410,216

[1] This column shows dollar value American farmers would have received for imported products if produced on American farms.

In the east central portion of Indiana lies the Tenth Congressional District, composed of the following counties: Decatur, Delaware, Fayette, Henry, Randolph, Rush, Shelby, Union, and Wayne. Throughout this district are 19,500 separate farms, totaling nearly 2,000,000 acres of agricultural land, which, for fertility and dependable production in quantity and quality, ranks with any like area in the country. From these acres a farm population of over 80,100 persons produce by their untiring efforts a goodly portion of the farm products consumed annually in this country. For example, the tenth district of Indiana produces annually, in round numbers, 15,250,000 bushels of corn, 6,000,000 bushels of wheat and oats, 18,000 head of cattle, 43,000 hogs, 33,500,000 gallons of milk, 1,000,000 pounds of butter, and 6,500,000 dozens of eggs, not to mention a proportionate quantity of numerous other agricultural products.

It goes without saying that the farm population alone could not consume that amount of production in the period of a year. But, from the sale of their excess produce, they secure the money to purchase manufactured products and all necessities of life not produced on the farm but essential to their livelihood, to their continued production of crops, and to the American standard of living to which they are entitled. And unless the produce can be sold at a fair profit it is, of course, impossible for them to invest in the manufactured necessities to a continued activity or to indulge in the luxuries commonplace with our standard of living.

How, in the face of a continued loss, as shown in the above chart, can the American farmer expect to break even, much less be able to contribute to the prosperity of the country through purchase of the things he cannot bring out of the soil? With continued loss of profit and an ever-mounting burden of taxation, is it any wonder that the American farmer is discouraged and no little disturbed about the promises which have been made him in the past?

The situation centers about one fact: He has been "sold down the river" by the New Deal administration, which in the past 7 years has failed to recall the splendid planks of a political platform which swept that administration into power in 1932; an administration which, while patronizingly making every effort to appease the farmer, was, on the other hand, setting up the very machinery, in the name of a good-neighbor policy, to destroy the American farmers' market by opening the gates to competitive farm products of inferior quality produced under standards of living far below our own, and consequently glutting our own markets with produce which could sell below our own farmers' cost of production.

Let us look at what the trade-agreement policy has really done—and as for what it has meant to the farmers in the Tenth District of Indiana I have set up figures showing an average year's production in leading commodities for each of the nine counties. A comparison of the following figures to this chart will give some idea of what the American farmers in general, and those in particular whom I have the privilege to represent, have been experiencing as the result of unfulfilled promises.

In 1931 we imported 335,000 bushels of corn, but in 1936, after the trade-agreement program had gone into effect, we imported 255 times as much, or 86,000,000 bushels. Now, corn is the leading product of the farms in my district, but it would take the farmers of the Tenth Indiana District over a decade to produce that much corn. In 1938 we imported 3,829,000 bushels of wheat, but the next year, 1939, foreign wheat on the American market increased 280 percent to a grand total of 10,747,000 bushels—more than a 2-year total production for the nine counties in my district. In 1939, 4,293,000 bushels of foreign oats were dumped onto our market, as compared with a mere 7,183 bushels the previous year.

It would take too much time to go into the various farm products with figures to show the full effect on each, but you may be assured that few, if any, have escaped the same encroachment by cheaply produced foreign commodities. However, it is of particular interest to note that in 1939 we imported 753,570 head of cattle as compared with 59,000 head in 1934; and the comparatively small figure of 34,000 pounds of pork imported in 1932 increased in 5 years to the astounding amount of 16,500,000 pounds in 1937.

Mr. Speaker, can the nearly 20,000 farm owners and operators of the district I have the honor to represent in Congress, and the many thousands more of solid American citizens who till the vast acres of our great agricultural areas, be expected to keep up their share of the responsibilities concurrent with the necessity for a sound national economy so essential to an adequate defense and preparedness, in the face of such deteriorating effects on their markets as has been produced under the New Deal foreign-trade policies? The answer is obvious. But, restore to the farmers the market which they developed; protect that market from invasion by cheap competitive farm products of foreign origin; and give them a program of sound facts, just and equitable to all, free from the dangerous uncertainties of constant experimenting, and the American farmer will do more to build up and to stabilize the national economic structure, so weakened by the New Deal's "planned economy," than any one thing the Government can do. The American farmer deserves a square deal.

An average year yield in 9 counties of Tenth Indiana District

[U. S. Department of Commerce figures]

Counties	Corn	Wheat	Oats	Hogs
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Head*
Decatur	1,799,373	576,109	24,773	46,559
Delaware	1,411,608	274,619	221,576	41,462
Fayette	883,133	347,872	26,817	31,516
Henry	1,739,037	459,771	321,744	54,372
Randolph	1,776,390	415,281	340,908	45,425
Rush	2,807,905	825,426	82,237	86,038
Shelby	2,479,051	751,156	98,164	44,424
Union	874,650	334,109	14,004	29,174
Wayne	1,487,425	600,090	92,883	54,476
Total	15,258,572	4,584,443	1,223,106	443,446

Counties	Cattle	Milk	Butter	Eggs
	Head	*Gallons*	*Pounds*	*Dozen*
Decatur	21,469	2,814,273	108,636	767,217
Delaware	23,772	5,553,772	132,908	1,030,502
Fayette	10,132	1,842,827	76,968	261,149
Henry	22,383	4,608,081	116,343	715,739
Randolph	23,933	5,478,458	161,815	1,234,527
Rush	18,343	3,076,077	138,420	791,423
Shelby	20,886	4,147,989	72,254	698,237
Union	8,000	1,363,980	48,716	221,119
Wayne	21,851	4,651,713	144,397	780,160
Total	170,769	33,537,170	1,000,457	6,500,109

America's Place in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, as the tread of armies shakes western Europe and the crash of gunfire echoes around the world, the task of those who would enlighten

America upon its place in international affairs becomes terrifyingly difficult. Flashing headlines render judgments obsolete before they reach print. Yet never before in the history of America is enlightenment more needed. Every possible agency in light of our good and bad experiences in international affairs should be explored. A firm foreign policy must take shape as quickly as possible. The people want to know. The people are entitled to know. America must gird itself to the problem with firmness. We need a new baptism of patriotism. Our Nation, while the mighty struggle in Europe grows, has till lately, to use Burke's phrase, "Slept in the thin ashes of seeming peace." We watch the conflagration grow. And with mixed emotions, some hysteria, some seriousness, some soundness, some fear, but with a national objective as to what we can best do to save and continue our system of democracy, free enterprise, and tolerance.

We want no lesson enforced by swaying rows of steel. But we must be realistic and thoroughly patriotic. Our deep attachment to the American tradition makes us anxious to confront this problem with acute concern.

We need not go too deep into the failure of the Versailles Treaty. We need not examine too critically the mistake in not creating a successor to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. We know and experienced the conservative reaction of the post-war years in England and the United States which cannot be denied created class dissension and disunity. We watched the misery of some great nations, lacking resources to supply their people with economic well-being, locked in grim social tensions. We have all played a role in producing the disasters which now overwhelm mankind. It is needless to dwell upon our contributions to this Iliad of woes. You remember our refusal to accept the League of Nations. Our Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley tariffs were expressions of economic nationalism, which, imitated by other lands, made for poverty and disorder in wide parts of the globe.

We led in the drafting of the Nine Power Treaty, but when Japan violated it and went into Manchuria, our leadership was, as then, blameworthy as Great Britain in failing to stop Japan, for President Hoover opposed any embargo. His moratorium proved tardy and inadequate. These are but a part of the long list of incidents. The elder Republican Party statesman can answer for them. Now, the worst is here. Tom, Dick, and Harry all have opinions about what is going on. You and I have sympathies. Nobody doubts that the mad dogs are loose in Europe. The crash of democracies is heard on every hand. It is easy to have, therefore, an opinion. No escape can be had from that. But what are we going to do about it?

One thing is clear. We must prepare ourselves for any possible eventuality. We have that definite duty toward democracy, our traditions, and the American future. Without going into detail, we are preparing rapidly. We have been building up our defenses for the past 5 years as rapidly as the Congress would allow. We are today no weak Nation. Events, however, call for an emphasis upon mechanized military defenses and the speeding up of the work. Congress has acted behind the leadership of the President quickly and sanely about this thing. No partisanship entered into the passage of the necessary legislation. Thus our first commission is clear, and we have taken ourselves to that task.

How are we to use this might that then will be ours? Clearly, it will be used with all its force against any aggressor upon our soil.

It is my firm opinion that it might also be used to enforce the fundamentals expounded by the Monroe Doctrine. We want none of totalitarianism on this hemisphere.

But we must have some conception of the policy by which we in any case would intervene. I frankly, Mr. Speaker, confess my inability to arrive at what I think to be the solution to the problem. But so deep is my concern and feeling for our democracy, I think we should all add to the discussion that will ultimately shape our policy.

I believe that the American people themselves have the right to have a say in the shaping of that policy, for out of the composite comes the essence of democratic thought. Having this in mind some 2 years ago, I have introduced at each succeeding session of the Congress a proposed House Joint Resolution No. 66. It, along with the so-called Ludlow amendment, has received wide discussion. It is a modification of the Ludlow proposition, which provides a national referendum before the declaration of war. The Constitution provides that only Congress can declare war. Be assured that I take no pride of authorship in the matter. The thought of the so-called Magnuson amendment has been expressed on many occasions by eminent students of American policy. In the light of changing events, it may not be the answer to the concern of the people, but it is a concrete suggestion that is worthy of your thought and the thought of the Congress.

House Joint Resolution 66 is as follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person, individual, or human, whether he be a citizen of the United States or otherwise, who shall be conscripted into the military service of the United States, shall be required to serve outside the territorial borders of the United States until, and not until, a Nation-wide referendum shall have been held and such method of warfare shall have been confirmed by a majority of all the votes cast thereon in such a Nation-wide referendum. The Congress may at any time it deems advisable submit by concurrent resolution the question to the citizens of the United States, the question to be voted upon being: 'Shall the Government of the United States, for the duration of war, conscript any of its citizens for military service outside the territorial boundaries of the United States?' Congress may otherwise, by law, provide for the enforcement of this section."

The powerful House Committee on the Judiciary, to whom House Joint Resolution 66 has been constantly referred, has had some discussion about it. I have never been able to get the matter to the floor for a vote. The reasons are obvious. It is too hot a question, Mr. Speaker. The committee, however, did ask the State Department for a formal report upon the proposal. Here is their reply:

JUNE 6, 1939.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SUMNERS: Careful consideration has been given to House Joint Resolution No. 66, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which you transmitted to the War Department under date of April 29, 1939, with a request for an expression of the views of the War Department relative thereto.

The proposed amendment would prohibit the use outside the territorial borders of the United States of personnel procured for military service by conscription unless and until approved by a Nation-wide referendum. Our experience in past wars has proved that selective service, or conscription, is the only effective method of providing the manpower necessary for the successful conduct of war. From the viewpoint of the War Department, therefore, the primary effect of the adoption of this amendment would be to curtail the ability of the United States to undertake military operations beyond its territorial borders by placing a limitation upon the manpower available for such operations.

It can hardly be doubted that the defense of the Panama Canal may require this country to employ its military forces in some area within the Western Hemisphere outside our territorial boundaries. Indeed, such operations may be required for the protection of vital installations within the continental United States in order to prevent an enemy from establishing himself in an area beyond our borders from which he might launch air attacks against such installations.

The time element, always important in military action, will be vital in the operations just mentioned. Any delay will yield to the enemy the great advantage of the initiative and thus seriously hamper our later war efforts. Yet the Government could ill afford to undertake such operations until assured that the necessary manpower would be provided to carry the operations through to a successful conclusion. With the proposed amendment in effect, such assurance would be delayed for the considerable period of time required to conduct the Nation-wide referendum. The delay might be disastrous.

It thus appears that the adoption of the constitutional amendment proposed in House Joint Resolution 66 would seriously handicap the War Department in the execution of its missions to protect the Panama Canal, and vital installations within the continental limits of the United States, and might prevent the successful accomplishment of those missions. Accordingly the War

Department is opposed to the adoption of House Joint Resolution 66.

The foregoing is based on the assumption that the term "territorial borders of the United States" includes its overseas possessions to which it has absolute title, such as Puerto Rico and Hawaii. If it does not include them, the reasons for opposing the proposed amendment are even more compelling. It is recommended that the committee, if it reports favorably on the joint resolution, amend it so as to define its scope clearly.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, which reports that it has no objection to this unfavorable report thereon.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. WOODRING,
Secretary of War.

I have no objection to an amendment covering the Panama Canal Zone or any of our possessions. They need to be protected. An amendment covering the basis of the geographic principles of the Monroe Doctrine might now be in order. What I do want is an expression of opinion on the broad proposition, particularly as it pertains to Europe. That seems timely.

The Ludlow amendment would make a declaration of war impossible unless approved by a referendum vote. The Magnuson amendment argument is that if every citizen knew that, no matter what happened overseas, he could not be forced to go without having first a chance to vote upon it, he might, says Bruce Catton, the noted Washington columnist, "be less skittish over an aggressive foreign policy." The bill would not tie the Army and Navy. They would still be subject to the call of the Commander in Chief. The traditional method of handling foreign affairs would be left undisturbed. The powerful American Navy could be used as freely as the circumstances required. The Army could be sent anywhere, upon orders, but it would be composed of volunteers. The delay involved incident to holding a referendum would not be harmful in the least.

In any case, there would be some delay in getting the machinery of draft in motion; the referendum could be set up at the same time and no valuable time would be lost. In fact, time and the successful conclusion of any such draft would benefit, because after the people voted and determined, say, that there should be a draft, the frame of mind of American manhood would be more responsive and the machinery would have the full cooperation of the people, after they have spoken in a democratic way.

A draft comes as an emergency. The American people would respond patriotically to that emergency if it was needed for the preservation of the country and our faiths. But, what is fundamental, they would respond in the democratic way.

Mr. Speaker, these are thoughts expressed only in the hope that we might do our bit to arouse opinion upon our problem. Only in this way can we solve it. It may be that the best thought, upon this and allied subjects, may deem it advisable to leave the things as they are. Should that be the thought, I should gladly reserve myself to that opinion. I want the American people to know where they are going. Knowing that will do a lot to alleviate hysteria and fear. Knowing that, the American people can set to their task of building a better America. I see that duty ahead.

The common people of this country—the people who fight and die—will do their duty.

Transfer of Naval Vessels

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the press throughout the Nation, under date of June 19, 1940, reported the transfer to Great Britain of 20 high-speed vessels now under construction on order for the United States Navy. The vessels involved are referred to by the Acting Secretary of the Navy as 10 motor torpedo boats and 10 submarine chasers, variously called "mosquito" vessels and "suicide" boats. These vessels are lightly armored and are designed to carry and discharge torpedoes or "seagoing" bombs.

It is obvious that their construction was for the purpose of augmenting the naval forces of the United States Government. The proposed transfer of these boats to Great Britain either by the Government of the United States or by the builders of these vessels appears to be in direct violation of title 18, section 23, of the Criminal Code of the United States. This section provides:

Arming vessels against friendly powers; forfeiture of vessel: Whoever, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, fits out and arms, or attempts to fit out and arm, or procures to be fitted out and armed, or knowingly is concerned in the furnishing, fitting out, or arming of any vessel, with intent that such vessel shall be employed in the service of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people, to cruise, or commit hostilities against the subjects, citizens, or property of any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States are at peace, or whoever issues or delivers a commission within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States for any vessel, to the intent that she may be so employed, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years. And every such vessel, her tackle, apparel, and furniture, together with all materials, arms, ammunition, and stores, which may have been procured for the building and equipment thereof, shall be forfeited; one half to the use of the informer and the other half to the use of the United States (R. S. No. 5283; Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, No. 11, 35 Stat. 1090).

Section 33 of the same title provides:

Same; sending out armed vessel with intent to deliver to belligerent nation: During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States (June 15, 1917, ch. 30, title V, No. 3, 40 Stat. 222).

These sections very definitely and positively make it unlawful to knowingly furnish, fit out, or arm any ship or vessel with intent that such ship or vessel should be employed in the service of belligerents, while this Nation is at peace. The Congress legislated on this subject as early as March 4, 1909, and the law has been continued upon the statute books to date.

It is interesting to note that while the original act of 1909 did not specifically cover submarines, President Wilson and his Secretaries of State, Bryan and Lansing, very definitely held that, although the act did not specify submarines, it was the clear intent of the law to include them within its provisions, and prohibited the exportation of submarines or boats to belligerents in the last World War.

In view of this specific act of the Congress in implementing our position as a neutral, and in the face of the penalties prescribed, I believe it a fair subject for immediate inquiry. The Congress and the people of this Nation should be advised whether or not the administration has adopted an attitude that all laws are to be cast aside and acts be permitted with impunity which might very clearly be the basis of criminal prosecution, and possible ultimate impeachment of those involved.

The plain spirit of the law is to prevent either the Government itself or private corporations or individuals from breaching the neutral position of this Nation by outfitting in this country and selling ships of war to belligerents.

The Congress is entitled to know the facts of the transaction reported by Acting Secretary of the Navy, Lewis Compton, to the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on June 14, 1940. Such utter and manifest violation of the criminal provisions of our Code should demand the immediate attention of the Congress.

Forgetting Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, announcement has just been made that the President has appointed Colonel Knox as Secretary of the Navy and Colonel Stimson as the Secretary of War. Both men are considered interventionists. Undoubtedly, they approve of the program that seems to be heading us nearer and nearer to our actual entrance into the war. It is obvious that the President is acting without the advice of Congress.

The following editorial appeared in the Washington Post this morning:

[From the Washington Post of June 20, 1940]

FORGETTING CONGRESS

The most disturbing fact about the release of the Navy's new "mosquito fleet," so that these fast boats may be sold by the manufacturer to Great Britain, is the secrecy with which the transaction was negotiated. Even the chairmen of the Senate and House Naval Committees were astonished to learn of the transfer.

Chairman WALSH of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee is reported to have accused administrative officials of engaging in "apparently secret negotiations" with the result of diminishing our defensive strength. A legislator holding his position would not make such a remark at this critical juncture without being deeply perturbed by the policy the administration is following.

Chairman VINSON of the House Naval Affairs Committee has written into the new naval expansion bill a provision to the effect that "no vessel, ship, or boat now in the United States Navy or being built therefor shall be disposed of by sale, charter, or otherwise, or scrapped, without the consent of Congress." Considered along with Senator WALSH's statement, this move strongly suggests that release of the "mosquito fleet" has met with sharp disapproval on Capitol Hill.

Heretofore Congress has given emphatic endorsement to the administration's policy of trading in airplanes and obsolete military equipment to help the Allies. It is not to be supposed that this desire to aid private American concerns in supplying the defense needs of the British has changed. But Congress is obviously bewildered as to where the line between our own defense requirements and those of the British Government is to be drawn.

The inescapable conclusion is that there has not been a meeting of minds between the administration and Congress on this matter. The President has not taken congressional leaders into his confidence in working out the details of our foreign policy in this period of grave emergency. That fact may become a source of grave misunderstanding and confusion.

Indeed, continued failure to consult Congress on questions of such fundamental importance might easily lead to recriminations that would materially weaken the position of the United States in the present crisis.

National Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. JOHN L. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great consolation to the souls of the American people to find that when the freedom of the American people is at stake the Democrats and Republicans can drop their petty quarrels and join hands in perfect unity in an effort to build up the national defense of this country to the extent that we can protect ourselves against any eventuality.

Congress joined hands in almost perfect unity last year and passed a neutrality act which has worked perfectly. Neutrality is all right in a world that respects it, but, as all of you will agree with me, Germany lauds it one day and violates it the next day just as it suits her book. As a shield against involvement, it has proved worth nothing. We should have regard for our national interests rather than for a theory of law that is being torn to pieces daily.

Congress has worked day and night, both the Republicans and Democrats, in perfect unity in an effort to build up the national defense of this country. We have made great progress in this work during the past 3 months, and we have this program working at full speed at the present time. Practically every automobile factory in the United States has been converted into an airplane factory, and they will soon be turning out thousands of airplanes every week. It was necessary to change the machinery in these factories. All the automobile companies in America have worked in solid unison with the Federal Government, and we should soon be able to build as many airplanes in 1 day as all other countries combined.

We will all agree that there has never been a time recorded in the world's history when the future of our country looked as dark as it does today. None of us know at what minute Hitler will send thousands of planes loaded with dynamite to blast into bits our industrial cities and the National Capital. We all know that, if Germany is successful in conquering Great Britain, through her superiority in the air and in other military tactics, she will first demand the surrender intact of what remained of the British Navy and her merchant marine. By gaining control of the sea she would continue her revolution and offer the South American republics an attractive means of commerce, and, in my opinion, these countries would trade with Hitler in preference to the United States, since we have a high tariff which almost forbids those countries from shipping their produce to the United States. Germany has planned this war in every respect, and if she wins over the Allies it will be because she knew what she wanted and took definite steps to get it, planning them in advance.

The American people have responded to the appeal of their Government with their customary courage and vigor. We will never be disappointed in those of our people who are truly American. We have only to fear the treachery of the few who seem to be determined at all costs to destroy the unity of spirit and effort which has characterized our people.

We can well remember that Hitler made a statement 6 years ago to the effect that he would revolutionize the world by first having the Nazi Government sympathizers organize within each country a sufficient force to carry out his plan of attack. He stated at that time that everything had been thought out to the last detail and that he had already selected men to run his form of government in the countries which he had planned to conquer. He also stated that they would come to his aid of their own accord and without any compensation. We have already seen his statement fulfilled in Poland, Austria, Holland, and Czechoslovakia, and it seems that the "fifth column" is working with great success in France at the present time.

I would like to state that there is not a Congressman who does not realize the seriousness of the situation. The world has never witnessed anything comparable to the ruthless and inhuman gangster tactics which are being used by Germany in trampling over Holland, Belgium, France, and Poland.

I believe that, within a short time, we will have built our military force up to the extent that we will be able to protect ourselves against any and all nations. We certainly cannot depend on England's Navy or anyone else for protection any longer. Naturally, we will find it necessary to lower our standard of living, as the national-defense program will place a heavy tax burden on all the citizens of the United States. I believe that we will all be happy to pay this tax and know that, when we close our eyes at night, we are properly protected against all enemies such as Communists and Hitler sympathizers.

We have passed legislation here which will give us two complete navies—one stationed in the Atlantic and the other in the Pacific Ocean—also sufficient air bases to support both navies. We pay our soldiers and sailors several times more than any other nation, and, naturally, it will cost us a great deal more to provide for a large Army and Navy. However, regardless of the cost, we know that there is nothing half so precious as our freedom and we are willing to spend everything we have in order to keep and preserve same.

This country will not tolerate any other country coming into our midst and telling us how to run our affairs, and, before Congress adjourns, we expect to see that all the laws on the statute books relating to aliens are enforced. We want to see every American who does not think enough of his or her country to fight for it placed in some jail where he can talk to himself to his heart's content. We have become too prone to criticize our Government and have taken our liberty and freedom as a matter of fact. A number of our people have learned to hide behind the skirts of freedom of speech in order to criticize their Government and elective officials, which, naturally, is music to the ears of Hitler and ideologic government.

We all know that this is a solemn hour for the entire democratic world and we also realize that we in the United States are now facing one of the most critical periods of our entire history. With the greatest possible speed we must prepare to the limit on every front. Only through the utmost of preparedness, quickly and efficiently brought to pass, can we be sure of peace on this hemisphere. In this tremendous effort all of us will be needed. Each one of us must contribute his or her part. It is no secret that the dictators have definite designs on this hemisphere. First by ideological penetration; second, by economic pincers; and, third, by military aggression they hope to bring this country within their power.

We all know that tremendous responsibility rests upon the Members of Congress and the President at the present time and the eyes of the people throughout the United States are directed upon us, expecting us to steer this country through these perilous times and save them from the hounds that have been let loose in Europe. Again let me stress the fact that now is the time for every free citizen of our country to show his patriotic love of his country and, in my opinion, the traitors will be spotted and will be taken care of in due time.

The people of America during the past 20 years have taken their liberty and freedom as a matter of fact and have forgotten the terrible ordeals that our forefathers went through in order to give us the freedom we enjoy today. We can remember only a few years back after the Revolutionary War and after the Civil War that our fathers and forefathers at times were compelled to till the soil by their own strength—the husband using his strength to pull the plow and the wife holding the plow handle. And now we have a few people in our midst who complain because the Government does not feed and clothe them.

I have recently heard so-called Americans stand on the street corners and curse their President and elective Government officials which, in my opinion, is worse than being a traitor. I have always made it a habit to respect our Presidents regardless of their party affiliations, as we will never have a democracy if we go around criticizing our form of Government in comparison with the slave type of government used by Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini.

We all know that we have gotten too soft here in America and it is about time we were taking a good baptizing in Americanism. We are getting that very thing at the present time and it will take all the courage that we can get to keep this country a democracy and a decent place in which to live when Hitler and his type are making such strides in capturing other democracies.

I naturally hate war, since I myself and four brothers served in the World War and both of my grandfathers lost their lives in the Civil War. However, I would be the first one to fight any person or country that made an effort to dispose of our precious freedom and our high standard of living in this country. This is a day of preparedness and the first preparedness in this country will have to be made in the hearts of every American citizen. We have appropriated billions of dollars to buy guns, airplanes, and other war materials; however, they will be useless unless we are successful in keeping national unity and preparing our people from within.

Ages of General Officers in the German Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY SIGRID SCHULTZ

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate had under consideration the Army promotion bill. There was much discussion and debate with reference to the ages of general officers, and the fact that young men ought to be in the responsible positions of general officers of the Army of the United States. I have before me an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of June 18 last. It is captioned "Hitler relies on young war chiefs for military success; youngest of generals only 39; old 'graybeards' are absent." The article is written by Mr. Sigrid Schultz, and is dated Berlin, June 16.

The article opens with this paragraph:

How systematically Germany has been placing comparatively young leaders at the head of the nation is best proved perhaps by the large number of such men in the three branches of the armed forces.

Then the article goes on to name the generals in high command, in responsible positions, giving their ages, and showing how young they are.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 18, 1940]

HITLER RELIES ON YOUNG WAR CHIEFS FOR MILITARY SUCCESS—YOUNGEST OF GENERALS ONLY 39; OLD "GRAYBEARDS" ARE ABSENT

(By Sigrid Schultz)

BERLIN, June 16.—How systematically Germany has been placing comparatively young leaders at the head of the nation is best proved perhaps by the large number of such men in the three branches of the armed forces.

The war is being conducted by generals who are 56 years old or under. Their commander in chief, Gen. Walther von Brauchitsch, is 59.

YOUNGEST LEADERS ARE 39

In this way Adolf Hitler has surrounded himself with high commanding officers who are nearly his own age. Hitler was 51 years old on April 20. Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg did not become an army leader until he was 67.

The youngest of the new war leaders are Gen. Hans Jeschonnek, chief of staff of the air force, and Lt. Gen. Hans Geisler, commander in chief of the naval air force. Both are 39 years old.

Lt. Gen. Eduard Dietl and Lt. Gen. Joachim von Kortzfleisch are 50. Both saw service in Poland, General Dietl in charge of an Alpine division and General Kortzfleisch commanding the first division at Insterburg.

Lt. Gen. Ludwig Kuebler, who is 51, led a force of Alpine troops through the Carpathian Mountains on the Slovak border during the Polish campaign.

VETERAN OF WORLD WAR

Gen. Nikolaus von Falkenhorst, who commanded the advance into Denmark and Norway, is 55, and one of the youngest generals in command of an army corps. During the World War he took part in the Battle of Verdun, the Aisne River, and in Flanders. He commanded an army corps in the Polish campaign and was promoted to the rank of general of infantry.

General of artillery, Walter von Reichenau, is 56.

One of the youngest admirals in the German Navy is Rolf Carls, who is 55. He commanded naval forces during Germany's

action in Norway. In the Spanish war he was for a time in command of German naval forces in Spanish waters. Last year he took over the German naval forces in the east.

General Admiral Alfred Saalwaechter, who holds one of the leading posts in the German Navy, and was greatly responsible for the naval operations in Norwegian waters, is 57.

SHARE MANY HARDSHIPS

All of these leaders have preserved a youthful elasticity of mind and body.

During the rapid advance of the Germans through Poland, Holland, and Belgium, they often slept on straw or on bare boards. They had the same food as their men and often would be with their advance guards, taking cover in roadside ditches with the youngest lieutenants.

The feat of General von Reichenau in swimming across a river in Poland to reconnoiter the area is remembered by the Germans.

Many of the generals and admirals also are excellent sportsmen. That they are much closer to the mentality of their young soldiers than the old "graybeards" of the last war goes without saying.

Alleged Discrimination Against Colored Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY R. J. REYNOLDS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a clipping from the Topeka Daily Capital calling attention to what I myself believe to be an uncalled-for and unwise discrimination against the colored men of the United States. The article was written by R. J. Reynolds, an intelligent and patriotic citizen of Topeka.

During almost the entire history of the United States its colored citizens have fought bravely and well when called upon for military service. Nearly all of them are native-born citizens and are loyal to the core. I suggest that the policy of our Military and Naval Establishments could well be modified to enable these men to serve their country, as so many of them desire to do.

I think the Senate would do well to consider carefully the point raised by Mr. Reynolds.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka Daily Capital]

FIFTH COLUMN TO ATTACK

(By R. J. Reynolds)

One of the laudable objectives which President Roosevelt now has before him is to wage an unrelenting attack against "fifth columnists" within our borders, and one of the points of concentration should be to remove those in charge of our military establishments who are not in harmony with granting colored citizens equal rights and opportunities.

A "fifth columnist" need not necessarily be one in authority who is a Nazi, a Fascist, or a Communist, for to the extent that we have men in high places within the Government, the Army, and the Navy, who are Negrophobist, we have men in charge who are betraying the principles underlying our form of government. This is true because when they deny the Negro an equal opportunity to be a defender and a protector of our democracy, they are discriminating against a native-born citizen 99 percent of the time, and one who has never known any other national loyalty except loyalty to America. In such a crisis as is now upon the world, it will pay America to trust him and enable him to display his loyalty without handicap or circumvention.

Such a lesson, it seems to the writer, should be gathered by us from the present plight of England. As P. L. Prattis, feature writer for the Pittsburgh Courier, recently pointed out, "The vast majority, some 400,000,000, of the subjects of the British Empire are dark-skinned people, black Africans, brown Asiatics, and East Indians. * * * The rulers knowing they rule by force have refrained from teaching all their subjects to fight for fear that some day some of these subjects might turn this knowledge against the exploiter. Maybe the English have been smart in this sense, but there is no one today who can deny that the English could use a few million more fighters. Nor will anyone deny that old John Bull would be thanking his lucky stars today had he started some 300,000,000 Indians turning out airplanes for the mother country. The color line kept them from doing so. The British Empire should have 500,000,000 subjects working for it. Instead, it has scarcely 70,000,000 and stands to lose its existence."

Thus we may say that this color prejudice which has long dominated the British Government is perhaps its biggest "fifth column" handicap today.

Here in America we are about to embark upon a vast program of expansion in our Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, and in industry. Yet up until now the Negro has not had an equal chance of participation. Our Navy, for instance, deliberately bars all colored applicants from enlistment except for mess department services regardless of their qualifications. Colored applicants are also barred from service in the Tank Corps, Nurse Corps, Signal Corps, Coast Artillery Corps, Chemical Warfare Service, Air and Field Artillery Corps, and, in fact, nearly all other special-service departments of our military forces where the training is of first class vocational value. In short, as one close observer has said, "Although the United States Army is supposed to be a democratic institution, colored citizens may only serve in two infantry and two cavalry regiments, all except one of which is engaged in noncombatant work of menial character."

The writer is not sure just who is responsible for such a condition existing, but is of the opinion that it thrives because of a "fifth column" within our Government that ought to be eliminated.

Embargo on War Materials to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM JOAN S. GREENE

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Joan S. Greene, of Cambridge, Mass., on the question of the embargo of war materials to Japan. This 10-year-old child has expressed herself better than others who have written thousands of words on the subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *June 16, 1940.*

DEAR SENATOR SCHWELLENBACH: Please put the embargo on. Some probably think it will get us into war. But that is not right. If we send scrap iron to Japan, Japan will make it into war implements to fight China now and us later. If we do not send her scrap iron and oil then she will not be strong enough to fight us.

I live in China so I understand. I do not want to take my best dolls back to China because it is not safe for them there. The Japanese might bomb them with American scrap iron made into Japanese bombs dropped from airplanes run on American oil.

My father is a doctor in China. He takes American scrap iron out of Chinese women and children.

I hope you put the embargo on.

Hopefully yours,

JOAN S. GREENE.

The Democratic Convention in Washington State Trend Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

LETTER FROM HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I sent to the Demo-

cratic Convention of the State of Washington, which met in Yakima, on June 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 13, 1940.

ED CONNELLY, Esq.,
Care Democratic State Convention, Yakima, Wash.

DEAR ED: I have read that you have been chosen as temporary chairman of the convention. May I congratulate both you and the Democratic Party. I disliked very much declining the similar invitation which had been extended to me. The final campaign this fall is going to be one which will seem strange to me because I will not participate in it. Every 2 years for the last 28 years (with the exception of 1918 when I was serving in the United States Army) I have actively participated in the Democratic final campaigns. Only once in such a final campaign did I ask anything for myself. It is going to be rather difficult for me to be sitting on the side lines. However, there is something I wish to say to this convention and I take this means of asking you to present it to them.

President Roosevelt's Charlottesville speech is acclaimed by everyone because of its candor and honesty of presentation Even those who disagreed with it were compelled to recognize that it was a fearless and honest statement of the President's position. It is particularly important this year that those in public life be honest with the people whom they represent. The world is aflame. The heat of the world's fires is affecting our own people. The Democratic Party need have no fear of the outcome of this campaign provided it is honest with the people and that its candidates are men whose personal honesty and moral integrity will give assurance to the people that their interests will be protected during the years to come. This will be no year for political slickerism. People are going to be compelled to entrust much to those whom they select next fall. You may be sure that only those will be selected and only those should be selected who can satisfy the people that they are worthy of the confidence that the people must place in them.

Please express to the convention my best wishes for a successful and harmonious convention. I regret that I cannot be there to participate in it personally.

Yours very truly,

LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH.

Trend Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in yesterday's edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "How We Are Being Led to the Brink."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 19, 1940]

HOW WE ARE BEING LED TO THE BRINK

Methods short of war. * * *

Yes, the people are in favor of aiding the Allies by methods short of war. That's why Congress revised the Neutrality Act to permit the Allies to come to our shores and buy anything they wish.

But the President has abandoned methods short of war. He is now going in for warlike methods, clearly and plainly unneutral, clearly dangerous for a country which is as badly defended as is ours.

Our people passionately hope for German defeat. They detest Hitler and all his works. They are linked to the British and French by a thousand bonds and ties, ties of language and of blood, ties of culture and of law, bonds of a common love of justice and freedom, a common hatred of tyranny and opression.

But do the people favor Roosevelt's reckless actions of late—actions which are recounted below? These actions show that Roosevelt has an obsession on foreign affairs and is jeopardizing our country's interests because of that obsession.

President Roosevelt cannot be trusted to keep this country neutral unless public opinion, acting quickly through Members of Congress and leaders of the Nation, forces him to desist from his present course.

The Post-Dispatch does not say this on its own authority. This is being said by many others, including leading Members of Congress and intimates of the President.

Yesterday Senator MCCARRAN, a Democrat, rose on the Senate floor and said: "There was never an hour, so far as I know, when this country was facing such an emergency—an emergency which was created, I am sorry to say, by some expressions that were uttered by the head of this Government not very long ago, which aroused the hatred of foreign countries at war."

Senator WHEELER, a Democrat, who has been prominently mentioned as a possible vice-presidential nominee if President Roosevelt runs for a third term, considers the situation so serious that he has undertaken a speaking tour warning against our entry into war. He is serving notice that he will not go along if the Democratic Party becomes a war party. Senator WHEELER is not a man idly to spread alarm.

Bruce Bliven, editor of the New Republic and a warm friend of the New Deal, writes from Washington that "it is my duty to report that a rapidly increasing body of opinion here believes this country will be at war with Germany within a matter of weeks." That was written before the President's warlike speech at the University of Virginia.

What are the concrete happenings which have convinced individuals and journals that we are being led, step by step, into the withering holocaust? There is space for only a few items.

In April, two Washington newspapermen, Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner, published, under the title American White Paper, a résumé of President Roosevelt's foreign policy since 1938. The writers claim—and there is intrinsic evidence to support their assertion—that the book was written with the aid and approval of sources close to the White House. They wrote:

"There is no reason to suppose that his (President Roosevelt's) mind would be closed, if the need arose, to assisting the democracies with our Navy and air force. He mentioned the possibility in his talk with Murphy (then Attorney General). And he has been significantly chary of loose Wilsonian promises, declaring only that an American Army would not be sent to Europe, and expressing the hope and belief that we would remain at peace."

If President Roosevelt thinks that we could throw our air force and our Navy into this war without going into the war all the way, he is probably the only person in the United States who thinks so. A man might as well tie one hand behind his back and go out to fight an armed lunatic.

At the University of Virginia, President Roosevelt disclosed also that he had been in secret negotiations with Mussolini. He revealed that he had warned the Italian Premier that if Italy entered the conflict, "no one could foretell how much greater the extension of the war might eventually become." Informed opinion interprets this to mean that the President threatened that if Italy went in on the side of Germany, he would put the United States in on the side of the Allies.

This policy was neither neutral nor democratic, but was a secret and unneutral policy carried on without the knowledge or approval of Congress or of the American people.

Maybe some Americans did not get what Roosevelt was talking about, but the object of his wrath certainly did not miss it. So we find Virginio Gayda, editorial spokesman for Mussolini, declaring that the war has now been reduced to a struggle between the United States and Great Britain on one side and "a large part of the rest of the world on the other." The Italian Government accepts Roosevelt's speech as a virtual declaration of war.

The President has become more and more open in leaving the inference in his public statements that he is not opposed to a declaration of war. He concluded his reply to President Reynaud Saturday by saying: "I know that you will understand that these statements carry with them no implication of military commitments. Only the Congress can make such commitments."

Did he not mean that, if the decision lay with him instead of Congress, he would have declared war? If he did not mean that, what did he mean?

We have remarked before that the Government's sale of Army and Navy supplies to the Allies, through turning them back to the manufacturers, is a palpable subterfuge to get around the plain provisions of international law.

There has been a pretense that the war planes so sold were obsolete. Possibly some of them were, but some of the planes were delivered to the Government only in March and April of this year and hardly have had time to become obsolete.

Formerly, we observed neutrality by not allowing military planes to be flown across our borders. But only Monday, counsel for the Treasury Department conveniently found that this rule could be tossed aside. One wonders if this is preparatory to a ruling that American pilots can fly the planes to Europe.

While there has been the pretense that Army and Navy matériel were being returned to the manufacturers, the transparency of this trick is demonstrated by the fact that we have permitted resale to France of the 75-millimeter guns which were bought from the French Government. They could not be returned to manufacturers because they never came from manufacturers. Isn't this an outright violation of neutrality? Gen. Hugh Johnson says it is.

Yet none of these things constitutes any such threat to peace as the proposals which are now being considered by Congress, apparently with the President's blessing.

There is a proposal that we repeal the cash-and-carry act and send food and clothing to Britain in American merchant ships convoyed by our warships.

There is a bill, which Senator MCCARRAN denounced yesterday, to allow the President to send Red Cross mercy ships to Britain.

This proposal is skillfully designed to win the support of sympathetic people, who might forget that war is war, and that Germany would hardly tolerate such a thinly veiled violation of her air and submarine blockade.

In the debate in the Senate yesterday, Senators CLARK of Missouri and BONE recalled that in the last war the Allies deliberately used the Red Cross and American flags to cover shipments of contraband. Is there any reason to believe that the same thing would not happen again and that all ships thus marked would be subject to attack?

Worst of the lot, possibly, is the proposal that the British Navy, in case it is forced to abandon its bases in Europe, be allowed to operate from United States naval bases. Such a possibility was discussed by a Senate committee last week, and favorable action on the proposal was urged by former Secretary of State Stimson in a speech at New Haven last night.

In view of all the evidence, it would appear that General Johnson was exercising extreme moderation when he stated yesterday, "There is no longer any question that Mr. Roosevelt is exercising no effort whatever to keep us out of war." Indeed, this would seem to be rather a triumph of understatement.

America is not prepared to go to war. Nothing is to be gained and much is to be risked by actions which cannot be backed by armed force.

Let us help Britain all we can in this dark hour. But let us not forget—and let not the President forget—the realities of the situation. Let us continue to use methods short of war, but let these methods actually be short of war.

If this is still a democracy, let us curb a President who speaks loudly and carries only an ancient blunderbuss.

The Party of the "Fifth Column," Part 4

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States Navy is our first line of defense and protection against invasion. No one, not even Congress itself, has the legal right to dispose of equipment or ships to private owners or foreign nations as long as such equipment is in fit condition.

From the Washington Times-Herald, June 19, I note that the President has sold 30 ships of our fleet to a foreign nation, in defiance of Congress and of our people, who are neutral and overwhelmingly for peace. The transfer of any part of our first line of defense to a foreign nation cannot be looked upon in any manner except as the act of a madman. I can only explain this atrocious act by his hatred for one as against his love for another foreign power. This, however, is no excuse for such an ill-advised and most dangerous procedure.

The Times-Herald, June 20, reveals that investigation has shown that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau fronted for representatives of the British Government in putting pressure on the Navy Department to release the vessels, and this can easily be understood because the English Government and Morgenthau are birds of a feather, working together for war, revolution, and the conversion of this Republic.

Congress has appropriated money to investigate, to apprehend and to punish saboteurs and other alien provocateurs. How will the President's act be classified? The press, radio, and administration nitwits talk about our foreign policy and "fifth columnists," of both of which they are either willfully ignorant or foolishly stupid. In the midst of this foolish twaddle by administration mouthpieces, their Chief, whom they so ably attempt to defend, in a most dastardly manner transfers a part of our fleet to a foreign nation. He gives away high-speed, new destroyers under the flimsy excuse that torpedoes are not ready—I suppose to provide another excuse for disposing of the torpedoes because we will have no destroyers. And yet, not one of these keen sleuths can find the "fifth column" when its headquarters are right in the shadow of the Washington Monument.

Congress should now take charge of the Government as it is supposed to do and impeach the President for turning our warships over to a foreign power and weakening our national defense. [Applause.]

Congress should now assume its full responsibility to the people and to this Republic, a statement which I made on January 20, 1939. Congress should not confine its investigation to the President alone but should investigate everyone connected with this traitorous deal. This is a treasonable act at any time, and in war punishable by death.

The same administration mouthpieces who defame patriotic American citizens in order to defend traitorous leaders condemned Colonel Lindbergh when he advised us to build our national defenses and to stay out of all wars. They insinuate that Colonel Lindbergh is a national socialist and pro-German when he advises us to rebuild our industrial structure and business at home. Colonel Lindbergh, in his broadcasts, has advised us not to meddle in foreign affairs in Europe or Asia, because it may bring about a casus belli. He suggests that we grant the European powers the same rights that we set forth in the Monroe Doctrine—namely, Europe for the Europeans and the North American Continent for the Americans. I say the North American Continent, for the simple reason that we would be unable to defend South America if the people in South America are unwilling to accept our protection.

Colonel Lindbergh has shown conclusively that he is much better informed in regard to foreign affairs than even our own State Department, and all his statements have been in the interest and for the welfare of our country. In other words, he is a true American, with his eyes open to the real danger which threatens our country. We need a Lindbergh for President instead of political party offerings. We need a real American Congress, President, and Supreme Court. Why are we unable to secure such government? Because of public apathy and indifference to its own welfare and because the press, radio, and movies are owned or controlled by the real "fifth column," a minority that calls those with the people's and the country's best interests at heart Nazi and Fascist.

The story, in brief, is that the internationalists want war for one purpose: To get even with him or those who challenged their rule in Europe. Should the money changers fail to win the European war, nothing will happen except that peace will be restored throughout the world. Gold has always been a source of strife, intrigue, and double dealing, due to the fact that its manipulators have used this valuable metal as a weapon of destruction. Gold has been used to bring to their knees such nations as depend on imports, for nothing can be bought except with gold or gold credit, and it is to retain that power that wars are fought.

The President's act, however, is important at this time because it shows that he has definitely committed this Nation to help the Bank of England and the international money changers. His actions show that the internationalist rules him and his administration, for they are the only people who want war, and the best evidence for that may be found in his attitudes and expressions.

The American people do not want war. We know that. I am also reasonably well informed that the Canadians and the English people did not want war. This also holds for the French. It was this uncooperative attitude of the people, and their recognition of the leaders, which led to the rapid defeat of the English and French Armies.

I may say at this point that this condition prevails in the United States. Our people, as I have said before, want peace, and have recognized the gradual conversion of our Republic into a centralized soviet form of government, based upon the same principles and converted by the same technique which was used by Lenin and Trotsky in their revolution in Russia. In order to make this clear, let me recapitulate the high lights of the last 12 years:

First. The warmongers, or money changers, brought about a deliberate inflation for no other purpose than to enrich themselves and make our own people poor.

Second. The same wrecking crew organized bank corporations or chain banks, in order to centralize and place our banks under their domination and control.

Third. It was their money which defeated Mr. Hoover, not because he had not gone along, but because they had found a person more suitable to their future plans.

Fourth. On March 4, 1933, the warmongers and international money changers met in Washington to plan for what we have today. That meeting was to instill fear in the heart of America, in order to provide an excuse for congressional cooperation in conversion of this Republic into what is now attempted, a dictatorial state. The fear psychology was to scare the people so that they would exert pressure upon Congress to give the President the green light.

Fifth. The next step is recorded in the Gold Reserve Act, which was adopted in 1934. This act took the total gold from the American people and gave it to the international money changers, who still own and control it. This left them in full command of international as well as national credit. In other words, it left them with the life and destiny of this Nation in their hands. The same act left us, the people, with a worthless commodity and managed currency which is now debased to the point where we are using blue and yellow chips instead of money.

This same act also gave the President and the Secretary of the Treasury $2,000,000,000 in gold to use as they saw fit.

Sixth. Russia was recognized, to facilitate dissemination of communism, in order to sovietize the United States.

Seventh. The next many steps, which I shall include in one, were the creation of the alphabetical bureaus based on the same plan as that of Russia. One of them failed while the Supreme Court still retained a little American spirit, but as this ebbed, communism has received full sanction and support from that body.

A few acts, such as the Wagner Health Act, were drafted with the idea of sovietizing the health service of this Nation. This act has not been passed, but, like many others, it is waiting for an opportune moment to spring forth in its full destructive form.

Eighth. The next important step was the reorganization plan of 1939.

There are many Federal employees in the Government who have been in the service for a long time and who are real, honest-to-goodness patriotic American citizens, and probably not favorable to change in our Government. These had to be taken care of, and silenced, just exactly as our real bankers were silenced when their banks were absorbed by the bank corporation chain system. How could this be done? It is evident that they could not be dismissed, as many of them are on the civil-service list and such dismissal would lead to criticism, hostility, and exposure of the New Deal plan. It was for this reason that the reorganization bill was introduced to Congress, and passed by a majority for which I have no word of expression.

This act made a monkey out of Congress, for it reversed legislative procedure and gave the President an opportunity to reorganize, shift, or dismiss all those who were not in agreement with the New Deal-Soviet plan. Other departments, where the heads might not be agreeable, were, for the convenience of the administration, transferred to departments or bureaus under well-trusted and selected New Deal disciples.

In other words, the Reorganization Act of 1939 gives the President the legal right to shuffle Government departments as easily as Louis XIV shuffled his deck of cards. This act was to give the President the legal opportunity to place uncertain departments under the watchful eye of the invisible government and his own appointees, so that they could be checked by the New Deal ogpu.

Passing of the act, moreover, demonstrated one point conclusively, and it was that Congress was still deaf, dumb, and blind to danger.

Ninth. The next important step was the Neutrality Act, the repeal of the arms embargo during the special session of last year.

We cannot, of course, draft a neutrality law and enforce such law on any foreign nation. We can only provide neutrality for ourselves, for which no law is required. The Neutrality Act was to give the President legal protection for evasion of neutrality, so that he could, without inviting legal interference, aid England and France, two powers to which he no doubt had committed our aid and resources in the present European war. This is quite evident in his attitude since the act was passed, for he has not been neutral or even attempted to be neutral. He has instead furnished unlimited amounts of war material, combat airplanes, and now, last but not least, he has furnished 23 new and modern ships of our own Navy to a foreign nation. This was the purpose of the Neutrality Act, and Congress again failed and fell into the trap set by the destroyers of America.

Tenth. The next step was the National Defense Act, which was passed a few days ago, and which was unnecessary. This act, however, gave the President and our warmongering press the opportunity to shout, "Don't come over to America. Don't interfere with the Monroe Doctrine, because if you do, we will fight."

The purpose of this act was to provide another possible excuse for the President to involve this Nation in war. I was opposed to this act, but by request I voted "present" instead of "no," and I am ashamed of the vote, because I should have voted "no" in order to express my contempt for this legislation as I have for similar acts passed by the majority in Congress.

Eleventh. Emergency legislation: I place this step at the end because, although it began during President Wilson's administration, it has never been repealed and has grown alarmingly worse during the Roosevelt administration.

The first step of this emergency began in the World War, when the Congress was stampeded into enacting an emergency act, an act which has become a greater and greater emergency until it is now a disease. This act has been used by Congress as a lullaby for its sense of responsibility. It is amusing to watch my colleagues always speaking about emergency, when as a matter of fact, the only emergency which now confronts the Nation is to get rid of the Soviet New Deal and the Communists now employed in all branches and departments of the Government. What we need is an emergency operation, and a few good surgeons to cut out the waste and rot that has grown on the most incompetent administration the Nation has ever had.

The next step, and I believe the end of the road of free government, may be found in S. 4141. If titles 2, 3, 4, and 5 of that act become law, every Congressman who votes for it should be hung by his own people when he goes home. If that passes, we will be regimented, coerced, and persecuted exactly as the people are now in Russia.

And this, gentlemen, is the plan of the New Deal, to which all of you have given your aid in order to destroy this Republic of the United States of America.

The Bridges Deportation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last there appeared in the Jersey Journal an article by that paper's brilliant columnist, D. John Rickard, which states accurately and discusses luminously the reasons which impelled my colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Hon. MARY T. NORTON, and myself to vote against passage of H. R. 9766, a bill to deport Harry Bridges. The article properly refers to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and myself as "loyal followers of the leadership of Frank Hague, one of the country's most militant and outspoken crusaders against communism." Both of us are proud of that leadership. Mayor Hague was the first public official in the United States to take a bold and determined stand

against the inroads of communism in this country. It was his brave fight against this loathsome alien philosophy and against its slimy devotees who sought to spread it in the city over which he presides by the almost unanimous consent of its people, which first brought home to the masses of the people a realization of how deeply communism had intrenched itself in America, and how numerous and crafty were its far-flung agents.

It was Mayor Hague's fight that stopped the sit-down strike in the United States. Long before there was a Dies committee, Mayor Hague, alone among the public figures of our land, had the courage, the resolute energy, and the hardy patriotism to expose and frustrate the avowed Communists and their fellow travelers. In fact, much of the testimony developed before that committee merely discloses situations which were clearly described and denounced by Mayor Hague several years ago. In the matter of arousing the American people to the dangers of communistic activities in America, Mayor Hague showed himself to be as far ahead of other public officials as he has been in many other fields of government, and notably in the all-important work of developing and rehabilitating the characters of our youth.

Mayor Hague hates communism. So do I. I supported him in his fight to drive it, and keep it, out of Jersey City, a fight that obtained eminently successful results. Like Mayor Hague, I shall continue to fight it whenever and wherever possible. But, in doing so, I shall not allow myself to violate the American principles I seek to defend, nor shall I ride roughshod over the Constitution of the United States. To have supported H. R. 9766 would have been to do both. Not only does the following article by Mr. Rickard explain my position, with respect to that measure, but the quotations from the letter of the Attorney General contained in the appended article from this morning's New York Times express views which I approve without reservation:

[From the Jersey Journal of June 18, 1940]

HART VOTED AGAINST BRIDGES OUSTER BILL AS UN-AMERICAN

(By D. John Rickard)

There has been much comment upon the fact that only two of New Jersey's Representatives in Congress voted against a bill ordering the Attorney General of the United States to deport Harry R. Bridges, west coast labor leader. The two New Jersey Representatives who voted against this bill, MARY T. NORTON and EDWARD J. HART, are members of the Democratic Party, residents of Hudson County, and loyal followers of the leadership of Frank Hague, one of the country's most militant and outspoken crusaders against communism. The bill demanded the deportation of Bridges for the reasons that he is a troublemaker and an undesirable alien with communistic leanings.

Remembering that both these Democratic Representatives had been in the forefront in Mayor Hague's fight to drive communism out of Jersey City and were ardently supporting him in his battle to keep this same Bridges and his henchmen out of the city during the seamen's strike a few years ago, most of us were surprised to find them refusing to join in a move to deport this man who is popularly believed to be a radical Communist.

So great was my own curiosity and interest that I took the trouble to telephone Representative NORTON and Representative HART, who are still in Washington, to inquire what reasoning had prompted them in their negative voting. To my great pleasure and relief I am now satisfied they did not run out on us but, rather, that they did the only conscionable thing to be done, that they saw an American principle at stake and they voted as their consciences and their Americanism dictated.

Congressman HART said: "I believe Harry Bridges is a Communist (though he may not be a member of the Communist Party), and I think he should be deported. I am just as thoroughly opposed to communism as ever I was. I hate communism in its every essence. My religious training, my political philosophy, and my social concepts are diametrically opposed to everything communism stands for. But I believe the way to destroy it is not to adopt the Hitlerian method of deporting one man out of a multitude. I voted against the bill in its original form because it is a completely un-American measure. I am unwilling to lend myself to a cause the success of which would inevitably violate American principles and the American code. That bill was the most vicious to come before Congress in my time and one of the worst ever to have been submitted in all the history of congressional legislation."

BILL OF ATTAINDER

He went on to explain that never before has the Congress of the United States attempted to deport one man, by name, for doing what thousands of others are doing. He called attention to the fact that the Constitution of the United States forbids the enactment of a bill of attainder. A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. In his opinion, Congressman HART said, the bill to order deportation of Bridges has all the substantial elements of a bill of attainder.

Dean James Landis, of Harvard Law School, sat as a regularly appointed quasi-judicial officer, appointed under provisions of law, to hear evidence and determine if Bridges is a Communist, and if he should be deported under the general law providing for deportation of aliens in certain circumstances. Dean Landis spent 11 weeks on this hearing. The proceeding was widely publicized, and all who could offer information were invited to testify. At the conclusion of the hearing Landis wrote a 150-page opinion in which he reported that there was not sufficient evidence upon which properly to hold that Bridges was a Communist or that he had been guilty of subversive activities.

In spite of the negative finding by a proper tribunal, after trial, Congress sought to assume a judicial prerogative, declare the man guilty after he had been found not guilty, and to visit punishment upon him without giving him an opportunity to be heard in his own defense. This, Representatives HART and NORTON contend, was an act attempted in direct violation of the man's constitutional right.

Both these Representatives believe Bridges should be deported and they sought to accomplish his deportation by legal methods. Two amendments to the original bill were offered. One would have provided that all alien Communists be deported. The second would have directed the Attorney General forthwith to bring proceedings in court to have Bridges deported by lawful means. Mrs. NORTON and Mr. HART voted favorably on both these proposed amendments.

WHY ONLY BRIDGES?

They contend that Harry Bridges should not be singled out by name. They argue that not only Harry Bridges but every alien Communist should be deported; that the Congress should enact such legislation as may be necessary to enable the courts to accomplish this objective. Such laws, they hold, should cover every one in the class with Bridges and not only one person. They argue that it is absurd to propose deporting Bridges solely because he is a Communist while the taxpayers are being called upon to pay for the printing on the ballots of the name of another Communist who is permitted to be a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. They say it is not reasonable to pay election officers in every State in the Union to tally and record the votes of American citizens in favor of one Communist running for the Presidency while enacting congressional legislation to deport another just because he is a Communist.

Congressman HART referred to a news item in Sunday's New York newspapers, reporting that the Young Communists' League of New York State met in New York Saturday. At this meeting the secretary of the league reported 1,900 new members had been recruited, bringing the total membership of the league in New York State up to 18,000. The Representative of New Jersey's Fourteenth District says he is in favor of taking all of the aliens from among this 18,000 and tieing them up in one bundle with Bridges in the middle and tossing the whole bundle of them out of the United States.

"If Bridges is deportable because he has violated a law then let us invoke the law and deport him," HART says. "If we have no law to forbid what he has done we should get busy and enact proper laws under which we may proceed against him. I will do all in my power to rid this country of its Harry Bridges but I will do it only with due respect to the Constitution and in conformance with the American way. I will not be a party to any medieval, preconstitution way of doing things."

CHEAP GESTURE

"I know what the popular vote would have been," he added. "If Mrs. NORTON and I had chosen the easy, expedient way, we would have been applauded. But that would have been a cheap political gesture. These days demand more than just a political viewpoint. American principles are at stake. We owe a duty to the Constitution and to the American system. I will not sell my conscience for popular favor. I won't use even a Harry Bridges to gain selfish ends when I know my country's welfare may hang in the balance."

To which Mrs. NORTON added: "It is sometimes very hard to go along with one's conscience when a dishonest vote is called for. The bill to deport Bridges called for a dishonest vote. One had to choose between doing the popular thing or the right thing. We did what we believed was the right thing to do in this case and we are going to stand where we are."

It seems to me Mrs. NORTON and Mr. HART have earned our respect.

Patriotic citizens cannot escape the soundness of the logic by which they were guided. The Congress of the United States is a legislative body sworn to uphold the democratic principles. The bill, as presented for their vote, was a measure in itself subversive of the fundamental principles upon which our constitutional form of government rests. It is an example of the kind of legislation the founding fathers sought to prohibit when they wrote the constitutional ban on bills of attainder. Those Congressmen who voted to deport Bridges after he had been formally cleared of the charges made against him, sought to follow the totalitarian method of ridding the state of "undesirables." With this bill as a precedent, who could say how soon Congress might extend its purge to eliminate others for even less cause or for no reason other than that they are "objectionable"?

Those who, like HART and Mrs. NORTON, hate all that Bridges stands for, can join proudly in opposing an action so wholly repugnant to everything for which America stands—and this regardless of what the future may hold for Harry Bridges, the individual.

[From the New York Times, of June 20, 1940]

JACKSON OPPOSES BRIDGES OUSTER—ATTORNEY GENERAL SAYS BILL IS ARBITRARY AND GIVES C. I. O. LEADER NO HEARING—GUILTY OF NO CHARGES—MEASURE SUSPENDS ALL LAWS AND HURTS ALIENS' RESPECT, HE WRITES SENATE GROUP

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 19.—Attorney General Jackson denounced today the recent action of the House in passing, by a vote of 330 to 42, a bill for the deportation of Harry R. Bridges, C. I. O. labor leader. Mr. Jackson said the bill was arbitrary, a departure from precedent, and exiled an individual without giving him a hearing.

Writing to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, Mr. Jackson noted that the west-coast leader had not been accused of unlawful entry or unlawful conduct or found guilty of charges of Communism, even after extensive investigations. Bridges might be all the House bill implied, he added, but he must not be made a martyr, even though he was "insignificant" when compared to the basic issue of the bill.

Respect for the United States Government among the 3,500,000 aliens here would be seriously affected if the Bridges bill were made law, Mr. Jackson argued. As an American, he stated, he refused to deny equal protection and fair hearings even to the "humblest or meanest of men."

JACKSON'S VIEWS REQUESTED

The Bridges bill, passed by the House on June 13 after a sharp debate, directed the Attorney General, "not withstanding any other provision of law," to deport the west coast longshoreman leader to Australia as a person "whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful." The bill, written by Representative ALLEN, of Louisiana, was sent to the Senate and referred to the Immigration Committee. Senator RUSSELL asked Mr. Jackson for the views of the Department of Justice.

"If this bill were to become law it would be an historical departure from an unbroken American practice and tradition," Mr. Jackson replied in a letter made public today.

"It would be the first time that an act of Congress has singled out a named individual for deportation. It would be the first deportation in which the alien was not even accused either of unlawful entry or of unlawful conduct while here.

"It would be the first time that Congress, without changing the general law, simply suspended all laws which protect a named individual and directed the Attorney General to disregard them and forthwith to deport 'notwithstanding any other provision of law.'

SAYS DUE PROCESS IS VIOLATED

"And it would be the first time since the alien and sedition laws a century and a half ago that any law would provide for a deportation without a hearing or without, indeed, the slightest pretense toward giving the accused what our Nation has long known as 'due process of law'.

"The extraordinary character of the bill upon its face is even more impressive viewed against its background. This same alien has been accused, investigated, and tried at great length, and judgment has been rendered that he had not been proved guilty of the charges made against him. By this bill the United States would deny faith and credit to its own duly conducted legal proceedings.

"We have in this country, subject to the jurisdiction of this department, some 3,500,000 aliens. One of our great tasks is to assimilate them into our native culture; this can only be done by a deep respect for our processes and tradition.

"How shall we teach this respect if the Government itself will not abide by a decision in an individual case, and makes acts whose nature is not specified, but which must have been lawful when done, the basis of deportation without hearing?

"What becomes of equality before the law, of the impersonal and impartial character of our Government, if it is to select unpopular persons to suffer disadvantage or punishment?

FOR SAFEGUARDS IF NEEDED

"I do not now consider whether such a law would violate the constitutional prohibition against congressional enactment of bills of attainder, of ex post facto laws, or the provision of our Bill of Rights, which declares that 'no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.'

"I do not now try to determine whether the language of this act would work an unconstitutional suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Nor do I inquire as to any breach of treaty engagements to render fair treatment to nationals of friendly powers lawfully in this country. The law makes me legal adviser only to the President and the executive departments, and my predecessors have held that they could not with propriety also render legal opinion to a separate branch of the Government.

"But, apart from any question of power, I cannot, as head of the Department affected by this bill, answer with anything less than emphatic disapproval your request for views upon it.

"The Congress has almost unlimited powers over aliens. It has embodied its policies in general laws. If it is convinced, as I am, that recent experiences show the need for additional safeguards, by all means let us have them.

HEARING FOR SUBJECT IS URGED

"We who are administratively responsible for dealing with these problems have advocated greater legislative precautions. But there is no condition, existing or threatened, which needs arbitrary legislation prescribing no rule of conduct but merely imposing banishment by legislative fiat.

"The interests of this Service can be best protected by enactment of clear and fair rules of conduct that aliens may know, so that those who obey may be unmolested, and those who disobey may be expelled. And let any man be heard in his own behalf before he is doomed to exile.

"Harry Bridges may be all that this bill implies of him. But certainly he does not deserve a place in our history as a martyr. He is insignificant compared to the issues presented by this bill. Our forefathers objected to a government where 'whatever pleased the prince had the force of law.' The report of the House committee comes close to reverting to this when it says that deportation 'without assigning any reason is inherent and asserted by this bill.'

"As an American I would not for the sake of my own liberty deny the protection of uniform and indiscriminatory laws and of fair hearings to even the humblest or meanest of men. As an official of the United States I cannot in good conscience do other than recommend strongly against this bill."

BRIDGES IN CONFERENCE HERE—WEST COAST C. I. O. LEADER MAPS EXPANSION OF UNION

Harry Bridges, leader of the C. I. O. longshoremen and warehouse employees on the Pacific coast, made a preliminary move toward extending his organization to New York City and other parts of the Nation at closed meeting of C. I. O. officials here yesterday.

Although no formal action was taken at the conference, representatives of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the United Retail and Wholesale Employees served notice that they would resist any activities by Mr. Bridges that would encroach on the jurisdiction of the retail and wholesale group.

Mr. Bridges, according to persons who attended the meeting at the Hotel Lincoln, took the view that there was a need for "organizing the unorganized" in the warehouse field, and that jurisdictional questions could be decided after workers had been brought under the C. I. O. banner.

The amalgamated, through its vice president, Louis Hollander, contended that a "dual" movement in the warehouse field would introduce confusion and bring into the C. I. O. the same kind of jurisdictional warfare that had proved so "demoralizing" in the A. F. of L.

The meeting was called under conditions of utmost secrecy by Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, acting at the request of Mr. Bridges. Executives of all C. I. O. unions with headquarters in this city were invited to attend.

Mr. Curran said the discussion was not confined to the warehouse workers but covered organizing campaigns to be undertaken by the C. I. O. in many other fields. He described the meeting as "an informal get-together," and said all the discussion had been carried on without discord or controversy.

No mention was made at the conference of the bill passed last week by the House of Representatives calling for Mr. Bridges' deportation to Australia. Mr. Curran declined to comment later on reports that members of his union would refuse to man any ship that might be used to carry Mr. Bridges out of the country.

The president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union has applied to the national C. I. O. for a broadening of his jurisdiction to warehouse employees throughout the Nation, but the application is awaiting final action. All attempts by Mr. Bridges to organize longshoremen in the East have been resisted by his A. F. of L. rival, Joseph P. Ryan, president of the International Longshoremen's Association.

Final Report and Program of the Congressional Conference on Unemployment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our Nation is to be found ultimately in the industry of its people and the full use of its productive machinery and its resources. Unemployment is the No. 1 problem of America and the No. 1 obstacle to true national defense.

On February 21, 1940, 24 Members of the House sent the following letter to their colleagues:

In the month of December 1939 factory production in the United States reached a level of 130—11 points higher than 1929. But the index of employment stood at only 104—slightly below the 1929 level. In the entire year 1939, we produced more goods than were produced in 1929, but we employed 1,000,000 fewer workers to do it and we had between 9,000,000 and 11,000,000 unemployed. We had recovery without reemployment. Under these circumstances recovery could not last and production is now once again on the downgrade, primarily because consumer buying power did not keep pace with production, and inventories piled up.

Unemployment is the first and most fundamental problem before this Congress and before the Nation today. For with it come the fear, doubt, and insecurity which inevitably fill the hearts of people who have no work to do or who may soon become unemployed. If we do all other things and fail to overcome this problem we shall in the largest sense have failed. If we conquer this problem we will place our democratic institutions in a position unassailable by any powers or subversive influences within or without our country.

It is true that more legislation aiming at a progressive solution of our problems has been put on the statute books in the last 7 years than in any other like period in our history. But unemployment has not yet been conquered.

It is time that earnest Members of Congress join together to carry on an incessant war on unemployment, on want, and lack of business opportunity in a land of possible plenty. It is time we put first things first.

Let us forget petty differences and join together for earnest thought and study of an attack on unemployment on the broad plane of simple devotion to our Nation, its institutions, and its people.

We ask you to be with us in the Veterans' Committee room, 356 old House Office Building, at 7:30 p. m. on Monday, February 26, to begin this work. At our first meeting there will be no speaker, and we will simply discuss together what we can and ought to do.

This is not a move to form a bloc or to gain political advantage for any person or any party or any particular program. It is precisely what it purports to be—a coming together of Members of the House to seek to work out and then act upon the answer to the greatest problem of our age.

We hope you will be with us when we meet on February 26.

As a result of that letter some 70 Members gathered together and went earnestly to work at a study of a program for the basic solution of the unemployment problem. They have been at work ever since. The group has been inclusive of four political parties and of members of divergent economic and political views. They have not, of course, perfectly agreed. But in submitting herewith our final report and program of action to the House and to the Nation, I think we are able to show a very remarkable area of substantial agreement among us and I believe we have demonstrated that the unemployment problem can and will be solved just as soon as enough of us sit down in dead earnest to the task with a profound consciousness that the job must be done.

FINAL REPORT AND PROGRAM OF THE CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

The conference takes the position that unemployment is the central and typical economic problem of the twentieth century, that there is not an unlimited time left in which to effect its solution, that the future of individual freedom and of constitutional government depend directly on its solution, and that we should proceed at once to a consistent, determined, and coordinated attack upon unemployment.

The causes of unemployment can be listed as follows:

1. Failure of the Nation to maintain a scientific balance between the increase in production of goods and services and the expansion of the volume and velocity of its medium of exchange.

2. The violent and perverse expansion and contraction of public and private debt.

3. The fact that of the 15 to 20 percent of the national income which is annually saved, a considerable proportion has been held out of use—neither spent nor reinvested. This constitutes one of the primary reasons why industry and agriculture cannot function on a reasonable capacity basis and cannot consistently recover their costs of production of goods out of the current market.

4. Technological change and the introduction of machinery without compensatory reduction in the prices of goods produced. Monopolistic controls and administered prices are a principal cause for the failure of prices to come down.

5. Monopoly, wherever it operates to reduce production and maintain artificially high prices for its products. This means much unemployment due to direct lay-offs by monopoly-controlled industries, and probably even more due to the indirect effect of having the monopoly take more than its share of the consumer's dollar, leaving far too little of it for competitive industries, such as agriculture, textiles, etc.

6. A short-sighted and unscientific tax policy. Federal, State, and local taxes overlap one another and in neither case are the levies calculated on sound tax principles. The farmer's taxes, for example, bear no relation whatsoever to his income and may indeed be heavier in a year of complete crop failure than in one of comparatively good returns.

Our taxes are not calculated to encourage initiative and investment, but on the contrary, they encourage purchase of tax-exempt bonds. Our tax system does not take any account of the importance of discouraging the holding out of use of large accumulations of liquid funds. Great loopholes exist in our tax laws.

Finally, our present tax system does not take sufficiently into account the principle of ability to pay.

7. Low farm income. The farmer should offer one of the greatest markets for industrial goods, but cannot do so as long as he receives, as a class, as cash income, only 6.6 percent of comparable national income while constituting some 25 percent of the population.

8. Loss of farm ownership, corporation farming, and the rapid introduction of machine methods into agriculture.

9. Exhaustion of natural resources, notably the topsoil in many parts of the country.

10. The existence of innumerable barriers against the free flow of commerce among the several States.

11. Failure of Congress to develop a long-range, scientifically financed public-works program which would be effective in the future as a stabilizer of employment or to prosecute such program as we have had with sufficient skill to actually stimulate private employment.

12. Remarkable increase in span of life and failure of Congress to provide adequately against destitution and dependency for people of advanced age in the Nation.

PROGRAM FOR THE SOLUTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

As a result of the work of the subcommittees of this conference, and based upon their findings, we recommend the following program for the speedy reduction and ultimate elimination of unemployment in the United States:

1. Assumption by Congress of its constitutional right and duty to "coin money and regulate the value thereof" and the establishment of a scientific tax program and a scientific monetary and credit system.

2. Passage of legislation to establish a national old-age retirement system for all groups, operated on the pay-as-you-go basis, and financed, in part at least, by inheritance and income taxes.

3. The granting of such appropriations to the antitrust divisions of the Department of Justice as it may be able to effectively use in breaking up monopoly control of prices in the United States.

4. Passage of legislation to assure the substantial passing on of benefits from technological improvements either to consumers in the form of lower prices or to other workers through reinvestment of savings effected.

5. (a) A legislative prohibition against the issuance of any more tax-exempt securities and the requirement that holders of presently exempt securities include such income as they may receive from them as part of their income received in computing gross income for income-tax purposes.

(b) Reduction of the exemption now allowed from estate taxes and gift taxes; revision of the individual income-tax schedule to provide both a lowering of exemptions and consequent broadening of the base and an increase in the tax rates in the middle and upper brackets; requirement that husband and wife file a joint return in all cases; repeal of consumption taxes to the greatest possible extent, except for the taxes on liquor, tobacco, and luxury items; and, as a measure for the discouragement of control of one corporation by another one, reduction of the exemption now allowed on intercorporate dividend payments.

6. The following measures for agriculture:

(a) Extension of the stamp plan for the disposal to needy people of agricultural commodities and the expansion of the home market for agricultural commodities.

(b) Marked expansion of marketing cooperatives, so the producers may have some voice and control over the sale of their commodities and the prices paid therefor.

(c) Elimination of monopoly control of the market for farm products.

(d) Elimination of speculative control of farm commodity prices.

(e) Extensive revision and reduction in farm real-estate taxes, so the same may be adjusted to farm income and ability to pay.

(f) It appearing that the protective tariff system is so interwoven into our economic and industrial structure that its immediate repeal would probably be unwise, the farmers of the Nation should either be accorded the same protection for their commodities; or until accorded such protection a direct subsidy should be paid the farmers to compensate them for the extra burden the tariff places on them.

(g) Numerous acts of Congress having been enacted for the protection of special groups, either by guarantee of minimum wages or prices, and all of these having increased the cost of necessities to the farmer, he should in return be guaranteed a price for his commodities of not less than the parity price on the domestically consumed portion of the crop.

7. Passage of legislation to make credit available to farmers at the lowest possible rate of interest and to make possible the refinancing of presently outstanding indebtedness at such rate, as a

means of preventing further foreclosures of farms; expansion of available funds and provisions for loans to farm tenants to enable them to buy farms on a sufficient scale to turn back the present increase of tenancy and make for an increase in farm ownership instead, and provision for loans to as many worthy former farm families as possible to enable them to settle on Federal reclamation project lands.

8. A broad program of soil and water conservation, including loans at very low interest to farmers to enable them to carry on conservation work on their own lands, and also rural works programs in areas where soil and water conservation problems and rural unemployment coincide.

9. Adherence to the policy that all power sites not now in the hands of private owners be retained for development by public agencies.

10. Passage of legislation to set up a long-range public-works program, emphasizing projects which will promote the general welfare and which are either directly revenue producing or will in future increase property values and the national wealth. Such a program to be used as an employment stabilizer, being expanded in time of rising unemployment and contracted as private employment picks up again. This program should provide that the work be done either by contract or by direct employment by Government agencies, whichever method is preferable in an individual case. Insofar as public works are self-liquidating the program should be financed without increase in the public debt.

11. Further reduction in the rate of interest on housing loans to individual home builders.

12. The removal of those barriers created by Federal and State laws and regulations which have the effect of preventing a free flow of trade among the several States, and particularly the highway barriers, the freight-rate barriers, and the "use tax" barriers.

13. Passage of legislation providing for Federal grants-in-aid to States to match State and local funds made available to establish in the school systems additional vocational training and guidance to prepare students for work in the skilled and semiskilled occupations in which an actual or threatened shortage of workers exists.

14. Passage of legislation to provide for development of strategic and critical metallic and nonmetallic materials within our own borders. The further purpose of such legislation, aside from relieving unemployment, is the encouragement of private enterprise to relieve this Nation of its dependence upon foreign countries for vital supplies, many of which are essential to national defense.

15. The encouragement through appropriate legislation of the cultivation of agricultural products heretofore not growing in the United States (such as rubber), and of industrial uses for agricultural products.

16. Creation of a regular standing committee of the House on employment.

In addition to the foregoing 16-point program, a substantial majority of the members of the conference favored the following additional provision: "The purchase by the Government of the United States of the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks."

Signed:

ALEXANDER, JOHN G. (Republican, Minnesota), with statement in opposition to broadening income-tax base and to the effect that stress should have been placed on need for homes and gardens for unemployed.
ALLEN, A. LEONARD (Democrat, Louisiana), with general reservations.
ANDERSEN, H. CARL (Republican, Minnesota), with reservations as to program point 9.
ANDERSON, JOHN Z. (Republican, California), with reservations as to program points 5 (b), 7, 9, and 10.
ANGELL, HOMER D. (Republican, Oregon), with minor reservations.
BLACKNEY, WILLIAM W. (Republican, Michigan), with reservations as to program points 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15.
BRYSON, JOSEPH R. (Democrat, South Carolina).
BUCKLER, R. T. (Farmer-Laborite, Minnesota).
BURDICK, USHER L. (Republican, North Dakota).
BYRNE, WILLIAM T. (Democrat, New York).
CANNON, CLARENCE (Democrat, Missouri), with minor reservations.
CASE, FRANCIS H. (Republican, South Dakota), with certain reservations.
CASEY, JOSEPH E. (Democrat, Massachusetts).
COFFEE, JOHN M. (Democrat, Washington).
CRAWFORD, FRED L. (Republican, Michigan), with reservations as to program points 5 (a), 5 (b), 6 (a), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15.
CROWTHER, FRANK (Republican, New York).
D'ALESANDRO, THOMAS, Jr. (Democrat, Maryland).
DINGELL, JOHN D. (Democrat, Michigan), with minor reservations.
ELLIOTT, ALFRED J. (Democrat, California).
ELLIS, CLYDE T. (Democrat, Arkansas), with statement that words "whenever practicable" should be added at end of program point 10.
FORD, THOMAS F. (Democrat, California).
GATHINGS, E. C. (Democrat, Arkansas), with reservations.
GILLIE, GEORGE W. (Republican, Indiana), with reservations as to 5 (a), 5 (b), 9, 11, and 13.
HALL, EDWIN ARTHUR (Republican, New York), with general reservations.
HARRINGTON, VINCENT F. (Democrat, Iowa).
HAVENNER, FRANCK R. (Democrat, California).
HILL, KNUTE (Democrat, Washington).
HINSHAW, CARL (Republican, California), with reservations as to program points 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11.
HULL, MERLIN (Progressive, Wisconsin), with certain reservations.
IZAC, ED. V. (Democrat, California).
JACOBSEN, WILLIAM S. (Democrat, Iowa), with reservations.
JOHNS, JOSHUA L. (Republican, Wisconsin).
JOHNSON, JED (Democrat, Oklahoma).
KEFAUVER, ESTES (Democrat, Tennessee), with reservation as to cause 1 and program point 1.
LANDIS, GERALD W. (Republican, Indiana).
LEAVY, CHARLES H. (Democrat, Washington), with reservation as to requiring joint tax return for husband and wife.
MCLEOD, CLARENCE J. (Republican, Michigan).
MASSINGALE, SAM C. (Democrat, Oklahoma).
MUNDT, KARL E. (Republican, South Dakota), with reservation as to program point 9.
MURDOCK, ABE (Democrat, Utah).
MURDOCK, JOHN R. (Democrat, Arizona).
NICHOLS, JACK (Democrat, Oklahoma), with minor reservations.
O'CONNOR, JAMES F. (Democrat, Montana).
OLIVER, JAMES C. (Republican, Maine), with reservation as to subpoint (g) under program point 6.
PACE, STEPHEN (Democrat, Georgia), with general reservations.
PATMAN, WRIGHT (Democrat, Texas).
RABAUT, LOUIS C. (Democrat, Michigan).
RICH, ROBERT F. (Republican, Pennsylvania), with reservations as to causes 3, 6, and 11; and as to program points 2, 6, 7, and 10.
SABATH, ADOLPH J. (Democrat, Illinois), with reservations.
SANDAGER, HARRY (Republican, Rhode Island), with reservations as to subpoint (f) under program point 6; and as to point 9; and with the suggestion that a perpetual census of unemployment be maintained.
SCHWERT, PIUS L. (Democrat, New York).
SCRUGHAM, JAMES G. (Democrat, Nevada).
SMITH, J. JOSEPH (Democrat, Connecticut), with reservations as to program points 1, and subpoints (g) and (f) under program point 6.
SMITH, MARTIN F. (Democrat, Washington), with statement that he favors gross income tax to finance old-age pensions rather than other taxes.
SPARKMAN, JOHN J. (Democrat, Alabama), with reservations as to program point 5 (a).
SPRINGER, RAYMOND S. (Republican, Indiana), with reservations as to program points 9 and 10.
STEFAN, KARL (Republican, Nebraska).
TENEROWICZ, RUDOLPH G. (Democrat, Michigan).
TERRY, DAVID D. (Democrat, Arkansas), with general reservations.
TOLAN, JOHN H. (Democrat, California).
VOORHIS, JERRY (Democrat, California).
WELCH, RICHARD J. (Republican, California), with minor reservations.

Harry Bridges

REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article cut out of the front page of last night's Evening Star, headed—

Fights Bridges' ouster—Attorney General Jackson expressed emphatic disapproval late today of a bill for the deportation of Harry Bridges, west coast C. I. O. leader.

In this morning's Washington Post, dated June 20, is also the heading—

Attorney General opposes bill to deport Harry Bridges—

And goes on to state that this would be the first time that action like this had been taken. I contend that thousands of

individual private bills have passed letting these people in, and, by the same token, this bill is just as good to throw them out.

The answer to this, however, is that this is the first time that I can remember when high Federal Government officials, such as Attorney General Jackson and Secretary of Labor Perkins, have displayed such a flagrantly amazing lack of intestinal fortitude and have refused to do their sworn duty for the people of the United States.

The further answer is that this Congress and the people that it represents have awakened to some things, and particularly to the protection that the "fifth column" traitors are receiving from weak, politically minded, high Government officials.

This Congress and these same people are no longer going to stand for these officials aiding, abetting, assisting, undesirable aliens, "fifth columnists," liars, perjurers, lawbreakers, disturbers of the peace, violators of the constitutional rights of millions of workers, employers, and the public, those guilty of moral turpitude, treason, and traitors, such as Harry Bridges.

Apparently no bill that could be drawn affecting Harry Bridges would receive the approval of some people. I tried this with a general bill, which is still alive, No. 8310.

The President should clean house and purge his administration of these weak-kneed officials, who either lack the intestinal fortitude or openly refuse to do their duty by all the people in this country.

I think one of the chief duties of this Congress is to stay in session and handle this "fifth column" assistance and put on some real impeachment trials.

Both Madam Perkins and Jackson have laws to which they have apparently shut their eyes. Why have they not enforced the laws and regulations shown on page 33 of the immigration laws issued January 1, 1930, and amended to and including December 31, 1936? Bridges, by his own testimony in the Landis case, can be taken under many sections of these laws.

Why have not either of them gone by Thirty-fifth Statutes, 1103, United States Code, title 18, section 142, which provides, with reference to naturalization of aliens, that where an alien shall swear falsely in event an oath is given, or make false affidavit, he shall be fined $1,000 and imprisoned not more than 5 years. There are other sections of this law pertaining to moral character and attachment to the principles of the United States.

Why are they afraid of this man? Has the "fifth column" made such strides that they can even now intimidate our officials? If this is true, it is time for all Americans, and particularly this Congress, to get busy.

This man Bridges, not later than last Monday, tied up 20 ships in Los Angeles Harbor, some of which were loaded with materials to be used in our national-defense program. Is

After adding this to his long list of violations, where does this man Bridges come for his protection? To official Washington; and apparently he is getting it. Is it not high time that these Government officials and others defending these subversive interests lift their voices and use their voices in behalf of and in defense of millions of good American citizens, whose constitutional rights and individual liberties have not only been invaded but violated and trampled in the dust? How far are we going to let these things go? How do you expect to protect this country under these conditions? Are you going to sit idly and helplessly by and let these people get away with this until they have taken us, and afterward say, "It is too late to do anything"?

Now is the time to take action. We must not request, but demand, that the laws of this land be enforced. If weak-kneed officials are intimidated, become afraid, and lack the intestinal fortitude to do their duty, it is time that this Congress make that their especial business and bring in these weak sisters, try them, impeach them, and, if facts justify, throw them out and put them in a place where they can no longer do injury to this country. [Applause.]

War or Peace in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES D. MOONEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by James D. Mooney, vice president of General Motors Corporation, at the fifty-fifth alumni reunion banquet, Case Alumni Association, Case School of Applied Science, University Club, Cleveland, Ohio, June 1, 1940:

I received your invitation to speak here today on my recent return from Europe, after an 8 months' journey in the belligerent countries. It occurred to me that you would like me to speak to you on the subject that is close to everybody's heart—the European War—with its threat of drawing America into its great catastrophic whirlpool.

Further, perhaps I could satisfy your interest most by discussing the European War in relation to the vital question, "Shall we have war or peace in America?"

I made my first trip abroad in 1918. I had been out of college for 10 years at that time, and away from my old Ohio home, but by a spin of the old roulette wheel of life I was assigned to the One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Field Artillery Brigade, of the Eighty-fourth Division, just as this division was leaving Camp Sherman, Chillicothe, Ohio, for France.

A year after the war was over, and by another spin of the roulette wheel, I went over to Europe on a business trip. And I have been spending half of my life over there ever since.

During this past quarter of a century, I have had a front-row seat at the long series of political dramas that have been staged in Europe. Naturally, I know something about European politics—but not enough, I warn you, to have any ready-made, pat answers to the many complicated problems over there.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE EUROPEAN SITUATION

However, my years of experience and observation in Europe and particularly my travels throughout the belligerent countries during the first 8 months of world war No. 2 make it possible for me to present to you the following observations:

1. The war is a colossal tragedy for Europe.

2. Normal economic life in Europe is already badly disintegrated.

3. During the past winter, the very first winter of the war, there were already millions of hungry and freezing people in Europe.

4. Europe is living and doing business on paper money. Public debt is piling up in every country at a staggering rate. This rapid increase in debt is badly weakening the paper moneys; the "black bourses" operating under cover everywhere are already placing heavy discounts on the nominal values of the various paper moneys of Europe. As the war goes on, we shall witness successive waves of currency devaluations, and finally, a complete collapse of the credit and currency structures of the various European countries.

5. If the war were to come to an end tomorrow, it would take from 5 to 10 years to re-create the ordinary processes of production and the normal channels of distribution.

6. If the war continues for another year or two, Europe is doomed for 20 years to far worse poverty than the present generation has suffered during the past 20 years as a consequence of World War No. 1.

7. The war is making a shambles of Europe. The war is creating the background for increasing the millions of starving men, women, and children in the belligerent and neutral countries. Hungry bellies are powerful generators of social disorder and revolution. If the war goes on very long, we shall have some shocking internal political disturbances in the various European countries.

8. During my recent 8 months' experience in Europe, I did not find a single man, from brass hat to taxi driver, who did not consider the present war a colossal mistake in international politics, and the consequence of a long series of political and economic blunders.

9. No general emotional background existed in Europe to support the undertaking of the war; memories and griefs from World War No. 1 were still too vivid and poignant. The disillusionment that followed the other war made people everywhere inert and unresponsive to the illusions and slogans projected by the propaganda artists whose job it is to generate hysteria and hatred.

10. If the war continues to gain in military momentum, there will ensue the slaughter of millions of men and the creation of millions of widows and orphans. The frightful tragedy in the situation arises out of the fact that this colossal sacrifice will add nothing valuable to human experience. Nor will the continuation of the destruction of Europe move forward one single step the acceptance of any political principle to enable men and nations to live in a more friendly, neighborly way with one another.

11. Tens of millions of families throughout Europe, men, women, and children, are praying to God every day that He will put some good will into the hearts of their political leaders and inspire them to declare an armistice. Peace would bring a general delirium of joy, a universal escape from fear, terror, horror, despair, and material and spiritual misery and devastation.

THE FUNDAMENTAL WAR AIMS

The time is too short to sketch here the war aims of the belligerents. But at the risk of seeming to make it all too simple, I shall state the fundamental causes of the war as follows:

Germany and Italy have felt that the power and control exercised by England and France over the commodities, raw materials, and trade of the world subjected their countries to the unendurable condition that food for their people and materials and markets for their industries had been throttled. Germany and Italy rearmed to eliminate this fear that their food supplies and commerce would be cut off.

England and France have had a growing fear of the military power of Germany and Italy and a growing fear of the challenge of this power to their own security.

England and France are fighting for their lives. Germany and Italy are fighting and striving to keep from being starved to death.

WAR THROWS DEMOCRACY OVERBOARD

These aims of the belligerents, as you see, have nothing to do with making the world safe for democracy. Each country is strengthening its governmental organization and structure in every way that will insure a more efficient conduct of the war. I need hardly remind you that in time of war a nation moves very rapidly in the direction of a highly centralized form of government—a dictatorship if you want to call it that—for the duration of the war. The ordinary peacetime privileges of democracy are very quickly thrown overboard.

WE ARE DRIFTING INTO THE WAR

The isolationists want us to stay out of the war. But during the past 23 years, beginning with our declaration of war on Germany in April 1917, we have very often taken an aggressive position in world politics and particularly in European politics. We have "blown hot," and, later, we have "blown cold," and abandoned our position.

Some of the positions we have taken, particularly in the field of international trade and finance, have had a great deal to do with causing the impoverishment of Europe—and, in turn, the present war.

We have had no compunction at all during the past 20 years about playing with matches in the house of international affairs. Now that the house is in flames, we can't run out and turn our backs on the whole affair. Americans have too proud a tradition as fighters to endure a national policy that would brand Americans as men who run away from anything.

Isolationism would serve our material interests best, but it is probable that we cannot and will not stay out of the war. Our general drift at the present time is certainly not in the direction of staying out.

We are already conducting an undeclared "economic war" on the countries we have identified as our potential enemies. We have just embarked on a stupendous increase in our armaments. As time goes on, the general hysteria will be increased in our country by the war news and propaganda, a war psychosis will have been generated, and eventually some dramatic incident will be seized upon to precipitate us into the war.

ANOTHER COURSE—COMPEL THE DEFINITION OF THE PEACE

What else could America do about this colossal catastrophe that is degrading and destroying Europe?

I propose to you now another course open to our country.

I propose that before we accept the inevitability of the war in Europe continuing—and the inevitability of our eventually going into the war—we consider another course of action for America. This course contemplates neither the improbable solution of "staying out" nor the emotional and catastrophic course of plunging immediately into the war. I propose to you that we consider the possibility of using America's enormous economic and potential military strength to compel a discussion of peace.

Now that we, as a Nation, have authorized another huge increase in our national defenses, it would be extremely useful to clear the air by establishing exactly what it is that we are preparing to defend.

If we intend to go to war then we ought to publish the conditions that will provoke us into the war.

We ought to quit telling the world that we won't fight under any circumstances. Americans are fighters too, and in this present situation we ought to begin immediately to discuss what we will fight for and why. If we are to fight because we crave a more peaceful and more orderly world, what are the condition on which a peace will be negotiated and what terms of peace will insure this more orderly world?

In 1917, when we went over to Europe to fight, we were told that we were taking part in creating the basis for a brave new world. When our sons eventually leave for Europe to fight, can't we be more honest with them? Can't we give our sons a more definite idea of what the brave new world will be like?

Are we sure that our sending men and guns to Europe to help shoot up the place will have anything to do with constructing a more orderly Europe? Is there still an opportunity for us to make it plain that before we join the fight we would like to know what the fight is all about and what the terms of the peace will be when the fighting is finished?

America has a tremendous potential military and economic strength. Before we decide suddenly to add this strength to the forces that are destroying Europe, at least we ought to take one last good look at the possibilities of using this strength in the international situation to compel a discussion of the basis for the peace.

WAR FOR AMERICA MEANS CATASTROPHE TOO

I have told you that the war is a colossal catastrophe for Europe. The catastrophe there arises principally out of the economic order that existed in Europe at the outbreak of the war and which is being spread and intensified with every day of war.

We have economic disorder in America, too. The South is staggering under the unsolved cotton problem. Because our productive industries in all parts of the country are strangled from one cause or another, we have several million men still out of work. We have slums and frightful housing conditions all over the country. We are continuing our drift into rising prices and inflation because of the rapid rise in our public debt.

Do you think our entry into the war will do anything but make these problems a hundred times worse? Can you escape seeing that when our sons return from the battlefields they will be confronted by a reconstruction problem that will make the social, economic, and political disorder of the past 10 years look like a pink tea?

A NEGOTIATED PEACE WOULD BE DIFFICULT

Negotiating a peace at this time, of course, would be extremely difficult. Peacemakers who interpose themselves between belligerents usually find themselves in the most thankless of jobs. This would be particularly true in the present situation.

It is evident that a formula providing security for the English and French, and removing the threat of starvation for the Germans and Italians, will be very difficult to construct and make acceptable to both sides.

A negotiated peace would require vast patience and persistence to effectuate. Once accomplished it would necessarily contain compromises on both sides that would make it subject to criticism by some of the politicians in the various countries.

But all these difficulties that can be charged against a negotiated peace can be compared with the terrors of a rough, cold sea that a man might be challenged to jump into from a burning ship. The sea is terrible, yes; but staying on the ship means suicide.

AMERICA CANNOT ESCAPE THE IMPACT OF THE WAR

The present war in Europe is suicide for the political, economic, and social order there. The war is dooming the present generations in Europe and their new-born children to long years of unthinkable poverty and social misery.

That America can remain unscathed or unaffected by this appalling misery of her neighbors and her blood kin in England, Germany, France, and Italy is an absurd assumption. The war will make us suffer too, not only in a material way but in conscience for such of the responsibility as rests on our shoulders for the deep underlying political and economic causes of the war.

The European war fascinates us and worries us. And we shall not sleep well as long as the war burns with a bright flame.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACE

Some opportune moment will come when all of the belligerents will welcome the proposal of an armistice by a neutral country.

Only America with her great economic and potential military strength can act as mediator and facilitate such a discussion of peace.

It will take courage and coolness to seize an opportunity to stay the destruction of Europe. I know you will join me in praying that America will not fail to accept such a challenge in behalf of peace.

Sugar Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE, OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the

Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, on April 11, 1940, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, under the terms of some of the bills before this committee that would amend the Sugar Act of 1937, the proposals to curtail the existing Philippine quota would result in the violation of the Independence Act. For this reason the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines must object to their approval.

At the outset, permit me to bring to your attention the circumstances leading to the limitation of our sugar quota at its present level, since a knowledge of these facts is essential to a proper understanding of the equity of our position.

When the quota system was inaugurated by the Congress of 1934 with the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act, the Philippine Legislature, upon the recommendations of the American administration, approved a sugar-limitation law designed to bring Philippine production into correspondence with the provisions of that act and the duty-free quota provided in the Tydings-McDuffie independence law. As a result, the Philippine sugar producers had to curtail their production of 1,580,443 short tons in 1933–34 by more than 50 percent, reducing it to 694,606 short tons in the following year.

My government and our producers, despite great sacrifices and losses, have ever fully and voluntarily cooperated with this administration in carrying out the objectives of the sugar-stabilization program, restricting our production to an annual average of approximately 1,000,000 tons to meet the duty-free quota under the Independence Act, plus allowances for Philippine consumption and for an emergency reserve. In 1935–36 our production was 982,221 short tons; in 1936–37, 1,117,827; in 1937–38, 1,054,617; in 1938–39, 983,564 short tons.

As this committee is well aware, the Independence Act of 1934, as amended in 1939, gives the Philippines a duty-free quota of 850,000 long tons of which not more than 50,000 may be refined sugar. But, if disposed to the payment of full-rate duty, we are permitted further to export in excess of this figure up to the limit allowed by the quotas allotted annually under the provisions of the current Sugar Act. All the sugar quota acts (Jones-Costigan Act, O'Mahoney resolution, the Sugar Act of 1937) have given the Philippines an allotment higher than the duty-free quota specified in the Independence Act. The Sugar Act of 1937, moreover, provides that the Philippine allotment shall not in any case be less than the duty-free quota in the Independence Act. Notwithstanding the fact that heretofore we have always been entitled to a higher allotment than the 850,000 long tons specified in the Independence Act, the Philippine Commonwealth has never taken advantage of this additional quota, over and above the Independence Act duty-free limitation, with the result that in the past 4 years we have given up as deficiency a total of 297,708 short tons: 97,909 tons in 1936; 86,805 tons in 1937; 53,883 tons in 1938; and 59,111 tons in 1939.

In the International Sugar Agreement signed in London in May 1937, in which both the Governments of the United States and the Commonwealth of the Philippines were signatory parties with 20 other countries, the Commonwealth Government agreed not to export to the competitive sugar market of the world "so long as the United States maintains a quota for Philippine sugar of not less than an amount equal to 800,000 long tons of unrefined sugar plus 50,000 long tons of refined sugar per calendar year." The United States Government further agreed, in the event the Philippine quota of 850,000 long tons were reduced, to permit the importation from foreign countries of the corresponding amount of such reduction. Consequently, any reduction in the Independence Act quota of the Philippines would have to be filled by foreign sugar. The benefits and advantages of such reduction would not, therefore, accrue to the domestic sugar producers in the United States but to foreign producers, unless the solemn treaty entered into by the United States, and in which the Philippines participated by request of the American Government, were violated.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it pertinent to stress to this committee the fact that in the 10-year period between 1935 and 1946 the Independence Act has provided a plan for the adjustment of Philippine economy and, simultaneously, of the interests of the United States in the Philippines. This plan was thoroughly studied and carefully considered by the Congress before its adoption. Under this arrangement provision was made for the entry of Philippine goods into the United States, with specific limitation of certain products such as sugar, coconut oil, cordage, cigars and scrap tobacco, and pearl buttons, and also for the payment of certain graduated rate of United States customs duties during the last 5 years of this period. For the proper protection of American interests in the Philippines it was agreed that throughout the transition of 10 years United States products would enter the Philippines without any restriction whatsoever, without any barriers or quotas, and without the imposition of customs duties. This order, arrived at after mature deliberation, must be protected and given the opportunity of realizing its objectives.

The passage of the Independence Act in 1934 was of a historic and transcendental importance to the Philippines. It was a generous gesture on the part of the American people. The 10-year period of economic adjustment is in itself proof of the breadth of spirit in which this act was conceived. Whatever advantages were obtained by the Filipinos under the law were granted by the Congress because they were deemed reasonable. The law was passed with the essential requirement that certain provisions had to be incorporated and made a part of the Philippine constitution, which would have to be specifically and definitely accepted by the Filipino people in a plebescite. This was done and the political and economic provisions of the law were accepted by an almost unanimous vote. The plan, after having been accepted and ratified by the people of the Philippines, I respectfully submit, cannot be altered unilaterally without violating its basic philosophy.

I contend, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that if any changes have to be made in the Independence Act during the 10 years of the transition and economic-adjustment period, the whole economic program conceived in that act would necessitate revision. The Independence Act, as visualized by the Filipino people, is a solemn agreement entered into by the United States and the Philippines for a period of 10 years. It would be difficult for my people to understand any changes in the act affecting only certain Philippine products, unless such changes were made with their consent. I cannot conceive, Mr. Chairman, how the Congress of the United States, with its consistent record of fairness and generosity, already demonstrated throughout the 42 years of our association, and more particularly at the time when the Independence Act was passed, could permit changes to be made adversely affecting the Filipino people and their economy exclusively without their agreement.

The Philippines has been a sugar-producing country for a great many years, and exported sugar before the American occupation. At the outbreak of the World War we were exporting a total of 261,000 short tons. Subsequently, the United States entered the war, and an industrial boom followed in its wake causing an acute shortage of sugar supplies in the United States. It was quite evident that the continental producers could not supply the local consumptive demands on account of the shortage of labor at the time, which had drifted to other industries. In 1916, upon the encouragement of the Federal Government, Philippine producers developed the manufacture and production of sugar on a large scale in order to help meet the shortage in the United States and at the same time to enable the Philippines to take full advantage of the benefits offered by American tariff protection.

Under such stimulation and incentive, Philippine production rose to one and a half million tons. At the time of the passage of the Independence Act and the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act, the Philippine producers, in order to conform to a fair and equitable plan of adjustment of Philippine-American economy, voluntarily reduced their production from one and a half million tons to a level that would meet their duty-free quota of 850,000 long tons. Consequently, the Philippines took a tremendous loss. Truly enough, under the quota system inaugurated by the Jones-Costigan Act, a general limitation was imposed on the marketing of sugar by all areas. But the fact stands, nevertheless, that the Philippines suffered the greatest reduction.

While under the sugar quota acts the Philippines has been credited with allotments which exceeded the quantity granted us under the Independence Act, I want to reiterate and make clear to this committee that the Philippines has never taken advantage of that additional amount, although we were entitled to it by law. We entered into an agreement with the United States under the Independence Act to ship 850,000 long tons, and we have abided by that agreement from the very beginning.

When the quotas were suspended last fall all the other areas were given an opportunity to increase their production without limit. The Philippines was the only area limited to 850,000 long tons, and therefore was precluded from increasing its production. The fact stands that if all sugar quotas were abolished now the Philippines would be the only country operating under a quota by a separate law—the Independence Act—and therefore is the only sugar-producing area which cannot ever be a menace to the United States producers.

The sugar industry is one of the most important factors of our economy. Its maintenance is essential to the continuation of our living standard, which is the highest in the Far East. It provides the main source of our national income, and the livelihood of two million of our people. The condition of our sugar industry, therefore, affects our purchasing power abroad. Because of our ability to sell our sugar and other products in this country, today we are the fifth best customer of the United States. In 1939, we purchased merchandise from you valued at over $100,000,000. For a great number of American exports, including cotton textiles, white flour, cigarettes, auto casings and tubes, sewing machines, dairy products, explosives, canned goods, fertilizers, paints, and many others, we are the best buyer in the world. The dislocation of this industry would proportionately curtail our purchasing power for the products of your farms and factories.

May I, therefore, hope that, in considering the matter of sugar, your committee will give consideration to the facts and circumstances I have referred to, that the major industry may be continued and thereby preserve the satisfactory and mutually advantageous trade relations between our countries?

I submit that any attempt to arbitrarily reduce the Philippine quota below that provided and contracted for under the Independence Act would be unreasonable and inequitable. In behalf of the Commonwealth Government, I, therefore, urge that the following provision in section 202 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937 be inserted in any sugar legislation that this committee may recommend:

"SEC. 202. (b) In no case shall the quota for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands be less than the duty-free quota now established by the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate your kindness and indulgence in allowing me this opportunity to appear before your committee.

Can We Keep Out of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if there has ever been a time in the history of our country when hysteria should be supplanted by calm deliberation, it is now. If there was ever a time to face the facts—cold and unpleasant facts—it is now. It is extremely unfortunate that we have among us and even in high places of Government persons who encourage hysteria and thereby prevent a proper estimation of the facts we have to deal with. There are, however, encouraging indications that the American people are not going to allow themselves to be carried away by emotion.

I do not for one moment minimize the dangerous condition in which we find ourselves as an unprepared nation in a world dominated by force. But I cannot subscribe to the belief that enemy aircraft is about to descend upon our Nation and ravage our lands and homes. There are no facts to sustain any such fear or alarm.

In addition to my membership in the House of Representatives I have been extremely fortunate in having the chance to serve on the Military Affairs Committee, which has given me an opportunity for greater knowledge of our defense needs and problems. I know, as do the men at the head of our Army, that we are not prepared for war. So great is our unpreparedness that we cannot sacrifice any essential weapons of defense to any other nation. Our job now and for some time to come will be one of self-preservation.

In order to proceed without delay in building our defenses let us keep two things in mind. One, we have absolutely no business in the European war and are resolved to stay out of it. Second, we must proceed at once to build up our own defense forces to a point of utmost efficiency and striking power.

Great fears have been raised that the so-called "fifth column" may be in our midst. That certainly is not news to those of us who had to fight so hard for the Dies committee to continue its work. But in my opinion the man or woman who advocates the armed participation of this Nation in the European war is as dangerous to this country as any "fifth column" agent that might be operating on the pay roll of the dictators. This is doubly true if we stop long enough to take stock of the condition of our armed forces, which are unprepared in an alarming degree.

Anyone who will face the facts knows that we are already extending every aid and assistance that we can without crippling our own defense to the Allies. We are doing everything short of war to aid the Allies and as our production is speeded up in our mills and factories they will be able to obtain unlimited stores of war goods which we will not need for our own use. But let no one forget that our own needs come first. The full productive capacity of American industry will be needed to supply our own needs for some time and we cannot afford to endanger our own security by giving precedence to foreign purchases.

Among the things we ought to bear in mind is the possibility that the Allies may loose this war. We all trust in God that it will not turn out that way but what fools we would be not to plan our own defenses upon the possibility of just such a turn of events. How many people would believe a month ago that the French Army, reputedly the greatest Army the world has ever seen, would be in utter ruin in a few weeks? In planning our defenses can we afford to completely overlook the fact that England might fare no better? In that connection it is extremely doubtful if actual military participation by this country in our present state of preparedness would alter the outcome of the war. Upon the expert testimony of the Chief of our Air Corps we know that we have less than 100 planes capable of matching the best the Germans have; we know also that but a handful of our troops have modern rifles; that we have almost nothing in the way of armored cars and large tanks; and that we are sadly lacking in modern artillery in any number. We know that the French Army was stronger in numbers and superior in the quality of its officers to the Germans. We know that the French were better prepared than we are today. Yet that failed to halt an enemy that had new, efficient, and modern weapons which the French did not. Such is the picture confronting us today and such is the picture that no sane American can afford to ignore.

We can take courage from the fact that no nation on earth has the abundance of resources and ability to build an invincible defense machine in so short a time as we can. The success of modern war is shown now to depend on planes, modern guns, tanks, armored cars, and other weapons that develop deadly striking power with tremendous speed. We have in this country the means of producing these machines faster, better, and in greater number than any other nation. In addition we have in our own country inexhaustible supplies of the fuel that is so essential to modern war machines. We also have the manpower which is possessed of greater versatility and which has a greater love of what is at stake if we are attacked than any other people. This combination when properly coordinated is unbeatable. We cannot hope to effect that coordination if we plunge into the European war.

Much has been said about policy and will continue to be said about policy. However, not one single remote act of provocation has been made against us by any source. On the basis of events to date there could be no possible justification of this country's entrance into this war. The time has come for a clear, direct, and unmistakable statement from the persons responsible for our policy as to just what our course is. If the policy makers know the sentiment of the American people they will not hesitate to say so, that all can understand that we will not send our armed forces to Europe but that we will keep them in the Western Hemisphere and proceed to equip them and add to them until no enemy or combination of enemies could even dent the outer ring of our defenses.

If this Nation representing the fullest growth of democracy takes a course leading to participation in the eternal quarrels of the Old World then we become guilty of the same crimes we attribute to the dictators who will not or cannot confine their aspirations to their side of the fence. If it is wrong for European powers to muscle their way into affairs of the Western Hemisphere it is equally wrong for this country to stake a claim in the affairs of the Old World.

Alaskan International Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

STATEMENT BY DONALD MACDONALD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, enclosed are some pertinent observations in view of recent events, on the proposed Alaskan International Highway by Donald McDonald, member of the Alaskan International Highway Commission, which should be called to the attention of the Congress. In view of the fact that the Commission has submitted its report to the President and the Congress, these are in nature of a

supplemental conclusive statement of Mr. McDonald in which I heartily agree:

The terrible onrush of recent events has drastically changed the picture as far as the project of the Alaskan International Highway is concerned. Whereas in peacetime the suggestion of a joint defense of the north by the United States and Canada might conceivably be offensive to either party, the existing threat of a totalitarian world in the hands of a species of paranoic Frankenstein makes any mutual-defense measure a necessary act of self-preservation. From this viewpoint the proposed highway can no longer be considered as just an economic instrument for the development of the North and a vitally important aid to the solution of the problem of unemployment.

It has now become the military and strategic necessity of such serious import that the need for its immediate construction constitutes a national emergency. Without the proposed highway the whole north, whether Canadian or Alaskan, is placed in serious jeopardy. No attempt at the solution of the defense of the north can be complete without it.

The situation is as follows: Alaska and the Yukon Territory at present is absolutely dependent upon sea transportation for practically everything it eats, wears, or utilizes. If transportation by sea was cut off, the north would begin to starve in less than 3 months. Every automotive vehicle—the automobile, the tractor, and the airplane—would stop moving. The population would be helpless with no alternative but to give up the country.

The Alaskan coast line is probably the most difficult to defend in the world. Following its thousands of bays, islands, and indentations, it is 26,000 miles long. The heaviest precipitation in North America is characteristic of most of that area. Rain, snow, fog, and sleet make a condition of low visibility the almost constant norm. Every rail and road head to the Alaskan interior and the Canadian interior is reached through the series of narrow fjords and passages that constitute the dangerously beautiful "Inside Passage" that extends for a thousand miles from the southern boundary of British Columbia to Skagway. This passage, a much vaster system than the coastal system of Norway and Sweden, is one of the most dangerous in the world. Not only are the tidal currents varying and deceptively strong but terrific storms sweep down glacial valleys, causing immediate changes in temperature, converting rain and fog to sleet and wet snow, impenetrably blinding.

The area is dotted with hundreds of wrecks and it has only been in recent years that the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey has charted and marked the channels so that a reasonable degree of safety exists. Navigation, always extremely hazardous, would be almost impossible with an alert, resourceful enemy in time of war. Enemy submarines would be based in any one of thousands of uninhabited seldom visited bays. Supplies for these ships could be rolled back into the timber and no one be the wiser. Patrol for such a coast line under the conditions cited would be a practical impossibility. The low visibility and hazardous flying conditions would preclude airplane patrol for 80 percent of the time. Only substratosphere flying at heights of 20,000 feet is possible as far as schedule air travel is concerned and this would be of no value for the defense of ocean-borne commerce. The probabilities are that our "one ocean" fleet would be too busy in more important zones to protect Alaska. Even assuming that a part of the fleet would be assigned to such duty, the task of keeping the sea lanes clear for commerce would be almost impossible for the reasons given. Submarines could move the buoys and channel markers leading ships to destruction. The restricted channels could be mined, lurking submarines could find no waters better adapted to torpedo attack. A single "fifth column fishing launch" could do irreparable damage.

The rail and road heads to the Alaskan interior are all alike in that they are all defenseless villages of from 500 to 1,000 inhabitants, are all approached through restricted channels with climatic conditions of low visibility 80 percent of the time; all have wooden docks and all could be seized and destroyed by sudden surprise attack with a boat crew of men in an hour.

The most important, in fact the only, railhead to the interior of Alaska is Seward, a village of 1,000 people. It is the terminous of the Government-owned Alaska Railroad. This is the only route to the Alaskan interior that is operated on a year-round basis. Seward also has the distinction of possessing the only piece of artillery in the Alaskan mainland. An antique cannon left there in 1867 by the Russians. It is 4 feet long and is used as a flower pot. The dock, topographical, and climatic conditions have already been described in the preceding type description. The gas and oil tanks are at tidewater and about 1,000 feet from the dock. The whole layout could be destroyed by conflagration in a few minutes. All the tonnage for the Alaska interior—food, clothing, gas, oil, capital goods, everything—must pass through Seward except during the summer months when goods may be hauled out by truck from Valdez over the Richardson Highway.

Congress has appropriated or will appropriate funds for two air bases for the protection of the Alaskan mainland. One of these is at Anchorage, served by The Alaska Railroad and 114 miles from Seward; and the other, now under construction at Fairbanks, the interior terminus of The Alaska Railroad and 472 miles from Seward. Of course, both of these bases are dependent upon Seward and sea-borne goods, gas, oil, etc., for their continued existence. Once they were cut off, the meager storage supplies of the Territory would rapidly be exhausted. Without other means of transportation, the establishment of such bases merely adds to the incentive for the capture of the territory and the destruction of water transportation. Once this was done, the valuable air bases, with their equipment and planes, would fall into the hands of the enemy as soon as their supplies were exhausted.

And this is only part of the picture. The Russian situation, always unpredictable but always a menace, enters. This has two aspects—land and air. Included in the numerous 5-year plans has been the construction of a road and eventually a railroad to East Cape, 57 miles from Cape Prince of Wales in Alaska. The railroad project was at the beginning of the century a daring concept of that foremost of American financiers, E. H. Harriman. He visioned a world railroad connecting the North American railroad system with the European. He was defeated in this project by Theodore Roosevelt, who prevailed upon the Japs at the Treaty of Portsmouth to prohibit the construction of the project. That is an interesting but another story, however. The Russian highway project, stimulated by the gold workings of the Lena River, is now more than two-thirds across Siberia, and the Russian fliers stationed for 6 weeks in Fairbanks in the attempted rescue of the transpolar fliers in 1936, stated that the Highway would be completed by 1942. In January 1939 the New York press announced that the Russian Government would cooperate with the United States in the construction of a tunnel across Bering Sea as a link in a world's highway. In 1942, with road or rail transportation completed, Russia would be in a position to invade Alaska. It would only be 600 miles to the air base at Fairbanks and but 150 miles from Nome.

The transpolar fliers with obsolete planes demonstrated the possibility of flying from Leningrad to a point well within the United States. As a matter of fact and from the viewpoint of stratosphere flying Fairbanks and Alaska generally are at the center of the world. All 'round-the-world flights must pass through Alaska, and all but one have passed through Fairbanks. It is an amazing thing, but in transpolar flight, Fairbanks is about midway between Leningrad and New York. It is 3,820 miles from Fairbanks to Leningrad over the pole and 3,260 miles to New York. From Fairbanks to Berlin is about 4,000 miles; to Narvik in Norway is 3,000 miles. Hughes flew from Fairbanks to New York in his record flight in 17 hours.

And so with a rapidly developing evolving aeronautical industry Alaska strategically, from the viewpoint of air conquest, is at the world's center. How important is that base at Fairbanks? From it, the whole of North America can be invaded. Cut off from supplies it would fall like a ripe plum into the hands of a conqueror.

Naval air bases are being built at Sitka and Kodiak. With the hazards of flying at low altitudes along the Alaskan coast it is difficult to see just what protection these bases will be. They would, of course, supplement the Navy—they could be a part of that "flank attack" in an enemy naval expedition originating in the east, but if the Navy was engaged and completely engaged, as it probably would be, in protecting the Atlantic and Pacific areas simultaneously, these bases would be of scant use in protecting sea-borne supplies for Alaska. It has been said that if such a condition ensued it would mean that we had lost the war. Such is not the case. Britain in similar plight in Norway, with her own great fleet intact and with the enemy's practically destroyed, was helpless.

In addition, as things are, the maintenance of sea-borne commerce to Britain has been a terrific fight, which, in the last war, was almost lost.

There is an alternative to this dark picture that would at least give the North a fighting chance and, at most, an assurance of victory in case of attack.

That alternative is the immediate construction of the proposed Alaskan International Highway.

This project originates at a Hazelton or Prince George point on the Canadian National Railroad most northerly in the continental railroad system of North America. These points are also served by the continental highway system. They are about 1,000 miles north of Seattle, at present the point of origin for supplies to Alaska. In case of military necessity, supply depots commanding the resources of the continent could be built at either of these points.

The highway extends northerly for 1,400 miles to Fairbanks, the interior terminus of the Alaska Railroad. With a fair road, this distance could be traversed by truck in 2 days—that is, from railhead to railhead.

By the sea from Seattle to Seward, and by rail from Seward to Fairbanks, it now takes 7 days. If speed of surface travel is of the essence in military strategy, this alone could justify immediate construction. Moreover, this route is immune to attack; constant, heavy costly patrol so necessary to the protection of the sea lanes is avoided.

The highway in British Columbia is located about 150 miles inland from the coast, back of the towering coastal ranges. Under such conditions it is evident that with air bases along its route it would be difficult to attack it from the sea, but air attacks upon invading enemy ships could easily be launched. Also, supplies and munitions of war could be flown the short distance to coastal cities in case they were cut off by sea.

Because the route is located back of the coastal ranges it is not subject to the immense precipitation of the inside passage. Snow fall is light; there is none of the sudden changes of temperature that transform rain and fog to sleet, the most dangerous menace to flying. Visibility is quite generally good. A Canadian company is now using the route on scheduled

flight from Vancouver to White Horse, flying twice a week. It is at present the only route being flown that connects Alaska with the outside.

At about halfway between its southern terminus and Fairbanks the highway will pass through White Horse, the northern terminus of the White Pass & Yukon Railroad, the southern terminus of which is at Skagway. This point is at a junction with the Yukon steamboat transportation that connects with the Alaska Railroad at Nenana, Alaska, and serves also the whole length of the Yukon. In addition, it is a junction of the Pacific Alaskan Airways flying out of Fairbanks to Juneau. This point is important strategically, both from the viewpoint of supply and transportation control. The precipitation at White Horse approximates that of Tucson, Ariz. From this point on to Fairbanks the route follows back of the Alaskan Range, whose peaks reach 19,000 feet.

The country throughout does not involve any major obstacles, construction is simple. The estimated cost of a gravel-surfaced highway runs from 13 to 15 million dollars. Built as an emergency job and to stand heavy travel, the cost would probably be double the latter figure. With 2,000 men properly equipped on the job, it could be built in a single season. The maintenance, because of its location and the proximity throughout its length of immense beds of glacial gravel, would not be excessive. Neither the first cost nor the operating and maintenance cost would approximate the total costs of the air bases now being built or contemplated at Anchorage and Fairbanks. Without the highway, their air bases are almost as much a liability as they are an asset as a means of national defense.

The highway, therefore, would cost less than half that of a battleship. Its maintenance and operation would be but a fraction of the similar costs of a battleship. The very existence of another transportation means of supply for Alaska, known to an enemy, might discourage an attempt to cut off Alaska by sea and thereby reduce the need of fleet protection. In the event, however, that Alaska was cut off from coastal towns, the air base at Anchorage, through the Alaska Railroad, could be supplied as could the whole of the interior through the existing road system and the Yukon, all centering at Fairbanks. In an emergency, the naval air bases could be supplied by plane. Alaska would have more than a fighting chance.

Alaska, one-fifth the area of the United States, is one of our most valuable possessions. She constitutes the only part of the United States with an expanding economy. The per capita production of wealth is over twice that of the United States proper. With a population of less than 80,000 people, she produces $100,000,000 annually, or $1,250 a head for every man, woman, and child in the Territory. The per capita consumption is several times that of any population in the world. She exports $75,000,000 annually, of which $24,000,000 is gold.

With the 580,000 square miles of untouched, unapprehended natural resources, Alaska could easily support several millions. Her climate and known resources are far superior to those of Finland.

Are we, from lack of vision, stupid inertia, or political and official obscurantism, going to risk the loss of an empire?

The need for the construction of the Alaska International Highway constitutes an immediate natural emergency. Give Alaska a fighting chance.

Letter Opposing Sending of American Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

LETTER FROM ELDER E. M. EVANS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter received from Elder E. M. Evans, of Putnam, Va. Elder Evans is one of the outstanding ministers in the Primitive Baptist Church, and I am sure he expresses the sentiment of the American people when he petitions that none of our boys be sent to Europe. May I add that the Primitive Baptist people are not only deeply religious but deeply patriotic. Man for man, you cannot find a finer, a more spiritual, a more patriotic people in our broad land. They are real simon pure, unadulterated Americans. The purest Anglo-Saxon blood to be found in the world today flows through their veins. They have made the supreme sacrifice upon every battlefield in America and, should we ever again be plunged into war, which God forbid, you will find them out in the forefront fighting under Old Glory to preserve our freedom and liberties. Elder Evans, who is one of the great leaders of this people, is only expressing the sentiment of every real American, when he petitions that our boys be kept out of the European conflict. In that petition I join and pray that it may be answered by an all-wise Providence.

The letter follows:

PUTNAM, VA., *June 19, 1940.*

Mr. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: I wish you to read the following to the Congress:

I have been serving as a minister for several organized churches, and have been in the ministry for 52 years of the Primitive Baptist. I am writing a petition to the Congress of the United States for about 800 people that I serve. I hope for Jesus' sake we are appealing to you to not send our boys across the water in the European wars. It is more than we feel like bearing. We cannot bear the thoughts of our boys going into this terrible war that is now going on in the European nations, and is motivated by a wicked spirit. It is without human affections. I myself have 9 boys and 7 of them are eligible to go into the war if the Government sees fit to send them and I am unwilling to send them to dc any fighting, but if the enemy approaches our borders, I would be submissive for my boys to enter. However, to cross the waters we are opposed. We pray to God that our Congress will not send our boys until it is necessary to protect our shores. We will be absolutely ready when the enemy approaches us. The Lord tells us to watch as well as to pray. We flatter ourselves to believe that the leaders of this free country will watch and we appreciate the fact that the Government is preparing to meet any emergency. We believe to have a true democracy that this nation of people that was once considered a Christian nation, that they should turn their thoughts to God and His great ruling power, and He would turn the counsel of the wicked into foolishness. If we forget God, then His vengeance may be against us, and He would turn us into the hands of our adversaries. His divine prophesy is that the wicked and all nations that forget God shall be turned into hell.

I am praying that God Almighty will look with mercy on France and all the Allies, who I think are fighting for the right.

We ought to be followers of justice and to fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man. If our Nation will look to God, I don't believe that war will come to our shores. You may not believe it, but God works out of the sight of men. When a man is fighting in self-defense, I do not consider it anything but right in the sight of God. If we have such a spirit as to raise up to kill our fellow man without a just cause, the invisible God will bring it to judgment.

I'm hoping that our President, with the Congress and Senate, through God's grace and mercy, will prevent us from starting any war, but will be prepared to defend ourselves if the enemy approaches our shores, for then we will have a clear conscience, because we then are fighting to protect the lives of our wives, children, and neighbor's children, and our beloved land, for whom our forefathers fought and shed their blood to set us free from the power of dictators. We do not realize the value of freedom until we lose it. Oh, that our Nation would stand for peace and happiness! The gospel of the good man is preached. If the enemy approaches our dominion, our boys will fight, and Almighty God will give us the victory.

I often think of the sleeping dust of the dear boys who are sleeping on the battlefield of the World War. I have never thought that we ought to have gone into that war. I am writing this with tears. I am trying to pray to God that no more of our American boys will die in such a struggle, and I am praying that God will touch the hearts and melt the spirit of the Congress of the United States and the President, that they will oppose going into any war unless it comes to us. To our Congress, dear Mr. FLANNAGAN, I want you to read this—to our Senator GLASS, Senator BYRD, and, in fact, all of our Congressmen.

I have heard so much of late of the death and suffering of mothers, children, and woeful destructions, that it has taken away my sleep at times.

We realize from reading the Holy Scriptures that the wicked are doing this work and that they are without human affection. The Lord tells us to love our fellowman.

I have seen lots of trouble, but I am trusting in a living God that there is an eternal home beyond here for those who fear Him. The wise God will bring every work into judgment, whether it be good or bad. He will house those who fear Him with eternal happiness.

I am hoping and believing that our President will use his powers to keep our boys from going into any war, but if we are approached, I believe that God will give us the victory.

May the Lord bless the whole Congress to work together for peace.

Written by E. M. Evans by the wishes of the Primitive Baptist Church in the behalf of all little children and mothers.

I am a very poor and awkward writer, but I hope you will understand.

Elder E. M. EVANS,
The Servant of the Church.

Preparations for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF SHREVEPORT LODGE, NO. 122, BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by Shreveport Lodge, No. 122, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, on the subject of national defense and universal military training.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a regular meeting of the above-named lodge held Thursday, June 13, the following resolution was adopted:

"Be it resolved by Shreveport Lodge, No. 122, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, That the Members of Congress be, and are hereby, earnestly urged to foster and support all proper legislation for the immediate production or acquisition of all necessary war equipment and compulsory universal military training and service in order that the Nation may be fully prepared to meet now or hereafter any emergencies; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be spread upon our minutes and copies be immediately sent to the Members of Congress in Louisiana, and that copies be furnished the local newspapers."

Oregon Resources and R. E. A. Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of urging upon my colleagues who visit the San Francisco International Exposition at Treasure Island to visit Oregon's exhibit. You will find it a most interesting one, calling attento the fact that we have in Oregon a Douglas fir stand of 330,000,000,000 board feet—enough, it is said, to replace every existing dwelling in the United States. In addition, attention is called to the wealth of this State in cedar, Sitka spruce, western hemlock, Ponderosa pine, myrtle, and other commercial stands of timber.

We also have 297,000 users of electricity in the State and included among them is 35,800 electrified farms. The Federal Power Commission reports that Oregon has the second lowest average residential rate of any State in the United States and close to the highest average use. While the State has a small population, it has shown remarkable progress in the development and use of these natural resources.

Under leave to extend, I include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of June 18, 1940, which is as follows:

OREGON'S TREASURE ISLE EXHIBIT DEPICTS STATE'S WEALTH, BEAUTY

Treasure Island, San Francisco Bay: A diorama of a rugged section of Oregon's coast, Hecta Head, in which whitecaps on rising and falling waves of the blue Pacific seem so real that visitors think they feel the spray, is in line for a Rockefeller Foundation award, officials at the State of Oregon exhibit here announced.

The artist, Bud Dietlein, has captured the beauty of the coast at this point in rugged cliffs, wind-blown trees, and rolling surf. Waves which begin on the horizon may be seen slowly rising and rolling in to shore. Even the dash of water against the rocks is carefully shown, and the exhibit never fails to attract. Citizens of Oregon, familiar with the scenic spot, stand or sit in front of the display and marvel at its beauty.

However, there are other things in the Oregon exhibit at the Golden Gate International Exposition, such as the Oregon Theater, where overstuffed chairs and sofas are provided for a scenic tour by film down the Oregon Trail.

As in other State exhibits, huge photographic murals are used to convey the scenic beauty as well as industrial activity of the region.

FAMOUS FOR MANY THINGS

Placards say that Oregon is famous for the following: First in forest wealth, 1,000 lakes, 16,000 miles of streams, the Mount Hood-Columbia River Highway, Pendleton round-up; produces 90 percent of the United States filbert crop; has the largest 4-H Club enrollment of any State in the West; largest producer of wool in the West, seventh in the United States; its scenic coast; winter sports; cheese production; winter pear crop; world's record Jersey cattle; first in production of quicksilver; and its superior Chinook salmon.

The State's production of numerous types of small grains is effectively told by a map in which each county is outlined in a different type of grain. Rye, alsike clover, wheat, and corn are noticed. In addition, production of fruit, such as prunes, apples, grapes, and figs and of honey is shown by specimens of these products.

Myrtle-wood and juniper-wood products are features which invariably attract housekeepers.

The entire Oregon exhibit at the fair is furnished with desks and counters made of Oregon lumber. Bulletins tell that the Douglas fir stand in the State is more than 330,000,000,000 board feet, "enough to replace every existing dwelling in the United States." Woods used in the furnishings are cedar, Sitka spruce, Douglas fir, Western hemlock, Ponderosa pine.

ELECTRICAL EMPIRE

The fact that the State is an electrical empire features, of course, Bonneville Dam, and the statement that there are 297,000 users of electricity in the State, including 35,800 electrified farms. The installed capacity of electric-power plants in the State is recorded as 369,243 kilowatt-hours, which generated in 1939, 1,308,727,000 kilowatt-hours.

The Federal Power Commission, says the exhibit, says its reports show Oregon "to have the second lowest average residential rate of any State and close to the highest average use."

Turkey raising, fishing, horticulture, and shipping are other predominant features in the exhibit.

Members of the Oregon staff at the exposition are Mrs. M. Marble, director, of Portland; Miss Laura McLeod, of Corvallis; Miss Myrtle Rorden, of Portland, and Mrs. Alice Allen, of Portland.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission also to include a brief discussion of R. E. A. expansion in Oregon, which appeared in the Oregon Voter in its issue of June 15, 1940. The article follows:

R. E. A. EXPANSION—NEW RURAL ELECTRICAL PROJECTS FOR OREGON

Planning of rural electrification projects continues at hot pace in Oregon. Two new important projects are now up for approval at Washington and the Benton-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., is asking a loan of $756,000 for the first of far-flung additions to its system as now being constructed.

Wasco Electric Cooperative, Inc., is believed almost certain to proceed with construction of a rural system to cost $160,000 or more. Agitation for this project began early this year. From Redmond completed maps, surveys, petitions have gone to Washington, seeking creation of Central Electric Cooperative system to cost around $200,000.

As proposed, the Wasco rural distributive system is to embrace some 263 miles of line. When the papers went forward there were 338 members of the cooperative. There were said to be an additional 239 potential customers. If one-half of these, or 119, sign up, the association would have 457 members, all considered as tentative customers. The communities expected to participate include: Columbia district, Eight Mile, Five Mile, Three Mile, Dufur Valley, Friend, Wamic, Kingsley, and Wapinitia. Representatives of R. E. A. have worked on the proposal and have expressed confidence that it will be given approval at Washington.

It is said that this R. E. A. project does not interfere with the northern Wasco County P. U. D. authorized by a vote taken last fall. Directors of the P. U. D. reputedly gave their approval admitting that the areas involved can obtain electrical service more speedily and economically by following the R. E. A. program than if they waited for the P. U. D. to build the necessary lines. Completion of the system by next fall is anticipated. W. Emery Davis is president of the co-op.

Legal counsel jobs, which constitute fat pickings in Washington public ownership affairs, still are few and not very fat in Oregon. Gus Solomon and Frank Keenan, Portland lawyers, are legal advisers for Wasco P. U. D. and its R. E. A. stepchild.

Central Electric Cooperative has a list of 382 farms said to have been signed. It would embrace the central Oregon irrigation district primarily. Later extension to serve Sisters is a possibility. There are listed an additional 290 farms which are considered potential future customers. R. E. A. field representatives have

worked with the local enthusiasts and predict official approval of the undertaking. They say also it should be possible to have most of the system operating by Thanksgiving. President of the association is Carl Baker. Max Cunning is attorney.

Both of these cooperatives of central Oregon are expecting to buy power initially from Pacific Power & Light Co.

Benton-Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., has been growing increasingly ambitious. It proposes early extensions totaling 581 miles, 499 miles in Lincoln County and 82 miles in Benton County. It is said that approximately 1,412 families would be served. Estimated cost of this system is $756,000, application for this loan having just been made. Ultimate extensions would include also 120 miles of line in Lincoln County, 140 miles in southern Marion County, and 75 miles in Polk County. Applications for these latter extensions may be made by July 1, the cost estimated at around $435,500.

Completion of the system as now projected would make Benton-Lincoln the second largest R. E. A. system in the Nation. It would have 1,109 miles of line costing about $1,446,500 and serving approximately 3,400 farms.

Construction of 193 miles of line for Benton-Lincoln R. E. A. is now in progress, loans therefor apparently totaling $255,000. First units will be energized about July 15. This big cooperative proposes to obtain Bonneville power at a substation to be built just south of Albany. It is said that more than 50 percent of the men engaged on the job with the construction company are members of the cooperative.

Other Oregon R. E. A.'s have been mentioned in Voter columns from time to time, and other new ones are being projected. The three here sketched are among the newest and largest.

Practically all important R. E. A.'s engage in the electrical appliance and wiring business, directly or indirectly. Federal funds are made available so customers may borrow and pay for wiring and appliances—even plumbing—at once, repaying the loans in subsequent installments.

We Oregonians may be pardoned in taking pride in the development we have achieved in this great western empire, and particularly in the advance we have made in those things which bring contentment and make life worth living. We are reminded of the warning which Horace Greeley gave when he said:

The emigration of more than 1,000 persons to Oregon in one body wears the aspect of insanity. For what do they brave the desert, the wilderness, the savage, the snowy precipices of the Rocky Mountains, the weary summer march, the storm-drenched bivouac, and the gnawings of famine?

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, June 14, 1940, was the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the birth of our country's flag. Because the State of Delaware was the first State to adopt the Constitution, the great New York World's Fair designated that day as Delaware Day. More than a thousand citizens from Delaware were present to take part in the Flag Day celebration. I had the honor of making the Flag Day address, which follows:

The State of Delaware is honored today by the great New York World's Fair because of its recognition on this special occasion. This is not an empty honor or one devoid of merit. For when we remember that upon the shores of our State, our forefathers were among the first settlers in the New World; when we remember the sacrifice and fortitude of our ancestors in establishing a sovereign State composed of the 3 counties along the Delaware; when we remember the sick man, Caesar Rodney, leaving his bed and in all haste riding to Philadelphia to sign the Declaration of Independence; when we remember the men of Delaware who contributed so much to the framing of our Constitution—five of whom are portrayed in that masterpiece, The Signing of the Constitution, by Howard Chandler Christy, unveiled in the rotunda of our National Capitol a few days ago; when we remember that Delaware, your State and my State, was the first of the 13 States to ratify the Constitution and is hereby represented by that first star in the galaxy of 48 stars of our national emblem which has given us the undisputed proud distinction of the "First State of the Union"; when we remember the great contribution our State has made to the formation and preservation of our Nation both in war and peace, I again say—this honor, which we appreciate, is a most deserved one.

On this one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the birth of our country's flag, it is most fitting and proper that we should stop for a moment along the path of time and, divesting our minds and souls from the desire of earthly pleasures, material, and aggrandizement, and fear of tomorrow, humbly bow at the shrine of our country's flag, and in communion there, receive the faith, the hope, and the courage which alone can sustain us during this most critical period in the history of civilization.

At the beginning of recorded time, Jehovah made his covenant with man promising that never again would He send the waters to cover the face of the earth and destroy all of mankind. He unfurled the first flag, the many-colored rainbow, which He set in the clouds as a symbol of security, and an assurance to all future generations of His watchful care. Since that day, man has employed his earthly banners as emblems of faith, of hope, and of high resolve.

"When the savage began to emerge from his isolation and took the first steps toward becoming a social creature, profiting by association and cooperation with fellow human beings, one of his first needs was a sign or a symbol whereby he could distinguish during primitive battles between creatures of his own tribe or family and those of enemy tribes. A peculiar type of club, a splotch of colored clay on the body of the warrior, and later some rude device or his clumsy shield served for a time the purpose of insignia. Eventually these bits of wood, bodily ornamentation, and shield signs were replaced by the skins of animals attached to poles so that they might be held high in the air and recognized at a distance. From such crude beginnings it is easy to trace the evolution of the flags of civilized man." (The Flag Book from the National Geographic Society Magazine.)

It was on June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress passed the following act establishing the Stars and Stripes as the flag of our country: "*Resolved*, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representating a new constellation."

You will notice that this act did not define how many points the stars were to have or how they were to be arranged. This date, however, is recognized as the birthday of the American flag.

When Vermont was admitted to the Union in 1791, and Kentucky in 1792, their Members in Congress claimed that these States also should be represented on the flag. In accordance with their wishes, Congress passed the following act, approved by President Washington January 13, 1794:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the 1st day of May A. D. 1795, the flag of the United States be 15 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 15 stars, white in a blue field."

With the admission of new States to the Union, it became obvious that a new star and a new stripe could not be added to the flag and still retain its symmetry. Therefore, after 2 years of discussion, Congress passed the third and last flag act, which was approved by President Monroe April 4, 1818:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the 4th day of July next, the flag of the United States be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 20 stars, white in a blue field.

"SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That on the admission of every new State into the Union, one star be added to the union of the flag, and that such addition shall take effect on the 4th day of July next succeeding such admission."

Prior to these dates, during the colonial period of our history, each of the Colonies had adopted for itself a special flag. During the early struggle for independence, various attempts were made to evolve a general flag emblematic of their cause, but nothing definite or permanent resulted. On June 14, 1777, however, there was born our country's flag, which through all the ages shall be the emblem of liberty and justice for all mankind.

In the words of Mr. Justice Harlan, of the Supreme Court: "To every true American the flag is the symbol of the Nation's power, the emblem of freedom in its truest, best sense. It is not extravagant to say that to all lovers of the country, it signifies government resting on the consent of the governed, liberty regulated by law; the protection of the weak against the exercise of arbitrary power; and the absolute safety for free institution against foreign aggression."

"It is claimed in popular tradition that the honor of making the first flag combining the Stars and Stripes belongs to Betsy Ross, a Quaker upholsteress and flag maker, who resided in Arch Street, Philadelphia. It is asserted by her descendants that Congress appointed a committee composed of General Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross, the latter an uncle of Mrs. Ross' late husband, who called upon her in May or June 1776 and commissioned her to make a flag from an imperfectly drawn design embodying the stripes and the union of 13 six-pointed stars. As the six-pointed stars were peculiar to the British, it is said that Mrs. Ross suggested that a star of five points would be more symmetrical and appropriate and the committee at once adopted the new design."

And thus a new flag was born. It represents the American Nation as it was at its birth; it speaks for what it is today; and it betokens what it may be in the future. Of all the flags of history, the American flag is the greatest, the most beneficient, the most

beautiful. In the language of flags it contributed a new word—that of liberty. It gave a new definition of home, a new ideal of the fireside, a truer conception of the brotherhood of man. It is the first flag that was ever born to represent a people rather than a dynasty. It is an honest flag, a righteous flag; and while during the 151 years of its life our country has engaged in a number of wars, yet it is a glorious and inspiring fact that it has never been flung to the breeze in support of an unworthy cause and has never known defeat.

"The flag whose red is her heroes' blood
That loved its infancy;
Whose white is her undying fame
Of stainless purity;
Whose blue her shield of honor is
Where, gleaming from afar,
We see a star for every State,
A State for every star.
The flag that leads our Army on
And floats above our fleet;
The flag that never yet has known
A national defeat."

I have seen the rays of the rising sun revealing the exquisite grandeur of the mountains of Switzerland. I have seen the snow-clad Italian Alps reflected by the rays of the evening sun on the bosom of beautiful Lake Geneva. I have looked with awe and reverence at the great cathedrals of Europe, but the most inspiring, the most beautiful thing I saw in that foreign land was my country's flag in the American cemetery near Belleau Wood. There it floated in the gentle breeze, protecting the last resting place of American youth who a few short years ago paid their full devotion to their country and its flag. There it floats today, the symbol of the faith, the glory, the honor of a free America. Shall this flag which has stood for the ideals of a free America thus forever stand? Yes; just so long as a united people stand for the flag and just so long as the American people stand for all that is just and equitable in law; all that is ennobling and uplifting in Christianity; all that is enduring in civilization.

Chief Justice Hughes most fittingly expressed what the flag means when he said:

"This flag means more than association and reward. It is the symbol of our national unity, our national endeavor, our national aspiration. It tells you of the struggle for independence, of union preserved, of liberty and union one and inseparable, of the sacrifices of brave men and women to whom the ideals and honor of this Nation have been dearer than life.

"It means America first; it means an undivided allegiance. It means America united, strong and efficient, equal to her tasks. It means that you cannot be saved by the valor and devotion of your ancestors; that to each generation comes its patriotic duty; and that upon your willingness to sacrifice and endure as those before you have sacrificed and endured rests the national hope.

"It speaks of equal rights; of the inspiration of free institutions exemplified and vindicated; of liberty under law intelligently conceived and impartially administered.

"There is not a thread in it but scorns self-indulgence, weakness, and rapacity. It is eloquent of our community interests, outweighing all divergencies of opinion, and of our common destiny."

If there ever was a time when our Nation needed perfect obedience to her laws and a closely cemented Union under one flag, it is today, when angry passions have reduced half the people of the earth to barbarism, when the godless philosophy of "Might makes right" is sweeping over the earth, and no light yet shines above the black horizon of the far-flung battle lines.

In these times which try men's souls, we should not be stampeded by hysteria or maudlin sentiment but should be guided in our every word and act by cool, considered judgment and an abiding faith in the Eternal God. We should not only determine to keep America out of war, but we should also determine to keep war out of America. Today, the greatest menace to that flag and the American ideals for which it stands is not so much without as within our own borders. Any man or woman who in America today claims the protection of that flag and the Constitution of the United States for which it stands and cannot press that sacred emblem to his or her breast with the same devotion, the same loyalty, the same love that a mother presses to her breast her first-born babe is not worthy to breathe the air of a free America.

"There is room in this, our country, but for one flag—the banner of the Stars and Stripes is the flag of our country. It floats over every inch of our vast national domain, the sign and symbol of the Nation's sovereignty and supremacy. In this free Government, all other flags are out of place."

Today, as never before in its history, our country and the flag for which it stands is threatened by foreign-inspired groups within our very borders seeking to create confusion, hatred, and disloyalty; seeking to corrupt and destroy our national existence and trample our flag under their filthy feet by setting race against race, class against class, religious group against religious group. As dark clouds hover over the world today, and the flags of many nations have been destroyed by ruthless dictatorship, our flag should be more precious to us than ever before.

Our Nation should here and now rededicate itself to those virtues bequeathed to us by our forefathers who gave us this flag and this country and swear by the Eternal God that this flag and this country shall not perish from the earth.

THE FLAG

(By Edgar A. Guest)

"There's no coward stripe upon it,
And no shame is written on it;
All the blood that's in its crimson
Is the blood of manhood true;
There's no base and brutal glory
Woven sadly in its story.
It's a bright flag, and a right flag,
And the flag for me and you.

"It's the flag without a fetter;
It's the flag of manhood better;
It has never done a mean thing,
Never waved above a brute;
Greed and hate it never shielded,
Unto wrong it never yielded.
It's a fine flag, a divine flag
That in reverence we salute.

"It's the flag of all the glory
That is written in man's story;
It's the emblem of his freedom
And the hope of men oppressed;
It asks no disgraceful duty,
Never stains with shame its beauty,
It's a pure flag, and a sure flag,
It's our flag and the best."

Oregon Strategic Minerals and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, World War No. 2 has brought tragically to our attention the need of the development, so far as possible, within our own borders, of sources of supplies of strategic and critical minerals. The western portion of the United States has a number of deposits which bid fair to provide a great deal of this much-needed material. I call attention to activities within my own State of Oregon along these lines. Under leave to extend, I include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of June 18 this year, as follows:

OREGON'S BLACK SANDS REPORTED TO YIELD CHROMITE FOR STEEL USE

SEATTLE, WASH., June 18.—Two discoveries about chromium, an essential war mineral which the United States lacks, were reported to the American Association for the Advancement of Science here today. A new source of chromium has been found in the black sands of Oregon, and a new scientific method of locating chromium promises to turn up more American deposits.

Chromium makes stainless steel. It comes from chromite, a mineral usually appearing in the form of heavy black rocks. The country now imports 500,000 tons a year, and all the present known American deposits, if worked to exhaustion, would not supply chromium needs for more than 2 or 3 years.

The chromium reports were made by John Eliot Allen, of Portland, Oreg., State geologist of Oregon. Oregon's black sands are deposits where the ocean once rolled, 6 miles farther inland than the present beaches, from Coos Bay and Marshfield, southward. The black sands lie in lens-shaped formations.

More important is the new prospecting technique. This is based on discovery that the earth, in forming its crust, has laid down the semiprecious black rocks in regular formations. These may be parallel zones, or steps, or crossed formations, somewhat like floor boards above beams. Most of the deposits are small, where they appear at the surface. But with the knowledge of prehistoric formation, a geologist can take a known outcrop as his reference, and with a compass point to the places where other deposits probably lie. Deposits have been traced in this way for 5 miles.

Mr. Allen said that in Oregon 229 chromite bodies have been found, 42 of them big enough to yield more than 100 tons each and one probably 100,000 tons. Montana and California have the other principal known home deposits of chromite.

In the Oregon Voter of June 15, 1940, a brief discussion of this subject appeared, reading as follows:

NEEDED MINERALS—OREGON HELPS IN CRISIS, ALSO TO GAIN BENEFITS

Oregon must be interested in our Government's search for so-called strategic minerals and the State may benefit substantially

from it. The new term connotes minerals "essential in peace and critical in war," which are produced domestically in quantities quite insufficient for our needs. As to the most important ones, a 5-year record shows the United States produces only 5 to 6 percent of needed manganese, 1 percent of chromium needs, 40 percent of mercury needs, 50 percent of tungsten needs, 0.5 percent of nickle needs, 0.2 percent of tin needs, and 10 percent of antimony needs.

Oregon can help wonderfully to fill the mercury needs of the country. It has chromite deposits which are being carefully surveyed. Idaho may be able to supply considerable antimony, as well as turning out mercury. Washington has a manganese deposit under survey by Bureau of Mines experts. In Nevada, nickel and tungsten deposits are being examined.

Over in the Coos County an expert of the United States Geological Survey is surveying the extent of chrome deposits, assisted by a crew of workers. Beach sands containing chromite are being studied. The deposits of the hills extend southward into California. Oregon is said to have some chromite also around Canyon City.

Whether or not it may be possible to produce chromium or manganese or tungsten from the deposits under investigation at approximate present costs is not very material. Under stress of urgency, the Government will see that the desired minerals and metals are produced even at two or three or five times the present cost. Procurement Division of the Treasury Department is authorized to make purchases of minerals and metals required by the Government.

Fortunately the Government has been forehanded here in the Far West in having just opened a fine new building for the Intermountain Experiment Station of the Bureau of Mines at Salt Lake City. This becomes an outstanding center of metallurgical research for the West. Many graduate students from schools of the West are expected to obtain practical training at the station, this being only one phase of its planned activity.

After having gone through alternate periods of boosting and then neglecting our mining industry, Oregon is very fortunately situated in now possessing an able and well-manned department of geology and mineral industries. Our mining industry is receiving the most practical State aid enjoyed within its long history.

Earl K. Nixon has had charge as director practically since the department was created in July of 1937. The State governing board was disappointed when Mr. Nixon recently tendered his resignation because he had received a flattering offer to direct mining development work in Peru and neighboring South American countries. Finally, Director Nixon was prevailed upon to retain his position, merely taking a 2-month leave for a trip to South America. It is understood that the question of his remaining there or returning is in abeyance. He is wanted by the South American interests because of his previous experience as mining expert there. F. W. Libbey, staff mining engineer, will direct department affairs during Nixon's absence. Whether Mr. Nixon is induced to resume charge of the State department or not, he will deserve thanks and encomiums from Oregonians for the good work he has done for the State.

Let's Throw the Light on Poll Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DES MOINES REGISTER

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Des Moines Register of June 11, 1940, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register of June 11, 1940]

LET'S TURN THE LIGHT ON POLL TAXES

Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, as chairman of the Senate Special Elections Committee, has received numerous requests, we are told, that his committee investigate possible corruption in elections of the eight southern States which require payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting.

While at first glance the standard of politics in the South may appear to be none of our concern, we have reason to take some interest in it. For one thing, our democracy in this country is not as strong as it ought to be as long as its processes are perverted in some areas for selfish ends. For another thing, the poll tax permits a control of congressional representation in these Southern States that gives them a wholly unwarranted advantage in power, through committee chairmanships, out of all proportion to their population.

The poll tax is not used to raise revenues. That is only a dodge. In no State does it produce as much as 5 percent of the total appropriation for education, though all poll taxes go into school funds. Indeed, in one State the collector will not even accept payment of the poll tax unless it is offered 6 months before election time. And here is the clue to its real function.

Poll taxes are levied to restrict the right to vote. Primarily they were aimed at the Negro voter, but it is estimated that now 64 percent of all white adults in the eight poll-tax States are barred from the ballot box by the tax. In the 1936 Presidential election only 20.4 percent of the adult citizens of Alabama voted. In Arkansas the figure was 18.5 percent; in Florida, 37.8 percent; Georgia, 19.6 percent; Mississippi, 16.2 percent; South Carolina, 14.1 percent; Tennessee, 33.5 percent; Texas, 26.2 percent; Virginia, 25.7 percent. The average for the eight States is 24.1 percent—the worst record of any region in the world having even a pretense of democratic suffrage. Mexico does twice as well.

These 8 States have 78 Congressmen. Of these 43, including the entire delegations of Arkansas and Mississippi, were chosen without a single opposing vote in the last election. In 16 of the 78 districts, less than 6,000 votes were necessary to elect a Congressman, although national representation is based upon 1 Congressman for every 280,000 people. In Iowa, in that election, more than 43,000 votes were cast for every victorious candidate.

Thus in the poll-tax States patronage is spread 6 to 10 times as thick, machine politics becomes more firmly entrenched, corruption at the polls unduly lengthens the tenure of Congressmen and, due to seniority, they come to hold a disproportionate number of important committee chairmanships. Of standing committee chairmanships in the Senate, the eight poll-tax States hold one-third, twice their due proportion. And in the House, poll-tax States also hold a third of the total.

The history of the South, as Barry Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, has observed, gives small comfort to the theory that a Government controlled exclusively by a small class possessing property and position would select the most useful public servants and place only the highest type of citizens in office. The record in the South is certainly no better, even if no worse, than for other regions.

Enlightened public leaders in the South have recently stirred up their own crusade against poll taxes—opposed, quite naturally, by the politicos who use the system to their personal advantage. What could be more proper, at a time when real democracy needs all of the vigorous championing that it can get, than that Senator GILLETTE'S committee should reveal to the Nation what the actual function and effects are of this autocratic system of vote control.

Service of Hon. Overton Brooks on the Committee on Military Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in January 1937, by selection of the Ways and Means Committee, there came to the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, of the Fourth Congressional District. At that time I was a senior ranking Democratic member of the committee and became chairman of it several months later when the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. LISTER HILL, was elevated to the position of United States Senator from Alabama. It has, therefore, been my privilege to work with Mr. BROOKS from the very beginning of his activities in Congress, and as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to observe his work on this important committee, and his interest in national defense.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to report to this House that the selection of OVERTON BROOKS to my committee has proved to be a wise one. OVERTON BROOKS has made good as a Congressman and as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs in the 3½ years of his service. He has risen until his name now stands the thirteenth Democrat from the top of the roster of this committee, which has 26 members.

Mr. BROOKS has had the good judgment and good sense to follow precedent in beginning his membership; he has worked hard, studied hard, listened, and learned during the

3 years of his service until now he is a most effective member. I might say that he came to our committee with a background and with experience which admirably qualifies him for the important work of the committee. He comes from one of the most important military centers of the United States—Barksdale Field, La.—and knows the Army from long association. In addition, he served in the First Division of the United States Army, Sixth Regiment of Field Artillery, in the last war and spent about 1 year in France, Belgium, and Germany. His advance to date has been rapid.

The work of the Military Affairs Committee has been important and heavy during this Congress. We have handled the most extensive and important expansion of the national defense ever known in times of peace. In a time when angry flames of war are surging through Europe and Asia, maintaining the security of American peace through a program of military preparedness for national defense has become a problem of the Federal Government of first concern, and the work of the Military Affairs Committee of this Congress has become of first-rank importance. In such trying times, I am glad to say that we have on the committee such men as the gentleman from Louisiana, OVERTON BROOKS. His work has shown marked ability and a thorough understanding of the many perplexing problems of our country's defense system. I am glad to be able to state that at all times he has manifested deep concern of our military objectives, and has likewise been courteous and cooperative.

Mr. BROOKS enjoys the esteem and confidence of all the members of the committee, and so far as I can recall, although I know him to be a busy man, he has missed very few sessions of the committee during the time of his membership.

Should a vacancy occur on this Committee of Military Affairs at the present critical time it is my thought that such a vacancy would not be filled by a new Member of Congress, but probably would be filled by the transfer of an older Member to this committee. It is, therefore, my desire and hope that he shall in these critical and trying times continue as a member of what is now strategically a most important committee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and this House for this opportunity of saying a word on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana, one of the members of our committee.

Bituminous Coal Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM FARMER AND CONSUMER GROUPS MEETING IN CONFERENCE IN CHICAGO

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the consuming public is rapidly becoming aware of the fact that it will be burdened with an uneconomic fuel bill this winter. The additional cost of coal under the artificial price schedules established by the Bituminous Coal Division will be terrific. It will amount to millions of dollars. This onslaught against the pocketbooks of Mr. and Mrs. America comes at a time when our people will be burdened with a heavy tax program for our national defense. In my opinion they will not suffer in silence the results of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937. They realize now that this act is an attempt to assure a profit to the marginal and submarginal mines at the expense of the consumer.

Several days ago the following telegram was sent to H. A. Gray, Director of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior in Washington. It speaks for itself.

TELEGRAM ADDRESSED TO H. A. GRAY, DIRECTOR, BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

JUNE 14, 1940.

Representatives of various farmer and consumer groups, meeting in conference in Chicago, June 14, 1940, unanimously passed the following resolutions and pledged themselves to circulate same among other interested groups in their various States:

There is a widespread interest and far-reaching influence involved in the proposed principle of fixing coal prices at the mines so as to equalize transportation charges and deprive the consuming and producing public of the benefits of the lowest available transportation costs.

We earnestly urge that the price schedules now being prepared by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior fix prices at the mines, regardless of the manner by which the coal is transported to consuming areas.

Users of coal are unalterably opposed to fixing mine prices so as to discriminate against any form of transportation, be it rail, river, or truck, as uneconomic, unsound, unjust, and not in the public interest.

We recommend the plan adopted by the Consumers Counsel in briefs and in oral arguments before the Division to the effect that there shall be no price differential at the mines to any consumers of coal, and we urge that this policy be adopted by the director of the Division and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The mid-continent area of the United States contains 49.3 percent of the country's population, produces 40 percent of its manufactured products, and 63.5 percent of its gross farm income. Its people, in 23 States, will be severely mistreated and damaged by coal prices fixed at the mines, which deny to them the savings from their use of the most economical forms of transportation.

Charles Danforth, secretary-treasurer, Upper Missouri River Valley Association, Yankton, S. Dak.; Oscar Helme, president, National Cooperative Elevator Association, Marcus, Iowa; Dr. O. O. Wolf, president, Kansas Farm Bureau, Manhattan, Kans.; Earl C. Smith, president, Illinois Agricultural Association, Chicago, Ill.; James Vint, manager, Farmers' Cooperative Elevator, and director, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture; Earl Peterson, coal manager, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, Minn.; F. M. Hoskins, manager, Lone Tree Farmers' Exchange, Lone Tree, Iowa; Lachlan Macleay, president, Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo.

Settlement of Alaska and European Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1940

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, several months ago identical bills were introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives, S. 3577, presented in the Senate by Senator WAGNER, at the request of Senator KING, and H. R. 8931, introduced in the House by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], each being entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement and development of Alaska." Reference will be made to the Senate bill only, as the House bill has not been acted upon or even considered.

The bill provides for the formation of corporations to be known as Alaska Development Corporations, each of which must have a capital stock of at least $10,000,000, and of that amount at least $2,500,000 must be subscribed before the corporation is eligible to do business. Each of such corporations may, under plans to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, undertake the settlement of people in Alaska and the establishment of such settlers in suitable enterprises. The Secretary of the Interior, by other provisions of the bill, is granted large supervisory authority over the corporations so to be formed and over their activities.

Those who may be so settled in Alaska are divided into four classes: The first, citizens of the United States; the second, quota immigrants and persons lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; and third, nonquota immigrants who may be admitted under present law; and the fourth class embraces nonquota immigrants who are eligible generally for admission to the United States but who cannot now be admitted because the quotas are ex-

hausted and because they do not come within any of the special nonquota classifications. Each of such immigrants must be between the ages of 16 and 45, physically and mentally fit, and not within any of the barred classes, must take an oath of obedience to the Constitution and laws of the United States, and must undertake to engage only in such occupations as are prescribed in the act for at least 5 years after his admission to Alaska and so long thereafter as he retains the status of a nonquota immigrant. The bill further contains a provision that such nonquota immigrant settlers shall not be admitted to citizenship until they shall have resided continuously in the Territory for 5 years following their admission and shall have been reclassified as quota immigrants. Under section 15 of the bill provisions are imposed upon the nonquota immigrant settlers who shall violate the provisions of their undertaking upon which they are admitted to Alaska, the punishment being imprisonment for not more than 3 years or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both, and the further penalty of deportation may be imposed.

Provision is made that any such plan shall, with respect to at least 50 percent of the number of settlers to be accepted, accord a preference to citizens of the United States possessing the necessary qualifications. But it should be here noted that under the bill as drawn there is no obligation to accept a single citizen as one of the settlers. No provision has been made in the bill that 50 percent, or any other proportion, of the settlers must be citizens of the United States.

Shortly after the Senate bill was introduced I received a letter from Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, inviting me to express my views with respect to the bill. This I did in a letter dated March 20, 1940, addressed to Senator TYDINGS. That letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 20, 1940.*

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Reference is made to your letter of March 14 asking for an expression of my views with respect to the bill (S. 3577) "To provide for the settlement and development of Alaska," which has been referred to your committee for attention.

Alaska is clearly underpopulated, and any proper and suitable legislation which will result in increasing the permanent residents of the Territory is deserving of every possible support. In the bill under consideration an increase in the population and the development of the natural resources of Alaska are sought through the formation of corporations which will presumably finance new settlers and new industries in Alaska.

Eager as I am to see the settlement and development of Alaska go forward at a much more rapid rate than anything heretofore known, there is one feature of the bill to which I cannot give assent and which is, and will be, opposed by practically every one of the present residents of the Territory, and that is the feature embraced in section 9 of the bill which proposes to admit into Alaska for permanent residence, and for residence in Alaska only, aliens who are not eligible to be admitted into any other part of the United States, and who would not become eligible to enter the States unless and until they should be admitted to citizenship at some indefinite future date. Under this plan there would be established in Alaska a class of aliens who could not be admitted into the States and whose residence would be restricted to Alaska, and who would, under the law, be required to undertake certain specified occupations in the Territory.

Section 14 of the bill provides that if any settler who violates any of the undertakings set forth in section 9 and assumed by him as a condition to his certification by any Alaska development corporation shall, upon conviction thereof, be subjected to imprisonment for not more than 3 years or to a fine of not more than $5,000, or both, and in addition may under certain circumstances be deported. This section appears to refer to the undertakings of each settler to engage only in such occupations as are set out in section 3 of the bill for a period of at least 5 years after his admission to Alaska and so long thereafter as he retains the status of a nonquota immigrant.

There is grave doubt whether the country of origin would accept any settler so deported and so it is likely that the only alternative would be the imposition of the penalty provided. I have been unable to find in the bill any provision to take care of the case of a settler who might go from Alaska to the States and so I assume that he would be returned to Alaska. Possibly he would be subject to the punishment provided by section 14. These provisions show that, under one aspect of the bill, continued residence in Alaska may be accounted as punishment for a criminal offense.

The present residents of Alaska take just pride in the fact that the Territory is an integral part of the United States and that all of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, except such as are applicable to States only because of their status as States, extend with full force to Alaska. To do what is proposed to be done by the latter part of section 9 of the bill before us would in a substantial sense, tend to create a barrier between Alaska and the several States which would be resented by all of the people of the Territory for they would feel that Alaska was being made into a sort of a concentration camp or semipenal colony. It would necessarily follow that anyone traveling from Alaska to the States would be obliged to show that he was not a member of one of the restricted alien settlements which are proposed to be set up in Alaska under the bill, and that would be considered intolerable.

It follows that before I could give consent to the passage of the bill, or even its serious consideration, it would be necessary to exclude therefrom all those parts of the bill which permit settlement in Alaska of aliens who would be simultaneously barred from the remainder of the United States. To my mind this is fundamental.

Moreover, it seems to me that no such provision is necessary when we consider that in the United States at the present time we have literally hundreds of thousands of some of our best citizens who have been obliged to leave the so-called Dust Bowl region and migrate to other parts of the Nation. These people are already citizens and they are sturdy, industrious, and self-reliant, would make admirable settlers in Alaska and they have enough of the Yankee genius to engage successfully in any industry or occupation. In addition, under the present quotas literally thousands of refugees have been admitted to the United States during the past few years and there would not be the slightest objection in Alaska to the establishment of those settlers, properly financed, in the Territory in substantial, noncompetitive industries and occupations. There is no lack of human material in the United States at the present time to populate Alaska, and so there is no sound reason why Alaska should be made an exception to the operation of the general immigration laws of the United States.

In my judgment, there is less race and other prejudice in Alaska than anywhere else in the Nation. There is no prejudice whatever against aliens. Some of our best citizens were born abroad and have been admitted to citizenship in Alaska. We do not oppose, and Alaskans never will oppose, the settlement in Alaska of aliens because they are aliens. We strongly advise against mass settlements in the Territory unless the settlers are amply and adequately financed, because we know that otherwise there will be much suffering and an intolerable burden will be thrown upon the Territorial government. But even if properly financed we definitely object to admission into Alaska of aliens who may not enter the States for the reasons above stated.

Unless the objectionable provisions are entirely removed from the bill I shall be obliged to oppose it, though I shall welcome the opportunity to support any sound plan for the settlement and development of Alaska which does not involve the building of any sort of wall between the several States and Alaska.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY J. DIMOND, *Delegate.*

Later a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs was appointed to consider the bill and to hold hearings with respect thereto. That committee consists of Hon. WILLIAM H. KING, of Utah (chairman); Hon. HOMER T. BONE, of Washington; Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina; Hon. GERALD P. NYE, of North Dakota; and Hon. ERNEST W. GIBSON, of Vermont. Hearings were had on the bill before the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator KING, and considerable testimony was adduced with respect thereto. At those hearings I appeared and presented to the committee a statement in opposition to the bill as written, based largely upon the objections set out in my letter of March 20 to Senator TYDINGS. However, the record of those hearings has not been printed, and, therefore, no copies are available. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, and also for the information of the residents of Alaska, it seems advisable that I should give here a further expression of my judgment concerning these measures.

Mr. Speaker, it is with really deep regret that I am constrained by considerations of national as well as territorial interest to object to the passage of this bill. It is always an unpleasant duty to oppose a proposition or a measure which is the result of high ideals and the best intentions, and which, in addition, has been given an inspiring or elevating label or name. This is called a bill to provide for the settlement and development of Alaska. I have devoted so many years to the advancement of the settlement and development of Alaska that I find it hard to resist the glamorous attraction of any measure with such a seductive title.

Moreover, I am not insensible to the probability that in opposing this bill I will be accused of opposing the settlement and development of Alaska, although nothing could be further from the fact. It reminds me of the instance when a Member of Congress introduced a bill which he called a bill to elevate the moral standards of citizens of the United States. After such a glowing title the bill proceeded to provide that no one should utter or print any statement about religion or morality unless such statement should be first approved by a public censor to be appointed by the President. When it was politely suggested to the author of the bill that not only was the bill not in harmony with certain provisions of the Constitution of the United States but that it also ran counter to the fundamental concepts of liberty of speech and of press, the critic was assailed by the proponent of the bill upon the ground that any objector to the measure must be opposed to an improvement in the morals and an elevation of the moral standards of the citizens of our country.

Now, I am opposed to the bill, but at the same time I am an advocate, with a fervor greater than anything which could be understood by its proponents, of the settlement and development of Alaska.

The title of the bill is a misnomer. It should instead be called a bill for the assistance and relief of the savagely persecuted people of some of the European totalitarian states. I am sure that no Member of Congress would feel any prejudice against the measure if it were given its true name. After all, we would be insensible, indeed, if we were not all ardently desirous of relieving, so far as we can in justice to our own people, the miseries and agonies of those of our European brethren who are now being forced into concentration camps or into exile, and many of them murdered, because they happen to belong to a particular race or adhere to a particular form for the worship of our Creator.

My objections to the bill are based upon several grounds, which I shall now attempt to state in orderly sequence.

First. The whole bill is really written around the provision for bringing into Alaska, and simultaneously barring from entry into the United States, nonquota immigrants. Aside from those provisions, the bill offers nothing new. Properly, it does not seek to give to corporations formed under its terms any new or special or exclusive rights in lands or waters or sources of wealth in the Territory. So, except for the power to bring in nonquota immigrants, the bill, if enacted, would not grant to any corporation created under it any right or privilege not now enjoyed by domestic business corporations.

Second. The idea of the settlement of Alaska through the agency of corporations of the type provided in the bill is evidently based upon the concept of proprietary corporations similar to the British organizations in the seventeenth century, like the Virginia and the Plymouth and other Crown-chartered companies. In passing, however, it may be noted that when the Virginia Co. was first chartered by the Crown, the design was not to settle the colony but for exploration and trade. Moreover, the Virginia Co. and its contemporaries were given advantages not sought to be bestowed upon the corporations to be chartered under the bill, if enacted, because those proprietary companies of former days were granted everything within the boundaries of the areas prescribed for them, and they were also the sole sources of Government and administrative authority, with a monopoly on all trade, communication, and transportation.

Third. Provision has been made in the bill that citizens of the United States, up to 50 percent of the settlers, are to be accorded a preference. It seems almost certain, however, first, that funds cannot be raised for the settlement of citizens in Alaska under the terms of the bill; and, therefore, second, that practically all the settlers will be aliens of some of the proscribed classes of several of the countries of Europe now under dictatorship. I suggest that the provision with respect to giving citizens preference up to 50 percent may be misleading because it is not likely to be used, and it will probably never be used, because no money can be found to finance citizens in this fashion.

Fourth. It is obvious that since under the terms of the bill the chartered corporations will not be granted any special privileges for the use of the lands or waters or the fruits thereof, if the plan of financing were sound it would already be used in Alaska by private corporations. The fact that it has not been used is strong evidence that it will not be used for citizens of the United States if the bill is enacted.

Fifth. My special objection to the bill is based on those provisions which seek to admit nonquota aliens to Alaska and at the same time bar them from the United States. I wish my position on this to be made clear. I am not here concerned with any changes that Congress may see fit to make in our immigration laws so as to take care of some of the people of Europe who are now being persecuted for racial or religious reasons, and who are deserving not only of our sympathy but of all the help that we can give them consistent to our duties to our own people. But I shall oppose to the full measure of all of my strength any proposal which will admit anybody to Alaska who is not eligible to enter the United States. Alaska is a part of the Nation and we decline to have it set off from the rest of the Nation as a sort of special land where people may reside who are not citizens and who are not permitted to be in the remainder of the United States. In the long run, to permit anything of that kind would be disastrous for the Territory. My views on that matter have been more fully expressed in my letter of March 20 addressed to Senator TYDINGS, previously quoted.

Sixth. It is not only that the Federal Government is concerned but the government of the Territory of Alaska, which represents the present population as well. If the plan goes through, the Territory will be called upon to spend large sums of money for education and social service for the new settlers, and it must be remembered, too, that the Federal Government will be called upon to spend considerable sums of money to provide roads for the settlers. Without roads no civilized community can long survive, and it is gravely doubtful that the new settlers will be sufficiently well financed to provide their own roads. In fact, they will probably consider that this service is one that is owed to them as residents, either by the Territorial or Federal Government.

Seventh. In order, as I assume, to quiet the apprehensions of the present citizens of Alaska with respect to the new nonquota immigrant settlers, provision has been made in the bill that each of such settlers must enter into an agreement that he will engage only in such occupations as are prescribed in section 3 of the act. Those occupations, however, cover almost every conceivable industry, business, and occupation which may be carried on in Alaska. Further provision is made that if an immigrant violates that undertaking he may be punished by imprisonment of not more than 3 years or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both, and shall be subject to deportation. It is tolerably plain that the deportation provision is little more than a gesture, for, unless the governments of the world change considerably, they will not accept back those who once leave for admission to Alaska, and so the only punishment that can be imposed is a penal one. I suggest that in this free country to punish a man by imprisonment or fine, or to say that one will punish him by imprisonment or fine, upon his leaving one occupation and undertaking another is so anomalous and so contradictory to the fundamentals of our institutions that it ought never to be tolerated or considered, because it is suggestive of the days when men were serfs attached to the land and were punished by whipping, or in some other fashion, if they ran away to the next province or went out of the boundaries of the local village.

Eighth. Despite the penal provisions and any other provisions in the bill, it seems all too probable and, indeed, reasonably certain that after the first year or so following the admission of the nonquota aliens, large numbers of them may become dissatisfied with the occupation or environment in which they find themselves and will decide to go to some other part of Alaska and there engage in some other occupation. They are all too likely to enter the cities of Alaska and there subject to additional competition the present resi-

dents, who are in business of one kind or another, or add to the unemployment problem. To hold out the threat of putting them in jail if they so behave is, in my opinion, worse than useless.

Ninth. I have an active, intense, and ardent desire to see Alaska settled, and I agree wholly that Alaska is capable of supporting a much larger population than it is at the present time. But there is not the slightest need, nor would any good purpose be served through attempting to settle Alaska under the bill before us. The best that can be said of it is that it may be harmless, because no funds can be found to finance any such corporation. But it is never justifiable to pass legislation because it may be harmless. There is a possibility that it may be terribly harmful to Alaska and to the present residents of Alaska through the admission of nonquota aliens, who will form a separate society or caste in our present casteless Territory.

Tenth. If it is really desired to increase the population of Alaska, nothing additional is needed except transportation facilities, principally to consist of roads in the Territory. As fast as roads are built in the Territory in suitable regions, people will settle along them and will make use of the agricultural and mineral lands and of the fisheries of the adjoining seas. Without roads, however, life in the more remote regions is hopeless, particularly for women and children. If Congress will provide, in addition to present appropriations, at least $1,000,000 a year for the next 10 years for road construction, and if Alaska is connected with the States by highway, it is my considered judgment that we shall get at least 5,000 new settlers a year, which are probably about as many as can be absorbed safely under the present economic set-up of the Territory. Of course, if our potential pulp industry is developed, we may confidently look forward to a much more substantial additional increase in population. For sake of emphasis, I must say again that our principal requirement for the settlement and the increase in population and the development of Alaska lies in roads; roads within the boundaries of the Territory. It would be helpful, of course, and greatly helpful, if a way could be found to complete the highway to Alaska from the States, a plan that is now under consideration by the Alaskan International Highway Commission. Airfields, too, are necessary, and air transportation facilities; but for the permanent settlement and development of Alaska, the first and most important thing needed is roads.

In this connection I am not unmindful of the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior that some of the people of Alaska prefer Federal subsidies to private financing and that they condemn the plan on that account. The exact language of Secretary Ickes in this respect given at the Senate hearings is as follows:

> There are other Alaskans who are so used to crying for and existing on Federal subsidies that any plan that would depend on private financing will be viewed as a substitute for Government spending (which is true enough), and they will condemn the plan on that account.

I regret exceedingly that any such statement was made as an argument in favor of the bill or made at all, for I know Alaska intimately and I do not know of any Alaskan, and I have never heard of one, and I do not believe there is one, who prefers Federal subsidies to private financing. In fact, the ardent desire of all of us is to be able to live without Federal subsidies of any kind at the earliest possible moment.

Therefore, while I have suggested that for the settlement of Alaska what is desirable and what is needed is an extension of roads in the Territory and have further stated that the additional sum of $1,000,000 a year could be well and profitably spent upon that work for the next 10 years, may I invite the attention of the Members to the fact that under the plan proposed in the bill it will be absolutely necessary, in my judgment, for the Government to undertake the building of roads, and the expense of that construction will be at least as large as the sum that I have suggested. So even if the bill is passed, I anticipate, and I have good grounds to believe, that the Government will be called upon to spend at least $1,000,000 a year for 10 years in the construction of roads in order to make life tolerable for the settlers. And if the Government spends that amount of money on roads it is not necessary to pass the bill at all, because Alaska will be populated just as fast as roads are built to take care of the needs of the settlers.

In fact, the principal reason why we in Alaska are obliged to call for aid from the Federal Government for the construction of roads and for other public works is largely because more than 99 percent of the area of Alaska is still in the public domain and the Government is proprietor and landlord. The roads to be built run through the public domain and open it up to settlement and development. If the Federal Government will give to the Territory of Alaska the title deed to all of the public domain in Alaska, both reserved and unreserved, the Territory of Alaska will never call upon the Federal Government to give a single dollar in subsidy or hand-out or any expenditure whatever except as to those functions like the Post Office Department, which are monopolized by the Federal Government. The people of Alaska are not to blame for existing conditions in the Territory. It is obviously to the national interest to have more people in Alaska and since the national interest is served by the increase in population of Alaska it is not unjust or unfair, nor should it be considered as a "crying for and existing on Federal subsidies" if we suggest to the Federal Government that as the great landlord of Alaska that Government may well provide a reasonable amount of money for the construction of roads in the Territory.

Eleventh: It has been suggested by Secretary Ickes that a precedent for this bill may be found in the law which provides for admission into the Territory of Hawaii of certain noncitizens. The Secretary's statement in that respect is as follows:

> The Congress has already made similar provisions with regard to immigration into our Territories, as for example, the admission to the Territory of Hawaii of immigrants not entitled to enter continental United States when the Secretary of the Interior finds that industrial conditions in that Territory so warrant.

Mr. Speaker, a reference to the law shows that there is no real analogy between the provisions for admission of noncitizens to Hawaii under certain cases and the provisions of the bill under consideration.

The facts are that when the Philippine Independence Act was under discussion, certain citizens of Hawaii, foreseeing a shortage of Filipino labor because in the bill the quota of immigration from the Philippines was fixed at 50, sought and obtained a provision under which it might be possible to have additional Filipinos admitted to Hawaii, the relevant language being as follows:

> This paragraph shall not apply to a person coming or seeking to come to the Territory of Hawaii who does not apply for and secure an immigration or passport visa, but such immigration shall be determined by the Department of the Interior on the basis of the needs of industries in the Territory of Hawaii.

It is clear, of course, that this provision refers only to Filipinos, who were then already under our flag, and the provision was asked for by some of the citizens of Hawaii themselves in order to guard against a shortage of workmen for the industries of that Territory. Upon inquiry it appears that the particular provision has never been used and no Filipinos have been admitted to the Territory of Hawaii under it. In fact, so far as I am able to find out, no application has ever been made for the entry of any Filipinos into the Territory of Hawaii under the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act, except those who may come in under the immigration quota of 50 fixed by the act itself. That particular provision which I have heretofore quoted, admitting Filipinos in limited numbers to come into the Territory of Hawaii for industrial purposes, has been found by the Hawaiians themselves to be definitely harmful and, accordingly, the able and distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, Hon. SAMUEL W. KING, sought repeal of that provision of the Philippine Independence Act above quoted, by a bill introduced in the House of Representatives (H. R.

7561) of the Seventy-fifth Congress. This bill passed both Houses of Congress but was vetoed by the President on the ground that the objectionable provision was a part and parcel of the Philippine Independence Act and that the Philippine Independence Act was a compact between the United States and the Philippines and, therefore, no part of the act should be repealed by the Congress except with the consent of the Legislature of the Philippines. The judgment of the President in the matter is unquestionably sound, but yet the fact remains that the people of the Territory of Hawaii themselves realize now the mistake that was made in having that particular provision incorporated in the Philippine Independence Act.

And so when it is said that this particular portion of the Philippine Independence Act serves as a precedent for what is being attempted in the bill under consideration, I must respectfully dissent and say that it is no precedent whatever and is not deserving of the slightest consideration.

Reference has also been made to the China Trade Act, but the discussion heretofore had proves that the China Trade Act has served as a model for the bill under consideration only as to the formation of the corporation sought to be organized. The China Trade Act contains absolutely no provision for the settlement anywhere or under any conditions of nonquota immigrants or superquota immigrants. And so it is only in a very limited or minor way that the China Trade Act can be said to be a model for this bill, and to call it a model without any qualification would be seriously misleading.

Twelfth. It has been suggested that much good will accrue to Alaska and to the United States by the development of new industries, and reference has been made to the importation into the United States of canned crab and dried herring. It has even been said that by the passage of the bill we shall enjoy the benefits of superior technical knowledge and skill, and, therefore, these new industries contemplated are likely to be successful. In this connection the questions propounded during the Senate hearings to one of the witnesses by Senator BONE were penetrating, and the answers to those questions lead to the inescapable conclusion that the importation of the articles mentioned are essentially based on a much lower wage scale in the countries from which the articles come. In every instance that I know of that has been referred to in the testimony with respect to the importation of articles which may be produced in Alaska, the very possibility of their being imported at the present time is derived from the fact that the workmen who produce those articles receive much lower wages than those paid to workmen in the United States under similar conditions. In other words, it is the low wage scales of the foreign countries which enables them to produce the articles and import them over our tariffs and thus drive our own citizens out of business, or prevent them from entering a particular business. It cannot be reasonably argued that the situation will be changed by the admission into Alaska of aliens, unless it is contemplated that their wages be much lower than the standard prevailing wages of Alaska. I assume that the proponents of the bill do not contemplate any action which will lead to the breaking down of our wage standards in the Territory, for that would be a calamity.

Thirteenth. The present citizens of Alaska should be considered, and undoubtedly will be considered, in connection with this proposed legislation. In order to make any such settlement as is contemplated under the bill a success, the people of Alaska must cooperate. The first thing that ought to be done is to determine whether they approve of the plan. So far as I know, the overwhelming majority of them at the present time do not approve of the plan of settlement embraced in the bill and particularly are they opposed to the settlement in Alaska of nonquota aliens who are barred from the several States, and from Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Before the bill is further considered the whole matter should be presented to the Alaska Territorial Legislature at the meeting of the body to take place between January and March 1941, and then if the Alaska Legislature approves of the plan, or approves of it with modifications, Congress may safely proceed, knowing that the plan will have the cooperation of the present residents of Alaska. If the legislature does not approve it then no further action should be taken.

Fourteenth. It is obvious that the bill cannot and will not be passed at the present session of Congress. At the present time the propaganda in its favor is likely only, with cruel results, to arouse false hopes in some of the oppressed who expect to be admitted to Alaska upon the enactment of the legislation. I have received several pitiful letters of that nature. It would be better and more in harmony with humanitarian sentiments to say now and here that the bill is not being seriously considered for passage at this session of Congress and that further action will depend upon the degree of cooperation that can be obtained from the people of Alaska as expressed by the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

The question may be asked whether the bill would be acceptable to Alaska if some provision were made so that officials of the Alaska government or Alaska Legislature might participate, in an advisory capacity, in the administration to be set up under the bill, and particularly with respect to investigations which might be instituted and carried on concerning any corporations organized under the bill if it should become a law. It is my considered judgment that any such participation in the administration would not make the bill agreeable to Alaskans. Certainly such amendment would not make the bill satisfactory to me. I should consider the right to give advice to be little better than worthless, and, so far as I am concerned, the bill in its present form must have the approval of the Alaska Territorial Legislature or the people of Alaska generally before I shall consent to its passage. If a new bill should be introduced, which would lodge full administrative control in an agency to be created by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, then, of course, the situation would be different. But, even in that event, I should long hesitate to consent to the provision designed to admit aliens to Alaska who are simultaneously barred from entering the United States, because that involves a matter of principle which I deem of the first importance.

Fifteenth. What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is larger knowledge of industrial and economic conditions and a well thought-out and worked-out plan, stated not in generalities but in detail, whereby settlers in Alaska may earn a living, and finally a competence, in new, noncompetitive industries. A year of exploration and research on the ground by industrial engineers, scientists, and businessmen might give us sufficient information upon which we could reasonably base some worthwhile legislation. At the present time this detailed information is simply nonexistent and, despite the brilliance of legal execution of Mr. Felix Cohen and Mr. David Speck, of the Interior Department, in drafting the bill under consideration, which, as a piece of legislative craftsmanship, is entirely admirable, what is now indispensable is a comprehensive and circumstantial plan by an industrial general staff which will lead, indeed, to a measure for the settlement and development of Alaska, and will afford whatever relief may properly be given to the persecuted people of Europe without running counter to the principle of unity between Alaska and the rest of the Nation.

What the People Desire on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM FRANK GANNETT

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from

Frank Gannett to chairman, resolutions committee, Republican National Convention, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Gannett's telegram follows in full:

Hon. HERBERT K. HYDE,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee, Republican National Convention, Philadelphia, Pa.:

After 3½ years of intimate contact with public opinion through conference and correspondence with tens of thousands of citizens in every State, I should like to present to your committee what I believe to be the desires of the vast majority of our people on the question of foreign policy:

1. They insist that the United States shall not become involved in any foreign war. To this end, they desire that we stop meddling in the affairs of Europe and Asia and no longer presume to be policeman for the world.

2. They demand that we adhere to and defend the Monroe Doctrine, which is a statement of reciprocal duties. We said that Europe must not intervene in the Western Hemisphere and, on the other hand, we undertook not to interfere in the Old World. This policy embodied the convictions of Washington and Jefferson and his disciple, Monroe. It was the basic pattern of American foreign policy for the century that followed.

Many times groups of our citizens have advocated intervention in behalf of persecuted peoples for whom they had deep sympathy, as we have sympathy today for the oppressed everywhere.

But only twice did we depart from this historic policy of nonintervention, once in the Philippines, and once in Europe, in 1917. The Philippine adventure is now being liquidated. And in 1920 our continuance in foreign intervention was repudiated when the Democratic candidates, Cox and Roosevelt, were overwhelmingly defeated on the League of Nations issue.

Our Republic was born and grew strong when despots and tyrants were in power. George III was a dictator. Napoleon was the nineteenth-century Hitler, and the Holy Alliance a model for the present Rome-Berlin-Moscow axis. We have preserved, and can preserve, our democracy, even in a world of dictators, if we make our defenses impregnable and put our own house in order.

Mr. Roosevelt's scolding, threatening, and unauthorized promises impossible of fulfillment, did nothing to check Hitler. But they have brought disillusionment and disaster to our friends and made enemies of other nations.

This is no time for sidestepping and pussyfooting. The situation is too grave to permit anything but a strong, clear-cut declaration.

The Republican Party must be the antiwar party. It must go to the people as the firm and uncompromising opponent of Roosevelt's war-inviting policies.

Our job is to release the industrial energy of America for preparedness, to make our Nation strong and great and prosperous, and to defend American democracy.

Our first duty is to our own country, to our wives, our mothers, and to American youth.

(Signed) FRANK GANNETT.

Argentina Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D. WINTER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS D. WINTER, OF KANSAS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENT WITH ARGENTINA

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement which I submitted before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on Monday, October 16, 1939, at which time the committee was conducting a hearing on the proposed treaty with Argentina:

To Committee for Reciprocity Information:

Ninety percent of the tariff concessions listed for consideration in negotiating the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina will directly affect agriculture in America. Many of these articles listed, such as beef and veal in tin, beef and horse hides, skins, cheese and casein, tallow, tankage, extract of meat, pickled and cured beef and veal, turkeys, corn, eggs, dog food, alfalfa seed, broomcorn, flaxseed and wool, will come in direct competition with agriculture and industry in my own State and district.

From experience which we have gained from some of the treaties which have been in effect for a sufficient period of time to determine what their effects have been upon agriculture, I want to strenuously object to the Government entering into any further reciprocal trade treaties wherein the American farmers' market is traded off for the benefit of eastern industrialists.

The stock farmers of Kansas, particularly, are opposed to the granting of tariff concessions to Argentina, or any other nation for that matter.

Mr. Miller, secretary of the Kansas Livestock Association, issued a statement recently which reads, in part, as follows:

"Producers of meat animals throughout our country need every possible help in obtaining the very best market for their products. Recent years of severe drought and unfavorable markets have brought serious losses to livestock producers, and if they survive these losses, they must have every aid possible in marketing meat animals. * * * Our beef producers naturally object to being sacrificed upon the altar of the so-called good-neighbor policy and no good neighbor would expect it."

The livestock producers of the United States should have the first opportunity at all American markets and the best aid that agriculture and livestock farmers can have is to provide them a market for what we produce in the United States and not provide that market for the farmers and livestock producers of foreign nations.

With the present protective tariff at 6 cents a pound on canned beef, our stock farmers have seen imports jump from approximatey 12,000,000 pounds for the first quarter of 1938 to over 13,000,000 pounds for the first quarter in 1939. At this rate, by the end of the year importation of canned beef will approximate 50,000,000 pounds, and I am informed that if the importation of canned beef should reach this figure it would be equal to at least 800,000 head of cattle, and if the tariff is reduced below 6 cents there is not any question but what this will mean increased imports. We, of course, must also remember that not one pound of grain grown in America will be used for feed to produce the beef which will be imported under such tariff concessions.

Time will not permit me to go into the various subjects upon which tariff concessions are contemplated, but a reduction of the tariff on any of the articles I have mentioned would vitally affect the welfare of the farmers and stock raisers of Kansas.

To ask the farmers and the stock raisers to bear the further burden of feeling the major effect of tariff concessions to Argentina is not just or sound in any sense of the word.

Argentina, with her cheap labor and lower standards of living, can out-sell any American product unless those American products are protected by an adequate tariff.

When reductions in tariff are made for one country they apply to all countries except Germany under the favored-nation clause of our reciprocal trade treaties, and if tariff concessions are made to Argentina they must of necessity apply to all South and Central American countries.

With over 10,000,000 Americans unemployed, it is a serious mistake on the part of our Government to reduce tariffs and thereby permit the products of Argentine labor to enter this country while we have this great army of unemployed for which we have been striving to find employment.

I vigorously object to the reduction of the tariff on any of the items listed in this proposed trade agreement with Argentina which pertain to agriculture and stock raising.

A "Fellow Traveler" Functions at the Taxpayers' Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the American people are conscious of the activities of the "fifth column" in the United States. If our country is to adequately prepare against any possible invasion, it is a known fact that the 130,000,000 citizens must preach and practice true Americanism.

A week ago, in the House, I directed the attention of the President to the fact that 563 members of a Communist fellow-traveler organization—the American League for Peace and Democracy—are still on the pay roll of the Federal Government, more than 7 months after publication of the list by the Dies committee.

I now present the Communist affiliations of Merle D. Vincent, Chief of the Hearings and Exemptions Section in the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

It is a matter of public record that communistic activities in Washington today center in the Department of Labor, the

National Labor Relations Board, the Department of Agriculture, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. Vincent is employed by the United States Government at a salary of $7,000 a year (Official Register of the United States, 1939, p. 145). He is also president of the Washington chapter of the National Lawyers Guild. This organization has been identified by the Dies committee as a Communist fellow-traveler group. In 1937 the guild was a crusader for the Roosevelt proposal to pack the Supreme Court. Only last week the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Adolf A. Berle, resigned from the Guild, stating publicly his reason:

> It is now obvious that the present management of the guild is not prepared to take any stand which conflicts with Communist Party line.

At about the same time the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert H. Jackson, also resigned from the National Lawyers Guild.

I ask the President of the United States how long he proposes to shelter the official leaders of such Communist organizations within the structure of the Federal Government?

If the communism of the National Lawyers Guild is so flagrant that it forces the reluctant resignation of the Attorney General and the Assistant Secretary of State, is it fair to the American people that the public pay roll shall longer support the titular head of the Washington chapter? Why should American taxpayers pay out $7,000 a year to provide leadership, office space, and secretarial service for a communistic organization which the Attorney General himself can no longer countenance?

I have examined the public record covering Vincent's communistic activities. In July 1939, he sent greetings to the International Labor Defense, a second organization identified by the Dies committee as a Communist front.

He is president of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a third Communist front, and successor to the now defunct American League for Peace and Democracy.

He was temporary chairman of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, which met in Washington June 7–9, 1940. A number of active leaders in the Communist Party addressed this gathering, which adopted resolutions opposing national defense. Vincent is listed as a member of the provisional committee. He was also a contributor to the May 1940 issue of Equality, a monthly propaganda magazine sponsored and supported directly by the Communist Party of America.

Along with Harry Bridges, whom the House voted Thursday to deport, by a vote of 342 to 30, Vincent was a speaker at the May Day rally of the Communist Party on May 1, 1939. During 1938 he solicited funds for assistance to the Communist government in Spain.

In March 1940, Vincent also sponsored a new organization styled the Descendants of the American Revolution, a movement launched to carry on Communist propaganda activities under a name which easily might be confused in the public mind with the Sons of the American Revolution. The S. A. R., of course, is a thoroughly reputable organization of American patriots.

If such subversive activities can be carried on with the tacit endorsement and approval of the President of the United States, paid for by the public funds, and dignified by the whole authority of the National Government, then the American people are entitled to know all the facts. If communism is to be longer coddled with fat jobs and secretarial assistance in the executive departments of the Government, then the American people well may look with deep misgivings upon the security and integrity of the entire defense program.

I shall continue to press this matter daily upon the attention of the White House until our President finds opportunity to state publicly whether he approves of these organized fellow-traveler activities within the Federal agencies.

Congress Should Remain in Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY SANDAGER
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks to include a telegram of the Rhode Island Textile Association, signed by Mr. E. F. Walker, Secretary-Treasurer, which I received just now urging that Congress remain in session during this crisis.

Needless to say, I am heartily in accord with the sentiments of this organization and those of many persons who have written to me lately urging our presence here in Washington. Events are moving so rapidly that Congress should be here ready to act to meet any new contingency.

While this is election year and the urge to go back home and mingle with the people of our districts, is, no doubt, strong in the minds of many, our first duty to those at home is to stay right here in Washington.

The telegram from the Rhode Island Textile Association follows:

> The officers and executive committee of the Rhode Island Textile Association, representing a majority of the textile mills in this State, believe that the safety of the country may be put in jeopardy if the Congress adjourns while defense plans are in such a chaotic state. Speaking solely as Americans interested in this country's welfare, they further believe that the Congress has already permitted too much delegation of power and that the duly elected representatives of the American people are under a solemn obligation to their contituents to remain on the job, regardless of politics, to safeguard the interests of those whom they represent, in the preparation and implementing of an adequate defense program. This is not a problem for one man or for any small group of men. It is the problem of the American people and you are one of our representatives chosen to speak for the people of Rhode Island in these matters which concern our lives, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
>
> RHODE ISLAND TEXTILE ASSOCIATION.
> E. F. WALKER, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

The Legion Called the Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

EDITORIAL BY RAYMOND J. KELLY, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the June 1940 issue of the National Legionnaire there appeared a most timely editorial from the able pen of Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion, which, because of the importance of the subject with which it deals, should be given the widest circulation. In order that the views of this distinguished leader of this great American patriotic society may be laid before the membership of this body and the people of this country, I ask unanimous consent that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As Mr. Kelly points out in a separate communication to the more than 1,000,000 members and 11,600 posts of the American Legion, the editorial which I have just asked be included in the RECORD of this day's proceedings "is written to men and women who * * * want peace—but not at any price—

to those who have known war as the ultimate tragedy and agony for the human race, but who, whatever the future holds for our America, will face it with unwavering courage and devotion. It is written to men and women who * * * appreciate the difficulty of making a positive pronouncement in days of rapidly moving international events."

The unanimous consent of the membership of the House of Representatives having been indicated, the editorial hereinbefore referred to follows:

THE LEGION CALLED THE TURN

(By Raymond J. Kelly, national commander, the American Legion)

The American Legion has a reassuring word for those among our fellow countrymen who, during recent days, have developed a definite hysteria, which, if allowed to go unchecked, might derange the national mind.

The Legion presumes to speak with some degree of authority, because consistently in the past it called the turn and pointed the way of sanity for handling many of the problems now confronting the United States.

For 20 long years the Legion raised its voice to the highest pitch in the effort to arouse the Nation to the need for an adequate national defense. Few listened.

Since 1922, the Legion has had a definite program looking toward universal service. In the event this country again became involved in war our plan would deprofitize such a conflict, leaving special privilege for none, equal service for all. Few paid attention.

Knowledge of the existence of subversive influences, apparently just now penetrating the public consciousness under the modern description of "fifth column," is neither new nor novel to the Legion. Few were aroused to the danger.

The definite complacence of America in a world rapidly becoming an armed camp with high-explosive potentialities has been reported by the Legion for many years. Few heeded the warning.

And so the Legion believes it is qualified from its record of service, both in time of war and in 21 years of peace, to counsel soberly and rationally the men and women of America.

In my belief the most menacing factor to the safety of the United States arises from within our borders rather than without. Our house must be set in order. But the neglect of years cannot be corrected in a few short minutes, hours, and days. What must be done we will do—if a determined and united America sets its will to the task.

In the first place, we should face the fact that communazi conspirators seeking to undermine and to destroy our institutions are fanatics. The truth as we know it is not in them. Reasonable treatment has no effect upon them, and but serves to embolden and encourage their efforts.

We have been told that far-reaching suppressive measures against flourishing domestic ideological conspiracies might injure innocent people. In my belief, the good of the whole Nation compels summary action to be taken by our properly constituted Federal, State, and local authorities to stamp out in their entirety the activities of these subverters, irrespective of what may happen to their fellow-travelers or innocent bystanders. This is no time for quibbling. We must pull no punches.

In my public utterances I have stressed the importance of American Legion organizations assisting and working through recognized law-enforcement agencies. I see no reason for deviation from that policy at this time. Only rarely when there is complete collapse of recognized law-enforcement agencies, such as may happen in times of great disaster, is it our job to do what we can independently.

In recent years many of our Legion Posts have prepared disaster relief plans to become effective at the onset of such catastrophes. In other words, the machinery of Legion support for law and order is already set up with a fair degree of efficiency. And those posts without prepared plans of this kind now must form them immediately. Such plans should be integrated with existing authority in every community where there is a Legion post.

Legion support in the field should be given the attempt to secure increases and strengthening of constituted police powers. Regardless of the cost, and even if requiring new local taxes, the personnel of local police, sheriff's forces, and State police or highway patrol organizations should be measurably increased. Better training and equipment should be provided. We should make our regular peacetime home defenses impregnable. The Leigon should head up public demand for this to be done.

Sate departments of the Legion can well initiate and urge the adoption of State emergency council set-ups. In several States this has been done already.

National Legion officials are engaged now in conferences and discussions with the Federal Government looking toward utilization of Legion organization and membership in the most effective manner possible in event of any conceivable emergency developing. Such perfected plans will be ready for immediate use when conditions warrant their invoking.

Posts and members of the American Legion are well informed of local conditions. Information in their possession about dangerous subversion, which can be substantiated, should be turned over through official post channels to the proper authorities.

Good, law-abiding American men and women who enjoy and cherish their civil liberties do not follow the policy of shouting about them. In many cases those who clamor the loudest about the dangers of losing such liberties bear the most watching. All too frequently they fear the loss of their opportunity to work for the destruction of our form of government. There are no less than 600 communazi organizations functioning in the United States. Many of these are Trojan horse front groups. Information about many of these subversive groups is available to posts through department and national headquarters.

Our posts and their membership should give the strongest support possible to the solving of complex problems now before the Nation in providing for a modern and adequate national defense.

For two decades our national defense lagged. We have been a complacent people. Only last week the first new United States battleship in 19 years was launched. We must appreciate that the hurried building up of such defenses may not make for the most efficient job possible. Errors will be made, and the ball will be fumbled. But the characteristic of a great pitcher is that he pitches over his errors and goes on to win. I am confident we are a nation of thoroughbreds, not to be upset or deterred from our purpose by such mistakes.

There is no change in the official position of the American Legion in regard to the neutrality of the United States. The Legion believes in the protection, at all hazards, of the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere as our primary obligation. While we are ill-equipped to provide even a minimum of protection for the Monroe Doctrine, it is idle to consider the feasibility of intervening in the great conflict across the Atlantic. With what would we intervene? How would we make our potential strength felt, short of 2 or 3 years? Fast moving, aggressor nations have no intention of allowing us to select our own time and place for exerting the might of a rearmed America.

The safety of America transcends any political issue. And such safety should not be subjected to the fear developed through hysteria.

At the 1939 Chicago national convention of the American Legion we were recorded as urging the Congress to remain in session during the period of emergency. I believe there is every legitimate reason for our Representatives and Senators staying on the job in the Nation's capital so long as national and international problems continue on a 24-hour basis. One million Legionnaires should raise their united voice in such a demand.

In the twenty-first year of the American Legion's existence, the Nation again calls. It is not a call to the armed forces of our country where once we served. Rather it is a call to develop sanity to supersede hysteria; to remove all doubt about the strength of our defenses; to have each of us individually willing to bear the heavy price of defense which must be paid to assure peace for our people. Midsummer madness; no. It's a blue-chip game and we must play them close, and play them to win.

For 20 years the Legion called the turn. It is confident its judgment for the future will likewise coincide with the safety and well-being for our country.

For God and country we have associated ourselves. We pledge again our loyalty to that creed.

Cooperation for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. SCHULTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM GARY CIVIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

GARY, IND., *June 18, 1940.*

Congressman WILLIAM T. SCHULTE:

The committee of 100 of the Gary Civic Association, Gary, Ind., realizes that the undivided cooperation is needed of all citizens in executing our national-defense plans. We extend to you, therefore, and through you to the Government of the United States our eagerness to serve now and at any time in the future in whatever capacity you may consider advisible or expedient so that the principle of democratic peoples may continue in the vanguard of all civilized nations.

H. C. DORMAN, *Chairman.*

Poets' Challenge for Peace and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

PETITION FROM POETS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I reproduce a petition signed by more than 400 poets. This group of people contains many of our outstanding writers.

POETS' CHALLENGE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, ALL STATE LEGISLATURES AND EXECUTIVES, AND THE JUDICIARY

As poets are the voice of the inarticulate and of the aroused conscience of their land, we, the undersigned poets, do hereby add our names to the Nation-wide demand that you exert your influence in the office which you hold under the will of the people of the United States to—

(1) Help keep this country from becoming actively involved in a war with any foreign power; to this end, oppose foreign loans and other aid to belligerent nations as well as the sending of American troops off American soil and oppose the war recruiting of United States; and in any contingency to—

(2) Cleave closely to the letter and spirit of the Bill of Rights, which guarantees freedom of speech, press, and assembly to all; interpret this cornerstone of Americanism to safeguard the rights of all labor unions and all minority social, political, and religious groups, including the right to advocate economic, social, and governmental change under the provisions of the United States Constitution; assure the utmost freedom to each group compatible with similar freedom to other groups;

(3) Promote adequate Federal and State relief and the restoration with a Ministry of Arts of all Federal cultural projects on an enlarged basis, aware of the fact that all 32,000 workers who were employed on the Federal cultural projects could be supported for 18 months for the cost of one battleship;

(4) Oppose regimentation of the civilian population.

A Democracy Cannot Be Static

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN TO GRADUATING CLASSES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and patriotic address delivered by President Alexander Ruthven, of the University of Michigan, to the 1940 graduating classes of the University of Michigan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow students, my message today is a twofold one. One part is addressed to your successors; the other is specifically for you.

To those young people who are planning to enter or return to the university next year I issue this warning: Michigan welcomes only students who are convinced that democracy is the ideal form of government for a civilized people. She will not be confused by sophistries built around meaningful but ill-defined phrases, such as "freedom of the press" and "freedom of speech," but will deal firmly, without fear or favor, with subversive or so-called "fifth column" activities.

"True freedom consists with the observance of law," and unlawful acts cannot be justified by differences in ideologies. Honest discussion is a valuable method of education, but is to be clearly distinguished from propaganda. The University of Michigan is an institution of the people, and its staff must continue to insist that Americans who prefer to live under other forms of government are in spirit unfriendly aliens who have no right to the benefits provided by our schools.

Now, may I speak directly to you?

If I were a king or, to be more modern, a dictator, I would issue an edict that none but earnest souls be permitted to address students on these and similar occasions. I would make sure that speakers under consideration appreciated their responsibilities and questioned their fitness for the task. I would favor those who could be counted on to feel, as they faced their audience, that they might have done well to have stayed at home and, as they finished, that their listeners probably shared this feeling. If you will accept these opinions as criteria to govern the choice of speaker, I assure you I am not out of place on this platform. The prayer in my heart as I came here today was recorded by an Egyptian scribe 2,000 years before Christ: "Would I had phrases that are not known, utterances that are strange, a new language that hath not been used, free from repetition, not an utterance which hath grown stale, which men of old have spoken."

While my prayer has not been answered, of some things I am confident. To indulge in platitudes, to pretend to a knowledge of economics, political science, or sociology only possessed by specialists, or to assume the role of prophet, sage, or seer would not be appropriate, for I trust that you have been trained to detect sham, to analyze propaganda, and to prick the bubble of conceit. To fail to be frank with you, to argue for the status quo, or to attempt, by rattling the dry bones of human failure, to frighten you into accepting generalizations of doubtful validity would hazard your resentment as an affront to the intellectual honesty which your instructors have assisted you to acquire.

There remains for me, however, one theme which can never become outmoded, and which may appropriately be discussed by an educator who has faith in the ability of the human race ultimately to raise itself above a barbarism in which men act in ignorance and on impulse to a civilization in which they act on knowledge and principle. I refer to the responsibility of the trained individual in a communal group. Specifically, I propose today to speak of one of the factors which tend to destroy the natural assets of youth and to vitiate the advantages of education—the mental and spiritual degeneration which often comes with age.

We in the United States have chosen to live in a democracy. Admittedly, our efforts have to this time produced only a blundering, inefficient, and otherwise obviously imperfect organization. The important consideration, however, is that we still desire and struggle to govern ourselves in ways which will preserve maximum freedom of thought, initiative, and action consistent with happy and peaceful communal living: To achieve, in the words of Thomas Mann, "That form of Government and of society which is inspired above every other with the feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man." We have also understood that education is an essential activity of democracy. Although we have not always fully appreciated the importance of training the individual for the responsibilities of citizenship, we have held to the concept that self-government demands for its competent expression wide distribution of all available knowledge and the ability to use it.

But, if for so much we may accept credit, we can no longer be content with the slowness of our progress and the blind optimism which has assumed that we are sufficiently rich, powerful, and isolated to be able safely to dawdle along toward Utopia.

Recent events have shocked us into the realization that an apparent general incapacity of historic democratic institutions to deal effectively with problems in a period of rapid change challenges the very existence of representative government. Unless all signs fail, a world-wide outbreak of an ancient struggle is impending—a conflict between two ideologies—individual freedom and regimentation. If this is true, it scarcely needs to be argued that the safety of democracy in America requires not only an immediate tightening of its defenses, but, more importantly, a vigorous offensive, involving an improvement of practices. The schools and other social agencies must reject the concept of social and moral neutrality and both teach and exemplify the principles of self-government. Individually our people must have a spiritual revival. They must abandon their attitude of laissez-faire, their belief that conditions of life in our country are as good as can be expected, their confidence that we can exist in splendid isolation. They must become intolerant of ignorance, greed, and injustice. They must reaffirm their belief in the equality, brotherhood, dignity, and moral responsibility of man; examine objectively our successes and failures as a nation; and dedicate their lives anew to the task of improving our efforts to govern ourselves.

As young people it will not be hard for you to understand the responsibility of individuals to strive honestly and effectively to apply the ethical concepts, values, and outlooks of democracy to their lives and institutions. Your difficulty will be that as your hair changes color and you are forced to become better acquainted with your dentist, you will tend to become too myopic to see far beyond your own interests. I venture the opinion that, despite all the trials with which they are afflicted, the schools are doing increasingly well the work of inculcating in their students self-confidence, love of freedom, belief in the right of free discussion and criticism, respect for fair-mindedness and honesty, and devotion to the common good. The main obstacle to their greater service has been, and bids fair to continue to be, lack of support of adults who have abandoned their youthful convictions and refuse to be bothered about the state of the Nation, except to

complain about it, or to recognize their obligations to society, except to obey such laws as they cannot evade. In short, our failure to improve our attempts at self-government is in important part attributable to our lack of success in carrying over the valuable attributes of youth and the benefits of education beyond commencement day—with a consequent unlovely narrowing of the mind and a depressing spiritual backsliding.

Youth is normally characterized by flexibility of mind, enthusiasm, curiosity, frankness, and courage. These traits, often misinterpreted as symptoms of a dangerous radicalism in times of fear and hysteria, good schools and wise teachers value and cherish, for they are the hope of the world. They are indications of spiritual health and intellectual vigor. But, unfortunately, in our civilization, when a man seriously takes up the business of making a living, he is inclined to become timid, conservative, selfish, mentally lazy, narrow-minded, and opinionated, just as he is prone to develop adipose tissue and hardening of the arteries. He often becomes more individualistic and less socially minded. He is discovered in attempts to justify his failure to be true to the ideals of his youth by appeals to practicability and the educational value of experience. He ignores what he has been taught, that, in resorting to this type of rationalization, he is merely salving his conscience and conditioning himself to things as they are.

There is little hope for the democratic order unless young minds refuse to undergo deterioration. Education is little more than preparation for a trade if its social values are to be lost in large part shortly after graduation. If injustice, prejudice, bigotry, and selfishness are inevitably to prevail in adult life, some form of totalitarianism is probably called for in communal living and at any rate is good enough for us. If we are to have and to deserve the freedom which it is the aim of democracy to provide, then we must somehow retain the faith, zeal, and flexibility of trained young minds.

Fortunately, while we cannot turn back the hands of the clock or halt our march to the grave, we can, barring accident and disease, and indeed in spite of these, preserve and increase our power of intellect and grow in wisdom throughout our lives. Study, observation, and experience, together with serious thinking and discussion, may be counted upon to keep the mind active, the ideals untarnished, and faith in man's destiny sufficiently lively to demand the works without which it is dead. Most important of all, these factors will produce a skilled social unit—the individual who can live happily both with his fellows and himself.

A great tragedy of mankind is the persistence of the age-old delusion that social progress can be ensured by organization and force, that enduring peace, justice, and security can be had by formula. Sound social advancement is a product of peace, and peace is inspired by tranquil minds. Petrarch tells us that "five great enemies of peace inhabit with us, namely, avarice, ambition, envy, anger, and pride. If those enemies were to be banished, we should infallibly enjoy perpetual peace." These traits, the causes of conflict, indicate undisciplined minds, uninformed minds, stultified minds, minds willing to sacrifice principles for the ease of complacency. Continued training and self-discipline can banish them and give to the individual that inner peace which makes him a dependable unit of an evolving civilization in which to an ever-increasing extent tastes are cultivated, "manners refined, views broadened, and nature spiritualized."

Members of the class of 1940, in behalf of your instructors, as you leave these halls, I deliver an admonition, voice a wish, and promise you a reward.

A democracy cannot be static. When it ceases to improve, it begins to break down. Its improvement is possible only as its citizens become increasingly worthy to govern themselves. Thus, you are to remember that a good citizen is one whose mind is always in the making.

Our hope for you is our hope for the democratic order, that you will always be of the group of men "who never seem to grow old. Always active in thought, always ready to adopt new ideas, they are never chargeable with fogyism. Satisfied, yet ever dissatisfied, settled, yet ever unsettled, they always enjoy the best of what is and are always first to find the best of what will be."

As a reward, I promise, if you are determined never to become bankrupt in intellect and in spirit never to grow old, you will, even in lives of toil and strife, enjoy that inner peace which passeth all understanding. You will not be:

"Like a tree grown in the forest;
In a moment comes its loss of foliage;
Its end is reached in the dockyard;
It is floated far from its place;
The flame is its winding sheet."

But you will rather be:

"Like a tree grown in a plot;
It grows green, it doubles its yield,
It stands in front of its lord;
Its fruit is sweet, its shade is pleasant;
And its end is reached in the garden."

History of Beet-Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 21, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, OF MICHIGAN.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, ever since I came to the Senate in 1928 I have been proud to be known as a "first friend" to the sugar-beet industry of the United States. I have been glad to join in leading every battle in its behalf. It represents a great cash crop for American agriculture, not only in my own Michigan but also in many other States of the Union. It represents an essential and indispensable commodity which should be, and could be, produced in the United States on a basis of self-sufficiency and self-containment.

We produce but one-third of our domestic sugar consumption. If we produced three-thirds, agriculture would be immensely benefited. So would labor. So would America.

This administration has occasionally been helpful—reluctantly helpful—to sugar beets and beet sugar. But it has always been fundamentally hostile, and it still is today. Its sugar policies always basically consult Cuba, and not the United States. Cuban sugar welfare comes first. I think American sugar welfare should come first. That always was, and always will be, my objective.

Mr. President, I have prepared an outline of the history of beet-sugar legislation under this administration. I had planned to speak in the Senate on the subject; but in view of the pressure of other vital matters upon these closing moments of the session, I am content to request that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1934 when it was first proposed to bring the domestic sugar industry under the control of the Federal Government, I expressed in the Senate a sincere apprehension. I pointed out that the representatives of the sugar industry from the eastern beet area, of which Michigan is a part, had reduced to writing their reluctance in asking me to support the proposed legislation. They had read the message of the President of the United States, dated February 8, 1934, which suggested that, "we ought first to try a system of quotas" before the President would "recommend placing sugar on the free list." The domestic industry had been informed that the President contemplated a reduction in the tariff under the flexible provisions of the Tariff Act. They also anticipated that there would be further reductions in the tariff on sugar considered in connection with a reciprocal-trade agreement to be negotiated with the Republic of Cuba. Therefore, under the circumstances, it was apparent that the payments to farmers were to become offsets against tariff reductions, which in turn would be offset by a processing tax on sugar proposed in order to finance these farmer payments.

We had in mind at that time, and perhaps it is wise today to remember, that on October 25, 1932, candidate Roosevelt made a speech at Baltimore in which he stated:

"Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I declared that all prosperity in the broader sense springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollar by making the tariff effective for agriculture and raising the price of farm products. I know of no excessive high tariff duties on form products.

"I do not intend that any duties necessary to protect the farmer shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

But in February 1934, President Roosevelt delivered a message to Congress in which he referred to the domestic sugar industry as "necessarily expensive" and followed this statement up with an unveiled threat by saying that, "I do not at this time recommend placing sugar on the free list." So the beet grower was confused.

In 1933, the domestic sugar industry had been invited to come to Washington to talk over their problems with Government officials. They left in Washington a selected committee representative of each domestic area to develop a plan of Government

supervision. Though a sugar stabilization agreement was reached by all domestic interests, the Secretary of Agriculture refused his approval without giving any official reasons, although it was the concensus of opinion that Cuban objections had prevailed.

Lest we forget, I will remind the Senate that the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States had fallen off to a point that in 1933 only 1,551,859 tons of Cuban sugar were marketed in the United States. The well-known reason for this was the extraordinary expansion of sugar production in the Islands (especially the Philippines and Puerto Rico) and the increasing production in continental United States. Cuba was gradually being edged out of its most available and profitable market by domestic islands within the United States tariff wall. I have always felt that the chief reason for this development was the extreme prices charged the American consumers in the post-war period, at the time when the Cubans had control of the market. This high-price experience had led to governmental encouragement of sugar production in domestic islands.

Therefore, it is entirely accurate to state that the adoption of the sugar-quota system under the Jones-Costigan Act, which came simultaneously with two tariff reductions on Cuban sugar, was primarily a program to stabilize the Cuban sugar industry and to earmark a larger share in the American market for Cuban sugar.

I expressed the opinion, when the Jones-Costigan bill was being considered in 1934, that the proposed act could be a benediction upon the sugar industry or it could become a curse. The answer, I stated, "lies entirely within the control of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture and their associated commissars in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. We are proposing for the time being, as I shall presently indicate, to give them the benefit of the doubt." In complete candor, I later recognized that the Jones-Costigan Act was well administered, as shown at page 160 of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in 1937.

Under the Jones-Costigan Act the consumption estimates were made with a view to adjusting supply and demand as accurately as it is possible to do so by anticipation. The Department did a good job, as the authority for changing the estimates several times during each year was not needed, and the price paid for sugar by the consumer was admittedly satisfactory to the consumer and was pointed to with pride by the President of the United States (in a message to the Congress of the United States, dated March 1, 1937) and by the Secretary of Agriculture (in a letter to Senator Harrison, dated May 7, 1936, and in a Statement on Sugar, issued March 15, 1937). The sugar industry had been reassured. However, my apprehensions had again become aroused in 1937 because of a proposal by the Department of Agriculture that a yardstick of price control should be provided in a new sugar law, to be based upon the profitableness of the production of the five major agricultural crops.

When this proposal was analyzed by the domestic sugar industry, it was found that according to Department statistics the five major crops had not been profitable for several years, and therefore, the pertinent question was asked at the hearing before the Senate Finance Committee in 1937, page 161, whether when the five principal crops were unprofitable, would the Secretary of Agriculture be required to make the production of sugar beets in the United States unprofitable, in applying the proposed administration yardstick? No direct reply was given, but the Finance Committee was not satisfied and rejected the proposed yardstick; nevertheless, the determination to change the policy of the Federal Government under the sugar program continued unabated. The old policy of estimating consumption on the basis of actual requirements of sugar was abandoned the day after the President signed the Sugar Act of 1937, and in its stead the policy of direct price control came into being.

Let me illustrate: The estimate of consumption for 1937 had been made under the Jones-Costigan Act at 6,682,670 tons, but on September 2, under the new Sugar Act, this was changed to 7,042,733 tons. The sugar market knew that this was entirely excessive and the statistical reports of the Department of Agriculture bore this out. This was later confirmed by a subsequent public release showing that actual deliveries for consumption in 1937 were 6,677,456 tons, which was practically the amount of the original but abandoned estimate, and way below the exaggerated figure of the amended estimate. This was the first demonstration of the change in policy from using the quotas strictly to adjust supply and demand to using the quotas for the purpose of depressing the price and thereby gaining greater control over the domestic sugar industry in all of its operations.

Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1937 provides that the Secretary when making consumption estimates shall take into consideration the consumption during the preceding 12-month period ending October 31 adjusted to reflect changes in inventories, population, and demand conditions. But, the effect of making available each year in 1937, in 1938, and in 1939 more sugar than was actually required by consumers was that the year-end inventories of cane refiners and importers have been built up so that on January 1, 1940, there was a total of 911,284 tons of sugar, all of which sugar is available for marketing in 1940 in addition to the total quotas amounting to 6,725,100 tons. Therefore, instead of the consumption estimate of 6,725,100 tons being the total amount of sugar made available, there has been actually made available a total of 7,636,384 tons of sugar in the United States during 1940. For the past 5-year period in the United States the average deliveries of sugar for consumption have been 6,702,807 tons, or 933,577 tons less than the amount of sugar now made available. This oversupply of 14 percent naturally brings about a maladjustment of supply and demand, and the result is that the duty-paid price of raw sugar is today less than it has been at any time since 1932 and less than it has been on the average for any year in the history of the industry. To bring this matter up to date, let me say that the consumption of sugar in the first 4 months of 1940 is running less than it was in the same period in 1939.

It should be pertinent to read a paragraph from the Democratic platform of 1936 in connection with the price of sugar. I quote:

"We have kept our pledge to agriculture to use all available means to raise farm income toward its prewar purchasing power. The farmer is no longer suffering from * * * 3-cent sugar."

The price of raw sugar averaged in 1932, 2.93 cents per pound, and it was from this depression price that the industry was to be saved by the sugar program. Under the Jones-Costigan Act the raw-sugar price was improved to 3.217 cents in 1935, 3.595 cents in 1936, and 3.449 cents in 1937. Then came the new Sugar Act, and the changed policy resulted in prices of 2.940 cents in 1938 and 2.989 cents in 1939. Now, today, raw sugar is being offered in New York at 2.75 cents with no takers, because every buyer of raw sugar knows that there is available more sugar than the United States market can possibly consume in 1940. I hardly would expect that this plank of the Democratic platform would receive any greater consideration than has been the fate of other pledges and promises, but I submit it as evidence that the New Deal is committed definitely by its own platform to protect the farmer from suffering under 3-cent raw sugar. It is no wonder that the farmer is no longer satisfied with promises and pledges, but wants to have written into the law a yardstick which will make it mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to pursue a policy which is fair and reasonable to the consumer and at the same time maintains the domestic sugar industry as a whole in accordance with law and the intent of Congress.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND IN SUGAR UNDER QUOTA LEGISLATION

At the end of each year the seaboard refiners and the importers of direct-consumption sugar have a certain inventory of sugar which has been charged against the quotas and which can be marketed in the following year in addition to the current quotas. Such inventory is called quota inventory. Therefore, the total available supply for distribution in any year is this quota inventory plus the consumption estimate for the year.

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940
Quota inventory, Jan. 1:						
Refiners' raws	201,769	90,516	141,412	164,829	179,418	448,324
Refiners' refined	320,325	165,967	249,752	341,776	311,149	358,505
Importers' direct	189,134	113,620	56,991	43,237	76,835	104,455
Total	711,228	370,103	448,155	549,842	567,402	911,284
Initial consumption estimate	6,359,261	6,434,088	6,682,670	6,861,761	6,832,157	6,725,100
Total available supply	7,070,489	6,804,191	7,130,825	7,411,603	7,399,559	7,636,384
Deliveries for year	6,623,698	6,704,496	6,677,456	6,642,981	6,865,402	[1] 6,636,384
Excess—Supply over demand	446,791	99,695	453,369	768,622	534,157	1,000,000
Quota inventory, Jan. 1:						
Refiners' raws	201,769	90,516	141,412	164,829	179,418	448,324
Refiners' refined	320,325	165,967	249,752	341,776	311,149	358,505
Importers' direct	189,134	113,620	56,991	43,237	76,835	104,455
Total	711,228	370,103	448,155	549,842	567,402	911,284
Final consumption estimate	6,359,261	6,812,687	7,042,733	6,780,566	([2])	[3] 6,607,745
Total available supply	7,070,489	7,182,7 0	7,490,888	7,330,408	([2])	7,519,029
Deliveries for year	6,623,698	6,704,496	6,677,456	6,642,981	6,865,402	[1] 6,636,384
Excess—supply over demand	446,791	478,294	813,432	687,427	([2])	882,645

[1] Estimated.
[2] Unlimited.
[3] Consumption estimate in effect June 15, 1940.

The above table shows that under the Jones-Costigan Act the normal year-end carry-over was less than 500,000 tons. Under the Jones-Costigan Act the consumption estimate was such that it provided for a carry-over of a little less than 500,000 tons, which is about normal, while under the present Sugar Act the carry-over provided for is greatly in excess of normal, and this year is practically twice normal. This means that at the beginning of 1941, if the United States consumption is the same in 1940 as it was in 1939, there will be a greater carry-over than on January 1, 1940, and if the present declining trend of consumption continues, there will be well over 1,000,000 tons of oversupply.

No one can deny that the purpose has now become to get greater and greater control over all of the operations of the domestic sugar industry, for the simple reason that the price for sugar paid by consumers at retail stores in 1940 is very much less than the price paid by consumers in the period 1934–36, which price

was considered fair by the consumer and satisfactory by the present administration. I will list at this time the retail prices of sugar, covering the period under discussion, so that comparisons may be made on the basis of actual cost to consumers.

Cents per pound

1923	9.9
1924	9.0
1925	7.0
1926	6.8
1927	7.2
1928	6.9
1929	6.4
1930	6.1
1931	5.6
1932	5.0
1933	5.3
1934	5.5
1935	5.7
1936	5.6
1937	5.6
1938	5.3
1939	5.4
April 1940	5.1

Under existing circumstances one is intrigued to inquire further as to why the policy of price depression should be persisted in by the administration, when the general policy has been repeatedly announced by the Secretary of Agriculture that the price of all agricultural products ought to be increased. I am inclined to believe that the answer can be found in the provision of section 202 of the Sugar Act, which states that when the consumption estimate is less than 6,682,670 tons of sugar, then the minimum quotas shall be applied to all domestic areas and all reductions in quotas must come off of the quotas for foreign areas, with the Philippine Islands set at the duty-free limitation provided in the Philippine Independence Act. Consequently, we have reached the point where it is no longer possible to reduce domestic quotas, and the only reduction of importance must be made in the Cuban quotas. The law requires the Secretary to make adjustments from time to time during each year when he finds that the estimate of consumption is greater than actual requirements, but quite evidently the more important consideration is that adjustments made at this time would necessarily have to be downward, and obviously the largest reductions would have to be made in the Cuban quota.

But, present action should be considered not only on the basis of present conditions and their effect, but should be considered on the basis of what has happened before in connection with quotas. In 1936 and in 1937 there were deficits in the quotas of some domestic areas and at the proper time these deficits were transferred to the other areas, as a result of which Cuba received more than one-half of all reallotments of such deficits. Thus, Cuba benefited to the extent of having her quota increased several times in the past, totaling to well over 2,000,000 tons in 1936 and in 1937. The very policies of the Department of Agriculture as applied in the past should require consistent adjustment of supply to demand in accordance with the provisions of the Sugar Act, but apparently a strict application of the law runs counter to the interpretation of the good-neighbor policy and does not fit in with the consistency of keeping Cuba as the chief beneficiary of the sugar policy of the United States.

The record shows that for some reasons which are locked in the bosoms and the consciences of the New Deal the general policies of the present administration with regard to agriculture are not applicable to sugar, or at least not applied to sugar. Although the President protested in 1932 against any suggestion of lowering tariff rates on farm products, the tariff on sugar has been twice lowered. Similarly, the price standards for agricultural products are not applicable to sugar. In September 1939, the immediate reaction to European developments brought both of these policies into what was obviously a temporary clash. It was well known to officials of the Sugar Division that the hysterical demand of consumers for sugar to be hoarded was entirely unjustified according to the information in the possession of the Department of Agriculture. There was ample sugar for everybody although the desire to hoard sugar in certain localities created an abnormal temporary demand. Instead of a public announcement being made by the President or the Secretary of Agriculture showing the actual situation which would have calmed the fears of buyers and prevented any speculators or profiteers from taking advantage of the excitement, the President, on the advice of the Department of Agriculture, took the more spectacular course and suspended quotas. This brought new problems for the sugar industry although it relieved the administrators in the Department of Agriculture of difficulties which were just about to expose the extreme and impractical burdens which had been placed unnecessarily upon the domestic-sugar industry. For one thing, some processors had been ordered not to sell their domestic sugar held in warehouses although foreign sugars were being brought in as a result of excessive estimates of consumption. That situation would have been hard to explain to the consumers. Also, there was a carry-over of approximately 300,000 tons of Puerto Rican sugar due to overproduction, which was becoming a major problem. The suspension released all of these warehouse sugars and the market hit the bottom, where it still remains.

But, the suspension of the quotas had automatically restored the tariff on Cuban sugar from 90 cents to $1.50. At first, the Cubans believed that they would be able to sell considerable sugar to Europe, but apparently the European countries had anticipated most of their requirements and, therefore, little sugar could be diverted from the United States market to Europe on the basis of war prices. Quite naturally, the Cubans began to protest about paying the higher rate of tariff, and the administration was in another dilemma. Let us see how the New Deal mind works in sugar and whether the domestic industry or Cuba became the chief beneficiary in the restoration of quotas.

First, the reciprocal trade agreement with Cuba was changed. In the original agreement, the tariff reduction to 90 cents only continued in effect while the quota system was operating, and when it became inoperative the duty automatically went up to $1.50. The State Department cured that situation, as far as suspensions may go, by changing the provisions so that the reduction in tariff is affected only when the quota system expires. So, if there is another suspension, there will be no quota restriction on Cuba, but nevertheless Cubans will continue to enjoy the tariff advantage despite the fundamental fact that the sugar program was originated on the proposition that the reductions in tariff were offsets to the processing tax on sugar and the payments to sugar farmers.

There was another situation to be met for the benefit of Cuba. Some 300,000 tons of Cuban sugar were in the United States or en route in the latter part of December. If the restoration of the 90-cent duty became effective only January 1, then all of this sugar would be charged against the 1940 Cuban quota. The Cuban owner or importer would have to choose between paying the higher tariff or having the 1940 quota charged with this sugar. The quotas for 1939 could not be restored because most areas had already exceeded their quotas. The administration met the situation by putting into the Cuban trade agreement a new provision whereby the rate of duty would be reduced, not when the quotas were reinstated, but when the President announced his intention to restore quotas. By this artifice the reinstatement of quotas was left to take effect in January 1940, but the announcement having been made on December 26, the tariff on Cuban sugar automatically went down to 90 cents during the last week in 1939 and 284,078 tons of Cuban sugar paid the lower duty and escaped being charged against the 1940 Cuban quota. Now, this sugar is being marketed in 1940 after Cuba had been given the double advantage of greater volume of imports and less tariff, both of which have had important effects as Cuban sugar has been sold in competition with beet sugar produced in the continental United States.

Discussion of this subject recalls the episode of Colonel Batista, who had been received with great pomp in 1938 as a benevolent dictator and who apparently had understood that he could go back to Cuba and announce that among the benefits of his triumphal visit to the United States, the duty on Cuban sugar would be reduced to 75 cents. But the announcements by Colonel Batista were made prematurely over the radio and at press conferences where American correspondents could hear. A Senate investigation was ordered and when the full light of publicity played upon this deal the administration denied any such agreement and sought to confuse the issue by charging that somehow lobbyists were to blame. Nevertheless, the duty was not reduced to the further advantage of Cuba.

I have found that the American public is not fully informed about the sugar program and that very few people realize how the sugar program, instead of being a burden on the United States Treasury actually works out as a profit. The Bureau of Internal Revenue collects one-half cent per pound on raw sugar, or 53½ cents per 100 pounds of beet sugar, and this has meant revenues annually amounting to approximately $70,000,000. The total cost of the sugar program is approximately $50,000,000. The actual figures for 1939, according to table 34, page 42 of the official report of the United States Tariff Commission of March 1940, entitled "Statistics on Sugar," show collections through the sugar tax of $73,233,000 and the cost of payments to growers under the program was $51,324,000; thus, the United States Treasury makes an annual profit of about $20,000,000. As far as I am informed, this is the only agricultural program which results in a profit to the United States Treasury. And, since the price of sugar to the consumer today is lower than at any time in the history of our country, with the single exception of 1932, it is obvious that the consumer is enjoying a benefit instead of carrying a burden.

Another part of the sugar program which is little known and not appreciated is that sugar farmers are the only ones that are required to pay a minimum wage to their labor and who agree in their applications for payments to pay this wage and not to employ child labor. All agricultural labor is exempt from other Federal wage laws. But the farmer who produces sugar beets or sugarcane must comply with minimum wage scales to become eligible for participation in the sugar program.

The whole idea of acreage restrictions under the Sugar Act was intended to result in fair and reasonable prices for the industry. The principle was that in compensation for acreage restrictions, the sugar industry would be maintained on a profitable basis. Yet, the opposite has happened since 1937, not through outside influences beyond control, but as a direct result of the policies of the administrators. The whole trend and purpose of the sugar program has now become openly to secure greater and greater control over the industry and all of its operations. I do not choose to enter into a detailed discussion of

the petty annoyances and harassments which have resulted from the unsympathetic and antagonistic administrative attitude, but to mention a few at least will demonstrate that the growers and sugar producers have concrete reasons for asking that the Sugar Act be amended in several important particulars at this session of Congress.

My information is that the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture, which administers the sugar program, consists of some 50 or more experts and specialists headed by a statistician from New York, but so far as I can learn there are no farmers in the Washington office. The time of planting sugar beets is certainly well known to the officials of the Department of Agriculture, and yet important decisions as to farming practices and as to wage scales have been delayed beyond the planting season and beyond reason. This has caused many growers to hesitate to enter the program, and those who have not refused to plant beets have been forced to begin their farming operations in the state of uncertainty as to what the actual costs of producing the planted crop might eventually become. The most recent instance is that of the determination as to proportionate shares of beet acreage in 1940. Limitations were placed upon this acreage at the first announcement which was amended after a few weeks to meet complaints, and finally, when a large part of the beet area had been planted in sugar beets and most of the beet purchase contracts signed, there were so many protests coming in from the field that the lid was taken off as it should have been in the first place. As a general rule farmers are subject to a great many uncertainties, and they naturally do not like to have additional uncertainties created and the result has been in too many cases that growers have been unwilling to continue to plant beets.

Although there is no authorization in the law or circumstances which require the enforcement of secrecy, the bases of determinations remain clouded in Department secrecy. No justification or explanation is made with regard to such important decisions as consumption estimates, although every person engaged in the business of producing sugar is directly interested in these determinations which control the production and marketing of their product. It has often occurred that public hearings have been held in connection with wage rates or farming practices or other matters requiring administrative ruling, and no evidence has been presented indicating a need for changes from year to year, but regardless of the record the determinations are forthcoming according to plan.

In keeping with the spirit of the manner in which the Sugar Act has been administered, we were treated to another one of the precedent-breaking occurrences which have become so frequent under the New Deal. The House Committee on Agriculture had called public hearings which had proceeded for 3 days with more than a score of witnesses suggesting amendments to the Sugar Act based upon the experience of the past 6 years under Government control. All of the farmers who appeared had presented to the Committee on Agriculture the problems which had arisen in their sections, and there was considerable agreement among these farmers as to changes which they recommended. At least there was sufficient information before the committee to work out a program of amendments. But before the hearing had adjourned the President sent a letter to the chairman of the committee in which he politely informed them that "no sugar legislation is necessarily required at this session of Congress, although it might be advisable to extend the life of the Sugar Act of 1937." In short, the President shut the door to amendments with advance notice of veto by anticipation.

Here we are in the midst of the greatest program of preparedness for national defense this country has ever known and we continue to depend upon offshore sources for 70 percent of our supply of this important daily food, while our growers are subjected to limitations and all sorts of restrictions, which cannot be amended. It is the same old story that the policies of the New Deal have general application, sugar excepted.

I am convinced that too much discretionary power has been given to the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act and there should be more definiteness in the provisions of the law so that the sugar industry may know exactly what to expect instead of being left subject to the statistical whims and economic fancies of young men in the Department of Agriculture who are more concerned with international theories than with the practical problems of farm life. The domestic sugar industry is entitled to explanations and justifications in connection with the rules and regulations which issue from the Department of Agriculture and which control practically their every activity on the farm and in the plants. Like most businesses, this industry is entitled to some progressive security, including the expansion normally necessary to healthy American agricultural and industrial life, and to be unfettered—yes, encouraged—in fulfilling its economic and civic purposes with benefits to the whole Nation which always flow from prosperous free enterprise.

As I review the experiences of growers and processors of sugar under the control programs inaugurated by the present administration, and after consultations with persons engaged in the domestic sugar industry, I have reached the conclusion that a great deal of the regimentation and restrictions placed upon the industry are unnecessary. I subscribe to the principle that our farmers in the United States are entitled to priority and preference in the home market and certainly farmers who produce a deficiency crop should be encouraged to produce more. No national-defense program can be complete which fails to take into consideration the availability of essential foods, and as a matter of practical preparedness, there should be more sugar produced in the United States, when we consider that less than 30 percent of the home consumption of sugar is produced on the mainland. It is my conviction that the best safeguard against sugar shortages and higher prices lies in permitting our farmers to produce to the extent of their ability. The sugar policy of the United States Government must necessarily be based upon an adequate tariff which protects our farmers and laborers against the lower standards in the tropics, supplemented by quotas against foreign countries for the proper adjustment of supply and demand and for the protection of consumers and producers alike.

Just as the consumers are entitled to receive the protection of the Government against excessive prices, our farmers are entitled to receive the protection of the Government against depressed prices, insuring them a fair return according to American standards. The experience of several years under Federal control convinces me that this is a proper function of Government, which can be successfully applied to the complete satisfaction of sugar-beet growers and of the consuming public.

Essentially, these desirable objectives can only be achieved through such an administration of the Federal sugar program as recognizes at all times that the chief beneficiary must be the domestic producer. It is perfectly obvious that the Sugar Act must be appropriately amended to secure these objectives and so that definite powers which do not permit of broad discretion such as is provided in the present law will insure to the domestic producer the protection and the kind of administration to which he is entitled and which in my opinion was intended by Congress that he should receive.

Politics or Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of June 11, 1940, entitled "Politics or Patriotism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 11, 1940]

POLITICS OR PATRIOTISM—WHICH ARE WE GETTING?

If we are not at war we ought to quit pretending we are.

If we are at war we ought to quit pretending we are not.

Let us quit pretending about anything. This is no time for pretense.

No time for smartness, for glib airiness, for conjuring rabbits out of high hats, for cleverness of any kind whatsoever.

The issue is simple and should not be clouded.

Th American people want preparedness as a preventive of war, not as provocation for one.

In the hullabaloo at Washington this single fundamental fact seems rapidly being forgotten.

President Roosevelt forgot all about it in his angry address at Charlottesville last night.

The people have consented without protest to the spending of many billions in the belief that they are investing their money in an insurance policy.

They have not agreed that it shall be tossed into a gigantic gamble on the turn of the dice in Europe.

The President has declared a state of something "short of war" existing. But there is no clear demarcation between the line of less than war and war itself.

All this is vastly disturbing to a public mind long inured to the modern technique of waging wars without taking the trouble to declare them.

As far as the Nazi high command is concerned, nothing we can now do or say will affect their belief that we are their sworn enemies.

They have no moral niceties about such matters.

Our finely spun technicalities about being into it up to our necks but "short of war" interest them not at all.

They know no law but that of might and care nothing about hairline definitions and shades of meaning.

It is as silly for us to think otherwise as it would be for a brave but defenseless poilu to argue his metaphysical rights as he is crushed under one of their tanks.

Berlin does not listen to Philadelphia lawyers.

As far as the Nazis are concerned, in their present military position, we are already at war with them and any formal declaration would be a "mere scrap of paper."

We may fool ourselves by pretending this is not so but we are not fooling Hitler and Goering.

For, if Germany should win, victory will be theirs before we could affect the scales one way or another even if we declared ourselves officially. Our military authorities agree that it will take us at least a year before we can be prepared to help with either men or equipment of any consequence. Before that time the decision will have come. If Germany cannot win by then, she cannot win at all. So say all the experts.

Therefore, facing the situation in the harsh realism of things as they are, we have but one course before us: To get this Nation on a sound foundation for national defense. And nothing else!

The people will not be satisfied with "guess and be damned" programs that are dazzling in conception but drab in conclusion.

Mr. Roosevelt asks for over a billion dollars, and the Nation applauds. Two weeks later he asks for another billion, with a casual, oh-by-the-way approach to the asking. The people agree to that. Nor do they flinch at the added tax burden of $650,000,000.

They are not afraid of realities. They are worried only over unrealities.

The national debt limit of forty-five billion is to be upped to forty-eight billion. The President has asked for $4,500,000,000 for the ensuing year. But from nowhere—least of all from the White House—comes a clear, concise statement of how this burden is to be financed, how much is actually needed, and what it is going to be used for.

The "on hand or on order" technique of the fireside chat seems to prevail in all the financial statements that have been issued.

Mr. Roosevelt confesses very little interest in where and how the money is to be raised. He merely says the Government has to have it. No one has questioned that, but the people do want to know where seven billions in the past 7 years has already gone for the same purpose with very little to show for it. And where this is going.

Nor will their doubts and uncertainties be cleared up by cheerful bedtime fireside chats. Rich and poor alike must be called upon to make tremendous sacrifices, and the palliatives of platitudes will not soothe them in facing a drift into a war they do not want.

If it is legal and proper and in keeping with a sound preparedness program to order the Army and Navy to turn back to manufacturers what equipment we now have on hand as "obsolete," for them in turn to sell to the Allies, what is to prevent the same tricky device being used when new guns, planes, and other essentials are delivered? "Obsolescence" can be an elastic word.

And stripped of its camouflage this latest move is as baldly an act of war as though we were to order the American fleet into action.

Another thing: There is a growing belief that in some phases of the Washington situation there has been more politics than there has been patriotism.

Ironically enough, the finger of suspicion this time is not pointed by Wall Street, economic royalists, or rival politicians. The charges are made by some of the staunchest defenders and advocates of the New Deal philosophy.

Space will not permit the quoting of more than three, but they are typical and their left-wing fidelity need not be doubted.

First, there is John T. Flynn, long a special economic adviser to the New Deal and one of its most prolific apologists. He charges that Mr. Roosevelt is using the present emergency as a smoke screen to hide the failures of his program to put men back to work and to restore prosperity.

Second, there is The New Republic which since 1933 has been the quasi-official organ of the so-called "palace janissaries," the inner circle of ardent leftists within the White House. This publication makes no bones about the Administration playing politics with one of the gravest situations that ever confronted our Nation. In the current issue it says:

"On the political side, the New Dealers sought to make use of the defense issue to create a coalition Cabinet, with the single-hearted purpose of rendering their conservative opponents helpless in the coming campaign.

"Among certain liberal groups it was feared that Mr. Roosevelt, in proposing a coalition, was surrendering to the Republicans, offering to make terms with them. On excellent authority it can be said that this is untrue.

"The new dealers were trying to ensnare hostages. It was a skillful plan. The Republicans could not have attacked the New Deal if the heads of their party were in Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet.

"Col. Frank Knox, the first Republican leader interviewed by Mr. Roosevelt, is supposed to have accepted the plan, and may yet enter the Cabinet. However, coalition was killed by the acerb anti-third-term statement of former Governor Landon."

Third, there is Oswald Garrison Villard, dean of American liberals, for many years editor of the other left-wing weekly, The Nation, and now its contributing editor. He writes:

"The national fright over the success of the 'blitzkrieg' has pulled the President out of a bad hole. War or no war, he had to have the right to get us further into debt since it is entirely beyond him to put our industry fully to work. * * * Hitler has given him another breathing spell. * * *

"Of course, the new taxes will not produce one-sixth of the sum—$4,500,000,000—which the President has asked. It is only a clever joke—not a serious effort * * *."

These accusations should be met.

The President himself should accept them as a challenge.

They are not isolated instances.

The fate of this Nation may well depend upon their truth or falsity.

The people have a right to know if politics is being played with human misery, if politics is jeopardizing all that we have or ever hope to have, if politics has taken the place of patriotism.

This is what the accusations mean—if they mean anything.

The issue is not one of men, money, and machines.

It is one of morals.

Calvin Coolidge once remarked that every word a President says weighs a ton. He meant that, because of the tremendous power a President possesses, he should carefully weigh his words.

The people, loving Mr. Roosevelt, as their friend and crusader, have smiled indulgently in the years past at some of his free vocal efforts and Puckish byplay. All in good fun, they said, each understanding the other.

Now there are these rumors, no longer passed along only by those who might be dismissed as reactionaries or disgruntled leaders of business. And from these reports stem the element of uncertainly which steals across our land. For Mr. Roosevelt still carries on in the same breezy insouciance that captivated most of us in his inaugural address, when his happy courage gave a despairing people a great new hope.

In the present sorry situation, however, that happy-warrior role seems synthetic.

The people know of the disgraceful situation that exists in the office of the Secretary of War, a sore that has festered for years—the deadly personal feud between Secretary Woodring and his first assistant, Johnson—a chaotic condition allowed to continue for the sake of political expediency.

The people know that Charles Edison was promoted to the Secretaryship of the Navy only to give him a prestige that would aid him in his campaign for Governor of New Jersey, as a Charlie McCarthy for the notorious Boss Hague of that State. His resignation is dated June 24.

The Army and Navy are our sole defense.

Yet we see these vital departments manhandled by misfits; and, in one of them, the personnel torn with openly declared enmities.

It is little wonder, then, that the people are willing to lend attentive ear to the steadily increasing barrage of reports that all is not well in Washington.

Only out of the deep wells of unsullied sincerity can be given the answer that will cleanse from their minds the miasma of doubts and fears which now inflicts them.

There is an explanation of the public's long complacency concerning oft-repeated charges of chicanery in high office.

There has been a Nation-wide moral let down.

There was the bitter disillusionment of the World War, the hyprocrisy and lawlessness that went with prohibition; the tragedy of the Harding scandals, the pain of which in the body politic was dulled by the narcotic of the Coolidge prosperity—which turned out to be a rubber check; there was the stodgy ineptitude of Hoover who told them that poverty had been wiped from the face of the earth. And now this!

A corroding cynicism, born of the constant crash of hopes, had calloused the people to accept without ringing protests of righteous indignation many conditions they knew to be wrong.

But the free press believes that there is an awakening at hand, a revival of our national sense of honor.

Out of our new common danger there can come a strengthening of our moral fiber, a revitalization of the old ideals once vouchsafed us by a benign and patient Providence—if He will but again grant us the power to see.

Without this there can be no true patriotism. For patriotism is an unselfish love of country that has its roots deep in the instincts of the people. It knows no party, no creed, no sectionalism. In its spiritual essence it is the living soul of the Nation.

Only through the reawakening of this spirit can there come to us the cool clear light of understanding—when we will know, deep within ourselves, that we are living a life and not playing like actors doing their parts upon a stage.

And reason, sound understanding freed of all theatricalism, dictates that it is our duty to keep out of other people's wars.

Sane people first look after their own children before they do those of their neighbors. God helps those who help themselves.

We can best serve mankind by keeping alive on this soil the principles of human liberty that first found root here.

To make the world safe for democracy in the last war we nearly lost our own. We may not be so fortunate another time.

Logic demands that we build a national defense to preserve ourselves and our principles of government.

If we do this we will be in better position to help in the restoration of a now mad world back to its sanity.

These are the reasons the people have willingly consented to the voting of all these billions to President Roosevelt—not for the purpose of becoming involved once more in the age-old conflicts of European power politics.

So, let's quit pretending.

And woe unto them who play politics in this hour of the Nation's deepest need!

Compulsory Military Training

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have this morning dispatched an open letter to His Excellency the President of the United States regarding the question of compulsory military training. It is a very great subject and a very important subject. I think the Members of the House who are not here and the Members of the Senate and public officials in general and leaders in the Government should know the contents of this letter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by reading the contents of the letter into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman is granted.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Why, if you feel it necessary to train the youth of America, do you not use the available local facilities first? It looks to me and to a lot of other people back home as though your idea of compulsory training would be a lot more American and a lot more practical and sensible as well as much less expensive if you would start out by using our facilities in each home community first.

As you know, many schools are standing by, waiting and anxious to institute Junior R. O. T. C. units, but they are receiving no encouragement either from you or from the War and Navy Departments.

In my own district our city vocational schools are waiting for word from you to train 1,500 additional aviation and auto mechanics, electricians, machinists, blacksmiths, radio mechanics, cooks, etc.

One school alone, De La Salle High School, has upward of 1,000 boys enrolled, and they have asked and are pleading for a Junior Naval or Army R. O. T. C. unit. Furthermore, the idea has the support of Archbishop John Gregory Murray, of St. Paul. Still, a deaf ear is turned to their request here.

We have many other local facilities in the institutions of higher learning, in camps and activities now set up and operating, so why look further and go to such radical extremes as proposed until we have exhausted the full utilization of our present local opportunities?

Reading my telegrams and mail, it is evident that sentiment is almost unanimously opposed at this time to compulsory military training and to the youth camps you have suggested.

Why take our youth from their homes and out of the wholesome environment in which most of them are living and transplant them into the lonely, inhospitable, and disturbing and discouraging arena of a training camp? Their mental, moral, and physical well-being is too important to be disregarded in that way. We should keep our youth in their homes and in their home communities just as long and just as far as possible and this suggestion I make here is in keeping with that idea and is a practical movement which will aid our need for preparedness and national defense, but at the same time be conservative of the best values of the Nation.

Mr. President, we want no foreign wars; we want none of our American boys to fight in foreign lands or seas; we want only to prepare to protect and defend our own shores and border, and the idea I have suggested is best suited to attain that end.

I am, most sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ALEXANDER, M. C.

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the organization of the youth of the country under Sidney Hillman means communism in the years to come. He is more dangerous than Earl Browder and a thousand times more dangerous than 10,000 Harry Bridges.

In order that the fathers and mothers of this country may know what is proposed with reference to their children, let me give you a brief word picture of this man who is playing such an important part in the remaking of America.

Sidney Hillman was born in 1887 in Zagare, Lithuania, where his father was a merchant. He was educated in a seminary of that city, and came to the United States at the age of 20. In New York City he became acquainted with Morris Hillquit and Leon Trotsky, and about that time became a member of the Socialist Party. He met Miss Bessie Abramovitch, a protégée of Emma Goldman, and married her.

In 1910 he marshalled his followers in a successful strike against Hart, Schaffner & Marx, garment manufacturers, and in the agreement which followed the winning of the strike, represented his organization as business agent or deputy from 1911 to 1914.

Hillman has been president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America since its founding in 1914.

He has been a director of the Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank, of Chicago, Ill., since 1922, and director of the Amalgamated Bank of New York since 1923.

His policy was partly indicated in an editorialized statement in the Advance, issue of March 9, 1917, as follows:

> We have unfurled the crimson banner of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America for the tens of thousands of workers who rally around it. It is bearing a message of hope and the salvation for the workers. Our banner will never be furled before we reach the goal—the emancipation of the working class.

At the convention of the Amalgamated, held in Montreal, Canada, in 1926 the Advance, issue of June 11, 1926, quoted Hillman as saying:

> I hope that our organization in the future, as in the past, will recognize every part of the labor movement as our own, whether in the textile mills, the needle trades, or anywhere else, because the cause of the labor movement is our own cause. We have given help to the strikers in Passaic; we have extended our help to every group on strike, and I believe I speak in the mind of our organization when I say that we will extend help not only to those who agree with us, but to those who may disagree as well.
>
> In the past we have regarded ourselves as part of the international labor movement. At the time of the famine in Russia we contributed generously over one-quarter of a million dollars; we contributed in the reconstruction of the needle trades of Russia. We have extended aid to the German labor movement, to the Polish workers, and to the workers in Austria.

Hillman's assistance to the aspirations of Soviet Russia took a more tangible form in his taking over the presidency of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation in 1922. This organization sent out a prospectus to their following, saying that they had obtained a concession from the Bolshevik Government, and they offered stock of the corporation at $10 a share.

In the October 6, 1922, edition of Pravda, the Communist Party in Russia published an interview with Comrade Sidney Hillman, saying in part:

> Comrade Hillman expressed his confidence that the Russian-American Industrial Corporation is but the first step toward a really practical help of the international proletariat to Soviet Russia, and that this corporation will play a great economic and political role in the future.

In the trial of Alexander Krasnotchekoff in Moscow, it was declared that the Russian-American Industrial Corporation was still indebted to the Commercial and Industrial Bank, this proving the connection of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation with Soviet financing.

Hillman visited Russia, among other things, to assist the Russian Government in setting up its garment manufacturing plants. The official proceedings of the 1922 convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, on page 426, refers to the visit Mr. Hillman had made to the Italian factories, which, at that time, had been taken over by the workmen. In part, on page 426 of the convention proceedings, Mr. Hillman is reported to have said as follows:

> In Rome I was doubly welcome; the secretary of the metal workers union gave me a letter, the only key to open the gates of the factory. With my Italian comrades, I landed in front of

the factory which looked attractive because of the fine "red" flag which adorned the building and the "red" sentinel who was keeping watch. I stayed for lunch with the members of the factory council. The council then took me through the factory. The first thing that attracted my attention was a series of inscriptions on the walls, including the Soviet emblem.

Reports current at the time indicated that W. Z. Foster organized the Trade Union Unity League in Sidney Hillman's office. Mr. Hillman was a member of the defense committee of the I. W. W. and was in the Foreign Language Information Service, an affiliate of the A. C. L. U. He was also a director of the Garland fund.

It is the well-established belief in banking circles in New York City that the Amtorg Trading Co. deposited funds in Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Bank, and that at one time the Russian Government itself did some of its business through the Amalgamated Bank.

It is also accepted in banking circles that next to one of the great commercial banks in New York City, the Amalgamated Bank has done more business than any other in transferring funds to Russia.

At a meeting held in New York City in 1933, at which there was discussion in connection with Communist elements in the ranks of the Amalgamated, one of the speakers—Walter Carmen, at that time editor of the New Masses—made the statement that many people handled the transfer of funds to Russia through the Amalgamated Bank.

In 1937 our information is that statements of a similar character were made by two persons, one of them representing the Confidential Secret Service Bureau of the Communist Party, United States of America.

Sidney Hillman's career is typical of the methods and proceedings of boring from within, explained in detail by D. J. Saposs in his "Left Wing Unionism."

It is not charged that Hillman is a member of the Communist Party, but he has kept in touch with revolutionary groups in this country and abroad, and has been a sponsor and executive board member of numerous left-wing organizations.

This is the man who has been chosen to represent or speak for labor on the Advisory Commission on National Defense, and the man who has been selected to organize the youth of the country.

Three Aces Versus the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, of June 1, 1940, entitled "Three Aces Versus the New Deal."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of June 1, 1940]

THREE ACES VERSUS THE NEW DEAL

The three tip-top American aces and authorities on aviation and air defense are now in publicly proclaimed agreement on the proposition that President Roosevelt's politically motivated defense program is "cockeyed."

That is quite enough to make the American people sit up, take notice, and call a halt. Not a halt on effecting actual defense, but a halt on the third-termites' partisan procession which, in Maj. Al Williams' words, is "tramping in the death march of the British admirals."

Major Williams recently toured Europe and intensively studied the airplanes and aeronautical methods and organizations of the principal powers of that continent.

Now, in a blistering denunciation of the Roosevelt purpose to help the Allies at the expense of our own national defense and national security, he has placed himself on record somewhat more vigorously than Col. Charles A. Lindbergh and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, his fellow aces, but in substantial agreement with those two gentlemen.

All three of these men love their country above all other things on the face of the earth.

All three have served their country well and ably.

All three are nationally and internationally famous.

All three are recognized as unselfish, nonpartisan devotees of strong and effective national defense.

All three are, indisputably, experts in their field.

It means a great deal, therefore, that all three agree that the Roosevelt policy is not merely faulty but actually of such a character as to imperil the best interests of the United States.

If you were in need of a surgical operation, you would welcome the services, or at least the counsel, of the three foremost surgeons in America.

If you were in need of legal advice, you would respect the opinions of the three foremost lawyers in the country.

America is now interested in national defense, which, all parties agree, centers primarily in air defense.

America, therefore, should welcome and act upon the expert counsel of her three foremost air-defense authorities—Charlie Lindbergh, Eddie Rickenbacker, and Al Williams.

What do these men say?

Lindbergh says this:

"If we are in danger of war, it is not because European peoples have attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of America, but because certain American people have attempted to interfere with internal affairs of Europe. * * * We need not fear a foreign invasion unless the American peoples bring it on through their own quarreling and meddling with affairs abroad. Our eyes should not search beyond the horizon for problems which lie at our own feet. * * * There is no longer time for us to enter this war successfully. * * * Let us stop this hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion. * * * If we desire peace, we need only stop asking for war. No one wishes to attack us, and no one is in a position to do so. * * * The only reason that we are in danger of becoming involved in this war is because there are powerful elements in America who desire us to take part. They represent a small minority of the American people, but they control much of the machinery of influence and propaganda. They seize every opportunity to push us closer to the edge. * * * Let us turn our eyes toward our own Nation and its defense."

And Rickenbacker says this:

"Each new instance of the bloody tragedy and suffering in Europe should restrengthen us in our efforts to keep out of that war over there. * * * Even if we wanted to go to the aid of France and England—which God forbid, unless we want to end liberty and free, representative government in this country for at least a century—we have nothing to offer those countries. * * * We are now enjoying liberties and a standard of living which we certainly will never see again, and which our children will probably never see again, if certain forces now at work are allowed to mislead us in the next 6, 12, or 18 months. * * * We could never transport troops abroad in the present circumstances, even if we were foolish enough to want to. * * * So let us serve free, representative government both at home and abroad by concentrating on solving our real problems here, to protect us from the menace of foreign invasion, which, in spite of what we hear, is still, at the worst, a long way off. * * * The greed and selfishness of a few, while reprehensible, are less to be feared in leading to American entanglement and involvement in the present war than public misunderstanding, resulting from misinformation and inflammatory propaganda. * * * Nothing caused the present European war that has not caused every European war for centuries. * * * Let's keep our heads and work for a real national-defense program—a defense of our own country, not somebody else's. * * * What we need is an enlargement of the plane-producing industry, subject to ready conversion for war use—our use."

That's what Rickenbacker says.

It's what every really competent authority on national defense has been saying for weeks and months.

Now, how about the third American ace? How about Maj. Al. Williams? What does Major Williams say? This:

"Our air-defense development has been retarded by politics and bureaucracy. * * * For 5 years, this administration has persistently meddled in international power politics and, at the same time, failed to provide an adequate national-defense system for the country. * * * This country is not the knight errant of the human race. The blood of America belongs to America—to no man or group of men—and it must not be shed or mortgaged again in foreign wars, nor on foreign battlefields. * * * As a knight errant of the human race, some men would have the United States pose before the world, while the knight's armor, his sword, and his shield are made of tin and of obsolescent design. * * * Our aircraft production has been muddled through this administration's persistent dumping of everything to the Allies. * * * We are confronted by coiners of dangerous international phrases, coined in subversion of the safety and peace of America. Congress alone can save us, and we alone—we ordinary Americans—can save Congress by telling these representatives of ours that we are determined to mend and put our own house in order * * * and to build a defense of this country. The President wants

airplanes in great numbers right now—to toss into this war. If he wants thousands of planes without waiting to build up an air force first, then production of planes for Europe is his goal—not the defense of America. * * * President Roosevelt's panicky 'flight schedule' for the air invasion of America is ridiculous, worthy of Hollywood, and certainly not of the White House."

That's what Maj. Al. Williams said—to the National Aviation Forum, meeting in Washington under auspices of the National Aeronautical Association. And when he said it, his listeners, all experts in aviation, responded with loud, long cheers.

Congress had better note those cheers—and note that they represent the sentiments of millions in the great patriotic American rank and file—millions without any official spokesman other than their representatives in Congress.

Congress Should Remain in Session While the European Crisis Lasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, with a large part of the world aflame, and with war hysteria beginning to take hold in internationalist and intervention circles, we Members of Congress should realize our responsibility to our districts and our country.

It is our duty to do everything we can to prevent America from being stampeded into foreign war.

I have enough confidence in the clearness of vision and level-headedness of Members of Congress to believe that we will not be found derelict in performing our duty.

One thing Congress should do is to remain in session continually as long as the crisis lasts. We should not think of adjourning. Ours is a government of coordinate branches and Congress must be alert and vigilant in doing its part to keep America out of foreign embroilment.

This is not a new thought as far as I am concerned. Last month I gave out a statement on the subject which, with the indulgence of the House, I submit for printing in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LOUIS LUDLOW ON MAY 27, 1940

I am opposed to adjournment as long the the European crisis lasts. Unless the war in Europe ends I think Members of Congress should forego the annual vacation and remain constantly on the job here until the Seventy-seventh Congress opens next January. Congress has a responsibility in connection with war and international relations, and we will be letting our constituents down if we do not discharge that responsibility. With the affairs of the world in as critical a stage as they are at present no one knows when something may come up that will require the attention of the legislative branch. Congress should stay right here and attend to its duties. Propaganda influences are dragging us closer to war, and the country will feel safer and more secure if Congress remains in session.

In emergent circumstances such as we may be facing, Congress should remain in constant session to collaborate with the Chief Executive and should not abdicate the important function which the country expects it to perform.

Government Spending and the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the inevitable has happened. We have been called upon to pass a bill raising taxes upon the over-tax-burdened people, to broaden the tax base, so as to force income taxes to be paid by millions who heretofore have not paid Federal income taxes, and to increase the debt limit above $45,000,000,000. For 7 long years the administration has been repeatedly warned that this would be the inevitable result of its wasteful, extravagant, and un-American policies. Everyone knew our Government could not go on forever spending billions more each year than it took in without finding somewhere along the trail a "pay day" sign.

What a different picture we would have had if the President had only kept his promises and his solemn pledges to the people of the United States. In his campaign he said he would reduce the cost of government 25 percent if he were elected. This could have been done and can still be done, without lessening any of the services rendered by the Government if favoritism, waste, and extravagance had been eliminated. Had this been done, we would have been able to provide for our national defense without any increase in taxes and without raising the debt limit. The President made the following statement when our national debt was less than half of what it is now; I quote:

"Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rests the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of agricultural products, and the availability of employment.

"The credit of the United States Government affects these fundamental values.

"It, therefore, becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it. Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of a loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger."

The President, in that statement, gave advance notice that he knew what would happen to a government which followed the same policies which he has put into effect since he has been in office. Even without any expenditures for national defense, his policies have practically bankrupted the Nation. This administration has spent about $65,000,000,000—has increased our national debt about $25,000,000,000, and in addition the Government has guaranteed bonds and notes issued by its corporations and credit agencies amounting to about $6,000,000,000, which is not included within the $45,000,000,000 debt limit.

One of the great problems which was causing the administration much concern was how to avoid raising taxes and how to avoid raising the debt limit before election. They would even resort to subterfuge by having the borrowing power of various agencies, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and others, increased so that they might provide money for various governmental activities without having it show, in their peculiar bookkeeping system, as a public debt. Then the realization of the unprepared condition of our country was brought forcibly to the front, which gave the administration a reason for raising the taxes and increasing the public debt limit.

Let us see just how negligent this administration has been. In 1933, when President Roosevelt assumed office, Hitler was an eccentric painter in Germany, and Germany had no army, no navy, no air force, and no armaments. Britain and France had the largest armies, navies, and air forces in Europe. A few months after the President took office Hitler came into power in Germany, and he has built his entire military machine while Roosevelt has been President. England and France were negligent in permitting Hitler to build his war machine and in not preparing to meet it. Since the President has been in office Congress has given him every penny he has asked for national defense, and when it was brought to light that we were so weak in preparedness there was only one place to put the blame, that is, the occupant of the White House. The President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Our country has representatives in the other nations, and we are supposed to have an intelligence division to keep us advised as to the progress and actions of other nations in military matters as well as other matters. What this intelligence division amounts to in this administration we do not know. Again, the finger points to the White House, where reports are made and our needs determined.

You will recall in 1935 Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, an expert on military matters, was requested to appear before a congressional committee, and he frankly told the committee the Nation's defenses were not in good condition and that they were not adequate. After doing this he was relieved of his commission and from active duty—that was the fate of the man who knew what he was talking about and who had the courage to tell of the true condition of our national defense. This administration cast him out of the Army. This instance shows that the administration was advised and did know in 1935 of the Nation's unpreparedness, and they cannot escape the fact that the Nation's present predicament as to national defense is due to the shortsightedness and stubbornness of this administration, which shows the fallacy of the administration's argument that they are the only ones qualified to undertake the rebuilding of the Nation's defense. It shows conclusively that this administration is not qualified, that it has utterly failed to do the things which should have been done and that it should not be kept in office.

It is not surprising that the President failed in his duty in regard to national defense; he has failed in his duty in regard to our domestic problems, and after 7½ long years, with a subservient Congress which gave him all the money he asked for and many times gave him blank checks to use as he saw fit together with almost unlimited powers, he has failed to solve a single domestic problem.

One of the great dangers to us in the present situation is that powers may be entrusted to this administration, always inordinately anxious for power, which will overnight establish a dictatorship at home, which we are so much afraid of abroad.

England, realizing the utter failure of Chamberlain, has displaced him. France, realizing the utter failure of her leaders, has displaced them in an effort to save her countries from destruction, and I believe the American people, realizing the failure of the present administration, will displace it in November while there is still time to save the Unted States.

The President said on September 3, 1932, at Bridgeport, Conn.:

> It goes without saying that the costs of Government are too high.

And in speaking of States he said:

> They are, moreover, making sensible far-reaching attempts not to go further into debt.

In Sioux City, Iowa, on September 29, 1932, Mr. Roosevelt said:

> We are not getting an adequate return in Washington, or to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services which are neither practical nor necessary. I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all our history, one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs or reduced earning power of the people. On my part I ask you to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expense of the National Government.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 19, 1932, he said:

> I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues in this campaign. In my opinion it is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business. Now, I am going to disclose to you a definite personal conclusion which I adopted the day after I was nominated in Chicago. Here it is: Before anyone may enter my Cabinet he must give me a twofold pledge of: One, absolute loyalty to the Democratic platform and especially to its economy plank; two, complete cooperation with me, looking to economy and reorganization in his Department.

In his campaign the President advocated a reduction in the number of Government boards, commissions, bureaus, but since being in office he has created and established more Government boards, commissions, and bureaus than any other President. He has increased the number of Federal employees by over 400,000; has centralized Government in Washington, and now says he wants to add another 100,000 Government employees.

In Charleston, S. C., on October 23, 1935, the President said:

> We are coming back more soundly than ever before because we are planning it that way. Do not let anybody tell you differently.

So we have the President's word that the conditions we have are because he planned it that way. If we are satisfied, then, of course, there is no reason to make a change. If we are dissatisfied, then there is every reason why we should make a change. I often think of the poet's words:

> The moving finger writes,
> And having writ, moves on,
> Nor all your piety nor wit,
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

For 7½ years the administration's moving finger has been writing. It has written the greatest record of extravagance, waste, spending, and governmental mismanagement that was ever written in the history of our country; and having written, the record is there and cannot be added to or taken from. This writing finger moved on and all the piety and wit to the administration cannot lure it back to cancel half a line or to wash out a word of it. On that record, this administration must stand.

It is pathetic to think that here in the finest Nation in all the world we have many millions of our citizens unemployed, and no doubt tonight many millions will go to bed hungry, and many will have no bed to which to go.

Our farmers are in a distressed condition and have been able to keep going only by reason of great Government grants. Business has lost all confidence in the integrity of the administration's promises. The administration has been at war with business and industry, which after all are the ones who must provide employment for our people. The only ones who are satisfied are the favored Government employees.

The President dramatized his message to Congress on national defense. Every few days he sends a message to Congress without arranging for a national hook-up on the radio, without having a joint meeting of the Senate and the House, and without having his cabinet present, but this was to be different. This message was hysteria creating, second only to the George Orson Wells broadcast. After Congress and all the people were told that we had practically no defense, and the question was immediately asked what had become of the over $7,000,000,000 which Congress had given him for that purpose, and suggestions were made that an investigation should be had to determine where the money went, the President then made a "fireside chat" in which he said we had the finest peacetime national defense we had ever had and spoke of what we had "on hand or on order." The facts demonstrate that it is practically all "on order." I think this broadcast will prove to be a great boomerang to the administration. It has called the attention of the public to its failures and shows the administration in its true light.

Many think there is a great attempt now to direct the attention of the people to Europe and European affairs so as to take their attention off of the administration's many mistakes and its failures in domestic matters. But one thing is certain, it has proven itself incompetent to manage the peacetime economy of the United States, and has completely fallen down on providing an adequate defense—our unpreparedness is its fault, the administration has spent the money and has nothing to show for it.

It is to be hoped that we will never again be involved in war, but if we should be, it has been demonstrated that as a wartime Executive the President would be a greater disaster than a peacetime Executive. Many are wondering today if we are to have another issue of "He kept us out of war." In 1916 the people wanted to stay out of war and the Democratic candidate was elected President on that issue, although it was known that Mr. Wilson was committed in a secret document to participation in the World War at least 3 months before election. Since the present war has been going on, this country has shipped great quantities of war

materials to Japan, to Russia, and to Italy and no doubt much of it has gone to Germany, and practically all of these war supplies have been bought with the profits we paid those nations for their gold, which we now have buried in the hills of Kentucky and which many people think will some day be valuable only for jewelry and with which to fill teeth.

It is very apparent that the administration at this time has no definite plans for a national defense. The President is still wanting blank checks and already it is rumored that much of the money Congress appropriated for national defense will be diverted into other channels. First, a definite plan of national defense should be adopted so that we would know just what armaments are needed; then these needs should be supplied at once so that we may have an adequate, coordinated, and sufficient national defense. While this is being provided, steps should be taken to solve our domestic problems. We still have many millions unemployed. The administration is still conducting a war against business. No solution has been found for our agricultural problems. Our national debt is enormous and taxes and expenses being increased by leaps and bounds. It is feared that, if domestic problems are not soon solved and our own house put in order, we may not have anything to defend.

Under this administration the producers of competitive agricultural products have suffered greatly. Our exports of these products have decreased and our imports greatly increased. The whole policy of the administration has been to regiment, to control, and, as the President said, to plan the lives and the business of our citizens.

The farmers are the best customers for the purchase of products from our factories. The laboring man is the best customer for the purchase of the products of our farmers. The American market is the best market in all the world and equals the combined purchasing power of any 500,000,000 people in the world. There is no reason why we cannot have a prosperous United States if common sense, tried and true principles of government are applied. It is very evident that this administration will not apply these. It is essential to the future of the United States that we have a change in our National Government. Whatever this administration has done that is good should be retained and improved, but the administration's disastrous policies should be stopped and this can only be done by the election of a Republican administration in November.

Roosevelt Goes Down the Road to War With a War Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the American people were shocked by the recent resignation of Harry H. Woodring as Secretary of War. According to the following newspaper report, Woodring stated he would not resign unless forced to do so:

[From the Washington Post of June 21, 1940]

FORCED OUT FOR TRYING TO SAVE DEFENSES, WOODRING IS QUOTED

TOPEKA, KANS., June 20.—The Capital said tonight that Harry H. Woodring told friends in Topeka 3 weeks ago a "small clique of international financiers" was seeking to force him out as Secretary of War because he opposed "stripping our defenses to aid the Allies."

The Cabinet officer, who resigned suddenly today to make way for President Roosevelt's appointment of Henry L. Stimson, a Republican, made his assertion June 1 after his arrival to receive an honorary degree from Washburn College, the paper said.

It added that Woodring asked that the statement not be published until after his resignation.

"I'm an advocate of adequate defense, but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles," the former Kansas Governor was quoted. "There is a comparatively small clique of international financiers who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower.

"I'm not going to stand for it and I'm not going to resign until forced to do so.

"They don't like me because I'm against stripping our own defenses for the sake of trying to stop Hitler 3,000 miles away. Eventually they will force me to resign, and I'll be darned glad to come back to Kansas, where the people have their feet on the ground and are not easily swayed by demagogues and subtle propaganda."

(The White House yesterday declined to make public Woodring's letter of resignation, declaring it was "too personal.")

It seems as if the international financiers are in control of the White House, have forced the resignation of Woodring, and are now rapidly proceeding to plunge this country into war.

ROOSEVELT DEVELOPS WAR CABINET

With the appointment of Henry L. Stimson, a noted interventionist, and Col. Frank Knox, another interventionist, to Cabinet positions, Roosevelt has indicated to the American people that he desires a war Cabinet.

DANGEROUS ROAD LIES AHEAD FOR AMERICANS

What a dangerous road we are traveling. In total disregard of the sound advice of our founding fathers, Roosevelt is hurling this Nation into the torture of war at almost breakneck speed. This Nation is unprepared for war. It would be a tragedy and a catastrophe to American life and culture to send our youth to fight and die on foreign battlefields.

The following editorial discusses our lack of preparedness:

[From the New York Enquirer of June 17, 1940]

UNPREPAREDNESS MEANS NOTHING TO WAR MAKERS

The pseudo statemen of France and England who involved their countries in war with Germany without being adequately prepared will have to do a great deal of explaining to the poor, broken-hearted French and British mothers who are today mourning the deaths of their loved ones in futile battle with the Nazi giant.

They will not alone have to do a great deal of explaining to their own tragically deceived peoples, but to others as well.

It should have been the sacred occupation of our Government to pursue a strictly neutral course in the whole abominable train of events which led up to the present European slaughter and destruction and during the conflict itself.

Our Government chose, however, to follow a course of hate and involvement which every sane person knew could not but redound to the gravest injury to the Republic. And it acted in this manner, in direct opposition to the traditional and vindicated policy of the Republic, while our country was astoundingly unprepared to do battle with those despots across the Atlantic whom our Government was continually baiting.

The men in Washington upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for this shameful chapter in American history will also have a great deal of explaining to do. Our people have a right to know why they did what they have done, in view of the momentous things at stake for them and their beloved America.

It has long been the arrogant custom of our superstatesmen on the Potomac to boast of the superiority of their information with regard to European affairs as they affect us and the powers now at war beyond the ocean. This makes their handling of the situation all the more outrageous. The American people should never grow weary of thanking Almighty God for having thus far preserved their country at peace, in spite of the mad doings that have taken place in Washington.

Just 4 days ago the Associated Press sent over its wires this meaningful dispatch from our National Capital:

"Senator DOWNEY told the Senate today that he had heard Ambassadors Kennedy and Bullitt and President Roosevelt as well forecast sweeping German successes in Europe.

"Mr. DOWNEY said that the Ambassadors to Great Britain and France 'prophesied to us what has happened in the last 60 days' at a joint session of the Senate and House Military Committees last year.

" 'They prophesied,' he said, 'that the war wouldn't last very long before both London and Paris would be compelled to fall.'

"President Roosevelt told him, the California Democrat added, that 'the military power of Germany was such that the overwhelming odds were in favor of Germany winning the war.'

"Despite advance information, he asserted, Congress, the President, and the Army and Navy 'have not met this crisis that has been developing in the last 2 years.' Instead, 'we have been blind and apathetic,' turning now to 'hysteria and confusion.'

In view of all that the warmongers have done to enmesh Uncle Sam in the insane bloodshed and devastation going on in Europe, with our country totally unable to undertake a war, what is to be said of the unprecedented outburst of the President of the United

States against the new Nero of Rome with regard to the latter's decision to make war on the Anglo-French Allies in unison with the Tyrant of Berlin? The very circumstances in which the Republic was placed as a result of its martial unpreparedness, not to speak of any other factor, imposed a solemn obligation upon our Chief Executive to handle the situation with the utmost delicacy.

He did the very opposite, however.

The Constitution gives to Congress, and solely to Congress, the power to declare war.

But on last Monday the President of the United States, in an outburst that will bring the blush of shame and the pang of resentment to Americans for generations to come, declared an executive war upon the Italo-German allies, without consulting anyone. Think of it—with our country entirely unable to prosecute a war of any kind.

Every well-informed American knows of the plan that has long been in operation to stampede the country and the Congress into war or to provoke a declaration of war upon the Republic.

It is unfortunate that the masses of our people, who are resolutely opposed to war but who are inarticulate, are not thoroughly aware of the far-flung and powerfully financed campaign which is being waged for the purpose of impressing upon Senators and Representatives a wholly false idea of the popular will with regard to our involvement in the war.

This is a time when the ordinary citizens of the land should bestir themselves and act with unrelenting vigor to the end that our servants in Congress and out of it will realize the legal penalty that awaits them if they embroil the Republic in another futile and criminal crusade in Europe.

Americans, write or telegraph or telephone your servants in Washington, Congressional and otherwise, and lay down the law to them in no ambiguous fashion—the law of sanity and peace for the United States of America.

Dagger wielding is an ancient profession in Europe and should cause no surprise to anyone. Sad to say, our own land is not devoid of dagger men. These are the gentry that, under the ballyhoo of "giving all aid to the Allies short of war," are covertly nursing a dagger to plunge it into the back of America's youth by tripping Uncle Sam into war—the real aim upon which their heartless hearts are set.

While all this never-ceasing pressure is being exerted with the object of sacrificing millions of our young men on foreign battleground, the ruling classes of England, those responsible for the present sorry plight of England, are carrying on in grand style. Indeed the British people themselves are not doing their full share. Only last Friday a special cablegram from London published in the New York Times had this to say—ponder these words, Americans:

"Yet in this rather apathetic land, which has not yet felt fully the fury of Nazi terror as Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, Poland, Denmark, and Luxembourg have felt it, it is still news that British workmen are giving up holidays to speed production of war materials. It was featured news that Parliamentary Secretary Ashton of the Labor Ministry said in the House of Commons today that the Government had asked a general cancelation or postponement of holidays during the crisis so there would be no interruption of munitions production and transport. Even the August bank holidays may have to be foregone, it was said, and Mr. Ashton concluded: 'The response has been magnificent. Production has been greatly accelerated but we must beware of any slackening.'

"The significance of this seeming trivial concession to the necessities of war must not be overlooked in this country where certain classes of rat catchers still are exempt from military service and where those who can afford it still dine sumptuously on caviar and the roast beef of Old England, washed down by fragrant German wines."

There you are, Red Russian caviar, Old English beef and fragrant Nazi wine for those who have brought a disastrous war upon England and who are laboring unceasingly, in unison with their cohorts here, to involve this Republic in certain destruction by involving it in dictatorship and war.

We Americans will deserve every evil that befalls us if we do not now get right out in the open and shut the mouths of the warmongers.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

Memorial Address in Honor of Minnesota's Former Governor, Floyd B. Olson, by Senator Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, Senator WHEELER gave a talk June 17 in Minneapolis upon the occasion of the Floyd B. Olson memorial exercises and dinner, which was listened to by thousands of our citizenry, regardless of party affiliation or other creed. This speech has so much of value in it that I suggest to readers of the RECORD its perusal. It was inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD at page 3960 by Senator CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri.

If the statement Senator WHEELER makes regarding the secret meeting of the committee of 18 international bankers, propagandists, and Wall Street operators calling themselves the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies is working, as he says, then much that we see in the public press today is better understandable.

The third from the last paragraph in the Senator's speech is also especially poignant, as are many other passages throughout the address, which I commend for widespread attention. I shall be glad to furnish copies of the address upon request.

Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. LELAND M. FORD, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements made by me before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Committee on Rules of the House:

The first thing I would like to do is to correct a typographical error in this bill. This is the last word in line 3. This word should be "heretofore", instead of "hereinafter."

First, I want it distinctly understood by all that this bill is not aimed at those people who have come into the United States from foreign countries and who are desirable. There are many of these people who have come into the United States who will eventually make outstanding citizens. This bill, however, is aimed at the undesirable alien.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill is offered for the reason that under the present immigration law there is no way by which undesirable aliens, who preach a doctrine of destruction of the Bill of Rights, the Constitution of the United States, and the Government itself, may be deported. In many instances such aliens have been known to advocate this subversive program even by force. Therefore this is to supplement the immigration law—immigration rules and regulations of January 1, 1930, as amended, up to and including December 31, 1936.

It is a very singular thing that many of these persons who preach this communistic doctrine of destruction of our type of government always scream for the very Bill of Rights and the protection under the Constitution that they would destroy.

TOLERANCE

There might be some who would state that a bill of this kind is intolerant. This is usually the refuge that some people take when they have no other argument with which to cover up. In my opinion, this is not a sound argument, because under the Government of the United States we do not tolerate everything and anything that might enter into some persons' minds. For instance, we do not tolerate murder, robbery, treason, assault, and many other crimes that I could delineate here. The reason these are not tolerated is that tolerance of them would not inure to the benefit and good of the greatest number of our people. So then, by the same criterion, could we write into our laws protection against the preachment of doctrines that would destroy the very Government itself, and we can write this in honestly and fearlessly and, last but not least, necessarily. One only needs to look to Europe to see how this boring from within has worked within the last few weeks, and it does appear that it is high time that those in offices such as we hold did their duty and protected their country against the effects of any such subversive doctrine or movement.

This Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has a very serious duty to perform here. This committee today occupies just as important a position in the defense of this country as does our Navy, our Army, or our Air Corps, for if this country is defeated and

its Government lost through the effective work of these "fifth columnists" and subversive interests, it is just as effectively lost as if our Navy were sunk, our Army defeated, and our Air Corps annihilated. I cite this in my request to give you the position that the country sees you in today and ask you to deport this man Bridges.

I am not a lawyer, but I have discussed this bill with authorities who are eminently able to say that the bill is in good form and is the type of bill that we should have to give the United States of America that measure of protection which it ought to have. I have discussed the wording, which I am again going to discuss with you now. First, this bill would permit the deportation of any undesirable aliens under our immigration law and would fill in a space that is badly needed. The best proof of this is the lack of ability of our officials either to do their duty or the lack of a law with which to do it, and I therefore propose to furnish this law as a remedy. Discussing the wording and use of the words "is" or "has been," "by his words or acts," "sympathetic with," "associated with," "affiliated with," or "seeks," or "has sought the support of Communists, Fascists, and Nazis in the United States or elsewhere."

In my opinion, this wording is not a retroactive wording in any manner whatsoever, nor should it be considered so, but it is a necessary wording by which an examiner may go into the background and history of the one being examined, qualify him, and draw therefrom the actual facts upon which to base a correct decision. If this wording were not in this bill, one certainly could not tell what might be the future acts of one under examination, what his subversive ideas may be, and only by the examination of his past actions—that is, affiliations, sympathies, etc.—can a true picture of his mind be drawn. As a matter of fact, a crime is judged not by what he might do, but the crime is fixed according to what he has done. Therefore, this wording is in here to determine what has happened in the past in order that judgment may be predicated upon it for the present and future.

Going into this further, it may be found that this bill says that "any alien shall be deported" who, "while in the United States, is, or has been, by his words or acts, sympathetic with, or is, or has been, associated with or affiliated with, or seeks or has sought the support, or who has used or uses the support of Communists, Fascists, or Nazis, in the United States or elsewhere, whether communistic individuals or communistic organizations, either of domestic or of foreign origin in whole or in part, in the interference with the good order and happiness of any local community, or with the established democratic, economic, or domestic relations within this Republic, or who has used or uses such communistic, fascistic, or Nazi individuals or communistic, fascistic, or Nazi organizations for compelling the adoption of his views, aims, or purposes regarding such domestic or economic relations, or who has heretofore admitted any of the foregoing acts."

We have lately seen what the effect of the spread of this communistic, fascistic, and Nazi doctrine has been, and I think the biggest thing we have in this country today to protect is our form of government. What is this communism, fascism, nazi-ism? Why are these people in this country, sent here by foreign governments? We had better examine into this matter. Let us not fool ourselves, because, if the doctrine which they preach should prevail, it certainly would destroy individual liberty as we know it, freedom as we know it, our Bill of Rights as we know it, and our Constitution as we know it.

I wonder if our people really fully realize what this means. Let us examine this for a minute. I don't see how any honest labor leader could help but support a bill of this kind, because the doctrine of communism, fascism, or nazi-ism certainly would destroy every labor union; and the best proof of this is to ask how many unions you find in Soviet Russia, or Italy, or Germany, where communism, or limited communism, is practiced.

Let me ask the further question of those who might be interested in this, who might be interested in any religion, How would they fare? The proof of this is the partial eliminating of religion in Italy, a further limitation in Germany, and its final wiping out in Russia. The same thing would happen to all business and all other interests. Therefore, as matter of self-protection, a bill of this kind definitely and positively must be enacted.

Going further into this bill, you will note that it says "who interferes with the good order and happiness of any local community, or with the established democratic economic or domestic relations within this Republic." That means such subversive racketeering as has been carried on by the undesirable aliens of the type of Harry Bridges. This man has cost the Pacific coast, the laboring people, the business, and public of this country hundreds of millions of dollars, and he has therefore become an undesirable alien. All one has to do is to read the findings and conclusions of the trial examiner, James M. Landis, in the matter of Harry R. Bridges, in which Mr. Landis "whitewashed" but never did exonerate Mr. Bridges. It will be found, when this report is summed up, that the pioneer people who settled the Pacific coast, the duly authorized authorities, the members of the American Legion, and our citizenry, were all held to be liars, and that Harry Bridges told the truth. All this despite the fact that Harry Bridges had given and signed documentary evidence that was available, wherein he proved himself a liar on more than one occasion by his own handwriting and by his signature to the application for citizenship. But still, in the face of this, Landis holds the word of Bridges above all constituted authority. This also despite the fact that Mr. Bridges makes such statements as this on page 127 of the findings and conclusions under footnote 22–a:

"Answer. Under certain circumstances, as I have already explained, there is lots of room for a lot more public ownership, or Government ownership; and under those circumstances I certainly believe in the abolition of private property. I don't see why a handful of individuals should control enormous tracts of land here; why they should control all the public utilities; I don't see why they should control the railroads, or the oil wells, or any of the national resources of the country. They stole them in the first place.

"Question (by counsel for the Government). Well, would you believe in the abolition of private property for the reason stated by the Communists?

"Answer. That brings to my mind the idea—when they talk of private property, they don't talk of somebody's 2-by-4 piece of land, they don't talk of a person's machine or house, or one thing or another like that——

"Question (interrupting). Will you pardon me right there? I believe that is exactly what Mr. Marx and Mr. Engels mean.

"Answer. Well, I certainly am 100 percent opposed to anything like that. That private property in the sense that you describe it to me, I take it to mean the big utilities, the big factories, the big industrial plants; in other words, the means of production of the various heavy industries. That is the way I construe that. And I am in favor of Government ownership of those things, yes; and if the Government can't make a better job of running them and paying something to the people that work in them than private industry has, then I would say give it back to private industry again. But I am pretty sure the Government can do it."

I could quote many passages from these hearings wherein Bridges is communistic, but still he has been "whitewashed" and this country is unable to send him back where he belongs without a bill of this kind.

On every bill that is brought up the friends of these "fifth columnists," agitators, and undesirable aliens always come in and scream for their constitutional rights, their right of freedom of speech, their rights of individual liberty, and point to those "fifth columnists," undesirable aliens, etc., as martyrs, but I have never yet heard any one of these same people lift up their voices in defense of the rights of the millions of people that men like Harry Bridges have violated. He has violated the rights of individuals when his men broke their arms, broke their jaws, and he has violated the rights of the working people themselves; he has violated the rights of the employers; he has violated the rights of the public. Can you say that a man like Bridges operates within the scope of what might be termed "individual liberty and constitutional rights," particularly when you have in mind the definition of individual liberty, which is the "right of an individual to do that which he wishes to do, providing he does not invade or violate the rights of others?" When these arms and jaws have been broken, was that a violation of individual liberty of those who have had their arms and jaws broken? When a plant is taken over, such as the Douglas plant, on a sit-down strike, does the taking of other people's property by force constitute due process of law? When property is destroyed that is not owned, is that due process of law? When the rights of the worker, the employer, and the public have been ruthlessly invaded and violated by force, is that due process of law or proper consideration of the rights of others under the Constitution of the United States? I say that it is not, and I say that it is high time that you and I and all the rest of us who believe in the Constitution of the United States, civil liberties, free speech, and individual liberty bend our efforts and raise our voices in defense of the rights of these millions of people.

If these things do not suit Mr. Bridges in this country, why does he not stick to those countries which do suit him? Why does he come here and try to overturn the customs, the Government, and interfere with the happiness of our people and all our local communities? If Moscow is such a fine place, why doesn't he stay in Moscow?

You hear great talk of civil liberties. Let us meet this question fairly. Should civil liberties extend to the actual destruction of Government? If the answer to this question is "No," which it should properly be, then are the congressional committees going to sit idly and complacently by while these subversive interests, the Communists, destroy the confidence in our people first, and in our Government secondly, and then call their subversive activities freedom of speech and civil liberty? You could call murder baseball if you wanted to, or you could call robbery by any other name than robbery, but it would still be robbery, according to what its duly constituted concept should be. Regardless of what they call their subversive activity, it should be checked, and it is high time that those in the high places of the United States Government had the intestinal fortitude to do this very thing.

I am going to make the prediction that unless those officers in high Government positions do protect this Government from these termites, who preach this alien philosophy of government, they will find themselves under a dictatorship and a changed form of government which will bring right into our homes the very conditions which we abhor in Europe today, where whole peoples are being liquidated, or, in plain English, murdered, wherein business, labor unions, and religion have been liquidated, and many other desirable things, and I say to you that these things are worth protecting, and you will never miss them until it is too late; but once they are gone, they cannot be retrieved.

Why should any desirable alien, in the first place, desire to preach any such doctrine? Why should any desirable alien object to a bill of this kind? This bill will touch the undesirable, and no one else.

The time has come when we must protect this country. The provisions of this bill are mild, because, if all those persons who love Moscow so well and the communistic form of government, were to preach a doctrine of destruction of the government in Moscow, they would find that they would be summarily executed, and not merely deported. What do you think Mr. Hitler would do? He would cut off their heads.

Harry Bridges has been preaching these principles, has been putting them into effect, and, under the Government ownership he advocated, the first time he struck or tried to strike, he would find a bayonet in his back if he were in any other country, and he might find it in his back in this country if the very things he advocates were put into effect, and he would no longer have the freedom and the liberty to do the things he should be able to do, or say the things he is able to say, to advance his treasonable program.

I say to you that he has misled labor and he is misleading labor when he advocates such a program as that. No sincere labor leader is ever going to advocate socialism, communism, nazi-ism, or government ownership in any form. Bridges has practiced the sit-down strike. What is this? It is the confiscating, for the time being, of other people's property without due process of law. Is this tolerant? Or is this in accordance with the Constitution of the United States? He brought this in from Europe. We should definitely and positively say to Mr. Bridges that we do not want these European "isms" in this country; that this is why the thousands of people came to this country, that is why the aliens who are spoken of in this bill came to this country, namely, to fight those European "isms" that restrict individual liberty and freedom and give to them things that are equitable.

The real labor leaders of the country will welcome a bill that will purge labor unions of these Communists, Nazis, and Fascists.

Let me illustrate to you what I mean by an undesirable alien, and I will use Harry Bridges as an illustration, and, in my opinion, he is the first that should be deported. We all know the program that Mr. Bridges has advocated, the heartaches, the distress, the actual bloodshed, the broken jaws, the broken arms that have occurred through his handling of strikes, etc. We all know, or any thinking man should know who has the welfare of labor at heart, that Mr. Bridges, by his destructive leadership, has not helped the laboring man, the businessman, or the public, but has injured them, destroyed wealth, and has set back the cause of labor many, many years, and has lost the respect of many thinking people. Mr. Bridges, in his destructive program, has lost sight of the fact that the biggest weapon that the honest labor leader has is public opinion, or public esteem. Mr. Bridges, because of his subversive activities, and his destructive program, has broken down, in a great degree, that public opinion and public esteem for labor. This was won by constructive labor leaders, such as Samuel Gompers, by many years of effort and constructive leadership. Now this man comes along and destroys it and all laboring men have to pay the bill for his destructive program.

Let us look into the matter of what I have termed an "undesirable alien" further, and see whether he has perjured himself, what his moral character is, and how he has actually conducted himself while in this country.

Taken from American Legion Magazine, February 1940:

"Harry Renton Bridges is an alien in the United States awaiting a hearing on deportation charges which were scheduled to have been heard in San Francisco on April 25, 1938. Bridges was served with a warrant on March 5, 1938, and was given a preliminary examination at the Baltimore office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service before Assistant Director L. R. Fouch after which he was held for hearing on the deportation charge.

"Bridges has never had to appear for the hearing on the charge because of the intervention of the Department of Labor, which acted on the ground that 'such hearing would be a waste of time,' and at present is still under warrant to appear whenever the Department of Justice, under authority of the Department of Labor, takes action.

"In a release issued in March 1938 the Department of Labor stated briefly that Bridges had first been charged with communism in 1934 and that an investigation was made at that time and that a report was filed on February 2, 1935, but that no action was taken until the fall of 1937, when 'certain persons filed new complaints against Bridges in the Seattle district of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.'

"An investigation of these charges was made that winter and the Department of Justice, faced by the evidence unearthed, was forced to take action on the charges, which was done by the serving of the warrant on March 5. This investigation, according to the Department of Labor release, was 'a thorough investigation of the new evidence.'

"The charges made against Bridges both in 1934 and 1937 were based upon his activities as a Communist or a labor leader engaged in communistic activities.

"Subsequent investigation of the Bridges case, however, has brought to light matter which has formed the basis of other charges which are expected to be brought against Bridges if and when his hearing is ever allowed by the Department of Labor. These charges have to do with his alleged falsification in his oaths taken with filing of his papers to seek citizenship. The alleged false statements have to do with the marital status of Bridges and are supported by further evidence of alleged violation of the Immigration Act.

"Emphasis is placed upon the marital history of Bridges because of the clause in the United States immigration law which says, in section 80 of the act of 1900, 'Whoever, in any proceeding under or by virtue of any law relating to the naturalization of aliens, shall knowingly swear falsely in any case where an oath is made or affidavit taken shall be fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned not more than 5 years.' (35 Stat. 1103, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 142.)

"The law also stated that 'no alien shall be admitted to citizenship unless (2) he has resided continuously within the United States from the date of his petition up to the time of his admission to citizenship, and (3) during all the periods herein referred to he has behaved as a person of good moral character, attached to the principle of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed in good order and happiness of the United States.'

"Bridges has, allegedly, violated both these clauses of the act, first by not behaving 'as a person of good moral character,' and secondly by swearing to false statements.

"Records on file in the Department of Labor show that Bridges came to the United States and registered as an alien on May 7, 1920. He went to work as a longshoreman in his port of entry, San Francisco. He soon went to New Orleans, La., where on July 13, 1921, he filed his first papers for application for American citizenship. He failed, however, to perfect his citizenship within the 7 years required by law.

"On August 9, 1928, less than a month after the expiration of his first period of application, he again filed first papers, this time making his declarations before the clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. He stated, at this time, under oath, that he was married and that the name of his wife was Agnes and that she was born in Scotland and that they were at that time living together.

"Again Bridges failed to perfect his citizenship within the required 7 years. He filled out Form A–2213, however, which is entitled 'Preliminary Form for a Declaration of Intention.' This form was signed on May 2, 1936. It is now on record in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

"In this form filed in 1936 Bridges declared that he was married, that his wife's name was Agnes; that she was born in Glasgow, Scotland; that they were married on May 1, 1934, at San Francisco; and that they had two children whose names were Kenneth McCley, born July 27, 1916, at Marshfield, Oreg., and Betty Jacqueline Bridges, born December 26, 1924, at San Francisco.

"In an attempt to clarify the apparently conflicting statements filed by Bridges relative to his marital status, an examination was made by Immigration Inspector Thomas V. Donoghue, who, on January 22, 1935, filed his report with the District Director at San Francisco. In his report Inspector Donoghue stated that the records of papers filed by Bridges in 1928 show that Bridges related, under oath that he had been married on December 2, 1923, under the name of Harry Renton Bridges; that his wife was Agnes Bridges; and that he had a child, Betty Bridges, born December 26, 1924, in San Francisco, at which time his residence was at 37 Altha Street in that city.

"Inspector Donoghue states further that he checked the records in San Francisco and found no record of such birth. Neither did he find a record of any such marriage. He later had a check made of the whole State and found no record of any such marriage.

"A subsequent investigation was made by Immigration Inspector M. C. Pommerane, who stated that he went to Marshfield, Oreg., to investigate the former status of Agnes Bridges, nee Brown, 'the present wife or consort of Harry Bridges.'

"He states that he obtained information that she had been formerly married to a Walter Moore, then living at 2055 Harrison Street, North Bend, Oreg., and that they had been married on May 26, 1917, had one child, and had been subsequently divorced on June 20, 1923.

"Raphael P. Bonham, district immigration director at Seattle, Wash., stated that the reason Bridges filed his second application of intention in 1928 so soon after the lapse of the first declaration at the end of 7 years was that 'he did not dare to apply for naturalization in view of the fact of being the father of a 4-year-old child to whose mother he was not at the time married. It is understood that he was convinced that naturalization would be refused but that he believed that by filing a new application of intention, with a period of 7 additional years in which to straighten out his domestic situation, he would be able to proceed with his naturalization.'

"Affirmation of these records by the northern district of California court follows: 'Harry Renton Bridges made declaration of intention August 9, 1928, showing Agnes Bridges as his wife. The record did not show marriage date but did state that his wife was born in Scotland. In his preliminary form for declaration, filed May 2, 1936, Bridges stated that he married Agnes on May 1, 1914, at San Francisco.'

"On December 19, 1938, the State registrar of vital statistics of the State of California filed a statement as follows: 'There is no record in California of Harry Renton Bridges and Agnes Brown (or McCley) having been married either on December 2, 1923, or

May 1, 1934, nor on any other date between July 1905 and June 30, 1938.'

"A further search was made by the State registrar, and a further statement was made to the effect that Harry Renton Bridges had never been married to anyone within the State of California.

"The evidence shows, therefore, that Bridges has filed separate statements in which he gives two dates, 11 years apart, upon which his marriage took place; that in one instance he admits to having two children and in another place, under oath, he states that he has had one child and that no record of any such marriage can be found in the State of California."

This is the history of an undesirable alien, and will indicate to you what I mean by an undesirable alien. This man does not even conform to the laws that our full citizens are supposed to conform to. Here, in my opinion, is an instance of perjury, of moral turpitude, and a lack of moral character, and I am going to ask every man on this committee the plain question: Did Mr. Bridges, or did he not, lie in some of those applications he made?

Let us see what an alien's status is when he arrives on our shores. Is it a right that belongs to him, or is it a right that belongs to us to permit him to land on our shores and assume residence in this country. There is no question in my mind but that aliens are permitted to assume residence in the United States, not as a matter of right, but as a matter of privilege, and when there is a violation of the hospitality of our country, most assuredly there should be legislation to provide for the deportation of such aliens who violate that hospitality. There is at present no statute on the books providing ways and means for deportation of undesirable aliens, but this bill, 8310, will provide this means, and would end a condition that no other country in the world would suffer to exist or would tolerate.

In summing this matter up, I would like to refer to *Frohwerk* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 204) in the Supreme Court. The Court said: "The first amendment, while prohibiting legislation against free speech as such, cannot have been and obviously was not intended to give immunity for every possible use of language." I believe it may be inferred, and might just as well have been written, that it was not intended to give immunity to every possible type of subversive action. The United States Supreme Court, in *Schenck* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 47), states: "Words which ordinarily and in many places would be within the freedom of speech protected by the first amendment, may become subject to prohibition when of such a nature and use in such circumstances as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about a substantive evil which Congress has a right to prevent. The character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done." Again I say the Court might have started out with "actions which" instead of the "words which" and carried on the statement, because we not only judge by a person's words, but we also judge by their actions, and I much prefer to judge a man by his actions than by his words.

I certainly do agree with Bainbridge Colby, in his quotation in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, January 3, 1940, wherein he states: "If an alien like Bridges, notoriously allied with Communists, if not one of them, can escape being considered in the Communist category, even an approach to an enforcement of the deportation law becomes something of a joke."

Gentlemen of this committee, I am telling you seriously that the people of this country are today looking to this Immigration Committee to take care of this very dangerous threat to our Government which comes through undesirable aliens.

I have here a file of letters from the American Legion national posts, State posts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, insurance companies, Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitutional Americans, Veterans Service League, newspaper excerpts, luncheon clubs, and many individuals who ask that this bill be enacted into law. This Congress has also been memorialized by both houses of the California Legislature, in Joint Resolution No. 23, in connection with this Harry Bridges matter. This was dated January 24, 1939. I have Assembly Joint Resolution No. 11, which passed the assembly on February 8, 1940, quoted as follows:

"Whereas in a recent hearing conducted by the United States Secretary of Labor to determine whether Harry Bridges, an alien labor leader on the Pacific Coast, advocated, or was affiliated with any organization seeking the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, testimony was introduced that the said Mr. Bridges attended numerous meetings at which members of the Communist Party were present; and

"Whereas there are many undesirable aliens in this country who although not members of the Communist Party, are engaging in subversive activities menacing the peace and future of our country, and who are or should be subject to deportation; and

"Whereas many people are of the opinion that Harry Bridges is an undesirable alien and should be deported from the United States; and

"Whereas the majority of people in the State of California believe that the question of whether Harry Bridges is an undesirable alien subject to deportation is one which should be ultimately determined in a court of law; and

"Whereas there is no provision in the existing statutes of the United States for a determination by the Federal courts of illegal presence of undesirable aliens in this country; and

"Whereas it is generally believed by citizens of California that the jurisdiction of the Federal courts should be expanded to include the right to expel undesirable aliens from this country after a preliminary determination of the facts by the executive branch of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation to provide for proceedings in the Federal courts to determine the right of aliens to be within the boundaries of the United States after a preliminary determination of that question by the executive branch of the Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and the Representatives from California are hereby respectfully requested to urge such action."

Herein you have the legislative bodies of California making the statement that Harry Bridges is an undesirable alien subject to deportation and advising you that apparently there is no provision in existing statutes for a determination of the Federal courts of illegal presence of undesirable aliens in this country. That is the specific reason I have offered this bill, to take care of the very point raised therein, in order that Mr. Bridges, and others like him, may be deported, and I am going to ask you to favorably report this bill, on the ground that it goes for the safety and welfare of the United States above all else.

Communism has no right to invade this country, to destroy American labor, American industry, the American home, the American moral standard, and the Nation's tranquillity, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, our liberty, freedom, and the Government itself. This destructive communistic philosophy has no right to be spread in this country, either by individuals or collectively, by force or in any other manner. It is up to this committee to do its patriotic duty and report this bill favorably, thus insuring the safety of this country and that of those within it.

Can Our "Democracy" Survive a War With Totalitarian Countries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, probably most will agree that a democracy is not well constituted to fight a bitter war. Probably fewer realize that the most dangerous foe of any great democracy is always at home, and not abroad. That foe is the devil which human nature has put in every human being. The maintenance of freedom and democracy necessitates continual struggle and unremitting self-discipline. Only when the individual must exert himself strenuously in order to enjoy the good things of life, does he remain strong. After the barest necessities, what a free man most wants is opportunity.

However, the mass movement for so-called security, under State assistance and intervention, has been subtly undermining the very foundations of freedom and democracy in Britain, and more recently and more insidiously in the United States. When the average man thinks that his future is reasonably safe, and that he can enjoy the necessities and many of the comforts of life without any great personal effort, private economic progress is dangerously near the end, and state socialism under a dictator is close at hand. False security breeds indulgence and not restraint, it is the siren song of opportunity.

In the last 25 years we have traveled far in the United States. Our businessmen have been busy with their philanthropies and benefactions, frequently helping the unfit rather than the fit to survive. Until almost too late they have avoided politics, but the "left wingers" have been bold and busy, particularly during the past 10 years. Where are we now?

Our Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by means of loans, is already in control of much of our business and banking—and more loans to industry are contemplated. Our supposedly private banks are virtually dominated by several Government agencies, including the United States Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The stock markets and the investment banking field are ruled by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and by the politically dominated Department of Justice. Even the great insurance companies are under the spur of Government investigation and threat, not because of any wrongdoing, but because they are large and have a great deal of investment power.

The railroads are not their own masters, but are ruled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by the Railway Brotherhoods. Our electric light and power companies live under the heavy hand of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, and the Federal Power Commission, with the continual threat of Government competition in the field. In addition, they are being regulated in minute detail by State public-service commissions. Radio and telephones are subject to the whims of the Federal Communications Commission.

The commodity exchanges and grain markets are obedient to the Department of Agriculture. Virtually all farmers in the United States are told what they can plant and how much. The Government is the country's biggest holder of both urban and rural real estate, as a result of innumerable defaulted loans made to private individuals. The Federal Trade Commission tells business how it can buy and sell. The National Labor Relations Board is virtually the last word in all employer-employee relations. All minimum wages and most hours of work are fixed by the Government.

Presidentially appointed commissions and administrative agencies make their own rules, and act as legislator, prosecutor, jury, and judge—virtually without recourse. The Supreme Court of the United States, with five recently appointed and politically minded judges, no longer holds the balance of equity between the citizens and the legislative and executive branches of the Government. The Court now acts largely as the supporter of the views of the Chief Executive of the country. And, of course, international law is now nothing but a myth.

Further, the mind of the people has been poisoned to such an extent that they generally believe their worst enemies to be their best friends. Our politicians in office fatten on liberal and unplanned appropriations, earlier for relief and now for defense, granted by both political parties in Congress, virtually without examination or opposition. Now, although the debt limit is being raised and vastly heavier taxes are being imposed for defense, yet we are told that, despite a threatened labor shortage, there will be no abatement of social reforms and that we must not curtail expenditures for work relief, public works, farm relief, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and the like.

Honest, straightforward men, who disagree with the prevailing trends, are attacked, maligned, and even accused of abetting subversive activities, by their political "servants" in Washington, and by the press, many of whose writers are themselves avowed Socialists and Communists. A former popular hero, Lindbergh, is savagely attacked in the press, and is accused by a leading member of the administration as virtually belonging to the "fifth column," because he informs the country that our airplane-defense problem, for geographical reasons, differs very much from that of Germany, and that for our own good we ought to keep out of foreign wars. Truly, as a distinguished Senator has stated privately, "Our column writers, who would drive us to war"—for racial or other ulterior and subversive reasons—"are our most dangerous 'fifth columnists.'"

If this analysis is measurably correct and realistic, we are even now close to a dictatorship of the proletariat. All thoughtful people in the United States had better be most vigilant and aggressive in their attempts to keep our country from becoming involved in this foreign situation, under a type of leadership, which, with fine-sounding slogans, would almost immediately extinguish the last torch of liberty and freedom which still burns in this land.

Farm Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, parity farm prices have remained far below parity or cost of production for the 7 years of this administration.

President Roosevelt, in his campaign in 1932, promised the American farmers that he would protect their home markets from the effects of cheap foreign competition. He promised that he would not reduce the tariff duties on foreign cheaply produced agricultural imports. Here are his words, I quote:

> I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

The record shows he did not keep his promise to the American farmers. He has negotiated 22 trade agreements with foreign nations and has drastically reduced tariff duties on 163 competitive farm products, which has caused foreign producers to flood our markets with products cheaply raised in foreign countries.

Here is a partial list of foreign farm imports which compete with Indiana farm products, and upon which duties were cut 25 to 50 percent: Cattle, hogs, pork, bacon, milk, cream cheese, chickens, ducks, turkeys, eggs, honey, barley, oats, rye, apples, berries, clover, alfalfa, cabbage, potatoes, and other vegetables.

While the Government is spending millions of dollars to remove the domestic surpluses of these products it has deliberately reduced the tariff rates and caused the importation of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of the very same products to glut the market and further reduce domestic prices.

The record of United States imports of agricultural products for calendar years 1938–39 (U. S. Department of Commerce figures):

Import items	Unit	1938	1939
Cattle	Head	424,022	753,570
Mutton, fresh	Pound	78,597,000	85,863,000
Hides and skins (total)	Pound	181,951,000	323,446,000
Cattle hides	Pound	59,650,000	134,107,000
Sheep and lamb	Pound	32,649,000	63,776,000
Barley	Bushel	126,000	776,000
Oats	Bushel	7,183	4,293,000
Wheat (all)	Bushel	3,829,000	10,747,000
Hay	Ton	18,954	48,348
Wheat byproduct feeds	Ton	58,394	458,957
Potatoes (white or Irish)	Pound	45,820,000	93,859,000
Peas, canned	Pound	5,653,000	8,346,000
Apples	Bushel	26,020	45,982
Cherries, fresh	Pound	855,000	1,482,000
Wool, unmanufactured	Pound	104,274,000	245,970,000
Wool noils, waste, and rags	Pound	3,803,000	18,343,000
Maple sugar and sirup	Pound	3,984,000	12,268,000
Milk:			
Fresh	Gallon	6,008	22,056
Dried and malted	Pound	80,735	2,465,032
Casein	Pound	417,000	15,832,000
Eggs in shell	Dozen	231,784	328,523

In the entire period from 1933 to 1939 United States farm exports have declined 9.2 percent, and have now practically stopped. During this same period competitive foreign farm imports to the United States have increased 30 percent.

The American farmers have been required to take 40,000,000 acres each year out of cultivation so as to produce less. In the 7 years of this administration this amounts to 280,000,000 acres.

During these 7 years foreign farmers used over 400,000,000 acres to produce competitive farm crops, valued at billions of dollars, which were sold in the United States. For 45 main crops the total acreage in the United States in 1938 was 342,000,000. So you can readily see that this administration has given foreign farmers our markets for their foreign-produced products for more than 1 year's acreage out of the last 7 years.

The net results of the New Deal's planning during the last 7 years are glutted markets, low prices, and billions of dollars in lost income for the farmers of the United States. The American farmers will not be further deceived. By sad experience they know that the first step for agricultural recovery is to protect our home market from cheap foreign competition and that the protection promised by Candidate Roosevelt was not kept after he got into office.

For the 7 years immediately preceding the New Deal—that is, during the 7 years 1926–32—the farm cash income averaged $9,046,000,000 a year. For the 7 New Deal years, 1933–39, the farm cash income averaged $7,247,000,000 a year. The average annual income per farm for the period of 1926–32 was $1,432, compared with only $1,062 for the period 1933–39.

Considering the actions of the New Deal, we wonder if the left hand knows what the right hand is doing. What one department does the other undoes, and the farmer and laboring man are the innocent victims. Two great governmental departments are at war with each other. One department is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to open new lands to cultivation. Another department is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to reduce the surplus of farm products. Another department is making trade agreements and lowering the tariff duties on the same farm products. Great importations of farm products have added to the domestic surpluses. The trade-agreement program is at war with the surplus-removal program. The Surplus Commodities Corporation spent $30,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in buying up and giving away surpluses for the fiscal years of 1938 and 1939, while at the same time and during the same period we imported from foreign countries $92,000,000 worth of the same commodities. These imports were encouraged and are largely the result of the reduced duties granted in trade agreements. What Mr. Wallace is trying to do, Mr. Hull is making it impossible to do. Mr. Wallace is attacking the farm surplus and Mr. Hull is piling up surpluses. This economic war between governmental departments is growing worse as additional cuts are made in duties on farm products, and the whole world is invited to add to the American farm surplus. Surely the President should call a Cabinet peace conference immediately and settle upon some policy before the American farmer and the American laboring man are completely ruined.

The Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish now to dwell on the forces of destruction which are ravaging and laying waste the world. I do not wish now to go into previous wars, not even that last war when the people of this country stood on quicksand and were gradually but surely sucked under.

I should like to present a message of hope. Even now, when, as I speak, the boundaries of countries are changing and plots against our own future may be in their conception, I should like to present to you a constructive proposal.

But before I do so, I stress the necessity, the extreme necessity, of the people of this country pulling together. I do not admit the metaphor of the President and Congress as a team. The term "team" indicates another opposing team. We are rather—all of us—in the same boat, riding troubled waters along an, as yet, uncharted course. And no one must be permitted to rock the boat and upset the safety of all.

Our defense program, which represents the course being mapped out for all of us, can be formulated neither by any one man nor by separate, isolated groups. Republicans, as well as Democrats, must be allowed, not only to participate, but to help take the lead in a program upon which the welfare of all of us must rest. Should there be a threat of war to the United States, lads from Republican households would be called upon to share in defending this land to the same extent as those from the homes of Democrats. Republican mothers, too, would shed tears.

You may reply, "But the defense program is strictly nonpartisan. It does not admit the existence of politics." That may be true insofar as the purchase of raw materials for defense purposes is concerned. It may be true as regards the actual construction of battleships. But, I maintain, not only are the Republican Members of the Congress unable at present to participate in the formation of our foreign policy, as it is affected by the present state of the world, but that our foreign policy is a chaotic, shapeless mass which needs to be put into a state of defense just as much as do the Army and Navy.

No President, no matter who he may be, could possibly undertake the tremendous task of deciding the fate of the country in wartime. No one man could undertake, alone, to guide the affairs of this hemisphere, in all their ramifications, without assistance. And such assistance as is to be had from calling in advisers from time to time—advisers who have already more than enough duties of their own—is insufficient.

I am not playing politics when I urge the necessity for Members of Congress, from both parties, to be allowed to help formulate the course this country is to pursue. Congress has been not willing, but anxious, to supply funds for defense. But the duties of Congress do not stop there. In urging that this body remain in session, Members of the House did not mean that their time should be spent in surrounding country clubs. They expected to be on hand to insure the safety of this land.

I have said I have a constructive proposal to offer, a message of hope. And so I have. But, first, I am issuing a warning against a disintegrated defense program. The Army and Navy each has its separate sphere. Many boards and committees are at work on isolated phases of the program. The Defense Commission has set up offices and taken on large staffs. But there is no policy-making body, no group to coordinate the program.

Despite the industriousness evidenced by many executive sessions, confidential plans, and secrets disclosed by our Ambassadors to the President's ear alone, there is no group of men to whom the whole framework is visible. There is no group of men supplied with sufficient information to know what our policies might be in the face of certain emergencies.

What emergencies might arise of vital concern to this country one cannot say, though dark predictions are heard on every hand. Were there a selected group of men to whom possible dangers might be confided they might analyze and weigh this unknown dread which has naturally enough provoked a flood of letters crying, "Keep us out of war." If our people are jittery, it is not surprising. They are met neither by silence, by specific information as to what is in store for them, nor by assurance that the men representing them are

being given an opportunity to protect their interests. Rather, they are given, largely through the press, darkly veiled hints.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff, told the House Military Affairs Committee there might be trouble in the Canal Zone, they read. Members of the Dies committee predicted a revolution in Mexico before July, they are told. Rumors of trouble to come in South America are spread. But no group has been appointed to coordinate all this information and formulate our national policy before such dire predictions could come true and, perhaps, constitute a threat to the United States.

There can be no criticism of the spirit behind our defense program. But the aims which stimulate it remain, as yet, undefined. There has been much discussion of an adequate Army and Navy but surely the word "adequate" depends upon our ultimate intentions. Surely it depends upon whether we propose to defend the United States, North America, or the Western Hemisphere. Is it not possible that we might expend huge sums of money in undertaking one form of defense, find we have to change our foreign policy, generally, and be left in the lurch with surplus supplies of certain armaments and insufficient supplies of others?

The work of defining our foreign policy is a crying, urgent necessity. International law, as you all know, has become an academic study. The word "war," in fact, can no longer be defined, since new methods of undermining a country have been developed. We no longer know what events in South America could be looked upon as a threat to the United States. There have been and will be revolutions. But should a leader in Argentina, for example, decide to take orders from Berlin, what would be our position? Is it not true that in case of sudden danger we would have to determine first our foreign policy before proceeding with positive action?

Let us not make the mistake England and France made, of having a fluid policy which calmly flowed about whatever chance obstacles were in the way. I am asking for a foreign policy to be made deliberately by a responsible board in whom the people may have confidence.

I am asking the President to appoint a select board, made up of an equal number of Members of both Houses and of both parties. If found advisable, the Members could be pledged to secrecy, but the people whom we represent would thus be assured that their interests were being jealously guarded by men who were devoting all their attention to matters of policy.

What good does it do for officials of the Army, Navy, or any other department to have "secret" information if those who mold our future are unable to profit by it? Everyone knows that certain matters have had to be kept secret, due to our expert military information service, which could not continue to function were the sources of such information made public. Such information has, however, rested in the archives of many groups and departments and needs to be dusted off and put to use.

I am making an appeal to this Congress to undertake a share in defense policies in the interests of the people whom it represents. I am asking that we muster our forces before it is too late. January is still many months away, and no party, no one group, no one individual should attempt to get a "corner" on our safety, to the danger of the entire country.

Agriculture in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. MOUTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. MOUTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have been brought face to face with the difficulties which confront the Nation, and I have sought to examine them for the general welfare and also in their relationship with the problems of the citizens of Louisiana.

In times of uncertainty and chaos, the thoughts of men inevitably tend to turn toward the solution of immediate problems. Emergency follows hard upon emergency, and it sometimes seems that no sooner is one problem met and solved than another arises to take its place. In the face of the blackness of the present and the uncertainty of the future, any attempt to look ahead and plan to meet future difficulties seems almost futile.

Yet, looking to the future is equally important in such troubled times as in more normal periods, if not more so. These things we know, that whatever the outcome of the present conflicts, and whoever the victor may be, yet the work of the world must still go on, and men must be fed, and clothed, and housed.

It is because of these thoughts that I was so gratified to read a recent release from the Department of Agriculture dealing with our available supplies of farm products and showing clearly that the Department is making plans to meet the future. It reads in part as follows:

> The opinion seems to be widespread in the United States that Europe in the coming months will see the most serious famine in the world's history. In view of this fear, attention should be called once again to the abundant supplies of food and fiber in this country. The ever-normal-granary program has placed the United States in a position to be of the utmost service to a suffering world when and if fears of famine and scarcity abroad become reality.

The report goes on to give figures on stocks and prospective production of a long list of leading crops: wheat, corn, oats, rice, soybeans, cotton, and fruits and vegetables; and with animal population, all cattle, dairy cows, sheep and lambs and hogs; and storage holdings of butter, cheese, eggs, poultry, beef, pork, lamb and mutton, lard, and condensed and evaporated milk. The picture is gratifying from the standpoint of adequacy of supplies of this long list of products, and certainly the American people may feel assured of an adequate supply of all the major foodstuffs with one significant exception, a crop which the Secretary apparently forgot about entirely, as he so frequently does, and yet the food which is the cheapest form of energy this country possesses, namely, sugar.

If this European war were being written in terms of foodstuffs, it would probably be recorded as the period of the greatest destruction of sugar in the world's history. Poland, that great sugar-producing country, was the first victim, and it is logical to suppose that vast areas of sugar beets were destroyed by the devastation of that country. On the other hand, the dairy and livestock industries of Holland and Denmark very largely escaped destruction by reason of the very rapidity of the conquest of those countries. Finally, the intense conflict in Belgium and northern France has taken place in the very heart of one of the richest sugar-beet areas in Europe. Probably at this very moment Germany's artillery is blasting sugar beets, German 70-ton tanks are rolling over sugar-beet regions, and French troops, on the defensive, are digging machine-gun nests in sugar-beet fields.

Meanwhile, this administration, not to be outdone by Hitler, is ordering the plowing under of sugarcane in Louisiana. If this destruction in Europe should lead to such a drain on world supplies of sugar as to divert away our normal sugar imports—even paying Cuba a premium for sugar which ordinarily comes to us—leaving American consumers face to face with a shortage, the Government of this country would have only itself to blame.

This is a point that is too little considered. Recently I was surprised on reading the list of strategic and critical materials which would be needed by this country in the event of war, to discover that the Army and Navy Munitions Board apparently did not consider sugar such a strategic or critical material. Then, I realized that of course the

Munitions Board concerned itself only with those commodities which were used directly by the armed forces or in the industrial process. But, if sugar is not fired from the guns or made into steel, it is at least eaten by the soldiers, by the workers in the munitions plants and other factories, and by consumers in general, as the cheapest energy food in time of peace or war. And, since modern wars, as we all know, are fought with all the resources of a nation, civilian as well as military, food as well as guns, sugar may fairly be considered just as critical and just as strategic a commodity as nickel from our northern neighbor, Canada, or antimony from our southern neighbor, Mexico.

That is why it is particularly unfortunate that we depend for such a large proportion of our sugar supply on distant foreign sources of supply, such as the Philippines. Does this House realize that sugar is the only major food for which we must depend in substantial part on far-away foreign countries? And that this dependence on foreigners has been brought about only through plowing up cane and restricting cane acreage to the point where an average Louisiana farmer can plant only two-thirds to one-half his former acreage? It would seem to be only elementary self-protection to permit Louisiana cane growers to harvest the same acreage they did in years past.

Certainly this Nation, more than any other, should realize the folly of depending on foreign source for its sugar, in view of its experience during and after the last war, when sugar mounted to 25 cents a pound. If the administration has forgotten that bit of recent history, the American housewife has not, as was shown by the panicky buying last September when war broke out in Poland. Has any Member of this House stopped to consider what would happen to the price of sugar in this country if, because of war, a shortage of shipping, or for any other reason, we were cut off from our Far Eastern source of sugar for even a short time? Already shipping rates from the Philippines have doubled since last fall, and with a renewal of the plane and submarine campaign against shipping in and out of Britain, this world-wide stringency in shipping space will become even more acute. In such circumstances, we may very well wish—too late—that plowed-up cane in Louisiana could be restored.

We live in troubled times. I am sure that to every Member of this House, as well as to every citizen of this country, the events of the last few weeks, since the opening of this session, and in fact since the recent hearings on pending sugar legislation, have brought home as never before the danger of assuming that others will do for us what we should do for ourselves. In the same way that we now see we should not depend on the British Fleet, so should we likewise realize that we cannot depend on any foreign source whatsoever for the satisfaction of our vital needs and that in the case of a product like sugar—where we have at home the soil, we have the climate, we have the land, the men, the equipment, and the technique to supply all the sugar we need as cheaply as in any other country in the world—we must look to ourselves.

Bituminous Coal Industry Supports National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

LETTER FROM CHARLES C. DICKINSON

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the bituminous coal industry is of vital importance to the Nation. It has gone through many trying times; it has weathered many storms. It now emerges as one great basic industry that is prepared and ready to meet any reasonable demands that the national defense program may make upon it. The leaders in the bituminous-coal industry have made a survey of their condition and have pledged their wholehearted cooperation to the President of the United States in seeing that the Nation is furnished with an ample coal supply. The National Coal Association's president recently sent the following telegram to the President:

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., *June 15, 1940.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, *The President,*
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous direction of our board of directors in session here today, and speaking for the producers of bituminous coal from coast to coast, we pledge their every effort and wholehearted cooperation in all matters pertaining to the Nation's fuel supply in any emergency. The existing facilities of our industry, mines, machines, and men are sufficient to step up the production of bituminous coal to whatever extent may become necessary to meet the needs of national defense. Producers of bituminous coal are confident of their ability to supply the fuel demands of industry, public utilities, the railroads, and the general public, under all circumstances, and assuming the full cooperation of the mine workers and the adequacy of transport, we foresee no basis for apprehending any coal shortage.

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION,
CHARLES DICKINSON,
President.

"Fifth Column" Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of veterans' organizations in my district:

Whereas at a joint meeting of the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, held at Hammond, La., June 17, 1940, it has come to the knowledge of the members of these organizations that there is a grave emergency confronting our country at the present hour; and

Whereas there exists in America today un-American organizations and individuals whose purpose is to destroy and undermine our Government from within by what is known as "fifth column" activities, as has been done in several European nations in the past few weeks; and

Whereas in the event of this country being forced into armed conflict or a grave emergency, the Regular Army and National Guard of this Nation will be needed for combat duty and should not be required to guard and protect local strategic points, such as public utilities, bridges, etc.; and

Whereas there are many veterans of the late war who are willing to offer their services for guard duty and to train such other persons who might see fit to offer their services for such duty; and

Whereas the youth of the Nation could be used to a better advantage if experienced by or through compulsory military training and thereby more able to protect themselves and their country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting request the National Congress to enact into law the necessary provisions for the organization and equipping of volunteer veterans' organizations as outlined above in each community of this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby endorse compulsory military training for the youth of our country, and respectfully ask the Congress to pass such laws immediately (before adjournment).

Whereas the ominous events transpiring in Europe bring the danger of the loss of liberty in all free countries more forcibly to our view; and

Whereas the other democracies have, through smugness and self-sufficiency, lost the needed opportunity to prepare themselves for the present emergency; and

Whereas the great French Republic has fallen and thereby lost all save one last bulwark to our liberty and safety; and

Whereas the British Empire represents the last bulwark between us and the menace of Germany and Italy; and

Whereas our last ounce of energy and support will be necessary to confine this struggle to other continents; and

Whereas if the British lose the struggle it will be up to America to stand guard for her very existence; and

Whereas the maintenance of England as a force to protect us will, under present circumstances, require full support of our war industries and probably our Navy and aircraft: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and Spanish-American War Veterans, at this meeting, urgently request the President of the United States and the Congress to take whatever measures are necessary to invoke the principles of a universal-service law and to speed, with all possible effort, the training and equipping of an Army of at least 3,000,000 effectives; be it further

Resolved, That this group appoint committees of correspondence to publicize to other Legion posts and the public in general, through the press the resolutions of this meeting.

Our Galloping President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 20, 1940]

OUR GALLOPING PRESIDENT

With due respects to President Roosevelt's foresight about the world crisis and the sincerity of his present eagerness to make up for his past failure to take adequate steps to prepare the country's defenses to support its policies, we feel constrained to point out that the chaos and the complete lack of planning in Washington borders on hysteria. In yesterday's news, for example, it was reported that the President favored "compulsory governmental service" and that the Navy was demanding $4,000,000,000 more so as to maks ours the greatest Navy in the world. The previous day the Army strength had been doubled—bringing it up to a point considerably below the Army of Rumania. Two billion dollars were also asked to create a vast purchasing corporation to buy Latin-American products so as to prevent Germany from obtaining too much influence in Latin America by exerting economic pressure. On June 14 the President was reported as favoring a curb on the export of machine tools. On June 11 he offered full material aid to the Allies. On June 8 he was reported as favoring rounding up scrap iron and rubber. On June 7 increases in the Navy amounting to $1,700,000,000 were approved. On June 1 he asked for power to call out the National Guard, and it was later hinted that this body might have to be used in Latin America.

All of these incoherent steps followed his assurances on May 26 that our defenses were in admirable condition—never better in our history—and that we would build them up "to whatever heights the future may require" and would "rebuild them swiftly." The force of this address was weakened by the fact that when he detailed such important weapons as airplanes and tanks he stated that specific quantities were "on hand or on order," and that he made no references to the extraordinary difficulty of turning out equipment swiftly. In other words, his picture was so worded as to lull the people into thinking that all was well with our defenses. Yet immediately thereafter he began calling for one gigantic increase after another, thus admitting, in fact if not in so many words, that our defenses are, in reality, woefully inadequate, and will remain so during the several years that will have to pass before the material now authorized or "on order" can be completed and delivered.

In other words, as we indicated last Sunday, and as our military expert, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, pointed out 10 days previously, there is as yet no sign that the administration has any plan, or even any clear idea of what the Nation's preparedness objectives should be. To make matters worse, there are clear indications that Mr. Roosevelt has such great confidence in his own qualifications as a military and naval expert that he is reluctant to call on experts or to follow their recommendations. He may be, of course, better qualified than other men to formulate a national plan. We may do him the injustice of imputing a lack of plan when, in fact, he may possess a clear one which he has not yet deemed it wise to make public. But we feel that the present procedure in Washington recalls too vividly to be comfortable the saw about the man who jumped on horseback and rapidly galloped away in all directions.

There is no doubt that Washington is galloping madly. There is also no doubt that Mr. Roosevelt is doing what he believes to be best under the circumstances. But it seems far from clear that he knows just where his policy is leading us, or just what we should have to implement it, or how long it will take to put flesh and bones on the skeletons of the defense organization which he has advocated. This is no time for aimless and planless activities. If the purpose is—as it should be—to prepare today against the eventuality of the complete success of the totalitarian powers, it is more than ever necessary that the Nation's needs be clearly stated and that the mobilization of the Nation's defense preparations be carried out coherently, as part of a clearly thought out and fully elaborated plan. To date the same hit-and-miss technique has been followed that was used during the financial crisis of the "first hundred days" in 1933. The very opportunism which at that time was useful is today destructive of sound preparedness.

The Defense Program and Roosevelt's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK E. HOOK, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, which I delivered over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. on June 11, 1940:

It was just about a year ago that some Republican leaders in Congress told President Roosevelt there would be no world war. They declared that the war in Europe was a phony war. Today, with Germany forcing the horrors of total war upon Europe, the cables and the radio scream the terrifying news of ravished nations, of the wholesale slaughter of soldiers and civilians, the brutal bombings of historic capitals, the wanton destruction of schools and churches, and the ruthless mowing down by machine guns of helpless women and children refugees. Monster war machines and explosives under Hitler's beastly direction wreak havoc never before known. The human mind can scarcely comprehend the horrors of this holocaust, or picture the dreadful devastation that has been wrought by this modern method of warfare.

In our own America our hearts bleed for the invaded nations and for theatened France and England. Our minds are gravely concerned for our own safety, should the maniac force unleashed by Hitler be directed against the western world. For among our people there flows the lifeblood of the peoples of these nations—the Poles, the Scandinavians, Danes, Dutch, Belgians, French, English, and practically all nations of the earth. Aye, and the blood of Germany and Italy! It is a part of the bone and sinew of America. We have in our United States thousands upon thousands of German- and Italian-Americans whose loyalty to America cannot be doubted, and who are just as much horrified, and who condemn as vigorously as any of us the brutality of Hitler.

As Americans we are taking inventory of our strength, trying to estimate each and every one of us just what has been done during the recent years to prepare us, and what must be done to make our country safe against the devastating force that threatens world civilization, for make no mistake, civilization is burning, the very foundation of democracy is threatened.

Tonight I want to talk to you about the Roosevelt foreign policy and to thank the Almighty that we have a leader in the White House who has been so right in direction and execution that nearly all Americans—Republicans as well as Democrats—admit that he has been months, even years, ahead of us in his thinking. The Roosevelt domestic policies have strengthened the business and agricultural resources of the Nation and have improved and modernized our Army, Navy, and air force. Our people are better fed, better clothed, and their health rating is higher than ever before in history. The Roosevelt foreign policy has been forever and a day one of defense of our shores in the interest of peace and our people may be sure that this defense program does not mean the sending of our manpower to Europe. It means just what it says—defense of our shores. Under Roosevelt's leadership our Americanism is being reborn. Our industries and agriculture, labor and capital are addressed to the task of building American strength and power to heights that cannot be successfully assailed by any force that may threaten. Let no ruthless dictator entertain the idea that Americans will not fight to defend our rights and our liberties.

American business is rallying behind the President in strengthening the defenses of America against new threats to our peace. There is a small percentage of destructive money grabbers who want a free hand to wax fat on the misery that world war brings and who fear the restraint that the Roosevelt policy of honest service in business and industry will exert against profiteering. Fortunately, it is only a small percentage. The vast majority of our great industrial leaders are supporting the Government. In such a crisis as this Americans are not divided. Capital, labor, industry, and agriculture are working together. No matter how we may differ or fight over domestic problems in time of peace, when America must be defended we are and will be a solid phalanx behind our Government and our President.

America will fight to preserve democracy and the only way we can preserve democracy is to preserve the capitalistic system. You cannot preserve the capitalistic system by allowing destructive capitalism as it prevailed in Germany to crush labor and industry. Labor and the capitalistic system must go hand in hand. Industry, labor, and agriculture must cooperate in the interest of national defense.

The capitalistic system which I refer to is the system of free competition. The chance of American youth to compete in everyday life. A chance to rise from the bottom to the top depending on his individual initiative, character, and ability. His right to free speech, free press, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Democracy is born in the hearts and minds of people. That spark so born can only be preserved if we preserve our individual rights. Individual rights can only be preserved by fair competition in industry, in agriculture, and labor.

Wholehearted and unselfish cooperation with the President's foreign policy is necessary to national defense.

How, then, can we justify the yipping of political coyotes who take every opportunity created by war-engendered fears to snap at the heels of Roosevelt? Keyed by the G. O. P. brain trusts the idea has been brought forth that America is caught unprepared and this idea, parroted by Republican candidates, has been broadcast to the four corners. The plot of these G. O. P. political strategists is to make people believe that nothing has been done for our Army, Navy, and air defenses by the Roosevelt administration during the past 7 years. This they say in spite of the fact that we have today the greatest air force, the most powerful Navy and the largest and best equipped Army that this Nation has ever possessed during peacetime. These are a good foundation for the Roosevelt program of national defense to mobilize the Nation for complete preparedness capable of meeting the new emergency.

Some disgruntled politicians have stooped so low that for possible gains they would try to make the American people believe that little progress has been made under Roosevelt but we know that it was the Roosevelt program which raised the Nation from its weak and beaten state of 1932 to our present condition of strength and power. What confidence can our Nation place in the advice of a former President who left office amidst the wreckage of our prosperity or in Wall Street's Willkie who would turn our leadership back to big business? Radio listeners know that the foreign policy advocated by Vandenberg, the great isolationist, was the antithesis of the Roosevelt foreign policy. They know the futility of Taft, special pleader for so-called strict neutrality. Real thinkers know that the Dewey myth has been exploded.

It is hoped that the Republican brain trusters at G. O. P. central headquarters overlooking Lafayette Square in the Nation's Capital, will cast their eyes on the statues of Lafayette, the Frenchman, of Pulaski, the Pole, and on the late-burning lights of the White House opposite, and raise the level of Americanism in the speeches they are dishing out for their keynoters.

Ill-advised Members of Congress mistakingly passed a Neutrality Act that played into the hands of Hitler and prevented our industries from expanding the production of modern war machines and munitions needed by those nations who stand between us and the force of Hitler and who have since been attacked. Hardly 3 months had elapsed after Congress adjourned when Germany invaded Poland and started the march of destruction, and the President found it necessary to call Congress into special session, at which time we passed a Neutrality Act at his suggestion that would protect our interest and not aid those who would destroy world civilization. We who have supported the New Deal are proud to have supported him in his foreign policy.

Little heed must be given to those who would sell America short and minimize our strength and accomplishments. They are the political "fifth column" that works insidiously from within, whose one desire is to take over the reins of government.

We, as Americans, must not forget that we control three-quarters of the natural available resources of the world and more than one-half of the gold, and that our people are vigorous physically and ingenious mentally. We must remember also that it was the genius of America in the interest of peace and the betterment of humanity that gave to the world such inventions as the tractor, airplane, and most modern machinery that has now been employed by the forces of destruction. We must also remember that warfare as waged by Germany is a war of machines on land, in air, and on the sea, and that Germany has made progress to date through accumulating vast supplies of war machines and munitions, oil, gas, and equipment. Success in modern warfare depends upon mass production, and we Americans must remember that modern mass production is an American development, and that no country, not even Germany, can achieve a more vital program of rapid mass production of war machines, tanks, airplanes, guns, and munitions than America can achieve when fully mobilized for a defensive war. We must remember also that our resources of oil, gasoline, steel and copper, fiber, hides, and food, the things necessary for powerful preparedness, belong to us in unlimited amounts.

The un-American activities of the so-called "fifth column" must be taken into consideration in any program of national defense. Those of us who are actually interested in destroying un-American activities and not shadow boxing with it have always contended that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, through the Department of Justice and the Army and Navy intelligence service, were the proper agencies to combat this evil.

I believe in this critical time that oratory, self-aggrandizement, newspaper publicity, or vague promises should give way to action. In order that we may have real action in wiping out this unsavory group, sufficient money should be appropriated and allotted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Army and Navy Intelligence Service in the interest of efficient operation. It is no time for any individual, no matter how high an office he holds in the governmental set-up, to cry out against any of the Government agencies commissioned to fight un-American activities. We should be careful, however, in this most important fight not to allow our emotions to carry us above the law. I therefore feel that it is the duty of each and every American citizen interested in the preservation of this Nation and the things for which it stands to report any suspicious action to the Government authorities. That cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Army and Navy Intelligence Division is just as necessary and important as a well-equipped army, navy, or air force. In the interest of America, in the interest of the preservation of the home as we know it, we must eliminate every trace of nazi-ism, communism, fascism, or any other un-American activity, or anything that is the antithesis of democracy, and we shall not falter until we have driven these un-American ideologies out of American life.

May God grant that we will rise as one in support of our President and create a military defense program that will be able to meet any threat to the freedom of our Nation. However, in doing that we must consider that we must keep the things that are worth while defending. Let us keep America as we know it—as we love it. Let not any "fifth column"—be it Nazi, Communist, Fascist, or destructive capitalism—interfere with the preparation of a defense of our shores.

Let all America join with President Roosevelt and his able Secretary of State in a foreign policy that has served us and will save us from the horrors of war.

Promise and Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1932 the Democratic candidate for the Presidency was Gov. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He came to the American people with a program which was to be put into effect with all possible speed to reestablish American institutions on the sound basis which they had occupied before 1929. In terms of vigorous denunciation, Candidate Roosevelt attacked Federal extravagance. He denounced the increase in our Federal bureaus. At Albany, N. Y., he told the Nation:

> Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits. Let us have equal courage to reverse the policy of the Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency. Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse.

With pride in his own achievements, Candidate Roosevelt pointed to his work in New York and at Buffalo, N. Y., on October 18, 1932, he asked:

> How does the credit of the State of New York compare with the credit of the other 47 States of the Union?

The answer he gave should be historic in the light of events since then, for he said:

> This State has the best credit and the soundest structure of government finance of any State in the Union, and I am proud that in this period of depression we have come through with the best balanced budget of any State in the Union.

Three days later at St. Louis, Mr. Roosevelt declared that—

At the very top of the credit structure of the country, surpassing all other groups in moral and material importance, stand the obligations of the Federal Government. These are paramount because government is essential to all ordered economic life. When they go, everything goes. I believe these obligations are secure. They suffer only to the extent that government is permitted to be extravagant, wasteful, or ill-managed. They suffer if the Federal Budget is not balanced, and particularly where the deficit of 1 year is not cleared up in the succeeding year.

Continuing, Mr. Roosevelt declared:

I called attention in my address at Pittsburgh on Wednesday night to the great importance of Federal Budget making as the foundation of the national credit. I pointed out that the Hoover administration had been responsible for deficit after deficit; that as one disastrous year succeeded another, no attempt was made to arrange the finances of the country so that at least the mounting loss of revenues might not be turned into a deficit for the next year. It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped and that rigid governmental economy shall be forced by a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income.

On March 4, 1933, in his first inaugural address President Roosevelt turned his attention to the serious problem of unemployment. Speaking directly to the Nation of putting people to work, he declared that the task "can be helped by insistence that the Federal, State, and local governments act forthwith on the demand that their costs be drastically reduced."

Six days later, talking to the Congress of the United States, President Roosevelt said, "For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

"For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was $462,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1932 it was $2,472,000.

"For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed $1,200,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriation bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed $1,000,000,000 unless immediate action is taken.

"With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed.

"Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger."

The record of performance, in the light of President Roosevelt's promises, seems almost unbelievable. The deficit for the year 1933 was more than $3,000,000,000. In 1934 it reached almost $4,000,000,000. In 1935 it amounted to $3,600,000,000. In 1936 it rose to $4,700,000,000. In 1937 it was almost $3,000,000,000. In 1938 it dropped to $1,400,000,000, but in 1939 it rocketed once more to $3,600,000,000.

The mounting public debt of the United States, which Mr. Roosevelt so bitterly decried in 1932 and 1933, moved from $19,487,976,000 in 1932 to $40,439,532,411 by 1939. If the accumulated deficit of $5,000,000,000 which Mr. Roosevelt found in 1933 was a fact of the utmost seriousness, adding to the ranks of our unemployed, contributing to the collapse of our banking structure, accentuating the stagnation of the economic life of our people, what must we say of the additional deficits that have been accumulated since he took office?

The record of promise and performance on the other major issues facing us is no less significant.

On December 31, 1932, 568,345 men and women were listed in the United States civil service. By June 30, 1939, the figure had mounted to 929,310. Today unofficial figures indicate that the number has mounted still closer to a million.

A series of alphabetical agencies, constituting the world's greatest bureaucracy, has been established. Into the daily conversation of the Nation have crept such new terms as:

A. A. A.—Agricultural Adjustment Administration.
C. A. A.—Civil Aeronautics Authority.
C. C. C.—Civilian Conservation Corps.
C. C. C.—Commodity Credit Corporation.
C. S. B.—Central Statistical Board.
E. C. W.—Emergency Conservation Work.
E. H. F. A.—Electric Home and Farm Authority.
E. I. B.—Export-Import Bank(s).
F. A. A.—Federal Alcohol Administration.
F. B. I.—Federal Bureau of Investigation.
F. A. B. V. E.—Federal Advisory Board for Vocational Education.
F. C. of T.—Federal Coordinator of Transportation.
F. D. I. C.—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
F. E. R. A.—Federal Emergency Relief Administration.
F. F. M. C.—Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
F. H. A.—Federal Housing Administration.
F. H. L. B. B.—Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
F. I. C. D.—Federal Intermediate Credit Bank(s).
F. S. A.—Federal Security Agency.
F. S. C. C.—Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.
F. S. L. D.—Federal Savings and Loan Division.
F. S. L. I. C.—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
F. S. R. C.—Federal Surplus Relief Corporation.
N. A.—National Archives.
N. B. C. C.—National Bituminous Coal Commission.
N. E. C.—National Emergency Council.
N. I. R. A.—National Industrial Recovery Administration.
N. L. R. B.—National Labor Relations Board.
N. R. A.—National Recovery Administration.
N. R. C.—National Resources Committee.
N. R. S.—National Reemployment Service.
N. Y. A.—National Youth Administration.
P. A.—Petroleum Administration.
P. C. C. A.—Production Credit Corporations and Associations.
P. I. R. A.—Prison Industries Reorganization Administration.
P. W. A.—Public Works Administration.
R. A.—Resettlement Administration.
R. E. A.—Rural Electrification Administration.
S. A. B.—Science Advisory Board.
S. E. C.—Securities and Exchange Commission.
S. S. B.—Social Security Board.
S. C. S.—Soil Conservation Service.
T. V. A.—Tennessee Valley Authority.
U. S. E. S.—United States Employment Service.
U. S. H. A.—United States Housing Authority.
U. S. T. B.—United States Travel Bureau.
W. P. A.—Work Projects Administration.

Since 1933, 70 agencies, most of them new, have begun the job of administering the Nation's affairs. At the top of many of them were people whose positions were identical with the "master minds" whom Mr. Roosevelt had himself denounced only a few years ago. Billions of dollars have been expended by these agencies in their seizure of control of the Nation's industrial, commercial, and educational activities. Bureaucracy, whose tendency to dominate the national life had been so vigorously denounced, is now in full swing. Mr. Roosevelt's plea for "fewer commissions and more leadership" has been amended to read, "more commissions and less leadership."

In still other spheres of action, the promise and performance record reads like a fantastic contradiction.

Speaking of Government control of business, Mr. Roosevelt declared on May 7, 1933, "It is wholly wrong to call the measures that we have taken Government control of farming, control of industry, and control of transportation. It is rather a partnership between Government and farming and industry and transportation, not partnership in profits, for the profits would still go to the citizens, but rather a partnership in planning and a partnership to see that the plans are carried out."

This was in the days when N. R. A. was in its beginning. Today that partnership has been abandoned. In its place

the President of the United States has invoked the Presidential wrath upon "economic royalists," "predatory business," the "malefactors of great wealth." The cooperation and planning of N. R. A. days has given way to prosecutions for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The partnership between Government and farming has become a partnership in which the Government partner dictates the terms of every agreement, decides every policy.

Addressing itself to the issues of Government in business, the Democratic Party in 1932 urged the "removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest."

Since 1932 the Federal Government under President Roosevelt's leadership has put Uncle Sam into direct competition with existing private business on a score of fronts. We have manufactured not only light and electric power in the Tennessee Valley Authority but also clothing, bedding, and hosiery.

On the basic issue of our governmental structure, Mr. Roosevelt declared in 1930, "The preservation of 'home rule' by the States is not a cry of jealous commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States. It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country."

Since 1930 things must have changed greatly in Mr. Roosevelt's view, for today the Federal Government has made of the States little more than cringing suppliants asking Federal favors wherever possible. Here is the record of promise and performance which we must analyze in 1940.

Mr. Roosevelt promised—

1. Reduced Federal expenditures.

2. Mr. Roosevelt regarded a growing deficit in 1932 and 1933 as a tremendous burden upon employment.

3. A marked decrease in the number of Federal commissions and agencies.

4. Decrease in Government personnel.

5. A pledge to utilize existing agencies and farm credit.

6. A pledge of cooperation with business, farming, and industry.

Mr. Roosevelt gave us—

1. The greatest deficit this country has ever known.

2. He has repudiated this conception entirely.

3. The greatest increase in commissions and agencies this Nation has ever known.

4. The largest increase in Government personnel in any 7-year period of our history.

5. A complete negation of the Democratic platform of 1932.

6. The bitterest crusade against businessmen, the most ruthless domination of agriculture this country has ever seen.

This is the record for all to read. The President argues that the contradictions in his program were necessary.

The Nation has witnessed the results of those contradictions. Those results are with us to stay; vast unemployment remaining at an absolutely static level since 1933; a tremendous increase in Government expenditure already being reflected in new tax burdens; a restless undercurrent of hatred rumbling through the population. These are the fruits of Mr. Roosevelt's contradictions.

If we are to enjoy a better harvest in the years to come, it is our task now to change our gardners.

Arno B. Cammerer—Faithful Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are informed that Mr. Arno B. Cammerer retires as the Director of our National Park Service because of ill health—his usual good health he sacrificed because of hard work, his loyalty, and love of service. We are informed that the Secretary of the Interior has induced this valuable official to remain available in an advisory capacity.

We who know Mr. Cammerer feel that he gave too much of himself to the Service, and we realize that this devotion to our Government and love of the great work which he performed was the direct cause for the necessity that he relinquish the rigorous executive duties of Director of the Service which he personally brought to its present high state. The record of his 36 years of exceptionally meritorious service to our Nation should be made now in order that those who are enjoying the benefits of our great national park system can pay some tribute to one who is greatly responsible for many of these accomplishments. Mr. Cammerer has been given recognition for his great work in medals, letters, and public acclaim, not only by distinguished groups and people in our own country but by representatives of foreign lands.

Mr. Cammerer was born in a sod house on the prairies of Nebraska. He later moved to Wisconsin, where the people grew to respect and acknowledge his great abilities. In Washington he has drawn to himself the friendship of many prominent officials. He has made friends with many Members in this House and the Senate because he brought into his service to our Government those fundamental truths and common sense which are the fruits of a life well lived and inherited from Nebraska pioneer parents.

We who have had the honor of working officially with Mr. Cammerer join with thousands of his other friends in wishing him much happiness and good health in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service, under Mr. Cammerer's direction, has grown rapidly. It became a gigantic service compared to what it was when he took over.

On July 17, 1933, Mr. Cammerer was appointed Director of the National Park Service, to succeed Horace M. Albright, resigned, and advancing from his previous position as Associate Director. This was done after seeking the advice and counsel of a group of outstanding conservationists and national park supporters, among whom were Dr. Herman C. Bumpus, Dr. John C. Merriam, Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, Dr. Frank R. Oastler, Mr. J. Horace McFarland, Mr. Frederic A. Delano, as well as Mr. Albright. Mr. Cammerer entered on duty as Director on August 10, 1933, the day that the President's reorganization order of June 10, 1933, went into effect.

That order enlarged the areas and functions of the service many times, and at once greatly increased the work and responsibilities of the Director. Prior thereto, the service had jurisdiction over 63 areas totaling 14,701,000 acres, of which 22 were national parks, 40 national monuments, and one a national historical park. On August 10, 1933, this was increased to 128 areas, totaling 15,179,000 acres, including the unit of the National Capital Parks system and the White House building and grounds. Added also were the assumption of functions of various independent establishments, and the administration and control of public buildings which the service held until July 1, 1939, when, by Executive Order, they were transferred to the Federal Works Agency. The service was also occupied with its tremendous new obligations under the C. C. C. and Public Works, and other relief programs.

Today, 7 years later, the service has charge of 204 units totaling 21,930,000 acres. The service also has charge of constructing the Blue Ridge Parkway at an estimated cost of $34,000,000, the Natchez Trace Parkway, at an estimated cost of $24,000,000, the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D. C., at a cost of $3,000,000, and the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St. Louis, Mo., for which it now has for land acquisition $9,000,000.

Prior to 1933 the average annual appropriation was $11,104,000; since then the average annual appropriation has been $16,024,700. Between the inception of the various

emergency programs and June 1, 1940, approximately $109,715,000 has been allotted to the Service by the Civilian Conservation Corps, $47,513,000 by the Public Works Administration, and $47,174,000 by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts.

Employees of the Service on June 30, 1933, numbered 2,027; on June 30, 1939, they numbered 13,751, and on April 30, 1940, they numbered 6,977, the Buildings Branch having been transferred to the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. Cammerer entered the Federal service in 1904. He entered the National Park Service on July 5, 1919, as Assistant Director, on direct request of former Director Stephen T. Mather and Secretary Franklin K. Lane. That position then ranked next to the Director. He accepted their offer at considerable financial sacrifice and solely because the great opportunities for real public service in the national-park field appealed to him. The records show that since his connection with the Service in 1939, he has taken practically no annual and sick leave and that from 1933 to 1938 he took 13 days and one-half hour of annual leave, 14 days of sick leave, but put in 5,327¼ hours, or 222 days, overtime, exclusive of overtime in the field. There are approximately 283 working days a year.

This application to his duties without thought of self suddenly had its effect when on May 1 of last year he suffered a complete collapse that with its implications forced him to bed for months. He has since made excellent recovery, and we, his admirers, pray for him many years of healthful and happy life.

Mr. Roosevelt's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday:

[From the Chicago Tribune of June 19, 1940]

MR. ROOSEVELT'S WAR

The French Government has given up the unequal struggle. The vast majority of Americans had hoped that France, as so often in the past, would succeed in resisting the invader. That hope has been disappointed. The victory has given Herr Hitler a chance to show, by making a magnanimous peace, that he is a statesman as well as a conqueror. Otherwise he will succeed merely in laying the foundation of another war, for it is as certain as anything can be that so great a nation as France will not remain forever in bondage and poverty. The same forces which wrought the French victory of 1918 out of the humiliation of 1871 operated to bring the German victory of 1940 out of the humiliation of 1919.

The question remains how France could have been brought so low in so short a time. Certainly the French greatly exaggerated their own strength and greatly underestimated the enemy's. For this miscalculation Mr. Roosevelt cannot avoid a large measure of responsibility.

He encouraged the French to believe they could count upon unlimited American help. He seized every opportunity to lead the French to believe this country would spring to France's defense. He was bellicose and unrestrained, and there is no slightest reason to suppose that his ambassadors in their private communications with the French Foreign Office were any less so.

At the dedication of the outer bridge here nearly 3 years ago Mr. Roosevelt proclaimed a policy which the French today must regard as a cruel betrayal. As the responsible head of the American Government, he declared that this country would join in "quarantining" the aggressor nations. To the French and to Mr. Roosevelt that meant Germany. Mr. Roosevelt was telling the French that America would join them in any resistance they might offer to German ambitions.

The French heard the speech and rejoiced. From that moment they counted upon America as an ally. Naturally enough, they took the word of the President as a commitment of the Nation and gave little heed to other voices in this country which opposed another military adventure in Europe. The French were encouraged in this mistake by the noisy interventionists in the East and more especially by the subsequent course of the Roosevelt diplomacy.

"America's frontier is on the Rhine," the President was quoted as saying on one occasion, and when he was attacked for this statement he repudiated the form of words but never their meaning. He remained bellicose through the successive crises that finally led to war. Once war was declared he gave France every encouragement to count upon American aid. The socialistic Blum regime, with its sit-down strikes, had deprived France of the armament sent to Spain and had slowed to a trickle the production of war materials from French factories. No doubt the French tolerated these abuses as long as they did in full confidence that America's industrial and military resources would be at France's disposal in time of need.

If the French people had reserved any doubts on the question of American support they must have been removed by Mr. Roosevelt's prompt action in demanding the repeal of the arms embargo almost as soon as war was declared. Congress assented under pressure from the White House. To the French that could have meant only that America would join the Allies within a short time. The repeal was read in France as a pronouncement to the world that America had chosen sides in the war. As quickly as public opinion could be prepared we would be engaged in the war.

Mr. Roosevelt all this time must have known that Congress and the country were determined to remain out of war and that in any event America had nothing to make war with. We had no Army to send abroad at once, as the French well knew, but they could not have realized the full extent of our unpreparedness in guns, ammunition, tanks, aircraft, etc. They did know that under Mr. Roosevelt $7,000,000,000 had been spent on defense. It was not until recent weeks that even in this country there was any realization of the wasteful and improvident manner in which that money had been dissipated.

Meanwhile France, counting upon Mr. Roosevelt, had entered the struggle. The moment came when France turned to us for the help which the President had proffered. It was not forthcoming.

Mr. Roosevelt's diplomacy is a long record of bellicose blundering, of bluff, and of false promises. If ever a man proved himself incompetent to manage the foreign relations of a Nation that man is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The William Allen White Committee and Emotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM UNCENSORED

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a publication called Uncensored:

[From Uncensored of June 15, 1940]

SHORT OF AID

When the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies was first announced, Uncensored (May 25) referred to it as William Allen White's committee No. 2, committee No. 1 having been his Nonpartisan Committee for Peace Through the Revision of the Neutrality Law, which devoted itself to fighting the arms embargo. Uncensored commented: "The present attitudes and past records of many members of Mr. White's committee No. 2 indicate that they will not long be satisfied with 'aiding with our supplies and wealth.' By all logic, committee No. 3 should advocate aiding with planes and pilots and committee No. 4 with an expeditionary force."

Logic has operated with indecent haste. Mr. White's committee now urges sending planes, guns, munitions, food. One way of sending planes would be a gift to the Allies by the United States Government of Army or Navy equipment. Since such an act could be regarded by Adolf Hitler as a declaration of war, the supporters of the White committee have committed themselves, most of them presumably unwittingly, to immediate war.

Some of the more vocal members of the committee have not acted unwittingly. Robert E. Sherwood, author and financial

guarantor of the committee's full-page advertisement, announced that he favors immediate entry into the war on the side of the Allies—for the moral effect. Herbert Agar, Col. Henry Breckinridge, Calvin B. Hoover, and Lewis Mumford, all members of the White committee, also urge an immediate declaration of war. These are the frontiersmen of the White committee.

To the advocates of the "all aid short of war" position, the most maddening question is, "What aid?" Calm analysis of each step short of war reveals that they are walking on air.

SUPPLIES

The Allies have more than $8,500,000,000 of purchasing power in the United States. If their resources outside the United States are included, the total becomes more than $19,500,000,000 (Uncensored, June 1). Repeal of the Johnson Act would be futile. The Allies do not need money. Since they can buy anything they need and their orders have been given preference, the precise meaning of "aiding with our supplies and wealth" is difficult to grasp. Fact is, the entire United States industrial machine has been at the disposal of the Allies for 8 months.

ARMS

The formula of the current White committee—sending planes, guns, munitions, food—involves at least the danger of the United States becoming an active belligerent. Under such circumstances our own defenses become immediately necessary. Yet Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, declared only a month ago that the United States could not possibly be ready for war before December 1941. The White committee, which wants arms sent to the Allies, in the same manifesto insists on national defense: "We can and should and will devote ourselves to a vast program of defense." Exactly how much equipment, if any, can the United States send the Allies without jeopardizing the vast program of defense which advocates of such aid also favor?

The most ingenious evasion of this question comes this week from William Allen White's son, William L. Admitting that our Army hasn't enough planes and tanks to fight a successful war even against Sweden, he thinks there might be enough to stop the Nazi drive and therefore proposes that all of it be sent over. "Because," he continues, "if we did this and the Allies were nonetheless overwhelmed, the British, out of a mixture of gratitude and self-interest, would send their fleet to us as the Germans were overrunning their island. With this new fleet, plus our own which is now in the Pacific, we could keep the Japanese, Germans, and Italians out of this hemisphere while our factories had a chance to build up a decent new armament of planes and tanks. But if we don't send the Allies any equipment in the next few weeks and they are crushed, I don't see why the British should will us their fleet, and I don't see then what could keep the totalitarian powers out of the Americas." William L. White, who is both homespun and sophisticated, is usually less homespun in his interpretations of world affairs. It is the dilemma facing the advocates of sending planes which leads him to such absurdities.

Unemotional Washington military observers maintain that there are no further steps short of war that can save the Allies. The likeliest result of such steps is war itself which, in turn, would save neither the Allies nor democracy.

EMOTION

In the light of these practical considerations, the cry for further aid to the Allies becomes a cry in the wilderness; it cannot answer the question, "How?" assuming that it has an answer to "Why?" Yet the cry is stirring wild emotions throughout the country. These emotions, seeking satisfaction, are finding it in the astronomical figures of an unplanned defense program and in the hysterical pouncing on "fifth columnists" which are threatening civil liberties in hundreds of American communities. The White committee has given direct encouragement to this hysteria. Under the heading, "The Fifth Column," its advertisement states: "All Americans should beware the prevailing Nazi-Communist propaganda which attempts to capitalize our desire for peace by opposing all our moves toward national defense—sabotaging all aid to the Allies—preaching that Hitler has already won and we must meekly appease him." On national defense, the ad says: "It will take years for us to build the necessary machines and to train the men who will run them. Will the Nazis considerately wait until we are ready to fight them? Anyone who argues that they will wait is either an imbecile or a traitor." Members of the White committee, which includes men and women who have fought for tolerance in the past, presumably support these incitements.

EVACUATION

The most advanced case of war hysteria has been discovered in the Social Security Board in Washington. Board officials are working out plans for evacuating children from the Atlantic seaboard in case of attack. The job was decided upon by a group of ardent new dealers who are now worrying themselves thin about the social consequences of the project. They have pierced the future so far as to foresee that the children might not be housed properly, that they might not have privies, and that teachers might not be available to oversee them. They are deeply concerned about the number of railway cars on Washington sidings. They doubt that there are enough for the evacuation.

Another social consequence gives them less concern. By shifting and expanding the Board's existing machinery, they are satisfied it will be possible to take care of pensions for the widows and orphans of the next war.

FRENCH PLANE PRODUCTION

In an effort to bedevil organized labor and Government control of national defense aviation magnates and their senatorial spokesmen have been pointing to what they call the "awful example of France" where "communized war industries" and the "sabotage of the popular front government" are alleged to be the cause of France's present plight.

The facts do not support these charges. The widest nationalization of France's defense industries was introduced in factories making cannon, guns, tanks, and ammunition. In France there has never been any criticism of the production of these implements of war. France's failure to mechanize and motorize sufficiently was due to the Gamelin defensive war strategy.

Criticism of defense production in France has been directed solely at the so-called nationalization of airplane manufacturing. This industry was only partially nationalized. Many aircraft factories were left entirely in private hands. A number were involved in a complicated set-up by which the government acquired majority shares of stock, left minority holdings in the hands of the owners, allowed the old boards of directors to remain intact with the exception of one government director, and permitted the old managements to continue to run the factories. The two biggest airplane motor factories, Hispano Suiza and Gnome & Rhone, were left entirely in private hands.

With this background, the actual picture of France's aviation problem emerges as follows:

1. One of the most serious delays in production was caused by the motor bottleneck. (The same is true in the United States today.) The two large privately owned motor factories were frequently attacked for their conservatism and their failure to keep pace with the rest of the industry. L'Intransigeant, big conservative Paris paper, led the attack on these two plants.

2. There is no evidence that strikes or the 40-hour week slowed down production of planes. Because of lack of tools and raw materials (both of which came from private industry abroad), workers could not have put in more time.

3. While it is true that production of planes fell to about 30 a month at the time of Munich, this record was no worse than the one made by private industry under the General Denain plan of 1934, which in 3 years turned out only 1,000 planes.

4. Meanwhile decentralization of the industry and tooling up proceeded under the semi-nationalized set-up. Experts in Paris have stated that this process could not have been accomplished by uncontrolled private industry because bankers opposed granting funds and private managements obstructed decentralization.

5. The tooling up and reorganization of the industry under government semi-nationalization did accomplish results. Production jumped from 30 to 250 a month within 10 months. The latest figures on French monthly production in the New York Times were 400 a month. In view of the relatively low industrial potential of France compared with Germany and England, this is considered a very good showing.

NICE ROAD WORK

"The frontier of our national interest is now on the Somme."—From a statement signed by Walter Millis, author of "Road to War."

CHAMIZAL

While Secretary Hull loftily lectures Mexico on the oil controversy which Mexico considers a purely domestic problem, long-memoried Washington observers are pointing out that the United States Government might first clean its own slate by settling the Chamizal dispute—for years a grievance against the United States in Mexican minds.

Facts of the Chamizal dispute are these: Years ago the Rio Grande shifted its course at El Paso, Texas. Mexico claimed that, according to the original boundary agreement, the shift put the valuable Chamizal section of El Paso into Mexican territory. The matter was referred to an arbitration commission consisting of an American, a Mexican, and a Canadian. The Mexican and the Canadian decided in favor of Mexico. The American refused to sign the award, and the United States refused to abide by the decision. There the matter has stood for 30 years. The suggestion is now being made in Washington that the United States should demonstrate its professed faith in treaties and arbitration by either delivering the Chamizal section to Mexico or offering an indemnity.

ARMS EMPLOYMENT

Testifying behind closed doors before a Senate subcommittee considering appropriations for the 1940–41 relief program, Col. F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of W. P. A. work projects, gave no encouragement to the hope that a vast defense program would at least mean a partial solution of the unemployment problem. Colonel Harrington said:

"I think it is certain that regardless of events abroad unemployment in the fiscal year 1941 is likely to number 8,000,000 to 9,000,000. * * * The expanded armament program will not materially affect the volume of unemployment or the pressing need for relief. In the first place, the sums appropriated for armament cannot be spent immediately. It will take time for those expenditures to get under way in important volume. There

is no question that tens of thousands of workers will be reemployed as a result of these expenditures, but the total potential reemployment is small in relation to the total number of workers who need jobs. The national-defense expenditures will be concentrated in a few key industries, principally aircraft, machine tools, and shipbuilding. Employment resulting from these expenditures will be heavily concentrated in specialized skilled trades and other skilled groups, and unskilled workers will not be directly affected.

"In this connection, it might be noted that the additional defense program recommended by the President's special defense message of May 16, 1940, will about offset the decline in expenditures under the P. W. A. program. About $900,000,000 of Federal and sponsors' funds will be spent on P. W. A. projects this fiscal year, but no new appropriation has been made for this purpose during the fiscal year 1941 and the carryover of the existing program into next year will be small. We hope for a slight increase in industrial production in the next fiscal year 1941 over 1940. There is, however, no certainty of this. The index of industrial production for the fiscal year 1940 will show an average of about 112. For the next fiscal year an extremely optimistic estimate of this index is an average of 115 to 117."

Colonel Harrington testified that the need for skilled workers in the arms industry would not materially relieve demands on W. P. A. because only 10 percent of W. P. A. employees are skilled. Therefore, he declared, only about 10 percent of the W. P. A. rolls could be absorbed "even if they go up to 45-, 50-, and 55-year-old men, which industry is not doing."

The Marxian Theory of Individual Property Confiscation Is Now Being Realized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the current war crisis has brought us face to face with the fruits of the New Deal philosophy to hamstring and hog-tie the private enterprise system of the United States. The current issue of the National Republic, one of our most widely quoted magazines, contains a striking article by Dr. R. J. C. Dorsey, professor of jurisprudence at the Washington College of Law, which should cause us to question whither we are heading. His analysis of the situation follows:

THE TAXROAD TO THE POORHOUSE

(By Dr. R. J. C. Dorsey)

Taxes, duties, imposts, levies, tariffs, excises, and exactments pursue the struggling individual political atom from the cradle to the grave. Irresponsible leaders, both in Europe and America are more or less responsible for foisting upon guileless populations incredible burdens of endless taxation. The time has come to change many of these leaders for men of a conservative type who at least have some sympathy for the miserable taxable entity who curtails necessary food and raiment to meet the rapacity of the tax gatherer. Certain men have insinuated themselves into positions of power who apparently are possessed with the idea that the people of their particular subdivision of the world's map, have been created solely for the purpose of contributing most of their daily wage and income to the State to be dissipated in schemes of doubtful integrity. The orgies of the present European war and the prodigalities of the American New Deal are instances in point.

In addition to the loss of life and property in the active centers of the present European conflict the millions of nationals of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, England, and France must pay huge war debts which mean generations of practical slavery for those concerned. This is due to the aggressions of the German and Russian forces combined with an inordinate desire of a few countries to retain what they have gained under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

Though far removed from the activities of the European war, our nationals are faced with the repayment of an immense Federal and State public debt which shall affect future generations as well as the present. This is due to a considerable extent to the aggressions of the New Deal combined with an unrestrained complex to centralize human effort for the use of the state. To our gargantuan Federal debt of $42,735,988,508.20 (May 10, 1940) we have to add billions more should the dictatorial powers of our country decree that we must finance the European struggle and carry on a war of our own. This increase of the public debt for the moment presents the most complete and satisfactory scheme to wreck our economic and political destinies.

The informative publication, the United States News, of May 17, 1940, informs us that "Jerome Frank, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, is one of the authors of President Roosevelt's New Deal." We recall this as one of the vehicles that has plunged our country into the quagmire of our unpayable public debt. In explanation the article continues: "His hand was important in the writing of two original phases of the New Deal program—the National Industrial Recovery Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act." These two legislative monstrosities were famous for their unconstitutionality. The aforementioned publication advises us: "Now, Mr. Frank is making notes on a plan to finance this country's possible participation in war." Apparently the plan "is patterned on the general outline of the proposal currently being advanced by Prof. John Maynard Keynes to finance Britain's war." It is estimated that "modern war will cost the United States at least fifteen billions of dollars a year more than is now being spent for defense." Among the several proposals is the reduction of civilian consumption and mass purchasing power by heavy excise taxes. Interest rates on mortgages are to be increased and family incomes taxed: Over $1,000 to $1,500, 2 percent; $5,000 to $10,000, 25 percent; over $100,000, 75 percent. It is the old method of confiscation through the means of taxation.

Another confiscatory measure is Senate bill (Lee bill) No. 1650, which has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs under report No. 441, and which may be voted on at any time. While the avowed object of the bill is "to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government," the bill in effect promises to be a confiscatory measure. Its enactment into law would tend to further favor socialism or communism, and undoubtedly would demoralize the economic system of our country at a moment when the Nation might need all of its powers of resistance unimpaired.

Under the provisions of the proposed legislation the Government could legally gain control and possession of from 5 percent to 75 percent of an individual's wealth according to a graduated scale of their holdings in excess of $1,000. The owner of such property is to receive in lieu thereof, Government obligations maturing in not less than 50 years, not tax exempt as to principal or interest, and bearing not more than 1 percent interest. No limitation is placed on the total amount of such obligations to be issued and no suggestion is given as how the money to pay the interest or repay the principal is to be raised.

The condition precedent is that Congress shall either declare war or an emergency created by the imminence of war which in the judgment of the President necessitates the drafting of manpower.

In the event a property owner has insufficient cash to pay for his bonds, the Government is authorized to take the owner's 6 percent note for any difference. Such note must be secured. In the event a delinquent fails to disclose his gross wealth and financial obligations he is subject to a $10,000 fine and 2 years imprisonment. Should he fail to purchase his allotment of bonds, the fine would be $100,000 and the imprisonment 5 years. Like other New Deal measures, there exists no right of appeal to the courts from any decision of the special wealth appraisal boards provided for. This so-called detailed census of individual net wealth as provided for by the terms of the bill is to be taken by the order of the President of the United States. The financial status of those persons included in the census would be made public. Such confiscatory legislation is wholly un-American and its enactment into law would greatly help to bring to fruition the complete transformation of our Republic into a Socialist-Communist theory of centralized State control of individual property.

Today, in our country, we are interested in the principles underlying our modern forms of taxation. We discover that the subject is closely related to the public debt. There is a suggestion of the mechanism by which a complete change in our form of government may be accelerated.

Under the correct theory, taxes are imposed for the support of a Government in return for the general advantages derived from the protection it is supposed to afford to the person and property of the taxpayer. There is no just reason to tax where there is a partial or total failure of such benefit or exchange of equivalents. There should be no forced construction of the word protection.

Conspicuous among the New Deal perversions of sound economic principles is found its modern interpretation of taxation. It willfully ignores the basic principle of protection underlying just taxation and uses it to drain individual wealth from its lawful owners. Much of the money paid by our taxpayers in taxes is used for other purposes than their protection. Considerable amounts are used to provide sinecures for party faithfuls and to subsidize those who advocate changing our form of representative government to some sort of Marxian state. Some of our tax money is used indirectly to seduce politically the minds of the masses in order to cause them to become discontented so that they may be made the instruments to wreck the very institutions that have been erected for their protection. American taxation has degenerated into a costly and vicious racket.

Some taxation is of course necessary for the maintenance of the state. But in its excessive phase it may be used as an instrument to destroy a state. Excessive taxation is a form of legislative confiscation and is often made use of by legislators who have lost their political sense of proportion. It may finally become the source of much misery and inconvenience. That is often the result of reckless spending by a state. This is our present position.

Apparently our country has been skillfully guided into its present unfortunate financial predicament. New dealers, Socialists, and Communists all appear to approve of excessive taxation as a means of confiscation of private property. "No Socialist Party can renounce under any and all circumstances the right to confiscate," wrote Norman Thomas. "After this first step of taking state power has been realized the workers make use of the state power to take possession of the instruments of production," wrote Earl Browder. True Communists favor confiscation through direct revolution rather than by the slower means of taxation. It is the Socialists who would commit a government to huge expenditures of money which would be reflected in an unpayable public debt. They conclude that the resultant discontent would be registered in a political upheaval which they hope to turn to their advantage and bring about their Socialist government.

The question arises, are our financial policies being suggested by sinister Socialist and Communist influences? We do know that certain forces have advocated the priming of our financial pump with borrowed money and that now our country is under the heaviest debt in our entire history and its people face heavy taxation. We have wasted billions of dollars and yet one out of every six workers remains jobless and we are presented with the possibility of another war with a major European power.

One may recall that in 1933 Prof. John Maynard Keynes, of the London School of Economics, contacted President Roosevelt, and that soon thereafter our country put into operation the theory of spending which that professor advocated. The chairman of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, sponsored this philosophy of spending when he said, "The more money you borrow and spend the more prosperous you are. A public debt is a public blessing." One must now confess that an unmanageable and unpayable public debt is not a blessing and that such would help to bring about the revolution advocated by Prof. Harold L. Laski, who was connected with the same educational institution in London and is reputedly a friend of Professor Keynes. One may gain an idea of the trend of thought of Professor Laski from his article in Current History, of March 1933. The occasion was the fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Marxism. He wrote in part: "The proletariat must seize the propitious moment to otherthrow its master; until that time comes they must do all in their power to disturb the existing regime. Where the workers are in the militia they must form secret organizations within to secure its control. Strikes must inflame the proletarian consciousness. Revolution demands of the revolutionary class that it secure its purpose by every means at its disposal. Revolution is war, war is built on terror. It must disarm its opponents by execution, imprisonment, forced labor, control of the press." Professor Laski has been permitted to lecture before the students in many American institutions of learning and evidently his efforts have not been in vain.

One of the causes of this taxing complex and mania is due to the expense of maintaining elaborate political machinery necessary to perpetuate the New Deal in both State and Federal Governments. There must be a front to every conspiracy, and the New Deal appears to be no exception. Human rights are interpreted as new dealers' rights to receive large Government salaries at the expense of the taxpayers.

The total expenditures of the Federal Government between June 30, 1933, and June 30, 1940, shall amount to at least sixty-two and one-half billions of dollars. The fact that about thirty-seven and one-half billions of dollars shall constitute all the Federal revenues in this period has had no effect on the spending program. This consequent $25,000,000,000 deficit had increased our public debt to $42,735,988,508.20 on May 10, 1940. On a basis of 130,000,000 population each individual now owes $328.73; a family of 4 owes $1,314.92.

Year after year our Government has gone heavily into debt. Between June 30, 1939, and May 10, 1940, the Federal Government has spent $8,207,379,580.03, though it only received to spend in a normal way $4,972,902,266.83. We are therefore sinking into debt at the rate of $10,268,181.95 per day. We are spending per minute, $18,093.87; each hour, $1,085,632.22; each day, $26,055,173.27. We receive $10,963.19 per minute; $657,791.30 per hour; $15,786,991.32 per day.

New Deal propaganda emphasizes that the rich must be taxed to pay the bills. This class, it is true, is now heavily taxed. What the new dealer does not stress, however, is that our whole population is being heavily taxed. Of the 6,231,431 persons who filed income-tax returns for 1937 only 2,309,753 paid income taxes and many in small amounts: about 2½ percent of our population. This encouraged the Government to resort to secret methods of taxation. It is on the backs of the millions of poorer people that the great burden of sacret taxes falls. In 1933 only 46 persons had incomes of over $1,000,000 annually; 84 had incomes between $500,000 and $1,000,000; 139 had incomes of $300,000 to $500,000; this accounts for only 269 people.

Once upon a time President Roosevelt truly said: "Taxes must be paid in the sweat of every man who labors." He also said: "Any government like any family can for a year spend a little more than it earns, but you and I know that a continuation of the habit means the poorhouse." Perhaps these two truisms did not harmonize with the ideas of the spending barons, for on May 22, 1939, in an address before the Retailers' National Forum, President Roosevelt made this remarkable statement: "Our national debt after all is an internal debt, owed not only by the Nation, but to the Nation." "If our children have to pay interest on it, they will pay interest to themselves." "A reasonable internal debt will not impoverish our children or put the Nation into bankruptcy." We do not know his exact definition of "a reasonable internal debt." We do know that debtors and creditors are not usually the same people, though they may inhabit the same country. To take cash from one pocket and place it in another matters little to the individual if the pockets have no holes in them. To take money from "A" and give it to "B" is not ethical, even if done by a government. In spite of misleading allegations, this and future generations shall be heavily taxed to pay the interest and to repay the principal of our national debt, unless repudiation relieves them from the burden.

The annual interest charge of the present national debt is over a billion dollars. This exceeds the national debt itself in 1916. Then our annual interest charge was a little over $23,000,000. This interest-bearing debt is largely held by banks, insurance companies, individuals, trust estates and funds, and is evidenced by obligations of various types, such as Government bonds, Treasury notes and bills, certificates of indebtedness, and other I O U's.

Our Federal Constitution gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare. No capitation or other direct tax can be laid unless in proportion to the census. Direct taxation comprehends a capitation or poll tax on persons as well as taxes on real and personal property and income. It took the sixteenth amendment to give the income tax constitutionality. Full and complete knowledge of the objects taxed and rates of taxation exists in direct taxation. The selection of the objects to be taxed as well as the establishment of rules which measure the contribution which each of these make to the tax is comprehended in apportionment. Under our reckless spending program the return from direct taxation is supplemented by indirect or hidden taxation. Notwithstanding receipts from direct and indirect taxation, huge deficits have been shown in our country for the past 10 years.

Indirect, secret, or hidden taxes are levied on the necessities of life and on commodities on their way to you, their ultimate consumer. They are paid by you as part of the price of what you buy. The resulting high prices curtail the amount of food and raiment your family should enjoy. All that most people know is that prices are getting high. The cause is a secret, indirect, or hidden tax. They accumulate as the article moves on its way to you. Your coat consists of cloth, lining, thread, buttons, etc. Each of these is taxed as well as the finished coat. These are paid and then passed on along the line of distribution by manufacturers, distributors, purchasers, and others, all being included in the price finally paid by you.

Illustrative of this, we have a list of 24 necessaries of life on which is estimated the number of secret taxes to be: 53 taxes on a loaf of bread (one-fifth of the selling price), 76 taxes on a quart of milk (one-fifth of the selling price), pork chops 119, beef 127, sugar 92, coffee 69, on a cotton dress 125 (tax $2.20), suit of clothes 105, shoes 126, stockings 56, handkerchiefs 59, overalls 148, soap 154, rent 54, coal 37, gas 41, electric power (about one-sixth of bill), telephone 39, newspaper 83, gasoline 205, oil 71, medicine 172; after the demise of a person his funeral contains 167 taxes, and the florist's bill conceals 40 additional taxes. On top of all these some States add a 3-percent sales tax. In actual practice, a sales tax does not indicate the abolition of these other taxes but an additional amercement, whether it is a local sales tax, a State sales tax, or a Federal sales tax; sometimes all 3. Each month for shelter, food, clothing, and light costing $122 the wage earner and the millionaire must pay indirect or secret taxes of $17.11, or $205.32 per annum. So you readily see that the luxury of a spending policy is extremely costly.

The American taxpayer is bewildered by the maze of technicalities and the legion of appellations used to distinguish one type of tax from another. The same taxpayer is amazed to learn the huge total he has paid in Federal taxes. Under the Federal system alone we learn of individual and corporation income taxes, excess profit, and unjust enrichment taxes; in 1939, $2,200,000,000 in taxes came from these sources. From capital stock, estate, and gift taxes, nerly a half billion was obtained, another half billion came from liquor taxes and still another half billion came from tobacco. Documentary stamps yieded $41,000,000 and nearly four hundred millions came from manufacturers' excise. (An excise tax is an inland imposition either upon consumption of commodity, retail sale, manufacture, or upon the vendor.) From taxes on bituminous coal, sugar, communications, oil transportation, safe-deposit boxes, admissions, club dues, adulterated and renovated butter, filled

cheese, mixed flour, oleomargarine, narcotics, marihuana, and so forth, came to $162,000,000. Taxes under Title VIII, Social Security Act (unemployment), amounted to nearly five hundred and thirty millions; under Title IX (on employment of eight or more), one hundred and one millions and from carriers and their employees, over $109,000,000.

Apparently the New Deal cares little for the fact that its policy of excessive taxation absorbs much money that might otherwise be placed in productive enterprises and thereby ease unemployment. Excessive public spending, especially giving away money, tends to discourage productive enterprise because an excessive share of earnings must be paid out in taxes. Intemperate taxation means that money is given up that might be put to valuable constructive use. Business is rendered powerless by excessive amercements. Even ordinary governmental spending produces taxation. Reckless spending means higher and higher rates of taxation and a consequent drying up of national wealth. The power to tax may be used to destroy business as well as a people.

Honest and healthy business is the source of wealth. From its successful pursuit is derived the fount from which wages are paid and profits are derived. When the volume of business decreases, income falls and there is less money to pay wages and taxes. That vague and indefinite mirage, national income, lessens with the failure of private income to advance. When sources of taxes dry up, employment falls and unemployment gains. It is alleged that between 1932 and 1938 investments in business corporations dropped from thirty-three billions to four billions. Instead of investing an average of nearly $5,000,000,000 a year in inaugurating, expanding, and improving business enterprises, the American people invested only $600,000,000. Excessive taxation is paralyzing American business initiative and thereby new employment possibilities. The thrifty portion of our population is becoming discouraged and slowly passing into that of unthrifty that are being cared for at the expense of the Federal Government.

The insistent forces who advocate changing our Government from a representative republic to their form of Marxism are aware of our chaotic financial condition, for they have helped to bring it about. No longer are the legislative and executive branches of our Government a reflection of the original intent as indicated in the Federal Constitution. In fact, many of the incumbents have been relegated to the position of "fronts" for groups who have the sole object of draining cash from the pockets of the people in the form of taxes and then directing its distribution. It is imperative that the conduct of all governmental affairs pass to those who understand the preservation of sound methods and who hold no brief for excessive spending or confiscatory taxation, and who would be too honest to repudiate Federal, State, or private obligations. Under the most favorable conditions it will take years of rigid economy before an approach to normalcy shall be possible. The neo-Communists-Socialists, better known today as new dealers, similar to their comrades in Russia, possess little real sympathy for humanity. Once given an equal opportunity here they would be as ruthless as the political new dealers of Soviet Russia. The question arises, "Are we, the people, to be made the slaves of a New Deal Government?" Montesquieu wrote, "The effect of excessive taxes is slavery." One marvels at the bovine docility of those of the American people who vote for legislators imposing these taxes that make possible this unlimited spending policy. Today our people are looked upon as a vast congeries of taxable entities who are being exploited by that highly organized group of tax gatherers known as the New Deal. The Marxian theory of individual property confiscation is now being realized through excessive taxation.

The closing of the banks, the creation of the N. I. R. A., the A. A. A., the ruthless slaughter of swine and cattle, the plowing under of crops, the institution of bureaucratic government, the vicious attacks upon the advocates of conservative policies, the debauching of our gold dollar, the disparagement of the Supreme Court, and the attempted "purges" were simply prologue to this great national debacle. The 3-billion-dollar inflationary power given to the President, the further power to debauch our gold dollar is in keeping with Lenin's advice: "The surest way to wreck a country is to debauch its currency." We know that the content of our elusive gold dollar has been reduced from 25 9/10 grains to 15 21/100. We know that most of our gold and silver has been cached; about 18 billions of gold in Kentucky and a billion of silver in West Point. Money has been borrowed from our citizens to pay foreign holders fictitiously high prices for gold and silver to be buried underground within New Deal control. To own more than a minimum of gold makes a criminal out of an individual. To own more than $400 in value in Russia also constitutes criminality. All this is part of the first act which part of the audience refuses to approve.

Our deceived, tax-ridden, and bureau-controlled country, with its millions on relief, and millions within one pay day of the shadow of the poorhouse; with its common delusions of wealth and grandeur and vague ideas of unrealizable potentialities, has accumulated a direct Federal public debt of nearly $45,000,000,000 and an indirect liability of 10 billions more, this supposedly to reduce unemployment, yet 1 out of every 6 persons is unemployed. Truly, those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.

Federal Finances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following analysis of the general-fund balance in the Treasury shows the state of our Federal finances. It shows that as at May 31, 1940, the balance stood at minus $14,024,475.10.

From whence has the Treasury been getting its money to pay its current bills?

I believe this should explain, in part at least, the purpose back of the administration's request for the enormous appropriations ostensibly for national defense.

Exhibits C and D show the general-fund balances at the end of each year from 1791 to 1939. From these figures it would appear that at no time previously in the history of our Republic has the balance in the general fund of the Treasury been depleted.

Exhibits A and B of the general-fund working balance as at May 31, 1940, were prepared for me by Joseph M. McCarthy, of the General Accounting Office.

Under exhibit A will be noted "Other liabilities not reported by the Treasury"—shown in exhibit B—amounting to $1,401,572,390.88. The President in setting up his Budget in January failed to take into consideration these liabilities against the general-fund balance.

The balance of $626,769,715.18 designated as "Actual general-fund balance" is misleading. It does not represent the true amount of the balance for the following reason:

Note under exhibit A the item "Silver bullion at cost value, $640,794,190.28."

This figure represents 1,232,296,519 ounces of silver at the average cost price, or about $0.52 an ounce.

But the Treasury cannot pay this silver out at its cost value. It can pay it out only at its monetary value, which is $1.29 an ounce.

Now, if the Treasury were using this silver which it designates as "seigniorage"—that is, if the Treasury were issuing silver certificates at the rate of $1.29 per ounce of silver against this seigniorage—it would be engaging in extensive inflation. I am, however, informed by Mr. Frantz, Administrative Officer, Bureau of the Mint, that the Treasury has not "coined" this silver seigniorage; that it has not issued silver certificates against it.

Therefore, the item, $640,794,190.28, shown under Exhibit A as "Silver bullion at cost value," should be eliminated entirely from the asset side of the general-fund working balance. Were that done, the "actual general-fund balance" as shown under Exhibit A would, as previously stated, be minus $14,024,475.10.

Now, should the Treasury take advantage of the inflation possibilities of this silver, should it monetize it by issuing silver certificates against it, then the general-fund balance would be entirely different from the figure $626,769,715.18 shown as "actual general-fund balance."

Monetized at $1.29 an ounce it would produce $1,589,662,509.51.

This latter figure would then take the place of the $640,794,190.28 shown as "assets." Were this done, then the general-fund balance would stand at $1,575,638,034.41. But with silver worth no more than $0.35 an ounce—arbitrary price fixed by the Treasury for foreign silver; if this arbitrary price were removed, it would probably drop to less than $0.20 an ounce—73 percent of this monetized silver, $1,160,453,632, would represent inflation.

Although the Treasury has issued about $1,200,000,000 in silver certificates since the Silver Purchase Act, at least 73 percent, or $876,000,000, of which is inflation, it has used this principally to pay for the silver it has purchased.

The evil effects of the silver inflation that has already taken place is well known to bankers and other informed persons. Having been used in this way it has not been subjected to much criticism. But should the Treasury undertake to monetize this silver and use it to pay the current expenses of the Government it would be an indication that it was in a most desperate condition.

Hence, of course, the Treasury will avoid using the silver seigniorage, as it terms it, just as long as it possibly can.

EXHIBIT A

Analysis of the general fund working balance as at May 31, 1940

	As per daily statement	Adjustments	Revised
Assets:			
Gold, unencumbered	$191,285,558.45		$191,285,558.45
Silver, unencumbered	27,935,654.51		27,935,654.51
Subsidiary silver coin	5,794,346.60		5,794,346.60
Silver bullion at recoinage value	523,742.96		523,742.96
Silver bullion at cost value	640,794,190.28		640,794,190.28
Minor coin	2,844,432.71		2,844,432.71
United States notes	1,485,408.00		1,485,408.00
Federal Reserve notes	12,250,135.00		12,250,135.00
Federal Reserve bank notes	570,985.50	$570,985.50	0
National bank notes	353,706.00	353,706.00	0
Unclassified, collections	17,444,110.86	149,036.47	17,295,074.39
Depositaries:			
To credit of Treasurer of the United States	1,299,326,147.93		1,299,326,147.93
To credit of other Government officers	32,914,834.06		32,914,834.06
Total	2,233,523,252.86	1,073,727.97	2,232,449,524.89
Liabilities:			
Treasurers' checks outstanding	18,939,804.00		18,939,804.00
Post Office Department	3,517,070.57		3,517,070.57
Board of trustees, Postal Savings System	67,636,290.21		67,636,290.21
Postmasters, clerks of courts, disbursing officers, etc	60,127,540.18		60,127,540.18
Deposits for redemption of national bank notes (5-percent fund)	255,615.16		255,615.16
Uncollected items, exchanges, etc	53,631,098.71		53,631,098.71
Total	204,107,418.83	0	204,107,418.83
Balances	2,029,415,834.03	1,073,729.97	2,028,342,106.06
Other liabilities not reported by Treasury (exhibit B)			1,401,572,390.88
Actual general-fund balance			626,769,715.18

EXHIBIT B

Statement of trust funds, etc.

General fund assets:		
Transferred from exhibit A		$2,028,342,106.06
Liabilities:		
Trust funds	251,911,377.14	
Secretary of the Treasury, special deposit accounts	92,037,836.39	
Other special deposit accounts	213,022,040.61	
Checking accounts of Government corporations and agencies	324,967,365.14	
Matured public-debt securities and other public-debt items	230,976,896.34	
Outstanding checks and interest-coupon obligations	288,656,875.26	
	1,401,572,390.88	
		626,769,715.18

EXHIBIT C

TABLE 1.—*Balance in the general fund of the Treasury, by calendar years, from 1791 to 1842, and by fiscal years from 1843 to 1922* [1]

Year ended Dec. 31:	
1791	$973,905.75
1792	783,444.51
1793	753,661.69
1794	1,151,924.17
1795	516,442.61
1796	888,995.42
1797	1,021,899.04
1798	617,451.43
1799	2,161,867.77
1800	2,623,311.99
1801	3,295,391.00
1802	5,020,697.64
1803	4,825,811.60
1804	4,037,005.26
1805	3,999,388.99
1806	4,538,123.80
1807	9,643,850.07
1808	9,941,809.96
1809	3,848,056.78
1810	2,672,276.57
1811	3,502,305.80
1812	3,862,217.41
1813	5,196,542.00
1814	1,727,848.63
1815	13,106,592.83
1816	22,033,519.19
1817	14,989,465.43
1818	1,478,526.74
1819	2,079,992.38
1820	1,198,461.21
1821	1,681,592.24
1822	4,193,690.63
1823	9,431,353.20
1824	1,887,799.30
1825	5,296,306.74
1826	6,342,289.48
1827	6,649,604.31
1828	5,965,974.27
1829	[2] 4,362,770.76
1830	4,761,409.34
1831	3,053,513.24
1832	911,863.16
1833	10,658,283.61
1834	7,861,093.60
1835	25,729,315.72
1836	45,756,833.54
1837	[3] 6,804,953.64
1838	6,633,715.23
1839	4,683,416.48
1840	1,704,561.80
1841	375,692.47
1842	2,079,908.13
Year ended June 30:	
1843	11,195,156.21
1844	8,612,850.23
1845	8,110,649.86
1846	9,683,869.83
1847	5,446,382.16
1848	758,332.15
1849	3,208,822.43
1850	7,431,022.72
1851	12,142,193.97
1852	15,097,880.36
1853	22,286,462.49
1854	20,300,636.61
1855	19,529,841.06
1856	20,304,844.78
1857	18,218,770.40
1858	6,698,157.91
1859	4,685,625.04
1860	3,931,287.72
1861	2,005,285.24
1862	18,265,984.84
1863	8,395,443.73
1864	112,002,776.10
1865	26,440,930.29
1866	112,476,770.66
1867	161,175,174.31
1868	115,133,529.82
1869	126,542,842.77
1870	113,485,981.01
1871	91,739,739.00
1872	74,437,358.54

[1] This statement is made from warrants paid by the Treasurer of the United States to Dec. 31, 1821, and by warrants issued after that date, and up to and including 1915 is exclusive of disbursing officers' credits and outstanding warrants.

[2] The unavailable funds are not included on and after 1829.

[3] The amount deposited with the States under act of June 23, 1836, having been taken out of the control of the Treasury Department by the act of Oct. 2, 1837, is not included on and after that date.

[4] Includes gold reserve from this date to 1900.

TABLE 1.—*Balance in the general fund of the Treasury, by calendar years, from 1791 to 1842, and by fiscal years from 1843 to 1922*—Continued

Year ended June 30—Continued.	
1873	$59,762,346.64
1874	72,159,597.17
1875	[4] 63,274,721.71
1876	58,947,608.99
1877	91,694,006.29
1878	177,498,846.71
1879	367,054,575.14
1880	168,299,404.40
1881	182,678,977.44
1882	162,323,331.14
1883	161,382,637.70
1884	165,046,380.59
1885	182,622,360.17
1886	232,099,178.05
1887	207,600,698.44
1888	244,094,169.01
1889	210,737,083.76
1890	190,841,184.72
1891	156,847,826.49
1892	129,182,494.70
1893	124,824,804.94
1894	118,885,988.16
1895	196,348,193.17
1896	269,637,307.07
1897	244,466,201.95
1898	209,282,643.13
1899	284,488,516.20
1900	156,827,608.37
1901	178,406,795.13
1902	212,187,361.16
1903	238,686,114.23
1904	172,051,568.02
1905	145,477,491.89
1906	180,689,354.82
1907	272,061,445.47
1908	245,171,347.73
1909	126,375,428.10
1910	106,894,675.67
1911	140,176,926.13
1912	167,152,478.99
1913	165,960,984.79
1914	161,612,615.53
1915	104,170,105.78
1916	235,925,945.68
1917	1,119,764,531.68
1918	1,684,929,580.21
1919	1,226,164,935.26
1920	359,947,020.33
1921	532,898,329.77
1922	264,126,935.85

EXHIBIT D

Balance in the general fund of the Treasury at the end of fiscal years from 1923 to 1939, on basis of Daily Statement (revised)

	Working balances [1]	Increment on gold	Seigniorage	Balance
June 30—				
1923				$369,886,816.03
1924				238,029,514.74
1925				219,979,440.82
1926				211,128,078.43
1927				232,598,120.48
1928				260,190,330.85
1929				324,506,850.83
1930				312,782,915.03
1931				456,580,692.52
1932				391,205,129.02
1933				853,777,775.22
1934		$811,397,066.00		2,552,504,743.42
1935	$971,612,635.94	700,097,188.85	$140,111,441.47	1,811,821,266.26
1936	1,966,530,627.36	140,499,017.46	315,900,856.96	2,422,930,501.78
1937	959,806,787.45	140,968,159.87	355,687,781.26	[2] 2,543,345,566.93
1938	1,608,682,810.62	141,903,609.77	446,038,793.66	2,196,625,214.05
1939	2,138,259,085.27	142,383,415.68	536,306,220.68	2,816,948,721.63

[1] The term "working balance" did not appear in the Daily Statement until Oct. 16, 1934.

[2] Includes $1,086,882,838.35 of inactive gold.

Source: Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The above figures were supplied by Mr. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, May 15, 1940.

Electrifying Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY SLATTERY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by Hon. Harry Slattery, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. on June 3, 1940, on the subject, Electrifying Rural America.

Mr. Slattery is an able, fearless, public servant. His address will prove of great interest to all those who are concerned with the splendid work which the R. E. A. is doing to bring light, heat, power, and comfort to the farm families of the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The lights are going out all over Europe. The Rural Electrification Administration is helping to turn them on all over rural America."

They were striking words, spoken to me from the heart of a man high in the esteem of the American people and high in the ranks of American jurisprudence as I sat with him on a recent evening.

Those words stuck in my heart. And if a phrase can embrace all the challenge and significance of an idea, that phrase is today's inspiration for the rural-electrification program: The lights are going out all over Europe. * * * R. E. A., as we call the Rural Electrification Administration, is helping to turn them on all over rural America. And as I speak to you tonight there are thousands of farm families along new R. E. A. financed rural power lines from coast to coast who listen by the light and hear by the magic of radio that electricity has brought at long last to their farms. They know much of the story I shall tell, and I trust they hear me with approval. To all of you, I report the progress of a development for the people of rural America that is closely linked with the lives and livelihoods of every one of us.

America needs light today, light for the mind and light for the eyes. With that thought in mind, I want to acknowledge with deep sincerity my gratitude for the opportunity to speak to you tonight, my gratitude to the blue network of the N. B. C. and to the Washington Evening Star. For these Star Forum programs are designed to bring light to our minds. And this brief discussion of the R. E. A.'s endeavor to help bring light to the eyes of rural America will, I think, stand up to that tradition.

BEGINNINGS OF MOVEMENT

For more than 30 years I have been intimately associated with the conservation and electric-power program in America. Twenty-five years ago I watched the beginnings of the movement to bring the benefits of electricity to the farms of the country. I heard the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, sterling leader and statesman, repeat often the slogan which he carried on the masthead of his weekly paper, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." He was one of the first to voice the hope of bringing the blessings of electricity to the families of rural America. He had the vision.

Twenty-eight years ago I saw the great strides already achieved in rural electrification in Ontario, Canada, and on my return from that trip I saw and talked with the great Steinmetz, wizard of electricity, at work in his General Electric Co. laboratories in Schenectady. He spoke even then of his belief in a network of transmission lines that would gird this country, border to border, and reach into every hamlet and every home. He had the vision.

I watched Gifford Pinchot, when first Governor of Pennsylvania, endeavor to awaken the Keystone State to the need for rural electrification. He had the vision.

In his efforts to decentralize industrial activity, Justice Louis D. Brandeis early saw the need and potentialities of electricity in small villages, towns, and on the farm. He also had the vision—and still has, I assure you.

During the administration of Theodore Roosevelt the grandfather of the present Secretary of Agriculture, affectionately known

to thousands of you in the Middle West as "Uncle Henry" Wallace, urged the cooperative electrification of our rural areas.

He had the vision then. His grandson, Henry A. Wallace, the present Secretary of Agriculture, has the vision now as indicated by his achievements for the farmer's welfare, and for rural electrification.

IDEA CRYSTALLIZED INTO ACTION

President Roosevelt has told how, while he was visiting Warm Springs some years ago, an idea crystallized into a plan of action. The idea which he had long cherished was: "Electricity is a necessity of modern life and ought to be found in every village, every home, every farm, in every part of the United States." The plan of action was the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration. All of us know he had the vision.

Today the work of the Rural Electrification Administration has brought that vision of these men and many others to a reality * * * electricity on the farm is a fact for hundreds of thousands of our people. For many more, it is on the march.

I wish it were somehow possible for you out there on the loudspeaker end of this discussion to shoot questions at me as I go along—then we'd have a real forum—but I think I can anticipate many of your possible queries.

What is this rural electrification?

Why is the Federal Government stimulating the development of electric service for unserved farm families, anyway?

Who benefits—only the farmer?

What does it cost, and who's going to pay the bill?

How is the program carried on?

What has been accomplished?

FACTS SIMPLE AND PLAIN

Let's turn the pages of the book of rural electrification on the march and sift the answers. The facts are simple and plain.

Rural electrification means, obviously enough, the taking of electric service unserved rural areas of the Nation. But it means more than that, too. It means the extension of opportunity for farm families to live on a plane equal to that enjoyed by the family in the city. It means bringing to the farmer new tools for making a better living—doing a better job of working a livelihood from the soil. It means better sanitation and a stepped-up standard of farm health. It means increased living comfort for all the farm family—not the comfort that softens a man's muscles but the comfort that promotes leisure and an opportunity to plan, to think, to sharpen the mind through intelligent use of leisure.

For the boy and girl on the farm rural electrification means a renewed interest in seeking his or her place in life, in the country—not in the harried confines of a city shop—or in the too-long line that still leads to a dismal employment office.

These things are the real essence of rural electrification—and the Rural Electrification Administration and its program are designed to speed the sound development of these basic improvements for the agricultural arm of the Nation.

As late as 1925 the established private power companies had extended electric service to only about 200,000 farms. At that time there were nearly six and a half million farms in America. From 1925 until 1935 service was extended to about a half million more, but the unplanned character of these rural extensions, often simply short fingers reaching out from the cities, merely skimmed the cream of potential rural consumers and left more than five and a half million farms unserved.

Nine farm families in every 10 did not have, and many of them had forsaken the idea of ever being able to get electricity.

IMPORTANT TO NATION

They needed it. And it was important to the Nation as a whole that they have it. I say it was important to the Nation because the efficiency and convenience of life in the city had developed rapidly, largely as the result of electricity, while people who lived in the country still had to get along with old-fashioned, and for some farm work, almost pioneer types of equipment. Socially and economically, country and city were thrown increasingly out of balance. In terms of effective living the agricultural arm of the Nation grew proportionately weaker as the urban arm became stronger.

No one needs an economist to explain that such a situation undermines the strength and the competence of our whole social and economic organism. And a situation that did not make good economic sense had to be remedied.

The Nation could not afford to have five and a half million farm families living in the era of the kerosene lamp while the rest of the Nation, the Nation in which they had to live and make a living, went speeding on, geared up for the age of electricity.

The Nation could not afford to have more than five and a half million farm families handicapped for want of the modern tools for better living and more effective production that had become such potent instruments for progress in the city home and factory.

It was evident that electricity could bring the farm family, insofar as electric service and its attendant advantages were concerned, into closer social and economic parity with the city family. And in 1935 the growing appreciation of these facts, coupled with the need for added stimulus to national and employment industry running in low gear, set the stage for the timely establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration.

ACTIVITY SPREADS

Congress acted under the dynamic intellectual and practical leadership of such men as Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska; Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas; and Representative JOHN ELLIOTT RANKIN, of Mississippi—provided the funds for actually building rural power lines. Construction took the place of conversation. And the rural-electrification program was under way. R. E. A. started lending money; low-cost electric service started to spread, slowly, but with growing vigor, into unserved rural areas, and the money used to build the lines prompted new activity in a hundred trades and crafts.

First benefits of the new rural electrification went to the farm family. Electricity lit the farmer's evening—sped his completion of a dozen nightly chores. Electricity sprang to action for the farm woman in her kitchen—pumped the water for her many tasks, and retired the awkward pail that had bent her back on countless trips to the pump. Farm youngsters turned to their schoolbooks with more enthusiasm and less eyestrain. Across the face of isolated countrysides thousands of folks thrilled to the magic of their new-found perfect farmhand—low-cost electricity at the snap of a switch.

And across the face of industrial America a new stimulus was felt as the demands of rural-line construction piled up new orders for wire and insulators and poles and hardware, piled up new demands for the services of workers in the mines, in transportation, and in electrical-equipment factories.

The new rural electrification built new outlooks and new incentives and new tools for the farm family while it bolstered employment and the pay roll of the Nation.

Who benefits from the far-reaching program to take low-cost electricity to the Nation's farmsteads? The farm families, yes; but you and I, as well. For each fundamental improvement in the lot of one branch of our national family spreads its benefits through the whole economic and social fabric of America.

During the first 5 years of operation, concluded last month, R. E. A. lent $270,000,000 for the construction of rural power lines to serve 850,000 farm families and other rural users. A relatively small amount of this money has been made available for financing farm wiring and plumbing and for the construction of generating plants in places and in situations where electricity could not be purchased wholesale at rates which would permit the rural electric systems to provide low-cost service to their consumer-members and pay out as the law requires.

SUM LENT AS INVESTMENT

Two hundred seventy million dollars is a tremendous sum of money, but it has been lent strictly as an investment. The law under which the Rural Electrification Administration operates requires that all this money be returned to the Treasury with interest within 20 to 25 years.

The American people, through their Government, have made this investment in the people and the prospects of America's most basic industry—agriculture. It is a sound investment. The cash will be repaid by the farm families who use electric service. And these families will also pay the small interest charge on that cash. But the return of actual value to you and me as taxpayers will exceed a hundredfold the money returned to the Treasury. No economist can compute the value to the Nation of the new vitality, the new standard of health and of living, the new impetus to better farm production, or the whole new outlook on life in a democratic United States that is the fundamental product of the rural-electrification program.

Money is the lifeblood and action is the creed of this dynamic effort to speed the electrification of rural America. But the job could not have been done as it has been done without the enlistment of new attitudes and new principles of management.

The new attitudes and the new principles are those of cooperation.

Cooperation is the idea and the method that has made possible most of the rural electrification stimulated by the R. E. A.

And cooperative principles of management—principles designed solely for the purpose of providing service, unhampered by the demand for profits—these principles are the operating device for building and maintaining the new rural electric systems.

Nearly 90 percent of all R. E. A. loans have been made to cooperative organizations of progressive farm people. Their functioning is simple, democratic, and well-adapted both to the temper and the interests of the farmer and to the job of providing electric service in rural areas.

This is how the cooperative grows and works in the field of rural electrification.

STEPS TO OBTAIN LOAN

A group of farmers who want service meet and organize as a corporation. They apply to R. E. A. for a loan. The amount of the loan depends upon the amount of line that must be built, the engineering and related problems that must be met in building comprehensive service for the area to be served, and the number of farms that will use the service. After a thorough investigation of the economic, agricultural, and engineering factors that will affect the financial and service success of the cooperative—and providing, of course, that the investigation proves the feasibility of the intended construction, R. E. A. grants the loan.

All farmers who are to take service join the cooperative. Each pays a nominal membership fee into the treasury of the coopera-

tive and this money is used to offset the expenses of organization and initial development. Each member has an equal vote and voice in the management of the cooperative, and this, I submit, is a pattern for true democracy in action.

The cooperative employs a manager and other competent personnel to handle specialized tasks of operation and management. These employees, responsible to a board of directors elected by and from the membership, run the business as any other sound business is run—always with this exception, however, that their responsibility is to the members, the folks whom they serve, rather than to stockholders. Their entire effort is directed toward the maintenance and improvement of service * * * a service job, undiluted by demand for profit.

The farmer-member's responsibility to his cooperative is simple. His sole obligation is to pay his bills for current, to use his electricity wisely and abundantly for the improvement of his home and his work, thus contributing to the financial soundness of his cooperative, and to take an active part in the affairs of his system to the end that it serve the whole farm community completely and as fully as possible.

Throughout all stages of the cooperative's organization and development the staff of the Rural Electrification Administration works with the staff and membership of the cooperative—smoothing its way in matters of law, assisting in the engineering and maintenance of the lines, helping the farm families to initiate the most practical and profit-producing applications of electricity.

That in brief is the way these rural electric cooperatives function.

THE RESULTS TO DATE

All these answers to the questions which I posed myself point up the final question which always comes to the alert mind: "So what?" What does all this mean in terms of accomplishment—accomplishment we can weigh and appraise? Does it all add up to a tangible result that justifies the expenditure of time and money and tremendous effort? A practical American wants results. These are the results to date of the R. E. A. program to electrify rural America.

More than 600 R. E. A. financed rural electric systems are now in operation. These systems are serving over half a million consumer-members and new members are being added every day. Nearly a hundred other systems are being speeded to completion and each tomorrow brings to my desk reports of construction completed, lines energized, the juice turned on. These additional systems will serve half again as many farm families and other rural users. Awaiting the momentary allotment of funds for construction are plans for 75,000 miles of power line destined to bring service to many thousands more. Moneys already allotted will ultimately bring electric service to 4,000,000 rural people.

Farmers in 45 of the 48 States have enlisted R. E. A. cooperation. Only in 3 States no R. E. A. power systems have been set up. There, in some instances, the farmers have been prevented in various ways from building and operating their own electric distribution systems. But I hope we will eventually bring R. E. A. to these States.

This movement for rural electrification owes no little to the firm support of the agriculture organizations like the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers' Union, and others.

I want to take this occasion to say, too, that the success of the R. E. A. program is due in a large part to the devoted day in and day out efforts of the men and women of the R. E. A. staff, both in Washington and in the field.

Since the inception of the R. E. A. program the number of farms served with high-line electric power has increased by 150 percent. In 1935, 1 farm in 10 had central-station service; today 1 farm family in 4 enjoys the new opportunity and incentive for more effective life and work on the farm that comes with the magic of electricity at the click of a switch.

These have been the physical, the tangible results of the R. E. A. program.

Less tangible, but no less real and important, are the human results.

SENSE OF NEW FREEDOM

Written in the eyes of thousands upon thousands of farm women is a joy and sense of new freedom from drudgeries inherited from the pioneers. The electric refrigerator, running water pumped with electricity, a bright light over her sink, an electric bulb in her hen house prompting extra-egg income from her hens—these things are not mere gadgets for improved living to the farm woman, these things are symbols of a dream come true.

Better farm management, made possible by electric equipment, reflects the electrified farmer's new sense of opportunity to make his farming a more profitable and a more satisfying way of life.

Farm youngsters have a yen to stick to the old place because the old place is a better place, as good as the city cousin's, when electricity turns on the lights.

Only they who toil in the highlands and along the river bottoms, they who work the soil to fill the larder of our Nation, they know best how great are these results. To them to new rural power lines are symbols of their modern pioneering, a new source of power for their modern progress.

In a letter to me commemorating the fifth anniversary of R. E. A., President Roosevelt acknowledged the significance of these human results in these words: "* * * even in a complex industrial economy such as ours the roots of national well-being strike deeply into the soil. But particularly in times like these, all who strive to bring to the life of the American farmer new comfort, new power, and new dignity may take special pride in their task."

SPECIAL PRIDE IN TASK

We do take special pride in our task. But it is the pride one feels as he accepts a challenge, such a challenge as was implied by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace when he said to our R. E. A. staff recently, "Electricity in agriculture is going to be enormously more important than any of us now appreciate."

We are challenged by many things today. Many are grim, but many others are promising. America has never looked down, and she never shall, so long as her men and women, free and independent in thought and action, can join together of their own will to accomplish common ends for the common good.

Our problems as a Nation are grave, but no chaos in the tides of human affairs can match the spirit of our confidence in the future of America.

And I say to you, everyone, that the electrification of rural America by and for the farmers themselves is a vital, democratic action. This is proof, positive and triumphant, that our American way of life is virile, and equal to every challenge of the future.

The Communist Party in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, on the floor of the House, commenting on the President's inordinate eagerness to be rid of those who would not, figuratively speaking, lick his boots, I referred to the stab in the back which was given by the President to the former Member of this body, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, John O'Connor.

This morning I am in receipt of a letter and a list of names from Mr. O'Connor, which are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 20, 1940.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARE: I read in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your reference to me. Thanks for remembering me. You did not state the half of it. What the Communists did was on direct orders, and not from Moscow. Those were the days when Earl Browder was a welcomed guest in the Northwest section of Washington.

Enclosed herewith find a list of names of those whom the Communists propose to run this year for electors in the State of New York. You will note the preponderance of the names of old-line American families!

I note that they have adopted a new emblem for this year. Formerly they used the hammer and sickle—tools literally unknown to them. Just last year they abandoned those implements and adopted a combination of the two letters "CP." This year it is the hoe and shovel, and I am willing to wager that none of the gentleman in the enclosed list ever had a hoe or shovel in their hands in their lives, but some of them may not also be allergic to bombs.

You will recall that I was successful in preventing the Communists from running for councilmen in the city of New York in 1939 and fought the right of Earl Browder to run for Congressman early this year. Just recently I tried to enjoin the three big radio chains from broadcasting his speech. I think I was right in every instance. Whether I shall move in the courts to throw out their petitions for electors will depend upon what happens at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago—if the same is not postponed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR.

COMMUNIST CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS IN NEW YORK STATE IN 1940

Max Bedacht, Angelo Herndon, Paul Novick, Lester Osband, Harry Liebenson, Corinne Graves, Joseph Soltan, Robert Rasmussen, Joseph S. Levinson, Eli Shmagin, Juanita Hayward, Henry

Berkow, Libbie Davis, Ethel Stalee, Irving Caress, Mary Engelson, Elsie Brody, Tuly Kandel, Beatrice Blosser, David Dorenz, Arthur White, Michael Ceresnak, Sender Garlin, Louis Rosenblum, Abner Winston Berry, Catherine Tietgen, Irene Mendel, Leucio Feleppa, Alfred Grayson, Irving Bazer, Edna V. Briehl, Charles Dorenz, Michael Fox, Thomas Myerscough, Robert Hartson, Dwight Kingsbury, Margaret Hoff, Julius Siegel, Soloman Katz, Hollis E. Bartholomew, Matt Wick, Gertrude Kowal, Mary Parrini, David Wagner, William D. Spurbeck, Joseph Green, Gilbert L. Anderberg.

From this letter, it will appear that the President was somewhat more than "inordinately eager" to assist his Communist friends in their political plans.

Since the Dies committee has disclosed the workings of the Communists after Mrs. Roosevelt gave them aid and comfort by appearing with some of their supporters before the Dies committee, it has become less popular to embrace their doctrines and follow them along the "party line."

It is one thing to have, during a campaign, the support of the Communists, to profit at election time by their votes, but something else again to be caught out with them after they have been exposed to the whole United States as working from vantage points in the New Deal administration to overthrow the very government which harbors and feeds them.

The odor arising from their treasonable conduct has become so strong that some Government officials have quite recently deemed it politically expedient to separate themselves, at least publicly, from the now not too advantageous connection.

David Lasser has just announced that he has resigned as national president of the Workers Alliance of America, giving as his reason that "domination and control of the organization by a political group made it impossible" for him to continue.

Not long ago, Federal Judge Igoe, of Chicago; Adolph A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; and Jackson himself resigned from the Lawyers' Guild, assigning substantially the same reason.

It is matter of common knowledge that the organization to which they referred as being in control was that of the Communist Party. As the Dies committee has ripped the lid off the Communist activities, and more and more of those holding Federal positions have been found under the cover, they have taken occasion to renounce their allegiance to the organizations controlled by the Communists.

Let us be charitable and assume that their resignations were prompted by the belated discovery of the kind of company they were keeping, rather than by the public indignation which has followed the publication of the Dies report.

Let us hope, too, that the resignation of the Attorney General had attached to it no strings and that there is in his mind no lingering affection for his old associates and that he will not again come to the rescue of Bridges, who is indelibly stamped in the public mind as a Communist.

What Has Happened to the National Resources Committee?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 1939, the President transmitted to Congress a report of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee, which report had been made to the National Resources Committee. This report had to do with the cut-over areas in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

On August 5, 1939, I called to the attention of the House of Representatives the recommendations made in this report. This region faces a serious unemployment problem and needs the rehabilitation program recommended by the committee. Again, on October 19, 1939, I pointed out to the House of Representatives the necessity of legislation to carry out the recommendations of the committee. Speaking generally, it would appear that this is just another report that is to be consigned to the dusty archives of the past—a lot of promises and no performance—an experiment that died before it was born.

WHAT IS THIS COMMITTEE?

The committee is composed of Cabinet officers and others. I have before me a pamphlet dated June 1939 which states that Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, is the chairman. They state:

> The National Resources Committee, a Federal agency planning for the better conservation and use of our national resources, succeeded to the functions and duties of the National Planning Board and the National Resources Board. The National Resources Board was established by President Roosevelt on June 30, 1934, "to prepare and present to the President a program and plan of procedure dealing with the physical, social, governmental, and economic aspects of public policies for the development and use of land, water, and other national resources and such related subjects as may from time to time be referred to the Board by the President."

This, then, is the committee and I have used its own language to describe the history and purpose of the group.

EFFORTS TO GET COMMITTEE ACTION

No recommendations are of any value unless they are used as part of a legislative program. That applies in connection with the report of the Northern Lakes States Region. We have held conferences with various officials, and have asked for specific legislation. It has been said that the machinery is already set up to put the report of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee into effect. At one conference held with various officials of the Department of Agriculture Mr. M. W. Torkelson, chairman of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee outlines a plan whereby the Soil Conservation Service should acquire submarginal lands and aid the settlers to go on to more productive land. He also suggested that the Farm Security Administration should take steps to aid farmers now on productive land to rehabilitate themselves by making proper loans. The United States Forest Service was discussed, and it was pointed out that they ought to work out a plan to give people who live in the cut-over areas an opportunity to work for the United States Forest Service. Of course all of these ideas were countered with the statement that it would require appropriations, and that there was no money available. At that conference, and on other occasions, I took the opportunity to ask that the Department furnish necessary legislation. and that Members of Congress would cooperate in trying to secure its enactment. Up-to-date nothing has developed along these lines. I hesitate to say that one department of the Government is unfriendly to the recommendations of another department. What are the facts? The report dealing with the cut-over regions of northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan was sent to Congress on July 31, 1939, almost a year ago. The administration has not submitted any legislation to carry out the recommendations of the committee. Is this all an idle or a misleading gesture, or both? Why the delay in bringing in legislation to aid the people in these areas? Responsibility rests upon the Department of Agriculture and those charged with doing something for the people in the northern sections who need help in the rehabilitation program. There appears plenty of money for everything else except the recommendations of the Resources Board.

"If Let Alone"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Henry Ford has stated that in 6 months he could revamp his great River Rouge plant at Detroit so that he would be able to produce 1,000 fighting planes per day, "if let alone." What does "if let alone" mean? Does it mean that as one of the so-called economic royalist Ford wants to reduce wages, and thus violate the wage and hour law? No; because Ford has always paid high wages, and has taken the lead in setting high wage standards. Does it mean that Ford wants to increase working hours per day, and thus violate the wage and hour law? No; because Ford had the 8-hour day long before it became the law, and has always insisted that a short working day meant greater factory efficiency. What then did Ford mean when he used those significant words, "if let alone"? I believe Ford used those words to serve notice on the country and the administration that American industry was not only ready but it was fully able to take care of every defense need; that American industry would and could rectify the short-sightedness of our Army leaders, our Navy leaders, and our administration leaders on our American preparedness program; that American industry could and would speed up our production of necessary war materials to make up for the almost criminal negligence of those responsible for our unpreparedness plight; that American industry can and will remove all bottlenecks now hampering production of necessary war materials—"if let alone." If the handicaps, the shackles, the obstacles, the red tape, and the irritating restrictions that the New Deal has placed upon American industry are removed this can be done. Would that mean lower wages? It would not. It would mean higher wages in the long run. Would it mean a longer workday? It would not. Instead it would mean steady work during the full year rather than alternating lay-off periods and work periods. Our needs can be supplied; labor can receive larger pay envelopes and more of them; the wheels of industry can be kept humming; but it all depends upon "if let alone."

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of the Government having adequate means with which to fully equip both its Army and its Navy. Our Government should, at all times, have at its disposal a very considerable armament ready for instant employment. We should keep abreast and, if possible, in advance of the balance of equipment; and the Government plants should always be kept in a position to meet as quickly as possible any situation or emergency that might arise.

It seems to me that for a long time we have not gone about the business of preparedness in a manner sufficient to protect our country adequately. But now we must get ready. We must grasp that tremendous fact. We must bear our part honorably, bravely, and efficiently. No one has any right to shirk. All of us should be greatly concerned about the welfare of our Nation. When I think of the sacrifices made by the fathers who made it possible for us to be free and enjoy the blessings of liberty for which they fought and for which so many of them died, I am inclined to advocate very strong measures that will protect the rights, liberties, and the freedom of our country. While I sympathize with the weaker nations who suffer unjustly at the hands of their despotic and selfish neighbors, yet I cannot forget the importance of preserving our own country, our own institutions, and our Constitution which gave to us our liberty and freedom. We cannot shirk from the necessary means to maintain our free Government which our forefathers employed to establish and fought bravely to maintain.

What can be fairer than to ask that each citizen be ready to do his part in fighting to maintain our democracy? What can be more unfair and unjust than to lay upon the shoulders of those willing to perform their duty not only their balance of the burden but also the load that should be carried by others?

I believe that prompt action is needed now. Our national resources and industrial power should be mobilized under wise direction. Our military forces should be completely organized, trained, drilled, and made ready for protection. We should show the world that we are earnest and united and that our power of wealth and men is behind our Government. There is no doubt in my mind but that the American people believe in a very strong national defense. There is no question as to their present deep-seated opposition to a course looking toward a foreign war. An armed force strong enough to restrain the aggressive dictatorships will require greater preparation than ever before.

I believe the defense of the Monroe Doctrine is necessary for national safety and that the continental-defense program which is needed in any event should be expanded to meet the requirements of protecting the Western Hemisphere from European and Asiatic aggression.

No Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing a day or two ago in the Boston Herald:

[From the Boston Herald]

NO ADJOURNMENT

Whatever doubts there may have been about the advisability of having Congress remain in session were removed by the surrender of France and the series of problems which will inevitably arise at once. They are problems which affect vitally the national and international interests of this country, and only the Congress is constitutionally authorized to deal with them.

The American republics have declared that they will not permit a transfer of western-world territory from one foreign power to another. The President himself said last week: "The Government of the United States will not consider as valid any attempt to infringe by force the independence and territorial integrity of France." But the Nazis today are masters of France. It is not at all improbable that they will demand as part of the booty control of French lands here and in other places. The decisions which we shall be called on to make immediately are as portentous as any in our history and obviously most of the measures to be taken must have the approval of Congress and should have the careful consideration of an informed people.

What is to be the fate of the French holdings in the Caribbean and the Atlantic? What will be the effect on this country if the

French Fleet, refusing to run up the swastika, should seek a haven in Canada? What is to be our future Government policy, as apart from our private benefactions, in the extension of Red Cross aid to the people of those sections of France where the Germans are now masters? What is to be the status of France's Western Hemisphere tracts, whether Germany claims them or not? If she announces that she does not care for them, and "fifth columnists" should set up regimes in them, what then, if France should be rendered impotent to administer them?

The terms of surrender are not known, but there is an abundance of terrifying evidence of what has happened to other nations which the Nazis have crushed. If Hitlerism is to be exemplified again as it has been many times previously, there will be mighty little left of the France that we have known.

In addition to international complexities, there is a long list of bills which Congress has not debated sufficiently and which cannot be disposed of properly before the tentative date of adjournment. The Republicans realize this. It is in no spirit of partisan antagonism that Republican Senators and Representatives have voted solidly against adjournment and against a long recess. Republicans and Democrats should have a full opportunity to attend their national conventions, as we cannot discontinue our procedure because there is a war in Europe, but arrangements for absence could be made without difficulty.

What might happen if the President should be allowed to exercise his uncontrolled discretion between an adjournment within a few days and a reassembling of Congress in January is not pleasant to think. He can prorogue Congress, of course, if he wishes to, as the Constitution gives him that authority. But in the present critical state of the Nation, such compulsory adjournment would cause a storm of protest throughout the country. The people do not trust any one man to render safe judgments at such a time as this. The dreadful uncertainty which now prevails everywhere will become immeasurably greater if one man and his associates have almost complete liberty of action.

Regulation of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBIA (S. C.) RECORD

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial carried in the Columbia Record, an outstanding daily paper in Columbia, S. C., my district, entitled "Regulation of Business."

Because this editorial meets so clearly with my views in connection with this most important matter I am asking the privilege of inserting same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Prior to 1933 certainly the Government did not have anything to do with regulating business; and what happened? I am not going to take the time to go over this past sad history.

I believe it was President Coolidge who stated on one occasion that if his administration could make business and industry, the financial interests of the country, prosperous, that prosperity would trickle down to all other classes. I am glad that the present administration does not feel that way.

During the past 7 years business and industry have been going places, and in every paper that you pick up giving reports of sales, profits, and so forth, we find increased business, increased profits, larger dividends, and yet, business and the Republican Party, apparently more interested in big business, in line with the statement made by Mr. Coolidge, continue to rap the New Deal about fighting and regulating business.

It would appear to me that businessmen, in the interest of their own success in business, would realize that the thing they should do would be to gather around a conference table and work out a constructive program whereby the unorganized classes, including farmers, would be taken into the picture to the extent that they would have some say so, in order to be able to control their business, the marketing of their products, and get a fair price for that which they produce.

If business, industry, and the financial interests of this country believe that their business is safe, in fact, if they believe that this country is safe, and that we shall be able to continue the democracy for which our forefathers fought, with farm prices ranging on an average of about 75 percent of parity, in comparison with the prices that farmers have to pay for that which they purchase, in the meantime forcing farmers and the consuming public to pay unreasonable, monopolistic, fixed prices, take it or leave it, they will wake up some of these days with another guess coming.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) Record]

REGULATION OF BUSINESS

The trend toward a greater amount of active governmental participation in the affairs of business enterprise is heartily deplored and stoutly resisted by the enterprisers themselves.

However, businessmen do not seem to realize that their own failure to perform their functions properly has been largely responsible for increasing governmental regulation.

And what are the functions of a system of business enterprise? The chief function is to provide the machinery by which the available supply of resources can be converted into goods and services to satisfy the desires of human beings. And in the final analysis, the success or failure of any system of enterprise, whether privately owned, publicly owned, or privately owned and publicly controlled, depends upon the efficiency with which it performs this function.

A system of business enterprise has also two other functions. They are to return profits to the owners of the enterprise and to provide employment for that part of the population which labors.

There are, of course, those who deny that enterprise has any other obligation than to return profits to managers and investors. To such it suffices to point out the lessons to be learned from the failure of the system of enterprise in Russia, Germany, and Italy to fulfill its proper functions.

The history of governmental encroachment upon business in this country is not that of a policy deliberately designed to suppress. It is rather a policy which has been made necessary or possible by the failure of the system to perform its functions adequately when left to its own devices.

This is well illustrated by experience in the field of banking. After the Second National Bank was abolished upon the election of Jackson to the Presidency, banking was an enterprise left entirely unhampered by governmental restrictions. The result is well known to any student of history. This was the year of wildcat banking, when the butcher, the baker, or the candlestick maker could found a bank if he chose, and he frequently did so choose. The effects upon the monetary and credit systems of the United States were disastrous. The only solution to the problem created by this failure of private enterprise was to place restrictions upon its activities. This was done by the passage of an act creating a national banking system.

Experience in other fields has been similar. The activities of the railroads were directly responsible for the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1887, after attempts at State regulation had proven unsuccessful. The formation of monopolistic trusts in the oil, sugar, tobacco, and steel industries produced the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890. In 1914 the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act were passed to strengthen regulation of monopolies. Regulation of public utilities and even the entry of the Federal Government into this field have been brought about by these same factors.

Other examples of this type of legislation are the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, workmen's compensation laws, the Social Security Act of 1935, and the wage and hour law of 1938.

The question is, therefore, not one of whether Government should continue to encroach upon the rights of private enterprise, but whether the failure of private enterprise to recognize and fulfill its functions will make such a step necessary.

Business with some show of justice complains of the handicaps that New Deal regulations have produced; the cry goes up for the unshackling of enterprise in the United States. These complaints and this cry will run through the Republican Presidential campaign like a theme song, but not even the Republicans will propose that the New Deal be undone. Business and industry need therefore to accept the accomplished fact and to go ahead despite the handicaps. Greater handicaps have been overcome and there are still profits for those who have the enterprise to go after them. The Federal income-tax law was, the calamity howlers had it, to abolish wealth in the United States; it simply made the Federal-aid system bigger and better.

The Sane Way of Financing National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

RADIO DISCUSSION BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, AND DANIEL E. CASEY, LECTURER ON ECONOMICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint discussion by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, ranking member, House Judiciary Committee, and Mr. Daniel E. Casey, lecturer on economics, Georgetown University, and executive vice president, American Taxpayers Association, Inc., broadcast over the coast-to-coast network of the Columbia Broadcasting System from station WJSV, Washington, D. C., June 20, 1940.

Mr. CELLER. Two very important and two very vital problems are before the American people today—first, the problem of providing an adequate national defense; and, second, the problem of providing the necessary funds to secure it. These are serious problems; they are problems which affect every citizen. They entail the heavy hand of taxation and the burdensome weight of an increased debt.

Mr. CASEY. I would prefer to consider them merely as two aspects of the same problem. It is delusive to think that we can solve one while ignoring the other. The matter of producing defense materials and the question of how funds should be raised are of equal importance, because our whole economy and the welfare of the American people depend upon their proper solution.

Mr. CELLER. All of us want national defense and it is clear that all of us are going to have to dig down to help finance it. All of us, no matter what our tax bracket, our line of business, trade, craft, or profession, are going to have to contribute our part to American rearmament. There were no 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock whistles in Hitler's preparation for conquest; none of the long, casual week ends that England maintained almost to the moment when the German Army reached the English Channel.

Mr. CASEY. If ever there was an object lesson for the American people, the world crisis and Washington's plans for building up the nation's defenses offer one. The last desperate appeal from France still rings in our ears. However, 4 years ago France embarked on a program which promised the people more wealth for less work. With unemployment increasing, trade stagnant, the national budget far out of balance, governmental expenses and taxes mounting, industry all but parlalyzed, and war becoming more imminent, France tossed overboard the popular front government of Leon Blum. But France awoke to her peril too late; she has paid a fearful price for her experience and we are foolish indeed if we do not profit by this lesson.

Mr. CELLER. I am convinced that we will profit from the experience of France. This country is united in its determination that our defenses shall be made impregnable regardless of the cost; that the Government's credit shall be made strong, whatever the sacrifices; that idle men and idle dollars shall be put to work to revitalize industry, no matter how many heads or pet political ideas are cracked in the process. The President lives in the White House. Why is it called the White House? Because, prior to 1812 we were unprepared as we are unprepared now. After the Revolutionary War there was a great antiwar hysteria. Everyone became a pacifist, with the result that Great Britain took advantage of that unpreparedness, entered our portals, and invaded the Capital. There was no resistance. We had no army to speak of. The British were able to burn the Capitol Building and much of Washington. The smoke was so great that the stone from which the White House had been built was covered with soot and black smoke. It was necessary to paint the stone white. Hence, the term "White House." The burning of our Capitol and the ruin of our White House in 1812 should serve to remind us that nevermore shall we have a national defense that is inadequate for all purposes.

Mr. CASEY. These preparations can be achieved by constructive methods, but we must remember that production today is clogged with the wreckage of American business. We see on all sides the tragic spectacle of factory after factory closed down forever. High taxes have closed their doors. The Bridgeport Screw Co., the Monumental Bronze Co., the gigantic factory of the American Tube & Stamping Co. are just a very few in one community that come to mind. These huge buildings may be sorely needed for production for defense purposes, but the only way to get them off the tax books was to demolish them. Every community could tell a similar story of buildings razed with the land becoming parking lots. The one idea that seemed to be accepted was that when industry did not provide work for every wage earner industrial management alone was to blame. This, of course, is completely wrong. It constituted a part of the vast amount of plain bunk put out by self-appointed authorities who tried to show us how to bring the Nation back to normalcy.

Mr. CELLER. Possibly too much dependence has been placed upon those who have had no practical management experience. When you have a four-cylinder motor hitting only on three, it is evident that the problem is a technical one. You don't waste your time talking about the possibility of getting more efficiency out of the three cylinders still functioning to replace the work of the dead cylinder, but you use your common sense and repair the damaged fourth cylinder that was put there for the same purpose as the other three still functioning cylinders.

Mr. CASEY. You have touched upon one of the first essentials. There is only one way to turn for the repair materials—that is, to American industry—industry which has been under severe attacks for many years, industry which is still operating under new and unprecedented controls. Enterprise should be fostered rather than penalized. National defense can be promoted by incentives, but not by penalties. The immediate job is to restore vigor to our industries, from which we must draw the weapons of defense.

Mr. CELLER. We have already taken the first steps in that direction; Congress has appropriated about four and one-half billions of dollars for defense. To be effective, these dollars must, of course, be converted into guns, bombs, planes, tanks, ships, and ammunition. Without these things in great abundance we are helpless and defenseless. The critical world conditions make it imperative that these defenses be supplied with all possible speed.

Mr. CASEY. Fine, Congressman CELLER, but all the dollars minted since the birth of the Republic will not repel one invader. France and England still have plenty of funds. I say to you that our first line of defense and our last line of defense today is in the factories and shops and in the great industries of this country. Our safety as a Nation depends upon their efficient operation, and that in turn depends upon friendly cooperation and relationship between capital and labor. But, above all, no group of men and no agency of this Government must be permitted to hamstring the industries of the country upon which our safety now depends.

Mr. CELLER. Industry has given public and genuine assurance that it will do its utmost. Labor, I am sure, will be willing to cooperate, and the Government can be depended upon to do its part. None of these things requires the abandonment of any sound social legislation. They do mean the removal of such legislative and administrative restrictions on industrial production as have been condemned by both military and industrial experience. We cannot permit past mistakes to be repeated now. That seems to take care of the first part of our problem, suppose we consider the cost and method of paying for this program.

Mr. CASEY. At the outset let us face the fact that the funds already appropriated by the Congress, huge as they are, represent only a drop in the bucket to what we will be called upon to spend for adequate defense. We need have no illusions on that score. The actual monetary outlay required for defense purposes must be raised by taxation, borrowing, or a combination of the two methods. The important objective is that any taxation must not be so severe as to stifle business activity, and that the impact of war borrowing must not be allowed to increase interest rates, cause forced liquidation of property with consequent loss of value, or otherwise cripple the business structure.

Mr. CELLER. The pending tax bill contains provisions for increased taxes and increased borrowing by raising the debt limit. Practically, we can be sure that a combination of the two methods will be used in our future defense efforts. The exact admixture of the two methods, borrowing and taxing, to meet cost of defense is a delicate question. It will depend in large measure upon the credit position and the borrowing power of the Nation, the amount of money needed, and the extent to which peacetime tax rates approach a point of diminishing returns.

Mr. CASEY. That last point is important. It is admitted by all competent authorities that in some instances rates have long since passed the point of diminishing returns. This view has been expressed publicly by Secretary Morgenthau, former Under Secretary Hanes, leading members of the House and Senate tax-raising committees, and a long list of qualified witnesses before those committees. Further, disregarding the proposed supertax of 10 percent, present tax rates are in many respects the highest in our entire history—much higher than they were in the bills enacted to finance the costs of the World War.

Mr. CELLER. This emergency hit us suddenly, and the pending tax bill is a temporary measure to provide part of the money needed for the huge defense expenditure. The tax-raising committees have promised that a thorough study will be made in the next few months and that recommendations will be ready in January for a more thorough tax revision.

Mr. CASEY. Such promises have been made for many years. Unfortunately, this bill does not remove the admitted business deterrents in existing tax legislation; it merely increases them. The first step taken in the defense program was to call into Washington the best industrial talent available to mobilize our resources—such men as Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Knudsen. That was

a proper step and met with Nation-wide approval. Tax revision is also a business problem; therefore, it is equally important in framing tax legislation that government should recognize the full weight of business intelligence and experience toward adopting a program which will not stifle business activity or undermine property values. The stakes are too high to take further chances.

Mr. CELLER. I agree that we must be realistic about this matter. Unfortunately in the past some of those who have been responsible for tax legislation have been lacking in this respect. I need only mention our unfortunate experience with the discredited undistributed profits tax. To remedy this condition, I introduced a joint resolution on March 5, to provide a Federal Tax Commission to study these problems. Its members will be representative of all groups of taxpayers.

Mr. CASEY. Speaking of tax studies, Congressman CELLER, you will recall that former Under Secretary of the Treasury John W. Hanes, in the fall of 1939, conducted what was probably the most comprehensive tax study ever undertaken by the Treasury Department. You and I accompanied many groups of the leading business executives in the United States to numerous conferences, participated in the discussions, and joined in recommendations, based on actual business experiences for necessary changes in the tax structure to promote the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. CELLER. Indeed I do remember those conferences. I was most favorably impressed by the factual data submitted by those business executives. On essential points, they were in substantial accord. This information is now available and it would be unfortunate if it were not taken advantage of. To disregard the facts established might affect adversely the success of the whole defense program. This is unthinkable, and I fervently hope that Treasury officials will seize this opportunity for recommending a program of sound, thorough, and constructive tax revision to meet present-day business requirements. Have you any specific suggestions to offer?

Mr. CASEY. Only those already submitted to Treasury officials and to tax-raising committees of Congress. They have been endorsed by practically every organization of businessmen, large and small, interested in taxation and are to be found in the recommendations of many recent nonpartisan surveys on the subject. They include:

1. Drastic reduction of the surtax rates in the upper brackets of the personal-income taxes.
2. Elimination of the individual normal income tax on corporate dividends.
3. Repeal of the capital gains and losses tax.
4. Elimination of the tax on intercorporate dividends.
5. Permission for affiliated corporations to file consolidated returns.

Mr. CELLER. Those are sound recommendations. I have both publicly and privately advocated these very changes for some time. They recognize the necessity for inducing greater and greater capital investment. They also recognize existing experience which has demonstrated that more taxes are collected with low rates and that confiscatory rates kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. I would go further. I believe in social betterment, but the taxing system should not be used for social purposes. We should not be Sir Galahads fighting dragons with tax armor. Taxes should be confined to their one legitimate function—raising revenue. Excessive taxation will merely burn the powder of national defense and exhaust our credit for future emergencies. Production for national defense requires the expansion of plant and equipment, which will be virtually valueless when the emergency is passed. Ample private capital is available. These dollars that the investor would like to venture in a dynamic, expanding America are now lying idle in the banks. They do not go into business largely because of the heavy and uncertain taxes; they go into the "cyclone cellar" of Government bonds that are tax exempt. The result is a creeping paralysis which is destroying industrial expansion. The use of this capital must be encouraged because it will to this extent prevent increase in the public debt. But it is clear that tax laws and regulations must be modified to permit wiping out the investment during the useful life of the new facilities; therefore, Government action should be taken as soon as possible to permit amortization of all new capital investment before a profit, subject to taxation, is recognized.

Mr. CASEY. The War and Navy Departments also maintain that tax measures must not impose so much of the burden on industry that the production of munitions and materials might thereby be hampered or even destroyed. They recognize that excessive taxes might result not alone in failure to secure supplies but also in loss of lives and possible defeat. Unfortunately, the bill passed by the Senate yesterday ignores all past tax experience; also the recommendations of the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. CELLER. It is regrettable that the Senate adopted the amendments offered yesterday. It is my belief they should be rejected by the conferees and I will do everything in my power to bring this about.

Mr. CASEY. I hope you may be successful. There is another factor to be considered. Our industries gave the country the highest standard of living in the world. Excessive taxation has lowered that standard of living. Further, a war machine diverts from the people a very large proportion of the goods and services produced each year, and thus greatly depresses living standards. It is man's greatest invention to impoverish the human race. Therefore, no barriers should be placed in the way of normal activity in business and industry so long as armament can be accommodated. American industry is so vast that it can accommodate both. All of this, obviously, depends upon sound tax legislation.

Mr. CELLER. I believe that adoption of the program we have outlined would in a reasonable time restore full employment and would so increase the national income, and thereby the Federal receipts, that we could finance a defense program of eight or ten billion dollars a year without increasing taxes or without further borrowing. All we have to do is to run our farms, factories, stores, and railroads at full capacity.

Mr. CASEY. Precisely. But the very obvious necessity of repairing the defense machine must not be allowed to cloak unnecessary appropriations having nothing to do with preparedness. It is the duty of Congress to see that no funds are appropriated for anything outside of the normal functions of government, a defense program, and matters of dire necessity.

Mr. CELLER. There seems to be no alternative to providing the funds needed to rescue us from the situation in which we have been placed. We need preparedness, concomitantly we need sound tax legislation which will bring about a healthy fiscal position that alone will make it possible for us to continue to carry on in a solvent condition once we possess the defense equipment which in sum total is costing us so dearly.

Limiting Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in yesterday morning's Washington Post, in which reference is made to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]:

[From the Washington Post of June 20, 1940]

LIMITING COMMITMENTS

There was good reason for the formal notification, served on the German and Italian Governments, that "the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

This definition of position is not merely an affirmation of part of the Monroe Doctrine by the administration. It is also endorsed by a resolution which passed the Senate unanimously and was this week approved by the House with only eight negative votes. Notice is thereby served that the United States would to a certainty oppose, by force of arms if necessary, any annexation by the Axis Powers of territory in this hemisphere now belonging to the Netherlands, French, or British Empires.

In view of the terms of peace now about to be imposed on France it was the course of wisdom for the Department of State to make our interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine plain in Berlin and Rome. But one could wish that this clear-cut statement had not been complicated and confused by the message which the President sent to former Premier Reynaud of France last Saturday.

In that statement, which had no congressional backing, Mr. Roosevelt said that "the Government of the United States will not consider as valid any attempt to infringe by force the independence and territorial integrity of France."

So far as the French possessions in the New World are concerned, that assurance would seem to have made the later intervention by the Department of State superfluous. It is in the nature of anticlimax to speak for the preservation of parts after one has gone on record for the maintenance of the whole.

Mr. Roosevelt's message to M. Reynaud, however, could be interpreted as indicating that the administration will refuse to recognize any territorial changes of any kind which may occur in Europe as a result of the war. That attitude is scarcely realistic and is unlikely to be maintained indefinitely. Therefore, it was not superfluous to follow Mr. Roosevelt's personal statement with a more limited definition of policy, supported by Congress, which will doubtless be made effective if occasion warrants.

Representative TINKHAM contributed to clarity of thought in the matter when he pointed out in the House debate that the original Monroe Doctrine "consisted of two parts, one as vital as the other." The first opposed European interference in the West-

ern Hemisphere. The second specified that "in the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so."

It would certainly seem logical to make sure of controlling the destiny of the New World before being too categorical about what we will or will not "consider as valid" with reference to Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Antipodes.

Amendment of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BREWERY WORKER

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brewery Worker, of Cincinnati, Ohio, which was published on June 12, 1940:

[From the Brewery Worker of June 12, 1940]

A BLOW TO LABOR PEACE

Approval of the A. F. of L.-Smith committee amendments to the Wagner Act will retard rather than help those who are diligently working for peace in the labor movement. The establishment of peace between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. might have been accomplished before this—in fact, there would have been no C. I. O. in the first place—had the A. F. of L. craft union leaders recognized the need for the industrial type of union in certain industries, particularly those in the mass-production or basic-industry fields.

These craft leaders have consistently fought industrial unionism whenever and wherever it has been established or even proposed, even when it was clearly apparent that craft unionism could get nowhere. Now, one of the amendments just adopted—making it mandatory for the Labor Board to certify a craft union when a majority of any specific craft asks for such certification—gives them the power to carve out small craft units from large plant-wide industrial unions. If put into practice on a large scale, the labor movement will again be given ample proof of the truth in that old adage which ends: "divided we fall."

It requires no great amount of thought to figure out that certain employers will welcome this opportunity to destroy the unity which has brought about the effective organization of the workers in their plants. Others, who have successfully held off unionization of their workers—by foul means or fair—will welcome the added support this craft-unit amendment (through setting worker against worker) offers them.

Of course, these amendments must still pass the Senate, and this is not expected at the current session. But those who speak with authority predict that the Senate will eventually fall in line, and it is upon this prediction that we base our own pessimistic prediction of troublous times ahead for the labor movement.

New Dealism or Real Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Thursday, June 20, 1940, the subject being New Dealism or Real Defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, the American people have been profoundly shocked by the collapse of French resistance. There can be no doubt now that the Nazi forces dominate the entire continent of Europe and threaten the very existence of Great Britain, from whom we derive all our language, our culture, and the underlying principles of our Government. A deep feeling of sorrow and anger underlies all day long every thought with regard to foreign and domestic issues. We see courageous but helpless people attacked and their freedom destroyed by a war machine without scruple and without mercy.

More than that, we see a complete change in the world in which we have lived. Whether Germany ever attacks the United States or not, we are going to find ourselves in a different world. While I do not consider that the effects on trade and on totalitarianism in the United States will be as serious as some think, certainly we will be in a world where ruthless force is triumphant over every principle of justice. Reliance can no longer be placed on international engagements. Force alone will rule the world, and any means, no matter how outrageous, to make force effective will be held justified.

We find today two conflicting sentiments among the American people: One, an intense desire to stay out of war; the other, to help the Allies, and now particularly England. There are many who wish us to declare war, and others, even in high places, who cloak their wishes under a quiet but steady advance in the direction of war, with a hope that public opinion may ultimately support a declaration of war. With the views of such persons I emphatically disagree. But there is little use in proposing a declaration of war today. Go to war? With what? We have suddenly waked up to find that our Navy is inadequate and our Army completely unequipped for modern warfare. Only the most heroic efforts can build up our defense in time to meet the possible threat of an attack on our own shores. Such aid as we could give the British by going to war could not possibly turn the balance abroad. There is only one real issue, and that is the issue of preparedness. First, why are we unprepared? Second, is the present Government competent to work out a program?

After a period of general naval disarmament and sincere attempts at military disarmament, Adolf Hitler came into power in Germany in January 1933, a month before President Roosevelt took office. The German Army at that time was limited by the Treaty of Versailles to 100,000 men. The administration of Franklin Roosevelt saw the repudiation of the Treaty of Versailles, the increase of that Army to 4,000,000 men, with completely mechanized equipment and thousands of the most modern airplanes. Those 7 years have seen the rapid increase of the Japanese Navy. If we find ourselves unprepared today, it can only be the fault of the administration which has been in power during those 7 years. Congress has been liberal in granting every request for appropriations, but apparently without result.

What is the reason for the present condition?

First, it is undoubtedly in part the complete absorption of the present administration in the New Deal. They have been much more interested in spending money for subsidies and boondoggling than for defense. They have been more interested in spending money that would produce votes than money that would produce airplanes. The country has been covered with public works which we could get on without, and in every election they have boasted of those public works in order to get votes. We have been spending at the rate of $9,000,000,000 a year, but we have little preparedness to show for our money.

In the second place, there has been no intelligent planning of our defense, and no coordination between the different bureaus which are concerned with it. There has been no one at all interesting himself in planning an adequate industrial capacity to produce arms, ammunition, and implements of war. For years Secretary Swanson was ill. After his death the vacancy was not filled for months; finally Mr. Edison was appointed, until he resigned to run for Governor of New Jersey. The Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War for months were apparently not on speaking terms. If we had had able Secretaries, presumably we would have made more progress with preparedness. The appointment today of Mr. Stimson and Mr. Knox will certainly cause a great improvement over the former condition, but they are apparently selected largely because they both lean strongly toward intervention in the war. Their selection, as Senator WHEELER, of Montana, said in the Senate this afternoon, indicates that the Democratic Party is rapidly becoming a war party.

Of course their appointment does not make this a coalition Cabinet or bring about national unity, because they do not represent the Republican Party or its views. They accept their appointments contrary to the advice of those who are leaders of the party and whose position against coalition government in time of peace is well known. Again, a vitally important step seems to be dictated by other considerations than a single eye to national defense. It may at least be suspected that the effort is to put the Republicans at a disadvantage.

In the third place, our lack of industrial capacity is undoubtedly due in part to a constant baiting of industry and to the New Deal policy of considering every industrialist as a criminal until he proves himself otherwise. There has been a constant stirring up of class

hatred against industrial managers, and no interest whatever in encouraging the building up of private industry.

In the fourth place, the people have been taught to expect something for nothing, to lean on the Government. We have not paid our way for years. Social security has been preached as the ultimate and only goal, without considering proper rewards that must be given for hard work, ingenuity, initiative, and courage. The Blum government, by such a codling process, undermined the vitality of France. We have not gone so far in this country, but the new dealers would take us there if they could. Only last month the President announced that preparedness need not modify in any way the activities of the New Deal. If those activities are not modified, we will never achieve preparedness. We are going to have to spend billions every year on defense. To do that, we must cut down largely the expenditures on domestic matters. We don't have to abandon true social reform, but we do have to cut out the frills and limit ourselves to the essential progress consistent with defense.

In the light of past experience, what is the chance of the new dealers making a success of preparedness? Hitler has succeeded in Europe because he has coordinated all the forces of the German nation to a single end. The New Deal has certainly not done that in dealing with domestic problems. It has failed even in its own field to make any plan or coordinate the hundreds of different bureaus carrying out various New Deal policies. A new pronouncement on defense appears every morning in the headlines of the newspapers. We hope that these various announcements may ultimately result in preparedness. But there is nothing in the record of the administration to lead anyone to believe that they will be any more coordinated or any more ultimately effective than the domestic policies of the New Deal.

Billions are to be spent and Congress has responded by almost unlimited appropriations. But appropriations do not necessarily result in preparedness. One essential of preparedness is a sound financial condition of the Government. We went into the World War with no debt and a balanced Budget; today we owe nearly $50,000,000,000 and have a Budget $3,000,000,000 out of balance for peacetime expenditures alone. Financial preparedness is essential for success in war. The break-down of our currency in the midst of war would be the most serious handicap to our armed forces. The President takes no interest. He told his press conference that it made no difference to him whether the money was raised by taxes or by borrowing, as long as he had it to spend. Last night Congress passed a tax bill raising the debt limit from forty-five to forty-nine billion dollars, and levying taxes which might amount to a billion dollars a year, less than one-fifth of the anticipated deficit for next year. The administration leaders prevented the attempt of Senators BYRD and TYDINGS to reduce Government expenditures other than those for preparedness. The President does not propose to reduce by one cent the appropriations made for domestic purposes before the crisis arose. The bill as presented by the Finance Committee was at least carefully prepared by the Treasury Department. The administration leaders permitted it to be so loaded up with amendments, including 300 pages which no Senator could possibly have read, that I finally voted against the whole bill, although I am strongly in favor of levying now much heavier taxes than the bill proposes. In short, the fiscal policy of the administration is still dominated by the false theories of the New Deal, by the theory that we can go on borrowing indefinitely and spend ourselves into prosperity. That policy will lead to destruction.

There is no evidence that the administration has thought through any complete plan of defense We have not even agreed what it is we are going to defend. Instead of working out a careful plan and presenting it to Congress, the President first demanded an extra billion dollars. A few weeks later he added another billion. Yesterday it was suddenly announced that we are to double the size of the Navy. There is a rumor that another billion dollars is to be asked for airplanes. No one can read the headlines for the past months without realizing that no plan exists and fearing that it may never exist. It is a repetition of the New Deal. The President's character is such that he approves a new plan every day without considering its consequences or its relation to what he has approved the day before.

No question is more important today than industrial mobilization. Not only do we have a badly equipped Army but we have no industrial capacity to produce arms, ammunition, or implements of war. Six thousand airplanes were authorized last year; perhaps 350 airplanes have been delivered on the order for 6,000. Our capacity up to the last reports appears to be 300 a month. War today is a matter of machinery, and yet there has been no plan for finding out what our capacity is or how it may be increased. If we wish to help the Allies, there is no way in which we can do so better than increasing our industrial capacity for our own defense and permitting it to be used in the meantime to manufacture equipment for the Allies. At the present moment Mr. Knudsen has a free hand to make a plan, but his whole authority is based on shifting sands. Six different departments of the Government are concerned with industrial production, and no one has power to coordinate them except the President himself. The Navy can build ships and guns. This week we authorized the Secretary of War to build factories for the manufacture of any kind of war equipment. Two days later we passed a bill authorizing Jesse Jones and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to go into the business of manufacturing arms, ammunition, implements of war, and machine tools without any reference to what the Secretary of War may do. Harry Hopkins, Secretary of Commerce, is spending all his time at the White House dealing with the same matter. The Procurement Division of the Treasury still has to do with purchasing many Army and Navy supplies. Mr. Knudson and Mr. Stettinius have only advisory powers.

Saturday I offered an amendment creating a War Resources Administration, with complete authority to make plans for increasing industrial capacity and carry on the Government's activities in that field. Apparently the President does not want any man, especially an industrialist, to have such power. He wants to keep all the strings in his own hands, and the inside new dealers want them there so that they may slip into the White House and keep the whole program in line with New Deal philosophy. The Stettinius Commission last summer was dismissed at the behest of Mr. Corcoran and his friends, and their report recommending a War Resources Administration has been completely suppressed. We have had an industrial mobilization plan for 10 years, approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Its major recommendation is the creation of a War Resources Administration, with a single head. Every government in the World War found it necessary to create a ministry of munitions. The results in this country were not satisfactory until Mr. Baruch was put in full charge of war industries. It is the only sensible way to create and carry out an adequate plan. But the Government's policies are still dominated by new dealism, and the proposal was rejected.

We have just had a plan proposed for subjecting girls and boys to compulsory military training. The plan is to be conducted under the auspices of Harry Hopkins and Sidney Hillman of the C. I. O. Its terms are vague, but it sounds like an aggrandized C. C. C. and Federal vocational education for every boy and girl in the United States. Its cost would certainly be more than $2,000,000,000 a year. If we are going to have military training, it should be by military officers. A voluntary plan should be tried first. I doubt if we can effectively train more than 500,000 boys a year, and I believe that many would volunteer if the plan was made convenient and reasonable. Again, the whole policy is to be dominated by New Deal philosophy instead of common sense.

Another grandiloquent proposal has been made for an economic union between the countries of North and South America. Again, it is vague; but the outlines seem to suggest that we will assist the Argentine in handling its agricultural surpluses to keep them away from Germany, a kind of continental A. A. A. We certainly have a difficult enough time to handle our own surpluses.

No matter how hit or miss these preparedness plans seem to be, every American will hope that gradually they will tend in the right direction. But the sad thing is that no one can guess what the final result may be until it is too late. We may wake up several years from now and find that we have spent vast billions more for new dealism than for preparedness. The American people want an administration devoted primarily to the single purpose of making America impregnable. I feel confident it can be done within the framework of American democratic principles. I feel confident it can be done with complete justice to all groups of the population and all sections of the country. But it can't be done without sacrificing some of our material comfort. It can't be done without postponing many of the things we would like to have. It can't be done unless the Executive abandons all prejudice; unless he picks out the strongest men in the United States and delegates power to them; unless he is willing to sacrifice the chances of reelection; and unless he is prepared to antagonize pressure groups, which have been taught that no administration will resist them.

Letter Opposing Adjournment of Congress and Involvement in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a young woman whose home is in the Tenth District of Indiana—the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Like all the rest of my colleagues I have been swamped with letters from the people back home expressing their views on the present national and international situation. But this letter is different in that it gives the result of a vote which could almost be termed a national poll. I was so impressed by the very definite sentiment it conveyed that I

would like to read it here for the benefit of my colleagues in the House. It reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1940.*

Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that you at present oppose the adjourning of Congress for the summer, and as a citizen of Indiana and the United States I wish to commend your stand on the subject of adjournment, and hope that you will continue to firmly oppose it.

I sincerely feel that at this time in our Nation's affairs it is important that all the men at the head of our Government should be on the job to help bring a wise solution of our problems as they exist critically at present in connection with the European struggle.

I should like also to ask you to do your utmost to prevent the United States from taking any active part in the European war. Our active intervention would be just as silly and just as futile as it was in the first World War.

I am a member of a class of over 700 summer students at Columbia University this term. This morning we voted on United States intervention or nonintervention. Out of our class of 710 members, who are teachers representing all parts of the country, only 1 person voted for active intervention. The rest feel much as I do—aid—like charity should begin at home.

Yours truly,

MARION BILBY, *Muncie, Ind.*

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the particular attention of my colleagues to the last paragraph of this letter, and to the fact that the vote was taken on, and the letter written from, the campus of Columbia University.

How the System Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the columnist, Jay Franklin, is one of the most consistent and outspoken advocates of the New Deal. His articles portray a deep and sympathetic insight into its inner workings. He once wrote that "everybody knows that, since March 4, 1933, the Federal laws have been drafted at the west end of Pennsylvania Avenue and that on many occasions Congress has had to mark time until the admiinstration draft of a measure arrived for passage."

The following column by Mr. Franklin appeared in the Washington Star for March 23, 1937, 2 years and 3 months ago. It is a frank confession from a New Deal writer as to how the system works:

[From the Washington Star of March 23, 1937]

"HOT DOGS" MIGHT SPURN SUPREME COURT JOBS, BUT OTHERS ARE AVAILABLE

(By Jay Franklin)

"Why send us to a nunnery?" demanded one of the New Deal lawyers who had read my column about putting Prof. Felix Frankfurter's "hot dogs" on the Federal bench as "wet nurse" judges. "Why lock us up at a tender age? The courts aren't going to be that important by the time Roosevelt gets through with them. Please let us see a little more life before condemning us to 20 years or so of listening to wrangling attorneys."

This is a point of view which may play havoc with the President's plan to appoint younger men to Federal judgeships. Perhaps they won't want the jobs, and he'll have to fall back on weary old politicos in search of a snug harbor for their declining years. After all, a lifelong income of from $10,000 to $20,000 a year is not to be sneezed at when you begin to slip in your sixties.

Otherwise, there is every reason to suppose that Mr. Roosevelt will offer some of the 25 additional junior judgeships to some of the Harvard Law School graduates who have staffed the New Deal's legal departments and have done the legal spadework which led to the present attack on the Supreme Court.

The old rule by which Presidents gave such appointments to beaten Representatives and "lame duck" Senators was based on more than party patronage or the desire to keep political antiquities from falling into complete disrepair. It was based on the sound fact that those who had helped to prepare and pass Federal legislation were especially qualified to interpret that legislation when it came before the courts for judiciary review.

By this test, it is the Frankfurter boys rather than the "rubber stamp" Members of Congress who rate the new jobs.

Everybody knows that, since March 4, 1933, the Federal laws have been drafted at the west end of Pennsylvania Avenue and that on many occasions Congress has had to mark time until the administration draft of a measure arrived for passage. So the men who do the drafting of the laws are no longer at the Capitol, but are scattered through the executive departments; and if there is need for later judicial interpretation the judgeships should be given to the men who prepared and eased through the measures involved.

So true is this that, in the case of at least two prominent New Deal lawyers, the cautious statute which bars Representatives and Senators from filling jobs which they themselves have created would seem to bar these two men from judicial appointment. For Tom Corcoran, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Ben Cohen, of the Department of the Interior, have done more to promote the passage of judicial reform legislation than most of the legislators who will vote for it. And if the measure goes through, ethical considerations would seem to debar them from consideration for any of the new posts which the proposed legislation will create.

Other Government lawyers are not so deeply involved and, when the President comes to pick his judges, he will find it difficult to avoid offering positions to some of the following members of the administration's legal staff who have borne the heat and burden of the battle:

Paul Freund, Charles Wyzanski, and Alger Hiss, of the Department of Justice; Edward F. Foley, Charles Kades, Henry Horman, Carl Farbach, and Norman Tietjens, of the P. W. A.; Frederick B. Wiener and Nathan Margold, of the Interior Department; Charles Fahy, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Allen Throop, Milton Katz, Stuart Guthrie, and Gerald Swope, of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Clarence Opfer, of the Treasury; Thomas Emerson, of the Social Security Board; Vincent D. Nicholson, general counsel of the Rural Electrification Administration; Blackwell Smith, of the old N. R. A.; the old A. A. A. group of lawyers, including Jerome Frank, Lee Pressman (now with John L. Lewis' C. I. O.), Francis Shay (now dean of Buffalo Law); Telford Taylor and Donald Hiss (brother of Alger Hiss); David E. Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Russell L. Snodgrass, Max O'Dell Truit, Frank Watson, and Cassius Clay, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

These are some of the younger men who carried the legal ball for Roosevelt in the first half of the New Deal. They are entitled to their "letter" in the shape of some of the judicial plums under the new set-up for the Federal courts. The only question is whether they will care to accept an appointment which is a life sentence to any modern lawyer of energy and ambitions while there are fortunes and careers to be made in the world outside the judicial cloisters.

America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents of the Sixth District of Michigan, the tenor of which letters is bitterly opposed to the United States' participation in the European conflict. These letters come from men and women in practically all trades, professions, business, and from every walk of life. Of these letters only eight have stated that it is the duty of the United States to declare war against Germany, and even these letters are faint-hearted in their tone.

If there ever was a time when the American people should be sane and sensible and sober, it is now. If there ever was a time when the American citizen should not allow himself to be swayed by war propagandists and warmongers, it is now. If there ever was a time when the American citizen should think in terms of his country, its welfare, and its future, it is now.

Day by day, in every way, the drift toward war is more apparent here in Washington. Propagandists in and out of

Congress are saying in loud and vociferous tones that the United States should declare war against Germany.

You will remember that in 1917 the then propagandists said that we should ender the World War "to save the world for democracy."

After losing thousands of fine American boys and spending billions of dollars, we came to a realization of the fact that our efforts to preserve world peace were futile. Any student of history knows that the pages of history are dotted with the ever-recurring and insistent wars incident to Europe. America has been particularly free from participation in these conflicts, except in the World War of 1917 and 1918.

Now, the question arises, should America embark in this European conflict? Are the fathers and mothers of America willing that their boys should be sent to fight on European soil? Judging from the letters that I am receiving, the answer to both of these questions is an emphatic "No!" The United States has all the problems that she can safely handle without participation in European conflicts.

Let us glance over the Washington record which will bear out my statement that day by day, in every way, we are approaching the brink of war:

First. One of the legislative measures now before this Congress is S. 1650, a bill to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government. This bill requests the President in time of war to take a census of the net wealth of the Nation and make the net wealth of each individual subject to the borrowing power of the United States, roughly as follows:

	Percent
$1,000 to $100,000	5–10
$100,000 to $1,000,000	15–25
$1,000,000 to $100,000,000	30–70
Above $100,000,000	75

Sums borrowed shall be represented by bonds payable in 50 years and bearing 1 percent interest—neither principal nor interest are tax exempt.

This bill authorizes the President, first, to accept property or services valuable for the prosecution of war and in payment for bonds; second, to accept notes or other obligations bearing a 6 percent interest and secured by liens upon specified property; and, third, to issue currency or notes upon the security of such property or notes. This bill has been severely criticized as unwise and un-American.

Second. There is also another bill pending in Congress, S. 4141, which provides revenue and facilitates the regulation and control of economic and industrial structure of the Nation for the successful prosecution of war, and for other purposes. This bill, 329 pages long, is another drastic move tending toward war.

Third. A few days ago one of the spokesmen of the President, a high official in Government circles, was quoted in the Washington Times-Herald, issue of June 18, as saying: "Let us think in terms in which Hitler thinks"; then he submits this program:

First. Confer upon the President the full wartime power to prepare and defend America.

Second. Confer upon the President power to suspend all rules, regulations, and statutes, including Army and Navy, and departmental seniority regulations which, in his judgment, interfere with the maximum speed in the production, transportation, or manufacture of defense material.

Third. Confer upon the President the power to suspend debt limitation if, in his judgment, such limitation is inadvisable.

This would make the President a dictator, and America would lose her boasted prestige as a Republic and substitute therefore a dictatorship.

Fourth. Another step which shows the tendency toward war is the announcement of the President of the compulsory training of youth. This would affect both boys and girls under the statement made by the President. This bill would take the boys and girls from millions of American homes, peace loving in their nature, and substitute in place of the peace-loving home life, a military training, directly or indirectly. This would affect 2,000,000 young men and women annually.

Fifth. Also, another compulsory military service bill has been filed in Congress. This provides for the registration of all men between the ages of 18 and 65 for war-service training. It is estimated that more than 40,000,000 men, citizen and alien residents, would come under the registration provisions of this bill. Punishment by imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to $10,000 is provided for those convicted of failure to register; and those who have registered but failed to report for training would be dealt with according to military law. The same would apply to those who desert.

Sixth. The nomination by President Roosevelt yesterday, Thursday, June 20, of Henry L. Stimson as Secretary of War, and Frank Knox as Secretary of the Navy, created much excitement in Washington. This was conceded to be a move to secure a war Cabinet, as both of these nominees have been devout advocates of the President's foreign policy, and have been in favor of intervention.

The United States, during the last few weeks in particular, has been supplying material aid to the Allies. This should be done, however, in conformity to law. The press, throughout the Nation, under date of June 19, 1940, reported the transfer to Great Britain of 20 high-speed vessels now under construction, on order for the United States Navy. The vessels involved are referred to by the Acting Secretary of the Navy as 10 motor torpedo boats and 10 submarine chasers, variously called "mosquito" vessels and "suicide" boats. These vessels are lightly armored and are designed to carry and discharge torpedos or "seagoing" bombs.

It is obvious that their construction was for the purpose of augmenting the naval forces of the United States Government. Therefore, the proposed transfer of these boats to Great Britain, either by the Government of the United States or by the builders of these vessels, appears to be in direct violation of title 18, section 23, of the Criminal Code of the United States. These sections very definitely and positively make it unlawful to knowingly furnish, fit out, or arm any ship or vessel with intent that such ship or vessel should be employed in the service of belligerents, while this Nation is at peace.

While the American people are practically united against a declaration of war, yet they are, in my judgment, practically unanimous in their desire to perfect an adequate national defense in all its units—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps—as the best means of keeping this Nation out of war.

During the last 7 years we have spent billions of dollars for the Army and Navy, and yet we are suddenly informed by the administration that our national defense is incomplete. The American people have a right to know where all this money has gone and if it has been wisely spent for the purposes to which it was appropriated.

Congress has manifested in this session a willingness to pass defense bills, regardless of politics, because every thinking person knows that in order to preserve our American form of government we must be prepared, in case of necessity, to defend that Government, should we be attacked. Most military and naval experts tell us that, with a strong Army, Navy, and air force, America would be practically invulnerable from the assaults of foreign enemies.

Practically everybody is agreed, then, that we should spend what is necessary for an adequate national defense. Everybody ought to agree that the money should be efficiently spent. Those who counsel caution, calmness, firmness, practicality, and economy are not disloyal citizens; nor are they "peace at any price" advocates; they are advocates of an adequate national preparedness at a proper price.

We cannot forget, and we ought not to forget, that whereas, when we started in the first World War, we only had a national debt of $1,100,000,000; now we have a national debt of approximately $45,000,000,000; and Congress has just

authorized an additional national debt of $4,000,000,000—largely for national-defense purposes.

While we are giving consideration to the thought of foreign foes, it is high time that we gave consideration to our enemies within. The Dies investigating committee has demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that there does exist in the United States a well-organized attempt to foist upon this country communism and other radicalism hostile to our American Government and to our American principles.

Many of these Communists hold prominent positions in public life and yet, for some reason or other, are not removed. The time has come in America when Uncle Sam should tell those foreigners who are within our country that they must become American citizens, loyal to our Constitution and to our flag, or return to the country that gave them birth.

No other nation has been as easy with these "fifth columnists" and other radical groups as has our country. Under our boasted "freedom of speech," we have allowed these radicals to say anything they chose at any time or place. We must clearly distinguish, however, between that "freedom of speech," which is guaranteed by the Constitution, and that "unbridled license of speech," which the radicals want, and yet which has no place in our constitutional history.

Several days ago a bill providing for the deportation of Harry Bridges was before the House. This bill was necessitated because the Department of Labor had been derelict in deporting Mr. Bridges. I listened in wonder to some of the arguments advanced during the debate on this bill, in which the speakers were shedding bitter tears over his deportation as unconstitutional, and yet, during many years, this same man, Bridges, has lived in this country, sharing its rights and its privileges, never becoming a citizen of this country, never taking the constitutional oath to preserve and protect and defend this country, never affirming his faith and love for the Constitution and flag, but preaching his doctrine of hate against our American form of government.

I am glad to state that the House, by a vote of 330 yeas to 42 nays, passed the bill to deport Mr. Bridges.

I have been particularly interested in the youth of the land. Ten years of my life were dedicated to teaching in the public schools of my home county. In addition to this, I have taught night classes in the factory school in Flint for many years, and have come in contact with thousands of fine young men and women.

I am receiving letters from these and other young people. These letters are opposed to war. These letters, however, are loyal to America. Practically all of the writers thereof would be willing to enlist in war, should our Nation be attacked, but practically all are bitterly opposed to America's entry in European war.

From these letters the following composite statement was taken:

This is the voice of American youth. We were born of the American Nation—born of mothers loyal and patriotic to the United States. We were nurtured by American ideals and American culture—yea, we were nurtured by American democracy. We are mature now. We have come to hold an unbounded love for our country; we are patriots. We believe in American ideals, culture, and democracy. Our country has instilled in us an invincible love for truth and freedom.

We have been led to believe that we have a republican form of government—that this is a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Therefore we consider our public officials as our agents, as individuals eager to know our will and to act accordingly. This letter is to help make that will known.

American youth demands that the United States preserve itself for this role, that it prepare to lead the world to permanent peace, that this generation give itself for progress—not destruction. No amount of loss of trade or markets is worth entrance into foreign conflict. No loss of capital invested by those for whom American opportunities were too limited can inveigle or ensnare us into fighting across the seas. We will not be propagandized by the proposed righteousness of any side in any war. We do not presume to know the remedy for the ills of the world, but we do know that wars solve nothing. We dedicate our lives to the maintenance of a haven of truth, liberty, justice, and peace in these our United States.

These are grave days for the United States. If the American people will stay sane and sensible and sober, if they will refuse to allow themselves to be inflamed by war propagandists, if they will think in terms of our fine constitutional heritage, then this Nation, in my judgment, will be saved from participation in European war.

Let us build up a fine national defense. Let us protect the welfare of our 130,000,000 people. Let us build up our national resources and then, when the European conflict is over, let us be the good Samaritan who will help to rehabilitate the devastated nations and endeavor with them to bring on a more permanent world peace.

The Dictator and the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

POEM BY SEVERANCE JOHNSON

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the author and by unanimous consent of the House, I quote here in full the copyrighted poem, The Dictator and the Devil, by Severance Johnson:

THE DICTATOR AND THE DEVIL

Death was his god. To Death he prayed for still
More instruments of fiendish power to kill
All in his path, more gases, bombs, more guns,
More warships of the air to drop down tons
Of blasting fire. "O Death," he cried, "My foes
Must perish. Once I conquered without blows.
I played the jackal in the lion's dress
And some I vanquished with sheer frightfulness.
Others I undermined with agents, spies,
Bribes, secret plottings, promises, and lies:
Then suddenly I sprang as does the beast
Or the assassin when his victim least
Suspects destruction. Death, O Death, give me
All of thy might that irresistibly
I may sweep all my enemies aside
And all the world triumphantly bestride."

Death answered, "No! I am no murderer.
If you think me an ally, then you err.
When troops are sent to war by men like you
I come forthwith, as does the nurse, to do
My bounden duty. Where she fails, I take
What's useless, so that nature can remake
All into other forms of life which grow
Until again at last their way I go.
Consult the Devil. He may give you aid.
He knows how war's most frightful tools are made."

Death's supplicant enraged sprang from his knees.
He spoke not, for Death's censure seemed to freeze
The curse upon his lips. Away he fled
Unto the lower regions. Guards in red
Asbestos uniforms conducted him
To a great palace built upon the rim
Of a sulphuric lake. Here on a throne
Of sabled satin Satan sat alone.
The two no sooner had beheld each other
Than both as with one voice exclaimed, "Hail, brother!"
The Devil adding, "Welcome to my home.
I always knew that you were bound to come.
You've seemed a despot after my own heart.
You seek omnipotence by every art
That's known to devils and dictators, who
In fact are members of the selfsame crew.
So tell me freely why you left the light
And journeyed hither through the depths of night."

The visitor repeated all his prayer
To Death; then said, "O Satan, if you share
My war with me, I shall remember you
Abundantly. I need munitions to
Destroy my foes. You have deposits vast
Of deadly chemicals, enough to last
Till Doom's Day; also a tremendous crowd
Of idle imps, who all might be allowed

To fabricate asphyxiating bombs,
Which I can use to fill a million tombs
With still more slaughtered foemen. In return
I'll make the nations that I conquer learn
To worship you; so, when their people die
Beneath my rule, their souls to you will fly.
Here is the contract. On this dotted line
You sign your name. That signature is mine."

The Devil's admiration for his guest
Turned into deep disgust. It was no jest
To find himself the object of a plot.
His temper always ardent warmer got,
As thus he spoke: "Fool was I once when I
Rebelled against my God and through the sky
Fell headlong into darkness, but I've learned
Much wisdom all the ages I have burned.
You may fool many others but not me.
You've hid within this document, I see,
Provisions in fine print by which you can
Depose me and put in here your own man,
Another Satan, who will rule for you,
As in your conquered lands your puppets do.
Then of its riches you will strip hell bare
And my poor devils will be doomed to share
The same vile fate which all your subjects know—
War, waste, and want, and wretchedness, and woe.
But why so many words, so much ado
About a contract which, of course, to you
Means nothing. Solemn treaties that you make
Are only shams for you to make and break.
At first I thought you mad but now I know
Much more than madness sent you here below."

"Are you a preacher?" the dictator cried.
"Enough. If you refuse to join my side
Then I shall force you to obey my will.
On earth those who resist me I do kill.
A devil may be harder to subdue,
But I have ways of crushing even you."
On Satan's sooty features gleamed a smile.
"With me," he said, "you had best stay a while,
A long, long while, a whole eternity;
For humans, like yourself, I never free.
I shall pass judgment now. Within a cell
Alone in utter darkness you shall dwell.
Nearby are other souls who worshiped might,
Who in their folly thought that might makes right.
Lamenting there through all the endless years,
You are condemned to weep as many tears
As you have caused to fall from others' eyes
And you shall suffer all their agonies."
Here the dictator, taken by surprise,
Sank through trap doors to where hell's bottom lies.

International Intrigue, Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include these letters in the RECORD, I now present further evidence which reveals international intrigue. My purpose in placing this in the RECORD is to give information to Members of Congress and to the people at home who are depending on us to preserve and protect and defend their rights.

The purpose of the administration backers is to deprive Congress of power by chiseling it away from this body inch by inch, so that the invisible rulers can operate in subversion of our Government by act of Congress.

To this I am opposed, and I am opposed to all the silly, stupid, and unconstitutional legislation which is now reaching the floor of the House and which the membership supports. Let us not forget that we, ourselves, will in the end become victims of our own stupidity if we give the slightest consideration to any legislation presented to this body by the invisible Government of the United States.

REPORT OF THE POLISH AMBASSADOR IN WASHINGTON, COUNT JERZY POTOCKI TO THE POLISH FOREIGN OFFICE IN WARSAW

JANUARY 16, 1936.

[Confidential]

To the FOREIGN MINISTER IN WARSAW:

The day before yesterday, I had a longer discussion with Ambassador Bullitt in the Embassy where he called on me. Bullitt leaves on the 21st of this month for Paris, from where he has been absent for almost 3 months. He is sailing with a whole "trunk" full of instructions, conversations, directions from President Roosevelt, the State Department, and Senators who belong to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In talking with Bullitt I had the impression that he had received from President Roosevelt a very detailed definition of the attitude taken by the United States toward the present European crisis. He will present this material at the Quai d'Orsay and will make use of it in discussions with European statesmen. The contents of these directions, as Bullitt explained them to me in the course of a conversation, lasting half an hour, were:

1. The vitalizing foreign policy, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, severely and unambiguously condemns totalitarian countries.

2. The United States preparation for war on sea, land, and air which will be carried out at an accelerated speed and will consume the colossal sum of $1,250,000,000.

3. It is the decided opinion of the President that France and Britain must put an end to any sort of compromise with the totalitarian countries. They must not let themselves in for any discussions aiming at any kind of territorial changes.

4. They have the moral assurance that the United States will leave the policy of isolation and be prepared to intervene actively on the side of Britain and France in case of war. America is ready to place its whole wealth of money and raw materials at their disposal.

When I raised the question as to what sort of horoscope Bullitt predicts for 1939, he replied that he feared danger of conflict between France and Italy, on account of colonies, in the spring. He thinks that the victory of Nationalists in Spain would put France in a very difficult situation, for it is then surrounded by Fascist states on all sides. Mussolini will then surely speak up and threaten France with war. As to my question, whether Germany would help Mussolini in such an undertaking, Bullitt replied that, according to his opinion, it is very doubtful if Hitler would let himself be induced, outside of giving moral support, actually to participate in such an undertaking, for it would then be clear that world war was inevitable.

Bullitt asserted most definitely that France should under no circumstances enter into any sort of agreement with Mussolini. During the last few months the situation had so improved in France that France alone could defeat the Italian Army and Italian Navy if Italy should launch an unprovoked attack. He branded Mussolini's actions and methods as most ordinary "gangsterism" and blackmail. During the course of the conversation, Bullitt also mentioned eastern Europe and Germany. He said that Polish foreign policy under the excellent direction of its Minister had stood the test and shown its feasibility. Poland had come out of last year's autumn crisis not only with arms in its hands but also as a victor.

He questioned me immediately about relations between Poland and Soviet Russia and about the significance of the renewal of the nonaggression pact between Poland and Russia. I replied that everything written by the press on the Russian question were mere speculations and conjectures. The renewal of the nonaggression pact with the Soviets was a necessity of the moment, since relations between Poland and the Soviets had deteriorated greatly, after the Czech crisis. The renewal of the nonaggression pact was merely a dot on the "i," no more and no less. It only aimed at renormalizing relations which had been unbalanced by events.

In reply to his question regarding our trade agreement with the Soviets, I declared that that agreement was in consequence of our occupation of the Alsa region and the great industries there. Poland was compelled to seek new export markets which it found to some extent in Soviet Russia. Bullitt's feeling toward the Soviet Union is pronouncedly unfriendly and extremely disdainful. He declared moreover that Germany for the time being was unlikely to launch an attack on eastern Europe since on the one hand Poland was too strong, while on the other hand, the situation was not yet sufficiently clarified as regards Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Certain preparations would still have to be carried out and positions consolidated. He expressed conviction moreover that Germany would carry out her plan concerning Ukraine, but not before 1940. I did not enter into discussion with Bullitt about such action. I merely asked whether western powers would become active in such event and whether they would attack the Reich allegedly in order to protect the Soviet Union. Bullitt replied that all imaginary armed interventions on behalf of some State which might become the victim of German aggression had been abandoned once and for all by democratic countries.

(Signed) JERZY POTOCKI,
Ambassador of the Polish Republic.

REPORT OF THE POLISH AMBASSADOR, COUNT JERZY POTOCKI, POLISH AMBASSADOR AT WASHINGTON, TO THE FOREIGN MINISTER IN WARSAW—REFERS TO CONVERSATION WITH AMBASSADOR BULLITT

WASHINGTON, *November 21, 1938.*

TO FOREIGN MINISTER IN WARSAW:

The day before yesterday I had a long conversation with Ambassador Bullitt, who is here on a vacation.

In the beginning he remarked that very friendly relations existed between himself and Ambassador Lukasiewicz in Paris, whose company he greatly enjoyed.

Since Bullitt regularly informs Roosevelt about the international situation in Europe, and particularly about Russia, great attention is given his reports by Roosevelt and the State Department. Bullitt speaks vividly and interestingly. Nonetheless, his reaction to events in Europe resembled the view of a journalist more than that of a politician, for in his conversation he alluded to the entire scale of very complicated European problems. From them he draws very negative conclusions.

Bullitt shows great pessimism in his conversation generally. He said the beginning of 1939 would undoubtedly be very exciting, aggravated by the continuous display of the possibility of war and by threats from Germany, as well as by the danger in the unclarified situation in Europe. He agreed with me that the center of gravity of the European question has moved from west to east, for the capitulation of the democratic states in Munich revealed their weakness compared with the German Reich.

Then Bullitt spoke about the complete lack of preparation for war in Britain and about the impossibility of converting English industry to a mass war-production basis, particularly in the airplane industry. He expressed himself with unusual enthusiasm about the French Army and confirmed the fact, nonetheless, that French aviation is outmoded. According to what military experts told Bullitt during the fall crisis of 1938, the war would last at least 6 years and would in their opinion end in the complete destruction of Europe, and with communism reigning in all states. Undoubtedly, at the conclusion, the benefits would be taken by Russia.

He spoke of Russia with contempt. He said the last purge, particularly the removal of Bluecher, had resulted in the complete disorientation of the Red Army, which is not capable of any active war exertions. In general, according to him, Russia is at present the sick man of Europe. He compared it with the prewar Ottoman state.

About Germany and Chancelor Hitler he spoke vehemently and with great hatred. He said that only energy at the end of the war would put an end to a future great German expansionism. To my question asking how he visualized this future war, he replied that, above all, the United States, France, and England must rearm tremendously in order to be in a position to cope with German power. Only then, when the moment is ripe, declared Bullitt further, will one be ready for the final decision. I asked him in what way the conflict could arise since Germany probably would not attack England and France. I simply could not see the starting point in this entire speculation.

Bullitt replied that the democratic countries definitely needed another 2 years until they were fully armed. Meantime Germany would probably have advanced with its expansion in an easterly direction. It would be the wish of the democratic countries that armed conflict would break out there in the east between the German Reich and Russia. As the Soviet Union's potential strength was not yet known, it might happen that Germany would have moved too far away from its base and would be condemned to wage a long and weakening war. Only then would the democratic countries attack Germany, Bullitt declared, and force her to capitulate. In reply to my question whether the United States would take part in such war, he said, "Undoubtedly, yes; but only after Great Britain and France had made the first move." Feeling in the United States is so tense against nazi-ism and Hitlerism, he said, that there is today a psychosis among Americans similar to that before America's declaration of war on Germany in 1917.

Bullitt then inquired about the situation in eastern Europe. He confirmed the fact that Poland was still a country which would resort to arms and fight if Germany crossed its frontiers. I well understand the question of a joint frontier with Hungary, he said. Hungarians, too, are capable of helping us. A joint line of defense with Yugoslavia would make matters easier in regard to German expansion. Then Bullitt spoke on the Ukrainian question and on German efforts in the Ukraine. He confirmed the fact that Germany had a complete Ukrainian staff which would take over the Government of the Ukraine in the future and which would create there an independent Ukrainian state under German control. "Such a Ukraine," Bullitt continued, "would naturally be very dangerous to you, as it would exercise direct influence on Ukrainians in Eastern Congress Poland."

"Already," he said, "German propaganda has moved entirely in an Ukrainian nationalist direction, and Carpatho-Ruthenian Ukraine would serve as a starting point in this future undertaking in whose continued existence Germany is much interested, especially for strategic reasons." Bullitt did not give the impression of being too well informed on the situation in eastern Europe, and he conversed in a rather superficial way.

(Signed) JERZY POTOCKI,
Ambassador of the Polish Republic.

A LETTER OF DR. GRAZYNSKI, IN KATTOWITZ, TO POLISH FOREIGN MINISTER IN WARSAW, DATED NOVEMBER 2, 1938

[Confidential]

Mr. MINISTER: I consider it my duty to inform you of what transpired between Mr. Kuulies Randa, former general director of the Trzynice factory plants, and Mr. Zieleniewski.

This conversation is of great importance, for Mr. Kuulies Randa is one of the most important Czech industrialists, whose name has lately been mentioned as a candidate for the presidency of the Czechoslovak Republic. Talking of the policy of Czechoslovakia, he expressed himself in the following terms:

"For a thousand years, the Czechs have formed a political unit of the Germanic Empire. After they acquired independence for Czechoslovakia, a group tried to formulate an independent policy. However, their efforts were frustrated, and the attempt failed. Now, in my opinion, the Czech state should return to its old role, participating in the political destiny of the German Reich."

Considering his position, Mr. Randa's words have great importance, and they indicate existing tendencies which have also been observed on other occasions.

(Signed) Dr. GRAZYNSKI,
Wojewod.

REPORT OF POLISH AMBASSADOR IN LONDON, COUNT EDWARD RACZYNSKI, TO THE POLISH MINISTER IN WARSAW

LONDON, *March 29, 1939.*

[Political report—Confidential]

To the FOREIGN MINISTER IN WARSAW:

The forceful development of the latest phase of the Czech crisis has deeply shaken public opinion here and has also caused an evolution in the attitude of the Government for stanch opposition to Germany. Hitler's latest moves were only confirmation of what was predicted and additional proof that energetic action was necessary. The Czech events gained greater importance, however, in the impression which they made on the conciliation camp here. The adherents to the latter generally avoided sincere announcements of their predictions and hopes. They generally limited themselves to declaring that Great Britain must limit itself to a defense of western Europe as well as of the British Empire and the communications of the Empire. Central and western Europe, however, would serve as a sphere for German expansion from which England could retreat without any great loss. The arguments of this camp, although not loudly proclaimed, nevertheless are perhaps the most important ones: The expectation that Germany would find it difficult to absorb territories ceded to it, and, thanks to these difficulties and thanks to the opposition of Russia, would lose the capacity to expand, and its forcefulness. It was foreseen that war between Russia and Germany would ensue, which would weaken both, not without affording indirect advantages to the western powers. The rapid succession of events by which Germany acquired valuable, bloodless booty showed the weakness of these arguments. It indicated the fact that, in the last analysis, this was an excuse for permitting the responsible statesmen of the western powers to withdraw along the line of least resistance. Serious misgivings arose when Germany, instead of losing force as a result of its action in the east, attained additional strength. From this conviction resulted an entirely new tone toward Germany: It found expression in the political English press in accordance with the government's wishes.

According to the reports exchanged in political and diplomatic quarters here it was not completely certain of the modifications of the "conciliation" sector. Sir John Simon, according to general opinion, is found in this sector, and is also believed to be the father of the project of the joint declaration by Great Britain, France, Poland, and the Soviet Union. The Premier, also, despite the determined tone of his latest speeches, no longer seemed free from doubts as to the gains in the partition started at Munich. This wavering seems, above all, to concern English relations to Poland. In the defeatist and conciliatory theory mentioned above there was apparently no clearly defined status for us. Now, in view of the German successes, which were attained by pressure, people here begin to fear that Poland also would end up compromising with Germany, and thereby the latter would be enabled rapidly to attack Russia. Uneasy at the thought that in such a development the west would also get its turn, and that German pressure could not then be repulsed. This conclusion indicates that English-Polish relations stand a chance of becoming closer. In addition, a serious argument has asserted itself for English cooperation with us; ever more crystallization of the conviction that Poland, aside from the Soviets, after all, is the only factor in eastern Europe possessing full political independence and foreign and domestic relations which permit of independent decision. The school of "conciliation," as is known, is striving here for limitation of English influence in the eastern Mediterranean and for defense of the Dardanelles which safeguard access to the Black Sea. It has been proven, however, that on the Balkan Peninsula, too—that is, in the forefield of Turkey—a situation exists which is not free from menace, and that the political mobilization of the states of the Balkin Entente in accordance with England's wishes and under its tutelage is meeting with difficulties. From all the above-mentioned possibilities and from others which, for the sake of brevity I pass over, the English Government chose the suggestion

of joint declaration by England, France, Poland, and the Soviets in order to turn to us. Since, however, until very recently, divergences and doubts reigned within the Government as to the advisability of this active method, a not very forceful or binding form of general declarations was chosen, drafted in a style permitting various interpretations. Proof that the resulting weakness is well recognized here can be gleaned from the fact that Poland's refusal to sign such a document did not cause great surprise here, and still another instance must be illuminated, so far as I am able to do so this moment. It is the status of British-Russian relations. As I previously had the opportunity to inform you in connection with the departure of Minister Hudson to Warsaw and Moscow (on the 10th of this month) the British at the time already hoped very much to be able to cooperate politically with the Soviets. The Soviets, on the other hand, showed a lack of lively interest. At the time they did it under a condition which so far has never been fully understood. Apparently they made signing dependent upon Poland's participation.[1]

It is not known whether the British Government turned to Moscow in an effort to get the signatures of the three powers, including France, and whether Moscow was unwilling to do so. At any rate there are many indications lately that relations are less happy now than recently in connection with British initiative. I shall mention this point again when reporting on my conversation with Ambassador Kennedy. Here I should like to add that Ambassador Majskij, whom I frequently met at receptions given in honor of President Lebrun, hardly suppressed the facts that he was well pleased with the recent course of events and at the same time showed much self-assurance. An element for instability in the Government here became very apparent during the recruiting dispute which for months has been the subject of hot controversies. In view of the considerable increase in the regular and territorial army, experts here explain the Government's hesitancy in introducing the bill on recruiting for technical reasons. They claim that the measure would have only a symbolic, demonstrative importance for the near future and would not make it easier, but rather more difficult in building up an army. Aside from the value of these statements, Mr. Chamberlain's vacillations seem to be traceable, above all, to his fear that the labor unions which oppose his recruiting schemes will line up against him thereby stirring up differences in Parliament, which is now almost unanimous. Instead of introducing the recruiting law, the Premier for the time being announced in the House of Commons the doubling of the so-called territorial army up to a figure of 340,000 men.

MY CONVERSATION WITH AMBASSADOR KENNEDY

This sizing up of the situation here was the chief topic of conversation which I had on the 28th of this month with the American Ambassador, Mr. Kennedy, and which, according to your instructions, Mr. Minister, I submitted to Director Lubionski.

I asked Mr. Kennedy point-blank about the conference which he is supposed to have had recently with Mr. Chamberlain concerning Poland. Kennedy was surprised and declared categorically that a conversation of such special significance never took place. At the same time, and thereby contradicting his own assertion to a certain extent, Kennedy expressed displeasure and surprise that his colleagues in Paris and Warsaw, "who are not, as himself, in a position to get a clear picture of conditions in England," should talk so openly about this conversation. As I saw that I would not attain very much in this way I turned the conversation to the present situation and begged the Ambassador to judge Britain's willingness for armed action. I have already reported to you, Mr. Minister, by telegram, on this part of the conversation. Kennedy, who intimated that his opinion was based on a series of talks with local, competent quarters, declared he was convinced that should Poland decide to resist Germany by arms, especially with regard to Danzig, it would draw England in its wake. That would not be, as Kennedy emphasized, a result of greater cordiality than shown by Britain toward us in the past, but merely a result from political necessity. Should Poland, on the other hand, be undecided, then conciliatory elements in the Government would use that, as the Ambassador said, to induce Britain to renounce binding itself to us. Mr. Kennedy is of the opinion that in local governments doubts continue to exist whether Poland is irrevocably determined to resist with regard to Danzig. In view of the present conditions which are changing with lightning speed, assurances of this kind would necessarily have been repeated frequently.

I thereupon touched on the Russian question. Mr. Kennedy was pretty reticent and obviously did not want to be drawn into discussion on British procedure toward Moscow (and also on difficulties which this procedure might encounter). He confined himself to the characteristic utterance that the British Government attached more importance to its cooperation with Poland than with Russia. That much I heard from Mr. Kennedy himself. On the other hand, there are rumors circulating among journalists here to the effect that the Ambassador actually did talk with the Premier in recent days about eastern Europe. On this occasion, it is asserted that he emphasized that America's sympathies for England in case of a conflict would depend to a great extent upon the determination with which England would take care of European states threatened by Germany.

(Signed) EDWARD RACZYNSKI,
Ambassador of the Republic of Poland.

[1] In the Foreign Office I was informed to this effect, while the Soviets on the other hand deny this. Apparently there is a caustic interpretation here: The invitation was sent to four states and the Soviets, as they assert, accept without any conditions. They accept, however, only in this form and with participation as the British proposal provides.

LETTER FROM THE POLISH GENERAL STAFF (DEPARTMENT TWO) IN WARSAW, TO THE FOREIGN MINISTER IN WARSAW

WARSAW, *August 8, 1938.*

[Confidential]

(Concerns the international situation as seen in Portugal)

The British military mission at present is busy in Portugal trying to outline military cooperation between Portugal and Great Britain. Admiral Wodehouse submitted the British demands to the staffs of the Portuguese Army and Navy, but all British projects were sabotaged by the Portuguese War Ministry and Government. In fact, the British mission did not receive a reply. Thereupon Admiral Wodehouse conferred with British Ambassador Selby, who advised the admiral to remain calm and reserved. Finally Wodehouse sent a direct report to London. Concerning this direct report Wodehouse himself said:

"I asked London whether I am to point the pistol to their heads or whether I am to wait. Anyway I shall now be more strict with them."

The Portuguese Gen. Peixote E. Cunha, known as the right-hand man of Salazar, who carries out reforms of the army personnel, told me that Portugal's future depended on an alliance with Great Britain, that Spain, quite independent of the outcome of the civil war, was a permanent threat to Portugal, and that Portugal would welcome the weakening of Spain even at the price of separating Catalonia from Spain.

Lt. N. Chamberlain, member of the British military mission, spoke of the danger of a European war. He said:

"We know that Germany and Italy are bluffing. Together with the younger officers of our staff I am of the opinion that we should start war immediately."

He explained that Germany could surprise nobody by new war machinery, that the German army was unprepared, that old German airplanes and armored material had but little practical value, and that Germany was in a bad moral and economic position (possibility of overthrow of German regime). He added that Germany lacks ore, oil, rubber, and food. Germany's possible partner, Italy, was in even a worse condition, since she was without any war materials whatsoever. He assured me that under the present circumstances war seemed unavoidable and declared it would be better to start war now when there was less possibility of danger. He pointed out that at present Great Britain can count on close cooperation with United States. I asked Chamberlain whether England in this event meant to introduce military conscription. He answered that he did not think so, for the following reasons: London was convinced that the most useful weapons would be the Navy, the air force, and armored units, as well as participation in warfare of trade and industry. He added that it was possible, of course, that as a result of events of the war, general mobilization might have to be resorted to.

Colonel Daly, of the British military mission, appeared to be optimistic over the results of the commission's work. He hinted that Great Britain would apply methods which would guarantee success. He said that at present everything was being done here to bring about an end of purchases of German war material. He added that recent experiences with German war materials in Rumania were unsatisfactory. Colonel Daly revealed that Germany lately had sold certain arms to "red" Spain. On the British possibilities in a future war, Colonel Daly was of the same opinion as Chamberlain, and emphasized the fact that good results had already been achieved in obtaining cooperation with United States. As to the introduction of military conscription in Great Britain, Colonel Daly declared that England by general military preparations, target practice, and the establishment of strong volunteer corps, had created the necessary conditions for large-scale extension of the British Army. He added that Great Britain had organized great strategical reserves in the colonies, particularly in India.

In the last 2 years staff officers for future wars are systematically trained at academies: An academy for training high officers for leading posts in political, administrative, and military authorities, and an imperial military college for preparation of officers of lower rank. In addition, the number of preparatory courses for general staff officers has been doubled. Thus, said Daly, Great Britain has created an organization for the whole Empire in preparation for the coming conflict.

Commander Gade, American naval attaché, said to me at the time:

"We are completely on the side of democracy so far as ideas are concerned. At present the possibilities for speedy aid to Great Britain and France are being studied in America. One must conclude that help shall not be sent as in the World War, only after 1 year when the first American soldiers intervened actively, but in the course of 7 to 10 days. As soon as the war begins 1,000 airplanes are to be sent."

Commander Gade furthermore drew my attention to the unpermissible methods of German penetration in South America, to which the United States could not consent. Commander Gade is

a man who enjoys the confidence of Roosevelt and is a personal friend of his. He has very close relations with Belgium, and is a friend of the Belgian King. He is very unfriendly toward Germany. Personally he is very wealthy.

From conversations with Chamberlain, Daly, and Gade I derived a feeling of quiet certainty—of close cooperation in case of a conflict. I talked more frequently with local Italians. They are extremely nervous, much interested in our attitude in a future conflict; with their backs to the wall they pointed to the menace to mankind and to civilization in a future war, which, for this reason, must be avoided at all cost.

While the French Fleet was here, Commander Darrieux, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Atlantic Fleet, regarded as the coming man of the French Navy, and known to me from an earlier visit to Lisbon, as leader of a destroyer unit, invited me personally to board the admiral ship, as well as to the inspection of the aircraft carrier *Bearn*. I went, together with Captain Stefanowicz, and accompanied by the French Minister. We were the only foreigners there.

Bearn lay in the middle of the Tejo River, far away from any possibility of closer inspection. In the course of the conversation Commander Darrieux spoke pretty calmly about the possibility of future conflict. Above all he emphasized the fact that in France the rightist circles and rightist press are unnecessarily afraid and that they judged the situation incorrectly. He regards the pacifism of the democracies as their biggest mistake, for by this creed one cannot be first in starting the war. In this manner one puts a most valuable trump card into the hands of the opponents—that of surprise. But he has opinions somewhat beyond this view. He believes it will be possible to come to terms with the Italians.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize the calm and unanimity of view of the representatives of Britain, France, and the United States.

What It Means to Me To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY WRITTEN BY PAUL BULLOCK, JR.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of sincere, and I hope justifiable, pride that I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following essay on a great subject by Paul Bullock, 15-year-old high-school student of South Pasadena, Calif.

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Paul Bullock, Jr.)

(The prize winning essay delivered over KHJ Monday evening, June 3, in competition sponsored by the American Legion)

To me, being an American is more than just a great privilege. It carries with it a responsibility—a responsibility to the millions of oppressed people throughout the world who look to America as the last citadel of hope and security on this war-torn planet.

On our fertile soil, rich crops are grown. Elsewhere, the soil is drenched with the blood of young men who are fighting against one another without quite knowing why. America is great because her people are tolerant and unafraid. We know that the truth cannot be permanently crushed. We are not afraid of the future. We Americans realize that human liberty is the most precious possession that a people can have.

In other countries, the people have destroyed dearly-won freedom and have submitted to the rule of a dictator. But dictatorships cannot endure. For in them there is no room for individual initiative or ambition. The individual inevitably loses his self-respect. And when self-respect no longer exists, progress stops. Over here, the coal miner and the banker are on an equal basis politically. We have recognized the fact that human beings are essentially alike. We have let the bars down and have said to young America: "You have your chance. Now let's see what you can do." That, to me, is the great virtue of Americanism.

We Americans are free—free from fear and free from hate. I can walk down the street with my neighbors without fearing the displeasure of an iron guard or a gestapo. I can talk and think and act as a free human being, not as the insignificant pawn of a dictator. My thoughts are my own, not those of some propaganda minister. I am not taught to hate others.

In a few years, I shall have all the responsibilities and rights of a citizen. I shall be able to choose my career freely. My conscience is my dictator. I am not forced to make war on my fellow human beings. And I make my own decisions. All these things mean a great deal to me. They are made possible because I live in America.

All races and all religious sects have contributed more than their share to American life. Science, art, literature, business, medicine, law, Government—in all these fields our knowledge has been enriched by the contributions of Catholics and Jews and Italians and Germans. To me, it is a great privilege to live in a country where opportunities for all still exist.

America is not perfect. But where else in this world can one live in the peace and security which we Americans have taken for granted? The future is still bright. There is still hope. That's what being an American means to me.

National Rifle Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

LETTER FROM C. B. LISTER

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately some irresponsible remarks have been made on the floor which seem to cast reflection on the National Rifle Association of America, which the following will correct:

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 5, 1940.*

To All Individual Members and Officers of Affiliated Clubs:

1. On Tuesday, May 21, Representative Samuel Dickstein, Twelfth District, New York City, taking advantage of the congressional immunity which makes it impossible to sue him for slander or libel, made a statement on the floor of the House of Representatives which was an unqualified lie in its presentation of purported facts and an unqualified slander in its implications and innuendo.

2. Mr. DICKSTEIN'S statement must be viewed as a considered attack on the National Rifle Association because it was not made during the normal course of any debate and the newspapermen at the Capitol were notified in advance that the statement was to be issued.

3. He said:

(a) that the association "had at one time sent representatives to the bund, in 1938, to solicit memberships";

(b) that the association "was recently exposed in the press when it was found out that this association had sold rifles to members of the Christian Front";

(c) that "today 2 bund posts of storm troops are known to be drilling with rifles more intensely than before" and that "their rifles are sold to them by the National Rifle Association of Washington, D. C."; and

(d) that "it is certainly a serious situation when an organization sells Government rifles—and at reduced prices at that—to Nazi agents and alien agitators and this is sanctioned by a citizens' rifle training division of the United States Government."

4. The facts are:

(a) The National Rifle Association has not at any time sent a representative to the bund or to any other organization to solicit memberships. Every member and club officer knows that the association employs no solicitors, pays no commissions on memberships, and that the limited staff makes it difficult to even attend the annual meetings of established leagues and State associations.

(b) The "exposure" of the National Rifle Association in connection with the investigation of the Christian Front (an anti-Jewish but not "bund" organization) came at a time when the association had been cooperating for more than a year with Federal and State authorities and proper committees of Congress in endeavoring to ferret out subversive elements in America. Three of the Christian Front members arrested by the F. B. I. were members of the National Rifle Association—but one had been a member of the New York National Guard at the time of his National Rifle Association enrollment, a second had been endorsed by this guardsman, the third had been endorsed by the second. These men were, of course, promptly eliminated from the National Rifle Association. According to press reports, a large number of New York City policemen and New York National Guard men were also members of the Christian Front. They were all armed by the city of New York or by the Federal Government. All had taken the required oaths to support the laws and the Government of the United States.

The association regrets that out of a membership of approximately 6,000 in the New York Metropolitan area, 3 men were

found to be Christian Fronters—but submits that this is a far smaller percentage than was apparently true of the New York City police.

(c) The association does not sell arms or ammunition to any individual or organization. The Director of Civilian Marksmanship, War Department, may sell specified rifles and ammunition to individual members of the association. During the time that the association has been furnishing leads and otherwise cooperating with the proper agencies in discovering and following the activities of subversive organizations, just 12 individuals, out of a total of over a quarter-million individual and club members, have been found to be affiliated with un-American groups. The majority of the 12 were involved from the standpoint of religious rather than international situations. A recent check of 3,000 names of persons suspected as bund members has shown only 8 rifles purchased since 1927 by people on this list.

(d) Every applicant for individual membership must be endorsed by a present member or by a military, police, or judicial officer. Every applicant is required to certify over the signature of his endorser that he is a citizen of the United States. It may be truthfully said that enrollment in the National Rifle Association involves at least as much check-up and endorsement, if not more, as does enlistment in most National Guard and Regular Army units.

(e) Every club application for enrollment as a unit must be endorsed by the adjutant general of the State in which the club is located.

(f) The sale of certain arms and ammunition to citizens is provided for by Congress as a national-defense measure under section 113 of the National Defense Act. Such sales are not, as Mr. DICKSTEIN said, made by the National Rifle Association under the sanction of a citizens' rifle-training division of the United States Government. The sanction comes from the Congress of the United States, and the sales are made by the War Department, Director of Civilian Marksmanship, under the supervision of the Secretary of War. None of the arms so sold have ever been used against the United States, but many of the past purchasers have given their lives or risked their lives in the defense of the United States. Mr. DICKSTEIN'S autobiography in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows no evidence of his having similarly risked his life for the sake of the Nation, in the safety of whose Congress he makes slanderous statements concerning one of the country's best known, most praised, practical patriotic organizations.

5. As a direct result of this attack by Mr. DICKSTEIN the sale and issue of Government rifles and ammunition—including .22's—has already been suspended by order of the President. In such manner has "the gentleman from New York" aided the preparations of America to train and equip its citizens to meet any invader and to defend our homes and factories from "fifth column" activities. Surely this result was not in his mind when he made his unwarranted, unexpected, and unsupported attack.

6. We appreciate the many loyal and indignant letters which have come to the association since the publication of Congressman DICKSTEIN'S statement. We suggest that members who know the facts, so far as they personally and their fellow club members are concerned, communicate those facts to their own Senators and Congressmen. No organization in America has cooperated more loyally with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Dies committee in the effort to uncover un-American activities. No civilian organization has worked more loyally with the War and Navy Departments through many years to develop a more adequate national defense. America has never been in greater need of an adequate small-arms training program for its loyal citizens than is the case today. This is the time to build up, not tear down, the National Rifle Association of America.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION,
C. B. LISTER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The Party of the "Fifth Column," Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. THORKELSON
OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, as I picked up the paper this morning I found an article with the heading, "Prepared U. S. Can Lick Hell Out of the World, Says Baruch." I say, there is nothing to hold Mr. Baruch, Mr. Warburg, Mr. Morgenthau, and the rest of the international bankers from starting out in defense of their own rotten system.

I have, since I came to Congress, gradually revealed information leading to the real international "fifth column," and Mr. Morgenthau, by his treasonable act of selling our ships to a foreign nation, confirms my statements and signs the indictment of the international bankers.

It was Mr. Bernard Baruch, M. Paul Mantoux, Albert Strauss, Thomas W. Lamont, and other international bankers who wrote the Treaty of Versailles and Trianon, which left Europe open for the war raging today.

It was Mr. Baruch who testified that, "I probably had more power than perhaps any one man did in the war," and I, to be just to these international racketeers, will grant that they are using that power to involve the United States in war today. It is indeed unfortunate that innocent people must suffer and young men must die in order to defend the most insidious and destructive "fifth column" in the world, namely, the international bankers and the communists that they nourished and set in power when they financed Lenin and Trotsky in Russia. This is the invisible government.

As I look over the record of 20 years ago, I wonder why Congress has not placed this information before the public so that the people could know who the real destroyers are. Nothing else could be expected from Mr. Morgenthau than what he has done, for he and his bankers are perfectly willing to sacrifice this Nation's security and our defense in order to protect their own unholy tribe. It is this "fifth column," the international bankers, which is the greatest threat and danger to our own people, and whose power must be curbed if we are ever to have peace. Gold certificates and gold-bearing obligations payable to foreign nations should be repudiated and the gold set aside as security and protection for the people of this Nation, to whom it rightfully belongs. When the international bankers are deprived of using gold as though it were their own property, there will be tranquillity and peace throughout the whole world, and this is the only way to lick the real war mongers, the international bankers.

It was a member of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. who financed Trotzsky and Lenin in Russia, and it was Mr. Warburg who aided in furnishing money through the Rhenish-Westphalian Syndicate, the Nya-Banken, and through the Deutsch Reichsbank, to finance and further aid the Communists in Russia. It is by their sanction and aid that communism is now a threat in the United States which the people themselves must eradicate because the Government has failed to do its duty.

It is these same international bankers who dominate the White House and who have written the policies of the New Deal for the past 7 years, and as a matter of fact, they have undermined this Government for 30 years. It is the same bankers who were instrumental in the enactment of the Gold Reserve Act that has made peons out of the American people.

With these international destroyers, I include their undercover man, Sidney Hillman, a Communist, and J. P. Morgan & Co., who were so active in involving us in the World War. It is indeed unfortunate that we allow the Federal Government to select these people to run the United States, when they have had no part in the creation and building of the structure itself. Like carrion crows, they have lived upon the people of this Nation for many, many years, and it is high time that we put them in their right place.

It is this that I have tried to bring to light since I came to the Congress of the United States. The gentlemen whom I have called "invisible government" are now realizing that they are being exposed, and are using every effort to hurry the plan that was laid 30 years ago.

However, the cat is out of the bag, for Mr. Woodring, the recent Secretary of War, realizing—as I have—the real "fifth column" stated:

> I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles. There is a comparatively small clique of international financiers who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower.
>
> They don't like me because I'm against stripping our own defenses for the sake of trying to stop Hitler 3,000 miles away. Eventually they will force me to resign.

The ex-Secretary of War made this statement some time ago, for he realized that, did he perform his obligated duty, the international financiers would not permit him to remain in office. That is precisely what has happened, for he has now been forced to resign. However, in Mr. Woodring's resignation, and in the traitorous transfer of ships to a belligerent power, the real "fifth columnists" have signed their own indictment, and my statements are vindicated by their own acts.

I realize that it is foolish to make a prediction, but it is quite possible that Germany will be at war with Russia before it is all over. The Russian Government, the English Government, and our own international bankers, the invisible government in the United States, are all of the same kind of people, and they are incompatible with those of us who believe in the fundamental principles of this Republic of the United States.

I may have been harsh in my exposés and in my statements, and I have been criticized, but win or lose, we must save America, and set principle above profit. It was upon those ideals that this country became a great Nation, and it is only upon those principles that we can maintain and support the structure that has been handed down to us by those who had dedicated themselves to these principles.

The Irresponsibles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY ARCHIBALD MacLEISH

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to insert in the RECORD a statement from the Librarian of Congress upon the responsibility of American writers and scholars. If his judgment may be taken as clairvoyant of correction, we shall have in these articulate ones a steadier vanguard for national solidarity in days ahead than we have had in recent years.

[From the Nation of May 18, 1940]

History, if honest history continues to be written, will have one question to ask of our generation—people like ourselves. It will be asked of the books we have written, the carbon copies of our correspondence, the photographs of our faces, the minutes of our meetings in the famous rooms before the portraits of our spiritual begetters. The question will be this: Why did the scholars and the writers of our generation in this country, witnesses as they were to the destruction of writing and of scholarship in great areas of Europe and to the exile and the imprisonment and murder of men whose crime was scholarship and writing—witnesses also to the rise in their own country of the same destructive forces with the same impulses, the same motives, the same means—why did the scholars and the writers of our generation in America fail to oppose those forces while they could—while there was still time and still place to oppose them with the arms of scholarship and writing?

It is a question the historians will ask with interest—the gentle, detached, not altogether loving interest with which historians have always questioned the impotent spirits of the dead. Young men working in the paper rubbish of our lives, the old journals, the marginal notations, the printed works, will discover—or so they will think—that the scholars and the writers of our generation in this country had been warned of danger as men were rarely warned before. They will discover—or so they will think—that the common inherited culture of the west, by which alone our scholars and our writers lived, had been attacked in other countries with a stated and explicit purpose to destroy. They will discover that the purpose had been realized. They will discover that a similar purpose, backed by similar forces, created by similar conditions, was forming here. And it will seem to them strange—ironical and strange—that the great mass of American scholars and American writers made no effort to defend either themselves or the world by which they lived.

They will make, of course, the necessary reservations. They will note that societies of scholars and associations of writers adopted resolutions declaring their devotion to civilization. They will note that certain young novelists and poets, the most generous and gallant of their time, unable to endure the outrage and injustice, gave up their lives as writers and enlisted in the hopeless armies to fight brutality with force. But, of those who truly faced this danger not with their bodies but with their minds, of those who fought the enemies of the intellect with the weapons of the intellect, of those who fought this danger with the weapons by which this danger could be overcome, they will record the names of very few. And they will ask their question: Why did we, scholars and writers in America in this time, we who had been warned of our danger not only by explicit threats but by explicit action, why did we not fight this danger while the weapons we used best—the weapons of ideas and words—could still be used against it?

It is not a question for which we are altogether unprepared. We have been writing out our answer for many years now in action and inaction, in words and in silence—in learned articles in the scientific journals and in controversial articles in the general magazines, in books, in blank faces after the passionate words, in bored eyes refusing to believe. The answer we have prepared, the answer we have written out for history to find, is the answer Leonardo is said to have given Michelangelo when Michelangelo blamed him for his indifference to the misfortunes of the Florentines. It is the answer of our kind at many other times and places. "Indeed," said Leonardo, "indeed, the study of beauty has occupied my whole heart." The study of beauty, of history, of science, has occupied our whole hearts, and the misfortunes of our generation are none of our concern. They are the practical and political concern of practical and political men, but the concern of the scholar, the concern of the artist, is with other, purer, more enduring things.

This is the answer we have written down for history to find. I doubt whether it will satisfy the ironic men who come to plague us on that waterfront where Teresias was made to drink the blood and answer. I think, indeed, it will not satisfy them. For it has not satisfied ourselves. We say with great firmness and authority, speaking by our words and by our silence, that the misfortunes of our generation are economic and political misfortunes from which the scholar can safely hold himself apart. We say this with all the authority of the political scientists of the past, to whom the misfortunes of the people were always political and economic and of no concern to the poet, the pure scholar, the artist intent upon his art. We say it also with the authority of the political scientists of the present, to whom all phenomena of whatever kind are, by hypothesis, economic and political. But though we say it we do not believe it. For we have observed these misfortunes. They have been acted out for us to see. And what we have seen is this: That the misfortunes of our time are not the misfortunes the philosophers, the theorists, the political scientists have described to us. They are not the practical concern of the practical man and therefore matters of indifference to the scholar. On the contrary, it is the practical man and the practical man alone—the man whose only care is for his belly and his roof—who can safely be indifferent to these troubles. The things he lives by are not menaced. And it is precisely the scholar, the poet—the man whose care is for the structures of the intellect, the houses of the mind—whose heart is caught. For it is the scholar's goods which are in danger.

It is perhaps because we have seen this and yet refuse to see it that our minds are so confused and our counsels so bewildered. Nothing is more characteristic of the intellectuals of our generation than their failure to understand what it is that is happening to their world. And nothing explains that failure so precisely as their unwillingness to see what they have seen and to know what they do truly know. They continue to speak of the crisis of their time as though the war in Europe were that crisis—and the war, they say, is no concern of theirs. They continue to speak of the crisis as though the imperialistic maneuvers, the struggles for markets, the propaganda in the newspapers and the radio were the crisis—and the maneuvers of imperialism, the propaganda of the press, and the struggles for trade, they say, are no concern of theirs. And yet they know—they know very well because they have seen—that these things are not the crisis but merely its reflections in the mirrors of action. They know that behind the war, behind the diplomatic gestures, behind the black print on the page and the hysterical voices on the air there is something deeper and more dangerous—more dangerous to them. They know that it is a condition of men's minds which has produced these things—a condition which existed and exists not only in Europe but in other parts of the world as well and not least in our own country. And they know that this condition of men's minds is not a practical, a political, phenomenon of no concern to the scholar and the man of thought, but something very different.

It is not, for example, a matter of purely practical and political interest that great numbers of men in various parts of the world wish passionately and even violently to give up the long labor of liberty and to surrender their wills and their bodies and even their minds to the will of a leader, so that they may achieve at least the dignity of order, at least the dignity of obedience. It is not a matter of purely practical and political significance that whole nations of men have gladly and willingly released themselves not only from their rights as individuals but from their duties as individuals; so that they are no longer compelled to feel or to respect the individual humanity of others—or to feel or to respect the things that individual humanity has, over many centuries, created. It is not a matter of purely practical and political

importance that governments which once, whatever they may have practiced, protested a respect for learning and the arts, should now permit themselves to show not only the power but, worse, far worse, the willingness, the purpose, to enslave both learning and the arts. It is not a matter of purely practical and political importance that societies which once made part of the community of western culture should now attempt by murder and outrage and exile to root out that culture and to replace it with private and parochial sciences and private and parochial arts; so that frontiers are armed, for the first time in the history of the West, not only along the rivers and the mountains and the boundaries of nations, but across the common earth of culture, the free land that was never fenced before.

I think no honest man will say that these are matters of practical and political significance alone. I think any man who considers with coolness and without the preconceptions of the dogmas the character of the crisis of his time will admit that this crisis is in essence a cultural crisis—a revolt of certain classes, certain conditions of men against the inherited culture of the west and against all common culture, a revolt by no means limited to those nations were it has been successful. Wars we have had before—many wars; murder also, inquisition of scholars, torture of askers, suppression and mutilation of truth. But in the past these things have been done, however hypocritically, in the name of truth, in the name of humanity, even in the name of God. The forms of culture were preserved; and in the preservation of a civilization as in the preservation of an art the forms are everything. What is new and unexampled in the times we live in is the repudiation of the forms. What is new is a cynical brutality which considers moral self-justification unnecessary and therefore—and this is perhaps its worst indecency—dispenses even with the filthy garment of the hypocrite. To use brutality and force, not in the name of right nor in the name of God but in the name of force alone, is to destroy the self-respect and therefore the dignity of the individual life, without which the existence of art or learning is inconceivable. To lie, not in the name of truth but in the name of lies, is to destroy the common basis of communication without which a common culture cannot exist and a work of learning or of art becomes unintelligible.

The truth is that the disorder of our time is in its essentials a revolt against the common culture of the West. For against what but the common culture did this disorder continue to struggle in Germany long after it had overthrown the former State? There was no domestic danger for it to fear. Against what but the western respect for the dignity of the individual was aimed the long series of outrages against the Jews? The Jews were impotent when they were subjected to the worst abuses. Against what but the western respect for the common, the nationless creation of the artist was aimed the destruction of the work of men like Thomas Mann? Thomas Mann had already been repudiated by his people when they accepted the government of his enemies. Against what but the western belief in the wholeness of western civilization was aimed the assault upon a church which was no longer a danger to any ruler and the fabrication of a paganism which needed only the blond sopranos on the ends of wires to be Wagner at his worst?

Intellectuals in America and elsewhere—writers, scientists, the men of learning—have attempted to ignore these questions. They have pretended to themselves that the burning of books, the exiling of artists, the invention of mythologies were merely incidents, afterthoughts, decorations; that the true crisis was the crisis of food, the crisis of arms, the crisis created by political forces, by economic collapse; that they had, and needed have, no truck with it. They have been wrong. These things are not incidents. They are not afterthoughts. They are the essential nature of the revolution of our age. For without this attack upon the habits of the mind, the reliances of the spirit, the revolution could not, by any possibility, have succeeded.

The revolution of our age—the revolution which has finally emerged and declared itself in action—is not the great revolution of the masses of which generous men once dreamed, and which other and less generous men have now so meanly and so bloodily betrayed. The revolution of the masses was a revolution which proposed to set up one faith against another faith, one culture against another culture; a faith in man, a faith in the power of the patterns of men's lives, against a faith in institutions and in money; a culture of the people against a culture of the exploiters of the people. The revolution which has finally and successfully emerged in action has no such faith and no such culture.

It is a revolution of negatives, a revolution of despair. It is a revolution created out of misery by dread of yet more misery, a revolution created out of disorder by terror of disorder. It is a revolution of gangs, a revolution against. And the enemy it must destroy is the enemy which, in all times and in all civilizations, has stood against the revolutions of the gangs—the rule of moral law, the rule of spiritual authority, the rule of intellectual truth. To establish the negative revolutions, the revolutions of which the only aim is power, the revolutions which have no means but force, it is necessary first to destroy the authority of the unseen sayings of the mind. It is necessary to destroy the things the mind has made. Caliban in the miserable and besotted swamp is the symbol of this revolution. As long as the unseen beauty in the air retains its voices and its seductive music and its stinging whips, the revolutions of the gangs are clumsy, blundering, grotesque, and foolish. They have one hope of success and only one—the destruction of the whole system of ideas, the whole respect for truth, the whole authority of excellence which places law above force, beauty above cruelty, singleness above numbers.

It is the distinction of our time—perhaps unhappily its most memorable distinction—that it, and it alone, has provided the formula by which this overthrow could be achieved. Only in our time has the revolution of the gangs discovered a strategy and a leadership brutal enough, cynical enough, cunning enough to destroy the entire authority of the inherited culture and thereafter to seal the doors against the searching and the asking of the scholar's mind, the artist's mind, so that the revolution of force, the revolution of despair, could flower and fulfill its possibilities.

It is to this disorder and not to some political and partisan dissension—not to some accidental economic break-down; it is to this direct, explicit, and intentional attack upon the scholar's world and the scholar's life and the scholar's work that American scholarship has been indifferent, or, if not indifferent, then inactive—merely watchful—fearful, watchful, and inactive; and it is there that history will place its question: How could we sit back as spectators of a war against ourselves?

I think—speaking only of what I have seen myself and heard—I think it is neither lack of courage nor lack of wisdom, but a different reason which has prevented our generation of intellectuals in this country from acting in its own defense. I think it is the organization of the intellectual life of our time. Specifically, I think it is this: That intellectual responsibility has been divided in our time and, by division, destroyed. The men of intellectual duty—those who should have been responsible for action—have divided themselves into two castes—two cults—the scholars and the writers; neither of these accepts responsibility for the common culture or for its defense.

There was a time a century ago, two centuries ago, when men who practiced these professions would have accepted such responsibility without an instant's hesitation. A century ago the professions of the writer and the scholar were united in the single profession of the man of letters, and the man of letters was responsible in everything that touched the mind. He was a man of wholeness of purpose, of singleness of intention, a single intellectual champion, admittedly responsible for the defense of the inherited tradition avowedly partisan of its practice. Where those who practice these several professions today divide the learned world and the creative world between them in irresponsible and neutral states, the man of letters inhabited both learning and the world of letters like an empire.

He was a man of learning whose learning was employed not for its own sake in a kind of academic narcissism but for the sake of decent living in his time. He was a writer whose writing was used not to mirror an abstract and unrelated present but to illuminate that present by placing it in just relation to its past. He was therefore and necessarily a man who admitted a responsibility for the survival and vitality of the common and accumulated experience of the mind, for this experience was to him the air he breathed, the perspective of his thinking. Learning to him was no plump pigeon carcass to be picked at for his private pleasure and his private fame but a profession practiced for the common good. Writing was not an ornament, a jewel, but a means to ends, a weapon, the most powerful of weapons, a weapon to be used. Whatever threatened learning or the ends of learning challenged the man of letters. Whatever struck at truth or closed off question or defiled an art or violated decency of thinking struck at him. And he struck back with every weapon masters of the word could find to strike with. Milton defending freedom of the mind in sentences which outlive every name of those who struck at freedom, Voltaire displaying naked to the grin of history the tyrants who were great until he made them small, Bartholomew de las Casas gentling cruel priests and brutal captains with the dreadful strokes of truth—las Casas, Milton, and Voltaire were men of letters, men who confessed an obligation to defend the disciplines of thought not in their own but in the general interest.

Had men like these been living in our time, had the intellectuals of our time been whole and loyal, it would, I think, have been impossible for the revolution of the gangs to have succeeded where success has been most dangerous—in the perversion of the judgments of the mind. Murder is not absolved of immorality by committing murder. Murder is absolved of immorality by bringing men to think that murder is not evil. This only the perversion of the mind can bring about. And the perversion of the mind is only possible when those who should be heard in its defense are silent.

They are silent in our time because there are no voices which accept responsibility for speaking. Even the unimaginable indecencies of propaganda, even the corruption of the word itself in Germany and Russia and Spain and elsewhere, even the open triumph of the lie produced no answer such as Voltaire in his generation would have given. And for this reason—that the man who could have been Voltaire, who could have been las Casas, does not live; the man of intellectual office, the man of intellectual calling, the man who professes letters—professes an obligation as a servant of the mind to defend the mind's integrity against every physical power—professes an obligation to defend the labors of the mind and the structures it has created and the means by which it lives, not only privately and safely in his study, not only

strictly and securely in the controversies of the learned press, but publicly and at the public risk and danger of his life. He does not exist because the man of letters no longer exists. And the man of letters no longer exists because he has been driven from our world and from our time by the division of his kingdom. The single responsibility, the wholeness of function of the man of letters, has been replaced by the divided function, the mutual antagonism, the isolated irresponsibility of two figures—the scholar and the writer.

Why this substitution has come about—whether because the methods of scientific inquiry, carried over into the humanities, destroyed the loyalties and habits of the mind or for some other reason—I leave to wiser men to say. The point is that there has been a substitution. The country of the man of letters has been divided between his heirs. The country that was once the past and present brought together in the mind is now divided into past on one side, present on the other.

Past is the scholar's country; present is the writer's. The writer sees the present on the faces of the world and leaves the past to rot in its own rubbish. The scholar digs his ivory cellar in the ruins of the past and lets the present sicken as it will. A few exceptions noted here and there—men like Thomas Mann—the gulf between these countries is complete. And the historical novels fashionable at the moment, the vulgarizations of science, the digests of philosophy, only define its depth as a plank across a chasm makes the chasm deeper. That it should be necessary to throw such flimsy flights from one side to the other of the learned world shows how deeply and disastrously the split was made.

That scholarship suffers or that writing suffers by the change is not asserted. Scholarship may be more scientific—writing may be purer. Indeed, there are many who believe, and I among them, that the time we live in has produced more first-rate writers than any but the very greatest ages, and there are scholars of a scholarship as hard, as honest, as devoted as any we have known. But excellence of scholarship and writing are not now in question. What matters now is the defense of culture—the defense truly, and in the most literal terms, of civilization as men have known it for the last 2,000 years. And there the substitution of the modern scholar-writer, however pure his scholarship, however excellent his writing, is a tragic and immeasurable loss. For neither the modern scholar nor the modern writer admits responsibility for this defense. They assert on the contrary, each in his particular way, an irresponsibility as complete as it is singular.

The irresponsibility of the scholar is the irresponsibility of the scientist upon whose laboratory insulation he has patterned all his work. The scholar in letters has made himself as indifferent to values, as careless of significance, as bored with meanings as the chemist. He is a refugee from consequences, an exile from the responsibilities of moral choice. His words of praise are the laboratory words—objectivity, detachment, dispassion. His pride is to be scientific, neuter, skeptical, detached—superior to final judgment or absolute belief. In his capacity as scholar the modern scholar does not occupy the present. In his capacity as scholar he loves the word—but only the word which entails no judgments, involves no decisions, accomplishes no actions. Where the man of letters of other centuries domesticated the past within the rustling of the present, making it stand among us like the meaning of a statue among trees, the modern scholar in his capacity as scholar leaves the present and returns across the past, where all the men are marble.

It is not for nothing that the modern scholar invented the Ph. D. thesis as his principal contribution to literary form. The Ph. D. thesis is the perfect image of his world. It is work done for the sake of doing work—perfectly conscientious, perfectly laborious, perfectly irresponsible. The modern scholar at his best and worst is both these things—perfectly conscientious, laborious, and competent: perfectly irresponsible for the saving of his world. He remembers how in the civil wars in England the scholars, devoted only to their proper tasks, founded the Royal Society. He remembers how, through other wars and other dangers, the scholars kept the lamp of learning lighted. He does not consider that the scholars then did other things as well as trim the lamp wicks. He does not consider either that the dangers change and can be greater. He has his work to do. He has his book to finish. He hopes the war will not destroy the manuscripts he works with. He is the pure, the perfect type of irresponsibility—the man who acts as though the fire could not burn him because he has no business with the fire. He knows, because he cannot help but know, reading his papers, talking to his friends—he knows this fire has consumed the books, the spirit, everything he lives by, flesh itself, in other countries. He knows this but he will not know. It's not his business. Whose business is it then? He will not answer even that. He has his work to do. He has his book to finish. * * *

The writer's irresponsibility is no less. Where the modern scholar escapes from the adult judgments of the mind by taking the disinterested man of science as his model, the modern writer escapes by imitation of the artist. He practices his writing as a painter does his painting. He thinks as artist, which is to say he thinks without responsibility to anything but truth of feeling. He observes as artist, which is to say that he observes with honesty and truthfulness and without comment. His devotion, as with every honest painter, is devotion to the thing observed, the actual thing, the thing without its consequences or its antecedents, naked of judgment, stripped of causes and effects. The invisible world, the intellectual world, the world of the relation of ideas, the world of judgments, of values, the world in which truth is good and lies are evil—this world has no existence for the honest artist or for the honest writer who takes the artist for his model.

He sees the world as a god sees it—without morality, without care, without judgment. People look like this. People act like that. He shows them looking, acting. It is not his business why they look so, why they act so. It is enough that he should make them happen. If he concerns himself with motives at all he concerns himself with the real motive, meaning the discreditable motive which the actor conceals from himself. His most searching purpose is to find, not the truth of human action, but the lowdown, the discreditable explanation which excuses him from care. The suggestion that there are things in the world—ideas, conceptions, ways of thinking—which the writer-artist should defend from attack—the suggestion above all that he was under an obligation to defend the inherited culture—would strike him as ridiculous.

Artists do not save the world. They practice art. They practice it as Goya practiced it among the cannon in Madrid. And if this war is not Napoleon in Spain but something even worse than that? They practice art. Or they put the art aside and take a rifle and go out and fight. But not as artists. The artist does not fight. The artist's obligations are obligations to his art. He has no others. Not even when his art itself, his chance to practice it, his need to live where it is practiced may be in danger. The writer-artist will write a bloody story about the expense of blood. He will present the face of agony as it has rarely been presented. But not even then will he take the weapon of his words and carry it to the barricades of intellectual warfare, to the storming of belief, the fortifying of conviction where alone this fighting can be won.

There are examples in history of civilizations made impotent by excess of culture. No one, I think, will say of us that we lost our intellectual liberties on this account. But it may well be said, and said with equally ironic emphasis, that the men of thought, the mean of learning, in this country were deceived and rendered impotent by the best they knew. To the scholar impartiality, objectivity, detachment were ideal qualities he taught himself laboriously and painfully to acquire. To the writer objectivity and detachment were his writer's pride. Both subjected themselves to inconceivable restraints, endless disciplines to reach these ends. And both succeeded. Both writers and scholars freed themselves of the subjective passions, the emotional preconceptions which color conviction and judgment. Both writers and scholars freed themselves of the personal responsibility associated with personal choice. They emerged free, pure, and single into the antiseptic air of objectivity. And by that sublimation of the mind they prepared the mind's disaster.

If it is a consolation to the philosophers of earlier civilizations to know that they lost the things they loved because of the purity of their devotion, then perhaps this consolation will be ours as well. I doubt that we will profit by it or receive much praise.

French Copper Mines in Mexico and Purchase of Silver Through Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN AND THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news item appearing in the Baltimore Sun of June 20, 1940, under the heading "Mexico reported taking over French mines," and also an item from the New York Times of June 20, 1940, under the heading "Morgenthau to sift rumor of sale by Nazis of silver from invasions."

There being no objection, the news items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 20, 1940]

MEXICO REPORTED TAKING OVER FRENCH MINES—COMPAGNIE DU BOLEO COPPER DEPOSITS HAD BEEN OPERATED FOR YEARS UNDER CONCESSION

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., June 19.—A report that the Mexican Government had taken over ownership and control of the French copper mines of the Compagnie du Boleo at Santa Rosalia, Baja, Calif., was received in shipping quarters today.

The French have operated the vast copper mines nearly half a century under a concession from the Mexican Government. In recent years the holdings have been exploited under administration of a Mexican syndicate headed by French engineers.

Several years ago the Compagnie du Boleo expended several hundred thousand dollars modernizing equipment. Most of the funds were acquired through a bond issue in the United States. Since start of war the mines have been employing 10,000 men on a 24-hour shift. The concession is the only one controlled by the French in Mexico.

[From the New York Times of June 20, 1940]

MORGENTHAU TO SIFT RUMOR OF SALE BY NAZIS OF SILVER FROM INVASIONS—SECRETARY ACTS ON REPORTS LOOT IS REACHING TREASURY THROUGH MEXICO—RECEIPTS HELD USEFUL IN PROPAGANDA HERE

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Secretary Morgenthau will look into reports that Nazi invaders are selling looted silver to the United States by way of Mexico, he told his press conference today.

The Treasury is paying 35 cents an ounce for foreign silver under a policy of buying all that is offered by foreign sellers.

The Secretary confirmed today, however, that he had the power to prohibit purchase of foreign silver or limit it in any way which is found to be in the public interest.

Senator TOWNSEND'S bill to stop foreign silver buying has been passed by the Senate and is now before the House. An attempt to attach the Townsend measure as a rider to the defense tax bill was defeated in the Senate.

A check of Treasury records shows that the countries thus far invaded by Germany had at least 100,000,000 ounces of silver coins, many of which would be hoarded or carried away by refugees. On the other hand, it was believed a considerable amount might be in local banks, shops, and homes, easily available to the Nazis.

In addition to the silver coins which might be available, there would be a considerable amount of silver in the form of household utensils, jewelry, and other ornamentation which could easily be melted down for foreign sale.

Reports reaching here from Mexico indicate that it was part of the Nazi plan to "cash in" on silver looted during invasions by selling it to the United States Treasury by way of Mexico, which is normally a heavy seller of silver to this country.

Assuming that the Nazis obtained 100,000,000 ounces of silver in their conquests and could sell it to the Treasury at the current price, $35,000,000 would be added to the Nazi war chest. Opinion here is that the sum would be used for propaganda or trade purposes in the Western Hemisphere, since the proceeds would be available to Nazi agents in the form of dollar credits.

In addition to the silver the Germans may have looted, Germany itself has a small amount of silver bullion, and the Italian Government called in its silver coinage, amounting probably to more than 10,000,000 ounces.

Flag Day Presentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK N. BELGRANO, JR., FORMER NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily the purely inter-office affairs of an American business concern, however widespread its operations may be, are of but passing interest, save, of course, to its own officials and employees. But occasionally something transpires within the inner circle of management which, when revealed by chance to an understanding public, instantly arouses enthusiastic praise and approval.

Recently such an incident occurred in the San Francisco Home Office of the Pacific National Fire Insurance Co., an incident to which I am happy to be able to call the attention of the Congress and the country. Not often is the machinery of a great business concern slowed sufficiently in its grinding of the grist called profits to stress the patriotic, to impress upon our citizens a better appreciation of the priceless privileges which are our heritage as citizens in this great Republic.

But the Pacific National Fire Insurance Co., under the patriotic influence of its most capable president, Mr. Frank N. Belgrano, Jr., did just that. Directing that all thoughts of the business for the moment be set aside, this concern—on June 14 last, Flag Day on the patriotic calendar—did an unusual thing. It caused a flag of our country, beautifully manufactured in silk, to be presented to its employees in each of its many offices, scattered, as they are, throughout this far-flung Nation; presented a flag to them that its display during these troublesome times might serve "as a constant reminder to their visitors and friends that our heritage is more precious to us than gold; yes, more precious than life itself."

On the occasion to which I have just referred, Mr. Belgrano delivered an inspiring address, one which merits and should have had a far wider audience than the small but fervent group which then surrounded him. Because I feel that it would be most important in the light of the times that his patriotic expressions be given the widest possible circulation, I am constrained to and do ask that the text of his address be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of this day's proceedings.

I need not add, as I am quite certain that everyone who has heard me mention his name is quite familiar with the fact, that Mr. Belgrano is a former national commander of the American Legion. By way of personal tribute, let it be said without fear of challenge that none among those who have risen to national leadership in this great patriotic fraternity is held in greater respect nor warmer affection by his comrades than is the gentlemen whose Flag Day address I now send to the Speaker's table.

The unanimous consent of the membership of the House of Representatives to the inclusion of Mr. Belgrano's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD having been indicated, Mr. Belgrano's address follows:

My fellow workers, members of the Pacific National Fire Insurance Co. family:

Never before in the history of our Nation has there been more reason for all of us to say, "Thank God I am an American"; never more reason for us to resolve—with unswerving determination—that America's torch of liberty shall never fall. If we ever needed a lesson on what liberty, freedom, and justice mean to us—and I am afraid some so-called Americans have needed such a lesson—we are getting it from Europe and Asia today.

In much of the world, civil liberty is gone; freedom of speech and freedom of the press are gone; religious tolerance, yes even religion itself, is gone; independent thought and action are gone. Ruthlessness grinds the small and weak under an iron and bloody heel. The Four Horsemen have resumed their mad, devastating ride. In all but modern methods of murder and devastation, the world overseas has slid back into the Dark Ages.

True, we are not without our problems—serious problems—but how puny they seem in comparison with those endured by peoples of other lands; and how bright, by contrast, is the picture of our own peaceful nation. And yet within the confines of our country, there are some who lend attentive ears to those subversive elements; to those "fifth column" propagandists, who would destroy this very Government of ours, and the American way of living—those who would have us substitute some alien doctrine fostered by any one of the cruel fanatical dictators who are today giving us, in the subjection of innocent people to their commands, an example of their ideas of human rights.

It is time for the citizens of America to speak. We must boldly declare ourselves and demand that these alien intruders return to the shores from which they came. We must be proud of our country; of our American institutions; of our form of government. We must tell our side of the story.

Aside from the spiritual values which have accrued to us from the privileges we inherited from our forefathers, let us re-examine just a few of the material values inherent in our American way—values achieved by free enterprise under the protection and guaranties of the Constitution of the United States of America, symbolized by this glorious flag of ours; values representing the highest standard of living for the masses that the world has ever known.

Economically America is the most powerful nation on earth. Its industrial system has revolutionized world trade. Its production methods have made possible the high standard of American living.

Do you realize that, although the United States possesses only 6 percent of the world's area and only 7 percent of its population, yet it harvests one-third of all the world's foodstuffs; that this same 7 percent of the world's population annually consumes 48 percent of the world's supply of coffee, 53 percent of its tin, 56 percent of its rubber, 21 percent of its sugar, 72 percent of its silk,

36 percent of its coal, 42 percent of its pig iron, 47 percent of its copper, and 69 percent of its crude petroleum?

The citizens of the United States own 80 percent of the motorcars operated in the world. They own 33 percent of the world's railroads and possess two-thirds of all its banking resources. Twenty-two million homes are wired for electricity and serviced by 20,000,000 telephones and 30,000,000 radios. We have the finest educational system in the world. Our facilities for the care of children, the aged, and infirm—our hospitals, and our health service—surpass those of any other nation.,

Countless other figures could be cited to show that more families are protected by life insurance and, of extreme importance, that more individuals in our country own more real property than in any nation, or group of nations, since time began.

The purchasing power of the American people today is greater than the combined total of the 500,000,000 Europeans. Likewise, it exceeds that of the billion Asiatics.

Let me make use of these figures in a simpler way. A typical American family's market basket contains a pound each of beef, bacon, bread, butter, potatoes, sugar, a dozen eggs, and a quart of milk. That market basket costs the average American steel worker 1⅔ hours of toil. For the same basket in France he would labor 3½ hours in normal times; in England 3¾ hours; in Sweden 4½ hours; in Germany 5¾ hours; in Belgium 7 hours; in Italy 10½ hours; and in Russia 25½ hours. In many of these countries he would find it difficult, regardless of price, to purchase some of these articles.

Surely the time has passed when we can be indifferent to things that are transpiring within our very midst. We must take active interest in the preservation of our present form of government, if we are to continue to reap these national benefits.

For a moment, let us think of ourselves and our own organization. In what other nation in the world would it have been possible for a fire insurance company, such as ours, to achieve in comparatively so few years, the position the Pacific National Fire Insurance Co. enjoys today? Free enterprise, security, and protection afforded us under our form of government, together with your loyal and energetic cooperation, have made Pacific National's record possible. And because we live in this great democracy, symbolized by our flag, I can give the command "Forward!" in the full realization that Pacific National will continue to grow and prosper. My job and yours—the present and future security of our families—are not dependent upon the whim of some dictator or the control of flames of hatred that may at any moment burst forth to destroy. They are dependent upon us—you and me—upon our foresight, confidence, judgment, loyalty, and energy. And no one, I repeat, no one can take this privilege away from us, or from the millions of Americans like us, without our knowledge and consent.

Let us walk down the middle of the road, following the direction so clearly defined by our country's founders. Our flag, the glorious Stars and Stripes, is the symbol of our very form of government. It stands for all that we are and all that we hope to be. In these troublesome times it is my thought that we should display this symbol. It would serve as a constant reminder to all our visitors and friends that we respect and revere the ideals for which it stands—loyalty, justice, freedom, and democracy—and that our heritage is more precious to us than gold; yes, more precious than life itself.

And so, on this Flag Day in 1940, I am presenting to you, my friends and colleagues in all our offices throughout this Nation, the flag of our country. Although beautifully manufactured in silk, its intrinsic value is small, but its real value is beyond price. It stands for a free nation of free men, devoted to the ideals it represents. I hope that whenever your eyes fall upon this national emblem you will feel that surge of pride, that wave of gratitude, which will daily inspire your silent prayer, "God bless America."

The Awakening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1940

STATEMENT BY GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by George N. Peek.

In times of world crisis and national confusion such as these, we must look straight to fundamentals. We must, moreover, be able to relate our policies and programs in specific fields to a central core of fundamental national policy. Much of the confusion and danger in which we find ourselves involved springs from the failure of the present administration to define clearly for itself and for the country a central core of unified national policy in which each field of endeavor would have its component part. Instead, the administration has pursued domestic policies irredeemably in conflict with each other and foreign policies which have conflicted with the domestic policies they should have supplemented.

A principal reason for this has been the failure of the administration to make and correlate essential studies of the cold facts of our national situation, internal and external. In spite of the mass of statistics collected in dozens of Government agencies in Washington, we do not know just what our national income is, how it is earned, whence it is derived, how and where it is spent. We do not know how many people there are unemployed, where they are, or what they could do. We lack essential studies as to the interrelation of wage levels and price levels. Yet current knowledge and current use of such facts as these are first essentials to the intelligent conduct of national affairs, and an essential foundation to the intelligent formulation of national policies, domestic and foreign.

The war, terrible as it is, has done one thing for this Nation. It has awakened it with a bang. After 7 years, we see what the dreamers, schemers, and bunglers have done for us. In spite of the huge expenditures of the past 7 years, we see unemployment and lack of social and economic balance; we see also that we are unarmed and unprepared. We have this opportunity at a critical moment to dispense with the bunglers and to follow our natural bent for organization, protection, and defense.

It is the inescapable duty of the Republican Party to identify and define a basic national policy and then to coordinate to it the various domestic policies on which our functioning as a nation depends, and to supplement it by a foreign policy and activity which such a unified national domestic policy demands. Our national interest must be the yardstick; to it all other policies must conform.

Every thinking man and woman must view with the gravest misgivings the recklessness and emotionalism which characterize the foreign policy of the present administration. It has already affected the abandonment of the safeguard of our neutrality. It is stripping us of military aircraft and supplies, without the prospect of their early replacement, at a most critical juncture in world affairs. It threatens, if not checked, to embroil us in a European war, with unforeseeable losses of blood, treasure, and strength; to involve us for generations to come in the politics and intrigues of Europe and Asia; and to facilitate the establishment here of a New Deal dictatorship. This is gambling with our national security and imperiling the very foundations upon which our democracy is laid.

The only way we can assist democracy abroad is by preserving and strengthening it here. Whether our personal sympathies for the people of the British and French Empires may be, we should conserve our men, money, material, and energies for the sole purpose of insuring and of making effective our national security.

We must start with the proposition that the national interest of the American people must be the primary concern of those whom we entrust with direction of our Government. We must build for ourselves forthwith a position of military and economic defense, within the field of our potential control, so imposing and so impregnable that no aggressor will dare assail it, either directly or indirectly—a defense which will function effectively to protect us, our economy, and our institutions, regardless of the changes which may come about in other continents as a result of the tragic events now transpiring in Europe and Asia. The present war may be short or it may be long-drawn-out, but we can be certain that its post-war effects will not pass within our time. Our national policy must be such that it can cope with the vicissitudes of war and peace alike, and must be fashioned with that in view. All that conduces to that end must be retained and strengthened; all that does not accord with that purpose must be thrust away, no matter what its individual appeal or desirability may seem.

If we are substantially in accord on this concept of national interest as the supreme need of national policy, many of the problems with which we deal fall naturally into place and dictate their own solutions.

I. MILITARY DEFENSE

Complete self-dependence for national defense in the air, on the land, and sea. A two-ocean navy or its equivalent to make us independent of the navy of any foreign country in our relations with the rest of the world.

Immediate negotiations looking toward our political and military control of all European-owned islands in our American waters in both the Atlantic and Pacific essential to our defense and defense of the Monroe Doctrine, accompanied by appropriate military arrangements with other American republics for the defense of the Monroe Doctrine.

II. ECONOMIC DEFENSE

The immediate gearing of our industry, agriculture, transportation, and labor to wartime requirements, under a Department of Economic Defense clothed with adequate powers and unhampered by political tampering or by bureaucratic or legalistic red tape.

Development of new resources or substitutes for needed essential supplies (rubber, tin, manganese, etc.) in the United States and the nations reasonably adjacent to us.

III. DIPLOMATIC DEFENSE

Reorientation of our foreign policies to conform to the paramount objective of national security, military and economic. Reaffirmation of our historic policy of no entangling alliances and that of the Monroe Doctrine. Conservation of our human and material resources to that end.

IV. INTERNAL STABILITY

Reorganization of the long-established protective system as the basis of American prosperity and social stability, and in particular its extension to insure fully the maintenance of a prosperous and self-dependent agriculture as the foundation of our economic system and of our social and political institutions.

V. FARM POLICY

The present agricultural program, as administered by Washington, is a demonstrated failure. We should, by amendment and improvement of existing legislation, make mandatory certain provisions and vigorously prosecute them administratively, so that the following shall be sustained:

The restoration of farm income and purchasing power and the maintenance of a free and self-dependent agriculture, which form the essential basis for industrial and national prosperity, employment, and security. Against the present program of restricted production and increased imports of competitive farm products, we should seek to increase farm income to its proper size through the medium of improved prices and increased sales for American farm products.

(1) The protection and full-price benefit of the American market for the American farmer by the limitation to actual requirements (by tariffs, quotas, embargoes, or otherwise) of competitive farm imports or substitutes therefor. A method by which this may be accomplished is suggested by H. H. 7590 (introduced October 19, 1939, by the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan), placing an embargo on farm imports whenever domestic prices are below parity.

(2) The development of new uses for American agricultural products in industry and commerce and the development in the United States of the growth of farm commodities or their substitutes previously imported.

(3) An American price for American consumption, independent of export or world prices. To accomplish this, in the case of surplus crops on which the tariff is ineffective until such time as (1) and (2) above become fully effective, the payment of benefits upon the domestically consumed portion of such crops to compensate for lack of tariff protection and to insure a fair exchange value with the products farmers buy. When this parity price has been attained, we should provide the machinery whereby the farmers may establish a self-sustaining program, without substantial cost to the Government, through the medium of an equalization fee, substantially as provided in the McNary-Haugen bill of 1928.

(4) Government assistance in disposing of surpluses in foreign trade for the best prices obtainable, bargaining for foreign markets selectively by countries and otherwise, both as to exports and imports.

(5) The adoption of a long-range program for conservation of the soil for its own sake, as distinguished from schemes for production control, such program to be administered by the land-grant colleges or other responsible State agencies with Federal financial and technical assistance.

(6) The encouragement of farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative organizations to decrease the price spread between producer and consumer, the extension of commodity loans to farmers on a sound basis to assist in carrying seasonal surpluses, and the encouragement of crop insurance under proper auspices.

(7) The encouragement of the better financing of farm mortgages on a sound basis through recognized public and private agencies at low rates of interest on an amortization plan, to the end that farm ownership may be more widely distributed in the hands of those who actually work the land.

VI. FOREIGN TRADE AND FINANCIAL POLICIES

These must be shaped to protect and supplement our basic national security, the military and economic policies which that entails, and the internal stability on which national security must rest. We should concentrate control of our foreign trade and financial activities in a foreign trade board.

Foreign trade and financial policy should be based upon and conform to the requirements of our domestic economic objectives. These objectives are the protection of the American market for American agriculture, industry, and labor, and the protection of American employment and standards of living. These should not be needlessly exposed to the impact of events abroad over which we have no control, nor should American recovery be sacrificed upon the altar of academic whims or internationalist diplomacy, particularly in the difficult post-war conditions with which we shall surely be confronted when the millions now engaged in warfare and in war production return to peacetime production and trade competition. Specifically there should be:

(1) A reorganization of the Tariff Commission into a foreign trade board as the responsible executive authority for the determination of foreign trade and financial policy in the light of American domestic interests and for the coordination of the foreign commercial and financial activities of the Federal Government.

(2) The establishment of a comprehensive system of national bookkeeping, expressed in simple arithmetic, covering all our commercial and financial transactions with other nations, as an essential basis for determining questions of foreign trade and financial policy.

(3) The adoption of a realistic policy of trading in the national interest under a system of quotas, and of selective imports and exports, granting tariff or other trade concessions only on a quid pro quo basis, thus returning to the traditional American policy of offering to all nations reciprocal treatment on the basis of the conditional most-favored-nation principle.

(4) Congressional approval of all general trade agreements which have been or may be negotiated, as an essential to the maintenance of constitutional and responsible government.

A method by which this program may be effected is suggested by a bill, S. 3238, introduced in the United States Senate on February 1, 1940, by the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG of Michigan.

To summarize, we must make national security the sole criterion of our national policies. We should seek it by direct military, economic, and diplomatic measures such as are outlined above. We must establish it upon a firm basis of internal stability, to attain which a sound solution of the farm problem is indispensable. We must supplement that internal stability by foreign trade and financial policies which will strengthen and insulate that stability against the shocks and strains of wartime and post-war conditions.

We are a warm-hearted and courageous people. We must be cool-headed as well if we are not to dissipate the heritage of our fathers by following the false gods of foreign intervention and war. Our experience in Europe in 1917–19 was a costly and terrible lesson in the futility and folly of intervening in European affairs. Americans should not have to learn that lesson nor pay that price a second time, for the price is the blood and shattered lives of our young men and it may be the permanent loss of our liberties to a New Deal dictatorship.

GEORGE N. PEEK.

JUNE 15, 1940.

A One-Man Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation were appalled when they learned the President, without consultation and without any intimation to the Committee on Naval Affairs, had secretly sold the Navy's new and modern "mosquito fleet" to Great Britain.

The people of this Nation want our national defense hurried to its completion, and the Congress wants to perfect our own national-defense program—not for aggression, but for our own defense. The Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for that national defense. We want that defense program completed. But in the face of the unprecedented action, on the part of the President, in selling our ships which are a part of our defense to a warring nation, it appears that he is trying to hinder and delay our preparation for our own defense. The people cannot understand the action of the President. Can he desire that our national-defense program be stopped, or scuttled? His action, which is without precedent, strongly indicates that he does not want our national-defense program completed. If the President takes the responsibility of trying to scuttle our national-defense program, as he has done in this instance, then the people should know about it and they should be given an opportunity to give their answer to such reprehensible action at the polls in November. He forgets that this is government of the people and by the people. He forgets the Congress is in session. He has in this instance committed an act which cannot be overlooked by the people of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is the only bulwark remaining which can keep our Nation out of war. The Congress will not fail the people of this country. The President has his "war Cabinet" named, and with the last two added, both of whom are internationalists and interventionists, he is apparently

ready to go forward in his constant attempt to cause our Nation to become involved in this European war. And yet the people of our Nation do not want war. They want peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very timely and illuminating editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of date June 20, 1940. The editorial follows:

FORGETTING CONGRESS

The most disturbing fact about the release of the Navy's new "mosquito fleet," so that these fast boats may be sold by the manufacturer to Great Britain, is the secrecy with which the transaction was negotiated. Even the chairmen of the Senate and House Naval Committees were astonished to learn of the transfer.

Chairman WALSH of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee is reported to have accused administrative officials of engaging in "apparently secret negotiations," with the result of diminishing our defensive strength. A legislator holding his position would not make such a remark at this critical juncture without being deeply perturbed by the policy the administration is following.

Chairman VINSON of the House Naval Affairs Committee has written into the new naval expansion bill a provision to the effect that "no vessel, ship, or boat now in the United States Navy or being built therefor shall be disposed of by sale, charter, or otherwise, or scrapped, without the consent of Congress." Considered along with Senator WALSH'S statement, this move strongly suggests that release of the "mosquito fleet" has met with sharp disapproval on Capitol Hill.

Heretofore Congress has given emphatic endorsement to the administration's policy of trading in airplanes and obsolete military equipment to help the Allies. It is not to be supposed that this desire to aid private American concerns in supplying the defense needs of the British has changed. But Congress is obviously bewildered as to where the line between our own defense requirements and those of the British Government is to be drawn.

The inescapable conclusion is that there has not been a meeting of minds between the administration and Congress on this matter. The President has not taken congressional leaders into his confidence in working out the details of our foreign policy in this period of grave emergency. That fact may become a source of grave misunderstanding and confusion.

Indeed, continued failure to consult Congress on questions of such fundamental importance might easily lead to recriminations that would materially weaken the position of the United States in the present crisis.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge the Congress to remain in session throughout this European crisis. I will vote to keep the Congress in session as long as the present crisis continues. The people of the country are demanding that the Congress remain in session as the only bulwark remaining to keep our Nation out of this European war. The Congress will not fail the people; we will remain in session throughout this emergency.

Spray Residues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KNUTE HILL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY DR. IRA D. CARDIFF

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Ira D. Cardiff:

SPRAY RESIDUES AS AFFECTING THE PROCESSOR

(By Dr. Ira D. Cardiff, president, Washington Dehydrated Food Co., Yakima, Wash.)

The apple is America's one staple fruit. The pear is a close second. To the man of moderate means, throughout the temperate zones of the world, they are ofttimes his only fruit. They also are among our most healthful fruits. "An apple a day keeps the doctor away" is more than a euphonious slogan—it embodies a deal of truth which mankind has gleaned from long experience. Mothers fed their babies scraped apple for intestinal disorders before the scientist had discovered the pentosans and pectins and their effects upon intestinal toxins. So, too, apple jelly and apple sauce were the most palatable and soothing fruits available for convalescents; while apple pie has been America's favorite dessert from early colonial days.

Because of its superior keeping qualities and ease of handling, the apple formed one of man's chief sources of vitamins A and C for many generations before vitamins were known to science. Likewise, in earlier days, the average youngster could not eat a slice of bread without its layer of apple butter—still the prince of all preserves. In the days of our fathers, apple cider came near being the national drink.

Both the apple and the pear lend themselves to a large variety of culinary uses. They are canned, dried, pickled, and preserved in a multitude of ways, sometimes with removal of the skin and often without, for in the layer of tissue next the skin is found the superior qualities of the fruit. It is here the sunshine is stored. May I quote from an editorial of the Portland Oregonian:

"These dried fruits, admirable even at home where they came from the bough, are greatly desired in other regions and climates that have not been blessed as our region. It is made possible to have apple pie at the poles of the earth, or a prune cobbler beside the upper cataracts of the Nile. And such things indeed have chanced before now. The Eskimo debutante, thoughtfully munching a slice of dried apple, as a grateful variant to the pièce de résistance of seal blubber, may one day prove equal to the fabrication of a pie. Fresh fruit is desirable, if fresh fruit is what you would have, and fruit in tins and jars is excellent beyond all disputing—but seems like a dried apple pie, for example, when correctly created, is a peerless achievement. It has that indefinable something, that elusive quality, which in persons constitutes charm. How surely the filched sunshine is restored."

In the preserving of these fruits, whether by drying or canning, they are, of course, washed before processing if they are not to be peeled. No reputable processor would think of handling them otherwise. However, of late years, processors have been unduly annoyed by drastic regulations with reference to the residue of sprays upon these fruits.

In the culture of the apple and the pear the use of certain mineral insecticides is inevitable. That some of the same remains upon the fruit at harvest time is also inevitable. That the amount remaining, especially after the apple has been washed in clean running water, is too small to constitute a menace to health can be easily demonstrated.

If the amount of this spray residue (chiefly arsenate of lead—$PbHAsO_4$) which remains upon the fruit at harvesttime were dangerous, many thousands of harvest hands, who eat enormous quantities of the unwashed fruit, would have perished. Yet the vital statistics of the country do not afford a single case. If spray residue is really very dangerous, Washington, as the chief apple-producing State, and by far the greatest consumer of arsenate of lead, should have a high death rate, and the apple counties of Washington should have a still higher death rate. Let us examine the record. The average death rate for 1,000 population in the 5 leading apple-producing counties of Washington—Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Okanogan, and Yakima—for 1933 was 7.33; for the State as a whole, 9.26; and for the United States as a whole, 10.9. In other words, the country as a whole has a death rate 33 percent higher than the 5 arsenic-eating counties of Washington.

Until about a decade ago no one ever thought of objecting to fruits on account of these insecticide residues. No one had ever, so far as is known, been injured from consuming the same, and there was no general practice of attempting to free the fruit from these sprays. This condition still obtains throughout most of the world other than the United States, and to a very large extent throughout the United States.

ORIGIN OF SPRAY RESIDUE PROBLEM

In 1926, in a remote corner of far away England, some local patriot discovered some United States apples showing traces of spray residue. England, at the time, being in the midst of an active campaign to encourage trade with her colonies (several of which were important apple producers), furnished the proper setting for a furor in regard to the "danger from spray on United States apples"—this notwithstanding the fact that apples from Canada, and other British possessions, also carried spray, and still do.

Immediately drastic regulations were put into effect by the United States Department of Agriculture in the shape of fantastically low tolerances and the major portion of the budget of the Federal food department was switched to this zealous fight to save the consumers of the country from the apple and the pear. These tolerances were at one time, arsenic 0.01, lead 0.018, and fluorine 0.01 grains per pound of fruit.

LEAD, ARSENIC, AND FLUORINE IN NATURE

The various elements (lead, arsenic, fluorine, zinc, etc.) used in the manufacture of sprays are very ubiquitous in nature. Lead is especially so. It occurs in practically all foods in larger or smaller quantities. It is present in probably 95 percent of the domestic drinking waters. It is present even in the water of mountain springs. In fact, it is present so universally in drinking water that the average individual probably consumes several times the amount of lead annually in drinking water that he does from the consumption of sprayed fruit.

Arsenic also is very prevalent in nature, though not so common as lead. The same may be said of fluorine.

Harding and Swan have found arsenic in certain foods as follows:

Grains of arsenic per pound of sea foods: [1]

Haddock	0.039
Clams	.01 to 0.018
Lobsters	.016 to .126
Shrimps	.017 to .077
Oysters	.01 to .016

Meyers has also gotten somewhat similar results from examination of other sea foods:

Grains of arsenic per pound of sea foods: [2]

Escallops	0.24 to 0.36
Mussels	.24 to .76
Cockles	.12 to .26
Lobster	.24 to .26
Lobster	.2 to .67
Prawns	.24 to 1.20

Remington and Jones have found, in analyses of a number of types of tobacco, arsenic as follows:

Grains of arsenic per pound of tobacco: [3]

Pipe tobacco—0.12, 0.136, 0.12, 0.15, 0.13, 0.05, 0.27, 0.16

Chewing tobacco—0.146, 0.110, 0.154, 0.131, 0.094, 0.074

Holmes and Remington found arsenic in cod liver oil far in excess of that on fruits and vegetables.

It will be noted from all of the above that the amounts of arsenic found are in all cases in excess, and in most cases far in excess, of the amount allowed by the Government on apples and pears.

In analysis of some 50 of our more common foods by the author, either lead or arsenic or both have been found and often in considerable quantities and in apple butter, manufactured by the Federal Government, arsenic in amounts in excess of the Food Department tolerances.

As to fluorine, investigations by the Tennessee Experiment Station, and others, reveal that fluorine is quite universally present in foods.

For example:

Grains per pound

Wheat flour	0.04 to 0.14
Kidney beans	.11
Green kidney beans	.09
Apricot pulp	.021
Cherry pulp	.025
Buckwheat	.15
The celebrated spinach	.025
Beets	.07
Canned salmon	.03
One of the most popular baby foods	.08

Numerous other illustrations equally striking might be named, indicating that the great bulk of our ordinary everyday foods carry the element fluorine in amounts far in excess of the tolerance permitted by the United States Department of Agriculture on apples and pears.

Both lead and fluorine in very considerable amounts have been found in our most popular and valuable baby foods—the latter sometimes six or eight times the tolerance of the Federal Government for apples.

PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF LEAD, ARSENIC, AND FLUORINE

Numerous experiments indicate that there is little or no danger from the consumption by the lower animals and also man of arsenic or lead in amounts many times the Federal tolerances for apples. For example, Thomas and Shelley fed chickens 13 grains of arsenate of lead per day for 60 days with no ill effects.

Dr. Aub, of Harvard, and his associates, some 10 years ago proved, by a long series of experiments, that practically all lead poisoning or physiological injury from lead arose when this element found entrance to the body by the lungs or skin—that very rarely if ever did lead poisoning arise from ingestion through the gastro-intestinal tract.

These researches of Aub and his associates have recently been confirmed by Dr. Kehoe and his associates from the University of Cincinnati.

The author fed arsenate of lead to a human being in doses from 50 to 100 times the amount of Government tolerances on apples for several weeks at a time, intermittently, over a period of a year and a half, with no observable ill effects to the subject.

The United States Public Health workers, Fairhall and Neal,[4] administered arsenate of lead to two human beings in the amount of 100 mg. in a period of 10 days with "no untoward effects on the well-being of these two individuals."

Talbert and Tayloe[5] of the University of Missouri conducted extensive experiments in feeding rats on arsenate of lead. They summarize the results of their researches as follows:

"If it may be assumed that the spray chemicals have an effect upon man similar to that which they have upon albino rats, it is the opinion of the authors that there is little likelihood of a human consuming as spray residue on apples, sprayed and handled in the usual manner, enough arsenic either at one time or over an extended period to be injurious."

Lynch[6] fed rats as high as 36 mg. per kg. of rat for 5½ months "with no retardation of growth in any of the arsenic-fed animals nor any observable differences in their physical vigor or appearance and in none of them was there any histological evidence of injury to the spleen, liver, or kidney due to the feeding of arsenic at the levels here employed."

According to Kehoe, the leading authority on lead today, "lead has a very low toxicity for most men, but the fact that an occasional person is susceptible has brought about such a state of clinical confusion that many erroneous diagnoses are made."

LEAD AND ARSENIC IN MEDICINE

Both lead and arsenic compounds are regularly used in medicine as specifics. Lead is administered in amounts of 3 to 4 grains per day; in other words, approximately 200 times the Government tolerance, or put in the form of apples meeting the tolerance, would mean daily 600 or 800 apples, including the cores. Arsenic is likewise used in medicine, and with very beneficial results, the amounts used being far in excess of that permitted by the Government on fruit.

EXPERIENCE OF PHYSICIANS

A canvass of physicians throughout the apple districts of Washington reveals that not one has ever had a well-authenticated case of either arsenic or lead poisoning from the ingestion of arsenate of lead by the gastro-intestinal tract. The members of Chelan County Medical Society, located at Wenatchee, Wash., on March 10, 1938, signed an unqualified statement to the effect that they "have never observed or treated a case of arsenic or lead poisoning in which the history indicated that there was any connection with the ingestion of apples or pears." Yakima County Medical Society appointed an official committee to investigate the matter, and after careful canvass of its 42 members—representing an aggregate of over 500 years of practice—not one of them had "treated a single case of either arsenic or lead poisoning in his entire experience which had been caused from eating sprayed fruit," and the society in a resolution stated: "We are of the opinion that the effect on individuals eating fruit sprayed with arsenate of lead is negligible." (Yakima County produces more apples than any other county in the United States.)

Dr. Talbert, of the University of Missouri, made a survey of the apple districts of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Arkansas, and Illinois and found "not a single person had knowledge of any person that had suffered directly or indirectly from either chronic or acute attacks of either arsenic or lead poisoning." Physicians report that patients are frequently prone to think themselves injured by arsenate of lead when suffering from other ailments which they dislike to admit. In Yakima there is the case of a man who refused to accept a syphilis diagnosis and another who is certain he does not have tuberculosis, though both tests are positive and definite, yet both are perfectly satisfied with lead-poisoning diagnosis, while the good doctor treats them for their true ailments.

LEGAL ASPECTS

During the early part of the United States Department of Agriculture's spray-residue campaign, many people were inclined to accept the Government rulings and attempt to comply with them. Others attempted to cooperate with the Government until the latter's operations became obviously too unreasonable. The United States Department of Agriculture finally observed a shipment of apple chops being loaded upon a Norwegian ship in the port of Seattle for shipment to France. When the ship in question touched at San Francisco, on its way down the coast, the Government compelled it to unload these chops and libeled the same on account of alleged excess arsenic. The owner of the apple chops contested the libel in the Federal Court of San Francisco, defeating the Government and compelling the release of the fruit.

While the trial in question was in progress, the Government seized, in St. Louis, a carload of apple chops belonging to the same company. It had previously certified this car out of Yakima. The owner of the chops resisted the seizure and after a year of effort succeeded in getting the Government to trial in St. Louis, with the result that the Government was again defeated, the court holding that "residue of the substances used in spraying growing apples does not constitute the addition of a poisonous or deleterious ingredient which might render the apple chops injurious to health; that the apple chops in question are not adulterated within the Food and Drug Act." [7]

The United States Department of Agriculture appealed this case, but again lost, and in affirming the decision of the lower court, the circuit court of appeals stated:

"It is to be noted, in this connection, that no expert who testified upon the trial was able to say that he knew of any case of lead or arsenic poisoning resulting from eating apples or the products of apples which had been sprayed with arsenate of lead."

---

[1] Harding and Swan, Sci. Am., Nov. 1933.

[2] Meyers, Medical Times, N. Y., 1929.

[3] Remington and Jones, Am. Chem. Soc., 49: 1410.

[4] Fairhall, Lawrence T., and Neal, Paul A., The Absorption and Excretion of Lead Arsenate in Man, U. S. Pub. Health Reports, 53: 29: 1231–1245.

[5] From Some Results From Feeding Spray Chemicals to Albino Rats, by T. J. Talbert and W. L. Tayloe, University of Missouri, Columbia.

[6] Coulson, E. J.; Remington, Roe E.; Lynch, Kenneth M.; Sic. 80: 230.

[7] *United States* v. *Washington Dehydrated Food Co.* (CCA–8, 1937), 89 Fed. (2d) 606.

During the spring of 1939 the Federal Government seized a large amount of maple sirup in Vermont and New Hampshire, alleging contamination with lead; in fact, according to the findings of the Government, lead occurred far in excess of the Government tolerances. The owners of the sirup resisted seizure, went into the Federal court, and decisively defeated the Government in its contentions.

During the harvest season of 1938–39, the Washington State Grange made several shipments of apples interstate with lead, arsenic, and fluorine well above the Government tolerances, advised the United States Department of Agriculture of such shipments, and challenged seizure of the same. The Government refused.

That there has been no danger from the use of these fruits in fresh condition should be apparent from the above; that there is still less danger from the same fruits, when processed, should be still more apparent; for in the processing they are invariably washed or peeled, also are usually diluted with water, or sugar; especially is this the case if they are used as a base for the manufacture of preserves from other fruits, for which apple pectin is so frequently employed.

That the canners, preservers, dryers, and juice manufacturers have been unduly harassed by spray-residue regulations is patent to all. They have been the unfortunate victims of bureaucratic hysteria. Regardless of how well-meaning our food enforcement officials may have been, it is quite apparent they have shown not only bad judgment in this case, but have also, without proper investigation, arrogantly and fanatically rushed into a crusade of needless expenditure of public funds and tremendous annoyance and expense to processors with no compensating benefit to consumers. Their mad campaign of upward of a thousand seizures probably has no parallel in the annals of law enforcement in the history of the country—unless, perhaps, in the palmy days of prohibition. Appeals to reason or common sense were without effect until the authorities were finally brought to a sudden halt by court decisions.

However, the processors are little less blameless than the bureaucrats in the matter. How many of them supinely submitted to regulation and actions which they well knew were wrong? How many processors, instead of asserting their rights, played the coward and the hypocrite? How many of them are still cursing the "——— ——— from the food department" one day and licking bureaucratic boots the next?

After all, these bureaucrats are not the state (although many of them frequently strike a Louis XIV pose); they are only our hired servants who should be given our whole-hearted and enthusiastic support when they are in the right and should be told very plainly where to get off when wrong. It must be borne in mind that many of them entered the bureaus from the ranks of the rah, rah boys via our celebrated civil service; that not one in a thousand of them ever saw the inside of a processing plant—much less operated one—until he presented his badge of authority and commenced telling you how to run your business.

Now, it is highly unbecoming and undignified, if not actually cowardly, for an old, experienced, and successful processor to allow one of these pretentious martinets to enter his plant and subject him to "bureaucratic blackmail" (I believe this is the expression commonly used), then curse him to his back after he has gone. Therefore I say the processor is as much to blame as the bureaucrat for this disgraceful fiasco.

The law does not give these men the right to enter processing plants without permission; therefore the owner who permits them to roam at will over his plant has only himself to blame if one of them becomes overzealous or officious, or exercises bad judgment. These fellows are only human, and they make their records chiefly by the number of seizures they make.

One of the major factors responsible for losses in the business world today is fear, cowardly fear. The average businessman is afraid of his customer, afraid of his banker, afraid of the Government, afraid of the press, afraid of the public, afraid of the church, afraid of the labor union, afraid of the inspector, probably afraid of his wife and his own shadow.

In fact it was fear—coupled with the desire for departmental aggrandizement—which made the Federal food officials intolerant of these residues and it was fear of criticism and loss of face which prevented them from correcting the matter when they found themselves in the wrong.

Col. Frank Knox—Pseudo Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to enlighten the American people I incorporate in the RECORD the October 1, 1939, statement of ownership of the Chicago Daily News. This paper is published and edited by Col. Frank Knox, a pseudo Republican, who has recently enlisted in the forces of the New Deal to serve as Secretary of the Navy in President Roosevelt's New Deal Cabinet:

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933, OF THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS PUBLISHED DAILY AT CHICAGO, ILL., FOR OCTOBER 1, 1939

STATE OF ILLINOIS,

County of Cook, ss:

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Frank Knox, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the publisher and editor of the Chicago Daily News, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Frank Knox, 1320 Sheridan Road, Lake Forest, Ill.

Editor, Frank Knox, 1320 Sheridan Road, Lake Forest, Ill.

Managing editor, Hal O'Flaherty, 202 East Walton Place, Chicago, Ill.

Business manager, Herbert L. Fairfield, 235 Grand Boulevard, Park Ridge, Ill.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given).

The Chicago Daily News, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. Stockholders: Daneco Corporation, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. (stockholders of which owning 1 percent or more of its stock being Mrs. Marjorie N. Aldich, 1501 Hinman Avenue, Evanston, Ill.; Laird Bell, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., Mary G. Ellis, 340 Main Street, Worcester, Mass.; Mrs. Beatrice G. Guck and Mr. Homer Guck as joint tenants, 105 East Delaware Place, Chicago, Ill.; Annie Reid Knox, 1320 Sheridan Road, Lake Forest, Ill.; Frank Knox, 1320 Sheridan Road, Lake Forest, Ill.; Ellen Stuart, 990 Sheridan Road, Hubbard Woods, Ill.; and John Stuart, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.); Charles H. Dennis, 1225 Michigan Avenue, Evanston, Ill.; De Soto Securities Co., 1300 Carroll Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (stockholders of which owning 1 percent or more of its stock being Percy B. Eckhart, trustee, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; Carlos K. Eckhart, trustee, 1300 Carroll Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Dorothy Eckhart Williams, trustee, 940 Lake Road, Lake Forest, Ill.; Raymond R. Wilson, trustee, box 1143, Palm Springs, Calif.; Chicago Title & Trust Co., trustee, 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.; Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., trustee, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Harris Trust & Savings Bank, trustee, 115 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.; Percy B. Eckhart, Edward G. Miles, and Harold Eckhart, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., as voting trust trustees for Katie L. Eckhart, 940 Lake Road, Lake Forest, Ill.; Carlos K. Eckhart, 1300 Carroll Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Dorothy Eckhart Williams, 940 Lake Road, Lake Forrest, Ill., and Hazel Eckhart Wilson, box 1143, Palm Springs, Calif.); Max Epstein, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; James L. Houghteling, 2424 Wyoming Avenue, Washington, D. C.; and Frank Knox, 1320 Sheridan Road, Lake Forrest, Ill.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) The City National Bank & Trust Co. is trustee for an issue of $3,500,000 par value 5-percent 10-year debentures (of which $2,657,400 par value is now outstanding) but there are no known holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of the total amount of said debentures.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid

subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above is 432,085. (This information is required from daily publications only.)

FRANK KNOX,
(Signature of publisher.)

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 4th day of October 1939.
[SEAL] PHYLLIS B. STARRY.
My commission expires December 12, 1939.

Mrs. John Bruce Dodd, of Spokane, Wash., Originator of Father's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL FROM SPOKANE SPOKESMAN-REVIEW

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, the third Sunday in June is recognized by common consent throughout America as Father's Day. The idea of setting aside this day to give special recognition to the fathers of America was originated by Mrs. John Bruce Dodd, a constituent of mine in Spokane, Wash., who was inspired by the kindness and sacrifices of her own father, and it was because of her persevering and persistent efforts, assisted by a group of other splendid women, that the observance of this day has not only become national but international in its scope. At present Mrs. Bert Cummings, of Spokane, is president of the International Father's Day Association which has groups in many cities of this country.

At the beginning of the Seventy-fifth Congress, I introduced a resolution providing that congressional recognition should be given to this day, just as we have to Mother's Day. I regret that this resolution was not enacted into law. It is my hope that it will be at some future time, and so long as I am in Congress I shall work for its enactment.

I feel it is an honor and a distinction to represent the congressional district wherein this splendid idea had its origin, and to represent in Congress the lady who gave the idea to the Nation and to the world.

Recently there appeared in our leading daily paper, the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., of Sunday, June 16, 1940, both an article and an editorial on this subject, giving some historical information concerning its origin and expressing some beautiful sentiments with which I am in full accord. I am pleased to herewith make the article and editorial a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Spokane Spokesman-Review of June 16, 1940]

HONOR FATHERS IN MANY WAYS—GIFTS AND CHURCH SERVICES DEDICATED TO HEAD OF FAMILY TODAY

Fathers will be recipients of gifts, affectionate tribute, and be the topic of sermons in churches throughout the Nation today. But the day will have special significance for Spokane, where first originated the idea of setting aside the third Sunday in June as Father's Day.

Proclamations setting the day aside have been issued by Gov. Clarence D. Martin for the State and Mayor Frank G. Sutherlin for Spokane. The Golden Gate International Exposition in San Francisco and the World's Fair in New York have both arranged special features for the day. Virtually every church has special sermons and music scheduled.

TRIBUTE TO SACRIFICES

The Father's Day idea originated with Mrs. John Bruce Dodd in 1898, when her mother died, leaving her and five other children dependent entirely upon her father. "His kindness and the sacrifices he made inspired me. I thought fathers ought to be revered as mothers always were," Mrs. Dodd said.

The day was first observed in Spokane in 1910 with special services in the Centenary Church, predecessor of the Knox Presbyterian. The women who joined the Reverend Conrad Bluhm that day in paying tribute to Spokane fathers became the core of an organization which has since become international in scope.

President of the International Father's Day Association today is Mrs. Bert Cummings, of Spokane.

Mrs. Mary A. Devereaux has been advised by O. J. Keatinge, of the Golden Gate International Exposition that special events scheduled for the day include the selection of the "typical American father," who will rule over the exposition Father's Day. Two runners-up will act as his aides. There will also be a fathers' chorus.

Elwood T. Bailey, of the World's Fair in New York has advised Mrs. Devereaux that a special program has been worked out for the day in the Court of Peace.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR

In urging Spokane citizens to observe the day appropriately, Mayor Sutherlin's proclamation said: "Whereas the courage, fidelity, devotion, and many sacrifices of the fathers of the land well deserve commemoration, and Father's Day, now nationally observed, was initiated in Spokane by Mrs. John Bruce Dodd; therefore, I, as mayor of Spokane, do hereby proclaim Sunday, June 16, as Father's Day and urge all to make it father's big day.

OLD FAITHFUL

On this day which has been set aside for the special recognition of father, there are two widely divergent methods of commemorating the event. Both are common to almost every other special holiday, and neither does justice to the event it celebrates.

In the first place, Father's Day has been crassly commercialized. But so has Christmas and Easter and Mother's Day. For days before the event the public is implored to remember father, and the coy suggestion is made that the only way father will know he is remembered is to present him with some gift.

The other method is to go into emotional raptures about father and to spill a lot of gush which makes poor old pater wonder what has gone wrong. Not that dad isn't properly appreciative of the spirit behind it all, but just the same he might wonder why all this fuss 1 day in the year, when he would really be grateful for a little more recognition the other 364 days.

Just the same, every father is worthy of a day in his honor, and in these trying times it might be well to consider every day Father's Day.

Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHREVEPORT (LA.) JOURNAL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal:

[From the Shreveport Journal of June 17, 1940]

CONGRESS TO STAY ON

Plans for adjournment of Congress June 22, just 2 days before assembling of the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia, have been abandoned. There may be a recess to allow the G. O. P. membership to attend the convention, but there will be no sine die adjournment, according to late dispatches from Washington. Reasons for the national lawmakers remaining in session are obvious.

While President Roosevelt is reported to favor ending the session, so that Members may go to their districts and look after their political fences—as is always done in Presidential election years—there is too much at stake now to make this advisable. Congress should be on hand to speed the defense program and to advise with the Chief Executive, even though he may feel that such advice would be superfluous; the fact remains, of course, that only Congress can make a declaration of war, and while all Americans sincerely hope nothing so drastic will have to be done, they much prefer that in time of emergency the Congress will remain on the job.

That President Roosevelt is capably handling the Nation's foreign policy is admitted by all except a few bitterly partisan foes, but even his closest friends could not wish to see him left there alone with the big problems the country today is facing. He needs, and should accept, the help and advice of patriotic Congressmen, Republicans as well as Democrats, at a time when the foreign situation

presents many perils. Thus far there has been splendid cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Mr. Roosevelt refers to himself and Congress as a "team"; neither "horse" should be required to pull the whole load during the next few months.

Members of Congress, naturally, are in much better position to know what the people of the United States are thinking—what attitude they wish their Government to assume and maintain—and Mr. Roosevelt should listen to what they report from time to time. After all, both the President and the Congress are servants of the Nation and must be guided by public opinion. There must be no brash and ill-considered action by either that will plunge the United States into the European conflict until and unless it becomes plain no alternative remains. Members of Congress should stay in Washington all summer if the war situation in Europe continues as a menace to our peace and security—and their constituents back home will see to it that their political interests do not suffer as a result of their attention to duty.

High Pressure Advertising Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about racketeering. The liquor racketeers of prohibition days occupied the stage for a while; then came the labor racketeers, many of whom are still with us according to Westbrook Pegler; and now comes the Democratic Party with its high pressure advertising racket in connection with the Democratic Book of 1940. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I want to call your attention, and the attention of the House, to the following editorial that appeared in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, June 20, 1940:

The Democratic National Committee is picking up sizable pieces of change these days peddling what it describes as "advertising" in its forthcoming convention book.

Take a look at the offering and behold what is possibly the highest "milline rate" in the country. For only $2,500 you can buy a full-page ad, in black and white, with a mere 25-percent extra for a "preferred position"—by which is meant, we presume, some such position as the space opposite an essay by Harry Hopkins on how the Budget is balanced by spending to save.

Or, if you choose a full-color page, the price is $3,125. And the back cover, in full color, $8,500—15 percent extra if it is a "bleed" page (which means type or the picture running clear to the edge, or "bleeding" off the page).

On the reverse side of the rate schedule appears the body of the advertising contract (not reproduced here). In four places on the contract appears the reminder: "Make checks payable to Democratic National Committee."

At no place is there any mention of how much circulation the advertiser will get for his money. Instead, when the head of a corporation signs this particular contract he is buying, or at least he thinks he is buying, what is called good will.

The ad solicitor does not carry a blackjack. He doesn't have to. He has behind him the prestige of a political party which for another 4 years may control the Federal Government—the greatest power in the land, and the biggest customer. When the ad salesman comes around offering a "bleed" page for a few thousand dollars, a corporation which does business with the Government may well believe it prudent to let itself be bled.

Among corporations listed as early space takers are three brewing companies (the Government licenses breweries and taxes beer); a manufacturer of pitchforks, hoes, and other implements (could this have anything to do with W. P. A.?); an aircraft engineering company (yes, the Government is starting a big defense program); a chain of drug stores (shades of the Patman chain-store tax), and a big tobacco company (the Government also taxes cigarettes).

The Corrupt Practices Act forbids corporations to contribute to political parties or campaign funds. The convention advertising dodge provides an indirect, and therefore legal, method of tapping corporate tills. But it will be legal no longer when and if the Hatch bill, now pending in the House of Representatives, becomes law. And that's another reason why Congress should stay on the job and dispose of unfinished business.

Independent Labor Versus "Fifth-Column" Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES SECCOMBE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK T. BOW

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Frank T. Bow:

The tragic collapse of the French Armies before the endless streams of terrifying German war machinery has emphasized as no word, no prediction of experts, and no warning could the complete dependence of modern armies and modern national defense upon the factories of the Nation. The products of the factories and the men who work in those factories for many years have been called the "home front" and the "last line of defense" and have been given other similar titles by those who sought to illustrate the importance to the Army of those who supply the sinews of war. Today the workers of the Nation must be looked upon, literally, as the "first line of defense." They are the first to go into action. Long before any Army of soldiers can take the field effectively, these squads and platoons and companies and brigades of workers, this army of labor, must have been in action. The complex and powerful machines of war must have been prepared by the army of labor in an overwhelming quantity; a never-ending supply of these machines for this new kind of war must come off the production lines to keep the field army strong. The clash of the advance guards in modern war is where steel meets steel in the factories. The army in the field cannot exist without the prior and the continuing existence and support and loyalty of the army in the factory.

These things have been brought home bitterly to the French and the British in the past few weeks and they have opened our eyes to our own needs and to our own shortcomings. The French lost this war of machines, this war of supply, this war of material, long before the final action in the field demonstrated that they were not prepared for this kind of war. The French lost this war in the factories, in the tragic years when small-caliber rabble-rousing politicians were keeping themselves in office by bartering the very life of the nation itself. The Communists, the radicals, the saboteurs, the intellectuals, and all those we now lump together as members of the "fifth column" understood what was happening and supported the politicians who were sapping the strength of the army of labor on the factory front with enervating doctrines and corrosive economic theories. In the past months the French have seen very realistically the results of the years of playing politics with the labor army and the machinery of production, and they have taken heroic steps to correct the mistakes and to make up the lost time. It was too late.

We in this country have been shocked into an acute awareness of our own unpreparedness. We have started to arm ourselves so thoroughly that the prospect will appear bleak to any predatory nation which may lick its chops over the material wealth of this country. The factory front is being called upon quickly to supply the deficiencies of the years we played politics and neglected the national defense. The army of labor is going into action.

Last month when it became apparent that Germany was overrunning Holland and Belgium and the French and British Armies in Flanders with no more difficulty than in the Polish campaign, the President delivered to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress his now historic message on national defense. This message made plain, in a dramatic way, our weakness in a world filled with uncertainties and alarms, a world in which our traditional security appears to have vanished like a mist.

The President set us upon the long hard road to military preparedness and national security from external enemies, whoever and wherever they may be. He sounded the reveille to the army of labor and industry.

Promptly, the dictator of one great branch of organized labor responded with reservations and with a veiled threat. He warned that the cooperation of the organization dominated by him was essential to the successful operation of war industries, and he made it clear that he would cooperate only if his terms were met; that he would cooperate only at a price; that he would allow his unions to work at arming the nation—if and maybe. To make the threat more pointed and emphatic, he said he was going to intensify an organizing drive in the aircraft industry, where we might be most vulnerable to the effect of strikes or sabotage. It should be observed at this point that the union leadership associated with this man has included the aliens and Communists who imported the sit-down strike and who have done so much damage to the legitimate union movement, and who have caused so much loss to the

workers and industry. It might be added further that this is the organization that the discredited National Labor Relations Board took to its bosom and devoted itself to building up.

In the other great branch of nationally organized labor the responsible leaders submerged narrow immediate self-interest and spoke as citizens and Americans, first and always. They pledged their unqualified support, and the wholehearted cooperation of their skilled craftsmen, of the fast program to bring our defenses up to date

It must be remembered, however, that the overwhelming majority of American workers are not represented by the spokesmen of either of the big national labor groups. When they have spoken, the voice of American labor has still not been heard. Three times as many workers are unorganized or are locally and independently organized as are claimed by the two national groups. We independent workers have maintained our individuality, our freedom of action and thought, and the democratic management of our own affairs. We live and speak and think in the American tradition as free citizens and not as a collectivized mass. And we owe no allegiance to anyone, nor to any alien creed or doctrine, that is higher than our allegiance to our community and our Nation. The sit-down strike has never been a device of independent labor. Sabotage of jobs and industry has never been the aim of independent labor. Communists have never got control of independent labor unions. Independent labor organizations have been barren feeding grounds for "fifth column" activities.

The tireless enemies within our borders who willingly work with potential enemies outside our borders have long known that the first attack upon us must come on the first line of defense, the labor army on the factory front. Their tactics have been carefully shaped to that design. Responsible leaders of labor and industry and Government have long known that the disorganization of the army of labor would be the first objective of the enemies of our form of government or of our Nation, and that it was the army of labor which must be most alert to the dangers of "fifth column" activities.

Independent labor, by the very nature of its independence and decentralized organization and control, has never harbored any "fifth columns" and there is room for no "fifth column" in it. As counsel to many separate organizations of independent labor which are representative of the millions in our ranks, I can say with assurance and conviction that the independent workingmen of our Nation will give full and unreserved support to the program for all needed national-defense measures; we pledge that the Nation may depend upon us for loyal and faithful execution of the will of our Government in these measures; and we pledge that the traitor and trouble maker and saboteur in the ranks of the labor army will be looked upon by us as a traitor would be in our armed forces in the field.

It is fortunate for the health of the Nation that independent labor still is independent despite the efforts of many radicals, alien sympathizers, and Communists, in and out of the Government, to put it under a heavy-handed central control. It is fortunate that the National Labor Relations Board has not succeeded in its efforts to bring all American labor under the heel of the C. I. O. and the Communist-dominated unions affiliated with it in the very industries most necessary to the national defense. Unfortunately, many in our National Government are still sympathetic with the aims of an alien labor minority, and independent labor must be on guard to maintain its integrity against the "fifth column" helpers in the Government. They will probably not be there much longer. An aroused nation will not tolerate them.

There are no Americans more loyal than those in the great army of labor. Independent labor will lick to a frazzle any "fifth column" on this front, and the Nation and the world will soon know that the American army of labor will win every battle on the first line of defense in the factories and shops of the Nation.

In Houston and south Texas there exists some of the finest independent unions in the country, making rapid progress under capable and unselfish American leadership, comprised of a membership devoted to the principles of American democracy; these groups have pledged themselves in this emergency not to strike or walk out or in any way disrupt the output of manufactured products vital to our national defense and have declared that all questions and problems between the employer and the union which they are unable to settle will be submitted to the conciliation services of the Department of Labor for settlement. Similar action has been taken by many other independent unions, including the Central States Petroleum Union, a large group of the Middle West.

For this country to be in a state of preparedness and to provide an adequate national defense means much more than the acquiring of numerical strength in the Navy, the raising of a great mechanized Army, or providing 50,000 war birds in a gigantic air fleet. It means that we must rekindle in the heart and soul of every American undying love of his country and unquestioned faith in the Republic in which he lives, together with the will to defend these shores at any cost. We must heed well the teachings of Washington, and exercise much care, and scrutinize the motives of entangling foreign alliances; and most of all, we must rebuild the moral fiber of our citizens.

Lincoln, long years before he became President, in speaking of dangers to the Republic, spoke these words which seem so applicable today. I quote:

"At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, that if it ever reaches us it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.

"I hope I am overwary, but if I am not, there is even now something of evil omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of courts; and the worse than savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice. * * * The answer is simple. Let every American; every lover of liberty, every well-wisher of his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of this country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. * * * Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in the schools, in the seminaries and in colleges; let it be written in primers, in spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpits, proclaimed in legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

The People Have a Right to Know—Are We for War or Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the President's appointment of two of America's most violent interventionists, Colonel Knox and Mr. Stimson, for the military posts in his cabinet has clarified the issue so clearly that all who run can read. Regardless of party affiliation, President Roosevelt is determined to surround himself with men whose first consideration is a desire to inject this country further and further into the European War rather than a desire to make America strong by protecting our own interests and preparing ourselves to guard the Western Hemisphere against any and all possible invaders from abroad.

The time is now here when Americans must make their choice between an American peace and steps leading to its protection by adequate preparedness, or intervention in the foreign conflict and steps leading to the sending of another American expeditionary force overseas. Men of both parties will be found on both sides of this clear-cut issue. It is for the American public whose sons would be sacrificed and whose liberties and freedom would suffer a blackout for the first time on this continent to decide which course America shall choose.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TELLS ITS OWN SIGNIFICANT STORY—OR DOES IT?

It is now freely reported in the papers and intimated by commentators of newspapers and radio, that President Roosevelt has decided to make the Democratic Party, which he so completely dominates, the "war party" in the next election, unless—unhappily—his "steps short of war" prove a shortcut into the war itself before the election. Some Democratic Congressmen and Senators have denied their desire to characterize the Democratic Party as the "war party" and are busily trying to think up alibis for the President's tacit admission of the bankruptcy of leadership which has overtaken his own party and his consequent seduction of the two most warlike figures of the Republican Party to form what is already being referred to as a "war cabinet."

WHERE DO THE DEMOCRATS STAND ON WAR?

An examination of the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the President's "bombers over Omaha" speech of May 16, tells its own indisputable story of whether those who accept the President's belligerent bent as typical of the Demo-

cratic Party or those who would alibi the party out of it are right. While the pages of the RECORD for the past month and long before have been filled with speeches and comments by Republican Senators and Congressmen pledging their devotion to American peace and proclaiming their unwillingness to plunge this country into the European war, what has been the attitude of Democratic—and especially New Deal—Senators and Congressmen? That is a fair question. And the RECORDS for the past few weeks speak for themselves. Peace has become a topic studiously to avoid by the President's followers in Congress.

With the exception of a few outstanding examples like Senators WHEELER, of Montana; VAN NUYS, of Indiana; WALSH, of Massachusetts; CLARK of Missouri; CLARK of Idaho; BULOW, of South Dakota; JOHNSON of Colorado; and HOLT, of West Virginia—not a new dealer among them—together with such Congressmen as the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LUDLOW; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SWEENEY; and a very few others, the Democratic Members of the Senate and House have maintained a most eloquent silence on the all-important issue of peace or war.

While practically every Republican in both bodies has pledged his devotion to the safeguarding of American ideals and their protection at home through nonintervention in wars abroad, the Democratic Members of Congress have kept conspicuously quiet in an awed and awful hush. It is against this sustained straddle on the part of Members of the majority party that the mothers of America are beginning to protest. It is against this eloquent evasion of any condemnation of American involvement in the European war that America is beginning to express resentment. In view of what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so clearly reveals in a study of its pages for the past 30 days, it is small wonder that those who would safeguard the peace of America throughout the country are beginning to refer to these statement-shy Democrats as the "war party" of America.

NO EXCUSE FOR STUDIED SILENCE ON THE NATION'S MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE

Mr. Speaker, I submit that every citizen in this country has a right to know where his Senators and Congressman stand on the all-determining issue of peace or war. No Member should be permitted by his constituents to maintain any longer an "on the fence and off the record" position on this all-important issue. Some commentators are publicly stating that "there are Members of Congress who are now ready to declare war." If this is true, the voters are entitled to the facts. Such Members should make their inclinations known. If it is not true, America is entitled to the reassuring information in public statements by their elected officials rededicating themselves to peaceful policies, preparedness to protect American interests on the Western Hemisphere, and pledges not to again send American boys to die on foreign battlefields in soul-shattering conflicts overseas.

SHOULD WE HAVE WAR OR PEACE?

This is no time to permit public officials to play professional political pranks with human destiny on this great issue, so close to every mother's heart; Members of Congress should make public their position. In America Members of Congress represent the people, they do not rule them. As the people's representatives, we owe an obligation to the folks back home to tell them where we stand on war or peace, and the people back home should insist that each of us fulfill that obligation now, without delay. Candidates cannot expect to curry favor and solicit votes by evading the issue of the day and by continuing a cautious concealment of where they stand on an issue which may direct the all-time destiny of this great Nation.

CITIZEN, WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

The editor of my home-town newspaper, the Madison Daily Leader, published in Madison, S. Dak., reviews the situation clearly in the following editorial. Realizing the flood of war propaganda now sweeping America and the stimulated demands for war which it inspires, he urges every citizen to write his Congressman his own opinion on the issue of the day. As a corollary of that thought, it follows that every Congressman should answer, specifically, the prayerful inquiries of his voters. Our people have a right to know precisely where we stand on the question of war or peace. You and I have an obligation to tell them faithfully and fully exactly where we stand. To do less is to play politics with the hopes and prayers of every father and mother in the land. And if we stoop to such a level of self-saving politics in this important crisis we should be retired from the offices we hold and men and women whose souls are made of sterner stuff should take our places in these hallowed Halls.

THE PEOPLE HAVE A RIGHT TO KNOW

An editorial from the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader, suggesting that the people have a right to know where their elected officials stand on the entrance of this country into foreign war:

Now that France has capitulated to Germany, and barring new European or Asiatic support for Great Britain (and there is still that probability), a greater demand than ever will be made by England that the United States intervene in the European war.

Only a few short days ago allied sources were quoted by one Washington columnist as saying that they did not want a declaration of war from the United States; that they needed matériel and not more men.

That was before France, with her big Army, was forced to ask for an armistice.

England does not have the support of that army now, and Britain herself has a relatively small army, insufficient in itself to carry a land war to Germany. That army can, and probably will, be bolstered by troops from her colonies and dominions. At that, it still may lack the numerical strength to challenge Germany.

This is especially true inasmuch as before England could attempt an assault against Germany it would have to effect a landing in German-held territory. There would be terrific losses connected with such an undertaking.

If England can hold off a Nazi blitzkreig against the British Isles and if she continues the war, she will most probably have to scrap plans for an economic war. The German fleet, combined with the Italian and the French navies (in all probability), may be sufficient to break the blockade, or at least to circumvent it. England's strategy of starving out Hitler then will go by the boards.

There would be one alternative, a counterattack on land and all that such tactics requires in the way of manpower.

Then will there be a demand from England that we intervene directly and declare war on Germany.

COLONEL LINDBERGH—DISTINGUISHED SON OF A COURAGEOUS FATHER

We have already advanced a long way toward declaring war. We have officially named names and chosen sides; pledged ourselves, again officially, to all-out aid to the Allies. A goodly number of Congressmen, officials in close administration circles, and influential private citizens, are already convinced we should declare war on Germany.

War fever in the East is increasing daily.

There are still a large number of people, especially in the Middle West, who believe that we should not meddle in Europe's ceaseless wars, but that we should build our defenses strong enough to protect the Western Hemisphere against aggression.

Colonel Lindbergh, although almost persecuted on all sides for his stand, voices the opinion of those who believe we should stay out of the war. Colonel Lindbergh, despite what almost amounts to persecution, continues to state his opinions—probably remembering the persecution his father suffered in 1917 for opposing our entrance into the World War, and remembering also that history proved his father right.

A determined campaign is being made to drag this Nation into war. Colonel Lindbergh suggests quick organization of groups to oppose American participation.

THOSE WHO WANT WAR ARE AT WORK—ARE THOSE WHO WANT PEACE?

We believe, like the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, in the stand expressed in an editorial last night.

"A response to Lindbergh's thought should be immediate. There should be organizations against war and, supplementing these, there should be countless letters and telegrams to Members of Congress."

The group that is determined to have us intervene in the European war is voluble, the campaign is well organized.

Congress can easily be misled by listening to the voluble part of our country. Silent opinion wields little influence.

IF YOU WANT PEACE YOU MUST FIGHT FOR IT

The opinion that we should remain out of the war is not a minority opinion, but so far it is largely silent. Congress must be made aware that it exists, immediately and forcefully.

The campaign of the interventionists, aided by war development, is growing quickly. The campaign of the nonintervention-ists must grow even more quickly and be even louder.

American Cotton Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLISON D. SMITH

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

SUMMARY OF RULES OF OPERATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the rules under which the American Cotton Cooperative Association operates.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. INTEREST RATES—FEDERAL FARM BOARD

The senior Senator from Tennessee charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, p. 4166) that Mr. Creekmore perpetrated a fraud by improperly borrowing Government money at the very low rates of one-eighth of 1 percent to 1⅛ percent, and then reloaning same to the State cotton cooperatives at an advance of 2 percent.

The facts are that these loans were made to A. C. C. A. by the Federal Farm Board pursuant to the express provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act, which was passed by the Congress and approved by the President on June 15, 1929, which was prior to Mr. Creekmore's connection with the cooperatives. Section 8 of that act (exhibit 1) in terms required the Federal Farm Board to charge cooperatives the lowest interest rate then being paid by the Government, as certified by the Secretary of the Treasury. See also the testimony of Governor Myers of Farm Credit Administration, Senate Resolution 137, page 348 (exhibit 1A).

The articles of incorporation and bylaws of A. C. C. A. were adopted in January 1930. This was also prior to Mr. Creekmore's connection with the cotton cooperatives. Those articles (sec. 3, art. 7; exhibit 1B) and those bylaws (sec. 3, art. 7; exhibit 1C) contained the recital that they had been approved by the Federal Farm Board, and both provide that no amendment shall be valid unless approved by the Federal Farm Board. One of these bylaws (sec. 15A; exhibit 1D) expressly required that whenever A. C. C. A. reloaned money to one of the State cotton cooperative associations which it had borrowed from the Federal Farm Board that A. C. C. A. should charge the State association an interest spread of not exceeding 2 percent, and that this spread in interest should be set up as a "loss reserve" to protect the Federal Farm Board against losses on loans. This bylaw also provided that the amounts set up in this loss reserve to the credit of the State associations could not be distributed to the State associations so long as A. C. C. A. was indebted to the Federal Farm Board. It is perfectly obvious from the bylaw itself that this provision was for the protection of the Government, and that this particular provision was not only approved, but was required by the Federal Farm Board.

The senior Senator from Tennessee also charged that the officials of A. C. C. A. benefited by the low interest rates charged A. C. C. A. by the Federal Farm Board, and by the higher interest rate which A. C. C. A. charged the State associations, and that "the farmers never got a thin dime."

But the records show that on February 14, 1934, the A. C. C. A. was not indebted to the Federal Farm Board, and that on that day it distributed all of the loss reserves to the State associations by applying same on the indebtedness then owed by the State associations to A. C. C. A. (exhibit 1E). The record further shows that at the close of the 1933-34 cotton season 9 out of the 12 State associations paid a cash patronage dividend to their farmer members (exhibit 1F). The aggregate of the cash patronage dividends received by the individual farmer members at the end of that cotton season was $353,573.38. Senate Resolution 185, pages 822, 823, 824, 825 (exhibit 1G).

2. WAIVER OF LIENS

Senator MCKELLAR charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, p. 4168) that Mr. Creekmore committed a fraud upon the Government by having the Farm Credit Administration waive the Government's first lien on cotton so that he could go to the New York banks and borrow money at 1 11/16 percent.

The facts are that the Farm Credit Administration did not waive any liens on any cotton. Governor Myers, at the Washington hearing, Senate Resolution 137, testified that the Federal Farm Board adopted a resolution on September 17, 1932, waiving its liens on cotton, and concluded his testimony with the following statement:

"So far as we have been able to find, this is the only instance in which either the Federal Farm Board, the Farm Credit Administration, or any of its agencies have waived prior liens which they may have had in connection with the extension of credit to the A. C. C. A." (p. 349).

The records further show that the A. C. C. A. is not now indebted to the Farm Credit Administration in any sum.

3. SALE OF LOOSE COTTON

The senior Senator from Tennessee stated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, p. 4185) that in handling cotton for various governmental agencies A. C. C. A. took samples of the cotton and afterward sold these samples as loose cotton. He charged that A. C. C. A. did not account to the governmental agencies for the proceeds.

The first specific cotton mentioned by the Senator is 1,600,000 bales of 12-cent-loan cotton. The records show that the cotton referred to was reconcentrated by A. C. C. A. for the account of Commodity Credit Corporation.

John D. Goodloe, then vice president and general counsel of Commodity Credit Corporation, testified (S. Res. 137, p. 476; exhibit 3) that the proceeds of this loose cotton were received by Commodity Credit Corporation. Oscar Johnston, former vice president of Commodity Credit Corporation, testified to the same thing (S. Res. 137, p. 147; exhibit 3A). Similar testimony was given at the hearings at Memphis, conducted by the Senator (S. Res. 185, p. 424; exhibit 3B).

If time and space permitted, similar statements could be made as to other cotton mentioned by the Senator.

4. FIVE-MILLION-DOLLAR LOAN TO STOCKHOLDER MEMBERS

Senator MCKELLAR charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, p. 4168) that "it was nothing more or less than stealing from the American Government" for Mr. Creekmore to influence the Farm Credit Administration to lend $5,000,000 to the State and regional cotton cooperative associations, which was used by them in purchasing $5,000,000 preferred stock in A. C. C. A.

The facts are that Governor Myers, at the Washington hearing (S. Res. 137), testified that the loan was made at the suggestion of the Farm Credit Administration because Farm Credit Administration considered it advisable "to require the member associations of American Cotton Cooperative Association to assume financial responsibility" for the central sales organization. He further testified that a total of $5,715,600 of A. C. C. A. preferred stock was pledged to secure the loan, and that on the basis of the net worth of A. C. C. A. on June 30, 1935, the pledged stock had a book value of $6,624,330 (pp. 321, 322, 377, 378; exhibit 4).

5. RECONCENTRATING COTTON

Senator MCKELLAR also charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, p. 4168) that Creekmore and his associates were responsible for Farm Credit Administration reconcentrating some 6,000,000 bales of Government cotton, and that the cooperatives "make very delightful pickings" in handling the reconcentration of these 6,000,000 bales.

The facts are that at various times A. C. C. A. entered into contracts with the Federal Farm Board, Secretary of Agriculture Hyde, Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Commodity Credit Corporation to reconcentrate cotton owned by the Government or upon which it held liens. N. E. Barker, chief business analyst of Farm Credit Administration, testified without contradiction that the savings in storage and insurance premiums effected for the Government and its borrowers by the service of A. C. C. A. in reconcentrating all of said cotton, except the 12-cent loan cotton, was $5,430,657.60 (S. Res. 137, p. 631; exhibit 5), and the record further shows without dispute that the savings to the Government in insurance and storage in reconcentrating the 12-cent-loan cotton was $2,246,418.84 annually (S. Res. 137, p. 632; exhibit 5A).

The Senator also charged that Commodity Credit Corporation should not have awarded the contract to A. C. C. A. for reconcentrating the 12-cent-loan cotton because it was not the low bidder (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, pp. 4184, 4190).

The vice president and general counsel of Commodity Credit Corporation testified directly to the contrary (S. Res. 137, pp. 458, 459). In his testimony he lists all the bids received, says all available data, including the various bids, were submitted to the Comptroller General of the United States, and also testified that the contract price for the services performed was less than it would have cost the Government if it had done the work with its own employees (exhibit 5B).

6. EXCESSIVE SAMPLING

Senator MCKELLAR charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 4169, 4185) that A. C. C. A. committed a fraud against the Government and the farmers in excessively sampling the reconcentrated cotton, profiting thereby to the extent of the "tidy little sum of $1,800,000."

Actually there has been no evidence presented in any of the various hearings that the cotton was sampled excessively. The records do show that the samples of the reconcentrated cotton were segregated and kept for the account of the governmental agency directing the operation, and, as I have heretofore pointed out, proper settlement was made with the various governmental agencies when the samples were sold as loose cotton.

7. SEED LOAN COTTON

Senator MCKELLAR charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9, p. 4169) that the Farm Credit Administration required that every bale of cotton grown by borrowers from the seed-loan office should be turned over to A. C. C. A. for sale, and that the farmers were

defrauded by excessive charges made by the cooperatives in accounting therefor.

Delivery optional with seed-loan borrowers

Governor Myers, of the Farm Credit Administration, testified at length in regard to the origin, operation, and settlement of the seed-loan cotton at the Washington hearing, Senate Resolution 137 (pp. 327–347).

In his testimony (p. 331) he stated that under regulations adopted by the Secretary of Agriculture the seed-loan borrower could deliver his cotton to any State or regional cooperative cotton marketing association, or if the borrower was not a member of and did not want to join a cooperative marketing association he could deliver the warehouse receipt for his cotton direct to the Secretary of Agriculture (exhibit 7).

Cash advanced, seed-loan cotton

The Senator on more than one occasion in the debate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 4171, 4335) referred to what he called a typical settlement concerning which he had taken testimony at the Memphis hearing.

He said in his speech on the Senate floor: "All these charges were admitted except the $5.59 for cash advanced. * * * They certainly were entitled to a commission, and in my judgment the commission was covered up in this $5.59."

And again he said: "There is not an item for commission, and my own judgment is that they did not want to put in commission because that would look bad, so they just charged the farmer with cash advanced for commission."

And finally he said (p. 4335): "Previous cash advance—which has never been explained * * * I assume that was in the nature of a commission which was charged * * *."

But at the Memphis hearing the Senator himself, in interrogating a witness, said (S. Res. 185, p. 15): "Previous to that time evidently the Mid-South had done just what you said a moment ago. Instead of settling it at once, they had advanced him $5.59 in cash, and, of course, that's a proper deduction."

Moreover, it was testified at that hearing without contradiction that this item on the settlement "cash advanced, $5.59" meant just exactly what it said (p. 194).

Charges other than seasonal charges, seed-loan cotton

The Senator on more than one occasion in the debate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 4170, 4329, 4335) criticized an item listed, "Charges other than regular seasonal charges, $1.40," stating in his speech: "Nobody under heaven knows what they were. * * * Mr. Henry could not explain that item."

But the Senator evidently overlooked the testimony of Mr. Henry at the Memphis hearing (S. Res. 185, pp. 200–201), which was unchallenged by the Senator at the time and which presented the facts in regard to the item (exhibit 7A). Ninety cents was for the estimated freight charges paid on the cotton, and 50 cents was for the estimated loss in weight which occurs in the holding of cotton during the summer season. The record shows final settlements covering exact costs were made (p. 198; exhibit 7B).

Membership fees, seed-loan cotton

The Senator also on more than one occasion severely criticized the charge of $5 for membership fee.

The criticism would cause one to believe it was a typical per-bale charge. Again the Senator evidently overlooked the testimony at the Memphis hearing, at which time he was advised that the statement of seed-loan settlements presented by him for interrogation was not a complete statement of the settlements and was not typical. It was developed at the hearing from interrogation by Senator BANKHEAD that the average membership was $1.28 per member, and that the average per-bale membership fee on such loan cotton amounted to only 37 cents (S. Res. 185, p. 192). It was developed during the hearing that the membership fee was not an annual fee, but for life if the member so desired (p. 201), (exhibit 7C).

During the Washington hearing on Senate Resolution 137, W. I. Myers, then Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, presented copies of the various contracts for the handling of the seed-loan pool cotton, copy of the Farm Credit Administration's instructions to the cooperatives as to the handling and sale of the seed-loan cotton, and statements in detail as to the charges accruing against the cotton and the settlement made (pp. 332–340, inclusive, and 340–346, inclusive). It is evident from the testimony that the Farm Credit Administration supervised the operation and the settlements made.

A. G. Black, now Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, in a letter dated May 7, 1940 (exhibit 7D), replying to an inquiry made by Senator BANKHEAD regarding the handling of the seed-loan cotton, stated in part as follows:

"When the cotton was sold it devolved upon the Farm Credit Administration as a matter of course to ascertain that settlements were made with the Government in accordance with agreements. Where the cotton was pledged to the Government on account of seed loans, this involved checks to see that any deductions from the proceeds of cotton belonging to the associations' members were in accordance with the existing marketing agreements. In some cases, the Farm Credit Administration negotiated with the associations to have the charges to members reduced below those provided for in the marketing agreements. Some of the associations cooperated by making such reductions."

8. GAMBLING

Senator MCKELLAR more than once charged the cooperatives with gambling, and stated that the losses experienced were largely because of their gambling in cotton (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 9 and 11, pp. 4183, 4185, 4328, 4329, and 4338).

If it was gambling to offset the sale of spot cotton with the purchase of an equal amount of futures contracts, the Federal Farm Board, in its first annual report for the year ending June 30, 1930, assumes the responsibility and thereby exonerates the cooperatives from the charge. On page 39 of the report the Federal Farm Board states:

"Beginning with the 16-cent loan advances to the cooperatives, and following upon the fall of the commodity thereafter, the price of cotton soon reached such a level that the cooperatives could not dispose of it at a price sufficient to pay the necessary carrying and transportation charges and the loans made thereon by the Board and other financial institutions. It was necessary, however, for the cooperatives to continue marketing their cotton in order to fill the demands of their customers and to maintain their business. To effect such sales, and yet to maintain their position in cotton for the security of the Board, the cooperatives replaced any cotton which they sold by the purchase of contracts for the delivery of cotton upon the New York Cotton Exchange."

There can be no question as to the general policy adopted by the Federal Farm Board in regard to the sale of spot cotton and the purchase of an equal number of futures contracts to maintain its position. There are several instances which can be cited where the Federal Farm Board and other governmental agencies have used the futures market to maintain their position when spot cotton was sold. As an illustration, the statement made by the Federal Farm Board in regard to the operation of the Cotton Stabilization Corporation in its third annual report for the year ending June 20, 1932, on page 74, states:

"In the fall of 1930 it became clear that demand was continuing to decline and that supplies of cotton outside the control of the Cotton Stabilization Corporation were more than ample to cover all requirements. Prices were declining. It was decided, therefore, to hold the stabilization cotton off the market during the remainder of the crop year 1930–31. In accordance with this policy, net holdings of stabilization cotton were not reduced during the fiscal year 1930–31, although from time to time sales were made to spinners from stabilization stocks. Such sales were immediately replaced by the purchase of other spot cotton or of futures, the latter being converted into spot cotton as opportunity developed."

Hedging cotton by the sale of futures against the purchase of spot cotton is a well-recognized practice. The purchase of an equal amount of futures to offset the sale of spot cotton is equally recognized by the trade and governmental agencies as a medium to maintain one's position in cotton. However, the Federal Farm Board was directing the policies of the stabilization operation in cotton, and the sale of spot cotton and the purchase of futures by the cooperatives were made with the knowledge and for the security of the Federal Farm Board.

9. MEMBERSHIP—TRUE COOPERATIVES

Senator MCKELLAR repeatedly charged that the cooperatives had no bona fide membership; that they had been requested and had failed to give a list of their members.

The facts are that exhaustive testimony on membership was heard at the Memphis hearing (S. Res. 185) and again at the Washington hearing (S. Res. 137). The membership list of the Mid-South Association of approximately 50,000, showing members' names, post-office address, and contract number, was submitted at the Memphis hearing (p. 189), and membership lists of other State associations were later submitted to the committee. The testimony at the Memphis hearing also showed the South Carolina Association had a membership of 10,000 (p. 150); the Louisiana Association a membership of 30,000 (p. 300); the Mississippi Association a membership of 65,256 (p. 336); the West Texas Association a membership of 5,600 (p. 362); the Brazos Valley Association a membership of 3,650 (p. 357).

In this connection the Senator also charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4188) that the only members the cooperatives had were those they claimed because they bought cotton from a man whom they had never seen before and not paying the check until he had signed a receipt showing he was a member.

Governor Myers testified (S. Res. 137, p. 376):

"The method used for obtaining membership or acknowledging membership varies, Senator. There are 11 present associations that have separate contracts with their members that are not given on a draft. There are only 2 member associations which have the complete contract on the draft which the member automatically signs when he signs the draft. There were 6 cases where the contract is referred to by reference on the draft, but by far a greater number of the State associations have separate, complete contracts that are not on the draft."

He also testified that the form of contract used was determined by the directors of each State association (p. 376; exhibit 9).

He also testified (S. Res. 137, p. 278):

"In connection with the eligibility of the American Cotton Cooperative Association and each of its stockholder-members we have, of course, sought information on the amount of member and nonmember business, and the information thus obtained has shown that more business was and is being done with members than with

nonmembers. In this connection we regard the acquisition of cotton from any person who is not a member of a stockholder association as nonmember business."

He further testified:

"I think it (A. C. C. A.) is fully in accordance with the law. I think, like all organizations, it falls short of our ideals. I believe that intelligent effort has been made, and is being made, more closely to obtain the ideals of what is expected in a farmers' cooperative organization * * *."

10. CONTROL—INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATE

Senator McKELLAR repeatedly charged that Mr. Creekmore absolutely controlled the cotton-cooperative movement, and that this control was assured by interlocking directorates.

Governor Myers, of Farm Credit Administration, testified (S. Res. 137, p. 277) that all of the voting power of A. C. C. A. was in its common stock; that its charter provides that only cooperative associations meeting the terms and conditions of the Capper-Volstead Act are eligible to own common stock; that the charter also provides that only one share of common stock could be owned by each of its stockholder members, and that each cooperative association owning a share of common stock nominated one director; that of the common stock, 15 shares are held by as many cotton-cooperative associations (exhibit 10).

He further testified at page 300:

"The board of directors of the A. C. C. A. is now composed of 15 members; one member is an official of a State association—not a manager—and is on the pay rolls of both the State association and the A. C. C. A. One is the president of a State association and on the pay roll of the State association but not on the pay roll of the A. C. C. A. Five members are neither officials of the State associations nor the A. C. C. A. and are not on the pay roll of either. Five members are presidents of State associations but are not on the pay rolls of either the State associations or A. C. C. A."

11. INSOLVENCY

Senator McKELLAR, in criticizing the Farm Credit Administration for loaning $5,000,000 to the State cotton-cooperative associations in 1935 with which to purchase preferred stock in A. C. C. A., charged that A. C. C. A. and the State associations were insolvent (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4334).

The complete answer is found in the testimony of Governor Myers (S. Res. 137, p. 321), where he said:

"After these loans were made, June 30, 1935, and the preferred stock was paid for, the financial statement of the American Cotton Cooperative Association, certified by Haskins & Sells, certified public accountants, reflected a net value of assets over liabilities in the amount of $7,143,095. All but $150,347 of the total assets were classified as current assets. The balance sheets of the 11 member associations which borrowed from the revolving fund—later increased to 12 associations—indicated a combined net worth of $1,443,266. These balance sheets were also certified by certified public accountants as of June 30, 1935."

12. DELAWARE CORPORATIONS

Senator McKELLAR charged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4345) State and regional cotton cooperative associations are Delaware corporations.

The true facts were given by Governor Myers in his testimony at the Washington hearing (S. Res. 137, p. 277–278), where he stated:

"Each active association that is a stockholder in the A. C. C. A. is incorporated under the Cooperative Marketing Act of the State in which it is operating. These associations are all nonstock organizations. Each restricts its memberships to actual producers of cotton. None of the stockholder members of the A. C. C. A. pay any dividends other than patronage dividends, and all of them are organized to operate on a mutual basis."

13. BENEFIT TO FARMERS

Senator McKELLAR repeatedly charged that the A. C. C. A. and its stockholder members were simply cotton merchants and that the farmers never profited a thin dime by their operations.

At the Memphis hearing, conducted by Senator McKELLAR, it was shown by undisputed evidence that the individual farmer members had received in cash distributions between January 1930 and June 1935, an aggregate of $4,225,253.12 (S. Res. 185, p. 823; (exhibit 1G).

I also quote the following from Federal Trade Commission, 1937, Agricultural Income Inquiry, page 48:

"Although a measure of proof in the terms of dollars and cents of the value of cooperative associations is difficult to obtain, the Commission desires to add its opinion to the vast body of opinion to the effect, namely, that true cooperative associations have been of great value to the producers of farm products. These cooperatives have significantly increased the bargaining strength of producers and have reduced the spread between producers' and consumers' prices. In the marketing of cotton, for example, the cooperative serves its members in the classing, assembling, and sale of cotton in merchandisable quantities of each grade, and staple, thus enabling its members to sell their cotton on the basis of actual grade and staple, rather than to sell it without classing or on the unfavorable classing of the country buyer. Moreover, the financial strength of the cooperative makes possible the orderly marketing of crops and more favorable prices for its members."

A Deadly Parallel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. D. WORTH CLARK, OF IDAHO

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered over the radio by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] on June 20, 1940, on the subject A Deadly Parallel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is hard to believe that only 22 years ago the first World War ended. After 4 years of carnage and slaughter, after 4 years of the roar of the cannon and the rattle of the machine gun, after 4 years of a civilization gone mad, the major nations of the world laid down their arms, and a weary and a haggard human race began to take stock of its tragic losses.

Europe found herself bankrupt and bleeding, with millions of her young lives snuffed out. The American soldiers returning from Europe left 50,000 of their comrades buried in the blood-drenched soil of France. They brought with them tens of thousands of other comrades crippled and maimed, doomed thenceforth to live only half a life.

And what did these returning soldiers find in America when they reached its shores? They found tens of thousand of young mothers who would never again look into the eyes of the boys they had so recently married. They found tens of thousands of little children who would never know a dad. How horrible—how utterly awful was this!

And yet at that time, deluded and gullible fools that we were, we thought that it was worth the cost because we were told that we were fighing a "war to end wars," a "war to make the world safe for democracy." What a travesty! What a hollow mockery are those phrases today! Yet when the war drums were beaten by the skilled but calloused hands of propagandists in 1917, every stripling American youth who sailed away went with the sentiment ringing in his heart that he was truly about to die in the cause of ending war forever and in the cause of making the world safe for democracy.

When he got to Europe, however, he found that, instead of fighting a battle for democracy, he was nothing but a pawn upon the bloody chessboard of European power politics. The white crosses which dot embattled Flanders today stand as mute witnesses to the bloody sacrifices of American youngsters, not on the altar of freedom but on the chopping block of the balance of power in Europe, over which balance of power the tyrants of the Old World have been almost continuously at war for a thousand years.

Then came the peace. And what a peace it was! America's might had made it possible. That peace could have made the world safe for democracy. It could have ended war, possibly for all time. But those same cunning politicians who so successfully enticed our boys to their death deliberately and criminally sowed in Versailles the seeds of the present conflagration. Even the magnanimous, idealistic Wilson did not know that both he and his country had been duped until he got to Paris, and there the sight of the vultures, who had so easily talked of democracy and civilization a few months before, proving themselves to be nothing more than cruel, cunning politicians, so overwhelmed Wilson that it broke his heart and ultimately his health. And in such a manner was the great American President sacrified in the web of European treachery.

After the first World War was over, its paid propagandists wrote many books in which they boasted, if you please, how they had duped America into war—and they even described their technique in detail.

War is a racket, a cruel, cunning, ruthless racket devised by racketeers, sometimes politicians masquerading as statesmen, sometimes industrialists who would coin their filthy dollars out of the blood of your boys. I want to say to you tonight in all sincerity that the war racketeers are busier in America today than ever before. I want to say to the American people that powerful influences are at work, deliberately and with malice, whipping you into war.

Let me give you just one example. Only a week ago there appeared a full-page advertisement in many of the large metropolitan daily newspapers of the country under the signature of an

organization entitled "Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies." In flaming headlines were the words, "Stop Hitler Now!" and then followed a tirade, which, although carefully worded, amounted substantially to a declaration of war against Germany. No one knows how much these advertisements cost, but they must have run into many tens of thousands of dollars. No one knows who is contributing the slush funds for this committee. We do know how it was organized. It was set up at a meeting of 18 prominent bankers in New York last April.

It was stated on the floor of the Senate that the man who called that meeting was Frederic R. Coudert, one of the men who helped generate the propaganda that took American boys to their deaths 22 years ago, when he was legal adviser to the British Embassy. Who else was there? Thomas W. Lamont, a partner of J. P. Morgan & Co., whose banking interests throughout the British Empire are more important to them than their interests in the United States. Then, there was Lewis Douglas, a man who has just resigned as president of a Canadian university, and Frank Polk, an active propagandist in the first World War. And who else was there? None other than Henry L. Stimson, who was only today nominated as Secretary of War by the President of the United States.

I might go on and on to show you how this committee, which I suggest cares infinitely more about helping the Allies than it does about defending America, is raising enormous sums of money and deliberately endeavoring to drive us once more into war. Now this committee is just one cog in the vast underground machine that is using every resource at its command to send your boys once more across the sea to die, and it may soon be successful.

We are talking now of methods short of war. No one has ever defined that term. No one knows when a method is short of war, and when it is not; but I venture to say that any method which has a tendency to lead us into a war is not a method short of war. "Methods short of war" is just another one of those catch phrases designed to conceal thought rather than express it.

War is not a dainty thing. You cannot hit a fighting nation over the head with a club and then smoothly say, "We are using methods short of war, and we do not intend to declare war formally upon you."

Only last week the Government, by sham and pretense, sent some of its military and naval planes to the Allies. Only yesterday, according to press dispatches, they sold the Allies 20 ships belonging to the United States Navy. Now, it may be that some of our arm-chair philosophers may say serenely that these are methods short of war. The fact of the matter is that, according to the Hague treaties, according to international use, and according to common sense, when the American Government furnishes ships belonging to its Navy and airplanes belonging to its Army to one belligerent, it commits an act of war against the other, and the other has a right to so regard it.

France has collapsed. England may do so shortly. One of these days we may have to deal with a German Government which is master of Europe, and we may have to deal with it all alone, and it may little behoove us then to tell that Government that we are still friends, because we only attacked them with methods short of war.

We have needlessly insulted Japan in the Pacific—Japan, who has a navy almost as large as ours. We have gone out of our way to call Italy offensive names. We are now deliberately committing acts or war against Germany. We deceive England and France by leading them to believe that we can give them help that is effective. We undertake needlessly, and without anyone infringing on our rights, to make mortal enemies of every powerful nation on earth, and yet we sit here with an Army which in its entirety could not whip five first-class German mechanized divisions, and a Navy which right today is afraid to leave the Hawaiian Islands for fear of what Japan might do. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." Our present policy seems to be, "Brag loudly, insult the world, and carry a toothpick."

But it is not yet too late. The Congress for the past 5 years has voted, and is today voting, every dime of money for national defense that has been, or is being, requested by the Chief Executive. Billions upon billions have been appropriated. We have the resources. We have the industrial facilities; and if these are used wisely, we should, within 2 years, have an army and navy and air force which, fighting on this hemisphere, could probably defeat any combination of enemies on earth. The best military and naval opinion is to the effect that it would be quite impossible for any nation or group of nations to prepare for the invasion of the United States short of that time, even assuming they desire to do so.

It would seem therefore that our course is a clear one. Let us quit insulting the world; let us concentrate our efforts not on helping the Allies but upon helping America by building up her defenses to an impregnable point. This procedure is bound to win as against a foreign invader. But the greatest battle that the American people have to face at this time is the battle against the propagandists who are seeking to draw us into war now.

If you, the American people, desire to win this fight, you must make your voices heard in Washington. Propagandists are very vocal. They accuse everyone whom they cannot influence of being pro-Nazi or a "fifth columnist." They are fundamentally cowards, but they are adept at stirring up emotions and creating hysteria. Their drive has almost reached its climax today. They have duped men in high places. They will stop at nothing to gain their ends. It is up to the great mass of the patriotic people of America to defeat them now. I feel sure that the American people will respond and that this battle of the home front will be won.

Closer to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of yesterday entitled "Closer to War."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 21, 1940]

CLOSER TO WAR

The President is moving closer to war.

This is shown by his sensational appointment yesterday of two out-and-out Republican interventionists to his Cabinet.

Colonel Knox and Colonel Stimson are men of the finest character. They are men of ability. In general, we hold them in the highest esteem.

But they, like Mr. Roosevelt, are making the ghastly mistake of trying to drag the United States into the European war.

Who says so? Colonel Knox says so. Colonel Stimson says so. Not in so many words, but in almost so many words.

What other construction could be placed, for example, on Stimson's violent speech at New Haven Tuesday night? In that speech, he urged that we let the British and French ships use all our ports in case their own bases in Europe become untenable. Would this not bring the war to our shores?

What other construction could be placed on the views of a man who, like Stimson, says we should, if necessary, send planes and munitions to the Allies in our own ships and under convoy?

This reckless proposal, of course, would not only violate our Neutrality Act; it would be an act of war.

Colonel Stimson was even more explicit. He said, "I believe that if we use our brains and curb our prejudices, we can, by keeping command of the sea, beat her (Germany) again as we did in 1918."

Is this not tantamount to a declaration of war?

Colonel Knox publishes the Chicago Daily News, a paper renowned for its news gatherers. But day after day Colonel Knox prints page 1 editorials of the most incendiary nature about the European war. Last Monday Colonel Knox sharply criticized the Republicans of Illinois for adopting a platform proposing that the United States keep itself clear of European quarrels and bloodshed. Does this not mean that Colonel Knox favors the opposite point of view?

The point need not be labored that both Stimson and Knox share the President's views regarding American participation in the European war.

With what shall we participate? This tragic question has not been answered to anyone's satisfaction by Roosevelt, Stimson, or Knox.

It is a notorious fact, set out by the Senate Naval Committee, General Johnson, Representative Ross Collins, General Hagood, and many other experts, that we are unprepared to defend our shores, much less fight in Europe.

The President's sudden concern about the War and Navy Departments comes late in the day. He has for many months permitted a state of anarchy to exist in the War Department. Secretary Woodring, a small-town banker from Kansas, was a lame-duck appointee. He got the job after he was beaten for reelection as Governor of his State. His feud with Assistant Secretary Johnson has been a national scandal, and it must have had disastrous results so far as the administration of the War Department is concerned.

As Secretary of the Navy, Roosevelt originally appointed the aged and ailing ex-Senator Swanson, who finally died. He then permitted a vacancy in the office to exist for many months, and finally named Charles Edison, a sick man, who now has resigned to become a candidate for Governor of New Jersey.

What sort of Executive is Roosevelt to permit the War and Navy Departments to be so badly administered at a time like this? His neglect is worthy of a Chamberlain.

But now, on the eve of the Republican convention, Roosevelt appoints two Republicans to his Cabinet. This is just too slick to deceive anyone. There is such a thing as a man being too clever. Under the guise of promoting national unity—which already exists to a remarkable degree so far as preparedness is concerned—he is trying to confound his political opponents by forming a coalition government.

There is no situation confronting the United States to justify a coalition government. That is a step called for only in the most dire emergency. What we need in the emergency in the War and Navy Departments is not two intensely interventionist politicians, but two corking good administrators and production experts who know how to spend the billions Congress has voted for defense—men like Knudsen and Chrysler, Lindbergh and Rickenbacker, men who know how to make the wheels go around and how to get a dollar's worth of value for a dollar's worth of money.

The recent behavior of the President of the United States is exceedingly untrustworthy. Great man that he is, Roosevelt has apparently been swept off an even keel by the agonizing events in Europe.

Congress, under the circumstances, has a grave duty to perform. Let it not shirk that duty, which is to prevent the President from plunging us into the European war.

A Republican Warning on Recent Cabinet Appointments

REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, from this distance it is amusing and interesting to observe the antics of the Kilkenney cats as they claw each other to death at the Republican national convention in Philadelphia. Prior to this administration North Carolina polled one of the largest Republican votes in the Union. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a short article from the Charlotte Observer, containing a telegram sent by the Republican State chairman of North Carolina, Hon. Jake F. Newell, to Alfred M. Landon and John D. M. Hamilton, excoriating them for their positions on the Knox and Stimson appointments. This telegram concludes:

We need leadership, not pettiness nor demagoguery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Charlotte Observer of June 21, 1940]

National Republican leaders were warned last night in a telegram signed by Chairman Jake F. Newell, of the Republican organization in North Carolina, and Ernest M. Morgan, Republican candidate for Congress, that "refusal to help the Allies in this hour is unthinkable and would annihilate the Republican Party."

The telegram was sent to John D. M. Hamilton, Republican national chairman; Alfred M. Landon, 1936 nominee for the Presidency and a member of the national committee; and J. Sam White, North Carolina member of the resolutions committee of the national convention.

The three with other nationally prominent Republican leaders are in Philadelphia laying the ground work for the national convention that opens there Monday.

APPROVE APPOINTMENTS

The nomination by President Roosevelt of Col. Frank Knox, Landon's running mate in 1936, as Secretary of the Navy, and Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of State, as Secretary of War, was also heartily approved by Mr. Newell and Mr. Morgan.

"I think it's the best thing the President has done since he's been in the White House," said Mr. Newell. "He named two men who are not only good Republicans but also good fine American patriots. I don't see a bit of harm in putting two good Republicans in a Democratic Cabinet. Seriously, too, I think it will have a good effect across the seas. It will serve notice on Hitler and Mussolini that we folks in the United States may scrap each other in politics as long as things are going along all right, but that when real danger faces us we are one united nation."

TELEGRAPH LEADERS

The telegram sent Hamilton, Landon, and White last night follows:

"Avoid error of refusing aid to Allies. This country favors blasting Hitler off the earth and preserving the British Empire as our own protection. Refusal to help the Allies in this hour unthinkable and would annihilate Republican Party. Through Knox and Stimson we can learn condition of country and keep them in the new President's Cabinet. We need leadership, not pettiness nor demagoguery."

The telegram was the result of the opposition reported developing yesterday among members of the resolutions committee of the national convention to any plank advocating United States assistance to the European democracies.

Mr. Landon, chairman of the subcommittee on national defense, which was to write such a plank, announced he had postponed a scheduled meeting of the group today "because of developments." It was said that at least 5 of the 11 members of the subcommittee had banded together to oppose the party's committing itself to any type of aid to England or France. They were said to oppose such a plank because to adopt one "would put the Republicans in the position of indirectly endorsing policies of the Roosevelt administration."

Both Mr. Newell and Mr. Morgan most vehemently condemned such an attitude on the part of the subcommittee members said to have made such expression.

The International Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR B. JENKS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I daresay that an inspection of the letters and telegrams coming into the offices of practically every Member of Congress on the international situation would disclose that deep concern, fear, and foreboding dwell in the minds of a great many people in this country. Approximately 40 percent of these communications coming to me urge immediate aid to the Allies by rushing airplanes and munitions to them; about 60 percent of these communications plead that the United States be kept out of the European war. To date I have received five letters from the State of New Hampshire specifically demanding that an immediate and outright declaration of war be made by the United States on Germany and Italy.

Simultaneously letters and telegrams are pouring in demanding that Congress remain in session for the duration of this critical period. I was very glad to go on record with the entire Republican membership of the House against adjournment; of course, I shall vote against any adjournment resolution that may be presented in the House in the immediate future, and in the event of the presentation of such a resolution I believe I would be in the majority.

The people of this country are familiar with the assurances given by the President to France and Great Britain that everything possible is being done to place our material resources at the disposal of the Allies. In his address on June 10 at Charlottesville, Va., the President said, "We will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this Nation."

It seems to me that it is imperative for all of us to view the situation realistically. Insofar as speedy and effective aid to the Allies is concerned, if we are to consider the situation factually we must concede that industrially it is one with which we are not equipped to cope immediately. Many people do not seem to take into consideration that from the close of the last World War until 1930 the United States was dealing in disarmament conferences and peace treaties, and that since 1930, due to the economic depression with which we as a Nation have been struggling for the past 10 years, industry throughout the entire country spiraled to an unprecedented low ebb, with the result that our industrial plants are neither geared nor mobilized for the prompt production of military equipment in any really appreciable quantities.

While the sympathy of the overwhelming majority of the American people is with the Allies, the fact remains that the aid this country actually can give immediately is governed by specific physical limitations which are the result of circumstances that have prevailed here for the past 20 years.

Let us briefly review those circumstances. Following the close of the last World War, in which the United States val-

iantly fought and lavishly spent "to save democracy," we joined in what I believe at the time were most commendable efforts to prevent a recurrence of another such appalling catastrophe, and with other nations we sought something that became known as collective security. In pursuance of that goal we signed, with 55 other nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Nine-Power Pact. Believing that collective security could be achieved and that the curse of war could be vanquished from the earth, we thought we could disarm. So in 1922 a disarmament conference was held here in Washington, through which we entered into a treaty under which we sank ships, agreed to refrain from building others, and generally reduce our armaments. This naval limitation agreement was entered into for a period of 15 years. That treaty, bolstered by the fervent hope for lasting peace, was the reason that the armament of the United States was at a diminished point in 1933 when the present administration came into being.

In the autumn of 1929, as we all recall, a financial debacle broke loose in this country which shook the very foundations of our economic stability, throwing millions of people out of work and slowing down industrial activity to an unprecedented low ebb. At the peak of this debacle it was estimated there were 16,000,000 persons in the United States unable to find employment; after struggling with our economic problems throughout the intervening period, it is now estimated that there are approximately 10,000,000 people still unable to find employment. These figures tell not only the story of the painfully slow rise of employment, but they indicate as well the distressing status of the industrial plants throughout this country, some of which have been closed completely, partially dismantled, or reduced to mere skeletons of former activity.

I suggest the careful consideration of the foregoing brief summary of the facts to those who are urging that the United States miraculously speed war supplies to the aid of the Allies.

For the information of those who are advocating the repeal of the Johnson Act, which prevents loans or the extension of credit to those nations which defaulted on their obligations to the United States, I ask leave to insert in my remarks an excerpt from the May 24, 1940, edition of the United States News, which outlines the financial resources of the Allies that could be converted to the purchase of supplies, including such military equipment as we have available or are in a position to produce:

So far the proposal of war loans to the Allies has received little support. Chief reason is the allied cash resources, which are said to be more than ample for the present and probably for several years.

If Holland, Belgium, and Norway are included, the Allies now have about $11,000,000,000 in assets which could be converted without great difficulty into dollars to buy war equipment here.

Nor is that the limit of allied resources which could be pledged for cash. This sum represents only bank balances and stocks and bonds in this country, about $4,000,000,000, and gold resources, about $7,000,000,000.

In addition the Allies have about $2,000,000,000 worth of direct investments in this country in factories, mines, and the like. If Switzerland is forced into the war against Germany, the allied cash supply will be increased by $1,700,000,000, the Swiss balances in the United States, and gold holdings.

Nor is this total of $1,700,000,000 the limit of potential allied cash resources. There are direct British investments of $2,500,000,000 in Canada and $5,000,000,000 in South and Central America which would be sold, thus raising the potential allied cash to $23,000,000,000.

If more were needed, the Allies have many islands in the West Indies—Bermuda, the Bahamas, Trinidad, and Jamaica, for example—which could be sold to the United States as naval and air bases for the protection of the hemisphere.

With world conditions what they are today and the threat of encroachment on our way of life ominously looming from across both the Atlantic and the Pacific, certainly we have no alternative to expanding our own defenses and making every possible effort to defend and protect this great and beloved country of ours under any and all circumstances.

The editorial which appears in the June 22 edition of the Saturday Evening Post—a reprint of which can be found on pages 3996 and 3997 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bearing on the deplorable state of our own national defenses is, I believe, deserving of the thoughtful consideration of every American. The building up of our own national defense for the insurance of the protection of our own country is our first responsibility and our paramount duty, as I see it, not only to ourselves but to the entire world. Adequately and properly supported, the determined insistence on the maintenance, continuance, and survival of our democratic system is a contribution toward world stability that cannot in these or future times be discounted. Nations, after all, are collections of individuals; and nations, like individuals, are influenced by and learn and profit from example.

It is our task to not only demonstrate to the world that our democratic system of government can withstand the strain of these troublous and turbulent times but guarantee the future safety of the American people under any and all circumstances.

The Confession of Failure

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following article carried on the front page of the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C., in its issue of Friday morning, June 21, 1940, as an editorial under the pictures of Frank Knox and Henry L. Stimson, speaks for itself. This Democratic newspaper carries on its masthead the statement that it is "The South's Oldest Daily Newspaper."

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of June 21, 1940]

THE CONFESSION OF FAILURE

The Roosevelt administration, the national Democratic Party, has suffered in popular esteem in the last 2 weeks more than in 7⅓ years, since March 1933.

The 2 weeks have brought bitterly to American attention the futility, the inadequacy, the incompetency of the country's "foreign policy," its utter unpreparedness to meet national peril.

"Never has a fireside chat brought down a bomber."

The desperate condition of the Allies has brought home to the Americans their own condition of impotency immediately to defend themselves, much the less to help the Allies.

Suddenly the Americans have awakened to the fact that while they have been wasting billions and billions of dollars on "social gains" and plunging into debt unparalleled, they have a small and unequipped army, few war planes, and an excellent navy with few war planes and hardly large enough to defend coasts of the Pacific and the Atlantic at the same time.

Suddenly they are aroused to the fact that since 1937 their Government has been defying the strongest military nation the world has seen, that it has been "gesturing with an empty gun."

Suddenly it has dawned upon them that their Navy Department has for years virtually been without a head, and that their War Department has had two small heads absorbed in a petty personal feud.

The New Deal has abandoned itself. Stettinius, of the Steel Corporation, and Knudsen, of General Motors, have been summoned and are displacing the Corcorans, Cohens, Lubins, and the other uplifters in Washington influence. Big men of industry are summoned by the denouncers of the "economic royalists."

Two Republicans, Knox and Stimson, in the country's disabled condition, its enfeebled and anemic state, are called to the rescue, and they come. Presumably they are not giving up their party, they are not deserters from republicanism, not third termers, but mere patriots willing to take the places of the poor creatures who have had the titles in the War and Navy Departments, lest things fall to pieces.

The national Democratic Party, the New Deal, has been compelled to appeal to the Republicans for men of ability, for men who can be of real service.

In the 2 weeks the administration's miserable failure has been laid bare.

The administration, the New Deal, confesses its failure. Its outcries are heard throughout the land.

The Electric Rate Book

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

THE ELECTRIC RATE BOOK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have at last succeeded in getting printed the Electric Rate Book, showing the electric light and power rates for all services, residential, commercial, and industrial, in every community in America of more than 250 people. This volume is now in the document room, and each Member is entitled to at least one copy.

You can compare the rates in any community in your district with the rates in any other community in America. It supplies the deadly parallel. It is going to be one of the most powerful weapons ever devised to protect the ultimate consumers of electricity against exorbitant overcharges.

I have also introduced a joint resolution to have additional copies printed to be distributed through the folding room. I want this publication made available to the people in every community, so they can tell just how much they are overcharged for electric energy and how to protect themselves against those overcharges.

I advise every Member to get his copy now, because this is going to be one of the chief issues in the coming campaign. The people are tired of paying an overcharge of $1,000,000,000 every year for electric lights and power, and the day of reckoning is at hand.

Get your copy now. Every Democrat will want one of these books during the coming campaign, and every Republican will need one.

Our Duty Is To Remain in Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the unparalleled crisis which confronts this Nation demands that Congress remain in session continuously and indefinitely. Events at home and abroad, national policies, and international relations are changing from day to day. Decisions must be made on questions that will affect the lives and fortunes of our people for a generation to come. Many of these questions require decision and approval by Congress; they must not be left to the judgment of one man.

The President already has emergency powers that have never been granted in such measure to any Chief Executive in peacetime. The administration has been trying to get rid of Congress that it may have a free hand in dealing in its own way with the present crisis. Billions have been appropriated for defense and preparedness. They have been voted almost unanimously, with no spirit of partisan opposition, but it is plainly evident from the scope of national and continental defense plans that these funds are but the beginning of a vast expansion of our military and naval forces.

Congress must remain in session to share responsibility for this program and exercise its judgment prerogatives as to the extent of American commitments and involvement in the present world turmoil. Congress, furthermore, is responsible for the source of the billions that must be provided. Already the extraordinary expenditures required reach nearly $5,000,000,000 and any layman can foresee that this is only the beginning.

To offset this great outlay and a Budget deficit of more than three billions, Congress has increased the legal debt limit by three billions and is providing one billion of new taxes. Thus it is seen that the four billions from taxes and increased borrowing authority amount to only one-half of the five billions voted for defense plus the three billions annual deficit. Such makeshift Federal financing cannot continue. It is the plain duty of Congress to undertake realistic revision of our entire tax structure. The new funds that have been authorized, the inevitable heavy additions that must be made, added to 10 years of deficit financing, threaten the stability of our national credit. Congress must reinforce Federal fiscal policies with prompt and realistic action to end the increasing deficits. Economy in Government expenditures outside necessary defense preparations must be enforced, at the same time Federal income is increased, if we are to make even a start at closing the great deficit gap.

In a world at war, when every day brings possible complications closer to the United States, we find a necessity for Congress to remain in session to perform its constitutional duty as a check and balance on the Executive department of the Government. In addition to emergency measures brought almost daily before Congress for consideration, there remain a number of important measures which should receive final consideration, measures that have received unquestionable public approval.

Among these are measures, not only necessary in normal times, but that will aid materially in the preparedness effort in which this country is now engaged. Amendments to the Walter-Logan bill, the Hatch Act, numerous defense measures in the offing, not to mention the President's revolutionary proposal for universal training of youth, multiply congressional responsibilities and demand continuous sessions throughout the existing emergency.

In the absence of Congress the Chief Executive can, under present world conditions, assume powers in addition to the vast authority he already possesses, that should not in time of peace be delegated to any one man in our Republic. It is the plain duty of Congress to remain in the National Capital to guard the safety of the Nation.

Should Face the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BUTLER B. HARE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE GREENWOOD (S. C.) INDEX-JOURNAL

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Index-Journal, Greenwood, S. C., of June 13, 1940:

[From the Greenwood (S. C.) Index Journal of June 13, 1940]

SHOULD FACE THE TRUTH

Leaders in both the Democratic and the Republican Parties should have the courage to tell the people of the United States the truth even though it is election year.

If we need national defense we need it in a hurry. We should appreciate the feelings of the Texan who said that although he did not often need a gun he always kept one handy because when he did need a gun he needed it mighty bad.

We cannot prepare for national defense properly and adequately by half-time efforts.

Until April of this year England and France thought they had the Germans bottled up and would soon have them begging for peace.

In England and France war materials were being turned out in a "normal way." No one was working much more or much harder than usual.

Look at the picture today.

Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium—completely overrun by Hitler, and in his absolute power.

England and France are terrified and citizens are working like men have never worked before to turn out war material.

In England munitions plants are running 7 days a week—night and day.

Prayers are made to all workers to work as they have never worked before.

It may be too late.

Here in America we are all defense-minded but have made no definite plan even yet for defense purposes, and are still talking about keeping social and labor legislation and so on and on.

The American people would better be told that getting ready for adequate defense is going to call for some sacrifice, and that it is going to be a little hard or will feel like that because we are too soft.

We should be told that and should be warned that national defense means work and lots of it.

It is no time for play; no time for "the more abundant life of leisure"; no time for looking out for No. 1 alone; no time for reaping large profits or benefits from war preparations; no time for strikes; no time for "slacking"; no time for doing as little work as possible; in short, it is a time for doing all the things quick and hard that England and France put off doing until it may be too late.

CONGRESS ONLY DECLARES WAR

Despite much talk about the President's leading the country into war, it is still a fact that only the Congress of the United States can declare war.

A President may advise it and even urge it, but the Congress only has the power to say the fateful word.

President Wilson requested it of the Congress on April 2, 1917.

The Senate voted in favor of war on Germany on April 4, 1917, by a vote of 82 to 6.

At 3 o'clock on the morning of April 6, 1917, the House of Representatives voted, by 373 to 50, in favor of war. It was Good Friday.

But, remember, it was the Congress that gave the word of authority.

As early as March 20, 1917, President Wilson was advised by his Cabinet that war was inevitable and that a call for a special or extraordinary session of the Congress should be issued.

This call said the Congress was "to receive a communication by the Executive on grave questions of national policy which should be taken into consideration."

Everyone in the country knew what it meant.

A country not prepared for war would better keep out of it unless attacked.

Stay on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is about to take a step today that should be encouraging to the American people. In spite of tremendous pressure, we have resolved to keep faith with the American people by remaining on the job. It is not only imperative that sine die adjournment be prevented but the recesses we are about to take should be no longer than reasonably necessary to permit various Members of the Congress to attend the party conventions.

For reasons which I do not attempt to evaluate the press seems to convey the impression that the Democrats want to adjourn and that our friends of the other party are entitled to all the credit for probable defeat of such a move. In all fairness, I think we should recall many of the Democratic Members are equally determined that we will not abandon our obligations to this Nation. Two solid Democratic State delegations have joined the forces that are willing to assume the duty of carrying out the direction of the American people by staying here until the legislative program is properly and fully carried out.

With considerable reluctance I have come to the conclusion which is shared by many here present that Congress stands almost alone between war and peace. The addition of two new men to the Cabinet whose public records and public utterances clearly indicate their prowar tendencies should give new impetus to and new justification for Congress to stay in session. It was the President himself who said that the "everyday decisions" by the Government determine its policy and its course. Up to this point the everyday decisions of Colonel Knox and Colonel Stimson have been in the direction of involvement in war. Can any reasonable person believe that these gentlemen have given up those tendencies?

It is true, of course, that only Congress can declare war under the terms of our Constitution. But we have all heard of such things in recent years as undeclared war. Our Government has never officially regarded the Japanese invasion of China as war.

We also know that some years back the United States Navy, acting without any authority whatsoever from the Congress and acting solely under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy bombarded the city of Veracruz, destroyed its buildings and killed its citizens. That should indicate that it is very possible for war to come about without the direction of Congress.

One of the distinguished appointees only the other night urged a plan of action for this country that was an open and outright declaration of war. Does anyone think that this country could remain out of the war if we accepted Colonel Stimson's advice and opened our ports to the navy of one of the belligerents and used our ships to convoy munitions to Europe? Such is the viewpoint of the men who will make the day-to-day decisions of our Government in this period of extreme crisis. It is the obvious duty of Congress as the elected representatives of the American people to remain on the job to watch with ceaseless vigilance those day-to-day decisions which determine the course our Nation will take.

Entirely aside from the duty of Congress to stay in session to steady the hand of government lest we become involved in war, there remains much to be accomplished, much to be desired in the way of passing necessary legislation to adjust the internal affairs of our Nation. How can we say that the legislative program is completed when the other body has not been able to consider amendments to the Labor Relations Act which were of such import as to pass this House by a 2-to-1 majority? Is the legislative program completed when this House has not had the chance, because of other duties, to give consideration to the Hatch bill, which passed the Senate months ago? Is the legislative program completed when we have not taken action on highly necessary amendments to the wage and hour law? Is the legislative program completed when the transportation bill reposes in committee? I think the answer is perfectly obvious.

Congress cannot adjourn now nor can it take recesses which amount to practical adjournment without abandoning our clear and unmistakable obligations imposed upon us by the Constitution.

I wish to conclude my remarks by inviting the attention of the membership of this House to a splendid editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 20, 1940, which I ask leave to extend in the RECORD at this point.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 20, 1940]

DUTY OF CONGRESS—STAY ON THE JOB

Leaders of the Senate and House have been maneuvering to obtain a sine die adjournment of Congress by Saturday or early next week. Despite a strong bipartisan sentiment against the proposal, the dominant party seems able to muster enough votes to end the session. Because of the perilous foreign situation and the jeopardy in which it thrusts vital American interests, adjournment now would be a bad mistake.

Never within recent years has there been a more imperative need for Congress to remain at its desks. Not only have the Nation's legislative representatives a signal opportunity for serving their country by remaining in Washington, but we conceive it a distinct duty of Congress to stay in session.

Suppose it be assumed the "must" legislation can be rushed to completion during the next few days, as Senate Leader BARKLEY contends. That still would not free Congress from a grave responsibility, the obligation of deciding foreign policies and defense problems now in the mold.

Gigantic events are in the world balance. The complexion of American domestic affairs and international attitudes has been changing with stunning rapidity. The burden of shouldering responsibility in the face of such fluid and grave conditions belongs primarily to the Congress.

Only the administrative leadership of our Government rests upon the President. His is the duty to carry out policies that should be definitely fixed by a Senate and a House directly responsible to the people. Our founding fathers with full design set Congress as a check upon the Nation's President. In a period of world cataclysm, when the United States and her future may be threatened, it would seem the worst sort of folly to minimize that constitutional restraint.

The President has said the matter of adjournment is immaterial to him, but that he sees no reason for Congress to remain in session after its main work, or "must" legislation, is completed. Democratic leaders of both branches insist on adjournment. It is difficult to avoid the inference that the administration wants to get rid of Congress so the White House may have a free hand. It is that which we fear. The welfare of the Nation should not be left only in the hands of a President whose vagaries are so often alarming and weakening to confidence.

Recess during conventions and at other times when convenient could be arranged. But an adjournment would mean Congress could not reconvene without a Presidential summons. A democratic Government certainly should maintain democratic representation at Washington in such critical times. Congress has a moral mandate to stay on the job.

I Am An American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental principles of Americanism receive their vigor and reality from the individual allegiance of the citizens. Any sense of loyalty to our national institutions or any zeal for their preservation must find its source in a spirit of Americanism actuated by pride of citizenship.

DEVOTION IS NEEDED

Philosophies of government are barren creeds unless vitalized by a patriotic devotion to the national welfare. For the American, this devotion is expressed by his love of country, his dedication to its democratic processes, and his self-esteem in partaking of its citizenship. His national creed, transcending all political and partisan considerations, is summed up in the simple but stirring statement "I am an American."

Conscious of the high honors and the privileges of his station, he also realizes that it entails grave obligations. The duties of citizenship—American citizenship—require an unswerving devotion to all the noble traditions which have made America a great nation. One of the most important of these is the responsibility of participation with the ballot in elections. Far, far too many eligible voters fail to exercise this duty of franchise. No person should fail to cast his or her ballot at each opportunity.

All of our citizens should be prepared to wage the good fight for our national ideals; for, in the final analysis, a nation is no greater or stronger than is the sense of responsibility borne by its citizens for its continued existence.

CONCENTRATE AFFECTIONS

Every citizen, native-born or naturalized, should be proud to say "I am an American" and happy to shoulder the responsibility of preserving the blessings of peace and liberty that it entails.

Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago on the House floor I quoted a certain challenge uttered by the Father of his Country. We should always keep in mind those unforgettable words of George Washington, who said:

Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has the right to concentrate your affections.

Hugh Johnson Points Out Roosevelt Is Out of Tune With 85 Percent of All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the President's appointment of two of America's most outstanding warlike interventionists, Colonel Knox and Colonel Stimson, to his Cabinet has led editors and commentators, as well as many Senators and Congressmen of both parties, to include that he has definitely chosen to present the Democratic Party to the people of this country as the "war party" and that he is building for himself a war Cabinet from recruits enlisted from wherever he can find them.

In the following article Gen. Hugh S. Johnson points out vividly how completely out of step the President is with 85 percent of the people of America in his belligerent plans:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This long-suffering country is being deluded by a label—the word "isolationist." If your conviction is that this is no time to commit flagrant acts of war against Germany, then you are an "isolationist." That would be fair if the definition stopped there. But it doesn't. By a system of warmongering sloganeering that word tags you (1) as believing that "what happens in Europe is no concern of ours"; (2) as failing to see that the British Navy is holding and whittling the Nazis and therefore that we must ally our efforts with its own; (3) that we are Hitler's meat anyway, no matter whether we attack him or not, and, therefore, the more we do to hurt Hitler and help his enemies the more we are doing for our own defense; (4) which is just beginning to be said by extremists, that any contrary opinion is pro-Nazi pacificism.

This is bewildering bunk. I know of nobody now labeled and libeled as an "isolationist" who thinks that what happens in Europe is "no concern of ours"; nobody who is not aware that the more Hitler's enemies can do to impair his armed strength the less of a menace he will be; nobody who is not righteously and indignantly anti-Nazi; nobody who does not believe in rearmament for total defense. I know many who, like this writer, have clamored for it for years, while those who now shout "isolationist" and are so ready to send our men or ships abroad were like England and France, asleep at the switch, wasting in boondoggling nonsense our ample opportunity and rich resource to arm to defend ourselves and (it may have been) to keep the peace of the world.

The issues thus dragged in are clearly false. These cover criminal neglect of national safety by smearing those who were right while they were wrong with a senseless epithet—"isolationist."

There is only one genuine difference of opinion here. It is whether it is better for us to insure war now, when we are disgracefully unprepared, by committing outright such acts of war as neither Hitler's nor any other government could ignore—or whether it is better to maintain our independence while we intensify our efforts to get into a position of impregnable defense. I think the former course is suicidal crapshooting with the destiny of our democracy.

An honest skeptic asks me why Germany would stand idle while America arms? That is a fair question going to the heart of the issue.

A favorite saying of Napoleon's was: "Empires always die of indigestion." Mr. Hitler has swallowed more in a shorter time than any other conqueror. Overseas campaigns, 3,000 miles away, are not undertaken without vast painstaking preparation. The kinds of military, naval, and air force adaptable to the overthrow of next-door neighbors by mechanical "blitzkrieg" are not at all adaptable to such an unprecedented effort—and Hitler has never yet gone off half cocked and unprepared.

Even with complete European conquest he has a tremendous job of consolidation, reorganization, and repair before he could willingly and with true Teutonic thoroughness undertake any such campaign so far away.

I'll admit that there is some element of gamble in this assertion, but it is an intelligent gamble with all odds long in its favor. Nothing we can now contribute will decide the war abroad. If we use the time probably available to us to put ourselves in a posture of real defense, our safety is 10 times more certain. But there is no

gamble at all if we insist on war by carrying it to Hitler now—when we have little for attack and no land and air defense.

That is the only issue. All the rest is fake "flub dub." The Republican task of platform writing is chiefly to make that issue clear—"complete preparedness—no war now." That is the hope and belief of 85 percent of our people. It is not the belief of this administration.

Alien Registration Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress is finally about to write into law H. R. 5138. This bill expresses the sentiment of the people of the United States and represents a clear, clean, and studied effort to deal with the alien and subversive elements in our country. Pursuant to the authority granted I desire to incorporate herein some thoughts expressed on this subject in a Flag Day address recently delivered by me, which seems appropriate on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the mere appropriation and expenditure of huge sums of money alone will never achieve thorough national defense. Preparedness means something more than merely building implements of war. It involves the revitalization of the moral, spiritual, physical, and patriotic fiber of our people. It means the development of an intense nationalism, love of country, sacrifice, and constant and eternal vigilance against the sinister and subtle influences of those who would destroy us from within. Is there a man or woman in this country today who dares deny the existence of a treasonable conspiracy in our Nation which is directed, fostered, and in large part financed from abroad, and which has for its ultimate objective the overthrow of our Government by force and violence? Recent disclosures have demonstrated beyond successful contradiction that un-American groups proclaiming foreign ideologies have received and continue to receive great sums of money and instructions from abroad to undermine and destroy, if possible, our democratic institutions and our republican system of government.

We stand here today appalled by the frightful destruction of life and property abroad. Yet while we stand staring in dread, while millions of mothers' sons are being butchered on the altar of hate and greed, our institutions at home are being disturbed and upset by the appalling gall and effrontery of groups who are permitted to stand in public places and defend the ideals of foreign nations and urge that such ideologies should replace our own. I can recall that when I have repeatedly called attention to the organization and the efforts of these haters of democracy, I have been called a "red" baiter by the Communist fringe. Others, convinced that a nation of 130,000,000 people need not be alarmed over the activities of a few Communists, Fascists, or Nazis, have been content to stick their heads under the sands of self-complacency and do nothing to abate the nuisance. They have said, "Why be alarmed and pay attention to a few lice?" Let me call attention to the fact, however, that a louse or a flea or a rat can carry a plague. A tapeworm can starve an athlete, and those who sleep with dogs may expect to wake up with fleas.

Russia is today ruled by a few Stalinists. In Germany a small minority seized the Government. A comparatively few "black shirts" took possession of Italy. Why, my fellow citizens, should we in the face of present conditions here at home consider ourselves immune? Why should we as a people stand idly by and, under the spell of 150 years of living under our Constitution and Bill of Rights, see slanders, lies, vilification, sabotage, fraud, and even murder committed under our very eyes and do nothing to report or prevent it?

I have come to the belief that such tolerance of intolerant traitors is in itself a species of treason, and that he who spends his time pleading the cause of communism, fascism, or nazi-ism, or any other foreign "isms," is un-American and unfit to longer be entitled to claim the protection of the rights he so boldly and blatantly seeks to destroy.

I deeply and firmly believe in jealously guarding the human liberties guaranteed under our Bill of Rights, and I will ever vigorously defend the right of every citizen who owes allegiance to the United States to advocate political, social, or economic change. That is one of the foundations and cornerstones of our Republic, but, my fellow citizens, I have come to the conclusion that if we are to survive as a Republic, in a world dominated by ruthless dictators, we must vigorously and definitely begin to draw the line. I have reluctantly concluded that we have let the foreign saboteurs perform within our country long enough. We have permitted them to preach their hideous gospel undeterred and unrestrained. We have allowed them to march through our streets, flaunt their red banner of tyranny. We have heard them denounce our Government and its officers. We have seen them stealthily and by misrepresentation and fraud worm their slimy way into labor organizations and into important positions in the Government service. We have seen them wreck business, stimulate discord, and promote racial prejudices. We have seen them deny God and the Christian doctrine. We have seen their utter and complete disregard of truth, common honesty, and decency. We have seen them take false names, deny their secret foreign allegiance, practice sabotage, character assassination, and vilification. We have seen them ensnare unsuspecting and decent citizens into so-called front organizations whose secret propaganda, despite the melodious character of their announcements, is to destroy us. We have seen their bloody purges, the stamping out of human rights, the denial of free speech, free press, and assembly. We have seen them destroy organizations of labor and fraternity, and in spite of all this, there are still those among us who would substitute such governments for our own, there are still those among us, some in high places, who continue to coddle and cater to them.

What a spectacle. Mr. Speaker, if a God-fearing American challenges such a program or rises to protest, such aliens in our midst or such natives of alien sympathy, shriek and scream for the protection of "civil rights" under the very Constitution they are trying to destroy. Tragic indeed is the situation when alien and native-born men and women, many occupying strategic positions in our Government, in our churches, schools, and colleges, men and women who may be otherwise sane and humane, unwittingly add their wails to the chorus of the Nation's traitors and help hold the protective mantle of civil liberties and civil rights about them.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

> If there be among us those would wish to dissolve this Union or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Thus a great liberal spoke. Thus many well-intentioned people speak today. Their cry is that the Constitution protects them in their right to speak, and they claim no harm can come if democracy has an answer. History records, however, that Jefferson was charged by some of his contemporaries with vindictiveness in his efforts to try to mete out punishment to Aaron Burr, whom Jefferson conceived to be a traitor to his country. In the face of the realities that confronted Jefferson at that time and in answer to his critics, Jefferson complained bitterly against granting—

> impunity to that class of offenders which endeavors to overturn the Constitution and are themselves protected in it by the Constitution.

In further protest, Jefferson said of Burr:

> The criminal is preserved to become the rallying point of all the disaffected and the worthless of the United States and to be the pivot on which all the intrigue and conspiracies which foreign governments may wish to disturb us with, are to turn.

Mr. Speaker, apply that doctrine to present-day conditions. In our simple desire to be fair, to be tolerant, and to enforce a strict technical interpretation of the Bill of Rights, are we not being foolish and silly? What would happen in any foreign nation today were Americans to go abroad and organize alien societies, publish newspapers, pamphlets, hold public meetings, conduct secret drills, wear uniforms, spit on flags, denounce the government and its rulers? You and I know they would last just long enough to face a firing squad or to be transported to a living death in some remote concentration camp.

In America, however, we are not only asked to tolerate the same conditions, but to protect them in an impudence almost greater than treason. How long, I ask you, shall we allow this situation to prevail? You know and I know that the alien purveyors of hate and treason in America are determined to tear down the Stars and Stripes from every masthead and to nail in its place the red emblem of Moscow or the swastika of nazi-ism, both of which flags, despite anything to the contrary belief, are joined together in a common purpose and symbolize a murderous, tryannical despotism. If such a crisis shall ever come to America, be it through the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist technique, mark you well, gone will be our liberties, gone our religious freedom, gone individual initiative, gone our Republic. Free speech, free press, free assembly, collective bargaining, religion, or economic freedom has no place in the totalitarian philosophy. Men and women and children become the conscripted vassals of the state.

My fellow Americans, we are at the crossroads, and the efforts of a free people to defend their liberties cannot longer be stalled and scuttled by the treasonable actions of any subversive minority. We have been patient long enough. The time is here for a housecleaning. The time is here now to stand up and be counted. I thank God that the American people are finally aroused and that grim determination is evidenced on all sides to protect and defend our Nation. With the democracies of the world being crushed and wiped out one by one, have we as a people not only the right but the solemn duty to demand that the enemies of our country among us, who insist upon preaching their ghastly doctrine, theories, and gospels, shall be rounded up and sent back to the countries they so ardently profess to love? In the midst of the perils that confront us, however, let us not give vent to unreasoning emotions. Let us be calm, sympathetic, and understanding, but, above all else, let us be firm in our resolve to take from this occasion an inspiration for a high ideal of citizenship. Let us be guarded and careful in our actions, lest there be an attempt to cast aspersions upon honest, decent citizens or aliens whose love of this country may be as deep as that of any native-born. Let us beware that in our zeal we shall not stop or curb the expression of intelligent and patriotic thought designed to carry us along the road toward economic freedom. Let us, above all, think in terms of the welfare of America and its problems, and let us take the Stars and Stripes from those who would trample upon it and unfurl it from every masthead in the land and proclaim to the world that liberty and justice, guarded by a free people, lives and carries on.

Alien Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1940, I addressed the House on the subject of War Propaganda and Alien Agents. At that time I brought to the attention of this Congress the serious situation resulting from the spread of war propaganda in this country. I pointed out that under an act of Congress approved June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631) every person who is now an agent of a foreign principal disseminating propaganda in the United States must file with the Secretary of State a registration statement under oath giving certain information about himself and his principal. At that time I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the list of agents so registered with the Secretary of State, together with the names of the foreign principals, the nature of the agent's business, the compensation, and the agent's nationality. As of March 19, 1940, there were 363 such agents registered with the Secretary of State. As of June 6, 1940, there were 23 additional registrations, making a total of 386 agents now registered in the office of the Secretary of State.

I am now inserting the additional 23 statements of registration made in accordance with the act of June 8, 1938, as amended, requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals. It must be noted that under the rules and regulations issued under this act, Department of State publication 1370, subagents are not considered subject to the requirement of registration.

PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS REGISTERED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE PURSUANT TO THE ACT OF JUNE 8, 1938, AS AMENDED, REQUIRING THE REGISTRATION OF AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS—SUPPLEMENTAL LIST AS OF JUNE 6, 1940

French News Service, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Presidency of the council of the French Republic, office of French Prime Minister. News service; to help American news agencies, newspapers, picture agencies, moving-picture companies, broadcasting companies, and educational institutions in obtaining from France news, current information, background information, photographs, and film. French News Service is financed by an appropriation from the budget of the presidency of the council of the French Republic. French.

American Bureau for Medical Aid to China, Inc., 57 William Street, New York, N. Y. American Bureau for Medical Aid to China; an independent agency. Humanitarian work, similar to Red Cross organization in United States (representative of Red Cross Society of China). Humanitarian, no compensation. United States.

Chinese Council for Economic Research, 1410 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. Independent—no direction or orders from any foreign source. Conducts survey in Far East, publishes bulletins; purpose to study and conduct surveys of financial and economic conditions in the Far East and to prepare bulletins and monographs embodying the results of this research and study. Accepts contributions. United States corporation.

James J. Lenihan, 512–522 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. Government of Norway. Attorney in case of *Christoffer Hannevig* v. *United States*. Fifty thousand dollars retainer fee—$25,000 received October 1938, remaining $25,000 contingent upon award in favor of Norwegian Government. United States citizen.

Carl Adolf Torstensen, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Government of Norway; attorney for Government; $50 a day plus traveling expenses. Norwegian.

James P. Selvage and Fred Smith, 16 East Forty-eighth Street, New York, N. Y.; Minister of Finland (Otis T. Wingo, representative in Washington, Finnish Legation); publicity and public relations; $1,500 a month. American.

Workers' Library Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, Manhattan, New York, N. Y.; representatives of several foreign publishing firms, London, Stockholm, and Moscow; publish, sell, and distribute books, pamphlets, and periodicals in English language, covering in the main social and economic and political questions; no contract of employment. New York corporation.

International Publishers Co., Inc., 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Lawrence & Wishart, Ltd., London, England; Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, Kuznetsky Most, Moscow; publishers (distributors of publications), publication, purchase, and sale of books and pamphlets; no written contracts. American.

General Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., of Greece, 8–10 Bridge Street, New York, N. Y.; Steamship Navigation Co., Ltd., of Greece (Greek line); general transportation (between Greece and United States), advertising; general agency contract; general agency for foreign principal.

French Book Selection Club, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Societie Nouvelle Sequana, publishers of Voici; book club and United States representative for Societie Nouvelle Sequana, publishers; percentage on books published. American corporation.

Artkino Pictures, 723 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. Soyuzintorgkino, distributors of Soviet films. Distributors of Soviet films in America; purchase equipment for motion-picture industry of Soviet Union. No compensation listed. American.

Daily Publishing Co., Inc., 50 East Thirteenth Street, New York, N. Y. No foreign principal. Foreign cable news service. Set forth sources of foreign cable news received from (1) United Press; (2) Runag (Rundschau, Deta Verlag AG); (3) Agence France-Monde. Gathering and dispensing news. No contract of employment. United Press pays approximately $223 per month compensation. New York corporation.

Polish Information Center, 151 East Sixty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. Government of Republic of Poland. Government work—supplying information on Poland; Polish history; cultural

attainments and aiding study of facts about Poland. On government budget. Polish.

Spanish Library of Information, 2 East Thirty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. National Press Bureau (foreign division) which is a branch of the Department of Interior of Government of Spain. Maintenance of a library—dissemination through publication and distribution of magazines, books, pamphlets, bulletins and press releases; news and ideas concerning or relating to government, trade, commerce, and other industries; people and culture of Spain and development and promotion of commercial and cultural relations therewith. No compensation listed; expenses paid by foreign principal. Resident agent in charge of registrant's activities is Javier Gayton de Ayala. Spanish.

Atherton & Currier, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. French National Railroads; French Government Tourist Bureau; General Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., of Greece. Promotion of tourist trade to France. Steamship and tourist trade to Greece; general advertising. Advertising commission basis. American corporation.

John Edward Alexander Dyason, room 409-B, Hartford Building, Union Square, New York, N. Y. Attorney for Edward Dyason & Co., correspondent for Austral-Asiatic Bulletin, to carry on business of share brokers and investment operations—buying and selling securities—both for personal account and others; to advise as to the operation of security holding; also correspondent for Austral-Asiatic Bulletin and attorney for Edward Dyason & Co.; £350 per annum from Edward Dyason & Co. until June 30, 1940. British subject by birth, citizen of Commonwealth of Australia.

American Express Co., 65 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Panama National Tourist Commission. A Panamanian Government agency promoting tourist travel to and in Panama. Registrant carries on a traveler's check and money-order business; a foreign-shipping business; also world-wide service which includes sale of air, rail, and steamship tickets, hotel reservations, etc. No formal contract—$18,000 contributed to advertising fund for 2 years by Panama National Tourist Commission. New York corporation.

Four Continent Book Corporation, 255 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. The All-Union Combine Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). Importing and exporting periodicals, magazines, newspapers, books, etc., and upon information and belief, publishing of periodicals and sale in domestic market. Contract basis, commission. New York corporation.

Hans Olav, Norwegian Legation, Washington, D. C. The Norwegian Government, Oslo, Norway. Government business; press representative of Norwegian Government, to supply newspapers and periodicals with items of current news interest about Norway; $425 a month. Norwegian.

Kurt B. Prinz sur Lippe, care of German consulate general, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif. German consulate general in San Francisco, Calif.; consular representative of Germany; German lecturer and interpreter of events and conflicts in Europe, which activity will be stopped with the ending of the war or if general circumstances will change in such a way as to endanger registrant's status as an immigrant. Compensation, expenses $60 to $100 per month; oral contract. German.

Anastassios Anastasakos, consulate general of Greece, New York, N. Y. Magazine Neolaia, and Touristic Greece, Athens, Greece; National Youth Association of Greece. Educational purpose, to advertise the two Greek magazines of an educational character and make subscriptions. No compensation listed. Greek.

World Tourists, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Twenty-four steamship lines listed (not considered foreign principals within the intendment of the statute); steamship companies selling steamship, railroad, and air passage, and promotion of tourist travel; general passenger travel agency. Commission basis. New York corporation.

Ask Mr. Foster Travel Service, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. South African Railway and Harbors. Operation of transportation facilities in South Africa; dissemination of information regarding travel facilities; $850 for contract year. Domestic corporation.

One Woman's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in this period of international excitement and the hysteria that is spreading throughout the country as a result of recent developments in the European war, I desire to present for the consideration of the Members of the House an article entitled "One Woman's Opinion," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of June 19, 1940, and was written by Mrs. Walter Ferguson. The subject is What Shall We Do in the Present European Conflict?

ONE WOMAN'S OPINION
(By Mrs. Walter Ferguson)

Almost overnight, Time magazine reports, letters to the editor took on a fighting tone. Pacifist, isolationist sentiment is dying. The drums sound over the land, and away we go—marching off to war.

It is evident that pressure amounting to strong-arm methods is thrusting us toward the "glory road." Into the horrible maelstrom we'll plunge unless a miracle saves us, and out we shall be spewed some day, shamed, repentant, broke, seeing all too clearly what we cannot see now—that our hand struck the death blow to democracy.

Under the guise of saving it abroad, we shall again become involved in the ageless, hopeless conflict in Europe which has seesawed back and forth for centuries. One hundred and thirty million Americans will deliberately walk into the slaughterhouse, and what a headache we'll have when the orgy comes to an end—as all wars sometimes must.

Then, once more, we shall hear the preachers proclaiming the pacifist creed, editors denouncing profiteers, politicians, and warmongers, while taxpayers with pockets rifled and sons dead, will swear, as they did in 1919, to fight no more on foreign soil.

The program never changes, nor ever will, I suppose, so long as our evangelistic spirit survives.

"Do you think," screams Dorothy Thompson, "that the United States of America can stand aloof from the vicissitudes of the world?"

Sure not! The vicissitudes, as well as the harebrained idiocies of the world, we make our main business. Our money went to Europe in a stream to rebuild cities that are now laid waste again after 20 years. According to Dr. Hans Zinsser, whose book, As I Remember Him, is just off the press, Herbert Hoover spent $50,000,000 in Russia right after the Romanoffs fell, to set up a health program which the Leninites could hardly wait to stamp out after they got rid of our Angels of Mercy.

Certainly the vicissitudes of the world are our meat; one only wonders whether we may not one of these days bite off more than we can chew.

In dealing with the European nations, Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling we should follow one course or the other—actively participate in running the affairs of the European countries and do our part in preventing war or refrain from taking any part in their controversies and conflicts. If we are to take an active part in European affairs, then we must act the part of a good fire department and devote our energies to fire—war—prevention and not rush into a disaster in an attempt to suppress the fire after we have neglected or refused to take any part in its prevention.

Coal and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Louis Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of War, before the Twenty-sixth Fuel Engineering Conference, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., Friday evening, June 21, 1940:

Partners in national defense, behind Germany's blitzkrieg against the armed forces of her adversaries is a definite plan to isolate, if necessary, to destroy, but preferably, to seize the industrial facilities of her enemies. In Czechoslovakia it was the Skoda Works that she desired; in Poland, it was the so-called industrial triangle that she wanted. In Holland, a primary objective was its factories. In Belgium and northern France it was the coal and iron deposits that she especially coveted. In each case, the capture or the destruction of the industrial areas hastened success on the military front.

If the soldier is the brain of modern war, industry has become its brawn. Today, the productive capacity of continental Europe is entirely at the disposal of Germany. A totalitarian regime backed up by this industrial might, to say nothing of the possibilities of other accretions as a result of future victories, makes Germany the most powerful military machine in all history.

The next objective of the Nazi regime apparently is the British Islands. Its final destination? Who knows? Whatever itinerary it has planned it must not include the Western Hemisphere. Neither by hostile invasion nor by peaceful infiltration must it be allowed to penetrate this continent. The duty to keep America free of its dire influences, humanity squarely has put up to us. We have men, potential soldiers whose equal for innate intelligence and skill even Germany could hardly find. We have machines, potential munitions plants whose match for precision and production even the mighty Nazi totalitarian regime could hardly develop. But note I said potential—potential soldiers—potential munitions plants—and what we need are actual soldiers today and actual plants today.

It takes time to get these sinews of battle, and time is our greatest need. Yesterday, last week, last month, last year, we had time. We did not make full use of it. It is gone, and there is no use trying to account for it now. We can and must exert, however, every effort to make up for lost time, the time we had to convert existing facilities from peacetime pursuits to the production of armament; the time to erect and develop new factories; the time to train labor and management in the art of munitions manufacture; the time to convert money into arms and equipment. We may not be able to conquer time completely, but if our entire Nation puts its shoulder to the wheel, we can hand it some mighty licks. We can yet lift ourselves bodily from the quicksands of military impotency and gain the firm ground of adequate national defense.

In our hour of need, American industry must come to our assistance, not only as it did a generation ago, but with even greater speed and efficiency. Today there is no munitions industry such as we had on April 6, 1917, as a result of extensive orders from the Allies, and even then it took a year to go into high gear. Today, no comparable armament plants exist in the United States, and the time element is even more acute. In these days of week-end "blitzkriegs," a year has become a decade; and the corresponding responsibility upon industry even more serious.

In the hands of the coal industry of America rests a large part of this responsibility. You, perhaps, hold the destiny of civilization. Yesterday this statement may have seemed fantastic, but today I feel sure that all of you realize that my remark is neither facetious nor in any sense an exaggeration. Coal is indispensable to industry. Industry is indispensable to munitions. Munitions are indispensable to victory in battle. Coal, indeed, may become the arbiter in America's preparedness program. With the coal industry of America, therefore, primarily rests the future of this country, and with it the preservation of world civilization.

What does civilization demand of America today? Briefly, to be strong, to save it, if need be, from its enemies. To be strong, America must at the very minimum acquire without delay a force adequate to defend the Western Hemisphere on land, on sea, and in the air. It must be prepared to prevent the establishment of bases in any of the American republics by an aggressor nation from Europe, from Asia, or from either or both directions. It must be able to concentrate men, properly equipped with the latest and most modern weapons and thoroughly trained in their use, at such points and in such numbers as will frustrate all marauders. It must be prepared to police our contiguous waters against modern pirates. It must insulate this hemisphere from Greenland to the Argentine; from Alaska to Chile against force rampant. To this objective, our country is now fully committed.

To accomplish this end, our program must include not only the raising, organizing, and training of our man power, but also the furnishing of these forces with adequate supplies and equipment. Our governmental plants, arsenals, and depots are wholly inadequate for this purpose. They were designed basically for experimental purposes rather than for the mass production of munitions. We are equipping them with the best of modern machinery and expanding their operations to maximum capacity, but we cannot hope to obtain more than 10 percent of our defense requirements from this source.

For the great majority of our indispensable munitions, including such items as steel, aluminum, radios, fire-control instruments, airplanes, machine guns, ammunition, shovels, trucks, tents, medical supplies, and some 70,000 other items, we must have recourse to American industry at large. Contracts are being placed with all possible dispatch, and within a few weeks the wheels of hundreds of manufacturing plants all over this country will be turning toward a stronger America.

Thousands of other factories have been surveyed by the War and Navy Departments. Their owners and their managers know what the Nation will expect of them in case the emergency becomes more acute. All of them appreciate, as does the War Department, that their ability to produce the required munitions within the necessary time in turn will depend in large measure upon the availability of coal.

During the last World War, coal became a major factor in the struggle. With the aid of their own mines and those within the occupied territory of Belgium and northern France, the Central Powers were able to maintain their munitions front for more than 4 years against an apparently impossible assembly of industrial strength. By furnishing coal freely to the neutral nations that supported her war efforts, and by curtailing the supply to those who favored Germany, Great Britain made use of her coal as a measure short of war to achieve her ends. Truly it became black gold, and far more potent than the yellow metal.

During the past year we again have noted that coal plays a vital role in the fate of nations. Germany made positive use of it to support an industrial war effort on a scale never before conceived by man. England vainly tried to use it in the negative manner, in the style of 1914–18. She was still fighting the present war in terms of the last. She was placing reliance on the passive measures of denying coal and other materials to the enemy and to neutrals as a means of warfare. Today France is on her knees. England has her back to the wall.

To us the lesson should be obvious. It transcends all other developments of the past 10 months. The enormous coal resources of this country must be capable of conversion promptly into sinews of war. Procrastination and delay must be sidetracked and our munitions program be given a clear track ahead.

That we may profit by our own errors of a generation ago, as well as by those of the Allies today, let us briefly examine our score in the last World War.

Most of us recall all too vividly the heatless and lightless nights of 1917–18. Think of it. The greatest coal deposits in the world beneath our hills, and the specter of famine throughout the land. Unlike Germany, we had no storage of national resources. Unlike England, we did not lack labor to remove it from the earth. Yet we found it most difficult to keep our wheels turning and our people warm during those critical months.

The difficulty lay not in production, but in distribution. The flow from the mine continued steady, but transportation could not be found to move it to the consumer. Our railroads became glutted with the precious mineral. Our industrial wheels locked, slowed, and all but stopped. The situation became so serious that the operations of some industries were suspended by Government order so that the flow of coal to essential points might be expedited.

In 1917 America was unprepared on its industrial front. We were without plans of any kind to meet the problems arising from fuel and transportation. Once the war was upon us, means necessarily had to be improvised in the midst of ever-increasing demands. Existing plants were expanded, new facilities were erected, and thousands of new wheels began to turn.

New wheels meant more transportation. More transportation meant more rolling stock, more terminal facilities, and more coal. With increased demand, prices began to rise. Coal tripled in value in 6 months. Disastrous competition existed among the Allies, between these cobelligerents, and our own Government, among the many procurement agencies of our armed services, and throughout industry itself. The speculator had a field day.

Finally the unprecedented severity of the winter of 1917–18 created an additional demand for coal and blocked transportation to a degree never before encountered in our history.

We met the emergency by makeshift methods. We had time to blunder through. No one here tonight believes that we ever again will be accorded such an opportunity to learn by trial and error.

I assure you that we have learned not only from our experience in the last war but from the current examples in Europe. The confused efforts of 1917 will not be repeated. Our industrial mobilization program is up to date, and has been subjected to scrutiny and corrective suggestions from all walks of our national life. We are confident that our plans are both practical and adequate.

Not the least benefit derived from these mutual studies has been the promotion of understanding between the armed services and industry. A generation ago the War Department and the manufacturer had scarcely a speaking acquaintance. Today each fully appreciates the problems of the other. With the best of cooperation they are making a united effort to promote prompt achievement of national security.

By the recent establishment of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, the President has taken a vital step toward applying the best talent in America to the solution of our industrial problems. Their names are well known to you; their abilities proved by their attainments. With the aid of such competent and outstanding leaders, our munitions objective, I am confident, will be quickly realized and our precarious position of material weakness corrected in full measure.

Aggressor nations know that America has the economic resources to achieve ultimate victory. But they likewise know that time and unstinted energy alone can transform our heritage of wealth into munitions. Lost time we cannot recover, but we can make it up in part by increased and concentrated effort. With the advice and assistance of the Advisory Commission, I feel certain that the necessary impetus will be forthcoming and that we will overwhelmingly defeat the time element.

There may be some among you who still hope, rather than believe, that "it can't happen here." I sincerely, and we all sincerely, hope and pray that it won't happen here. But I believe that we are all agreed that it might happen here.

We must not gamble away our national destiny nor the destiny of civilization on mere conjecture. There is, at the very least, a definite threat to our existence as a free people. The Nation must be made impregnable to all foreign assaults without delay.

On Saturday, June 15, the board of directors of the National Coal Association, in convention at White Sulphur Springs, sent the President of the United States a significant telegram. In it they pledged their whole-hearted cooperation in event of an emergency and expressed their confidence in their ability to keep the wheels of industry turning. That is the sort of united support which must and will be forthcoming from all groups of American industry if we are to build a wall of steel around this continent.

Build it we must, and build it so high and so strong that all aggressor nations will forever be denied access to that last great bulwark of democracy—our Western Hemisphere.

The Danger of Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this article in the RECORD because, although it was carried in the Hearst papers and in the Washington Times-Herald, it is pertinent at this time, when other papers are trying to lead this Nation into another foolish war.

Let us keep our feet on the ground and look at this from a purely realistic viewpoint.

China has been in a chaotic state since the merchants of England introduced opium to the Chinese. This was under the benevolent aid of the international bankers. China has not had an army since the days of Genghis Khan. After that war they built a wall and forgot the world. They had no factories to build airplanes, war machinery, ammunition, or any of those things that are required by a well-groomed war machine. They have no regulated agricultural industries but, instead, farm as all orientals do—on a sort of family or individual plan. There are very few industries in China, and the mineral and other natural wealth has not been developed. Their cities are built to great extent of wood and in such manner that they are not protected from fire hazards. There has been no unity in China since the Boxer War and no effort by anyone to establish a sound and sane government. China has been ruled by chiefs or leaders of clans, who have been at odds with each other for many, many years.

China has no commerce, no ships, no navy, or anything afloat to provide protection for her coast line. In other words, the 400,000,000 people in China, while they are wonderful people, a people whom I admire and for whom I have the greatest respect, have not been in a position to protect themselves from invasion by anyone but have, instead, left themselves open to exploitation by every European nation. England and France were the two greatest offenders until Japan was bitten by the bee of conquest.

In spite of all this unpreparedness and defenseless condition, Japan today, after 3 years, operating with modern war machinery, with the aid of the United States and with the aid of European nations, has not been able to conquer China.

In view of this failure of Japan, will anyone in his right senses believe for one moment that any European dictator can conquer the world? This is particularly true if you bear in mind that such conquest must be conducted over 3,000 or more miles of water. Venturing a guess, I would say that invasion of England may prove too costly for the German command and that, if attempted, it may end in the same fiasco as the English invasion of Norway, the entente invasion of Gallipoli, and the Napoleonic invasion of Russia.

Let us therefore be calm and serene, for, as I have said before, when the European war is over, no one will be able to make any attack or attempt at invasion for many, many years.

The constant propaganda to instill fear of invasion is a smoke screen to divert public attention from trouble within our own Nation and from the international financiers who fear that their power to dominate the world gold will be destroyed should the Bank of England lose this war.

HITLER DISCLAIMS ANY DESIRE TO INVADE THIS HEMISPHERE—TERMS "FIFTH COLUMN" FEARS AS STUPID; DENIES AIM TO SMASH BRITISH EMPIRE

The Times-Herald is privileged to present herewith the first interview to be given a foreign journalist by Adolf Hitler since the beginning of the present German campaign. This remarkable interview by Karl von Wiegand is published not only as a matter of newspaper enterprise, but of historical importance. Readers, of course, will remember that Hitler is an artful advocate of his own cause.

(By Karl H. von Wiegand, chief foreign correspondent of the Hearst newspapers and for 28 years outstanding American political observer in Europe and the Far East)

WITH THE GERMAN ARMIES NEARING PARIS, June 14.—"The Americas to Americans, Europe to the Europeans."

This reciprocal basic Monroe Doctrine, mutually observed, declared Adolf Hitler to me here, not only would insure peace for all times between the Old and New Worlds, but would be a most ideal foundation for peace throughout the whole world.

In caustic language, with scorn and indignation, he denounced "the lies" that he has or ever had in "dream or thought" played with the faintest idea of interfering in the Western Hemisphere by any manner or means.

He characterized America's fears of him or Germany as most flattering but "childish and grotesque," and the whole idea of the possibility of the invasion of the United States from Europe by sea, air, or the mythical "fifth column" as "stupid and fantastic."

DOESN'T INTEND TO ATTACK PARIS

With his great German war machine, whose amazing perfection of organization, strength, strategical, and tactical leadership has startled the world, now on the edge of Paris, Hitler told me he had "no intention of attacking the beautiful French capital if it remains an open city like Brussels."

Vehemently the Fuehrer denied he ever had or even now has, as a war aim, the smashing of the British Empire.

He spoke most warmly of Premier Mussolini and welcomed Italy's entrance in the comradeship of arms.

A plane picked me up in the airport of a city where sirens, the deep baying of antiaircraft guns, and dull explosions which sounded like bombs had awakened me after midnight. I was so tired that I did not care what happened and I went to sleep again in the plane.

RECEIVED BY RIBBENTROP

We landed in a field. Then there were hours of motoring in an open car in the blazing sun. The German Foreign Minister received me in the large chateau headquarters of a division general with a peppery name, just behind the left wing of the German front.

I had an interesting talk with the Foreign Minister. After talking with him, a German general and another member of the general staff, I was driven by car many more miles to the rendezvous with the Fuehrer.

Hitler dashed up in a six-wheeled open car, sitting beside the chauffeur, with the second car following. There was a clicking of heels and an outstretching of arms in salute.

Von Ribbentrop greeted him at the entrance.

It is 2 years since my last talk with Hitler.

Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, Dr. Dietrich, Minister Schmidt, Counselor of the Legation Hewell, and others were present.

The Fuehrer had insisted on formulating his replies to my questions in writing. These in hand, he discussed them for nearly an hour.

MONROE DOCTRINE VIEW

He began with America's attitude toward Germany and his attitude toward America.

"Germany is one of the few countries which hitherto has refrained from interfering in any way in America," he wanted to remind me.

"At no time has Germany had any territorial or political interest in the American continent," Hitler declared.

Then, with rising voice:

"Nor has Germany any such interest now. Whoever states anything to the contrary is lying deliberately for some purpose.

"How the American continent shapes and leads its life is no concern of mine, and of no interest to Germany.

"And that, let me say, holds good not only for North America but equally so for South America.

"But let me observe this. I do not believe that a doctrine such as proclaimed by your President Monroe can be interpreted to have been or to be a unilateral claim to nonintervention.

"Actually the purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, I believe, was not only conceived and proclaimed to prevent European countries from interfering in the Americas (which England, with her great territorial and political interests in America, keeps doing) but likewise to restrain America from interfering or mixing in European affairs."

UNITED STATES "NOT MY BUSINESS"

"George Washington's own warning to the American people confirms the logic and reasonableness of such interpretation.

"Therefore, I say, America for Americans—Europe for Europeans."

Asked how he viewed America's rearmament program at this time, as announced and advocated by President Roosevelt, Hitler said:

"In answering that question I shall once more apply the Monroe Doctrine and therefore refrain from expressing my opinion or views on the United States' armament program.

"America's arming is none of my business. I am in no way interested in it.

"I, myself, have been compelled to carry out the greatest armament program the world has ever seen, so that I, for one, am in a position to distinguish very well indeed between colorful fabulations and the real possibilities or practicabilities. There seem to be some fanciful views on that subject."

UNITED STATES CAN'T HELP ALLIES

I tried to feel out the Fuehrer on America's matériel sales to the Allies.

"America's intervention in the European war in the way of mass deliveries of aircraft and other war matériels cannot affect the outcome of this conflict," declared the Fuehrer with emphatic finality.

"It is not necessary for me to give my reasons for this in detail. In the end reality will decide."

I touched upon the "fifth column," which seems to have fired the imagination of many countries.

REPLY IS SARCASTIC

With a touch of sarcasm Hitler said:

"The so-called 'fifth column' conveys nothing to me because it doesn't exist except in the imagination of fantastic minds or as a phantom created by unscrupulous propaganda for obvious purposes. If competent governments drive their peoples into war and they then experience pitiable collapse, it is understandable that they prefer to shift the responsibility elsewhere.

BLAMES POLITICIANS

"The main object of this propaganda slogan is to find a collective term for the internal opposition which, of course, exists in all countries. It is composed of extreme nationalists, internationally minded Communists, pacifists, and others opposed to war.

"Since politicians of those countries are unable to deal with their opposition decently, they proceed by accusing those elements of high treason, cloak their illegal methods with patriotic arguments, and motivate their action morally in the eyes of the world by applying the hair-raising term 'fifth column.'

"Our opponents are going to lose the war because their military organizations are bad, their leadership worse, and their conduct of the war in many instances disastrous."

Again and again Hitler emphasized that it was England which declared war against Germany on "ridiculous, stupid pretexts," adding:

"Germany will win the war because the German people know their cause is just and they know what they are fighting for and because the German military organization and leadership is better. We shall win because we have the best army and the best equipment."

WOULD "PROTECT" BRITAIN

Was it one of his aims to destroy the British Empire, I asked him?

"It never has been my aim or intention to destroy the British Empire," the Fuehrer vigorously declared. "On the contrary, just before the outbreak of this war, which I reiterate was launched by Britain and France, I submitted proposals to the British Government wherein I went to the length of offering the armed assistance of the Reich for safeguarding the British Empire.

"My offer was scorned.

"I have asked nothing of England beyond that Germany should be considered and treated as an equal, that England would protect the German coast if Germany became involved in war and that I be given German colonies—and I will get them.

"Openly it was declared and printed in London that national socialism must be destroyed, that Germany must be broken up, utterly disarmed and made powerless.

"Never have I voiced any such aims or intentions against Britain."

ASKS FREEDOM OF SEAS

"When battle after battle went against England the rulers in London appealed to America with tears in their eyes, declaring Germany is menacing and seeking to break up the British Empire.

"One thing, it is true, is going to be destroyed. That is the capitalistic clique which was and still is prepared to sacrifice millions of human lives for their mean, petty, personal interests.

"And that, I am convinced, will not be done by me but by their own people."

The Fuehrer declared this war certainly would scrap the British system of sea control as now exercised by England, and that that would be a great blessing to the world in the future.

"The freedom of the seas which Germany has in mind is the absolutely indisputable right of all nonbelligerents to use the seas in trade between themselves unconditionally, without being subject to any control by the warring powers," he said.

Hitler added that laws that would really restrict a blockade to the coasts of warring countries would not be affected by such a common-sense change.

DISCUSSES MEDITERRANEAN

The Fuehrer declared Germany has "neither territorial nor political interest in the Mediterranean," continuing:

"The German nation refuses to accept conceptions whereby everybody is entitled or even bound to interfere everywhere and with everything.

"If certain nations—Britain and France take the lead among those—see fit to declare that they and they alone have interests all over the world, that constitutes a claim to world domination.

"Germany, for one, will not tolerate that other powers concern themseves with her living space. In return, she will refrain from intruding in affairs outside her own vital sphere and which mainly concern other nations.

"If, as has been the case, a British cabinet minister declares that England's frontier is the Rhine, this is really the limit both as regards stupidity and unbearable arrogance."

GEOGRAPHIC DELUSIONS

"It could hardly be more stupid to declare that Germany's frontier is the Mississippi, or the Amazon, or the Yangtze.

"Incidentally, we shall now settle this question of the Rhine frontier once and for all, so that in the future it is to be hoped that British prime ministers will not be liable to such geographic delusions."

I asked the Fuehrer if he would not give me an outline or some idea of his concept of the peace to come. I had heard so much about a revolutionary concept of peace he had in mind and that the peace treaty would be very short.

Hitler was disinclined to commit himself at this time. He said:

"There is only one German peace aim, and that is the establishment of peace.

"The principle on which peace is founded will, however, be a realization of the fact that there can be no real peace unless the vital requirements of the great nations be duly respected and that only a fool can believe that a surer Versailles could be an improvement on the international cliques who live by inciting peoples to hatred and who seek to conceal, or even redress, the consequence of their inborn political inefficiency or their economic failure by resorting to war.

"NO VAIN SACRIFICES

"I am aware of the fact that this aim cannot be reached by treaties alone, but must come about by the dawning of reason within the nations.

"If military efforts of Great Britain and France should bring about a victory of reason even in those countries, the sacrifices of this war will, perhaps for the future of the world, not have been so in vain as it may now seem."

As Hitler arose and shook hands with me I asked him once more to spare Paris, if possible.

He replied:

"You have that at heart no more than I have, and you will be no more happy than I will be if the French Army leaders show common sense and make that possible for me."

Federal Benefits to First Congressional District of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1940

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have secured information from the various Government departments which discloses the many and valuable benefits that have been provided for the people of the district I have the honor to represent by the Federal Government since March 4, 1933.

The following information relates to the 11 counties of this congressional district and is self-explanatory:

County	Number of families, 1930	Number of dwellings, 1930	Number of individual income-tax returns, 1935	Number of passenger automobiles registered, 1936	Number of families with radios, 1938	Number of residential telephones, 1935	Number of domestic electric meters, 1930	Number of farms, 1935	Number of retail employees	Number of wholesale employees	Number of manufacturing employees, 1935	Number of persons on farms, 1935	Number of unemployed reporting, 1937
Bowie	11,584	10,900	601	5,089	8,130	1,796	3,420	5,081	865	159	1,113	25,499	2,956
Cass	6,632	6,400	174	2,377	3,890	581	495	5,504	335	31	390	24,978	2,288
Delta	2,988	2,900	29	1,235	1,810	605	525	2,192	152	4	29	9,780	498
Franklin	1,961	1,900	21	576	1,150	164	206	1,641	59			6,907	362
Harrison	11,320	10,900	621	4,342	7,760	1,937	2,938	6,749	778	76	1,442	29,996	2,072
Hopkins	6,797	6,600	121	3,101	4,300	1,408	1,085	5,067	286	27	87	21,518	1,175
Lamar	11,548	11,100	462	5,111	7,910	2,072	3,361	5,582	804	180	573	26,598	2,777
Marion	2,442	2,400	56	833	1,500	148	254	1,598	101	23	87	7,516	654
Morris	2,226	2,100	25	760	1,350	229	390	1,452	88	3		6,825	813
Red River	7,053	6,900	80	2,415	4,290	775	887	5,108	241	29	273	23,257	1,647
Titus	3,683	3,500	72	1,659	2,360	411	626	2,482	245	21	153	10,702	1,199
District total[1]	68,234	65,600	2,262	27,498	44,450	10,126	14,187	42,456	3,954	553	4,147	193,576	16,441

[1] Computed.

The following tables are also self-explanatory:

Principal loans and expenditures by the Federal Government, Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

A. COUNTY AND DISTRICT TOTALS

County	Total loans (repayable)	Total expenditures (nonrepayable)	Total loans and expenditures	Other benefits		
				Total housing insurance [1]	Farm debt reduction [2]	Active project allotments [3]
Bowie	$2,969,008	$4,978,660	$7,947,668	$194,569	$1,633	$895
Cass	1,032,197	3,024,736	4,056,933	62,738	17,688	55,660
Delta	745,671	1,999,595	2,745,266	8,612	1,207	----------
Franklin	230,927	1,096,372	1,327,299	14,822	2,589	158,200
Harrison	1,346,473	5,327,965	6,674,438	165,919	8,032	----------
Hopkins	830,918	3,025,444	3,856,362	212,853	453,511	----------
Lamar	2,239,122	5,872,170	8,111,292	139,352	247,010	50,000
Marion	330,799	927,074	1,257,873	18,922	4,276	21,300
Morris	361,857	1,014,157	1,376,014	1,926	757	----------
Red River	1,046,039	3,515,132	4,561,171	44,417	30,838	----------
Titus	459,445	2,025,477	2,484,922	75,445	1,093	65,500
District totals [4]	11,592,456	32,806,782	44,399,238	939,575	768,634	351,555

B. PROGRAM AND AGENCY TOTALS

Program and agency	Counties										
	Bowie	Cass	Delta	Franklin	Harrison	Hopkins	Lamar	Marion	Morris	Red River	Titus
LOANS											
Current programs:											
Federal Loan Agency: Reconstruction Finance Corporation [5]	$587,804	$103,770	$117,818	----------	$83,000	----------	$861,409	$9,000	$45,388	$142,300	$60,0
Federal Works Agency: Public Works Administration (non-Federal projects) [6]	300,000	123,886	21,000	----------	150,950	----------	185,700	----------	70,700	87,300	----------
Department of Agriculture:											
Farm Credit Administration:											
Land Bank Commissioner [7]	229,500	112,300	176,850	$41,900	94,600	$197,950	286,350	9,000	27,400	200,650	71,250
Emergency crop and feed [7]	507,600	234,618	20,365	56,474	269,813	79,957	83,569	116,254	43,116	163,420	93,508
Farm Security Administration:											
Rural rehabilitation	240,115	268,447	154,870	53,082	270,729	240,834	318,301	134,774	78,534	236,872	45,230
Farm tenant purchase	69,318	43,243	----------	----------	38,824	60,349	68,897	----------	----------	46,328	----------
Rural Electrification Administration [8]	78,500	127,722	230,750	52,625	99,222	143,375	140,000	49,222	78,500	140,000	131,125
Completed programs:											
Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	$215	$3,058	$2,292	$16,131	$193	$21,766	$748	$1,342	$1,201	$5,749	$6,707
Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	955,956	15,153	21,726	10,715	339,142	86,687	294,148	11,207	17,018	23,420	51,625
Total repayable	2,969,008	1,032,197	745,671	230,927	1,346,473	830,918	2,239,122	330,799	361,857	1,046,039	459,445
EXPENDITURES											
Current programs:											
Federal Works Agency:											
Public Works Administration:											
Non-Federal projects	245,000	64,074	16,790	----------	1,805,279	53,182	190,729	36,000	43,386	97,950	32,679
Federal projects	1,095,600	----------	----------	----------	8	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Completed projects	246,992	599,504	315,152	296,168	1,104,482	398,346	627,536	130,525	198,117	719,936	525,451
Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings	----------	53,187	67,320	----------	11	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Work Projects Administration	1,243,187	478,677	307,035	167,048	517,689	737,218	1,957,302	218,837	228,931	637,897	355,528
Other projects under works program	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Federal Security Agency:											
Social Security Board, old-age assistance	294,326	147,716	75,975	54,755	164,685	199,035	333,334	65,720	61,561	164,717	89,599
Department of Agriculture:											
Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:											
1936	204,638	174,421	141,167	59,326	154,466	216,070	306,329	54,360	69,145	218,781	129,548
1937	163,069	176,488	143,187	65,595	170,975	202,495	219,751	49,998	70,364	211,286	142,121
Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation	17,898	26,461	8,371	11,167	29,955	17,774	26,149	8,645	9,619	39,481	8,500
Completed programs:											
Federal Emergency Relief Administration	544,557	416,722	129,618	192,946	475,296	283,564	620,291	137,623	107,225	422,551	252,316
Civil Works Administration	211,583	192,027	51,339	34,142	267,155	108,283	303,604	58,095	45,442	111,154	113,857
Agricultural Adjustment Administration, rental and benefit payments	711,810	695,459	743,641	215,225	637,964	809,477	1,287,145	167,271	180,367	891,379	375,878
Total nonrepayable	4,978,660	3,024,736	1,999,595	1,096,372	5,327,965	3,025,444	5,872,170	927,074	1,014,157	3,515,132	2,025,477
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable	7,947,668	4,056,933	2,745,266	1,327,299	6,674,438	3,856,362	8,111,292	1,257,873	1,376,014	4,561,171	2,484,922
OTHER BENEFITS											
Federal Housing Administration:											
Modernization and improvement loans insured	79,339	42,238	4,112	2,622	71,019	40,973	91,849	11,322	1,926	15,717	41,445
Mortgages accepted for insurance	115,230	20,500	4,500	12,200	94,900	171,880	47,503	7,600	----------	28,700	34,000
Total housing insurance	194,569	62,738	8,612	14,822	165,919	212,853	139,352	18,922	1,926	44,417	75,445
Farm Security Administration, farm-debt reduction	1,633	17,688	1,207	2,589	8,032	453,511	247,010	4,276	757	30,838	1,093
Public Roads Administration, active-project allotments	895	55,660	----------	158,200	----------	----------	50,000	21,300	----------	----------	65,500

[1] Insurance of modernization and improvement loans, and mortgages accepted for insurance by the Federal Housing Administration.
[2] Farm Security Administration.
[3] Public Roads Administration.
[4] Computed.
[5] Feb. 2, 1932, through June 30, 1939.
[6] These projects received both loans and grants.
[7] As of Dec. 31, 1938.
[8] Total project cost divided by number of counties participating.

Source: Office of Government Reports, Statistical Section, Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The Federal Government has not spent money for a more useful and constructive purpose than the money expended through the National Youth Administration. Every dollar invested by the Federal Government in a young man or young woman is an investment that will be helpful to the country for an average of 40 years. It is particularly an investment in good citizenship.

The following tables are self-explanatory:

Aid received from the National Youth Administration

A. COUNTY TOTALS

County	Student aid					Work projects					Total				
	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	Total	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	Total	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	Total
Bowie	$5,967	$5,913	$4,482	$4,833	$21,195	$7,256	$4,478	$15,677	$39,472	$66,883	$13,223	$10,391	$20,159	$44,305	$88,078
Cass	1,566	1,512	1,296	1,296	5,670	1,288	3,106	7,850	13,993	26,237	2,854	4,618	9,146	15,289	31,907
Delta	1,026	972	756	918	3,672	1,237	1,026	1,156	253	4,272	2,263	1,998	1,912	1,171	7,944
Franklin	702	648	540	594	2,484	496	801	1,263	1,089	3,649	1,198	1,449	1,803	1,683	6,133
Harrison	20,385	27,783	14,877	17,415	80,460	3,797	8,109	12,184	14,038	38,128	24,182	35,892	27,061	31,453	118,588
Hopkins	3,942	3,996	2,862	3,024	13,824	2,108	285	1,728	1,312	5,433	6,050	4,281	4,590	4,336	19,257
Lamar	7,479	7,155	6,993	7,695	29,322	8,650	11,375	15,354	31,994	67,373	16,129	18,530	22,347	39,689	96,695
Marion	648	648	540	594	2,430	650	419	631	4,524	6,224	1,298	1,067	1,171	5,118	8,654
Morris	1,242	1,242	810	1,026	4,320	248	1,452	2,477	3,000	7,177	1,490	2,694	3,287	4,026	11,497
Red River	3,888	3,834	2,430	3,240	13,392	1,968	5,813	7,375	9,340	24,496	5,856	9,647	9,805	12,580	37,888
Titus	1,512	1,836	1,188	1,296	5,832	1,167	941	1,857	10,160	14,125	2,679	2,777	3,045	11,456	19,957
Grand total	48,357	55,539	36,774	41,931	182,601	28,865	38,405	67,552	129,175	263,997	77,222	93,944	104,326	171,106	446,598

B. DISTRICT TOTALS

	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	Total
SCHOOL AID					
Number of schools	97	158	146	160	
Average number of students	679	713	511	623	
Total allocations	$24,462	$24,084	$18,414	$20,736	$87,696
National Youth Administration job applications received				1,141	
COLLEGE AND GRADUATE AID					
Number of institutions	5	5	5	5	
Average number of students	221	292	170	196	
Total allocations	$23,895	$31,455	$18,360	$21,195	$94,905
National Youth Administration job applications received				876	
WORK PROJECTS (OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH)					
Allotment of Federal funds	$28,865	$38,405	$67,552	*$129,175*	$263,997
Average number of youth	540	375	824		
TOTAL FEDERAL FUNDS					
Student-aid program	$48,357	$55,539	$36,774	$41,931	$182,601
Work projects	28,865	38,405	67,552	129,175	263,997
Total	77,222	93,944	104,326	171,106	
Grand total					446,598

Plans for the future: In terms of the youth to be served, available funds, and sponsors, it is planned to emphasize the extension of resident projects, the operation of metal and wood working shops, the construction of community recreation buildings, additions and improvements to schools, home economics, and vocational agriculture buildings for schools, and the improvement of recreational facilities for schools and parks.

Plans already under way include the completion of a recreation community building in Marshall, a vocational agriculture shop building for the Queen City Public School, an N. Y. A. community workshop in Texarkana, and an athletic dressing room for the De Kalb Public School.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

The Work Projects Administration has been of substantial assistance to the people in many ways.

The following table is self-explanatory:

Expenditures of the Work Projects Administration, July 1, 1935, through Mar. 31, 1940

County or major type of project	Number of projects	Work Projects Administration expenditures			Total sponsors' expenditures	Total program expenditures	Sponsors' percent of total
		Labor	Nonlabor	Total			
SUMMARY BY COUNTIES							
Bowie	74	$1,332,216.27	$236,687.11	$1,568,903.38	$301,030.92	$1,869,934.30	16.11
Cass	50	522,582.14	122,207.66	644,789.80	278,942.35	923,732.15	30.20
Delta	36	307,468.41	107,668.07	415,136.48	115,451.21	530,587.69	21.76
Franklin	25	170,360.96	42,213.45	212,574.41	29,759.50	242,333.91	12.28
Harrison	50	598,575.13	127,797.61	726,372.74	233,540.55	959,913.29	24.33
Hopkins	82	712,251.27	179,672.11	891,923.38	245,567.65	1,137,491.03	21.59
Lamar	97	1,967,542.92	455,383.71	2,422,926.63	669,067.38	3,091,994.01	21.64
Marion	30	244,771.86	55,554.33	300,326.19	105,473.60	405,799.79	25.99
Morris	33	237,472.80	58,594.69	296,067.49	53,123.17	349,190.66	15.21
Red River	57	643,508.24	178,566.59	822,074.33	125,293.54	947,368.37	13.23
Titus	39	364,509.50	88,874.11	453,383.61	104,928.87	558,312.48	18.79
Total	573	7,101,259.50	1,653,219.44	8,754,478.94	2,262,178.74	11,016,657.68	20.53
SUMMARY BY TYPES OF PROJECTS							
Highways, roads, streets	269	3,266,187.91	947,591.82	4,213,779.73	1,387,056.93	5,600,836.66	24.77
Public buildings	59	643,482.36	129,795.01	773,277.37	338,403.50	1,111,680.87	30.44
Recreational facilities	7	95,364.49	23,879.84	119,244.33	49,374.44	168,618.77	29.28
Conservation	6	46,379.55	12,123.47	58,503.02	7,280.26	65,783.23	11.07
Public utilities	30	252,230.17	65,849.36	318,079.53	163,635.72	481,715.25	33.97
Sanitation and health	54	715,358.71	88,327.54	803,686.25	134,666.60	938,352.35	14.35
Professional and service	49	140,448.84	3,356.49	143,805.33	52,957.32	196,762.65	26.91
Sewing rooms	85	1,921,686.62	381,786.94	2,303,473.56	124,869.72	2,428,343.28	5.14
Goods	2	15,246.00	76.86	15,322.86	1,757.23	17,080.09	10.29
Commodity distribution	11	3,360.89	190.32	3,551.21	1,188.61	4,739.82	25.07
Not elsewhere classified	1	1,513.96	241.79	1,755.75	988.41	2,744.16	36.01
Total	573	7,101,259.50	1,653,219.44	8,754,478.94	2,262,178.74	11,016,657.68	20.53

Conference of Lumber Manufacturers of Arizona and New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

MINUTES AND RESOLUTIONS OF CONFERENCE

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Minutes of annual conference of the principal lumber manufacturers of Arizona and New Mexico, together with their employees, who were represented by the president of each local union of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America throughout the two States, the secretary of the State federation of labor, secretary of the State council of lumber and sawmill workers, and the vice president of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, held at Gallup, N. Mex., on Friday, June 14, 1940.

Mr. Vincent Jaeger, New Mexico State labor commissioner, was also invited and was present at the conference.

It was mentioned that there are numerous operators cutting Government timber on lands under the supervision of the United States Forest Service and various Indian agencies who are not adhering to the provisions of the Wage and Hour Act. After considerable discussion, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Be it resolved*, That Mr. C. H. Cunningham, of McNary, Ariz., and Mr. Everardo Gallegos, of Bernalillo, N. Mex., both members of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and Mr. E. C. de Baca, secretary of the New Mexico Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers, be authorized, in behalf of the operators and employees of the lumber industry in Arizona and New Mexico, to appear before such United States Senators and Members of Congress as might be interested, as well as the heads of the appropriate departments of the Federal Government, to request that henceforth all firms, persons, corporations, or partnerships cutting timber on lands of the United States or lands under the management of agencies of the United States Government be required to comply with the Wage and Hour Act, and as a condition to cutting said timber be required to sign an agreement that they will comply with such minimum-wage and maximum-hour provisions; further, that the operators under all existing contracts covering the above-mentioned timber be required to execute a supplemental agreement that they will comply with said Wage and Hour Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in order to bring about a more thorough policing of the wage and hour law, the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Act be requested to appoint and domicile in each of the States of Arizona and New Mexico a representative to enforce the provisions of said act."

It was also brought out that it is questionable whether some of the operators cutting Government timber in Arizona and New Mexico are complying with all the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding the trucking and hauling of lumber and railroad ties on public highways, particularly where the product so hauled is of an interstate character or nature, and it was—

"*Resolved*, That Messrs. Cunningham, Gallegos, and De Baca be further authorized to request the proper officials of the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the operations of such parties who it is believed are not complying with its regulations with respect to trucking and hauling of lumber and railroad ties on public highways."

A report was made that various operators are ignoring the requirements of the social-security and unemployment-compensation-insurance features of existing laws, and after some discussion the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the officials in charge of enforcement of social-security and unemployment-compensation-insurance legislation be requested to make a diligent audit of the sawmill industries of the States of Arizona and New Mexico to the end that all operators, large and small, be required to comply with the provisions of said laws."

A resolution passed by the lumber operators on January 17, 1940, and a resolution passed by the New Mexico Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers on April 13, 1940, concerning the operation of a band mill on the Navajo Reservation at Fort Defiance, Ariz., were read, and not having heard anything further from the Government agencies concerned regarding the competition presented by the mill in question, it was duly moved that the annual conference reiterate the stand taken by the above-mentioned resolutions and that copies of same be hereto attached and made a part hereof. Whereupon the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That Messrs. Cunningham, Gallegos, and De Baca be authorized to proceed to Washington, D. C., on or about June 18, 1940, to bring the matter of the band mill operating on the Navajo Reservation at Fort Defiance, Ariz., to the attention of Senators CARL HAYDEN, HENRY F. ASHURST, CARL A. HATCH, and DENNIS CHAVEZ, and Congressmen JOHN R. MURDOCK and JOHN J. DEMPSEY; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That while in Washington on this matter Messrs. Cunningham, Gallegos, and De Baca endeavor to get a definite commitment from the United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs that the sawmill at Fort Defiance will not produce any lumber over and above that to be consumed by the Indians on said reservation; and that under no circumstances whatever will any of said lumber be offered for general sale, either in normal or other lumber markets, but will be confined to the sole and exclusive requirements of the Navajo Indian Service."

A further report was made concerning the lack of complete protection under the Workmen's Compensation Act of the State of New Mexico, and the attention of the Labor Commissioner of New Mexico was directed toward bringing about, within the limitations of the present legislation, such action as may be necessary to insure that labor employed by the lumber industry will be adequately protected.

It was moved, and unanimously carried, that Messrs. Cunningham, Gallegos, and De Baca be authorized to do everything necessary, in conformity with the foregoing minutes and resolutions, to the end that the matters mentioned herein will be expeditiously settled to the satisfaction of the operators and employees of the lumber industry represented at this annual conference.

Whereupon the conference adjourned.

The Sleep Walkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. BYRNES
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Sleepwalkers," by Walter Lippmann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SLEEPWALKERS
(By Walter Lippmann)

Obviously it would have been better if the Cabinet had been reorganized 6 weeks ago, better still if it had been reorganized at the outbreak of the war, and the historians will long be busy explaining why such an obvious and necessary measure was so long delayed. Obviously also this is only a partial reorganization. It will have to be followed by several other changes, notably in the establishment of a true administrative agency through which Messrs. Knudsen, Stettinius, and Budd can operate, and in the appointment of a new Secretary of Labor.

But sober reflection and, above all, the experience which impending events are going to provide will demonstrate, I think, that Colonel Stimson and Colonel Knox have done a great service to their country, and, however disconcerting it may seem now to some of the political managers at Philadelphia, a great service to the Republican Party.

For 18 months the Republican Party has been walking in its sleep. At no one of the critical junctures of this period has the party understood the situation or proposed measures to deal with it or offered the country positive leadership. There have been many individual Republicans, of course, who were aware of what was going on. But they have been in a helpless minority and, as an organized party, the Republicans have had no policy at all. A year and a half ago, when they were told that war was coming, the politicians said that this warning was "ballyhoo" and "warmongering." Last winter they voted to support the administration's wholly inadequate program of national defense, but they are not on record, I think, as having made any kind of effort to make the program more adequate. They refused to support measures to avert the European war, saying as late as last July that they knew there was not going to be a war. One can, I think, search the speeches of Mr. TAFT and Mr. Dewey, and search them in vain, for any evidence of foresight as to what has happened, for a single proposal which has sought, in advance of the administration, to strengthen the national defense. The speeches of Messrs. TAFT and Dewey during these critical months make Mr. Neville Chamberlain seem like a farsighted and strong statesman.

The alarming inadequacy of this whole performance has caused profound misgiving within the ranks of the Republicans of this

country. That is why Mr. Wendell Willkie has risen so spectacularly. That is why Mr. Hoover has once again a popular following. And that is also why Mr. Roosevelt has become so much stronger than he was a year ago. A very large mass of the people in both parties have watched the conduct of the regular Republican politicians and have concluded that unless the Republican Party can turn to someone like Willkie or Hoover it will be led by men who are walking in their sleep, by men whose minds have not grasped the situation in which this country finds itself.

But long before the elections in November it may become clear to everyone that the United States is isolated in a highly armed, hungry, and jealous world. Even if that does not happen because the British are able to sustain the resistence, it will, nevertheless, be a fact—and this is one of the most momentous facts of modern history—that the capitalist system of private property and free enterprise and free labor has come to an end in every industrial nation on the face of the globe, excepting only in the United States.

The two American parties are nominating candidates whom they hope to make President during the next 4 years. Has it dawned upon the platform makers and party managers at Philadelphia that the next President of the United States is going to administer our affairs in a world where the whole commercial system we have known has broken down, in a world in which private property and private enterprise have been replaced by a regime of military socialism?

Do they realize what this is going to mean? That when an American businessman wants to sell or buy in Europe and Asia he will not be trading with other businessmen but with monopolies administered by dictatorial governments? That when he competes in the few free markets which may be left, say, in South America, he will be competing not with foreign businessmen but with a European government monopoly?

Do they realize that the American farmer and the American producer of raw materials will be able to sell to this monopoly only if this country will take in payment the manufactured goods of Europe? Have they grasped the fact that these goods are going to be produced by highly skilled labor which is paid the wages of sweated labor and, so far as the conquered people are concerned, the wages of slave labor? Have our labor leaders grasped the fact that the trade-union movement in all other industrial nations is dead, and that they will be competing in the American market and in all other markets with workers who have no rights and have a standard of life lower than any white men has known for much more than a hundred years? Have our manufacturers and bankers and shareholders and bondholders grasped the fact that this European government monopoly of industry will not only rest upon sweated labor and slave labor but that it will have no financial overhead to burden the costs of production? For the capitalists of Europe will have been expropriated, the Germans in fact though not perhaps in appearance, the conquered capitalists completely?

Has it occurred to the Republican leaders in Philadelphia what it will mean to compete with such an industrial machine as that? Do they realize that no existing tariff, no subsidy, no system of labor laws, no system of trade-union agreements can protect American agriculture and industry against the inroads of such a system? For if they let in the imports from such an industrial machine, how can American producers survive in competition? And if they shut out the imports, how can American surpluses be disposed of?

These are a few of the facts which the American people are going to have to live with and deal with in the next years. No one in his senses can think he has a ready-made plan for dealing with them. But if they can be dealt with, the party in power must be led by men who are awake to what is happening. The sleepwalkers in Philadelphia do not seem to have even a dim appreciation of what is happening, and that is why the salvation of the party depends upon men like Hoover and Willkie, Stimson and Knox, who do know what is happening.

Men like these, whether they serve the Government in office or in the opposition, alone can save the Republican Party from a disaster like that which has overtaken Neville Chamberlain and his following. These men, whom the little politicians dislike, are identifying the Republican Party with the energetic defense of American vital interests and establishing it as a party suited to the times we live in. If they succeed, the Republican Party will be fit to be trusted by the country. If they fail, if the sleepwalkers are in command at Philadelphia and later of the Government itself, the American people will pass through the most dangerous period of their history, led by men who do not know what they are doing.

International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in the column written by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, entitled "One Man's Opinion," relating to the foreign policy of the United States, which recently appeared in the press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This long-suffering country is being deluded by a label—the word "isolationist." If your conviction is that this is no time to commit flagrant acts of war against Germany, then you are an isolationist. That would be fair if the definition stopped there. But it doesn't. By a system of warmongering sloganeering that word tags you: (1) As believing that what happens in Europe is no concern of ours; (2) as failing to see that the British Navy is holding and whittling the Nazis and therefore that we must ally our efforts with its own; (3) that we are Hitler's meat anyway—no matter whether we attack him or not, and, therefore, the more we do to hurt Hitler and help his enemies, the more we are doing for our own defense; (4) which is just beginning to be said by extremists, that any contrary opinion is pro-Nazi pacificism.

This is bewildering bunk. I know of nobody now labeled and libeled as an "isolationist" who thinks that what happens in Europe is no concern of ours—nobody who is not aware that the more Hitler's enemies can do to impair his armed strength the less of a menace he will be—nobody who is not righteously and indignantly anti-Nazi—nobody who does not believe in rearmament for total defense. I know many who, like this writer, have clamored for it for years, while those who now shout "isolationist" and are so ready to send our men or ships abroad were like England and France, asleep at the switch, wasting in boondoggling nonsense our ample opportunity and rich resources to arm to defend ourselves and (it may have been) to keep the peace of the world.

The issues thus dragged in are clearly false. These cover criminal neglect of national safety by smearing those who were right while they were wrong with a senseless epithet—"isolationist."

There is only one genuine difference of opinion here. It is whether it is better for us to insure war now, when we are disgracefully unprepared, by committing outright such acts of war as neither Hitler's nor any other government could ignore or whether it is better to maintain our independence while we intensify our efforts to get into a position of impregnable defense. I think the former course is suicidal crap shooting with the destiny of our democracy.

An honest skeptic asks me why Germany would stand idle while America arms? That is a fair question, going to the heart of the issue.

A favorite saying of Napoleon's was: "Empires always die of indigestion." Mr. Hitler has swallowed more in a shorter time than any other conqueror. Overseas campaigns 3,000 miles away are not undertaken without vast painstaking preparation. The kinds of military, naval, and air force adaptable to the overthrow of next-door neighbors by mechanical "blitzkrieg" are not at all adaptable to such an unprecedented effort—and Hitler has never yet gone off half cocked and unprepared.

Even with complete European conquest, he has a tremendous job of consolidation, reorganization, and repair before he could willingly and with true Teutonic thoroughness undertake any such campaign so far away.

I'll admit that there is some element of gamble in this assertion, but it is an intelligent gamble, with all odds long in its favor. Nothing we can now contribute will decide the war abroad. If we use the time probably available to us to put ourselves in a posture of real defense, our safety is 10 times more certain. But there is no gamble at all if we insist on war by carrying it to Hitler now, when we have little for attack and no land and air defense.

That is the only issue. All the rest is fake "flub-dub." The Republican task of platform writing is chiefly to make that issue clear—"complete preparedness; no war now." That is the hope and belief of 85 percent of our people. It is not the belief of this administration.

The W. P. A. Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a review of the hearings on the Relief Act for 1941 discloses some startling facts, and the report of the investigating committee discloses that the W. P. A. is seething with politics, favoritism, and a diversion of relief funds to employ thousands who do

not need relief and in the payment of exhorbitant administrative salaries and expense accounts. The report of the committee made by Mr. TAYLOR, democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee, contains the following statement, I quote from the report:

The investigation has divulged many past misdeeds. Some were known to W. P. A. authorities and nothing was done about them. * * * The category runs all the way from minor abuses to major offenses. The chief sources of abuse of public funds occur in the improvement of private property at public expense, the lack of proper supervision, the employment of persons not in need, the operation of projects of doubtful public utility, padded sponsor's contributions, purchase of excess equipment, and hire of equipment at excess rates, operation of projects on which a high percentage of nonrelief labor is required—

And so forth. These hearings consist of about 2,500 pages and it is impossible to more than scratch the surface of the irregularities and abuses shown.

The committee report also shows—

(a) That many supervisors are selected on the basis of political pull, for the political influence they can wield; (b) that many supervisors have no economic need of their jobs and no interest in the program beyond the wages and power over the men; (c) that many supervisors are incompetent, inefficient, and that when funds are cut and people must be dropped, the poor project worker who is in need is dropped and the well-fixed supervisor is retained in his comfortable job; that the ordinary project worker cannot get a supervisory job unless he has a pull or political connection.

The lack of proper supervision as set out in Mr. Taylor's report is caused on account of the employment of political henchmen for these positions, who in many cases are given this employment on account of their political influence rather than on account of their ability, and it is a rare experience for a man in need and on relief to receive a supervisory, boss, or timekeeper job.

Here are a few of the abuses: On 1 project W. P. A. employed 265 relief workers and 189 nonrelief workers. On another project they employed only 185 relief workers, while 864 nonrelief workers were employed. On another they employed 221 relief workers and 171 nonrelief workers. On another they employed 17,651 relief workers and 5,712 nonrelief workers. On the W. P. A. building at the New York World's Fair, which cost $504,103, they employed only 17.7 percent relief workers and 82.3 percent nonrelief workers.

A sample of waste of relief funds is shown in excessive material purchases by W. P. A. In 1 State they had on hand for a long period of time and unused, 6,588 long-handle shovels; 110 sewing machines; 342 long-handle, square-point shovels; 10 electric grindstones; 2 electric grinders; 157 drinking fountains; 185 wheelbarrows; 1,771 railroad picks and 797 axes. The report contains this quotation:

The above are only samples of the various excess material on hand in the warehouse and unused, and which, in many instances, have been in stock since 1938.

The report also says:

Large quantities of wheelbarrows were junked by cutting their frames and wheels with an acetylene torch and by splitting or cutting their bottoms with an ax or other sharp instrument.

At this warehouse there was a high percentage of nonrelief workers employed. In 1 instance there were 2 supervisors to 1 worker, and in 4 instances the supervisors' pay roll exceeded the workers' pay roll. Another project shows 6 supervisors to 27 workers.

On a household demonstration project, which contemplates training girls in housework, from March 1938 to March 1939, a total of 1,049 guests were served meals with no cost to the guests and these guests were high Government officials, W. P. A. officials, local politicians and civic leaders, and their wives. This project also served free tea parties, buffet lunches, and meals for large groups. There was no sponsor's contribution in connection with the project.

Many instances have developed where the "favored ones" have done very well on relief employment. One instance is John J. McDonough. From 1905 to 1914 he was foreman of construction and sewer inspector at $21 per week; from 1914 to 1934 he received $2,500 per year as industrial health inspector. He became affiliated with W. P. A., his first salary being $4,800 per year. He has drawn since February 1939, $8,000 per year. The hearings are full of such instances.

The hearings show many instances where, at the very time relief workers were being laid off and the excuse given "insufficient funds," the administrative personnel was being increased and the salaries of nonrelief workers being increased.

Another project shows a total of 2,078 employees; 200 were engaged in supervisory or clerical duties. The hearings show the finding of correspondence from Federal and State officials demanding increase in numbers on rolls at or near election time, and the files show large numbers of dismissals shortly after election.

The W. P. A. officials devoted time to politics and tickets to political rallies were sold to employees during working hours through pressure methods. Employees and persons renting trucks to W. P. A. were solicited for political donations. Of course, we all remember how the relief rolls were greatly increased just before the 1936 election and that the number employed was greatly reduced immediately after election, and then again just before the 1938 election great numbers were again employed only to be laid off after the election; it is expected that the same thing will happen just before election this year.

The hearings disclose many improvements to privately owned property of W. P. A. officials.

Another project shows excessive purchases of equipment which is now in warehouse, of 3,616 wheelbarrows, 3,167 shovels, 12,134 picks, and 1,264 Windsor-back chairs, all purchased in 1936 or before that time.

W. P. A. expended $521,047.75 on construction of a race track at Del Mar, Calif., which is now run by Bing Crosby.

At another warehouse there were 42 portable water coolers on hand and 41,103 boxes of paper cups on hand, each containing 150 cups; 44,183 yards of cloth, purchased by W. P. A. and delivered to the warehouse in October 1938, have not been used.

At another warehouse there were employed 16 supervisory employees with monthly salaries totaling $1,750 while there were employed but 61 nonsupervisory employees whose monthly salaries totaled $3,328.82.

At the Miami warehouse the evidence shows that over a period of 13 months, from December 1938 to January 31, 1940, textile inventories were increased more than 12 times; namely, from 29,069½ yards to 298,512⅞ yards; the evidence further shows that while these inventories were increasing the sewing-room workers were being dismissed; also, a large quantity of corduroy was purchased, stored, and not used; also a large quantity of 90-inch sheeting is stored there but not used. At Miami 11 married women are employed in administrative positions, all of whom have husbands with independent incomes.

Nothwithstanding there were over 250 certified relief clients awaiting assignment to W. P. A. in Gainesville, Fla., 18 members of the University of Florida football squad were carried on the pay roll of W. P. A. during the months of June, July, and August of 1938.

Here is a characteristic condition shown on the projects in Montana. W. P. A. employment reached more than 22,000 in November 1936. By August 1937 this employment dropped to approximately 8,000, but a new high was reached just before the 1938 election when approximately 22,500 were employed, then by August 1939 this employment had been reduced to about 13,500.

It is shown that there are 93,500 employed in administrative or supervisory positions, not including supervisory officials drawing less than $1,200 per year. It might be well to remember that just previous to the 1936 election in Indiana the relief rolls were greatly increased and immediately after the election W. P. A. began laying men off until they reached a low of 40,000 in 1937; by April 2, 1938, this number had increased to 84,931, and it was gradually increased until on October 29, 1938, a few days before the election, a total of

101,374 were employed on W. P. A. Again they began laying workers off immediately after the election and, by January 28, 1939, only 82,545 were employed; many of those laid off were told it was because they voted wrong.

W. P. A. has expended enormous amounts in rental for theaters. The hearings show they have paid several times as much as the theaters were worth, and expended about $175,000 to produce a moving picture without using any relief employees—this all being done as a part of the propaganda program.

About $300,000 of relief money is expended for salaries of people engaged in W. P. A. propaganda, and another $430,000 expended for printed matter, radio, movies, and exhibits. W. P. A. spent $115,000 for a hen house so as to produce 72,000 dozen eggs per year in competition with our farmers.

The W. P. A. claims to have revamped the Federal writers' project and advise that 11 of the 13 supervisory officials identified as Communists have been discharged.

Many State W. P. A. administrators receive larger salaries than the Governors of the States receive.

Indiana has done fairly well. The State administrator of W. P. A. receives a salary greater than that of the Governor of the State. He has been quite a traveler, the record showing that he has made 72 week-end trips from Indianapolis to his home in Evansville on official travel status; that he conveniently found it necessary to make trips to French Lick at the time of Democratic meetings and to Chicago at the time of the world series, and even to Louisville, Ky., at the time of the Kentucky Derby—all these trips were paid for on the per diem and mileage basis out of W. P. A. funds; and he goes in style—he had an Indiana State police escort to the Kentucky line, where he was picked up by an escort of Kentucky State police, who managed to get him to the Derby in safety. We surely give a lot of attention to our W. P. A. officials.

W. P. A. in Indiana paid $46,246.29 rental for a machine which had a value of only $20,000; they even hired a common, ordinary rowboat worth about $20 and paid a rental of $30 per month. Is it little wonder, with such expenditures, that the W. P. A. show they have "insufficient funds"?

The Indiana State administrator received for travel in and out of the State a total of $3,336.40. This, however, is small compared with travel expenses of Howard O. Hunter, deputy commissioner, who, between December 1937 and January 1, 1939, spent only 56½ days in his official station. His legal residence is Chicago, Ill., where he spent 209½ days on a per diem allowance. Each spring he traveled at Government expense to Louisville, Ky., at the time of the Kentucky Derby. I wonder if this was a sort of meeting place for W. P. A. officials? Mr. Hunter filed travel expenses totaling $17,730.65.

The Washington office of the Division of Information between July 1, 1938, and April 20, 1939, expended $38,146.87. They have a director, a special reports section, a special assistant, special writers' unit, photographic unit, radio and motion-picture distribution unit, race-relations unit, senior information officer, information-assembly unit, periodical service unit, clipping-service unit, field-relations section, and visual-information specialist, employing 75 in the Washington office.

W. P. A. has refused to make public or to advise Congress of the number of nonrelief employees or the amount of money expended for nonrelief employees.

It has developed that during the later part of 1939 and the early part of 1940 W. P. A. had a quota for Indiana of about 8,000 more than were employed. For several months W. P. A. has been reducing the number of relief workers employed, claiming "lack of funds." It is little wonder they might be short of funds if you could go through the 2,500 pages of hearings and see the gross waste and extravagance of W. P. A. administration.

Funds appropriated by Congress to provide relief work for the fiscal year 1941 become available to W. P. A. July 1, 1940, and over $1,200,000,000 has been appropriated, which can be expended in the 8 months beginning July 1, 1940. John K. Jennings, Indiana State administrator of W. P. A., under date of June 19, 1940, advised me that he had been instructed to the effect that drastic reductions in W. P. A. rolls be made in every county during the month of June, and that he was advised that "the bill covering appropriations for the coming fiscal year—that is, beginning July 1, 1940—does not contemplate providing any material relief from the present employment situation before the late fall."

This is purely politics, and I may say of the lowest type. There is nothing in the bill to prevent W. P. A. from employing as many as they desire or to require them to wait until early fall to increase the number employed. Apparently, those administering W. P. A. intend to permit many of our citizens, both young and old, with large families, and those who are unable to find employment on account of the failure of this administration to solve our unemployment problem, to suffer and go without relief work for several months in order that the relief rolls may again be loaded just before election. It was hoped that, following the expose of the political manipulations and the favoritism and waste of W. P. A. administration, that some good would develop; that W. P. A. officials would at least attempt to administer the law in the spirit in which it was enacted; that is, expend the money appropriated to employ those needing relief. But, apparently, this is a vain hope, and many have become firmly convinced that this administration will never administer the law from the relief standpoint but will continue to use it as a political football. There is only one hope left, and that is that in November the taxpayers, whose money is being used, and the people who need this relief work and cannot get any of it, will decide to join together and make a change in the administration.

No Intervention: Our People Do Not Want War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer for today, which I believe reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the American people:

NO INTERVENTION—OUR PEOPLE DON'T WANT WAR

This Nation has reached the fork in the road.

It must follow the road to the right or the road to the left.

Whichever road it takes it must take it now. It can't stand still.

The road to the right is the road to continued peace, a road which is not altogether smooth, but still is hedged about with the ideals, the moralities, and the inherent decencies of normal living

The road to the left, a road which has no turning, leads as straight as the arrow flies, inevitably and irrevocably, to war:

War, with its unspeakable hardships, its terrors and filth, its physical tortures and its spiritual agonies, its blood and lust and disease and death.

There is not the slightest doubt that the vast majority of the American people desire most earnestly to take the road to the right.

But, strange to say, in the face of all this country has learned through its own bitter experience with war, it almost seems easier to take the road to the left. Why?

Because there are forces at work, more powerful, perhaps, than we realize, that are driving us—against our will—in the direction of war.

It is needless to recount in detail the progressive moves that have led this peace-loving country to a point where war is just around the corner. Every thinking person knows what they are.

But as a matter of immediate moment we may note that, not content with giving the Allies such material aid as was possible and entirely proper under the terms of our Neutrality Act, we are now getting ready to raid our own meager warehouse and give

away implements of defense, built and building—and imperatively needed—for our own protection.

We have made and are making elaborate plans for organizing the country, rigorously and dynamically, on a war basis.

We are planning to push our young men by force into training for war, although we are in no imminent danger of war unless we bring it deliberately upon ourselves.

We are witnessing the construction of a tax measure which is to be effective (please note) after we get into war.

In a word, we are getting all dressed up for the big parade when the day comes which we had hoped and still hope, with all our hearts and souls, will never arrive.

Most dangerous of all, perhaps, from the very start of hostilities in Europe and even before the hostilities started, we seem to have permitted Great Britain and France to get the idea that we would not only supply them with all material aid required, but, if necessary, with men.

And now we have Stimson and Knox, rank interventionists, going into the President's Cabinet.

Once more let us remind the American people that we went into another European war 23 years ago, with bells ringing and flags flying and orators shrieking and women weeping and children crying—and for what?

We went, they told us, to make the world safe for democracy.

But what we did—and let's not fool ourselves—was to help make the world safe for unemployment, pauperism, revolution, despotism, and dictatorship.

We went to Europe with high hopes and more or less noble aspirations to give our money and our sons to set the world right.

We came back across the Atlantic with a frightful cargo of dead hopes, dead men, and dead dollars.

And now? Are we going out now to prove the truth of the jokesmith's quip that "They always come back for more"?

Not if we have just a glimmer of light, a mere modicum of neatness and order left in the place where we keep what we are pleased to call our brains.

Not if we stop thinking with our emotions and begin to think with our minds.

All right, says a bystander, but what would you have us do? Sit on our thumbs and wait for someone to push us over?

The answer to that is "No."

As a people we are becoming increasingly aware of the dangers that beset us in a lunatic world that has now stopped cutting out paper soldiers and developed a suicide complex.

If, as we believe, this country can remain an island of sanity in a world gone mad, these things we must do:

(1) We must build up our defenses with the least possible delay to a point of absolute safety, not reckoning the cost. (If we do that, and do it in time, we need have no war unless we ask for it, because no one will attack us.)

(2) We must uphold the Monroe Doctrine with every ounce of power we possess, if and when it is threatened.

(3) We must call upon our statesmen to let us plain citizens do the talking, if talking there must be, and themselves think more and talk less about what is going on in Europe and who is to blame.

If you think this reasoning is sound, we suggest that you pass the word on to your representatives in Congress. You can tell them:

"Take chances, if you must, with the things that don't imperil this Nation's continued existence, with the things that don't menace this Nation's soul. But take no chances when it comes to involving us in war.

"Rush work on our preparedness plans. Defend our interests uncompromisingly in this hemisphere. But don't meddle or let anyone else meddle with the Frankenstein that's been built up in Europe.

"The people of this country may forgive you for your many shortcomings in other respects. But they will never forgive you if you get them involved needlessly in war.

"Take notice: The people of this country don't want war."

The Attorney General Denounces the Alien Bill to Deport Bridges

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. ROBERT H. JACKSON

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a letter from United States Attorney General, the Honorable Robert Jackson, to Senator R. B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, in which that eminent jurist expresses his considered opinion and solemnly declares that the alien bill to deport Bridges is unsound, both in the law and ethically.

The letter is as follows:

JUNE 18, 1940.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is an answer to your request for the views of this Department concerning the bill H. R. 9766, which provides:

"TO DIRECT THE DEPORTATION OF HARRY BRIDGES

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the Attorney General be, and is hereby authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful."

If this bill were to become law, it would be a historical departure from an unbroken American practice and tradition. It would be the first time that an act of Congress has singled out a named individual for deportation. It would be the first deportation in which the alien was not even accused either of unlawful entry or of unlawful conduct while here. It would be the first time that Congress, without changing the general law, simply suspended all laws which protect a named individual and directed the Attorney General to disregard them and forthwith to deport "notwithstanding any other provision of law." And it would be the first time since the alien and sedition laws a century and a half ago that any law would provide for a deportation without a hearing or without, indeed, the slightest pretense toward giving the accused what our Nation has long known as due process of law.

The extraordinary character of the bill upon its face is even more impressive viewed against its background. This same alien has been accused, investigated, and tried at great length, and judgment has been rendered that he had not been proved guilty of the charges made against him. By this bill the United States would deny faith and credit to its own duly conducted legal proceedings.

We have in this country, subject to the jurisdiction of this Department, some three and a half million aliens. One of our great tasks is to assimilate them into our native culture; this can only be done by a deep respect for our processes and tradition. How shall we teach this respect if the Government itself will not abide by a decision in an individual case, and makes acts whose nature is not specified, but which must have been lawful when done, the basis of deportation without hearing? What becomes of equality before the law, of the impersonal and impartial character of our Government, if it is to select unpopular persons to suffer disadvantage or punishment?

I do not now consider whether such a law would violate the constitutional prohibition against congressional enactment of bills of attainder, or ex post facto laws, or the provision of our Bill of Rights which declares that "no person * * * shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." I do not now try to determine whether the language of this act would work an unconstitutional suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Nor do I inquire as to any breach of treaty engagements to render fair treatment to nationals of friendly powers lawfully in this country. The law makes me legal advisor only to the President and the executive departments, and my predecessors have held that they could not with propriety also render legal opinion to a separate branch of the Government.

But apart from any question of power, I cannot, as head of the Department affected by this bill, answer with anything less than emphatic disapproval, your request for views upon it.

The Congress has almost unlimited powers over aliens. It has embodied its policies in general laws. If it is convinced, as I am, that recent experiences show the need for additional safeguards, by all means let us have them. We, who are administratively responsible for dealing with these problems, have advocated greater legislative precautions. But there is no condition, existing or threatened, which needs arbitrary legislation prescribing no rule of conduct, but merely imposing banishment by legislative fiat. The interests of this service can be best protected by enactment of clear and fair rules of conduct, that aliens may know, so that those who obey may be unmolested and those who disobey may be expelled. And let any man be heard in his own behalf before he is doomed to exile.

Harry Bridges may be all that this bill implies of him. But certainly he does not deserve a place in our history as a martyr. He is insignificant compared to the issues presented by this bill. Our forefathers objected to a government where "whatever pleased the prince had the force of law." The report of the House committee comes close to reverting to this when it says that deportation "without assigning any reason is inherent and asserted by this bill."

As an American I would not, for the sake of my own liberty, deny the protection of uniform and indiscriminatory laws, and of fair hearings to even the humblest or meanest of men. As an official of the United States I cannot in good conscience do other than recommend strongly against this bill.

With personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

Whither Are We Bound?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SUNBURY (PA.) DAILY ITEM

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunbury Daily Item:

[From the Sunbury Daily Item of June 20, 1940]

WHITHER ARE WE BOUND?

Is the plan announced in Washington for regimenting American boys and girls for a year of training and discipline intended as a foretaste of the much-discussed M day, the skeleton work of which was built during the past several years? M day, or mobilization day, you will recall, contemplated under the guise of emergency, assumption of all powers of Government by the Executive Department, a dictatorship in fact if not in name, a centralization of authority in one stroke such as has been attempted in a variety of measures defeated by Congress in recent years at the insistent demand of the public.

This is not a time for quibbling or for acrimonious partisan debate. The Nation not only asks but demands the utmost speed in the building of defenses, orderly preparation along well-defined lines, but it wants, and is entitled, to a clear chart of the course to be followed. It wants, and the safety of the Nation requires, less of the growing war hysteria, less of the day-to-day commitments of the Nation to far-reaching policies without the knowledge or consent of Congress.

A prominent educator who has been active in the student peace movement in recent years writes the Daily Item:

"I am all for adequate national defense, but I have seen no plan for the coordination of defense preparations. Clearly, the coordination of Nazi air, army, and naval forces gave them the victory in Norway, and is winning for them in the west. Why does not the administration enlighten us on its plans?

"We are not ready to fight. For this reason alone—and a very practical one it is—we must stay out. In reference to the 'Stop Hitler Now' movement, the New York World-Telegram asks the very pertinent question, 'Stop him with what—our fists?'

"Certain elements are trying to stampede the people into war. It has been amazing to me to read so many belligerent commencement addresses by presidents of eastern universities, by Conant, of Harvard; Fox, of Union; and others. They not only demanded adequate national defense, which we all desire, but also intervention. How can they forget so soon the wounded, the gassed, and the shell-shocked, the broken hearts, resulting from the last war? Is all this not so important to us that we must wage another crusade to save democracy when we know that the only way to save it for the United States is by providing adequate defense and solving our social problems?

"Should we declare war, let it be in a period of sanity and realism, not in a moment of emotional hysteria."

National unity is the first need in the present situation, and there is no better way of encouraging discord and loss of confidence than through impulsive thought and action, as exemplified in explosive extemporaneous utterances in Washington, the covert transfer of American torpedo boats to the British Navy, secret agreements on war material prices, and hints of youthful labor battalions. Absolute frankness is the answer. The people of these United States have a right to know whither they are bound.

War Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE TACOMA (WASH.) NEWS TRIBUNE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial on the subject of war hysteria which appeared in the largest daily newspaper in my district. In this editorial the senior Senator from our State, Senator BONE, is panegyrized for his attitude and speeches in the other body and we are cautioned against becoming victims of a hysteria. I urge the careful reading of this editorial as an expression of a viewpoint entertained by vast masses of the American people who are too often inarticulate in letting their feelings become known.

Back here in the East, particularly in the National Capital, many of us are insulated against the plain people at home. If one were to read the columnists in the metropolitan press and be influenced by the editorials of the great newspapers of the east, one would quickly be inclined to support a resolution for a declaration of war; but let no one be hoodwinked by that. The American people do not want war.

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News Tribune of June 8, 1940]

WAR HYSTERIA

Senator HOMER T. BONE, of this State, sounded a much-needed word of caution at Washington, D. C., in his appeal against speeches in the upper House which are designed to whip up war hysteria. Especially blameworthy along these lines have been recent inflammatory proposals by Senator ———, one of the administration leaders.

If Senator ——— had his way, our Navy would already be engaged in the war against Germany and our boys would be drafted for immediate service overseas. Other Senators and Representatives have echoed this viewpoint until these speeches give every indication of a deliberate plan to put this country into the war at once and start our boys going overseas, just as they did in 1917.

Senator BONE asserted it was time to clarify the picture and put an end to this hysteria. "Otherwise," he cautioned, "we are going to be charged here with doing things that permit public sentiment to be inflamed so that this country is pushed into the vortex of war."

Senator BONE calls for more frankness and less camouflage in the present situation. "If we are going to war," he says, "let us say so and not finally edge the American people slowly and carefully toward the edge of the precipice, only some day to have them wake up and find themselves slipping downhill, where they cannot save themselves."

Proper defense steps are, of course, necessary in an emergency. No one questions the wisdom of putting our Army and Navy in condition to defend this country, as we should have done 5 years ago. However, this is an entirely different proposition from immediate American participation in the war overseas.

Our unpreparedness is so great that, even if we got into the war at the present time, we could probably do little to save the Allies, as it would take many months to arm and equip any expeditionary force which we might send abroad.

Meanwhile the American people should know just what steps are being taken toward our involvement in the struggle. If we are again led into the war, as in 1917, the country should realize clearly the vast sacrifices in life and property which such a path of involvement would mean.

Roosevelt or Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY ROWLAND R. PETERS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD another article by Rowland R. Peters, editor, Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum, which appeared in that publication June 11, 1940.

I think the inclusion of this article in the RECORD is very appropriate at this time, in view of the fact that on next Monday at Philadelphia definite consideration will be given to the question of "Roosevelt or Peace."

The article follows:

[From the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum, June 11, 1940]

ROOSEVELT OR PEACE

It has been apparent for 3 years, more apparent in recent months and dangerously apparent at this hour that the time is nearing for the people of the United States to choose between Franklin Roose-

velt and peace. So long as he remains the head of the American Government our chances of staying out of Europe's hell will continue to diminish as they have been diminishing in past months.

Those who have scoffed at charges that Mr. Roosevelt is making every effort to set himself up as a one-man government and that he is thinking of America's security in terms of politics instead of terms of dead and wounded surely must have a reversal of opinion after hearing his Charlottesville address last night. He reduced the United States from a neutral nation to a nonbelligerent country, to the same status held by Italy until the dictator of that country enrolled his people in war yesterday noon.

Mr. Roosevelt told both Germany and Italy that America is solidly behind the Allies. He has been telling them that for months, but last night's pronouncement was in the strongest language yet employed. He definitely and most unnecessarily cast the United States on the side of the Allies. He spoke as he has no right to speak. He spoke as a dictator instead of as a President of 130,000,000 people who, although in sympathy with the allied cause, realize, as does he, that such forthright pronouncements can mean nothing more than the strengthening of hatred that already exists in Europe toward this country, a hatred that has been cultivated by Franklin Roosevelt since the day he made his outer-drive speech in Chicago. When one man presumes the right to endanger the lives and welfare of 130,000,000 people it is time to strip him of all power.

The Agricultural Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is a very important industry in the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana, which I have the honor to represent.

This district has more than 23,000 of the best farms in the United States, upon which live some of the finest people in the Nation, and the products of these farms are as fine in quality as any in the world. These farmers till more than 2,000,000 acres of soil each year, and they contribute over 15,000,000 bushels of corn, 5,500,000 bushels of wheat and oats, 236,833 bushels of potatoes, 32,248,805 gallons of milk, 1,083,886 pounds of butter, 702,100 pounds of wool, 6,930,613 dozen eggs, and many other products annually.

The people of my district are very much interested in agriculture. It contributes directly to the support of about 100,000 of the people I represent and the entire social and economic fabric of almost every resident of every city and village in the district is indirectly supported by agriculture. These people are vitally interested in governmental policies and problems which affect the welfare of the American farmer. Producing large quantities of farm products is one thing, but finding a profitable market for them is quite another thing. Farm income has been at a shameful level in recent years, and one of the principal reasons for this is that the American market, our home market, and the best market in the world, no longer belongs to the American farmer.

In recent years this administration has gradually been turning it over to farmers of foreign nations. The blame for this cannot be escaped by the Federal Government. The trade-agreement policy of this administration has permitted—yes, it has invited foreign countries to import competitive farm products, many of them without paying any duty, at very low prices in direct competition with our farmers' products. They have lowered duties from 25 percent to 50 percent on the foreign-produced farm products which compete with the products of the farmers of my congressional district.

Our Government is spending millions of dollars to put new farm land into production. At the same time it is paying billions of dollars to our farmers to curtail production, while at the same time it is encouraging the importation of vast quantities of these same crops from abroad. What one department attempts to do is entirely offset by what another department does. Persistent efforts have been made by the New Dealers to convince our farmers that they are benefited by the administration's trade policies and that our imports of farm products are unimportant. A different story, however, is told by the facts. Our imports of competitive farm products averaged $537,198,000 annually during the fiscal year 1937–38. In the United States the average acreage in cultivation was 341,000,475 during these years. The average of crops grown per acre was $16.02, and the acreage displaced by competitive farm imports for this period was 33,533,000 acres per year. It does not sound like an unimportant matter. The value of all crops grown in my congressional district during 1938 was less than $18,000,000, about 3 percent of this amount. For the entire State of Indiana the amount was less than $165,000,000. The total value of all crops grown in Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Rhode Island during 1938 was only $533,000,014. In 1939 we imported from foreign countries into this country competitive farm products amounting to $616,149,000. The amount of land on American farms which has been displaced by competitive imports is larger than the reduction in acreage which has been brought about by the New Deal.

It can rightly be seen that while the Government, under the guise of soil conservation, is paying the farmers approximately $500,000,000 to reduce acreage and production, it is not only permitting but actually encouraging competitive imports valued at a greater amount.

It must be agreed that our agricultural condition would greatly improve if the American market was preserved for the American farmer. To illustrate how our farmers' markets have been taken away, and to impress more clearly on the people of my district the significance of this competitive importation, I have prepared a table showing the average annual yield of principal farm products in the 10 counties I represent. I am going to show the import figures for some of these crops and suggest that they be compared with the figures in the table which appears below.

Corn is the No. 1 crop in my district and in the State of Indiana. In 1931, before this administration came into power, and before the present trade policy went into effect, we imported only 335,000 bushels of corn. In 1936, after the present administration came into power and its trade policies were put into effect, we imported 86,000,000 bushels of corn, about 255 times as much. Some of the best corn country in the United States is in my congressional district; but it would take the farmers of my district about 6 years to produce that amount of corn. Wheat is a large crop in my district. Wheat imports totaled 3,829,000 bushels in 1938, and in 1939 we imported 10,747,000 bushels of foreign wheat, an increase of 280 percent. In 1938 we imported only 7,183 bushels of oats, but in 1939 we imported 4,293,000 bushels of oats. In 1938 we imported 126,000 bushels of barley; in 1939 we imported 776,000 bushels. In 1938 we imported 45,820,000 pounds of potatoes, while in 1939 we imported 93,859,000 pounds. In 1938 we imported 104,274 pounds of raw wool; in 1939 we imported over 245,970,000 pounds. In 1934 we imported 59,000 head of cattle; the amount of imports was increased to 424,022 head in 1938 and to 753,570 head in 1939. In 1932 our imports of pork amounted to only 34,000 pounds, while in 1937 we imported 16,500,000 pounds. I think you all remember when the President ordered the Navy Department to buy its corned beef from Argentina, and attempted to justify it with the statement that Argentine corned beef was cheaper and better. It probably is cheaper, but I do not think anyone grows better beef than is grown in the United States, and certainly we cannot have farm prosperity if our farmers have to compete with the cheaply produced beef of foreign countries.

The products of the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana are produced under American cost standards, and at one time were sold on the American market at a fair price. Today

our farmers are compelled to sell at far below the cost of production in direct competition with low-cost farm products. The farmers of my congressional district have been robbed of their just rights, their home market has been taken from them, and no new markets have been provided to replace the home market. The protection they once received from a sympathetic and understanding Government has vanished. No wonder our farmers feel they "have been sold down the river."

In 1932 Candidate Roosevelt, in making a bid for the farmer vote, promised the American farmers he would protect their home market. In one of his campaign speeches he said—I quote:

I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

After election he conveniently forgot about this as well as many other promises. He has drastically reduced tariff duties on 163 competitive farm products and is inviting farm producers to flood our market with products cheaply produced on foreign soil.

The New Deal should return the American market to our farmers. This market has a greater purchasing power than any 500,000,000 people in the world. It is the richest and best market in the world, and should be returned to the people who developed it.

Yield of principal farm products in 10 counties of sixth Indiana district for an average year

Product	Unit	Boone	Fountain	Hamilton	Hendricks	Montgomery	Parke	Putnam	Vermillion	Vigo	Warren	Total
Wheat	Bushels	419,372	350,225	402,392	415,909	638,498	359,896	288,092	291,107	430,792	129,991	3,726,274
Oats	Bushels	327,216	154,379	209,656	160,710	359,899	89,072	71,820	124,107	35,034	331,691	1,863,584
Barley	Bushels	1,742	1,460	2,167	646	190		300		2,848	1,895	11,248
Rye	Bushels	16,529	35,029	17,993	41,643	58,629	24,127	28,091	19,217	16,927	10,559	268,744
Mixed grains	Bushels	5,978	437	664	800	1,898	970	2,909	1,562		518	16,736
Hay	Tons	22,268	13,602	24,617	25,703	18,179	20,842	23,810	9,825	17,647	8,046	184,539
Corn	Bushels	2,264,268	891,413	2,068,929	2,089,212	2,078,378	1,353,954	1,616,919	767,978	1,388,126	955,396	15,474,573
Potatoes	Bushels	25,941	26,433	32,300	26,443	29,879	17,008	30,934	4,818	15,103	28,024	236,833
Apples	Bushels	4,906	44,296	10,508	12,681	4,889	4,436	29,863	9,234	3,899	2,233	126,945
Cherries	Bushel	296	475	739	242	305	318	1,010	228	756	360	4,727
Peaches	Bushel	1,487	1,092	3,440	846	1,288	757	19,637	850	549	938	30,884
Pears	Bushel	10,681	4,891	10,364	8,605	4,122	12,379	2,843	1,523	4,663	4,162	64,233
Grapes	Pound	56,041	36,801	97,320	116,306	47,737	77,931	53,773	32,856	177,463	28,921	725,149
Milk	Gallon	4,486,664	2,417,980	5,337,869	5,093,081	3,265,224	2,921,364	2,779,049	1,246,954	2,761,438	1,939,202	32,248,805
Butter	Pound	68,657	114,826	88,268	105,172	137,626	132,132	137,815	47,008	149,486	93,096	1,083,886
Wool	Pound	150,237	53,004	82,255	102,470	111,542	60,217	93,107	11,996	10,380	36,892	702,100
Eggs	Dozen	939,753	572,576	927,626	926,751	769,824	681,984	848,676	229,679	527,832	505,912	6,930,613
Chickens	Number	385,620	278,824	424,037	360,129	400,180	271,529	335,491	124,122	291,923	309,081	3,180,936

The Age of Machines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Oregonian, for June 19, 1940:

[From the Oregonian of June 19, 1940]

THE AGE OF MACHINES

Germany's terms to France—not the surface terms, the words, but the conditions actually imposed upon the vanquished—may well fix the tenor of human life for ages.

America is still untouched. Hitler will die. Nothing is permanent except change. These conquerors who strut across the stage will be gone presently. All that is true. But it is also true that man is at some tremendous crisis in his history, as heavy with possibilities as the industrial revolution or the expansion of Europe at the discovery of the New World. And Hitler—for Mussolini is only a voice at the conference table—will decide the morals with which this new era of mankind gets under way.

If he will not grant "peace with honor"—if he reduces the French to the slave status of the Poles, and with them the Belgians, Dutch, Danes, Norwegians—it means that he intends to face Britain, the United States, Russia, and Japan for the mastery of the world, using mechanized German warriors supported by labor battalions formed from the beaten. It means that the old style war and peace are gone from this civilization. We no longer can fight and afterward be reconciled, to live and fight another time. That has been the European people's way up to now. Extinction of the enemy has never been the thought. Victory has meant only temporary advantage. It has meant the upbuilding of one empire and the stripping of another. Not even Napoleon sought to turn the conquered Germans or Austrians or Italians into dull and herded labor forces. Our past has been bloody and often cruel, but at least there has been sportsmanship and an underlying comradeship of European man.

Something strange and degrading and forever dangerous has been brought into this traditional scene by Hitler. Perhaps he is not the creator of this new thing. We doubt that he is. It is more realistic to say he has been created by it.

But the fact remains that under his leadership Germany has shown the world the possibilities inherent in perfect harmony between men and machines. The age through which we have just passed, from the industrial revolution to the present, has been in truth an "industrial" age. We have tinkered with tools and excitedly fashioned marvelous machines; we have built planes to flock through the skies, swift ships for the sea; we talk around the earth; our factories, with their precision instruments, are wondrous beyond any one man's imaginings. They had to be put together, laboriously, piece by piece, by the efforts of millions of specialists.

But it remained for the Germans—mechanical by training and by bent of mind, and at the same time bitterly searching for a way of revenge upon their former conquerors—to shove us, in one horrible military campaign, from the industrial age to the age of the machine.

They, the Germans, had surrendered themselves to absolute regimentation. And this obedience enabled the military commanders to develop, for the first time, an absolute coordination of men and machines, so increasing the force of the latter far beyond what it had been in the past.

Every description of German advances in the Low Countries and France tells this same story over and over again. Here came the squadrons of bombers, systematically attacking concentrations, supply dumps, hangars, and finally the infantry positions themselves, so that the defenders had to keep their heads down. Then as the German light tanks advanced, the planes moved up and down the defense positions spraying machine-gun bullets. Behind the light tanks were the giant ones, the moving forts, with both artillery and machine guns. * * * And all this with a dreadful, routine perfection, as though the men were extensions of the levers they pulled and the wheels they turned. For the first time, under battle conditions, men seemed as much a part of their machines as men of the past ages belonged to their horses.

It is no use denying the German devils their due in this respect. But we do not need to be nervous about it. They have scored a break-through on the continent by their innovations. It is possible they may succeed against Britain also, even though so far they have only proved themselves in land attack, which always has been their preoccupation. But the principles of their attack are essentially simple, not difficult to catch up with, for such a country as the United States, with machine possibilities beyond their own and with better men. With us, however, it has become a question of clear-sightedness, decisive action and sacrifice. If we have patience with our Chamberlains, the true age of the machines will strike us before we have prepared to turn it aside.

Valiant for Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE NORLIN

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have the honor to insert in the RECORD a commencement address delivered June 10, 1940, at the University of Wyoming, by Dr. George Norlin, president emeritus of the University of Colorado. The address constitutes a document of ringing relevance to the crisis of the hour. Dr. Norlin, from residence in Germany, knows whereof he speaks as touching pressing dangers to our way of life. From the purest patriotism, he knows, too, whereof he speaks as touching the priceless heritage of all unchained hearts. His has been for years a valiant voice crying against the danger of lethargy and the illusion of isolationism. His professional life has been tinctured with the quintessence of patriotism, and his ripened wisdom carries all the courage of Valiant for Truth, whom he here commends to junior and senior partners in the precious citizenship of America.

VALIANT FOR TRUTH

(By Dr. George Norlin, commencement, University of Wyoming, June 10, 1940)

I have taken my subject and my text from an old book, about 300 years old now. I wonder how many of you who are today graduating from this university are familiar with it. I would guess that I could count them on the fingers of one hand. Yet its language and imagery have become a part of our everyday speech. It has been translated into 75 languages and dialects. When I was a boy, it and the Bible formed the essential nucleus of any household library. It was regarded as an indispensable vitamin in the mental diet of youth, and it had a greater circulation than its antitype, Mein Kampf, today.

The book was written by a man whose whole life was a brave testimony to the truth as he saw it. He was a dissenter from the established Church of England, and he expiated that crime by 12 years in an English jail. During this imprisonment he occupied himself with making shoelaces to support his family and with the writing of Pilgrim's Progress.

The book has in it the Delectable Mountains, which is one of the bright spots in the pilgrim's march. But there is also the "slough of despond," the "castle of doubt," the "giant despair," "savage beasts," all manner of "foul fields" and poisonous propaganda. Yet in the midst of all these tests and trials, where everywhere unclean hands reached out to drag him from the path of truth, there is one who does not faint, who does not lie down, who stands his ground against the powers of darkness, who is valiant for truth.

Should you by any chance desire to get a copy of Pilgrim's Progress, you might rummage for it in a second-hand book store in some remote alcove where dead immortals rest in peace; and should you by any chance desire to seek out Valiant for Truth—I mean the backbone to look truth unflinchingly in the face, to live by it, and, if necessary, to die for it—you might come across it in the rubbish of a civilization which existed before mighty empires, hell-bent for war, had spurned the way of truth and peace and sanctioned their wild-beast aggressions by a million tongues of lying propaganda, leaving the rest of the world, where truth still glimmered, horrified, aghast, irresolute, not knowing what to do, shaken in our own faith, and incapable of resolute action in the face of a physical brutishness directed by the brutishness in the heart of men. The material destruction, the wholesale slaughter is bad enough, but, more terrible still, is the devastation wrought in human souls—for the lamps of truth are blackened out and we are living in the age of lies.

When I visited Munich in the early summer of 1932, I found the university for which that city is famous closed because the student rioting within its halls made any academic procedure impossible. The trouble began when a professor of history, true to his calling as a high priest of truth, tried to discuss objectively the Treaty of Versailles, calling attention to the fact that settlements and treaties made after prolonged and bitter warfare are not written in the milk of human kindness and citing in evidence the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which Germany imposed on Russia in the course of the World War.

Now, in the interest of truth, I wish to suggest to those, if any such there be, who think that the shortcomings of the Versailles Treaty justify the Germany of today in trampling underfoot every vestige of decency and honor—I wish to suggest that you compare that much maligned treaty, as the Munich professor did, with the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. You may find that the Versailles Treaty is in comparison as merciful as the gentle dew from heaven. Also, I would have you imagine what the settlement at the end of the World War of two decades ago would have been like if Germany had dictated its terms. You might then be in a position to picture what the world in which you live will be like if the war now in progress should end in a Pax Germanica.

But I am straying from my point. What I want to emphasize is that as early as 1932, some months before Hitler came into power, one of the great universities of the world was closed because one of its professors was valiant for truth. He was telling the truth objectively. He lost his job, and he was but the forerunner of many. When in the following January Hitler came into power, every professor in every German university who dealt with truth objectively lost his job and in most cases was punished for his crime. For there was instituted with the triumph of Hitler what they called frankly the nationalization, the Germanization of truth—truth made in Germany.

The truth as it is now taught in Germany is that in the last World War Germany was not in the least to blame, but that, on the contrary, she was the innocent object of a world conspiracy to crush a superior, God-chosen race which has never been defeated, which can never be defeated, and whose divine mission it is to impose its civilization by force of arms upon all the inferior peoples of the earth.

That is but a sample of truth made in Germany. I cannot take the time here to trace the progressive steps of the Germanization of truth as I saw it on the ground in 1933 and have heard of it through German mouths the last 7 years. I must let it suffice to say that what the Nazis call their world philosophy, their Weltanschauung, is such a tissue of blatant lies that it is the eighth wonder of the world how even a brown shirt could take the madness of it seriously, unless we accept Hitler's word that any lie, no matter how incredible or fantastic, is made true by loud and assiduous repetition.

No less astounding is the phenomenon of statesmen and peoples of other countries putting any faith whatever in the word of a man who frankly says in his Mein Kampf that it is the part of statesmanship to deceive and mislead not only other peoples but one's own people whenever lies will serve the purpose of the ruling power, and who has in fact been marching toward his goal over roads paved with broken oaths. He lied to Austria; he lied to Czechoslovakia; he lied to England and France; he lied to Poland; he lied to Belgium; he lied to Luxemburg; he lied to Norway; he lied to Denmark; he lied to Holland; and now, in the breaking of his solemn covenants and in devastating neutral and innocent countries with fire and sword, he justifies his fiendish course by forging white papers to show that he is merely taking them under his protection to rescue them from being violated by the Allied Powers. Satan was once said to be the father of lies, but he has abdicated in favor of one greater than he.

So now we have truth made in Germany, truth made in Russia, truth made in Italy, truth made in Japan—truth made out of whole cloth to justify whatever savagery they may desire to perpetrate. They have even claimed that God is with them, and now they are sure, for did not Napoleon point out that "God is on the side of the strongest battalions"?

And we have also truth manufactured in the United States; for we, too, have fashioned our own myths to justify our apathy in the face of that advancing savagery.

If that last assertion shocks you as a truth made by me, let me quote a statement found in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly by the poet, now Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish. Speaking of what has been happening across the Atlantic and especially of the darkness which is spreading from the German madness over the minds of men everywhere—over your minds and mine—he complains: "These things are now commonplaces. They are commonplaces to such a point that they no longer shock us into anger. Indeed, it is the essential character of our time that the triumph of the lie, the mutilation of culture, and the persecution of the word no longer shock us into anger."

They no longer shock us into anger. Why should we be angry? What goes on over there, we have been saying, is no concern of ours. It is no skin off our backs. Let them stew in their own juice. As for us, let us go about our own business; let us live unto ourselves.

In fact, isolation has been our national religion for many years. We have preached it fervently like crusaders in a holy cause inspired and led by the Holy Ghost. And yet we are not entirely comfortable. We can't help wondering whether it is cricket for us to sit idly by, thanking God we are Americans, while the hounds of hell are running loose in Europe. We aren't very proud of ourselves; we do not feel very heroic, and so we hide our apathy under shining masks. We comfort and justify ourselves with myths.

It is of these myths of our own making that I wish to speak. First, there is the myth which has been so propagandized in the United States that most of our students, and I dare say most of our people, accept it as the truth. I mean the myth that we were fooled and duped—led by our noses—into the war of 1914–18, by big business and misleading propaganda and that we are never going to be fooled again.

That is a myth out of whole cloth. It is propaganda and not history. In fact, we pushed ourselves into that war. There was an overwhelming sentiment in favor of our entering upon it. We

felt that isolation from that conflict was unworthy of us; that the issue of that war was of profound concern to us; that we had precious and vital interests in common with one side against the other; that the brutal invasion and devastation of little Belgium by a great power in violation of a solemn treaty was intolerable; that the sinking of American ships which were entitled to the freedom of the seas was intolerable. Above all, we were lifted up on the wings of a high hope—the great hope that if we threw into that war our power, our prestige, and our relative detachment from the quarrels of Europe, we would be in a strong position to see to it that out of the ashes of that conflict there would grow some world parliament—some league—which could prevent such cataclysms in the future.

The President of the United States who had kept us out of the war for 3 years, at length in 1917 said to Congress and the Nation:

"The right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world at last free." So he said, and so we thought, almost every one of us.

It was a war to end war, or so we thought. It did not turn out as we thought. We were on the side of the victors, but we won nothing for which we fought. And why? Mainly because we did not follow up our victory and reap its fruits; because a minority in the Senate of the United States thwarted our President and the great majority of our people in our desire to take our place in a world council, and to join with other peoples in a league to prevent aggression, to give security to small nations who wanted only to go their own way in peace, and to outlaw war as the be all and end all of national policy.

That defeat of our aspirations shocked us all, and for a time we rebelled against it, but our enthusiasm cooled; apathy seized our jaded spirits; and we set our feet in the path of "normalcy"—that bastard word which masks the lie that every man liveth unto himself, every group of men, every nation of men.

In fact, we fought and won and ran away. We left the League of Nations, the child begotten of American hopes, a foundling on the doorstep of Europe—a Europe torn by rancor and hate. We not only abandoned it and disowned it but held in contempt its weakness caused by our running away. We seemed even to rejoice over its failure with a triumphant "I told you so." And so we made the world safe, not for law and peace, but for criminals and gangsters.

Who dares say that if the most powerful nation on earth—the outstanding democracy of the world—had lent to the League its strength, its prestige, and its comparative detachment we should now find ourselves face to face with the organized savagery of this day?

Do you suppose for a moment that Hitler would have been so daring in his assaults on democracies if he had not known that he could proceed as if the United States did not exist?

The hope of the world 20 years ago lay in Woodrow Wilson and the people of the United States. Who cheated that hope? Who defaulted in that crisis? Let us be honest with ourselves, let us face the truth, let us stop patting ourselves on the back, let us stop this scapegoat business, let us stop sublimating an inglorious and self-defeating selfishness by pretending that through our remoteness and alcofness we can best keep oil in the lamps of the world.

Well, that is one myth with which we comfort ourselves and hallow our conduct. It is parroted on the street, it is taught in our schools, it is repeated on the rostrums of our universities, and we hang its phylacteries about us with comforting and prideful religiosity.

Another myth by which we hallow our isolation is that in the conflict now raging there is no essential difference between one side and the other—no real difference in method or in purpose. Both are tarred with the same brush. Both are imperialistic, fighting only to extend their dominions. Therefore there is no reason whatsoever why we should side with either party to the conflict, even in our sympathies.

I have heard that doctrine preached on our own campus in Boulder. I have seen students passing resolutions to that effect all over the country. They have been fooling themselves; they have been duped; they have had their eyes veiled from the truth by those who should know better. Here I should like to say, what should go without saying, that a professor in a university is virtually under oath to speak the truth and nothing but the truth; and that when he speaks not ex cathedra—not from his chair, but from a soap box—not having taken the pains to know whereof he speaks, he is as much a falsifier as any blatant Hitlerite.

This myth has been hushed the last 2 weeks. At least I have not heard it for some little time. The language of events has answered it. To discuss it seriously now would be to insult the intelligence of a moron. It is a tale told by an idiot. Indeed, recent events have made it painfully obvious that the allied powers are at a tremendous disadvantage because they are bound by barriers of decency and honor which the enemy smashes through without scruple and without shame.

There are mixed motives in this war on both sides. England wants to hold her Empire intact and so does France, against a Germany which will tolerate no empire but her own. The Hitler tyranny is, so far as I can see, a black darkness. But that is not to say that the warring democracies are all white. We have many bones to pick with them. England's refusal to make a firm stand with us in the Manchurian crisis has left a sore spot. The appeasement policy of England and France, their trust in the word of an unspeakable liar, their unwitting partnership with Hitler in the Czechoslovakian outrage, was a cruel stupidity which has chilled our sense of fellowship. Yet now these are trifles which pale into insignificance in the overwhelming crisis. With the rape of Poland, England and France were shaken out of their temporizing and, though ill prepared, they have met and are meeting the dreadful issue with honest and unflinching resolution. And today the clear truth which puts all other things in shadow is this: Our little planet is now a great battleground on which two ideas or two sets of ideas—two philosophies—are engaged in a struggle to the death. Not that they face each other for the first time. They have met before on a thousand battlefields—nations against nations, parties against parties, blocs against blocs, man against man, individuals at war with themselves. But they are now met in a colossal struggle such as the world has never before seen, and the issue of that conflict seems to be in some final sense fateful for all mankind, fateful for us.

Two ideas, two sets of ideas, two philosophies meeting head on—what are they? On the one side is thé Nazi Weltanschauung, which stands for the exploitation of human beings on a national and even on a world scale. It has no regard whatsoever for human life as such, not even the life of its willing or unwilling subjects These have no rights, not even the right to live. They are of value only as they contribute to the power of the State. They are just so many cells in a vast organism. If they do not function, or are suspected of not functioning healthily and loyally to the ruling power, they are cancerous growths which must be removed by ruthless surgery. They are to all intents and purposes slaves, whipped into step by a leader, alias a driver. There is no personal freedom. The only freedom is the freedom of the State to work its absolute will, and the will of the Nazi state is the will to war and conquest.

All the domestic regimentation of the people is for one end—the complete militarization of the state, the welding of every man, woman, and child into a unified, smooth-running, invincible machine of destruction, a machine which is beyond good and evil, which is a law unto itself, which is amoral and elemental, having no more conscience than an earthquake or a flood, being in fact more cruel than nature in her most savage moods; for nature is merely indifferent to our humankind, whereas this monstrous violence seeks out men and women and children for destruction. Nazi-ism strives for the triumph of death over life. As someone has said (I think it was Heywood Broun), nazi-ism is the religion of lost souls, and its votaries having lost their souls feel that they must gain the whole world.

That, stripped of its disguises and hallelujahs, is one philosophy, one religion. On the other front is an idea, a faith, which is a slow and painful birth of ages of human aspiration and struggle. It is the revolutionary idea, or set of ideas, that man is not a means to an end, not something to be exploited by class or by state for wealth or for war, but an end in himself; that the highest of values on this earth is the value of free men, that the only morality, the only justice, which is built on a rock is that which respects the sacredness of the human personality; that laws and institutions and states are made for him and by him, not he for them; and that the first business of men living together—the first business of the state—is not to coerce him under the despotism of a regimented mob for an ulterior purpose, but to cherish and promote his individual freedom to grow in peace into the full stature of his being.

That idea, which we name democracy, has never been realized in fact. Democracy is not an accomplished thing, not an established thing. Rather it has been a dynamic faith which has always had to do battle, and today with its back to the wall is battling for its very existence.

I say with its back to the wall, but that is an understatement. For it is not only Germany that threatens. Other totalitarian powers are poised like vultures above the battlefields of Europe, awaiting greedily the moment when it will be safe for them to descend and gorge their bellies. At this very moment Italy dives to her feast.

"Whatever touches my neighbor touches me" was once the motto of a noble house. That has not been our motto. Our slogan has been that whatever happens to our neighbors over there is their business and none of ours.

That is a monstrous myth, not to call it by an uglier name, which has for some years clouded our vision, and which has been, I am convinced, responsible in a degree for the unchaining of brutishness and savagery abroad. Now, if I am not mistaken, our eyes are just beginning to open to the truth. Whatever touches the spirit of freedom in Europe touches our own freedom, and if the lamps of democracy are quenched everywhere else in the world we cannot isolate ourselves from the universal darkness; and we are now being confronted by the question which Lincoln asked in a great crisis, the question whether we in the United States, the custodians of a freedom which for more than a century has been a banner to the world at large, "shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last, best hope of earth."

That is truth, and the myth which has obscured it is, I think, being dispersed day by day. If what happens over there is none of our business, why have we been seized with panic after panic at the reverses of the Allies? Why, after the seizure of Denmark and Norway, did President Roosevelt urge an addition of more than a

billion dollars to a war budget of already staggering proportions? Why, after the conquest of Holland and Belgium, did he propose the expenditure of more than a billion dollars on top of that? Why is it proposed to increase the legal limit of our national debt by $4,000,000,000? Why did the level-headed Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, in a radio address last Tuesday, speak in terms of equaling Germany's war budget of $20,000,000,000 a year? Why do we, the people, knowing that our pockets must be picked to support these enormous expenditures, face these proposals without a murmur of dissent? Why are many of those who were hysterical in their zeal to keep us out of war now pleading for immediate intervention by the United States? Manifestly, we have been thinking that the Allies would slay the dragon without our turning a hand. But now that our neighbor democracies across the sea are in imminent danger of annihilation, our pious masks have been shaken off by shock after shock, and we are routed into thinking that what is happening over there is terribly our business.

I do not mean that we should be knight-errants in this business. We are properly concerned about our own security—the defense of our land. But the question is, When and where do we begin to defend ourselves? Do we begin when bombs fall on New York, when an enemy ship of war steams into the Golden Gate, when a foreign army sets foot upon our shores, or do we begin before the enemy is upon us and amongst us?

There are many who have urged that we can best serve humanity by absenting ourselves from the turmoils which beset mankind, by crawling into our own dugout, safe from bursting bombs and the cannon's crash. They do not say it in these words. They say, rather, that we should keep ourselves unspotted from the world, building up our own power—our own bloodstream—so that when the peoples of Europe are bled white we can march into that helpless chaos and establish a righteous peace.

Is that not another myth to buttress our self-righteousness? After the war which ended 20 years ago, in which we made tremendous sacrifices of money and, in a less degree, of men, we ran away from the peace. Now, it has been proposed that, without any sacrifice whatever beyond strengthening our armaments, we shall be in at the kill and on the peace. Out of the war, in on the peace. I do not know how that sounds to you. To me it sounds like a cracked bell.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not urging that we plunge, eyes shut and heads down, into the present inferno. It is now out of the question for us to build up an expeditionary force that could be of any use in stemming the advancing madness abroad. I do not know that we can spare the Navy from the threats in the Pacific. My own feeling is that we have missed bus after bus until now there are no busses running any more. The question is not should we do anything, but what can we do to help. Whatever we can do we should now do for our own security.

The great democratic powers in their extremity call for our help. They do not ask for men. They ask for machines. We can scrap our hypocritical neutrality and be a nonbelligerent. We can speed up our manufacture of guns and airplanes and other implements of war as if we were ourselves at war, and speed their shipping to our sister democracies. We can abrogate, if you want to, our surrender of our right to sail the seas. We can wipe out the Johnson Act and give credit to those who are fighting their and our battles abroad. We can do many things short of military intervention. There is some risk in doing so; but is there not greater risk in not doing so? Nothing ventured, nothing won.

One thing we can do at once—and that is the whole burden of this paper—we can be brave enough to look unpleasant truths in the face without flinching and without crawling. We can be on the alert against the lies that not only excuse, but sanctify, the unspeakable terrorism abroad. And we can be equally alert against the lies which we are prone to tell ourselves in sublimation of our own apathy and anemia.

Civilization and truth go hand in hand. It is truth that makes us free. "Hateful to me as the gates of hell is that man who says one thing with his lips and hides another in his heart." These words, which I have taken from the oldest document of our western civilization, may be said to be the keystone of the structure of any tolerable existence, and they may well serve us at this juncture, now that in the days to come it is of tremendous importance for our own security that we exercise a judgment unclouded by myths and lies.

Let me close by going back to my text. My plea is for valiance for truth. The fighting spirit of German youth has been built up ever since Hitler came into power in 1933, by the most colossal machinery of propaganda that has ever been devised to misshape the minds and hearts of men. German youth have been dazzled by the prospective glory of imperial power. They have been made to feel that they have something to live for, to fight for, to die for. By a strange perversity they are valiant for lies. But what are we who live in freedom, taking it for granted as we take for granted the wholesome air we breathe—what are we willing to fight for or, if necessary, to die for? Our own skins? May it not be that peace at any cost may be bought at the cost of everything which makes life tolerable? Is there nothing in this world more precious than life itself?

What democracy needs and needs terribly right now is a fighting heart. Forget if you will everything that I have said, but listen, I beg of you, to the words of a great soul, a great German, a great humanist, exiled from his native land, now late in life sinking his roots into our own soil, Thomas Mann. These are his words: "What we need today is a humanity strong in will and the soldierly determination to preserve itself. Freedom must discover its virility, must learn to walk in armor and defend itself against its mortal enemies, must at last realize, after the most bitter of experiences, that with a pacifism which will not have war at any price, it is provoking, not banishing war."

These words are 2 years old. Two years ago they caused only a lifting of our eyebrows. Now they shine with truth.

The Mask Is Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, June 1, Harry H. Woodring, then Secretary of War, said:

I am an advocate of adequate defense, but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles.

There is a comparatively small clique of international financiers who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess, with everything we have, including our manpower. I am not going to stand for it, and I am not going to resign until forced to do so.

June 20 came the show-down. Woodring was forced to resign, and in went Stimson and Knox, both Republican interventionists, who will help the administration to get us into war.

New Deal politicians in Washington considered their appointment by Roosevelt, on the eve of the Republican Convention, as a "smart political trick," in that it was thought it would enable the President to claim he was thinking of the country as a whole.

It has had the opposite effect, for, while he gets two Republicans into his Cabinet, he, at the same time, gets two men who support his own policy. The result of his policy, if continued, is to involve us in a war for which we are unprepared. The move was designed to aid his efforts to insure for himself a third term, or the power to name and control his successor.

There is one good thing about the appointments. The mask is now off. Roosevelt and his followers stand revealed as the "war party"—something which many of us knew, which others suspected, but of which all can now be certain.

The issue is thus clearly drawn for the November election—Roosevelt and his adherents for war; the rest of us for peace. It is time that the issue of whether America comes first, or whether we are to become a pawn in world wars should be overwhelmingly decided one way or the other in November.

YOU—NOT SOMEBODY ELSE—WILL BE DRAFTED

Under the plans now prepared, the President proposes to register all men between 18 and 65; those between 18 and 21, and those between 45 and 65, for service in home-defense units; the others for universal service.

BOYS AND GIRLS, TOO

He has another plan to draft all boys and girls, forcing them for 1 year to take military training under Sidney Hillman. He graciously added that the camps for the boys would be located 25 miles distant from the girls' camps. The significance of this remark he did not make clear. Nor did he state how far from either camp the cemeteries would be located. If war comes, many a cemetery will be needed for the graves of our soldiers; many a hospital for the human wrecks it will make.

Our boys and girls under Sidney Hillman and his adherents? Of Sidney Hillman's appointment to another post, Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, said:

What the President has done is to put the entire vast problem of unemployment under the defense program in the hands of a representative of a minority faction, riddled with Communists, and engaged in making war upon more than 4,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor.

As a Representative, every act of mine is directed toward keeping Congress in session, preventing the establishment of a dictatorship here at home, the bringing about of an efficient, intelligent program for national defense, and to keeping us out of war.

We all have the task of seeing that those at home and those here in Congress do not lose their heads; do not vote to throw away our dearly won liberties, our economic prosperity, because of war hysteria or an adherence to so-called social legislation.

This Government of ours is sound. We have the ability to adequately prepare for any danger that may come. We should have the good sense to stay out of war, and by a united effort and with the help of God, we should be able to place in control of our Government safe, competent, loyal, God-fearing men who believe in our country, in our form of government, in our religion; men who will think of America first.

Wasting Money in Times of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the need for making every dollar go as far as possible, notwithstanding the fact that additional taxes will be imposed by this Congress upon the people, some Members of Congress still continue to spend for the sake of spending.

No better illustration can be given than that which occurred in the House on June 19, 1940. There was a proposition to appropriate $500,000, or half a million, to help farmers who were in the so-called shelterbelt—where, you may recall, trees were planted by the Government some time ago—build ponds on their land.

Quite naturally, being anti New Deal as I am, my criticism might be considered biased, so I will here quote the words of the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, a Democrat, a member of the Appropriations Committee, on this subject:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a moment or two. This is the old shelterbelt idea. Formerly the Government planted trees on these Dust Bowl farms free of charge and paid the farmers to fence and tend them.

Now they are asking the Government to build ponds on the same farms—to spend public money on private land—not as a loan but as a gratuity, and want half a million dollars to carry on this benevolent work. The truth is that this land should never have been put in cultivation. It is not suited to farming and should have been left as grazing land. Farmers on this marginal land will never be self-sustaining, regardless of how much free money the Government ladles out to them year after year and especially when it is handled as the go-betweens are handling this particular money. They are asking for $500,000. The break-down accompanying the estimate shows that $360,000 of the $500,000 will go for salaries of high-powered, high-priced employees, and only $140,000 of the $500,000 will actually reach the farmer. In other words, this appropriation is primarily to provide fat, juicy sinecures out of the Public Treasury at a time when the Treasury is empty and every dollar of the $500,000 must be borrowed.

At Valley Forge, when the need of the American Army was greatest and when the fortunes of the Revolution were at the lowest ebb, such few cattle as they were able to obtain for the depleted commissary were bought from the neighboring farmers.

Among them was a cantankerous old gentleman who first agreed to sell his stock for Continental scrip, but, after the cattle had been delivered, concluded he ought to have British gold. It might have been that he fell under the influence of the contemporary "fifth column." At any rate he visited camp and created considerable disturbance over the price of his beef. Finally he was taken to Washington and Washington listened to him patiently and then said, "Here we are, striving our utmost to maintain harmony, drill an army, and establish the independence of the Colonies and you come rushing into camp bawling, 'Beef, beef, beef.'"

History repeats itself, and at a time when the entire Nation is cooperating on a defense program and exerting every energy to maintain the independence Washington established, these gentlemen inject a discordant note—$500,000 for juicy jobs—and flock to the floor of the House bawling, "Pork, pork, pork." [Applause and laughter.]

You will note that of the $500,000 but $140,000 would go to the farmers. The balance, or $360,000, would go to the officeholders for giving the money to the farmers—a rather high price to pay Santa Claus, who, after all, is only a make-believe Santa Claus.

Amendment of Raker Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY THE DOWN TOWN ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article at the request of the Down Town Association of San Francisco:

FACTS TO SUPPORT SAN FRANCISCO'S APPEAL FOR AMENDMENT OF RAKER ACT

(By the Down Town Association of San Francisco)

1. San Francisco received no gifts from the Federal Government on the Hetch Hetchy project. The city has paid in full and generously for everything it got.

A. San Francisco deeded to the Federal Government 1,700 acres of land in and adjacent to the national park. In return the Government gave the city the right to use 2,580 acres flooded by reservoir—rights on only 880 acres more than the city deeded to the Government.

B. The city has paid the Government to date $360,000 rental for the lands it uses, and will pay $30,000 a year forever and a day.

C. The city has spent $82,670 on trails, $513,500 on roads, and paid the Government $1,250,000 cash in lieu of building still other trails demanded by the Secretary of the Interior.

D. All the expenditures made by the city for the Government were shown in court to total $2,702,607. As City Attorney O'Toole said in his brief, "The city has given the Government more than 10 times the value of the lands which the Government gave the city the right to use."

2. San Francisco did not obtain a single water right from the Federal Government. San Francisco owned all its water rights.

All the city's water rights were acquired by appropriation under the laws of California. The Government had no interest whatsoever in them. The Raker Act in its closing sentence expressly declares it has no intention of interfering with the appropriation or use of water.

3. The Federal Government did not give San Francisco any land for its main plant, the Moccasin powerhouse, or its principal right-of-way for power transmission lines.

The Moccasin power plant is on city-owned patented land. So is the transmission line from that power plant to Newark.

San Francisco's Hetch Hetchy power is produced by water used under the city's own rights acquired by California law, developed in power plants upon its own fee-simple lands, and transmitted by wires situated upon a city-owned right-of-way, except for the small early intake powerhouse and a transmission line from it to Moccasin.

4. The Hetch Hetchy project was and is essentially a water-supply system.

Electricity was only incidental to the main purpose when the Raker Act was adopted. The city has spent the colossal sum of $142,695,000 to provide an adequate water supply.

5. Since July 1, 1925, the city has disposed of Hetch Hetchy power under an agency agreement with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Up to December 31, 1939, the city had received $30,972,415 for this power. This vast sum went toward payment of interest and principal on Hetch Hetchy bonds and in reduction of the tax rate. This revenue is now $2,400,000 a year.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States held this method of power disposal violated the Raker Act. Unless a solution of the problem is found, the city power plant will be shut down, with a consequent loss to the city of a $2,400,000 annual revenue.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1940, San Francisco's tax rate will be the highest in its history. The loss of that power revenue would increase the tax rate a further 27 cents.

6. San Francisco's only recourse is to appeal to the Congress for an amendment of the Raker Act to permit San Francisco to sell its

Hetch Hetchy power to corporations just the same as is done on every Federal hydroelectric project in the country.

7. The only other alternative would be the voting of a huge bond issue for construction or acquisition of an electric distribution system. Seven times the voters of San Francisco have refused to incur such indebtedness. On May 19, 1939, by a vote of 123,118 "no" to 50,283 "yes" the voters rejected a $55,000,000 power bond scheme. They knew that $55,000,000 would be only a start. Ten years ago the city engineer estimated the cost of a complete system at $85,000,000. It would cost more now. Hetch Hetchy can produce (even if Red Mountain power station was completed) only 84,000 kilowatts out of more than 225,000 kilowatts needed to supply San Francisco. Experience has taught the voters to expect that as soon as the first funds were expended there would be insistent demands for more millions and tens of millions for complete system. San Franciscans remember that the Hetch Hetchy water project started in 1910 with a $45,000,000 bond issue for construction and "completion" of the system, and that it has now, including Spring Valley, run up to $142,695,000 and is still not finished. Our citizens have clearly shown that they will not be bludgeoned or coerced into starting on another $100,000,000 indebtedness.

8. Amendment of the Raker Act is the only solution.

9. It is not unreasonable of San Francisco to ask this relief from the Congress.

San Francisco asks only that it receive the same treatment from the Federal Government as other governmental agencies. It respectfully, nevertheless most emphatically, asks and expects to receive relief from unfair and unreasonable discrimination against it in the matter of disposal of Hetch Hetchy power.

10. No other city or irrigation district or Federal hydroelectric-power project is prohibited from selling power to a private corporation. On the contrary, every one of them is either specifically authorized or is permitted to do so.

Consider this:

A. Oakland, Berkeley, and other cities across the bay from San Francisco, in Alameda County, received a grant of land by act of Congress, April 27, 1934, upon the Mokelumne River. They paid the Government $5 an acre for 780 acres; no restrictions, no annual payments, no roads to build, no conditions attached; and this East Bay water district generates power at a hydroelectric plant located on the very land the Government granted it, and sells that power (for $400,000 a year) to the same Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which has been distributing Hetch Hetchy power.

B. The acts of Congress creating every one of the following Federal projects authorize sale of electricity to private corporations: Bonneville Dam, Boulder Dam, Fort Peck project (in Montana), Tennessee Valley Authority.

C. The Department of the Interior owns and operates, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, a power plant in the Yosemite Valley, a part of the same national park in which Hetch Hetchy is situated. Under the Secretary of the Interior, surplus power from the Yosemite Valley plant is sold to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

D. The Turlock and Modesto irrigation districts generate power from the selfsame Tuolumne River water that generates the Hetch Hetchy power. These irrigation districts sell part of their power to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

To deny San Francisco an amendment of the Raker Act is to discriminate against this city and is to say that, notwithstanding the accepted practice and policy of the Federal Government, San Francisco and San Francisco alone throughout the Nation must forthwith burden itself with an enormous indebtedness, or, as an alternative, be deprived of more than $2,400,000 annual revenue from the electric energy generated by plants and works that have been developed and paid for at enormous cost by the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Amendment of the Raker Act as desired would in nowise prevent the city from acquiring its own electrical distribution system whenever our voters are convinced that the necessary expenditure therefor is economically sound and for the best interest of San Francisco.

We do not believe that San Francisco is an orphan child of the Nation. We do believe that in common sense and ordinary fairness, San Francisco will be given the benefit of the same liberal policy in distribution of electric power that the Federal hydroelectric projects and other municipal and governmental agencies now enjoy.

Dated: May 8, 1940.

THE DOWN TOWN ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but that our best interest as a nation will be best served by staying out of the European war, and by rearming ourselves to such an extent that no nation nor probable combination of nations dare attack us. If we do these two things I am persuaded that we shall be able to live at peace with all the world and avoid the unspeakable tragedy that our involvement in the present war would bring upon the people of this country.

Men and women everywhere are deeply disturbed and disquieted by the events happening abroad and by the successive moves which our own Government has been making, which seem to be leading us straight into the war.

I, as perhaps every other Member of Congress, have been receiving and continue to receive daily, scores of communications from constituents, voicing their fears and their hopes. A typical example of these communications and one that speaks more eloquently than I can speak, of the fears, the interest, and the hope, yes and the faith, of typical Americans, is as follows:

BRIDGEPORT, OHIO, *June 19, 1940.*

Congressman EARL R. LEWIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our all is at our Government's disposal, to protect the United States, but to help Europe—no. Give them all but men. Keep our boys home to defend our own land. They can do America no good lying in Europe dead.

We did our part in the other World War. What has it done for us? Look my record up. Company M, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry, Forty-second Division. Severely wounded under machine-gun fire in Argonne front.

We have a son 19 years old. Leave him home, please. We know what war is.

We are trusting our God and Government to keep us out of Europe.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. CARL C. DRUMMOND.

Whither America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH CONRAD FEHR

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Joseph Conrad Fehr, entitled "Whither America?"

Mr. Fehr is a lawyer of standing connected with the Federal Trade Commission, and he has written a very important article. Whether or not it is controversial I express no opinion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER AMERICA?

(By Joseph Conrad Fehr)

"'Notre ignorance de l'histoire nous fait calomnier notre temps."
—Flaubert.

World War or no World War, the dominant political question of the time in which we live is whether the people are capable of choosing their own public servants. In the United States, particularly, it is more than apparent that not only the present administration, but any administration, is not likely to be without effective opposition for a long time to come. Those who believe that opposition is vital to a proper balance of governmental powers in the interest of minorities, continue to insist that the people usually decide wisely while those who feel that opposition is of less importance than the existence of a unified political party strong enough to translate the will of the majority into a definite effective working program will continue to claim that the people are always their own worst enemies. This perennial ideological conflict has once more been the subject of a colorful dramatization by way of the recent debates in Congress on the repeal of the Embargo Act.

Lowell was probably right when, in comparing democracy in England and in the United States, he said, "England, indeed, may be called a monarchy with democratic tendencies, the United States a democracy with conservative instincts." And as long as men everywhere demand the superlative and are constantly seeking a guide, neither Englishmen nor Americans, whatever their

traditions, are ever entirely satisfied with their forms of government.

In past centuries men everywhere turned to and were satisfied with monarchy as the ideal form of government because of its cohesion and readiness and effectiveness to act promptly. Monarchy afforded visible persons who knew their own minds and aims and a powerful organization. Such a governmental system seldom failed to enlist loyalty on the part of the governed, whenever the rulers maintained themselves as wise servants of all the people.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, which nineteenth century liberalism served to build up into a political philosophy, has in modern times achieved only a measurable success, as, for instance, in Switzerland and, to a lesser extent, in some of the governments incorporated in the British Empire. Even in these democratic commonwealths the smallest legislative assemblies cannot do all their work without the aid of committees, and this, of course, means that the real work of government is done by individuals.

Representative government is a modern development of which the ancient world knew nothing. In order to accomplish its purposes, it is only necessary that legislative and administrative acts be guided, according to the will of the majority of the people on the theory, wise or not, that the dominant power should have its way. It is in this sense that the form of representative government peculiar to the United States is generally referred to as democracy which, as a matter of fact, is realizable only on the smallest scale. Hence, as Woodrow Wilson repeatedly pointed out, it is erroneous to speak of "the sovereignty of the people" in a "vast and miscellaneous democracy" such as ours. "Leadership," he said, "cannot belong to the multitude." In this respect, if in no other, he agreed with Machiavelli that it is impossible for the universal mass of men to govern themselves. The American people have a sort of judicial sovereignty, not a creative one—one that may pass judgment, give sanction, or furnish standards, but which cannot direct or even suggest policies. The people, who, through their votes at the ballot box, can neither legislate nor administer, must therefore accept the governing act of representatives.

No so-called democratic society has been successful in more than a moderate degree. Democracy, with its encouragement of "mass production in opinion," to quote a phrase from Chief Justice Hughes, is a most difficult and delicate form of government. It has an exaggerated belief in the power of legislation. In so large a country as ours, with its conglomerate legislation, the largest number of persons have to be persuaded to do particular things. The task is further complicated by our Constitution, which by its very enumeration of the powers of the Federal Government plainly indicates what Congress cannot do—those restraints upon the action of the National Government that have won the admiration of most commentators abroad as well as here. Except in time of war, the personal power of the President of the United States is really not so great as many believe. In normal times he is powerful only when he has the backing of Congress. Then, too, the alleged usurpation of legislative powers by the Federal judiciary, when from time to time it nullifies the will of the people's representatives, has served to discourage any display of energetic leadership on the part of the Executive.

It is therefore not altogether an advantage that we have written our constitutional law in definitive documents. Written constitutions are, at most, only generalizations of political experience. The success of government in accordance with such blueprints depends upon the men the people choose to sit in places of authority over them. Whereas the Executive is required to think and act nationally, there are very few men, if any, in Congress who dare stand for the Nation. By the very nature of our representative form of government each man in Congress stands as the representative of his part of the country. And that, paradoxically enough, is at once both the strength and weakness of our dual federalism.

The only essential difference between the democratic process in this country and in other so-called democracies is that political leaders in other countries have from time to time been able to make a clean sweep of existing constitutions and forms of government—as was true of Caesar, Napoleon, and now of Hitler—whereas the man of the hour in the United States at any particular time could never break the Constitution but at best could only strain it. That was true of Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln as it is of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The American Revolution, which was fought to establish popular sovereignty, and its Declaration of Independence owe virtually all their "thunder" to Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Thomas Paine. The Constitution of the United States, on the other hand, shows on its face that the founding fathers, after months of debate, determined that the natural-law doctrinairism and romanticism so useful in arousing the enthusiasm and patriotism of the people in winning the war for independence proved impracticable as a vehicle for the establishment of "a more perfect Union" to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Although the founding fathers discovered that every expansion of the scheme of government which they were engaged in formulating was inevitably bound to be in a democratic direction, they were far from wishing or intending to establish a democracy in the strict sense of that word. The tripartite form of government established by them was the result of growth and not a sudden theoretical innovation. The debates of the Constitutional Convention make it clear that not only the leaders but most of the members who participated had a profound mistrust of mere theory and intended to put as many obstacles as they could devise in the way of the people's whims and caprices, if not of their will, and finally succeeded. Indeed, our forefathers were definitely of the opinion that too much freedom in the people is as dangerous as too much authority in the governing body, and that even under democratic institutions men are not all equal, that comparatively few are born to lead, and the many to be led. They seem to have been in agreement with John of Salisbury that "* * * only that power is secure in the long run which places bounds to its own exercise."

As early as 1778 Zephaniah Swift, of Yale, grasped the true significance of the peculiar representative form of government which our forefathers adopted. "Our representatives stand in the place of the people, and are vested with all their powers," he said. "They are representatives of the community at large and have the right and obligation to disregard the instructions of the people." As will be noted, Swift had the discernment to realize that it is impossible for any government to collect the general sense of all the people because they do not have access to information as do their representatives.

That is to say, the representatives of the people should be persuaders—leaders. The late Senator Borah, of Idaho, is a conspicuous example of a people's tribune who, after deep study, advised his electors what was for their best interest rather than serving as a slave to their wishes. He knew, perhaps better than any other contemporary American statesman, that to say we Americans have government by public opinion and that the people's representatives in legislative assemblies are trustees of the electors make for concepts that are only partially true of our peculiar governmental system. The people, of course, never act as a unit. Although from time to time consulted about their Government, the people, as such, do not conduct it. If sovereignty is supreme political power, as students of the subject will doubtless agree, then it follows that the sovereign power is that to which the majority of a community is generally obedient—its leaders. The greatest peril facing governments moving in a democratic direction is the people's separation from those they have placed in authority over them. What we persistently call our democratic government can escape disintegration only through organization and full knowledge by the people of its leaders and their confidence in them.

It is erroneous to say that our founding fathers made a complete break with the past. Their labors show that they were wise enough to know that a new system of government cannot be ordered like groceries or furniture and that they were in touch with the centuries as no American statesmen have ever been, before or since. In his address before the Pennsylvania State Convention called to ratify the Constitution, James Wilson, one of the most learned and influential members of the Constitutional Convention, perhaps best explains the end at which he and his colleagues had aimed, as follows:

"* * * Our wants, our talents, our affections, our passions, all tell us that we were made for a state of society. But a state of society could not be supported long or happily without some civil restraint. It is true that, in a state of nature, any one individual may act uncontrolled by others; but it is equally true, that, in such a state, every other individual may act uncontrolled by him. Amidst this universal independence, the dissensions and animosities between interfering members of the society would be numerous and ungovernable. The consequence would be, that each member, in such a natural state, would enjoy less liberty, and suffer more interruption, than he would in a regulated society. Hence the universal introduction of governments of some kind or other into the social state. The liberty of every member is increased by this introduction, for each gains more by the limitation of the freedom of every other member, than he loses by the limitation of his own. The result is, that civil government is necessary to the perfection and happiness of man. In forming this government, and carrying it into execution, it is essential that the interest and authority of the whole community should be binding on every part of it."

No intelligent person can well gainsay that history justifies this conclusion.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the future of American democracy depends upon whether our governmental system, with its checks and balances, can be adjusted to cope with the urgent problems facing the Nation without yielding to the forces which have transformed many of the limited democracies of Europe into totalitarian states. There are those who insist that in order to make our democracy function, the National Government must be granted far-reaching powers over the social and economic life of the Nation for the purpose of bringing production, distribution, employment, purchasing power, price adjustments, and currency stabilization into balance. They argue that this can be done as long as the people can change the character of their government and have an effective leadership. On the other hand are those who view with alarm such extensions

of governmental power and predict that such a program, if carried out, would bring despotism in its wake—the despotism either of a ruthless ruler, as in Germany, Italy, and Russia, or, what is just as bad, of a dominant group.

The chief function of the democratic form of government is to avoid violence through peaceful adjustment. It does not mean, as the celebrated Austrian scholar Ludwig von Mises, has stated, "that everyone makes and administers laws but that lawgivers and rulers should be dependent on the people's will, in such a way that they may be peaceably changed if conflict occurs." Even in nondemocratic states, a government can maintain itself in the long run only so long as it has the backing of public opinion. In this sense, the otherwise ruthless and dictatorial personal governments of Julius Caesar, Caesar Augustus, Cromwell, and Napoleon were democratic. They had won and maintained the support of the people. Indeed, Napoleon proudly boasted that he was the "people's king." His popularity with the people was such that millions of them went into the very jaws of death to aid him in accomplishing his aims during the 15 years he was in power. Although he never renounced the principles of the French Revolution, Napoleon insisted that, apart from men and women, nothing had meaning and, hence, that there can be no liberty in the abstract. His experience had taught him that without leadership no state is possible and that, therefore, the leader creates the nation in the same sense that the father is the creator of the family. To him the still prevalent idea that peoples create their rulers was as absurd as to say that a child creates its parent. His entire career ridiculed the doctrine of Rousseau and other eighteenth century political philosophers, that leadership is predicated upon a contract and delegated by the people, to be inherent in the people. If a leader cannot lead, he maintained, then there is no leader and, therefore, the people have no effective leadership, finding themselves much as does a leaderless army which becomes an agglomeration of fugitives or of bands of freebooters to be eventually destroyed as a nation.

Indeed, all the great leaders of both the ancient and modern world who entertained this philosophy of statecraft conceived that their object was best obtained by showing that leadership is ecstatic and full of passion, not merely a contract or a chairmanship.

Un-American as these concepts are, it is nonetheless understandable why so many of the peoples of continental Europe and South America, heirs to centuries of monarchial traditions and culture, have since the World War welcomed the return of the Caesars.

It has been the experience of nations, as of individuals, that life is one compromise after another with the best and noblest principles and aspirations. On paper the United States has what to foreign observers is the grandest form of government ever devised by the will and mind of man. But in practice our Government has been and, of course, always will be, subject to criticism and even censure. That the creation of our peculiar form of dual federalism was predicated to a large extent upon the many irreconcilable political theories advanced by those eminent Jesuit scholars and thinkers of the sixteenth century—Bellarmine and Suarez—and such political philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as Hobbes, Milton, Locke, Hume, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine, Adam Smith, the French encyclopedists, as well as other political theorists of ancient, medieval, and modern times, cannot be disputed. It is doubtful that any of these thinkers—not even Montesquieu, the most ardent champion that a system of checks and balances ever had—would have approved in toto the new scheme of popular government devised in America, across the seas, which is said to represent "the accumulated wisdom of the ages." Neither would Plato nor Aristotle. Yet each contributed what was deemed a workable theory of government, and the whole pattern of the American constitutional system probably represents a potpourri of their combined thought.

History amply proves that the masses will invariably follow the leadership of one or a few men. This fact, once understood, explains why every pursuit of class interests, every promise of a paradise on earth for the losers of life's game, and humiliation of all who dare oppose the multitude is of the essence of politics. In the realm of politics, which has never yet shown any signs of becoming an exact science, democracy, above any other form of government, finds its justification in the widespread belief among people that mankind can be perfected. Because of this belief, democracy, under the influence of nineteenth-century liberalism, made great progress in enfranchising individuals with greater rights and privileges on the theory, no doubt, that people without rights are always a menace to social order.

Thus in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries democracy brought about more and more limitations upon the power of the sovereign, whether king or a majority, and left to the intelligence of the individual the control of such behavior as concerns primarily himself. In this sense the American system means a free state, granting opportunity to all. "And if our checks and balances sometimes prevent the speedy action which is thought desirable," to quote Chief Justice Hughes again, "they also assure in the long run a more deliberate judgment." The people eventually get what they really want whenever their demands are supported by a preponderant and abiding sentiment. With all its ups and downs, this system has served to foster in the people the generous belief that a social order is not bad simply because it helps one more than another. Time and again it has been shown, in the United States as elsewhere, that gifted individuals who have been prevented from rising are dangerous only if their appeal to violent action finds an echo in a wide stratum of discontented men. That was true in the days of Andrew Jackson, and it is true today.

Since the advent of the twentieth century, however, the center of gravity of the spiritual and cultural world has shifted. Liberty, which Hobbes defined as "political fragments," has now come to mean the right of individuals to participate in a sort of dictatorship of the crowd—in the tyranny of all over each. Each new victory of democracy seems to put the individual at the mercy of the crowd. Liberty, which in its classic sense is identified with the individual, has been emasculated to mean the rule of the crowd even though individual rights are destroyed, and is therefore illusory because the masses do not know what they want to think or do.

This crowd behaviorism so characteristic of the present-day collectivist pattern of life, has already forced many a man's spirit to lay down the sceptor of personal responsibility. For more than half a century Carlyle, John Stuart Mill, and other political philosophers have been warning against the rise of the crowd—the masses—to power, asserting that wherever the masses obtain such power it is invariably accompanied by a ruthless destruction of the best fruits of civilization.

The modern world has thus acquired a new gospel which latter-day evangels are "shouting with a loud voice * * * to every kindred, tongue, and people." Its sum and substance is that the world is to be reformed not by each man mending his own ways but by everybody joining in drawing up a new constitution. Indeed, democracy itself has been made to serve as the stepping stone for the triumph of the people, not as individuals but as mass. The plain man has come to resent superiority and claims to be just as good as anybody. The educated man who once received deference is now suspect. Excellence and superior intelligence are no longer held in high regard. Tolerance, always a rare virtue, is now rarer than ever and is struggling against the passions and prejudices of the crowd as never before. The revolt of the masses has resulted in the removal, one by one, of restraints upon mass action. And in the United States, because the Supreme Court has succeeded in setting up constitutional barriers against the follies of the crowd as well as against the usurpation of greater authority by the Executive, that institution has been challenged as an autocratic, outworn, puritanical arbiter of our national and individual rights and wrongs. Politicians as well as the people find it so easy to forget that just as our English forbears set up Parliament "as a bridle to the King" so also our Constitution makers purposely set up the Supreme Court as a bridle to both the executive and the legislature.

Struggle for power invariably characterizes the behavior of the crowd. Its thinking is illiberal, although it imagines that it loves liberty. But it tends always to strangle the individual. Essentially, therefore, there is no substantial difference between the unlimited power of the majority and the unlimited power of an autocrat. The idea of a state predicated entirely on political might governs in the case of both. Aristotle grasped this fundamental truth more than 2,200 years ago and stated it as follows:

"The ethical character is the same; both exercise despotism over the better class of citizens, and decrees are in the one what ordinances and warrants are in the other; the demagogue, too, and the court favorite are not infrequently the same identical men, and always bear a close analogy; and these have the principal power, each in their respectcive forms of government, favorites with the absolute monarch and demagogues with a people * * *."

Is it not still erroneously believed by people generally that whatever they demand their leaders should perform? Government by popular but responsible leaders is not widely regarded as government of and by the people. The masses, drunk with power, insist that the people should guide their leaders and not be led by them. Hence, except in times of great emergency, any independence or initiative on the part of a leader in any so-called democracy is generally condemned as "undemocratic." Thus, the chosen representatives of the people find themselves much in the same position occupied by the courtiers of absolute monarchs. Their business is to flatter and obey the crowd.

The underlying error of the ever-extending power of the crowd over the individual is that people generally have come to believe their freedom to be material to each, while each at the same time considers himself to be above the natural conditions of social existence. This confusion of ideas has already had, and will continue to have, profound consequences in the lives of individuals and nations. The classic conception of freedom, which meant self-restraint, has been allowed to degenerate into dreams of paradise. Insatiable longing to obtain something for nothing has taken the place of practical measures for social betterment. Through the substitution of propaganda (emotionalism) for education (thinking) the standardized, stereotyped ideas of the crowd are being plunged into intolerance patterns of such proportions as the world has never before known.

When all is said and done, democracy is only a philosophy of earthly life. It has never pretended to be anything else. As a vehicle of government, democracy has sought to be impersonal. It is not really a system of government but an idea, which flowers at its best among people who enjoy seeing the unfolding of a human personality and who detest any system or device that seeks to repress and dwarf personality. Its foremost principle has been the self-determination of people as individuals. That is to say, the basic principle of democracy is a sincere belief in the sanctity of

man's soul. Hence, all democratic forms emphasize human personality and its dignity. Perhaps it is this emphasis upon the individual rather than the family which, as Dr. Alexis Carrel recently hinted, is one of the most serious defects of democracy.

When they adopted the constitutional system peculiar to them, the American people seemed to be completely aware of the fact that the two poles of social life are war and peace, violence and law. They, therefore, dedicated their form of democratic government to a just administration of law as the only reliable vehicle for the settlement of strife in both domestic and international affairs. And in this sense, we can truly claim to have "a Government of laws, and not of men."

The causes for the crisis of constitutional government in our day, here as elsewhere, may fairly be said to be the development of collectivism, the intervention in public affairs of the uneducated and even illiterate masses through the expansion of universal suffrage, on the theory elaborated by Jeremy Bentham that the democratic processes should result in "the greatest happiness for the greatest number."

If we allow ourselves to be misled by leaders who grovel before stupidity and abandon the many intellectual and cultural advantages that civilization has set before us, we cannot hope to preserve our heritage. We can succeed only if, as individuals, we allow our hearts and minds to reactivate the unfaltering faith of our forefathers in truth and justice, and recognize that there are "duties" and "obligations" as well as the "rights" and "privileges" we so much prate about.

If, as the inheritors of all that our forefathers wrought for us, we will be patient enough to stop, look, and listen before we leap, we should be able to hear the Father of his Country pleading with us across the span of a century and a half to remain true and steadfast to the "noble experiment" which he and his associates bequeathed to us. In Hamilton's draft of Washington's Farewell Address we find this notable declaration:

"This Government, the offspring of your own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitution of Government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, 'till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government."

The tremendous dynamism of the historical epoch in which the world now finds itself posits the awful question, whether the governmental system which our forefathers created for themselves and their posterity will endure into the next century. And the responsibility for the right answer to this question rests squarely upon the present generation, tugged as it is to right and left amid an ever-growing welter of hopes and doubts.

Congress' Rights in Prescribing Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, a wide awake constituent has just called to my attention a resolution adopted in the House in the year 1864 by a vote of 119 to 8. The resolution declares a fact which may have been lost sight of. If you care to study the situation presented for reprinting the resolution on October 6, 1917, at page 7884 of the bound volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, I am sure memory will be awakened in you as it was in me, by the stirring address of the late Senator La Follette. He used the resolution in speaking to the question of personal privilege. It sometimes pays to delve into history to improve the present perspective.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution to which I have referred:

Resolved, That Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States, as well in the recognition of new powers as in other matters, and it is the constitutional duty of the President to respect that policy no less in diplomatic negotiations than in the use of the national force when authorized by law.

Still the Secretary of State advises us that it would be practically impossible for him to furnish to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs essential substance of reports and communications received by the President and the Department of State concerning foreign affairs in the war zones of foreign countries and the repercussions therefrom. However, we are told that the "team" must pull together.

Appropriations for National Defense Since Advent of New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1940

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE FROM 1933 TO 1940, INCLUSIVE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during the fiscal years of 1933 to 1940, inclusive, the New Deal, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, has had total appropriations of $8,219,393,227 for national defense. To date $5,953,537,901 has been expended. But in spite of these tremendous appropriations and expenditures this Nation has no defense and, as shown by War Department figures which I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page 3917, our Army had less equipment on May 1, 1940, than the British abandoned in their retreat from Norway.

In view of the present state of unpreparedness I believe it is well to inform the Congress and the Nation the amount of moneys appropriated and expended in the fiscal years of 1933 to 1940, which are contained in the following consolidated statement:

	Appropriations	Allotment of emergency funds	Total	Expended
1933:				
Army	$304,961,492		$304,961,492	$295,111,986
Navy	347,152,220	$238,000,000	585,152,220	342,176,417
Total	652,113,712	238,000,000	890,113,712	637,288,403
1934:				
Army	277,050,381	96,688,252	373,738,633	272,652,668
Navy	324,755,626	39,098,924	363,854,550	303,639,404
Total	601,806,007	135,787,176	737,593,183	576,292,072
1935:				
Army	280,848,897	8,857,678	289,706,575	364,859,410
Navy	314,567,433	40,993,440	355,560,873	440,604,669
Total	595,416,330	49,851,118	645,267,448	805,464,079
1936:				
Army	355,523,020	9,551,451	365,074,471	339,598,167
Navy	496,572,848	252,356	496,825,205	518,625,222
Total	852,095,868	9,803,807	861,899,676	858,223,389
1937:				
Army	388,244,859	18,069,820	406,314,679	362,005,183
Navy	597,567,939		597,567,939	539,030,790
Total	985,812,798	18,069,820	1,003,882,618	901,035,973
1938:				
Army	415,263,154	74,939,334	490,202,488	431,410,612
Navy	535,172,626	740,173	535,912,800	587,945,491
Total	950,435,780	75,679,507	1,026,115,288	1,019,356,103
1939:				
Army	460,201,254	31,097,625	491,298,879	495,671,698
Navy	642,511,999	35,984,134	678,496,133	660,206,184
Total	1,102,713,253	67,081,759	1,169,795,012	1,155,877,882
1940:				
Army	923,142,603	18,220,400	941,363,003	
Navy	943,363,289		943,363,289	
Total	1,866,505,892	18,220,400	1,884,726,292	
Grand total	7,606,899,640	612,493,587	8,219,393,227	5,953,537,901

Navy figures exclude Work Projects Administration funds. For the period commencing with the fiscal year 1935 and ending Mar. 31, 1940, Navy allocations of such funds totaled $73,032,787.80, and expenditures totaled $69,300,150.16.

The Monroe Doctrine—America for Americans, Europe for Europeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1940

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, while House Joint Resolution 556 before the House for consideration does not in my opinion fully define the Monroe Doctrine without the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], and there may have been a more opportune time to bring up this resolution than under present conditions in world affairs, but the resolution is now before us for action and we must accept or reject it. The administration's forces have voted down the Tinkham amendment, yet I feel under all the circumstances I should support this resolution in its present form and at this time. The more relevant parts of this resolution are in words as follows:

> Whereas our traditional policy has been to consider any attempt on the part of non-American powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to the peace and safety not only of this country but of the other American Republics, therefore be it
>
> *Resolved etc.*, That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power.

The great fundamental basis of our foreign policy was enunciated by President George Washington when he said: "Friendship for all nations and entangling alliances with none."

MONROE DOCTRINE—TWO PARTS

The Monroe Doctrine consists of two parts. One provides against meddling of European, Asiatic, and African nations in the affairs of this hemisphere. The other warns against our meddling in the affairs of the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. In other words, we say that those nations should mind their own business and we would do likewise. The resolution before us, however, deals with only one part of the Monroe Doctrine. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIMKHAM], Republican, offered an amendment to cover the other part, which declares against meddling in the affairs of the nations of Europe and other nations of the Eastern Hemisphere. The administration defeated this amendment. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], Republican, offered a motion to recommit with the Tinkham amendment. The administration forces of the House defeated this motion to recommit.

This resolution, it will be observed, declares it would be dangerous to the peace and safety of our country as well as other American nations for non-American powers or nations to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, and it is resolved by the House and Senate that the United States would not recognize any transfer and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power.

President Monroe enunciated the principle set out in this resolution in 1823. It was the real American policy that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Clay, and others had helped to crystallize.

Great Britain, France, Holland, Spain and one or two other countries held possessions in the Western Hemisphere at that time—1823. President Monroe announced that there could be no acquisition of new territory, colonization, dominion, or control by any other non-American country or countries except those that then held possessions in this hemisphere. This Monroe Doctrine has been followed by this Nation and acquiesced in by other nations throughout the world for the last 117 years.

We must protect our Nation and hemisphere. Germany has overrun Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France. No treaties have been made as yet. This action by the Congress and our Government is to warn Germany and Italy that they cannot acquire title to any of the islands or other possessions of these conquered nations or the lands of any other nation in this hemisphere that they might conquer. The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are great arms of defense of this Nation. If we should permit Germany and Italy to acquire the territory now held by France, Holland, Great Britain, or any other non-American nation, they would be able to establish Navy, Army, air, and submarine bases along the shores and on the borders of the United States as well as other countries in the Western Hemisphere, placing them within close striking distance of our country and greatly endangering the security of this Nation. We must keep them out of this hemisphere.

WE MUST NOT MEDDLE

We can justly and properly claim the Americas for Americans. On the other hand, we must not meddle in the internal affairs of Europe and Europeans. Thomas Jefferson in a letter on October 24, 1823, expressed a sound foreign policy for our Nation in this respect when he said:

> Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with affairs on this side of the Atlantic.

Henry Clay, as Secretary of State for the United States, expressed the same policy:

> Whilst we do not desire to interfere in Europe * * * we should regard as dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of our hemisphere.

And to the same effect spoke our Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, in 1820:

> We contend that it is just as important to the welfare of this country not to meddle in the affairs of non-American nations as it is for non-American nations to meddle in our affairs on this hemisphere.

So the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], in order to carry out both parts of the Monroe Doctrine as expressed by President Monroe, Thomas Jefferson, and other great Americans in the early history of our country and adhered to by Lincoln, Grant, Cleveland, and McKinley, introduced the following amendment to this resolution:

> That in the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.

This amendment should have been adopted, but it was defeated by the administration forces, and the resolution before us and adopted carries only one part of the Monroe Doctrine and leaves out the part warning us against meddling in the affairs of the nations of Europe and other non-American nations.

We must observe both parts of the Monroe Doctrine for the safety and security of this Nation. The American people in 1917 and 1918 meddled and became involved in the first World War for the high and laudable purpose, as we thought, to make the world safe for democracy. That war in the end will cost this Nation a hundred billion dollars. It took the lives of a million young American men by wounds or disease. It made hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans. It did not make the world safe for democracy. It sowed the seeds of the present greater World War.

There are now some in high places and other American citizens who would involve us in the present World War. They are fighting in Europe, Asia, and Africa for the very things they have fought about and over for nearly 20 centuries—territory, trade, power, greed, and selfish ambitions, inflamed by centuries-old hatreds and jealousies. We must not intervene in that war. We are not prepared, according to the statement of the President and other high officials of the Army and Navy, to defend our own country, much less to travel three to four thousand miles to get into a fight in Europe.

In the last 7 years Congress has appropriated and turned over to the present administration approximately $8,000,000,000 to improve our national defenses. Furthermore, a subservient Congress appropriated and turned over to the President more than $20,000,000,000 in blank checks to do almost as he pleased with the money. Billions of that money could have been used to improve our Army, Navy, and the auxiliary units, but billions were wasted in paying salaries and expenses of hundreds of thousands of useless office-holders, playing politics, and in "boondoggling" projects.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, one of the ablest Army men in this Nation, in his testimony a few days ago before a congressional committee astonished the Congress and the Nation with a detailed statement showing how woefully unprepared this Nation is even for our own defense. There is only 1 mechanized division, about 15,000 men. An army is not prepared unless it is mechanized. Our aircraft equipment it pitifully small. We have very very inadequate coast defenses. Mayor LaGuardia of New York City said we did not have enough coast and antiaircraft defenses to defend Coney Island, much less the great city of New York. We are told we do not have sufficient equipment for all branches of the Army and auxiliary units to equip an army of 75,000 to 80,000 men.

The President in one of his fireside chats recently spoke of having so much of this equipment and that equipment on hand and on order. He meant of course, that recently orders had been submitted to the producers for certain equipment. It takes time to produce equipment. We cannot defend our own borders merely with "on order." Guns, shells, and tanks and other equipment, must be built and not merely "on order" to be of use in defending our Nation. Why was not the President frank with the American people and tell them that "on order" referred to guns, tanks, shells, and other equipment not in existence? Why did he not disclose to the American people just how many tanks, guns, shells, and other munitions of war the country had on hand and ready for use? Had he done so the American people would have been much more astonished and more alarmed than they now are.

It will require a year or two, or perhaps more for this Nation to fully equip itself to defend our own country. Notwithstanding this condition the President and the Navy Department have recently turned over to the Allies a lot of our newest submarines. In fact, they have not yet been completed. Great quantities of guns, shells, and other war supplies have been turned over to the Allies. These include some of our best planes and we are informed that about 400 of these planes were captured in France by the Germans.

Senator Walsh, Democratic Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, threatens to have The Assistant Secretary of the Navy and others indicted for turning over our submarines to the Allies without the consent of Congress. It is now generally understood that Secretary Woodring was forced to resign because he refused to strip the Army of its materials and necessary weapons of defense and send them to Europe, and refused to embark on a policy of intervention in the European war.

Our first duty is to be in a position to protect and defend this Nation, and the Western Hemisphere. In fact, our Nation now and for months, and perhaps a year or more could contribute very little in actual defense of the Allies.

There is quite a difference in the present occupant of the White House and another Roosevelt who said this Nation should speak softly but should carry a big stick. The present occupant of the White House speaks loud, long, and often in threatening and most belligerent terms, but according to his own statement of our national defense he carries a very small stick indeed. He vituperates and threatens as it were with an empty pistol in his hand.

We should not meddle or intervene in the European war. If we should intervene or meddle with our unpreparedness, disaster would overtake us.

PREPARE BUT DON'T MEDDLE

This Nation must at once set about to fully and thoroughly prepare its defenses on land and sea, in the air and under the sea, so that we may be able to defend ourselves successfully against any and all who may assail us. Congress with uniform unanimity has voted billions of dollars in the last month for these purposes. But will these billions be wisely expended or will they be wasted as the President has wasted other billions of dollars? This is the question that causes deep concern to the American people. We have an insignificant number of tanks, shells, guns, and other equipment, and trained pilots and tank operators.

We talk of conscripting the American youth and bringing into being overnight an army of a million or two million men. On an average, it requires 7 tons of equipment for each man in the Army. The first and important step is to provide equipment. We cannot fight with broomsticks and toy pistols.

Henry Ford has assured the President and the country that his plant could within 6 months be producing a thousand airplanes a day. We all know the productive genius and capability of Ford and his staff, but would we not be safe in predicting that this administration will not give Mr. Ford and his staff an opportunity to produce these planes? Those who know believe that he can do what he says he can do. Let us take politics out of our program of national defense and all pull together earnestly and patriotically and build up our national defense so that we may be able to defend our country against any and all who may attack us.

KEEP OUT OF EUROPEAN WAR

While I strongly favor our Nation's being thoroughly and fully prepared to defend this country and uphold the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere, I am equally strong in my opposition to this Nation becoming involved in this new World War. Through bitter experience we found out in 1917 and 1918 that we could not settle the political problems of Europe, Asia, and Africa. They have not been able to settle them, and we cannot settle them. Through all the centuries every few years they have a new war. When they develop a new group of young men and build new war machines, they again go to war.

A little over a century ago Napoleon Bonaparte, of France, with his legions marched into Berlin, Germany. In 1870–72 Bismarck, with his German legions, marched into Paris, France, and took possession of the city and the country. In 1918 and 1919 the French and their allies, including the United States, again marched into Berlin, Germany, and now in 1940 we have Hitler and his German hosts marching into Paris again.

In the last century there have been a number of partitions of Poland; Sweden, Finland, and other countries have been taken by other European armies, and we find them today still fighting for territory, trade, power, greed, selfish ambitions, and they will continue to fight, and territories in Europe, Asia, and Africa will continue to change ownership. Dictators will continue to rise and fall as they have through all the centuries since time began. But must the United States about every 20 or 25 years be called upon to furnish the flower of its young manhood and bankrupt this Nation and disorganize the economic and social life of our country to meddle in the affairs and engage in the wars across the sea? Did we not learn our lesson in 1917 and 1918? We must not again send American boys to fight and die in foreign lands and on foreign seas to promote the jealousies and hates, the greed and selfish ambitions of the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Our country is not prepared with weapons and equipment to engage in such war, and, furthermore, we would go into that war with national obligations exceeding $50,000,000,000. Let us not forget that wars are fought with money and credits. Sound financial policies and ample credits are really one of the first-line defenses of any Nation. This has been breached by this administration. If we persist in meddling and entering this new World War it will mean complete bankruptcy of this Nation, a complete disruption of the economic, social, and political structure of this country, and in the end we will likely find that we have lost our own liberties and freedom.

Let us repair our finances, strengthen our economic life, get rid of "fifth columnists" and subversive groups, enemy aliens, strengthen the American people in democracy and in the American way of life, and refrain scrupulously from meddling in the affairs of the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Any other policy will mean disaster to this Nation and to our people.

Communistic Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT G. ALLEN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received a telegram from Mr. Charles Gwynn, chairman of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania, in Pittsburgh, Pa. Comrade Gwynn in his telegram protested against the activities of the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, and his committee as invading State rights and intimidating citizens. I attach below my answer to this telegram:

JUNE 22, 1940.

Mr. CHARLES GWYNN,
Chairman, Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. GWYNN: I have received your telegram of June 20 stating that the Dies committee is sending letters to all signers of the Communist Party nominating petitions in Pennsylvania. You state you consider this action an invasion of State rights and an intimidation of Pennsylvania citizens. If Mr. Dies wishes to send letters to the Communists in Pennsylvania, he has a right to do so. Pray tell me what is wrong with that. You suggest that Mr. DIES is attempting to coerce my constituents. I assure you that you and the members of your party are not my constituents; you are Joseph Stalin's. I do not want you and you do not want me. The feeling is perfectly mutual.

You do not represent a political party in Pennsylvania. You are part of a foreign conspiracy working under orders emanating direct from Moscow. Your avowed purpose is the overthrow of this Government by force. You are traitors to this country, and if I had my way, you would be dealt with as such. You are abusing the privileges granted by our Constitution. The result has been pure, unadulterated license. Despite your subversive activities, you have been treated with kindly tolerance in this country. In the face of a serious crisis this extreme tolerance is a luxury which we can no longer afford. If you do not like this country and its institutions, I suggest that you get out. Go to that Muscovite Utopia which you are trying to establish over here.

I sincerely trust that the Dies committee will investigate the manner in which you secured names for the Communist Party nominating petitions. Your solicitors repeatedly lied to poor and ignorant people who thought they were signing a petition to keep this country out of war or a petition requesting jobs, etc. The whole procedure was a shameful and cowardly act for which you should be held responsible. Instead of protesting to Mr. DIES as you request, I am going to urge him to press the case against you more vigorously than ever. Let me repeat that there is no room in America for you and your kind at this time. I deeply regret that we have permitted you such unrestricted freedom as you have enjoyed in the past.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT G. ALLEN.

Mr. Speaker, certain members of the Communist Party in western Pennsylvania circulated nominating petitions as a prelude to placing Communist candidates on the ballot in my State. The solicitors deceived innocent men and women by stating that the petitions were for the purpose of keeping America out of war. In my own district many worthy people whom I know well were duped in this manner and signed the Communist petition, not knowing what they were doing. In the Monessen Independent there appeared the following letter signed by a group of my constituents who unwittingly signed the petitions referred to above. This letter is printed below. I have asked leave to insert it in the RECORD so that Members of Congress will thoroughly realize the subterfuge and treachery being practiced by the agents of Moscow in the United States.

SAY PETITION SIGNED BY MISTAKE

TO THE EDITOR:

In the June 18 issue of the Pittsburgh Press, all of the undersigned names appeared as being registered to the Communist Party.

All of the undersigned are registered Democratic voters in Westmoreland County.

During the month of March 1940, certain individuals of the City of Monessen had in their possession a petition which they presented to the undersigned persons and requested them to sign said petition and advised us that the petition was for the purpose of keeping America out of war. We placed our names on said petition with that understanding without reading the petition, and assumed that the two above persons having the petitions executed were truthfully stating the purpose of the petitions.

The publicity was very embarrassing and was very difficult in explanation. We have been very loyal citizens of the city of Monessen, State of Pennsylvania, and of the United States.

We have all been duped in placing our names upon something that neither our hearts nor our political or social intentions would justify. We have learned a very serious lesson and wish to warn the rest of our friends not to place their names upon anything without first reading the same.

Very truly yours,

Steve Vlasic, Matt Zoretich, Joseph Kuseck, Jr., Stephen Bukovac, Charles Marsich, Henry G. Campbell, Nick Zoretich, Michael Delare, John Belavich, Jr., John Beck, Marko Begg, Mike Buchar, Joseph Kusick.

How Far Should We Go in Aiding the Allies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BATTLE CREEK (MICH.) ENQUIRER AND NEWS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News. This editorial asks the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, organized and financed by international bankers, the pertinent question, "How far is this going?"

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News]

HOW FAR IS THIS GOING?

The "Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies" is now organizing with petition passers and interest rousers to stir up the country. This is the committee which bears the name of William Allen White as chairman, and whose full-page advertisement calling for the mobilization of opinion was recently published.

It is important to know how far this thing is going.

How far is it by this route to a frank advocacy of our joining in the war?

How many steps of "everything short of war" to war itself?

What is it proposed that we put into the war—since it manifestly is not a war (France hasn't found it the kind of a war) that can be fought with gestures or speeches or harsh words or stern resolutions?

Taking the Roosevelt inventory, or the Army staff inventory, or another inventory presumably reliable, of our present weaknesses and needs—and what does the committee to defend America propose we should send the Allies?

And if we send it how do we get on with our own defense program to protect our own shores? And when we have sent it and it isn't any more effective (and it couldn't very well be) than what France herself had—then how far is it to the point where the committee will be saying, "We must make good our pledges; we must send our boys over?"

This propaganda movement is insidious. It moves through emotions. It gets people emotionally stirred up and it gets them into commitments which their sober judgment will later regret.

By the most conservative reports we have a job to do in getting America ready to defend herself here at home, and ready to have her word respected as it will not now be respected—a job that will take all our concentration and effort without our scattering our attention and effort into foreign fields where, however noble our purpose or however right we may theoretically be when we say it's to our interest to have Hitler stopped over there—we haven't anything with which to do the job.

And if we're saying now—if what Mr. White's committee is saying through the use of Mr. White's name—is that by putting on a

strong act we can encourage England to hold Hitler until we get ready—why, what then?

What's the commitment there?

Is it anything less than a declaration of war now, to be fulfilled by our actually sending the expeditionary forces over as soon as England calls on us to make good?

The committee makes a rousing appeal to sentiment. The petition circulators can easily find signers who, at the moment feel a thrill of righteous emotion as they demand action.

The place where sentiment and sense both are needed now is in the behalf of the United States of America.

And because this is so, it's important to watch the spread of all these appeals to impulse and emotion whose logical outcome is a war without means of fighting it.

James Willis Taylor

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES WILLIS TAYLOR, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is never too late to eulogize a departed Member, to mentally reincarnate for a few moments a vision of one who was more than stanch friend and true, or to seek to draw a lesson from his splendid life.

Habit and custom are abiding things. They wear grooves in a man's mind even as rivers score earth's surface as seaward they went their way. We may dam them up for a while, but always they must find an outlet.

Twenty years ago when I first entered the Halls of Congress, I looked to the late J. WILL TAYLOR as mentor and friend. In those trying days of adjustment to sudden precipitation into the national scene, his counsel and sage advice were of paramount importance to novitiate me.

Time and again, in the midst of confusion and debate, I would seek out his face to read thereon those signs which only true friendship can know or understand.

As the years fled, bringing with them a measure of self-reliance, the habit continued of looking about to find his face in some form of reassurance that all was well and calm. Even today—months after his untimely passing—I find myself still unable to break off that custom of two decades, even though knowledge of my loss follows swiftly thereafter.

Yes, it is hard to realize that strong, ever-faithful friend is gone and that I must put away in the background many of the things for which he stood to me.

"I am a little ahead of you, gentlemen," quipped Robert Louis Stevenson, years ago, as he toppled over dead in far-away Vailima. A little ahead, forsooth!

How true that is, not only of our late friend but of all the others who enter the portal of death ahead of us. We may shudder, hesitate, or try vainly to hold back, but through that door ahead of the living, we must go.

Others of you here have already eulogized my late friend. You have told of his splendid record of unstinting service and achievements. I shall not vainly try to add to that luster. Time is already giving it the patina it so richly deserved. Instead, in all reverence and humility, I seek to summarize briefly the outstanding lesson his life left for me to read and profit by.

Death has no personal terrors for me. Often I have been close enough to him to know that he is kind—friend, and guide to something better—rather than terrible foe. We fear and respect him, but that is because of our own failings and shortcomings. Every instinct we possess assures us that what we call life is but a prelude to greater things than we dare dream of. Greater than our instincts are the endless proofs we find all about us in science and nature. Miserable indeed must be the man who views death as the end of existence rather than the true beginning of it.

What stunned and left me breathless about J. WILL TAYLOR's death was the suddenness of his passing. One moment he was a very definite part of my circle—the next moment, without warning, he had vanished with never a chance to do those hundred and one things we always plan to do tomorrow, yet somehow fail to do in the fullness and haste of the moment. Oh, he truly did much, but I know he dreamed of doing even more.

I was in naval hospital when the news came to me last November. For a long while it seemed unreal and incomprehensible. It was a shock I can scarce put into words. Had I been up and around it would have been hard enough to bear, but on my back in a hospital bed, it smote me with even greater impact.

For death is a very real thing in a hospital, even though one's own ailment happens to be minor or otherwise. All around are doctors and nurses fighting against it and the battle is endless and without lull.

Lying abed alone most of the time, one cannot help but do a lot of reflecting. Life suddenly takes on new and different values. You see it from a new vantage point—a post from which you can revalue it and measure it differently than when in the midst of work or play.

Alert to our work, no matter how altruistic we may be and how eager we are to serve our fellows, we cannot help but think of ourselves and our dependents. In fact, that is perfectly natural and commendable.

But, as I said, a hospital bed is a new vantage point from which to revalue life—especially when the news has just come to you that a close friend has passed away. You suddenly realize, as if for the first time, how short at the longest and how transitory and evanescent it really is. Dreams, ambitions, high hopes, and great plans flash through one's mind like a panorama and then with a start you realize that any second may bring abrupt ending to everything. With staggering force you realize as if for the first time that maybe there is not so much time left after all and that it behooves one to remember full well that old admonition on the sun dial: "It is later than you think."

It is later than we think, and our friend, beloved J. WILL TAYLOR, would tell us so if only his voice could come roaring down to us from the beyond.

Over and above the splendid example of his long and useful life here in our midst, his sudden end rammed home to me with stark force the truth in that old, old line of Marvel's—

> Always at my heels, I hear
> Time's winged chariot drawing near.

Servants of the people, we live in the most crowded, tumultuous hours of our Nation's history. Millions of our people look to us for the solution to endless woes and griefs. Across the seas, on either side of us, millions of other people are locked in hates and conflicts and because we are truly earth's last great democracy, they too, look to us for some ray of hope.

Our own people we dare never fail and perhaps it is written in the book of fate that somehow, by example of peaceful leadership or otherwise, we are also destined to help those other nations who can no longer help themselves.

But, Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues, it is later than we think and at our heels time's winged chariot draws remorselessly near. Yesterday has gone—today is fast going—tomorrow may never come.

My friend J. WILL TAYLOR had a keep sense of humor many people didn't suspect. That humor saw through sham and pretense and false trappings. He knew I was his friend and I do not believe he would have wanted me to stand here and say of him "he did this and he did that. He belonged to this order and that order, and so on."

No; he wouldn't have liked that thought. He would be the first to cry out, "Have done with the past—hurry and utilize the present," or words to that effect.

So, my colleagues, from a heart and mind brimming over with memories of a fellow legislator gone before us through the portal of death, I give you what I take to be the last lesson of his useful life to us who are left behind.

Tomorrow may never come for some of us, and it behooves us, therefore, to utilize today full well.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

ARTICLE BY HUGH RUSSELL FRASER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask permission to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column entitled "Inside Washington," from the pen of Mr. Hugh Russell Fraser, which article interests itself in foreign affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Hugh Russell Fraser)

President Roosevelt is not planning to send an armed expeditionary force to Europe but he is hoping—if Congress will let him—to send the Navy and America's small but highly efficient air force across the ocean if Britain is threatened with destruction.

This is the cold, sober fact of the situation, and by the time this is in print such a proposal may actually be made.

That is one more reason why it is vital that Congress stay in session.

True, not all of the administration would favor for a moment any such use of the Navy and Air Force. Among these is A. A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, and one of the original brain trusters. Mr. Berle is reputed to be outspoken within official circles on the propriety of America's minding its own business. He wants our Navy kept here.

The striking thing about the whole situation, however, and the one that is completely inexplicable, is: Here is a crisis in the history of the Nation and the world, a moment when events are taking place with a rapidity that can only be estimated literally by minutes, and yet the President of the United States wants Congress to adjourn.

Why? It is a fair and logical question. Why the hurry to get Congress out of town when the welfare of the Nation is at stake? What's the hurry?

One thing is certain: The voters better examine the list of those Congressmen who vote to adjourn and then keep those Congressmen permanently at home.

Senator HOMER T. BONE, of Washington, and Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, who are supposed to be very "dangerous" men now, even suspected of being "fifth columnists" because they want to keep America out of Europe's war, say that what 120,000,000 Americans need most right now is a good lesson in geography.

A little knowledge of geography will do wonders and clear up a lot of fears about the possibility of invasion of the United States by Nazi Germany.

For example, did you know that the Atlantic Ocean is 3,000 miles wide?

Of course, if your answer is "No," and if you think the correct answer is 3,000 feet, then hurry over to defend the British Government, because if you don't you will be next. That is plain, common sense.

On the other hand, if you are one of these peculiar fellows who believes that 3,000 miles means 3,000 miles, then consider this further fact:

The best, most up-to-date modern bombers cannot make a round-trip flight of more than 1,000 miles without refueling.

That means that without securing a base in the New World they could not fly more than 500 miles in our direction, loaded with bombs, without giving up hope of returning. And if they gave up hope of returning, they could not—even under the most favorable conditions—get even halfway across the Atlantic toward us.

"Oh, but the enemy can get a base in the New World."

How? Such a base could not be secretly seized. It would have to be secured by armed invasion, and this could not be done but by a navy much larger than ours. And the distance between Europe and any possible base in the New World would be so great as to make this impossible as long as the American and any portion of the British and French Navy existed.

And even if, by some possible feat, such a base was obtained, it would still be out of bombing range of the United States.

Suppose the base was the Azores. They are 2,000 miles from the American coast. Suppose it was the Bermudas. They are 690 miles away, more than 200 miles farther than the farthest modern bombing range. Or what do you think of the British West Indies? The nearest is 1,385 miles from Florida. Yes; and include the Cape Verde between the coast of Africa and Brazil and you have 1,500 miles.

What else is there? Greenland? Aside from the testimony of aviation experts that it is utterly impractical as an aviation base, it is 1,300 air miles from the United States. In fact, the most up-to-date modern Nazi bomber, flying from Greenland toward the United States could not get even half way to New Foundland without having to give up all hope of returning.

And yet fears are aroused that we face imminent danger of invasion.

Mr. Roosevelt's scary timetable of air distances will go down in history as one of the most remarkable documents ever compiled. For example, he told the Congress that a plane could fly from the Canal Zone to Tampico, Mexico, in 2¼ hours. The distance is 1,521 miles, and the plane would have to travel at the rate of 676 miles an hour.

Now it so happens there is not a bombing plane in the world that has a maximum speed in excess of 350 miles. And the average Nazi bomber can rarely exceed 300 miles an hour. What is more, only special speed planes can fly above 500 miles an hour, and the only record of speeds above 600 miles an hour have been claims for breath-taking dives when the whole power of the plane is released to plunge it to the earth. And yet here we have the picture of a plane hurtling toward us twice as fast as the speed of any known bomber and almost at the rate of speed of sound.

Even if Britain should be destroyed tomorrow, the military and naval experts agree that we are not in danger of armed invasion, and that no nation or group of nations would be so foolhardy as to try it in the face of 3,000 miles of ocean. But we should arm, not only against "fifth column" activities here, but also against all future risks. That is plain, common sense, and it will be done.

But that is not all that the interventionists want us to do. They have a program that would make George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson turn over in their graves. And item No. 1 on their program is: Get Congress to adjourn.

The Alien Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ASHEVILLE (N. C.) CITIZEN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Alien Problem," as published in the columns of the Asheville Daily Citizen, of Asheville, N. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALIEN PROBLEM

The State Department has acted none too soon in restricting alien entry into this country. It is quite right that in times such as these no foreigner should be allowed to come into the United States who does not prove to constituted officials the gravest need for doing so. And, what is more, the few aliens admitted should be watched, fingerprinted and tabulated so that their every move will be known to the powers that be.

But this is only a beginning in dealing with the alien situation. There is no use for us to lock the doors after the horse is stolen—or rather the other way round—after the Trojan horse has been admitted. We already possess enough unknown, unregistered, and unwatched aliens in the United States to prove a serious "fifth column" menace if and when the time should come. We must not fool ourselves, we have been far too good-naturedly tolerant and lax in this respect.

True, we have had strictly observed quotas in regard to regular immigration. But we have allowed uncounted numbers of aliens into the country on travel and student temporary passes and then not followed them up. Most of these people were honest and bona fide, and afterward went back home as they intended. But a certain percentage were not. They entered the United States on such passports, traveled to some part of the country where they were unknown, changed their names, and settled down. The aggregate of such immigrants is probably considerable, judging from the reports of officers on the trans-Atlantic liners, who brought them over but did not take them back.

Upon our success and unity in handling this alien question will depend the success of preserving our democracy in case of a Nazi victory in Europe. It is wise, of course, to shut out undesirable immigration in the future. But it would be even wiser to make a thorough check on all aliens here now. The efforts of the Government in this direction should be supported by every citizen. No honest foreigner would object in the slightest to showing his identification papers on the proper occasions. He is used to that at home and understands its purpose. It is from the men and women of malicious intent from whom we may expect to hear objections raised to all the new Federal regulations in regard to foreigners.

Opinion in America on the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

LETTERS FROM THE RALEIGH NEWS AND OBSERVER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three articles in the form of letters addressed by individuals to the public forum of the News and Observer, a daily newspaper published in Raleigh, N. C. These articles are entitled "Sorrowful Memory," "This War and the Last," "Work for Peace," being by Mr. S. L. Morgan, of Wake Forest, N. C.; Mr. R. L. Batten, of Micro, N. C., and Mr. W. Scott Hobbs, of Clinton, N. C.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE'S FORUM—SORROWFUL MEMORY

To the Editor: It heartens me that you continue, like a lone voice in a world gone war-mad, to hold out against the war hysteria, even daring once lately to quote Jesus the Pacifist as telling us to love our enemies and to turn the other cheek. It seems like the last word before the expected order to arrest all opposing or criticizing the giant war program. Not a day but some mighty one with loud-speaker expresses "pity mingled with contempt" for pacifists, or tells a grand jury to watch as suspects and "throttle in their tracks" all who balk at the Nation's colossal preparation for war. Already the air is stifling with the smell of war. One hears the click of handcuffs and prison doors. And now it is the voice of the military commander in chief of tomorrow to all the Nation: "The order is given—new billions into our war machine—all roads to that objective must be kept open." Loud applause. Tomorrow perhaps the order to arrest.

The blood freezes in those who remember how it resembles the drift in 1917 as we entered the World War.

Fearing to oppose, but happily convinced it was a "war to end war," I fell in with the solemn, cheering procession, and "for the duration of the war" I "did my bit" with a will. What shades of a conscience I had left I stifled. I swallowed the lying propaganda of the Government and gave it out in sermons and 4-minute speeches.

Then utter disillusionment. Sorrow for all the aeons ahead that I, a preacher, prostituted my office and helped carry the Church for futile, brutal war. With that sorrowful memory I dare to pass on the warning to the preachers and churches that already are falling for the war dope. While I have liberty to say it—tomorrow it may be gone—I admonish at least my brother ministers against repeating the blunder I made, of actively supporting war and meriting the reproach of the world, that the Church and preachers are always for war.

S. L. MORGAN.

Wake Forest.

THIS WAR AND THE LAST

To the EDITOR: Since we got into "foreign entanglements" we celebrate the American Decoration, giving little reverence to the American Declaration. "We are in blood steeped so far that to go back were as tedious as go on." We have abandoned the policies of Washington and Monroe. Kipling wrote, "At the eleventh hour they came." We fought just long enough to create a great national debt and an obligation to carry on the policy of Wilson to make the world safe for democracy; but all we got out of it were a few noble experiments like woman suffrage and prohibition, farm control and the W. P. A. We would not let them fight the war to victory, but accepted an armistice; and Wilson largely dictated the terms of peace that gave Germany the chance to fight again, with the same Kaiser still at large "sawing wood." Our labor unions are almost entirely under foreign control; our religion is centered in Rome and London; distillery has supplanted artillery in our naval and military officers' mess; while our iron, fuel, and useful war materials and equipment are going for foreign gold, of which we have a useless amount in a couple of gopher holes. The whole country is "slap happy" on foreign and domestic liquors, wines, and beers. Now we must cope with the policies of such military dictators as the Kaiser in Japan, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia, etc., but let's don't be "over there."

W. SCOTT HOBBS.

WORK FOR PEACE

To the EDITOR:

A great nation and a great people should be led by a wise, thoughtful leader, but when we hear our leader declare a slogan similar to one we heard 22 years ago, "Stop the Kaiser," and today it's "Stop Hitler." We stopped the Kaiser, didn't we? Not at all, for today the war is far worse than it would have been had we stayed out of it. How can our leader declare such a slogan? Our business is here at home. We still remember the World War; how our young men were carried away, to never return, to make the world safe for democracy. We made it, didn't we? Such talk is foolishness if it does come from our leaders. We haven't any front-line defense in Europe. Our defense line is upon the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, here in America. Our forefathers went through untold hardships to get away from warring Europe, and now we haven't anything to do with their disputes.

We hope Mr. Roosevelt will not lose his head, like Mr. Hitler has, and rush into war. If we do, we are as bad as he. Our radio, Sunday-school teachers, and many others are saying "Stop war with war," but Jesus did not say so. Mr. Roosevelt says he is praying for peace. Why not work for peace by being friendly to all nations?

R. L. BATTEN.

Affairs in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE ALASKA WEEKLY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials from the Alaska Weekly, published every Friday by the Alaska Weekly Corporation at Seattle, Wash. The first editorial is that of Friday, May 10, 1940, entitled "Ickes Once More on the Loose," and the second published Friday, May 24, 1940, entitled "All for the Refugees."

These editorials pertain to a bill now pending in the United States Congress which is being sponsored by the Department of the Interior and the Administration pertaining to the settlement of many thousands of refugees in Alaska under the guise of developing Alaska, but in truth and in fact, in my opinion, it is merely a smoke screen to obscure, in a sense, Alaska as a stepping stone for refugees from Europe and Asia to the United States of America.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alaska Weekly of May 10, 1940]

ICKES ONCE MORE ON THE LOOSE

Secretary Harold Ickes is once more out in the front line fighting for the colonization of Alaska by war refugees. His attitude toward Alaskan objections to his pet scheme is that such objections are based on a selfish desire of the present residents of the Territory to hold fast to what he terms the "monopoly" they now enjoy of the natural resources of the northland. Practical arguments against the advisability of such a colonization scheme, coming from men familiar with Alaska, are contemptuously dismissed as beneath the notice of the omnipotent Ickes and those who have the temerity to oppose the mighty one are berated for their presumption.

At the present time, as set forth in this column last week, chambers of commerce, newspapers, and other public-service institutions throughout Alaska are busily engaged in attempting to stop an influx of penniless job hunters for whom no jobs exist. They are doing so not because they do not desire population, nor because they object to the people who would like to make Alaska their home, but merely because there is no practical means of assimilating these good American folk in Alaska's present state of industrial development. Alaska has no Grapes of Wrapth picture, nor does it desire one.

We bring this matter up once more for the very simple reason that it presents for consideration the fact that there are thousands of good, sturdy American men who desperately need transplantation to a land of opportunity and who stand in as great need of aid as do European war refugees. Surely the American Government can arouse as great a concern for these Americans as it seems to feel for the unfortunates of Europe.

If Alaska is to be colonized in other than the normal fashion in which other American frontiers have been colonized there is no occasion for it to be colonized by a horde of refugees undesirable to Alaskans while thousands of Americans who would fit automatically into the Alaskan picture are clamoring for the opportunity.

In submitting his views to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs the Secretary advised the committee that domestic and international conditions rendered the colonization of Alaska a "matter of peculiar urgency," and added that the sending to Alaska of European refugees in a number to equal the present American population of the Territory would benefit national defense. No sane person, free of ulterior motive, and considering only national defense, could be sufficiently asinine to presume that a few thousands of aliens in Alaska would be of equal value, in the event of the necessity of defending Alaskan shores, with an equal number of Americans, nor that said aliens might not prove a menace.

The legislation now receiving such enthusiastic support from the Secretary of the Interior is, of course, the follow-up of the Slattery report which was ordered prepared by the Secretary, not to get at facts, but for the purpose of paving the way for this legislation. We have no means of knowing the source of the "private funds" which are said to be available for the purpose of relieving war suffering through Alaska colonization but it may be pointed out that when the plan was first forecast in the Slattery report the only war which existed was the deplorable war being waged by Hitler against the Jews of Germany.

Whether, as appears obvious, the plan contemplates the colonization of Alaska by some thirty or forty thousand privately subsidized Jewish unfortunates, or whether an equal number of suffering Poles or Finns may be expected in Alaska, is immaterial. Alaska wants none of it, and while we realize that what Alaska wants is unworthy the attention of Secretary Ickes, there may be other spots in which the Alaskan voice may be heard to advantage.

[From the Alaska Weekly of May 24, 1940]

ALL FOR THE REFUGEES

Hearings on the bill, "To provide for the settlement and development of Alaska" began before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs last week, or rather, before a subcommittee of that committee. Members of the committee present at the opening day of the hearings were Senator KING, of Utah, chairman; Senator BONE, of Washington; Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, and Senator NYE, of North Dakota. Notes taken at the hearing and forwarded to the Alaska Weekly leave us in doubt as to Chairman KING's position. Senator NYE had nothing to say, and Senators BONE and REYNOLDS were frankly and militantly opposed to the measure.

As was long ago pointed out by the Alaska Weekly, the Slattery report was written to pave the way for this bill. In other words, facts marshalled in that report were set together to support a foregone conclusion rather than to aid in the formation of a conclusion as to the most feasible manner of developing Alaska. The bill itself consists of some 15 pages of verbal smoke screen and a few lines of meat which clearly reveal the purpose presaged by the Slattery report—that of colonizing Alaska with refugees, financed by private capital. That it is Jewish capital and that the refugees to be pcured into Alaska, if this bill is passed, will be Jewish is obvious.

We are not in sympathy with those who base their objections to the proposed colonization plans on this latter fact, except insofar as it is the concensus of opinion among those who know the country that Jews would be the least desirable of immigrants because of being the least adaptable to conditions such as those prevailing in Alaska. Opposition to Jewish refugees based on racial antipathy will never meet with our support nor, in our opinion, will any appreciable amount of that type of contemptible silver shirt, un-American opposition ever develop in Alaska.

The Department of the Interior cohorts led by one Felix Cohan, who drew the bill, descended on the committee in full force on the opening day of the hearing. The Bureau of Mines, the national parks, the Alaska Railroad, and many others were represented and a reading of the questions and answers would be comic if it were not tragic. When intelligent men are reduced to the status of stooges who must do the master's bidding and hang their heads or refuse to answer when honest answers would hurt the cause it is a sad spectacle which bespeaks bureaucracy at its worst.

As each of these witnesses told of the wealth of minerals to be developed, of the forests to be turned into pulpwood, of the resort hotels and golf courses to be built, Senator REYNOLDS had but one stock question: "Don't you think we have a few men among the 11,000,000 unemployed American citizens who could chop that timber?" "Don't you think that among the 11,000,000 unemployed American citizens there are men who could mine that coal?" Some of the mental gymnastics performed by the witnesses to evade straightforward answers to that question were little short of pitiful. One could envisage the lash of the big Ickes whip beneath which they cowered. Under the searching questions of Senator REYNOLDS the witnesses one by one were forced to admit that they had never been to Alaska and had gained the "expert" knowledge they were relaying to the committee from books and conversations.

When Senator REYNOLDS informed one witness that the bill was obviously a measure for the colonization of Alaska with refugees the witness insisted that it represented an honest effort to develop Alaska. As the discussion of the refugee problem developed and the witnesses were urging that humanitarian interests be considered Senator BONE said, "It won't be hundreds or thousands of refugees as the witness has enumerated, but millions will be refugees. How can we make selections from among those bewildered and battered people? Only God Almighty can solve this business * * * a terrifying thing. It is far from inconceivable that we may be refugees ourselves."

Felix Cohan testified that already $2,500,000 had been guaranteed for Alaskan industries if the guarantors were allowed to bring their own people in as experts. When asked to name these people who had subscribed to such a fund, he refused to divulge the names and merely insisted that millions for Alaskan industry would be made available if the bill were passed. When asked if there were Americans who would put up money for the relief of foreigners who would not put it up to aid Americans, the witness had to admit that they would probably not furnish the funds with the refugee provisions omitted from the bill.

In all of the opening day of hearings only one voice was raised by a witness in defense of Alaska, that of Col. John Thomas Taylor, director of the legislative committee of the American Legion. Colonel Taylor pointed out in no uncertain terms how the deadly infiltration of "fifth column" elements was already undermining our democracy and urged that we protect Alaska rather than throw open its doors to the Trojan-horse methods of Europe.

By the time this issue of the Alaska Weekly sees the light of day it may be too late to prevent favorable committee action on this nefarious Department of the Interior conspiracy but it will not be too late to bombard Congress with Alaskan protest. Delegate DIMOND is fighting it with every power at his command and, in a signed statement presented to the committee, he said, "Alaska is part of the Nation, and we decline to have it set off as a sort of special land where people may reside who are not citizens and not permitted to be in the rest of the United States." That statement expresses the feeling of the majority of Alaskans but it will not do merely to decline, we must all fight, as DIMOND is fighting, to stop it at all costs.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD TIMES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Hartford Times of June 20, entitled "Quantity and Quality," which article, it seems to me, will be of great interest to those actively engaged in the work of advancing and building up our national defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times of June 20, 1940]

QUANTITY AND QUALITY

The launching of the preparedness program projected question as to whether the usual requirements for first-class quality in equipment furnished shall be retained or whether serviceability and perhaps performance shall be sacrificed in the interest of obtaining a great volume of war material promptly.

Germany was able to win in Belgium and France by virtue of having an overwhelming supply of airplanes, tanks, and other motorized and mechanized equipment, although individually her artillery pieces and airplanes were inferior to those of the Allies.

Single British air fighters almost invariably shot down or put to flight a single German opponent or several of them, but Germany's advantage in numbers was so pronounced that the superior quality of Allied material was not effective against it.

From this it is argued that we should sacrifice quality in order to obtain enough equipment quickly.

It is undoubtedly true that a plentiful supply of all sorts of equipment is our first need—motorized artillery, armored trucks and cars enough, and clouds of airplanes. We need these at the earliest possible moment. Perhaps we can have them without losing the advantage that goes with quality. Where there is anything like numerical equality, quality may become an important factor toward victory.

In the early days of the war, the French grounded their airplanes for engine overhaul and servicing after 50 hours in the air. Their American equipment had to be overhauled only after 600 hours in the air. Ability to remain in the air is important and offsets some difference in numbers although not any such disparity as existed between the Allies and Germany.

The same thing would be true of tanks which would stand up under service and of artillery better equipped with fire-control and other devices.

The Army is being urged to abandon, at least temporarily, its practice of constantly refining and improving its tanks and of frequently changing models of trucks and armored cars, sticking to present models until it gets a sufficient quantity. There undoubtedly would be an advantage in that. If there is anything we are in a hurry about, Army equipment is it.

As to airplanes, the Army has just given a contract to Henry Ford to produce 3,000 Rolls-Royce liquid-cooled motors in the next 8 months. That incidentally is only 3 days' work when he gets production up to 1,000 a day, but when he has delivered 3,000 motors in 8 months he should be able to deliver 3,000 more in much less time.

The United Aircraft Corporation is producing at the rate of 850 engines a month. In the 8 months given Mr. Ford to complete his order it probably will produce 7,000 motors, or double his allotment. The Wright Co. also is in full production.

True, United and Wright production is not fully available to the United States now. If the war should end, however, it would be. In addition, there is the General Motors Allison plant.

It would seem therefore that the country's engine-building capacity is sufficient so that it might be able to have both quantity and quality. Certainly that is so as far as any orders already placed by the Government or in sight are concerned.

As long as that is true, and as long as quality is so important as between forces not greatly disparate in numerical strength, it is to be hoped that the Nation will avail itself of both factors to the fullest possible extent.

Peace, Not War, Is What the People of This Country Pray For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy the Congress is about to recess rather than adjourn. In such a critical period we would deserve the condemnation of the people of the country if we voted to adjourn.

In the last few days bills authorizing and appropriating billions of dollars for national defense have been passed. Democrats and Republicans alike joined in supporting them. True, we have performed our duty in making money available but as I see it we have another duty, and that is to see that the money is spent wisely. What the Congress wants, and what the country must have, is a Navy second to none, and an Army equipped with every modern device from the latest type of guns for the infantry to tanks and planes so that the world will know, although we are a peaceful Nation, we are ready to protect ourselves against invasion.

The people of this country, with few exceptions, do not want war. They pray for peace. Congress alone can declare war, and I know of no Congressman, no matter what his or her sympathies might be, who has expressed a desire for war.

In my opinion, there has been too much talk in recent weeks. When we considered amendments to the Neutrality Act we were told by many we were taking the first step that would lead us into war. I said then, and I say now, that those amendments have kept us out of war, and will continue to keep us out of war, so long as we abide by that act. What would have happened if we would have let our ships and our nationals enter the combat zone? You know how many neutral ships were sunk. Ours would have suffered the same fate.

In the Neutrality Act we said to the world, "If you have money to buy, we will sell whatever is produced in this country, provided you take it away in your own ships." We will not extend credit to any nation. We will not let any ship flying an American flag enter the combat zone, and we serve notice on our citizens, "If you travel in the combat zone, you do so on your own responsibility." No matter what our likes and dislikes might be we must adhere to these declarations.

The Treaty of Versailles is responsible for the present war. One of the great nations of the world claimed by that treaty it was deprived of its possessions and seeks now to redeem them, as well as require those who were responsible to make additional concessions. Whether or not their efforts will be successful remains to be seen. True, we do not like their form of government, and it is likewise true they do not like ours. I cannot see that it is our duty to try and reform the world. If it could be done peacefully, well and good, but it can only be done by force. Until some overt act is committed against us, I maintain it will be to our advantage to always bear in mind our present Neutrality Act. We are a peaceful people, and no act of ours against a belligerent should disturb that peace.

In the event of war, millions of the young men of our Nation will be called to the colors. Who are we that we should ask them to take up arms against nations who up to this time have not quarreled with us? Let us not become hysterical. Let us remember our Constitution and our laws are only supreme here and that we have no authority to force our views upon the people of other nations. Whether a minority or majority is responsible for the form of government in other nations we do not know, but because we might not like their form of government we have no more right to destroy it than they have to attempt to destroy ours. Let us deal with those in our own country, no matter whether they be aliens or native born, who would destroy our form of government. Congress has set up the machinery and provided the money to enforce our laws against subversive activities. It is up to the executive branch of the Government now to enforce those laws, and we should see that it is done.

As for the spending of the money we have appropriated and the carrying out of the authorizations we have passed, I say again if ever there was a time Congress should check expenditures it is now. This is an ideal moment to serve notice the Congress is on guard and let it be on guard. There is no necessity for the Congress to approve all contracts but we can, by requiring a proper accounting of those in charge, check what is being done. We have authorized expenditures for ships that cannot possibly be carried out in less than 6 or 7 years. We just do not have the facilities in this country to build in less than that time all the ships we have authorized. We do have or can arrange for facilities to properly equip an Army. That must be done. We must speed up the construction of planes. We can arrange for the construction of tanks and other necessary equipment which we need so badly. The people of the city, I in part represent, do not want war. I do not want war, and I never will vote for war simply to help some nations that are at war. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, published Thursday, June 20. It follows:

AN ANSWER TO THE WAR HAWKS

The 30 professional and businessmen (including Edward T. Gushee of St. Louis) who recently urged that the United States declare war on Germany at once, in defense of "our ideals, our institutions, and our way of life," now have an answer in a statement by a group of this city's leaders. It is a calm and reasoned answer, a commonsense answer. Its gist is in these words: "We feel that the United States can best fulfill its obligations to the world by remaining out of the present conflict."

This group of 15 St. Louis men is plainly not moved by political partisanship. Its members are not professional pacifists, nor are they sympathizers with the axis countries. Each one is a thorough American, convinced that this country has no business in the European war, and willing to speak out publicly against pro-intervention sentiment.

Their names, representative of St. Louis business, law, and other professions, constitute a roll of patriotic citizenship:

Thomas N. Dysart, president of the Chamber of Commerce.

Walter W. Head, president of the Boy Scouts of America.

J. Lionberger Davis, president, Security National Bank, and president, local American Red Cross chapter.

Dean Joseph A. McClain, Jr., Washington University Law School.

Dean Alphonse G. Eberle, St. Louis University Law School.

L. Warrington Baldwin, president, Missouri Pacific Railroad.

Former Circuit Judge Fred J. Hoffmeister.
Dean Alexander S. Langsdorf, Washington University Engineering School.
Prof. Tyrrell Williams, Washington University Law School.
William R. Orthwein, former president, St. Louis Lawyers' Association.
Isaac Hedges, manager of Cupples Station.
Albert W. Dehlendorf, vice president and secretary, Lindell Trust Co.
Joseph Forshaw, president, Forshaw of St. Louis.
Clarence H. Poindexter, general agent, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.
Arnold G. Stifel, president, Stifel, Nicolaus & Co.

Recommendations for Tort Claim Adjustments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

STATEMENT OF CHARLES RUZICKA

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the extension of remarks a statement made by Mr. Charles Ruzicka, member of the standing committee on jurisprudence and law reform of the American Bar Association, before the House Judiciary Committee on April 3, 1940:

As a member of the standing committee on jurisprudence and law reform of the American Bar Association, and on behalf of the American Bar Association, I wish to urge a favorable report by the House Judiciary Committee on H. R. 7236, which provides for the adjustment of tort claims against the United States and which confers jurisdiction in respect thereto upon the district courts of the United States and the Court of Claims in matters in which the claims do not exceed $7,500.

At its annual meeting, held in San Francisco in July 1939, the American Bar Association adopted a resolution approving in principle an act permitting the United States to be sued in respect of claims for property or personal injuries due to the negligence of Government officers or employees in performance of their duties. The association believes that the bill now being considered by this committee will go far toward remedying a situation which has been the subject of much general concern and has been appreciated particularly by Members of Congress and by the Attorneys General of the United States. The present bill was drafted by the Department of Justice and was approved and recommended by Mr. Justice Murphy while he was Attorney General and is now recommended by Attorney General Robert H. Jackson. This action by the Department of Justice was taken only after careful investigation and examination of the subject matter.

The bill serves a twofold purpose: First, it will relieve Congress of the necessity of considering the many private bills which are offered at every session, with the attendant waste of time necessarily involved in their consideration; and, secondly, it will afford the private citizen easy and simple access to the courts of the United States for the relief of injuries to person and property occasioned by the negligence of the Government's agents while acting within the scope of their duties. It is not the purpose of the American Bar Association in any manner to criticize or deprecate the fine work of the several congressional Claims Committees, but it must be realized that the basis of relief afforded by these committees is the bounty of the Government in permitting some claims against it to be recognized while reserving the right to refuse other, though equally meritorious, claims. In other words, relief through congressional committees is a matter of grace and not of right.

It is submitted that the ability to proceed against the Government for torts committed by its agents should be a right. In effect, the United States is a corporation, exercising all the privileges and functions of a corporation, and should be answerable to its citizens for its wrongs in no less a degree than a private person or a body corporate.

In approving and passing this proposed legislation, Congress would be doing no more than it has already done with respect to other classes of claims, notably, claims on contracts, infringements of patents, suits arising out of admiralty or maritime torts, and others. It has been suggested that the work of the congressional Committees on Claims have reached a high stage of efficiency, which the American Bar Association does not wish to dispute. It must be conceded, however, that this was not always the case, and it is within the realm of possibility that at some future date, when the membership of these committees has changed, the committees as then constituted might not function with the same efficiency and care as they do now. The American Bar Association believes that the remedies afforded in the proposed bill should not be subject to the change in complexion of these Claims Committees, brought about by the passage of time or the well-known uncertainties of national elections. We believe that the proper forum for relief for personal injuries or injury to property, occasioned by acts of governmental agents, is in the United States courts where the judge would have the opportunity of seeing and examining all witnesses and weighing the matter of liability, rather than having the relief in any manner dependent upon representation before committees by congressional representatives through friendship or because of political affiliation.

The absence of adequate remedy for injuries growing out of the actions of governmental agents, other than through the grace of Congress, was the subject of concern of one of the greatest presidents of the United States. In his first annual message to Congress, delivered on December 3, 1861, Abraham Lincoln made the following recommendations, which we submit are as appropriate now as they were then:

"It is important that some more convenient means should be provided, if possible, for the adjustment of claims against the Government, especially in view of their increased number by reason of the war. It is as much the duty of government to render prompt justice against itself in favor of citizens as it is to administer the same justice between private individuals. The investigation and adjudication of claims in their nature belong to the judicial department. * * * It was intended by the organization of the Court of Claims mainly to remove this branch of business from the Halls of Congress; but while the court has proved to be an effective and valuable means of investigation, it in great degree fails to effect the object of its creation for want of power to make its judgment final."

The American Bar Association strongly urges that H. R. 7236, with such amendments as shall be deemed proper to clarify any ambiguous provisions, be approved by this committee and passed by Congress. It may be that need of further amendments will be revealed in time, but it is our opinion that the bill should be passed and put in operation without further delay.

So much for the official position of the American Bar Association. Speaking now for myself, individually, I am opposed in principle to the amendment to H. R. 7236, suggested by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, because I am opposed to further extension of the already overexpanded Government of the United States by bureaus. Our forefathers wisely divided this Government into executive, legislative, and judicial departments, and I believe that permitting a bureau to generally handle remedies for private wrongs would be an unwarranted usurpation of judicial functions. The poor injured person should be given the same right to have his day in the United States courts as has been given by Congress to big shipowners to sue in tort, contractors, patentees, and taxpayers. There should be no discrimination in Congress between citizens of this country. The poor and the rich should be treated alike. Members of Congress should not be obliged to spend a great deal of their time in pressing private claims, but in these critical days should be able to give their time to matters of high importance to our great country and the people. It is an imposition to call upon Members of Congress to handle private claims.

The method of relief afforded by the bill in its original form is simple and direct in utilizing the district courts of the United States, which are now and have been functioning most efficiently for many years.

Nobody Will Be Deluded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN A. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BINGHAMTON (N. Y.) PRESS

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of June 21, 1940]

NOBODY WILL BE DELUDED

Yesterday was a rather sad day for the American people. It was a sad day in the history of American democracy. The President of the United States chose it as the day on which to announce that he was going to play politics with American defense in America's hour of need.

Even the most casual American will have no illusions about the nomination by Mr. Roosevelt of Henry L. Stimson, Republican Secretary of War in the Taft Cabinet and Secretary of State in the

Hoover Administration, to become now the Secretary of War succeeding the inept, cantankerous, and altogether undesirable Woodring. The appointment of Col. Frank Knox, Chicago publisher, Vice Presidential nominee with Alf M. Landon in the 1936 Presidential campaign, is a piece of the same political cloth, and will be so recognized.

Not that anybody in America doubts the experience and the executive ability of Mr. Stimson. Not that anybody will question the value, the courage, and the executive experience of Colonel Knox. That isn't the point. Both men, if they were given those jobs under fair conditions and without expectation of interference, could and would probably do a first-class job. Certainly Mr. Stimson is head and shoulders above Secretary Woodring, although that is a doubtful compliment. And there isn't any question as to the ability of the Chicago publisher as an organizer and as a "go-getter."

But in appointing these two Republicans Mr. Roosevelt has given unmistakable notice of something which the American people are not going to like very well. It isn't as if there weren't a great many Democrats in the United States, like Barney M. Baruch, for instance, entirely capable of filling either of those positions. It isn't as if Mr. Roosevelt were unable to find in his own party outstanding men of experience to become Secretaries of War and Navy. The fact that he has chosen Mr. Stimson and Colonel Knox instead of two Democrats might, at first blush, seem to indicate a desire on the President's part to unite the entire country behind his policy, whatever it may be from day to day, for the well-being of American defense and for the security of the citizens of the United States.

But it isn't quite as simple as that and most folks will wonder why President Roosevelt thinks the American people are quite as simple as that.

In the first place, both Colonel Knox and Mr. Stimson are interventionists; both are rabid in their partisanship toward France and England. Most Americans share that partisanship to a certain extent, but not to the point of intervention; not to the point of putting the United States, unarmed, unprepared, and unequipped as it is, into this war.

One has to go no further than the consistent record made by Mr. Stimson on the question of intervention in the Japanese conquest of Manchuria. At that time he wanted the British Government to join with the Government of the United States in a display of naval strength against Japan in the Pacific, designed to serve the purpose of international policing and to shoo Japan away from her conquest in the Far East.

He has never given up the idea of intervention. He is as strong for it today as he ever was, and Col. Frank Knox' views on the same subject are well known. In other words, they fit precisely the sort of thing that Mr. Roosevelt has been doing and saying with reference to the conflict in Europe. They fit his "stab in the back" speech at Charlottesville. They fit his insistence on the sale of munitions and matériel to the Allies. They fit his almost surreptitious sale of smaller United States naval vessels to Great Britain, which was not made public until Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, a member of Mr. Roosevelt's own party, dug it out and made it public to Congress and to the people of this country.

These two appointments are made with an obvious purpose, and that purpose fits every other part of the pattern that Mr. Roosevelt has been making in the past 2 months, as, a step at a time, he has pushed this country further and further in the direction of actual participation in the war in Europe.

And that would be bad enough, but that isn't all of it—not by a long shot. Mr. Roosevelt chose as the day of his pronouncement the same day on which the plenipotentiaries of France were preparing to meet with the plenipotentiaries of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy to discuss the terms of French surrender. It was the same day on which Marshal Petain told the world in a radio broadcast of some of the causes leading to the French debacle.

Marshal Petain enumerated some of the causes to which he attributed the French defeat. He did not label as such and in so many words the principal cause—playing politics with national defense.

He didn't have to, because all the world knows—from the statesmen down to the various laymen—that England and France occupy the unenviable position they do today because their so-called statesmen, from the day when the Treaty of Versailles was signed, played politics with national defense.

And so it is a regrettable thing that as the two great democracies of western Europe are falling under the flail-like blows of those realists, the totalitarians, our President of our Republic, the one remaining strong democracy in the world, should inaugurate, on an open basis, the playing of politics with American national defense.

For that's exactly what Mr. Roosevelt has done. There was some discussion of a coalition Cabinet a few weeks ago. It was predicated upon the contingency that Mr. Roosevelt would announce he had no third-term aspirations and would not be a candidate for a third term as President. Mr. Roosevelt then made no such commitments. No coalition Cabinet, he said, was being considered seriously. Now he has named two leading members of the National Republican Party, one to the post of Secretary of War, one to the post of Secretary of the Navy. And his nomination of these gentlemen to the Senate is not accompanied by any indication that he will not be a candidate for a third term as President of the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt chooses the eve of the Republican National Convention to make his announcement. His purpose is so obvious as to make the wise sneer. He himself has made it entirely plain.

Mr. Roosevelt is an astute political observer. He has many listening posts over the land. The reports that he has been getting from Europe may not have been too accurate, but if he is willing to listen he can always get the truth about what is happening in the United States, and particularly what the common, ordinary people of the United States are thinking and saying about him and his policies. Hence his frequent trial balloons; hence his frequent abandonment of plans represented by those trial balloons. He gets public reaction quickly and accurately, when he chooses.

The appointment of Messrs. Stimson and Knox isn't the first indication that Mr. Roosevelt has been hearing the voice of the people on the subject of national defense or the lack thereof. His message to Congress on that subject took cognizance of the fact that the people of the United States, in the face of the news from Europe, were beginning to say, "Well, why hasn't the Roosevelt administration taken care of our national defense?" Because just about the time the bad news from Europe was beginning to break, generals of the staff and admirals of the Navy were going before congressional committees and telling some regrettable truths about the status of our defense. So Mr. Roosevelt went before Congress, beating his Republican opponents to the punch for the moment, and admitted quite frankly that the country was on its uppers as far as guns and munitions were concerned.

There is a story around Washington that he was told in the days immediately following that he had admitted too much. The following Sunday night he had his fireside chat with the Nation and in that fireside chat, it will be remembered, he tried to leave the impression that after all he wasn't the only one responsible for not attending to the defenses of this country. He intimated that the administrations which had preceded him hadn't done their bit either.

Then that Monday night Herbert Hoover lashed back, pointing out that after all preparedness is only a relative matter and that people in his time as President had their faces turned toward peace.

That answer was of such nature as to make the average American say, "Yes; Mr. Hoover is right." Then, when the Republican forces began to gather in Philadelphia this week it was plain enough that the administration would have to face the issue of national defense in a big way.

It was the dominant theme of the hearing before the Republican National Convention's resolution committee. One way or another, it crept into a great many speeches. One way or another it crept into the opinions expressed by members of the resolutions committee, and by arriving delegates all the way from Oshkosh to Tampa.

And so, obviously for the purpose of anticipating the pronouncement of that issue by the Republican National Convention, and obviously for the purpose of throwing a monkey wrench into the Republican convention's machinery, and equally for the purpose of establishing a defense alibi for himself, Mr. Roosevelt has appointed Mr. Stimson and Colonel Knox.

He has picked out two good Republicans and has handed to them the stripped national defenses of the United States. He is making them responsible for taking over and trying to do something with a badly botched job—botched not by the Republicans but by his New Deal administration in the years when he was starving national defense in favor of social reform.

It is a barefaced political effort to avoid political responsibility for a reprehensible condition brought on by bad planning, by an attempt to substitute conversation for action; brought on by the crippling of industry; brought on by following the general nonmilitaristic ideas of those questionable fellow travelers who seem to have had such an important part in the decisions of Mr. Roosevelt's administration.

A week ago in an editorial captioned "Only One Issue," the Binghamton Press called attention to the fact that the issue of national defense, and the admitted failure of the New Deal administration to do what it should have done with national defense in the 7 long years of prodigious spending of billions, was the first and foremost item for the consideration of the Republican National Convention—that it was a natural issue for the 1940 Presidential campaign, coming from the people themselves, based on public fear and on public apprehension entirely justified by the defenseless condition in which we stand against the threat of what is happening in Europe.

What Mr. Roosevelt did yesterday demonstrates the accuracy of that diagnosis made by this newspaper. Mr. Roosevelt saw national defense coming upon him as an indefensible issue before he went before the Congress of the United States. He has been seeing it more clearly every day. He recognizes that in his message to Congress he pleaded guilty to neglect of his constitutional duty to the people of the United States before the issue was raised by his political opponents in the 1940 campaign.

And he recognizes, as Wendell Willkie says, that here is an issue which is nonpartisan and which concerns the safety of all the American people and demands the best effort of all American people.

For the first time the New Deal is conjugating, not in the future tense, but in the past and very imperfect. For the first time Mr. Roosevelt isn't telling what he is going to do. He realizes that he must account for what he has not done in terms of the safety of American homes.

And so, by what he may have considered a master stroke, he has sought to thrust the full responsibility for the failure of his administration—for the diversion of billions which should have gone into national defense to other and more frittering purposes—upon two Republican gentlemen, well intentioned and patriotic and able, who represent just two more victims of the sleigh-ride operations and technique of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This newspaper has disagreed with Mr. Roosevelt on many occasions—never as profoundly as at this juncture. It is difficult to forgive any man who plays politics with national safety, particularly when such a sinister and bloody lesson on that point is being written across the face of Europe.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. GARRETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, during the brief time that I have been in Congress, I have fully realized and consistently adhered to the common rule of the House that a new Member should be seen and not heard until and unless he becomes thoroughly familiar with the rules and customs of the House, and not then unless the matter involved directly interests or affects the people whom he represents or what he says is of some benefit to our country. Too many, Mr. Speaker, I observe, take up much of the valuable time of this House in speaking on matters which are of no concern whatever to our people. I have had no desire to get in the headlines of our newspapers but my main desire has been to faithfully, humbly, and honestly serve my constituents who sent me here to represent them.

This Government of ours is so large, its ramifications are so widespread, and its functions so diverse that it has developed, to my mind, into a government of specialists. For that reason, I have preferred to allow those who head the major committees, those who have made a special study of a subject and have gone into its phases as it affects all the people, take the lead in every discussion and from the knowledge which they have, the things which they have learned and the study they have made, try in my own mind to reason out the needs and the effects of such legislation and vote for what I conceived to be the best interest of my people and the people of this country. No man living has a brain strong enough, strength of body great enough, nor time at his disposal to study enough to know everything about what is being done in Congress and be able to appear before this body at any and all hours and talk intelligently on any and all subjects which come before us. We must be specialists and must study one thing at a time, and must be in touch with the one thing which is pertinent to the interests of our country.

At this time the most important subject before our country is that of national defense. This, every Member of this body is studying. This is the one big subject of our mail; our people are interested. A wave of fear has hit our people. They want to know that those things which they have taken for granted in the past are now safe. They know the history of their freedom has been written in the blood of martyrs for that freedom and they are asking us to do all that we can, regardless of the cost, to insure that the things we have always held dear shall endure for them and their posterity.

MY VOTE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the time that I have been in Congress, we have seen the nations of the world rearming. Spain was in flames when I took my oath of office. Italy had just presided at the rape of Abyssinia, and the storm clouds were hanging over both Europe and Asia. I voted for the President's requested Neutrality Act, and I have supported him ever since on each act which he has requested which would protect our Nation from any entanglement.

I have gone with him on each appropriation which he has requested for the support of the Army and Navy. As Commander in Chief of those forces he has been in touch with their needs—he had his specialists, men trained in the mad science of destruction, men whom we have educated and paid for that purpose, that they might know what to do when the time came for our Nation to be protected. These men from time to time have come before our committees and told their needs, asked for the money that they felt was necessary, and, all too often, we have haggled with them, feeling the security of the oceans that surround us and the might of the fleet of another nation was our first line of defense.

Mr. Speaker, I was never the man to shirk a duty. I have never hesitated to handle a situation when it had to be handled and at this time I want to confess that, along with all of you, I have had those same feelings. But with my sense of duty to myself and my country, as I would to my own family if in peril from a monster, I want this Nation rearmed now. I want to see its forces strong enough that no power-mad dictator will dare to storm its shores.

Our President asked us 3 years ago for a stronger Navy and I voted to give it—not to him necessarily, but to our country. He has asked us for additional moneys for the arming of our men and their training. I have voted to give it to him, and I am today proud of those votes. It means, as he has said, that we have a stronger Army and Navy than we had in 1917 when we entered the World War. But it is not strong enough. War maneuvers have shown the weakness of our Army and its lack of many essentials. Now is the time to prepare and eradicate those weaknesses.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a football team would Knute Rockne have had at Notre Dame, a team which swept the imagination of the Nation, had he tried to play those other teams with only trained backfield men and green linesmen? A great tackle is not trained in an afternoon and the best quarterback that ever lived must know the rules before he can run the team. We have untrained linesmen galore, the boys in our factories and on our farms; we have excellent quarterbacks in our schools and colleges, material for a great army but it is not coordinated, it does not know the game and does not have a play which has been mastered. Let us give those coaches at the head of the Army and Navy, the head coach, our President, and his assistants in both branches, line and backfield, the men that it takes to make a team, and they can and will do so. It is almost too late for the big game is at hand, but by hours of masterful drill, scraping the locker room of equipment and in the hysteria of a last desperate drive among the student body and alumni we can get that team on the field before it is too late. Maybe then we can sit back in our seat and cry to them to hold the line. But until we have made that effort, done that scraping and sent that wave of hysteria which comes from a pep rally moving those forces, we cannot ask them to hold the line. The coach cannot be ready, the game will not start and there will be a forfeited contest with the loss and disgrace that goes with a defeat.

Digressing as that illustration is and without any spirit of levity in it whatsoever, I have tried to show the desperate need of our country in language which all our young people and many of our older ones will understand. Let us get a team together which will be so strong that in desperation we will not have to make the goal-line stand that France and England are making but one which will sweep with the rapidity of lightning, time after time, down the field for goal after goal if needed.

A MILLION MEN SPRINGING TO ARMS

This Nation was founded by men who had been reared to the use of firearms. They knew how to shoot and when to

shoot. On the frontiers and among the settled portions of the country there was life to defend and game to take. The last frontier has been shattered and most of the game has gone. We laid aside those rifles two generations ago and now we must learn. Yes, in time of peril, a million men would spring to arms, grab a single-barrel shotgun with a range of possibly a hundred yards and go forth to die like rats cornered in a granary until that second or third million lay with them and this Nation could gear its factories to produce weapons of war. There is no question of valor, no disparagement of courage when the cry goes up to give them arms. It is a matter of weeks and months to assemble stores and supplies. Let us get them now. Warehouses should bulge with shoes, clothing, blankets, medical supplies, and essential ammunition; arsenals should have thousands of cannon and millions of rifles and the sky should be dark with airplanes if we are to speak to Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin with the words which they understand.

"FIFTH COLUMNISTS"

But the enemy to which we have turned our eyes is that enemy without. Within our gates we have those who are almost as dangerous for they are working in the dark. They are aliens and disloyal traitors to our country and ideals. I have voted for each appropriation for the Dies committee. I have voted against the measures which the Communists and tiny pinks have wanted for their own purposes. They are a menace and behind the battle cry of civil liberties and their rights have wormed their way into the folds of our national life. In times of peace and national safety we have allowed them those rights; now in times of peril they menace our national safety. Every disloyal person to this Government must be put in his own place. He must be made to feel the sting of disapproval, the full force of his traitorous thoughts, and the penalty of the traitor must be his. Those who are alien by birth, by thought, and by action should be deported to their native country, exiled to the land of their interests and hopes or confined where they cannot harm our own Nation and its ideals. This must be done calmly and with justice that none who unthoughtedly have espoused their cause may fail to have that chance of repentance nor redemption but which they must prove in their deeds and actions. Those who have sheltered in our Nation from a love of freedom should be allowed to become citizens, but from now on I believe this should be a land of Americans, devoted to the American ideal and with the freedom and rights which goes with all that that term implies.

Those who come in the category of "fifth columnists" should beware, for an aroused public opinion has caught up with them. It has based itself on the standards of Americanism, with all that that term means, and there can and will be no deviation from that ideal. The alien should go to his home, the alien ideal to the mire from which it spawned, and the traitor within our own gates should either repent of his sins and seek absolution in his life or suffer the penalty, whatever it may be.

A NATION DEFENDED

A nation which its people will defend and for which they will give their all is a nation which has something to offer its people. This Nation has the greatest storehouse of national wealth of any land on earth. It has the iron ore, coal, oil and gas, the potential agricultural wealth, aside from what has been developed, the manufacturing institutions manned with the world's best brains, to feed and clothe the nations of the world. The United States can support and care for its people. We want nothing from any nation on earth. Our industry, genius, and wealth is here for the use and benefit of our people and the benefit of the world if we are left in peace. If aroused to war we can and will be a scourge to those who face us.

IDEALS ARE OUR BULWARK

This Nation was founded on the ideals of liberty and justice to all. It was built on the scheme that all men were created free and equal. So they are and as long as a man respects the rights of his fellow man, stays within the bounds of that common law which has made us a Nation of individuals and not dumb driven slaves, we have that liberty and freedom, that equality and justice which is an inherent right of every man. Only the usurper of power can disagree with these ideals and principles.

For those reasons I have supported the broad policies of the New Deal. I have felt that every man had a right to a chance at a livelihood and when through world conditions, some local twist of fate, or some fault which could be laid to the door of anyone he was deprived of that right, then the Government should provide him with his opportunity. That is the heart and soul of the New Deal which came into existence with the advent of President Roosevelt and has been the theme of our national life since that day.

THE BASIS OF A NATION

The basic factor for a nation which is amply defended is a contented people. There should always be such a condition in any land and a happy and free people can and will defend themselves. Those in need should have help and those who suffer should have surcease. This is the base of the relief program and I have wholeheartedly supported each request of the President for such funds as will enable our people to work and enjoy some of the fruits of their labors. The W. P. A. and P. W. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A., and their kindred work has had my support that our men and women might have food and clothing and a shelter for their children until world conditions could and would release them for other and more productive labor. There have been mistakes in these programs, there has been some waste and some extravagance but as long as men have been employed, women and children fed and clothed, and those things done which make for the happiness and benefit of our country we can stand some of that waste and loss that our people may be loyal and true to their ideals. "The poor you have with you always," is as true today as when it was uttered in Galilee and our people, with the generous heart which has always been theirs, do not want to see hungry, naked, and starving people in a land of plenty.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The New Deal, a function of the Democratic Party, offered the first great social step forward when to those who had no opportunity to save a competence it started the social-security program. This program in the minds of our people is tied up with only that part of the governmental machinery which operates under that title. That work is now an integral part of our national life and the ideal condition which we have dreamed about may grow from it with its care for the aged, the offer of pensions for those who are unable to work, a storehouse of funds for those who have worked and are now unemployed, its opportunity for service to those unfit and crippled, and its refuge for the sick and weary.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Through accident, or design of fate, we began in the infancy of our Republic a pension system for those who had served in its armies. For several generations this was the pension system. It has grown, and today it is a commonly accepted fact that a man who serves under arms for this Nation shall be granted some form of a pension when, through age or disability, it becomes necessary for him to have help. This is just and right and speaks the gratitude of our people. The veterans of our country's armies are not recipients of charity, they are being paid in cold cash out of the gratitude of our people, an emolument for the services they render and in gratitude it is being done.

Along with this system there has grown in the past few years a civil-service retirement system. Those civil servants of the Government who grew old in its service, infirm in their duties, and disabled by the rigors of their employment built a retirement system which is truly a part of our national social-service work.

Now the idea has arisen, and it is a worthy one, that those who have labored through the years, reared families of

strong sons and daughters, served their country in the pursuits of industry but have expended their earnings and their life in the endeavors of being citizens should receive some care and attention from those who enjoy the fruits of their labor. I am referring to old-age pensions. I have voted that this be done. *I have no apology to make for that vote.* I promised my people when I came here that I favored an old-age pension for those who were in need, and want that protection. It is my opinion that our people are willing to grant this relief to those who have labored and served and, in the twilight of their life, face want and poverty.

All the various pension systems which we have worked out through the years are merely phases of this thing we call social security. It may be that to you it is not social security to grant pensions and hospitalization to veterans or our aged needy, but what can you call it? It is a safety measure for the life of our people and a hope that makes them willing to work and endure, for the benefit of the common heritage, our national life and honor.

LABOR AND MONEY

I have the utmost respect for the man who works and works diligently. I have done manual labor and know what it is to end a day with a body bathed in perspiration. I know that all the citizens of our country cannot have white-collar jobs and that those who labor have their rights and their duties. I have stood for those things for them, and expect to do so. Many of our laws designed to protect labor have been a detriment to them, for in enthusiasm we have allowed those who want to divide and destroy to dictate to those who are the closest to those who work. A man who hires men to work and who has any sympathy, or any thought for his own good, wants men to work where they are happy, where they can best deliver a full day's work, and where they will be better able to live a contented life.

I have found no man who was really opposed to a workingman living in a good house with decent surroundings. If he is the right kind of an employer, he wants good schools and recreation facilities for those who live in the laboring man's community, and for that reason I have supported measures which would tend to produce such conditions. We want to have a happy people and a people that are learning and enjoying the things of life. This they get when the ideals set by this New Deal have had a chance of fruition.

However, there have been men in industrial life, as well as short-sighted union leaders, who have tried to force issues and destroy constructive work. These things move slowly, and back and forth the pendulum of progress and retrogression swings, until some day it will reach the level which is that ideal. Picture to yourself the conditions among our laboring men 100 years ago. This Capitol was built by men who worked for a pittance 12 hours or longer a day. Then came the standard 10-hour day and a slightly higher wage, and many of the men in this House can remember the thrill which came to the workingman of our country when Henry Ford announced an 8-hour day with a minimum wage of $5 per day. It takes time and struggle to achieve this ideal, but it is going to come forth for the benefit of mankind.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

One of the earliest political battle cries that most of us can remember was that the natural resources of our country must be conserved. There has been plenty of talk about it, but, as Bill Nye said about the weather, "not much has been done about it," until the New Deal, this progressive and aggressive force which hit our country 8 years ago, began to solve some of its problems. Rapacious timber barons had denuded and destroyed our forests, and now we have planted millions of trees at public expense to take their place. Our oil supply was being wasted, and laws for conserving it had to be be enacted—a law which has proven a success, despite the will to disobey which is inherent in so many people and their desire to cheat. The loyal and honest have stood by the Connally Hot Oil Act, and that reckless flow of our subterranean wealth has been curbed to our national needs.

So it has gone with those resources which are not replacable. Along with them through the years we have wasted the soil of our agricultural lands in a manner which was shameful. For over 50 years we knew the value of a terrace to hold water and stop washing, but not much was done about it until this administration started a soil-conservation program. Most of our people have not caught the full significance of the program but think of it in dollars and cents and look upon it as a waste of public funds—funds which you and I know are being deposited in the bank of posterity that our children's children to the tenth generation may benefit from this movement.

The full force of the agricultural program has not yet been felt. It is a storehouse of treasure for the future, and blessings will flow on those who have worked for its fulfillment. Yes; it has worked a hardship on some, but it has proven a curb on others who were ruining the soil and not using it for the good of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of many things which are not possibly pertinent to the one theme of national defense. Our minds today are on cannon and airplanes, a field full of big guns to growl and a sky full of planes, or a navy which is the master of both oceans, or a way in which we can use to the best advantage our vast storehouse of national wealth; these other things are pertinent for our thoughts. However, they are things which a grateful Nation has tried to do and, in the weakness of our mortal efforts, has sometimes failed to see in their full significance. I have tried to show them to you as a part of our national life, a second line of defense, which makes our people love their country, appreciate the soul which motivates it, and be ready and willing to live or die beneath the folds of its flag.

Men are calling that emblem, the oldest flag that flies in strength today, "a dirty rag." They are not true to the ideals for which it stands, and they are willing to betray the blood that was shed on Bunker Hill and at Gettysburg. It means something to me and mine, and while this Nation stands it will mean something to the millions who have the blood of those patriots of the past flowing through their veins.

When I announced for Congress 4 years ago I told my people that I was opposed to a war of aggression. I am still opposed to war, as strongly now as then. But it is not enough just to be opposed. I am also opposed to my home burning up. But that would not stop it should my neighbor's house be on fire and the wind blow the flames toward mine and the firemen not come. I had a letter yesterday from a great man in Texas, not a mighty man, but a man great in soul and life, a man who has stood close to his God through the years, a man of prayer and faith; and in his strong heart he said: "Better that his two sons should die than that they live under the heel of a power-mad dictator." What would life be worth without liberty? What would bread be worth if we were slaves? What would a home be worth that had the shadow of the conqueror over it and the fear of the doomed as its constant menace? May God deliver our Nation from that fate. He can do that for us if we will do our part. Our part is to part with our money to buy the needed things for our own defense. Are we craven; do we love a dollar more than liberty, or a moment of lazy life than a life of service for humanity?

This Nation—at least that part that I represent—demands that we take strong measures; that we prepare to the uttermost our people for their defense; and that we stand on our national honor as a nation should, ready to help those who need help; that we stand for justice and right; and that as a strong, militant force we be ready to say to those who would deny us our national rights: "We spend, but we spend for safety; we build, but we build for the future; we rearm, not for conquest, but for safety. Beware that you touch us not."

Tabulation of Mail Received by Senator Wheeler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

TELEGRAMS AND LETTERS RECEIVED

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement containing a tabulation of mail received by me following my speech at a mass meeting in Washington on the subject "Keep Out of War."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TABULATION OF MAIL

On Friday, June 7, I spoke on Keep Out of War at a mass meeting in Washington.

On Saturday, June 7, the office received 387 telegrams, 112 post cards, 413 letters (letters and post cards all from New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Virginia, District of Columbia, for total of	912
On Monday, June 10, we received 114 telegrams and 1,452 letters and post cards for a total of	1,566
On Tuesday, June 11, we received 42 telegrams and 918 letters and post cards for a total of	960
On Wednesday, June 12, we received 13 telegrams and 1,635 letters and post cards for a total of	1,648
On Thursday, June 13, we received 185 telegrams and 1,525 letters and post cards for a total of	1,710
On Friday, June 14, we received 92 telegrams and 1,048 letters and post cards for a total of	1,140
On Saturday, June 15, we received 28 telegrams and 842 letters and post cards for a total of	860
On Monday, June 17, we received 212 telegrams and 1,003 letters and post cards for a total of	1,215
On Tuesday, June 18, we received 41 telegrams and 694 letters and post cards for a total of	735
On Wednesday, June 19, we received 35 telegrams and 887 letters and post cards for a total of	922
On Thursday, June 20, we received 51 telegrams and 810 letters and post cards for a total of	861
On Friday, June 21, we received 113 telegrams and 960 letters and post cards for a total of	1,073
On Saturday, June 22, we received 43 telegrams and 569 letters and post cards for a total of	612

In 14 days the office has received on the question of keeping this country out of war the total of 14,114 communications.

Of this total, the amazing fact is that only 413 writers disagreed with my stand, and of this number, only 53 actually came out openly for declaring war now to aid the Allies. The remaining 360 urged strong national defense and pleaded for national unity. Three called me a "fifth columnist"; one termed me the leader of the "fifth columnists." Percentagewise, the daily mail ranged from 1 percent against me to a high of 6 percent, with the average for the 14 days being less than 3 percent opposed to the stand I took against involving this country in war.

A complete break-down has not yet been made, but these data are available:

Mail has come from every State in the Union, from Alaska, Panama Canal, Puerto Rico, Mexico, and Canada. The largest amount of mail came from New York State, California was second, Texas was third, Illinois fourth.

Up to last Wednesday, June 19, I have received communications from more than 1,700 ministers, priests, and rabbis, all commending me; 312 organizations, such as labor unions, both local and national; parent-teachers associations, farmer's groups such as the Farmers Union, Grange, etc., American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Spanish-American War Veterans posts, mothers organizations, and peace groups sent me wires or letters or petitions offering every assistance.

Organized student groups from 27 American colleges wired or wrote; 7 college presidents, more than 100 college professors and teachers, and hundreds of grade-school teachers also wrote. So far I have had letters commending my stand against involvement in war and against going too far with aid to the Allies from more than 400 prominent industrial and businessmen of the Nation; many of these are in any Who's Who of American business. But the great bulk of the communications come from mothers and fathers who say they have sons to offer America—not for the blood bath abroad but to defend their homeland.

Incidentally, on yesterday and today I have received 71 telegrams and 91 letters on the appointment of Messrs. Knox and Stimson. Up to a little while ago the first such communication was yet to be received to urge me to vote for confirmation; all so far oppose the nominees.

Nor did I point out that the tabulation of mail and telegrams so far received does not include mail from my State of Montana. From home I have received more than 500 communications, and less than one-half of 1 percent disagree with the stand I have taken.

I thought perhaps my colleagues might find this summary of a cross section of what America is thinking interesting.

Keep America Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP OF DUBUQUE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by the Most Reverend Francis J. L. Beckman, S. T. D., archbishop of Dubuque, at a Midwest peace rally held under the auspices of the Constitutional Government Club, and broadcast over radio station WKBB.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In God's providence, and with a fervent prayer to guide us, we have assembled here this evening to raise our united voices on behalf of the America we love. Our prayer is for peace abroad; our determination is for peace at home. Our message is a counsel against madness and an indictment of greed. The voice of Midwestern America is adequately represented here, a strong, clear voice which may not be ignored. Despite all prospective assertions to the contrary we are moved in this action by an intense love of country and an earnest desire to serve the national interest. The bitter lessons of the past are remembered here and we hold sacred our obligation to preserve America's youth from a new and futile slaughter abroad.

To most of us here in the Midwest it seems incredible that the new Europe for which we gave our blood and treasure some 20 years ago has turned out to be the old Europe all over again engaged in a Roman carnival of destruction which would blanche the face of Nero! We are shocked and bitterly disillusioned at what we see there. But we are even more shocked that once again in this beloved America, last sanctuary of liberty and the Christian ideal, there are those who would have us repeat the folly of 1917!

COUNTERACT HYSTERIA

Once again, the propagandists tell us, we must make the supreme sacrifice, this time for the defense of Christianity itself! In some quarters the hysteria for American intervention has risen to alarming proportions. Here in the Midwest we are met to counteract that hysteria and to plead with our eastern brothers for restoration of national sanity. To the east and west of us the enemy has done well and cleverly in stirring up the masses for war; with the help of God and a normal intelligence we are resolved not to be stirred except for peace. Above the hysterical shouts of the enemy our voice is still supreme: "America, keep out of this war!"

My dear friends, let us ask ourselves some pertinent questions: Who is the enemy? Who is at the bottom of all this agitation for war? Reason and tragic experience dictate the madness of even thinking about our involvement except on strictly defensive principles. The mission of America is peace and the preservation of Christian civilization; who, then, would pervert it for war?

I believe we may say without malice and in all sincerity that the enemy, as we call him, is a personification of all individuals whose greed and lust for power transcends any concern for the well-being of humanity. Wars, born in hell where chaos is a virtue, are the chief works of such individuals who cunningly set class against class, religion against religion, nation against nation, while the plunder and the power, the very material destinies of peoples are concerntrated increasingly in their hands. These are the men who move in the shadows, conspiring silently but with no less deadly

effect for the aggrandizement of their greed. These are the perennial antichrists, the instruments whereby whole nations are punished for their transgressions from God.

HYPOCRISY, DECEIT

The method employed by "the enemy" to achieve his ruthless ends may be summed up in a single phrase: "Divide and rule." The creation of confusion and of enmities among men is fostered by means of propaganda cunningly conceived and administered. Most diabolical, those who oppose these unscrupulous forces and stand firm for the right are themselves painted to the people as the traitors and blackguards responsible for the hate and mistrust engendered on every hand. Hypocrisy and deceit are the chief tools by means of which those in high places divide the people of their vicious ends. They wear the mask and nations suffer when they plot together.

At this critical hour in our Nation's history, knowing the clever plan of "the enemy" to divide us and render ineffective our efforts for peace either at home or abroad, we of the Midwest have a solemn duty to unite against the invasion of hysteria. Our ranks must remain unbroken, the armor of our intelligence impregnable. Even in the face of possible incidents which may be designed to fire the public indignation we must analyze calmly and coldly the hysteria of the hour, measuring our problem in the light of reason and the bitter experience of the past.

There is an old saying: "Fool me once, shame on you; but fool me twice, shame on me." Many of us were tricked and fooled by the propagandists in the last war. It was simpler then for we were easily won over on the slogan: "Make the world safe for democracy." It must not be simple this time. I as but one member of the cloth am standing at this microphone now because I know with thinking Americans everywhere that we cannot afford to be duped again.

Our people demand, and justly so, that we uphold the right, clarify the issues, and fight to the last man of us against any attempt to make this glorious America an ally of internationalism; our people demand that with one united voice we rise up and brand the propagandist traitors in our midst for what they are. With all our strength, we particularly of the Midwest unite against the divider in crying: "Look well, people of America. This is no holy war. This is an internationalist war based on greeds, a struggle to the death between irreconcilable systems of economy. We shall not, we must not fight in such a war."

In support of our contention that the present European war is purely economic in origin and nature the following passage taken from the renowned encyclical by Pius XI, "Quadregisimo Anno" is most appropriate:

"In the first place then, it is patent that in our days not alone is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few. This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience.

"Concentration of power has led to a threefold struggle for domination. First, there is the sphere itself; then, the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles; finally, the clash between the states themselves.

"This latter (the clash between states themselves) arises from two causes, because the nations apply their power and political influence, regardless of circumstances, to promote the economic advantages of their citizens, and because, vice versa, economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between peoples.

"The state, which should be the supreme arbiter, ruling in kingly fashion far above all party contention, intent only upon justice and the common good, has become instead a slave, bound over to the service of human passion and greed."

KEEP FAITH

My dear American friends, here in a few words is food for much thought. Here is no propaganda, here is the truth upon which wars are predicated. All the bands that play, and the flags that wave, and the pretty phrases that are coined cannot now hide the facts as they did in 1917. Today we know or should know what it is all about.

Tomorrow is Memorial Day and all America will pause to honor its soldier dead. Perhaps also will come a pause in the hysteria of the hour. Many young men there are who marched away in the name of hysteria, whose lives were forfeit to our folly.

They believed in us and in the cause we represented to them. The price of their faith is our disgrace, for we have not kept faith with them. How shall we redeem ourselves? What pledge to make our dead worth while? In this solemn hour as the bugle sounds upon the hill let us unite, east and west, to promise them we will not make the same mistake again. Our deathless resolve must be a free America, an America wiser for experience, strong in the thought that God is with her, and America united for peace.

"One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Let's Produce Them Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, only one man in this House has been more energetic and insistent than I that we produce in this country all of the strategic, critical, and essential minerals of which our country is capable. So vitally important is a sure and adequate supply of such minerals to our national defense that it is extremely unwise to depend on other countries to produce them for us any longer than it takes us to bring them into production.

This same thing holds true concerning all classes of strategic, critical, and essential materials not of a mineral or a metallic character. Such items as rubber and fiber come within this class. Perhaps it is because I represent a State fifth in size in the American Union, located in the Southwest, in the sunshine corner of our country, where almost everything needed to supply man's wants, mineral or vegetable, may be found or grown, that I am so optimistic about our country's ability to fill its own needs.

In Arizona's vast spaces there is every variety of climate from the Equator to the North Pole, and every treasure of the earth which could adorn or be useful in the service of man. In a superlative degree, Arizona matches the words of Henry W. Grady in his description of Georgia:

> There is all that can please or prosper human kind. A fertile soil beneath a perfect climate yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone. There by night the cotton whitens beneath the stars, and by day the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf.
>
> There are mountains of exhaustless treasures; forests, dark and primeval; and rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wantonly to the sea.

Arizona certainly has mountains full of treasures. These treasures today are not only gold and silver and the essential copper, but the less generally known strategic minerals needed both in war and in peace. Arizona also has "forests, dark and primeval," for along that mountain diagonal which stretches from the northwest to the southeast lies one of the largest yellow-pine forests in America. However, it is in the foothills, on the sunlit plains, and the rich river valleys toward the southwestern corner of the State which is the greatest agricultural treasure that we have.

For a quarter of a century we have known that rubber can be produced from the desert vegetation which grows wild and may also be cultivated in such a climate. We know, too, that a most valuable fiber, which we now import from the tropics, may be had from the leaves of the yucca plant which grows in abundance in some desert portions. We are told that both the guayule, or rubber yielding plant, and the yucca, or fiber-bearing plant, may be grown in that sunshine belt stretching from Texas through New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California to the Pacific. Now, both rubber and fiber are essential in peace and vitally necessary in war, to such an extent that we ought to encourage their production.

The second deficiency bill, which is before the House, contains an appropriation of $500,000 to encourage the production of rubber in the Western Hemisphere. I wish it might have been twice that amount, which was at first included in the bill, and I wish that at least $100,000 had been used to encourage cultivation of the guayule plant in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, to increase its rubber content and thus furnish a large supply of new rubber.

It may be that synthetic rubber will be increasingly improved and produced, but so long as we depend upon natural rubber it seems more reasonable that it should come from a plant which takes only 4 years to bring to maturity, than from a tree which takes very much longer to bring to full production. I earnestly hope that a due share of this half million dollars for the production of rubber will be spent on improving its prospects and increasing its yield in the "sunshine laboratory of nature" in the great Southwest.

A Midwestern Editor Asks Congress Some Pertinent Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD, under the heading of "The people have a right to know—are we for war or peace?, on page 4132 I listed some reasons why a great many citizens in America are beginning to wonder where their Representatives and Senators stand on the all-important issue of war or peace. A search of the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issued since May 16 must prove highly disappointing and disillusioning for many citizens who fail to find their elected officials taking any public stand on the biggest issue before the American people for the last quarter of a century. Today I received an editorial from a South Dakota paper which emphasizes the point I tried to make yesterday about the duty which every Member of Congress has to his constituents at this time to make clear his position concerning the entrance of America into the European War. I am asking permission to reprint that editorial at the conclusion of these remarks.

THE TIME HAS COME TO FACE THE ISSUE SQUARELY

With the President's recent appointment of what is freely being referred to as a war Cabinet, and the repeated charge that the Democratic Party under the domination of President Roosevelt has become the "war party" in America, the time has come to face the issue squarely. When men of the prominence and public honesty of Senator WHEELER of Montana, Senator Clark of Missouri, and Senator Holt, of West Virginia—all three of whom are Democrats—accuse the Democratic Party—their own party—of becoming the war party, it places a high responsibility upon that political party to accept or disprove the allegations so that all America may know the plans and the position of the party presently in control of America's destiny.

This is no time for evasion. It is no time for a Member of Congress to try to face in both directions. It is no time to use weasel words and deceptive phrases in withholding from the people the true attitudes and position of Members of Congress whose good judgment or prejudicial positions may mean the difference between life and death for millions of American boys.

AMERICA BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

The American Republic belongs to the people of America. Our job is to represent these people and the people have a right to know where their Representatives stand. Most of the Republicans and a distinguished minority of outstanding Democrats have frankly and openly declared themselves. Unfortunately, the big majority of Democratic Members have conspicuously failed to clarify their positions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in public statements to the press. The people who do the fighting in a foreign war have no opportunity to vote on decisions of war or peace, even in this greatest of all republics in the world. But they do have a right to know how their Representatives stand on this question while there is yet time for them to counsel with their Congressmen if their attitudes run contrary to the desires of the folks at home. Citizens should insist that all Congressmen face the issues of the day squarely and openly so that the true functions of democratic government can be exercised and majority opinion prevail at this time of national crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I now give you this editorial by D. C. DeVany, of Vermillion, S. Dak., editor of the Vermillion Plain Talk, and one of the most accomplished editors of my State. Mr. DeVany is a former State president of the South Dakota State Press Association. I am also reprinting a copy of my letter to him written in acknowledgment of this fine editorial.

[From the Vermillion (S. Dak.) Plain Talk]

A CRITICAL SITUATION

(By D. C. D.)

This is Sunday, June 16. I read the Sunday papers before coming to the office. On my way to the office I met and talked with several persons. We talked about the war situation. The newspapers I read before leaving home were filled with matter relating to just one thing—the war situation. I turned on the radio and heard about what? The war situation, of course. A friend writes from New York City that the fear and war psychosis has the people of that city firmly in its grip. The same story comes from Washington.

And the various analyses that one reads only lead to confusion of thought.

One wonders where we are drifting and why.

We vowed we would never enter another European war—that never again should a drop of American blood be spilled on European soil—but the other day we heard our President tell the world that we would supply the Allies with every available material resource at our command. It was as close to a declaration of war as it was possible to come. It could easily provoke war—and Congress, which has the sole power to declare war, made little protest.

Plans are under way for compulsory military training.

More alarming still is that plans are all in shape for the selective draft.

Is Congress acceding to all this?

Has Congress succumbed completely to the idea of war abroad instead of devoting itself to an impregnable defense system?

Will Congress pass the selective-draft law and all the other laws asked or desired by the Executive, giving him full dictatorial powers over all our people simply by declaring an emergency to exist?

Will freedom of speech and action and the right to protest be cast into the discard overnight?

Will Congress make all these provisions and then, at the wish of the Executive, adjourn, leaving everything in his hands?

The Executive has expressed the wish that Congress would adjourn quickly after giving him the powers he wishes.

Are these powers safe in the hands of the President?

Are they safe in the hands of any one man?

Is Congress only an unnecessary adjunct to our Government at such a critical time as this, when our collective wisdom would seem insufficient?

Granting that Congress is willing to do all this, would the situation be any different than in Europe where parliamentary bodies were dissolved with the utmost abandon?

In other words, is our Congress so supine that it will do or permit all these things?

The events of the last few days have seemed to indicate that Congress is just that.

Will they stand idly by and see this Nation plunged into war, or worse yet assist in it, against the wishes of the great majority of the people they represent? If so, they are totally unfitted for the positions to which we elected them. If so, they are just as much overlords as are the overlords of Europe and we no longer have a representative Government, a Government by the people, for the people, and of the people.

These are serious things, to think about seriously—and to think about before it is too late.

Things are moving forward at an unthinkable pace. We have been moved toward war so rapidly in the past 2 or 3 weeks that it is unbelievable, inconceivable.

If we are not to go to war abroad, Mr. Average American Citizen better wake up. He better wake up immediately. He better protest to his Congressman and Senators and to the President of the United States—and better do it at once—and in vigorous, unmistakable fashion.

Maybe we should go to war.

Maybe we are ready to go to war.

Maybe you who read this are willing to enter the front line to be run down by a tank or bombed from the air on a European battlefield.

Maybe you think that our frontier is the Rhine, or the English Channel, and that we should be defending it there now whether we have any guns, tanks, bombing planes, or not.

Maybe we should fight though we have nothing with which to fight, as other nations have done, and to their sorrow.

If you believe all this, then, of course, the thing to do right now is to do nothing and let a handful of men in Washington take care of the matter as they see fit.

But if you don't believe these things then you better make your wishes known, and known quickly, to those whom you have chosen to represent you in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

And this is not to cultivate war hysteria, fear, or loose or fast thinking. It is only to call attention to cold, brutal facts as they appear this beautiful Sabbath morning with this country still at peace and much of its population praying for the peace of the entire world.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1940.

Mr. D. C. DEVANY,
Editor, Vermillion Plain Talk, Vermillion, S. Dak.

DEAR D. C.: I have greatly enjoyed reading your editorial entitled "A Critical Situation," appearing in the Vermillion Plain Talk for June 20, 1940. You have called the attention of the country to some mighty pertinent questions, and I am reprinting this editorial in today's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be given Nation-wide circulation. I am enclosing a copy of the reprint herewith.

It is genuinely encouraging to read a sensible editorial like yours when a fellow is here in the East where so many of the big city newspapers are plumping for American intervention in the bloody business now taking place in Europe. I presume many of these interventionistic newspapers and columnists sincerely believe that America can flirt with war without actually fighting in war, but I am afraid that many of them actually refrain from advocating an open declaration of war only because they feel the public "is not ripe" for such an audacious course. Unfortunately, many of these papers have financial interests in Europe or are connected with banking institutions which operate European branches, and some of the papers themselves have foreign editions published in Europe. Possibly this personal contact with Europe colors the thinking of these writers and makes them see less clearly the importance of protecting American interests at home, but in all events, I repeat, it is gratifying to read your message of real Americanism, written by a man whom I know always puts America's interests first.

I agree with you wholeheartedly that the question of war or peace is not one for, as you say, "a handful of men in Washington" to decide. It is the people's problem because it involves the peoples' destiny. I hope your editorial will help awaken Americans everywhere to their responsibility to counsel with their Congressmen and to find out from each of them specifically where they stand on this all-important issue. As for me, you can put me down definitely among those who feel that America should keep out of the war in Europe and devote its great genius to developing without delay an impregnable defense for the Western Hemisphere and the ideals of Christianity, peace, and democracy which flourish on it.

With kindest personal regards, and best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL MUNDT, M. C.

The Cause of Human Freedom Will Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 22 (legislative day of Friday, June 21), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CORDELL HULL TO HARVARD ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, delivered to the Harvard Alumni Association at Cambridge, Mass., on June 20, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply conscious of the honor which was conferred on me this morning. I am happy to visit this magnificent campus. From it, throughout our country's national existence, generations of leaders have gone to every corner of the land bearing the torch of truth and of humanity. There is no more fitting site from which to survey the great problems and issues that now confront this Nation.

These are black days for the human race. These are ominous days for us in this country.

There are at work in the world today powerful forces the significance of which no individual and no nation can ignore without falling into a position of the gravest danger and of the utmost jeopardy. These forces are not new in the experience of mankind. They rose on many occasions in the past and, for varying periods and with varying intensity, held sway over human affairs. They spring today from the same source from which they have always sprung in the past—from godless and soulless lust for power which seeks to hold men in physical slavery and spiritual degradation and to displace a system of peaceful and orderly relations among nations by the anarchy of wanton violence and brute force.

Fortunately, these forces have not triumphed in every instance in which they have challenged human freedom and interrupted the advance of civilization. There are times in the lives of individuals and of nations when realization of mortal peril, far from making men recoil in horror and defeat, strengthens and ennobles the soul, gives indomitability to will and to courage, and leads to victory through suffering and sacrifice. History records many heartening instances when in this manner the forces of conquest, violence, and oppression were hurled back and the onward march of civilized man was resumed.

Never before have these forces flung so powerful a challenge to freedom and civilized progress as they are flinging today. Never before has there been a more desperate need for men and nations who love freedom and cherish the tenets of modern civilization, to gather into an unconquerable defensive force every element of their spiritual and material resources, every ounce of their moral and physical strength.

We, Americans of today, have behind us a century and a half of national existence, to which we point, with justifiable pride, as a successful experiment in democracy and human freedom. That experiment began when a resplendent generation of Americans resolved to stake on its success their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. With unshakeable faith in their cause and an unswerving determination to make it prevail, they risked their all for the creation of a nation in which each citizen would have—as his inalienable rights—liberty under law, equality of opportunity, freedom of thought and of conscience. Those Americans believed unreservedly that in a nation founded upon these great principles, the people could enjoy individually a far greater measure of well-being and happiness than is possible under any other form of political and social organization, and could achieve collectively a degree of internal strength and unity of purpose necessary to ensure for the Nation itself the inalienable right to manage its own affairs solely by the will of its own people.

A century and a half of active and, at time, tumultuous history have vindicated this faith. The Nation which that generation of Americans founded lives today and has grown great and powerful beyond the fondest dreams of its founders. This has come about because, through the stresses and strains of internal adjustment and external conflict, succeeding generations of Americans have never faltered in their devotion to that faith and have rededicated themselves to it, freely and reverently; because in each generation there was sufficient resoluteness of spirit, tenacity of purpose, moral and physical courage, and capacity for unselfish sacrifice to accept individual and collective responsibility for the preservation of the principles upon which this Nation was founded and upon which it has built its way of life.

Our American history has not been achieved in isolation from the rest of mankind; there is no more dangerous folly than to think that its achievements can be preserved in isolation. It has been a part of a vast movement—in the Old World, as well as the new—which has opened new vistas in the destiny of man; which has carried human progress to new and exalted heights, which has, through scientific attainment, lessened the tyranny over man of the blind forces of nature; which, as never before, has expanded for the human race as a whole the opportunity for freedom of mind and of spirit. To this great stream of new ideas, new attainments, new cultural values, we have made our contribution; and we ourselves, in turn, have been nourished by it.

The massed forces of lust for tyrannical power are directed today against the very bases of the way of life which has come to be the cherished ideal of a preponderant majority of mankind—against the moral, spiritual, social, political, and economic foundations of modern civilization. Nation after nation has been crushed into surrender, overrun and enslaved by the exercise of brute force combined with fraud and guile. And as the dismal darkness descends upon more and more of the earth's surface, as its menacing shadow falls blacker and blacker athwart our continent, the very instinct of self-preservation bids us beware.

We have the power to meet that menace successfully, if we, at this time, face the task which is before us in the same spirit in which former generations of Americans met the crises that confronted them in their times. We need material means of defense. These means we are determined to create, and we are creating them. But more than that is needed.

Men will defend to the utmost only things in which they have complete faith. Those who took part in the struggle by which freedom was won for this Nation would have found its hardships unbearable, if they had not been imbued with transcendent faith in the things for which they fought. The task of preserving and defending freedom requires at times as stern and determined a struggle as the task of achieving freedom, and as firm a faith.

No more vital test has ever confronted the American people than that which confronts it today. There are difficult and dangerous times ahead. Our national independence and our cherished institutions are not immune from the challenge of the lust for power that already stalks so much of the earth's surface. Unprecedented effort and heavy sacrifices will be required of us as the price of preserving, for ourselves and for our posterity, the kind of America that has been fostered and preserved for us by the vigilance, courage, and sacrifice of those who preceded us. We shall succeed if

we retain unimpaired the most precious heritage which they bequeathed us—an unshakable faith in the everlasting worth of freedom and honor, of truth and justice, of intellectual and spiritual integrity; and an immutable determination to give our all, if need be, for the preservation of our way of life.

Without that faith and that determination, no material means of defense will suffice. With them, we need fear no enemy outside or within our borders.

In times of grave crises there are always some who fall prey to doubt and unreasoning fear; some who seek refuge in cynicism and narrow self-interest; some who wrap themselves in the treacherous cloak of complacency. All these are dangers that lie within us. All these impair the faith and weaken the determination without which freedom cannot prevail.

Each and every one of us must search his mind and his heart for these signs of fatal weakness. The stern realities of the crisis which is upon us call, as never before, for vision and for loyalty. They call for all the strength of hand, of mind, and of spirit that we can muster. They call for self-reliance, for self-restraint, for self-imposed and freely accepted discipline. They call for the kind of national unity that can be achieved only by free men, invincible in their resolve that human freedom must not perish. They call for unselfish service today if we are to win through to a secure and bright tomorrow.

A responsibility seldom equaled in gravity and danger rests upon each and every one of us. Neglect or delay in assuming it, willingly and fully, would place in mortal danger our way of life and the sacred cause of human freedom. Were we to fail in that responsibility, we would fail ourselves; we would fail the generations that went before us; we would fail the generations that are to come after us; we would fail mankind; we would fail God.

I am supremely confident that we shall not fail. I am certain that in the minds and hearts of our people still—still—lie welling springs—inexhaustible and indestructible—of faith in the things we cherish, of courage and determination to defend them, of sacrificial devotion, of unbreakable unity of purpose. I am certain that, however great the hardships and the trials which loom ahead, our America will endure and the cause of human freedom will triumph.

Leadership and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS BIDDLE

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Francis Biddle, Solicitor General of the United States, before the Pennsylvania Bar Association, Bedford Springs, Pa., June 19, 1940:

I am particularly happy that the Pennsylvania Bar Association wanted me to talk to you tonight. It is not only that I should have been chosen on a program which includes Mr. Justice Roberts, Pennsylvania's most distinguished lawyer—an added honor to me; but, too, because I am back again among my own friends, the men I have grown up with and practiced law beside for almost 30 years. I used to go pretty regularly to the Pennsylvania Bar meetings. For the past few years circumstances have prevented me. But to a lawyer who loves his profession as I do mine I know of no greater refreshment of the spirit than the Springs of Bedford when they are dedicated to our use.

When Mr. Wright first suggested that I speak I had thought of saying a few words about administrative law. But that was before Norway and Belgium, Holland and France. The subject seemed pale and academic in the light of flaming cities not so very far away. And so, realizing as I so particularly do in Washington, where a stream of letters from men of every age and of every political point of view is constantly crossing my desk, asking what they can do to help—realizing how profoundly we are searching our hearts to know where we have failed and how we can lead—I felt that we should turn our thoughts to problems of leadership. And I think in some ways lawyers are eminently qualified to lead. From the beginning we have played a dominant part in the creation and development of American institutions. Whether that leadership has lost its strength, so that today it is less persuasive, is another question. But I know this—that today in America leadership, wise and strong and cool-headed, and, above all, American, is called for as never before.

So I have chosen "Leadership and Democracy" as a title. Obviously the same sort of leadership does not grow out of a democracy as is essential to a dictatorship. Ruthlessness, fear, iron discipline, suppression of the right to criticize, the complete submergence of the individual to the state—and the state is the dictator—these are the means and the end in itself, in a large sense, in the totalitarian state. Not altogether the end for the religion of dictatorship of armed imperialism has its dreams and its symbols, which we must understand if we are to check its advances: The mystic dream of imperial Rome, of imperial Germany; the absurd, yet effective, cult of race superiority—in Germany the blond beast—and the accompanying need for sacrificial atonement. Thus, as the state takes on a god-like form, the conception of man shrinks and western Nazi and Fascist philosophy of the superstate approaches oriental fatalism, with its cruel disregard for human life as the ultimate good. In our looser democracy no such tightened and mechanized contraction can exist. We worship our God, but in our own way. And our God is a Redeemer, a gentle and forgiving God, and not the cruel conqueror—barbarism and the dark ages. Our symbols, too, are mystic. But they carry deep to the heart not pride of conquest and the voluptuous satisfaction of cruelty, but the peaceful ways of a people who have developed their own free life. We have been let alone and have gone our way.

But no longer now. Here is most of Europe fast forming into a single dominating power—mechanized, cruel, contemptuous, drunk with success and ambition. Our way of living is vitally threatened—our whole ancient Christian heritage and culture.

The strength of a dictatorship is, of course, its great unity. It can act swiftly. Divided counsel does not hold its arm. The balance and healthy clash of opposing ideas do not delay its achievements. It cannot be deliberate, built as it is for war as the chief quality of its being. Under the propulsion of war men may be content for a time to sacrifice all for the half blind end of conquest. The common will is synthesized for the supreme moment—a phrase we hear so often on the lips of the Fuhrer and the Duce. But supreme moments cannot be stretched to fill the steady throb of human life, when men are tired of the will to destroy, and perhaps wish only to be happy again. It is for that longer and enduring peace and normal growth that democracies like ours are calculated to give men the good life of self-control and self-expression, nourished from the soil of their own culture. And so, too, for the supreme moment of conquest or defense, of war and the waging of death, democracies are slow to move, uncertain when to abandon cherished ideals for an immediate end, hesitant to apply the necessary discipline of regimentation which they have been taught from childhood to despise.

Leadership in a democracy, then, in a time like this is to stir and unify the people, not to march in the robot step of forced obedience, to a blind end, but, having looked at fascism and communism and found them both hateful, as once we found hateful the scourge of Negro slavery, to choose our own way as free men, knowing what we want. And then, until this crisis is over, to subordinate all we have and all we hold dear to achieve that end.

If there is a "fifth column" latent in our land it will find expression first in the chaos of mob disorder out of which dictatorship springs. In the war hysteria which is now upon us already in the name of patriotism some of our citizens in responsible positions are leading the attack on aliens—refusing them relief, denying them ordinary civil rights, taking away their work—a program, I should think, hardly calculated to increase their loyalty, or to add to their respect for our ways, by threatening starvation and persecution. And all because they, to whose class all of our ancestors once belonged, have so cherished our design for living, our American freedom, that they have come to our shores to cast their lot with us. Public opinion should rally to their support. On the whole the newspapers have protested against these un-American proposals—and notably the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, the New York Tribune, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Philadelphia Record. But I have not noticed any Governor of a State protest against this rising tide of petty persecution, or suggest that aliens are or can be made an integral part of our American way of living.

On May 15, 1940, over a month ago, there was introduced in the House of Representatives a bill directing the deportation of Harry Bridges. The Secretary of Labor had considered his case and found that he was not deportable. The case was closed. Recently, the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote passed this bill. This is a star chamber proceeding, directed against a single individual, that amounts to a bill of attainder. And yet I have heard no bar association, no leader of the American bar, protest.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration to which the bill has been referred has asked for the views of the Department of Justice on this bill. Today the Attorney General has expressed his views in a letter which I shall quote in full:

"This is an answer to your request for the views of this Department concerning the bill (H. R. 9766) which provides:

" 'To direct the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges

" '*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful.'

"If this bill were to become law it would be an historical departure from an unbroken American practice and tradition. It would be the first time that an act of Congress has singled out a named individual for deportation. It would be the first deportation in which the alien was not even accused either of unlawful entry or of unlawful conduct while here. It would be the first time that Congress, without changing the general law, simply suspended all laws which protect a named individual and directed the Attorney

General to disregard them and forthwith to deport 'notwithstanding any other provision of law.' And it would be the first time since the alien and sedition laws a century and a half ago that any law would provide for a deportation without a hearing or without, indeed, the slightest pretense toward giving the accused what our Nation has long known as 'due process of law.'

"The extraordinary character of the bill upon its face is even more impressive viewed against its background. This same alien has been accused, investigated, and tried at great length, and judgment has been rendered that he has not been proved guilty of the charges made against him. By this bill the United States would deny faith and credit to its own duly conducted legal proceedings.

"We have in this country, subject to the jurisdiction of this Department, some three and a half million aliens. One of our great tasks is to assimilate them into our native culture. This can only be done by a deep respect for our processes and tradition. How shall we teach this respect if the Government itself will not abide by a decision in an individual case and makes acts whose nature is not specified, but which must have been lawful when done, the basis of deportation without hearing? What becomes of equality before the law, of the impersonal and impartial character of our Government, if it is to select unpopular persons to suffer disadvantage or punishment?

"I do not now consider whether such a law would violate the constitutional prohibition against congressional enactment of bills of attainder, or ex post facto laws, or the provision of our Bill of Rights which declares that 'no person * * * shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.' I do not now try to determine whether the language of this act would work an unconstitutional suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Nor do I inquire as to any breach of treaty engagements to render fair treatment to nationals of friendly powers lawfully in this country. The law makes me legal adviser only to the President and the executive departments, and my predecessors have held that they could not with propriety also render legal opinion to a separate branch of the Government.

"But apart from any question of power, I cannot, as head of the Department affected by this bill, answer with anything less than emphatic disapproval your request for views upon it.

"The Congress has almost unlimited powers over aliens. It has embodied its policies in general laws. If it is convinced, as I am, that recent experiences show the need for additional safeguards, by all means let us have them. We who are administratively responsible for dealing with these problems, have advocated greater legislative precautions. But there is no condition, existing or threatened, which needs arbitrary legislation prescribing no rule of conduct, but merely imposing banishment by legislative fiat. The interests of this service can be best protected by enactment of clear and fair rules of conduct that aliens may know, so that those who obey may be unmolested and those who disobey may be expelled. And let any man be heard in his own behalf before he is doomed to exile.

"Harry Bridges may be all that this bill implies of him. But certainly he does not deserve a place in our history as a martyr. He is insignificant compared to the issues presented by this bill. Our forefathers objected to a government where 'whatever pleased the prince had the force of law.' The report of the House committee comes close to reverting to this when it says that deportation 'without assigning any reason is inherent and asserted by this bill.'

"As an American I would not, for the sake of my own liberty, deny the protection of uniform and indiscriminatory laws, and of fair hearings to even the humblest or meanest of men. As an official of the United States I cannot in good conscience do other than recommend strongly against this bill.

"With personal regards,

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT H. JACKSON,
"Attorney General."

Recently I had occasion to refer in a public address to the swiftly increasing cases of mob violence in connection with Jehovah's Witnesses. As a part of their religious creed they consider it improper to offer obeisance to anyone but their Creator and refuse, as a consequence, to salute the flag. To us to whom the flag means so much that is passionate and beautiful, I can see how such an attitude might be deeply offensive. But what has happened? Self-constituted bands of mob patrioteers are roaming about the country, setting upon these people, beating them, driving them out of their homes. In at least one instance, I am told, a sheriff, pretending to lead them out of harm from the barn where they had taken shelter, terrified and powerless, brought them straight back to where the mob was waiting. The Attorney General of the United States has ordered an immediate investigation by the F. B. I., to see if any civil rights of these persons have been interfered with which we can protect. We shall not tolerate such Nazi methods.

I have spoken of the longing which almost all of us have to do something for the national defense, for our country, during this troubled hour. It is enervating to have to sit still, with hands folded, while the Paris that we love is dark under the swastika, and the beautiful, proud, reasonable French spirit is flickering in the night. But even if we cannot march or fight or help run the Government, we—all of you—who are qualified by education and position to do so can lead those of our youth who are not certain whether what we Americans have is worth fighting for. They are skeptical, disillusioned. For that we are largely responsible. We haven't been able to organize a society where they could be sure of getting work decently paid for, the lack of which is their chief need. And when they grumble or pass resolutions which run counter to our common American will we call them "reds." Doubtless some are; but what are we doing to tempt them to be Americans?

One of our faults, I think is that we have not preached sacrifice enough, have accented security too exclusively. Of course, life without physical security isn't much of a base for patriotism. But we must preach sacrifice, too, remembering how great must have been the German sacrifice to achieve this shameful end. Cannot then we, too, sacrifice some of our little personal liberties and ease to be given a chance to achieve a life that is noble and integrated?

Everywhere organizations of citizens are springing up to combat the "fifth column." I can understand the impulse that is behind such movements. But they have elements of great danger. I quote from a recent editorial in the New York Times dealing with an announcement of the Associated Farmers of California that they have declared (I quote) "total war on subversive groups," and the most intensive American drive ever directed at a "fifth column." The Times editorial wisely says: "It will seem to many who are not involved in California's quarrels that this move shows distrust for the regular police machinery of the State and Nation; that it involves a dangerous element of secrecy; and that no matter how fine the announced intentions, it may be capitalized for the advantage of those engaged in it. * * * It is highly important that no group should be permitted to act on the assumption that persons who disagree with it or stand in its way economically should therefore be treated as 'fifth columns.' * * * This country is likely to become a madhouse if anyone with an interest or a grievance may use the country's danger to promote the interest or satisfy the grievance."

And so as lawyers we can insist that our ancient rights, so dearly won, be not trampled on; that we continue to be a government of law; that we look to that government to enforce that law; that we add whatever strength it needs, now in this time of peril; that to be strong does not necessitate being cruel; that the third degree shall not enter here as it has in Germany; and that because our hearts are overwrought we need not lose our heads. Let us remember what Matthew Arnold said in the Hymn of Empedocles:

"I say, fear not! Life still
Leaves human effort scope;
But, since life teems with ill
Nurse no extravagant hope.
Because thou must not dream,
Thou need'st not then despair."

Proposed Planks for Republican Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

PROPOSALS BY THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposed planks submitted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the Republican Party platform, presented to Republican Party resolutions committee, Wednesday evening, June 19, 1940:

We believe in the preservation of permanent peace for America, and consequently in nonintervention as to wars conducted between other nations.

We believe in being prepared against war by being well prepared for war by a greatly expanded Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as well as National Guard, C. M. T. C., R. O. T. C., and Reserve Corps, generously equipped with scientifically constructed airplanes, ships, tanks, guns, and other modernized, mechanized, and motorized matériel, designed to, and sufficient to, protect the Americas against any possible aggression.

We believe in the application of detailed plans for speedy effective mobilization of men and money, labor and industry, in the event of unwanted war.

We shall strive to eliminate excess profits from the processing and handling of materials for national-defense purposes, both during time of peace and in the event of war.

We pledge ourselves to continue the traditional policy of the Republican Party to promote more adequate and equitable governmental provisions for America's disabled veterans and the dependents of deceased war veterans.

We shall strive to provide the opportunity for gainful employment to all unemployable war, campaign, and expedition veterans;

as an example to private industry, all Federal agencies should be required by law to extend more effective preferences for the appointment and retention of veterans (including the wives of unemployable veterans and the widows of veterans) as to all positions for which they may be qualified.

We shall strive to reduce all immigration quotas and to prevent the immigration of any alien whose employment would probably displace that of some American citizen.

We believe that all aliens in this country should be registered, identified, and fingerprinted by the Department of Justice.

We shall insist upon such effective border patrols as will prevent the smuggling of aliens into this country.

We shall try earnestly to effect the prompt deportation of all aliens guilty of penal crime, of those who have been engaged in "fifth column" activities, and of those who do not believe in or who advocate any change by force in our form of government.

We urge that Federal security benefits, grants, loans, contracts, employment, and other governmental payments be restricted to American citizens.

To promote the efficiency of the various agencies of the Federal Government, and in order to extend equity to its employees we pledge our best efforts to bring about the prompt extension of classified civil-service status to all of its non-policy-making employees.

We reaffirm our strong faith in our representative form of government, as provided for by our Nation's Declaration of Independence and Constitution, as amended—to preserve freedom of religion, speech, press, radio, assembly, and petition for all citizens, with equal rights for all and special privileges for none; to perpetuate individualism; to avoid regimentation; to assure equalized opportunity for social and economic security; to guarantee due process of law; to protect the individual against destitution; to protect private property; and to provide for the constant progress and protection of our Nation and of its people.

Republican Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, OVER THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO., JUNE 22, 1940

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech to be delivered by me Saturday, June 22, at 8 p. m., over the National Broadcasting Co.'s Red network:

No President has had a greater opportunity to promote world peace than Franklin D. Roosevelt, but, by his repeated provocative attacks on foreign nations and their rulers, he has destroyed his influence as an arbitrator for peace. It is heart rending that President Roosevelt, through his own intermeddling and blunders, has forfeited the opportunity of using the great moral influence of America to promote a peaceful settlement between Great Britain and Germany, before devastating air raids have wiped out whole cities and slaughtered hundreds of thousands, and maybe millions, of women and children, innocent victims to the horrors of war.

The conflict between France and Germany has drawn to a close. I believe history will relate, and in the near future, that President Roosevelt and Ambassador Bullitt were largely responsible for prodding, goading, and pushing France into war before she was adequately prepared by intemperate and false secret promises of implied armed support.

I anticipate that disillusioned French statesmen will soon present a detailed account of this duplicity and diplomatic intervention into European disputes. It will make interesting reading and shock and arouse the American people to the unprecedented and dangerous meddling of the New Deal into foreign controversies. It must not happen again. What has happened to the Woodrow Wilson policy "of open covenants, openly arrived at"?

Let us have an end to the secret diplomacy and the secret commitments of President Roosevelt that have brought ruin and disaster to France, and from which we have escaped only by a miracle and the will of the American people expressed through the Congress to keep out of war.

President Roosevelt alarmed the Nation by his inflammatory Italian "dagger in the back of its neighbor" speech, but what about the President's dagger thrust in the heart of France that left her defenseless to her enemy because she relied on his implied and false promises of support?

It is only the result that counts—France lies prostrate, and bleeding, perhaps destroyed for a generation, as much by the velvet glove and secret diplomacy pledges of President Roosevelt as by the Italian dagger in the back.

The moral for America is to speak softly, but carry a big stick, and not make unredeemable secret promises with a feather duster.

We should mind our own business and keep out of Europe, and build so powerful a national defense that Europe will keep out of America.

The best way to put an end to this un-American type of secret diplomacy is to relegate its authors to private life at the polls in November.

Every day proves more and more that the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, is the interventionist and war party in the United States, as I have repeatedly stated for the past year.

The appointment to his Cabinet of Colonel Stimson and Colonel Knox, the two leading interventionists formerly in the Republican Party, confirms in the minds of the American people that the Democratic Party is in fact the war party, and that President Roosevelt is rushing America headlong into the horrors and bankruptcy of a foreign war.

Personally, I welcome the departure from the Republican Party of these two outstanding interventionists, and their entrance into the Democratic war party. It clarifies the issue and makes it crystal clear to the American public.

The Republicans at Philadelphia must not and will not dodge the issue of war or peace. The Republican Party must afford the people an opportunity to vote on this paramount issue, which transcends all party lines.

As ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, on which committee I have served for 20 years, I urge the Republican Committee on Resolutions to write into our national platform a pledge that we will not go to war unless we are attacked or the Monroe Doctrine is violated by the invasion of any part of the American continent.

The simpler and more concise the better, and easier to present to the people.

France, as always, has fought gallantly, but was overwhelmed by sheer force of numbers, backed by a superior air force and by an avalanche of tanks. We in America must learn from her defeat, and I urge the Republican convention to come out strongly in favor of making America invincible on land, sea, and air. The slogan of the Republican Party in the 1940 campaign should be "Preparedness, peace, and prosperity."

France was also betrayed by her enemies from within, her Communists, defeatists, internationalists, and even cabinet ministers like Mr. Blum, who opposed adequate armaments and left France defenseless before the invader. We must likewise take this lesson to heart, and the Republican convention should urge the deportation of alien Communists and Nazi agitators and plotters.

We should recommend outlawing the Communist Party as being part of the Communist International at Moscow and taking its orders from a foreign country. We should favor the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens, particularly the Communists, Nazis, and Fascists, and the enactment of my bill to prohibit the arming, drilling, and wearing of uniforms by all un-American groups like the Communists and bundists.

There is no room in free America for any alien agitators of the left or right who spread poison and hatred against our institutions and urge the overthrow of our republican form of government.

These revolutionary alien termites, who are secretly undermining and plotting against American institutions, should be rounded up without fear or favor and sent back to their native lands where they can enjoy the lack of freedom of speech, the pitiful wage scale, and the oppressive laws to which they have been accustomed in the past, and their jobs should be given to loyal American citizens now walking the streets.

I am inclined to believe we have more to fear from our enemies from within than those from without.

These are recommendations I specifically urge for adoption in the Republican national platform. The main recommendation, however, is the simple keep-out-of-war pledge unless attacked.

If we evade or pussyfoot on that issue, by resorting to glittering generalities or platitudes, we will forfeit public confidence and our duty to our country.

The Whig Party attempted to compromise between freedom and slavery in its day, and disappeared unmourned as a party. We must steer clear of any such craven and cowardly course. Let us go to the people on a preparedness, peace, and prosperity platform without any evasions or reservations.

Let us make clear to the American people that the election of a Republican President means no American intervention or war in Europe. Let them decide on election day the course of America for peace or war.

I believe if the Republican Party accepts this challenge and makes this issue of keeping out of foreign wars it will sweep every eastern, western, and nothern State and elect their candidate for President and a Republican House of Representatives.

President Roosevelt's attempt to purge Democratic Senators and Representatives elected by the people, who had the courage of

their convictions in fearlessly upholding constitutional government, is a matter of history. It has left a bad impression in the minds of the American people.

The purge of Secretary of War Harry H. Woodring, of Kansas, because of his opposition to our involvement in the European war and his unwillingness to denude the defenses of America at the dictation of President Roosevelt, goes far beyond former attempts to purge Members of Congress in his own party.

It creates a national issue that transcends all party lines, and involves the actual defense of the United States. There should be a complete and thorough investigation of all the facts to ascertain if Secretary of War Woodring, a former past commander of the American Legion in the State of Kansas, is being purged because of his opposition to intervention and war, to selling Army equipment needed for our own defense, and the alleged attempt to divulge Army secret inventions, including our new bomb sight.

Senator PITTMN recently joined hands with such warmongers as Dorothy Thompson, H. V. Kaltenborn, and Walter Lippmann, in denouncing Col. Charles A. Lindbergh for appealing to the American people over the radio to use their influence to keep America out of the European war. I do not believe Colonel Lindbergh needs any defense before the American public. However, I am glad to uphold his right both to free speech and to discuss our foreign policies over the radio.

I agree with most of his suggestions, and particularly with his stand for airports and air bases in Latin America, and his advocacy of a united American Hemisphere defense. Even if Senator PITTMAN does not agree with his views, he should remember the words of Voltaire: "I may not agree with what you say, but I shall defend with my life your right to say it."

Have we already become a dictatorial nation, and has honest criticism been outlawed? Must Colonel Lindbergh go hat in hand to Senator PITTMAN and get his permission to speak on our foreign policies? Has censorship already been clamped down by the new dealers? Have the Constitution and Bill of Rights been purged or repealed by the new dealers?

Lindbergh is only a symbol or a spokesman for the inarticulate millions of American mothers, farmers, wage earners, and veterans who insist that America must stay out of the European war unless we are attacked or the Monroe Doctrine is violated. Lindbergh is the voice of 90 percent of the American people, and represents their will. Therefore, he suddenly becomes a dangerous disturber to the plans of the warmongers and interventionists, and word goes out to the New Deal columnists and satellites to "get Lindbergh; it does not make any difference how hard you crack down on him, but get him."

The result is a ferocious campaign of ridicule, derision, and personal abuse. The public is told that he knows nothing about Europe, foreign affairs, or national defense, or even airplanes. What is really back of this campaign of vilification and falsehood?

The fact is simply that Colonel Lindbergh dares to tell the truth about the drift to war under President Roosevelt. It is time the American people woke up and faced realities regardless of party affiliations.

It is time they faced the fact that the Democratic Party, under the temporary control of President Roosevelt, is the war party in the United States and that we are not only drifting into war but almost in it under his interventionist leadership.

In fairness to the Democratic Members of Congress, at least 80 percent are not for war, and practically 100 percent of the Republicans. President Roosevelt has enormous powers and influence and could cause a war situation. However, I would not be surprised to see him give hypocritical lip service to peace and run for reelection on a "I kept you out of war" platform, as Woodrow Wilson did, and we found ourselves in the war a month after he took office for the second term.

What galls the administration is that Colonel Lindbergh, Senator Wheeler, Senator Clark of Missouri, and Senator Johnson of Colorado, all Democrats, and the Republican Members of Congress see through this hocus-pocus and remember the Wilson peace pledge in the 1916 campaign.

It is my personal conviction that if President Roosevelt should be reelected he will consider it a mandate to put us in the war, just as he claimed his reelection in 1936 to be a mandate to usurp the powers of the Supreme Court when he never mentioned the Court issue once in that campaign.

We are soon to celebrate the greatest of all American national holidays—the Fourth of July—commemorating our Declaration of Independence, and the setting up on this continent of a new nation with new ideals of freedom and democracy, and marking our separation from the eternal wars of Europe.

As America celebrates its Independence Day this year—at this sad time when most of Europe and Asia are at war—let us rededicate ourselves anew to the American spirit of independence from European blood feuds and power politics and European "isms" and wars.

Let us on this great national holiday rededicate ourselves to free government in the Western Hemisphere, to freedom from Old World wars, to making democracy work in America, to a perpetuation of peace and the perfection of our preparedness.

I hope that Fourth of July speakers everywhere will stir Americans to recognize our own strength, our own ideals, and to reaffirm our independence from all entangling alliances, and from the disaster, bloodshed, and bankruptcy of foreign wars.

It Is the Truth That Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in my speech on the rule providing for the consideration of the Navy construction bill, I obtained unanimous consent to insert an editorial appearing in the June 19 issue of the Chicago Daily Times, but having been obliged to refer to other matters during the course of my speech, and desiring not unduly to take up the time of the House when such important legislation was being considered, I am inserting it in the Appendix as an extension of remarks.

Mr. Speaker, when in 1937 President Roosevelt gave an address on the occasion of the dedication of the Outer Drive Bridge in the city of Chicago, his remarks were principally addressed to the urgency of a revision of the Embargo Act—the so-called Neutrality Act—to enable our country to remain out of war. For several years prior and ever since this address the Chicago Tribune has violently assailed the President on every recommendation he had made for national defense, and immediately after the deliverance of the Outer Drive Bridge speech, he was viciously, unjustifiably, and unwarrantedly assailed by the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Examiner. There followed a deluge of hundreds of telegrams and thousands upon thousands of letters urging that I oppose the President's national-defense program and that I vote against the Neutrality Act. I felt it necessary that I answer several of these telegrams and letters coming as they did from some men of standing, and I stated it was my opinion that they were unduly alarmed, that they were being misled by these newspaper articles, and that I feared the Chicago Tribune and Examiner were playing into the hands of Hitler.

I quote a paragraph from one of the letters:

> I feel that President Roosevelt's message has made it clear to every intelligent American that his only desire is to keep us out of war and, therefore, I urge you to read his message and not to be led astray by Mr. McCormick.

Some of these letters came to the attention of the Tribune and thereafter I was subjected to outrageous vilification. But these attacks were so ridiculous that I ignored them and will ignore similar attacks in the future which unwarrantedly reflect on my stand and opinion on public questions. However, today there came to my notice an editorial appearing in the June 19th issue of the Chicago Daily Times, a newspaper whose circulation is deservedly growing with leaps and bounds, which refers to the Chicago Tribune's policy with respect to the national defense program.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the editorial should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I insert it at this point:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of June 19, 1940]

THE TRIBUNE AND DEFENSE

On Monday the Times ran an editorial on the debunking of oracles. The editorial was written before the collapse of France. It appeared in print on a day when all Americans were searching their souls prayerfully, each asking: "What can I do to help my country?"

For some it was a day of awakening to the fact that the European war was too near our shores for comfort. For many it was the day of awakening to the need of national unity.

Certainly it was no day for recrimination. It was a day for Americans to forget past mistakes, to get together shoulder to shoulder and to say "From here out we stand together, regardless of politics, for the common defense of our land." And in that spirit of the day, the Times decided to print today a little piece to the effect that the national emergency overshadowed oracles and justified the adjournment of their debunking.

The Tribune, however, persists in recrimination against the President of our country. There is no adjournment of its propaganda that he was hell bent for our participation in the war of

Europe; that his countrymen could not believe his solemn statements to the contrary; that our defense program has been bungled.

Yesterday's Tribune editorial entitled "Mr. Roosevelt's War" said that "Mr. Roosevelt cannot avoid a large measure of responsibility" for the fact that "the French greatly exaggerated their own strength and greatly underestimated the enemy's." The President, the Tribune said, "seized every opportunity to lead the French to believe this country would spring to France's defense."

The facts are that the President, more than Chamberlain and more than Daladier, had the Nazi military machine sized up for what it was. And he told his fears to the country. Before the war started he warned Congress against "storms from abroad." Further, he warned that "we must be strong enough to ward off sudden attacks," that we would not have time to prepare adequate defense of this continent if we waited too long. If France had taken Hitler as seriously as Roosevelt took him, France might be a fighting nation, not a prostrate one.

In his message to Congress, January 12, 1939, the President said:

"Calling attention to these facts does not remotely intimate that the Congress or the President have any thought of taking part in another war on European soil, but it does show that in 1917 we were not ready to conduct large-scale land or air operations. Relatively we are not much more ready to do so today than we were then."

On other occasions the President assured citizens that he opposed sending an expeditionary force to Europe. He insisted that we prepare for defense.

Having blamed Roosevelt for France's defeat, the Tribune on Tuesday said that we must now attend to our own defense—"so long neglected." It said that shortages in Army equipment "are an evidence of the grossest neglect and incompetence." It forgot to point out that if we are unprepared for defense, its own argument that Roosevelt was going to spring to the defense of France becomes ridiculous.

This community remembers how for a long time the Tribune has opposed Mr. Roosevelt and the leaders of the Army and the Navy on their defense efforts. It appears that until yesterday the Tribune did not think there would be a Nazi assault in this part of the world. Now, almost panicky, it demands a defensive military alliance with Canada. Until yesterday the Tribune believed Hitler and Von Ribbentrop as against our President, our admirals, our generals, and our aviation experts.

On February 17, 1939, in an editorial, the Tribune said:

"American armament is being speeded up on the theory that the United States is in almost as imminent danger as Great Britain and France say they are. The alarm is fabricated and its dimensions expanded in spite of the fact that the enemies mentioned already have their hands so full at home and with other well-armed countries that they want nothing but peace with America and say so."

The Tribune professed to take Hitler's word that he had no military designs over here as against Roosevelt's word that he had no military designs in France. What Hitler said the Tribune believed—and wanted the country to believe. What Roosevelt said the Tribune wouldn't believe and wanted the country not to believe.

On November 29, 1939, the Tribune repeated its faith in Nazi propaganda to lull America to sleep. It said:

"The Germans have their hands full as it is. All common sense tells the people of the United States that they are the best protected and safest of neutrals. And yet they hear more of the ever-present threat of war than even the Belgians, the Hollanders, and the Swiss.

"In spite of the heroic commitments of Der Fuehrer and Il Duce, Italy is a nonbelligerent and Mussolini seems to be confident that he doesn't have to go to war if he doesn't want to. Happily for the Italian people he doesn't want to. * * *

"These war clouds and the war cries coming out of them are the only excuses from which the demand for a new war bill of $2,500,000,000 could emerge. Is this additional money to be spent for the defense of the American continent from invasion? If that is the pretext, the reply is that such expenditures are not needed for the purpose."

If the Tribune had had its way, this country would have swallowed Nazi promises as Poland, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg were expected to swallow them. If the Nazis fooled the Tribune, they didn't fool Roosevelt. He kept right on speeding up American armament.

The Tribune, at long last, approves the administration's plan for an Army of more than 400,000 men. It thinks 450,000 men would be just enough to protect our own soil from invasion. Last November Maj. Gen. Charles M. Wesson, Chief of Ordnance of the United States Army, said we should provide munitions for the mobilization of a million men. He didn't advocate mobilizing the million men, but wanted the munitions—just in case. Gen. Wesson's statement looked "suspicious" to the Tribune, and it said so in an editorial November 12, 1939. It said further: "This Nation needs a field army of perhaps 100,000 * * to make its land defense secure."

Our Army today is approximately 242,000—and its still going up. The present field strength is more than 100,000—what the Tribune demanded as a maximum a few months ago. Yet the Tribune now says, "We have practically no Army. This is not the fault of the Army." Is it the fault of Members of Congress and newspapers opposing a larger Army?

We are glad to see the Tribune this week express at long last a hearty respect for "the long-range bomber which, if provided in sufficient numbers, will protect us from invasion." The Tribune adds: "But appropriations were lacking."

The Tribune has persistently opposed a large military aviation force since 1933, when it said that we needed only a small number of planes "for experiment and emergency work" and that "for war on a modern scale we must rely on the resources provided by the expansion of commercial aviation."

Later it called Igor Sikorsky, builder of planes, and Frank Hawks, war pilots, alarmists because they testified to the effectiveness of enormous bomb carriers which were able to blast whole cities into ruins. The Tribune said of bombers then, "This is trash."

That was in 1934. But the Tribune hadn't learned the truth even a year ago. It opposed the 1939 appropriations to the Army and Navy "because the military aviation excitement is largely in the racket stage." Our military administration wanted air bombers, but the Tribune said the "ballyhoo" about the dangers of aerial bombardment was political, not military. There was, it said, proof that there was no efficacy in bombing.

The Tribune kept calling for a demonstration of the efficiency of air bombers. President Roosevelt was convinced of their efficiency long ago; now, after France, the Tribune has had its demonstration.

The community is well aware that the Tribune is opposing President Roosevelt for a third term. No one knows yet whether the President is going to run again. If he does run, the voters will judge him by his record. The record can't be changed by hysteria. And hysteria is the one ingredient that the country doesn't need and won't accept in an emergency which calls for national unity.

The country isn't sufficiently prepared yet. But it will be prepared because most men and women of both parties want it armed for defense without partisanship.

Memorial Day Services, Bell, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY GEORGE O. WHEELER

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by George O. Wheeler, editor of the Industrial Post, of Bell, Calif., at the Memorial Day services in the Park Lawn Cemetery, at Bell, Calif. It was one of the largest gatherings of its kind ever recorded.

I have been asked to speak to you for a few minutes on some subject appropriate to this occasion. I have never had an assignment that has caused me so much concern during the last few days before the time for its fulfillment.

I was told that I might coordinate fast transpiring developments in Europe today with the patriotic nature of this Memorial Day.

It seems to me that it is almost impossible for one to reach any clear understanding of what is happening in this war-torn world one day to the next, so rapid are the developments.

We are gathered here today to pay our tribute to soldiers of this Nation who have made the supreme sacrifice or who have died after having been in the service of their country.

Our memory of these men is that they have contributed a very important part of all that we hold near and dear to us in liberty and freedom and happiness.

Surely it is appropriate that this custom should be maintained each year to keep fresh in our minds the real cost of our cherished privileges.

Their sacrifices challenge us, the living, and particularly so at a time such as this when the world is aflame with all of the horror of a warfare such as man never saw before.

It is with this thought in mind I have taken for my subject, And What Shall We Do?

I hasten to say that I will not speak of this question from a national point of view. I will only speak from the point of view of the American individual citizen.

I believe that we citizens face the greatest challenge since the days of the Civil War when our country was torn from one side to the other.

In some ways I fear it is a worse situation, for our enemy at this time steals about in the dark, works relentlessly with an unseen hand.

Within our rank and file are subversive interests that are working to destroy national morale.

These interests operate under all sorts of classifications. They include the bunds, the Communists, the Fascists, and the "isms."

They include, too, the people who wave the American flag and cry for "more and more freedom." They want freedom to criticize and tear down and cynicalize love for American life and tradition, and they offer something untried and different to take its place.

The Americans who listen to these propagandists become excellent subjects for those with out-and-out treasonable intentions.

And then I would add to the list of those who are menacing real Americanism today those who say, "All this talk about 'fifth columns' means just nothing at all."

You frequently hear people say, "Everything is all right." Yesterday a man told me, "It can't happen here." There are those who observe in a judicial manner that "we won't have trouble if we don't start looking for it." These people, I say, are menacing real Americanism today.

These people offset the influences of patriotic movements, thereby giving the "ism" people a better working ground.

Fellow citizens, only the blind will not see.

In Europe nations are falling overnight these days.

They are nations who would not see.

They said, "Everything will turn out all right."

This week a man came into my office looking very sad. I said to him, "My goodness, you look troubled."

He answered, "I am troubled. I have just received a letter from my father in Norway, and he wrote that it is an awful thing to lose your country."

And I have read that letter over and over and I think a hundred times a day about that line: "It is an awful thing to lose your country."

I happened to be at a meeting where Bruce Findlay, of Pomona College, spoke on "Americanism." He said: "You don't lose your liberty as you lose your hat. You lose it step by step, a little bit at a time."

During the past month I have lost all interest in national politics. Personally, I don't want to be Democratic or Republican, or anything else for awhile. I just want to be an American. I just want to be for the President of the United States. I believe I see a call from my country—a call for loyalty—and that flag—and everything it has meant to me in life.

I received a telegram from our Congressman KRAMER this morning, in which he states, "Both Democrats and Republicans have consolidated solidly behind the President in his program for national defense and have shown an overwhelming desire to support him in any appropriations required to meet this emergency."

He said (apparently for publication in the paper): "Please assure the people in the Thirteenth District of my wholehearted patriotic support in backing the President 100 percent."

This is the sort of Americanism America needs today.

And I know some people say, "Don't get excited." They say, "Everything will be all right." They say, "It's newspaper talk."

All I can do, when I hear of this, is to think of Holland, and Denmark, and Norway, and Belgium—and there'll be more on the list, too, in a few days.

It wasn't so much that these countries fell to a powerful war machine. It was the way they fell.

They crumbled from within.

They collapsed because:

The enemy's orders came over their army communication lines.

Because high officials welcomed the invaders.

Police escorted invading soldiers into cities.

Secrets of the dikes fell into enemy hands.

Army officers failed to blow up bridges that allowed the enemy to advance.

Disloyalty and fear and apathy were instruments of enemy propagandists.

Communism weakened national fiber and resistance.

Maybe the democracies had become too democratic.

Maybe the learned political observer, Lincoln Steffens, was right when he said 10 years ago, "Democracies will rot away if they do not change their viewpoint."

After all, democracy is not new. It is very old. It was tried out in Greece, hundreds of years before Christ, and it failed utterly.

It does not exist, even in Britain and France, at this moment.

So we can't be too sure about security.

We must temper our conception of what democracy is to permit.

We must get into our national viewpoint a strong sense of patriotism.

We must be alert to Americanism in every sense of the word.

We must tell these foreign propagandists in no uncertain terms we want none of their doctrines. Maybe a good way to start is to send the leaders back to their own countries.

We must prepare a defensive machine second to none on earth. Maybe it will cost $10 or $20 or $50 for every person in the United States—but what is that compared to the price of freedom.

We must fill the skies with airplanes, and train lots of pilots.

We must encourage our legislators to be more and more conscious of Americanism.

We must speak of being loyal to our country, to our children.

We should keep a mental record of people who show disloyalty to our country.

We must develop stronger patriotic programs in our schools, and I say with special attention being given to our colleges.

All of this I believe should be done with the spirit of defending and not with the thought of going to war.

This is my interpretation of the answer to the question, "What shall we do?"

It is my idea of what these splendid Americans who served their country would be thinking of, were they alive today. I believe, so far as it is in my modest ability to interpret, it is the general opinion of the more fortunate veterans who are still with us today.

To these veteran organizations America owes much.

They, and for years they alone, have stood out in this big job of keeping the great American spirit keenly sensitive to patriotism.

The war veterans' organizations are America's great fort, so far as the ranks are concerned at this time.

In conclusion, I would say:

Let's take no chances. We are big and strong and resourceful. We need not worry. We need only think and act, and then America will remain for Americans, and the sacrifices made by American soldiers whose memory we pay tribute to today will not be made in vain.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE L. GARRETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time the Members of Congress are receiving an enormous amount of mail on the present international crisis and on the dangers of war. Mixed with these letters we have a growing number of letters from those who went into the Army and Navy in the war which is known as the World War.

In the present crisis we must not forget those men who did their part then. We owe a duty to them now. Many of them have begun to break physically, to suffer the ravages of their age and the loss of their facilities of life as they advance into old age and helplessness.

It was my privilege to serve on the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee for 2 years. As a member of this committee I inspected many of our hospitals. I had a chance to see some of the work which has and is being done for them. Most of the present laws passed for their benefit were enacted before that time, but during the past 3 years we did pass what are now known as—

Public Law No. 127, which extended the expiring 5-year level-premium insurance policies for another 5-year period;

Public, No. 304, which granted an automatic pension to Gold Star Mothers and Fathers and gave them the pension based on the amount which we felt was commensurate with the insurance they had been receiving;

Public, No. 338, of the Seventy-fifth Congress and Public, No. 146, of the Seventy-sixth Congress were passed, which enabled alien veterans, men of another nationality who had served in our armed forces, to become citizens on the basis of that service and that allegiance to our country.

Public, 514, Seventy-fifth Congress, to liberalize benefits for widows and dependent children of World War veterans;

Public, 166, Seventy-sixth Congress, to provide national flags for the burial of former service men and women;

Public, 197, Seventy-sixth Congress, to restore benefits to World War veterans suffering from misconduct cases;

Public, 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, further liberalizing benefits granted to veterans, their widows, and dependents as granted them under Public, 484, of the Seventy-third Congress;

Public, 250, Seventy-sixth Congress, increasing the amount of Federal aid to disabled soldiers in soldiers' homes to $240 per year.

Furthermore, I voted for the bill to grant a pension to the widows and dependent children of veterans regardless of the service connection or cause of death of the veteran.

I have no apology for any of these votes, for I feel that we cannot do too much for these men and their families, and it is my sincere hope that in the things which this Government is doing for them that we are showing some appreciation for the things they did for our country.

Like all the Members of Congress I daily have the letters above-mentioned. These men are having trouble proving their claims. The years have gone by with many of them too proud, too busy, or too far away from the men with whom they served to secure the evidence they need and which will satisfy the Veterans' Administration as to the worth of their claim. In the light of existing veterans' legislation, I can readily see why the Veterans' Administration makes many rulings which are apparently unfair and detrimental to the interest of the veteran.

For the above reason, to get away from the cold and strictly legalistic viewpoint of the Bureau, I introduced H. R. 8627, which would grant to these men who feel they have been unjustly treated the right of judicial review of their claims in their own courts before a jury of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I have been unfair to the Veterans' Administration in the introduction of this bill, neither do I feel that the rights of the Government are being given away, for any man is entitled to go into court for his rights. Why should the veteran not have that right when he feels that he has been deprived of the same? The Veterans' Administration's claim that the cost in administering this law would be prohibitive is not, in my opinion, well founded; since they have their own lawyers and they base their decisions on the evidence which the veteran presents. Why not let a jury do the same? Why have the Veterans' Administration as both judge and jury?

In conclusion, let me state to you that I have never hesitated for the benefit of the veterans, their wives and widows, to vote for bills to work for their interests and to do all that I could to forward their claims. I saw their need for hospitalization and introduced a bill for a hospital in west Texas. Such a hospital is now in operation in Amarillo, and the second new one is to open soon in Dallas. They need and deserve not our pity but our help, not our alms and mere hand-outs but real service in the days of their growing infirmities. Many of them are now broken in body from the privations which they endured. Let us not break their spirit as well by refusing them a chance to prove, in the good old American way, their cases in the courts of their country.

Farm Prosperity and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUDOLPH G. TENEROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

RADIO PROGRAM

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, at 1 p. m. today I appeared on station WMAL, National Broadcasting Co., Washington, D. C., as the guest speaker of the American Good Government Society. It was during this time that roll call No. 161 was taken in the House and I was unavoidably absent.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of the broadcast:

Dr. STADERMAN. Congressman TENEROWICZ, I understand you introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which, if enacted, would provide for the conservation of petroleum resources and increase the use of agricultural commodities. Is that correct?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. Yes; that is true, Dr. Staderman.

Dr. STADERMAN. Congressman TENEROWICZ, will you explain this bill to us?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. My bill provides that all motor fuel subject to interstate commerce regulations must contain a given percentage of alcohol manufactured from American-grown agricultural products only. The enactment of this bill, H. R. 9582, will tend to do two things: first, conserve our petroleum resources, and second, increase our farm acreage under cultivation by about 30,000,000 acres immediately.

Dr. STADERMAN. Congressman, would you tell us some of the advantages of such a program to the American farmer?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. At the present time, conservation of our strategic materials for our national defense comes first, and next comes our domestic need for restoring to the farmer his necessary purchasing power, which, of course, means his security.

The defense angle of this bill pertains to the conservation of petroleum for our more vital defense needs. The farm angle of the bill would provide for the industrial use of agricultural products for the creation of a national motor fuel and give the American farmer a market for his surplus crops. A program of this nature would require the services of about a million more American farmers and would certainly go a long way toward solving the farm and unemployment problem.

Dr. STADERMAN. Congressman TENEROWICZ, you stated you believed it essential in this great emergency for us to conserve our petroleum reserves; how do our Army and Navy officials feel about the need of a petroleum conservation program?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. The justification and need for the United States to embark on an immediate program of this nature can best be shown by a letter written to me recently by Mr. R. R. Sayres, Acting Director, Bureau of Mines; in part I quote: "Concerning oil reserves, page 134, National Resources Committee Report, shows a table prepared by H. J. Wasson in which the petroleum reserves in 1938 were estimated at 10.2 years supply, in terms of future production, and at 12.7 years in terms of current production."

Former Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Edison, wrote recently as follows; I quote: "The conservation of such petroleum deposit is essential because the United States needs oil vitally. Now that almost every vessel of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the merchant marine is driven by oil, the powers conferred on the Congress by the Constitution of the United States 'to provide and maintain a navy and to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States' can best be exercised by the conservation of petroleum deposits."

Dr. STADERMAN. Has the Government ever considered using a substitute power fuel with oil conservation in mind?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. Oh, yes; they have done considerable research in the matter and even recommended the use of agricultural products, as can be shown by a letter written by our Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Agriculture, dated December 1935, in which he stated, I quote: "The continued adequate supply of fuel for motor vehicles and airplanes is one of the essentials of national prosperity in which the Department of Commerce is directly interested. Despite the present supply of petroleum, authorities agree that the country must look forward to a diminishing supply, which condition may shortly make necessary importations of foreign crude oils. In order to be of significance in relation to the present motor-fuel demands of the United States, alcohol must be produced, not from a limited supply of waste products, but from farm crops which can be raised and handled in quantity for the main purpose of producing alcohol or other suitable fuel."

Dr. STADERMAN. Congressman TENEROWICZ, how much alcohol would be needed to supply the United States with a 10-percent alcohol-blended motor fuel?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. Well, Doctor, the people of the United States consume about 25,000,000,000 gallons of gasoline a year. Ten percent of this would mean 2,500,000,000 gallons of alcohol that would be required for a 10-percent blend. The farmer, of course, is interested in knowing just what crops he must raise to produce the most alcohol. To give you an idea of some of the crops used I will mention a few—although almost all crops may be utilized in the processing of alcohol for motor fuel, but some give a greater yield.

For instance, 1 ton of wheat makes 85 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of corn makes 84 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of buckwheat makes 83.4 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of grain sorghum makes 79.5 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of barley makes 79.2 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of sweetpotatoes makes 34.2 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of potatoes makes 22.9 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of Jerusalem artichokes makes 20 gallons of alcohol; 1 ton of apples makes 14.4 gallons of alcohol; and 1 ton of sugar beets makes 22.1 gallons of alcohol.

One important feature of an alcohol motor fuel processed from agricultural products is the fact that second-grade produce, the culls, the seconds, and all excess crops can be utilized. These have formerly caused the farmer to suffer a great loss through spoilage and defects.

Dr. STADERMAN. Congressman, has a program of this kind ever been tried with success anywhere?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. I might answer that question by showing that 50 countries in the world are using a national substitute fuel, principally Germany, England, and France.

Some countries found it expedient to do so because of lack of their own petroleum reserves. They feared that in case of war or a blockade their supply of fuel might be cut off and thereby cause their industries to stop operation. Other nations use a substitute fuel in order to be self-sufficient and utilize their home-grown produce. In that way they have been able to keep their people employed, their land under cultivation, and save the cost of imported fuels.

I personally feel that the United States should do what other nations have found it expedient to do in order to make their nations self-sustaining. If my bill, H. R. 9582, is enacted requiring a national alcohol-blend motor fuel we will increase the national income of the American farmer by at least eight hundred million to one bil-

lion dollars. The motor fuel alcohol industry would become one of the major industries in the country and provide the greatest outlet possible for the products of the American farmer.

Dr. STADERMAN. If this idea has been presented before, and the benefits you state are true, what stand in our way of embarking on such a far-reaching program, Congressman TENEROWICZ?

Congressman TENEROWICZ. Well, Dr. Staderman, I personally feel that the only thing now standing in our way is the awakening of the consciousness of the American people to the fact that our permanent security lies in our becoming a self-sufficient Nation.

Former world markets are closed to us and for this reason we must plan on not only supplying our own agricultural needs but also our industrial needs. This would bring about the abandonment of our present agricultural policy of scarcity. Industrial uses must be found for our surplus crops and are being found daily—thanks to the ingenuity of American chemists.

As far as the industrial use of agricultural products is concerned—a national alcohol fuel program, if put into effect by the American Government, would be a great step forward toward making us less dependent on world markets and more self-sufficient. It would place additional millions of acres under cultivation—it would stabilize the American farmer by creating a new industrial market for his produce—it would add to our own capital investment—and it would put millions of men to work.

Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune Tenders Services of the Negro Women of America to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to President Roosevelt, which reflects the highest patriotism, Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, president of the National Council of Negro Women of the United States, Inc., has tendered the services of the qualified Negro women of the United States for the period of the emergency. In her letter she reminds the President that in the ranks of Negro womanhood in America are to be found many women of ability and capacity for leadership. She offers her own services "without reservation" and says, speaking of the women of her race:

> Use our qualified Negro women among the active forces who are working toward the protection of our democratic stronghold.

Speaking for millions of Negro women, she gives the assurance to the President that her race is eager and waiting to do its part.

Mrs. Bethune's letter to the President is as follows:

The PRESIDENT, JUNE 4, 1940.
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a time like this, when the basic principles of democracy are being challenged at home and abroad, when racial and religious hatreds are being engendered, it is vitally important that the Negro, as a minority group in this Nation, express anew his faith in your leadership and his unswerving adherence to a program of national defense adequate to insure the perpetuation of the principles of democracy. I approach you as one of a vast army of Negro women who recognize that we must face the dangers that confront us with a united patriotism.

We, as a race, have been fighting for a more equitable share of those opportunities which are fundamental to every American citizen who would enjoy the economic and family security which a true democracy guarantees. Now we come as a group of loyal, self-sacrificing women who feel they have a right and a solemn duty to serve their Nation.

In the ranks of Negro womanhood in America are to be found ability and capacity for leadership, for administrative as well as routine tasks, for the types of service so necessary in a program of national defense. These are citizens whose past records at home and in war service abroad, whose unquestioned loyalty to their country and its ideals, and whose sincere and enthusiastic desire to serve you and the Nation indicate how deeply they are concerned that a more realistic American democracy, as visioned by those not blinded by racial prejudices, shall be maintained and perpetuated.

I offer my own services without reservation, and urge you, in the planning and work which lies ahead, to make such use of the services of qualified Negro women as will assure the thirteen and a half million Negroes in America that they, too, have earned the right to be numbered among the active forces who are working toward the protection of our democratic stronghold.

Faithfully yours,

MARY MCLEOD BETHUN,
President.

Carl Edgar Mapes

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARL EDGAR MAPES, late a Representative from the State of Michigan

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, words are almost futile and language inadequate when the mystery of death takes away a beloved friend and fellow colleague.

Muted by grief, we often turn helplessly to the Bible, great poems, or other sources for the tributes our minds are too shocked to freely pour forth.

Somehow there seems nothing among printed words to which I can turn for an expression of my sense of personal loss at the passing of CARL MAPES. To me his life seemed too lofty and sublime for mere words to eulogize.

Over the years of our long association there had grown a bond too precious for comparison with most others. In those years I truly found him a fountainhead from which there constantly flowed all the attributes of manly perfection. His life seemed a shining mirror from which one constantly saw the reflection of idealism, sincerity of purpose, and matchless integrity. More than most men, he understood the futility of words when action was needed and his positive "yes" or "no" was the Roman sign of an impartial judge who had weighed all sides with utter fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I would be a happy, thrice-blessed man if in the last moment of my own life I could look back on a career as useful and distinguished as that which CARL MAPES did when God called him home.

All of us who knew him closely are enriched by the priceless memories and ideals he left behind—all of us who worked with him could not be other than better by reason of his shining years amongst us.

From the bottom of my heart I commiserate with his State, his constituents, and his bereaved family.

Samuel Davis McReynolds

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if a growing boy, filled with visions of usefulness, were to come to me for advice, I would find it an easy task to give him a shining example whereby he could not fail.

I would say to him in all sincerity: "Go study the life, obstacles, devotions, principles, utterances, and achievements of SAMUEL DAVIS MCREYNOLDS.

"Emulate his patriotism; imitate, if you can, his tenderness and his fighting ability. Cling as steadfastly, tenaciously and courageously as he did to all the principles of decency, good government, and Christian ideals.

"Do that, my boy, and when you die men will long pause and remember, your friends will mourn, and your proud State will write your name in indelible ink across the pages of its history."

Mr. Speaker, Hawthorne's Stone Face imbued the boy Ernest to great usefulness and fame. Over the years other boys have been given noble impetus by like determination. Down in the hills of eastern Tennessee, however, our youth

could seek far and wide ere they found a more noble, simple, yet greater pattern to be guided by than the life of our late friend and colleague.

Back to Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN JARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is time now for America to get back to the old and tried principles of government, principles which made this country great. The following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick expresses my views exactly:

BACK TO EARTH

The United States seems to be turning away from all kinds of "isms" and back to the fundamental theory of our Government, namely, a free people and individual opportunity—a government to protect, not to compete, with its own citizens in business.

To quote the President, "Private industry will have the responsibility of providing the best, speediest, and most efficient mass production of which it is capable."

There can be no question of the desire of American industry to cooperate to the limit of its ability with our Government to attain unprecedented heights of efficiency and service to the end that America may swiftly be provided with the best defense system in the world. And there should be no question of the willingness of our public servants, from the Executive down, to cooperate with private enterprise in order to guarantee the successful completion of that gigantic task.

It has taken a world calamity to reawaken our people to the vital role which private enterprise plays in our national life.

The men, the machines, the resources, and the technique which private enterprise has developed, are our first line of defense. The great industries of America made possible the highest peacetime standards of living for all—and out of these industries, staffed with free men working under a free enterprise system, must come our weapons of defense.

The time when we could afford socialistic experiments to the destruction of private enterprise—if we ever could afford them—has passed. The national defense is the first and foremost duty of the Federal Government in its determination to perpetuate the American way of life.

We must get back to the fundamentals of democracy if we are to survive as a free and secure people where government is the servant, not the master, of its citizens.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on national defense delivered by me over station KMOX at St. Louis, Sunday, June 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I have been asked to discuss national defense for a few minutes this evening, and I shall try in these few minutes to give you my views.

I was asked by the War Department last fall, at the direction of the President, with four other Senators and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to make a tour of the Army posts of the United States, Panama, and Puerto Rico. We also visited arsenals and some industrial plants. We left Washington on October 6 by plane and visited every post of importance in the United States, all of the Central American capitals, and Mexico City, as well as Panama and Puerto Rico.

We found a lack of the necessary matériel and weapons for adequate defense. In the Panama Canal Zone there was a shortage of antiaircraft guns, and of coast-defense guns on the Atlantic side of the Canal. This shortage of antiaircraft guns has since been remedied.

The administration of the Canal Zone, for defense purposes, is under a major general and the necessary air and ground forces to prevent attack from both land and sea. A very efficient air force is stationed in the Canal Zone and is to be equipped with the necessary bombing and pursuit planes of the most up-to-date type for the Canal's defense.

An effort is being made to arrange for listening posts in the Pacific, southwest and northwest of the Canal, far enough away to warn the defense forces of the approach of any enemy aircraft.

We found the Central American republics very friendly, and willing to cooperate for the defense of this vital artery in our commercial and defense set-up.

The west coast defenses, from Los Angeles to Seattle, are very excellently organized, and except for a shortage of equipment and a lack of the the necessary planes and antiaircraft guns, can be adequately defended. These shortages are being rapidly met, and I believe the western coast defenses and the Panama Canal will shortly be very efficiently defended from attack.

We visited all the plane factories on the west coast and found them very busily engaged in turning out planes for France and England. This expansion for furnishing the Allies with planes has speeded up production and, I think, has been to our interest, because planes which are being furnished to us now are those which have been improved by information gained from the war now going on in Europe.

The eastern seaboard suffers from the same lack of matériel and the necessary plane defense as does the west coast and the Panama Canal. This situation, however, is being rapidly remedied.

Puerto Rico is the natural eastern defense base for the Panama Canal. Air bases are being established both by land and sea forces. The Spaniards always considered Puerto Rico the key to the Caribbean Sea and heavily fortified it as long as 300 years ago. The story was told us that Charles V, King of Spain and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, once made the statement to one of his ministers, who asked him of what he was thinking when he was looking out of one of his castle windows over the Atlantic. His reply was that he thought he might be able to see the fortifications of Puerto Rico, as enough money had been spent on them to make them reach the sky. Those Spanish fortifications, however, are of no value in this day and age except as something for the sightseers to look over.

This 20,000-mile tour by the Members of the House and of the Senate was an educational tour and was well worth the time spent upon it. We have been able to intelligently go at a program for national defense which, I think, in the long run will be sufficient for our purposes in the Western Hemisphere and will prevent us from being attacked.

I do not think any Member of the House or the Senate wants to involve the country in war, and I am very sure that the President is very anxious to keep us at peace.

There have been Members of the Congress who have advocated an adequate national-defense program for the last 10 years, but whose voices were not heeded because the country was committed to a pacifist policy inaugurated in 1920, when our great naval vessels then under construction were destroyed and the Nine Power Treaty was negotiated, which was supposed to outlaw war. Whenever any warning was sounded, either in the Senate or in the House, in the interest of national defense, that Senator or Representative was immediately branded as a warmonger, and the pacifist Members of the Senate and the House were successful in crying him down. I think some people honestly believed that there would never be another war after the last World War, but we are in the midst of another one much more horrible than the one of '14 to '18. The machine age is being used to destroy civilization instead of to make the world a happy and peaceful place in which to live. For that reason it is absolutely necessary that this country effectively set up a national-defense plan which will protect the Western Hemisphere.

I believe that an army of 400,000 men is adequate for the first line of defense on land and to act as instructors to the citizen army. I think we should have a navy second to none, and the necessary air force to support it. If it takes 50,000 planes and a hundred thousand pilots, let's build the planes and train the pilots. I think we should have a citizen army, trained on the Swiss plan, subject to call in case of an emergency, and the necessary tanks, armament, and other matériel to equip these forces.

These things cannot be done in a day nor in a year. We must pursue a policy for several years to get an adequate national-defense set-up. Every bulwark of democracy in the world has been eliminated except Britain. Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France are all conquered and a part of the totalitarian states of Europe. Russia, Italy, and Germany now dominate the European scene, and it will be a most difficult world in which to live by our democratic way if Britain is conquered.

Every effort possible is being made by the administration adequately to prepare the country for defense. Not a Member of

Congress wants to send any Americans into the present war, but good, common sense forces us to revise our pacifist policy, as George Washington said, in time of peace prepare for war. It is perfectly asinine to talk of sending men to Europe. We could not do it under 2 years if we wanted to, and I have yet to meet the Member of Congress who wants to go to war anywhere.

It is my honest opinion that had we been adequately prepared in 1914 and 1915 we would never have had to enter that conflict.

A nation such as ours, with all the resources that are necessary for a happy and contented population, will not be allowed to smugly enjoy these resources if the totalitarians win the war and we are not adequately prepared.

This is not a partisan need. It is a national and patriotic one, and I am happy to say that the national-defense bills have passed through the Congress without a vestige of partisan clamor. One or two of the bills passed the Senate unanimously and passed the House with such overwhelming majorities that no taint of partisanship could be charged.

I think that now the executive department of the Government should be given a chance to organize the national-defense set-up and proceed as rapidly as possible to its consummation. If it is necessary for the Congress to stay in session, due to the situation in Europe, I think it should spend its time meeting the domestic necessities and if an emergency arises be prepared to act.

I personally do not believe that we will or should become involved in the European brawl. I do believe, however, that we should be prepared to defend the Monroe Doctrine and the Western Hemisphere, and we ought to sell all the planes and matériel possible to the British Empire. These sales should in no way be allowed to affect our own program, but I believe they would help improve our industrial set-up to meet the emergency by speeding up production.

We have a long and far-flung coastline, from Maine to Panama; from Alaska to the Hawaiian Islands; and from Lower California to Puget Sound. We have Russia and Japan at Alaska's doorway now in the Pacific and we must he prepared to meet any contingency in the Atlantic. France, Holland, Denmark, and Britain all have possessions in our dooryard in this hemisphere. And we have a Monroe Doctrine which we must uphold or abandon. No one wants to abandon that policy.

There is another phase of national defense which is of vital interest to our country and its welfare. That is the disloyal inhabitants who are enjoying peace and freedom here and yet who would like to overthrow our form of government. I believe those people should be sent to the countries they admire and that every effort should be made to eliminate any "fifth column" activities. That is being done by the proper authorities. But we must not become hysterical and go witch hunting in our enthusiasm to eliminate a possible "fifth column."

There are just as good and loyal citizens among us who have been naturalized and who are descendants of emigrants from other countries than England as are those of colonial descent. Let us not start any persecutions. I hope the demagogues will stay out of the coming campaign and that we may sanely discuss our issues in that campaign without rabble-rousing. Leaders of both parties have declared for a safe and adequate national defense. Let us quickly proceed to set it up.

Graduation Exercises of F. B. I. Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the graduation exercises of the fourteenth session of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy, in the Great Hall of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., on June 29, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You men have now finished a training course. In that course you have probably been taught much that you will never have occasion to use. For example, you have been taught how to shoot. We all trust that you will never have occasion to draw your gun. You may, therefore, think that the training was unnecessary and unimportant but that is not the case. Seldom in anyone's life does he ever have an opportunity to do exactly that which he has been trained to do. I said that likely you will never draw your gun. That does not mean that you will not be an efficient police officer, quite the contrary. The two greatest police systems that I have ever studied and observed—the great imperial metropolitan police system of Japan, where every officer wears a sword, but where it is assumed almost a disgrace ever to draw that sword, and where I have never seen one drawn in an experience of nearly 6 years. The London bobbies, an extremely efficient group of policemen, never carry anything on ordinary duty. It was within my experience in Hyde Park in London to watch an officer come over and touch on the shoulder a railing anarchist and ask him politely if he would just as soon abuse the King and his government at another place as he was interfering with traffic where he was standing.

I knew and traveled with a British vice admiral who had taken part in every war that England had from the nineties on through the World War. He had been in all of them and had been sent the world over. He had commanded a full fleet, but he told me that it was without his experience ever to have shot at an enemy or ever to have ordered a shot fired at an enemy. I read Plato's Republic when I studied Greek years ago. I have not had a single occasion to use that experience in my life, but tomorrow afternoon I am going to discuss over the Columbia Broadcasting System, with three other men, some phases of Plato's political theory. The point I am trying to make is that seldom does the opportunity come to many of us to do extraordinary things, but the extraordinary thing comes at the time when we least expect it; and being prepared to use one's head and coordinate with his head, his hands, and his feet, immediately, shows the well-trained person.

As a student of sociology I have watched two or three devastating fires. In one city the fire raged for 2 days. It is no reflection on government or on society when I tell you that the first group of individuals to break and to lose control of what they should be doing was the fire department. It was no fault of theirs—the fire was just too big for them. The next group to lose coordination was the police, and then the National Guard was sent for, but it was too big for them to cope with. Finally, it was noted that people began gathering around natural leaders and a social organization started to operate. Policemen, firemen, and the National Guard men became greatly effective under the leadership which developed. I have been caught in the midst of mobs and I have despaired of getting out. One time I think I was saved from actual injury by a bit of rather sober thinking. I tell you this story not as a story but to illustrate a point about people when they are on a rampage or when they are acting in an unusual way. I knew the great respect that these people who were rioting had for an American. In this particular riot they were rioting against Englishmen; therefore I knew if I could get over the fact that I was an American and not a Britisher, that the mob's attitude toward me would be changed, but how to do that I didn't know. Then I remembered that I had a gold watch; and I remembered, too, that when the Spanish-American War broke out my father, in his store, put little flag stickers on all the packages, and I put one of these little American-flag stickers in the lid of my watch. I knew that if I showed that watch that I might lose it, but I knew that if I didn't show the watch I might lose myself; and while I valued the watch, I valued my hide more. I took the watch out and opened the lid slowly and looked at the time for an instant or two. Someone said, "Amerikajin," and soon all were saying, "Amerikajin"; and I walked away.

Now what has that got to do with a talk to graduate police officers? Simply this: If you are going to try to control men without knowing something about human nature, you are going to fail. The American Government is going to fail in this training activity unless it remembers a few fundamentals and essentials. The first essential is that all the trainees have strong bodies and alert minds. That means, at least, the essentials of a grammar school education and the simple elements of social living with proper mental and physical hygiene. Therefore, the Government plan must be built upon courses of elementary education, elementary health, and elementary social living. Without those things the training will fail. What could any of you have done here if you were defective in body, mind, and ordinary understanding? What good would your training have been if it had not been under competent trainers?

A mob does not make an army, a group of burly men—a police force; nor will a complete reading of Sherlock Holmes make a detective. America stands for so much more today than she has ever stood for that those who serve America in any capacity must stand for much more than those who came before them. Never belittle the ideals of American institutions. You will see those ideals abused more than once. You will find the advantage taker running rampant in America very often. You will be tempted to feel that decent living, decent training, proper ideals, are hardly worth while because the poor liver, the ill-trained, and the advantage taker seem so often to succeed, but if you will watch you will find that this is less often than you imagine. You have been given a taste of a high-minded esprit de corps—don't lose that spirit. You have been told what constitutes the morale of a government police officer—don't be cynical about that because both the esprit de corps and the morale of the great institution you have been working with during the last few weeks will be here stronger and finer many years after you have gone and not to have lived in harmony with those two splendid ideals will cause you to spend hours of regret in future years, and a man who regrets his life has, in a sense, lost his life.

Water for California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Richard L. Neuberger on the subject Water for California.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Oregonian of May 19, 1940]

WATER FOR CALIFORNIA—IMMENSE IRRIGATION, POWER, AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT STEMS FROM MOUNT SHASTA; TAKES MOISTURE TO VALLEYS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Within sight of the Oregon border, Mount Shasta's 14,161-foot summit, a mighty fortress of snow and ice, stands guard over the northern end of the great central Valley of California. Off its glacier-barricaded ramparts mountain torrents twist and foam. The pine forests in the foothills trill to the sound of falling water. Creeks and rivers rib the countryside.

Far to the south, where the treeless Tehachapi range hems in the central valley's lower reaches, this scene has its antithesis. Land is caked and drying. Half a million acres of fields and orchards have not enough water. Peaches and grapes wither in the sun. Lettuce plants shrivel and blow away. Wells hit an arid bottom. Sagebrush advances on farms like an invading army.

Five hundred long miles separate the eternal snows of Shasta from the dying agricultural region at the opposite end of the valley. Five hundred miles—farther than from Portland to Boise, as far as the measureless distance between Paris and Berlin. Yet the United States Government has begun a project designed to transfer the superabundance of moisture at Mount Shasta to the baked-out land at the foot of the Tehachapi.

This is a colossal undertaking. A few comparisons prove it. Grand Coulee Dam, athwart the Columbia River in the State of Washington, is the greatest edifice ever reared by man. Next in size is Boulder dam on the swift Colorado, Shasta Dam, key unit of the Central Valley project, will be when completed nearly twice as big as Boulder, slightly more than half as big as Grand Coulee. It will be many times larger than Bonneville.

Shasta Dam will span the Sacramento River near its origin in the slopes below Mount Shasta. The dam will be two-thirds of a mile long, higher than the 42-story Smith tower in Seattle, 2 city blocks in thickness at the base. Over its parapet the waters of the Sacramento will crash in a spectaular cataract 3 times the height of Niagara. Behind the dam a vast reservoir will be formed, extending to within 50 miles of the California-Oregon boundary.

DAM SCHEDULED TO AID FLOOD SITUATION

Shasta Dam will accomplish a variety of purposes. The Sacramento River will be backed up until it creates a lake which fills wooded basins, inundates hills, and clogs canyons. This will regulate and control the river all the way to its confluence with the sea behind the Golden Gate. Spring floods will be eliminated and so will the low waters of the autumn. Year-round navigation will be provided upstream as far northward as Red Bluff, and once again barges and packets will ride the Sacramento's swells.

The water in the Shasta Reservoir, water rushing down from Mount Shasta's lofty crags, will provide three specific benefits. Roaring over the steep spillway, it will generate 515,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity. Added to the normal flow of the Sacramento, it will insure enough water in the river to permit diversion to the southern end of the valley. A canallike channel at the delta of the Sacramento will take water to rich farm lands, which, without this water, are doomed to become an arid and desolate basin.

The increased force and volume of the Sacramento will do something else. Where the Sacramento River, coming from the northern end of the Central Valley and the San Joaquin River, flowing sluggishly from the southern end of the Central Valley, go together into the Pacific Ocean, there are some of the richest farms in America. This agricultural delta is sometimes called "The Little Holland of California." Asparagus for salads eaten in Oregon and berries for shortcake baked in New York are as likely as not grown on the delta.

OCEAN WILL BE KEPT IN PLACE BY RIVER

But the delta is menaced by the ocean. Over its 400,000 acres salt water creeps apace, befouling wells, and destroying crops. Salinity gives taste to fruits and vegetables when they are in a chafing dish, but it kills them in the soil. The farmers on the tidal flats have been as ineffective as King Canute in keeping back the sea. The "cold, green mantling" has surged on and on, threatening crops worth $30,000,000 a year.

Yet the day of the ocean's dominance over the Sacramento is almost ended. No longer during the low-water season will the river poke down out of the north, a weak and feeble trickle. Shoving it onward, when Shasta Dam is built, will be a hugh lake covering 29,500 acres and containing 4,500,000 acre-feet of water. Moisture accumulated at the crest of the spring freshets will replenish the river at the depths of the fall drought. The Sacramento will be a booming, vigorous force all year along—a force strong enough to drive back the tidal waters as they struggle to get onto the lands of the delta.

The Central Valley project is an enormous one. It includes not only the Shasta Dam on the Sacramento but also the Friant Dam on the San Joaquin. Although smaller than the towering Shasta structure, Friant Dam will be considerably more than half a mile in length and will compare favorably in size with such dams as Bonneville, Norris, and Casper-Alcova. Its maximum height will be 300 feet, which is 12 feet higher than the National Capitol Building at Washington.

CANALS CARRY WATER FROM MOUNT SHASTA'S SLOPES

Two dams are not all there is to the Central Valley undertaking. The $170,000,000 it is costing will pay for more than that. Three hundred and fifty miles of canals will carry water from the glacier-spawned rivers of the Mount Shasta watershed to arid farms and ranches. Siphons, tunnels, and bridges will carry these canals through hills, across gullies, and over ridges. It is an experiment in moving climate. Snow that cloaks the precipices of Shasta will eventually irrigate orchards 500 miles away.

The Central Valley has two main rivers. The Sacramento and its tributaries encompass two-thirds of the valley's water supply, the San Joaquin one-third. Yet the area drained by the San Joaquin, with far less rain than the Sacramento region, requires two-thirds of the water. So the Central Valley project is switching the water supplies, so to speak. Shasta Dam is increasing and stabilizing the Sacramento's flow, in order that the excess of the flow can be diverted southward to the San Joaquin crops, which need additional water to survive.

Seasonally, as well as geographically, the distribution of water in the Central Valley is bad. Almost every spring the sun drills great gaps in the Shasta snow fields and the Sacramento runs riot. More water comes down from the highlands than the bed of the river can hold. Towns are flooded, settlements isolated, and railroads and highways washed out. Then, all the water having rushed down pell-mell, the rest of the growing season finds the river barely more than a drip.

Correcting these numerous maladjustments of nature is the purpose of the Central Valley project. It is the second most extensive construction enterprise undertaken since President Roosevelt entered the White House. The first is the Grand Coulee development. The two jobs are somewhat similar in magnitude and construction technique. Both also are being done by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, which is an agency of the Interior Department.

But between Grand Coulee and Central Valley there is a vital distinction. Grand Coulee is exclusively to develop and improve a new area. It will reclaim 1,200,000 acres in the State of Washington which are now largely desert. The objective of Central Valley is resuscitation. It will rescue half a million acres, which, having already been developed and improved, are now in danger of reverting to the desert from which they were extracted.

In the San Joaquin end of the Central Valley half the canned peaches in the world are grown. Walnuts, olives, almonds, grapes, and apricots abound. On the delta of the Sacramento most of the Nation's asparagus is cultivated. Now these crops need help.

People of Oregon have overlooked the fact—but it is a fact, nevertheless—that this State is sandwiched in between the two biggest reclamation undertakings in history. To the north the colossus of Grand Coulee, unparalleled in size and dimensions, rises on the Columbia River. To the south Shasta Dam takes shape in the shadow of the snowy peak from which it derives its name. On each side of Oregon's borders the great dams are under construction. Grand Coulee will be completed the end of this year. Shasta, started much later, will be finished in 1944.

CONGRESS MAKES APPROPRIATION FOR NEXT YEAR

The Senate and House of the American Congress have just voted $23,600,000 for the Central Valley project for the next fiscal year. More than seven times that much will have to be appropriated before the project is finally done.

To date $44,600,000 has been made available by Congress and Government agencies for the Central Valley project. Eventually the project will be self-liquidating, in the estimate of the Bureau of Reclamation. The sponsors believe that revenues from the sale of power and fees collected from water users will return the entire investment of $170,000,000.

After 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of the Shasta Dam hydroelectric power output have been put at work pumping surplus water from the Sacramento River into the San Joaquin River canal system, there still will be 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours left for commercial sale. This is enough power to serve a million farm houses. Revenues resulting from its disposal will go toward retiring the cost of building Shasta Dam.

Thousands of ranchers and farmers in the San Joaquin area—men whose crops now face the searing heat of the sun unprotected by water—will be glad to pay for water rights in the new canal system. Already 2,500 operators of farms have formed an irrigation

district which will contract with the Federal Government for water. An orchardist growing peaches in the shadow of the Tehachapi Range will pay Uncle Sam for water from the Mount Shasta ice fields 500 miles away. Contracts like this are depended upon to liquidate the investment in the project.

One of the principal phases of the work is relocating 37 miles of the Southern Pacific's main line between California and the Pacific Northwest. This is the biggest railroad job now under construction in the United States.

Shasta Dam will not only back up the Sacramento River into a big reservoir. It also will make lakes of two of the Sacramento's main tributaries, the Pit and the McCloud. These vast pools, extending fingerlike into the serried highlands below Mount Shasta, will flood a large part of the Southern Pacific's right-of-way. The Federal Government is spending in the neighborhood of $20,000,000 to relocate the line.

A feature of the relocation will be the highest railroad bridge in the world. It will span the Pit River and will be 500 feet high. This is almost as tall as the Washington Monument, but passengers on the trains which run between Portland and San Francisco will be unaware of this. When the reservoir is full, the deck of the bridge will be only 35 feet above the water. A penny dropped off the observation platform of the Cascade Limited would fall but a slight distance to the surface of the water, yet it would have a prolonged drop through 500 feet of water before settling on the bottom.

DOUBLE DECKER—MAMMOTH BRIDGE CARRIES BOTH TRAINS AND AUTOS

The mammoth bridge will be a double-decker. The lower level will be used by trains. The upper deck will carry four lanes of Highway 99. The two principal piers supporting the bridge will be 95 by 90 feet at the base. They will practically be skyscrapers in themselves. The Southern Pacific's new line also will include numercus other bridges and tunnels. It is one of the most prodigious railroad relocations ever undertaken. An 1,820-foot tunnel even has been drilled to get Southern Pacific trains past the site of the Shasta Dam while construction is in progress.

The Central Valley project will have an effect on the agricultural economy of the whole Pacific seaboard. Navigation benefits alone may have an important bearing on freight rates. Sacramento River shipping will be increased as much as Bonneville Dam has stimulated navigation on the Columbia. Traffic on the Sacramento has declined 50 percent in the last decade. Now Shasta Dam will bury sandbars and shoals beneath a layer of smooth water. Shipping will not be subject to all the hazards of alternating floods and drought. Steamboat whistles will mingle with—and challenge—the train bells at Red Bluff.

Construction on all the phases and parts of the Central Valley project is in progress at the present time. A deep excavation has been dug and workmen are ready to pour concrete at Shasta Dam. Laborers and engineers are laying the new Southern Pacific right-of-way across the uplands. The highways and roads are being relocated. The Contra Costa and other canals are well along. Throughout the sprawling Central Valley, which is one of the great agricultural regions of the world, work and effort are under way.

Perhaps in trade, commerce, and related benefits Oregon may reap considerable advantage from its geographic position, just north of the Central Valley and just south of Grand Coulee. The Columbia, when it reaches the Oregon boundary with Washington, is still foaming from its drop at Coulee; and from the Oregon boundary with California Mount Shasta is visible, a white monolith on the horizon, birthplace of water to rescue the distant orchards and fields along the San Joaquin.

The Perils of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House a short news story carried recently in the New York Times. Of course, I cannot vouch for its accuracy but assuming that it is accurate, and it appears to be, it brings a lesson of great importance to us all. Note well what the old philosopher has to say about what was expected of a representative and reflect upon what is expected here, and remember that France has met disastrous defeat.

(By G. H. Archambault)

BORDEAUX, FRANCE, June 22.—To escape the turmoil of overcrowded Bordeaux and to rest overwrought nerves for a brief time, this correspondent wandered out into the suburbs until he reached a famous vineyard some miles out of the city. The gates were open.

The correspondent wandered in, watching men spraying the vines against mildew and other pests. A lark sang blithely on high. All was peace in the dawning sun.

An old vigneron appeared and bade the visitor welcome. Rugged, tanned, bent by years of labor, he represented that France which is eternal. After the customary courtesies he unburdened himself:

"So you write for an American paper. Then tell the Americans this:

" 'My father fought the Germans in 1870. I fought them 20 years ago. My son is fighting them now; heaven knows where he is. Of these three wars we have won one and lost two. But we are not beaten. There are very hard times before us. May God in His mercy make us fit to bear them.'

IDEALS HELD LACKING

"It may surprise you, sir, to hear an old Frenchman invoking God, since we have been hitherto an avowedly Godless state. That, indeed, is one of the causes of our misfortune. We have lacked an ideal. I confess that in this matter I have been as guilty as most of my countrymen. We came to imagine that the proper duty of man was to arrange an easy way of life, individualistic to the point of selfishness.

"I am old enough—I shall be 73 next month—to speak plainly without being accused of afterthoughts. I tell you that we followed the wrong road. We were all democratic in spirit but in reality we were too much concerned with self. It was to a great extent the fault of our institutions, which tended to breed politicians instead of statesmen and which set party interests before those of the nation.

"This is not the time to apportion the blame; in truth we are all responsible. We saw no further than the parish pump and we were well satisfied when our representatives in Parliament brought home some of the gravy. We looked upon the state as a universal purveyor and we always spoke of our dues, seldom of our duties.

"I am myself of the left; here most of us vote Radical-Socialist. But labels are of no account now and to tell the truth all parties are equally responsible. All of us, in every party, looked upon our representatives as natural intermediaries between ourselves and the government for the distribution of manna from the state coffers. It reached the point where ministers of finance dare not reveal that they had a surplus; otherwise every party claimed its share.

DEFENSE FUNDS DIVERTED

"Periodically money was asked of us for national defense. We gave it unstintedly. Then we learned that it had been spent for other purposes and we were asked for more. We gave it again. The politicians explained that it had all been expended for 'social' reforms.' No doubt it was, but it did not help much when it was divided among millions. What are a few hundred francs a year to an old man incapable of work?

"For many years now it had become evident that our parliamentary form of government had failed. Every successive Cabinet had been compelled to ask for dictatorial powers in order to be able to administer the country. But we persisted in our errors. For one thing, we persisted in leveling the nation down and in imagining that the state would prove an everlasting milk cow.

"The awakening is rude. A terrific task faces our young generation—what is left of it. We old men must do all we can to help morally and materially. We are about to become slaves, but I am convinced that adversity will weld the Nation. We shall have to bow our heads, but no force on earth will be able to break our hearts.

"Tell all this to the Americans and warn them at the same time of the perils that may befall democracy everywhere when it forgets that free men have duties as well as rights."

National Rifle Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 one of my colleagues from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] addressed the House with reference to Nazi bund activities and made certain references to the National Rifle Association of America which placed that great organization in a very bad light in the eyes of the American people.

I do not know the source from which the gentleman from New York received his misinformation, but I do know that his statements were misleading and untrue in every particular. I regret that my absence from the floor at that time made it impossible for me to promptly reply and correct the injustice done to one of our oldest practically patriotic organizations.

I refer to the National Rifle Association of America as a practically patriotic organization because it wastes no time with uniformed marching teams and Memorial Day speeches but for 69 years has devoted its energies to the task of improving the small-arms marksmanship of the Regular Service, National Guard, and civilians who may be called to the colors in a national emergency. It has no honorary officers and has never used the subterfuge of inviting "big names" to serve on some honorary advisory board.

The National Rifle Association was organized as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the State of New York in 1871. Some of the outstanding figures in American military and political history have been proud to comply with its membership requirements, pay their dues, and serve as active officers and directors without pay. Its membership list carries the names of Ulysses S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Myron G. Herrick, Benedict Crowell, and many like them.

Its board of directors today includes such men as Rear Admiral Russell Waesche, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard; Superior Court Judge Hilliard Comstock, of California; United States Senator Ernest Lundeen; Brig. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, adjutant general of Minnesota; Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, commanding the Twenty-ninth National Guard Division; J. W. Woolrey, the national director of marksmanship for the American Legion; Seth Gordon, chairman of the board of game commissioners in the great State of Pennsylvania; Lt. Col. Payson D. Foster, assistant treasurer of the Detroit Edison Co. and inspector of small-arms practice for the Michigan National Guard; Gustavus D. Pope, of Detroit, a member of the International Executive Committee of the Red Cross; Fred C. Mills, national safety director of the Boy Scouts of America; and 50 other patriotic, sensible, successful businessmen, professional men, police officials, and members of the Military Establishment of the United States. I have been a member of the National Rifle Association since my early days as a member of the Alabama State National Guard rifle team at the national rifle matches and have served as a member of the association's board of directors for the past 5 years. To say that men of the type who are now directing and have in the past directed the affairs of the National Rifle Association would willfully permit it to be used as a tool of subversive agencies is too absurd to require refutation—to say that men of this caliber could be duped into being used as a tool of subversive agencies is both absurd and an insult to our intelligence.

I have been in a particularly good position to know whereof I speak in this respect. As a member and as acting chairman of the Dies committee investigating un-American activities, I can testify that the National Rifle Association has from the very beginning cooperated wholeheartedly with our committee in turning up leads and in furnishing factual information. As a director of the association I know that it has similarly cooperated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and with the military intelligence services. Staffed by trained, level-headed men, intimately familiar with police and military activities and methods, the association has consistently avoided the hysterical and the spectacular, it has therefore avoided publicity—but its contributions to the national welfare have for that very reason been practical and truly helpful.

Few Americans realize that through the efforts of this 69-year-old patriotic, nonsectarian, nonpolitical, nonprofit association we have in the United States and its outlying possessions a nucleus of trained small-arms marksmen equivalent to more than 10 of the new Army divisions. In more than 2,200 civilian rifle clubs in every State of the Union, in Hawaii, the Panama Canal Zone, and Alaska, there are able, upright, patriotic American citizens who have purchased arms and ammunition and trained themselves in small-arms marksmanship. These civilian clubs have at their own expense constructed target ranges, many of which offer the only convenient place for the practice of local National Guard companies. These civilian clubs and their ranges afford our best nuclei for the establishment of home-guard units when the National Guard is mobilized in the field.

We have all admired the marksmanship and courage of the Finns, we have marveled at the courage and the ability to enforce neutrality of the Swiss. Few Americans realize that in our own National Rifle Association we have the same kind of an organization as that which has functioned so successfully in Finland and in Switzerland to train citizens in small-arms marksmanship by providing the incentives of sportsmanship and competition.

It will amaze most of my colleagues to learn that the Army of the United States had no program of small-arms instruction until after the National Rifle Association was organized. The first small-arms instruction manual used by the Regular Army was written by the National Rifle Association.

We had no national program for the encouragement of small-arms marksmanship in the Regular Army or National Guard through the medium of competitions until the National Rifle Association, over the objections of some high ranking Army officials, called the situation to the attention of Congress and the national rifle and pistol matches were established by law in 1902.

Neither Congress nor the War Department had any plan for the encouragement of small-arms practice among our civilian population until the National Rifle Association called our attention to the deficiency and Congress provided the authority for the Secretary of War to establish a national board for the promotion of rifle practice and a director of civilian markmanship in the National Defense Act.

There are other patriotic organizations with a larger membership; there are other organizations which seek and receive more publicity; but I seriously doubt if there is any organization in America which has actually contributed as much to the national defense with as little in the way of public or official support as the National Rifle Association of America.

It is my sincere belief that the people of the United States and we as their representatives in Congress owe a vote of commendation and thanks to this composite group of civilians, reservists, guardsmen, and regulars who despite indifference and opposition have for 70 years, at their own expense, consistently, constantly, and courageously forwarded the cause of small-arms marksmanship in America.

The President's Speech at the University of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

EDITORIAL AND COMMENT FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, by leave just granted, I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a metropolitan newspaper of wide circulation and distinction.

Katherine Dorst, a brilliant commentator for that newspaper, has written a succinct and cogent analysis of it, which, together with the editorial, I believe worthy of a place in the permanent record of these times, when national amity is, and is destined to be, one of the great contributory factors in the preservation of our democracy.

The editorial and comment follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 17, 1940]

HERE AND THERE

(By Katharine Darst)

The Globe-Democrat editorial page, which has attacked the New Deal policies of President Roosevelt fearlessly, is in the vanguard of those who with equal courage have upheld his speech at the University of Virginia.

Why? Because he spoke the truth as most Americans feel it.

By this time we have heard from the carpers. This group is composed of a number of elements which offer an interesting subject for study.

They are those opportunists who are ever ready to jump on any band wagon that looks like a winner.

They are those cautious souls whose fear of the truth is based on the fact that it might possibly react unfavorably on them and theirs. They have forgotten that it will react just as quickly in this case when favor has been curried.

They are those of foreign birth who have been quicker to take advantage of the opportunities this country offers than to adopt its responsibilities for a way of life.

They are those snobs who invariably side with the minority, feeling that the majority opinion is bound to represent a low-brow view.

They are some who are using the President's forthrightness as a political springboard.

In such company, oddly enough, and leading the pack, we find a group who have pointed out that "the truth is always in order."

Obviously, the truth is not always in order. In this particular instance we believe the truth as Roosevelt spoke it to have been in order, but that can be argued. No one person, no one editorial page, which has contended in the recent past that the truth is always in order has the right now to deny to the President the prerogatives it has claimed for itself. For the President to have said what the majority thinks brings us no nearer to war than a democracy is near to war at any time when brigands are abroad. He cannot declare war any more than he could prevent an attack on this country.

All he can do is to call "Fire, fire" as he sees the conflagration spreading. He has done so. He has spread the alarm. He has given us the warning that Leopold failed to give Belgium, that Chamberlain, and Stanley Baldwin before him, failed to give England, and Blum failed to give France. They are discredited because they conciliated the vandals.

Let Roosevelt win in the next election or let him lose, but let that be on his 8-year record in office. If we listen to those who boo the speech at Charlottesville, we are less intelligent than the people of France and Britain who let Hitler arm without arming themselves. We have had our warning; what are we going to do, snipe at the man who issued it?

FULL SPEED AHEAD

President Roosevelt, in his address at Charlottesville, eloquently expressed the feelings of the people of the United States as to Italy's entry into the war, as to the policies and purposes of the Nazi-Fascist aggressive warfare against democratic nations, and as to our own profound concern in the possible consequences of that warfare to the peace of our own country. "Overwhelmingly we, as a nation, and this applies to all the other American nations," he said, "are convinced that military and naval victory for the gods of force and hate would endanger the institutions of democracy in the Western World—and that equally, therefore, the whole of our sympathies lies with those nations which are giving their lifeblood in combat against those forces."

With that statement there can hardly be any disagreement in this country, as it applies to this Nation. We wish we could feel as certain as to some of the other American nations. There is no question about where our sympathies lie. Nor is there any great difference of opinion among us as to the necessity of giving the Allies all the material aid we can, short of war, not only for their sakes and the cause for which they are fighting, which in its fundamentals is our cause, but for our own sake. "We will extend to the opponents of force," said the President, "the material resources of this Nation, and at the same time we will harness and speed up the uses of those resources in order that we ourselves in the Americas may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense."

That is a message of reassurance and encouragement to the Allies, battling so desperately for their existence. All the material resources of this country are at their service, and rightly so. This paper has again and again insisted that we should do everything in our power, and as speedily as possible, to supply them with the instruments and the materials of warfare they so greatly need. And as a matter of fact they are being supplied with these requisites as rapidly as they can be furnished. But in thus stating it unequivocally and emphatically as a fixed policy of the American Government and people, the President undoubtedly assured the Allies of the moral and spiritual support of the American Nation in this dark hour, which, taken together with the promises of material aid, should be infinitely cheering to them. The response from them was immediate. Clement Atlee, speaking in place of Premier Churchill, told the British House of Commons that Roosevelt "had vitally inspired the free peoples of Europe. His assurance that the material resources of his great Nation would be placed at the disposal of the Allies makes it inevitable that, however hard the road, the cause of civilization will in the end prevail."

The need of extensive preparedness for our own defenses cannot be too strongly emphasized, and it is important, as the President says, that it be speeded up. "Signs and signals call for speed—full speed ahead," he said. Obviously it should be speeded up as rapidly as is consistent with systematic and effective construction. We can make the greatest speed if we have first decided what it is that we require and how it is to be provided. Our trouble with preparedness in the past arose from differences of opinion among the authorities and changes of opinion as to details, that caused endless delays. The Government should have its blue prints and specifications ready and then put the machinery of industry into operation on such definite foundations.

The President's condemnation of Mussolini is, of course, in accord with American opinion, but coming from him as the head of the American Government it has far greater force than any expressions of individual sentiment. But it includes a disclosure of the efforts of the President to prevail upon Mussolini to prevent the spread of the war by himself remaining out of it, that accentuates the likeness of the Italian dictator to the German model, or whom he has become the imitator, and therefore the justice of the general obloquy heaped upon him by civilized people.

American Democracy on the Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, these are times that try men's souls. Today the most momentous problem that confronts the human race on this planet, especially the Western Hemisphere, is, What price freedom? Never before in our history has there been such imperative necessity for unity, courage, most earnest consideration, and absolute loyalty to our form of Government. These are crucial times for America.

Never before has the executive department and the Congress of the United States had such grave responsibilities to wisely and patriotically handle so many thousands of intricate matters so tragically vital to the American people. Every hour of every day brings increasing horror and destruction to life and property in countries less fortunate than ours. In these conditions of the world it is difficult to gain general attention to things happening in our own country. The majority of our people know very little about the conduct of peaceful, constructive activities in the United States which, by comparison, seem commonplace to the average reader of today's headlines.

One of such activities which looms more and more important to our national economy is the conservation of the public domain in the vast grazing territory of the West. Every resource that we have is an element in a sound program of national defense. In the event of greater and urgent demand for meat, leather, wool, and mohair, the people of this country will look to the range livestock industry and the public-domain grazing resources for a large part of these essentials. I am happy to report that both the industry and the range are now in better position than ever before to meet any emergency.

Six years ago, on June 28, 1934, the President approved an act "to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes."

This act is commonly known as the Taylor Grazing Act, an appellation which gives me humble pride and does me signal honor. After having worked for many years to secure legislation to protect the public range and lend stability to the range livestock industry, eventually in 1934 I had the satisfaction of piloting this great conservation measure to its final enactment. It seemed like an interminable effort during those years to arouse the then complacent Congresses to their own responsibility, to make them realize the need for a change in the century-old public-land policy of the United States. I want to again gratefully acknowledge that had it not been for the support, inspiration, counsel, and encouragement given me by my western colleagues, some of whom I am sad to say are not now with us, the whole conservation program would have been lost or long deferred. Also, had it not been for the indefatigable support of the able, dynamic Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, the future of the range would at least have been doubtful. As it stands today, results already obtained have more than justified the predictions made by friends and sponsors of this act. It brings to mind the wisdom of the founders of American independence, who, in spite of the apparently unlimited resources surrounding

them, foresaw the danger of indiscriminate, unplanned, improper land use. Patrick Henry, for example, displayed such foresight when, in 1777, he said:

Since the achievement of our independence he is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies.

Nearly 100 years later, in 1872, Senator John J. Ingalls, who wrote that immortal essay on grass, said:

Grass is the forgiveness of Nature—her constant benediction. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. Its tenacious fibers hold the earth in place and prevent its soluble components from washing into the wasting sea.

Well do I remember the statement Secretary Ickes made to the Public Lands Committee in 1934, a few months before the Taylor Grazing Act became law. His vision has proven to be so clear that it seems fitting to repeat in substance those historic words:

I have seen pictures recently of the condition on the range in Arizona, New Mexico, and other Western States, where, a generation or two ago, there was ample grass, and they are now bare lands and gullies. The land is being destroyed. It is being destroyed beyond hope of redemption. All the Government wants to do is to control the range in the interest of the people whose livelihood depends on the restoration of that range where there is forage now, and we want to protect that forage. If it is now insufficient we want to build it up. In certain areas where there is no forage we want to plant grass. We are trying to do something for the stockmen and not do anything that will take the bread out of their mouths.

The western stockmen who had for years clamored for Federal attention to the dwindling range resources of the public domain at last had something real upon which to base opinion on a great public question. Reassured by the words of Secretary Ickes, they rallied support in characteristic fashion. So today, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that we have in operation a range conservation program in the Western States featuring perhaps the greatest cooperative effort between the Federal Government and the people that has ever been undertaken in our public-land history.

Few laws in recent years affect so many people in so many ways as does this grazing act. For the first time in its history Congress has specified a plan for range control on the public lands to benefit both the forage and the livestock industry.

My father was a cattleman on the plains of northwestern Kansas when I was a small boy, and I watched great cattle herds trailing between the Rio Grande and the Milk River. I saws the herds of many thousands of buffalo vanish in 1872 to 1875, mostly through man's greed for hides and grass. When the cattle boom collapsed, dragging fortunes into the dust, my father lost everything he had. I cringed with the thought of wasted resources and blasted hopes. I left the plains and went off to work my way in school, and in 1881 went to my beloved State of Colorado. From that day to this I have constantly tried to do something helpful for the benefit of the stockman and the forage so necessary for a successful economy. There is no possibility of estimating the money value or the human benefits this Grazing Act has been and will be in the years to come to the people of those 10 Western States.

On each anniversary of the approval of this Grazing Act, June 28, 1934, I have submitted to Congress, to the stockmen, and to the country a résumé of the activities and progress of the law, and I hope the stockmen have, as I have, each year been more gratified with its success. I trust that date will always be an important anniversary in the development of the 10 Western States.

I may suggest that it is an important date in the history of the world. On June 28, 1914, the first great World War started and on June 28, 1919, the Treaty of Versailles was signed.

It is a very great gratification to me to have piloted through Congress in my name several other great conservation measures, especially the 640-acre stock-raising homestead law, under which more than 31,000,000 acres of almost barren public land has gone to patent and into private ownership and beneficial use.

The orderly use and conservation of the public domain by stockmen is a lifelong subject with me. I was a member of the Colorado State Senate 12 years before coming to Congress nearly 32 years ago—44 years of consecutive legislative service, that has never been duplicated in the history of our Government—and I gratefully acknowledge that the people of Colorado have most generously enabled me to attain several other national legislative blue ribbons.

In 1899 I was the author of the present drastic law regulating the use of the public range in Colorado, prohibiting Jersey, Texan, Mexican, Cherokee, or any other kinds of scrubby bulls from being turned out on the open range, authorizing the elimination of their activities, and compelling all cattlemen to put a bull of at least half standard breed on the range for every 25 cows, and providing severe penalties for any violation of those restrictions. I established a different ratio, but with similar restriction, on stallions and rams.

That law effectively cleared the range of all kinds of scrubby stock and for 40 years the stockmen of Colorado have had the benefit of that Taylor Grazing Act. It made a very prompt and marvelous improvement in the stock of our State. There is no State in the Union that now has more thoroughbred or finer cattle than our Herefords. Today there are over a million sheep and 250,000 head of white-face cattle and 6,000 horses on the public domain in our centennial State, three-fourths of them in my congressional district.

I fought for the conservation of the public domain under Federal leadership because the citizens were unable to cope with the situation under existing trends and circumstances. The job was too big and interwoven for even States to handle with satisfactory coordination. On the western slope of Colorado and in nearby States I saw waste, competition, overuse, and abuse of valuable range lands and watersheds eating into the very heart of western economy. Farms and ranches everywhere in the range country were suffering. The basic economy of entire communities was threatened. There was terrific strife and bloodshed between the cattle and sheep men over the use of the range. Valuable irrigation projects stood in danger of ultimate deterioration. Erosion, yes even human erosion, had taken root. The livestock industry, through circumstances beyond its control, was headed for self-strangulation. Moreover, the States and the counties were suffering by reduced property values and decreasing revenues.

Because of its general character the remaining public domain could not be managed successfully under private ownership. Yet in the general scheme of things the whole economy of the arid region is dependent both directly and indirectly on continued beneficial use of the public lands. Unmanaged and unprotected, the forage was decreasing at an alarming rate. Other lands were suffering likewise. To save these lands a national land policy was necessary. This the Grazing Act furnished. It has been frequently called the magna carta of western conservation. The Grazing Service was established in the Department of the Interior to guide the program and cooperate with the livestock industry and with local, State, and Federal agencies in a continued effort toward profitable and orderly use of all the resources involved.

Because of my love for the outdoors and a lifetime of intimate association with the range, its problems, and its people, I often inquire into the affairs of the Grazing Service and how they are handling this great conservation problem.

The Grazing Service is a young organization. Its history is, therefore, immediate. Its future lies ahead, and judging from performance, the Nation and the livestock industry need have no fear of the course that will be followed. The key to its whole program is based on simple laws of Nature founded on mutual cooperative effort. When you dig under the surface of this condition as I have for years you come up with renewed confidence in the American way of life. This law exemplifies American democracy on the range. We of the West are proud that the principle "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," has not perished from the earth on the public domain.

Director Richard H. Rutledge, with 35 years of public service behind him, aptly phrased Grazing Service policy in these words:

Perhaps we need to have scientists, statesmen, and scholars call our attention to the necessity for care of soils, waters, and vegetation. In the final analysis, however, the problem must be reduced to the practical. It is the stockman on the range and the farmer who must see the need for care of resources, rationalize theories, do the work, and make a living at the same time if results are to be accomplished. There is no group of people more ready or more able to do this than the livestock men of the western ranges. The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.

In other words, the tremendous achievements of the Grazing Service in 6 short years are due primarily to a policy of "home rule on the range."

Home rule on the range is a reality in the grazing districts. At the outset Secretary Ickes proposed that advisory committees of stockmen be elected in all grazing districts to be formed who should have original responsibility to recommend the issuance of grazing licenses and rules of fair range practice in each district. This was a voluntary executive act on the part of the Secretary of the Interior who realized the need for intelligent cooperation between the Government and the users of the range. This true spirit of cooperation and understanding proved successful both from the standpoint of the administration and that of the stockmen. Accordingly, under the sponsorship of the range users, "home rule on the range" was written into the law itself. Through the concerted efforts of western Members a year ago, Congress made the advisory board system a permanent feature of the Taylor Grazing Act by the addition of the following language:

SEC. 18. (a) In order that the Secretary of the Interior may have the benefit of the fullest information and advice concerning physical, economic, and other local conditions in the several grazing districts, there shall be an advisory board of local stockmen in each such district, the members of which shall be known as grazing-district advisers. Each such board shall consist of not less than 5 nor more than 12 members, exclusive of wildlife representatives, one such representative to be appointed by the Secretary, in his discretion, to membership on each such board. Except for such wildlife representatives, the names of the members of each district advisory board shall be recommended to the Secretary by the users of the range in that district through an election conducted under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary. No grazing-district adviser so recommended, however, shall assume office until he has been appointed by the Secretary and has taken an oath of office. The Secretary may, after due notice, remove any grazing-district adviser from office if in his opinion such removal would be for the good of the service.

(b) Each district advisory board shall meet at least once annually at a time to be fixed by the Director of Grazing, or by such other officer to whom the Secretary may delegate the function of issuing grazing permits, and at such other times as its members may be called by such officer. Each board shall offer advice and make a recommendation on each application for such a grazing permit within its district: *Provided,* That in no case shall any grazing-district adviser participate in any advice or recommendation concerning a permit, or an application therefor, in which he is directly or indirectly interested. Each board shall further offer advice or make recommendations concerning rules and regulations for the administration of this act, the establishment of grazing districts, and the modification of the boundaries thereof, the seasons of use and carrying capacity of the range, and any other matters affecting the administration of this act within the district. Except in a case where in the judgment of the Secretary an emergency shall exist, the Secretary shall request the advice of the advisory board in advance of the promulation of any rules and regulations affecting the district. (Approved July 14, 1939.)

This act, in my opinion, has welded for all time the mutual efforts of the Government and the range users. A great majority of the users are people whose fathers were among the pioneers who settled upon the land of the West and developed it against tremendous odds.

As the frontier pushed west much of the original public domain passed into private ownership under the homestead laws. Grants to States and railroad companies, withdrawals, and reservations accounted for additional large areas. Thus after about 100 years of western expansion there remained about 165,000,000 acres of vacant public land. This is roughly 10 percent of continental United States and compares in area with that of Texas. This area, chiefly valuable for grazing, is mainly in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming. The Taylor Grazing Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish grazing districts out of this public land aggregating 142,000,000 acres.

The trapper and the prospector hold significant places in American history. They established the outposts of civilization in the new country. The cowboy and the farmer who succeeded them remain to develop a successful economy around the range livestock business. From the very beginning of settlement in the West stock ranches were selected and developed with a view to the public range resources that surrounded them. This was not only a custom but it was a necessity for a successful economy in the region.

Grazing districts are organized to protect and improve the natural resources of the public domain and promote the proper use of privately owned lands and water dependent on the public range. Thus the relationship of range and ranch is fostered for the benefit not only of local citizens but of the Nation generally.

The 53 grazing districts may be likened to 53 great ranches the size of Connecticut, in which the problems of land husbandry, livestock management, and range protection are approached on a broad cooperative basis.

In the organization of these districts there was at once the problem of protecting the forage, building up the range, and providing for the livestock industry dependent upon the range. One of the first effects of this range control was the elimination from the range of the so-called nomad; the tramp and migratory sheepmen who had no real-estate investment, no burdening property taxes. This type of operator roamed the range at will, creamed the forage that rightfully belonged to the established rancher, and moved on to repeat the practice elsewhere. With the cooperation of the advisory boards these range "chiselers" were eliminated from the range without serious disturbance to the livestock industry generally. Although there has necessarily been some reduction of range use, there has been at the same time improved and stabilized use of private properties, resulting in a general improvement of land and stock values.

The demand for use of the range is much greater than can be satisfied under present range conditions. This present-day demand reflects, in large measure, the needs of the dependent population for well-rounded, stabilized range and ranch operations to meet local economic needs. It is apparent therefore that the stockmen themselves and the Grazing Service are faced with the mutual responsibility of promoting the economic welfare of the range region while rehabilitating the resources to meet the actual demand. This is a dual task in conservation. It calls for a program that includes discontinuance of all improper range practices and the construction of necessary range improvements, backed by real cooperation of the range users. The results of the past 6 years indicate that this is a successful approach to the desired goal. In dealing with the range and all its varied conditions the Grazing Service is in constant touch with the people whose very existence depends on the products of the range. The program begins with the questions how, when, by whom, and to what extent shall the range be used; and continues with the planning and placement of improvements on the range. This program is developed around full utilization of the stockman's wealth of experience.

The apportionment of range privileges has reached the term-permit stage in three districts where temporary 1-year licenses have now ripened into 10-year permits. This represents a great deal of work gathering and shifting facts, in which the advisory boards contributed generously of their time and experience. Recently the Director of Grazing authorized the issuance of term permits in all grazing districts or any part thereof as soon as the necessary information is available and a substantial agreement has been reached between the range users, the advisory boards, and the administrative officials. This is an important step in stabilization of the livestock industry.

A summary of licenses and permits operating in grazing districts during 1939 is shown by the following tabulation:

Summary of grazing licenses issued by the Grazing Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, for the year 1939

State	Number of districts	Number of licenses and permits	Cattle	Horses	Sheep	Goats	Total livestock
Arizona	4	603	54,863	2,259	119,107	39,342	215,571
California	2	719	69,267	3,287	366,040	627	439,221
Colorado	5	1,878	162,239	5,540	951,969	116	1,119,864
Idaho	4	3,942	163,056	14,314	1,661,276	82	1,838,728
Montana	6	1,322	99,982	17,827	750,758	58	868,625
Nevada	5	1,978	269,543	13,954	1,081,113	1,846	1,366,456
New Mexico	6	1,881	250,462	12,295	529,022	64,240	856,019
Oregon	7	1,565	155,918	11,953	536,852		704,723
Utah	9	5,178	192,335	10,442	2,618,918	28,720	2,850,415
Wyoming	5	1,543	155,357	14,497	1,501,267	221	1,671,342
Total	53	20,609	1,573,022	106,368	10,116,322	135,252	11,930,964

There was a time when feelings between sheepmen and cattlemen were very bitter. Old animosities are now forgotten. Representatives of both industries are now working harmoniously for better livestock conditions and better range.

At a recent advisory board election in Colorado a cowman friend of mine was defeated for reelection. He received a letter from a sheepman with whom he had served on the board for 3 years. That letter is significant of the change that has come over the stockmen in 6 years. It reads as follows:

> It is with regret that I learn that you are not returned to the new Taylor board. The reason must be better known to those who did the voting. I regarded you as the fairest cowman we had on the board. Could this be the reason for your defeat? If so, the minds of the voters are not running in the right direction. When those in power work for the welfare of all, and disregard the classes of stock to be grazed, the Taylor Act cannot help but succeed.
>
> I am glad of the acquaintance we formed while on the board together and wish you every success.

The stockmen of the West are pulling together. To me there is no stronger testimony than this expression of mutual cooperative effort.

Fundamental in the grazing-district program is a policy that will fit the complex land-ownership pattern into workable, manageable units. The 53 grazing districts cover a gross area of about 258,000,000 acres of which 141,000,000 acres, about 55 percent, is public domain. The remainder belongs to States, counties, corporations, and individuals, and much of it is of the same general character as the public domain. Through exchange, agreement, exchange of use, and lease, the control and management of large non-Federal areas is being consolidated under systematic land-planning principles of the grazing service. Unified land control enables the stockman and the grazing service to plan on a long-term basis. In addition States, counties, and individuals who own such lands receive an assured income for the use thereof. Rentals and fees are paid by the stockmen who use the land under terms specified in the agreement. This is one of the many ways in which the Taylor Grazing Act has given impetus to an over-all program of proper land use in the Western States.

Roughly $1,000,000 in grazing fees is collected from the stockmen annually. One-fourth of this amount goes back to the grazing districts to be used for purchase, construction, and maintenance of needed range improvements. Fifty percent of fees paid is returned to the States for expenditure under the direction of the respective State legislatures. Most of the States have passed laws directing that the money be spent under the supervision of advisory boards for range improvements, rodent control, reseeding, predatory animal control, and other essential activities for the betterment of range and livestock conditions in the districts. Under this plan the various localities receive fair and equitable distribution of the range improvement funds.

The 90 C. C. C. camps assigned to the Grazing Service have performed a tremendous job in conservation. Their activities range from fighting grasshoppers to fighting range fires. All in all the combined forces of husbandry and conservation have resulted in accomplishments that stagger the imagination. The enrollees of the C. C. C. camps have handled their jobs in a manner that will be an everlasting credit to this Nation. Some of these boys who came to the camps discouraged and bewildered now hold responsible positions in both private and public employment. The types of work that these boys perform on the range are too numerous to mention. Among the accomplishments in the range improvement program of the Grazing Service the following are outstanding:

Bridges		235
Fences	miles	3,104
Reservoirs		238
Springs developed		539
Wells drilled		173
Cattle guards		350
Corrals		259
Truck trails	miles	6,530
Stock trails	do	2,123
Check dams and other flood-control structures		53,740
Diversion dams		722
Poisonous-plant eradication	acres	354,824
Insect-pest control	do	112,142
Rodent control	do	9,329,633

Selected enrollees make maps, operate automotive equipment, work in repair shops, examine range, operate radio transmitters, and do many other special jobs that equip them for skilled and professional work.

Hardly a day goes by that I do not receive word from stockmen expressing how the Taylor Grazing Act in one way or another has helped to put the range and the livestock industry on a firm and lasting basis.

Prosperity in the livestock business means prosperity in the community and the Nation generally. The stockman is engaged in the production of food and clothing so necessary to an abundant life. Range conservation means that the worker in the industrial center can rely on continued production of these essential commodities and that they will be available to him at a price he can afford to pay.

In conclusion, I want to sincerely thank the thousand or more boys in the 90 C. C. C. camps in the Grazing Service for the fine, emblematic and realistic tribute they recently paid me by the presentation of a heavily gold-plated gavel. It is the regular sized Stanley Hammer which they use every day in the construction of drift fences, and many other kinds of work on the public domain.

I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for 20 years. Since becoming chairman nearly 4 years ago, I have received nearly a hundred gavels, and on behalf of the committee and myself, I want to express to all those hundreds of donors our grateful appreciation for these rare and artistic tokens of good will. No two of them are alike. The have come from nearly everywhere under the American flag. They all have a real meaning. They are all emblematic of something worth being commemorated. Some have taken several months to assemble the material and required the highest skill and care to construct, and I am proud to add the C. C. C. boys' contribution to this marvelously diversified, artistic, and unique collection.

Eight-Hour Day for Marine Cooks and Stewards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM MARINE BRANCH OF THE COOKS AND STEWARDS ASSOCIATION OF PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram which I have received from the

Portland branch of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Association. The telegram follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 26, 1940.*

HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association wishes to acquaint you with the following facts in relation to our present negotiations. The employers are utilizing the present war hysteria in an endeavor to break down the conditions we have enjoyed in the past by refusing to complete negotiations in good faith on our proposed agreement. We have been negotiating for the past 9 months, and during that time were able to come to a mutual agreement on many points in dispute. At the present time the union finds itself in a position where there is one basic issue. That is our demand for the 8-hour working day which was adopted by the United States Congress in 1892. We have been unable to arrive at an agreement on this point. This agreement terminates on June 30. If the present attitude of the shipowners continues, a disruption of maritime commerce on the Pacific coast will inevitably result. The marine cooks and stewards want to prevent this happening and sincerely believe this situation can be avoided, provided the employers immediately cease using the war hysteria subterfuge to evade bona fide negotiations. We are therefore calling upon you to use your good offices to see that a satisfactory agreement is amicably contracted at an early date. Please insert this wire in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EDDIE LANE,
Agent, Portland Branch, Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY DR. RUTH MILLER STEESE

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on citizenship delivered over radio station WKOK, Sunbury, Pa., June 24, 1940, by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, State legislative chairman, American Legion Auxiliary of Pennsylvania:

CITIZENSHIP

(By Dr. Ruth Miller Steese)

"That old statehouse bell is silent,
Hushed is now its clamorous tongue.
But the spirit it awakened
Still is living—ever young.
And when'ere we greet the sunlight
On the Fourth of each July
We will ne'er forget the bellman
Who, betwixt the earth and sky,
Rang out our independence,
Which, please God, shall never die."

We are about to celebrate a national holiday, Independence Day, which marks the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, by the Members of the Continental Congress, then assembled in the State House in Philadelphia. It was on this day, in the year 1776, that a great experiment in self-government was begun. This was the day which marked the birth of a Nation dedicated to the personal and religious liberty of mankind.

The Declaration of Independence is one of the most profound, one of the most serious, and one of the most inspiring professions of political faith that ever emanated from the minds of men. Based upon the recognition of a Divine Creator and an all-seeing Providence, the name of the Heavenly Father greets us in the opening and is prayerfully invoked at the close of this document, thus assuming the role of the cornerstone and also the keystone of this great temple of freedom, the sanctuary for the rights of mankind.

In the 164 years since the first Independence Day, we have been prone to take for granted that the liberties then obtained, are forever secure. But as we look out upon the world of 1940, we realize that man, with all his civilization, with all his culture, and with all his freedom, has gradually been surrendering these blessings, and that his life has become one of regulation and regimentation. In the great effort to earn a living and to educate the youth, the men of today have allowed their liberties to be taken away from them.

As we face the Fourth of July this year, it is important that we should familiarize ourselves with the events which brought about the establishment of our democracy and the recognition of human and individual rights. We are living in a great age, in an era of great achievements and progress, as well as in a time of great and terrible destruction of nations and civilizations. To be an American citizen today is a blessing which almost all peoples throughout the world would be glad to enjoy. But this blessing of American citizenship imposes upon us a responsibility to take thought of our national existence—to try to find some way by which we can guarantee to ourselves and to posterity a finer civilization, a greater opportunity and the assurance of the retention of that priceless heritage—a truly democratic government.

As American citizens, most of us are guilty of one of two great crimes against our Republic—either that of indifference or that of ignorance. We received the opportunities and the blessings of this great Government of ours through no direct efforts of our own, we accept them without any thought and we hope and trust that we can transmit them in the same way. Eternal vigilance has always been the price of liberty. We must awaken from our sleep, put away our apathy and assume our individual tasks as individual citizens of the greatest nation on earth.

Daniel Webster once said, "God grants liberty only to those who live it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." The democracy which guarantees to us our liberty will not fail in this country, unless you and I first fail that democracy. Whether our country is to go forward to the attainment of greater ideals depends upon the preservation of our free form of government. We cannot dream and achieve visions, if our minds are bounded by autocratic rules, our hands shackled by the dictates of force, and our voices hushed by the loss of personal liberty.

Every good citizen is thinking of his country today. He is giving of his best to make democracy live. He realizes that he has a sacred and solemn duty laid upon him—a duty commensurate with his ability, his resources, and his intellect. Just as the men at Valley Forge offered their life's blood to establish this great Nation, we today must give—not our lives—but our time and our ability and fulfill every obligation which our citizenship imposes upon us. As we pledge to our Nation our best efforts, let us strike hands with and salute the Continental Congress which on July 4, 1776, gave us the Declaration of Independence and with them, let us exclaim, "With a grim reliance in the protection of Divine Providence we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

T. V. A.—Experiment in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM R. CLARK, O. P.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by William R. Clark, O. P., on the subject, T. V. A.—Experiment in Democracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Holy Name Journal of May 1940]

T. V. A.—EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRACY—AN EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT PROJECT IN WHICH NATURE HAS BEEN FORCED TO REVEAL HER LATENT POWERS AND THE NATIVES HAVE BEEN GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY OF ENJOYING BENEFITS HITHERTO DENIED THEM

(By William R. Clark, O. P.)

The Tennessee Valley Authority (T. V. A.) has been a bone of contention with the political leaders of this country since the first appropriation for its realization was approved in 1933. Even before the Government took a hand in the completion of the project at Muscle Shoals the question of public ownership of utilities was debated in the halls of the learned. With the New Deal came an experiment in public ownership that has made countless enemies among those privately interested in ownership of power and an even greater number of friends who wanted power at a reasonable rate. This discussion has almost obliterated from the horizon the manifold activities of the T. V. A. In the public eye there is only that of the "Government in business." Who ever hears of flood control, navigation, soil control, experimental farms, reforestation, fish hatcheries, recreational projects, planned communities, adult education, low-cost housing, etc., etc.? Yet all these subjects are of great interest to the T. V. A. "experimenters."

The economic side of life often runs over into the social side, but it is quite possible to study a social question without becoming involved in its economic entanglements. We are wont to measure too many things in dollars and cents the while we ignore the wider and more fundamental aspects of life. Thus the arguments pro and con the T. V. A. have for the most part centered about the economics of such an experiment. The directors, however, while not being so

impractical as to overlook the money angle have insisted that the social and humanitarian aspects of the experiment are of greater importance.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN

"Homo homini lupis," said the philosopher of old. Man is a wolf to man, and not alone in the Little Red Riding Hood story. While this country was founded upon a principle of human equality and democratic rule, that principle seems to have become stalemated in life as a whole and relegated to political speeches. The rule remains democratic, but the agencies that enforce the rule have been growing into an absurd and unjust abuse of that principle of freedom. "Let there be freedom of enterprise, and this country will become wealthy." The Constitution assured business of freedom of enterprise, and as a country we have become the wealthiest in the world. But this wealth-getting has been so closely connected with the enslavement of the less privileged and with wastage of raw materials that the old axiom about the wolf seems most applicable here in this land of plenty.

Our land resources have been squandered, not in foolish farming but in a criminal lack of foresight. Our lumber resources have gone in the same way. Ghost towns dot the land as gruesome reminders of a "get-rich-quick" policy that cost much in human suffering. Floods ravage fertile valleys, because there isn't enough flora in the hills to hold the moisture. The water rushes down the slopes taking with it tons and tons of soil to silt up the streams and prevent navigation. These are but some of the thoughts in back of the gigantic enterprises called the T. V. A. experiment.

It would not be sufficient merely to harness the water power of the Tennessee River and its tributaries for the sake of generating inexpensive electric power. The dams must be storage dams, to control flow of water in times of drought as well as in times of abundant rainfall. The dams must be navigation auxiliaries to control shipping along this internal waterway. And, incidentally, the dams have created recreation facilities undreamed of by a people who had seen speedboats and camping equipment merely in the mail-order catalogs. The educational work of the T. V. A. has been principally along the lines of helping people help themselves. They have been taught the value of cooperation, genuine democratic activity, and community cooperatives have sprung up all along the Tennessee River, from Knoxville, Tenn., to Gilbertsville, Ky. T. V. A. power is sold only to retailers, and one of these eligible consumers is a cooperative. The T. V. A. is in the wholesale business, not retail.

A TRUE FEDERAL PROJECT

The Government of these United States is Federal, a general government for the association of independent and sovereign members called States. Each State has its own government. But where a project takes in a region that includes several States, only the Federal Government has the power to control the project. With that in mind, the region around the Tennessee River, which includes six States, was designated as the location of one of the greatest experiments yet undertaken by the Government. The Corporation was created with authority to initiate and pursue business enterprises more or less independent of congressional consent. Even in this the T. V. A. was unique. This was the first Federal Corporation endowed with autonomous power to perform its duties.

Perhaps everyone who reads the daily papers knows that the T. V. A. power system stretches from Knoxville to Paducah, each dam with its generators plugged in to the trunk lines, each generator helping its neighbor supply the demand for electric power. And perhaps everyone who has heard of Norris Dam knows that it is at the head of the Clinch River, which empties into the Tennessee about 20 miles below Knoxville. Norris Dam is a pile of steel and concrete 265 feet high anchored into the very hills from which the stone was quarried to build the dam. In back of the dam is Norris Lake, formed from the backwater, 72 miles on the Clinch River and 56 miles on the Powell. This brought boating and bathing to the valley on a large scale. Then in a pine forest nearby is Norris Park, a colony of about 100 log cabins made from trees in the vicinity by the C. C. C. and lighted by T. V. A. power for the use of vacationers. Each cabin is furnished with two double beds, linen, kitchen with Hot Point stove, and screened porch. The rent is $15 a week. Late last summer there was still a waiting list of those anxious to rent the cabins. Near Norris Dam is the town of Norris, built for the construction men and their families. The town is complete with 331 family housing units, post office, town center trade shop, school, and shopping center. The school auditorium serves as gymnasium, movie theater, and church. It presents a scene of rural beauty, yet is modern and equipped with conveniences as up to date as science can invent.

COMPLETELY TRANSFORMED SECTION

Knoxville is the headquarters of the T. V. A. More than 11,000 are employed in the various activities of the Authority in that city. One native citizen said that the T. V. A. had transformed Knoxville from a country town to a metropolis. From Knoxville one goes across the Great Smokies to another project on the Hiwassee River. In building this dam it was discovered that dustproof stone crushers were not only more healthy for the workers but more economical, a revelation in that industry.

On down the river are Chickamauga Dam, near Chattanooga, Guntersville Dam, Wheeler and Wilson Dams, the latter having been taken over by the T. V. A. to make agricultural phosphate in peace time rather than war-time nitrate for which it was originally intended. Around each of these T. V. A. centers are to be found the rural cooperatives which purchase the power and retail it to the member customers. Most famous of the cooperatives is the Alcorn Electric Association, with headquarters at Corinth, Miss. This association has paid off its original loan and has reduced the electric rates to the lowest ever known in this or any other country, and is paying dividends to its members. It brought rural electrification to sharecroppers and farm owners alike, and makes possible such things as the community refrigerator—a cooperative project enabling farmers to have fresh meats all summer long, rather than "just salt pork till frost comes."

At the Hiwassee project, homes were built for the workers and their families at a cost of about $1,000 per four-room unit. They had all facilities, such as running water and electricity. But when the construction was about completed and the workers began to move down the river to the Gilbertsville project, there was no further use for the homes at Hiwasse. So, rather than raze the houses and build new ones at the new site, the houses were jacked up, rolled onto a barge, and floated down to the new location. Here they are arranged in accordance with the directions of city planners, making another model T. V. A. community.

COSTS COMPARED WITH NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

In dollars and cents the cost of the T. V. A. projects is as gigantic as the dams it has built. The project at Norris, for instance, up to June 30, 1938, cost $32,749,776. This sum is about one-fourth less than the Navy spent for new construction during the year 1933 when this project was inaugurated. The Norris project represents an investment as great as three new battleships. The life of a battleship is about one generation; Norris Dam is expected to last as long as the hills from which the stone was hewn for its construction. The lake behind the dam might fill up with silt, the engineers say, in 2,500 years. But until that happens, about 80 generations will have benefited by this investment.

No attempt is made here to answer all the questions about the Tennessee Valley Authority. These comments represent merely a few reflections on a 10-day trip to the valley which included conversations with officials and beneficiaries of the T. V. A. There is unanimous approval of the Authority among farmers and rural people who have learned of contour plowing, check-dams, and rotation of crops from the Authority and the Agriculture Department working together. City dwellers are happy that their light bill is smaller. Vacationists have found new places of interest. Outdoor life has taken on a new meaning for the natives of the valley. Tourists have found that some of the most magnificent natural scenery lies in the vicinity of what some have called God's Valley.

A moderate estimate has placed T. V. A.'s saving to the country through flood control at $115,000,000. In 1937, when the Ohio River and the Mississippi River Valleys were flooded, the T. V. A. dams cut off much of the water that would have poured farther and more destructively over the land down to the Gulf.

While this might sound like an exaggerated report, it is meant merely to give the impressions of one who was not satisfied with reading pamphlets and statistical reports of the T. V. A. The writer has promised himself the treat of returning to the valley someday when the mountain laurel is in bloom, and when some of the projects begun in this year will have reached maturity. But a return to the valley without the T. V. A. still in operation would mean only a ghastly visit to a graveyard in search of natural beauty. This experiment in democracy, it is hoped, will not be found wanting in the high courts of those who rule the destinies of men.

National Old-Age Assistance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, it would be unfortunate if the Seventy-sixth Congress should adjourn without consideration of a national old-age assistance plan. House bill 5620, embodying such a plan, has been before us for many months. I introduced the bill, commonly known as the General Welfare Act, as far back as April 6, 1939. We have been unable to convince the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the necessity of hearings. Sensing this opposition we have resorted to the only other alternative under the legislative procedure of the House, and some months ago placed on the Speaker's desk a discharge petition in an attempt to force the bill to the floor. This is known as the Magnuson discharge petition No. 15. Under the rules of the House, after a bill has been referred to committee, with their refusal to act on the said bill within 30 days, the sponsor of the legislation may resort to the so-called discharge petition method. It is the only way a bill can be forced out of committee, and, fortunately or unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, committees still control legislation in the House.

In order to bring a bill to the floor by the discharge method the rules require 218 signatures. This is a majority of the House.

The Ways and Means Committee still remain adamant to this legislation, and we have therefore, the past few months, made a conscientious effort to obtain the required number of names on the petition.

This is no easy matter. Members are reluctant to lend themselves to this extraordinary procedure, but the serious plight of the aged of the Nation calls for this departure. Evidence of the importance of this problem is that at the close of the legislative day, Saturday, June 22, 184 Members have actually placed their names on the Magnuson discharge petition. At least 10 more have signified their intention of signing. This seems to be indicative of the importance and necessity of considering this bill, when so many Members of this House signify their feelings about the matter in this special way.

The movement has been wholly nonpartisan. About half of the names on the petition come from the Republican side. The interest is not sectional. Members from nearly every State in the Union are on the list, the only exception being the so-called deep South. Surely the Ways and Means Committee cannot be proceeding on the basis that the legislation lacks the interest or consideration of the Congress and the people of this country. Surely on a matter of such import this committee, representing the people as they do, should not have to be forced to place this bill up for consideration.

It is true that the Congress and this committee have given time, thought, and study to the present social-security system and the old-age matching plan there included. I have reason to believe that the thought of the committee is favorable to the retention and possible enlargement of the social-security system, and that this thought precludes their consideration of other national plans.

There are many in this country who believe the Social Security Act to be wholly inadequate in this regard. There are almost 190 Members of Congress who believe there should be a national unified system of pension supplanting the act now in force. There are many others in the membership of this House not on the petition who would readily vote for a system as embodied in the so-called Magnuson bill. Surely this interest within this body itself should be sufficient to have the matter considered, even though members of the committee might be opposed to the idea. I am almost certain, however, that our only hope for consideration is the obtaining of the necessary 218 names.

Last session this House had the opportunity to cast decision upon the so-called Townsend bill. So much agitation was stirred up throughout the country by the proponents of national old-age pensions it was thought best to have the matter disposed of one way or another by the House. I have every reason to believe that a precanvass was made of the House Members prior to the consideration of the bill. It was pretty common knowledge to us that there were not sufficient votes to pass the measure. The vote was 302 against and 97 for.

Although I did not agree with some of the provisions of that bill, I do so agree with the broad basic principle and necessity for a national system in lieu of the matching plan that I, along with my delegation, voted for the bill. It was a start in the right direction.

I believe the General Welfare Act embodies the most intelligent approach to the problem. It does, however, have the same broad principles embodied in the Townsend bill. Proponents of the Welfare Act have no quarrel with the Townsend supporters and should not, because we are all seeking the same objective. I believe H. R. 5620 has some betterments as compared with the so-called Townsend Plan, which is now also called the General Welfare Act. Because of this fact I have reason to believe that it would pass the House by a substantial vote. The opponents of this plan and other national plans of old age pensions in the House know this to be true. As one Member expressed it to me the other day, "We would be afraid to bring your bill out because it might pass."

We are faced, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with this problem. We are sincere in our belief that the problem of the aged in this country is rapidly becoming more serious and is one that should be met by the Congress and both political parties. We shall continue our drive to obtain the necessary signatures. It would be far better for both the legislation and this body if this bill could be considered in the regular legislative way with hearings and amendments to the end that we get a well-rounded bill covering all phases of the problem.

Many of the Members are not familiar with the details of H. R. 5620. No Member, however, is unfamiliar with the pitiful problem of the aged in this country and surely all Members are interested in a common-sense pension. The Gallup poll recently showed that 94 percent of the people want such a pension.

The bill provides, briefly, for the amendment of the Social Security Act to give all unemployed citizens over sixty years an honorable Federal annuity of from thirty, minimum, to sixty dollars maximum per month—to be financed by a 2-percent gross income tax on added values. In other words, the cost of the product or things sold is deducted from gross income, which prevents the pyramiding of the tax and the building up of monopoly and is fair to those with a large turnover but small profit. All pay and all receive real social security. A deduction of the first sixty per month is allowed out of fairness to those in the low income group, so as not to tax purchasing power as the Social Security Act now does.

IT IS A SIMPLE, SENSIBLE NATIONAL PENSION ACT

I do not want to be understood in opposition to the Social Security Act. It is surely much better, and a step in the right direction, as compared with the utter lack of any social security prior to its passage. It provides for a matching system for old-age pensions. I do not think it goes far enough. It surely has not solved this particular problem.

The Federal Government now will pay half of the pension granted in any State up to $20 per month. The result is that we have 48 different systems. Some State old-age assistance laws are good and some are bad. The cost of administration is high, thereby using much of the money that should go to those in want. Every time there is a change of State administration, politics are played with the misery of these people.

Restrictions and qualifications in State laws deprive many citizens of the pension. Some States pay as low as $8 a month and that to very few. Confusion has arisen. Demagogues feed on this confusion and the people of this country know the trouble we have had in many communities, politically and otherwise, with the "pied pipers" of crackpot pension schemes playing upon the plight of aged American citizens. It has been a cruel thing the way that their enthusiasm has been aroused with promises that these demagogues know never can be fulfilled. I could go into detail for hours upon the difficulty, complexity, and injustice heaped upon the elderly people because of the very nature of this administration of the various pension laws. There is only one answer to the problem, one answer that will do away with all the crackpot schemes, the politics, the maladministration, and the injustice, and that is a uniform national common-sense plan that would apply to all citizens in all States alike.

We have long since committed ourselves to the broad principle of old-age pensions. That being done, why not go at the thing in a sensible way? The Social Security Act may be all right as far as it goes, but it favors 65-year-old workers who have had steady jobs, aliens are not barred, a 1-day-old child is eligible, and temporary pensions are granted upon loss of position at any age, but what are we going to do with millions of our citizens who are not included in its benefits? Millions of people who helped build up the country who have paid taxes for many years and since the depression have been unable to find work because of their age. Even if we came back to a boom period in this country, these millions could not get back into industry. I ask any Member of this body over 45 or 50 years of age to go out and try to find a job in industry.

They will not hire you. Medical science on one hand has lengthened the span of life, while technological advances on the other hand have shortened the span of man's usefulness to industry. The breach is becoming wider, and as it widens this problem becomes greater. This group of people must be taken care of as a group. Under the present Social Security Act, there is merely a favored group that are subsidized. Surely we cannot be so blind as to not see the problem.

There is no certainty under present laws, State and National, for an aged person, and the haunting fear of misery and poverty is doing much to undermine the morale of the Nation. A national unified system would do away with that. The strange thing about it is that no one objects paying a tax if he knows it is going for the support of our elderly citizens. Even ancient tribal custom carried out the same form of tribute. The odd thing here, in the House, is that most of the younger Members of this body not only recognize the problem but want to do something about it, whereas the opposition seems to come from the older Members. We younger Members know that this matter will plague us until something is done about it.

The adoption of H. R. 5620, instead of being harmful to the social-security plan, would be definitely beneficial because it would take care of that phase of national social security. Surely there is no Member of Congress who can say that he is thoroughly satisfied with the State systems or that the Social Security Act fully meets the problem.

We hear a great deal of talk nowadays regarding national defense. We hear a great deal of discussion regarding the preservation of American democracy. We are all sincere in that duty and international events have made it necessary that we build up those defenses. The Members of Congress know how active I, personally, have been in this matter. But hand in hand with this goes our domestic problems and, after all, America's first line of defense is a happy and contented people—people that are taken care of adequately and in keeping with the resources and the plenty this Nation can provide.

These "isms" we hear so much about can only take hold where there is poverty, want, and discontent. We accomplish the preservation of our democracy and the stamping out of those "isms" we fear more surely by meeting such problems as the plight of the elderly citizens of this country than any other way I know of. There should be no diminishing or diversion of this effort because of international events.

The old people of today are not the forgotten people of America, but surely they have been the most kicked-around people politically. It is time we put an end to it.

It is my firm opinion that the payment to, and the expenditure by, in business and trade, the elderly people will prevent inflation because of the impetus that would be given to circulation of money. Present freezing of resources is bound to result in inflation.

After all, the matter is almost fundamental. Briefly, you create prosperity and a continuing prosperity. You let every man and woman in the United States retire from work at a reasonable age on an adequate pension. By that you create a special class of consumers, and the simple remedy is bound to follow. You need not have to force these people to spend the money. Most of them will find it just adequate to live on, to be supplemented to some things they have already worked hard to acquire.

Of course, we need not feel that our activity on the Magnuson bill has been wholly to no avail. The famous political writer, Walter Davenport, writing for Collier's magazine, says this, among other things, of the Magnuson bill:

> It is causing the White House more concern than any member of its numerous family. It has forced the Social Security Board to draft liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act.

You will recall that we amended the Social Security Act last session from Government contribution of $15 per month to $20 per month to the States, making it possible, if the State will set up systems, for an elderly citizen to get $40 per month maximum. That is at least something, but if, as in Mississippi, the State can produce only $2.03 per pensioner, the Government contributes only $2.03, it is worth little. Even in Mississippi this is not a living income, and nobody can prove that it is.

Such is the trouble with the State systems. In 2½ years about 1,800,000 elderly Americans have received about $375,000,000 from Washington. There are millions of other elderly people who have received nothing. The figure 1,800,000 is indicative of the inadequacy of the present system, reaching only a special few. Under that set-up the average should be, for this special few, about $20 per pensioner, but facts from the States will show that only one State—California—pays to that special few anywhere near that amount. New Mexico contributes no more than $3.50. In 15 States the pension is lamentably small. Administration costs necessary with 48 complex systems eat up anywhere from 8 to 42 percent of the amount available.

The fundamental vice of the Social Security Act is that it levels a treble tax on pay rolls. Taxing pay rolls by taking money out of purchasing power retards recovery. I can appreciate that there are many schools of thought relative to the taxation feature of any type of social security for the aged. No one tax plan is letter perfect. It is bound to have some flaws, but we can base our tax plan by following some fundamental rules, and it appears to me that the statutory goal of the Social Security Act of a 9-percent pay-roll tax will plunge us deeper into the mire of depression. What we need is fewer taxes on pay rolls.

The Welfare Act tax on the accumulated wealth of the Nation would aid recovery if based on business volume. It would be a tax to bring greater volume. Businessmen generally are willing to allow a 2-percent discount for cash turnover, and the 2-percent tax on business volume would be based upon ability to pay. No one would be asked to pay unless he had the money in his pocket. The plan is therefore "pay as you go." No one can deny the logic of that. Whatever he would pay would be saved by a cutting down of other taxes, for the 2-percent gross income tax has a hundred-dollar exemption and deductions for pay rolls, taxes, and interest on debts, and is a replacement tax.

I merely point out these things, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me, realizing there will be much argument over tax basis for a national system, some of my thoughts on this matter and what seems to me to be a sensible approach, even though there should be some difficulty relative to the tax base, it is a matter that can be welded and worked into shape as the plan advances.

What is more important is the dire necessity for some sort of national old-age pension system. The problem is becoming worse. I have hundreds of letters from fine, elderly American citizens. They do not belong to the special class heretofore mentioned. They are caught in the cumbersomeness and complexities of 370,000 county systems and 48 State systems.

Just let me quote one such letter:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 30, 1939.*

DEAR MR. MAGNUSSON: I have just learned that our rent is to be cut in half, and some are to be cut off entirely, which means be turned out in the street.

Since my dear husband has passed on I have been obliged to exist on $5.60 per month of late for groceries, and in a cheap room at $9 per month, and our landladies can't keep us if we can't pay. Anyway we do not get paid monthly for the rent, only by voucher and she has to wait for 3 months before she can get one cashed, and now to cut us half, or off entirely, is appalling in this United States of America. So I am asking you to do all you can to pass the best National Old Age Pension that can be passed and save us from the streets, as we elderly citizens cannot get work to help ourselves, hence we are helpless.

Yours sincerely,

Now, that letter is typical. These old folks get all mixed up with W. P. A. regulations, State welfare acts, counties whose warrants are not cashable, professional social welfare workers and snoopers until they hardly know which way to turn.

Is it not time that we put an end to this? The bill would abolish direct relief to able-bodied young and middle-aged people on the dole in the productive period of their lives. The money that the elderly people use under this pension will

create new employment and the retirement of elderly people in many cases would make way for the young people coming. It would bring in under social security the following groups not now covered—and these exemptions are one of the main causes for my complaint against the present system—the farmers, farm laborers, domestics, casual laborers, housewives, professional men and women, business men and women, the unemployed—whose plight, if they are elderly, is pitiful in this land of plenty—and all those over 60 now barred from social security because they cannot buy the annuity policies the Government is selling.

The means test, pauper's oath, and investigation by professional snoopers would be eliminated and social security would be made dependent upon age, citizenship, and retirement. Sweden, probably the most experienced of all countries with old-age assistance laws, long ago abolished the qualification test. Look at our administration costs in the various States. These qualifiers are taking the money for embarrassing our elderly citizens that should go into the payment of pensions themselves. I have always maintained that the cost of qualifying amounts to 10 times over the cost of some so-called chiselers who might take the pension not needing it. They would be few, but with the abolition of the qualifying phase would follow the abolition of the humiliation and embarrassment now heaped upon the elderly people who must go through a virtual third degree in most all of these States before they can get a measly pension.

We must also remember that the present Social Security Act does not take care of those whose reserves have been completely wiped out by two depressions.

Another angle of this problem relates to the young people. It is often unfair to ask them that they remain unmarried in order to support their parents. This is especially true when we consider the resources and plenty of the Nation itself. These things destroy the home. The home is the basis of our civilization, and we cannot survive if we become a nation of "boarding houses."

Why, even the United States Supreme Court has recognized not only the problem but the principle that giving aid to the aged would be "conducive to the general welfare." As far as I can ascertain, the plan would fit into our industrial and political system. Surely it would help preserve our economic system and help end "isms." It is not crackpot. It is consistent with common sense.

Surely we are far behind other nations in the matter of economic security for elders. Something is wrong with us when we consider that the United States constitutes 12 percent of the world's population and owns 42 percent of the world's wealth. Pensions are paid in many other countries having the other 88 percent of the world's population and only the other half of the wealth.

Surely there is something to be corrected when I get letters such as this:

I am a widow, 69 years old. Have lived in the State 17 years. Was born of American parents in Maine and have worked and supported myself for years, up to a few years ago when my health failed and made it impossible for me to work. I applied for the old-age pension when it became a State law, and after trying for a year I received a pension of $20 per month for a year and 4 months. At the end of that time an investigator called and told me my pension would be cut. Instead, the pension stopped altogether. I am entirely dependent on my son-in-law, as I own no property and have no income or savings. I have only the one daughter. This brings me to the point of my letter to you. Mr. MAGNUSON, I don't know what to do. My son-in-law is a barber and works on commission. His wages amount to $24 or $25 per week. He supports four adults on this—himself, wife, daughter, and me. He has debts, incurred mostly through illness in the family, but owns his home, which has a necessary amount of upkeep. When I apply for my pension I am told that my son-in-law must support me and that his wages are sufficient so to do. In spite of the fact that one of the employees at the pension bureau admitted to my daughter that the budget upon which they based this opinion was not workable unless a family fell far below a decent living standard. My granddaughter has worked her way through school, but seems at present too young to get a job. When she gets a job she cannot add much to the family income except to take care of herself. Here is what I cannot understand. Maybe I am getting childish. I know personally where pensions are being paid. I am desperate. Can you tell me how it is done? My family is growing bitter. My son-in-law wonders why we should bother to go to the polls, why we should struggle to be decent citizens, why he should work at all. The family is willing enough to share with me and care for me, but the point is, Why should they have to when there seems to be plenty of everything available and others seem to be getting pensions? What is the difference? We are Democrats. Does that make a difference? We are of old American stock. Does that make a difference? We are Christians. Perhaps that makes a difference. We are respectable and law abiding. Does that matter? Please believe I am in no sense writing you just to whine or because I expect you to be responsible personally. There is something wrong somewhere. I am unable to go personally to see about my pension, but my daughter has spent hours at the bureau waiting for interview. She says, "It seems all so complicated, and so forth."

This is again typical of the complexities involved in State administrations.

Many persons think that the plan would be to tax one large class to benefit a smaller class, and therefore shy away from it. However, the real aim of all this type of legislation is to be beneficial to every class and every kind of business.

Our elderly people have given their best years to make whatever contribution they were capable of to the American scheme of life. Now they are past physical prime and constitute a labor surplus, a factor intensifying the problem of finding jobs for younger Americans. We are cognizant, surely, of those terrifying twilight years of half-living. Legislation of this type is simply an effort to carry out a Christian duty of the American people.

I suppose there is not a single Member of this House who does not in his heart desire to provide dignity and security for retired workers past 60 years of age. I assume there is only one question in the minds of the Members, and that is, Can it be done in justice to the other segments of our population and without injury to our general economy?

I have said that I assume the problem is obvious, and without being boresome, but because these facts must be reiterated, let me give you some idea of the problem in cold figures. Only 3 percent of our population earn an average income in their productive years of over $225 per month. Social-security research has determined that but 5 percent of American citizens past 60 have any reserve. That group is becoming increasingly large.

I again command your attention to the Discharge Petition 15. These people have been patient long enough. I am sure they will have something to say about it this fall at the polls. The State systems are becoming more and more entangled. The group of recipients under the present Social Security Act is not expanding. The numbers of those in need outside this pall is increasing. The whole problem is not only a sore spot in our economy but in our plain political duty. There are but a few days left. Help me to get H. R. 5620 on the floor and do your part to help our aged citizens.

Why Additional Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation Funds Are Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, our exports of farm products for the last 10 years have averaged nearly $800,000,000 a year. That entire market is now threatened by war and American agriculture will face a real crisis by harvest time.

The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation has available to it for this fiscal year $205,000,000 for the removal of agricultural surpluses. For next fiscal year it will have $187,000,000 for the same purpose if the agricultural appropriation bill is passed as it now stands.

Since the Congress considered the addition of $85,000,000 to 30 percent of the customs receipts, the international situation has become increasingly acute. By way of indicating the

internal dislocations which would result from the loss of export outlets, the following figures are submitted:

1. Forty-five percent of the prune crop is normally exported.
2. Fifty percent of the cotton crop is normally exported.
3. Fifty percent of our flue-cured tobacco crop is normally exported.
4. Thirty percent of the raisin crop is normally exported.
5. Forty-five percent of our winter pears are normally exported.
6. Ten percent of our apple crop is normally exported.
7. Prior to the droughts of 1934 and 1936 nearly 40 percent of our lard went into exports. Stocks at present are extremely heavy.

Somewhat lesser percentages of California barley, of corn, walnuts, pecans, and citrus fruits are threatened with the loss of export markets. The loss of these export outlets can easily break the price structure on the entire domestic crop in many cases. The loss of export markets for wheat normally would be very serious, but because of drought in the Winter Wheat Belt this season the situation is not apt to be too critical for this coming crop year.

Should the war come to an abrupt termination, with a consequent lessening of industrial acitvity in this country, serious surplus situations would arise in connection with crops produced primarily for domestic consumption, because of curtailed buying power in our cities.

It is impossible now to estimate the difficulties, crop by crop, which such a situation would present, but the price structure would be threatened for dairy products, poultry products, meats, fruits, and vegetables.

During the next few years world events probably will force us to turn more and more toward various programs to increase domestic consumption. This year we made available 100,000 bales of cotton, with ticking to match, for our self-help mattress program. Five or six times that amount of cotton could be used for this worthy work.

Three million school children this year got their noonday lunches free—made in whole or in part from surplus foods. About 9,000,000 children in our low-income areas are eligible to get free lunches. Every one of these undernourished youngsters ought to have a chance to eat the surplus as a mattter of national health defense.

Four million persons will be taking part in the food-stamp plan by late summer—over 20,000,000 are eligible to participate. They need that extra 2½-cents worth of surplus foods, a meal for a minimum diet. Over 1,000 communities have asked for the food-stamp plan but it will not be possible to reach over 150 with funds now available.

Two-thirds of our families have to get along on an average cash income of $69 a month. They cannot buy enough to give the wheels of industry more than a turn or two. Their unsatisfied wants offer our farmers and businessmen the greatest market that has ever challenged them. If we cannot sell our farm surpluses abroad, we have got to widen our domestic markets. It makes sense to develop those markets, so as to use the surpluses that nature has given us.

How Will the National Conventions Treat the War Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS LUDLOW OF INDIANA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I submit for the RECORD an address I delivered over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Wednesday evening, May 15:

ANNOUNCER. Both major political parties are expected to devote much time and thought to their foreign-policy planks during their respective conventions.

Tonight the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, Democratic Member of the House of Representatives from Indiana, discusses the question: "How Will the National Conventions Treat the War Issue?"

Representative LUDLOW is widely known as the author of the Ludlow amendment which would call for a national referendum before the United States could enter war overseas.

Representative LUDLOW.

Mr. LUDLOW. With Europe and the Orient aflame, and with forces unleashed which threaten the destruction of the world, a burning question confronts every one of us tonight. It is, What shall we do to keep our country out of war?

We should profoundly think and reverently pray over this question, realizing as we must, if we can read the portents of the times and if we have studied the trends of history, that if we become involved in this maelstrom of war that is sucking into its vortex most of the countries of the world it will mean a black-out of our own democracy, the enthronement of a dictator in the United States, the loss of an incalculable number of precious lives, and a last lingering surrender of the liberty that was handed down to us as a priceless heritage from our forefathers, who fought and died that we might be free.

In deepest humility, let us ponder over the tremendous import of the issues involved while we seek by appropriate thoughts and acts to measure up in this crisis to the full stature of men and women and to prove our love and loyalty to our country and our God.

To the great assize let all come—all—for the decisions and judgments we shall have to make within the next year will involve the well-being, happiness, and independence of 130,000,000 people, and everyone is entitled to have his say; and let no one be heard to challenge the motives and sincerity of any other one. With the darkness of night beginning to envelop the world, we, in our great American commonwealth, which is about the last refuge of freedom, should be as one family, with common interests, hopes, and aspirations, and it does not lie in the mouth of anyone to impeach the sincerity of any other. No man nor any set of men has any monopoly on patriotism.

Within the next year titanic forces will be in operation to drag us into the war. To counteract these forces and to insure our immunization from involvement we must begin to build for peace. We are treading now very much the same road we traveled before we entered the war in 1917. The propaganda mills are grinding a familiar grist, scaring us half to death with doleful warnings that we must enter the war "to save democracy" but always failing to tell us that if we do we will lose our own priceless democracy at home. Then, too, just as in the years immediately preceding the World War, we are permitting ourselves to become the beneficiaries of a vast allied war trade which, unless I am mistaken, will before long be pulling us into the conflict with the strength of a million hawsers. When the Allies' cash runs out and they can no longer pay on the barrel head there will be a demand for credits to the end that their war orders may be filled in our factories and our men employed, and I fear that the last sad chapter will be the sending of our soldiers overseas to protect our stake in the war.

That brings me to my main theme, "How will the national political conventions this year treat the war issue?" Knowing the politicians as I do, I would predict that if the people demand a forthright peace plank in the national platforms this year, they will get it, but if they do not so demand and insist, the politicians will pussyfoot and dodge and give them a fake peace plank of glittering generalities that will sound well and mean exactly nothing. If the public sentiment of America will become aroused and make itself felt in a great swelling tide at the Republican national convention at Philadelphia next month and the Democratic National Convention at Chicago month after next, it can force the adoption of a genuine peace plank that will keep us out of war. I have proposed such a plank for both of the national political platforms, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That we favor a Nation-wide referendum before declaration of war, except in the case of invasion of the United States or some other country in the Western Hemisphere or internal rebellion."

The adoption of that plank by both of the great political parties would buttress the United States against the forces which most certainly will be hammering at the doors of America and dragging us to the edge of war next year, if not sooner. It would definitely serve notice that the United States will remain at peace with the world unless our country is attacked or invaded or unless the Monroe Doctrine is violated. It would serve notice to the world that America, adhering to the traditions of Washington and Jefferson, intends to stay out of Europe and that Europe must stay out of the Western Hemisphere. Such a notice would clarify the atmosphere and stabilize the peace of America.

What would this proposed plank mean? It would mean that when it comes to deciding whether our boys shall be sent overseas into the slaughter pens of foreign wars, which are not of our making and for which we are in no degree responsible, those who have to do the dying and the suffering and to bear the awful burdens and costs and griefs of war shall have something to say about it. It would mean, too, that our boys of conscription age would have a right to vote on participation in foreign wars. A boy who is subject to conscription certainly should have the

same right as his elders to vote on whether or not his body shall be shot or blown to bits or rammed through with a bayonet in some foreign land. My proposal would mean, too, that women would have their first opportunity to make their influence felt in respect to taking part in foreign wars, as they would have the same right as men to vote in a referendum on overseas war. And why should women not have that right? Women go down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring our boys into the world. Why should they not have something to say as to whether their flesh and blood shall be hurled into the hell of a foreign conflict? In the present Congress only 7 of the 531 Members are women, so you see how pathetically impotent is the opportunity afforded to women to express whatever may be women's viewpoint on any particular war proposal. As long as the war-declaring power remains vested in Congress women will be out of the picture as far as having anything to do with making war is concerned. They furnish the cannon fodder, it is true, and they ought to rise and demand a voice and a vote on sacrificing their boys in war's hell overseas.

At present, although we boast that we are a democracy, it is not the people who decide whether our boys are to be sent into the shambles of foreign wars, but a little group in Washington, all immune from military service. War may now be declared by 267 Members of Congress, a bare majority of both bodies, who are always in every international crisis singularly swayed and influenced by one other individual, that individual being whoever happens at any given time to be the President of the United States. Why should a little handful of men, an infinitesimal fraction compared with the whole population, have authority to plunge an entire nation into an overseas war? Under my constitutional amendment Congress would continue to have the power to declare war if the United States or any country under the coverage of the Monroe Doctrine is attacked or invaded, but the people would have the right to say whether we shall send our soldiers overseas to fight in foreign wars. The plank I propose is in practically the same language as the resolution adopted unanimously and with tremendous enthusiasm by the Young Democrats of America at their 1937 national convention in Indianapolis with James Roosevelt presiding. So it has, to start with, the sympathetic interest of 5,000,000 young Democrats. My proposed plank would not interfere with our national defense in any way, shape, or form, for if there is an attack on the United States or some other country in the Western Hemisphere the referendum would not apply. I personally believe in the strongest defense measures and I think that a combination of adequate national defense and a referendum on foreign wars would be the very best peace insurance this country could possibly have.

I predict that if both national conventions will adopt this plank declaring that the people shall have the last say on entering foreign wars there will be no danger that we will be swept into war next year or in the years to come, as far as we can now foresee. It would mean that the people would be the jury that would decide the momentous question as to whether or not we shall enter wars overseas, and that, I think, would be eminently just, for it is the people who have to suffer the heartbreaks and the unspeakable agonies of war. The principal, and not the agent, should make the great decision, and in this case the principal is the 130,000,000 people who comprise the American Nation.

There will be a national election this year, and at this time no one knows who will take the helm as President early in the coming year. After January 20 next we may not have in the White House a counterpart of our present Chief Executive. Who knows? The next President may be anxious to get America into war. He may be a militarist at heart, bent on personal aggrandizement, or he may be an internationalist with a sincere and conscientious, though, I think, mistaken, conviction that America should police the world. But one thing that is certain is that the next President, whoever he may be, is not going to maneuver this country into a foreign war in the face of a positive plank in the national platforms declaring in favor of lodging that authority with the sovereign people.

Since this is the season when delegates for the national conventions are being chosen, you of the radio audience can help by contacting delegates and prospective delegates and party leaders and securing pledges from them to approve the plank I have drafted and which I propose for the national platforms.

As I see the situation, there is not much likelihood that we shall be drawn into the war during the next few months. Propaganda has not had a full opportunity to get in its work. The crucial time will come next year after the election. The national conventions to be held in June and July will outline the policies the two major parties will be expected to follow after the election. As friends of peace, the most important thing we can do is to secure the adoption in both national platforms of a definite unequivocal peace plank that will pledge both parties to carry into effect the almost unanimous will of the American people that we shall remain American and shall keep out of foreign wars and foreign entanglements.

And, finally, if you think I am on the right track, I wish you would write to me and give me the benefit of your views. I need the inspiration of your counsel.

H. R. 5138—Alien Registration Act—Prohibiting Subversive, "Fifth Column," Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I joined with my colleagues from the State of Washington, Messrs. COFFEE, HILL, LEAVY, MAGNUSON, and WALLGREN, in voting "yea" on roll call 161 in favor of agreeing to the conference report on H. R. 5138, the Alien Registration Act of 1940, prohibiting subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities.

The sponsors of this legislation assert that in its present, final form it represents the first and only thoroughgoing attempt to plug up the loopholes which experience has disclosed in our immigration and deportation laws, which were amended a quarter of a century ago. I agree with their conclusions.

In stating my opposition to the special bill to deport Harry Bridges, on account of its unconstitutionality and violation of American traditions, I said:

> Instead, let Congress enact general legislation, within the guaranties of the Constitution, applying to all aliens, including Harry Bridges, if our present laws are insufficient. Let Congress provide by general legislation for the deportation of all aliens who advocate or teach the doctrines of nazi-ism, fascism, or communism.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that this bill now accomplishes those salutary objectives. The United States Supreme Court in the Strecker case held that the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917 did not apply to an alien who had been a member of an organization which advocated the overthrow of our Government by force or violence if he had ceased to be a member. This measure amends that act to provide that any alien who at any time after his entry into the United States shall have been a member of such an organization shall be deported. Under this law any alien who has been a member of a subversive organization—communistic, fascist, or nazi—before coming to our country, cannot enter. If at the time of his entry or any time thereafter he belongs to such an organization, he shall be deported. Harry Bridges, or any other alien, can be proceeded against and granted a hearing under this law in proper constitutional, American fashion.

Section 1 makes it unlawful for any person, with intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces, to advocate or cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, or to distribute any written or printed matter which advocates such insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty.

Section 2 makes it unlawful for any person to knowingly or willfully advocate, or, with the intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any government in the United States, to publish or circulate any written or printed matter which advocates, or to organize any society or group, or knowing the purposes thereof to affiliate with any such society or group, which advocates the overthrow or destruction by force or violence of the Government of the United States, the government of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, the government of the District of Columbia, or the government of any political subdivision of any of them.

Section 3 makes it unlawful to attempt to conspire to commit any of the acts prohibited by this title.

Section 20 amends section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, by adding thereto several new subdivisions, the principal provisions of which are as follows:

Subsection (b) provides that, in addition to aliens who are deportable under other provisions of law, the following aliens shall be taken into custody and deported: Aliens who knowingly and for gain have assisted any other alien to enter or to try to enter the United States in violation of law, aliens who have been convicted of possessing and of carrying certain firearms in violation of law, and aliens convicted of violating the provisions of title I of this bill.

Section 23 amends the act of October 16, 1918, which provides for the exclusion and deportation from the United States of aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes, so as to provide that no alien shall be admitted to the United States who has at any time been a member of such classes, and to also provide that any alien who has been a member of such classes at any time after his admission to the United States, for no matter how short a time or how far in the past so long as it was after the date of entry, shall be deported.

Section 30 provides for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens entering the United States after the effective date of this section.

Section 31 requires the registration and fingerprinting of aliens already in the United States, and aliens who might in any manner gain admission to the United States without being registered and fingerprinted under section 30. Under this section aliens less than 14 years of age are not required to be fingerprinted, but they must be registered.

Section 32 fixes the time within which registration is required for aliens in the United States on the effective date of sections 30 and 31, provides an exemption from the registration and fingerprinting provisions for officials of foreign governments and members of their families, and authorizes special regulations to be made for the registration and fingerprinting of special classes of aliens.

Resolutions of Alabama Writers' Conclave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

RESOLUTIONS PREPARED BY DR. GEORGE LONG

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Alabama Writers' Conclave in session at Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala., June 21, 1940:

At no time in modern history has civilization faced such a critical moment as it faces today.

The American people, together with those peoples who are fighting for democratic freedom against the totalitarian states in Europe, are compelled to review the fundamental principles on which a democratic social structure is erected, and by which its international relations are defined and determined.

In the belief that, because of modern invention and the ever-widening scientific control of environment, the environment for modern man is now inevitably world-wide, and cannot be limited by national boundaries for trade, commerce, finance, industry, education, culture, and religion, and

In the belief that any civilization is an intellectual structure builded of what men think, although it is incidentally emotional and economic, and

In the belief that the subdivisions of labor for guiding a civilization, although useful and appropriate, must not be allowed to obscure essential unity of aim and purpose at the heart of such civilization:

For these reasons, and on these convictions, the Alabama Writers' Conclave, assembled at Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala., calls upon:

First. The intellectual leadership of the Nation to devote its time and energies to the task of plain restatement and reaffirmation of the principles and problems of a democratic society, as these affect the interest and judgment of the citizens of our country, in order that our citizens may know both by knowledge and by insight by what principles and to what purposes they live their daily lives. For the world we live in is as large as we are able to think it, and as vital as we are able to comprehend it. "There is no truth except to our own conviction, and no goodness except to our own insight * * * although it is of the nature of truth and goodness to be objective."

Second. We call upon the political leadership of the Nation to view its political responsibility at this time, in terms of human welfare and in terms of the immediate defense of our traditional democratic institutions. Further, we respectfully suggest that the unit of political outlook be the Western Hemisphere and the fighting democracies of Europe, that democratic principles may be everywhere promoted. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places."

Third. We call upon the religious ministry of the Nation to vitalize what religion most obviously enjoins; namely, that there are some things more precious than life itself. Further, that they teach with renewed emphasis the worth and dignity of man, in order that men may be lifted above the rage of the pagan cruelties and brutal practices of those self-willed minds which would confine human energy and ambition to contractual slavery. For on the worth and dignity of man and his willingness to make the supreme sacrifice when required, rests his right to free speech, a free press, unhindered assembly, the freedom of his body as of his mind, and the right to worship according to the dictates of a cultivated conscience.

Fourth. We call upon economic and industrial leadership in the Nation to use its great organizations as it may command them, and the trained minds which it has at its disposal, to make our Nation strong in the strength of national welfare for all classes and conditions of men; strong in the strength of adequate national defense with all the material agencies of defense and attack; and that it make available such material agencies of defense and attack for the struggling democracies of Europe as it is possible for the United States to contribute to our sister democracies.

Fifth. We call upon, as we commend, all those agencies which have to do with the education of the minds of the citizens of our great country; such agencies, for example, as the newspapers and educational institutions, for their efforts in this service, that their zeal may not suffer in measure nor their purpose retreat under pressure of any kind. And we urge these, and all other institutions of like opportunity, to continue their good work in giving the public an objective account of national and world conditions, that our people may know the high purposes to which they are called by American citizenship and by which their lives may be guided, the high ends to which they may give their labor, so that freedom may be known for its great issues and Government for its great liberations. For it is the truth which makes men free, and it is freedom which makes governments secure. An intelligent electorate, morally and intellectually competent to make choices which secure intelligent and patriotic political leadership, which guarantees intelligent controlling bodies in politics, industry, religion, and education, must be, in large measure, the task and the responsibility of a free press and of educational institutions.

Finally, we authorize the secretary of the Alabama Writers' Conclave to send copies of these resolutions to His Excellency, the Governor of Alabama, to our newspapers, and to our Representatives in the National Congress.

EMMETT KILPATRICK, *President,*
MRS. KAY KYSER, *Secretary.*

The National Farm Program in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the national farm program in Montana has brought about a steady improvement in the position of the farmers and ranchers of the State during the last 7 years.

By 1939 the farmers of the State had 108 percent more cash income than they had in 1932. Farm cash income in Montana in 1939 was $96,023,000, of which $12,271,000 was in Government payments. In 1932 farm cash income in Montana was $46,000,000.

I want to emphasize, however, that money cannot begin to measure the progress which has been made toward greater security and better living for thousands of Montana farmers. Enormous gains have been made in the conservation of the soil, the basis of all prosperity. Farmers throughout the

State have been helped to find greater security on the land through improved farm credit, debt adjustment, better leasing arrangements, rural electrification, and better land use practices of many kinds. All these activities have been part of the national farm program and must be remembered when we try to evaluate the progress which has been made.

Montana farmers are better prepared than at any previous world crisis to face whatever changes the future may bring. The failure to make the needed adjustments after the first World War was one of the major causes of the difficulties which beset Montana farmers, in common with those of other Western States, by 1932. The farmers now have a workable program of adjustment which they themselves have helped to construct under authorization of Congress, and which they know how to operate after 7 years of progressive experience.

Montana farmers, along with farmers in general, still have many difficult problems, and the new war in Europe has added to these problems. But farmers now have in the national farm program the machinery which they can use to protect themselves against the shocks of rapidly changing conditions.

In order to get at some of the problems that face the farmers and ranchers of Montana and the United States, let us take an inventory of our programs and accomplishments as they look right now.

First of all, let us look at wheat. We are in the second year's full operation of the A. A. A. wheat program which was authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. With the recent announcement of the 1941 acreage allotments, the preliminary work for the third year is well under way. During this time the wheat farmers have used a new program to do what the old Farm Board finally admitted would be necessary. They have gotten the wheat surplus in hand, and in doing this they have gone further in establishing an effective ever-normal granary.

Here in this State and throughout the country most of the commercial wheat farmers have cooperated in the farm program and have complied with their acreage allotments. In 1939, for example, the national seeded acreage was 64,000,000 acres, 20 percent under 1938. This reduction, the biggest ever made in 1 year, proves that wheat farmers will work together when they have the opportunity. Farmers were prepared to deal effectively with changing supply and export-market conditions.

As a result of the adjustment made in 1939, and the improvement in the supply situation, it was possible to increase the national allotment in 1940 from fifty-five to sixty-two million acres and the Government crop reports indicate that the second year of the wheat program will be as great an achievement in cooperation as the first.

Wheat farmers are avoiding costly surpluses, but they are at the same time providing plenty for all needs. Through the program they are in a position to handle these supplies in an orderly manner. It is in this phase of the program where the wheat loan was used to such a remarkable advantage during the last year.

For the country as a whole, farmers stored about 167,000,000 bushels of 1939 wheat under Government loan. Developments in the wheat market from the time of harvest to the January–April period, when most of the wheat was redeemed by farmers, demonstrates some of the benefits of the loan. In Montana, for example, the average price of wheat to farmers last August was 45 cents a bushel. Compare this with the April 15 farm price of 77 cents a bushel.

Montana farmers had over 6,000,000 bushels of 1939 wheat under seal in farm granaries throughout the State. A part of this has been resealed under the loan-extension provisions beyond the April 30 maturity date. More than 11,000,000 bushels of '39 wheat were stored in commercial warehouses by Montana producers. For the more than 18,000,000 bushels of wheat put under loan in Montana, the price increase from harvest to April meant an increased value of approximately five and one-half million dollars.

But this benefit was not all the wheat farmers received as a result of their A. A. A. farm program. You all know that the United States price of wheat is usually based on the world price. Liverpool, for example, is normally about 30 cents higher than the domestic farm price. This covers the cost of getting the wheat from farms in this country to the Liverpool market.

By the time United States wheat farmers began harvesting their 1939 wheat, however, our domestic price of wheat had risen from 30 to 35 cents a bushel above the world price, largely as a result of the wheat program. In other words, even the wheat farmer who did not take advantage of the loan last fall got from 30 to 35 cents a bushel more for his wheat than if his price had been based on the world market. Keep in mind that this price benefit was enjoyed by our farmers before the outbreak of the European war and before weather conditions in the Winter Wheat Belt could possibly influence the wheat market.

Let me sum this up. At the time the wheat was going under loan last fall, our prices were between 30 and 35 cents above the world level. After that time prices in this country went up around 30 cents a bushel. The farmer who put his wheat under loan last fall and redeemed the wheat in April got from 60 to 65 cents more than he would have gotten if he had been forced to sell it at the world price last fall.

Add to this the 11-cent parity payment and 17-cent conservation payment which a wheat farmer could earn by cooperating with the 1939 wheat program. In other words, the farmer who held his wheat until April got an average farm price of 89 cents a bushel plus an A. A. A. payment of 28 cents, or a total of $1.17—less interest and storage charges—instead of the 20 to 25 cents he would have gotten had he been without a program.

Another measure in the ever-normal-granary program for wheat which operated for the first time in 1939 was crop insurance. For the country as a whole, nearly 166,000 wheat growers insured their 1939 crop. This year about 378,000 have taken out crop insurance. The story of 1939 crop insurance is best told in the ten and one-quarter million bushels of wheat indemnities collected by about 56,000 growers who otherwise, without insurance, would have had nothing to cushion the shock of crop failure.

Here in Montana 5,200 growers insured their crops in 1939, and 1,742 growers received 681,010 bushels of additional wheat because they had their crop insured. In 1940 more than 4,000 policies have been written, each covering an average of about 70 acres.

Here, then, we have the record of progress made by the wheat farmers in improving and stabilizing their income and supplies. They have protected their prices from a severe world depression, and they have used the loan to take advantage of price increases and to bring order into their marketing operations. The work accomplished by wheat farmers through cooperation and through a complete wheat program will give heart to farmers in facing the problems that they will meet as a result of changed world and domestic conditions. We know now that the outbreak of war in Europe, at least so far, has brought no new or great demands for our wheat. In fact, quite the contrary has been true, as those countries which have had the exchange to buy have used their dollar exchange in this country to buy airplanes and other industrial products which they could not get elsewhere.

Of course, no one can foretell the future, but wheat farmers who have studied the facts have come to the conclusion that during the critical years ahead a national program will be even more valuable than in the past. The American wheat farmer has developed his production plant on an export as well as a domestic market. If war shuts off export markets, the problem of adjustment that will be necessary will need more than ever a program for Nation-wide cooperation.

Even in the next few months as farmers harvest their 1940 crop, developments which no one can foresee now may raise havoc with our wheat market. What happened in the middle of May just after the invasion of the Netherlands and Belgium demonstrates how events on the battlefield can affect the farmer in Montana. With the A. A. A. farm program, however, the cooperator knows this much, that with a loan averaging 64 cents over the country and with 19 cents conservation and parity payments, he is at least assured of a minimum income from his wheat this year.

The wheat and flour export program was adopted to move our wheat and to assist our farmers in maintaining their fair share of the world market. During the year ending June 30, 1939, 118,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat were exported, of which the export of 94,000,000 bushels was assisted by the subsidy. The program is continuing this year, but is operating on a restricted basis because of world conditions.

The wheat program, of course, is only one part of the national program for agriculture. Montana agriculture in 1939 earned about half its cash income from crops, principally wheat, and half from livestock. The income from crops was $41,341,000, and from livestock and livestock products, $42,411,000.

In the past our farming system has tended to concentrate its labor and money outlay on the land devoted to harvested crops. There was a tendency to neglect pasture and range. Montana farmers and ranchers who have adopted practices under the agricultural and range programs have made definite progress in meeting local problems and in building up the value and usefulness of the State's farm and range land.

I will cite only a few examples of what our farmers and ranchers have done in the last few years. Look, for example, at the strip cropping that has been instituted over a large part of Montana's dry-land farm area. You will find large numbers of fields laid out in alternate strips of growing crop and fallow. It is one method farmers are finding useful in stopping soil drifting and controlling wind erosion. In 26 of the counties in the dry-land area, about a million and a half acres are now being strip-farmed.

Along with this type of practice, farmers and ranchers have added to the value of several hundred thousand acres of range and pasture by seeding it to perennial grasses, mainly crested wheat grass. Farmers and ranchers have carried out this practice under both agricultural and range conservation programs, and since 1936 an estimated 800,000 acres have been seeded. This is not only providing an early forage but is also retarding wind and water erosion by giving the land a permanent cover.

The Montana farmer and rancher knows the value of water to his business. His problem has been to hold on to his land and under the agricultural and range programs it has been possible for them to make increasingly better use of water resources with new reservoirs, with spreader terraces, with contour furrowing, and similar practices. In 4 years of the A. A. A. program Montana ranchers and farmers have built approximately 8,500 reservoirs as a means of retarding water run-off and bringing about a better distribution of livestock.

I mention these few practices as an example of how the program has helped agriculture in this State. Even if I were to list all the practices which have been approved for payment under the programs, I would not be giving a complete picture since so much has been accomplished by bringing the conservation problems clearly to the front. In 1939 cooperators with the agricultural conservation program earned about $7,500,000 and cooperators with the 1939 range program earned an additional $625,000. These amounts represent only a part of the value that has been added to Montana farm and range land. It is safe to say that the results gained in increased resources have been worth many times the investment.

Through the programs of the A. A. A. and the Soil Conservation Service, Montana farmers have made great progress in soil improvement and erosion control.

The Soil Conservation Service has offered its assistance in two main ways: Through erosion-control demonstration areas, and through cooperation with soil-conservation districts organized by popular election.

There are two erosion-control demonstration areas in Montana, embracing a total of 72,239 acres. One of the projects is located at Culbertson, the other at Dutton. There is a C. C. C. erosion-control camp located at Lewiston; the camp-work area embraces about 50,000 acres. There are six land-purchase areas under the supervision of the Service. These areas involve an acreage of 14,357,103 acres.

Farmers and ranchers have organized, by popular election, two soil-conservation districts. The Wibaux district in Wibaux County embraces 565,000 acres, and the Reserve district in Sheridan County embraces 70,000 acres. The Service is cooperating with both districts in providing technical assistance in drawing up farm plans and certain materials and C. C. C. labor, where available.

Farmers and ranchers, with the help of the Soil Conservation Service are developing water supplies in 4 water-facilities areas covering 2,409,560 acres. The Service has also helped to work out erosion-control plans on 25 farms selected by the Montana Agricultural Extension Service which are outside of demonstration and camp areas. There are 12,250 acres in the extension demonstration farms.

During the last 5 years, 156 farmers in demonstration and camp areas have planned and applied complete erosion-control programs over 58,700 acres with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service. Plans have been drawn up for the use of grazing and other facilities on 3,790,000 acres of the land-purchase areas.

Work under the Pope-Jones water-facilities program is progressing with 13 plans completed on 26,387 acres.

Altogether the Service has entered into 323 land-use agreements with farmers and public agencies operating 3,901,648 acres of land.

Here is a brief summary of accomplishments in the demonstration areas (reports of accomplishments in the recently established soil-conservation districts are not available):

Over 13,000 acres are now cultivated on the contour. Crop rotations have been worked out for over 44,000 acres, and 36,000 acres are now strip cropped. Nearly 13,000 acres have been retired from cultivation, and about 12,000 acres of cover crops have been planted for defense against erosion. Ninety-five thousand linear feet of diversions have been constructed on range and farm lands.

Contour furrows and ridges have been constructed on over 46,000 acres of range. Water spreaders have been built on 4,300 acres and 840 water-storage structures, mostly stock ponds, have been constructed in demonstration and camp areas.

Hay acreage has increased by 7,500 acres in these areas. Over 4,000 acres have been terraced.

I would like to say a few words about the work of the Farm Security Administration in my State. Farm Security helps distressed farmers—victims of adverse conditions beyond their control. In recent years thousands of drought victims have been forced to turn to the Farm Security Administration for help. Since the summer of 1935 until March 1, 1940, 23,384 farm families in Montana have been aided by this agency in one way or another.

Severe drought, low prices for farm products, insects, and other circumstances beyond their control brought hardship to many Montana farm families during the last decade. First, they needed immediate relief but they also needed some more permanent help if they were to continue to farm. Those who decided to stay on at farm operations needed debt adjustment, money for seed, feed, and equipment. Hundreds of small farmers who turned from dry farming to irrigation enterprises, or who shifted to livestock raising from crop farming, needed information on the conduct of their new operations.

The Farm Security Administration has helped low-income farm families in Montana get a new start through rehabilitation loans, accompanied by assistance in the development of complete farm and home management plans.

Representatives of the F. S. A. helped borrowers to work out farm plans which included provision for sufficient forage for range and subsistence livestock, crop rotation in order to build up the soil, and a well-balanced, adequate diet the year around.

Altogether, a total of 14,770 standard and emergency rehabilitation loans have been made to hard-hit Montana farmers over the past 5 years, amounting to $9,554,358. Recently, a survey was made of over 2,000 of the standard rehabilitation loan borrowers in the State, and some of the results were extremely interesting and significant.

This survey showed that these borrowers had an average net income last year of $1,188.26 per family, as compared

with $736.86 in the year before they obtained rehabilitation loans. This represents an increase of 61 percent.

These borrowers already have repaid $2,475,436 into the Federal Treasury, and much of the money is not yet due.

Farm families in the drought areas needed more than loans during the worst of the drought. They had to have direct grants to buy food for themselves and feed for livestock. A total of 229,148 small grants, averaging about $22.50 each and amounting to a total of $5,154,829, has been made in my State.

Many of those who received grants needed immediate help before they could set forth on the loan program. Hundreds of others accepted technical aid and followed suggestions for making their farm units self-sufficient.

Montana rehabilitation borrowers last year produced $726,283 worth of goods for home consumption as compared with only $423,063 worth before they came into the F. S. A. program. The average production of food for home consumption before these families borrowed from F. S. A. was $193 a year; last year it was $325, an increase of 68 percent. They canned 446,131 quarts of fruits and vegetables, or an average of 200 quarts per family; and they produced 1,097,609 gallons of milk for home use, an average of 492 gallons. To feed their livestock they grew 118,930 tons of forage, an average of 53 tons each. This kind of diversified farming has meant a higher standard of living, a better diet, and usually a marked improvement in health.

The debts of 1,100 Montana farmers have been adjusted downward by 25-percent farm debt adjustment committees. This is a free service which is available to every farmer. In Montana the burden on these 1,100 farmers before adjustment was $3,304,389. The debt after the settlements between debtor and creditor was $2,474,404. As a result the farmers were able to pay $66,264 to their county governments in back taxes.

Cooperatives of one kind or another have played an important part in the Great Plains. In Montana this is true even though the small farmers are well scattered throughout the State and cooperation is often very difficult. The Farm Security Administration has made 43 group service, or cooperative, loans amounting to $157,817 in Montana, and 1,619 small farmers got the benefits of working together. These 43 co-ops provided a variety of service—purchasing, marketing, buying manure spreaders, grain drills, tractors, binders, rakes, hay loaders, and combines, and getting irrigation facilities, sire service, and cooperative feed mills.

It is not always possible to help distressed farmers get back on their feet through financial aid, or to help them get started in livestock enterprises or irrigation farming. They may need new farms that will produce them a decent living. In a small way the F. S. A. has been attacking this land problem through homestead developments. In Montana two projects are operating at present, and a third will be ready for settlement in 1940. The projects will cover over 40,000 acres of decent land and will give 378 relocated families a chance to succeed. Already more than 300 families are living on the projects in new houses and on good land.

Those of you who believe that farm tenancy is confined to the Southern States may be surprised to know that nearly 27 percent of the farmers in Montana are tenants. The Farm Security Administration's farm-purchase program for tenant farmers has begun to help these Montana tenants get farms of their own.

A number of farm-security loans have been made to farmers to enable them to get small water facilities for their farms. The F. S. A. program has helped 1,458 tenants get written leases in place of vague, oral agreements. It has enabled borrowers to increase the size of their farms by 191 acres since they came on the program. All of these things have had their place in helping many distressed farmers in this State to become self-supporting and secure.

One part of the national farm program which is of great importance to both producers and consumers is the surplus-removal programs.

Surplus farm products, including apples, oat cereal, graham and white flour, have been bought in Montana by the F. S. C. C. during the period July 1, 1938, to December 31, 1939. These farm commodities, costing nearly $85,000, were bought under the surplus-removal program to improve marketing conditions for producers.

During this same period more than 20,000,000 pounds of surplus commodities were shipped to the Montana State Department of Public Welfare. These commodities were distributed by the welfare department to relief families and to free school-lunch programs. According to the latest reports more than 17,600 undernourished children in 540 schools in this State received these lunches daily.

The newest program of bridging the gap between abundance and need, the food stamp plan is now operating in two Montana areas—Great Falls, and the rest of Cascade County, and Missoula, and the rest of Missoula County. At the end of April nearly 6,000 people in these two areas of the State were taking part, and had received by that time $13,865 in additional buying power. It is likely that the full potentialities of the stamp plan have not been realized in the two areas, for the plan did not go into operation in Great Falls until March 25, and in Missoula not until April 1, 1940. Experience has shown that several months' operation are required to reach the maximum number of families.

Since the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935 Montana has become a leader among the Western States in rural electrification. Eleven cooperatives have borrowed $2,398,100 for the construction of 2,500 miles of line which will serve between six and seven thousand farms. Of these cooperatives, 10 are already in operation, with 1,700 miles in service, to which nearly 4,000 farms have already been connected.

In December 1934, before the R. E. A. was established, only 2,768 Montana farms were connected to high-line electric power. Approximately three times that number are now connected, it is estimated, with the number rapidly increasing. The major part of this increase has been the direct result of the R. E. A. program.

The program which farmers now have links improvement of their cash income with conservation of cropland and range, and with greater security and better living on the land. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Security Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration have all worked together to accomplish these ends in Montana. Farmers themselves control and administer the program locally. It provides a means by which farmers can adjust to new situations as they develop.

No one claims perfection for this program, but it is an honest and sincere effort to give to the farmers a better plan and program for their future than has ever been offered. I have, in season and out of season, worked and cooperated in bringing about the beneficial results set forth in this statement and I assure the farmers of Montana, that so long as I am a Member of Congress I will continue to support such legislation and such improvements to the foregoing program as will be beneficial to the farmers of Montana. I also repeat what I have said on the floor of the House many, many times: That as far as possible the American market should be reserved for the American farmers and livestock men and also we should produce a larger percentage of the sugar consumed in the United States.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

RESOLUTION OF DE SOTO POST, NO. 42, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of

De Soto Post, No. 42, of the American Legion, Department of Louisiana:

Whereas our country was founded in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity;

Whereas the ideals and principles for which the American Legion and our forefathers fought are threatened by forces from abroad and various "isms" from within;

Whereas the members of this organization, as well as every citizen of these United States, have a duty to perform passed on to us by the fallen hands now stilled under the sod of the battlefields of France; and these buddies of ours, who cannot speak for themselves, but whose spirit are with us, expect and have a right to demand that we hold aloft in this troubled world those ideals and principles for which they died;

Whereas most of our leaders in the Government have been fighting against great handicaps trying to prepare this country for defense from forces abroad and enemies from within, but have been and are now being deterred by certain individuals, organizations, and cliques to the great danger of this country of ours;

Whereas the members of this organization know from experience that in order for men to defend their country they must be properly trained, and industry and the resources of the country must be mobilized;

Whereas countries in Europe have gone down to defeat, and others may go down, for the reason their leaders have failed in their duty to their people, having taken the road of appeasement and pacifism, which roads lead to disaster and slavery;

Whereas the only language understood by the enemies of those ideals and principles is airplane for airplane, tank for tank, gun for gun, and battleship for battleship; and that this is no time for muddling, but the time has come to answer force with force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By De Soto Post, No. 42, of the American Legion of the Department of Louisiana, in special meeting assembled, and attended by numerous ex-service men not members of this organization, and other citizens of this community, that we go on record condemning the tactics of those individuals, organizations, and cliques in deterring our Government from preparing our country for its adequate defense; and that by the right of public assembly, we request, implore, and demand of those in authority to immediately and forthwith place this country on a footing of preparedness by the conscription of man power, property, and industry, if need be, before it is too late; be it further

Resolved, That this organization, all ex-service men, and the mass of the citizens of this community are behind the President and his aides in pushing to the fullest extent the preparedness program started; and we request, implore, and demand that this program go forward without let-up in spite of the obstacles placed in the Government's way by those individuals, organizations, and cliques in this country who are of the same mind as those who have caused the downfall of other countries by their muddling tactics; be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion knows no ism but Americanism, and we recognize that no class, creed, or organization has a monopoly of this great principle; be it further

Resolved, That we will not stand for any Trojan horse or "fifth column" activities in this community; and propose to fight and carry on for those buddies of ours who have passed on and those who are now incapacitated, all as we see the light and under the great principles of this organization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators, Congressmen, a copy be furnished the press, and a copy spread upon the minutes of our post.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF POST NO. 24, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of American Legion Post No. 24, of Newberry, S. C.:

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

In the present national and international crises, you, as leaders of our Government, have sources of information which the people of this Nation do not have; therefore you can best formulate national policies of defense. However, in formulating such policies, as leaders in this democracy, you will necessarily take into consideration the public's attitude; and

Whereas the freedom of our national and individual liberties are seriously threatened by the ruthless aggression of the dictator nations, which, if unchecked, will destroy our democratic form of government by "fifth column" activities and eventually actual invasion: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Post No. 24, Newberry, S. C., in regular meeting assembled—

First. That we offer our services to our Nation and to our community for the promotion of their safety against aggression from within and from without.

Second. That we heartily commend the efforts of our President and Congress to prepare this Nation for defense and entreat you to exercise fully, with boldness and dispatch, the leadership which we have vested in you.

Third. That we recommend the enactment of such legislation as will permit our Government and its citizens to extend to Great Britain and her Allies prompt assistance by furnishing war materials, supplies, and necessary credit to the full extent of our ability without jeopardizing our home defense.

Fourth. That we deplore the attitude of those citizens who would place governmental expenditures for current peacetime needs above our pressing demand for large appropriations to facilitate immediate defense; these citizens apparently being unable to understand that their enjoyment of peace and personal liberty to speak, act, and worship as they please may be destroyed unless vigorously and promptly defended.

Fifth. That we, as members of the American Legion, Post No. 24, Newberry, S. C., will stand with you wholeheartedly in whatever action you make take though it will mean sacrifices, hardships, and suffering for months and perhaps years.

Sixth. That copies of this resolution be furnished to the President, to Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, Senator JAMES F. BYRNES, Congressman BUTLER B. HARE, department commander, the American Legion of South Carolina, and the local press.

Adopted June 24, 1940.

Address Nominating Hon. Dewey Short for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD KNUTSON, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia, June 1940:

Fellow Republicans, you have named as the standard bearer of the Republican Party a great and outstanding American who will lead us to victory in November, thereby assuring that our cherished institutions and ideals will be preserved for posterity. The need is for a balanced ticket; one where each of the nominees will carry his full share of the load and at the same time measure up to the demands of the times and the best traditions of the grand old party.

In selecting the nominee for Vice President we must not lose sight of the fact that it is within the range of possibility that he may be called upon, through unforeseen contingencies, to become the chief magistrate of this great and glorious republic.

It has been well said that unusual times call for unusual men. These are most unusual times, so I appear before you thrice armed.

I shall not weary you with a long and exhaustive dissertation on the accomplishments of the one who I think should be nominated as our candidate for the Vice Presidency. He is known to most of you as a militant and fighting Republican.

Party adversity has but made him more militantly active. He is a loyal son of the party that saved the Union in '61 and has given to the Nation such towering giants as Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, and McKinley.

Since entering the national arena he has time and again spoken from coast to coast, expounding undiluted Americanism and sound Republican doctrines. One of the great orators of the day, his scintillating aphorisms and homely metaphors never fail to stir his hearers to the highest levels of enthusiasm and contemplation. This is equally true in the Congress, on the platform—wherever he speaks.

A keen student of history, politics, and economics, he has a penetrating discernment into the fallacies and foibles of the New Deal. Indeed, he was one of the first to place the New Deal under the microscope, where he found it to be a thing of froth that covered broken promises, reckless spending, dangerous experiments, and alien and hostile influences that have wormed their way into every branch of the Federal Government.

He, whose name it is my pleasure and honor to present to you, has had a long and distinguished career in the Congress of the United States, where he is beloved and respected by his colleagues for his sterling Americanism, his courageous heart, his rugged honesty, his loyalty, his ability, and his friendliness.

He comes from the valley of the Mississippi—the heart of the Nation, where we absorb with every breath, love of country; where the very breezes continually refortify us with loyalty to the Republic and to that glorious old flag whose stars and stripes have been baptized in the best blood of American manhood.

He, whose name I shall present, was born amidst lowly surroundings as were the immortal Lincoln and Garfield. He understands as few do the problems of humanity, be they on farm, in shop, in factory, or in the home. Notwithstanding the handicaps imposed upon him by poverty from his very childhood, he has risen through personal integrity, ability, untiring industry, and altogether by his own efforts to become one of America's foremost legislators. Not only has he been educated in the school of hard knocks but also in some of the leading universities of America and Europe. By temperament, training, and experience he is in every way big enough and broad enough to fill the chief magistracy of the Nation should occasion arise.

His services to our party have been so outstanding that he deserves, and should receive, the nomination for Vice President by acclamation. That, indeed, would be a fitting reward for one who has been up in the front line for 15 and more years battling for American ideals and the Republican Party.

Fellow Republicans, it is my great privilege, my honor, and my pleasure to give you for Vice President of the United States a great American, Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri.

The Law Against Monopoly Has Passed the Half-Century Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1940

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, July 2, 1940, is the fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act. While this act has not accomplished all that the framers of the law intended or hoped, still I shudder to think what would have happened to our system of free and independent business enterprise if it had not been for this statute.

While the Sherman Act has been on the statute books for 50 years it was not until the present administration, and particularly under the supervision of the Honorable Robert Jackson and the Honorable Thurman Arnold, that the act has been vigorously enforced. In antitrust matters alone these gentlemen have established enviable records. They have proved that with proper and impartial enforcement of the antitrust laws the great body of consumers will receive untold benefits. I need only cite the prosecution of the major oil companies on the Pacific coast, which has resulted in untold savings to the motorists in my own State and other States on the Pacific coast.

The framers of the Sherman Act, in addition to giving the Federal Government authority to proceed criminally or by injunction against violators of the act, also provided a remedy in section 7 whereby the independent businessman or consumer who is damaged by a conspiracy in restraint of trade or a monopoly is given a right of action for treble damages.

This little-known and less-understood section of the Sherman Act has been litigated in the courts more than is generally understood. It is particularly fitting that the cases adjudicated, together with a statement of the principles and procedure in treble damage actions, has been published for release on the fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act. I refer to the book, Treble Damages Under the Antitrust Laws, written by Paul E. Hadlick.

This collection of material clarifying the individual's rights, when he has been damaged by a conspiracy or monopoly, will be a valuable aid to the independent businessmen and their lawyers throughout the Nation.

In conclusion, let me remind the Members of Congress that the Congressional Conference on Unemployment found that monopoly was one of the causes of unemployment. That conference said:

Monopoly is dangerous wherever it operates to reduce production and maintain artificially high prices for its products. This means much unemployment due to direct lay-offs by monopoly controlled industries, and probably even more due to the indirect effect of having the monopoly take more than its share of the consumer's dollar, leaving far too little of it for competitive industries, such as agriculture, textiles, etc.

And that same conference, as part of a program for the speedy reduction and ultimate elimination of unemployment in the United States, recommended—

The granting of such appropriations to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice as it may be able effectively to use in breaking up monopoly control of prices in the United States.

New Uses for Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS R. HENRY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems facing us today as a part of the program for putting America back to work is finding new uses for agricultural and forestry products. A very significant advance has been recently made in perfecting a process for turning wood into liquid and utilizing not only refuse forestry products but also to utilize the entire tree in a new way. As a part of my remarks I ask leave to include a discussion of this process by Mr. Thomas R. Henry, appearing in the Washington Star of June 10, 1940. The article follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 10, 1940]

NEW FIBER IS SEEN AS PRODUCT OF LIQUEFYING WOOD—CANADIAN CHEMIST ALSO SPECULATES ON CLUE TO CANCER GROWTHS

(By Thomas R. Henry)

CINCINNATI, April 10.—Turning wood into a liquid has been accomplished by Canadian chemists.

Prof. Harold Hibbert, of McGill University, told the American Chemical Society here today how he takes whole logs and converts them into fluid without losing anything in the process.

Within the last few weeks, he said, he has been able to duplicate the accomplishment of German chemists in liquefying coal in order to convert it to gasoline. This is now the chief source of Germany's motor fuel, and upon the process depends to a large extent the Reich's ability to remain at war.

VISIONS NEW TYPE OF FIBER

Dr. Hibbert's liquid wood, however, will serve only purposes of peace. He has not even explored its possibilities as a fuel, he said. His process is similar to that of the German coal-liquefying technique. The logs are reduced to sawdust and treated with hydrogen gas under high pressures. They then undergo, Professor Hibbert said, "complete transformation into water-white liquids which can be separated by distillation without decomposition. These separate parts hold great promise as raw materials for a future new synthetic organic chemical industry; one of them, in particular, is so closely related to the raw material from which the new fiber nylon is made that it should prove readily possible to obtain from it a new variety of this synthetic fiber, the raw material being wood instead of coal."

Last year Professor Hibbert announced that he had extracted vanillin, the flavoring material hitherto obtained from the vanilla bean, from the wood of Canadian spruces. Now, he says, an experimental factory is turning out about 300 pounds of vanilla extract a day.

The Canadian chemist and his collaborators have been working for the past 10 years to find some use for lignin, the part of wood which must be discarded in making paper or rayon. It constitutes nearly half the weight of the wood. His investigations now show, Professor Hibbert said, that this substance is formed as a product of plant respiration, or in the course of "digestion" of the carbohydrate foodstuffs consumed in the plant and from which it obtains the energy necessary to grow.

SIMILAR RESPIRATION

Professor Hibbert also presented a new theory of the manner in which a plant derives its growth energy, and it is very similar to modern theories of animal-cell respiration. It is now known, he said, that one part of this plant-breathing mechanism is occupied by vitamin C, used to prevent scurvy in human beings, and that certain other products with similar groupings in their molecules are known to function in the same way in plant respiration.

He now has found, he said, that the original substance from which lignin is derived is a member of the same class, although it is not known whether it has any vitamin properties. All these substances, upon exposure to air, are readily converted into brownish substances. They are responsible for the brown discoloration of freshly cut apples or bananas and probably for the fact that newspapers turn brown with age.

Professor Hibbert also found that in tumors which appear on sugar beets the amount of lignin is greatly in excess of the normal for plant cells. Thus, he believes, growth of tumors on plants is due to some disturbance in normal breathing processes. The same also has been suspected with respect to animal tumors. Thus, Professor Hibbert pointed out, a whole new field may be opened up on the mechanisms of abnormal types of animal-cell growth, such as result in cancers.

WASTE BEING UTILIZED

Meanwhile five industrial uses have been found in the United States for some of the 15,000,000 tons of lignin in sawdust, shavings, and other forms of wood waste. In addition to this, said Dr. Edwin C. Jann, of the New York State College of Forestry, the millions of tons of waste straw, corncobs, and grain husks contain from 15 to 25 percent of lignin.

The Department of Agriculture laboratories, he said, have developed ways of solidifying the lignin solution from pulp plants, which now goes to contaminate rivers, by combining with it carbon dioxide from factory smokestacks, and making from it various forms of plastics.

A molding powder has been developed from lignin which can be used in building up boards from fiber sheets. Some of these plastics have extraordinary strength and water resistance. They are all black, some reaching the color of ebony. Other laboratories have developed means of obtaining from lignin various hydrocarbons, acids, and aromatic substances.

GROWTH VITAMIN DISCOVERED

Existence in nature of a hitherto unknown growth vitamin which works in almost unbelievably small quantities in promoting the growth of certain bacteria was described by Dr. A. E. Oxford, of the University of Wisconsin. It is a twin of biotin, the essential growth factor for yeast, for soil bacteria, and for the bacteria in milk which convert sugar into lactic acid. As little as a thirty-thousandth of an ounce is sufficient to bring about the otherwise impossible fermentation of sugar. The new substance, Dr. Oxford said, works in even more minute amounts, but must be added to the biotin to make possible the increase of bacteria used in an acetone-producing process.

Methods similar to those used by astronomers for telling what stars are made of now are being used to protect the purity of American whisky, said Dr. A. J. Liebmann, New York chemist. Minute amounts of a sample of whisky are burned in an electric arc and the spectrum of the light photographed. The most minute amounts conceivable of any contaminations are revealed by the lines appearing in the spectrum.

"In Time of Peace Prepare for War"—George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is the party that has followed most closely the admonition of George Washington when he said, "In time of peace prepare for war."

Go down to the War Department and look over the records for the last half century and you will find it was during the Democratic administration that this Nation strengthened its national-defense installations and set-up. Yes; you will find that the Democratic administrations were always preparing for continuous peace in the United States—realizing that the only way we can feel secure and the only avenue we have to look forward through to continuous peace was through ample preparation by the installation of national-defense units of the Army, Navy, and other service organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the former President Hoover make a statement over the radio at the Republican convention the other evening that sounded to me as though some one of his friends had given him the wrong figures when he was quoting expenditures of this administration. The next day I went to the records of the War Department and secured the correct figures. These figures were relative to appropriations for Army national defense during the last dozen years.

I was surprised to find that for the 6 years 1929 to 1934, inclusive, there had been appropriated by the Republican administration $1,886,037,487 for Army national defense, and for the 6 years 1935 to 1940, inclusive, that the Democratic administration had appropriated for Army national defense only $2,791,338,904.

Mr. Hoover and other Republican so-called leaders have been shouting over the radio and giving interviews to the effect that this administration has been negligent in their preparation to defend this country. Since many of them who make these statements are my colleagues here in the House, I would not say they are making false statements, but I do say that before they speak they should secure the correct figures and facts. Surely they do not want to lead the American people into believing statements that have no foundation or facts back of them.

If you will check the records in the War Department, you can find out where every dollar of the $1,886,037,487 was spent. It was spent honestly. I cannot say it was spent wisely in all respects, but I can say it matters not whether the Republicans or Democrats are in power, the War Department gives an honest account of their expenditures.

You will find that at the end of the first 6 years, 1929 to 1934, inclusive, we had practically no antiaircraft, no antitank guns, no modern tanks, just a few first-line planes, deplorable quarters in which we were housing our doughboys and noncommissioned officers and in some cases our officers, no mechanized units in the Army, and so forth.

If you will examine the records as to how and for what the $2,791,338,904 was spent in the 6-year period, 1935 to 1940, inclusive, you will be agreeably surprised.

If you go down to Fort Knox, Ky., you will see a mechanized Army unit second to none in the world, not so heavy as the German units, but you will find that we have more than 1,000 modern medium-weight and light-weight tanks and armored cars. You will find that we have thousands of first-class high-powered antiaircraft guns. You will find that we have taken the wagon wheels off our field artillery and modernized them with mobile equipment. You will find modern installations of all kinds that go to make up a mechanized army.

If you go to March Field, Calif., to Selfridge Field, Mich., to Barksdale Field, La., to Kelly and Randolph Fields in Texas, to Langley Field in Virginia, to Dayton, Ohio, to Bolling Field, D. C., to Mitchel Field, N. Y., to Maxwell Field, Ala., you will find large, up-to-date air bases. You will also find modern equipment. You will find that we have more than 3,000 modern planes of different types at these fields and other fields the Army has, to say nothing of the more than 2,000 planes England and France and Sweden and Denmark and other countries bought and paid for from our industries and took from our shores in keeping with the law.

That is not all. Go to our airplane factories and our arsenals and ask them how their facilities for turning out equipment now compare with what it was in 1934. You will find they will tell you that they can turn out 5 times more equipment now—and in some cases 10 times more—in a day or month than they could in 1934.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, if it were possible for all the people to see the equipment that this administration has bought for the Army since 1934, they would be filled with pride at not only the quality but the quantity of first-class national-defense installations the Nation now enjoys.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we do not have enough of any of these articles of national defense, but what we do have as to size and type is the very best that money can buy. We must have thousands and thousands more planes, more tanks, more

antiaircraft guns. The 1941 appropriation will provide for additional increments of these installations and undoubtedly the next Congress will add more until we have the proper national defense for the preservation and security of our Nation.

Pennsylvania Turnpike Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER A. JONES BEFORE HOUSE ROADS COMMITTEE, JUNE 11, 1940

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Hon. Walter A. Jones, chairman of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, at an informal meeting of several members of the House Roads Committee on June 11, 1940, regarding the financing and construction of the Pennsylvania Turnpike and proposing the building of other similar multilane, limited access highways.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that at this particular hour no subject is more important for consideration by your committee than that of super express highways about which I wish to talk to you. A few months ago in Chicago I heard a distinguished member of this committee say that the important work of your committee is done without politics. This statement made a great impression upon me because it is on that basis that we have built the great Pennsylvania tunnel superhighway. Especially is it important that the work of your committee and such projects as our great highway should be built without politics because there is a direct relationship between our economic development and prosperity and proper transportation facilities. Therefore, I feel that your committee is of very great importance.

PENNSYLVANIA TURNPIKE

The time is so short I am not going to tell you much about the turnpike. In 1937 the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed the turnpike act which set up a commission of five members to build a high-speed superhighway through the Allegheny Mountains by using the old railroad right-of-way and tunnels of a railroad started and partly built 50-odd-years ago by Andrew Carnegie and his associates. The tunnels were bored through about 30 percent quantitatively. We enlarged them. They were built for only one track and we enlarged them to make them wide enough to allow two lanes of automobile traffic. The members of the commission were appointed. My term is for 10 years and I am its chairman. I had never built any superhighways but I was not at a particular disadvantage because no one else in this country had ever built a superhighway.

GERMAN SUPERHIGHWAYS

My first act was to go to Germany to study the Hitler highways. As you know, Mr. Upham spent considerable time in Germany and is fully informed as to the engineering of the Hitler roads, which plan involved the building of a circle around the city of Berlin from which circle highways extended in all directions like the spokes of a wheel. If you gentlemen could have seen what I saw you would have already had these superhighways started and some of them built by now. One day when I was out to the northwest of Berlin about 45 miles, I had stopped the car at the side of the road to measure the width of the pavement. There I found two lanes of concrete—one in each direction, each 27 feet wide—54 feet of concrete pavement with a parkway between the lanes. While I was standing there I noticed a fleet of trucks coming. I stepped aside to watch them pass. In a moment came the head of the fleet, each truck filled with infantry. These trucks were going 50 miles an hour and in a few minutes came another fleet filled with machine gunners. These were also going 50 miles per hour. In a few minutes came another fleet loaded with artillery—whizzing by. I never will forget, Mr. Chairman, the creepy feeling I had when I stood there and watched these soldiers going at that rate of speed because I knew that swift transportation is the most important thing in the movement of troops and armies. That we know has been one of the great advantages on the side of the Germans in the present war.

HOW TURNPIKE WAS FINANCED

I want to impress upon you how this superhighway, the Pennsylvania turnpike, was financed. I will give to each of you a copy of the act. It authorized the commission to sell bonds; bonds that specifically state on the face that they are not the liability of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and are payable solely out of revenue from fares. We do not call them tolls. We could not sell these bonds to the public nor interest private capital but it was necessary to make the effort and prove that fact for the record. Therefore, we came to the Government and finally got $70,050,000 from the United States Government for this project. Fifty-five percent of this or $40,800,000 came from the proceeds of 30-year bonds bought by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They bear 3¾-percent interest. They are free of taxation, State and Federal. We obtained 45 percent or $29,250,000 from the Public Works Administration as a grant. That, the grant, is the cash equity in our set-up. As fast as we have needed money we have it from the two Government agencies. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which committed itself to take down these bonds in installments, has taken them as fast as needed in allotments of $10,000,000 and as fast as this happened a syndicate of private bankers has come in and purchased these from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In other words, with the exception of the Public Works Administration equity, these bonds have been distributed to the public. The Government had to start this great project as it is too big to be done by any one State. The building of a system of superhighways can only be done by the Federal Government as the central authority.

NATIONAL SUPERHIGHWAY AUTHORITY PROPOSED

What I propose is a national defense superhighway authority set up on practically the same basis as the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, this authority to have the power to issue bonds which would not be an obligation of the United States Government. These bonds, both as to principal and interest, would be paid out of revenues received, so I urge you to consider the formation of a Federal authority to build these superhighways on the same basis as the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission is building the great tunnel highway. This Federal authority could build such a system of military-defense roads without $1 of appropriation of Government money. The fact that the public has bought all of our Pennsylvania turnpike bonds up to this time although we have not yet finished the road or had any revenue is proof of the interest and belief of public investors in revenue securities. The experience in other revenue-producing projects in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been so successful is further proof of the soundness of this plan.

LIMITED ACCESS ROADS

These should not be toll roads in the real sense of the word. There is a distinct difference between a toll road and a self-liquidating superhighway. It matters not how fine a road is built, it is still nothing but a road if it has grade crossings and if it has access to adjoining property. Bear in mind the Pennsylvania turnpike is 160 miles long with only 11 places of entry. There is not a single grade crossing. You start at one end and go the entire length of the highway without crossroads. There is not a red light and the only signs are those that slow up a motorist when approaching a tunnel. The entire right-of-way is fenced as a railroad right-of-way is fenced.

BUILD WITH PRIVATE CAPITAL

Such a system can be built with private capital if you will form a Federal authority with power to issue bonds, with the interest guaranteed by the Federal Government. This guaranty would only be a guaranty, no money at all, except the initial advance would be required. Mr. MacDonald, who is an outstanding authority on highways, has a very efficient organization. Let this National Defense Superhighway Authority be a part of his organization, but with the authority to sell these bonds. Banks which are now bursting with money would quickly purchase and distribute these bonds. Mr. MacDonald's organization would have to do the engineering. As this is done and sections of the road are finished and the revenues begin to come in a sinking fund would be set up to amortize the bonds. They should be 50-year bonds. The initial money, which could be advanced by some of the agencies to this national authority, would be amortized in the early stages and paid back. In other words, private capital would furnish every cent of the cost of this great proposition.

These highways should circumvent the towns. I have made a rough blueprint, which I will leave with you, together with a copy of our Pennsylvania act. I hope you will not consider this presumptuous.

HEARINGS HELD IN 1937

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, excuse me for interrupting, but I would just like to say this at this time: On May 18, 1937, this committee held a hearing on superhighways. Three bills were considered at that time. Two were introduced by myself. I say this with no credit for myself, but in those resolutions there was set up an authority in line with what Mr. Jones has said today. I simply wanted to say that for the committee and I congratulate Mr. Jones for furthering our interest in this project. I have believed in superhighways for many years and am certain there are many members of this committee and Members of Congress who are equally interested.

Mr. JONES. If I can revive what you have started, Mr. Congressman, it would be a fine accomplishment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What kind of signals do you have where there are 10 approaches?

Mr. JONES. As you come up on the highway there are three lanes instead of two. You come up on an accelerating lane and there you gradually increase your speed with the traffic that you are entering, and when you attempt to get off at one of these interchanges you go into a third lane, called the decelerating lane.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What are your fares to be on this highway?

SCHEDULE OF FARES

Mr. JONES. We have set up a scale of fares which we have recommended to the Government agencies for approval. Approximately, for passenger automobiles, it will be $1.50 for the entire trip. That means whether there is 1 passenger or 10 in the automobile. The fares for trucks will depend upon size and weight, varying from $3 to $10.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What is the driving time now between Harrisburg and Pittsburgh on the presently constituted highways?

Mr. JONES. On presently constituted highways at the maximum legal speed of 50 miles per hour, and considering the traffic and the terrain, 6 to 6½ hours.

Mr. RANDOLPH. On the superhighway?

Mr. JONES. Two to two and one-half hours.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The public, you believe, will be willing to pay the fare because of the time saved and the better riding facilities?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The engineers have laid this road out for 100 miles per hour safe speed. We will guard this, but with the present speed of automobiles and the fact that our roads are built on the average for safe speeds not to exceed 30 miles per hour, you can see what an attraction it will be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the width of each lane?

Mr. JONES. Twenty-four feet in each direction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the width of the parkway?

Mr. JONES. Only 10 feet.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Planted?

Mr. JONES. Planted with grass and shrubs.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In addition to the safety on the highway—and the time saving—another matter is the small amount of fuel consumption.

Mr. JONES. That is very important; the traffic engineers who made a thorough study of this matter figured that down to a fraction of a cent. That's why all the trucking companies that move fleets of trucks from Missouri and Nebraska and the Western States to eastern tidewater have studied this route and assure us they will use it. Depending on the point of origin, it is 200 miles shorter to the seaboard from the Midwest and Northwest than the routes they are now using.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Take your lane of 24 feet. Will a passenger car have to pass those trucks?

Mr. JONES. The trucks and slow-moving traffic will have to use the outside lane.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Do you go through any important municipality?

Mr. JONES. Not one. There are roads that come out from the municipalities and connect with the superhighway. On this map I have suggested a road from Richmond to Boston and Chicago and St. Louis to connect with this, bypassing all large cities. You could not finance a road going through the large cities.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This is for through traffic from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh—you spoke about acquiring railroad right-of-way.

Mr. JONES. That railroad was started by Carnegie and Vanderbilt to force the Pennsylvania Railroad to give them satisfactory rates on steel.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. How long did they build it?

Mr. JONES. The tunnels were about 30 percent finished in quantities removed. I want to qualify this statement, but I think about 45 percent of the grade was built. We have used very little of it, comparatively. In order to get these tunnels we had to buy the whole thing.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Has it been used as a railroad?

Mr. JONES. Never was used.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Was that a franchise?

Mr. JONES. They owned the right-of-way for 160 miles and more. They had spent from eight to ten million dollars. We bought it for $2,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What additional amount did you spend for the right-of-way?

Mr. JONES. Our total right-of-way will cost us, including the railroad right-of-way, about $3,500,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will that include the approaches?

Mr. JONES. Our construction is averaging $425,000 per mile.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Perhaps you misunderstood; did you acquire a certain width?

Mr. JONES. Our right-of-way is 200 feet wide. We had to acquire 160 miles 200 feet wide. That has cost us about $3,500,000, including the original $2,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did you buy any adjacent park lands?

Mr. Jones. Not as such. In addition to the 200 feet in rare cases we have bought more than that for specific uses.

Mr. PATTON. Any utilities for the traveling public?

Mr. JONES. There will be a very fine set of filling stations in each of which there will be restaurant accommodations for the public.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is that top of concrete?

Mr. JONES. All concrete.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Most economical and durable?

Mr. JONES. That seemed to be the consensus of opinion of the Commission and the Government engineers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This commission located the right-of-way? This is a five-man commission, and you are chairman. All matters decided by a majority vote?

Mr. JONES. I say this with a great deal of pride. This commission is a bipartisan commission but there has never been a split vote on any decision of policy, on recommendations, or letting of contracts. There have always been thorough discussions to get at the facts, but our commission, I repeat with a good deal of pride, has worked diligently to do the very best thing in the very best way for the project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. How would you say your superhighway compares with this road outside of Berlin?

Mr. JONES. I would say there is a great improvement. Our highway is a great improvement with two exceptions. They have wider pavement. They have 54-foot instead of 48-foot pavement, and they have an average of 20-foot parkway, and we have only 10 feet. Going through this mountainous region it would have been very expensive to have a wider parkway.

Chairman CARTWRIGHT. I too have been in Germany, and I want to say that anything that Germany can do well America can do better.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Entirely different conception from the Merritt Parkway which is for local use.

Mr. JONES. I am hoping to have you gentlemen consider taking up steps to create this authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is your reaction to the report which was submitted by Mr. MacDonald with respect to toll roads?

Mr. JONES. I agree absolutely with Mr. MacDonald that we should not have tolls on roads, but I differentiate between a road and a superhighway. I say that superhighways should not be free until the users have paid for them by fares. A high-speed superhighway that has a fenced-in right-of-way free of grade crossings is more than an ordinary road.

Mr. RANDOLPH. You bring up this report of Mr. MacDonald. Mr. MacDonald has come with reluctance to a feeling for superhighways. In conferences 3 years ago he was against superhighways, and since then I have seen a gradual change in his attitude.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is there any other turnpike in the country?

Chairman CARTWRIGHT. There is a bridge—Oakland bridge.

Mr. JONES. There are a number of bridges and projects of that kind that have been financed by revenue bonds. I understand Mr. Jesse Jones thinks very favorably now of the possibility of financing great public works with revenue bonds. I want to tell you one great service you gentlemen of the committee can do. For instance, here is a map showing the roads in the northeast section of the United States, which is the thickly populated section. From Richmond to Boston, and Chicago and St. Louis to connect with this road would cost a little less than $1,000,000,000, based on our cost per mile. The most of every dollar that goes into public roads goes directly or indirectly into the pay envelope. Here is a proposition that can be done with private capital that would get this money out of the banks and into circulation, and build a great public works without taxation, and at the same time go very far to increase employment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In order to bypass the municipalities, have you much of a curve in your road? I understand you have but 3-percent grade. What about your curves?

Mr. JONES. We have no curves over 6 degrees and very few of those. That means our sharpest curve is on a maximum radius of 995′ and at no point is the sight distance less than 1,250′.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is there any curve in any place where it would be dangerous to travel at 75 to 100 miles per hour?

Mr. JONES. None whatever. They are superelevated according to the latest engineering. There is no curve where you would need to slow up at 75 to 80 miles per hour.

Mr. PATTON. You will have no bottleneck from Richmond to Boston.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Average cost per mile is around $400,000?

Mr. JONES. We are spending $70,050,000. That includes the cost of financing and it is 160 miles long—that is, $425,000 per mile. Bear in mind that that average is high because we have 7 miles of tunnels and those tunnels cost us $14,000,000.

Mr. PATTON. How many years do you think it will take the fares to amortize it?

Mr. JONES. The bonds are for 30 years. Our traffic engineers predict, and I believe they are right, that we will pay those bonds off in 16 to 17 years. I am proposing for your consideration if you set up this National Defense Superhighway Authority that you issue 50-year bonds. With this idea you will be accumulating a sinking fund. You will gradually want to extend these highways as the population grows and the demand for them develops. Suppose when you come to the end of 50 years that you have only amortized 50 percent of them; the Government in its issues of bonds over many, many years has set the example of refunding.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. You don't have a serial bond?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What do you plan to do wth the revenues?

Mr. JONES. The revenues are deposited in a sinking fund.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the objection to a serial bond?

Mr. JONES. I don't know what objection there would have been because it was never considered in the financing. The R. F. C. just made it one maturity, namely, 30 years.

Mr. PATTON. How many of these superhighways do you think would be of practical service to the whole United States and how would you designate those? I mean for military purposes and national defense.

Mr. JONES. In answer to that very important question, I would say that we should follow the recommendations of the engineers of the United States War Department. There is more capital, more of the best of road engineers, and all the material necessary to build a vast system of superhighways and that with private capital if the proper methods are pursued. The rapid movement of troops, as I have mentioned before, by the Germans in the present war makes the importance of superhighways to us stand out very

greatly. People and materials will more and more be moved by automotive power. The building of these highways will do much for the railroads. This has been proven in the experience of constructing the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jones has been a man always, and I say this in his presence, who has dreamed dreams and has made them dynamic and I have known him for many, many years and his interests in West Virginia.

Mr. PATTON. He is making them come true.

Chairman CARTWRIGHT. He is a man who is doing things.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to have the record show that I trust this committee will, with as much dispatch as possible, arrange to go into this situation further.

Chairman CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry the time must be shortened because the House is going into session an hour earlier than usual this morning. I thank you for coming, Mr. Jones, and hope you can complete at some future time your explanation of this important project and your ideas about financing and building other limited-access highways.

Saving the Eskimos and Reindeer from Extinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to be able to present to the House the attached statement of the Secretary of the Interior in which he gives a concise and illuminating report of what has been accomplished in carrying out the provisions of the Alaska Reindeer Act, which was approved September 1, 1937, and particularly with respect to those portions of the act which authorize and direct the Secretary to purchase all Alaska reindeer and all necessary reindeer-range equipment owned by others than natives of Alaska and to hold the same in trust for use and benefit of the natives or else distribute them among the natives. The act in question contemplates the establishment of a self-sustaining economy for the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska through the use of reindeer, and to that end it was thought necessary to purchase and distribute among those natives, or to hold in trust for their use, all reindeer owned by others than natives, and then to aid the Eskimos and other natives in the establishment of a reindeer business or livelihood or industry which would insure their economic security for an indefinite period in the future.

The act of September 1, 1937, authorized an appropriation not to exceed $2,000,000 for the purposes mentioned. However, no appropriation was immeditaely made and many objections were offered to the making of any appropriation at all pursuant to the authorizing act. Many Members were doubtful as to the wisdom of the policy thus sought to be established and felt there was a lack of information as to the relevant facts which ought to be known in detail before any appropriation should be made. Accordingly, in 1938, a total of $50,000 was appropriated for the purpose of making an investigation, survey, and appraisal of all of the facts and circumstances connected with the matter, and it was provided such investigation should be made under the direction and supervision of a committee to be appointed by the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives acting jointly. The chairmen of the two committees mentioned, Senator GLASS, of Virginia, and I, selected as members of the special Reindeer Investigation Committee the following: Mr. C. E. Ratchford, Assistant Chief, United States Forest Service, chairman; Mr. Frank H. Reeds, Colorado rancher and editor; and Dr. I. D. Wilson, professor of biology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

The members of the Reindeer Committee spent almost the entire summer of the year 1938 in Alaska and made a complete and comprehensive and thorough survey and appraisal of the whole subject. A number of round-ups of reindeer took place under the direction of the Reindeer Committee, the reindeer so rounded up were counted and their ownership as determined by earmarks noted. A thorough aerial survey was also carried out of the principal reindeer ranges and even a flight was undertaken to Nunivak Island to inspect and count the reindeer located there. During the following winter the Reindeer Committee made a complete and circumstantial report to the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, and in that report the Reindeer Committee definitely and unanimously recommended the carrying out of the Reindeer Act in all of its various phases, including the purchase of the non-native-owned reindeer and range equipment. Upon consideration of this report the Appropriations Committee of the House recommended and Congress appropriated the sum of $720,000 for purchasing the reindeer and reindeer-range equipment owned by others than natives of Alaska.

It will be recalled that there was long and vehement opposition encountered in securing passage by the two Houses of the appropriation mentioned. In one bill the item was rejected by the House but approved by the Senate and lost in conference. Ultimately, in a deficiency bill which I reported, a similar item was approved by the House after vehement debate on August 2, 1939, and was then rejected by the Senate, but was finally agreed to in conference. During the debate on the several bills which contained these items, much opposition was expressed to the entire program and every change was rung, in ridicule and sarcasm, upon the proposal, as it was called, of going into competition with Santa Claus and thus foolishly wasting public funds.

Those objections were largely the result of a lack of knowledge of the subject. I had twice visited Alaska and investigated these conditions. Alaska is a long way off, and it is not so easy to comprehend all of the various factors of Arctic climate and conditions and physical circumstance and the nature of the natives of Alaska, especially the Eskimos who live largely on fish and reindeer meat. They are all citizens of the United States, which made it advisable and indeed absolutely necessary that the action proposed be undertaken in order to prevent either the extermination of the race through starvation, or else a continuous dole to avoid that starvation. Such misapprehension is easy to understand because the members of the Appropriations Committee who took the greatest interest in the measure were, at first, extremely doubtful of its wisdom and a bare majority of them were convinced only by the report of the reindeer committee sent to Alaska for the purpose of making a study of the entire subject.

It should be noted here that the Delegate from Alaska, Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND, whose knowledge of the Territory, vast in area as it is, cannot be doubted or disputed, vigorously supported not only the enactment of the Reindeer Act itself—the authorizing act—but also continuously urged upon Congress the advisability of making the necessary appropriation to put the act into effect. Every assertion made by Mr. DIMOND in support of the policy was wholly borne out and sustained by the special reindeer committee which made such a thorough study of the entire matter.

Upon the passage of the bill carrying the appropriation, the Secretary of the Interior selected as his representative to purchase the non-native-owned reindeer and the reindeer-range equipment, Mr. Charles G. Burdick, then employed in the Forest Service in Alaska. Mr. Burdick lost no time in undertaking the work, and, as is shown by the report of the Secretary, Mr. Burdick has now completed the purchase of all of the non-native-owned reindeer and reindeer-range equipment, with the exception of not more than 1,000 reindeer which must be obtained by condemnation proceedings, as authorized by the act. The number of reindeer so purchased by Mr. Burdick amount to 82,538 and the average price paid therefor is a little more than $3.98 apiece.

In making his investigation preliminary to the purchase of the non-native-owned reindeer, Mr. Burdick found that there were considerably fewer deer than had been seen in the summer of 1938. The reduction in the number of reindeer was the result of many thousands being killed by wolves and by the extreme severity of the winter of 1938–39, which was accompanied by deep snow and glaciation of many of the ranges so that many more thousands of reindeer, lacking adequate herding or attention, starved to death.

Accordingly, as shown in the report of the Secretary, not only is the amount of $720,000 appropriated sufficient to purchase all of the remaining reindeer and reindeer-range equipment subject to purchase, but after completing the purchase there remains an unexpended balance of $274,083.28, which will be returned to the Treasury. This does not take into consideration the additional sum of $75,000 which was also appropriated for administrative expenses, because all of that amount either has been used or will be necessarily used in the future for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act.

The Members of the House will note from the report that the Reindeer Service of Alaska has started a herding and development program that promises well for the industry in most parts of the reindeer areas. Herding has been resumed and will be extended and enlarged. All of those having knowledge of the industry agree that herding is absolutely vital not only for the welfare of the industry but to its very existence. When herding ceases the reindeer become wild, mix with the caribou, and wander off, or are readily destroyed by the predatory wolves and coyotes. The severe losses of the winter of 1938–39 might have been largely avoided or even entirely prevented by proper care and herding. Semidomesticated reindeer are just like sheep. They have no means of defending themselves against packs of wolves and a pack of wolves will just simply slaughter a whole herd of reindeer in one night and eat their tongues and then move on for more. The wolves have been rapidly increasing on reindeer meat. The only way the reindeer can be preserved is by herding the wolves off of them. If the wolves are successfully kept away from them for a year or two most of those wolves will starve to death and the problem will not be so critical. The tragedy of the whole situation is that herding of reindeer was once considered unnecessary and thus all but abandoned. The lesson so learned was a costly one but, in any event, at the present time there is every prospect that the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska will have in the future, under wise and efficient management, a source of livelihood, and it may even be called an industry, which will give them a substantial degree of economic security, not dependent upon Government dole, which they otherwise could never have known. It is more than ever clear that the passage of the Reindeer Act and the appropriation of the money to put it into effect were complementary parts of a wise and statesmanlike program for the Government to undertake, and thus avoid the necessity of providing relief, with its demoralizing effects, for these sturdy native Alaska citizens who in view of the destruction of both the reindeer and fishing possibilities their only sources of food by the white men, could not have survived without some kind of help. The Eskimo cannot grow anything up at the Arctic Circle. The winters are terrifically cold, long, and dark. There is no vegetation up there. It is a marvel to me how the Eskimos have existed so long under those almost inhuman conditions.

Let me recall an event showing typically the character of the Eskimo. On the upper rim of this continent more than 300 miles north of the Arctic Circle on a misty day in late August 1935, the airplane carrying the renowned and beloved Will Rogers and the world-famous pilot, Wiley Post, plunged into the shallow water and underlying mud, instantly killing both Rogers and Post.

The only human being who saw it was a lone Eskimo named Clair Okabacher. He ran to the rescue and when he found them both dead he ran 15 miles over the soft Arctic tundra to Point Barrow to secure help. They went to the wreck in boats and had to take the plane apart somewhat in order to remove the bodies and brought them to Point Barrow, whence they were flown to the States by the noted Alaskan flyer, Joe Crosson.

One other incident relative to this Eskimo who carried the message so swiftly to Point Barrow is worth telling. When the news of what he had done and the prompt and praiseworthy performance of the Eskimo messenger reached the States a purse of $800 was promptly raised through voluntary contributions and sent to him.

Clair received the money and without delay, characteristically carrying out the tradition of his people and his race, gave a great feast of potlatch to all the Eskimos of the region, relieved the most pressing necessities of those who were in want and within the next day or two he had no money left. Congressional medals had been given for no more meritorous services to humanity.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly worth while to preserve that hardy, brave, and courageous race. For that reason I take joy in having been able to assist in the passage of this reindeer legislation and in seeing the program on the way to being successfully carried out, thus assuring our Eskimo friends who would be just as generous and just as charitable if we were among them and needed help, some reasonable degree of security and means of livelihood for themselves and their children and their children's children.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay deserved tribute not only to the Secretary of the Interior, who has acted with such wisdom and competence in carrying out the will of Congress, but also to Mr. Charles G. Burdick, special representative of the Secretary, who has displayed admirable energy, discretion, and soundness of judgment; to Mr. J. Sidney Rood, general superintendent of the reindeer service; and to the committee who made the investigation in Alaska, Messrs. Ratchford, Reeds, and Wilson, for without their highly intelligent, careful, and painstaking study and report, nothing whatever would have been done.

It gives me particular pleasure to commend my friend the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] who, by reason of his marked ability and unquestioned integrity, enjoys the respect and confidence of every Member of this body. In this, as in all other matters, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] has served well his constituents.

There is one feature of this entire transaction that is deserving of special comment, and that is that everyone has been dealt with equitably. There has been no disposition on the part of anyone connected with the Government to get something for nothing, or to take advantage of superior power or position. There has been no disposition to override or to ignore the just rights of any person. I think it will be admitted that there was an absolutely fair count or estimate of the reindeer purchased, and that a fair price was in every instance paid therefor. Complete honesty has characterized the whole transaction. Local circumstances and conditions were taken into consideration because, in some parts of the reindeer area, the reindeer were worth more than in other parts. The reason for that is obvious. Where there is a market for reindeer and reindeer are readily available to that market, those deer are worth much more than similar animals which may be anywhere from 100 to 300 or more miles from a market. The reindeer on Nunivak Island were found to be better stock than those on the mainland, and therefore they were worth a higher price than the others. At the same time the rights of the Government were rigidly safeguarded. No more was paid for any property purchased than was required by complete honesty and fair dealing. Altogether the Members of Congress who have been helpful in bringing about this program can feel gratification over what has been done; and those in the executive department who have so faithfully and expeditiously and efficiently carried out the will of Congress are justly deserving of the thanks of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I have served long in this body and I take what I conceive to be a just pride in the House of Representatives and in its accomplishments. During my period of service here I have been privileged to participate in the enactment of a very large number of measures, not only of great public interest, but of outstanding public benefit, measures which tended to bring some degree of security or peace or happiness to the citizens of our country. But in nothing that I have been able to do, Mr. Speaker, do I take a greater satisfaction than in my part in carrying forward this humane

program for the actual preservation of the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska from extinction. With efficient administration, which we have every right to expect, generations yet unborn will have reason to be thankful for the setting up and the carrying forward of this program under the authorizing act and the appropriations thus made by the Congress of the United States. Every Member of the Congress, whether he supported that appropriation or not, can take like satisfaction at the outcome.

It is indeed a matter of deep gratification to me to have been able to take an active part in the enactment of that legislation and in helping to carry out its terms to this most successful conclusion.

The report of the Secretary is embraced in the following very exhaustive and gratifying letter addressed to me, and accompanying statement and tabulations, which I submit herewith. It is concise and clear and he has acted in this matter with his customary courage and efficiency.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 24, 1940.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: On September 1, 1937, the President approved legislation passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress to provide subsistence for the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska by establishing for them a permanent and self-sustaining economy, to encourage and develop native activity in all branches of the reindeer industry, and for other purposes. In enacting this legislation the Congress adopted a policy of eliminating all participation in the reindeer industry in Alaska by whites and other nonnatives. The act authorized an appropriation of $2,000,000 for use by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out its provisions but did not actually appropriate any money for this purpose.

The Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1939 authorized a survey and appraisal of the property and reindeer to be acquired for the natives of Alaska under the provisions of the act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 900), to be made under the direction and supervision of the chairman of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives acting jointly, and appropriated $25,000 for necessary expenses in connection with such survey and appraisal. An additional $25,000 for the same purpose was later made available by the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1938. Acting under the authority contained in this appropriation, the following persons were appointed as members of the Reindeer Appraisal Committee: C. E. Rachford, Assistant Chief, United States Forest Service, chairman; Frank H. Reeds, Colorado rancher and editor; and I. D. Wilson, professor of biology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

The members of the Reindeer Appraisal Committee proceeded to Alaska during the summer of 1938 and made a thorough survey of the Alaska reindeer industry, spending several months in Alaska and visiting most of the ranges in the reindeer country. Upon its return to Washington, D. C., a report of its findings was prepared and submitted to the Congress. This report recommended that an appropriation be made by Congress for the purpose of acquiring all non-native-owned reindeer in Alaska and such reindeer property as might be needed for the efficient conduct of the Alaska Reindeer Service.

After consideration of the report submitted by the Reindeer Appraisal Committee at hearings held by the appropriations committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives, the Congress came to the decision that the policies set forth in the act of September 1, 1937, were sound, and included in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, approved August 9, 1939, an appropriation of $720,000 "for all the purchase, in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem advisable, of reindeer abattoirs, cold-storage plants, corrals and other buildings, and communication and other equipment, owned by nonnatives in Alaska * * *," plus $75,000 for "necessary administrative expenses in connection with such purchase and the establishment and development of the reindeer industry for the benefit of the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska * * *."

It is now my privilege to submit herewith, for the information of yourself and the other members of the House Appropriations Committee, a report of the present status of the reindeer acquisition program which has been carried out by the Department of the Interior under the authority of the legislation referred to above. It will be noted from this report that the reindeer acquisition program is practically complete at this date and will be completed prior to June 30, 1940, when the appropriation for the acquisition of non-native-owned reindeer in Alaska will cease to be available. It will be noted also that this program has been carried out most successfully within the limits of the appropriation made available by Congress for that purpose. The approximate amount which will be needed for the acquisition of non-native-owned reindeer is $332,991. The approximate amount which will be required for the acquisition of reindeer property owned by nonnatives is $112,925.72. These figures indicate that the total expenditures for the acquisition of reindeer and reindeer property owned by nonnatives will doubtless be less than the amount appropriated in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939. By adding these two amounts total obligations of $445,916.72 are indicated. This amount subtracted from the $720,000 appropriated leaves an unexpended balance of $274,083.28, which will be returned to the Treasury. Of the $75,000 appropriated for administrative expenses, approximately $48,300 had been obligated on May 30, leaving a balance of $26,700, which will be needed for the construction of skin-drying sheds and the purchase of equipment and supplies to be used in the establishment and development of the reindeer industry.

The attached report shows the total number of non-native-owned reindeer already purchased to be 82,538, the average price per deer to be $3.98 plus, and that Mr. BURDICK was able to reach an agreement with all nonnative owners of the larger herds in Alaska. There are only 2 or 3 small herds owned by nonnatives which it will be necessary to acquire through condemnation proceedings, and necessary funds are being deposited in the district court in Alaska to take care of such awards as the court may make in these cases. The total number of reindeer involved in condemnation proceedings is small and probably will not exceed 1,000.

It is a source of considerable satisfaction to this Department that it has been possible to carry out the reindeer-acquisition program so expeditiously and within the funds made available by Congress. We have been advised by Mr. Burdick that all of the nonnative owners of the larger herds in Alaska feel that they have been treated fairly and that they have been given full opportunity to present their claims and to participate in the surveys and round-ups held in Alaska during the past winter for the purpose of arriving at as accurate an estimate as possible of the number of reindeer belonging to each nonnative owner. We are also advised that the Eskimo owners of reindeer, many of whom were employed in the reindeer round-ups during the past winter, feel that the Government has done an excellent job in its efforts to arrive at a fair settlement with nonnative owners, and that most of the native owners of reindeer in Alaska feel very much encouraged over the entire reindeer situation at the present date. They are now taking greater interest in their reindeer, and, under the direction of the Alaska Reindeer Service of this Department, we are once more embarking on a constructive program, which includes such herding as may be required, selection of adequate pasturage and assignment of grazing areas, annual round-ups, marking, castrating, butchering, training of sled deer, and other activities, which it is hoped will place the Alaska Reindeer Service for the natives on an efficient basis in future years. Our program contemplates the distribution of the reindeer acquired from nonnatives to native communities throughout Alaska which do not at present possess reindeer or which do not possess a sufficient number for their needs. During the current fiscal year arrangements have been made in many places for the employment of native herders and apprentices, and a total of approximately 30 have already been employed.

It is our hope that the period of controversy between whites and natives in Alaska in connection with the reindeer industry is now at an end. We believe also that the new program on which we are now entering will result in adequate protection to reindeer-grazing areas and a reduction in the number of predators, which during the past few years have greatly reduced the number of reindeer in several areas.

The greater portion of the credit for the successful conduct and the prompt conclusion of the reindeer-acquisition program is undoubtedly due to Mr. Charles G. Burdick, who was appointed by the Secretary of the Interior as his special representative in charge of the reindeer-acquisition program in Alaska. Additional credit is due to Mr. J. Sidney Rood, general supervisor of the Alaska Reindeer Service, who acted in close cooperation with Mr. Burdick throughout the acquisition activities during the past winter and made available to Mr. Burdick at all times his knowledge of the reindeer situation in Alaska, including his acquaintance with both nonnative and native reindeer owners and herders, transportation facilities, grazing areas, etc.

Should your committee desire any additional information or have any further questions to ask in connection with the reindeer situation in Alaska, this Department will be pleased to furnish such information as is available from time to time.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

REPORT ON STATUS OF REINDEER-ACQUISITION PROGRAM AS OF JUNE 1, 1940, AND RÉSUMÉ OF ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION THEREWITH DURING 1939–40

August 9, 1939. Date of approval of Third Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1939, containing an appropriation of $795,000 for the purchase of non-native-owned reindeer and reindeer property in Alaska and for necessary administrative expenses in connection therewith.

November 1, 1939. Mr. Charles G. Burdick, who had been appointed as special representative of the Secretary of the Interior to head up the reindeer-acquisition program, reported in Washington, D. C., for conferences and instructions. En route from Washington, D. C., to Alaska, Mr. Burdick conferred with all nonnative

owners residing in continental United States and discussed with them their claims to ownership of reindeer and reindeer property in Alaska.

January 2, 1940. Mr. Burdick arrived at Nome, Alaska, accompanied by Mr. W. J. Clark, of the Office of Indian Affairs, who had been detailed as fiscal agent and office manager, with headquarters at Nome, to assist Mr. Burdick in the reindeer-acquisition program.

February 1, 1940. Edward C. Kelly, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, was detailed by the Department of Justice and added to Mr. Burdick's staff at Nome, Alaska, as legal adviser.

Beginning February 1, 1940, and continuing until about April 15, 1940, reindeer round-ups were held on practically all ranges where nonnative ownership was involved.

Where nonnative ownership was heavy and it was anticipated that difficulty might be experienced in arriving at agreements as to the number of reindeer on the range, the round-ups were supplemented by reconnaissance surveys by crews of two men each, with dog teams, who covered the back country for the purpose of estimating as accurately as possible the number of reindeer which had been missed when the round-ups were held. Aerial surveys were made by Mr. Burdick, General Reindeer Supervisor Rood, nonnative owners or their representatives, and Eskimo chief herders who were familiar with the location of reindeer on the ranges, particularly of any remnants of herds not included in round-ups. On other ranges round-up counts were checked against data in the files of the United States Reindeer Service. The reindeer round-ups under the supervision of Mr. Burdick were carried on where possible in conjunction with regular annual round-ups of native-owned reindeer. At most round-ups the Government furnished subsistence supplies to the Eskimo herders, although on some ranges it was necessary to pay wages in addition to subsistence.

Every assistance was afforded nonnative owners in locating their reindeer for sale to the Government. All of the nonnative owners, except the Lomen interests, cooperated in varying degree in sharing the costs of reindeer round-ups. All of the Lapp owners donated their labor throughout the period of reindeer round-ups and in handling, marking, and castrating the reindeer, with the Government furnishing subsistence supplies. Williams and Traeger furnished no labor but paid half of the subsistence costs at round-ups. This cooperation and sharing of expenses by nonnative owners resulted in great savings of administrative funds appropriated for reindeer acquisition, and gave the nonnative owners a feeling of participation in the round-ups and in the acquisition program. They were thus more satisfied that the actual counts of reindeer and the estimates of ownership were as accurate as was humanly possible. Many owners are disappointed that they are not receiving more money, but practically all feel that they have been dealt with fairly. The price paid ranges from $3 to $8 per head.

On all of the mainland area from Kotzebue Sound to Kvichak Bay, in Bristol Bay, the $3 evaluation governed exclusively. This figure was arrived at on the basis that the reindeer had little value to the nonnative owners, but that this was a fair value to the Government in extinguishing nonnative equity and establishing a native economy. No nonnative owners in this area protested this evaluation very strenuously.

The reindeer on Umnak Island were valued at $4 a head. The basis for agreement on this price was that it would cost the Government more than the total amount paid for the Umnak Island reindeer to establish a reindeer herd on that island if there were no reindeer already there.

In the Naknek area the price agreed upon was $6 per head. The basis of this agreement was that in the Naknek region a local market exists for all reindeer meat that can be produced and that the established price for reindeer meat is 15 cents a pound. The price for reindeer skins in this area is $3 each. A small herd south of Naknek was acquired at a price of $8 a head. This was a compromise offer for the purpose of avoiding condemnation costs, and these reindeer had that value to the owner.

The price agreed upon for the reindeer on Nunivak Island was $6.50 a head. The basis used in arriving at this price was that these reindeer are larger and better animals than most of those on the mainland of Alaska. They are so located that transfers of reindeer to other locations for the purpose of establishing new herds can be made easily. There are no warble flies on Nunivak Island, and as a result the skins of these reindeer are of a higher grade than elsewhere. A large number of parka skins can be obtained during the coming summer and sold at prices ranging up to $4 each, leaving the meat for use by the natives of Nunivak Island who are in need thereof. It is probable that this Nunivak Island herd can be operated at a good profit for the general benefit of the reindeer industry because of low operating costs and for the reason that no herding is required and there are no predators on the the island.

While the act of September 1, 1937, required that declarations of ownership be filed not later than September 1, 1938, this requirement has been considered as directional rather than mandatory, and on this basis a few reindeer have been purchased where declaration of ownership was not filed within the prescribed time limit. These few isolated cases, as stated, involved only a small number of reindeer.

Tabulation of reindeer acquired by the Federal Government from nonnative owners under the reindeer-acquisition program

Name of owner	Number of reindeer purchased	Price per head	Total amount
Alaska Livestock and Packing Co. (Lomen's)[1]	25,000	$3.00	$75,000
Alaska Scandinavian Reindeer Corporation, by C. E. Parker	[2] None		
Aleutian Livestock Co., Inc	800	4.00	3,200
Bahls, Peter N	2,359	3.00	7,077
Bahr, Clement	435	3.00	1,305
Bahr, Mary E	28	3.00	84
Bahr, Mary R	54	3.00	162
Bahr, Ole, Jr	87	3.00	261
Bahr, Ole, Sr	378	3.00	1,134
Bango, Isak A	1,895	3.00	5,685
Born, Frank	16	3.00	48
Boyne, Clement	773	3.00	2,319
Boyne, Nils	91	3.00	273
Bradley, E. C	226	3.00	678
California Friends Board of Missions	None		
Fowler, Chas. A	400	3.00	1,200
Gierke, Robert	218	3.00	654
Hagberg, Anna A	6	3.00	18
Herbert, John L	500	3.00	1,500
Holy Cross Mission	100	3.00	300
Hunter, Henry Roy	72	3.00	216
Jean, Joe L	115	3.00	345
Klemetsen-West, N	917	3.00	2,751
Knaflich, Louis	102	3.00	306
Kvamme, Jens Anderson [3]			
Larch, Edward Oscar	None		
Miller, Frank [4]			
Moravian Mission	4,272	3.00	12,816
Nakela estate	None		
Nicholson, John [4]			
Neely, Mrs. Everett	None		
Nilima estate	None		
Nunivak Development Co. (Lomen's), Northwestern Livestock Co	17,000	6.50	110,500
Olson, Ole	None		
Oman, Herman	20	3.00	60
Petrie, Lucy [5]			
Pioneer Reindeer Co	13,500	3.00	40,500
Do	6,000	6.00	36,000
Polk, Ole	9	3.00	27
Polte, Otto [6]			
Stenfield, Ole (estate)	221	3.00	663
Steinhauser	None		
Sara, Clement	702	3.00	2,106
Siri, Peter	351	3.00	1,053
Swedish Evangelical Mission	7	3.00	21
St. Mary's Mission	1,054	3.00	3,162
Traeger, Chas. A	1,242	3.00	3,726
Trodahl, Anna Gertrude Schwalbe	18	3.00	54
Twitchell, Adams Hallis	400	3.00	1,200
Thuuri, Pher	540	8.00	4,320
Venes, Nora [5]			
Williams, Frank P	2,530	3.00	7,590
Wilkins, Kid [4]			
Nonnative owners not listed in previous tabulation:			
Larson estate [7]	555		
Merrill	4	3.00	12
Total	82,442		328,326

[1] This includes all Lomen reindeer on the Alaska mainland.
[2] Not settled.
[3] Not settled. Will probably have to go through condemnation proceedings.
[4] Reindeer transferred to native children.
[5] She is a native.
[6] He is a native.
[7] Necessary to settle through court to clear probate debts.

The permanent Alaska Reindeer Service, under the supervision of Mr. J. Sidney Rood, general reindeer supervisor, approved the number of reindeer acquired from nonnative owners in each case before the deal was finally consummated, and the assistant to the Attorney General who was detailed as legal adviser to Mr. Burdick approved each title of ownership before payment was made.

Condemnation proceedings were filed with the district court at Nome, Alaska, on May 8, 1940, covering reindeer claimed by Jens Anderson Kvamme, the Larson Estate, Charles E. Parker (also known as the Alaska Scandinavian Reindeer Corporation), and a few unknown owners.

The case of Joe L. Jean, against whom condemnation proceedings were contemplated, has been closed out of court. Mr. Burdick also expects to be able to close the case of Jens Anderson Kvamme out of court; but he states that there is little likelihood of his being able to close out of court the case of the Alaska Scandinavian Reindeer Corporation (C. E. Parker). The claim of the Larson Estate and the case of the small number of reindeer belonging to unknown owners must go through condemnation proceedings. The court expects to sit at Nome on July 8 for final hearings on the reindeer acquisition cases. The Kvamme case may prove to be difficult if settlement is not made out of court. Mr. Kvamme protests the proposed basis of settlement as offered by Mr. Burdick. We do not at this time know exactly what is contained in Mr. Burdick's offer to Mr. Kvamme.

The following is a summary of the total obligations incurred for the purchase of non-native-owned reindeer:

	Number	Price per head	Amount
Reindeer purchased	58,198	$3.00	$174,594
	800	4.00	3,200
	6,000	6.00	36,000
	540	8.00	4,320
	65,538	[1] 3.33	218,114
Nunivak	17,000	6.50	110,500
Total	82,538	[1] 3.98	328,614

[1] Average cost.

The estimated additional number of reindeer yet to be purchased includes:

Owner:	*Number of reindeer*
Jens Anderson Kvamme	600
Alaska Scandinavian Reindeer Corporation (C. E. Parker)	160
Larson estate	555
Unknown owners	144
Total reindeer yet to be purchased	1,459

The approximate cost of these reindeer will be $3 each.

The location and price agreed upon of improvements being acquired from nonnative owners are listed below.

Location:	*Amount*
St. Michael	$7,750.00
Egavik	19,175.80
Nunivak	4,735.18
Nine Mile Portage	250.00
Nabachtoolik	175.00
Choris Penn	75.00
Golovnin	22,360.63
Elephant Point	21,376.86
Teller	21,284.25
Frosklund (no purchase).	
Unalakleet (corrals, cabins, harness)	718.00
Pastolik (Williams)	300.00
Fowler and Twitchell	2,500.00
Nome Cold Storage	7,500.00
Naknek Range (corrals, cabins, etc.)	3,925.00
Akulurak (corral)	800.00
Total	112,925.72

At this time the total anticipated expenditure of reindeer acquisition funds amounts to $445,916.72, and the unexpended balance is $274,083.28, which equals the total amount available, $720,000.

Of the $75,000 appropriated for administrative expenses in connection with the reindeer-acquisition program, the actual obligations to April 30, plus estimated obligations to June 30, are as follows:

Salaries	$12,663
Traveling expenses	18,778
Reindeer round-ups	7,878
Equipment	664
Miscellaneous expenses	726
Estimated court costs	5,000
Contingent expense	2,591
For construction of skin-drying sheds and purchase of equipment and supplies for the establishment and development of the reindeer industry	26,700
Total	75,000

The Reindeer Service started a herding and development program that promises well for the industry in most parts of the reindeer area, but there are a few places in that area where native apathy exists, and in these few places the herds will probably diminish. Reports received state that predators have caused less destruction to the reindeer during the winter of 1939–40 than during the previous winter. This improved condition is largely due to the fact that more herding has been done by the native owners and herders during the past winter than previously. During the winter of 1938–39 losses of reindeer due to starvation were heavy. This was caused by heavy snows, severe spring storms, and glaciation on reindeer ranges. During the winter of 1939–40 losses from these causes have been negligible. This improved condition is due to the fact that during the past winter there has been a minimum snowfall in the reindeer country, and ample feed has been available at all times. According to reports received, the reindeer fawn crop in the spring of 1940 has been normal, ranging up to 60 percent of adult females. Last year in some areas less than 1 percent of the fawn crop survived, on account of wolves chasing does away from the fawning grounds and resulting in starvation of the fawns.

The cost to the Federal Government of carrying out the reindeer-acquisition program and eliminating nonnative ownership of reindeer in Alaska has been approximately a half million dollars. There can be no question but that Congress, in appropriating funds for the elimination of nonnative ownership of reindeer, took the very best method of honorably extinguishing the nonnative equity in reindeer and reindeer property in Alaska, and establishing the reindeer industry as an exclusively native economy.

The Actual "Fifth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1939, I turned over data, including a photograph, to one of our intelligence departments, which revealed that the Jews were organizing an army to fight some place in the United States.

A week ago, the same picture was published in the Washington Daily News, with the following caption:

Tough boys enlist. Joseph Otmar Hefter, writer and war veteran, looks over three recruits in his New York headquarters. He wants "tough young Jews" for an American-Jewish border regiment. Their duties would be to defend the Alaskan and Mexican borders of the United States should trouble come.

On June 23 I received this letter, which is self-explanatory:

NEW YORK, *June 22, 1940.*

HON. JACOB THORKELSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THORKELSON: As an American citizen I request that you demand the proper authorities to make an investigation and report of reputed Jewish army sponsored by the New Zionist organization, 1123 Broadway, in New York, and furthermore, that you insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From the information at my disposal it appears that for the past 9 months there has been in process of organization, in this country, a Jewish international army to be comprised of over 100,000 armed men who are refugees and stateless Jews, the Jews of Palestine, and volunteers from neutral countries, including the United States.

It is reported that this army is being organized by one Valadimar Jabotinsky, president of the World New Zionist organization and founder of Jewish battalions in the last World War.

It would appear that this is an un-American organization, fully armed, and not under governmental control, but under the New Zion movement, which is a duplicate government. It is understood they have their own flag, which is not the American flag, and are to drill their forces, but not in connection with the United States Army nor State militia.

This may be a part of the noted "fifth column" and their activities should be thoroughly investigated and if found subversive the proper authorities should take immediate action to stop their operations.

Will you kindly acknowledge receipt of this letter and keep me advised as to what governmental action is being taken?

Very truly yours,

HENRY WINSLOW BROOKS.

Mr. Speaker, the information which I turned over last year, with the picture that appeared in the Washington Daily News and the letter from Mr. Brooks, should establish sufficient evidence that there is a definite plot on foot, led by the Jewish Communists, to seize our own Government. This group of subversives is the actual "fifth column," and is now operating under the benevolent protection of the Justice Department. This Jewish communistic army is no doubt to cooperate with the Jewish Communists within the United States and with the Fourth International, under the leadership of Trotsky, who is now located in Mexico.

The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League of New York City is, according to its own letters, engaged in espionage of those who have exposed these subversive groups. This league is conducting its own intelligence or detective service, its own bureau of investigation and defamation. The same organization is

also conducting a propaganda bureau which is no doubt the source of the attacks upon such Members of Congress as refuse to go along and submit to the dictatorship of this league.

The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League should be disbanded by the Government, for it has no more right to exist than any other subversive group. The fact that it was organized by Samuel Untermeyer should be sufficient evidence that its viewpoint is internationalistic and not American. Moreover, no minority group in the United States has a legal right to operate its private detective service as this league is doing. This intelligence service is not to protect the American people, but it is instead to protect those who are engaged in the destruction and subversion of our own Government. I hope the Intelligence Department will now take heed and conduct such investigation for which they are paid, and for which they have obligated themselves to the people of this Nation.

Findings of the Munitions Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks excerpts from Report No. 944, Part 6, Munitions Industry, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

I am inserting this in the RECORD in order to complete the picture of those who were instrumental in leading the United States into the World War. In my previous remarks on Gold and Its Power, Can the American People Be Fooled Again?, and on the neutrality debate last fall, I included with my remarks much data which is on file in the Congressional Library. I now include the findings of the Munitions Committee.

FINDINGS

The committee finds that:

1. It is most important for the Nation and Congress to have full and exact information concerning all the changes in the neutrality policy made by the administration and the reasons for these changes. Congress was not kept accurately informed during the neutrality years of 1914–17.

The committee finds, according to testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter I, Establishment and Alteration of United States Loan Policy, August to October 1914, that in August 1914 the Department of State declared that loans by American banks to belligerent governments would be considered unneutral in spirit. This declaration had no legally binding power, but the testimony indicates that if it had not been modified such loans would never have been made. The committee is interested to observe that this ruling was made at a time when the American banks were reluctant to extend such loans. In October 1914 the Department, in a secret ruling officially revealed only to J. P. Morgan & Co. and the National City Bank of New York, made an artificial distinction between loans and credits, permitting the extension of the latter to belligerents. Although the rumors of this change were published in the press at the time, no official statement was made until March 31, 1915. Meanwhile, in an official letter of January 20, 1915, to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Department failed to mention this distinction, thereby officially misinforming the Senate. The committee is further of the opinion that this secret and artificial distinction permitted the beginning of the war trade and boom which later in 1915 produced a serious disbalance of American exports.

2. Loans to belligerents militate against neutrality, for when only one group of belligerents can purchase and transport commodities the loans act in favor of that belligerent. They are especially unneutral when used to convert this country into an auxiliary arsenal for that belligerent who happens to control the seas, for that arsenal then becomes the subject of the military strategy of the other belligerent.

3. Such loans cannot but profoundly affect the neutrality of mind and spirit of those holding them. When the responsibility for the sale of such loans is placed by foreign belligerents in the hands of any one large banking group, as was done in the case of J. P. Morgan & Co. during the World War, where out of some $2,500,000,000 allied indebtedness J. P. Morgan & Co. arranged for or managed some $1,900,000,000, the concentrated power and influence of such loans on the neutrality of public opinion can be greatly accentuated. When the banking houses floating these loans are also financially interested in munitions companies depending for continued profits on foreign orders, the foreign belligerents have the power of securing the support of these banking houses for loans through favors to the munitions companies.

The committee finds, on the basis of exhibits and testimony introduced into the record and discussed in chapter IV, Importance of Financial Interests, that the situation in regard to the rifle industry was symptomatic of what was potentially the case in regard to many other industries. It appears, further, that expansion of the rifle factories to fill Great Britain's war orders had procured a situation where not only manufacturers themselves but their bankers were dependent on the continuance of the war business. It appears further in this instance that the relation between finance and industry, war orders and British credit had become so intimate that it was necessary for the British Government to buy rifles which it did not need in order that the American industrial and financial community should not be angered and refuse to cooperate in British financing in the United States. This refusal would certainly have damaged the British ability to prosecute the war. The committee is of the opinion that the need of the rifle manufacturers and their bankers for orders from the British Government determined their activity in floating the proposed loans. The committee is also of the opinion that the de facto ownership of munitions plants by the British Government constituted a violation of American neutrality that should not have been countenanced by the United States Government.

4. Loans extended to the Allies in 1915 and 1916 led to a very considerable war boom and inflation. This boom extended beyond munitions to auxiliary supplies and equipment as well as to agricultural products. Such loans may be expected to produce a similar situation again. Practically all these loans were partly maintained in price by the expenditure of amounts equal to about one-eighth of their par through the sale of collateral to support them on the market.

5. The nature of such a war-boom inflation is that, like all inflations, an administration is almost powerless to check it, once the movement is well started. Our foreign policy then is seriously affected by it, even to the extent of making impossible the alteration of our foreign policy in such a way as to protect our neutral rights.

6. The foreign policy of the United States from 1914 to 1917 was, in fact, affected by our growing trade with the Allies as well as by natural sympathies. The neutral rights we claimed were simply not enforced against our largest customers.

The committee finds, on the basis of the testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter III, War Trade Expansion, that the development of the export of war commodities to the Allies resulted in a widespread expansion of almost all the lines of American business, an expansion which J. P. Morgan & Co., in their commercial-agency contract, specifically undertook to stimulate. As a result, by 1916 there was created a tremendous industrial machine, heavily capitalized, paying high wages, and dependent upon the purchasing power of the Allies. The committee is of the opinion that this situation, with its risk of business depression and panic in event of damage to the belligerents' ability to purchase, involved the administration so inextricably it prevented the maintenance of a truly neutral course between the Allies and the Central Powers. Such a neutral course threatened to injure this export trade.

7. It is not desirable for the Nation that any foreign belligerent or any bankers representing them be allowed to get into a position as they did in 1915, when sudden stoppage of the support of sterling (or any other foreign exchange) can influence an administration into a reversal of our neutrality policy.

The committee finds, on the basis of testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter II, Exchange Crisis of 1915 and Further Changes of Loan Policy, that by August 1915 the expansion of American exports to the Allies had rendered it difficult for them to pay for these supplies by the usual mechanism of the foreign-exchange market. At this time publicly issued loans of belligerents were still under the ban and the British and French Governments desired to float such loans. It appears that the British Government was pressed by J. P. Morgan & Co. to float a secured loan in the United States but declined to do so. It appears further that the British Government was deliberately inactive in mobilizing gold or American securities or permitting the development of acceptance transactions to ease the strain on sterling exchange. It appears that the sudden and still inadequately explained withdrawal of J. P. Morgan & Co. from supporting sterling exchange, on August 14, 1915, resulted in a precipitate drop in the rate for sterling with resulting great alarm for the fate of American exports. This alarm was communicated by various interested parties to the State Department and the Treasury with the plea that the only remedy was to permit the flotation of a large British loan in the United States. It appears that prior to the clearance of such loan from President Wilson the British and French had first considered inundating the United States with gold in order to dispose the banks to float this loan. It appears further that the break in sterling exchange provided an adequate substitute and that gold in considerable quantities was not shipped until later. On the sudden withdrawal of J. P. Morgan & Co. from the exchange market, after they had spent $154,000,000 in supporting it in the 6½ months prior to August 14, sterling fell from $4.71 to $4.51, a fall which the committee concludes may very well have been deliberately arranged to bring pressure on the United States to change its loan policy.

After August 14, $12,000,000 was purchased in London, which had a further depressing effect. After the Anglo-French loan of $500,000,000 was floated sterling was raised to $4.76 7/16 and maintained there at great cost till the end of the war.

8. The committee finds that it is not desirable that the Federal Reserve banks be allowed to participate in belligerent financing since this may involve the American banking reserves in the credit of foreign nations whose fiscal position is being strained by war.

On the basis of testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter V, Relations Between Banks and Government Organizations in Subsidiary Allied Financing, the committee finds that the very considerable influence of J. P. Morgan & Co. and the banks allied with it in allied financing was exerted on the governmental agencies to procure the opening of the Reserve banks to belligerent acceptances.

9. It is not desirable for the Nation to engage in a war boom which may end suddenly and especially in any war boom which is financed by loans floated in this country.

The danger in this situation is not only in sudden deflation but in pressure by commercial and banking groups to keep our foreign policy favorable to the nation with which they trade. This may possibly prolong a war at the expense of the neutral rights of the United States.

The committee finds, on the basis of testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter VII, Anglo-American Fiscal Crisis of 1916, that in the late fall of 1916 the strain of financing her American requirements was beginning to injure the commercial fabric of the British Empire. The British Government was reluctant to lose more gold and more American securities, and was most reluctant to sell or pledge in the United States any of the equities which constitute the British commercial empire. The suggested offering of unsecured short-term Treasury bills in late November 1916 was one of the means of avoiding the use of further securities. The committee is of the opinion that President Wilson's urging that the Federal Reserve Board ban such bills was the result of his fear that it would be gravely embarrassing to the United States to have the American banks loaded with such bills. This would interfere with American Government borrowing should there be any change in American foreign policy. The committee is further of the opinion that the President's ban on a German loan and the evident desire of the Secretary of State to force a hasty break with Germany indicate that the change in foreign policy which he was most probably contemplating was the entrance of the United States into the World War on the side of the Allies.

The committee is of the opinion that some hint of this matter was conveyed to the British Government through Sir Cecil Spring-Rice after his conversation with Secretary Lansing and Governor Harding. Such an opinion is necessarily a matter of hypothesis, but the striking failure of the British Government to mobilize its resources after this date may be taken as confirmation of this hypothesis. The committee notes that subsequent to December 5, 1916, the British Government in spite of its great needs practically suspended the sales of securities in the United States, increased but slightly its gold shipments, continued its purchasing at approximately a normal rate, and relied heavily upon the temporary demand loans of J. P. Morgan & Co. for its American needs. The committee notes that from the beginning these loans were considered temporary in nature and it fails to see that J. P. Morgan & Co. has offered any plausible explanation of means for their liquidation subsequent to December 5, 1916. It would seem possible that the British Government expected that the United States would soon enter the war and pay them off directly or indirectly.

The committee notes that this was indeed the expectation of J. P. Morgan & Co. openly proclaimed subsequent to April 6, 1917. The committee is also interested to note that Mr. Thomas W. Lamont discussed conditions in the financial markets with Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo on or about January 25, 1917. A few days later, subsequent to the receipt of the German note announcing resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare but prior to the dismissal of Ambassador von Bernstorff, Mr. Lamont was aware that Secretary McAdoo planned to float a possible $1,000,000,000 of an American bond issue for war purposes.

The committee takes note of a serious contradiction between the statements of the Morgan witnesses in regard to the credit resources of the British Government just prior to the American entrance into the war (statements calculated to allay any thought that the British would have lost the war without American interference or that there would have been any panic among American manufacturers or holders of Allied obligations if British credit had then failed), and the statement of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice and the British Chancellor of the Exchequer in July 1917 to the effect that the British Government had come to the end of its resources in gold and marketable securities.

The committee further notes that Mr. Lamont's cable in regard to the possible good effects of curtailing British purchases in America—before the full significance of the Reserve Board warning was understood—indicates perfect awareness on the part of J. P. Morgan & Co. of the influence of business sentiment on Government policy and of the methods of exerting compelling pressure on an administration.

10. In view of the announced and known plans of various nations to arm their merchantmen with 5-inch guns, and the general construction of all the new merchant vessels with gun emplacements, it is essential that, in advance of any foreign war, Congress define for the Executive the extent to which it considers armed merchantmen to be warships, and the extent to which it will permit American citizens to travel on them or to be employed on them as crew. Former Secretary of State Lansing's argument in regard to armed merchantmen attacking submarines should be given full consideration in view of the practical certainty that this situation will arise immediately upon the outbreak of any future war.

The committee finds, on the basis of testimony and exhibits introduced into the record and discussed in chapter VI, Relation of Export Trade to United States Foreign Policy, 1915–16, that the essential problem in the submarine controversy between the United States and Germany lay in the matter of the status of armed merchantmen.

The committee is of the opinion that the unofficial negotiations of Colonel House, by which this private person sought to bring the United States into the war on the Allied side, contributed to the abandonment of the sound position in regard to armed merchantmen proposed by Secretary Lansing in the modus vivendi. The committee is, however, at a loss to account for the abandonment of this suggestion by the State Department merely in the face of the British refusal to consider it. The committee takes note, however, of the fact that the modus vivendi would have resulted in an increase in the effectiveness of the general blockade of the British Isles and an increased damage, correspondingly, to the American export trade in war materials. The committee also notes that use of the retaliatory powers to embargo war exports granted the President by Congress in September 1916 was rendered impossible by the discovery that their exercise would probably do more damage to American industry than to Great Britain.

11. The committee finds that the commercial and financial interdependence established between the United States and the Allies prior to our entry into the World War involved, as a war necessity, our financial support of the Allies after our entry into the war. The United States in fact extended $7,077,000,000 to the Allies in loans after our entry into the war and before its close, and $3,273,000,000 after the close of the war. Of these sums approximately $650,000,000 was used to pay off indebtedness to private holders in the United States, about $2,000,000,000 in support of British and French exchange, of which a large portion resulted in a domestic revenue to these Governments, approximately $100,000,000 to the indirect support of the White Russian Armies, and the payment of American creditors of the defunct Russian Government.

The committee finds on the basis of exhibits and testimony introduced into the record and discussed in chapter VIII, Influence of Foreign Debt, that while certain administration officials proposed that these great financial advances from the United States Treasury be used to obtain conformity by the Allies with our own war aims, they were in fact not so used.

The committee finds that Treasury officials did all in their power to protect the fiscal interests of the United States but that the circumstances of war led to the use of money for ends not considered desirable when the United States entered the war.

The committee finds that the failure to obtain marketable obligations under the war-debt agreements contributed to the damage of the American banking system in 1931 and 1932. It finds that these marketable-bond clauses, signed in 1923, appear to be surrounded with legal ambiguities which should have no place in important inter-Government agreements.

It should be interesting to Members of Congress to follow up the Munitions Industry report, for it coincides with other information which is available to my colleagues who take an interest in international affairs.

As you read this, do not forget that the loans extended to Great Britain and France were obtained by the issuance of Liberty bonds and other Federal securities which were sold to our own people. By investing their money on the side of England and France, the people became stakeholders in the war.

President Wilson recognized this in one of his early proclamations in which he said:

> If our people ultimately acquire a pecuniary interest in one side or the other in this conflict, it will inevitably affect their attitude toward neutrality.

That is precisely what happened. The people invested their money on the side of the Allies, and their sympathies followed their dollars.

CHAPTER I. ESTABLISHMENT AND ALTERATION OF UNITED STATES LOAN POLICY AUGUST–OCTOBER 1914

In the following report on the hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry, held January 7 to 16 and February 4 to 5, 1936, the object has been to summarize the main facts indicated by the exhibits and the testimony.

Note: The testimony on which the following report is based was largely that of J. P. Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont, George Whitney, and Russell C. Leffingwell, partners in the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., New York; Frank A. Vanderlip, former president of the National City Bank of New York; and Albert Rathbone, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The concentration of the committee's attention upon the activities of J. P. Morgan & Co. should not be taken to indicate more than that this firm was the largest single group engaged in purchasing and financing for the Allies. Of the rough total of exports in the years 1915 and 1916 of $7,000,000,000, the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., through its export department, arranged for the purchase of $3,000,000,000. Of a total of some $2,500,000,000 Allied indebtedness contracted in this country prior to April 6, 1917, $1,900,000,000 was arranged or managed by J. P. Morgan & Co.

The attitude of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. toward the World War was given by the witnesses on the opening day in the following passages:

Mr. MORGAN. We agreed that we should do all that was lawfully in our power to help the Allies win the war as soon as possible. That thought was the fundamental idea underlying everything that we did from the beginning of the struggle till the armistice in November 1918.

Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Morgan, I want to be sure I understand what the first sentence in the third paragraph means, namely: "We agreed that we should do all that was lawfully in our power to help the Allies win the war as soon as possible." Does that apply from 1914, the opening of the war?

Mr. MORGAN. Right from the very beginning; yes, sir.

The committee took some further interest in the relations between embargoes and difficulties of the rifle companies and the connection of this with the general financial and political situation at the time. In regard to the American protests on the blacklist, and the British reply thereto, an extract from the diary of Colonel House—page 266—was introduced—Exhibit No. 2120—in which Colonel House recorded a conversation with Frank Polk, then counselor of the Department of State:

Polk agreed with me that unless the British helped in some way, unrestricted U-boat warfare may soon begin. We think the British foolish not to give way on the blacklist and to arrange for less rigorous censorship of the mails. It is a question how far the President will be justified in straining our relations with Great Britain rather than consent to their insolent methods of conducting their blockade. A note has just come from Great Britain about the blacklist which Polk considers offensive, although Lansing thinks otherwise. He did not bring a copy of the note because it had just come and he was afraid to have one made. The State Department will try to suppress the note until after the election. Polk thinks the President is likely to give them a jolt which will not increase good feelings toward us. He suggests two methods to bring them to their senses. One is the restriction of further loans and the exportation of gasoline. He thought we might do both under pretext of domestic necessity and in a way which would not justify retaliation.

Let me now end with a final conclusive statement of part 6:

CONCLUSION

The committee finds that the testimony and exhibits discussed in the foregoing section show that the involvement of the commercial and financial interests of the United States in the cause of the Allies was so great that after the United States entered the war it became impossible to conduct a foreign policy based solely on the interests of the United States and that unavoidably the United States became the underwriter of the peace terms of the Allies and the indefinite supporter of their credit without ever having intended to do so.

The committee finds that Treasury officials did all in their power to protect the fiscal interests of the United States, but that the circumstances of war led to the use of money for ends not considered desirable when the United States entered the war.

The committee finds that the failure to obtain marketable obligations under the war-debt agreements contributed to the damage of the American banking system in 1931 and 1932. It finds that these marketable-bond clauses signed in 1923 appear to be surrounded with legal ambiguities which should have no place in important intergovernment agreements.

This is a brief excerpt of the investigation of the munitions industry and aims. Could the people in this Nation be informed of this, there would be no desire to engage in this war nor any future war for the international bankers.

Good Earth and Its Tillers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. A. G. ELLIOTT, OF CORSICANA, TEX.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an address delivered by Mr. A. G. Elliott, vice president of the First National Bank of Corsicana, Tex., before the Fifty-sixth Annual Convention of the Texas Bankers Association, held at Galveston, Tex., on May 23, 1940.

Mr. Elliott is my lifelong friend, we having been boys and schoolmates together, and he has been engaged in the banking business in my home town for many years. He understands the practical need of the farmers and has always been sympathetic and interested in their problems, and the address delivered by him gives his experience, knowledge, and observation of the problems of farmers and is especially helpful in pointing out the importance of the conservation of the soil.

GOOD EARTH AND ITS TILLERS

(By A. G. Elliott, vice president, First National Bank, Corsicana, Tex.)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my subject is Good Earth and Its Tillers. The deep, rich soil of Texas was our birthright and we have destroyed a large part of it by ignorance and indifference. Not over 50 years ago it was a virgin soil, a rich vein of gold, and the owner, and tiller, mined it for all there was of value in it. No food was returned to it, no protection given it from the elements, and much of it has become nonproductive, and the crops grown are of inferior quality. The agricultural education of our farmers and the conservation of our soil have been too long neglected.

This, I believe, is the fundamental difficulty with agriculture and country banks. It is one main reason we have lost foreign markets and is the cause of our being a patron, or a victim, is you choose, of Government agencies.

If we bankers had been smarter 20 years ago and made investigations into the farmers' knowledge and methods of carrying on their operations and had gotten firmly behind the A. and M. Extension Service in its effort to give him technical training in agriculture the situation might now be different. We considered a man a good farmer in those days who worked from sun to sun and kept a clean field. The looser he kept the soil, which was preparing much of it to wash away, and the more he burned cotton stalks and weeds, the better we thought he was tilling.

Then the whole country seemed to try to forget about our crops and to think that gushing oil wells and a return of 8 percent from stocks would last forever. The farmer even began to buy oil stocks and Cuban Dominican Sugar, Old Ben Coal, and other such promising stocks and bonds, while his garden spot was planted to cotton. He bought chickens and turkeys and beef and pork from the town butcher. His orchards were killed by insects for the lack of a little attention. One morning the stock market broke, the oil gushers were put on pumps, and we began to look around for the old stand-by—products from our wonderful soil. I believe some of us feel so chagrined when we realize what we have wasted that we howl about the Government agencies to salve our pride.

Farming can't be done by ear in this country any longer. We have reached the time when it must be directed by those educated in scientific methods. The time was when we could throw a handful of cottonseed into our rich, black soil and a bale and a half and even two bales were picked from an acre of ground. We used to get our blackberries and dewberries wild, too, but those days have passed.

The agricultural colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture have, through scientific research, been storing up the answers to the farm problems for more than a half century. When Seeman A. Knapp wrote the Smith-Lever agricultural-extension bill in 1914, he had a vision of this information being disseminated to those who so vitally needed it.

Bankers and farmers didn't listen to these strange and peculiar educators; they considered them just absent-minded professors, who were too radical to be noticed by those who were making fortunes by putting every foot of land into cotton. Now, that much of the fertility of the soil is lost, are we bankers and old-style farmers

able to bring back agricultural prosperity? I say it is time for horticulturists, home economists, agronomists, soil conservation and agricultural engineers to take over the productive end of farming. Agricultural and mechanical colleges had to furnish men and the Government had to furnish some cheap money to bring this agricultural country out of the doldrums.

The depression, which first affected most groups of our citizens in 1929, merely made critical an already serious economic problem among the Nation's farmers. Years of disastrous farm prices, coupled with careless, unscientific methods of tillage, unsound tenure systems, heavy debt burdens, and serious erosion of soil had, and has, pushed a large part of our rural friends into desperate straits, from which there was no chance to escape without Government aid.

We bankers and we farmers are waking up when it is almost too late, to find the fertility leached out of the soil that remains, and literally thousands of acres are covered with clay from which the top 6 inches of soil has been washed into the Gulf of Mexico.

I have been in the banking game for more than 40 years in an agricultural district and have been in close touch with the farmer and know the problems of the tenant, the landowner, and the financial agencies backing their operations. The homes of many tenant farmers and resident landowners—good, honest, industrious citizens who have in years past been financially substantial—have become so dilapidated that the situation is a disgrace to this area. The houses have rotted porches, broken windows, leaky roofs, and large cracks in the walls, which are health hazards in the winter. They have no pictures or paper on the walls, no magazines or books, no running water or bathrooms, and all of these things have become necessities to even the small-income groups in other occupational fields. One would not expect to secure a living from an oil well that has been pumped dry, and one need not hope for a livelihood from soil that has lost fertility.

Something had to be done. The banks were charging off losses on many of these farmers to whom they had been lending for seasonal operations year after year because their work stock was 15 to 20 years old and their land was impoverished.

There were two possible methods of meeting the situation. Needy families had to be supported indefinitely on direct relief or they had to be helped to regain independence and self-respect and to climb back to a normal standing in community life.

The plan being followed seems best to me. Many of these families are receiving loans at a low rate of interest from the Rural Rehabilitation Agency. Most important of all, those receiving the loans are put under the supervision of trained home economists and agriculturalists. It would have been futile to have loaned them money and not have given them this technical help. They had failed in the only occupation they had any knowledge of, and they would never have succeeded without being taught new methods. Families receiving these loans must plant a garden, and vegetables from it, not used fresh, must be canned while young and tender. Chickens for eggs and meat, cows to supply milk, and calves fattened for canning for the winter beef supply are required in the plan. All cash expenditures must be budgeted. Soil-conservation practices must be followed, insects must be carefully fought, and improved varieties of seeds are planted.

An example of how these families have been brought back to the status of productive citizens will be given under a discussion of this particular governmental agency.

The manufacturer and industrialist have been favored with a protective tariff since the American Revolution, and I can see no sound reason why our agricultural industry should not have some of a like protection and benefit, call it what you wish, agricultural adjustment payment, parity payment, or any of the other crop benefits. When a manufacturer of farm machinery or automobiles, or a producer of oil, finds his market glutted, he does not hesitate to close down or curtail production, but when the farmer undertakes to curtail production, howls go up to high heaven that he is starving the Nation. Can you see any more reason why he should work without profit for his labor, than that the oil producer should sell his rich discovery for less than he chooses to take for it?

There are several Government agencies operating in our district which, in my opinion, have done much good. I am not speaking for other districts, but I strongly suspect their situation is the same.

We have the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Office, generally referred to as the seed-loan office, which has been making loans since 1931. They are not allowed to make a loan to any farmer who can secure a loan from his local bank, and in his application he must make a sworn statement to the effect he cannot secure a loan from his bank, or any other source. These loans are secured by a first lien or mortgage on the crops to be grown during the current year, and bear interest at the rate of 4 percent, for only the actual time the money is used. The maximum amount that can be loaned to any individual is $400, and the average loan is $100 to $150. In Navarro County this agency has made approximately 1,300 loans in the past 8 years, amounting to about $110,000, and of this amount, I am reliably informed, 97 percent has been repaid in full. Had it not been for this agency many of these farmers would have been thrown on direct relief and would have remained there. Can any bank or fair-minded individual justly complain or object to this agency? I say "No."

The Farm Security Administration is another of these agencies. It operates in three divisions: Rural Rehabilitation, Debt Adjustment, and Tenant Purchase. I shall discuss only the Rural Rehabilitation, because of the lack of time. In Navarro County it is serving now approximately 200 families. When farmers apply for loans at this office it is because they are unable to secure credit elsewhere. The reason for their inability to secure credit elsewhere being due to insufficient collateral or overburdened debts. The agency must be furnished with a statement from the local banks that they will not make the loan, and it has relieved banks of many past-due and slow loans. These loans are made for a period of from 1 to 5 years, and I am informed they have been repaid almost 100 percent, with the exception of a few delinquent loans, originating in 1935. This repayment is due largely to the supervision of the operation of the farms and homes, and of the expenditure of the cash on a sound budget basis. Can any fair-minded bank or individual justly object to or criticize this agency? I say "No."

I could give many, but have time for only one illustration to show its successful operation—the case of Robert Richardson, of Richland, Navarro County.

In 1936 Mr. Richardson applied for a Rural Rehabilitation loan. Prior to that time he was a merchant in a rural community and lost all of his possessions with the exception of 1 cow, valued at $20, 1 hog, valued at $6, and 8 hens, valued at $4. He received a loan of $906.15 with which to purchase 4 mules, 12 hens, 1 sow, 4 turkeys, necessary farming implements, feed, seed, and food. At the end of 1936 he paid $495.67 on his account. The first part of 1937 another loan was made to him for $234. He repaid $392.45 in spite of the low prices for farm products. He now has about 15 hogs, 175 hens, 3 cows, a tractor, plenty of feed and seed, and his net worth has increased from around $25 to about $1,000. His chickens and cows and hogs now provide all of his living expenses, and he hopes to get out of debt this year.

The Production Credit Association was created during the present administration. It refinances farm indebtedness and lends to crop producers for the breeding, raising, and fattening of livestock. Loans are usually made for from 3 months to 1 year, but if not liquidated at maturity, and requirements of the P. C. A. have been complied with, I am informed, arrangements can be made for renewals for longer periods. The rate now is 4½ percent. Every loan is secured by a chattel mortgage, which enables us to know exactly the loans it makes, because the daily mortgage report we subscribe to shows these loans. Most of the loans can be classed as good but slow, and with very, very few exceptions, are not acceptable to banks in our territory. No solicitation for loans is made and the association is not in competition with our banks.

It is my conviction that much good has been done by this agency. I am speaking for our district, which is composed of the counties of Ellis, Hill, and Navarro.

A camp of the soil conservation corps is located in our county, and now has under supervision 300 farms, which comprise a total of 48,000 acres. There are 150 applications on file for further contracts, which they have not been able to reach. The only criticism I have ever heard of this agency, is that its operation area is limited to 15 miles radius. Because of the excellent results achieved there are efforts being made to extend the limits. Like other governmental agencies, it is supported by Federal funds, and like others, it is of such educational benefit that most of our citizens think it would be almost a calamity to withdraw its activity.

If time would permit, there are others of these agencies I would tell of, and especially the Rural Electrification Administration, making the rural homes more attractive, and the work of the housewife less burdensome.

So, speaking from the viewpoint of a country banker, living in the heart of a country supported principally by agriculture, and being fully aware of the plight into which we had allowed ourselves to drift, I heartily endorse the set-up the Government so efficiently worked out to deliver us from the oppressor, and to boost and educate our citizenry to care for its soil.

About 30 years ago I had the good fortune to be associated in a bank with my dear friend, Frank Drane, who passed away about 2 years ago, leaving a fortune of some three-quarters of a million dollars to charity. He was a stanch advocate of scientific farming. He preached soil conservation, diversification, and constant rebuilding of the soil fertility.

In closing I give you his definition of agriculture.

"Agriculture, man's first and best occupation,
The greatest science, the noblest art;
It provides and maintains the warp and woof—
The fabric of the world.
To so understand its science,
And so practice its art,
As to cause the soil to yield its maximum
Comforts for this generation,
Yet leave it richer for the next, is
A possibility,
A duty,
A worthy ideal,
A great achievement."

Ernest Willard Gibson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the death of ERNEST WILLARD GIBSON, Senator from the State of Vermont, on June 21, 1940, removed from the Senate of the United States one of the outstanding Members of that body. He was quiet and calm but always effective. He was a typical American, and his life covered a wide range of activities. Throughout his busy career he served his State in many official capacities, and he served his country as a colonel in the last World War.

Mr. GIBSON and I met in 1929 when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I was entering upon my first term as a Member of the House of Representatives. Frequently I had occasion to consult my colleague and always found him most courteous and willing to help me in the many problems that confronted a beginner in Congress.

He earned his promotion to the Senate in 1934 because his services in the House of Representatives had been of great benefit to his native State, and he deserved the promotion. Others will tell of his fine record in the Senate.

Now that Senator GIBSON is gone, his ability, his fidelity, his patriotic record, his devotion to duty, will all loom large in the memory of those who are privileged to have had his friendship.

A prince once said of a king struck down:
"Taller he seems in death";
And the word holds good, for now, as then,
It is after death that we measure men.

And so, as the years go by, we will keep green in memory the good qualities of our departed friend, and our appreciation of his fine friendship will become larger and larger. He always measured up to every occasion, and the whole Nation has suffered a loss.

The death of Senator GIBSON was a personal shock to me. During his service in the Senate I had occasion to call upon him for help in connection with a legislative program in which I was interested, and from him I received the most loyal and effective cooperation. He had no personal concern with my problem, but a simple request on my part caused him to take the same interest in the legislation that he would manifest in something that concerned his own State. His sympathy was broad, and his understanding perfect, and I have always remembered the fine attitude he adopted when I conferred with him. Now that he has gone, I reaffirm my gratitude to a man who measured up to the great traditions of the United States Senate.

The earthly ties are broken, but I have an abiding faith in the philosophy of a life eternal, and sometime, and some place, there will be a great reunion, and those that have gone before will meet with those that are to follow. I refuse to subscribe to any doctrine that death ends all. I prefer the philosophy in this modest verse:

There is no death, the stars go down
To rise upon some fairer shore
And there in Heaven's eternal crown
To shine forever more.

With this viewpoint, I say that our friend is just away, and on the great judgment day he will meet and greet his friends of the days gone by. We believe in the immortality of the soul, and in the language of our great American poet: "Dust thou art to dust returnest was not spoken of the soul." In this faith we live, and we say farewell, but not forever, to our departed friend and neighbor.

And now, as a tribute to this good fellow, I conclude these remarks with this verse which expresses my feelings fully:

Green be the turf above thee
Friend of my better days,
None knew thee but to love thee
None loved thee but to praise.

I revere and respect his memory. May he rest in peace.

The Way a "Blitzkrieg" Works—Will We Profit by It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN M. McCUTCHEON RALEIGH

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was Bismarck who said that it takes a wise man to profit not only by his own experience but by the experience of others. America can consider itself fortunate that in the tragic crucible of Europe's disaster and chaos it has the chance to profit from their experience. Certainly in the unfolding of German military tactics and strategy it may learn what a modern streamlined power is doing.

This is primarily the day of Germanic foresight, ingenuity, and power in land and air movements. Their machine is the last word in martial might and progress. They shattered the maxim of Napoleon with emphasis on the "big battalions." They have also blotted out the incubus of all great military minds of Europe, the unwillingness to employ science in the development and use of weapon power.

Seemingly, too, Germany has utilized the fears of Marshal Saxe to eliminate his apprehension that "multitudes serve only to perplex and embarrass."

In this article of John M. McCutcheon Raleigh, of the Saturday Evening Post, there is an insight into concentrated weapon power with the minimum of manpower. It is enlightening and challenging.

I have no doubt that our military master minds with our industrial giants will evolve for America a more formidable machine than Germany now has. For once a machine is perfected and is brought into play, its improvements can be few and far between. Time and use do not allow a complete or even a partial change. That is why America will be able to outdo the German machine for she has the experience of their genius in this direction as a base. Our task is to see and profit.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

(By John McCutcheon Raleigh)

With respect for past mistakes and experience as a stern teacher, the German infantry school has perfected offensive attack to a fine science. One innovation is particularly effective. The phrase, "The damned artillery's dropping shells on our own men" is familiar to most infantry soldiers who fought with the A. E. F. The Germans claim they have eliminated this possibility to a great degree.

All infantry regiments have their own heavy-weapons company. This unit is equipped with guns, howitzers, and grenade throwers, both light and heavy, and moves with the regiment. The heavy-weapons company is commanded by the regimental colonel and, except in rare cases, remains attached to the headquarters of the regiment, fire being directed from that point. No longer must infantry rely solely upon artillery support from a separate organization.

Coordination of artillery and advancing troops from the same source greatly limits the chances of infantry receiving shellfire from their own batteries.

The all-purpose German infantry regiment has more than artillery attached. Heavy machine-gun and additional grenade-thrower support is delegated to battalion heavy-weapons companies, which are lighter armed units carrying out the same idea on a smaller scale as the artillery-fire power supplement of the regiment as a whole.

Battalion heavy-weapons companies are armed with 12 heavy machine guns, six 80-millimeter heavy grenade throwers, and 6 similar lighter weapons of the same type.

As a foreign military observer put it, "Now they've got everything with the foot soldier but the kitchen sink."

He enumerated the supplementary equipment * * * 75-millimeter howitzers, plenty of heavy and light grenade throwers, heavy machine guns, and dozens of motorcycle-mounted regimental runners. Add to this a complete antitank company of 18 guns, special machine-gun carts to drive off hostile planes, attached chemical units, and you've got an organization that is self-sufficient for any ordinary attack.

All of this armament is either with the infantryman or practically on his heels in battle. Infantry artillery around Warsaw was often within 50 yards of the actual contact point of hand-to-hand fighting.

Fire power is the keynote of all infantry organization. Supporting weapons are incorporated into all units, even down to the squad. Profiting from World War tactics, the German squad has absorbed lessons from all the armies involved in that conflict. The German practice of mass attacks—close-packed waves of infantry advancing in regimental formation—has been entirely shelved. The value of the individual soldier who can carry on by himself has not been overlooked.

Wherever German soldiers are fighting today their activity can be summed up in one word, "teamwork." Primarily, the squad illustrates the principle.

A squad consists of 10 men and a light machine gun. Three men serve the gun. One is detailed to carry ammunition and six riflemen protect the fire-power weapon. The squad is not disrupted by the supplying of ammunition. That is the duty of a single man. The remaining men insure the protection of the machine gun and consolidate its position.

At the battle of Oxhoeft, in Poland, an infantry regiment clearly showed its independence of other units. An officer at the scene of general action over a wide front described, step by step, the functions of an infantry regiment whose objective had to be taken without artillery support from the rest of the attacking force and the help of planes.

The artillery brigades available were busy pounding defenses on the other side of a ridge that afternoon and the air force was concentrating on the Hela Peninsula.

The officer called attention to a hill on which was located a Polish cadet school. The buildings were held tenaciously by the Poles and were proving a troublesome obstacle to the German advance.

As if in a classroom, the oberleutnant explained the attack as it had progressed.

The regiment advanced in deployed order to the edge of Gdynia and the slope atop which was the officers' school. The regimental heavy-weapons company split into two sections, one at each flank of the attack. The light field guns and 75-millimeter howitzers commenced a devastating crossfire, while the 150-millimeter howitzers, biggest artillery pieces of the heavy-weapons company of the regiment, laid down a destructive barrage on the road behind the school.

The barrage prevented reinforcements from joining the besieged Poles. The grenade throwers of the regimental heavy-weapons company went forward with the infantry to within 200 yards of the objective. Here they took cover and poured a steady stream of grenades on the buildings.

The heavy-weapons companies of the 2 attacking battalions crept closer, where they effected crossfire with their grenade throwers and 24 heavy machine guns, 12 from each inner flank.

The antitank company of the regiment remained with the troops in the center, ready to repel any Polish tanks that might make an appearance.

After an intensive preliminary bombardment, the attacking battalions began creeping forward by squads, operating on a ragged line, each 10 men fighting as a separate small unit. The companies used light grenade and flame throwers in their sectors as needed.

STREAMLINED ARTILLERY

Every German division has its complement of field artillery. Before the war one regiment was assigned to a division. Now it is believed that two regiments to a division is the standard.

The weapon most widely used in the field is the 105-millimeter gun howitzer. Nazi officers believe this piece combines the best qualities of the French 75- and the 155-millimeter howitzer. Named a gun howitzer, it is capable of operating in both capacities—as a field gun, firing shells in a flat trajectory, and as a howitzer, when the muzzle is elevated to a sharp angle and powder charges are altered.

The dual use of the piece was best illustrated in front of Warsaw. Several artillery regiments laid down effective field-gun barrages to cover troops advancing on the suburb of Praga. After the foremost trenches were taken, the batteries moved up and began dropping howitzer shells into the city to silence Polish gun positions in the parks and squares. The flat-trajectory barrages provided excellent covering fire for advancing infantry, and the howitzer high-angle fire enabled direct hits on sheltered gun emplacements surrounded by high buildings.

An artillery oberst, or colonel, stated: "It was advisable to take advantage of our gains immediately and begin shelling Polish batteries in the city proper. Instead of waiting until weapons of a precise nature, such as howitzers and mortars, were brought forward in sufficient numbers, my 105's were able to accomplish the howitzer task with no loss of valuable time." He said in conclusion, "This double use of the principal regimental weapons helped end the siege more quickly than was anticipated. As you Americans say, we 'streamlined' our field artillery, and both purposes of the 105's are best shown by the operation just completed."

A PLACE FOR THE HORSE

Heavy-artillery regiments are usually attached to corps. Their weapons are 210-millimeter and 40-centimeter howitzers. Pieces of larger caliber are under the command of army headquarters.

Foreign observers were astonished to note, in the giant parade held in Berlin on Hitler's fiftieth birthday, the appearance of a motorized gun of surprising size. The piece was either a 210- or a 240-millimeter gun, which is a much larger weapon than a howitzer of the same bore. Ordinarily, such cannon are railway-mounted, and are termed railway guns. None of the massive motorized weapons were used in the Polish campaign, but a number are said to be in service at the West Wall.

The majority of vehicles in the German Army are still horse-drawn. Although divisions have at their disposal units of tanks and motorized infantry, the rule, excepting armored and motorized divisions, is horse-pulled vehicles. For the past 5 years Germans have bought large numbers of American Missouri mules. When a particularly big order was placed, the purchase was made through blinds, persons who claimed no connection with the Nazi government. Otherwise the purchasers made no attempt to disguise their identity.

No mules were seen in Poland. The high command had correctly figured upon appropriating Polish mounts and draft animals. Thousands of beasts were obtained. Poland is a famous horse-raising country, and at the end of the campaign most of the army vehicles seen were drawn by squat, steppe-bred animals. Most purchased American livestock is said to be at the West Wall, where the terrain is more suited to mule-hauled transport.

Mass attacks of hundreds of tanks are probably the only effective method by which German armed offense could attempt to break the Maginot Line with any hope of success. But breaking through is another matter whose complexity is shrouded in the deepest secrecy. The sole information available from any source on this question is that in Berlin archives is a plan whose chance of succeeding has not as yet been sold to ranking German officers. In open country, the tank in force is a valuable weapon.

In pursuing the truth behind this, a novel type of reconnaissance work became evident. In each battalion of signal-corps troops is an intelligence section which is partially composed of motorized radio direction finders. The finders pick up enemy messages and locate their source. Thus the headquarters of a hostile division is established. Most radio-issued orders come only from a divisional headquarters. The entire disposition of enemy divisions along a battle front can be ascertained by this espionage of the air waves.

A German signal-corps soldier in Lodz, immediately after the fall of Warsaw, described the efficiency of the intelligence sections by saying, "The Poles will never be able to understand why they had to move their headquarters six times during the siege. For us it was easy. We picked up their radio messages from the sender at headquarters, located where it was, and then sent bombers to make them move." Identical tactics were similarly effective in the fighting around Radom and Kutno. With headquarters continually shifting and steadily harassed by bombings, it is not surprising that the Polish commands lost contact with their troops.

To prevent the exposure of their own headquarters until it does not matter, the German Army uses its radios only for the command of execution in an attack. All other orders are either telephoned or delivered by motorcycle messengers.

Another story of a German subterfuge was heard in Berlin press circles, but was never substantiated. It was claimed that valuable information was being secured by tiny microphones planted by night patrols near Allied outposts. Nazis boasted that the Berlin high command received records of what Tommies and Frenchmen talked about in front of the Maginot line. German officers who were quizzed about the story smiled and refused to comment. It was generally believed that the tale of the "whisper mikes" was either ridiculous or contained too much truth for the officers to remark upon its veracity.

Tarnung, or camouflage, is dear to the heart of the German soldier. Staff commands in the Siegfried line believe they have developed the art of concealment to its highest degree. The general aspect of the West Wall is a series of pill boxes, or bunkers, which complement one another in machine-gun and artillery cross-fire. Miles of antitank traps and barbed wire interweave between the small individual forts.

Some of the pill boxes and gun positions have been built to resemble ordinary objects, such as houses or gas stations. Near Saarbrücken are emplacements that appear to be inns, farmhouses, and barns. But actually within the light wooden walls are guns of the greatest caliber. In contrast, other positions are so cleverly concealed that they are not visible except as low copses of shrubbery as little as 20 yards away.

German patrols blacken their steel helmets to prevent the sun from reflecting on the metal. A rubber strap is attached to the headgear and in it are stuck branches and leaves. When a soldier raises his head the greenery is deceptive and not likely to be noticed by the enemy.

Congress Should Not Adjourn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, people in the district I have the honor to represent feel very keenly that Congress should stay in session during the World War developments. They feel that Congress should assert its constitutional rights

and that the executive branch of the Government should counsel with Members of Congress to the end that no steps may be undertaken that will lead the United States to become a participant in the present European conflict.

This opinion, shared by nearly everyone in the district, is well expressed in the Duluth Free Press in an editorial of June 21, 1940. This is one of our leading weekly newspapers, published by George M. Jensen, of Duluth, Minn. Mr. Jensen is recognized as one of the able newspapermen of the State of Minnesota. The editorial says:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY IN SESSION

With the war in Europe rapidly nearing its most crucial stage, with the prospect of a German invasion of England, which will probably be the most deciding factor in the war, Congress should stay in session until the crisis is past.

The President is committed to providing all possible aid to the Allies, which meets with the approval of the great majority of the people in the country. Congress is more or less committed to the same program, in that it has cleared the way for such aid in every way possible.

But the present course of the Government is rapidly leading the Nation into the war, and with the brakes provided by Congress removed by adjournment of that body, the pace might be accelerated tremendously.

Individual Congressmen may feel that with the election coming up this fall they should be at home mending their political fences. Staying in session, however, when duty to their country demands it will put them much higher in the public eye than would abandoning their jobs for the private work of campaigning.

Other newspapers and many individuals express the same opinion. They feel that important matters which confront the Nation should not be left to the judgment of any one man, and that Congress should be consulted in all of these matters that deal with national defense.

Advocate Giving Surplus to Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY VETERANS OF INDUSTRY OF LEFLORE COUNTY, OKLA.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the county council, LeFlore County, Okla., which were sent to me by their chairman, Mr. Steve McFall, Poteau, Okla.:

Whereas for the past 10 years, we have had continuously great surpluses of man power and unemployed in the United States, and approximately 10,000,000 men lying idle, and such idle men could very easily have produced tangible wealth in the approximate total of $10,000,000,000 per year; and,

Whereas in such length of time there has been wasted in these United States, a grand total of $100,000,000,000, or more, and such waste of production is still going on, day by day; and,

Whereas fully one-third of our people are deprived of the common subsistent necessities of life and are in a near starving and naked condition, and great suffering and undernourishment obtains among the mothers and little children of our lands; and,

Whereas approximately another one-third of our citizens, who may have the subsistent necessities of life, do not have the comforts and conveniences of life that could be available to each and every American citizen, if such idle man power were utilized and men given productive work; and

Whereas there are great surpluses of all kinds of foods and raw materials within the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demand of our Representatives in Congress and of our Government, a cooperative economic and social structure that will place these 10,000,000 unemployed to work to the end and purpose that plenty of the necessities, comforts, and conveniences of life be produced for the use of every citizen of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That great surpluses be produced and used and stored for such time as necessity may require that such be used to feed the famished and starving, and clothe the naked people of the nations now at war; and be it further

Resolved, That such a peacetime Christian cooperative economy be established in our United States, as not only to provide for our needs and comforts, but to create, produce, and store great surpluses of foods and commodities for the use and benefit of a suffering humanity the world over, wherever required; and be it further

Resolved, That all such surpluses of foods, clothing, and material things be donated and given to the American National Red Cross for the use and benefit of our fellow human beings, wheresoever situated, and without regard to color, class, race, nation, or creed, in order to feed the hungry and clothe the naked of this world.

Adopted this 2d day of June 1940, at Arkoma, Okla., at the regular monthly meeting of the County Council of the Veterans of Industry of America, for LeFlore County.

COUNTY COUNCIL, VETERANS OF INDUSTRY OF AMERICA,
LeFlore County, Okla.
STEVE MCFALL, *Chairman, Poteau, Okla.*

The Right Way and the Wrong Way—the Constitution and the Bridges Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, there was submitted to the House a bill officially designated H. R. 9766, and commonly known as the Bridges deportation bill. Many opinions have been expressed by persons who never saw this bill as to the wisdom and need of such legislation. Conceding that Bridges should be deported, still there would be no need to weaken or destroy the Constitution in order to accomplish this purpose. We do not need to burn the house in order to roast the pig. There are doubtless undesirable aliens whose presence in this country is hurtful, among the three and a half million alien residents now here, and while they may not be as well known as Bridges, still if one of them presents an individual problem, if this problem were undertaken to be met by passing a special bill for each individual, then the Congress would have no time left whatever to care for the great national and international problems that constantly require attention and legislation.

Before we can fairly express an opinion or pass judgment on this matter, we should know just what the legislation provides and for that reason I quote the bill as it passed the House:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful.

It would be well for those interested in this subject to repeatedly read the language contained in this bill, and then to read the Constitution of the United States, particularly article I, section 9, and the fifth amendment.

It will be noticed at a glance that this bill does not make the slightest pretense of providing for any sort of a charge being filed, a hearing being held, nor in any way outline the procedure to be followed, other than to merely command the Attorney General "that notwithstanding any other provision of the law" to immediately take into his custody and immediately deport to Australia, Harry Bridges.

The highest law-enforcing officer of the United States, the Attorney General, is commanded to disregard and disobey all existing law, on the subject of deportation, and the Congress of the United States is placed in the position of itself destroying every constitutional and legislative safeguard and restraint which have previously been enacted through the years on this subject. The Attorney General of the United States is ordered by the Congress to become a violator himself of all existing law on this subject, and that irrespective of the oath that he took to uphold, support, and defend the Constitution and the laws of the land. I am at a loss to understand how any person can take the position that this bill is not

violative of the Constitution and if it became a law would make this a country where the will of Congress without restriction or restraint and without regard to the judicial and legislative branches of the Government would be the supreme law. We would certainly no longer have "equal justice under law."

I have no interest whatever in Harry Bridges, but I have a tremendous responsibility as a Member of this Congress, representing more than 300,000 splendid American citizens, that requires sufficient moral courage, never to knowingly cast a vote to weaken, destroy, or tear down the Constitution of the United States. It was for this reason, and no other, that I voted as I did.

Now, let us look for a moment at the bill that was considered by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the one that was reported by that committee for consideration to the House. It read:

That the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody and deport to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, in the manner provided by sections 155 and 156, title 8, United States Code.

The RECORD will show that five Members of the Washington State delegation, on roll call voted for consideration of this bill. There was some question as to its constitutionality but it will be noted that it made provision that any deportation must be in accordance with previously enacted laws.

In order to accomplish the purpose sought and yet not do violence to the Constitution, a substitute bill was offered by the gentleman from Montana, Congressman JAMES O'CONNOR, who is a very able lawyer, a former district court judge, and a gentleman of unquestioned integrity and ability. His amendment read as follows:

That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed to immediately institute proper proceedings in the proper court to deport Harry Bridges, an alien, in accordance with sections 155 and 156, title VIII, United States Code.

I supported the O'Connor bill because it provided for a charge being filed and proceedings in conformity with the existing deportation laws and in keeping with the Federal Constitution. This, the O'Connor amendment, was defeated principally because there was no opportunity given for discussion, less than 10 minutes' time being taken on its consideration.

Following the O'Connor amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] offered an amendment the result of which would have had the bill read as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport any undesirable alien who advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

I supported this proposal, though it goes a long way toward an encroachment upon the judicial and legislative branches of our Government. I gave it my support because I realize in these strenuous times strong efforts must be made to control subversive influences, but those efforts must never be allowed to go to the point of destroying the Constitution itself.

On a teller vote the Anderson amendment received about 40 percent of the vote cast and therefore was lost. This brought us back not to the original bill that the committee had reported but to the substitute, which is as nearly a legislative decree and mandate as any decree and mandate ever issued by Stalin, Hitler, or Mussolini. I did not vote for it. I could not in good conscience vote for it when I knew that by so doing I would violate my oath as a Member of the Congress of the United States and knowingly become a party to the most vicious of all subversive activities, that of tearing down and destroying the Constitution and the Bill of Rights that through 152 years has safeguarded and protected America and now in these agitated and uncertain times is the only safeguard we have left.

It will be noted that of the four proposals submitted, I voted favorably upon the consideration of the three of them, and my recollection is that the entire Washington State delegation so voted.

Soon after the vote was taken I responded to a request from the Spokane American Legion Post, asking for my reasons for voting as I did, with the following telegram:

Your telegram received re Bridges vote. Evidently provisions of bill not understood at home. No veteran or citizen can be more opposed to communism or nazi-ism than I am. House has passed a bill for which I voted whereby Bridges could be deported, if charges against him are proven. The bill about which you wire is unique in that such a bill was never passed in the 152 years of our Government, where Congress voted a man guilty without charging an offense or giving him any right of a hearing. Our forefathers knew the dangers of bills of attainder, denial of due process, and denial of the writ of habeas corpus. They protected us against its dangers by the provisions of the Constitution. Bridges was not an issue in my vote, but the sacredness of the American Constitution, which I have sworn to uphold, was. I have resisted any encroachment upon the rights of the legislative branch of our Government by the judiciary or the executive. In this case I voted against destruction of judicial functions by the legislative branch. Periods of hate and national emergencies often threaten to overthrow fundamentals of our democratic principles.

Totalitarian and communistic governments issue decrees of guilt and punishment. America passes laws and the guilt and punishment are fixed by judicial decisions. The only way to preserve the long-established safeguards of liberty and government by law are to preserve the Constitution and not to destroy it.

Since the full import of the meaning and effect of the bill passed by the House of Representatives became known to the Nation, the leading newspapers and columnists, even those of the most conservative type, roundly condemned the passage of the bill as being a vicious and dangerous precedent and in violation of the Constitution. I quote from only a few of them:

Machinery ought to be at hand authorizing the deportation of any noncitizen whose presence is found hurtful to this country. If existing law does not provide such machinery, and apparently it does not, or the Bridges measure would not have been considered necessary, that defect should be promptly rectified. It certainly would be more efficient practice to have blanket regulations covering undesirable aliens than to require a special act of Congress each time some Bridges turns up. (Editorial from Philadelphia Inquirer, June 15.)

The 329-to-42 vote by which the House of Representatives adopted a bill directing the Attorney General forthwith to deport Harry Bridges as an alien, whose presence in this country has become a menace, plainly suggests that the war hysteria is itself becoming a serious menace. If Congress can strip an alien of the protections of "due process," it can also strip a citizen of the same protection. * * * When Congress itself sets an example of hysteria, the danger of its infecting the lesser agencies of government is vastly increased. * * * The Senate will perform a national service if it rejects the Bridges deportation bill. (From editorial in Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va., June 16.)

No doubt the House is justified in its suspicion that Mr. Bridges has harmed the shipping industry on the west coast, and it seems probable that on net balance he has done an ill service to labor. But none of this justifies the legislative method used. Wholly apart from the question of whether this particular bill is constitutional, it is difficult to think of a more dangerous precedent than the passage of a measure designed to punish a specific individual by name, and not for the violation of some clearly defined law of general applicability. Democracy is not to be defended by imitating the arbitrary legislative devices of despotism. (From editorial, New York Times, New York City, June 15.)

Among the 42 who voted against the anti-Bridges bill were conservatives without sympathy with Bridges or his methods. But they did not think the man big enough, or the issue presented by his activities important enough, to justify the evil precedent of ousting an individual for whose expulsion a clear case had not been made out under the general law. It is not an American practice or tradition to go gunning for individuals with an act of Congress. (From editorial, Philadelphia Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., June 15.)

It is a profoundly disturbing indication of the depth to which the antialien hysteria in this country has penetrated. In less emotional times we cannot believe that the Congress of the United States would give even serious consideration to a bill which short circuits the orderly deportation procedure and violates the tradition that even aliens are guaranteed the equal protection of our laws. (From editorial, Evening Post, New York City, June 15.)

Congress would have been far wiser to direct its attention to the problem as a whole rather than vent its anger against a single man. * * * But Congress has not the time, the ability, or the information to tackle such matters case by case. * * * If Harry Bridges' presence in this country is dangerous or illegal, the real fault is either with the law or the officials who administer it. This is where changes should be made for the future protection of the Nation. (From editorial, The News, Wilmington, Del., June 15.)

Talk about mass hysteria. The august House of Representatives of the United States gave a prize exhibition of it last week when it did something never before done in our history: passed a bill for

the deportation of a single alien, Harry Bridges. The vote was 330 to 42. The names of the 42 deserve a special roll of honor. At the risk of seeming invidious, I list here, to show the quality of the opposition, the 4 Republicans, of those voting who refused to be swept off their feet: BRUCE BARTON of New York, ROBERT LUCE, of Massachusetts, WILLIAM J. MILLER, of Connecticut, who lost both his legs as an aviator in the World War, and JAMES J. WADSWORTH, of New York. * * * Passage of the bill would be far more subversive of the Constitution than anything that Bridges has ever done or could conceivably do. (From the column of Charles G. Ross, published daily in many newspapers throughout the country, June 17.)

Harry Bridges, the west coast labor leader, must feel highly flattered. The House of Representatives has put the great law-making machinery of this Nation into motion and has actually passed a bill for the particular purpose of expelling this one man from the country. Of course, the bill is unconstitutional, and the House knows it. The author of the bill himself admits it. Bills of attainder are part of the apparatus of dictatorship and were among the things the founders of the Republic were careful to provide against. Were it otherwise, Congress could short-circuit courts and laws, and simply banish people or put them into jail by its own edit. (From editorial, the Dispatch, St. Paul, Minn., June 15.)

The House of Representatives has passed a bill to deport Harry Bridges, about whom so much controversy has centered in recent months. There is little doubt that such a bill is unconstitutional. * * * The only effective action which can be taken in such a situation is action which will punish and restrain every person engaged in the activities considered objectionable. Picking one man out of a group because he happens to be an alien will be of no real help. (From editorial, the Sun, Springfield, Ohio, June 15.)

Unfortunately, the House action seems as charged, to be something like a bill of attainder, outlawed by the Constitution. (From editorial, Press-Herald, Portland, Maine, June 17.)

Passage by the House of Representatives yesterday of the bill to deport Harry Bridges, C. I. O. leader on the Pacific coast, was an affront to the Constitution, to the dignity of Congress. * * * It is utterly ignominious and discriminatory for Congressmen to draft special legislation against one man. * * * The issue is not Bridges. His methods may or may not have been bad. What matters is that one of the two great legislative branches of the United States can prostitute legislation by divorcing it from broad principle and reduce it to the unabashed railroading of one man. It remains for the Senate to kill the Bridges bill and to read the House a lesson in the American way. (From editorial, Star-Times, St. Louis, Mo., June 14.)

Not only did the House ignore these official findings but the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization did not even accord the accused man a hearing before reporting favorably upon the bill for his deportation. In the course of the debate it was said that this is the first time a bill aimed exclusively at the punishment of one man has come before Congress. That is not surprising, since our Government is supposed to be one of laws.

What is almost past belief, however, is that a legislative body sworn to uphold democratic principles should be so misguided as to approve a measure subversive of the fundamental principles upon which our constitutional form of government rests.

If emulation is the sincerest form of flattery, then Hitler and Mussolini should extract great satisfaction from the unprecedented action of the House.

Much more than the wholly unimportant future of Harry Bridges is at stake in the present instance. His foes as well as friends can meet on common ground to oppose an action which is utterly repugnant to everything for which America is supposed to stand. (From editorial, The Washington Post, Washington, D. C., June 15.)

If by means of some legalistic legerdemain, legislation of this type could be upheld as a constitutional exercise of power, it would be no less objectionable. For to deport an alien by "legislative flat," without a hearing, is to commit an arbitrary, tyrannical act.

Equality before the law and impersonal and impartial enforcement of the laws are impossible if individuals are singled out for punishment without being charged with any specific violations of the law. (From editorial, the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., June 21.)

My own home newspaper, the Spokane Spokesman-Review, which is an unqualified Republican paper, and at times has been caustic in its criticism of the present administration, the Democratic Party, and the New Deal, and certainly can have no possible leanings toward the C. I. O. or the maritime union or Harry Bridges, in an editorial of June 21, among other things, has this to say:

Attorney General Jackson's protest against enactment of the House bill to deport Harry Bridges is well grounded in principle and his argument is sound * * *. It is true that the bill is devoid of the slightest pretense of giving the accused what our Nation has long known as "due process of law * * *."

Nevertheless, Jackson happens to be right in his argument on this Bridges bill and, despite his inconsistency, there is weight in his contention that:

"Harry Bridges may be all that this bill implies. But certainly he does not deserve a place in our history as a martyr. He is insignificant compared to the issues presented by the bill * * *." (Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., June 21, 1940.)

"It would be the first time," the Attorney General replied, "that Congress without changing the general law, simply suspended all laws which protect a named individual and directed the Attorney General to disregard and forthwith to deport 'notwithstanding any other provision of the law.'

"And it would be the first time since the alien and sedition laws a century and a half ago that any law would provide for deportation without a hearing and without, indeed, the slightest pretense toward giving the accused what our Nation has long known as 'due process of law.'" (Washington Post, Washington, D. C., June 20.)

Mr. Speaker, there can be little room for doubt that the bill as it passed the House is unconstitutional upon at least three grounds: First, it denies the privilege of a writ of habeas corpus; second, it is a bill of attainder; and third, it is a denial of due process. There can be no doubt whatever that it was intended to deny the right of an application for a writ of habeas corpus because the author of the bill stated on the floor of the House, when arguing in the support of his amendment, that he intended the bill should do this. He was asked specifically if Bridges would have a right to a writ of habeas corpus, and he replied, "Not under the provisions of this bill." This discussion will be found on page 8204 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 13.

Neither time nor space would permit me to submit a legal brief upon the constitutional provisions which are violated by this bill, but a mere reading of the bill indicates that no formal charge would be made; no hearing would be held, but by simple legislative enactment a judgment is entered and an execution issued.

The Supreme Court of the United States, after the close of the Civil War had occasion to pass upon what constituted a bill of attainder, and in that decision, we find this language:

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. "Bills of this sort," says Mr. Justice Story, "have been most usually passed in England in times of rebellion, or of gross subserviency to the Crown, or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable, as well the free as enslaved, to forget their duties, and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others." These bills are generally directed against individuals by name, but they may be directed against a whole class" (*Cummings* v. *Missouri*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 323, 18 L. ed. 356).

It has been contended by some persons that because a person happens to be an alien he has no constitutional rights. On second thought, one should readily see what a dangerous and awful situation would prevail if that were true. In order to eliminate even a possibility of such a construction being placed upon the Federal Constitution, Congress long ago, by an act, in 1870, which is designated in the Federal laws as Revised Statutes 1977, under the title "Equal Rights Under the Law," stated in unequivocal language that the Constitution applies to all persons, aliens as well as citizens.

Far back in the early decisions—one of the first cases being *Pennoyer* v. *Neff* (95 U. S. 714), and then a later case, *The Powell* v. *Alabama* (287 U. S. 45)—it was held by the United States Supreme Court that the due-process clause of the fifth amendment applies to all persons, irrespective of whether they are aliens or citizens. And, again, very specifically dealing with this exact question, involving deportation, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *The Japanese Immigrant Case* (189 U. S. 86), and, later, the case of *The Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 481), specifically held that not only citizens but also aliens who are within the borders of the United States are protected by the guaranties of the United States Constitution.

Now, I have gone to some considerable length to make clear that this bill is dangerous, unconstitutional, and un-American, and it would strike a deadly blow at constitutional government if it should ever become a law.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated that I have no interest whatever in Mr. Bridges, nor in any of his associates, and he has very few supporters in my district. In casting my vote on this dangerous legislation I was confronted with a proposition of having sufficient intellectual honesty, moral courage, and patriotic resolve to disregard political implications and reactions that a vote against this bill might have upon my personal and political fortunes. I voted consistent with my oath to "support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

I have never during the 4 years that I have been a Member of Congress, irrespective of the nature of the legislation or who might desire its enactment, cast a vote for a bill that was of questionable constitutionality, and the Supreme Court has never held any measure that I have ever voted for unconstitutional. I have upon at least a half dozen occasions voted against legislation that had as its objectives that which was highly desirable, but the method and manner proposed seemed to me to be in direct violation of the Federal Constitution. If the time ever comes when I cannot follow that independent course in the discharge of my congressional duties, then I certainly would not want to continue a Member of this distinguished and honorable body.

The President's Third Term "Blitzkrieg" Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the members of the House the following illuminating article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, which appears in the May 21, 1940, issue of the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 21, 1940]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

Our problem is in production and not in politics. There is a crisis in national defense. It is a need for immediate rearmament. It is a problem of industrial production and it is that alone. The record of this administration and the published programs of both the Army and the Navy are absolute proof that it is moving to a solution far too slowly to be of any use. It can be made to move much more rapidly. Ours is the most efficient industrial production machine in the world. It has the best production managers—men amply able to get this vitally necessary increased speed for the Government. But this Government has no such men.

The screamingly obvious necessary first step is to get them—right now. They don't have to hold office. They will come on request. They will see what is needed. They will get their fellows in industry to cooperate voluntarily.

Are we doing that? We are doing just the reverse of that. It is well known in Washington that the President is planning to put three Republicans on his Cabinet in the vital posts of War, Navy, and Commerce. Names mentioned are Frank Knox, Alf Landon, and Fiorello LaGuardia. Is that a production measure or a defense measure? It is not. It is pure politics. It is third-term politics.

It is said to be to "unify the country" on the rearmament program. The country doesn't need any unification on that. It is almost unanimous on that. The real purpose is plainly to break down our two-party system using this as an excuse—and to regiment the election. With the trend toward dictatorship the greatest threat in the world, this is the last thing the head of a Democratic Party should be trying to do. The two-party system is the essence of our democracy and the American way of life. This is a blow at its heart.

Mr. Roosevelt pleaded for the adjournment of politics. He himself is the hottest political issue. If he wanted to adjourn politics, he would announce himself in public as he has to some people in private as not available for a third term. His failure to do so establishes clearly enough that the only politics he wants adjourned is politics opposing him.

Nobody can believe even Mr. Roosevelt's assurances, except in writing and in public, that he is not a third-term candidate. Yet no self-respecting Republican could accept a place on this Cabinet without believing that. If any did, he would be exposing himself to sucker stultification after a third election of Roosevelt, after the powers of a dictator had been granted the President, after the party of opposition had been suppressed, and after he himself had been kicked heels-over-head into the gutter to the raucous razzberries and laughter of the White House jannissariat which is already gloating over what they regard as the steady progress of this strategy. Some of their intimates tell me that their glee over this progress would raise goose-pimples on the corpse of Andrew Jackson.

In the direction of a real solution of the overwhelmingly vital problem of production to bring an uninstructed political amateur into the War Department, for example, to take the gimp and tucker cut of Louis Johnson, would be a catastrophe. It would paralyze progress for weeks. Mr. Johnson has now been educated. He has always had great energy. He now has understanding. If he were freely permitted to create an advisory staff of industrialists, he could do the job. To replace or smother him on the plea of political unity, notwithstanding productive paralysis, would be an act of sabotage in national defense.

This barefaced use of a national crisis for the purposes of a partisan political attempt to perpetuate a particular President and increase his powers is the blackest mark with which this administration has yet smirched its own record—more impudent and impious than the 1937 conspiracy to revolutionize this to a personalized government by the court-packing and other defeated legislative plans—worse than the purges and the W. P. A. political bribery and coercion of 1938. As in those other cases there is strong hope that its stench is so great that it can't be swallowed.

Colorado River Water To Be Softened for Domestic Use by Metropolitan Water District (H. R. 6831)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, today the House, on motion of the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable RENÉ L. DEROUEN, distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 6831, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain of the public lands to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the extraction of sodium chloride (common salt) for water-conditioning purposes.

At the request of the Metropolitan Water District, I introduced this bill on June 14, 1939, and it was then referred to the Committee on the Public Lands. Hearings were held by the committee after the bill had been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, and on July 31, 1939, the bill was reported out with an amendment and committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Report No. 1243. The bill was passed in the House unanimously on July 31, 1939, and went to the Senate, where it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. This committee reported the bill to the Senate on June 3, 1940, Report No. 1748, and it was passed in the Senate with an amendment on June 21, 1940. As I have already stated, the House has today agreed to the Senate amendment, and the bill, H. R. 6831, is now on its way to the President for his signature which will make it a part of the public law.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is important to that great body of people who through their municipalities are subscribers to and customers of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. The district is a public and municipal corporation composed of the areas of 13 California cities, to wit, Anaheim, Beverly Hills, Burbank, Compton, Fullerton, Glendale, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Pasadena, San Marino, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, and Torrance. Its sole function is the storage, transportation, and distribution of water primarily for domestic use, for sale to its component cities on a wholesale basis. The district has a contract with the United States for delivery of water from the Colorado River at Parker Dam and has nearly completed construction of a 240-mile-long aqueduct from the Colorado River to the coastal plain of southern California.

The water of the Colorado River is too hard for ordinary domestic use, running about 300 parts per million—125 parts per million is an acceptable standard—consequently as part of its project the district will construct a water-softening plant. Hardness in water is caused primarily by three substances: First, calcium carbonate; second, calcium sulfate; and, third, magnesium sulfate. The first is eliminated by a lime treatment; the second and third will be removed by passing the water through a substance called zeolite. The

ability of zeolite to remove the calcium and magnesium sulfates becomes exhausted by use. It may be regenerated, however, by treatment with salt brine. Salt acquired by the district under the terms of H. R. 6831 will be used for this purpose.

There are extensive unused deposits of sodium chloride—common salt—in the public lands belonging to the Government in southern California, and it is the purpose of this bill to permit the Metropolitan Water District to lease these lands for the extraction of salt on the same terms and paying the same rate that any other applicant would pay. However, the district will be limited to mining salt for its own use in conditioning its own water. It will not be permitted to mine salt for commercial purposes; that is, for purposes of sale.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have been of this small service to the people of southern California and to their great undertaking, the Metropolitan Water District. It has been my great pleasure to work in cooperation with Mr. James H. Howard, general counsel for the district, both in this matter and in connection with the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, which is expected to obtain final passage shortly.

Administration Avoids Foreign Entanglements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Government of England released from London on June 25 a statement by Prime Minister Winston Churchill which in part said:

Churchill told the House of Commons today that on June 16 France informed him that the American response to a French appeal for aid was "unsatisfactory," and that France again asked to be released from her pledge not to negotiate a separate peace.

This statement of Churchill's is the pinnacle of proof that the Roosevelt administration has hewn to the line when it comes to living up to the Neutrality Act and avoiding foreign entanglements.

For weeks, yes, months, we have heard some of our opponents, some propagandists, some Nazi-minded individuals, use the radio and press to the effect that the administration was leading us into foreign entanglements. But "the proof of the pudding is in the eating."

You see, France asked for material, equipment, planes, and so forth, and at the same time asked for credit, and at least a strong hint for men. But President Roosevelt's reply to France, as stated to Churchill, was of such a nature that France knew that the administration was firm in its stand against foreign entanglements, and against credit to any foreign nation.

So again, Mr. Speaker, the administration has given assurance by action to the American people that we are not going to send our boys and ships to fight a war on any foreign land or foreign waters. By foreign we mean European or Asiatic lands and waters.

The Democrats do not have to put a plank in their platform that they are not going to participate in a war on foreign soil or waters. They have already demonstrated it. The people throughout the Nation know that this administration is not going to get them into any angle of a European or Asiatic conflict. Even the high-school boys and girls understand that. I have heard people standing on the streets wondering why the Republicans put a plank in their platform to the effect that they were opposed to the United States entering into any foreign wars. That was sort of a reflection on the intelligence of the American people for them to put that plank in the platform because it is definitely understood by all—men, women, and children—that that is what both parties stood for.

Keeping Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1940

LETTER FROM HON. RUSH D. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR FRIEND: Last fall I wrote the people of my State that I would not favor any move to take my country into war either through the front or back door. I maintain that position. I also ask my people to recall these letters and see if I have not told them the truth about the developments that have followed.

I called for a three-point program, although I said more could be added. The three points were: First, a strong national defense; second, preservation of the Monroe Doctrine; third, mind our own business.

We are accomplishing the first, although we could speed it up. A resolution to give legislative effect to the second has been passed by Congress. It is the third point I desire to discuss.

There are too many indications that there are certain Government officials who are intervening in the quarrels of Europe. If the war continues and the intervention policy continues, the United States will be in the war. That would be mass suicide. It is said we must enter the war to save democracy. We were told that 25 years ago, and instead of democracy being saved, dictatorship sprang up throughout the world. Today we are told that this is a battle for civilization. We were told the same thing 25 years ago. We know our entrance in this war will destroy our democracy here and will hurt civilization. We must keep our country at peace as a glowing sign for the entire world to see that democracy does pay, that democracy can work. We are told we are in danger of a German attack. Part of this fear is sincere, but not informed. Part of this fear is generated propaganda to get us in this conflict at once. Turn back the pages of the newspapers to 1915 and 1916 and the same cry can be found. The greatest authorities on military, naval, and air defense say we cannot be successfully invaded; but let us prepare our defenses at once so that no foreign power can set up a base on the American continent. None has been established, and until they are, no effective attack can be made.

Remember, the United States can get into this war either by a declaration of war by Congress or by creating and provoking incidents that cause an act of war to be committed by another country. Let us stop these actions that may cause such an act. Hysteria has been deliberately spread to get the people ready for war. The penalty for the conclusion of such a policy is death and disaster.

I have delivered speeches on this subject, some on the floor of the Senate and others over the radio. One radio speech brought me more than 25,000 requests for copies from every State and from nine foreign countries. This speech as well as the discussions in the Senate are available for the asking. Just write your name and address on this letter and return it to me or write me a postal card or a letter and they will be sent at once. The time to work for peace is while we are at peace. Shall we sacrifice our finest young men on the battlefields of Europe in another ever-occurring European war? I say, "No."

Sincerely,

RUSH D. HOLT.

Edward Walter Curley

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. EDWARD WALTER CURLEY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we must be unashamed publicly to admit our deep sorrow and grief upon the passing of our beloved colleague from New York, EDWARD W. CURLEY.

His passing, on January 6, 1940, left me with a deep feeling of having lost a kindly and true counselor and friend.

His legislative life was marked throughout by his deep devotion to duty and his sense of responsibility of the trust that was his. His long experience and his kindly nature were invaluable in the deliberations of our body. His leadership and advice were a source of inspiration and guidance to me. His gracious nature and warmth of greeting will always be missed and will be long remembered.

He was a product of New York and our great city can be as proud of him as he was of it.

To his wife, who was always his constant companion, I extend my deep sympathy and to his constituency, I recall that there has been taken from us an able Representative, a devoted friend, a man among men.

May he rest in deserved peace.

William Irving Sirovich

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1940

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM IRVING SIROVICH, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I shall forever remember with high regard our colleague the gentleman from New York, Dr. WILLIAM I. SIROVICH, who was called from us on the 17th of December 1939. He was called, as he lived, from among friends without number, gained through a life of public service, a life motivated by the highest ideals, filled with a love for mankind, and fervently kindled with a desire to improve the lot of his people.

Erudite, active, liberal, alert, kindly, and attentive, here was a Representative from whom all privileged to know him could and did take inspiration.

His passing leaves a void in this harrowed world difficult to fill, and the memory of him will long be felt throughout our Chamber. His constructive legislation, aiding the plight of those needing a champion and friend, will outlive any material monument that may be raised by a mournful family and a grateful constituency.

A great surgeon, scholar, statesman, and stalwart servant has passed on.

May he rest in peace, comforted in the thought of having lived a kindly, religious, constructive life in the service of the world.

The Critical Question of Farm Surpluses—Can We Use Our Cotton at Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN PACE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY MILO PERKINS, DIRECTOR OF MARKETING, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, while we are devoting so much of our time in preparing our military and naval defenses, we must not overlook the possible consequences of the war in Europe on the farmers of this Nation. I invite your special and sympathetic consideration of the following address delivered in Los Angeles last Friday by Hon. Milo Perkins, Director of Marketing, United States Department of Agriculture.

The cotton producers of this Nation face a most serious situation. They are fortunate in having a man with the vision and ability of Mr. Perkins to work with them in finding an answer to their problem, and I hope the Congress and the Nation will give his message the attention which the present unusual conditions demand.

These are days the like of which no man has ever seen before. Some of us are frightened and some of us are angered by what is happening abroad. Many of us are bewildered. We know mentally that the days ahead may hurt us badly, but we have not yet felt the blows in full force. Whenever I have a chance to speak to farm folks I like to discuss city problems, and whenever I am speaking to city folks I welcome the chance to discuss farm problems, particularly those which are increasing as a result of war in the world.

Today, however, I have a most unusual opportunity. Some of you are farmers, some of you are textile workers, some of you are manufacturers, and some of you are merchants. All of you are consumers. The California Farm Bureau is to be congratulated upon arranging a meeting of this sort in the interest of the general welfare. Farmers know that half of the agricultural problem lies in our cities, and they want their customers in the cities to work out their farm problems with them. If only all of us can do our reasoning from the same sets of facts, we shall be able to work out sensible solutions together. The one thing we cannot afford during this period of world crisis is national disunity. As the richest and the most fortunate nation on the face of the earth, we can afford almost anything else.

We are approaching harvest time for the American farmer. Even if the war abroad lasts for a while, our foreign outlets for farm products probably will be much less than they were last fall. The nations which Germany has conquered cannot buy from us as they did a year ago, and Great Britain herself, engaged as she is in a life and death struggle, must put first things first. Guns and bombs and tanks and airplanes are more important to her than being able to get the prunes and raisins, for example, which are produced here in California in such abundance. There are difficulties ahead even if the war lasts. Should there be an early peace, the problems would become extremely critical overnight. We probably would face the worst crisis in our agricultural history. While only 10 percent of our total business is represented by foreign trade, such an average figure is very deceiving. By way of indicating the internal dislocations which might result from the loss of agricultural exports, I should like you to consider the following figures:

1. Forty-five percent of the prune crop normally is exported.
2. Fifty percent of the cotton crop normally is exported.
3. Fifty percent of our flue-cured tobacco crop normally is exported.
4. Thirty percent of the raisin crop normally is exported.
5. Forty-five percent of our winter pear crop normally is exported.
6. Ten percent of our apple crop normally is exported.
7. Prior to the droughts of 1934 and 1936, about 30 percent of our lard went into export. Stocks at present are extremely heavy and threaten to depress the price of cottonseed this fall.

Nor is that all. Somewhat lesser percentages of California barley, of corn, hops, walnuts, pecans, canned goods, and citrus fruits are threatened with the loss of export markets. The loss of these foreign outlets can easily break the price structure on the entire domestic crop in many cases. The loss of export markets for wheat normally would be very serious. Because of drought in the Winter Wheat Belt this season, bad as that has been for producers in certain sections, the situation is not likely to be quite so critical for this current crop year as would otherwise be the case. For the long pull, however, it's bound to be one of our real agricultural headaches. Our exports of farm products have averaged nearly $800,000,000 annually for the last 10 years. War is now threatening that entire foreign market.

An abrupt termination of the conflict, with a consequent lessening of industrial activity in this country might result in serious surplus situations in connection with crops produced primarily for domestic consumption, because of curtailed buying power in our cities. It is impossible now to estimate the difficulties, crop by crop, which such a situation would present but the price structure might be threatened for dairy products, poultry products, meats, fruits, and vegetables. Domestic as well as foreign outlets for several hundred millions of dollars' worth of farm products, conceivably may be lost during the coming year. Present appropriations for surplus removal are inadequate, of course, to meet such a crisis. In the past farmers have been hurt more by war than any other group. We've got to prepare ourselves to meet the costs of this conflict as a whole people. Perhaps we must be prepared to meet it as a whole hemisphere. Some very interesting proposals in that direction are now being seriously explored. If a huge cartel should be set up to handle all export surpluses of this hemisphere, it would prevent the totalitarian nations from playing one country or one business firm against another. Any surpluses which could not be moved into foreign trade might be distributed internally in both North and South America, thereby raising the living standards of the whole hemisphere.

I am glad today that we are discussing cotton in general and the cotton stamp plan in particular. Everyone is agreed that the loss of any substantial part of our export market for cotton would cause worse internal dislocations than would be the case with other crops. It is well to keep certain general over-all facts in mind when we think about cotton as it applies to our rural economy from Georgia to California.

It has been estimated that about 14,000,000 persons are dependent directly or indirectly on the production of cotton. If we were to stop producing cotton for a foreign market, the country as a whole would inherit a bigger relief load than that now being carried by W. P. A. The immediate cost of caring for these persons would

be far greater than the cost of using the cotton surplus here at home if that were at all possible. We might as well, therefore, set it down as an axiom that cotton production cannot be cut much below 12,000,000 bales in the near future without creating more costly problems than such an acreage reduction would attempt to cure. Certainly this is true for the early part of the forties.

Let's take a quick look at the cotton-surplus problem. In 1933 we set out to reduce our surplus of cotton. By 1936 the 13,000,000 bales on hand in 1932 were reduced by approximately one-half and to almost normal proportions. But something happened in 1936. The original Triple A program was killed. In 1937 an avalanche of cotton—19,000,000 bales—descended upon us, and, so far as our supply was concerned, it carried us back to 1932. The rest of the world grew another record crop.

Due to a combination of fortunate circumstances, the repetition of which the cotton farmer is not likely to see for a long time, we have succeeded during the current cotton year in cutting Government-loan stocks from eleven and four-tenths million bales to about nine million bales. Still the cotton-surplus problem remains extremely serious. Ouf soil-conservation and acreage-adjustment programs, therefore, certainly must be continued, even though world conditions may force us to change their emphasis somewhat. The country can't stand another 19,000,000-bale cotton crop. Since cotton farmers get about half the share of the national income which they enjoyed before the first World War, I don't see how the Nation can object to parity payments which bring them only part way toward the purchasing power, in terms of city goods, which they formerly enjoyed. They ought to have their full and just share of the national income, and they would if city folks knew more about their problems.

Obviously, the cotton loan must be continued to support a minimum price to producers, but it will lead to eventual disaster unless we can move the cotton we produce into consumption both here and abroad. Let's not do any wishful thinking about that, and let's not wait until we've got a 2-year supply of cotton in the loan before we do anything about it. The cotton farmer has too much at stake for anything like that to happen.

Prior to the first World War cotton farmers got about 3 percent of the national income; recently, even with benefit payments added, they have gotten about half that. The over-population in rural areas in the cotton South is more critical than in any other farming section. Our cotton farms have a million more persons on them than was the case before the first World War. Large families on small farms. Hard work on thin land. Small incomes even on the rich lands of the delta. A shocking lack of cotton goods in homes on the very land where the cotton is produced. That's part of the picture of the cotton South.

Human erosion has tended to out run soil erosion in some of our Southern States. Some 58 percent of the farmers in the cotton-growing States are tenants. A third of them move every year. Statistics are not dull and uninteresting when we translate them in terms of families who know real poverty as intimately as they know the weary treadmill of the seasons. Today the richest State in the cotton-growing South ranks lower in per capita income than the poorest State outside. Even in 1939 southern farm families received only one-third the average annual income of farmers elsewhere. No wonder they can't buy enough to give the wheels of industry more than a turn or two. No wonder there is unemployment in our cities.

It is really impossible for us who are fathers in this room to know what it would be like to bring up families on a cash income of around $5 a week; and yet these southern farm families are the families which are contributing more children to our democracy than any other group in proportion to its size. Innocent victims of malnutrition make mighty poor citizens. Let's not fool ourselves—the problems of the cotton South are the problems of the whole Nation.

Soil erosion on the lands where cotton has been grown for over a century is now a matter of national concern. Cotton has been grown, for the most part, on the poorest land in the Nation. About 61 percent of all the land in the United States that is badly eroded is in the southern Cotton Belt. In these same Southern States 22,000,000 acres of formerly fertile soil are ruined beyond immediate repair. An expanse as large as South Carolina has been washed away. Another area the size of Oklahoma and Alabama has been seriously damaged, and the sand and gravel washed off this land has covered another valley the size of the State of Maryland.

Great progress recently has been made, of course, in stopping further erosion. Farm-management plans which call for diversified farming rather than one-crop cotton farming have made some headway. The very excellent work of the Farm Security Administration with several hundred thousand cotton farmers is proof of the fact, but they would be the first to admit that it's a long, long road. And yet I am convinced it's a road along which the South may be forced to walk by world events over which it had no control. It makes sense, theoretically, to combine three or four small cotton farms into one more diversified production unit, but the difficulty lies in finding a way for the two or three displaced families to make a living not only in terms of available jobs but in terms of their skills. That does not mean that this is not a desirable direction in which to move; quite the contrary. I am only pointing out that it's a job for the long pull, like our efforts to promote new industrial uses for cotton which can stand on their own feet commercially. These may mean a lot several years from now, but they can't make even a dent in the cotton-surplus problem this year or next.

Not quite a year ago we started an export-subsidy program on cotton to help the American farmer regain his fair share of the world market. It cost over $40,000,000, but during the period of its operation our loan stocks have been reduced and our exports have been about double those of the previous cotton-year. This increased movement of cotton abroad resulted in a higher domestic price level and therefore added to the purchasing power of cotton farmers. The increase in actual consumption of American cotton abroad, however, apparently will be only about one-sixth of our increase of exports of the raw staple when this cotton-year is compared to last. In other words, foreign spinners have largely replenished and built up their inventories of American cotton.

Export subsidies are very useful expedients under certain conditions, but my own feeling is that they may be less and less effective in the years ahead of us. Certainly that appears to be the likelihood today. Before we resort to export subsidies in the future, we must be reasonably sure, among other things, that they will really increase exports. In a totalitarian world, where goods are bartered and price is not a determining factor, export subsidies would become old-fashioned and impotent. They wouldn't, except in isolated instances, get the job done. More modern ways of getting rid of surpluses would have to be used. What the South must have is actual results in terms of maintaining total cotton consumption—as much abroad as possible, and as much more at home as is necessary to make up for any loss of foreign markets.

We might well consider the continuation of an export subsidy on cotton textiles sold by American manufacturers within the Western Hemisphere, however. There is much to be said for pushing such a program aggressively. It is one way of expanding our commerce north and south in a world where it is getting harder and harder to hold the trade we have enjoyed for decades along lines that run east and west.

Were it not for war in the world, we would have reason to hope that we might work out a way to establish a balance between supply and demand so far as our cotton inventories are concerned. We cannot feel that sort of security for cotton, however, in view of the present international situation. Just how much of our export market for cotton we are likely to lose, and for just how many years it is likely to remain lost, is a matter where one man's guess is as good as another's. It is tied up with dozens of complicated problems, such as how much we are willing to import from abroad, how far we can get with a cartel to handle all export surpluses of this hemisphere, who wins the war, and the accessibility to dollar exchange on the part of foreign nations. I think we can set it down as a basic principle of national policy, however, that we will retreat from foreign markets, if retreat we must, as stubbornly as possible. The more of our foreign markets we can hold, the less savage will be the adjustments which are required internally. Since we are the only major nation which has surpluses of both farm and city goods, however, it may become increasingly difficult for us to trade with the rest of the world, particularly after we get all its gold. That certainly will be true if we continue wanting to sell as much as we can abroad and wanting, at the same time, to import as little as possible. World events easily may shut off a big foreign market for our cotton, whether we like it or not. These are days when we need to think boldly in terms of the worst that might happen. The worst that might happen, so far as cotton is concerned, is to lose our export market entirely. This is unlikely to occur, of course, but let's take stock of what we could do in the event of such a calamity or of a world situation which closely approached it.

This year we shall consume close to seven and one-half million bales of cotton domestically; and with the increased industrial activity which will result from the rearmament program, I think we can start with the mildly optimistic assumption that we can hope to maintain this level of cotton consumption for awhile.

Now let's explore how much extra cotton we can consume domestically if world events shatter the economy which we have known since childhood. We are making this forthright sort of appraisal in the Department of Agriculture, crop by crop, so that we will be prepared to meet the blows which may fall upon us at any moment. It means a challenge to our ingenuity and a reorientation of our thinking far greater than anything that was necessary in the early thirties. I would like to set forth some of the things which would bring our domestic consumption of cotton more nearly in line with the minimum domestic production which seems necessary to prevent an utter collapse of our southern economy which is now so dependent on cotton. Let's see how much we can increase the present domestic consumption figure of seven and one-half million bales.

Putting aside any future possibilities which may develop from new use programs, suppose we set down these figures first and then discuss them. Naturally, I am not suggesting such a program now; rather, I am thinking out loud about a future which may be pretty dark. And I am thinking about the Federal subsidies which might be necessary during a transition period of a few years while we're trying to diversify our southern agriculture and grow less cotton. This represents the maximum goal we can hope to reach as I see it:

A possible home-consumption program for cotton in bales

1. Present annual rate of domestic consumption	7,500,000
2. Mattress program for low-income families making less than $50 a month	600,000
3. Substitution of cotton, industrially, for all jute and burlap now imported	1,000,000
4. Cotton-stamp program which would raise cotton goods purchasing power of all families making less than $200 a month to that level	2,000,000
	11,100,000

It is not impossible therefore to consume around 11,000,000 bales of cotton annually and to use it in our own country—right in our own backyard. Any such program would mean a tremendous increase in textile activity here at home—an increase amounting to more than a third of the cotton-mill consumption of cotton for this year. Even if our textile mills were on a 24-hour shift, which is undesirable from many points of view, they could not consume more than nine to nine and one-half million bales of cotton a year. If world events should force us to a domestic consumption which ran close to 11,000,000 bales annually, we would have to build new cotton mills, buy new machinery, build more garment factories, hire men and women to work in them, and put more clerks to work in our retail and wholesale business firms. Under such conditions several hundred thousand persons in families now dependent on public aid could be supported by breadwinners at work in private industry. While such a program as this would make a big dent in unemployment, it also would require a big Federal subsidy. Business rather than Government would hire the unemployed, but it would still be done with tax dollars. Let's see how much it would cost on this maximum basis.

	Bales	Additional annual cost to Federal Treasury
1. Present consumption	7,500,000	None
2. Mattress program	600,000	$39,000,000
3. Substitution of cotton for jute and burlap	1,000,000	[1] 5,000,000
4. Cotton stamp plan on maximum and extreme basis suggested above	2,000,000	[2] 600,000,000
Total maximum cost		644,000,000

[1] Annual loss tariff revenues now collected on burlap. All former buyers of jute and burlap would have to bear the higher cost of cotton fabrics, however.
[2] Over half of this amount would go to employ persons now out of work.

Now, let's examine these possibilities one by one. This past year we supplied a little over 100,000 bales of cotton, with ticking to match, for various mattress-making projects throughout the country. This could be stepped up to about 600,000 bales a year and held at that level for a few years. One of the ironies of the rural South lies in the fact that hundreds of thousands of families who produce cotton are without mattresses on which to sleep. More of the money spent on this kind of program gets back to the cotton farmer than under any other approach to increasing domestic consumption. That, plus the fact that these low-income families contribute their own labor to make their own mattresses, is the chief advantage of this work. It may be desirable later on to work out some sort of program with mattress manufacturers for very low-income city groups. The disadvantage of counting too much on mattress outlets lies in the fact that after a few years the rate at which cotton could be used for this purpose would be slowed down, whereas purchases of clothing and household necessities are made much more frequently. Merchants in the counties where mattress-making projects have been in operation report a sharp increase in their sales of beds, springs, sheets, pillowcases, comforters, and blankets. That is a corollary advantage which cannot be measured exactly, but we ought not lose sight of it. For a few years at any rate, therefore, this work could raise the domestic consumption of cotton to 8,100,000 bales a year.

I do not want to be misunderstood as having recommended that we bar the importation of jute and burlap. On the contrary, what we are doing here today is to think out loud and to think boldly about what we might have to do as a result of world events which are not of our own choosing. If there should be an early peace and if there should be a change in the status of India, which now is the exclusive source of jute for all the world, we might find ourselves wanting, for a variety of reasons, to bar the importation of jute and its products.

This would not cost the Federal Treasury a dime, except for the tariff revenues now received on some of the jute products coming into the country. It would, however, like all less drastic tariff measures, amount to an internal tax which would have to be borne by the population generally, including the cotton farmer. He would have to pay 25 to 30 cents a pattern more for cotton bagging, which would replace the cheaper covering now made of jute. The flour millers would be obliged to buy cotton bags exclusively for their bran and shorts. Rice, cottonseed meal and cake, and dozens of other processed commodities would have to be sacked in cotton bags rather than in burlap. Automobile manufacturers and furniture factories would have to use cotton cloth in place of burlap. Farmers growing potatoes and rice and some of the small grains, to mention just a few commodities, would have to sack their products in cotton bags, which are more expensive than those made of burlap. The higher resale value of cotton bags would not offset the cost. The difference per unit would be only a few cents, but the total extra cost for a year would run into tens of millions of dollars, even though that cost would not be borne by the Federal Treasury.

This is one of those things to which the Nation would not resort except in time of critical international crisis. So far as the cotton South is concerned, however—and I want to repeat that its problems are of such magnitude that they concern the whole Nation—it would mean a new outlet for over a million bales of cotton a year. That cotton would have to be woven into cloth, and its weaving would reemploy tens of thousands of persons who are now out of work both in the South and in New England. When men get off relief rolls and get jobs in private industry they buy more food and they buy more cotton clothing, and this broader market for farm products increases farm income. Any increase in farm income is reflected several times over in increased national income. This brings us to a possible 9,100,000-bale annual consumption of cotton domestically.

In February, when the cotton stamp plan was announced, Secretary Wallace said:

"In the long run, the present war is very likely to harm cotton farmers to a greater degree than they were harmed by the last World War. Our export markets may be sharply curtailed if war continues. The situation is likely to be even worse when the war is over. It seems to me, therefore, that it is very desirable to get an experience record with the cotton stamp plan to determine in practice whether it will provide a practical means of effecting increased domestic consumption. There may come a time when it will be necessary to engage in a program of this kind on a national basis."

Obviously, the Secretary has been concerned for some time about what we might have to do in the future to cushion the shock of losing any substantial part of our export market for cotton. The cotton stamp plan at the moment is set up on a very much more conservative basis than the maximum figure which I have given you. This is true both with regard to the income groups we are now reaching and the amount of cotton goods being given free. This is appropriate in an experimental program, and nothing short of world tragedy is likely to force the American people to provide cotton goods on any such basis as that suggested. It would mean an almost explosive change in our present conceptions of Federal responsibility. For my own part, I shudder somewhat at the administrative problems connected with a program of this magnitude, to say nothing of its cost. I feel sure that we can stop far short of it and keep our cotton stamp program on a much more modest basis. If it became utterly necessary, however, it would be much cheaper to use the surplus in this manner than it would be to make drastic cuts in cotton acreage with all the relief costs which would follow in the wake of such an action. It is apparently not impossible, therefore, to consume 11,100,000 bales of cotton a year here at home.

Our cotton stamp plan is designed to make it possible for low-income persons to use the cotton surplus—chiefly by wearing it. Families of four making less than $500 a year spend approximately $17.90 annually for clothing and household goods made of cotton. On the other hand, families making $5,000 a year and over spend $111.96 annually for these same commodities. There is a tremendous untapped market for cotton goods here at home among the bottom two-thirds of our population which has to get along on an average cash income of $69 a month for a whole family. The following table brings out these consumption figures by income groups in greater detail:

Estimated annual expenditures for cotton goods by nonrelief families, 1935–36

[Preliminary, subject to revision]

Income class	Clothing				Household goods	Total
	Husband	Wife	Boy, 6 to 11	Girl, 6 to 11		
Under $500	$5.65	$3.50	$4.17	$2.94	$1.64	$17.90
$500 to $1,000	8.57	4.86	5.96	4.65	3.33	27.37
$1,000 to $1,500	10.84	6.24	7.41	6.56	5.68	36.73
$1,500 to $2,000	12.80	7.45	8.75	8.30	7.08	44.38
$2,000 to $3,000	15.47	9.13	10.50	10.44	10.01	55.55
$3,000 to $5,000	20.19	11.61	13.33	13.59	14.85	73.57
$5,000 and over	31.79	17.29	17.11	16.83	28.94	111.96

Estimates prepared by Marketing Section, U. S. Department of Agriculture, based on survey records obtained in Consumer Purchases Study conducted by Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of Home Economics, in cooperation with the Work Projects Administration, National Resources Committee, and Central Statistical Board.

If world conditions over which we have no control should ever force any such total cotton program as this upon us as the fastest and cheapest way out for a few years, we ought to be honest with ourselves about taxes from the very beginning. We would have to pay for it and we ought to pay as we go as completely as we can. That would mean an entirely different attitude toward taxes than you and I have known since we were youngsters. It would mean making up our minds more strongly than ever that economic democracy is worth fighting for and its preservation is worth paying for. The riches produced by a nation at work, of course, would help to offset the cost. Government can't get blood out of a turnip any more than business can. It can't collect taxes from the unemployed any more than it can from businessmen whose plants are running half time. It can and must collect adequate taxes from all of us who are working full time in proportion to our ability to pay. Everyone knows that the most effective way to increase tax revenues is to wipe out unemployment.

We have lost 100,000,000 years of man-hours in this country in the last 10 years. That has meant lower living standards for all of us, to say nothing of broken morale. One of the worst national costs of this unemployment probably won't show up before the armament program gets under way. I have in mind the lack of skills on the part of those who have had no chance to engage in useful occupations. We can't cure this situation over night but cure it we must, and as fast as we can. Any national goal short of full employment for every able-bodied man in America is dangerous to us as a

nation. Our very security as a people depends upon available work for everybody; it depends upon using and not wasting our surplus manpower. The dictators learned that lesson long ago and all too well. Our manpower is our greatest national asset, and we've got to utilize it to the fullest. Full employment costs less than idleness.

We are faced with what might be called a mixed economy. That is, there are no longer any single panaceas for our problems. Things won't work automatically any more. We can make a flourishing thing of industrial capitalism in this country during the next century but it will take the united determination of our whole people. It will take courage because we shall have to toss overboard some of the cherished economic notions which worked in the nineteenth century but which won't work in the middle of the twentieth century. Important as it may become, the cotton-stamp plan is only one small sector of the whole front. If ever it becomes necessary to broaden and expand this work to cover the Nation, retail merchants have got to win their battles on their part of the front. A gap in the business lines at any point might cost us the war we are fighting to make economic democracy work in this hemisphere. Let's examine this cotton-stamp plan in more detail.

Starting only a month and a half ago, on May 7, we began the experiment in Memphis, Tenn. Reports from there have been most encouraging. On June 3, it was begun in Springfield, Mass., and recently it was announced for St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn. We hope it can be put into effect soon in Los Angeles County. This is the newest cooperative effort to meet a truly national problem—the cotton problem. As I have indicated, the Department has approached it from many points of view. The cotton-stamp plan is just one of these. It has a very special significance, however, for it is the first program to enlist the active cooperation and support of the retail and wholesale trades as well as that of the textile and garment manufacturers. In fact, in handling this phase of the program through the normal channels of trade, we have placed a very high degree of responsibility on the trade groups. Their initiative and support will determine the effectiveness of this approach to widening the domestic market for cotton and cotton products.

The mechanics of the plan are very simple. Here is how it works:

1. The cotton-stamp plan, like the food-stamp program, provides for the movement of surplus cotton goods entirely through the normal channels of trade. The Government will give eligible needy families new buying power in the form of special cotton-order stamps, and these families will then use the stamps to secure cotton goods at retail stores.

2. Participation by needy persons is voluntary. The State and local agencies handling public assistance certify those who are eligible to participate.

3. In order to assure regular cotton expenditures by needy families, those wishing to participate are given an opportunity to buy cotton stamps in an amount approximately equal to their present cotton expenditures and available resources. For each dollar expenditure they receive another $1 worth of free surplus stamps. The stamps purchased by the eligible families are colored green, and those given free are colored brown. Both colored stamps have a value of 25 cents each.

4. Minimum and maximum expenditures to be made at 3-month intervals are as follows:

a. One- and two-person families can purchase, as a minimum, for each 3-month period, a $4 book of stamps for which they pay $2 or, as a maximum, a $6 book of stamps for which they pay $3.

b. Three- and four-person families purchase, as a minimum for each 3-month period, a $6 book of stamps for which they pay $3 or, as a maximum, a $10 book of stamps for which they pay $5.

c. Five-person and larger families purchase, as a minimum for each 3-month period, an $8 book of stamps for which they pay $4 or, as a maximum, a $12 book of stamps for which they pay $6.

In some areas more money has been spent for cotton goods in the past than our purchase requirements would indicate. Wherever that is true, the purchase requirements are increased accordingly.

5. Both stamps are used by the needy families securing them to buy new cotton goods sold in retail dry-goods stores for human or household use, which are made entirely from cotton produced and manufactured in this country.

6. Merchants who receive these stamps paste them on cards provided, certify that they have been received in accordance with the regulations, and then present them for payment either to the local office of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, to their wholesalers in payment of bills, or to their banks for collections.

This program was the result of many discussions with farm leaders, labor leaders, textile and garment manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The National Retail Dry Goods Association and the Institute of Distribution have pledged and given their assistance. Last December, the Cotton Consumption Council, at a meeting in New Orleans, adopted the following resolution:

"(a) That the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation be asked to give due consideration to the possibility of initiating, in certain carefully selected municipalities, a Federal Cotton Stamp Plan (similar to the Federal Food Stamp Plan now in operation) that will be thoroughly acceptable to the cotton-vending retailers, of all types, of the selected municipalities, and which will be intended to stimulate the cotton purchasing power of the families of these municipalities that are receiving public assistance.

"(b) That as, if, and when such a cotton-stamp plan may be provided by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, resultant cotton stamps shall be used in any retail establishment of the municipalities in which the program may be instituted to buy any goods manufactured from cotton, provided such goods are made wholly of cotton, produced in the United States, and manufactured in this country * * *."

The Cotton Consumption Council is made up of representatives of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, cotton growers, cotton manufacturers, and the principal organized retail distribution groups. Representatives of the following organizations attended the New Orleans meeting:

American Cotton Cooperative Association, the Cotton Textile Institute, Durene Association of America, Independent Food Distributors Council, Institute of Distribution, Limited Price Variety Stores, National Association of Chain Drug Stores, National Association of Food Chains, National Cotton Council, National Council of Shoe Retailers, National Retail Dry Goods Association, National Retailer-Owned Grocers, and Wholesale Dry Goods Institute.

The Institute of Distribution, including major cotton-selling chain stores representatives, endorsed the cotton-stamp plan at a recent meeting in New York City. The resolutions of the institute concluded as follows:

"Be it, therefore, hereby resolved that the cotton-selling chain store companies composing the Institute of Distribution, Inc., group represented at the January 30, 1940, meeting go on record as favoring the undertaking by the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation of a cotton-stamp plan, in a few trial municipalities, thereby increasing the ability of publicly assisted families to purchase goods made in the United States wholly of cotton produced in this country. This experimental approach is favored in order to determine the practicability of the plan. Be it further resolved that companies composing this group pledge themselves to cooperate in this Federal cotton-stamp plan to the fullest possible extent as if and when undertaken in any municipality in which their stores are located."

As the Secretary of Agriculture pointed out: "The many practical and constructive suggestions of farm groups, as well as trade groups, and their pledges of whole-hearted cooperation have been most helpful and encouraging to all of us in government. It is only through this kind of united effort that we can hope to solve our economic problems."

If the textile and garment manufacturers or the retail stores look upon the cotton-stamp plan only as a way of getting a volume of business through free stamps which they otherwise would not enjoy, then the program is certain to be a failure. We are counting upon them, however, to provide the most attractive and the most inexpensive articles made from cotton which their ingenuity can devise. We believe in the genius of American businessmen, but we know that this genius operates most effectively where the volume of business is adequate. Our cotton stamps provide an extra volume of business, and the rest of the job is squarely up to industry itself.

Retail merchants are on the front line, and we are counting upon them to push the sale of cotton goods not only to those who will be using the stamps but to every family in town. The food trades have moved more than a dollar's worth of surpluses for every Government dollar spent to redeem the free food stamps. That is one of the outstanding successes of the food-stamp plan. If the dry-goods merchants can successfully push the sale of cotton goods to families who are not getting public assistance, then the cotton-stamp plan can become one of the major ways to expand domestic consumption. It will be another proof of the new era we are entering; it is an era of business and Government cooperation in the interest of the general welfare.

We hope to move forward gradually with the expansion of this program, as we did in the case of the food-stamp program, not only so that we may have time to measure its economic significance but also so that we may have time to iron out small mechanical difficulties which are bound to arise. The cotton-stamp program can be set up in towns where the food-stamp plan is running, at very little additional administrative cost and for that reason we are going to confine it to such areas. Nearly every area in which the food-stamp plan is operating has asked for the cotton-stamp plan.

Early this month the food trades in Los Angeles put on a gigantic drive to move farm surpluses to every family in Los Angeles County. We think they did a splendid job and that experience here will be made available to merchants in every other stamp town in the country. We in Government realize that aggressive merchandising is an art in itself and that business folks have forgotten more about it than we will ever learn. I want to throw down a challenge to dry-goods merchants, however, and to ask them to redouble their efforts to move more cotton goods to every family in the country. Cotton farmers need that help now more than ever before.

That is our real reason for going through the normal channels of trade. We are not going to interfere with gross retail mark-ups. In the first place, such a goal would be administratively impractical, and, in the second place, we know that businessmen have enough sense to realize that the way to make money is to cut the gross mark-up to the bone and count upon volume for net profits. The further they can go in that direction, the more they can help the cotton farmer. Competition, where it's keen, forces such a policy anyway. We are doing our part to help by putting out an additional amount of purchasing power in the form of cotton stamps which should make it easier to do a more effective merchandizing job than would be possible in the absence of such a program.

The eyes of the country will be upon these early cotton-stamp towns for months to come. While we are launching this program now upon an experimental basis, we have an obvious faith in what businessmen can do, or we would not be launching it at all. If it

doesn't work, we will have to discard it and try some other approach. If it does work—and I believe it will—we may have a mechanism of tremendous national importance at this time of international crisis. I know of no other program which requires the cooperation of so many parts of our whole economy. That is what I like best about it. If all of us pull together in America, we can do anything.

Somewhere around 15 cents of the consumer's dollar spent for cotton goods at retail under the cotton-stamp plan gets back to the cotton farmer directly. Most of the remaining 85 cents goes to employ labor directly and indirectly in our transportation systems, in our cotton mills, in our garment factories, and in our wholesale and retail stores throughout the country. That has always been inherent in the process of distributing cotton goods. This reemployment aspect of a cotton-stamp plan is one of its very great advantages, however, particularly since it is a rather ingenious way of letting industry itself hire the unemployed all along the line. The program benefits not only farmers but labor, business, and low-income families as well. If ever the Nation decides to expand the cotton-stamp plan to cover the country, therefore, consideration should be given to charging part of its cost to the broader cost of reaching full employment.

I hope that world events will not force us into a national cotton program of the extreme magnitude suggested, nor of one even approaching it. I hope that there will be more of brotherhood than of bitterness at the peace conference, and that world trade will be expanded rather than restricted after this war is over. I hope that every able-bodied man in America can get work in private industry and that our stamp plans can be contracted to businesslike ways of caring only for unemployables. All of us hope for these things, but we wonder. And because we wonder, we've begun to prepare for the worst—just in case. Military preparedness has properly concerned us first. Economic preparedness cannot be a separate thing, however. They are like the two sides of a single coin, and we must keep that coin whole and shining on both sides if we are to do business and hold our own in this topsy-turvy world.

The sweat and the labor of millions across the South produce a textile of value. It will cost us less to use it here at home than it will not to grow it. Cotton is only one of the many farm products which are going to be in trouble as a result of the war, however, and agriculture is only one segment of our whole economy which may have dark and difficult days of readjustment to face. Will we help each other out of the pits into which many of us are likely to be thrown by events abroad? That's the real challenge to our democracy at this time of world crisis, and its survival depends upon ordinary folks like ourselves. It won't be an easy thing to maintain national unity unless we do more than our part as individuals for the good of the whole.

One farm group after another has come to us during the past month for help on a much bigger scale than was necessary last year. Each, of course, has been directly concerned with its own immediate problems, and it has not always been easy to keep attention focused on the problems of agriculture as a whole, to say nothing of our broader needs as a nation. This is a normal, human reaction to a frightening foreign situation which has grown steadily worse since the Congress passed our appropriation bill. As this is being written it looks as though we may have about $30,000,000 more for surplus removal for the coming fiscal year than we had last year. However, the demands upon those funds are very much greater than they were before the critical turn of events abroad. Obviously, we can't do the impossible, but the Congress has shown a very real understanding of the magnitude of surplus problems and we are going to do the best job we can with the funds available to us.

We mustn't let any disunity creep into our thinking during this time of transition when we're trying to measure just how vicious a blow the war abroad is likely to deal our various groups of farmers and city folks by harvest time. We're all in one boat and we can't get anywhere trying to grab from each other. The foreign situation may become so critical by fall that we'll have to broaden our present programs for increasing domestic consumption. If that happens, let's meet the situation together as a united people. Let's show the dictators that unity based upon voluntary understanding is a stronger, more lasting thing than singleness of purpose based upon force. That's one of the things our democracy can contribute to the new age which lies beyond this conflict.

During the decade of the forties there will be hunger and starvation and death from cold winters without fuel in other parts of the world. These physical privations will be added to the heartaches of those who must endure them and live on without the love and companionship of those who were killed in the war. It's horrible beyond imagining.

We and our families have been spared that suffering. All we've got to do is to change with the necessities of the times and find workable ways to distribute the goods all around us to those who are willing and able to work for them. There's enough, and more, for everyone here at home. There's plenty, and then some, for us Americans on both continents of this Western Hemisphere.

The brotherhood of man is real, for all the wars of the moment, and because it is, there must be ways to give the peoples of all the earth a readier access to the things which can be produced upon this planet. The real adventurers of the next hundred years will be folks with practical imagination who discover such ways. Only one basic economic problem faces the world, and that is how to use the human and material resources of the entire earth to the utmost. Science already has made it possible to double our standards of living. That's the most important fact in modern history. We no longer have to grab from each other in order to have enough for ourselves. We have only to use our common sense, to work together and be decent to each other.

So far as increased domestic consumption of surplus cotton is concerned, we have barely scratched the surface with our mattress program and our cotton-stamp plan. We've gone somewhat further with the use of surplus foods, but that job is not even half done. This year, for example, 3,000,000 school children got their noonday lunches free—made in whole or in part from surplus foods. About 9,000,000 children in our own low-income areas are eligible for free lunches, however. For my own part, I feel that every one of these undernourished youngsters ought to have a chance to eat the surplus as a matter of national-health defense.

By late summer 4,000,000 persons will be taking part in the food-stamp plan, but more than 20,000,000 now living on an average of 5 cents a meal are eligible. They need an extra 2½ cents' worth of vitamin-rich, surplus foods a meal for a minimum diet. Most of us in this room spend from two to three times that amount for food. More than a thousand communities have asked for the food-stamp plan, but we can reach only a fraction of that number under our present schedule.

Let's not forget that two-thirds of our people—including over 80,000,000 persons—have to get along on an average cash income of $69 a month for a whole family. Let's remind ourselves constantly that their unsatisfied wants offer our farmers and businessmen the greatest market that has ever challenged them. If we can't sell our farm surpluses abroad, we've got to widen our markets here at home. It makes sense to develop those markets, so as to use the surpluses that Nature has given us.

Aircraft Engine Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great amount of speculation and of unfair criticism concerning the ability of the aircraft-engine industry to turn out enough motors to equip the 50,000 planes per year which the President has set as our goal, I should like to read into the RECORD an article which appeared recently in the column written by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner. I hope that every Member will take the time to read this article and to weigh carefully its significance.

When the President first made known his desire for the production of 50,000 planes per year for the use of our defense forces, it was immediately shouted down as an impossibility. And the reason for this impossibility was given as being a "bottle neck" in the aircraft-engine industry. It was pointed out by pseudo technicians that planes needed motors, that motors needed machine tools, that there was a bottle neck in the engine industry, that there was a bottle neck within a bottle neck in the machine-tool industry, and so on ad infinitum, until it became an accepted fact that we simply could not produce 50,000 planes a year.

And then, as in the World War, we heard suggestions to the effect that the automobile industry could break this bottleneck by being tooled for the production of airplane motors. If my memory serves me correctly, during the last war the auto industry attempted the production of plane motors to speed plane production, and after the expenditure of vast sums of money the experiment ended in dismal failure. I believe that somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000 was wasted in that attempt on the part of the Government to turn out planes. But even experience appears to be no teacher in this case, for we now have the same suggestion being made, though on the testimony of some of our leading aeronautical engineers the production of plane motors by automobile manufacturers is unwise. It seems almost trite to put the question as to just why an automobile plant can be retooled any faster than an airplane plant, and I am inclined to think that it cannot, but that the idea is based on the popular picture of the motorcar industry, with its mass production and fast assembly lines.

We in Connecticut know and are proud of the ability and capacity of the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Corporation to produce quantities of plane engines of unexcelled quality. We also know and are proud of the fact that Pratt & Whitney has

very quietly but efficiently stepped up production to meet foreign orders, and we are positive that if the President and the Congress really want 50,000 planes per year, Pratt & Whitney, Curtiss-Wright, and other airplane-engine factories can produce the motors to make those planes effective. In less than 8 months Pratt & Whitney has built, equipped, and staffed an entirely new plant, and that plant is now producing engines to the limit of its capacity. If more engines are needed, it will not take long to expand further. The delay is obviously in the final go-ahead signal on the part of the Government and the availability of the necessary wherewithal. With Alsop and Kintner, I can only agree that the bottleneck is in Washington, and I think that others will be of the same mind after they have read the following article which I am submitting.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1940]

THE CAPITAL PARADE—PLANE ENGINE PLANT'S FEAT POINTS TO WASHINGTON AS PRODUCTION BOTTLENECK

(By Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner)

HARTFORD, CONN., June 19.—In Washington, where wise men talk solemnly of "bottlenecks which make it quite out of the question, oh, really impossible" for the United States to rearm as rapidly as dire necessity demands, you are constantly told that "the worst bottleneck of all" is in aircraft engines. Here in Hartford, where they actually make aircraft engines, you are forced to conclude that the only real bottleneck is in Washington.

If you doubt it, pay a visit to the Pratt & Whitney engine plant, which is one of the two biggest in this country. You will stand in a huge, brightly lighted shop, with nearly 300,000 square feet of floor space. You will watch workmen calmly and steadily checking shining new engine parts, as strange and wonderful in shape as a fine Chinese bronze, to tolerances as microscopic as twenty-five thousandths of an inch. You will see row upon row of the almost magical machine tools, which can turn out such parts, one after another, without mistake. And you will be told that where you stand, only 9 months ago, there was an empty parking lot, and that so short a time before most of the men you watch belonged to the legion of young people who have never had a job.

It is a pretty exciting experience, and it leaves you with no doubt at all of anything but the will and ability of the Government to utilize the American ingenuity and the American energy which can accomplish such miracles.

FIFTY THOUSAND PLANES A YEAR?

It is hard not to doubt the Government's will and ability to use these incalculable resources, for there is no sign at all as yet that they are going to be used. The Pratt & Whitney plant and its most important competitor, Curtiss-Wright, are now turning out in the neighborhood of 1,500 aircraft engines a month. Other plants' production brings the total monthly output of the big engines used by combat planes to around 1,800. And you learn here that the Government has only to lift a finger, has only to make the money available, for this production to be doubled in the next year. With production doubled, we shall be turning out nearly enough engines to reach the President's goal of 50,000 planes a year.

Unfortunately you also learn here that the finger has not been lifted, that the money has not been made available. Some time ago it was reported in this space that Dr. Meade and Captain Kraus, the excellent men whom Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., brought in to handle the aircraft-production problem in the Treasury, estimated that an additional $1,000,000,000 above the appropriations already before Congress would have to be provided to give real meaning to the President's words to the American people. The next day it was stated at the White House that no such additional appropriations were contemplated.

IT CAN BE DONE

Yet investigation on the spot fully confirms the view that if the President really wants an output of 50,000 planes a year he has only to say so. Already, here and in the Wright plant, output has been increased at a rate which seems incredible.

It has been done easily, sensibly, without strain. This plant, not so long ago, was preparing to close for lack of orders. Then came the Allies' need, which first used up all existing plant capacity and then outstripped it. On October 12 ground was broken for the new shop, telegrams went out to machine tool and other factories where arrangements had already been made to buy the required shop equipment, and a labor-training program began.

Among the jobless youth of Connecticut, who had inherited the tradition but not the experience of skilled mechanics, the State employment service called out those with the highest mechanical aptitude. The State technical schools went on a three-shift basis, and when the young men had received initial training in the schools they were put through a final course in the Pratt & Whitney plant. By the time the new building was up the machines and men were ready to move into it. It is now producing engines as rapidly as the old shop. And the same process can be repeated immediately.

But before it can be repeated the money must be appropriated. This plant and Curtiss will need $200,000,000 for plant and operating capital and $300,000,000 in orders to do the job. Certainly, if the engine plants can use such a sum, an additional $1,000,000,000 for the whole aircraft industry, including the propeller makers, the body manufacturers, engine makers, and all the rest of it, is not very much. That $1,000,000,000 is now lacking. Unless it is provided before the adjournment of Congress the President's 50,000-plane program will be a delusive dream.

Bill to Deport Bridges Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

OPINION OF O. R. McGUIRE, AN OUTSTANDING ATTORNEY OF THE WASHINGTON BAR

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion as to the constitutionality of H. R. 9766, the bill which I introduced to deport Harry Renton Bridges. Senator KING, a few days ago, requested Hon. O. R. McGuire, an outstanding attorney of the Washington bar, to give him an opinion upon this question. Mr. McGuire has furnished Senator KING with that opinion and stated that he entertained "no doubt that the Congress has the constitutional authority to deny the benefits of such immigration and naturalization laws to any particular alien and to direct his deportation." The opinion of Mr. McGuire seems to be so conclusive that I believe the membership of the House would be interested in it and I therefore include a copy of it with my remarks:

JUNE 22, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM H. KING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KING: There has been received your request for my opinion as to whether there exists in the Constitution of the United States legislative authority for the Congress to direct by statute the Attorney General of the United States to forthwith take into custody the person of one Harry R. Bridges, a west-coast alleged Communist as well as an alien, and deport him to Australia, from whence he came, and of which he appears to be a citizen, if it appears to the Congress that his continued presence in the United States is undesirable.

While I have been unable to locate a statute of the Congress wherein it has been directed that a named alien be deported, there are many statutes which have been enacted by the Congress which have relaxed the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States so as to authorize the administrative officers of the United States to admit into this country named aliens, and I entertain no doubt that the Congress has the constitutional authority to deny the benefits of such immigration and naturalization laws to any particular alien and to direct his deportation. My conclusion in this respect is based upon the following considerations:

Applicable terms of the Constitution of the United States.

As bearing upon your question, the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

Article I, section 1: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *."

Article I, section 8: "The Congress shall have power * * *

"To establish a uniform rule of naturalization * * *.

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof."

Article I, section 9: "* * * No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed."

POWERS AND DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS NOT NAMED IN CONSTITUTION ARE SUCH AS MAY BE PRESCRIBED BY THE CONGRESS

The terms and conditions under which aliens will be admitted to the United States and the terms and conditions under which they will be permitted to remain in our country were not stated in the Constitution. Also, the duties, responsibilities, and powers of the Attorney General of the United States likewise were not stated in the Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated in *Floyds Acceptances* (7 Wall. 666, 685 (1869)) that when any question is raised as to the powers of an officer of the United States:

"The answer which at once suggests itself to one familiar with the structure of our Government, in which all power is delegated and is defined by law, constitutional or statutory, is that to one or both of these sources we must resort in every instance. We have no officers in this Government, from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who do not hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority. And while some of these, as the President, the legislature, and the judiciary, exercise

powers in some sense left to the more general definitions necessarily incident to fundamental law found in the Constitution, the larger portion of them are the creation of statutory law, with duties and powers prescribed and limited by that law. * * *"

And in prescribing such duties and powers in the law, the Congress is not constitutionally confined to prescribing duties and powers which may be exercised and performed by the President. In *Kendale* v. *United States* (ex rel. Stokes, 12 Peters 522), the Supreme Court of the United States had under consideration a question as to the authority of the Secretary of the Navy. In answering that question the Court declared that:

"There are certain political duties imposed upon many officers in the executive department, the discharge of which is under the direction of the President. But it would be an alarming doctrine that Congress cannot impose upon any executive officer any duty they may think proper, which is not repugnant to any rights secured and protected by the Constitution; and in such cases the duty and responsibility grow out of and are subject to the control of the law, and not to the direction of the President. And this is emphatically the case where the duty enjoined is of a mere ministerial nature."

This is emphatically a government of law as prescribed in the Constitution and the statutes enacted by the Congress in accordance therewith and under certain circumstances subordinate officers of the Federal Government are legally responsible in their individual capacity for the violation of that law to the prejudice of private individuals even though that violation may have been under orders of their superior officers (*Little* v. *Barreme* (2 Cranch, 170 (1804)).

It seems necessary to refer to these elemental principles of our fundamental law because of a predilection in some quarters for a system of parliamentary government modeled upon those in foreign governments which are not ruled by fundamental law as is the United States by its Constitution.

The Congress having created the Department of Justice by statute has the constitutional authority to direct by statute the chief officer thereof to perform any duties consistent with the Constitution and there is no executive or administrative officer of our Government with legal authority to countermand such a statute.

THE PROPOSED STATUTE DIRECTING THE DEPORTATION OF BRIDGES

The bill, H. R. 8766, Seventy-sixth Congress, which was passed by the House of Representatives on June 13, 1940, by a vote of 330 as compared with 42 against it, directing the deportation of Harry R. Bridges, is as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful."

SOME DECISIONS OF THE COURTS AS TO ALIENS

It is an inherent attribute of sovereignty that a nation has absolute control over what aliens it will admit within its boundaries; the conditions under which they shall be admitted; whether they shall be permitted to remain within its boundaries; and whether they shall be forced to depart therefrom. Mr. Justice Field, writing for a unanimous court in *Chae Chan Ping* v. *United States* (130 U. S. 581, 611 (1889)), held that a statute enacted by the Congress had the effect of modifying the terms of a prior treaty and a prior statute so as to exclude aliens who otherwise would have been entitled to entry into the United States and said:

"To preserve its independence, and give security against foreign aggression and encroachment, is the highest duty of every nation, and to attain these ends nearly all other considerations are to be subordinated. It matters not in what form such aggressions and encroachment come, whether from the foreign nation acting in its national character or from vast hordes of its people crowding in upon us. The Government, possessing the powers which are to be exercised for protection and security, is clothed with authority to determine the occasion on which the powers shall be called forth; and its determination, so far as the subjects affected are concerned, are necessarily conclusive upon all its departments and officers. If, therefore, the Government of the United States, through its legislative department, considers the presence of foreigners of a different race in this country, who will not assimilate with us, to be dangerous to its peace and security, their exclusion is not to be stayed because at the time there are no actual hostilities with the nation of which the foreigners are subjects. The existence of war would render the necessity of the proceeding only more obvious and pressing. The same necessity, in a less pressing degree, may arise when war does not exist, and the same authority which adjudges the necessity in one case must also determine it in the other. In both cases its determination is conclusive upon the judiciary."

After reviewing some of the diplomatic history of the United States with respect to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens, Mr. Justice Fields further stated for the Court that—

"The power of exclusion of foreigners being an incident of sovereignty belonging to the Government of the United States, as a part of the sovereign powers delegated by the Constitution, the right to its exercise at any time when, in the judgment of the Government, the interests of the country require it, cannot be granted away or restrained on behalf of anyone. The powers of Government are delegated in trust to the United States, and are incapable of transfer to any other parties. They cannot be abandoned or surrendered. Nor can their exercise be hampered, when needed for the public good, by any considerations of private interests * * *."

While this case of Chae Chan Ping dealt with the constitutional power of the Congress to exclude aliens who had once been in the United States and who sought to return under permits issued to them when they left on a temporary visit to their native land, the case is important for a statement of the constitutional power of the Congress to legislate with respect to aliens. That power was exercised in *Bugajewitz* v. *Adams* (228 U. S. 585, 591 (1913)) to bring about the deportation of an alien for prostitution under a statute of the United States which so changed a prior statute as to authorize such deportation. Under the prior statute the alien would not have been subject to deportation for prostitution, and it was claimed that the attempt to deport the alien under the subsequently enacted statute deprived her of due process of law. Mr. Justice Holmes, in writing the opinion for a unanimous court, denied the claim and said:

"The attempt to reopen the constitutional question must fail. It is thoroughly established that Congress has power to order the deportation of aliens whose presence in the country it deems hurtful. The determination by facts that might constitute a crime under local law is not a conviction of crime, nor is the deportation a punishment; it is simply a refusal by the Government to harbor persons whom it does not want. The coincidence of the local penal law with the policy of the Congress is an accident (*Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States*, 149 U. S. 698; *Wong Wing* v. *United States*, 163 U. S. 228; *Zakonaite* v. *Wolf*, 226 U. S. 272; *Tiace* v. *Forbes*, 228 U. S. 549). The prohibition of ex post facto laws in article 1, section 9, has no application (*Johnannessen* v. *United States*, 225 U. S. 227), and with regard to the petitioner, it is not necessary to construe the statute as having any retrospective effect."

This Bugajewitz case not only answers any possible contention that the above-quoted bill directing the deportation of Bridges is an ex post facto law prohibited by the Constitution, but it recognizes once again the constitutional authority of the Congress to direct by law the deportation of any aliens in this country whose presence therein the Congress deems hurtful to the general welfare. The only difference between the Bugajewitz case and the Bridges case is that in the first-named case the woman was deported because she was a prostitute in violation of a general statute which made prostitution cause for deportation when at the time of its enactment the fact of Bugajewitz being a prostitute was not a cause for her deportation, while in the case of Bridges the statute refers to him alone and directs his deportation because his continued presence in this country is deemed by the Congress to be hurtful to the United States.

The bill for his deportation is certainly not a bill of attainder. See *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333, 377 (1867)), and *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277, 323 (1867)).

In the above-quoted bill to deport Bridges, the Congress is not attempting to exercise the powers and office of a judge. In fact, the bill does not require the Congress to exercise any judicial power with respect to either the guilt or innocence of Bridges with respect to any crimes or misdemeanors which he may have committed. On the contrary, the Congress is exercising its strict legislative function in declaring that the continued presence of this alien in our midst is harmful, and in directing that the Attorney General of the United States forthwith take that alien into custody and deport him to the country from whence he came and of which he is a citizen or subject. In so doing the Congress is but exercising the sovereign legislative authority which it possesses under the Constitution of the United States to enact a statute to not only direct and control the Attorney General of the United States, whose office the Congress created and whose powers are subject to legislative determination, but to determine that the continued presence of a particular alien in this country is dangerous to its peace and security. As recited by Mr. Justice Field in the above-cited Chae Chan Ping case, the Secretary of State, in a communication of September 1869 to our Minister to France, stated:

"The control of people within its limits, and the right to expel from its territory persons who are dangerous to the peace of the State, are too clearly within the essential attributes of sovereignty to be seriously contested."

That the Bridges deportation bill would not be an ex post facto law if the bill should be passed is not only established by the above-cited Bugajewitz case but it is also established by *Mahler* v. *Eloy* (264 U. S. 42 (1934)) and *Johannessen* v. *United States* (225 U. S. 227 (1912)). The latter case was one to cancel a certificate of naturalization on the ground that it had been fraudulently and illegally obtained before the enactment of the statute authorizing such cancelation procedure. It was there claimed that the statute authorizing cancelation of naturalization certificates fraudulently and illegally obtained was ex post facto legislation but the court denied the claim and said that:

"It is, however, settled that this prohibition is confined to laws respecting criminal punishment, and has no relation to retrospective legislation of any other description (Cooley, Const. Lim., 6th ed. 319; *Calder* v. *Bull* (3 Dall. 386))."

No one of the States in the Union is attempting to interfere with Bridges and hence this bill is not within the prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution as considered in *Truax* v. *Raich* (239 U. S. 33, 44) and *Terrace* v. *Thompson* (263 U. S. 197 (1923). Nor may Bridges claim the protection of the fifth amendment against the action of administrative officers and agents of the United States in accordance with the above-quoted bill, should it become law. The proposal here is that the Congress

shall exercise its constitutional legislative authority and jurisdiction to declare the continual presence of Bridges in this country to be undesirable and to direct his expulsion and deportation. *Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698), *Wong Wing* v. *United States* (163 U. S. 242). In fact, the Congress may provide by statute that the decisions of administrative officers in the exclusion and expulsion of aliens shall be final and conclusive if such decisions be made in accordance with such statute and the procedure therein prescribed, *United States* v. *Ju Foy* (198 U. S. 253 (1905)). Mr. Justice Holmes stated for the court in this case that:

"If for the purpose of argument, we assume that the fifth amendment applies to him, and that to deny entrance to a citizen is to deprive him of liberty, we, nevertheless, are of opinion that with regard to him due process of law does not require judicial trial. That is the result of cases which we have cited, and the almost necessary result of the power of Congress to pass exclusion laws. That the decision may be entrusted to an executive officer, and that his decision is due process of law, was affirmed and explained in *Nishimura Ekiu* v. *United States* (142 U. S. 651, 660), and in *Fong Yui Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 715), before the authorities to which we have already referred."

The Congress has exercised from time to time the constitutional legislative power to suspend the immigration laws in particular instances and admit named aliens to the United States. It would seem that the Congress is no less in the exercise of constitutional legislative power if and when it should provide by statute that benefits or privileges of immigration laws or treaties shall not be available to any particular alien whose continued presence here is deemed hurtful to this country for any reason whatever and that he shall be forthwith deported so as to remove such harm from our midst.

Respectfully,

O. R. McGUIRE.

Newspaper Comment on Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ARTICLE FROM SALAMANCA (N. Y.) REPUBLICAN-PRESS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the editorial columns of the Salamanca Republican-Press, Salamanca, N. Y., of July 1, 1940:

[From the Salamanca (N. Y.) Republican-Press of July 1, 1940]

NEWSPAPER COMMENT ON WILLKIE

Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial-Appeal (Independent Democratic): It was an expression of the Republican rank and file become impatient with the bumbling of the professional politicians. Democracy was functioning at Philadelphia. Undeniably Willkie's nomination places before the country the Republican Party's strongest candidate. He will be a hard campaigner. The country cannot help but be the gainer to have the best man the Republicans have leading their fight.

Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution (Democratic): The Republican National Convention in nominating Wendell Willkie their choice for the Presidency undoubtedly chose the best man they have available. There is no doubt Willkie will give any Democratic nominee a strong run for the prize and, if his opponent is any other than Roosevelt, he may, under certain circumstances, be our next President. If such is decreed by fate, we could have had a much worse one.

Baltimore Sun (Independent Democratic): The Republican Party has nominated for President its ablest man. Not only is Wendell L. Willkie the ablest man who was available in the Republican ranks, he had directed his abilities to the most enlightened and patriotic causes. His victory has been achieved without political organization and without political backing. It is a victory which is a miracle of American politics.

Albany Knickerbocker News (Independent Republican): Wendell Willkie goes before the people as a popular choice, but in no respect a politician's choice. Running on a platform that must appeal to lovers of liberty, coming out of a convention that is the very epitome of democratic process, Candidate Willkie will enjoy at the start a strong advantage over his opponent, who can be no better than the selection of a boss-ruled party, with a ready-made program that went far toward forcing the opportunity for a Willkie to spell its doom.

Kansas City Star (independent): The Republican Party has cut loose from the moorings of political regularity and launched out on a huge tidal wave of popular acclaim. If ever the people of America prayed, "God, send us a man," it has been in the last 6 weeks, and if ever such a prayer was answered, it has come in the nomination of Wendell Willkie as the G. O. P. candidate for President of the United States.

Boston Herald (independent): The Republican convention which nominated Wendell Willkie was the most bossed national gathering in the history of the party, but it had the right boss. That boss was public opinion. It is hardly necessary to say that the convention selected the man most likely to win and best qualified to administer the affairs of the United States. Under Mr. Willkie the party will enter the campaign with more enthusiasm and with more reason for it than at any time since 1928.

Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald (independent): Even while we are in the throes of today's excitement it is plain to be seen that the story of Wendell Willkie is more than another Cinderella story. American politics has always been regarded as a sort of closed racket, to be practiced only by those who specialize in it. Yet in this convention of 1940 the Republican leadership was forced to accept and nominate a businessman, a private citizen without previous political experience.

Los Angeles Times (Republican): Willkie's spectacular victory leaves no doubt that he is the man now considered by a majority of the delegates to have the best chance to win in November. For this, however, the party's representatives at Philadelphia are not entitled to all the credit, or even to most of it. The real choosing of Mr. Willkie as the Republican standard bearer was not made in the convention hall but in the living rooms, cross-roads grocery stores, street corners, and other informal meeting places of tens of thousands of Republican communities throughout America. If ever a man was nominated in response to popular demand, against powerful rival coalitions and against all the "dope" of political wiseacres, it is Wendell Willkie.

Minneapolis Tribune (Independent Republican): "It may be that the convention merely considered Willkie as the best candidate, which he unquestionably is, but that is only another way of saying that he has captured the imagination of the American people, and that still leaves the fundamental question of his vote-getting powers unanswered. He has demonstrated his popularity as has no other Republican candidate in generations. For the Democrats he is a man to be greatly feared despite their far-flung political machine. He is the man who can make the finest contest—an election instead of an auction."

The New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune (Independent Democratic): "In our judgment, the convention made the best choice available, times and conditions considered. Mr. Willkie's independence, his freedom from embarrassing political alliances or entanglements become elements of strength. His writings and utterances, by their candor, common sense, and good spirit, have favorably impressed millions of Americans. The same fine qualities and abilities that won the nomination should carry him far in the campaign. Senator McNARY, of Oregon, nominated for Vice President at Mr. Willkie's request, according to Philadelphia report, should prove an excellent running mate."

The Chicago Daily News (Independent): "Wendell Willkie is a fighter. He is independent, courageous, and forthright. His views are fresh, frank, vigorous, and inspiring. The politicians may not like a man like that, but the people do. He interests and attracts them. That is why he was able to rise in a few brief months to national eminence. That is why he was nominated for the Presidency by the Republican convention at Philadelphia last Thursday night. His nomination should prove a blessing to the Republican Party. His personality will draw new support and win new enthusiasm. His counsels, being untrammeled and unhackneyed, will refresh and invigorate."

The Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital (Republican): The rise of Wendell Willkie to a commanding position is one of these political phenomena which happens only in a free democracy. His voice, raised in defense of his own business, was like that of John the Baptist crying in the wilderness. But he talked his way directly into the hearts of the people, who are tired of being led from one futile experiment to another. It will take more than fireside chats to divert attention from Willkie, who set the prairies on fire with his logical approach to domestic and foreign problems.

New York Sun (Independent): What a few weeks ago seemed impossible has become a fact; what seemed only an ideal has become real. The Republican National Convention, going upward on the tide of public opinion, has rejected the old habits and fears of small politics. It has nominated for President of the United States the man best fitted to these perilous times. He goes into the campaign without political debts. His opinions on the issues are known and he will not recede from them. He brings to this great battle a clear mind, a temperament devoid of hatreds and prejudices, a deep knowledge of his country and its needs. It matters not who is nominated to oppose him. The New Deal has no such man to offer as this one.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 22, 1940

LETTER FROM ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the State of California is a group of teachers who take their jobs seriously. They believe that the real instructor takes an interest in national and world affairs. This group of teachers has banded themselves together under the name of Association of California Classroom Teachers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from them. It carries much food for thought.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA CLASSROOM TEACHERS,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 6, 1940.

Hon. LEE E. GEYER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Would it be possible to make provision in the war preparedness appropriations bills that all factory extensions and equipment subsidized by Government expenditures shall be, in peacetimes: (1) The property of the people; (2) run to capacity producing goods for the needs of the masses; and (3) said products sold at the lowest possible selling price.

Preparedness? Yes. We should all be for such a program, if not accompanied by exploitation of the many by a very few.

However, why should a few industrialists and bankers be provided, in perpetuity, with huge manufacturing establishments, well-equipped at the expense of the taxpayers?

Is there any reason why said industrialists and bankers should be given the right to exploit the people further with the people's own money—even under the guise of a war preparedness program?

President Roosevelt has publicly stated that there would not be any huge war profits accruing to anyone this time. Yet, it would seem that even a blind man could see the huge grab taking place, without any protest that we know of, right now. These people are determined to get their profits both before and after we go into this war, and they are going to be far larger profits than were made in the previous war unless we do something about it, and do it quickly.

For instance, since airplanes seem to be the best line of first defense in the present war the costs these manufacturers are exacting is a matter of common knowledge. Why should the Government pay anywhere from $50,000 to $400,000 per airplane when it stands to reason that, under mass-production methods, they cost but a fraction of these huge sums. Either the Government should draft the production of these somewhere near cost or manufacture its own airplanes. Then, after the end of the war—who are to get the subsidized factories? How many more will be out of employment at the will of the masters of Government-subsidized factories?

It looks to us as though the middle is to be squeezed from both ends. Surely something should be done and can be done to prevent a large part of this grab if our representatives in Congress do the right thing. We are writing you regarding this point of view, hoping that something will be done to safeguard the interests of the masses at this time. We think no one can deny the serious import of the social and economic aspects of these questions.

Yours very truly,

LOUISE F. KELLOGG,
First Vice President.

Under Protection of the New Deal, Are Detroit C. I. O. Union Racketeers To Sabotage Our National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some of you may recall that months ago I put into the RECORD official documents showing that the C. I. O. in Detroit, for more than 40 days, held up delivery of materials needed by the Navy Department in its program for national defense.

The New Deal administration took no steps whatever, either to end that trouble or to prevent a recurrence. Yet it is asking, and Congress is appropriating, billions of dollars for national defense, while the administration, knowingly and deliberately, promotes a labor policy which not only increases the cost of national defense but actually sabotages that program.

Just why the present administration, some of whose prominent officials, like Attorney General Jackson, have held membership in organizations which they now admit are controlled by subversive elements, should lend its aid to these groups which make efficient, economical preparedness utterly impossible, is something that the average patriotic citizen cannot understand.

If we remember, however, that long ago a former Cabinet official stated that the new dealers were more interested in preparing the soil for a successful revolution, for the overthrow of our constitutional form of government, the whole plan becomes clear.

This administration for months has been engaged in a course of conduct which actually prevents speedy, adequate preparation for national defense.

Let me here quote from a news article taken from Social Justice of the issue of July 1, 1940, a letter from a Detroit lumber company to the editor of that publication. That letter is as follows:

To the EDITOR:

This letter is written to acquaint you with the facts of a situation involving this company in which we feel the essentials of social justice have been sadly lacking. We are presenting this case to you in an effort to get before the public, through your publication, a startling example of intolerance and injustice, posing behind the honest desires of capable American workmen.

On Saturday, June 8, at 6 a. m., our main plant was picketed by a group about 250 strong, identifying themselves as members of various locals of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. Many wore badges indicating they are employed at Dodge Bros., Plymouth, Packard Motor Car Co., and other similar concerns. In the group were fewer than 25 of our own 720 employees. The rest of our men were on hand, ready for work, and did work. By noon the line of picketers had dwindled to about 12. The same procedure was repeated Monday morning, with considerably fewer pickets on hand. Throughout the last week a thin trickle of picketing has been kept up. Meanwhile, efforts have been made to organize our men further—with no success. Production is normal.

Every possible effort has been made to avoid any clash of forces. Everything has been conducted peaceably with the exception of inflammatory literature distributed by C. I. O. organizers.

We think you will agree that this is not a strike—since our employees are not leaving their work and are in no way dissatisfied. As a matter of fact, some of the original strikers have asked for reinstatement on the grounds they were intimidated into signing membership cards in the newly organized United Construction Workers Union.

This wildcat picketing is the result of nearly 6 months of organizational effort on the part of the C. I. O., in which they failed to get more than 20 members from our employees. They failed for a very simple reason, but one which is not given much attention these days—our employees are satisfied and happy in their jobs. They are earning an average annual income of nearly $1,800 a year, working 12 months of the year, and are in no mood to join their neighbors in pursuit of engagingly high hourly wages coupled with less than 5 months' work a year.

At the time picketing started, there were three or four men actively and vocally interested in provoking dissatisfaction here. On the word of these men, certain outside agencies, working with the unions, have provoked what most reasonable men would consider a farcical strike. Unfortunately, we are the goats. We know from boasts of union organizers that this company is being made a guinea pig for the building industry of Detroit. We are a target simply because we are prominent—not because any union or any workman has a legitimate complaint against the company.

This is amply proved, we believe, by the fact that the C. I. O. has made but two demands of us: A strictly closed shop; the firing of certain persons whom they feel are unfriendly to their cause. These are the only demands ever presented by the union. They continue, however, to delude the men by informing them that they are working for "higher wages, shorter hours, better conditions." It is too obviously true that they are interested in nothing more than furthering their own selfish interest at the expense of this company and its crew of capable employees.

We would like very much an early opportunity to discuss this matter with you, present figures, and go into all the ramifications. May we arrange an appointment?

Thanks very much for your attention to our problems.

Sincerely,

CURRIER LUMBER CO.,
P. J. CURRIER, *President*.

DETROIT, MICH.

What these racketeering so-called unionists—and certainly no true union-labor man is engaged in any such activity—attempted to do to this lumber company, they try on other employers. Their object very plainly is the creation of discord, dissatisfaction, industrial strife, the collection of dues, and the establishment of themselves in positions of political power. They are racketeers, pure and simple, and should be dealt with as such.

It is to be hoped that, when Wayne County has finished with its present prosecution of city and county officials, its law-enforcing officers or the Department of Justice will make an investigation of what has been happening in Michigan and see that, for once, the civil rights of the men who want to work, as distinguished from the so-called civil rights of the men who are preventing our citizens from working, will receive some protection.

The Senate Civil Liberties Committee has long persecuted employers, thrown a mantle of charity and of official protection around union and Communist organizers. It is about time that the public learns the close connection between the present national New Deal administration and those racketeers and Communists who pretend to be acting for union labor.

Speech Nominating Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg for President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

SPEECH OF HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF, OF MICHIGAN, AT PHILADELPHIA, PA., THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to present the name of Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG as a candidate for President of the United States at the recent Republican National Convention in Philadelphia. Senator VANDENBERG received the well-earned tribute of votes in that convention at one time or another from almost every State in the Union—indicating the whole Nation's appreciation of his statesmanship and public service. He was not nominated for President. But we of Michigan—who unitedly supported him at Philadelphia from start to finish—have the completely satisfying consolation that he can now remain in the United States Senate as a tower of strength not only in the Republican Party but also to the American necessity for sound and seasoned leadership in this critical hour.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing below the nominating speech referred to.

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, there has been too much talk here in Philadelphia this week about stopping this candidate or that candidate. [Applause.] We seem to lose sight of the fact that the candidate we really have got to stop next November lives in Washington [applause] and my man can do that job. [Applause.]

Let me warn you and all the people of the United States that if in the next November election you vote for the third term, it may be your last opportunity to vote.

In view of the solemnity of this occasion; in view of the tragic conditions facing this country and the world, I ask that following my remarks there be no demonstration.

The spirit of the thinking people of the country, looking with hope to this great convention, was, I think, typified by the man I shall name, when he said to me as I was leaving for this session, "If I were a part of that great convention, I should feel like entering the hall upon my knees." [Applause.]

I wish to reiterate what has frequently been said during this convention. The nominee of this convention, whoever he may be, must become the next President of the United States.

We owe it to the spirit of the Republic—yesterday, today, tomorrow.

We owe it to the free institutions which sprang from the courage of 1776 and from the hearts of our forbears who stood here in Philadelphia where we now stand.

We owe it to the wisdom of 1787, which here produced the greatest document ever struck from the hand of man at a single instance—the Constitution of the United States.

We owe it to the preservation of this inheritance against all enemies, foreign and domestic; against all subversion, at home or abroad; and against 4 more years of state socialism, of Roosevelt depression, and of an American dictatorship which would break the most sacred traditions of democracy in order to perpetuate its power!

We owe it to our great dead, our living, and our unborn!

The Liberty Bell must ring again!

The nominee of this convention must become the next President of the United States.

He must be able not only to win in November; he must also be able to organize an administration in January—for the benefit of the whole United States—which can save America from the precipice of war abroad and from the precipice of disaster and disintegration at home. He must have the broadest experience available. He must have the surest record. He must have been tested under fire. He must have national confidence. He must know Washington and America and the world! He must be from the people and for the people. He must be young in vigor, yet seasoned and matured in living contact with all the vital problems which he must master as the receiver of the greatest bankruptcy in history. He must be pro-America and all-American!

When the tumult and the shouting die, when the excitements and the incitements of this great parliament are a memory, there must remain, an intellectual conviction that the nominee of this convention deserves to be the next President of the United States.

In this spirit, and for the sake of our common responsibility, I ask you, my fellow delegates, to give me your brief attention while, under instructions from the Republicans of Michigan, and without intended reflection upon any other candidate, I tell you why countless Americans from coast to coast believe that this distinguished gentleman—his party's leading and often lonesome congressional champion throughout the darker days when the New Deal rode high—should win your votes.

If he does, the nominee of this convention will become the next President of the United States.

Every issue which we shall take to the country is personified and dramatized in his record. Indeed his record is substantially his party's platform. The country, in this campaign, will look at the man rather than the platform. The man will be the platform. Therefore, we vastly simplify our approach to the popular conscience if, in the person of our nominee, we can point to deeds rather than mere words as the national reliance.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in respect to foreign contacts. Here is a nominee who has served 12 long years on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; who knows this desperate problem intimately in all of its developing jeopardies; who has spent a lifetime defending George Washington's Farewell Address with its injunction against alien entanglements and alliances; who believes that America must keep out of this war and out of any policies tending to pull us in—unless the war comes to our homeland or its essential outposts; who takes the Monroe Doctrine literally and insists that this western world shall survive as the impregnable citadel of republican institutions; who long since ceased to be an "isolationist" in the sense that we can be immune to great events in this foreshortened world, but who long since became an unchangeable "insulationist" in the sense that we must think, speak, dream, hope, and plan for "America first and America last" in dealing with the forces of disintegration and destruction which plague the victims of power politics in other lands.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in respect to the national defense. Here is a nominee who has lived through the congressional failures upon this score for the past 7 years and knows at first hand the national need; who has preached preparedness for decades—not for war, but against war if it ever comes to our shores; who has supported every dollar sought for national defense in this emergency, but who has relentlessly demanded on the Senate floor that we shall implement these appropriations with expert civilian administrators—armed with power to act—so that we may hereafter avoid the wastes and disappointments which have cursed us through the impotence of the gigantic political bureaucracy of these recent, sterile years.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in respect to the dynastic danger of a third-term Presidency in violation of every republican tradition upon which our free democracy rests. Here is a nominee who not only battles every inch of the way against the tragic notion that America has at last become a one-man country, but also who throws this whole burning question of the Presidential tenure into bold relief by asserting that America's 1940 need is a Republican Chief Executive prepledged to one term so that he and his party and their Jeffersonian allies may be wholly free of any incentive save the one great, transcendent purpose to produce an all-American administration that will save the Repub-

lic. No other man can make this third-term issue quite so crystal clear.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in respect to American business and its release from the tyranny which has throttled progress and prosperity during these 7 socialistic years. Here is a nominee who has fought the battles of free enterprise every inch of the way in the highest legislative forum in the land. He has faithfully served the rule that private initiative and private enterprise must be our economic reliance in the American way. He has been a torch of hope in a night of gloom. He knows the employer's problem because, for a quarter century, he was a successful employer. Yet he knows the worker's problem because he has toiled in the ranks. He knows the labor problem because he dealt happily with unions for a quarter century—without a moment's friction or a moment's strike. He knows what it is to meet a pay roll because he has met pay rolls. Yet he knows the burdens and the heartbreaks of the humble and the poor because he came from them in the desperately hard beginnings of his self-made career.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in respect to economy in government and the need to save the American taxpayer from every needless drain upon his hard-pressed purse. Here is a nominee who has been the greatest, single economist in Congress. A distinguished Democrat has credited his personal efforts with saving the country $500,000,000 in the last 7 years. The Florida Canal, the Quoddy nightmare, the Tombigbee extravaganza—all these, and many others, are victories in his constant fight against Government waste. It is for his spectacular success in guarding the Public Treasury against its more wanton raiders that a great metropolitan newspaper has called him "the most useful Member of the United States Senate." He personifies, as can no other living American, the need for courage and conservation in saving the public credit from disaster, and his key place upon the Senate Finance Committee for many years is the capsheaf to these indispensable credentials.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in social vision. Here is a nominee who has drawn the sharp line between social-mindedness and socialism in a long legislative record which is as notable for its practical and constructive liberalism as for its fidelity to the great fundaments of economic law. Social vision? He wrote the Amendment to the Banking Act of 1933 under which Federal bank deposit insurance was inaugurated in January 1934. The Chairman of the F. D. I. C. calls him "the father of bank-deposit insurance." Social vision? He led the battle which recently stripped the Social Security Act of its utterly indefensible reserve provisions which robbed its beneficiaries of many of their rights. As a result, he saved thousands of employers and millions of workers a 50-percent increase in their pay-roll taxes last January. Social vision? He sponsored the Senate's inquiry into profit-sharing as a means for the larger and more equitable distribution of the fruits of labor among those who toil.

Suppose the voter wants to know where we stand in respect to tariff protection and the larger development of American markets. Here is a nominee who has been a faithful "protectionist" all his life and who proves, by his record, that he wants a scientific tariff constantly and faithfully to measure the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. He demands the American market for American labor. He demands the preservation of American wages and living standards. He demands that reciprocity shall be a two-way street. He demands that agriculture shall be protected against all competitive imports so that the two-price system shall bring agriculture to parity in its share of the national income. He demands that we shall realistically face the economic competitions of the world and that we shall be wholly armed, with every necessary economic weapon to defend American business and labor and agriculture in the grim post-war economic readjustments that will threaten every American standard we hold dear. With our banner in his hands, we shall need no promises or explanations. America's economic aspirations are written in his record.

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, here is the seasoned champion of every purpose to which the Republican Party dedicates itself. Here is the tried and trusted veteran of all the recent wars that have been fought in our behalf. Here is the first favorite—on every test of the leaders of the Nation's thought in Washington. Here is the appeal not only to our own partisans but also to those millions of Jeffersonian Democrats whose votes we want and need, because they have frankly asked for him. Here is a hard and popular campaigner, as he proved by his 1934 survival in what otherwise was a welter of defeats. Here is a scholar whom great universities have decorated with their degrees. Here is an historian who has contributed richly to the libraries of our tradition. Here is a leader whose presidential stature has been universally recognized for years. Here are character and capacity. Here are wisdom and experience linked with vigor and vitality. Here is the very personification of American opportunity in a self-made career which has taken him from the lowliest places to the highest seats of power. Here is our hope for November and the country's hope for 1941.

He has not sought this recognition. But he is ready to lead our forward march.

He has never failed his party or his Nation—and he will not fail them now.

By instruction from the united Republicanism of Michigan, and with the prayers of millions of our fellow countrymen from coast to coast, I invite you to the vanguard which shall lead to victory.

I nominate United States Senator ARTHUR HENDRICK VANDENBERG for President of the United States.

The American Man of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from one of my constituents:

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN HENDRICKS: The so-called propaganda for the "forgotten man" is a vanishing myth. In his stead we have the American man of today, who has maintained as such since the days of 1776.

He lives in every village, town, and city of our land, though he may be somewhat handicapped in the great metropolis, where he is crowded, pushed, shunted, and regimented, sometimes to the loss of real individuality and, to a great extent, vision.

So we will consider the man in the open country, for he is legion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian border to Mexico.

He is an individualist, pays his taxes gladly, votes his convictions in local affairs as well as national, has a family, owns his home or is paying for one, is in business or has a profession, perhaps a tiller of the soil—at least, his vocation was his own choice.

He belongs to Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Civitans, Elks, Masons, or Legion—all have the American flag as their emblem—is a member of the city council, school board, or is a bank director; belongs to some church or attends one on Sunday; plays golf, hunts, and goes fishing with his kids. To a large extent, takes a vacation once a year where he contacts other men for their viewpoints on life. This, my dear Congressman, is the real "man in the street," who nationally has not been called upon since 1918 to 1922.

In 1918 perhaps he was a Boy Scout or a good soldier at the front, or a manufacturer who gladly, as I did, turned his factory from a luxury producer to one of war necessities. He bought Liberty bonds and will again; did without sugar and luxuries. He is millions and wants this next "job," now on our hands, done right.

To a very large extent, this man has not been collectively approached or advised with as yet, for he does not, as a general thing, write his Congressman and seldom if ever visits Washington except for sightseeing for a day when he shows his family the Capitol and White House.

This is the man our Government must now call upon for advice, service, and action. This is the man who will save this country from the European "hurricane" that is approaching, for he is willing to obey the orders of leaders who he knows should be capable of setting up and finishing the job of national defense as a whole.

"Fifth columnists," malicious aliens mean nothing to him, Mr. Congressman, for he is millions against a few thousand, and the prepared millions are unconquerable when they finally swing into action.

This is the composite picture of the so-called man in the street. I know him, am one of them. He will respond 100 percent.

FRANKLIN M. SAWYER.

Yes—The Veterans Called the Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with the cruel flames of war sweeping over much of the world the United States is faced with a serious and critical problem of national defense.

Leaders of American industry and labor have been called to give aid in the rapid development of a program which will afford our land all of the necessary equipment to make us safe from any attack.

It seems to me that we should insist that in this program to make our country strong we should have a ready ear for the advice and aid of the men who in time of other great

emergencies were ready and willing to serve in the armed forces of our Nation.

A little more than 20 years ago over 4,000,000 of the finest men in the United States willingly accepted the highest duty of citizenship when they served in the World War. They trod the mud and hell of the western front and saved the democracies from a crushing defeat.

These men were not professional soldiers; they were a good cross section of our citizens. They fought because they felt as have all Americans since the days of Lexington and Concord, that our Nation's honor was at stake.

After the war they returned home and found their way into the great ex-service organizations. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, founded by the men who served overseas in the Spanish-American War, became almost overnight a large and powerful organization. Hundreds of thousands of the men who fought on the western front and in Siberia affiliated with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. More than a million more World War veterans joined the American Legion. This World War veteran organization has been a bulwark for America ever since the day of its founding. The war-disabled in many instances became members of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

You may ask why have you mentioned these organizations just at this moment? I mention them because they for more than 20 years have been begging the people and the Congress to do the very thing that we are now rushing to accomplish. They knew that to be great, a nation must be fortified with a well-rounded and complete national defense. They have crusaded year after year to tell every one of us that the time might come when the armed forces would again have to protect our democratic institutions.

During all of these years the veteran groups have not only wanted armament. They have guarded jealously the principles of Americanism for which they fought. They have repeatedly supported legislative committees when those committees were fighting to expose the work of the "fifth column" in this Nation. Sneers from the fault finders who said, "it can't happen here," meant nothing to the ex-service men. They hammered home the fact that the forces of subversion were burrowing into our national life in an organized attempt to overthrow the Republic.

I am firm in the feeling that the leaders of our country could well call into Washington the heads of the great veteran organizations and counsel with them. Utilize the thousands of posts of these groups to properly acquaint the people of the Nation with all of needs in this national-defense movement. Let the Department of Justice have access to their files on the un-American hoodlums of the "fifth column."

Mr. Speaker, these men and women of their auxiliaries are pledged to serve, they are ready to work; let us now be frank enough to accept their help.

W. P. A. and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES KRAMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY COL. F. C. HARRINGTON, COMMISSIONER OF THE WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Col. F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration, over the Mutual Broadcasting System network, speaking from station WOL, Washington, D. C., Sunday, June 30, 1940:

I welcome the opportunity to speak to a radio audience upon this topic because I feel that the possibilities for utilizing the W. P. A. in the preparedness program are not well understood at this time when the Nation's energies are being concentrated on national defense. It will therefore be my endeavor in the time which is available to me to describe the methods by which the resources of this large organization can be utilized to help us prepare this Nation for the eventualities which may lie ahead of us.

In the first place I would like to explain what we are legally authorized to do. The Emergency Relief Appropriation Act which provides funds for the fiscal year which begins tomorrow was approved by the President last Wednesday. Congress inserted a number of provisions in this legislation which were designed to give W. P. A. authority to utilize its resources in the defense program. I shall refer to some of these specific provisions later in my address, but I would like to say at the outset that we can execute almost any type of work that is included in the preparedness program except the actual manufacture of war materials; that is, warships, airplanes, guns, tanks, ammunition, and the like.

Secondly, I would like to refer to the means which we have at our disposal to perform this work. There are today assigned to the W. P. A. program approximatey one and three-quarter million men and women. This army is controlled through a simple, flexible, organization which reaches into each of the 48 States and 3,000 counties of the continental United States and into Hawaii and Puerto Rico. A job for which plans are available can be started in almost any locality within a few days. This organization was able to mobilize 250,000 workers to meet the emergency which was created by the Ohio Valley flood of 1937; and within a few days after the disastrous New England hurricane in 1938, 100,000 workers were engaged in the preliminary steps of averting damage to life, health, and property and enabling the communities to resume their normal way of life. I feel no uncertainty that an organization which was able to function in these emergencies can be mobilized to assist effectively in the preparedness program.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week, in connection with the approval of our legislation for the next fiscal year, a meeting was held in St. Louis which was attended by all of our State administrators and by members of our Washington staff. The principal and most important topic of discussion at that meeting was national defense, and plans for the utilization of the W. P. A. in connection with national defense were explained, discussed, and agreed upon. The W. P. A. is ready to move.

I wish to say a word at this point concerning what the W. P. A. has done in the past in work which is of definite value at this time in connection with preparedness. We have built commercial airports in large numbers and have worked upon many military airports. We have carried on an increasingly large program of construction on military and naval reservations. We have built many armories. We have constructed hundreds of thousands of miles of roads. We have erected temporary shelter for the increased strength of the Regular Army and have provided many facilities in training areas of both the Regular Army and the National Guard.

In general, our program for the future involves a concentration upon activities of this type, as well as the addition of others which will contribute to preparedness. It is my hope that by autumn as much as one-third of the W. P. A. may be engaged upon projects which contribute in some measure to the national defense.

The work which we shall do will be divided into three categories. The first of these includes the projects of the War and Navy Departments which they operate directly with funds which are transferred to them by W. P. A. The workers on these projects are just as much a part of W. P. A. as those who work on locally sponsored projects but the execution of the work, including its supervision, is handled directly by the War and Navy Departments.

A second category of our program, which will be considerably larger than the one that I have just described, consists of projects which are sponsored by the War and Navy Departments, but which are operated by the W. P. A. within its programs in the various States. These projects are on military reservations and in naval stations, because the War and Navy Departments cannot legally sponsor projects except on land which is either owned by the Federal Government or held on long-time leases. Work of this kind has been going on for several years, so that the methods of doing it are well understood, both by the War and Navy Departments and by ourselves. All that is necessary, therefore, is to expand an activity that is already in existence.

The third category into which national defense projects will fall is in what is called our non-Federal program. This includes the projects which are sponsored by the States, counties, and municipalities and by the public agencies of those political subdivisions. Practically the only limitation in this field is that the projects must be public projects on land which must be publicly owned, although Federal ownership is not required. In this field we shall carry on projects for airports, for National Guard armories and training areas, for the construction of roads which are of military importance, and for many other kinds of work.

Another preparedness activity in which W. P. A. expects to engage in the coming months is that of training persons for industries which are engaged in production for national defense purposes. Our Appropriation Act contains specific authority to permit us to engage in this activity. We shall have a dual purpose in this: First, to provide the trained workers which industry will need; and secondly, to endeavor to assure W. P. A. workers of an opportunity to secure a share of the increased employment which will result from our preparedness effort. The plans for this training are well developed, and the initial steps to put them into effect will be taken during the coming week.

In touching upon the matter of training, I wish to repeat a statement which I have made on numerous occasions. This is that our W. P. A. workers want private jobs and take them eagerly when-

ever the opportunity is offered. Furthermore, we want them to take such jobs, and I wish to assure the public that our effort to fit W. P. A. into the preparedness program does not mean that we have any desire to retain our workers if industry has a place for them.

I want to say a word concerning the nonconstruction workers who constitute about 20 percent of our employees, because I do not want it felt that they have no place in the preparedness program. I hope that it will be possible to retrain many of these men and women in new occupations and place them in private jobs. Those who remain on the W. P. A. can, moreover, make a real contribution to preparedness in the fields of research, recreation, health, and in the production of articles where such production can be carried on without competition with existing industry. I do not propose to utilize the W. P. A. in such competition, but rather to endeavor to move our workers into the plants of private industry where jobs are available.

It is appropriate that I should speak to the sponsors of our projects in connection with these national-defense activities, and there are two points that I wish to make in this connection. The first is to ask for the support and cooperation of sponsors in the selection of projects to be carried out. Since the supply of available certified labor in the various communities is limited, we shall want to close down some projects or reduce employment upon them in order to concentrate the available W. P. A. labor supply upon other projects which are of greater importance in the present emergency. We shall in some instances move workers from communities into work camps in order to execute important projects.

I feel that our sponsors will realize the necessity for these measures and accept this condition without complaint, particularly as the work that we shall be doing on the national-defense projects will be of real and lasting value to local communities.

The second point relating to sponsors concerns the much discussed question of sponsors' contributions. The law requires an average contribution from sponsors of 25 percent in each State program. Some relaxation in this respect is permitted in connection with national-defense projects, but since the amount of money that we can spend for materials and equipment is limited, it will still be necessary that sponsors defray the bulk of these nonlabor costs if worth-while work is to be done. The Appropriation Act for the coming year contains a special authorization for the use of not to exceed $25,000,000 for the purchase of materials or the rental of equipment on projects which are certified by the War and Navy Departments as valuable for military or naval purposes. However, when this amount is spread throughout the country, it does not look nearly so large as when one reads the bare figure. We shall, therefore, expend these special nonlabor funds as judiciously as possible and only upon projects which are selected and approved by the War and Navy Departments as being useful for military or naval purposes.

There is one word of caution that I feel I must inject into this address; that is, that the primary responsibility of W. P. A. is still to provide work and wages for the needy unemployed. We cannot and should not fail to discharge this responsibility, because these wages mean food, clothing, and shelter for needy families. Therefore, we must continue to carry on our program in communities where the projects upon which we are working, although they may be of great public benefit, are not directly connected with preparedness. However, to the greatest degree possible, the energies of W. P. A. will be devoted to furthering national defense.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that what we are proposing to do with W. P. A. in connection with preparedness is nothing new. The pioneering has been done, and what is required of us is a concentration of effort in a particular field in which we are already operating. I look upon W. P. A. as having a definite and important place in the second line of defense in this Nation. And I want to say emphatically that the W. P. A. is made up of good Americans. Their Americanism and patriotism are just as keen and intense as anybody else's.

Let me repeat that we need local support in this endeavor. I have reason to believe that that support will be forthcoming, as I have received voluntary assurances to that effect from many communities in all parts of the country. Granted that support, we are ready, willing, and anxious to bend all of our energies to furthering national defense. W. P. A. is going places in the preparedness program.

Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM VINCENT B. FELITTO, NATIONAL COMMANDER, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram which was sent on June 12, 1940, to the President of the United States by Vincent B. Felitto, national commander, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.:

The national department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in the name of each and every member thereof, desire to reaffirm and rededicate in emphatic terms our pledge of faithful, loyal, undivided, true, and wholehearted allegiance to the cause and best interest of our United States.

Men and women of Italian birth and descent in all walks of life demonstrated their loyalty and patriotism to the United States by enlisting in the service of the armed forces of the United States in 1917 over 700,000 strong, each rendering valiant service to our country in time of need.

Now, again we, our sons and daughters, with our lives stand ever ready to defend our glorious country against all enemies.

We place the service of the members of our organization at the call and disposal of our President.

(Signed) VINCENT B. FELITTO,
National Commander, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

More Spinach for Opponents of Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the traditional contradictory platform of the Republican Party on expanding export trade, and at the same time proposing increased tariffs, the following excerpts from the Saturday Evening Post, written by their candidate on the eve of the Republican Convention, ought to make interesting reading to the proponents of Hawley-Smootism who have opposed trade agreements.

Foreign policy includes foreign trade. We want to promote our trade with the rest of the world. We have millions of men looking for jobs. We have vast quantities of agricultural and industrial products looking for a market. We can help the farmer as well as the worker by promoting our trade with other countries.

International trade agreements should be helpful to this objective. In a world where tariffs are so high as to prevent the exchange of goods, and in a world where some tariffs are obviously necessary to protect different wage and price levels, the reciprocal-trade treaty is simply a means whereby two nations sit at a table and say: "We will agree to reduce the tariff on this product, which does not compete particularly with us, if you will agree to reduce the tariff on our products, which does not compete particularly with you."

* * * * * * *

Americans have demonstrated that they are as good businessmen as the people in other countries. They can bargain efficiently in their domestic trade, and they can bargain with equal efficiency in their foreign trade. We had a foreign market worth billions of dollars to us once. To be exact, it was worth $5,240,000,000 in 1929—enough to provide thousands of the jobs which the unemployed are looking for. We may never get all of this trade back, but we can certainly get part of it back. Trade treaties are a step in that direction.

Mr. Willkie's words are not in keeping with the foreign-trade plank of the Republican platform. It will be interesting to see which is "repaired," the squeaky platform or Mr. Willkie's straight-from-the-shoulder stand.

The Washington Post said of this plank of the Republican platform:

Particularly inaccurate is the reference to "one-man tariff making." Anyone familiar with the Hull reciprocal-trade agreements knows that they were carefully negotiated by experts after hearings and extensive analyses of domestic industries affected. The cause of intelligent debate on vital issues would have been better served if the resolutions committee had concentrated its attention on clarification of its own position on tariffs and foreign trade.

Mr. Raymond Clapper, in his article in the News (June 26, 1940), after Mr. Hoover's "swan song" and the adoption of the Republican platform, stated:

Republicans want a tariff log-rolled by Congress in the good old-fashioned way. Mr. Hoover himself says that Europe's foreign trade will be totalitarian controlled. Yet neither he nor the other Republicans offer any method of dealing with that situation except to go back to a high-pitched protective tariff. The Republican idea

still seems to be that we can sell everything abroad and buy nothing.

If the Republican Party can offer nothing better than that, it doesn't deserve to go back into power.

The Washington News of June 25, 1940, carried the following statement as Mr. Willkie's reply to a question on trade agreements.

Trade treaties? Taft, Blaine, and McKinley, all Republicans, favored the reciprocal-tariff principle. There's no world trade now and Hitler has made this question moot, but after this is all over we are going to have to have larger trade areas if we maintain our living standard without deficit financing. The way to do it is through agreements.

Mr. Willkie stands with me in support of trade agreements. Perhaps Franklyn Waltman, publicity director of the Republican National Committee, in speaking of Republican opposition to trade agreements was wrong when he said:

Few people, perhaps, will find any news in the statement that Republicans never seem to learn.

At least Mr. Willkie seems on the right track in advocating a Democratic tariff policy.

The Good and Bad Alien in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over station WJZ, Sunday, June 23, 1940:

The present day hysteria centered around the fear of the "fifth column" has again brought to the forefront the position of the alien in the United States.

In the course of our national history we have always either coddled or feared the alien. There were times when we boasted of the fact that our Nation was made up of many racial stocks, and that, therefore, all of us were aliens, one or more generations removed from some foreign country. At other times, we adopted a policy of a thorough "Americanism" which would deny any rights whatsoever to the alien in our midst. Even as early as the end of the 18th century, we had alien and sedition bills thus linking for the first time alien activities with un-Americanism. Nevertheless, the alien problem necessarily must be with us and cannot be solved so easily.

The subject of immigration is, and always has been, a controversial one. For some unfortunate reason, whenever immigration is discussed, either in Congress or before any other group, emotion and prejudice are permitted to hold sway, and an objective consideration and analysis of any phase of the subject becomes impossible. There are extremists who believe that all immigration should be stopped, and the deportation of all possible aliens now in the country directed. There are other extremists who are convinced that we should have the "open-door" as to any and all immigrants, and that deportation of aliens should be rigidly circumscribed to a few classes. It is hard to be impersonal and to treat this subject dispassionately.

For many years following the formation of the Nation, practically unrestricted immigration was encouraged. The economic condition of the country probably contributed to that policy. The country was in need of development—the alien sought to improve himself. Little thought was then given to the effect such immigration would have upon the future of the Nation.

Shortly after the World War, many persons reached the conclusion that the policy of unrestricted immigration had served its purpose, and that stock should be taken of its effect upon the country and the body politic is continued. In the year 1931 the view was reached that the interests of the country and the welfare of the people required that a stop should be put on the unlimited entry of aliens into the United States. And for the first time in our history Congress placed on the statute books the principle of numerical restriction—the quota system. Thereafter, by successive acts and administrative rulings, the immigration of aliens into the United States has been for all practical purposes stopped. In fact, while the Immigration Act of 1924, the present quota law, renders possible the admission in round figures of 150,000 aliens annually, the actual number of immigrants entering the country for the past few years has never reached 50,000 yearly. If consideration is given to the number of alien departures from the United States, we now have for a long time emigration instead of immigration of aliens.

Although some of the antialien extremists would have it appear to the contrary, the immigration of aliens is no longer a problem. The number permitted entry is infinitesimal. The number of aliens in the country legally is without doubt not much more than 3 percent of our total population and rapidly diminishing. The number of aliens who are here unlawfully, while difficult to determine accurately, is probably not more than a few thousand, and not the four or five million aliens which some of the groups who have antialien views would have you believe.

Since the outbreak of the present war it is impossible to fear immigration quotas from Europe. There are no shipping facilities, and for all practical purposes immigration as generally known has virtually come to an end. We still have, however, the problem of the alien in our midst. Some of the aliens came to us under the quota laws, some from nonquota countries, and some others were admitted here for temporary residence and have been either unable or unwilling to terminate their temporary stay in the United States. All these classes require special consideration. It is against these aliens that the trend of antialien legislation is directed.

Some of us would have you believe that every alien in the United States is an actual or potential member of the "fifth column." In this way a large number of legally admitted aliens are under suspicion, and the American public is aroused against them for no reason whatsoever. I shudder to think how many innocent persons will find themselves under an unjustified attack from many quarters.

I believe it is my duty as chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to assure the law-abiding alien that he has nothing to fear from any hysterical outbursts by ill-informed persons.

Let us not be intolerant or unreasonable in our views relating to aliens. Let us not be sentimentalists so that any hardship to an individual undeserving alien appalls us. Let us not be prejudiced against the foreigner in our midst so that their very presence is looked upon as a menace to our form of government and to our economic life. Let us seek to do that which is right in keeping with American ideals.

It is particularly in times of great national danger that we are inclined to be unjust. The menace to our institutions is not an imaginary one. Forces of evil have been unleashed in Europe and a grave condition confronts our people menacing the very way of life and health to which we have been accustomed, and which we desire to continue.

Europe has seen tragedy in the destruction of democracy, and there is hardly a place in the world left where our form of government and our way of life is practiced. As a result, a good many aliens in this country who are thoroughly imbued with the principles of democracy and love of democratic institutions find that they have no place to go to.

Some of these aliens are as American in their point of view and their love for our institutions as any person whose ancestry can be traced back to the *Mayflower*. Some of these aliens are just as good Americans today as native-born Americans. Some of these aliens are as devoted to our Bill of Rights and our Constitution as any of its founders. Some of these aliens are as thoroughly idealistic in their desire to protect the American way of living as were those who gave their lives in the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. These aliens must be assured that we will stretch out a helpful hand and guide them to the path of Americanism in every manner, consistent with the maintenance of our institutions and the survival of our form of government.

While we are bending every effort to eradicate any alien who advocates anti-American doctrines, we will act the part of a big brother to any alien who is in love with our institutions, and so it is very important to make a distinction between the subversive alien whom we wish to eliminate from our midst and the friendly alien whom we intend to educate to a still further appreciation of Americanism, and the making of a thoroughly dependable member of our body politic.

There are bills now pending in Congress which are vicious in their nature and pernicious in their object. These bills are born of ignorance and failure to appreciate the value of a good alien and his importance to the American scheme of things. I will never permit any good alien to suffer simply because there are many bad aliens who should have been deported long ago, or should not have been admitted in the first place. Many of these vicious aliens have taken up citizenship and have technically become naturalized. In those cases, naturalization was not an honest desire to adopt the American way of life and to become American in spirit, but was merely a matter of convenience to enable one to function as an American for the destruction of our Commonwealth. I refer to people of the type of Fritz Kuhn and other members of the German-American Bund, who may be technically citizens of the United States. There are many Communists who have become naturalized Americans without intending to live the life of a good American or become imbued with the love for their adopted country. These men should be classed for what they are, not Americans but subversive aliens and should be treated as such—the type of alien whom this country should get rid of at the first possible opportunity.

Among the bills now pending and ready for congressional action, is a bill which seeks the registration and fingerprinting of every alien in the United States. This bill is a particularly dangerous measure because it may result in a great deal of hardship and

hysteria for our own citizens. If this bill is allowed to become a law, a good many citizens of the United States who may look alien, will be sent to jail and made to prove their American citizenship. Aliens themselves will not be hurt in any way by this proposed statute, since they are accustomed to registration and fingerprinting, etc. It will be the American citizen who may be hurt if some underling of the Immigration Service will think that he is an alien.

And so, I repeat that we must not do anything detrimental to the alien who will in due time become an American citizen who loves this country, and who simply wishes to adopt its ways. We will, however, do everything in our power to rid this country of all undesirable aliens who would use America for un-American and anti-American purposes.

No one has a better right to speak both for and against this type of legislation than myself. I have been a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives since 1922, and chairman of the committee since 1930. I investigated un-American activities by aliens as a member and vice chairman of the first committee appointed by Congress on my motion in 1934. It was this committee which unearthed a great deal of evidence which has since been used by all the agencies of Government to track down activities of aliens who came to this country for the sole purpose of subverting our Government and institutions.

I spoke on the floor of the House and before the public on innumerable occasions pointing out the dangers which we were facing from these un-American activities by aliens. It was originally because of my calling attention to this menace that the American public became aroused and alarmed and took the necessary steps to protect this country from the alien menace. It was all because of this feeling that aliens have been instrumental in destruction and sabotage, that a good many of us have reached the contrary conclusion, and that is that all aliens are subversive and dangerous.

I do not wish to have this impression remain in the minds of the American public, and am therefore taking the opportunity of stating once and for all that I have nothing but sympathy and affection for the legally admitted alien, who wishes to make America his home, who loves its institutions, and who will in due course become an American citizen. I encourage these aliens feeling that America, which had given them a welcoming hand, will continue to maintain an interest in their welfare; particularly do I wish to welcome to America all those refugees from dictator ridden countries of Europe, who have found in America the only home where democratic ideals still exist, and where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are still the basis of our existence. America has always been the home of liberty, and will continue to be so, and we shall not deny to the liberty-loving alien the privileges of America which we claim for ourselves.

The Interdependence of Land Values and Public Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY PAUL J. RAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, before Portland, Oreg., Realty Board June 28, 1940:

Students of public-utility economics have often remarked about the very close relationship between land values and the development of public utility services. You gentlemen represent the group in the community who are most vitally interested in land values. I represent the activity of the Federal Government in this area in the field of public utilities, particularly electric power. When we sit down together at the luncheon table, it is only natural that we each refer to our own interests and that we give some thought to the interrelationship between your work and mine.

The easiest way to demonstrate to you that you are vitally concerned with the various public utilities is to call to mind the typical situation in which a sale of residential property is consummated. The items which enhance the value of such property, the talking points which you gentlemen employ, the factors which probably clinch the sale, relate in large measure to public-utility services. The average man, when he buys a home, wants to know how many minutes that home is from his work and what kind of transportation service is provided. He wants to know whether the house is equipped adequately for electric lighting, refrigeration, and cooking, and whether it is serviced by a central electric system. He considers the rate which he must pay for electric service. He wants to know whether gas is available for heating his house. He is interested in the water system and the rate which he must pay for that essential commodity. He gives attention to the telephone service. All of these questions involve public utilities. If there has been a full, intelligent development of public utilities in the community, his questions may be answered in such a manner that he will conclude, as you hope he will conclude, that this home represents a desirable and economical place for him and his family to live.

Knowing that both you and the average man place such a high value upon public utility service, the public utility industry has played an important role in almost every new development of residential property. It has either been ahead of you men in anticipating the development of new areas or it has kept pace with you by providing adequate utility service to aid the development as soon as the areas showed promise.

The kind of example I have just given is, of course, too obvious and too easy. But having now established that there is a direct relationship between public utility service and land values, let me broaden the discussion and go into the nature of that relationship more basically.

My prime interest is, of course, electric power, and I will confine my discussion almost entirely to that particular public utility service.

One of the most significant developments in the electric-power field in recent years, and the one most important to land values, is the extension of the radius in which electricity can profitably be transported over transmission lines. Thirty-five or 40 years ago it was not thought practicable to transport power more than 50 miles. Today the practical limit has reached approximately 300 miles and is continually expanding. What does this mean for a region like the Pacific Northwest? It means, first of all, that industries do not have to be near the point of power generation, that they can avoid the congested overvalued land in the center of a city and can move to its environs or even outside the city altogether, opening up entirely new real-estate areas for development.

More important than this, it means that the water power contained in a mighty river can be taken from the river at the point in the river's course most advantageous for power development, and can be sent from that point throughout the entire area, benefiting people who are hundreds of miles away. It makes the greatest natural resource of the Pacific Northwest, Columbia River power, available to a home owner in Portland, to a farmer along the river, to a mine owner in northeast Washington, and to a businessman at Salem. It enhances to that extent the potential and actual value of land in all those places.

Another dramatic effect of electric power development upon land values in this area is found with respect to agricultural lands.

This part of the country is far removed from the Nation's population and commercial centers. It is at once obvious that the value of agricultural land in the Pacific Northwest is largely dependent upon transportation costs, the cost of carrying the products of the land to market. Those of you who have dealt in agricultural land in this area know to your sorrow that the one factor which has retarded the agricultural development of eastern Oregon and Washington is the cost of moving fruit and grains to market. One public utility, transportation, has failed to solve the problem. Transportation costs, though tending gradually downward, have never been sufficiently reduced to make really profitable the growing of grain and fruit in the vast expanses of Washington and Oregon suited for the purpose.

A partial solution to this problem is now apparent, and the solution comes from another public utility industry—electric power. There are untold acres in this part of the country which can and will grow agricultural products (products of greater value than grains) in paying quantities if the land can be supplied with water.

The problem of irrigation is tied up with the problem of electric power. The development of large scale hydroelectric power and irrigation projects presents the greatest challenge and one of the richest fields for future development in the whole public-utility industry. It takes water to transform marginal agricultural lands into profitable agricultural lands. And it takes power to pump that water up from the river levels to the levels of those agricultural lands and to place it under sufficient pressure so that it can be spread over a wide area. Private capital has made some important contributions already to the irrigation of the potentially valuable agricultural lands in the Pacific Northwest. And the Federal Government has begun actively to promote the projects which are too large to be handled by private financing.

The Grand Coulee area offers a fine example of the benefit to land values which can be expected from this kind of public-utility development. As a result of the cheap electric power which will be produced at Coulee Dam, there will be 1,200,000 acres of productive, marketable farm land, where today there is almost a desert. The homes of the people who live in the area will be made pleasanter and their work easier by that same cheap electricity which insures the flow of vital water.

All of this is directly related to you, gentlemen, and to your future as real-estate men. The people who live on those farms and the merchants and professional men who come to serve them will look to Portland, as well as the Puget Sound cities and Spokane, as the natural distributing points for all of the manufactured products and the consumers' goods they need. They will look to these cities as the shipping points for the products they raise. This will mean an enhancement of business opportunity in Portland and in the whole area, and the growth of commerce, all of which inevitably means that business property in Portland will have greater value.

At a time when one public utility, transportation, has not sufficiently developed itself to solve the problems of this area, another public utility, electric power, will step into the breach to insure the development of vast areas of land to its maximum use.

Let me turn from agricultural property to urban property. I want to trace the influence of the development of electric power on community life in cities generally, and I want to consider the influence of electric power in effecting the growth and development of Portland particularly.

Public utilities have a tremendous effect upon the planning and growth of every community. In my little illustration about the average man I have already spoken about the part which the public-utility industry plays in developing and even in anticipating the development of suburban residential areas within a community. Of such areas it is as true as of agricultural land, that almost the entire value which the land has is imparted to it by public utilities.

Let me mention another illustration of the effect of public-utility development upon land. The development of a new industry has customarily brought with it a smoke nuisance, making the area surrounding the industrial plant unhealthy and undesirable for habitation. When electricity is the principal source of power for moving machines the smoke nuisance is almost entirely eliminated. That will undoubtedly be the case in the industrial development of this city. Property owners in the vicinity of industrial plants who years ago would have suffered a substantial decrease in the value of their land will have electricity to thank for the preservation of the attractiveness and the value of their property.

But there are some effects of the development of the electrical industry which are even more basic than these of which I have spoken. In recent years there has been in the United States a great trend away from home ownership. Discouraged by the physical labor involved in heating and maintaining family life in an individual home, larger numbers of people have been turning to small apartment units. Sociologists decry this development. This apartment living means that hundreds of people are placed in single congested city blocks. It has effects upon the health, morality, and family life of people which are just beginning to be apparent.

This trend away from home ownership has a definite effect, too, upon the utility industry. Being cramped for space, the designers of the modern apartment save room generally in planning the kitchen. And as a result of this crowded and sometimes inadequate kitchen space the people who live in apartments have an increased tendency either to eat out or to consume various precooked foods. When this is so, the average per family consumption of utilities, particularly electricity, drops. Statistics demonstrate that fact graphically.

Some time ago public-utility economists concluded that the only way in which the trend away from home ownership could be reversed was through the development of labor-saving devices for the individual home, devices by which heating, cleaning, washing, etc., could be conducted by the individual home owner with the minimum of effort and at low cost. The electrical industry has already taken action on that theory. New electrical appliances are being continually developed to solve the problems of the individual home owners. I needn't point out the obvious fact that cooking, cleaning, washing, refrigeration, and a dozen other home chores have been made easier and cheaper. The only substantial home-ownership problem which is not yet solved by the electric industry is home heating, and recent research indicates that we are on the threshold of the solution of that problem. These new electrical home appliances, when coupled with low electric rates, offer the definite possibility of arresting, if not reversing, the trend toward the abandonment of the individual family dwelling. Portland has made particular progress in this direction, being aided by fairly low electric costs and low home-building costs. But even in a city of this type it is not too much to say that the trend will not definitely be reversed unless electric rates are brought continually downward.

We seem to have gotten on the subject of Portland's future. On that subject let me speak directly and frankly to you gentlemen. I have already mentioned the possibility of a considerable commercial growth for Portland as a result of the dramatic transformation of more than a million acres of desert land into productive farm land in the Portland trade area. That opportunity for commercial growth is extremely important to Portland and its business and commercial houses should plan now how they can take full advantage of it. But even more important to Portland is the industrial growth that is to be anticipated for the Pacific Northwest.

This area contains practically all of the strategic minerals needed for the Nation's defense. It has plentiful quantities of other raw materials. Its water power, which is still mostly undeveloped, is a tremendous natural resource, comprising more than 40 percent of the total potential hydroelectric power in the country. Moreover, there is a large market here for industrial products. The area has continually imported commodities in large quantities which it could have produced. This combination of a ready market, sufficient raw materials, and cheap, plentiful power is unbeatable. I can see it perhaps a little more clearly than you gentlemen because over at the Bonneville Power Administration it is my job to estimate and forecast this industrial development and to plan my transmission system and my power-generating facilities to take the maximum advantage of it. I am as confident of a great industrial development, including heavy industry, for the Pacific Northwest as I am that the sun will rise tomorrow.

Over at Bonneville we are receiving numerous inquiries from concerns who are interested in coming to the Northwest to process its undeveloped mineral resources. They want to mine and process aluminum, magnesium, manganese, chromium, molybdenum, copper, steel, alloys, nickel, quicksilver, calcium carbide, and a dozen other minerals and mineral products. There will be, I think, a substantial mining and mineral development in the Pacific Northwest. I am anxious that Portland, as well as every other community in this region, obtain its proper share of these new industries and of the munitions, airplane, and other defense industries which are likely to locate in this area.

With her excellent harbor facilities, her railroad and air terminal, her supply of intelligent skilled labor, and her position near the mouth of the Columbia but at a distance up-river which reduces its vulnerability to attack, Portland is strategically located to participate in this industrial growth and perhaps to lead it.

But all of these advantages are not enough to insure Portland's industrial development. Things are not as they once were. With the improvement of transportation and communication, and with the extension of the distance for electric transmission, industries no longer need to locate in metropolitan areas. Industries pay heed to the advantages of a city. They consider Portland's assets; those that I have mentioned. But there are two other considerations to which every industrial manager pays attention in deciding where to locate.

I have reference first to industrial sites. You gentlemen comprise the real-estate interests in Portland. I plead with you not to kill the goose that lays the golden egg by overvaluing industrial sites within the city. Don't begin to capitalize on these industries before you actually have them.

The second major item which industrialists will consider in casting about for a place to locate is the power system and the power rate. Since Portland is situated at a great distance from coal or natural gas, Portland's new industries must depend upon electric power. In fact, cheap electric power is the one factor which will make many of these new industries feasible and economically profitable. Besides her harbor, her labor supply, and her transportation facilities, Portland must be able to assure industries, especially the heavy basic industries to whom power is a major factor in production cost, a cheap and plentiful power supply.

I don't know how you gentlemen feel about it, but it appears self-evident to me that a city in which the distribution of electric power is carried on by two competing, duplicating power systems is not a city which offers the maximum present or potential advantage to industry. If I were an industrialist, the possibility of Portland's electric rates being materially lowered in the future would appear to me to be limited by the fact that distribution is not in single hands.

Gentlemen, as men of affairs who are immediately interested in the future development of this city, I think you should begin to concern yourselves with that problem. I needn't point out to you how important future industrial expansion is to all property values. We both know that the rental value of office space in the downtown area is dependent upon the demand by commercial, industrial, and professional people. We both know that the value of warehousing and commercial property located outside the metropolitan district is dependent upon the volume of commodity movement into and out of the city. We both know also the value of industrial property depends upon the attractiveness of the city to new industries and upon the expansion of those already here. We realize that the enhancement of the value of residential property depends upon the growth of the city and the employment of larger numbers of well-paid workers. Being directly interested in industrial expansion, your interest in the problem of electric distribution is direct and automatic.

The only figures which we have available to illustrate the cost of duplicating electric distribution systems in a city this size are furnished by the city light department at Seattle. In 1936 that department made a complete survey of the duplicating systems there and estimated that the rate payers of the city could save more than $3,000,000 a year if electric distribution were placed in the hands of a single agency. I have no reason to believe those figures inaccurate or to believe them inapplicable to Portland.

The consolidation of Portland's electric-distribution facilities, which is so necessary, can be brought about in two ways—either through municipal acquisition of both systems or through voluntary consolidation of the two present private systems. It is significant, I think, that within the last few years such cities like Los Angeles have taken steps to consolidate their two systems, and other cities, like Nashville and Knoxville, have taken steps to place in public hands the distribution of electric power. In each instance this action has already paid dividends in industrial growth. Portland, like these other metropolitan areas, should put its electric house in order. To succeed, the movement toward consolidation of electric power distribution must be given an active impetus by such men as yourselves, who are seriously interested in the future of the city and who recognize the relation of electric power distribution to the city's future.

Let me conclude by speaking a moment about a subject in which I know you are greatly interested—taxes. Much can be said in favor of the point of view that our present taxation system places a disproportionate burden on land. Such a tax system as ours would be admirably suited to a feudal economy in which land was the major source of wealth. But it is highly unfair to the owners of land in an economy in which intangible wealth is of greater significance and extent. But laying aside the inherently unsatisfactory nature of our present taxation system, since we are committed to it, we should attempt to administer it fairly and without undue hardship upon any class or group of the population.

With that principle in mind, I want to mention two problems relating to taxation: Taxation of industries and taxation of electric utility property.

First, about industrial taxes: In the scramble for new industries, real-estate men and others who are immediately interested in their coming, often succeed in convincing the city government and the public that a particular new industry should be relieved from taxation partially or entirely. As interested as I am in obtaining new industries for this area, I would advise very strongly against such tax exemption. New industries place new burdens on city government. Each is a potential sanitation and relief problem. Each requires fire and police protection and countless other services of municipal government. Industries that benefit from such municipal services should have to pay their share of the costs. I don't think that the tax burden is being fairly distributed, nor do I think that the city will in the long run benefit from the coming of any industry, if the industry must be bribed by tax exemption. I can say to you now that the Bonneville Power Administration will not encourage any of its power customers to seek tax exemption from any city but will do everything in its power to discourage that practice. For cities to begin giving such privileges results in one city being played off against another. It results in hard feelings within the city because of the discrimination against the industries already present. It places a disproportionate burden upon the rest of the community.

Now, a word about public-utility taxation.

The coming of large public Federal hydroelectric projects like Bonneville has brought with it a revival and an intensification of the public power issue. Because they think that private utilities pay more taxes than public plants and believe that the removal from the tax rolls of private utility property will increase the burden cast upon the remaining property owners, many landowners, perhaps including yourselves, have consistently opposed the public acquisition of power-distribution properties. They fear its effect upon their own taxes. Now, that's a legitimate ground for opposing any political movement, and you, or anyone else, have the right to oppose a political movement on whatever ground you choose. But as rational men, interested in the eventual welfare of the community, you should make it a point to ascertain the facts before being outspokenly opposed to any political reform.

Congress has directed me to reserve one-half of the power produced at Bonneville for public agencies. For that reason, we at Bonneville are anxious that the public know the truth about all methods of distributing power, and particularly about public power distribution.

In the first place, you should know that it is not true that private utilities pay more taxes—and by that I mean contribute more to the Public Treasury—than public power systems. The statistics simply disprove that generally held belief. Statistics assembled by the Federal Power Commission indicate that private plants pay 14.4 percent of their gross revenue to the Public Treasury. Public plants are commonly called upon to contribute more than regular cash payments. They are asked to give their surplus funds and innumerable free services (for such things as water pumping, street lighting, park lighting, etc.) to the public. On the average, they contribute 26.8 percent of their base revenue back to the Public Treasury.

These are figures for the United States as a whole. Now let me tell you how Bonneville in particular feels about this question of taxes. Let me explain the recommendation we make for handling taxes to every municipal plant and other public agency with which we enter into contract relationship. We urge the adoption of these principles whether or not the public agency is required by law to make any contribution to public funds. We write these recommendations and this plan into practically every power contract which we sign with public agencies.

First of all, we make a distinction between taxpayers and rate payers. These are analytically different groups of people. People do not use electricity in the same ratio that they pay property taxes. The two groups must be treated differently. Oftentimes there are tax funds invested in a municipal power plant. It is not fair to use the taxpayers' money to acquire ownership of a public power plant which is operated for the benefit of the rate payers, without giving the taxpayers a fair return on the money they have invested. Therefore, we have recommended, and sometimes we have had to insist, that electric rates for public plants which buy Bonneville power should be high enough to include a fair return on any tax funds that are invested in the public plant. That interest is paid by the municipal plant into the Public Treasury.

This is an academic problem for newly acquired public plants and those about to be acquired. It is not now customary to invest large sums out of tax surpluses in the acquisition of a light plant. The first reason is that there are no tax surpluses left, but an even more important reason is that there are other means of financing the acquisition of private utility property. Practically all of the recent public acquisitions of power facilities have been financed by revenue bonds which do not obligate tax funds and give the bondholders no control over the rate of levy or the time of levy. They are paid entirely from the proceeds of the electric plant. But in the older public plants where an investment of taxation funds clearly took place, we are insisting on a return being paid on those funds.

Now, how about taxation on the utility property itself? Let us say that a municipality or a P. U. D. wants to take over a private plant. We realize that the tax structure would be disbalanced if a community suddenly lost the taxes theretofore paid by the private utility property. We have taken the position that all municipal plants and other public agencies should voluntarily pay into the Public Treasury an amount equivalent to the State and local taxes previously paid by the utility whose property they have taken over. Our standard retail rates are based upon this theory and are high enough to include this tax equivalent. If the people of Portland were to authorize the city to acquire the private electric systems, I have no doubt that such a provision would be included in any contract which Bonneville would sign with the municipal plant. Such a provision would protect property owners from the loss of a large block of taxable property.

Let me again say in closing what I have been trying to say throughout these remarks. As men whose livelihood is bound up with real-estate values and whose future is dependent upon an active market for land, you are by necessity intimately concerned with public utilities and particularly with the electric-power system which serves your city. If you conclude that the distribution of electricity in your city is not as economical and as efficient as it might be, it is to your own self-interest to see to it that the distribution of electricity is made more economical and more efficient. How that should be done is a matter for you and the other responsible citizens of the community to decide. Much could be done for Portland's future by consolidating the two present distributing systems. If this consolidation is effected by placing the plants under municipal ownership, that could be done without increasing the burden upon the owners of land within the city. The choice of remedies is in your hands.

Time to Know the Road Along Which We Are Traveling and to Avoid the Pitfalls Along the Way

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

THE SHOWDOWN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the convention over, it is time for Republicans in Congress to inaugurate and insist upon a policy which will prepare us for anything which may come from without; have some prospect of restoring recovery at home. Republicans have voted every dollar the President asked. Now is the time to begin insisting that it and further appropriations be not wasted; be wisely spent.

The day of boondoggling in international affairs and home defense is past. No longer is there time for, nor safety in, political sideshows, however novel, conducted by New Dealers. With the disclosure of danger from subversive leaders in the administration itself and the threat of armed forces from abroad, the performances of the great magician in the White House are as ashes from a burned-out fire. They leave us cold and shivering.

What this country needs, and what it will insist upon when the people as a whole once discover the effect of the cruel and ghastly joke which has been played upon them during the past 7 years, is a safe and efficient building up of the national defense on business principles; the extermination of un-Americanism here at home.

SENSELESS SPENDING

During the past 7 years, we have spent billions in advertising and in staging the most stupendous spending spree of all time. While our attention has been distracted by these amazing performances, those who would destroy our Nation have been boring from within. Only recently did Attorney General Jackson, Assistant Secretary of State Berle, and others high in administrative circles disassociate themselves from organizations which they acknowledged were controlled by subversive influences.

PAYING THE FIDDLER

The show being over, we must pay the fiddler for the music to which we have been dancing. With danger from abroad knocking at our door, we need something more than fireside chats and appropriations, spending for the sake of spending, strutting on the world's stage with a chip on our shoulder and nothing to make good our bluff and bluster. Teddy's thought, "Speak softly and carry a big stick," is a good one now.

OTHER BILLIONS

The President asked, and Congress has appropriated, over $5,000,000,000 for national defense. Much of it cannot be spent for years. The President is asking for additional billions, without any proof that he can or will wisely spend

what he has. Appropriations standing alone mean nothing. Nor does the spending of billions insure adequate defense. Upon the shoulders of the Republican minority in Congress rests the patriotic task of seeing to it, by vigorous, effective organization and a constructive program, that the billions of dollars are intelligently, economically spent for that purpose.

WATCHING EXPENDITURES

Republicans will forget partisan politics and insist that the only legislation which gets through Congress shall be that which is for the good of the Nation as a whole. Republicans should cease to swallow without examination legislation proposed either by the New Dealers, the Army, or the Navy. To prodigal spending should be added economical buying and efficient production.

COUNT THE COST

Let us have a program. Let that program be one which either initiates or offers by way of amendment legislative safeguards which, while preparing for national defense, exterminating subversive activities, will protect and insure the continuation of our form of government—a government by law under the Constitution rather than a government by those who think themselves supermen, possessed of master minds. "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" For what shall it profit future generations of Americans, if, in preparing to meet foreign aggression, we lose the liberty and freedom we now enjoy?

THE PEOPLE ARE RESPONSIBLE

Yes; we here in Congress have a duty, but the people have one just as great, just as urgent. From now until election day in November, they should watch their Congressmen and Senators; inform themselves of the questions which must be answered; answered correctly, if we as a people are to retain the freedom, the prosperity, the liberty, which we so long have enjoyed; which we have never sufficiently appreciated.

THE FUTURE IS IN OUR HANDS

Whether we and our children here in America are to continue to have a land of opportunity, homes of our own, an education for the asking, freedom to worship, the privilege of earning our living and accumulating for our old age; or whether we are to become as cattle in the stanchions, as work horses in the harness, dumb humans serving the purposes of a dictator drunk with power, depends not wholly upon the people's representatives in Congress, but upon the willingness of the people to pause in their tasks or their pleasures; inform themselves of existing facts; consider those facts sanely and solve intelligently and soundly the questions involved; give the right answers by their ballots in November.

We must decide whether we intend to follow the New Deal along the road of wasteful spending into national bankruptcy, regimentation, the concentration of power in Washington, meddling in the internal affairs of Europe while insisting that European nations stay out of the Western Hemisphere; whether, in short, we are to attempt to settle the quarrels of Europe by entering into the World War, either directly or through the back door; sending millions of Americans to die, either in the Eastern Hemisphere or in South America or Mexico.

We must decide whether we are determined to return to those principles of constitutional government which for 150 years have guided us faithfully along the way which gave us prosperity, freedom, opportunity; which, if we continue to follow, will enable us to adequately prepare to successfully meet and overcome all dangers, whether they come from within or without.

We must decide whether we intend to avoid, as Washington advised, entanglement in the affairs of Europe; so prepare for national defense that even the most aggressive and insane of foreign dictators will not dare to attack us.

Unless we answer these questions correctly, we shall go the way of the nations of Europe; our children will be deprived of the blessings which we have enjoyed and will become, as have the peoples of Europe, but cannon fodder.

Wendell Willkie, the Republican Nominee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE MONROE (MICH.) EVENING NEWS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are all very much interested in the reaction of the country to the nomination by the Republicans at the Philadelphia convention of Wendell Willkie as the Republican standard bearer for the 1940 election. It seems to be generally conceded that Mr. Willkie has aroused an enthusiasm seldom equaled in political annals. Therefore, pursuant to permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two editorials from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News. These editorials were written by J. S. Gray, the editor, who was present in the press gallery throughout the convention. This newspaper is one of the outstanding small-town dailies in the country. It is independent politically, and I am convinced that these editorials indicate the general feeling of the people in Michigan.

The editorials are as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN NOMINEE

Every American, no matter what his political affiliations, can rejoice at the outcome of the Republican national convention as far as its choice for President is concerned. Adherents of all political parties welcome the emergence of popular leaders and the expression of the will of the people at nominating conventions.

No one can say Wendell Willkie bought the Republican nomination. No one can say the delegates did the bidding of any political boss in choosing him. No one can say his selection does not represent the rank and file of Republicans, east, west, north, or south, rich or poor, in office or out. No one can say Mr. Willkie is the tool of Wall Street or public utilities or big business or anything else. He is simply the overwhelming choice of a vast majority of the partisans duly chosen to make a nomination for President, and of the other partisans back home.

He was named over the opposition or indifference of almost every recognized and titular leader of the Republican Party. If he cares to, he can virtually clean house in the entire command of his party. Republicanism underwent a new birth at Philadelphia when its rank and file turned their backs on its past potentates and picked a man utterly outside all organization recognition. Everything smacking of old guardism was tossed overboard when the most unbossed, the freest-thinking, the least awe-struck Republican convention since the beginning of the party expressed its earnest desire and nominated a man who was not even considered in the running 6 months ago.

The minority, opposition party, thus makes a fresh start. The bitterness and defeatism of 8 years are wiped out. The campaign begins with a clean slate. The councils of the past are ignored. The leaders who went down to defeat are deposed.

A man with no political background, no partisan obligations, no pledges or promises for patronage, no embarrassing links with bosses, no tie-up with ax grinders, has become the nominee of a major political party. He accomplished what no accredited prophet of political behavior would predict 4 weeks ago.

Even when the pressure upon him was greatest, during the early balloting, and when the temptations of "deals" were obviously held out to him, it appears that he went his own steadfast way. He was determined to win only if a majority of the delegates wanted him, and he would have no truck with the dickerers and make no commitments to anybody.

Because Wendell Willkie enters the 1940 campaign under such circumstances, and as a fresh vindication of the democratic process, members of all parties can join with Republicans in jubilation. The people have had their way, the partisan dictators have met their match. Whether or not Mr. Willkie wins a majority of the popular vote cast in November, he has reinvigorated America's faith in self-government, restored confidence in democracy, renewed our determination to pursue our way in the face of disturbing events abroad and proved once more that a people who undertake to rule themselves not only can produce their own leaders, but provide them with the opportunities to lead.

"BLITZ" CAMPAIGN

The gauntlet has been thrown down by the Republicans; the Democrats must answer the challenge July 15. The one man who personifies everything domestically opposed to the New Deal from T. V. A. to "brain trust," from business baiting to Kelly-Hague-Pendergast-ism, from Court packing to pay roll packing, is out in

front of the Republican parade that will pass the voters' reviewing stand November 5.

Obviously the United States is about to witness a campaign the like of which it has never seen. In one corner a fresh, vigorous, inexhaustible Wendell Willkie, not shopworn by previous campaigning, who sleeps 3 or 4 hours out of 24, runs half a dozen utilities, meets all comers, speaks what he thinks, and has an utterly nonpolitical mind.

In the other corner is the New Deal, embattled for the first time by a fire-eater, one who does not wait, mouselike, for the opposition to strike, but carries the fight into enemy territory. If any persuasion were needed to spur the new dealers on in their third-term draft movement, it was the sixth ballot at Philadelphia. That doesn't entirely dispose of the question, however, for the President has yet to speak his own mind.

But no matter whom the Democrats let their mantle fall upon in the Windy City, whether it be Paul V. McNutt; Honest Harold Ickes, the former Republican, the hoe-handle diplomat; Cordell Hull; Henry Wallace, the farmer's friend; or even Frank Hague's "Golden Boy" Cromwell, late of Ottawa, the country is in for a heavyweight championship battle, with no holds barred, ere November rolls around.

A man who can sweep from a bare 1 percent to the lead among a half-dozen rivals in the Gallup poll in a mere 2 months, make the Old Guard knuckle down, and capture a Republican Convention after only 2 years of Republican Party membership is a fellow the new dealers will have to watch out for.

A man who can predict his nomination on the sixth ballot, and win, has something to rival that, until now, peerless prognosticator James A. Farley. A man shrewd enough to pick Senator CHARLES MCNARY, of Oregon, for a running mate and schedule his acceptance speech on the front steps of his high-school alma mater in an Indiana town has already won his political spurs entitling him to match wits with a purge-directing Tommy Corcoran. A man who can meet reporters at all hours of the day or night and never utter a roorback has something that none other than F. D. R. himself possesses.

Front pages will blossom and radios will crackle between now and November with a brand of "blitz" campaign the like of which America has never seen, from the days of torchlight processions down to the nights of fireside chats.

A Reply to Political Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LECOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWTON (IOWA) DAILY NEWS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newton Daily News, of Newton, Iowa, of June 26, 1940:

[From the Newton (Iowa) Daily News of June 26, 1940]

A REPLY TO POLITICAL CRITICS

Governor Stassen's keynote speech to the Republican National Convention Monday night should provide ample reply to various of newspaper and radio columnists who have been rather free with their criticism of Republicans for daring to speak out against some of the acts of the present administration.

Governor Stassen bottomed his keynote on a broad base—that of united Americanism. Said the hard-hitting Governor of Minnesota, "As Americans, Republicans propose to stand behind the acts of the President and Congress now in power—as long as it continues in power. But at the same time Republicans have a responsibility to make 'constructive criticism,' to engage in 'vigorous debate' on questions that come before the Nation. That is the animate evidence that democracy is still living," declared the youthful Governor.

To those columnists, and we are sorry to say there are a number of them such as Walter Lippmann, Dorothy Thompson, and sometimes Raymond Clapper and Mark Sullivan, this should provide stinging rebuttal to charges of Republican stagnation and playing of politics.

Republicans have opposed some of the measures of this administration, particularly as regards this country's conduct in the field of international relations. Democrats have opposed the administration, too, on that score. These critics call that playing politics. Simply because opposition is voiced to some of the statements and proposals of our President, is that a sign of lack of statesmanship? After all, who are these commentators, themselves individuals with individual opinions to say the final word with regard to human progress and human achievement? Quite proper for them to express their opinions. But similarly theirs doesn't happen to be the last word either.

Meantime, it is well again to emphasize the importance of maintaining fulsome discussions here in America at this time. And while some want to go to war now, and some don't, the important thing is to permit complete discussion of the matter.

A Prayer for Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have the greatest admiration for the common-sense judgment of our able and genial colleague from Wyoming, the Honorable FRANK O. HORTON. So all of you, I am sure, will be pleased to learn that his fame is not confined to the State he represents single-handed or to the hallowed Halls of Congress. It extends to Indiana, home of the next President of the United States—Wendell L. Willkie—who was started on the way to the White House with the assistance of this same gentleman from Wyoming.

As proof of this fact I am placing in the RECORD a recent editorial from my home-town newspaper, the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, commenting on the attitude of the gentleman from Wyoming, Congressman HORTON, on a vital problem of the moment. I commend it to the attention of every Member of this body:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of June 22, 1940]

A PRAYER FOR COURAGE

Representative FRANK O. HORTON, of Wyoming, has recently given expression to some mighty fine common sense on the subject of the much-twittered but ill-considered phrase: "Help the Allies with everything short of war."

Representative HORTON asks, When does a pig become a hog? Is there any fine line of distinction? Can you tell just where one stops and the other starts?

He applies a similar line of questioning to short of war. And he correctly says that the American people properly refuse to throw their hats in the air and go along with the procession until they know where they are headed and by whom.

The gentleman from Wyoming is not impressed by big names among either individuals or newspapers. He is concerned with hard facts and logical conclusions.

As for one-man Presidential action in aiding the Allies with either surplus or obsolete equipment—

Mr. HORTON has noted that of 50 so-called obsolete planes recently traded in to make them available to the Allies, 22 were invoiced to our Government since March 7, 1940; and that of the remaining 28, the oldest was delivered on May 16, 1939. Obsolete, indeed!

A similar situation prevails with respect to battleships, rifles, cannon, machine guns, etc.

And "it makes little difference whether the President will sell these direct to a belligerent or through a junk dealer." Nor does it appear that the President has any proper legal authority to make any such deal.

Moreover, article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907, concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in any time of war, provides:

"The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war materials of any kind whatever is forbidden."

Both the United States and Germany solemnly signed that treaty. The United States is a neutral power. England and France are belligerents.

Hence, the President, on his own authority, has treated a contract signed by this country's agents and ratified by this country's Senate, as a shabby scrap of paper.

As Representative HORTON says: "The action just taken and about to be expanded by the President is an utter violation of every principle of international law and is tantamount to an act of war."

But under the Constitution it is the Congress, not the President, who is authorized to declare war. And, as the gentleman from Wyoming says, "If this tantamount-to-war action by the President leads to a declaration of war, then actually the President has usurped the most sacred and inviolate right of the Congress."

And such usurpation of power spells dictator.

But what if Germany wins in Europe? What if Germany construes the President's action as a declaration of war? Inquires Mr. HORTON: "Would we or would we not be considered by the victor as among his defeated enemies and demands made upon us to pay the cost of the war?"

Well, certainly we have never in our entire history been in poorer shape to defend ourselves than we are today. And so: If our boys do go abroad to fight again, they will go unprepared to meet modern warfare—just like cattle being led to the slaughter.

If they are butchered—on whose hands will their blood be?

Congress has still the duty and the power to prevent such butchery. As the people's advocate, it should summon the President before the bar of judgment, and cancel all war-provoking acts. May God grant that Congress shall muster the courage to do that very thing before it is too late.

Nominating Wendell Lewis Willkie for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the text of address of Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, nominating Wendell Lewis Willkie as the next President of the United States, before the Republican National Convention, June 27, 1940, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, men and women of America, this is a free and independent convention of a great political party. It is one convention in which the delegates are going to choose the candidate. It is representative government in action. It is proof that democracy is yet alive and efficient.

If anyone were to ask me what job in this convention I would like best to have, I would choose the job I've got right now. I'd say, I want to place in nomination before this independent body the name of the next President of the United States—Wendell Lewis Willkie.

I nominate Wendell Willkie because, better than any man I know, he can build this country back to prosperity.

I nominate him because, better than any man I know, he can keep us out of war. As a veteran who served in France he knows the horror of war at first hand. He is against war. And he can scare these dictators by building us the greatest defense system on earth.

I nominate him because he is the strongest campaigner that the people of this country have seen in a generation. He can win next November. He has licked Franklin Roosevelt once; he can do it again.

I nominate him because if he were elected he would make a President that this country would be proud of; because every one of you would be proud to say to your children and grandchildren, "I helped to put that man in the White House."

I nominate him because he understands business; he is one of the most successful managers in the country.

Because he understands labor; he has 30 contracts with established unions, both A. F. of L. and C. I. O.

Because he understands agriculture; he has worked on farms and he owns five in Indiana.

He will pull these groups together. He will never make a deal, domestic or foreign, that will be unfair to any one of them.

I nominate this man because he knows what an organization is; because, out of his own experience, he knows how to work with, through, and for an organization.

I nominate him because he is a Republican who will stand by his party, win, lose, or draw.

And in presenting this nomination, I ask only one thing. I ask that this proposition be decided on its merits. That's the way I want it decided. That's the way my candidate wants it decided. And that's the way the people want it decided.

And let me tell you this from my candidate, from all his supporters, and from myself: Whoever you select to lead this party to victory next November, you'll find us in there pitching to assure that victory.

Back in Indiana where he was born, this man had a nickname. They called him "Win" Willkie. Indiana had the right idea about him from the beginning.

Put yourself back in that little old town of Elwood 48 years ago. There was a boom in natural gas. They had so much gas they never turned out the lights. Then the gas ran out and everybody in town went broke.

Why, this man Willkie knew about public utilities before Franklin D. Roosevelt had hardly heard of Indiana. And I'll say this: It'll be better to have a public-utility President than a President who has no public utility.

Win's father and mother were both lawyers. They loved books, they loved ideas, and they loved freedom. That's what they taught their children.

Win is an Indiana boy. He went to Indiana University. He was admitted to the Indiana bar. He went to war from Indiana. And he married the librarian of Rushville, an Indiana girl.

He got to work right early. When he was 11 he went into business with one of his older brothers. Later he harvested wheat in Minnesota. He dressed tools in the oil fields in Texas. He operated a cement-blocking machine in Wyoming. He ran a boom-town hotel in Colorado. And he bummed his way out to California in a freight car to pick vegetables.

He's familiar with every region of the United States, mostly because he's worked there. He knows the land and its history. He learned history in Indiana; he taught history at a school in Kansas; and he made history in the valley of the Tennessee.

He knows the east coast and the Alleghenies, the broad plains and the Rocky Mountains, the west coast, and the southern coast. He can see all that in his mind's eye.

In all those areas he has been the friend of the people; today he is hailed in all those areas by the people; and my proposition is that we put him to work for the people.

As he says, he left Indiana because the competition got too tough. But I'll tell you why he left. He left because of an irresistible urge to test himself against the toughest jobs that are to be found in this great enterprise that we call the United States.

He left Indiana to face, time after time, the challenge of a free, hard-working, competitive system.

He met that challenge at the bar. And you of Ohio can remember him as one of the most brilliant lawyers in Akron for more than 10 years.

He met that challenge in industry. And you of Georgia, of Michigan, of Ohio, of Indiana, of Illinois, of Pennsylvania, of South Carolina, of Alabama, of Mississippi, of Florida know him as one who has produced more electricity for less money than any major operator in the land.

He met that challenge when he stood up almost alone against the New Deal on an issue involving the rights of all of us to do business—and won it.

And he is meeting that challenge today by standing without compromise for the simple, homely principles of liberty.

Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, in this day of trial, when we stand in doubt before the terrible events of Europe; when we stand in danger, our arms bound by the restrictions of a hostile Government in Washington, our minds poisoned by political philosophies that we can only dread: I submit that this man who has thrust himself into every corner of our American life, from the wheatfields to the skyscrapers of Manhattan, and from the Indiana bar to the committee rooms of Congress—that this man Wendell Willkie is the man we need for the defense and rehabilitation of our American life.

The people of this country are worried, and perplexed. They want the wheels of industry to turn, they want bigger farm incomes, they want a better break for labor, they want to give new opportunity to those who are now unemployed. Above all they want to defend this country from aggression.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is the man the people are looking for. If any man can do that job, Wendell Willkie can.

I have heard it said—and we have all heard it said—that he is unavailable to our party because he is a businessman. Worse, he has made a success of that business and of himself.

Are we to understand from this proposition, Mr. Chairman, that any man is barred from our deliberations who has been an American success?

What should that Indiana boy have done when he accepted the challenge that came his way? Shall we say that a man must refuse to enter American industry in order to become a leader of this Nation?

Is that the stand that the Republican Party is prepared to take?

Fellow delegates, that is New Deal propaganda.

I have a boy 11 years old. He's ambitious. And I want him some day to make a contribution to his country.

What path shall I tell my boy to follow? Shall I say to him:

"Son, if you want to get anywhere in this world for heaven's sake don't succeed in business? If you get an offer to head up a big industrial company, don't accept it. If you have a chance to increase our American standard of living by producing more goods for less cost, don't take that chance. Because if you do the Republican Party won't accept you."

Or shall I say to that boy: "I know a man born in Indiana just like you. His dad didn't have any more dough than I've got. He didn't have any better opportunity than you've got. But that fellow got a chance to run one of America's big enterprises. He took that chance. He succeeded at it. And I want you to do likewise."

You bet I'm going to tell my boy that. I'm not going to fill him full of New Deal propaganda. I am going to fill him full of the old fight.

Let's look at the record.

On January 1, 1933, this man I'm giving you became the president of a business with assets of over a billion dollars, employing 25,000 men and women in 10 States. This company was operating at a deficit. Its morale was low.

On March 4, 1933, 4 months later, Franklin D. Roosevelt took office as President of the United States. Our country was also operating at a deficit; the national debt was $23,000,000,000; and industry and agriculture were demoralized.

Now what's the picture. Why, the enterprise entrusted to Franklin Roosevelt is worse off. The national debt is crossing $45,000,000,000. We still have at least 9,000,000 unemployed; labor dissatisfied; business without hope; and the country unprepared for the international crisis facing it.

But what happened to the job that America gave Willkie 7 years ago? He hit it like a ton of bricks. That company is making a profit today. It has built new plants. It has expanded. It has cut its prices and raised its output.

While Roosevelt was promising the more abundant life, Willkie was delivering it. He raised the standard of living of every schoolteacher, factory worker, and farmer on his lines.

While Roosevelt was unbalancing an $8,000,000,000 budget, Willkie was helping to balance the $800 family budgets of his customers.

I tell you, the balancing of those $800 budgets is the immediate goal of the Republican Party.

My man has helped to balance them in 10 States. Let's let him try it in 48!

Or do you believe with the new dealers that there is no hope?

Do you believe that the growth of this country is finished?

Do you believe that the family budgets can never be balanced, the family incomes never increased?

If you believe these things don't nominate my man.

For I tell you that this man is going to fight. He believes that this country will grow, that these budgets are going to be balanced and those incomes increased. If you nominate him, that's what he'll fight for, and that will be a fight to tear a man's heart out.

I'm not kidding you. This is one of the serious moments in American history. We are not gathered here merely to confer a title of honor, or to distribute rewards.

I say we are gathered here to save this country from disintegration. We are gathered to assign the most stupendous job on the American record. We are not rewarding anybody.

He whom we choose here will age more rapidly than we. He will never again enjoy life as he has enjoyed it in the past. The scars of the fight that lies ahead of him will be with him forever.

The people of this country have risen up in overwhelming numbers to tell you this. They have risen up to tell you that they want this fighter, this man Willkie.

How do I know this? Again, the record is my proof.

A year ago a few personal friends began saying that this man ought to be President. He turned them off with courteous and friendly gestures. Six months ago he was known as an occasional contributor to national magazines. Three months ago a few individuals who made no pretense at a knowledge of politics set out to see what they could do.

And then—less than 9 weeks ago—the first Willkie for President club was started. And a great uprising of the people began.

In less than 9 weeks, by voluntary effort, without a political organization, and with no campaign fund, this man has been taken up by the people in every walk of life and in every corner of the land.

And as one who believes in the democratic process and the Republican Party, I am confident that you delegates will not ignore that demand.

I have heard it said that we, the delegates to the Republican National Convention, would never nominate this man because he is too recently a Democrat.

Is the Republican Party a closed corporation? Do you have to be born in it?

In 1936 my candidate became a Republican by conviction. He voted that year for the ticket that we nominated in Cleveland. In 1938 he demonstrated his conviction by enrolling in the Republican Party.

Mr. Chairman, we do not run the Republican Party on the basis of seniority.

Let it never be said that we bar from our deliberations a man who is one of us—a man who believes in us—a man in whom millions of our people, members of our party, already fervently believe.

Now let's get down to business here.

You know, and I know, that Wendell Willkie can win next November.

I ask this question of those delegates and candidates in whose districts he has appeared. If you were running for office, wouldn't you like to have this man come into your district as the head of your party? Wouldn't you like to have him stand shoulder-to-shoulder with you on a platform to make the fight of your political lives? I know the answer. The answer is "yes."

My man can win because he stands four-square for those two great principles of our party—freedom of life and freedom of enterprise. The Republican Party will vote solidly for Willkie.

He can win because millions who habitually belong to no party—the huge, shifting balance-of-power vote—crave those blessings of freedom. They will vote for Willkie.

He can win because millions now enrolled in the Democratic Party crave those blessings—denied to them by their own party. They will vote for Willkie.

When this man appears before the country in a real campaign, the whole blessed Nation will vote for him. I tell you we'll have a Republican stampede.

I know what I'm talking about. I've been here in Philadelphia for 2 weeks riding in front of a tidal wave the like of which has never been known in national politics. I've felt the surge of the people beneath me. And I've seen a vision.

I see now as I have never seen before that a great battle has broken out upon the earth. It is a battle between slavery and freedom.

We have talked about economic competition and industrial competition. But I see now a more desperate competition—a competition between two different ways of life—the totalitarian and the free.

Fellow delegates, to win that competition we must be strong. Only the strong can be free.

If Hitler can build a stronger system than ours, we shall lose that competition to Hitler. Our way of life will be liquidated.

Already the New Deal, impotent to compete against the rising totalitarians, has made a move toward drafting the manhood of this country. This is exactly the opposite direction from the one in which we ought to move.

The only way we can compete against a competitor is to make our own system work in its own way better than the competitor's system.

This is my vision. Millions of people in this country have seen it, and millions more will follow.

We, the people, want a man whose honor and integrity cannot be questioned.

We, the people, want a man whose personal loyalty has met the test of thousands upon thousands to whom he has freely given it.

But above all we, the people, want a strong man to defend our freedom.

A man who can liberate us from the grip of depression.

A man who can save us by building the greatest defense system in history.

A man who can awaken our energies to create for us a new world.

Mr. Chairman, I'm just a young Congressman from Indiana, but in 6 years I've seen 'em all. And when I stand in the presence of this man in this crisis I say to myself: There's a man big enough to be President of the United States—Wendell Lewis Willkie.

The Man of the Hour for 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

TELEGRAM OF TWENTY-FOURTH WARD DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF ST. LOUIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, to anyone familiar with Missouri Democratic politics the Twenty-Fourth Ward of the city of St. Louis has long been recognized as a bulwark of democracy in our State. This ward year after year casts a Democratic vote that is larger than that cast in many a congressional district. It has been my good fortune to have the high honor of representing the twenty-fourth ward of St. Louis in Congress.

Several days ago the great Democratic organization of the Twenty-Fourth Ward of St. Louis addressed a telegram to the President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent to close my remarks by extending that telegram in the RECORD at this point.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 24, 1940.*
President, United States, Washington, D. C.

The twenty-fourth ward Democratic organization in regular meeting assembled unanimously adopted the following resolution: "We believed in you in 1932. You have shown and convinced us from the bank holiday of March 1933 down to the present moment that your every concern and heartbeat has been for the man in the street and that you are animated with a consuming desire to at all times serve the best interests of our beloved country. Because of this our ward gave you 21,383 votes in 1936, as against 11,321 for your opponent. We believe you to be the man of the hour in 1940. Yours has been an inspired leadership and you retain today, as you have always had, our utmost confidence. We pray Almighty God may continue to guide and direct you in your every act."

LOUIS J. GUALDONI,
Committeeman.
LURENE C. KAISER,
Committeewoman.

Will Gold Become Useless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK MAGAZINE

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the ever-important subject of gold and its future no article has come with such clarity and cogency as the current one in the June 1940 issue of the National City Bank of New York Magazine.

I am taking advantage of the unanimous consent that I have obtained to include the summary of that study in the RECORD.

[From the National City Bank of New York Magazine of June 1940]

WILL GOLD BECOME USELESS?

In the discussion up to this point the assumption has been that gold will continue to hold its place as a monetary base and chief medium for making international payments. Query—how do we know that this assumption is correct? The answer is, frankly, that we don't know. Nothing is certain in this world, least of all conditions and practices after the war. However, there are good reasons for continuing faith in gold.

First, there is the long-established tradition in favor of gold. This did not just happen. Gold, more than any other material, combines the necessary attributes of basic money. It is prized for its beauty; it does not tarnish; it has scarcity; its supply shows relatively constant growth compared with violent fluctuations in most commodities; it cannot be ground out on printing presses like paper money or ballooned to the skies like bank credit; it is durable; it can be divided into parts of any size without loss of value; it is easily manipulated; and finally, it is easily transported. In times of danger and disaster mankind has always turned to gold as the one sure sanctuary. What else is so easily hidden from the enemy, so indestructible, so easily removed to a place of safety, so certain of future value as gold? The fact is that the world has experimented with all kinds of materials, both as money and as a store of value, but because of inherent qualities none has stood the test of time so well, or achieved such universal recognition and acceptability as gold. All this may seem elementary, but it is well to ponder these things when doubts arise concerning gold.

True, the gold standard broke down during and after the great war of 1914–18, but so did the silver and managed-currency standards. Moreover, this break-down did not signify that gold itself was any less prized. The phrase so often heard that such and such countries have "abandoned" gold is misleading and does not mean what it sounds like. What has occurred is simply a suspension of the willingness to redeem currency and bank deposits in gold, decided upon to safeguard the national gold holdings from exportation to other countries. This is not "abandonment" of gold, but the reverse.

A second important reason why gold is unlikely to lose its value is that not only the United States, but other countries as well, have large vested interests in gold. The British Empire alone accounts for nearly half the gold output of the world, and in many other countries gold production is an important national asset. These countries would not look with favor upon the displacement of gold as a monetary metal; and even in the event of political changes resulting from the war these vested interests would remain, though possibly shifted to other national jurisdictions.

A third important argument in favor of gold is one that should hardly need emphasis at this time—its dependability as a war chest. In the great war of 1914–18 gold, shipped here in what was then unprecedented volume, helped the Allies pay for needed materials and supplies before we entered the war. Later, in the Italian-Ethiopian war, gold from the banking reserves and gathered from the people contributed a vital share of Italy's foreign exchange requirements to carry on the war. Japan likewise found gold an unfailing source of purchasing power, and has striven in all possible ways to expand its output in order to maintain the flow of imports essential for war purposes. And now the new war in Europe is demonstrating as never before the great value of gold as a war chest.

Credits may be refused, payments in goods impeded both by inability to supply the goods or unwillingness of foreign markets to receive them, and securities prove of uncertain value, but the nation that has gold can always command purchasing power abroad. It is one of the strong points of the Allies that they have large stores of gold to assure them this command over foreign markets. It is one of the admitted weaknesses of Germany that she is lacking in this vital resource. Was there ever a time more inappropriate for questioning the value of gold? Conceivably the time may come when we, too, shall be in need of a war chest, and be thankful that we have it in gold.

Still a fourth argument for gold is that, war or peace, there is no satisfactory substitute for it as a means of settling international trade and controlling the exchanges. Without gold it would probably be impossible for stabilization funds to operate, for no major country would be willing to accumulate indefinitely the paper currencies of other countries. And without such controls, or the stabilizing influence of free gold movements, exchange conditions between anything like free economies would be chaotic.

The one alternative to gold would be complete regimentation of foreign trade by governments, with resort to all the cumbersome and stifling mechanisms of so-called clearing agreements, blocked currencies, and the like. In effect, it would mean reducing world trade to a primitive barter basis. Possibly, in the disorganization resulting from war, such desperate devices may be accepted for a time, but it is idle to talk of barter as a permanent substitute for gold. No such volume of trade as blessed the world in the years before 1914, and again for years during the twenties, would be possible under a system of barter. None of the nations knows this so well as those who have tried barter since the break-down of the exchanges—among them Germany. There were no stancher champions of the gold standard than the bankers of Germany, and among them Dr. Schacht, economic controller of Germany for a time under the National Socialist Party. It was Bismarck who put Germany on the gold basis in 1873, using the gold indemnity received from France after the victory of 1871, and it was Schacht who piloted Germany back to the gold base after the World War—aided by the Dawes loan of 1924.

It is true that Germany has been "getting along without gold" but this has not been from choice but from necessity. Germans have likewise been getting along without a lot of other things that they will want to have as soon as they are able to pay for them. How many people can seriously think that Germany will putter around for long with barter if and when it can get gold?

Of course, so long as Europe is dominated by war, and industry and trade are suppressed, gold will tend, both for safety and in obedience to movements of trade, to concentrate in this country. But this will not always be so. Out of the present chaos must eventually come peace, reconstruction, and a new order of things, in which the countries of Europe, with their wealth of trained labor, industrial equipment, research laboratories, and capable scientists, will again become factors in the trade and capital markets of the world. To attempt to put a time schedule on this process obviously would be impossible, but of one thing we may be certain—the balance of payments will not always be in favor of the United States. And as the currents of international trade and capital movements shift, so will gold movements shift. Other countries will begin to take a larger share of the new gold production, and possibly even draw substantially from our own large holdings. Thus, in the course of time, will gold maldistribution—which has its seat in world confusion and disorder—be corrected.

WHAT TO DO

In conclusion, what should we do about gold? As Secretary Morgenthau said in an address last month, "There is only one sound way in which we can work to reduce the inflow of gold and to promote the return of at least a part of the wealth it represents to useful service in the lands from which it came. That way is to do all in our power to contribute to the return of peace to the world and to encourage reconstruction and the restoration of normal trade." For reasons given, it seems abundantly clear that there is little cause for worry on the score of gold losing its value, our being left "holding the bag," and the like. It seems equally clear that we should keep on buying gold at the present price. However we may feel about the wisdom or necessity of having raised the price in the first place, it is now much too late to go back. For the past 6½ years the Treasury's policy of holding the price unchanged has been a factor making for stability and confidence. To reduce the price now would produce a new series of dislocations and disturbances.

Indeed we could well afford to go beyond the mere maintenance of the present price, by formally terminating the executive power to further devalue the dollar, and by anchoring the currency firmly on the solid foundation of gold. Possibly we might even go the whole way of paying out gold freely in exchange for currency notes to all who might want it. Granting that the amount taken might not be large, nevertheless it would in proportion reduce the large Treasury gold stock and bank excess reserves. Moreover, and perhaps more important, it would increase confidence in the money and make more difficult in the future changes in its gold value. Certainly we could dispense with the unnecessary and costly accumulation of silver.

The more serious if less immediate problem pertaining to our growing gold stock is not the danger of its becoming worthless, but rather the danger that lies latent in these huge additions to the credit base. With bank-excess reserves standing above $6,000,000,000 and still rising, the potentialities for excessive credit expansion and inflation are ever present. It is in this sector that the longer-term problem lies, even though the present problem is still to get money to work.

Various suggestions to improve the mechanism of monetary control have been made which require careful study. It may be assumed that the possibilities will be fully explored by the committee of Congress headed by Senator Wagner of New York and now engaged in making a comprehensive study, in cooperation with other Government agencies and banking associations, of the entire banking and currency system.

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK.

Sixth Congressional District of Texas for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

RESOLUTION BY CITIZENS

Mr. LUTHER A JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, at Waxahachie, in Ellis County, Tex., which is in the Sixth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, 2,000 citizens of Ellis County gathered in a patriotic mass meeting for the purpose of expressing their opinion relative to the international crisis and the preparation and defense of America with reference thereto.

A citizens' committee was appointed to draft resolutions, and the resolutions, after being so drafted, were presented to the mass meeting and unanimously adopted.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the resolutions so adopted, with the names of the citizens' committee signed thereto.

Be it resolved by those herein assembled, That we, the citizens of Ellis County, at a county-wide meeting held in the city of Waxahachie, Tex., on this the 21st day of June 1940, do hereby reaffirm our unfaltering faith in the principles of democracy to the end that government of the people, by the people, and for the people under the Constitution shall be forever perpetuated;

That we hereby reaffirm our loyalty and faith in our Government and to the President and Congress of the United States, and that we hereby evidence our full faith and confidence in their efforts to perpetuate the principles of democracy and the liberties and freedom of a great Nation; that we do hereby

Further resolve, That in our judgment this Nation must be promptly and adequately armed to an extent sufficient to meet any threat to this Nation from any source whatsoever, and to this end we strongly urge the Congress and President of the United States to proceed without delay to build a powerful navy, an army of whatever size the world conditions may require in the opinion of those charged with our defense, an air force second to none, and that all the necessary mechanized equipment be provided without delay; and, further, that if, in order to attain these ends it becomes necessary to commandeer the full resources of this Nation, we hereby urge the Congress and President of these United States to lay aside factional differences and to proceed without fear for the accomplishment of such ends;

That we hereby express our sympathy for the cause of the Allies in their fight for the democratic form of government, and urge that they be promptly furnished with all the munitions, arms, and equipment of war consistent with the safety and defense of our own shores;

That we do hereby further urge upon the Congress the passage of laws to prevent subversive movements within, to the end that the united efforts of this Nation in its program of defense shall not be interfered with. In line with this paragraph, we commend to the Nation the distinguished services of the Honorable MARTIN DIES in his exposure of elements that would undermine our Government from within while accepting the protection and hospitality of our people; and

That a copy of these resolutions be forthwith placed in the hands of our Congressmen and of the President of the United States.

Unanimously adopted by 2,000 loyal citizens present with the high purpose of presenting to the world a united front and of upholding the hands of those charged with our defense.

The Citizens Committee: Lynn B. Griffith, chairman; S. Goodwin Sweat, A. Dupree Davis, Roy Connally, J. R. Teague, O. E. Clift, W. D. Colvin, C. C. Randle, D. G. Hipp, F. A. Still, F. L. Wzor, R. F. Chapman, A. R. Stout, Dr. Frank McKennon, W. C. Bynum, Floyd Coubalt, J. L. Gammon, Forrester Hancock, Paul J. Schwab, John W. Arden.

Air-Mail Pick-Up Should Be Widely Used

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I trust the President will soon sign H. R. 9899, which passed the House of Representatives on June 21, and 1 day later passed the Senate. Our action in this matter has received favorable newspaper comment. As an example, I include at this point in my remarks the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin:

AIR MAIL PICK-UP ENDORSED

When the House unanimously passed a bill to permit the Civil Aeronautics Authority to license nonstop air mail pick-up service, a step delayed by the present press of business was taken as expected. The experimental pick-up system, demonstrated successfully in 59 cities of Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, and Ohio, had been called a success by the Post Office Department. Some 22,000 operations had been undertaken without serious mishap.

The expansion endorsed by the House action relates to the application of All American Aviation, Inc., for authority to operate on a permanent basis in the four States named above and three others—New Jersey, New York, and Kentucky. Pick-up service has been requested in many places.

The pick-up system is at once a direct service to communities that cannot economically support an airport and are not important enough for transport stops, but require faster mail facilities, and a line of feeders for air mail main lines. The method may lead to a fortunate combination of local service and general aviation progress.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that it will not be many months before several hundred communities in this country can be served by this system. It is noteworthy to state that the Post Office Department, following the 1 year of experimental service, reported to the Congress that the service is feasible and should be continued and expanded. I have been identified with the legislation, from its inception, which made possible the successful experimental development. I have watched closely the pick-up system as it has operated in the States of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Real benefits have resulted.

Not many months ago I called attention to the possibilities of this service through an article in Popular Aviation, which I later incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wrote:

Imagine a rural free delivery of the air. Air-mail service that does not pass over and ignore the little homesteads of 400 to 500 persons. That instead blankets the entire Nation with routes that will give these little towns an air-mail service just as efficient and virtually as frequent as now is rendered to the country's largest metropoli such as New York, Chicago, Kansas City, San Francisco, and others.

Quoting further from that article, I said:

If you can see this picture you realize that such an R. F. D. of the air promises to bring about the most far-reaching development that commercial aviation has seen since it first became a reality. And this kind of service is not a wild dream.

Continuing in that vein I wrote:

The small cities are finding air mail of greater value than it has proved to large cities on the major air lines. Most of the larger cities also have excellent railroad facilities so that even without air transportation they would have good mail delivery. But this is not the case with many of the towns served by Triple A. Some of them, such as Glenville or Grantsville—both West Virginia county seats—do not even have railroads. They are turning with great enthusiasm to air mail. Glenville, with a population of only 800, has a daily dispatch of about 3 pounds. On a per capita basis this exceeds that of the world's largest air-mail center.

The middle of May found the experimental period coming to a close. It was decided that the service be suspended until Congress had put its stamp of approval on the plan. This has been done. I hope that it will not be long until the Civil Aeronautics Board can approve pending applications for routes which will expand this necessary phase of the development of civil aviation in the United States.

The Outlook for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, THE TEMPLE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, of the Temple, Cleveland, Ohio, before the National Conference of Social Work on Thursday evening, May 30, 1940, at Grand Rapids, Mich.:

THE OUTLOOK FOR AMERICA

It would be difficult even in normal times to discuss the subject which has been assigned to me, The Outlook for America. Tonight it is quite impossible. The outlook for the entire world is being determined today, and for decades to come, on the battlefields of France and Flanders. Destiny now waits upon military decisions. There is no way of formulating a world outlook without reference to these unpredictable military decisions. Should the Allies win, the world will be one kind of place for men to live in; should they lose, it will be an altogether different kind of place—radically and fundamentally different.

The outlook for America is likewise inextricably bound up with these fateful military decisions now in the making. The American people have now realized this fact, though somewhat belatedly. It took the frightening and shocking events of the last few weeks abroad to startle our people into a final realization of the interlocking destiny of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, and into a final surrender of those comfortable and beguiling notions of political and economic isolationism. From now on we will not expect our foreign policy to be spun in an international vacuum. The fiction of national security through strict neutrality has been shattered forever. The nations which relied upon it have been destroyed. Our defense program must now envision an embattled America in a world of powerful neighbors whose way of life and whose political and economic creeds are potential enemies of America.

Suddenly we have discovered that our national existence is not quite secure. Neither our wealth nor our Military Establishment, nor the intervening oceans now seem to be adequate defense. Suddenly we have discovered that we are not quite secure even from attack from within. We have become apprehensive of the menace of subversive forces within the Nation, which we chose to ignore heretofore, but which we now realize might in a critical hour for our Nation undermine our strength and our strongholds, just as they have done in so many countries abroad. The Old World has moved in upon us, unbidden and unwelcome. But it is here! The feverish eagerness with which we read every new edition of our newspapers and listen to broadcasts of international news, is an indication not merely of our interest in an historic struggle which is going on overseas, but of our profound and troubled concern with the implications of that struggle for us and our children. We suspect that the shifting lines on the maps of the battlefields of Europe which we so avidly scan are projections and extensions of our own national destiny in the proximate future.

If, therefore, you ask me what is the outlook for America, my answer would have to be that it depends, to a large extent, and for a considerable time to come, on the outcome of the present war. The outlook being uncertain, the American people must prepare itself for either eventuality, for a victory or a defeat of the Allies.

If the Allies win, victory can come only after a prolonged and exhausting war which will shake the very foundations of the social, political, and economic life of Europe. Much will be destroyed beside material wealth and cities, towns, and provinces. A colossal effort will have to be made at the conclusion of the war to reconstruct Europe, and this time it must be made according to a saner and juster pattern than that which followed the first World War—one that will carry with it the promise of a more lasting peace. America will have to share in the responsibility for this gigantic task of reconstruction; for its own economic and political fortunes will be vitally involved. To do that we shall have to reconcile ourselves to the necessity of assuming definite obligations and responsibilities for any international order which we shall help to bring into existence. We shall not dare to repeat the folly of 1919. We shall make no proposals and offer no counsel without at the same time indicating our readiness to assume our full and just share of responsibility for the carrying out of these proposals and for the embodiment of these counsels into concrete social structures. We shall not again deposit any of our brain children upon the doorsteps of Europe—and precipitously abscond.

It is, of course, doubtful whether our advice will be heeded by the victorious Allies if we deny them, in this their bitter struggle and in these their dark days of agony and suffering and sacrifice, maximum aid. If we cannot help them to win the war, they will feel free to dispense with our advice to fix the peace. Americans who counsel noninvolvement in the European struggle, even in a nonmilitary sense, ought not to be thinking in terms of our involvement in European affairs after the war by way of our unsolicited counsel and gratuitous moral scolding and curtain lecturing from the side lines at the peace conference.

This, too, should be clearly grasped. If we wish to make secure our way of life for ourselves and our children, we must help to make it secure in the world. A victory for the Allies will help to make it secure. A victory for the Nazis will destroy it in Europe and will endanger it on this hemisphere. This is realism. All else is wishful and addled thinking.

The question today is not one of praise or blame of Allied innocence or guilt in the past or in the present. France and England are not without blame for many of the moral disasters of the last 20 years. Their leaders committed gross and criminal follies. Fundamentally they neither worked for peace nor prepared for war. They failed to rise to the spiritual exigencies of the new order which the World War made inevitable. They destroyed with their own hands the ideals of collective security, disarmament, and the rich promise of the League of Nations. But all that does not lessen by one whit the present Nazi menace to civilization, the imminent threat to all the precious values which western civilization evolved through long centuries of intellectual and spiritual struggle and aspiration. The Nazis have clearly defined their own creed and their program. They have not been reticent about their true intentions. They mean to destroy the culture of the western world, as it has evolved ever since the American and French Revolutions—a culture based on the inalienable rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuits of happiness, the importance of the individual, the restricted authority of the State, religious and racial tolerance, brotherhood and universal peace, and to substitute for it a neopagan culture of their own, based on a conscious and thoroughgoing revolt against liberty, on the concepts of a monolithic state, the submergence of the individual dictatorship, racialism, and war as a national policy and destiny. The Nazis have incorporated that philosophy ruthlessly within their own borders and are imposing it upon other countries wherever their military prowess entrenches them. They intend to destroy the independence of all the small peoples, and to build up an empire which their vaulted ambitions refuse to circumscribe, in which all subjugated peoples will toil in serfdom to maintain in affluence and in mastery the elite of the Germanic race.

The delinquencies, mistakes, and sins of the Allies in the past cannot be held to condone these vicious doctrines, nor the brutal and inhuman actions of the Nazis since they came into power. They do not atone for the rape of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Luxemburg, and Belgium, nor for the shameless and unspeakable persecutions of a helpless and honorable racial minority within their own country.

It is therefore not consistent with the facts, nor a contribution to clear thinking, nor a service to humanity to popularize the idea that in the European struggle now raging there are no basic issues involved with which the American people need at all be concerned, nor that both sides are equally culpable, nor that America stands to lose nothing if Hitlerism succeeds in destroying the last few outposts of democracy and freedom in the Western World. Such reasoning at this late date has all the earmarks of "fifth column" propaganda.

If the Allies lose, Europe will be turned over to the moral anarchy of this streamlined barbarism of the twentieth century, and the rest of the world will not long escape the effects of it.

If the Nazis win, the outlook for America and the American way of life is grave, indeed. We need not fear any imminent invasion, but our American world will become closely encircled by a hostile world, and the pressure upon it will increase as the years go by. It is in the very nature of dictatorships to be aggressive and missionary. The last few years have given ample proof of it. In a world in which there will no longer be a British or a French Empire, the United States will find itself alone, pledged to defend with inadequate resources the whole Western Hemisphere in the face of four powerful imperial dictatorships, grown strong and arrogant with the greatest spoils of all time. We shall have to arm ourselves to the teeth and increasingly to pour our reserves of wealth into our defense program. We shall have to gear up our national economy to a wartime footing and keep it there. Conceivably, our industrial organization will come steadily under added forms of central planning and control, and a system ultimately approximating the emergency forms adopted recently by England will come to pass in our country. There will come about an attenuation of the democratic processes and a lessening of the latitude of liberalism. An intensified nationalism, more suspicious and less tolerant, will emerge. The American way of life will undergo slow, unconscious, but quite definite changes.

But our greatest danger will come from within. A Nazi victory abroad, which will lay the world at their feet, will hearten and inspire their agents, friends, and admirers here. Nothing succeeds like success. Fascists and Nazi sympathizers, adventurers, and would-be Hitlers will spring up like mushrooms all over our country. They will attempt to do here what the Nazis will have succeeded so

brilliantly and so swiftly in doing abroad. They will, of course, receive guidance and support from what will then be the greatest empire on earth—the victorious Third Reich. The Americas will be overrun by Nazi agents and the United States, the richest country in the world, will become their special stamping ground. There will not be lacking powerful industrialists here who will be willing to play the role of American Fritz Thyssens to would-be American Hitlers.

What role the Nazis have prescribed for the United States in their political Welt-anschauung is not clear at the moment, but certainly when they make known their program there will not be wanting within our borders a powerful "fifth column" prepared to help them realize it. The members of this "fifth column" will not be recruited exclusively or even principally from the ranks of aliens, but, as in England, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway, from the blue bloods who always escape fingerprinting and surveillance, from people prominent in the public eye, lay and cleric, from the circles of high Government officials and the military, from reactionaries who hate progressive social legislation and organized labor so bitterly that they will not hesitate to sacrifice all our free institutions in a desperate gambler's throw to save their special privileges. Some of these highly placed personages have already been decorated by the Nazis. Not all who belong to the "fifth column" are necessarily paid spies, agents, and traitors. In that column are also the far more dangerous gentry who have superseding loyalties and who have no use for American free institutions when they thwart their special interests or prejudices.

The outlook for the United States in case of a Nazi military triumph is thus a very serious one indeed. Nevertheless, we ought not to fill our minds with thoughts of doom, or resign ourselves to defeat. Not all of these things may come to pass, or even many of them. There are always the unforeseen and incalculable elements in every historic constellation. No one can plot the future with any degree of certainty. Chance, accident, unforeseen personal and impersonal forces may give the direction of events a sharp turn one way or another. Nevertheless, we should prepare ourselves, as far as possible, for all eventualities. We should build up our national defenses to a point consistent with the definite commitments and responsibilities which we intend to assume in connection with our foreign policy. Also, they should be built up reasonably to a degree where they would be a strong deterrent to any would-be aggressor.

A clear definition of our foreign policy in relation to the 21 countries on this hemisphere is clearly indicated and most urgent. If we mean to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, it is important that the nations which we are to protect from foreign invasion shall, knowingly and willingly, share with us in a well-defined and conserted program for the collective military defense of this hemisphere. We should not plan for them. We should plan with them. They must assume their clear share of responsibility for joint diplomatic action involving the fate of this hemisphere and for military defense measures. For the nations of South and Central America to maintain formal and separate neutrality status, to act independently, unrelated to a central hemisphere policy, or to carry on independent diplomatic negotiations which might unwittingly entangle them in the imperialistic machinations of foreign nations, or to tolerate "fifth columns" in their midst and the establishment of centers of powerful alien influence, is to create dangers on this hemisphere for the United States which might involve us in war against our will. Time should not be lost in implementing the declaration of the solidarity of America adopted by the Eighth Pan American Conference held in Lima in December, 1938, in bringing about a stronger federation of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, and in formulating specific agreements and covenants among them on all matters involving their collective security.

We should not forget, however, that a strong military defense for our Nation, in itself, is not sufficient. A greater defense for a nation is the loyalty of its citizens and their essential spiritual unity. There are two ways in which these can be conserved. The forces hostile to our form of government and to our free institutions must be continuously exposed and their power broken. No democracy is immune, or can hope to remain immune, as long as it is a democracy, from anti-Democratic propaganda either native or foreign. Forces opposed to democracy will use the very technique and machinery of democracy, as well as its abundant tolerance, to destroy it. In the face of this, democracy must not remain naive or complacent. It must aggressively and relentlessly expose and harass every form of propaganda which is hostile to our basic conceptions of life and government. The agents of foreign dictatorships and their native-born kinsmen must be kept under constant surveillance. Those who wish to destroy free America should not be permitted the glamour of putting their followers in uniform or of parading our public thoroughfares.

But, no hysteria. No witch hunting. No mass stampede away from the Bill of Rights and the constitutional guarantees of a free people. We should not in our great concern, zeal, and impatience, permit ourselves to resort to extralegal and unconstitutional methods to obtain even worthy and desirable objectives. To destroy liberty in an effort to preserve it is the height of folly. The detection, arrest, and punishment of spies, saboteurs, and plotters against our domestic peace and security should be left to our legally constituted authorities who are charged with the enforcement of our laws and the defense of our free institutions.

It should be borne in mind that education still remains the strongest bulwark of a free people. The American people should be educated in the techniques of modern propaganda which have been so skillfully elaborated in our day. They should be made aware of the methods which are employed and the true character of the organizations and governments which employ them. They should be informed as to how racial and religious antagonism are aroused and exploited, in order to divide a people, disrupt its unity, confuse its counsels, and undermine its national resistance to an aggressor. Systematic courses in the detection of and the prophylaxis against false propaganda should be introduced into the curriculum of every high school and college. Furthermore, we have long assumed that education in democracy will somehow take care of itself, as an unconscious byproduct of our day-by-day living. This is no longer true. Democracy is under fire today and on the defensive. Both its theoretic soundness and its practical value have been denied. Many people have rejected it as antiquated, inefficient, and distinctly harmful. Antiliberalism and antidemocracy have today a passionate and heroic zeal behind them. Totalitarianism has millions of enthusiastic devotees in all parts of the world. Quite deliberately and specifically we must begin to educate our people anew, and especially our youth, in the principles, practices, and advantages of democracy.

In the school, the home, the church, through the written and the spoken word, an educational crusade in defense of democracy must be launched. And the time is very short. In this connection, we ought to bear in mind that the source of all political democracy in the western world is fundamentally religion, and that the basic charter of man's dignity and freedom is God.

Friends of democracy have forgotten the religious origin of the democratic dogma in the modern world. They have forgotten that political freedom came to the western world as a result of the struggle for religious freedom and not vice versa. Religion kindled the torch of political freedom in the world, and irreligion is extinguishing it. The reason why the democratic movements are perishing in the western world today is because of an increasing pessimism due to a loss of confidence in the reality of God in the life of man. Man has become frightfully small in our day, reduced in stature, stripped, and spiritually cowered, because his kinship with God, which crowned him with glory and honor and made him "a little lower than the angels," has been contemptuously rejected by a world which has tried to build its life upon foundations of pseudo-scientific materialism. No society can long remain Godless and free. If our crusade to redeem democracy is to succeed, it must draw its inspiration from the inexhaustible fires of religious faith, from the classic religious dogmas that God created man in His image, and that man was endowed by his Creator with inalienable rights of which no state, no bureaucracy, no majority, and no class has the right to deprive him.

The loyalty and unity of our citizens can be enhanced still more if they are made to feel that the American way of life is the best way of life, because in it they find security and happiness. Democracy cannot long survive widespread and prolonged economic suffering. All dictatorships have risen to power upon the economic miseries of their people. A generation of young men and women denied the opportunity to work and to build careers, consigned to demoralizing idleness and frustration is dangerous explosive material. Even the brutalities and indecencies of dictatorship become less repugnant and the ways of freedom appear less appealing in the presence of democracy's tragic failure to care for its people and to safeguard them against frequent and disastrous periods of unemployment and suffering.

Sound American patriotism must quickly translate itself into an intelligent and ardent program for social justice, for a fairer distribution of the social goods, for a larger measure of protection of our people against the hazards of unemployment, sickness and old age. Sound patriotism will look upon the disease and crime-breeding slums of our land, the blasted areas, the underprivileged children, the jobless and hopeless youth, the unemployed man, the underpaid worker, the unsheltered aged, as the real Trojan Horse which traps a free people into destruction. People who feel that they have a stake in their country, that the institutions of their land are being used to the utmost to help them to a more secure and abundant life, and who can see in them the promises of even greater happiness and well-being for their children, will not be inveigled by the propaganda for a totalitarian millennium, and will not be led into revolutionary adventures.

On the other hand the individual citizen should not unload all his responsibilities upon his government or blame it for all his misfortunes or expect all salvation from it. Nor should he sponge upon it for all manner of hand-outs. Those who wish government to provide them at all times with bread and circuses must be prepared to surrender to it all their liberties. Total dependence upon government means total control by government. The danger to a free society is not so much the encroachment by government, as the encroachment of citizens upon their government with all manner of demands which are rightly the responsibilities of private citizens or of associations of private citizens. The individual citizen must discipline himself against the temptation to become the happy-go-lucky ward of what he hopes will be a generous and tolerant and never-failing provider—called the state. Our youth must be trained to regard government as the defense of a free people which must be served and safeguarded through sacrifice, not exploited.

In our effort to maintain our way of life here, we will be strongly helped by some important factors which are uniquely our own.

Ours is a long-established democracy. We have gone through severe crises before, including a Civil War, without sacrificing our democratic apparatus. No long-established democracy has collapsed, even in Europe. We prefer to govern ourselves. The idea

of being ruled by a Fuehrer, a Duce, or a Commissar is hateful to our very souls.

We have a wholesome capacity for self-criticism. We are ready to acknowledge our mistakes and to take the blame. We can and do reverse ourselves. We are not hostile to experimentation.

We have vast natural resources. Ours is not a country, but a continent. This is not a starved or crowded land, and our people are not doomed by circumstance to a low standard of living. Poverty is one of the bitterest enemies of democracy. There need be no poverty in our country.

We are a young Nation. We are not handicapped by Old World animosities. We have no threatening neighbors on our frontiers. More than any other people on earth, we can, if so we will, pursue our chosen way of life with confidence and with high hopes.

What is this American way of life? What are the classic elements which give uniqueness and distinction to it?

1. The importance of the individual. Every man is possessed of certain inalienable rights. The state cannot veto them. No majority can abrogate them. All men, regardless of race and religion, are equal before the law. Any attempt to subjugate the individual to the state, or to discriminate against him in law because of race or creed, is a frontal and deadly attack upon the American ideal.

2. Government by consent and not by constraint; government from within and not from without. Dictatorship is government imposed from without. Democracy is government self-imposed from within. The American genius strives to achieve the best possible way of life for the largest possible number of citizens through their own voluntary enterprises, through free experimentation, and step by step through the evolutionary processes of trial and error. The American genius rejects all proffers of ready-made millenniums at the spearpoint of revolution and dictatorship. It prefers the slower and less glamorous way of government. But it also avoids all the horrors of government by purges and liquidations, by terrorism and expropriation by espionage and slavery.

3. The grace of tolerance. We are a composite people. Many races had a hand in the discovery, exploration, colonization, and development of this great country. Ours is a nation made up from its very inception entirely of immigrants. Our American life is a fine mosaic in which many separate race and religious identities are grouped into one noble pattern. Despite occasional lapses, there has prevailed a wholesome attitude of good will, tolerance, and cooperation among our people. The genius of America has manifested itself in steadily dissolving the hard concretion of groups and reducing them to their individual human components. Europe is concerned with the rights of minorities. America is concerned with the rights of men.

Those people, therefore, in our midst who would break up American life into hostile racial or religious groups, and who would persuade others to judge American citizens not on the basis of individual worth, character, or achievement, but on the basis of the race to which they belong, or the religion to which they subscribe, are the deadliest foes of the spirit as well as the peace of the American people.

This true vision of American life should be kept undimmed in these darkening days. It is our sole hope for the future. It is our one chance to keep our dear country free from the ravages of the hates, bitterness, and conflicts which have disfigured the Old World. For the last 20 years the desperate people of Europe have tried a way of life which is the very opposite of the American way of life—the suppression of the individual, government by ukase and dictatorship, and race and religious intolerance—and it has led them, as inevitably it must, to the blood-soaked battlefields of war.

Let us not follow in their tragic footsteps.

Memorial Day reminds us that in every hour of grave national crisis there were found brave men in our land who were prepared to die that America might live. Let us, their descendants, prepare ourselves to live in such a way that America may not die.

The Republican Platform of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by incorporating in the RECORD the Republican national platform for 1940, providing for a constructive program of Americanism, preparedness, peace, and prosperity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The platform follows:

The Republican Party, in representative convention assembled, submits to the people of the United States the following declaration of its principles and purposes:

We state our general objectives in the simple and comprehensive words of the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

Those objectives as there stated are these:

"To form a more perfect Union; establish justice; insure domestic tranquillity; provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Meeting within the shadow of Independence Hall where those words were written we solemnly reaffirm them as a perfect statement of the ends for which we as a party propose to plan and to labor.

I

The record of the Roosevelt administration is a record of failure to attain any one of those essential objectives.

Instead of leading us into more perfect union the administration has deliberately fanned the flames of class hatred.

Instead of the establishment of justice the administration has sought the subjection of the judiciary to executive discipline and domination.

Instead of insuring domestic tranquillity the administration has made impossible the normal friendly relation between employers and employees and has even succeeded in alienating both the great divisions of organized labor.

Instead of providing for the common defense the administration, notwithstanding the expenditure of billions of our dollars, has left the Nation unprepared to resist foreign attack.

Instead of promoting the general welfare the administration has domesticated the deficit, doubled the debt, imposed taxes where they do the greatest economic harm, and used public money for partisan political advantage.

Instead of the blessings of liberty the administration has imposed upon us a regime of regimentation which has deprived the individual of his freedom and has made of America a shackled giant.

II

Wholly ignoring these great objectives as solemnly declared by the people of the United States, the New Deal administration has, for 7 long years, whirled in a turmoil of shifting, contradictory, and overlapping administration and policies. Confusion has reigned supreme. The only steady undeviating characteristic has been the relentless expansion of the power of the Federal Government over the everyday life of the farmer, the industrial worker, and the businessman. The emergency demands organization—not confusion. It demands free and intelligent cooperation—not incompetent domination. It demands a change.

The New Deal administration has failed America.

It has failed by seducing our people to become continuously dependent upon government, thus weakening their morale and quenching the traditional American spirit.

It has failed by viciously attacking our industrial system and sapping its strength and vigor.

It has failed by attempting to send our Congress home during the world's most tragic hour, so that we might be eased into the war by word or deed during the absence of our elected representatives from Washington.

It has failed by disclosing military details of our equipment to foreign powers over protests by the heads of our armed defense.

It has failed by ignoring the lessons of fact concerning modern, mechanized armed defense.

In these and countless other ways the New Deal administration has either deliberately deceived the American people or proved itself incompetent longer to handle the affairs of our Government.

The zero hour is here. America must prepare at once to defend our shores, our homes, our lives, and our most-cherished ideals.

To establish a first line of defense we must place in official positions men of faith who put America first and who are determined that her governmental and economic system be kept unimpaired.

Our national defense must be so strong that no unfriendly power shall ever set foot on American soil. To assure this strength our national economy, the true basis of America's defense, must be free of unwarranted Government interference.

Only a strong and sufficiently prepared America can speak words of reassurance and hope to the liberty-loving peoples of the world.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

We are still suffering from the ill effects of the last World War, a war which cost us a $24,000,000,000 increase in our national debt, billions of uncollectible foreign debts, and the complete upset of our economic system, in addition to the loss of human life and irreparable damage to the health of thousands of our boys.

The present national administration has already spent for all purposes more than $54,000,000,000, has boosted the national debt and current Federal taxes to an all-time high; and yet by the President's own admission we are still wholly unprepared to defend our country, its institutions, and our individual liberties in a war that threatens to engulf the whole world; and this in spite of the fact that foreign wars have been in progress for 2 years or more and that military information concerning these wars and the rearmament programs of the warring nations has been at all times

available to the national administration through its diplomatic and other channels.

The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace. We accordingly fasten upon the New Deal full responsibility for our unpreparedness and for the consequences of involvement in war.

We declare for the prompt, orderly, and realistic building of our national defense to the point at which we shall be able not only to defend the United States, its possessions, and essential outposts from foreign attack, but also efficiently to uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine. To this task the Republican Party pledges itself when entrusted with national authority. In the meantime we shall support all necessary and proper defense measures proposed by the administration in its belated effort to make up for lost time; but we deplore explosive utterances by the President directed at other governments which serve to imperil our peace; and we condemn all executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States.

Our sympathies have been profoundly stirred by invasion of unoffending ccuntries, and by disaster to nations whose ideals most closely resemble our own. We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense.

We believe that the spirit which should animate our entire defensive policy is determination to preserve not our material interests merely, but those liberties which are the priceless heritage of America.

REEMPLOYMENT

The New Deal's failure to solve the problem of unemployment and revive opportunity for our youth presents a major challenge to representative government and free enterprise. We propose to re-create opportunity for the youth of America, and put our idle millions back to work in private industry, business, and agriculture. We propose to eliminate needles administrative restrictions, thus restoring lost motion to the wheels of individual enterprise.

RELIEF

We shall remove waste, discrimination, and politics from relief—through administration by the States with Federal grants-in-aid on a fair and nonpolitical basis, thus giving the man and woman on relief a larger share of the funds appropriated.

SOCIAL SECURITY

We favor the extension of necessary old-age benefits on an earmarked pay-as-you-go basis, to the extent that the revenues raised for this purpose will permit. We favor the extension of the unemployment compensation provisions of the Social Security Act, wherever practicable, to those groups and classes not now included. For such groups as may thus be covered we favor a system of unemployment compensation with experience-rating provisions, aimed at protecting the worker in the regularity of his employment and providing adequate compensation for reasonable periods when that regularity of employment is interrupted. The administration should be left with the States with a minimum of Federal control.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Republican Party has always protected the American worker.

We shall maintain labor's right of free organization and collective bargaining.

We believe that peace and prosperity at home require harmony, teamwork, and understanding in all relations between worker and employer. When differences arise, they should be settled directly and voluntarily across the table.

Recent disclosures respecting the administration of the National Labor Relations Act require that this act be amended in fairness to employers and all groups of employees so as to provide true freedom for, and orderliness in, self-organization and collective bargaining.

AGRICULTURE

A prosperous and stable agriculture is the foundation of our economic structure. Its preservation is a national and nonpolitical social problem not yet solved, despite many attempts. The farmer is entitled to a profit-price for his products. The Republican Party will put into effect such governmental policies, temporary and permanent, as will establish and maintain an equitable balance between labor, industry, and agriculture by expanding industrial and business activity, eliminating unemployment, lowering production costs, thereby creating increased consumer buying power for agricultural products.

Until this balance has been attained, we propose to provide benefit payments, based upon a widely applied, constructive soil conservation program free from Government-dominated production control, but administered, as far as practicable, by farmers themselves; to restrict the major benefits of these payments to operators of family-type farms; to continue all present benefit payments until our program becomes operative; and to eliminate the present extensive and costly bureaucratic interference.

We shall provide incentive payments, when necessary, to encourage increased production of agricultural commodities, adaptable to our soil and climate, not now produced in sufficient quantities for our home markets, and will stimulate the use and processing of all farm products in industry as raw materials.

We shall promote a cooperative system of adequate farm credit, at lowest interest rates commensurate with the cost of money, supervised by an independent governmental agency, with ultimate farmer ownership and control; farm-commodity loans to facilitate orderly marketing and stabilize farm income; the expansion of sound, farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations; and the support of educational and extension programs to achieve more efficient production and marketing.

We shall foster Government refinancing, where necessary, of the heavy Federal farm debt load through an agency segregated from cooperative credit.

We shall promote a national land-use program for Federal acquisition, without dislocation of local tax returns, of nonproductive farm lands by voluntary sale or lease subject to approval of the States concerned; and the disposition of such lands to appropriate public uses including watershed protection and flood prevention, reforestation, recreation, erosion control, and the conservation of wild life.

We advocate a foreign-trade policy which will end one-man tariff making, afford effective protection to farm products, regain our export markets, and assure an American price level for the domestically consumed portion of our export crops.

We favor effective quarantine against imported livestock, dairy, and other farm products from countries which do not impose health and sanitary standards equal to our own domestic standards.

We approve the orderly development of reclamation and irrigation, project by project, and as conditions justify.

We promise adequate assistance to rural communities suffering disasters frcm flood, drought, and other natural causes.

We shall promote stabilization of agricultural income through intelligent management of accumulated surpluses, and through the development of outlets by supplying those in need at home and abroad.

TARIFF AND RECIPROCAL TRADE

We are threatened by unfair competition in world markets and by the invasion of our home markets, especially by the products of State-controlled foreign economies.

We believe in tariff protection for agriculture, labor, and industry, as essential to our American standard of living. The measure of the protection shall be determined by scientific methods with due regard to the interest of the consumer.

We shall explore every possibility of reopening the channels of international trade through negotiations so conducted as to produce genuine reciprocity and expand our exports.

We condemn the manner in which the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements of the New Deal have been put into effect without adequate hearings, with undue haste, without proper consideration of our domestic producers, and without congressional approval. These defects we shall correct.

MONEY

The Congress should reclaim its constitutional powers over money, and withdraw the President's arbitrary authority to manipulate the currency, establish bimetallism, issue irredeemable paper money, and debase the gold and silver coinage. We shall repeal the Thomas inflation amendment of 1933 and the (foreign) Silver Purchase Act of 1934, and take all possible steps to preserve the value of the Government's huge holdings of gold and reintroduce gold into circulation.

JOBS AND IDLE MONEY

Believing it possible to keep the securities market clean without paralyzing it, we endorse the principle of truth in securities in the securities acts. To get billions of idle dollars and a multitude of idle men back to work and to promote national defense, these acts should be revised and the policies of the Commission changed to encourage the flow of private capital into industry.

TAXATION

Public spending has trebled under the New Deal, while tax burdens have doubled. Huge taxes are necessary to pay for New Deal waste and for neglected national defense. We shall revise the tax system and remove those practices which impede recovery and shall apply policies which stimulate enterprise. We shall not use the taxing power as an instrument of punishment or to secure objectives not otherwise obtainable under existing law.

PUBLIC CREDIT

With urgent need for adequate defense, the people are burdened by a direct and contingent debt exceeding $50,000,000,000. Twenty-nine billions of this debt have been created by New Deal borrowings during the past 7 years. We pledge ourselves to conserve the public credit for all essential purposes by levying taxation sufficient to cover necessary civil expenditure, a substantial part of the defense cost, and the interest and retirement of the national debt.

PUBLIC SPENDING

Millions of men and women still out of work after 7 years of excessive spending refute the New Deal theory that "deficit spending" is the way to prosperity and jobs. Our American system of private enterprise, if permitted to go to work, can rapidly increase the wealth, income, and standard of living of all the people. We solemnly pledge that public expenditures, other than those required for full national defense and relief, shall be cut to levels necessary for the essential services of government.

EQUAL RIGHTS

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women.

NEGRO

We pledge that our American citizens of Negro descent shall be given a square deal in the economic and political life of this Nation.

Discrimination in the civil service, the Army, Navy, and all other branches of the Government must cease. To enjoy the full benefits of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness universal suffrage must be made effective for the Negro citizen. Mob violence shocks the conscience of the Nation and legislation to curb this evil should be enacted.

UNAMERICAN ACTIVITIES

We vigorously condemn the New Deal encouragement of various groups that seek to change the American form of government by means outside the Constitution. We condemn the appointment of members of such un-American groups to high positions of trust in the National Government. The development of the treacherous so-called "fifth column," as it has operated in war-stricken countries, should be a solemn warning to America. We pledge the Republican Party to get rid of such "borers from within."

IMMIGRATION

We favor the strict enforcement of all laws controlling the entry of aliens. The activities of undesirable aliens should be investigated, and those who seek to change by force and violence the American form of government should be deported.

VETERANS

We pledge adequate compensation and care for veterans disabled in the service of our country and for their widows, orphans, and dependents.

INDIANS

We pledge an immediate and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

HAWAII

Hawaii, sharing the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of our national laws.

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

We shall encourage a healthy, confident, and growing private enterprise, confine Government activity to essential public services, and regulate business only so as to protect consumer, employee, and investor and without restricting the production of more and better goods at lower prices.

MONOPOLY

Since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act by the Republican Party, we have consistently fought to preserve free competition with regulation to prevent abuse. New Deal policy fosters Government monopoly, restricts production, and fixes prices. We shall enforce antitrust legislation without prejudice or discrimination. We condemn the use or threatened use of criminal indictments to obtain through consent decrees objectives not contemplated by law.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

We promise to reduce to the minimum Federal competition with business. We pledge ourselves to establish honest accounting and reporting by every agency of the Federal Government, and to continue only those enterprises whose maintenance is clearly in the public interest.

FREE SPEECH

The principles of a free press and free speech, as established by the Constitution, should apply to the radio. Federal regulation of radio is necessary in view of the natural limitations of wave lengths, but this gives no excuse for censorship. We oppose the use of licensing to establish arbitrary controls. Licenses should be revocable only when, after public hearings, due cause for cancelation is shown.

SMALL BUSINESS

The New Deal policy of interference and arbitrary regulation has injured all business, but especially small business. We promise to encourage the small-business man by removing unnecessary bureaucratic regulation and interference.

STOCK AND COMMODITY EXCHANGES

We favor regulation of stock and commodity exchanges. They should be accorded the fullest measure of self-control consistent with the discharge of their public trust and the prevention of abuse.

INSURANCE

We condemn the New Deal attempts to destroy the confidence of our people in private insurance institutions. We favor continuance of regulation of insurance by the several States.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

We shall reestablish in the Federal civil service a real merit system on a truly competitive basis and extend it to all non-policy-forming positions.

We pledge ourselves to enact legislation standardizing and simplifying quasi-judicial and administrative agencies to insure adequate notice and hearing, impartiality, adherence to the rules of evidence, and full judicial review of all questions of law and fact.

Our greatest protection against totalitarian government is the American system of checks and balances. The constitutional distribution of legislative, executive, and judicial functions is essential to the preservation of this system. We pledge ourselves to make it the basis of all our policies affecting the organization and operation of our republican form of government.

THIRD TERM

To insure against the overthrow of our American system of government we favor an amendment to the Constitution providing that no person shall be President of the United States for more than two terms.

A PLEDGE OF GOOD FAITH

The acceptance of the nominations made by this convention carries with it, as a matter of private honor and public faith, an undertaking by each candidate to be true to the principles and program herein set forth.

We earnestly urge all patriotic men and women, regardless of former affiliations, to unite with us in the support of our declaration of principles to the end that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Statement Pertaining to S. 134

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW EDMISTON

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, the George-Edmiston bill (S. 134) and the House bill introduced in this Congress (H. R. 2005) were given long and careful study by the House Committee on Military Affairs. The bills as introduced at the beginning of this Congress were identical with H. R. 8176, which was passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress and disapproved by the President. The committee appointed a special committee to confer with the Veterans' Administration to draft a bill which would overcome the objections to H. R. 8176. The committee accepted the changes suggested by the Veterans' Administration and incorporated them in S. 134, and undoubtedly the Veterans' Administration will recommend its approval when passed by Congress.

The Veterans' Administration's report on H. R. 8176 estimated that 3,194 emergency officers who have 30-percent permanent disabilities would be returned to the retired list at an annual cost of $3,696,000. The Veterans' Administration estimated under this bill, with the amendments, that 1,998 would be returned at a cost of approximately $1,750,000, a difference of more than $1,900,000.

The Veterans' Administration, and others having to do with the retirement of emergency officers, admit that the President was misinformed when he was told that the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act introduced the principle of rank into the World War compensation structure. The act of July 9, 1918, provided retirement for provisional officers, and many were retired at the end of the World War period. Those provisional officers who were not given commissions in the Regular Army were in fact emergency officers. The act of June 4, 1920, provided retirement for emergency officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who were disabled in line of duty on a parity with the officers of the Regular Establishments—there was no causative-factor requirement for either of the above groups. Further, every law providing pension for disability incurred in line of duty during active service, from 1776 down to the Spanish-American War, was based on rank, officers receiving one-half pay for disability incurred in line of duty.

This bill must not be considered as new legislation. Under the present law—section 10, Public, No. 2, the Economy Act—emergency officers wounded in action, and a few disease cases who were actually evacuated from the front lines, are now receiving retired pay. This bill simply extends the privilege to those who actually came out of the war with permanent disabilities caused by disease, and everyone who would be returned to the retired list under this bill would have been retired had they served in the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as an emergency officer of the Navy or Marine Corps, or as a provisional Army officer. They would also be eligible for retirement under Public, No. 18, Seventy-sixth Congress. This act grants retirement to officers of the National Guard and Reserve Corps who are called to active duty for 30 days

or more—both peace and war service—if they are disabled by disease or injury in line of duty during such service, and places the Reserve and National Guard officers of the future on an exact parity with officers of the Regular Establishment.

The enactment of this legislation will do away with the so-called causative-factor requirement, which makes it necessary for the emergency officer to show by a preponderance of evidence that but for his World War service his disability would not have occurred. It is impossible for those disabled by disease to meet this requirement, as Members of Congress who have handled these cases will know. All of those who would benefit under this bill will be required to show that they came out of the war with their disability.

Ninety percent of those who would be returned to the retired list under this bill are in the ranks of captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant. Approximately 800, or 19 percent, of the emergency officers removed from the retired list under the Economy Act have died. It is estimated that about 20 or 25 of those the Veterans' Administration considered would come under this bill have died since the report of November 20, 1939. The average age of this group is 58 years (44 to 84). Their disabilities range from 30 percent to 100 percent and average 60 percent. The disabilities of most of this group were caused by disease, and at their advanced age, the death rate is very high. Within a very few years a large percentage of them will have died.

The emergency officers are the only group of World War veterans suffering with direct service-connected disabilities that have not been given full restoration of benefits taken away by the 1933 Economy Act.

The restrictions contained in this bill, and the large number of deaths, have cut the number who would be returned to the retired list to less than 40 percent of those removed under the act of March 19, 1933. The Veterans' Administration has stated to members of the Military Affairs Committee that S. 134, as amended, is the best bill that has been offered and it is felt that they will recommend its approval when passed by Congress.

The Veterans' Administration in reports on previous emergency officer bills has stated the estimates as to numbers could be considered as the maximum, and it is believed that their estimate of 1,998, less deaths since November 1939, can be considered as the maximum. The rehabilitation services of the major veteran organizations who have handled these cases estimate approximately 1,600 would be returned under this bill at a cost of about $1,400,000, and that within 10 years more than half of them will have died.

Nebraska's Challenge To Make Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

ADDRESS BY ROBERT LASCH

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Lasch, who is State editor of the Omaha World-Herald on the subject Nebraska's Challenge To Make Democracy Work.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Columbus (Nebr.) Telegram of June 24, 1940]

NEBRASKA'S CHALLENGE TO MAKE DEMOCRACY WORK—LASCH SAYS STATE'S PEOPLE HAVE JOB IN REBUILDING AGRICULTURE

Following is the text of a speech by Robert Lasch, State editor of the Omaha World-Herald, given Sunday at Harmon Park at Kearney. The occasion was the annual picnic of employees and officers of five public hydroelectric and irrigation districts.

His speech follows:

We are remote from war—here in this beautiful park, in this pleasant city just halfway between the two coasts. We are about as remote from the terrible events of Europe as one could get—in a physical sense.

And yet all of us know how closely the war has touched us since the 10th of May.

We have experienced the desperation and despair of defeat almost as acutely as the people who are doing the fighting.

GOT SCARE OF OUR LIVES

We have sat by our radios, and snatched our newspapers, and worried, and fumed, and hoped. We have seen the worst happen—and we have got the scare of our lives.

We deluded ourselves, for a long time, by thinking that it didn't matter to us what went on in Europe. Now we are suddenly and painfully aware that it does. A world in which totalitarian dictatorship rules undisputed in Europe is not the same old comfortable world we have known for all these years.

Our faith in democracy—our dedication to liberty—our conviction that the most inefficient republic in the world is better than the most powerful dictatorship; this faith is being revived and renewed by the ordeal of fire.

MUST MEET CHALLENGE

The democracy that we so long took for granted has been challenged—and seriously challenged. Now we know that we can take nothing for granted any more—and that the challenge must be met.

There is, after all, only one way to meet the challenge.

That is for every one of us, who possesses this burning faith in freedom, to pitch in—and help make democracy work.

We have got to be strong, as a nation. We have got to be united, as a people. We have got to be resourceful, and energetic, and self-sufficient, as a democracy.

When I say our task is to make democracy work, I am not thinking only in the national sense. I am thinking about our own, common, every day affairs, here at home. The Nation is no greater than its parts. Democracy in the Nation will be no stronger than it is in the States—in the counties—in the towns—and in the public power and irrigation districts.

I was talking the other day—through no fault of my own—with a bond counselor, who specializes in utilities. He knew a great deal about the Nebraska power and irrigation districts—or said he did—and he was able to give me a great many reasons why they were doomed to failure.

Well, I had heard all this before, and some other things, too.

MISSED VITAL POINT

For example, I had heard that the Columbus powerhouse was tipping over, and would soon outlean the leaning tower of Pisa. I had heard that it was impossible to transmit power as the hydrogrid was going to transmit it. I had heard that every one of these projects had long ago been proved impossible.

What struck me was that although this man had a very fine technical knowledge of investments, he was totally ignorant of the real social significance of these Nebraska developments.

He seemed not to realize that these districts are, in the purest sense, democracy at work—that they are people's districts, raised up by the people, to do a vitally necessary—and, indeed, indispensable—job which nobody else was doing or offering to do.

Along the Platte, along the Loup and its upper reaches, the people of Nebraska are setting about the task of conserving and making full use of their water resources. Some day, we hope, they will be discharging the same responsibility along the Republican, the Blue, the lower Platte, the Cedar, and every other workable stream in the State.

This is something that cannot be expressed in terms of the bond market. The canons of Wall Street simply do not apply.

In 1929 we in Nebraska harvested $326,000,000 worth of crops. Ten years later, in 1939, our crops were worth $114,000,000.

In 1929 our farm income was $480,000,000. In 1939 it was down to $247,000,000—a decline of 48 percent.

If anybody wants to hunt out the reason and the justification for these projects, he can find them right there.

MUST ADJUST OURSELVES

If you were dying of thirst, you would not measure the value of a drink of water in terms of debentures or bonds. Nebraska lies in a twilight zone, midway between the arid west and the humid east; and our soil is dying of thirst. The development of our water resources is absolutely necessary unless we are to give up our position as a principal agricultural State and go back to an economy of grass.

Nor is it solely a question of our own selfish interests as a State. Whatever happens abroad, or whatever happens in our own country during the months ahead, it is plain that we shall have to adjust ourselves to a new kind of world.

Abroad a whole continent is engaged in destruction. In this country we are embarking upon a new course, which for as far as we can see ahead will drain a great deal of our substance into nonproductive works of national defense.

These two facts can mean only one thing: For years to come this country is going to need all the energy, all the resources, all the production of wealth it can muster.

The public power and irrigation districts can and must contribute to this new surge of productive energy—whether by increasing the productivity of Nebraska soil or by energizing the transmission lines with power.

JOB IS HARD

But it is one thing to say this and another thing to do it. Nobody knows better than you, who have worked at this job, that the road is long and hard, the disappointments bitter, the discouragements profound.

We hear a great deal in praise of private enterprise. I presume that none of us here would deny that it is the right system of private economic enterprise which, along with democracy, we are trying to preserve. We have a strong feeling that the two go together—for whenever they have been separated, democracy has disappeared.

But while we pay this tribute, let us not forget to say a word, as well, for public enterprise—for the people's enterprise—in doing tasks which nobody but the people can do or will do.

PEOPLE ACT SLOWLY

In some ways, success in a public enterprise is infinitely more than in a private one. When the people act, they generally do so slowly, and uncertainly, and with a great deal of argument. There are set-backs, mistakes, man failure, all kinds of weaknesses peculiar to any democratic undertaking. The spur of self-interest arising from personal profit is lacking. All that keeps the thing going is faith and the will to keep fighting.

So when one of these public enterprises succeeds, in my opinion our applause ought to be loud and long and accompanied by a prayer of gratitude.

You in the public power and irrigation districts are engaged in such an enterprise. You carry the responsibility not only for the welfare of your own undertakings but for those that are yet to come.

It is upon how you conduct your business that the future development of our water resources will depend. For the big job, Nebraska's big job, has only begun. You, as pioneers, are compiling a record, and that record will very largely determine whether Nebraska goes ahead and does the whole job, as it ought to be done, or whether Nebraska gives up in defeat.

DON'T NEED DICTATORS

I do not envy you this responsibility; but on the other hand, I do envy you the opportunity. It is an opportunity to demonstrate, in our own back yard, that democracy can work—an opportunity to prove that the people do not need the services of supermen or dictators, but find within themselves the strength and resources to do what must be done for their own welfare.

When the public power and irrigation districts discharge that obligation, they will be contributing not only to the cause of Nebraska but to the cause of the Nation and of democracy.

Confusion in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of the issue of July 1, 1940, entitled "Confusion in Defense."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 1, 1940]

CONFUSION IN DEFENSE

It is already being hinted that Congress will be called upon to appropriate still more billions for national defense. War Department sources have indicated a wish for equipment costing $3,000,000,000 more than that already authorized, and in addition also, apparently, to the $4,000,000,000 already authorized by the House for a two-ocean navy.

No one wishes to economize where economy would mean inadequate defense. But before new billions are authorized or appropriated the public is entitled to a far clearer picture than it has yet had of how the billions already appropriated are to be spent. It also has a right to ask that only as large funds should be appropriated or authorized now as are necessary to insure the fullest and most efficient physical production for defense that we can secure within the next 12 months, before the end of which time new appropriations can be made in the light of the situation as it then appears.

To appropriate more than this would be actually harmful. It would complicate our already grave fiscal problem; putting our national finances in order is an essential part of national defense. And it would tend to give us dangerously false ideas about the state of our defenses. Big monetary appropriations lead many people to believe that we have equally big defenses. But defense is not a matter of monetary appropriations; it is a matter of actual physical production of planes and ships and tanks and guns and the training of men. To put faith in appropriated billions as such is to mistake the shadow for the substance.

No clear picture whatever exists in the public mind regarding the directions in which the billions of dollars already appropriated are being spent. As a result of an attempted analysis published today the National Economy League concludes that "confusion still seems the order of the day in Washington. It is evident from a review of the figures revealed that we have a loose-leaf method of adding billions and yet more billions to defense costs with seemingly no adequate analysis of needs."

It is not merely that the ordinary citizen does not know how the money appropriated for defense in the last few weeks is to be spent. Congress itself does not know; and this refers not only to the average Congressman but even to the committee members who recommended the appropriations. As Representative COLLINS, of Mississippi, said, in speaking to General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, in a committee hearing: "All we can do is to ask you to protect this money and see that as much of it as possible goes for the purpose that the American people have been led to believe it has been appropriated for."

Many of the appropriations, in short, have been in the nature of blank checks. The picture remains blurred, since appropriations are made according to bureaus and departments instead of according to specific items of expenditure. The greatest discretion is allowed in the provisions for speeding up production and in financing additional capacity in Government and private plants. Analyzing three recent acts—the Military Establishment Appropriation Act of 1941, the Navy Department Appropriation Act of 1941, and the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1941—and congressional hearings and reports on them, the National Economy League finds that appropriations for these purposes for the fiscal year 1941 total about $4,300,700,000, which, together with authorizations for naval vessels, bring the total of commitments for defense to about $6,000,000,000.

A wide section of the general public is under the impression that these new funds are going mainly into airplanes, the point at which our defense at the moment most seriously and quickly needs to be amplified. But the analysis of the League does not support this impression.

The analysis of naval appropriations, for example, raises direct and immediate questions. As compared with actual expenditures of $669,000,000 for the Navy Department in 1939, appropriations for 1941 so far are $1,868,000,000. And of this amount, $853,000,000 is for construction, replacement, alteration, and repair of naval vessels (not including $141,000,000 more for ordnance and not including the whole new plan for a 70-percent increase in the Navy), while only $161,000,000 is for the Bureau of Aeronautics, plus contract authorizations of $125,000,000. In view of the fact that our most serious shortage today is in airplanes rather than ships and that planes can be built so much faster than ships to meet the present emergency, is it sensible for the Navy to be planning to spend many times as much on ships as on planes?

The questions that the League's analysis raises point to the need of a board of the best experts available in various fields to study the new defense program and to plan a balanced defense for the future.

Senator McNary's Nomination for the Vice Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, a very fine editorial was printed in the Washington Post on June 29, 1940, commenting favorably on the nomination by the Republican National Convention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] for Vice President of the United States. It is a well-deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 29, 1940]

TWO SIDES OF A TICKET

The selection of Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY for the Republican Vice-Presidential nomination was wholly logical. He adds strength and balance to the ticket, in addition to being particularly well qualified for an office of which both the actual and potential importance are too frequently obscured.

The nomination of Mr. McNARY is receiving some criticism on the ground that his views tend to cancel out those of Wendell Willkie, the Presidential nominee. Anyone acquainted with the careers of the two men knows that they do not see eye to eye on every issue. Yet both belong to the liberal wing of the Republican Party. And any differences between them are minimized by the strong assumption that Mr. Willkie had approved the selection of Mr. McNARY before Friday's balloting began.

The contrast between Mr. Willkie and his running mate, moreover, itself helps to make them a formidable team. Those who expect the nominee for the Vice Presidency to be an understudy of the Presidential candidate misunderstand both our party system and the genius of American Government. Every administration at Washington, and consequently every party ticket, must represent a harmonious compromise of viewpoints, policies, and interests. And that is most readily accomplished by choosing for the second place a man who complements the qualities of the standard bearer.

From this viewpoint, of course, Mr. McNARY is an admirable selection. His long experience as a legislator, and particularly as minority leader in the Senate, supplements Mr. Willkie's intensive experience in many fields of private enterprise. Mr. Willkie represents the East and Middle West; Mr. McNARY, the far West. The former's specialty has been industry; the latter's, agriculture.

This diversity of interest and experience is desirable for reasons other than its broad appeal to the electorate. The Vice President ought to be, and frequently is, a close adviser to the President and a potent factor in shaping administration policy. He is particularly useful in this respect when his temperament, as well as his experience, varies from that of the President. Should the Republican ticket win, McNARY, the conciliator, would be in a position to render the most valuable type of service to Willkie, whose energy will always arouse some opposition merely because it is forceful.

Finally, the Vice President has an important function of his own as presiding officer of the Senate. For that task Mr. McNARY's qualifications are almost unique. He is universally respected and loved by Members of the Senate without regard for party lines. And he is recognized as probably the ablest parliamentarian now serving in that body.

Statement by Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., on United States-British Accord With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

ARTICLE BY YATES STIRLING, JR., REAR ADMIRAL, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., retired, an American naval officer, with a long and distinguished career in Asiatic waters, has contributed an article to the United Press regarding Japanese-American relationship. I read one sentence only:

For our part we should begin negotiations for a new basic treaty with Japan to replace the agreement terminated by us last January and should try generally to normalize Japanese-American relations.

I so completely agree with Admiral Stirling's conclusions, as I have been constantly watching events for the past 12 months, that I ask that the full article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-BRITISH ACCORD WITH JAPAN ON EAST ASIA IS URGED BY STIRLING—ADMIRAL STRESSES NO POWER CAN HALT TOKYO'S MOVE—SAYS PACT WOULD ENABLE OUR FLEET TO GO TO THE ATLANTIC

(By Yates Stirling, Jr., rear admiral, United States Navy, retired)

It is becoming increasingly clear, in my opinion, that our interests as well as those of Britain lie in reaching a friendly understanding with Japan, if one can be attained.

Japan so far is following a policy of nonbelligerence toward the war, but there are indications she may be leaning toward collaboration with the axis powers. Obviously that collaboration is not in the interest of the British or ourselves.

The question is not one of appeasing the Japanese. It is one of looking facts in the face.

The Japanese Foreign Minister, in his address to the world Saturday, stated the situation we face. He asserted that Japan was the dominant power in east Asia and indicated that the empire shares the view of the axis powers that a new world order must be created in which the great military powers in the chief geographical divisions of the world will dominate groups of the smaller nations.

The plan, as I understand it, is that Japan intends to become—as, indeed, she already is—the dominant power in east Asia and contiguous areas of the Pacific Ocean. This part of the world, if the Japanese can make good in their far-reaching plans, would be reorganized economically, and to an extent politically and militarily, so that it would constitute a unified whole of cooperating peoples. Japan would be the great armed power that would prevent encroachments by other great powers and would make east Asia a region primarily for Asiatics.

VAST CHANGES INVOLVED

If one looks at a map it is apparent that the Japanese plan involves changes in the whole strategic and economic set-up that has prevailed in east Asia for more than a century. It means that British and French power in east Asia must be broken and that our own role in this part of the world, if peace is to be maintained, must be limited largely to fields in which we will not challenge the Japanese.

For the British and French the immediate problem is more serious than it is for us. Britain's naval station at Hong Kong already is menaced by Japanese forces, the British concession in Tientsin has been rendered impotent.

Japanese inspectors are stationed in French Indochina and the Japanese are exercising increasing control on the French concession at Shanghai. The Japanese have obtained concessions from the Netherlands Indies and are demanding more, including a larger share of the trade of these rich islands.

Throughout the whole area they have chosen for themselves the Japanese are on the move. History would indicate they can be stopped only by superior military force. And there is no power now that can divert its force to this region. We have been forced by the developments in Europe to disperse our naval power. British, French, and Netherland strength in the Orient is negligible.

The problem, as I see it, is to prevent Japan from adopting a policy of complete cooperation with the axis powers. This can be done only by convincing Tokyo that Japanese interests, in the long-range view, lie in cooperating with us and with Britain. And I believe that is where they do lie, economically, culturally, and strategically.

The great bulk of Japan's trade, outside her own immediate sphere, always has been with us and the British Empire. These economic interchanges are largely reciprocal and noncompetitive.

JAPAN NEEDS OUR FRIENDSHIP

Strategically the Japanese position never will be secure in east Asia so long as we are a potential enemy. We have the resources to build a greater Navy than Japan ever can hope to build. In the present expansion of armaments the Japanese are bound to fall behind very rapidly as soon as we hit our stride.

Culturally the Japanese always have leaned toward us and Britain rather than Germany and Italy.

The first move the British and French need to make, in my opinion, is to recognize that their possessions in east Asia cannot be defended. Once that is done, a risk of Japan's involvement in the war will have been averted. A first step might be for the British and French to agree that they are ready to give up their possessions in China proper, including Hong Kong.

China long has demanded a return of these areas, and an announcement that they will be returned as soon as satisfactory conditions can be arranged probably would do much to remove the immediate danger of possible Japanese invasion.

For our part, we should begin negotiations for a new basic treaty with Japan to replace the agreement terminated by us last January and should try generally to normalize Japanese-American relations.

There is every indication that we may need all our strength, naval and otherwise, to face the threat that may come from Europe if Germany's operations against Britain end in success. It would seem but the part of wisdom to assure the safety of our Pacific flank if we can do so with honor.

Program of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WAUSAU (WIS.) PILOT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a thought-provoking editorial entitled "United States Program of Defense" inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD. The editorial is taken from the June 20, 1940, issue of the Wausau Pilot, published in Wausau, Wis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Pilot of June 20, 1940]

UNITED STATES PROGRAM OF DEFENSE

The sudden burst of understanding on the part of the public that democratic institutions are in danger the world over seems to have come with the same thunderbolt that carried it to the minds and ears of America's responsible leaders. The latter may have been a little short-sighted but no more so than the people they represent who, in majority, have opposed repeatedly attempts to keep the United States thoroughly prepared to defend herself no matter what was happening in the rest of the world.

This newspaper has been a strong advocate of preparedness through the years. It has more than once expressed the opinion that an armed force of 800,000 was none too great for the United States to maintain. We repeat that assertion today. Instead of having W. P. A. bands playing music on courthouse squares, these same musicians should be playing for American youth in training for their own moral and physical good and for the welfare of their country.

Compulsory military training as a goal seemed unattainable not long ago, although many have advocated it as a means of keeping our mental fiber toughened and the spirit and love of democracy "fierce," as the President was wont to describe the right feeling in his recent address. Years of easy national spending and the consequent softening of the stuff men are made of mean just that much harder work to swing a good defense program into action. We lack not only soldiers and equipment but the trained workmen, the skilled craftsmen to make the mechanical machinery needed. Today's necessity requires us to put the splendid youth of the country into immediate training so that they will know how to use modern weapons. It means, furthermore, the use of every means to school skilled workmen. Our gigantic natural and industrial resources must be so tapped and organized that we could place ourselves on a war footing without costly and perhaps fatal delay.

The argument now being waged as to whether the Roosevelt reforms of 7 years shall be retained in speeding up industry and in occupying labor seems futile and silly to us. Of course, both employees and employers will have to sacrifice to protect their country for the great good its democratic government and democratic way of living can contribute to their lives and their children's.

If it proves necessary no mere reform, no social measure, no wage or hour or profit control or regulation can stand in the way of the proper defense of the United States. That must be obvious to everyone who participates in such an argument and if they think otherwise, it is said with an ulterior motive such as politics.

The United States, like all other nations in the world today, is in the center of a fast moving stream, the currents and eddys of which are varying and mystifying. We shall miss the dangerous shoals and rocks only by keeping our single objective in mind every minute and hour of the day.

Let the Government and Congress which is supposed to sense the will of the people quickly, push aside the red tape that forces delay, marshal the forces of industry and manpower, and see to it that the reputation of the American people for doing a job thoroughly and quickly is not lost now.

We shall avoid war only by such strength of armed might that no assailant will dare molest the Americas.

Will We Do It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial under the heading "Will We Do It?" appearing in the July 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 6, 1940]

WILL WE DO IT?

We do not believe the great ways of thinking and feeling that have made this country what it is can be overthrown. They may be betrayed. Therefore we say—saying it bluntly as a challenge—that for a time already too long the American people have been out of character in their emotional premises, in their reactions to evil and in their choice of mentors and leadership. And if the principle of free government were really in danger in the world, it would be owing less to the rise of the totalitarian powers than to the softness of a people upon whom freedom has conferred incomparable gifts.

Not the first bad sign, perhaps, but certainly a very wrong turn, was when the country followed the magicians who said there was an easy way out of depression. Repudiation of debts and contracts, debasement of money, inflation, confiscation, redistribution of the national income by law, then recovery, the more abundant life, less work for more pay, and security forever—all of that was wishful thinking.

Such was the beginning of a headlong flight from individual responsibility. It was the beginning of a dangerous habit of soft living unearned. We presented the spectacle of a people trying to consume more than they produced and able for a while to do it because they had been so rich. We had the finest industrial machine in the world, and for 7 years we have been consuming it. Do you know what that means? Take a single fact as it was stated by Mr. Hoover, that, according to a recent census of machine tools in the United States, 70 percent of them now are more than 10 years old, whereas in 1932 only 52 percent of them were more than 10 years old. And no move had been made to enforce an embargo up to June 4.

All this time certain hungry nations commonly called the have-nots, and first among these the German people, were working twice as hard as we were, consuming not more but much less than they produced, in order by heroic self-denial to create a surplus. We were purposely destroying our surplus, saying it was ruinous. They were putting theirs into war machines, with intent, when they were ready, to turn them on the soft democracies and take from them what they wanted.

We knew it, we watched them doing it. Behaving as if our power were still intact, we warned them not to do what they were intending to do. Yet they went on as if we had said nothing. They knew what we had done to our strength, that we had let our armaments rust.

From here on it is painful. When the war the Germans had been preparing was imminent, what did this country, the richest, most powerful republic that ever lived on earth—what did it do? It adopted the thesis that its own first line of defense was in France. It would not itself go to the battlefield. Never. Yet the aggressor had to be stopped; the free governments of the world must stand together. Therefore, it would sell food, supplies, planes, and war munitions to France and England, provided they came in their own ships to get them and paid cash; it changed its neutrality laws accordingly, and argued as it did so that it was helping to save democracy, keeping itself out of war, and doing business, all at the same time. And such was the leadership the people followed, apparently unaware that if the thesis were true, their country's behavior was pusillanimous.

The thesis was false. Our first line of defense was not in Europe. It was here. American civilization, that is our own possession. It could not be saved in Europe or defended there. We are its sole defenders and it can be saved only here.

Well then, the war came, and suddenly it appeared that the strength of the aggressor had been fatally underestimated. Thereupon a great voice was heard in many places at once, as if it were the American voice, saying we must rush to the side of the Allies with material aid—with credit, munitions, anything but men—because it would be cheaper and more intelligent to do that than to let the war come to us, and because (we quote it exactly): "The success of the Allies is vital to us."

We do not believe that was the American voice. It was the voice of fear, to say no worse of it. "Vital" is not a word to be misunderstood. It means something essential to life. Was it the American voice saying the life of this American republic was at stake on the outcome of a war in Europe, even such a thing as the fall of the British Empire? Never had the American spirit a voice like that.

May came. The historian who examines the American newspapers for the month of May 1940 may wonder how much of ourselves we saw in that mirror.

What had happened? The power of the German war machine had been revealed, its triumph was a definite possibility, the fall of the British Empire was imaginable, and the American mind passed through the strangest experience of its life. The emotion was that of dread, acted upon by hysterical mentorship. If we may speak of the national mind, certainly never had its behavior been so unimportant, so weak against the impact of deformed ideas crashed forth before they were born, such as the idea that we should forsake our political traditions and name Mr. Roosevelt on both party tickets, because that would be a demonstration of unity, meaning mass-mindedness, and it would be dangerous in this emergency to change leadership.

The President's own first contribution was a defense message, hastily prepared, in which he suggested how easy it would be for the aggressor to get here with bombs unless we were prepared to stop him enroute, which we were not. He imagined that adequate American preparedness would require 50,000 airplanes and then asked the Congress to increase the Regular Army and Navy appropriations by a sum not much more than the amount it was voting for the W. P. A. program. Less than 2 weeks later he was saying to the reporters at a White House press conference, as reported in the New York Times, "that there was no reason for the country to become discomboomerated. The women of the country would not have to give up their cosmetics, lipsticks, and chocolate sodas in consequence of the preparedness program. * * * The whole idea was that the present state of international affairs called for

an outlay of about a billion and a quarter dollars over and above the two billions that were being spent on the Military and Naval Establishments." Three days later he was saying, in another message to Congress, that "the almost incredible events of the last 2 weeks" made it necessary to appropriate another billion for defense.

While the Germans were doing without butter and buying one cigarette at a time in order to have guns, we were changing our automobiles once a year. "We have not manufactured a big gun for many years," says General Marshall, our chief of staff, "but it would take about 2½ years to make a 16-inch gun and carriage," for the coast defense.

We are not prepared to fight the aggressor. Yet we defy him. He shall not make us give up any of our social gains, says the President. He shall not upset the normal American way of life. American women shall have their cosmetics still, in spite of him. Preparedness the easiest way!

If the Government knows what the problem is, comprehends it even dimly, it is treating the American people as if they were children unable to bear reality. If it does not know, its incompetence, hitherto an economic disaster only, may come to be remembered as a calamity.

The problem is not that we stand alone in this hemisphere, with not one powerful friend in the world to help us defend it. When was it that we stood not alone here? Where was that powerful friend in the world ever willing to help us defend American civilization? We are sick of hearing that the British Navy all this time has been defending our Monroe Doctrine. More than once we had been willing to fight the British Navy for it. Our part is to stand alone for so long as we have the hardihood, the spirit, and the fortitude to do it, and when we haven't, we may as well stop talking about American destiny.

No. The problem is that a balanced distribution of power in the world has been upset. A new and frightful power has appeared, an offensive power, moved by an unappeasable earth hunger, conscious of no right but the right of might. It does not threaten this country with invasion; at least, not yet. It does threaten the Western Hemisphere by economic and poliical designs in the Latin-American countries, and this, for us, is an ominous fact. But the larger aspect of what has happened is that the world is in a state of unbalance. Until an equal defensive power has been created in the hands of people who prefer peace to war, there will be no safe living in it, no security for free government.

Who shall create that equal defensive power and restore the balance? You have only to ask the question to get the answer. There is one country in the whole world that can do it. In that simple sense it is the United States against Germany, now or later. And that is not to speak of war. It is the minimum price of peace.

The cost of doing it, in terms of self-discipline, harder living, more work, may be terrific. This is the truth that we have so far declined to face. It might well cost us, not some billions more or less to be voted by Congress, not a 10-percent increase of the income tax, but possibly a quarter of our total national exertions for several years. There is no easier way. A thousand airplanes a day, if necessary. That is the American voice. It is possible. But how many of us realize what we should have to do without for a thousand airplanes a day? What we will, that we can do.

What the Stars and Stripes Stand For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch calling attention to the significance of the American flag and the principles for which it stands:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 9, 1940]

WHAT THE STARS AND STRIPES STAND FOR

It is fitting that we should be asked to display the national colors this week—Flag week. Yet this act can have little meaning without the realization that the flag is only a symbol—a symbol for America.

America is more than a flag, more than an anthem, more than patriotic oratory. It is more, even, than this land.

My own Manhattan with spires, and the sparkling and hurrying tides, and the ships,
The varied and ample land, the South and the North in the light, Ohio's shores and flashing Missouri,
And ever the far-spreading prairies cover'd with grass and corn.

America is the sum total of many, many men, and women, great and small, quick and dead. It is the sum total of the things they did and are doing to make democracy work. It is action. It is work undertaken to give substance to ideals.

America is George Washington forsaking the plow at Mount Vernon for the cold and the hunger of Valley Forge. It is Thomas Jefferson, with no taste for public office and a skin too thin for the acrimony of politics, accepting that office and enduring that acrimony for the sake of high duty. It is Abraham Lincoln taking up the sword to save the Union, and then bidding the States to bind up their wounds "with malice toward none, with charity for all." America is the sum total of its heroes giving meaning to Jefferson's inalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But, perhaps even more, America is a great host of lesser figures with less glamorous histories—men who saw tasks that needed to be done and did them, men who saw wrongs that cried to be righted and righted them.

There are, for example, the able and far-sighted administrators like Albert Gallatin, Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury. This French-Swiss immigrant, who never learned to speak good English, not only put an end to the congressional custom of making lump-sum appropriations without designating the specific purposes for which public money was to be used but he also introduced the present system of Treasury reports, halved the national debt, financed the War of 1812, and became the father of Federal aid for the building of our great network of roads that he saw to be necessary for binding together a great country.

Then there are the men of righteous anger like Benjamin H. Bristow, of Kentucky, whom Grant unwittingly called to be Secretary of the Treasury. Bristow was horrified to see how greedy hands were looting the public coffers. Investigation soon convinced him that the distillers of St. Louis were paying taxes on only a third of the whisky that left their warehouses. That was the beginning of the exposure of the whisky ring. The trail of bribery led to the White House itself. Bristow obtained more than 250 indictments in St. Louis, Chicago, and Milwaukee, but convictions, unfortunately, were few, and he lost his own post for his zeal.

But Bristow's work was not in vain. He became one of the first soldiers in a great crusade that took form as the Nation's growing wealth tempted the buccaneers to make corruption part of the warp and woof of America. The New York Sun exposed Oakes Ames and the Credit Mobilier scheme, which cost the United States millions of acres of land and millions of dollars, ostensibly given for building our first transcontinental railroad, but actually siphoned into the pockets of the robber barons. Here in St. Louis, Joe Folk fought Butlerism. In New York, the lances were raised against the Tweed ring. Only the other day Boss Pendergast left the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth. The prosecution of the heirs of Huey Long is current history in Louisiana. So the crusade continues on one front and another.

Courage is perhaps the best synonym for this concept of America—courage as it was exemplified by old Bob La Follette and Nebraska's GEORGE NORRIS and their little band as they stood up in the Senate in 1917 and faced the storm wind and the tempest in a vain effort to keep us out of the first World War, steadfastly shielding the last spark of reason and conviction against all-engulfing hysteria.

America means a less spectacular kind of courage, too. It means the kind of courage that enabled the elder La Follette and his sons after him to make Wisconsin a model of honest and advanced government, the kind of courage that kept Senator NORRIS fighting for his Tennessee Valley dream until it became a reality, the kind of courage that sent a Jane Addams into the slums of Chicago to establish Hull House as a model for so many projects that are making concrete the hope and promise of the Bill of Rights.

More important than anything else, perhaps, America means a high sense of justice, a scrupulous respect for the rights of all, even the most unpopular minorities—a sense of justice such as that of John Peter Altgeld, Illinois' eagle forgotten. There was something in the destiny of this man that would not allow him to settle into the comfortable life of a small-town Missouri lawyer. There was something that drove him on to Chicago and the executive mansion in Springfield. There, in the face of the most articulate and powerful elements in the State, he pardoned those Haymarket rioters who had not been hanged. That was in 1893, and the next year, before the hue and cry had subsided, he bitterly protested against President Cleveland's unconstitutional use of Federal troops in Chicago's Pullman strike. Altgeld was hounded into poverty and almost into obscurity. But not quite. Vachel Lindsay was able to say to his spirit:

"A hundred white eagles have risen, the sons of your sons,
The zeal in their wings is a zeal that your dreaming began,
The valor that wore out your soul in the service of man."

America, of course, is Holmes, and Brandeis, and Cardozo, the Judges, shaping the law to the will of the people. It is also Brandeis, the advocate, pleading for decent working conditions for the women of Oregon, and striving with his insurance system to assure the workers of Massachusetts the secure enjoyment of the fruits of their toil in the twilight of their years.

America, too, is the educators—Mark Hopkins on his log and Robert Hutchins in his Gothic tower, working, in Jefferson's words, "to diffuse knowledge more generally through the mass of the people, realizing that knowledge is power, and that in a democracy power belongs to the many, not to the few."

And America also is the writers—Tom Paine and Harriet Beecher Stowe, and John Steinbeck, those with the power of words that move men.

America is also the great legion of the unnamed. It is the Quaker doctor and nurse and teacher going up into the hills of Kentucky. It is the labor organizer daring tar and feathers in the almost feudal pockets of the southern hills. It is the employer who cheerfully complies with a wage-hour law and a Wagner Act. It is the good citizen who makes an honest income-tax return and marks an intelligent ballot each election day.

There is no need to call the roll longer. America is all those who know how to make democracy work, all those who know that their duty is to do the task at hand.

This America is more than a flag. It would be great without any banner or anthem or slogan. And no mere salute to a bit of bunting, no mere singing of a song, is sufficient to make any man a part of this America. Patriotism is in the deed, not in the symbol.

What's Wrong in Washington?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of the issue of July 1, 1940, under the heading "What's Wrong in Washington?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 1, 1940]

WHAT'S WRONG IN WASHINGTON?

The people of this country want our Government to stand up for its every right. They want no appeasement. They want no Munich. This is not to say that there shall be no dealings with Germany and/or Italy should Europe's war end. It is saying only that the Nation wants no trying to mollify the dictators. That doesn't work. Appeasement is interpreted by the dictators only as a sign of weakness.

Nor is there any reassurance in such indecision as marked President Roosevelt's approval of conscription for training manpower one week and his backing up the next week with an explanation that he had been hasty. This rightabout face came when some of the blatherskite politicians, who put politics above country, started the cry that the Democratic Party was becoming the "war party."

So, it seems, the training to be given young men who are assisted by Government is to be mostly in how to make and repair tanks, how to service war machines. We are to have machine guns with nobody to fire them, airplanes with no one to operate them in combat, if necessary, tanks with no one to run them. We are to spend billions for the machines of war and not train men to know how to use them. It is time we dropped this attitude that Government must help everyone who needs assistance, but that nobody must be required to do anything for Government he may not want to do.

And the Senate of the United States. What a weakling it is proving to be. With every call for another billion dollars it falls all over itself to vote the appropriation. But it votes not to end the senseless and extravagant foreign-silver-buying program. It votes not to reduce Government peacetime extravagances by even so little as a 10-percent cut in nonmilitary categories. It rejects 5 percent. It rejects even a $500,000 saving in all the billions. Not one cent in all the wasteful pump priming and social experimenting that has been going on will these politicians give up.

The people of this Nation who earn their keep in shop and office and on the land want Government to have every dime that is considered necessary to make this country impregnable to attack from any quarter.

But they want incompetency cleaned out.

They want indecision and floundering to end.

They want extravagance and nonvital spendings stopped.

They know that they are going to have to take up a notch in their belts. They understand that the tremendous burden of defense coming on top of the load the depression has heaped upon them will mean a lowering of the general standard of living. And they are willing to face this.

But they would like to see some recognition of realities and a pulling in of the politicians' belts, too. It is time for the exploitation of the Nation for the benefit of politicians and their hangers-on to stop.

It is time for sanity.

Danger to United States From "Sixth Column"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE MITCHELL (S. DAK.) DAILY REPUBLIC

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Daily Republic of Mitchell, S. Dak., on June 20, 1940, written by Mr. Arthur Watwood and relating to the subject of subversive activities in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic of June 20, 1940]

"SIXTH," NOT "FIFTH COLUMN," GREATEST DANGER TO UNITED STATES, REPORTS WATWOOD

WINNER, S. DAK.—Arthur Watwood, of Winner, Democratic candidate for Congress, west of the river, is not worried about the "fifth column" as much as he is about the "sixth column," he indicated in a speech before a farm group, near White River.

"We know," said Mr. Watwood, "that our Government, under the leadership of Roosevelt, is now checking the people who live in this Nation—receive the protection of our Government, enjoy the privileges of citizenship, and yet, at the same time, endeavor to promote governmental ideologies—contrary to our system of government. We call such people 'fifth columnists.' The Department of Justice now has a record of such people."

FAR MORE DANGEROUS

"But," continued Mr. Watwood, "the Government does not have a list of the 'sixth columnists'—who are far more dangerous than the 'fifth column' group. They are more dangerous, because of their prominence and the conspicuous places which they hold. Some are Congressmen, Senators, Governors, and civic leaders. By their constant criticism of Roosevelt and his new national-defense plan, they give comfort to the enemies of our form of government and serve as tools of the 'fifth column.' They have become obstructionists to our program of national defense—so badly needed, and to our program of Americanism, as sponsored by the American Legion and other patriotic groups."

Concluding Mr. Watwood declared, "Why should these 'sixth columnists,' drawing in many instances salaries as Senators and Congressmen, be permitted, now in a national crisis, to oppose every move Roosevelt makes for our national defense? I have noticed, however, that many who now oppose our great President, also opposed the President on his battle to end starvation in America. But Roosevelt, the humanitarian, has gone steadily ahead working for the people, notwithstanding such criticism. I predict that regardless of the activities of the 'fifth and sixth columns,' if renominated by the Democrats in their coming convention, he will be reelected President of the United States by an overwhelming majority. The people of this Nation will not repudiate the greatest friend they have."

Oregon Proud of McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Oregon is justly proud of the nomination of its senior Senator, Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, as the running mate for Wendell Willkie to carry the banner for the Republican ticket in the coming campaign. Senator MCNARY is a native son of Oregon and lives on the farm where he was born of pioneer parents. His long service in public life has endeared him to the people of Oregon. Before coming to the United States Senate he served as Associate Justice of the Oregon Supreme Court. He has been an outstanding

exponent of liberal legislation and particularly legislation having for its purpose the placing of the farmers of our Nation on an equality with industry.

I ask leave to include as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Oregonian under date of June 29, 1940, discussing the two candidates on the Republican ticket. The editorial follows:

WILLKIE AND M'NARY

Our Oregon Republicans, and a great many of his neighbors of other political persuasion, wanted Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY to have a chance at the Presidency as the nominee of the Philadelphia convention. There were few party members in all the Nation who did not feel that Oregon's senior Senator possessed all the qualifications required of a candidate. For the matter of that, there would be but few of any party to dispute it. But now the chance has gone glimmering and the fateful ticket of 1940 is Wendell L. Willkie, risen like a comet, though far more substantially, and Senator MCNARY, tempered like a tried blade. Here in Oregon there is no repining. What we think of the ticket is that America needs it, and that if it cannot win a Republican victory no ticket could.

The fact is that we of Oregon, when it was apparent that Senator MCNARY could not have the Presidential nomination, and at a time when it seemed that log-rolling in the hall of convention might roll the fortunes of Willkie under, were praying for this. It appeared to us that the nomination of the utilities executive, who likes to grow hogs in Indiana, and the Oregon native son, who long since earned the right to the designation of "statesman," would establish the unbeatable leadership for which the party was calling from a chaotic wilderness—and not only the party, but a country in crisis, confused and uncertain of everything but the need for strong men and sound guidance. The time was not the time for politics, as politics has been habitually played. Well, sir, the prayer was answered, as it was answered for millions of Americans by the nominations of Willkie and MCNARY.

In no more than the conventional sense is the Republican ticket political. You cannot style an answer to prayer a mere matter of politics, and especially are you prohibited from such usage in a time when we are taking our basic Americanism, exposed and rubbed raw by abrasive events, far more seriously than we have at any hour in 20 years past. There is a Nation-wide conviction that the near future will require, if the American Nation is to weather the gathering storm, such national leadership as citizens will swear by, being neither persuaded to this trust by rhetorical cajolery nor induced by the giving of favors and alms. In a word, ours is a Nation that finally, as at the last stroke of the eleventh hour, with midnight hurrying, has determined that what it wants, and without delay, is results that insure security. In casting about for a phrase to define the Willkie-McNary ticket, as a response to the national need, one cannot improve on the popular plaudit that it is a "natural."

Wendell L. Willkie, the public-utilities executive who has ransomed that sometimes epithetical designation from suspicion and cheap derision, and of swift ascent from private obscurity to public renown, by virtue of those individual gifts of which nobody knew a few months ago. And Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, whose name for brilliant integrity almost is as common to the firesides of the people, and this without least self-seeking, as it is to the floor of the Senate. Willkie with his gifts of phrase and of person, his warmth and his vitality, his incisive and searching, his astonishing knowledge of what is going on in the Nation and the world, and what it all means. MCNARY, the veteran, to whose name attaches no breath of criticism, but all of praise, and is a household word in the farm houses of America; the same who has kept his conscience, his dignity, his undisputed leadership in the counsels of his country and his party through a period that has destroyed many affiliations and wrecked many friendships, and whose personal friendship even is cherished by the opposition. The ticket of Willkie and McNary. Is it to be marveled that enthusiasm responds to it here, as enthusiasm shall respond throughout the country?

In Oregon we are grateful to Senator MCNARY for the loyal and unselfish service he has given to this State and the Nation, but for this last service, that of his permission to the party to draft him as Vice Presidential nominee, against his inclination, we are doubly grateful. His place, the Senator felt, was in the Senate, where by the exercise of experience he could best serve his country. But Oregon felt that, failing of the Presidential nomination, the place of the senior Senator was beside the Republican nominee. And, as we say, this feeling was not restricted to party; it was spontaneous and unlabeled. That the Nation felt so, too, is attested by the insistence of the Philadelphia convention that no other Vice Presidential nomination would content its delegates. It was Willkie the country wanted as the Republican Presidential nominee. It was MCNARY that both Willkie and the Nation wanted as Willkie's running mate.

Out of the confusion and welter of the Republican National Convention, at which the columnists joined the new dealers in scoffing, came in spite of all attempt at prevention the ticket for which the party and the people had prayed. It is a good omen for America when she has need for good omens. We dare think it the guaranty of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Journal, which generally has supported the present administration, in a leading editorial in its issue of June 28, 1940, discusses the nomination of Wendell Willkie as Republican nominee, as follows:

WENDELL WILLKIE EMERGES AS REPUBLICAN NOMINEE TO GIVE JOYOUS BATTLE TO OPPONENT

In Wendell Willkie the Republicans have named their most formidable candidate. He will be infinitely more of a match for the Democratic nominee than Thomas Dewey, Senator Taft, Senator Vandenberg, or Governor James.

For 7 years the Republican organization has spent its time hating Roosevelt and all of his works. As campaign year rolled around the party found itself without an outstanding candidate and without a constructive program. As convention time approached, however, blanket opposition to all New Deal reforms necessarily faded before common sense and popular demand.

Then came the welter of war, which made wholesale attack upon the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration quite indiscreet, to say the least.

For a week the G. O. P. platform-makers labored and labored in Philadelphia and brought forth a mouse-like effort that is not strong enough to support such a candidate as Willkie. Willkie, the nominee, however, is so much bigger than the formal platform that he may be expected to scrap it plank by plank, build his own platform as he goes along regardless of party orthodoxy.

A few months ago the name Wendell Willkie was a whisper in the political breeze. He was known in business circles as a capable lawyer and utility executive and in administration circles as a persistent and powerful opponent who fought the New Deal alone in a successful defense of the rights of those he represented when they clashed with the bureaucracy of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

A few months ago he began to make public addresses here and there. Among the first was before the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, where his criticism of the New Deal was tempered with constructive comment so liberal as to strike terror to the heart of the smug of the Union League Club. His ready wit upon the "Information, Please" program recommended him to the national radio audience.

In April, in an off-the-record dinner panel discussion before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, by sheer force of personality and quick thinking, he stole the show from the acerb Harold Ickes. The next week, in New York, in an address before the American Newspaper Publishers Association, he observed that business was being criticized by the administration for not doing what the administration would not permit it to do.

A public address in Massachusetts followed and then a swing through the farm belt of the Mississippi Valley.

Wendell Willkie was emerging as a political candidate. His phenomenal rise from scratch as a boy amidst comparatively humble circumstances in Indiana to a high position in the much-maligned utility field was made known to all of the people, including the fact that until recently he had been a lifelong Democrat, and now, as then, quite on the liberal side.

And the Willkie movement assumed major proportions overnight. As a serious political effort, its principal impetus was from downtown New York in an effort to stop Dewey, and from investment bankers at that.

So fast did the Willkie idea take that when balloting began at Philadelphia, Thursday, Willkie was no longer in the dark-horse class. From third place on the first two ballots Willkie jumped to second place on the third ballot; was first on the fourth and fifth, and was unanimously nominated on the sixth ballot. On the convention floor young Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, performed yeoman service with professional skill in Willkie's behalf.

Now Willkie is the Republican Presidential nominee, and as such stands out like a red necktie on a pious clergyman. In the flush of his victory he has the cordial assurance of support from his opponents and their campaign managers.

News of his victory he greeted with the simple statement: "I am deeply grateful; I am overwhelmed. And now I want to go and join my family."

There you have it. The Journal welcomes his nomination because of his frankness and candor. At the moment of his nomination the Journal ventures the thought that should he be elected his liberalism and sense of social justice will annoy exceedingly some of those who will shout for him the loudest during the campaign.

Some days ago Willkie quipped: "I don't want to meet Galento; I want to meet the champ." Well, Willkie has formally qualified for the bout and unless the unexpected happens—and it well may happen—Franklin Roosevelt will emerge from the formality of the Chicago convention as the Democratic champ.

It will be a grand fight and whoever may win, the plain people of the United States won't lose.

Mr. Speaker, after the nomination of Senator MCNARY the Oregon Journal, in its issue of June 29, 1940, further discussed

the Republican ticket and the candidacy of Senator McNARY, as follows:

POLITICS OF THE OLD MACHINE SORT HAD TO TAKE A BACK SEAT WITH THE NOMINATION OF WENDELL L. WILLKIE

On their farms and in their hamlets and cities the American people may call what they have just witnessed a "Willkrieg." Politics hasn't a match for the way Wendell Willkie rose in 2 months from political obscurity to dominance as a Presidential candidate, nor for the way his name rode through the Republican National Convention to win unanimous nomination before the sixth ballot ended.

Now, the performance stands to repeat in the larger arena and in the elimination contest affecting Democratic Presidential aspirants. The Republicans have presented their most powerful candidate, with a feeble platform. The Democrats, to get the edge, must produce a great candidate with an equally great platform. And even then, as Willkie said, the fight will have just begun.

But, beyond the party label, the Willkie nomination comes from a deep impulse in national life. The Presidential campaign will be waged between ideas of government. In a world that has so far left the United States out of a movement toward national socialism or, more properly, state capitalism, the Willkie nomination bespeaks a strong stand by business and industry for a capitalistic democracy, with its free enterprise, competitions, and ownerships.

Dewey, if nominated, would have become the prosecutor of the New Deal; Taft, if nominated, as the leader of movement toward conservatism. Willkie, Democrat until he broke with the New Deal, espouses such New Deal reforms as social security, wage-hour legislation, old-age and unemployment insurance. He acknowledges the abuses that became flagrant under preceding Republican administrations in finance and industry. He applauds Federal control over banking, the issue of new securities, utilities, aviation, and communications, and interstate enterprise.

But if you want to get the Willkie platform down into words so few that they make the Republican platform seem as lengthy as Gone With the Wind, it is domestic recovery, national defense, the re-creation of free economic enterprise, the dismissal of a government-controlled economy, gradual curtailment of the spend-lend program, budget balancing, tax reduction, and trade promotion.

What's going to happen to public works, electrification, and trade treaties in their present administration? Maybe the Democratic platform will have to answer.

If one assumes the nomination of Roosevelt at Chicago, and if the international crisis continues, the contest between Roosevelt and Willkie will be determined to large extent on the national-defense issue.

Even if European hostilities end, it will still be necessary to convince the American people that total defense of the Western Hemisphere is imperative.

It is to be assumed that Roosevelt and Willkie are not far apart on this fundamental issue. But if the Roosevelt defense program bogs down in the next 3 months, if it is unable to translate money into armament swiftly enough to satisfy a jittery people, Willkie will have the advantage.

We come now, however, to the peculiar power that will mark the Willkie campaign—good humor, absence of epithets, and a liking for people, including opponents.

One more word about the Republican convention. It was unbossed. It gave youth a voice. The nomination was made on the floor, not in a "smoke-filled room." We are going to have a great campaign in full sight and hearing of the people who will decide it—and thank God that they still do.

M'NARY IS IDEAL RUNNING MATE FOR WILLKIE; OREGON PROUD OF HER SON

Tremendous strength is added to the Republican ticket by the nomination of Oregon's own Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY for the vice presidency and as Wendell Willkie's running mate.

The Willkie-McNary combination will appeal to business, industry, and the farm. It will draw more closely together the East and the West. It will be hard to beat.

Like Willkie, McNary rose to eminence from the grass roots. He became minority leader of the United States Senate through sheer ability, long-headed judgment, and the influence commanded by the respect accorded him by his colleagues.

Although he occupied an increasingly larger place in the national picture, Oregon, its people, and its interests have had his instant, effective attention.

The nomination gives Oregon a place on a national Presidential ticket, for the first time in 80 years. In 1860 the Democratic convention at Baltimore composed of seceding delegates from the Douglas convention nominated for the Presidency, John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky, and for the Vice Presidency, Joseph Lane, first territorial Governor of Oregon and later Congressman. Breckenridge and Lane ran against Abraham Lincoln of Illinois and Hannibal Hamlin of Maine.

McNary is of Presidential stature. His heart is with the plain people, the producers, and the workers. His personal and political philosophy is essentially liberal. He supported many New Deal measures. He's almost as good a "Democrat" as Willkie. His nomination may constitute an answer as to what will happen to great public improvements like Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the Willamette Valley projects. He and Willkie constitute a team of nearly equal pulling power.

His nomination fills Oregon with pride.

Patman Chain-Store Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1940

STATEMENT BY RALPH BURKARD, COMPTROLLER, FIRST NATIONAL STORES, INC.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following final statement of Ralph Burkard, comptroller, First National Stores, Inc.:

THE RECORD CLOSES

(Final statement by Ralph F. Burkard, comptroller, First National Stores, Inc., on Patman chain-store bill)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Ralph F. Burkard. I am comptroller of First National Stores, Inc., and a member of its executive committee. Our principal offices are at Somerville, Mass., and I have been with the company for 22 years.

On April 12 Mr. C. F. Adams, treasurer of our company, testified before this committee in opposition to H. R. 1.

I have been present throughout the greater part of these hearings, including the period of rebuttal statements by the proponents of of this bill. Furthermore, I have carefully read these statements and have concluded that while they contain no new facts which require extended discussion or answer, I feel that a further statement is justified in view of the character of the material presented by the rebuttal witnesses. I have made my views known to representatives of other multiple store companies who have appeared here, and I am authorized to state to you that they share these views.

In their rebuttal the proponents have again indulged in specious generalities entirely unsupported by facts and have, at best, merely reiterated their shopworn and, I think, wholly unsubstantiated arguments. To this they have added ridicule and unwarranted criticism of those men and women, from practically all walks of American life and from every section of the country, who have exercised their constitutional right of petition by appearing before you in opposition to this bill. I feel sure that you will agree with me when I say that ridicule and such criticism are not substitutes for facts.

The record shows that in addition to the testimony of men actually engaged in our system of distribution, approximately 148 witnesses (exclusive of the oil witnesses) from some 35 States appeared personally before this committee to oppose the enactment of H. R. 1. Who were these 148 witnesses? They represented farmers, laborers, consumers, manufacturers, real estate owners, economists, editors, scientists, teachers and other important elements of our national life. Representatives of many outstanding national associations in various fields also appeared in opposition to this bill. I submit to you gentlemen that such testimony as this cannot be rebutted by ridicule, nor can the judgment or testimony of a rebuttal witness, whose publication is devoted to abuse of the multiple unit system of distribution, be substituted for that of such highly regarded and representative organizations. Moreover, I wish to point out to this committee that nowhere in this record will you find the testimony of a single witness in support of the bill who speaks with any authority for labor, the farmer, or the consumer.

A review of the record of these hearings shows that 65 witnesses appeared personally on behalf of agriculture, 46 on behalf of manufacturers and processors, 8 on behalf of labor, 6 on behalf of real estate, 7 on behalf of consumers, 4 outstanding economists and marketing experts, and 12 representing miscellaneous interest, all opposing and condemning H. R. 1. Some came as individuals, while many came representing companies, associations, and organizations.

Among those who appeared for agriculture in opposition to H. R. 1 were authorized representatives of the following:

The National Grange, American Farm Bureau Federation, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Maine Potato Growers, Inc., International Baby Chick Association, National Wool Growers Association, Massachusetts Fruit Growers Association, National Swine Growers Association, Michigan Bean Producers Association, Missouri Apple Growers Association, American National Livestock Association, Georgia, Florida, Alabama Peanut Association, Vermont Maple Cooperative, Inc., North Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative Association, Producers Cooperative Commission Association, Empire State Potato Group, Connecticut Regional Marketing Authority, Ohio State Apiaries Cooperative Association, Carolinas Cooperatives Consolidated, Texas Citrus Fruit Growers Exchange, Michigan Bonded Fruit Growers Association, Pacific Egg Producers Cooperative, Inc., South Carolina Peach Growers Association, Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers Association, Georgia Vegetables Growers Asso-

ciation, New York State Vegetables Growers Association, the Horticultural Society of Virginia, Lehigh Valley (Pa.) Cooperative Farmers, Mutual Orange Distributors, United Fruit Growers Association, Rio Grande Valley Citrus Exchange, Growers and Shippers Cooperative Union, Florida Avocado and Persian Lime Growers Association, Farmers Cooperative Exchange and North Carolina Cotton Growers Cooperative Association, the Fergus Falls (Minn.) Cooperative Creamery Association, the Eagle Valley (Minn.) Cocperative Creamery Association, Bellows Falls (Vt.) Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Mid-West Producers' Creameries, Inc., Denver (Iowa) Creamery Farmers' Cooperative Creamery.

Many other farm organizations and individual farmers and shippers appeared and condemned the bill, while the record shows that not a single representative of agriculture appeared in support of it.

The record of the hearings further shows that representatives of the following labor organizations appeared in opposition to H. R. 1:

Retail Clerks International Protective Association, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, International Typographical Union, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, International Allied Printing Trades Association, Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C.

On the other hand, not a single representative of labor appeared in support of the bill.

The record further shows that the following consumer organizations appeared in opposition to H. R. 1:

American Home Economics Association, American Association of University Women, Massachusetts Committee on Consumer Legislation, Philadelphia Consumers Advisory Council, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Again, not a single representative of a consumer organization appeared in support of the bill.

In addition to these organizations there appeared, as I have already stated, 46 manufacturers and processors, 6 representatives of real estate, and 4 economists and marketing experts in opposition to the bill. We submit that these witnesses are better qualified to know what is best for their interests and the organizations for which they speak than is the publisher of an anti-chain-store trade paper, the executives of the National Association of Retail Druggists, the National Association of Retail Grocers, or the United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

The proponents of H. R. 1 have made several charges, without submitting supporting data, and I should like briefly to refer to certain of them, as obviously it would be impossible for me to refer to all of them.

1. They assert that multiple-store operators depress farm prices. Suffice it to say on this point that all the farm organizations and all the individual farmers who appeared before this committee testified to the contrary, while not a single farm witness appeared to substantiate this charge.

2. They assert that multiple-store operators depress real-estate values. As in the case of farm prices, every real-estate witness testified to the contrary.

3. They assert that multiple-store operators injure labor. The representatives of labor appeared before this committee condemning the bill, and testified that the opposite is the fact. Again, not a single labor witness appeared to substantiate this charge or to favor the bill.

4. The proponents of H. R. 1 continue to assert that the multiple-store distributors engage in the practice of loss-leader selling. Every chain-store executive who appeared and testified before this committee condemned severely the practice of loss-leader selling and stated that his company did not indulge in it. Mr. Adams, of the First National Stores, testified to the fact that the multiple-store distributors have cooperated with other distributors in fostering legislation in the various States to outlaw loss-leader selling. In fact, they cooperated in drafting a model bill to put an end to this vice.

5. One of the proponents stated again on rebuttal that the bank accounts of the multiple-unit distributors were concentrated in New York City. The proponents continue to make this statement, despite the fact that the record proves conclusively the contrary. Mr. Sams, president of the J. C. Penney Co., testified that 76 percent of the company's bank balances were deposited in over 1,550 banks, all outside New York City.

Mr. Adams, of the First National Stores, stated that our company's bank accounts are all in the New England States and at least 80 percent are in the country banks. We have no bank account in New York City.

I will later ask leave to file a statement from the Safeway Stores, Inc., showing that in the 993 towns in the United States in which it does business it carries 1,130 bank accounts and that for the last 3 years less than 7½ percent of its cash was on deposit in cities in which Safeway does not operate, including New York City.

In the brief filed by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. as a part of the record, it appears that that company maintains accounts in 3,517 banks located in all parts of the United States.

Moreover, a recent survey of the chain food industry shows that 94 percent of the bank deposits of the companies were in the States where the stores were located.

6. The proponents have asserted again that the stock of companies engaged in the multiple-store business is closely held. This charge has been repeated, in spite of the fact that the record discloses the contrary to be true. I ask leave at this time to insert in the record immediately following my statement exhibit A, a table showing that the stock of these companies is widely held throughout the United States. The table also shows an average of over 10 stockholders for each store, and further a close corelation between the number of stores and number of stockholders in each State.[1]

7. The proponents again asserted that companies engaged in multiple store distribution have interlocking directorates. I ask leave to file as exhibit B a table showing that these companies have practically no interlocking directorates.

8. One of the proponents of House bill 1 testified that producer-consumer campaigns conducted by the food chains to move farm surpluses shift consumer demand away from other products and eventually depress farm prices.

Many agriculture witnesses testified to the contrary. Also the United States Department of Agriculture, in a report on retail sales campaigns for farm products, released in December 1938, said:

"The campaigns are of special interest because they are the first widespread attempt to gear the retailer (the most remote and usually the least responsive link in the marketing chain) more closely into changing demand and supply conditions. Organized efforts of this kind, sometimes referred to as producer-consumer campaigns, were begun by the grocery chains in 1936. Since then other trade and retail groups have undertaken similar programs. At least 20 major agricultural products have had the sales support of such drives within the last 3 years."

Discussing the effects of these drives, the report said on page 3:

"Increases in prices to producers as a result of special sales efforts may come about in either or both of two ways. As a result of advertising or more prominent store display, consumers might be induced to buy more of a commodity at the same price (or the same quantity at a higher price). This is sometimes referred to as an upward shift in demand. The second way in which producers stand to benefit is from any narrowing of marketing spreads that may accompany the campaigns."

The Department of Agriculture said that while there may be a diverting of consumer purchases, "there can be little doubt of the value of any program that helps to relieve groups of producers who are in an especially unfavorable price circumstance, especially if the program results in a narrowing of marketing spreads" (p. 14).

9. The proponents of H. R. 1 have repeatedly stated that the independent merchants are declining in number and in their proportion of the total food business done in the United States.

The facts do not support this contention.

I have here, to file with the committee for the record, a statement dealing with the number of stores and volume of sales of independent and chain food stores. This statement covers the years 1929, 1933, and 1935—taken from the United States Census of Distribution—and the years 1936 to 1939, taken from the Progressive Grocer, the trade magazine that has been cited frequently by the proponents of H. R. 1 during this hearing in support of their contentions.

These figures show:

A. The independent food-store sales for 1935 increased $1,090,000,000, or 39 percent, over 1933, which are the last Census of Distribution dates.

B. The chain food-store sales for 1935 increased $257,000,000, or 12 percent, over 1933.

C. The percentage of total food business done by chain stores in 1935, as compared with 1933, declined, while during the same period the total percentage done by independents has increased.

D. The number of independent food stores in 1935 increased 51,362, or 20 percent over 1933.

Mr. Chairman, may I file this statement for insertion in the record at this point in my remarks?[2]

10. During this hearing the proponents have repeatedly stated that the chain stores are or threaten to be a monopoly. In the light of irrefutable evidence in the record, it is apparent that no monopoly exists, there is no potential threat of monopoly, and there is no possibility of monopoly in retail distribution.

It seems very strange to me that a few witnesses who purport to represent retailers doing 77 percent of the volume of business in the United States are seeking through legislation to destroy or cripple their multiple-store competitors who do 23 percent of the business—claiming that the 23 percent have or threaten to obtain a monopoly. This seems especially strange in the light of the fact that in 1935 there were 304,398 independent grocery and combination stores in the United States as compared with 48,239 chain outlets doing the same type of business. For 1939, according to our best estimate, the number of these independents has increased over 1935, while the number of chain outlets has declined to approximately 40,000. Moreover, in all lines of retailing there were 1,474,149 independent stores in operation in 1935 as compared with 127,482 chain outlets in operation in that year. These facts, I believe, clearly refute any charge of monopoly and remove any basis for fear of monopoly.

Before leaving these points, I want to recall to the committee's attention the brief, entitled "Keep Market Street Open," which Mr. Sams presented at the conclusion of his testimony. This brief shows where companies have their headquarters, where they operate, how many stockholders they have, how shares are distributed, who are their directors, and many other facts pertinent to this issue. All source material is documented for immediate reference.

H. R. 1 is not in any sense a revenue measure. If this bill were enacted into law, it would add great burdens to the consumers of

---

[1] The chairman granted Mr. Burkard's request and exhibits A and B were inserted on p. 2247 of the printed record of the hearings.

[2] The statement referred to appears in the appendix of this pamphlet.

this country, who are entitled to have the necessities of life distributed at the lowest reasonable cost. Moreover, the record shows that the Federal, State, and local governments would lose many millions of dollars annually in direct revenue, to say nothing of the indirect taxes which would be lost.

It is punitive taxation at its worst, designed solely to destroy an efficient, modern, and up-to-date method of distribution. It sets a precedent for the destruction by taxation of any business or endeavor operated upon a multiple-unit basis. Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, an important labor leader, testified that the principle of this bill, carried to its logical end, would permit the taxation and destruction of national and international labor unions. Mr. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, testified that the philosophy of this bill would permit taxation of farmers' cooperatives which, in essence, are integrated organizations not greatly different in nature and operation from chains. The possibility of H. R. 1, even in its present form, being construed to cover retail automobile dealers has been seriously discussed at these hearings, as has also the possibility of amending the bill to cover manufacturer's branches, chain wholesalers, and chain oil refineries. Voluntary chains, because of their centralized control and close similarity to corporate chains in their operations, would probably be construed as being covered by this bill.

In my opinion the principle involved in this bill is a perversion of the taxing power of the United States since it would be used to destroy a legitimate business, and I am sure that this committee, with its knowledge of taxation, will not want to set a precedent of this character, because once established it is a direct step away from our democratic form of government.

I believe that the record demonstrates that the economies of distribution present in the multiple store system are available to 108,000 retailers in the food field alone who have joined voluntary groups, as compared with only 40,000 food stores operated by corporate chains. These voluntary and cooperative organizations, as well as the efficient independent stores, do not need and have not sought to destroy their competitors through discriminatory measures such as House Resolution 1. These groups are doing an efficient job in the field of distribution and are furnishing keen competition to companies engaged in the multiple-store system.

Companies engaged in multiple-store distribution have been subjected to reckless and unfounded charges for a number of years by a few individuals who hope to benefit from the destruction of what witnesses who have testified believe to be the soundest, most economical and efficient method of distribution yet devised. This hearing has afforded the first opportunity of presenting to a committee of the Congress the facts concerning our business, and the opportunity thus afforded has been welcomed by our company, and I am sure by all multiple store companies.

Company executives who have appeared have endeavored to present factual information to acquaint this committee with the development of the multiple-store system of distribution, the policies, methods, and practices followed by the companies, the benefits and assistance to producers, manufacturers, and processors of a wide range of commodities produced or manufactured in the United States, and finally the social and economic contribution to the public welfare. It has never been the policy of my company, either at this hearing or elsewhere, and I am sure that it is not the policy of any other company engaged in the same method of distribution, to condemn or criticize other methods or systems of distribution. I believe that there is ample room in our economy for each method of distribution, and that by encouraging each method producers, laborers, manufacturers, and consumers will reap the greatest benefits.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave of the committee to file certain documents for inclusion in the record at the close of my statement. These documents have been handed to me by representatives of various companies and relate only to specific statements made by proponents in their rebuttal.

Permit me to express the deep appreciation of my company for the patient, thorough, and fair manner in which this committee has conducted this hearing. I am confident that this feeling is shared by every chain store company representative that has appeared at the hearing. I do not wish to burden your committee with further testimony, because I believe that the record clearly demonstrates beyond question the unsoundness of H. R. 1.

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX

The statement referred to by Mr. Burkard is as follows:

SALES AND NUMBER OF CHAIN AND INDEPENDENT FOOD STORES, 1929–39

Official figures on total food-store sales are available only for the three census years of 1929, 1933, and 1935. All food stores include grocery, combination, delicatessen, bakeries, meats and sea food, fruit and vegetable markets, dairy-products stores, etc. Sales were as follows: [3]

1929	$10,837,421,000
1933	6,793,010,000
1935	8,362,425,000

[3] Census of Business: 1935. Retail Distribution, vol. I. United States Summary, pp. 2–04 and 3–04.

Sales of chain and independent grocery and combination grocery and meat stores only in the 3 census years were as follows:

Year	Total	Chain stores	Independent sales	Percent chain sales to total
1929	$7,352,791,000	$2,833,979,000	$4,518,812,000	38.5
1933	5,004,284,000	2,209,000,000	2,795,284,000	44.1
1935	6,352,420,000	2,466,588,000	3,885,832,000	38.8

The sales of all retail food stores declined materially between 1929 and 1933 due to the depression. The decline in the sales of independents for this period was greater than that of chains. This was undoubtedly due, at least in part, to the fact that consumers with reduced purchasing power took advantage of lower chain-store prices. Between 1933 and 1935 the sales of all retail food stores materially increased. The increase in the sales of independent food stores amounted to more than a billion dollars, or 39 percent, and the increase in the sale of food chains was $257,588,000, or 11.7 percent. In other words, independent food sales declined more from 1929 to 1933 but recovered more from 1933 to 1935, so that the proportion of food business going to the chains was about the same in 1935 as in 1929.

The percentage of food business done by chain-store organizations is overstated, and the amount of food business is understated, because it does not take into account sales of food in stores other than food stores, or in food stores other than grocery and combination stores. For example, according to the 1935 census, country general stores had sales of $1,110,403,000. More than half of the sales of these stores consist of food products, and 96.5 percent of these were independent stores. Thus, in country general stores alone, another $535,000,000 worth of food was sold in independent stores even if only one-half of their sales were food products. This together with sales of other types of food stores would reduce the proportion of food sold by chain organizations in 1935 to 32.8 percent instead of 38.8 percent given in the table above.

In addition to country general stores many other stores that are not classified as food stores sell food products although the volume of their food sales is not known. Feed stores, general merchandise stores, and department stores are examples. The amount of food sold by house-to-house peddlers and roadside stands is not known, or is incompletely known.

According to the 1935 census, the sales of eating and drinking places amounted to $2,390,860,000. If only half of these sales consisted of food, another $1,195,000,000 is added to the food bill of the country. Hotels, Pullman cars, hospitals, and clubs are other places where food is sold in large quantities.

All of these places, ranging from country general stores to private clubs, must raise the food sales of the country, in one form or another, by a few billion dollars. Exclusive of food produced for home consumption, the value of all food sales probably is close to $15,000,000,000. In that case, sales of food by chain organizations are well below 30 percent of the total, and the largest food chain in the country does less than 7 percent of the total food business, and in the matter of food sold at retail for off-premise consumption, probably not more than 8 to 9 percent of the country's total.

Although official data are lacking for years subsequent to 1935, estimates of the food business of the country for these later years have been made by the Progressive Grocer, a trade publication. The classification of grocery and combination stores in this publication differs from the census classification in that they include other types of food stores. For this reason they are not strictly comparable with census figures, nevertheless I am submitting them as a possible indication of the trend.

SALES OF CHAIN AND INDEPENDENT GROCERY AND COMBINATION STORES 1936–39 [1]

Year	Independents	Chains	Total	Chain, percent of total
1936	$5,188,000,000	$2,638,000,000	$7,826,000,000	33.71
1937	5,458,000,000	2,698,000,000	8,156,000,000	33.08
1938	5,076,000,000	2,657,000,000	7,733,000,000	34.36
1939	4,990,000,000	2,900,000,000	7,890,000,000	36.76

[1] Facts in Food and Grocery Distribution, January 1940, published by the Progressive Grocer, 171 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y., p. 4.

The number of chain and independent grocery and combination stores in census years was as follows:

Year	Independents	Chain
1929	234,082	52,618
1933	253,036	49,664
1935	304,398	48,239

Thus between 1929 and 1935 the number of independent grocery and combination stores increased by 70,316, or 30 percent, while the chains decreased by 4,379, or 8.3 percent. The change in number is even more startling in 1939. It is estimated by our trade association that there were no more than 40,000 chain grocery and combination stores by the first of this year. This estimate is confirmed by Facts in Food and Grocery Distribution, the booklet previously cited. According to this estimate the number of chain grocery and combination stores has declined more than 12,000 in the 11-year period, 1929–30, or nearly 24 percent.

The number of independent grocery and combination stores in 1939 is estimated in Facts in Food and Grocery Distribution to have been 386,000, a total of nearly 152,000 more stores than reported by the census of 1929. While these figures may not be strictly comparable they do reflect the very large increase in the number of independent stores, despite the charges of proponents of H. R. 1 that the independent is being driven out of business.

For all lines of retailing the number of chain and independent stores is given below for the 3 census years: [4]

Year	Independent	Chain	All others [1]	Total
1929	1,295,114	144,606	103,438	1,543,158
1933	1,349,337	141,603	35,179	1,526,119
1935	1,474,147	127,482	52,330	1,653,961

[1] "All others" include such retail outlets as utility-operated stores, mail-order houses, direct selling, commissaries, etc.

So far as I know, there has been no reliable estimate made since 1935 of the total number of retail outlets for all lines of trade.

Aping John Bull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SOCIAL JUSTICE

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the July 1, 1940, issue of Father Coughlin's Social Justice:

[From Social Justice of July 1, 1940]

APING JOHN BULL

Is Mr. Roosevelt, consciously or not, aping John Bull?

John Bull, we remember, promised military aid to the defense of Poland, Finland, Norway, Belgium, and France. Relying upon the British promise, the brave defenders of these countries often defied their own better judgment and stood up against unbeatable odds, spurred by the thought that the British would come. Time after time the British ran out on their promises.

Mr. Roosevelt promised every assistance short of war—and then some—to Premier Reynaud to carry on the defense of France. So confident was Reynaud in the Roosevelt promise to "fix things up" at home that he held out against the counsel of his own countrymen. Then came the Roosevelt canvass of Congress and the fateful week-end telegram to Reynaud: "Of course, I did not mean fighting men; that's up to Congress." And M. Reynaud, like many another disillusioned chancellor, resigned.

The John Bullers are always long on promises and short on performance.

The 1932 platform of Mr. Roosevelt's political party was glorious for its promises. It is still good as new; the promises are practically untouched. Instead, we have the inglorious record of their nonfulfillment in 1940.

[4] Source: Data for 1929 from the Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930. Distribution, vol. I. Retail Distribution, pt. I, p. 68; data for 1933 and 1935 from Census of Business, 1935. Retail Distribution, vol. IV. Types of Operation, pp. 13 and 169.

Townsend Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend organization is holding its fifth national convention in St. Louis, Mo. Delegates from every State in the Union are in attendance. At the opening session Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the founder of the movement, delivered a keynote address. I ask leave to include this address in an extension of my remarks. The address follows:

COMPLETE TEXT OF DR. TOWNSEND'S KEYNOTE ADDRESS AT CONVENTION

We come before you in the most solemn period in our Nation's history. The United States of America and the future of our people are at stake.

During my visit to the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, I found little realization of the gravity of our situation. The delegates seemed more like grown-up schoolboys at play. I am reasonably certain that the Democratic Convention in Chicago will not reflect any higher degree of statesmanship or knowledge of our national peril.

The mightiest revolution in the history of mankind has taken place in Europe. A single totalitarian power has swept into absolute control of every inch of Europe's continental coast line from the Arctic Circle to the Spanish border. Four hundred millions of people and an entire continent with its resources have fallen under the domination of a single despotic leader. In the Far East another dictatorship, not friendly to the United States, is commanding comparable strength and absorbing the land and resources of its neighbors.

Between these powers there lies the mighty Russian Empire—another vast continental monopoly of completely controlled production, distribution, and trade. The United States is indeed isolated. We have no one to look to but ourselves and the intelligence of those we delegate to represent us.

DICTATORS FREE TO ACT

The three great dictatorships of Europe and Asia have no one to question them. They are not beset by financial worries; there is never any question about what they can afford. If they have gold, they use it; if they have no gold, they use goods. They may be compared to the elder Rockefeller in dealing with independent oil producers—or to a powerful string of chain stores in competing with the corner grocer. They are utterly ruthless in subjugating the rights of individuals and nations to the demands of their nationalistic aims.

In this mightiest of revolutions, the rules we have known in the past have been swept aside. The world moves in new ways. Never has democracy faced such a challenge. It is up to the people of America to prove that the ideals by which we have lived and grown great can triumph over the world-crushing forces of domineering overlords.

With these thoughts in mind, I attended the Republican Convention in Philadelphia. It was my conviction that the delegates assembled there would be sobered and exhalted by the responsibilities entrusted to them—that they would be considering the wretched plight of 10,000,000 men without jobs—that they would be sympathetic to the demands of 10,000,000 of our elder citizens left without hope in a world their energies had helped to create.

I dared to hope that they would realize that the first line of national defense is the health and well-being of all our citizens.

But what did I find? Just the usual convention picture. Similar in every way to the conventions of preceding years—except, perhaps, that the delegates were a little more vociferous, a little more given to horseplay than they were in 1936 when New Deal popularity was at its height. There were the usual swarm of job seekers ready to cheer their heads off for the candidate whose selection might land them a soft berth. There were elephants parading the street. There were joyous celebrants in the cafes and bars intent on smashing each other's straw hats. There were organized cheering sections for the Grand Old Party—shouting college yells until their overstrained throats gave out. And this, my friends, is not political claptrap.

I am, myself, a registered Republican. We gather here as representatives of all political faiths. We have put our cause above political party faiths.

WHAT WE MUST DO

I know, and you know, that unless there is a veritable uprising in the land, the Democratic Convention in Chicago will be but a repetition of what we have seen in Philadelphia. We must solemnly realize that the United States of America—and everything we hold dear—is at stake. Future generations will point to us and ask what service we performed in the hour of our Nation's peril.

We must build a city invincible.

"I dreamed in a dream," said Walt Whitman, "that I saw a city invincible to the attacks of the whole of the rest of the earth. I dreamed that was the new city of friends."

It is in that spirit of friendship and toleration—a toleration broad enough to cover race, creed, and politics—that we hopefully gather here in convention to build a bulwark in the face of desperate times. We pledge to the work that we do the intelligence of our brains, the work of our hands, and the strength and full affection of our hearts. We realize that we are members—one of another—and together we worship the Father in spirit and in truth. It is indeed our task to make His kingdom come here on earth.

In this spirit of consecrated service to mankind, we come before you with solemn warning: This Nation—founded on patriot blood—trembles on the brink of an abyss. Those to whom we have delegated power seem to have closed their eyes, but we—the people—are awake. And we intend to save America from all perils, including both those within and without.

The industrial activities of the entire world are geared to wartime production—the machine-tool industry and most of our factories are devoted to the ghastly business of creating instruments of destruction.

A MORE FRIGHTENING PICTURE

We do not wish to create a war scare or to join in predictions that war planes are likely to bomb Denver or St. Louis tomorrow, but we do bring you an even more frightening picture.

What will happen to our economy—this boasted American economy—when peace is finally declared?

The normal crops of Europe have been crushed beneath tractor, wheel, and marching feet. A few short months and the Old World will face continental famine. Russia, the potential bread basket of Europe, has been unable to secure sufficient machinery; it is not making the exports of food that were promised. A world torn with strife cannot return to normalcy at the mere signing of peace treaties.

The outlook for foreign trade is bleak, indeed. Reciprocal trade treaties are now mere subjects for academic discussion. We face a permanent loss of about $6,000,000,000 in annual world trade, together with the resultant loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs. Russian purchases in the United States last month fell to $2,750,000, compared with a monthly average of close to ten millions. Nations that were formerly our customers are now under the dominion of Adolf Hitler and will buy little or nothing. What trade we will have will be based on barter. The days of favorable trade balances are gone.

We are faced with the necessity of discarding our old squirrel-like philosophies and seeking ways and means to distribute our goods instead of burying gold in the unresponsive soil at Fort Knox. Our national policy has been to imitate old King Midas; we have turned the goods our own people need into imported gold. There is nothing for advocates of such policies to do save follow the classical example of Midas and jump in the river—to come up later with jackass ears.

STRIKING AT REPUTATIONS

Instead of seeking answers to our problems, national political conventions, says Westbrook Pegler, are largely concerned with tearing the reputations of potential candidates into shreds. If a man takes a drink, he is a drunkard. If a candidate comes to the convention well advertised, he is presumed to have bought his delegates and to have questionable connections with Wall Street. If he is an independent, he is accused of being a wily stooge of sinister forces.

It is inconceivable that any man should be the public's choice. If he is a Catholic, he is supposed to be in the service of the Vatican; if a Jew, he is strongly suspected of being a Communist and an international banker in the employ of Hitler at one and the same time. If a Protestant, he is a prohibitionist and a dangerous bigot; while if he ever spoke favorably toward union labor, he is a treacherous "red" hired by Joe Stalin. And, we may add, if he be so unfortunate as to have humanitarian ideals and favor security for the aged and a decent, Christian living for the rest of his fellow beings, he is branded as a "crackpot" without question.

Our statesmen and political leaders do not seem to be aware of the desperate plight of the Nation. If peace should suddenly descend upon the earth, it could scarcely be termed an unqualified blessing, for our country faces the worst catastrophe from an economic standpoint that civilized man may ever see. There will be more millions without jobs than we can imagine.

Considering the current advances of technology and the ultimate cessation of war activity, it is not too much to state that we may look for at least 21,000,000 men parading the streets without means of sustenance. No nation could exist for long under such a condition. The threat of bloody revolution would be upon our hands.

There is an answer, and that answer is in this solemn conference: We are not gathered here to seek political jobs nor to gratify personal ambition, but, rather, to build for the good of all mankind.

In our recovery plan we have the key to America's salvation.

We are here dedicated to the highest patriotic service. We have come together voluntarily to build that city invincible—that new city of friends that can withstand the attacks of the rest of the earth.

When we part at the close of this convention we know that each of us must go forth with the load of an overburdened society upon his shoulders; we know that it is up to us to turn the tide of disaster from a world that the Supreme Economist intended should be a commonwealth for all men. Each of us must solemnly realize that we can look only to ourselves for the fulfillment of this task. The burden is yours and mine. Humbly, proudly, and unflinchingly we will take up the challenge of that burden. We have the weapon and the answer. We are confident that we shall accomplish a victory.

Official surveys indicate that our farms and factories are now operating at less than half of their capacity. It is physically possible to have an abundance of useful goods—it must be made financially possible—that is our demand.

The enactment of the Townsend recovery plan, to which our hearts and souls and minds are dedicated, immediately will place into circulation the necessary billions of dollars to keep our industrial machine functioning. We will substitute the abundant life for the criminal activities and hates in which the world is now engaged. The retirement of our aged will make up for the loss of world-wide markets and immediately give to our industrialists, our farmers, and our businessmen a home market of almost unlimited proportions.

Natural demands for food, clothing, and shelter for the people of this Nation—for the young and for the old—for the unemployed and the oppressed—have never been implemented with money. We have never known how great effective demand could be. America's market is right here at home, and we propose to prove it.

With the enactment of our bill now before the Congress of the United States, we, the elder citizens of America, give to the world a new design for living, a new leadership under God. We shall furnish mankind with a sample of the kingdom of heaven on earth, and, in doing this, we shall outlaw war eventually—outlaw starvation of the innocent and oppression of the weak. We shall rise to the full stature of the sons and daughters of the one and only King.

Our Flag: Display It, Respect It—Apostrophe to Our National Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

POEM BY WILLIAM T. KERR, PHILADELPHIA, FOUNDER AND NATIONAL PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FLAG DAY ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Apostrophe to Our National Flag by William T. Kerr, Philadelphia, founder and national president, American Flag Day Association:

APOSTROPHE TO OUR NATIONAL FLAG

(By William T. Kerr, Philadelphia, founder and national president, American Flag Day Association)

Pride of all America
Admired by all the World!
  Floating o'er every schoolhouse,
  On every hilltop,
  in every valley and plain.
Liberty's school master!
Tyranny's scourge at all times
  in every clime and nation.
Laughing to scorn the teachings
  of Monarchy's "divine right"!
Setting at naught the claims
  of princes and potentates!
Standard of freedom
  civil and religious!
Emblem of a united people,
  the greatest and grandest Nation
  sun e'er shone o'er:
  knowing no master, fearing no king,
  kneeling to none but Almighty God!

Marking the pathway for
other nations to tread!
The beacon light of civilization!
"Old Glory" we salute thee!
There is no stain on any stripe
in all thy years of life!
The luster of thy stars
Shines out more brightly
as Time rolls on!
Born June 14, 1777
Midst cannon's roar
and blast of musketry!
Standard of Washington!
of Lincoln!
and all the long line of
America's patriots
who gave their lives in war
and spent their strength in peace
for righteousness.
Foreign foes throughout great wars
fell 'neath thy withering glances
While mistaken brethren who
for a time forgot thee
Now love thee all the more!
Proudly aloft thou wavest, welcoming
freedom-loving seekers but crying
"Back" to every foe of America's greatness,
"Our free institutions, handiwork
"of our illustrious forefathers
"Must not be destroyed,
Hands off!"
Beautiful starry banner! there is
none fairer or grander anywhere.
We rejoice with thee on
this thy natal day.
Long may thy stripes and stars
Fly to the breeze, bidding
defiance to thy foes,
proclaiming liberty!
Long may thou vigil keep
O'er millions patriots homes,
Stamping indelibly, deep
into the minds of all,
That free America,
Than which there is
None greater now
in all the earth,
Will yet greater be,
when every son and
daughter of thy soil,
and every other in our midst
shall know naught save
One God!
One people!
One language!
and
One flag "Old Glory"!
Yours and mine.
Teach its history!
Proclaim it to all
in picture, song, and story,
Let none forget its cost
in blood!
and tears!
and untold sacrifice.

"Old Glory" speaks: "Americans, what you are I am, don't let the red flag of communism or anarchy supplant me."

Republicans Out of Step With Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, during the past month or so there appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of four or five statements by a number of my Republican colleagues from Indiana—particularly Messrs. JOHNSON, GILLIE, SPRINGER, and LANDIS—attacking trade agreements. Although these statements seem to have a common origin, they were made before the Republicans nominated Mr. Wendell Willkie as their standard bearer. In view of Mr. Willkie's stanch advocacy of the principle of trade agreements, I wonder what my Republican colleagues will now say about the trade-agreements program.

Just to keep the RECORD straight, I want to quote two statements from the writings of Mr. Willkie on the subject of trade agreements. The first is from Fortune Magazine of April 1940, after the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in the House and before it was voted upon in the Senate, as follows:

Take the problem of the Hull trade agreements, for example. Here again there has been a tendency for the Democrats to huddle in one corner shouting their enthusiasm, and the Republicans to huddle in another prophesying calamity. We, the people, had better confer by ourselves. * * *

Now obviously it will not do for one great nation to become a free-trade country by itself. For the United States to erase its tariffs all at once would be ruinous to our people and many of our industries. The present Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is wise and temperate, realizes this. And so he adopted the reciprocal trade agreements as a step toward increasing our foreign business gradually. Under this policy the United States takes up the problem of tariffs with each country separately; lists the products that it would like to export; studies a similar list submitted by the other country, and then a deal is arranged, each country making such concessions as it can, with the least possible harm and the most possible benefit to its own people. This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries too. What could be simpler or more in accord with common sense? What could be better qualified to benefit us, the people, as a whole? Of course, we have to make sacrifices. But the point is that, owing to the way the agreements are negotiated, the sacrifices are always, and should always be, less than the benefits gained. That is, we, the people, profit.

The other is from the Saturday Evening Post of June 22, 1940, about the time of the convening of the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia, as follows:

Americans have demonstrated that they are as good businessmen as the people in other countries. They can bargain efficiently in their domestic trade, and they can bargain with equal efficiency in their foreign trade. We had a foreign market worth billions of dollars to us once. To be exact, it was worh $5,240,000,000 in 1929—enough to provide thousands of the jobs which the unemployed are looking for. We may never get all of this trade back, but we can certainly get part of it back. Trade treaties are a step in that direction.

These excerpts are not merely a few sentences taken from their context, as some of my colleagues from Indiana did with respect to President Roosevelt's statement in 1932 in their recent extension of remarks, but are substantial paragraphs apparently expressing the considered views of the Republican candidate before he had seen the weak, contradictory, and vacillating plank on foreign trade which was adopted by the Republicans at Philadelphia.

In spite of certain newspaper reports of what Mr. Willkie has later said about trade agreements, I think it is a little premature to bury the trade-agreements program, because Hitler has voided some agreements. Let us not throw up the sponge quite so soon. There are yet beneficial agreements with Canada, Cuba, Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, and other Latin-American countries. There ought to be others in order to strengthen the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. As Mr. Willkie is reported to have said at the convention:

After this is all over we are going to have to have larger trade areas if we maintain our living standards without deficit financing. The way to do it is through agreements.

Therefore the thing to do is to keep this program in existence as far as possible, strengthen and expand its area of operation, and be prepared for a better economic peace than is proposed in the Republican platform which offers another Hawley-Smoot war-provoking tariff plank.

INDIANA AND TRADE AGREEMENTS

The trade-agreements program has been one of the major forces in improving the condition of Indiana farmers and others since the present administration came into power. Under this administration the farm cash income of Indiana, excluding Government payments, rose from $143,000,000 in 1932 to $260,000,000 in 1939. That is a key figure. It alone is a sufficient reply to my colleagues.

Without attempting to answer their garbled and untrue charges that any program of this administration has been injurious to farmers, I want to submit a few official figures on

the relationship of the program to the State of Indiana which my colleagues omitted in their statements.

Conditions of Indiana industries under the Hawley-Smoot tariff period, 1929–39

Industry	Decrease from 1929 to 1933		
	Decrease in number of wage earners	Decrease in wages	Decrease in value of production
Total, all industries	115,758	$246,715,638	$1,499,745,534
Motor-vehicle bodies and motor-vehicle parts	5,488	11,885,272	56,517,344
Motor vehicles, not including motorcycles	13,540	24,057,222	162,364,092
Electrical machinery apparatus and supplies	8,685	14,693,111	82,972,465
Glass	2,154	4,722,120	11,969,007
Furniture, including store and office fixtures	9,978	14,587,589	62,226,683

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Conditions of Indiana industries under the trade-agreements program [1]

Industries	Increase from 1935 to 1937, trade-agreements period		
	Increase in wage earners	Increase in wages	Increase in value of production
Total, all industries	65,146	$144,314,687	$848,017,854
Motor-vehicle bodies and motor-vehicle parts	7,148	12,853,979	56,413,778
Motor vehicles not including motorcycles	2,556	7,801,745	119,027,419
Electrical machinery apparatus and supplies	6,233	11,745,780	39,799,147
Glass	763	2,838,165	6,527,001
Furniture, including store and office fixtures	3,766	5,251,023	22,886,062

[1] Latest Census of Manufactures data were published in 1937; additional gains have been made since that year.

Comparative conditions of agriculture in Indiana under the Hawley-Smoot tariff period and the trade-agreements period [1]

Commodity	Indiana cash farm income received during 3 years under—		Gain to farmers, 1936–38
	Hawley-Smoot period, 1931–33 [1]	Trade agreements period, 1936–38 [1]	
Wheat	$31,155,000	$58,937,000	$27,782,000
Oats	8,824,000	9,340,000	516,000
Corn	27,289,000	56,300,000	29,011,000
Hogs	129,323,000	247,247,000	117,924,000
Sheep and lamb	9,251,000	15,093,000	5,842,000
Cattle and calves	56,967,000	119,605,000	62,638,000

[1] The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act became effective on June 18, 1930, hence that year was not included; the year 1933 was included because the Trade Agreements Act was not authorized until June 1934; only 4 agreements had been negotiated by the end of 1935.

NOTE.—Figures do not include Government payments.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

Another Trade Agreement Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS RECORD

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item appearing in the Daily News Record, of New York City, under date of June 26, 1930. This is another trade agreement fiasco.

CANADA VOTES 10-PERCENT TAX ON IMPORTS—ONLY GOODS UNDER BRITISH PREFERENTIAL TARIFF NOT INCLUDED

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, June 25.—Canada's war budget, submitted to Parliament yesterday, provides for an immediately effective tax of 10 percent on all imports from the United States and other countries not under the British preferential tariff, and for an increase to 75 percent from 50 percent in the maximum wartime excess-profits tax.

Since the sales tax of 8 percent on dressed and dyed furs is imposed at the initial point of processing and not on the finished garments, this tax is increased to 12 percent, so as to be in line with the rate of 8 percent on finished cloth garments.

There are heavy increases in income taxes, making them the greatest in Canada's history, with special war income tax on earnings of $600 yearly and more. Taxes on new automobiles are 10 percent up to $700, and up to 80 percent on values in excess of $1,200. Higher taxes are imposed on smokers' supplies.

The Republican Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD TIMES

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, one of the candidates before the Republican National Convention whom the public does not remember is a man by the name of Gannett. Mr. Gannett has a chain of newspapers. I have not always been in agreement with Mr. Gannett, as he will readily admit and as most of us who know the circumstances will understand; but Mr. Gannett seems to know something about the Republican platform which was adopted at Philadelphia.

In the Hartford Times of June 27 is an editorial entitled "The Republican Platform." The Hartford Times is one of Mr. Gannett's newspapers, and this is Mr. Gannett's estimate of his own party's platform. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of June 27, 1940.]

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Of the Republican platform, honest appraisal can say little more than that it is a queer jumble of traditional political folderol, contradictions, and glaring attempt to be all things to all voters. Its most palpable artificialities are its straddling on foreign policy and its hypocritical castigation of the New Deal while, at the same time, embracing most of its chief policies, as on farm subsidy, social security, labor, etc. The platform is a confused statement born of confused minds.

Republican leaders labored long and tediously over the foreign policy plank. The struggle between interventionists and isolationists resulted in a straddling declaration.

On the one hand, "we favor extension * * * of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense."

On the other hand, the party "is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war."

Irrespective who the Presidential candidate may be, he will have no difficulty being both interventionist and isolationist as the campaign occasion and location may require. There is abundant elasticity in the phrases "requirements of our national defense" as limiting or expanding our help to other nations, and "involving this Nation in foreign war," as marking safe limits against involvement. Both phrases can mean what the candidate feels they should mean.

Even more two-faced is the platform on outstanding domestic issues. Since the election verdict is almost certain to lie in the West, the farm issue is of prime political significance. The Republican Party outdeals the New Deal on Federal subsidies. "The farmer is entitled to a profit price for his products."

Until a balance has been established between labor, industry, and agriculture, "we propose to provide benefit payments * * * free from Government-dominated production control." That is going beyond the New Deal which has wisely seen the necessity of controlling production if subsidies are not to stimulate expanded acreage and ever-mounting surpluses.

The platform favors "adequate farm credit at the lowest interest rates * * *" under "ultimate farmer ownership and control." That is another outright bid for the farm vote.

Like the New Deal, the platform also favors "Federal acquisition of nonproductive farm lands." It would "foster Government refinancing of the heavy farm-debt load." That must mean extension of the present Government farm-loan plan.

On another important New Deal policy, that of social security, the Republicans are more than converted to it. They "favor the extension of old-age benefits * * * to the extent that revenues raised for this purpose will permit." An obvious bid for the Townsend vote.

In view of the generosity displayed in the farm and social security planks the later promise that public expenditures, "other than those for national defense and relief," shall be "cut to levels necessary for the essential services of Government," does not mean a thing. For, if farm subsidies and social security benefits are deemed essential, there obviously can be no cutting of expenditures.

As a campaign document, the Republican platform is a typical and traditional deliverance. As an honest statement of national policy by a major political party, it is a travesty.

The American Negro Exposition in Chicago

REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the opening of a unique but important exposition in Chicago. This exposition is, in fact, the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the emancipation of the Negro in this country. Congress has generously appropriated funds for the exposition, and it is my hope that every Member of Congress will visit this exposition. It opens tomorrow, July 4, and will be open until Labor Day, September 2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I received from the President of the United States on this matter, to include the commission which he issued to me as the commissioner of this exposition, and to include a telegram I have received from the director of the exposition together with my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Senator SLATTERY and Dr. Patterson met here Wednesday, confirmed Mr. Lightfoot's appointment, and were most enthusiastic over progress of exposition. A program is being arranged for the 4th of July opening. President Roosevelt will press button 1 o'clock eastern standard time. Hope you will have your greetings here by wire in plenty of time. President Roosevelt also will send greetings. Federal appropriations not yet in hand, but progressing.

CLAUDE A. BARNETT.

JULY 3, 1940.

MAYOR EDWARD J. KELLY AND THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO EXPOSITION,
Care of Mr. Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Director, 3632 South Parkway, Chicago, Ill.:

Heartiest congratulations upon the great work you have done in making ready the American Negro Exposition. I regard this exposition, showing to the world as it does the progress made by the Negro in America during the first 75 years of his freedom, a distinct milestone in the progress of the American Nation. The Negro has developed into a substantial American citizen, although due recognition has not been given him. The exhibits which you are showing the American public will do much in bringing about this recognition which up to this time has been so unjustly withheld from him. In fact, the exposition has already done much in the way of bringing about better understanding and good will between the races. This is evidenced by the enthusiastic interest shown in the exposition by the Legislature and the Governor of Illinois, by Mayor Edward J. Kelly and the people of Chicago, by the various departments of the United States Government, by the Members of the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, and, finally, by the President and the members of his Cabinet. I regard this as our supreme educational effort.

It has given me pleasure to work with your commission. My bill, which secured for the commission an appropriation of $75,000 from the Federal Government, has given me as much, if not more, genuine satisfaction than any single thing I have done since I became a Member of Congress. It is with deep regret that I am unable to be present at the opening of the exposition. I shall come to Chicago at the earliest possible moment and shall continue to do all in my power to aid you in the fine job you are doing, thus rendering the American Negro and the American Nation a distinct service.

ARTHUR W. MITCHELL.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 5, 1940.

Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: I have just had the pleasure of signing commissions appointing you, Senator Slattery, and President Patterson, of Tuskegee, as members of the auxiliary commission provided for in the act of Congress approved May 24, 1940, to authorize an appropriation to assist in defraying the expenses of the American Negro Exposition to be held in Chicago, Ill., during 1940 (Public, No. 522, 76th Cong.). When you are organized, I hope the commission will select as its secretary-treasurer some thoroughly qualified person, preferably someone from a Chicago bank.

I thank you for accepting this service and trust that it may prove most interesting and enjoyable to you.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

President of the United States of America

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greeting:

Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the integrity and ability of ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois, I do appoint him a member of the auxiliary commission charged with the expenditure of the funds appropriated by Congress to assist in defraying the expenses of the American Negro Exposition to be held in Chicago, Ill., July 4 to September 2, 1940, which auxiliary commission shall work in conjunction with the Afra-Merican Emancipation Exposition Commission appointed by the Governor of the State of Illinois, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of this commission with all the powers and privileges thereunto of right appertaining during the pleasure of the President of the United States for the time being.

In testimony whereof I have caused to seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 5th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1940, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fourth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

Washington Editor Urges Support for Mundt Amendment in Pollution Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, according to an announcement by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman MANSFIELD, chairman of the House conferees on the pollution bill, S. 685, he is going to bring the pollution bill back to the House on Tuesday, July 9, to ask for further instructions to the conferees. After several meetings the conferees have been unable to agree as to whether to accept the so-called Mundt amendment providing that no new stream pollution shall be permitted without approval of the United States Public Health Service or to ratify S. 685 in its original version, which simply appropriates money to study the problem, and sets up no restraints or restrictions against either existing or future forms of pollution.

When this legislation was last before us, the House, by a 2-to-1 vote, ratified the Mundt amendment, which has the united support of all national conservation organizations in America. This amendment was a compromise between those who preferred stricter legislation to control pollution and those who feel that nothing should be done by the Government to protect the public waters of America. Senate bill 685, with the Mundt amendment, does nothing about prevailing

forms and sources of pollution, but it does take the forward-looking step of establishing standards and setting up a procedure by which detrimental types of new and future pollution may be regulated or restricted by the Government. If America is to do anything more courageous about the problem than simply turning the public waters over to the polluters themselves, it can proceed no more slowly and reasonably than the provisions of the Mundt amendment. Without that amendment S. 685 is a wasteful expenditure of the taxpayer's money, and without that amendment S. 685 contains not a word or syllable which would control or regulate the pollution of American streams. In fact, S. 685, without that amendment, is a definite backward step, since by implication it notifies polluters that the Government will not interfere with their nefarious practices and gives them carte blanche to continue poisoning the peoples' waters.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to the House conferees for upholding the House position in the conferences on this legislation. It is my hope and expectation that this body will again reaffirm its support of the Mundt amendment and I hope that every friend of conservation, every friend of public health, and every friend of a cleaner and better out of doors will be present on Tuesday, July 9, to vote for this amendment, so that at long last this country make take one small but definitely forward step in solving the age-old problem of pollution.

In today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, I found the following editorial on this subject, which I now offer for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 3, 1940]

MAKE IT REAL

A congressional resolution authorizing the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland to work together in a voluntary program of pollution control for the Potomac River watershed is now waiting the President's signature.

This is a good thing and we are all for it. But lest anybody be deceived that it can accomplish very much we have to point out all voluntary projects of this sort usually bog down. But there is pending now before a conference committee of House and Senate a bill by Senator BARKLEY, amended in the House on a motion by Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, which may do some good if the Mundt amendment is preserved. It would provide that no new stream pollution would be permitted without approval of the United States Public Health Service. But lacking this amendment, the Barkley bill is mainly a "pork barrel" project.

If the Mundt amendment is dropped, the whole thing may as well be dropped. Political pork is too expensive today.

Elimination of "Fifth Column" Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in the month of April 1939, I introduced in this Congress a bill which would require the registration of all aliens coming into the United States. I have made speeches on behalf of this bill, and I have urged consideration of it. Sometime after the introduction of my bill the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives adopted a comprehensive bill containing very similar provisions to the one which I had introduced, with the additional feature of requiring fingerprinting of aliens. This bill, called the Smith bill, came up for consideration about a year ago in the House and was passed. It was only about 3 weeks ago that the Senate finally acted upon this bill and the President has just signed it. It is now the law of the United States, and under the terms of the bill all aliens within our country must be registered and fingerprinted. In this manner, law-abiding aliens who honestly love this country and respect its institutions are protected and safeguarded. At the same time the enemy alien within our borders will be fingerprinted and registered and watched and promptly arrested in the event of any violation of our laws.

Another step which has recently been taken in the drive by Congress to eliminate "fifth column" activities in the United States is section 9 of the Hatch bill which requires the Civil Service Commission to approve each application for a position from the standpoint of the patriotism and loyalty of the applicant for a Government job before he can receive the position. In this way the Civil Service Commission now refuses to certify to any department of Government for any position any person who is a member of the Communist Party, the German bund, or any other communistic or Nazi organization.

Recently during hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the committee aggressively and militarily demanded assurances that the Civil Service Commission would not approve anyone for employment "who had 'fifth column' " tendencies. As an additional safeguard the committee demanded in reference to War Department applications that the War Department have the right also to pass upon the patriotic qualifications of every applicant, and in the event there was doubt about the patriotism of any applicant certified by the Commission, the Secretary of War might yet have the authority to refuse to accept the appointee. I am introducing a bill, Mr. Speaker, which in the event of any emergency, will speed up the trial of any "fifth column" violator. For instance where an individual, whether he be alien or citizen, is charged with the crime of espionage, sabotage, or anything which might be known as an un-American crime, he shall be brought to trial within not more than 15 days after the arrest. Under the terms of this bill all preliminary motions and pleas shall be disposed of at the time of the trial and appeals from the decisions of the trial courts shall be heard at the earliest possible moment. I want to say in reference to this bill that when the safety of our Nation is in jeopardy, and every department of government and every governmental official is bending every energy to place our people in a position to defend themselves properly, any "fifth columnist" who seeks at this critical time in the affairs of the Nation to stay the hand of government should be immediately arrested and given a prompt trial with the proper punishment for his crime. Crime such as espionage and sabotage in time of peace are most despicable and those guilty should be punished severely.

About a year ago the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives amended the bill covering the penalty for the crime of espionage during time of peace. At this time the maximum penalty was increased from 10 to 20 years. Of course, spying in time of war as well as treason is punishable with the penalty of death.

A recent report of the Dies committee of the House of Representatives makes the statement that most of the legislation necessary for the handling of the enemy-alien situation is already on the statute books. The great need is for prompt and effective enforcement rather than for more laws. Congress has recognized this recommendation of the Dies committee and we have recently provided for an increase of more than 600 agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is hoped that this additional number of agents will be sufficient to properly enforce our "fifth column" laws and to promptly visit proper punishment upon those "who bite the hand that feeds them." Should additional F. B. I. agents be needed for this, I am ready to vote for further funds for this purpose. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress has already authorized the expenditure of between five and seven billion dollars on national defense. Within the next few months additional billions may be necessary and our people are ready and willing to make the sacrifice necessary, whatever it may be, to provide proper defense for our land and our people.

In 1 year of "blitzkrieg" warfare Germany has conquered eight peaceful and unoffending countries and now is proceeding to the battle of England, which will perhaps begin soon. In 8 years prior to the present war, it is estimated that Ger-

many under Hitler has expended over $100,000,000,000 on its vast military system. It is the most warlike nation at the present time ever seen in the annals of history. To date it had prospered by the sword; but in doing so, it has taken the lives of millions of innocent people and has spread untold misery and suffering throughout the world.

Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

Just as surely as it is written in the Scriptures, so surely will Hitler fall and the German menace be effectively curbed.

The countries that have been conquered by Germany failed to realize the gravity of the situation before the attack and failed, perhaps, to willingly make the sacrifices necessary as a people to protect themselves against a foe armed to the teeth and without moral restraint. One by one they succumbed to the totalitarian warfare and to defeat. In desperation General Weygand, of the French high command, cried out to his soldiers, "Hold tight to the soil of France."

Although there is cause for alarm in this country, at the same time we have many reasons to rejoice. The critical events of the past year have molded our country into a united people. Again we displayed a wholesome respect and a deep reverence for our traditions and our institutions and our flag, which shows a rejuvenated patriotism. Again, we as a people are beginning to realize that we must not only live within our Nation but must live for our Nation. Again, we feel the quickening urge that a land worth living for is worth fighting for and that this is a nation worthy of all of the toil, the labor, and the sacrifices which we must be called upon to make. When therefore we hear Kate Smith on the radio in the evening every red-blooded American feels a deeper admiration and a greater love for the last great Republic in the entire world, as he hears—

God bless America,
Land that I love,
Stand beside her and guide her
Through the night with a light from above;
From the mountains, to the prairies,
To the oceans white with foam,
God bless America,
My home, sweet home.

And God will bless America. It is a land of peace and happiness and contentment. We want to keep it such.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting resolution adopted by the South Carolina Automobile Dealers' Association at its annual convention at Caesars Head, S. C., on June 17, 1940.

In placing this resolution in the RECORD it is for the purpose of indicating the patriotic attitude of the business people of my district in being willing to sacrifice their business for the sole purpose of being helpful in building up a national-defense program as promptly and as successfully as possible:

Be it resolved, That the South Carolina Automobile Dealers' Association, assembled in regular meeting on June 17, 1940, in Caesars Head, S. C., realizing the importance of our national-defense program, of which we heartily approve, request the automobile manufacturers to assist our Government in every way possible, even to the curtailing of automobile production if necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Congressmen representing this State.

Universal Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BUTLER B. HARE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, when I was a student at college, it was the custom of the institution to require each applicant for graduation, following the completion of the required course of studies, to prepare and deliver a speech at commencement on a subject assigned him by the college faculty. It was my good fortune to meet the usual requirements, the subject assigned me being Universal Empire. In the light of my subsequent training and experience, I would probably make some minor changes in the speech if called upon to discuss the same subject today; but in view of the present situation in Europe and the thought I endeavored to convey at that time, I have asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the speech I made upon graduation at Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., June 13, 1899:

UNIVERSAL EMPIRE

The love of power—power which gives authority to command one's fellows—is one of the strongest passions of the human soul. This passion, like all other passions, grows by what it feeds upon. A little power begets a longing for more power. Complete control over a few leads to a desire for control over many. Thus it is that rulers are seldom satisfied with the conquest of one nation. There is always just one more to be brought under their power; and when the nearest and strongest have been conquered, then it is they begin to dream of universal empire. Then it is they see the finger of destiny pointing their way and marking them for some greater work. They begin to call themselves benefactors. They speak of missions. Then it is they discover that what they once believed to be selfishness is after all pure and disinterested love for their fellow man. They must be of service to their unfortunate and deluded brothers. There is a great burden of responsibility placed upon them, but they must bear it.

If destiny has pointed her finger at a Roman, it's the Roman burden that must be taken up; if at a Moslem, it's the Moslem burden that must be taken up; if at a Spaniard, it's the Spanish burden that must be taken up; if at a Frenchman, it's the French burden that must be taken up; if at an Englishman, it's the English burden that must be taken up; and if destiny has pointed two fingers, one at England and the other at America, then it's the white man's burden that must be taken up.

These sons of destiny are exceedingly thoughtful and considerate people. They have always been so. In all ages they have reasoned alike and come to the same conclusion. Hear one of them: "I'm the object of destiny. I'm duly impressed with a sense of my great duty to my unhappy brothers. Duty demands that I shall take up their heaviest burden first."

If the unhappy deluded brothers cannot at once understand and appreciate the love and solicitude of their benefactors, if they ask for a little explanation, if they dare object and plead their ability to bear for a little longer at least their own burdens, then the great hearts of their deliverers are so moved with compasion that they resolve from a high sense of duty to take up at least the greatest burden, though the bearer be put beneath the ground. Thus the most brutal conqueror often in the end has been able to plead philanthropic or religious motives as his excuse for countless murders.

I would not have you think that I have particular reference to the little philanthropic job we are now doing some thousands of miles across the Pacific. While it may be that history is repeating itself in this case with some minor factors changed and that our little job is not essentially different from the general type of such work, yet it is not of the present I desire to speak. I prefer to follow in the well-beaten paths—the paths made by my predecessors on other commencement days—paths which suggest other ages and other men.

It grieves me to think that I shall now be forced to say some very uncomplimentary things about two of my best historical friends. Two friends who have come to my rescue in times of doubt, who have given me utterance when my tongue was about to cleave to the roof of my mouth, and who have stood between me and utter confusion and shame. They have been true and useful in other days and I shall not at this time fail to make mention of them. I refer to Mohammed and Napoleon. They shall prove my contention though it be to their own shame.

However, there comes to memory a third name—the name of another true and tried friend—a name that served a good purpose on many another day and many another subject, but a name although unsuited for this day and this subject. O immortal

Washington, illustrious Father of thy Country, how shall I pass thee by on this occasion! I call my professors to witness that this is my first offense of omission. Thou wast neither fool nor genius. Thou wast ever a modest man and contented thyself with being the father of but one country.

We said a moment ago that the most brutal conquerors in their efforts for universal empire had been able to plead philanthropic or religious motives as their excuse for wholesale murder. Mohammed began his career by seeking a little more power than he as a private individual could command. Attaching some half-dozen followers to himself by well-fabricated accounts of visions and revelation which he claimed to have had, he quits the calling of a peaceful trader and turns to that of a bandit. Success in capturing a few small caravans and the cry of persecution bring him other partisans to whom he promises much spoil in this life and immunity in the life to come. This movement from this small beginning in a few years sweeps over the half of two nations. Followers flocked to him by the thousands. He begins to believe his own stories and his disciples believed more and more in him. The people of the desert were fired by religious enthusiasm and love of spoil as no people ever before. The whole of Europe was threatened. A mighty kingdom was founded. Universal empire beckoned the Moslem on. Love for men's souls is the excuse the world is given for the longest and most barbarous struggle that stains the pages of history.

Napoleon was a soldier of fortune and no doubt thought at the beginning of his career that a very small fortune would satisfy him. But his desire for power increased with his success until a morbid passion to rule became the one and only passion of his soul. There was nothing to which he would not stoop to gratify this passion. The love of power became his god and there was nothing too sacred to be sacrificed upon its altar. This deity begot in him a belief in destiny and destiny pointed to universal empire. And yet this brutal despiser of all mankind succeeded in persuading himself that love for the principles of the French Revolution and devotion to the downtrodden millions of the earth inspired him, animated and controlled him in all his rapine.

Now why was it that these and other men failed to attain universal dominion? Success seemed to be within their grasp. There were thousands of their contemporaries who believed in their destiny and were ready to bow down and worship the ruler of all the earth.

Deluded beings. They had not considered the great law of growth, which after all is but the law of necessary and inevitable change. They had forgotten the great distinctions which God has made in races. They did not realize, as many now do not realize, that laws and customs cannot be successfully imposed upon a people from without; that institutions to be beneficial to a people must be the outgrowth of the peculiar life and environment of that people. No, as long as nations persist in producing diversity and not uniformity in races; as long as the axis of the earth remains inclined 23½° to the plane of its orbit making zones of varying temperature; as long as the sentiment of patriotism is kept alive in the human breast and there are men whose hearts are stirred by the love of home and native land; so long will universal empire remain the dream of ambitious genius, the phantom of fools.

On Willkie-Hull Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

ARTICLE BY WENDELL L. WILLKIE

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that the Republican candidate for President, Hon. Wendell L. Willkie, at one fell swoop brushed aside and annihilated the fictitious and misleading arguments and stubborn opposition of high, Smoot-Hawley tariff standpatters, and approves Cordell Hull's trade-treaty program. In this connection, I incorporate as a part of my remarks a statement of the Republican candidate for President which appeared in the April edition of Fortune magazine:

[From Fortune for April 1940]

WE, THE PEOPLE—A FOUNDATION FOR A POLITICAL PLATFORM FOR RECOVERY

(By Wendell L. Willkie)

FOREIGN POLICY—TRADE

But underlying the immediate issues arising out of the war there is a deeper need. We, the people, want to know where we are being led. We want some reasonable and effective standard by which we can measure our foreign policy, year after year. And this standard, to be realistic, must be harmonious with our domestic policy. Just as it is necessary to put our own house in order on a businesslike basis, so it will be necessary, in the long run, to develop a businesslike foreign policy. The aim of such a policy would be, on the one hand, to protect our interests against the encroachment of others; but, on the other hand, to further our interests, increase our markets, and put our capital to work by helping other countries to make a profit, too. This is a sound business principle. But hitherto it has been obscured in our foreign policy by emotionalism and domestic politics.

Take the problem of the Hull trade agreements, for example. Here again there has been a tendency for the Democrats to huddle in one corner shouting their enthusiasm, and the Republicans to huddle in another, prophesying calamity. We, the people, had better confer by ourselves.

One of the things that made this country great was the fact that it represented the greatest free-trade area in the world. Its citizens have been able to ship their products for several thousand miles, up and down and crosswise, without trade restrictions or tariff barriers. If Europe had been like this, the history of the world would make pleasanter reading. Of course, in view of the discrepancy in standards of living, this sort of free trade cannot be world-wide. Yet the importance of trade to us is incalculable. Before the depression our foreign trade totaled in the neighborhood of $9,000,000,000 a year; at the bottom of the depression it had shrunk to $3,000,000,000 a year. We thus lost a $6,000,000,000 business, and rather more than half of it represented a decline in our exports. Obviously, if we could get that market back today it would mean a lot to the man who is looking for a job, or the farmer who is looking for a buyer. But, while our foreign trade has recovered to about $5,000,000,000, further recovery is closed because all the great trading nations of the world, including our own, have set up tariff walls to keep out each other's products.

Now, obviously, it will not do for one great nation to become a free-trade country by itself. For the United States to erase its tariffs all at once would be ruinous to our people and many of our industries. The present Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is wise and temperate, realizes this. And so he adopted the reciprocal-trade agreements as a step toward increasing our foreign business gradually. Under this policy the United States takes up the problem of tariffs with each country separately, lists the products that it would like to export, studies a similar list submitted by the other country, and then a deal is arranged, each country making such concessions as it can with the least possible harm and the most possible benefit to its own people. This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries too. What could be simpler or more in accord with common sense? What could be better qualified to benefit us, the people, as a whole? Of course, we have to make sacrifices. But the point is that, owing to the way the agreements are negotiated, the sacrifices are always, and should always be, less than the benefits gained. That is, we, the people, profit.

We do not put much faith in the figures cited by the Republicans to show how damaging these Hull agreements have been, or in the figures cited by the Democrats to show how profitable they have been. It may be years before conclusive results can be shown. But it is inconceivable to us that prosperity can be reestablished without any foreign trade. And it seems clear that if we are to have foreign trade it must be done on a reciprocal basis. We, the most successful people in the world at business and industry, know that there are two parties to every trade, and that one cannot always profit at the expense of the other. It is of vital importance to us that the other party profit too.

America Must Marshal All Its Forces for the Testing Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of another Fourth of July observance, I desire to place in the RECORD a few sentences from a most challenging and thought-provoking article which appeared in the New York Times magazine section of Sunday, June 30. There is much truth in the writing of James B. Reston, who wirelessed the story from London. He graphically tells of the break-down of the democracies in Europe, and gives reasons which are becoming apparent to those who read and look behind the mere recital of war dispatches. All of the material is worth reprinting, but I shall use only the final thoughts, as follows:

If the history of this appalling tragedy teaches us anything, it teaches us that we in the United States, who ourselves have been following the paths of least resistance in internal and international

affairs for years, must face up to the responsibilities of defending the Nation, without illusion and regardless of personal sacrifice.

We must all learn the lessons of these last 7 years. Our generals now see that the old theory of a defensive position in warfare is as obsolete as the bow and arrow. Our admirals must recognize, as most of them now do, that without equality in the air sea power is crippled. Our air officers must admit, as the Germans have proved, that the air arm is now most effective under command of those who are directing the land forces. Our manufacturers, labor, and political leaders must now see the necessity for patching up their squabbles and getting down to work. And the people of the United States—every man and woman—must remember that war is no more than a simple test of strength, that a nation is no stronger than the collective will power of its people.

America's Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

ADDRESS OF PHILIP D. REED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently there convened in the Nation's Capital several thousand young businessmen representing the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. They assembled here in annual convention to take thought of the pressing problems of the day and to seek information. Many notable addresses were delivered to this group, including that of Mr. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co. It is a vital message and deserving of careful study and for that reason I am asking the consent of the House for its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am told that the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce comprises approximately 100,000 young business and professional men between the ages of 21 and 35, and that you come from every State in the Union as well as Hawaii and Alaska. May I say that the very existence of the Junior Chamber as an active, vital agency for the exchange of views and the development of leadership is a most heartening and reassuring thing in these dark days.

I venture to say that every one of you in this room feels deeply and personally the responsibility, shared today with older men, but which in the course of a few short years will be transferred almost wholly to your generation—the responsibility of guiding, directing, and administering the destiny of the United States of America. What that task will comprise, what new conditions will then exist, no one can accurately foretell. But it requires no clairvoyance to see that the next 5 years will in all likelihood be the most vitally important ones in the history of our Nation. The things to be done during that period, the legislation to be adopted, the leadership to be developed, the reaction and response of the American people to the events which lie ahead in the struggle between dictatorship and democracy will in my judgment irrevocably fashion the pattern of life to which we younger men, our children and our children's children will of necessity conform.

The interests, therefore, of the generation you represent are greater in terms of the years ahead than those of any other part of our adult population. It follows that your generation must not only make its influence felt during these formative years, but that it must base its judgments and its action upon a real understanding of the issues, the trends, and the problems with which we as a nation are confronted.

Today we are in the first throes of organizing an enormous program of national defense. No one, I think, will doubt this country's need of greatly enlarged military, naval, and air defenses. To accomplish this herculean task quickly, efficiently, and well, there must be the closest kind of cooperation and team work between Government, industrial management, and labor. It is inconceivable that there should be a lack of it from any quarter, for the ultimate purpose and objective of this program is the preservation of our homes, our institutions, and our way of life. Patience and understanding will be needed. Delays and disappointments will occur. Sacrifices and concessions will be required. But as Americans all—and always—with the vitality and resourcefulness and organizational ability that have enabled us to create the greatest and most efficient production machine in history, we will do this job and we will do it well.

One month from now our two great political parties will have selected their candidates for high office and the campaigns will be getting under way. The responsibility that falls upon the delegates charged with the duty of selecting the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates in this period of world crisis is exceeded only by that which must rest upon the shoulders of the men selected.

The great issues today are not those we are accustomed to associate with party politics. They are cosmic questions, affecting on the one hand our relationships and ability to live with the other peoples of the world, and on the other hand the review and redetermination of our own doctrines of self-government. As normal human beings we all want to find the right answer to these vitally important questions. There can be no doubt of the sincerity and loyalty of our political, industrial, and labor leaders, but they and all of us must recognize before it is too late that the problems before us are far larger than the individual interests of any party, section, or group.

Large portions of the world's population have in recent years surrendered democratic freedom for dictatorship. The state has replaced the individual. These changes abroad have evidenced themselves in this country in many small ways. Each step is comparatively insignificant when taken by itself, but in the aggregate they constitute a definite and unmistakable trend toward centralization and enlargement of government powers and toward government by men rather than by laws.

We have been through 10 years of serious economic disorder. During that period we have made progress in certain directions, but none at all in others. For example, no one can question the fact that very real social progress has been made. The value and desirability of these accomplishments from the social standpoint are self-evident. Nor would any of us wish to see them lost, if we as a Nation can support and justify their continuation. The difficulty is that social legislation almost invariably costs money, large sums of money, and can be supported only if the economic condition of the country is healthy and prosperous. We all agree, I am sure, that American citizens should not be permitted to starve, that "made" work is better than the dole, that old-age and unemployment insurance and guaranteed bank deposits are fine and worthy things, that maximum hours and minimum wages are all to the good in sweatshop industries, that reclamation and rehabilitation of the soil is essential for the future of America, that slum clearance and low-cost housing are much to be desired. But I repeat that these enactments cost money, billions in the aggregate, and they can be supported through the years only if our economic system is sound and successful.

The fact is, however, that the economic record of the past decade is just as disappointing as the social record is gratifying. In a recent editorial Fortune magazine points out that our national income is back to 1919, our unemployment problem completely unsolved, our national debt up nineteen billions (now amounting to $1,250 per family), and that, comparing the period 1933–39 with 1923–29, the only significant increases among 22 basic economic measurements were in population, strikes, strikers, Federal taxes, Federal expenditures, and national debt. All the other items show a decline varying from 9 percent to 84 percent, and include manufacturing employment, industrial production, wholesale prices, factory pay rolls, national income, new construction, and corporate financing.

We must, I submit, place more emphasis on economic recovery, lest, failing to achieve it, we are forced to abandon—as we surely would be—the social advances of the last decade. For government cannot create wealth. All it can do is redistribute existing wealth. A great deal of new wealth must be created to support our social program, and this can be done only by increasing output—the production of useful goods. To reach this goal we must move forward on the economic front.

Oliver Wendell Holmes once said:

"The longing for certainty and repose is in every human mind. But certainty is generally illusion and repose is not the destiny of man."

I do not know the circumstances which prompted Holmes to make that statement, but if it was true then, how deeply, how desperately, true it is today. Certainty—that is to say, assured security—is generally illusion, and repose—that is to say, escape from hard work—is not the destiny of man. That quotation, gentlemen, is heavy with truth. May we all heed and profit by it.

The question of what is wrong with America's economic system, what has caused the long-continued apathy in our industrial and financial mechanisms, has produced a long list of conflicting explanations and as many suggestions, equally conflicting, for the correction of the difficulty. Stemming from totally different concepts of the cause of our lagging activity, the proposed corrective measures are not only diverse and inconsistent, but certain of them would alter fundamentally our traditional view of government and its functions and the jealously guarded freedom of action which American citizens have so long enjoyed.

This brings us face to face with a serious problem—a problem that is real, because it goes to the roots of our system of constitutional democracy, a problem that cannot be ignored. Let us examine ourselves as adult Americans. Are we good judges, competent critics, and intelligent readers of our country's history? Are we well enough grounded in political economy to judge what is good for our future, and what is bad? Do we understand the fundamentals of the American system under which we have grown up? Lacking that knowledge of fundamentals, how can we distinguish between proposals which are consistent with the pattern of that system and those which would impair and destroy it? Can we fashion for ourselves some kind of simple projector by which the trends and tendencies of the day can be clearly viewed and contrasted with the doctrines upon which this Nation was founded? These questions, gentlemen, are far easier to ask than to answer.

We are told that the average American has received no more than a seventh-grade schooling. It is clear, therefore, that the

ordinary citizen cannot be expected to understand and pass intelligent judgment upon the complex questions which are ever before us in business, banking, agriculture, government, and many other fields. But it is he, nevertheless, who will determine whether and to what extent America will continue to live by the principles so firmly established by our forefathers. What can we do to keep these simple and fundamental doctrines ever before us?

No one knows better than I the difficulty of keeping even reasonably well-informed on the major problems of the day and the hours of reading and study it takes to satisfy not a New England but merely a midwestern conscience that one's views and pronouncements on current questions are not simply parroted from his favorite columnist but are bottomed by thoughtful analysis and honest conviction. And because our Government is and must be active in so many fields, and because the legislative and administrative questions before it are so diverse and numerous, it is most difficult to preserve perspective, to see the forest despite the trees, and to maintain an objective and consistent viewpoint. The task of thinking simply, unemotionally, and directly has perhaps never been more difficult and surely never more urgently needed than in this forty-first year of the twentieth century.

Formula for thinking, like rules for making friends and influencing people, must be open to the charge of oversimplification and must prove to some extent ineffectual. Nevertheless, in this disturbed and complex day in which we live, when in foreign lands cutlaws and iconoclasts seem successfully to be defying the validity of the virtues we have always embraced, when character and integrity appear almost to inhibit rather than to help one's cause, it may not be unprofitable for each of us to sit down quietly and restate to ourselves as simply and briefly as we can the fundamental principles which made, and if we hold firmly to them, which will preserve, our American way of life.

Were we each to do this, the enumerations would doubtless differ, both in number of items and in the order of importance of the common ones. The central core, however, would surely be the same. If from that core we could formulate a simple one-page statement, a primer if you like, of the doctrines of American self-government, and if we could spread that statement far and wide across the land for every American to read and live by, the present trends toward government by men rather than by laws, toward enlargement and centralization of government functions and toward government by small but articulate pressure groups, would be arrested in their tracks.

And were I asked to set down in brief and simple fashion the items I would include in a primer of American self-government, they would be these seven:

Our American Constitution is of inestimable value. In clear language it safeguards the fundamental rights of the individual. It limits the powers of government to those expressly and by clear implication granted to it. Because amendment is difficult and time consuming, it stands as a bulwark against hurried, ill-considered, or emotional change. The first item of my primer of American self-government is, therefore:

1. Understand, honor, and preserve the Constitution of the United States.

American government, whether national, State, or local, comprises three branches, which in order to prevent concentration of power must always be kept separate and distinct. They are the legislative branch, whose duty it is to enact all laws subject only to the principles and limitations laid down by the Constitution; the executive branch, whose duty it is to administer, but never to make, the laws of the land and to operate all government services; and the judicial branch, whose duty it is to interpret the laws made by the legislature, to decide whether they conform to the Constitution, and whether acts or omissions of the people or the other departments of government are in accordance with the law. The second item of my primer is, therefore:

2. Keep forever separate and distinct the legislative, executive, and judicial functions of government.

Government is created by and belongs to the people. It has no rights or powers except as the people grant them. The cost of government must be paid for by the people through taxation, and the tendency is for government to grow and become increasingly costly. Because government is not like private business, in which competition and the profit motive provide a tremendous incentive to careful planning and efficient operation, government is inherently less efficient than private business. Therefore it should be permitted to do only those things which government alone can properly do and which are necessary for the welfare of the people. Thus the third item of my primer becomes:

3. Remember that government belongs to the people, is inherently inefficient, and that its activities should be limited to those which government alone can perform.

Of the many rights and guarantees which Americans enjoy under the Federal and State constitutions, perhaps the most important are freedom of speech, freedom of worship according to one's own conscience, and freedom of decision and action in such matters as where to live, what kind of work to engage in, whom to work for, and at what pay. This freedom of action, coupled with the right of the American citizen to have and to hold the fruits of his labor and to save or dispose of them as he wishes, is called the enterprise system, and it provides opportunity and incentive to improve one's position in life. Our fourth item, accordingly, is:

4. Be vigilant for freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of action.

The enterprise system under which thousands of private businesses and millions of men and women are constantly searching for new, better, and more useful products and services, and for ways to improve and lower the cost of existing ones, has produced a standard of living in this country higher than any which the world has ever known. The enterprise system cannot function successfully without incentive to improve, expand, and to create new enterprises. Accordingly, if the profits of business are taxed inordinately, or if restraints and limitations are imposed which deprive the managers of reasonable freedom of action, or if Government competes or threatens to compete with private business, the enterprise system will languish. These things should therefore be avoided; and if they are, the inherent incentives of the system will cause business to expand, to create new enterprises, and profitably to produce ever better, ever cheaper goods for more people to buy. Along this road lies progress and the only permanent solution of our unemployment problem. The fifth item is therefore:

5. Cherish the system of free enterprise which made America great.

Thrift and economy are still the great virtues they were in our grandmothers' time. Debt burdens the future, and too much of it impairs one's credit. Borrowing, therefore, should be resorted to only in periods of real emergency. These principles apply equally to Government and to private citizens. The difficulty is that Government can borrow more readily than the citizen, and having borrowed for the benefit of one group, it is very difficult not to do so for other organized groups. Our national debt has risen enormously in the past 10 years despite substantial increases in taxation. All this money must some day be repaid out of future taxes. Our immediate problem is to stop piling up more debt. This is not easy; indeed, for the moment it is impossible. The safeguard we must seek is widespread understanding of the problem, plus realistic and courageous leadership. Briefly stated, our sixth item becomes—

6. Respect thrift and economy and beware of debt.

Integrity of contract and respect for the rights of others are foundation stones of civilization. They have been all but destroyed in many quarters of the world, and until they are restored barbarism will stalk the earth. Let us keep the candle of integrity burning brightly in America. If we do so, we shall one day use it to rekindle the flame of mutual trust, fair dealing, and respect for others in a suffering and chastened world. The seventh and last item of our primer is therefore:

7. Above all, let us be scrupulous in keeping our word and in respecting the rights of others.

This, then, is one primer of American self-government. If each of you would write your own, I am sure I would be satisfied to accept them. For it seems to me that the principles are so simple, so clear, that having thought them through we may say of them in the language of our forefathers, "These truths we hold to be self-evident."

But thinking on these subjects, and particularly thinking through on them, is not sufficiently widespread. Is it not our task as Americans to encourage and stimulate such thinking in every way at our command? For if our educators, our business and professional men, our churchmen, and our farmers, our trade and civic organizations would write their primers of American self-government and tell the story on a national scale through the press, the radio, the pulpit, the classroom, and the public forum, how could we fail to reinculcate in the minds of our 130,000,000 home-loving citizens the rules for living the American way?

And now in closing let me say that I have deliberately avoided anything but passing reference to the wars abroad. Tragic and disastrous as they are for those involved and for ourselves, and essential as it is for us to view them realistically and to prepare for bitter times ahead, let us emphatically remember that these wars may obscure but they cannot and will not cure our domestic ills. Indeed, if on a peacetime basis we view dangerous tendencies toward the extension and concentration of government, toward the creation of too powerful bureaucracies and toward unparalleled enlargement of our national debt, is it not clear that the preparation for or actual engagement in war must speed and aggravate these tendencies? Let us, therefore, keep our vision unclouded by emotionalism, and let us recognize that conditions beyond our borders make ever more compelling the need for understanding, for teaching, and for living our primer of American self-government.

Resignation of Secretary Woodring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. MARTIN of IOWA. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting at this time to express on the floor of the House my appreciation and admiration of the outstanding service rendered by Hon. Harry H. Woodring as Secretary of War, especially in the field of

personnel legislation. I will confine my remarks mostly to that field because that is the field in which I have had the privilege to work with him most during my term in the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. Woodring demonstrated time after time a keen understanding and appreciation of the vital importance of morale in the Army. He made it his business to make thorough and careful study of the many and complicated and complex problems affecting the Army personnel.

The splendid cooperation he gave the Committee on Military Affairs throughout our study and consideration of the Army promotion bill in this Congress helped very materially to accomplish a fundamental improvement in personnel legislation of permanent character and far-reaching importance. Truly it can be said the Army and the Nation have benefited much by his valuable service. In his resignation the Army and Nation have lost one of the most able and progressive Secretaries of War.

I prepared the foregoing statement immediately following Mr. Woodring's resignation and from that day to this I have been waiting with great expectancy the revelation of the true reason for his resignation. The following associated press article appeared in the Washington Post for Friday, June 21:

FORCED OUT FOR TRYING TO SAVE DEFENSES, WOODRING IS QUOTED

TOPEKA, KANS., June 20.—The Capital said tonight that Harry H. Woodring told friends in Topeka three weeks ago a "small clique of international financiers" was seeking to force him out as Secretary of War because he opposed "stripping our defenses to aid the Allies."

The Cabinet officer, who resigned suddenly today to make way for President Roosevelt's appointment of Henry L. Stimson, a Republican, made his assertion June 1 after his arrival to receive an honorary degree from Washburn College, the paper said.

It added that Woodring asked that the statement not be published until after his resignation.

"I'm an advocate of adequate defense but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles," the former Kansas Governor was quoted. "There is a comparatively small clique of international financiers who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower.

"I'm not going to stand for it and I'm not going to resign until forced to do so.

"They don't like me because I'm against stripping our own defenses for the sake of trying to stop Hitler 3,000 miles away. Eventually they will force me to resign, and I'll be darned glad to come back to Kansas where the people have their feet on the ground and are not easily swayed by demagogues and subtle propaganda."

(The White House yesterday declined to make public Woodring's letter of resignation, declaring it was "too personal.")

Another Associated Press article appeared in the Washington Evening Star last night, as follows:

WOODRING EXPECTED TO REVEAL STORY OF HIS RESIGNATION

KANSAS CITY, July 2.—The Star in a special dispatch from Topeka said today Harry Woodring was considering open discussion next week of events which led to his resignation as Secretary of War.

The former Governor, who returned to Topeka last night, will be guest of honor at a banquet there July 9. The Star quoted him as saying there was a definite likelihood he would discuss his position on affairs and his Cabinet resignation at that time.

If the reason for Secretary Woodring's resignation is based upon his opposition to "stripping our defenses to aid the Allies" I will very gladly commend him for his service in that respect in addition to my foregoing commendation for his keen and sympathetic understanding of the problems of personnel legislation and the effect of such legislation on the morale of our Army.

I only hope that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs will continue their investigation of this most important matter until they have clarified the entire situation leading to Mr. Woodring's resignation. I believe it is of the utmost importance to our entire Nation to discover and to publish the causes for Mr. Woodring's resignation to enable us all to see clearly the path we are traveling in national defense and our international relations bearing thereon. These are exceedingly dangerous times and the developments regarding the shift in the Cabinet in this field call for far more than ordinary study and consideration by all of us.

Let us hope that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs will supply us with the facts and if they fail to do so, let us hope that President Roosevelt and Mr. Woodring will see the importance of publishing the full facts of the case to the end that the American public will be fully and correctly informed on affairs of such moment.

Status and Plans for Completion of the Inventories of the Historical Records Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

ADDRESS BY SARGENT B. CHILD

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following extracts from an address made by Sargent B. Child, Director, the Historical Records Survey, Division of Professional and Service Projects, Work Projects Administration:

Nationally, the Historical Records Survey projects no longer operate as one of the Federal arts projects but as a unit within the research and records section of W. P. A., headed by Mr. Harvey E. Becknell, which, in turn, is a part of the Professional and Service Division, which is under the administration of Mrs. Florence Kerr. Since the major part of our work is in the field of public records, this change has resulted in a much closer integration of our work with the general research activities being carried on by the Work Projects Administration. The research and records section technically directs many research projects in the fields of public administration and political science. The procedures developed in relation to these projects have been of great practical use in planning Historical Records Survey projects. Conversely, the resources of the archives of State and local governments have been made usable by the Survey for the other research activities. Further, the actual use of our inventories by the other projects has brought forth valuable suggestions for improving the quality of the information contained in them.

The emphasis of the Survey program in 45 States has continued to be on county archives, and in New England we have continued to emphasize the town archives. In many projects it has been difficult to enlarge or to make permanent our editorial personnel due to the operation of the 18-month ruling in the present law, which requires that each certified person be severed from W. P. A. pay roll after he or she has worked 18 months. Many editors later return to their old desks, but many do not, and, therefore, it has been necessary to continue to train new editors. We are establishing subeditorial offices in some States to compile preliminary editorial drafts of inventories. While we have widened the editorial bottle neck in many States, we have not completely solved the problem. However, we have gone a long way in what we consider to be the right direction. In spite of this, the field work has crept ahead of the editorial work in many States, not only in the listing of town and county archives but also in the listing of State and municipal archives. Publications of State archives have appeared in three States during the past year, and we expect that by September 1 of this year that 7 more State projects will be represented by publications in this field. Three States have issued inventories and municipal archives, and it seems quite clear that at least a dozen additional State projects will have issued inventories of municipal archives by September 1, 1940. To those who have advised us to complete the inventories of county and town archives before the inventories of municipal and State archives are undertaken, we must answer quite frankly that we do not intend to lessen the emphasis of county and town archives. We must defer, however, to the wishes of the 51 sponsors and the thousand-and-one cosponsors, who donate large sums to cover publication costs as well as other nonlabor costs, when they ask us to issue inventories of State and municipal records.

* * * * * * *

I know that a number of you are interested in learning something about the quality and the quantity of the inventories and guides which have already been issued. I shall not attempt to take your time by giving you a long list of those who have endorsed the publications of the Historical Records Survey, nor to give you a large number of cold statistics to indicate exactly how many offices have been inventoried, in how many counties by how many workers, who have consumed so many man-hours. I do think, however, that

A few statements of fairly recent date may not be out of place here. Let us start with the Survey of Federal Archives. The work published by this section has been welcomed by librarians, Federal officials, and others. Mr. James A. McMillen, librarian of the Louisiana State University, recently wrote: "I am very much pleased with the character of the work done by the Survey of Federal Archives, as is demonstrated by the volumes delivered to us. We were especially interested in securing copies of translations of the records of the Spanish Governors of West Florida, because of the great local demand for these records. Judging from the copies of the first 10 volumes which were delivered to us, the translating and editing have been entrusted to people capable of doing a scholarly and reliable job. This is quite reassuring and confirms our belief that Louisiana State University, in sponsoring this project, was performing a useful service to both Louisiana and the world of scholarship." After receiving the California judiciary section of the Inventory of Federal Archives, the clerk of the United States district court at San Francisco stated: "I have read the book from cover to cover and find it well arranged and the information it contains will be very helpful. Your office should be highly commended for compiling and publishing this book."

This series of inventories which contain the records of the various Federal agencies, in the 48 States, is well on toward completion. The project has been completed and closed in Missouri, and it is rapidly approaching completion, including the publication of the product, in 10 additional States. In another year's time practically all the regular inventories will have been completed. Two hundred and ninety volumes have already been issued for the Survey of Federal Archives, and approximately 95 additional volumes have been approved for publication, many of which are now being mimeographed.

The registers of ships which have been maintained in the customs ports since 1789 contain valuable sources of information for the history of shipping and commerce. In addition, the information concerning owners' names, occupation, and residence provides data which is much sought after for purposes of genealogical research. They also contain information regarding the physical details of ship construction which is valuable to model builders and persons interested in ship design.

The large demand from various sources for the data contained in the registers is the basis for a project which is under the supervision of the Survey of Federal Archives section. The aim of this project is to publish a volume or series of volumes for each port, giving the information contained in the registers in a uniform form from 1789 to date. The volume for Plymouth, Mass., has already been published; those for other New England ports will follow.

Another reason for operating this project is the fact that none of the older ports has complete series of ship registers. This is due to the fact that many volumes were crated and sent to Washington in 1880 in order to establish claims arising out of the French spoliations of the Napoleonic period. The latter are now located in The National Archives. The value of this work may be indicated by quoting from a recent letter by Mr. J. W. McElroy, deputy archivist for New England: "Mr. Samuel Eliot Morison, who had been asked by the New England Quarterly to review the Essex Institute's recent Ship Registers of Newburyport, recalled that this project was carrying on similar activities, and by telephone requested copies of all ship registers thus far produced by the project, so that he might compare the two. He told me later that he had found that the work of The National Archives W. P. A. project compared favorably with that of the Essex Institute, in accuracy and clarity, and in general appeared to be a very scholarly piece of work."

Let us review the county and town archives section. Inventories of the archives of over 350 counties have been issued and another 75 have been approved for publication. In a recent letter to Lieutenant Colonel Mathews, State administrator of Work Projects Administration in Pennsylvania, Mr. J. P. Breedlove, librarian emeritus of Duke University library, wrote: "The inventories of county archives of the several States have been coming to the Duke University library quite frequently this year. We are glad to have these inventories, for they are a very valuable aid to graduate students, members of the faculty, and others who are studying county history and government, and who are writing on this subject. These inventories will be used quite a good deal in all the university libraries in the country in the next few years." A letter from Mr. F. F. Holbrook, director of Historical Society of West Pennsylvania, states: "I have had some experience in inventorying county archives, and the present offering (inventory of the Wayne County archives) seems to me to have all the earmarks of a most competent and thoroughgoing job. As * * * a supporter of the Government's enlightened policies in this direction, I welcome this and other previous offerings of yours as contributions to our cultural advancement." The Governor of the State of Oregon, Mr. Charles A. Sprague, in a letter to Mr. E. J. Griffith, State Work Projects administrator, wrote: "I want to acknowledge receipt of the inventory of the county archives of Josephine County. I can see where this may be of value for reference purposes. I notice that 'Dog licenses' follow 'Dance permits' and 'Dance permits' follow 'Authority to solemnize marriage.' I suppose that is a proper sequence. At any rate, young married folks today seem to want to dance and own dogs, so Josephine County is set up just right." Another letter, from Miss Margaret C. Norton, superintendent of the division of archives of the Illinois State Library, states: "Our experience in Illinois has been that the archives survey has done a great deal to interest people in the preservation of records and that it has particularly been popular with the State officials, whose records have been inventoried. It would have been almost impossible for us to have moved into our new State archives building and to have inventoried, unfolded, and otherwise prepared for use the records which came into the building without the assistance of survey workers. We are very enthused over the work as done in Illinois."

The inventories of 50 towns and cities in New England have appeared and another 25 have been approved for publication. Two key volumes on town offices to which I have referred earlier are being mimeographed at the present time in New England. The Massachusetts volume will contain 250 town offices.

I have already commented upon the fact that there has been little publication up to the present time in the field of State archives and municipal archives. We expect to have a rather heavy production in both of these fields due to circumstances which I have mentioned earlier. With reference to the guides and inventories of manuscript materials and the check lists of American imprints, I am glad that I can defer to Mrs. Eliot and Mr. McMurtrie to give you a more complete report than time permits me to give here. I do wish to point out, however, that we are greatly concerned with the problem of how to meet the demand which is increasing both in insistence and in volume for the publications in these two divisions of the Survey.

More progress has been made this year than in any past year with the publication of the inventories of church archives. This is due to the fact that more labor has been available. When the archives of the counties have been inventoried and rechecked, the majority of the workers in most States undertake the listing of church archives. In order to speed up production of the volumes of this series, we are permitting inventories of the various denominational archives to be issued by dioceses, by synod, by association, and occasionally by city, instead of waiting until all of the archives of a particular denomination have been listed in a State. While only 30 volumes have appeared thus far, an equal number have been approved and are being mimeographed. I think it is fair to estimate that more than 1,000 workers have been engaged in inventorying church archives. They have collected data on more than 90,000 churches during the past 4 years.

In the field of American portraits we have added no publications to the 2 volumes which were noted last year covering 2,700 portraits in Massachusetts. However, where the listing of portraits does not interfere with the regular program of the other divisions of the Survey, workers are now busy in all of the New England States. Check lists of portraits for New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina are also being compiled. The New Jersey project will begin work in this field before July 1, 1940.

I am glad to report that the compilation of the Messages and the Papers of the Presidents, 1898–1938, has been completed by the Columbia University unit of the New York City survey. This important series of volumes will be published in the near future. An index to the Executive orders has also been completed by the same unit of the New York City project and will be published before October of this year. You have been interested in the compilation of an annotated bibliography of American history which has been carried on during the last 4 years. This tremendous compilation of 29,000 annotated titles is within 2 percent of being completed. In the near future it is expected to break down the files of this material into several hundred subject fields and send each to a specialist for review. While this review is being made, all titles and annotations will be rechecked. It is expected that the bibliography will begin to go to press by the end of the calendar year. A bibliography of American musical activity has also been completed by the Survey in the District of Columbia and will be issued by July 15, 1940.

Now, let us look a few moments to the future. I have already stated that I believe, now that the transition from the Federal project to a series of State-wide projects has been made safely, that the Historical Records Survey is stronger today than it was a year ago. I do not base this statement merely upon my own observations, and those of the regional supervisors nor upon the reports sent to us by the State supervisors. I think it is rather obvious to anyone who realizes the magnitude of the support which has come from the State librarians, the State archivists, the secretaries of state, and even the Governors themselves, cannot help but acknowledge that the Survey has grown in influence, in usefulness, and in its public service. Less time is devoted today by the State supervisors and their field assistants in obtaining the permission of public officials to inventory their records. In fact, the State supervisors in some States have to decide the priority of granting the requests made by numerous public officials that an inventory be made of the archives under their jurisdiction. These decisions must be made under the present circumstances on a basis of which town, county, or department of a State government can pay for the publication of the inventory, instead of upon the value or importance of one county over another or one State department over another. Everything else being equal, the supervisor will choose, of course, the more important from a historical or governmental point of view.

In terms of manpower the Survey has also gained strength. The policy of the Work Projects Administration, working in the interest of economy, is to encourage more large State-wide projects and fewer local projects which employ relatively few people. We have absorbed a number of local projects, and it is estimated that ap-

proximately 10,000 persons are now engaged in some phase of the work of the Historical Records Survey and its allied projects. The present employment, therefore, exceeds any peak of employment which the survey has had in the past.

It is inevitable that with the passage of another year a larger number of persons have learned about the purposes, the activities, and the publications of the Survey. Nor are these persons merely interested individuals; many of them represent libraries and historical or educational institutions, and they usually request that they be placed on the mailing list to receive copies of our publications. If the person is a college librarian, he frequently quotes the opinions of several members of the faculty and gives the number of students which the library serves; if it is a librarian of a great city library, his letter is likely to contain statistics which lead us to believe that the needs of thousands of literate citizens cannot be covered; and if it is the custodian or curator of a historical society, we are made aware of the unusual holdings in American history of that institution and of the fact that this is another depository which must be placed on our mailing list. The problem of furnishing additional libraries and institutions, which are not now on the mailing list, with copies of our guides, check lists, and inventories, is one that is most baffling to us. We have not yet found a way to solve it. We think it is probable that we will be able to establish a few additional regional depositories for the inventories published in the neighboring States. It seems utterly unfair to us, nevertheless, to ask local officials of a county, which is already struggling with its budget, to contribute money to publish an inventory, a great majority of copies of which are to be distributed in other counties and in other States. It is becoming more and more difficult to expect the officials in financially poor but historically rich counties to become enthusiastic about publishing 250 copies of an inventory of their records, many copies of which are to go to the Boston Public Library, the Hall of Records in Annapolis, the State Library in Florida, the University of South Dakota, the Princeton University Library, the Historical Society of Wisconsin, or the University of Oregon, to mention but a few of the Nation-wide depositories. We are equally troubled in asking boards of trustees of historical societies for funds to publish their holdings for Nation-wide distribution. Since we confess that we ourselves have not been able to find a solution to this increasingly pressing problem, we invite you in all sincerity to suggest ways and means which may lead to a solution.

It is most encouraging to us to learn that students in increasing numbers in post-graduate schools are using the inventories prepared and edited by those who have been for the time being at least unemployed. This is a relatively new note in American education. We hope that the Survey may continue to serve these students by continuing to keep the libraries of the universities which they are attending on the mailing list. We are impressed by letters from librarians of denominational libraries asking for inventories of the archives of other denominations. We like to see this evidence of mutual interest and respect between the various religious bodies in this country, but we have not yet learned how to meet their needs.

Recently we have discovered that by reprinting the historical sketch and the governmental organization essay of the county and town inventories, county and town boards of education will contribute enough money for these reprints to permit an adequate supply to be published for the schools and also to permit the purchase of a sufficient amount of paper on which the complete inventories may be mimeographed. In a growing number of States we are discovering that the local governing bodies wish to print the inventories. This occurs, however, only in the more prosperous sections of the country. We cannot expect now or in the future, however, that inventories of valuable public records or of manuscript material or of church archives can be printed in the less prosperous communities.

I say, in summary, to those of you who are receiving copies of the Survey publications, I hope you may continue to receive them. If you do remain on the mailing list you will receive the publications in increasing numbers. To those of you who may desire to have copies of these volumes sent to the institutions which you represent, I say that I hope your requests may be granted but first we must cooperate in an effort to find a solution to the publication problem.

In looking toward the future, you may wonder what else the Survey may undertake besides increasing the rate of publication of the State and municipal archives inventories as well as those for the Federal agencies in the States, the counties, and the towns. The cautious expansion of the survey of American portraits has already been mentioned. I cannot emphasize too greatly the policy we must follow of not undertaking new tasks which will modify our present speed-up program. In States which have both manpower and materials, we are starting work on records created by or relating to the American Negro. These inventories will follow the present patterns established in the manuscript, and church records departments. Indexes to source material in the public records inventories relating to the American Negro will also be created.

We are also studying the possibilities of compiling special inventories which will be guides to all sources of vital statistics in the public records and church records in the Nation. While this appears to be a tremendous undertaking, it may prove to be relatively simple. There is a growing demand in Federal and State agencies, not to mention private agencies such as insurance companies, to find out just what data exists in each State and in each county relating to birth, marriages, and deaths. To make this data available, we have simply to lift the vital statistics entries from the inventories already published and add to them similar entries from our files which contain many times the amount already published. While the resulting compilation would not be complete, it would be most useful and 6 or 8 months after a vital statistics inventory for a State had been issued, a supplementary volume could be issued based upon material located subsequently to that which now has been compiled.

Another task which is being studied has to do with the microfilming of newspapers, particularly those files which have been published since the beginning of the pulp era of American journalism. I do not think it necessary for me to tell you of the storage problem which confronts librarians with reference to newspaper holdings. It would be ideal to microfilm all complete files of newspapers of historical or social value. But since this task is too large and too expensive to be undertaken even by a large army such as the Historical Records Survey, it might not be unwise to discuss at least the possibility covering certain very valuable newspapers from 1865 to 1910. These newspapers not only take up very valuable space but they are disintegrating at a rate that startles researchers in many fields of scholarship. Making indexes to newspapers which fall apart when handled is scarcely an activity which we can intelligently endorse. If this source material can be preserved on film and then indexed, we feel we would be doing a great service. The present stumbling block is the cost of the film and equipment; a problem with which most of you are quite familiar. One sometimes is astonished, however, upon realizing the comparative costs of microfilming versus the cost of storage of these tons of newspapers over a period of years. For a sponsor or a group of sponsors, however, the labor costs for undertaking such a piece of work are practically nil.

Democracy and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address over station WEVD on June 28, 1940, as follows:

Democracy, among other things, is a government in which minorities and majorities have equal rights—free speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press—the right to order their lives in their own way. The touchstone of democracy is that the individual himself has dignity and knows that he has worth and cannot be ordered around or carried in the vest pocket of a vile dictator like Hitler or a despicable group headed by a Mussolini or a Stalin.

It is well to recall to mind in these days of world doubt and despair that democracy is not a new or untried invention. It is as old as the hills. It has matured through the centuries. In Britain and in America, at least, its roots have grown deep into the soil.

Democracy is worth fighting for. We in the United States particularly have a democracy worthy of defense, despite its faults and defects, many as there may appear to be. Be it remembered that these blemishes are far outweighed by wholesome advantages. In the language of William James, our democracy has, of all governments, brought the "greatest good to the greatest number."

Let me point out that democracy cannot always be defended by merely preserving peace. Remember people have perished by peace as well as by war. Ancient Rome wanted peace and hired other people to fight their battles. Those hired mercenaries in turn overcame Rome. To mention current history, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, and Finland deeply and sincerely desired peace. With one exception these peace-loving countries are in ruins today.

Peace is a worthy ideal but there is an ideal even more compelling—justice. To live democracy must, at all costs, preserve justice; otherwise it would be a mere ghost of its glorious past. We have preserved justice in this land of ours for more than 150 years. Our first thought, therefore, should be the defense of our just democracy.

Just as our forefathers in inaugurating our great democracy and experiment in human freedom on this continent were willing to stake their all on its success, we, too, should be willing to give our all, our property, our lives, our sacred honor, to defend that which is no longer an experiment but an assured worthy success.

Democracy should not be static. It should change with the times. We must not only talk democracy, we must live it. We must always strive to direct it toward a better order, to create more happiness for our people. We must see to it that democracy is

not checkmated, is not curtailed, but rather that it is encouraged and made more embracing in its benign influences. Above all, we must defend our democracy from within and from without.

We must meet the competition of dictator countries. We must be prepared to match their armaments. But, also, the enemy lurks within. There are many Trojan horses within our confines. We must uncover insidious penetrations into this fair land of ours by Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin. At times these vultures have conquered without firing a shot. I am confident that our democracy can fight and conquer hidden as well as unhidden foes. To do this, we must have intelligent leadership. That leadership resides in the personality of President Roosevelt. He has wisely asked that we arm ourselves clear up to the hilt. He urges this because he knows, and you know, that unless we do so, democracy is dead—dead as a door nail.

A revolutionary, dictator movement—the very antithesis of democracy—in a comparatively short space of time, because of lack of preparedness of its enemies—has swallowed most of the continent of Europe. In the East, similarly, Japan, aping the axis powers, is establishing its undemocratic sovereignty over Asia and threatens us from across the Pacific. In between the two movements lies the Russian bear, which has crushed all the democracy it could seize for the time being. It gluts for more. Yesterday it was Estonia and Latvia. Today Bessarabia.

The last vestige of democracy in Europe—England—is about to be attacked by land, sea, and air. Its downfall means the downfall of a democratic empire covering one-fourth of the globe. If England falls the Western Hemisphere will be all that will be left of democracy. We must preserve what little democracy may remain. In order to fight we must prepare with a two-ocean Navy and with huge land and air forces.

In that armed preparedness there is something more involved than submarines, airplanes, tanks, and Garands. There must be a weeding out of those forces which make for dissension among our people. There must be a will to prevent internal strife, racial and religious prejudice. There must be a willingness to sacrifice, an unquenchable love of freedom and an insistence upon the individual rights of man. A democracy, disunited and discontented, becomes an easy target for the war lords.

Defending democracy at this juncture means preparedness. It is argued in certain quarters that military, aerial, and naval preparedness militates against and is inconsistent with democracy. That is damnably untrue. It emanates from the enemies and not the friends of democracy.

During the last World War we armed and trained over 4,000,000 men and sent 2,000,000 soldiers to France. Our fleet was built up to reach a staggering tonnage. That was militarism with a vengeance. Yet our democracy remained intact. It emerged unimpaired from such a crisis. Keep this in mind. We have had 31 Presidents. Each, under our Constitution, has been endowed with tremendous power. They have been Commanders in Chief of our Army and Navy. Despite their power, not one of them has ever sought to subvert the Government or to override the will of the people on any essential point. This is all the more remarkable because at least seven of these men were chosen because of conspicuous military service. I refer to Washington, Jackson, Harrison, Zachary Taylor, Grant, Garfield, and Theodore Roosevelt. The military point of view, so deeply imbued in these men, did not affect their democracy. All of them advanced the cause of democracy. Furthermore, during 150 years we have been engaged in numerous wars—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, not including the numerous frontier and Indian wars. Despite the military campaigns involved, there has been an ever-growing list of benefits from our widening democracy. To name a few celebrated examples, I cite the emancipation of the Negroes after the Civil War; the seventeenth amendment, in 1913, which made our Senate more responsible to the popular will by providing for their direct election; the right of franchise extended to women in 1920; the lame-duck amendment in 1933.

During these 150 years our civil liberties have been gradually encouraged. In the early days of our history there were, for example, all manner of religious bars against Catholics, Quakers, Jews, and atheists.

In New Hampshire suffrage was limited to Protestant taxpayers. In South Carolina, only to free, white men, believing in God, heaven and hell, with a freehold of 50 acres. A Governor of South Carolina had to be possessed of 10,000 pounds of property, comparable to a million dollars or more today.

States have been educated gradually to relax these prohibitions. We have traveled long distances along the paths of democracy and will continue to do so.

The founders of the Republic, be it remembered, were not all quiet old gentleman in stocks, living honorable and prophetic lives for the uplifting of us, their putative descendants. They were a very human lot of people, who, liking to win, were not overnice about the means. We have made great strides in morals since those days.

Let us emphasize the advancements made by labor, with consequent shorter hours, higher wages, and better conditions. There has never been any undue interference with the freedom of the press, free assemblage. Whenever attempts have been made to restrict, as before the Civil War, the literature of the abolitionists, the courts intervened. Same held true recently for birth-control documents. We have created great benefits for our youth through the C. C. C. and the National Youth Administration. We now have old-age protection as provided in the Social Security Act. We have various loan agencies to help those who cannot help themselves, such as R. F. C. and H. O. L. C. We have arranged for slum clearance through the Federal Housing Administration. Farmers have been helped in innumerable ways. In the various bills recently passed by Congress for military and naval preparedness, there were included therein safeguards for agricultural and industrial workers. In this way our democracy goes hand in hand with defense.

Lastly permit me to point with pride to the greatest example of democracy—the nomination of Wendell Willkie. Here is a man granted the highest honor within the gift of one of our great parties who a short time ago was "unbossed, unwept, unhonored, and unsung." By sheer force of character and personality he overwhelmed the delegates and became the standard bearer of the Republican Party.

Our democracy marches on. It girds its loins to defend itself from all its enemies, here or abroad, seen or unseen.

Will Democracy Survive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES G. BINDERUP

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following radio talk by Hon. Charles G. Binderup, June 2, 1940, over stations KMMJ, Grand Island, Nebr., and KGFW, Kearney, Nebr.:

ANNOUNCER. We are pleased to again present this morning Mr. Charles G. Binderup, former Congressman from Nebraska, on the regular Sunday morning series known as Binderup's Financial School of the Air. These programs are a part of the educational program of the Constitutional Money League of America, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization with headquarters at Washington, D. C., which organization recently published the first textbook of its kind for schools, teaching the true fundamentals of our money system. Also as a part of their educational program, the Constitutional Money League of America publishes a monthly magazine, the Constitutional Money Advocate, and distributes books and free literature on the subjects discussed over these programs.

Mr. Binderup, last Sunday we were proud to have you present Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, senior Senator from Nebraska, and Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University, in an electrical transcription of the radio talks which you personally conducted over a Washington, D. C., station last summer. Their subject was 100 percent reserves back of demand deposits as a means of preventing depressions and bank failures. What will the subject be this morning, Mr. Binderup?

Mr. BINDERUP. I am pleased to greet our radio audience and my congenial announcer, Mr. Petersen. My subject for today is to explain definitely how and why money is the only wheel of distribution, a phrase oftentimes made, a subject seldom understood.

I am just in receipt of a very fine letter asking me if I think our democratic form of government will survive the terrific strain brought about by this continued depression which has lasted over 20 years and has refused to be solved by pouring money into the "tax-exempt, interest-bearing, Government bond rat hole" that has no bottom.

WILL DEMOCRACY SURVIVE?

The answer to the question depends absolutely upon how democracy operates the three component parts of the capitalistic system. Our capitalistic system of government may be likened to a three-wheel cart, the wheels being production, distribution, and consumption. If at any time any one of these three wheels lags behind in strength or fails to carry its load, the entire cart collapses. These wheels must carry a human cargo. The welfare of humanity depends on these three wheels each doing its part. Nations have invariably failed by always using the production wheel as the master wheel, which they have guarded, supported, and cared for in every way, while the two neglected rear wheels, consumption and distribution, have been allowed to follow as best they could in some old rut in any shape without care or consideration. Laboring under this illogical plan, we have wondered why Uncle Sam's three-wheeled cart has broken down about every 7 years. It will con-

tinue to break down more often as it grows older, unless we change the wheels around and give our attention to distribution (money) as the master wheel, for everyone knows that distribution has always found the beaten path for the consumption wheel. By that I mean we have always been able to consume what has been distributed to us. The wheels of distribution and consumption have ever paved the way for production, i. e., show a distributing and consuming power and the production wheel always follows, and it will continue to follow until we have exhausted labor or the natural resources of the earth. There is no limit, my friends, to prosperity until one of these factors have been exhausted. For every nation that was once and is no more, time has written the following epitaph on the pages of history: "Died because its people failed to solve the problem of equitable distribution."

We have, through the development of our natural resources and through the progress of science, increased our capacity to produce to a very great degree. but the fact is, and the difficulty has been, that whenever we have approached a maximum of production, one of the three wheels of our capitalistic system has broken down, namely, the distribution wheel (by which I mean our money system).

Twenty-seven times in our Nation's history, whenever we have approached a time when we attempted to satisfy the wants of our people, when we have approached a maximum of production and a maximum of consumption; whenever we have neared that standard of living to which the great resources of our Nation and the energy and integrity of its people so justly entitle them, the one part of our capitalistic system, the wheel of distribution (the monetary system) has broken down, bringing misery, want, and starvation to millions of our people and threatening our very democracy.

Will democracy survive? Yes; if we return to the Constitution and once and for all rightly solve this one part of our capitalistic system, the monetary system of our country, through Government monetary issue and control, as advocated by the Constitutional Money League of America, Washington, D. C.

How often it has been said that money is the only wheel of distribution for trade and commerce. It is no wonder that the people do not understand what is meant by this phrase, as 97 percent of our money is so definitely intangible. If I should say a freight or express car or truck was the wheels of commerce and distribution everybody would say, "Of course they are." Everybody can see that. But when I tell you that none of these can function as instrumentalities of distribution unless assisted by money, the arch vehicle of trade and commerce and distribution, people just cannot understand that without money there cannot possibly be trade, commerce, or distribution.

Let me picture an extreme case that we may fully understand the power of money, and just how and why money is the wheel of distribution. Suppose all the money were taken out of circulation. Do you realize that the entire Nation would stand still? Distribution would be at zero. We would then have 100 percent unemployment. Not one single man, woman, or child would have a job. Every freight or express car or truck would be standing still, for there would be no money for gas. Our cities would black out and water hydrants would be dry, for we would have no way of paying labor. Every doctor, lawyer, or merchant would be out trying to find something to eat out in the forest or field, trying to get food directly from Mother Earth, as all commerce would be at a standstill. Do you realize that in 10 days the people in the cities would be starving to death, and there would be murder and chaos in the mad scramble to get something to eat? You would be murdered by the hungry mob if they thought you had a slice of bread in your possession. Take our money out of circulation and civilization will perish immediately.

The plan to preserve and promote civilization with Government monetary issue and control is so simple. You can read the plan in Uncle Sam's Hospital Chart in 10 minutes, and any child in the eighth grade can understand it.

So, as we explained, with all the money out of circulation, we would have 100-percent unemployment and the Nation would die. Now, suppose half of the money were taken out of circulation as it is at present. Can you vision with me that half of commerce is standing still; that only half of labor is employed, of that labor and the farmer is only half paid? Let me repeat, if you take all the money out of circulation, we would have 100-percent unemployment, no one would have a job and the price of farm commodities would be at zero. Then with only half the money in circulation, is it difficult for you to understand that half of labor would be unemployed and the price of commodities would be at half price? Well, if you can understand this, then you do understand the money question, for that is all there is to it.

Now, to further prove that money is the only wheel of distribution, and trade and commerce, let me relate the following incident:

One day John Jones found a $5 bill in an old strong box that had been hidden away for 50 years. It was real money, a Government receipt for services rendered, Uncle Sam's note, a greenback. Now, when John spent this $5 for goods or services he not alone benefited himself, but he started trade and commerce to the extent of this $5 to the benefit of the entire Nation, for it continued traveling throughout the veins and arteries of distribution, transferring goods or services in trade and commerce from one to another, to the extent of $5 a week. Because statistics prove that a dollar changes hands on the average of once a week, this $5 bill created $5 times 52 weeks, or $260 in transactions a year. So I say it was not John alone who profited by finding this money, but merchants, farmers, or laboring men did $5 more business a week forever after, just because John found this $5 and spent it into the channels of business. We all profited in expanded business to this extent. Yes, this $5 is still going on and on traveling and perfecting $5 of transactions a week, solving the unemployment problem to this extent. Let me further state, there is not a power on earth that can stop this $5 from performing its services to humanity every week as a distributor of goods and services, helping to overcome unemployment and raising the price level by supplying a demand for goods.

Of course, someone could exchange his own goods or services for this $5 bill and then deliberately burn it up or destroy it, although he would become criminally liable to Uncle Sam for destroying this kind of money, regardless of the fact that the bankers destroy our money (bankers' credit money) by the billions whenever they feel like it. Or, he could lock up this $5 and keep it from circulating. But in all events he would have lost his own services or goods which he had exchanged for it. Other than this unlikely condition, I say the $5 John put into circulation, when he found it and spent it could not be stopped from doing its services to humanity, creating its $260 in transactions a year and business would be just that much better. May I stress most emphatically that not one penny of this $260 in additional business could have been possible, had John not found this $5. Business would have been short this amount in transactions and the national income would have been short accordingly. In other words, it would have been a brake on distribution and prosperity to just exactly this extent.

Now let me go further. This $5 bill had been out of circulation for 50 years. Thus by being lost, the same as hoarded, for 50 years, it had hindered or prevented the flow of trade and commerce and distribution to the extent of five times 52 weeks times 50 years, or a total of $13,000 in business transactions had been stopped because this $5 was lost. And because John discovered this $5, $13,000 in new business will be created every 50 years from now on. Every man, woman, and child will receive his or her prorated share of this benefit in added distribution, added business, forever. To this extent John was responsible for solving the unemployment situation by putting $5 again into circulation.

Now, friends, this miniature illustration should be interesting when it is led on into greater figures. Let us follow the dollars in larger amounts under the same undisputed philosophy, as explained about the $5 bill somebody had taken out of circulation and which was later found by John.

It was on May 18, 1920, that there was committed against the people of the United States the greatest crime ever committed against a trusting public, when 52 bankers held a secret meeting in the Treasury Building at Washington, D. C., and took $10,000,000,000 of the people's money out of circulation, as related in the book, Uncle Sam's Hospital Chart, the facts of which are taken from Senate Document 310.

At this time these bankers destroyed $10,000,000,000 of the people's money. But this was a different kind of money than the $5 bill which John found. This was pen-and-ink money, ledger-entry money, which is created by our banking system out of thin air and likewise vanishes when so commanded by the system, into thin air. But this kind of money is just as much used as money as Uncle Sam's own real money. In fact, it makes up 97 percent of our money.

It was just 20 years ago since this crime was committed from which we have never recovered. Let us see just how much business was blocked by this destruction of the Nation's circulating medium of exchange, money. Remember, a dollar changes hands on an average of once a week. The $10,000,000,000 destroyed on May 18, 1920, stopped trade and commerce to the extent of $10,000,000,000 times 52 weeks times 20 years, or $10,400,000,000,000 of business transactions to date.

In other words, the action of the bankers in this secret meeting blocked just $10,400,000,000,000 in transactions and not one single penny, not one red cent of these business transactions was possible without this money. I challenge the world to deny it.

In 1929 this same bunch of international bankers met again and took away from the people $8,000,000,000, which, according to the same statistics, robbed the people of $4,160,000,000,000 in business transactions. Again, in 1937, the same procedure by our banking system took away from the people $3,000,000,000 of our medium of exchange, or $468,000,000,000 in business transactions. So, by stopping dollars in these cases alone, the same as the illustration of John and his $5, these bankers stopped this vast amount of business by taking away from the people the wheel of distribution—money—in the total amount of $15,028,000,000,000 (fifteen trillion, twenty-eight billion dollars) of business transactions since the crime of May 18, 1920. And the people wonder why the factories are empty or running part time. You hear them say, "What in the world has happened to business? What has happened, that we are in want in the midst of plenty? Who stopped the clock?" They wonder why people could not pay their taxes and interest, and why the Nation has doubled its national debt; why 1,500,000 farmers lost their farms by foreclosure, and 20,000,000 laboring men lost their

jobs and homes. They wonder why a great Nation with unlimited resources and labor went bankrupt in the midst of plenty. Why are "reds" and radicals springing up among our own people? Where did they come from? The Fascists and Nazis, and other foreign military organizations that are forming to oppose our Government, have become so serious a problem that Congress has deemed it necessary to form a Committee under Congressman DIES to stop or hinder free speech, the very foundation of a free democracy. I say "Why?", especially when Congressman DIES knows the fundamental reason and still persists in administering palliatives to Uncle Sam in place of prescribing the fundamental cure, when he knows, as any man with common sense knows, you cannot stop communism and fascism and Bund organizations, and other foreign influences against our Government with prison or deportation, with shot and shell, or sword or gun, for every time you catch one and inflict punishment, a hundred others are born. But I know a way you can stop all this. I know a way you can successfully choke to death every sign of these foreign "isms." You can destroy their motive until they will come to hate their own philosophy. Just choke to death with honor and righteousness and fairness their reason for resorting to these un-Christian, uncivilized plans. Make restitution for the crimes of 1920, 1929, and 1937. Put the money back into circulation. Recreate jobs and rebuild homes, the units in the foundation of our Government. Move the capitol from New York back to Washington, and I don't mean move the agents of the hidden government to Washington, I mean power and principle.

Yes, my friends, out of these poor skeletons of humanity you can make the greatest citizens. Help them to get a job and a home and they will beg to become American citizens and help and cooperate in a great democracy, when our Government again deserves this compliment. All it takes is justice, the very foundation on which our democracy was originally builded.

The question is asked, "Will democracy survive?" Yes, if we, the people will rightly balance the load on our three-wheeled capitalistic cart. If we will abide by the Constitution in article 1, section 8, "Congress shall coin all money and regulate the value thereof," by controlling volume and velocity of money as explained in our monthly magazine or in our book, Uncle Sam's Hospital Chart, or in the textbook which we have just recently completed for schools, teaching the basic principles of constitutional money, or by following these radio broadcasts called Binderup's Financial School of the Air every Sunday at 9 a. m. over Station KMMJ, Grand Island, Nebr., and at 12:30 p. m. over station KGFW, Kearney, Nebr.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you. You have just listened to Mr. Charles G. Binderup, former Congressman from Nebraska, in another of the series known as Binderup's Financial School of the Air. We will have Mr. Binderup with us again next Sunday at this same time, 9 a. m., for another of his interesting talks on national problems of the day. Be sure to listen and advise your friends to tune in.

Free literature on the subjects discussed will be mailed upon request. Just address a letter or postal card to the Constitutional Money League of America, Washington, D. C., or to the station to which you are listening. We will see you again next Sunday, Mr. Binderup.

Third Term for President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, July 1), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, in the July issue of Current History there appears a very interesting and informative article by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Current History and Forum for July 1940]

F. D. R. MUST RUN AGAIN

(By Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, United States Senator from the State of Pennsylvania)

I am for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President in 1940, to serve his people and the Nation for another term in the White House.

Will he accept the nomination the Democratic National Convention will undoubtedly tender him in July? He must. The people are demanding it.

During the summer of 1939 one of the most astute of all Washington political observers, Charles Michelson, veteran political writer and publicity director for the Democratic National Committee, declared it his opinion that the President would prefer a case of hives to 4 years more of the heartache that being President means. And he added:

"It will not be an easy choice at that. Circumstances might arise that would make it impossible for him to lay down his burden. The world may be at war, with or without threat of involvement; or some other equally acute emergency may eventuate that would forbid change of administration. The man in the White House is not the kind of an individual who would let his personal desire interfere with what seemed to him to be his duty."

Circumstances have arisen which make it impossible for Franklin D. Roosevelt to lay down his burden. A deadly and devastating war grips Europe and threatens to spread to our hemisphere.

Roosevelt's call from the people rests not merely upon the demand for a strong man to lead in this hour of emergency, but likewise upon the need for a consolidation and extension of the great social gains he has begun. That he has not already consolidated these gains is not his fault. As a matter of cold political fact, if Roosevelt is elected to the Presidency again, he will have an opportunity to serve his first real term of office. Roosevelt's first term, which began in 1933, was canceled, vetoed, by the Supreme Court. His second term, which began in 1937, has been hampered by Tories and political ingrates.

He should, at least, be given an opportunity for 4 years in the White House with assurance that his program will no longer be torn apart by Court decisions or emasculated by selfish interests who have stabbed at him from behind his back.

All should agree that, irrespective of another term for Roosevelt, there must be another term for his ideas. Are there no other Democratic leaders qualified to be President? Of course there are. But where is the candidate that can be trusted to embody and carry forward these ideas and these programs of the New Deal as effectively as President Roosevelt? Regardless of their loyalty for the New Deal, and their zeal in making those principles effective, no New Deal leader can approach Roosevelt in popular appeal or forceful guidance of the people toward his objectives.

The people themselves are answering the question for us. They are saying that so far there appears to be only one to guarantee the continued enjoyment of the many social, industrial, agricultural, educational, and cultural gains that have been made under his administration, and that one is Franklin D. Roosevelt himself.

As a practical politician, I say that talk against another term for Roosevelt is bad politics. Those who hold office of trust in the United States Government talk with a bad grace of limiting the President to two terms. A quarter of the membership of the Senate has served more than two terms of 6 years each, and another quarter of the Senators are serving their second term—and hoping for a third. Three-fourths of the membership of the House of Representatives are serving a second term or more. Our Federal judges are appointed for life.

We need experience in public life, and most of all in the Presidency. Will Senators who have served from 10 to 30 years argue that another Presidential term would violate a "sacred tradition" of two terms? Will they contend that it is morally wrong or politically unwise for a President to serve longer than 8 elected years? Can Senators who have served since the World War convince us that we must get rid of Roosevelt because he has been in the White House since 1933?

Some members of the Democratic Party say they have such high regard for President Roosevelt that they feel sure he will not challenge the third-term myth. Some of these men have had such high regard for Mr. Roosevelt that they have balked, filibustered, or mutilated some of the President's measures taken during the last 3 years.

Let us examine this tradition more closely. It is supposed to rest upon the words and example of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. There was calm, measured logic in Washington's statement of his position on the question. It was outlined in his letter to Lafayette on April 28, 1788, in which he reviewed various issues raised in the Constitution then under discussion. He wrote:

"There are other points on which opinions would be more likely to vary. As, for instance, on the ineligibility of the same person for President after he should have served a certain course of years. * * * There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will by any practical intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it—but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity. * * *

"Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who, on some great emergency, shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

Such was the final judgment of the Father of his Country, the first President. Jefferson favored a single term of 4 to 6 years, yet he served two terms totaling 8 years. He admitted that he might serve three terms under certain conditions, and he controlled Presidential policy for 16 years after he left office.

The two-term tradition is a political taboo which we should have discarded long ago. As Jay Franklin has said:

"Freedom from taboos in every other walk of life than politics has been responsible for much of our national progress. The third

term taboo is only a lamp which should have been puffed out long ago, just to show that we could do it. The common sense of politics is to keep a good man as long as he is useful and to get rid of a bad President as soon as his incapacity is evident."

We have modified many of our political practices as the Republic grew and needs changed. We changed our Constitution to collect a Federal income tax. We elect United States Senators by direct vote of the people instead of by legislatures as was the custom for more than a century. We have given women the suffrage—against the howls of those lovers of tradition who declared we should not shake off this taboo against women exercising this fundamental right of citizenship. We have seen the Supreme Court recently follow the will of the people in social legislation rather than stick to archaic constructions of law.

Traditions have no validity except when the value of their fundamental premises remains unimpaired. Jefferson feared that America might have a king if a third term were permitting, making exception only of Washington and himself. If monarchy threatens America, then his reasons hold. But who believes that a monarchy would be possible in the United States today?

If traditions had never been broken, George Washington and the revolutionary patriots would never have taken up arms, Abraham Lincoln would never have freed the slaves.

Surely, then, we need not cling to a tradition that, in these times of crises in world affairs, has no rhyme nor reason for continued existence.

I favor another term for President Roosevelt as an American. I know what he has done to save America, our people, our peace, our free institutions, our faith in God and man.

I favor another term because I am a liberal and I believe in democracy. Our people realize the real issue. The real fight we face is between liberalism as represented by Roosevelt and reactionary toryism as represented by judges and lawyers who cheated the people out of the benefits of Roosevelt's leadership in his first term and the ingrates and middle-of-the-roaders who have tried to stifle his program in his second term. The people want our liberal democracy to continue. They know that Roosevelt alone can insure its safe continuation.

These are dangerous and critical times. We can afford nothing but our very best man in the White House. What other man than Roosevelt could match the dignity of a king and queen, representing us as their hosts in a manner that made the whole Nation proud of him, and at the same time know and feel the problems of the unemployed miners of Pennsylvania and the hardships of the struggling farmers of the Middle West?

In these times of real danger to America—danger from within and from without—we need a real leader, someone who can really represent our democratic will to survive. And we know that in Franklin D. Roosevelt we have such a leader.

But, some may contend, the President may seize the power to make himself a dictator, particularly with his increased emergency powers in this crisis of national defense. Such a fear has been deliberately fostered at other times in our history in order to thwart the will of the people. The hollowness of this pretense is easily seen. If the President might seize dictatorial powers, it is obvious that he could do so as easily in the first and second as in the third term. If the people of their own volition give more power to a President, they still operate within the framework of democracy. They cannot give him power beyond that permitted under the Constitution. No matter how often the people elect a President, they still control his operations and the boundaries of his duties, through their elected representatives—in the Congress.

It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to argue that Franklin D. Roosevelt would seek to become a dictator. Such a position could be defended only on the ground that the people are not able to govern themselves, that Congress and the courts may be expected to abdicate their functions and prerogatives, and that President Roosevelt himself would seize by force of arms authority not granted him by the Constitution and the people.

As Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes has said: "Our democracy does not rest upon any such flimsy foundation as those who persist in invoking the 'sacred tradition' would have us believe. Our institutions are firmly founded upon the ultimate right of the people to decide for themselves whom they wish to have to serve them and the manner in which they shall be served.

"If the people can give, the people can also take away. If they can be trusted to elect a President for one or two terms, they can be trusted to decide for themselves whether they want a President to serve them for three terms. In the final analysis, the safety of our institutions depends upon the ballot box, and so long as we safeguard that right, so long will our Nation be a free, self-governing democracy. * * *

"Moreover, it should be remembered that the Presidency is not a despotic office but is responsible to an alert and independent Congress. No matter how long a President might remain in office, he would still be subjected to the democratic processes, checked by the Congress and the judiciary, and exposed to the watchful eyes of a critical free press."

Can any "danger" of another term for Roosevelt compare with the risk we run of having forced upon this country a figurehead, a stuffed shirt, an incompetent middle of the roader, or a young and inexperienced man? Everyone in America knows that we need now as never before a man with mature knowledge of the world, knowledge of America, the ability of leadership, determination and courage. Can any political fixers who would oust Roosevelt on the pretext of a tradition fail to believe that if they do they will be branded throughout this country as the professional embezzlers of the rights of a free and democratic people?

We Americans know that to our people Roosevelt is not just a name in the papers, as are other possible candidates for the Presidency. Almost every American old enough for school has by this time actually seen President Roosevelt. He has seen and been seen by more of our people than has any other man in the United States.

The people do not want shadow candidates now. They want Roosevelt, because they trust him and his leadership. They demand that the leadership he has given them since 1933 be continued.

Who is supporting President Roosevelt for a third term? The farmer whose land was saved by the New Deal, the factory worker who got decent hours and working conditions and the right to stand up and bargain with his employer like a man, the sharecropper of the South, the migratory worker of the West, the honest businessman who has been saved from bankruptcy, the men out of a job who got relief work on self-respecting terms, the old people who got pensions, the citizens who are the beneficiaries of a greater social justice.

President Roosevelt has said: "The social and economic forces which have been mismanaged abroad until they have resulted in revolution, dictatorship, and war are the same as those which we here are struggling to adjust peacefully at home."

The amazing energy and courage with which Franklin D. Roosevelt has met the challenge which leaders of countries now at war failed to meet is demonstrated by headlines from almost any daily paper.

"Federal public assistance benefits 17,880,000 persons. * * * C. C. C. provides useful work and training for 2,000,000 youths. * * * P. W. A. makes possible 80 percent of all construction in the United States. * * * Government interest rates lowest in history. * * *" and so on through countless daily news dispatches.

These headlines tell a doubly significant story. First of all, they indicate the tremendously wide influence which the idea that "something is going on in Washington" has come to play in the daily routine and normal life of everybody in the Nation. Social security, new as it is, has become an established fact of American life. So it is with measure after measure inaugurated by President Roosevelt. There could be no greater tribute to the soundness of these measures than that their application has become a matter of course. Furthermore, the American citizen accepts them as his right. The New Deal is made up of rights guaranteed the citizen unrecognized by his Government before 1933. He wants those rights continued—with President Roosevelt still in command.

I recognize this movement for another term as the most remarkable development I have experienced in my 44 years of practical politics.

It is a movement not sponsored by newspapers, nor by political leaders meeting in back rooms to "put Roosevelt over" for the nomination soon to be made. It is a demand on the part of the people for the victorious completion of his program, and for continued leadership in the time of gravest international crisis since 1917.

All that can be said against another term is that it has never been done before. To which I answer that we never had such conditions to be remedied before. We have never had such leadership before. We did not have Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House before 1933.

Good Behavior of Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

MINORITY REPORT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MINORITY REPORT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK (TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 5939)

It is with great reluctance that I must differ from the views expressed by our esteemed chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. However, H. R. 5939, providing for a rather novel "trial of good behavior" of United States district judges, is so transcendental in importance, and so fraught with intense interest, that I would indeed be derelict in my duties as a Member of Congress and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary if I would not express my views, although they may not be in accord with those of our distinguished chairman.

The underlying purpose of the plan proposed is partly a sort of mild chastisement of the Senate. The Senators have frequently, it is charged, not done their duty as members of a tribunal hearing impeachment charges preferred by the House. Particularly as in the last impeachment trial, the Senators go in and out of the chamber during the trial—few, if any, remain throughout the proceedings yet all have a solemn duty to perform. But because the Senators may not do their full duty is no valid reason for setting up the novel proceeding embodied in this bill. The proper remedy is for the Senators to perform their duty.

GOOD BEHAVIOR IS NOT A JUSTICIABLE QUESTION

Under the Sumners bill, the court, composed of three circuit judges as selected by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, hears the charges preferred by the House of Representatives against a district judge. The Attorney General prosecutes. These charges shall grow out of the "good behavior" provision of the Constitution. Section 1 of article III of the Constitution states, among other things, that "The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior * * *." The charges, therefore, that this new court must sift is the lack or failure of good behavior, that is, misbehavior. What is good behavior? The Constitution does not define it. The instant bill does not define it. What does it mean? What is good behavior to one man may be bad behavior to another. What is one man's meat may be another man's poison. What is good grounds to one man may be "coffee grounds" to another. President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, would undoubtedly hold Mr. Lewis, of the C. I. O., guilty of bad behavior; while Mr. Lewis would undoubtedly hold Mr. Green similarly guilty of bad behavior. When Cleveland, in the Pullman strikes, called out the troops, a vast number of people wanted him impeached, while on the other hand many people praised him to the skies. Who knows where the truth lies? Who knows what is good behavior? The common criminal can claim violation of the due-process clause of the Constitution if the law under which he has been indicted is vague and indefinite, or the indictment itself is ambiguous or indefinable. Certainly, when one is charged with bad behavior, he is indeed at a loss to know what that means. He can and will invoke the charge of violation of due process, in this new court.

Remember, also, in impeachment the Senate can only convict for "high crimes and misdemeanors" and then only by a two-thirds vote. In the new court, conviction can be for misbehavior and by a majority of three judges. A vote of two of the three judges is all that is necessary. Be the dissent ever so strong the judge must be removed. The right of appeal to the Supreme Court does not cure the vice of the bill.

THIS BILL WILL STRIKE AT THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY

We often grow impatient with the courts and the judges, especially when they decide against us. But all sensible men in retrospect are grateful to the judges and the courts, primarily, for their protecting of our liberties; for their protecting the weak against the strong, the poor against the rich, the subject against the ruler, and the humble citizen against the harshness of government. We are often tempted, at times, to strike at and punish the judges. But we must remember that judicial independence is essential to any government designed for free men. The courts must be made as impervious as possible against unnecessary or unwarranted attacks from either the executive or legislative branches of the Government. Montesquieu said, "There can be no liberty if the power of judging be not separate from the legislative and executive powers." This bill would make easier and more frequent the attacks on the judges and the courts. It is claimed that the remedy of impeachment is difficult and cumbersome. I believe that is as it should be. The power to attack the courts should be sparingly, if ever, used. Impeachment is difficult. It should remain so. The constitutional fathers so intended.

Frankly, are our courts so bad? Our district judges are as conscientious, courageous, and intelligent a lot of judges as can be found in any land. As a class, they are comparatively free from corruption, chicanery, and fraud. Occasionally, there may be one or two who misbehave. These occasions are rare. Even the diamond has flaws; the sun has its spots. The judges as a class are entitled to a few renegades. In 148 years since the Constitution only 9 judges have been impeached, a very good record. Of the 9 judges impeached, 5 were found innocent. There have been only 4 judges found guilty and removed in 148 years.

WHY IS THE BILL LIMITED TO THE TRIAL OF DISTRICT JUDGES?

The President appoints all the judges, the district as well as the circuit judges. The Presidential appointees as circuit judges can try district judges, why could not Presidential appointees as district judges try circuit judges?

TRIAL OF A DISTRICT JUDGE IS IMPORTANT

The author of the bill says that he limits his bill to the trial of district judges because they are not as important as the other judges, and that the only time when "impeachment" should be invoked should be in case of judges higher than the district court. He says "the commentators on the British Constitution all recognize 'impeachment' as not an ordinary proceeding, but as a proceeding to be called into action in extraordinary times and conditions." But, unfortunately, the author of the bill fails to realize that the framers of the Constitution understood the transcendent importance of "impeachment"; they were familiar with the writings on British "impeachment"; they, nevertheless, said indisputably, it must be exercised in case of removal of all judges, high or low. They recognized that the office of district judge was important enough to warrant "impeachment." If they felt differently they would have said so. Thus, only an amendment to the Constitution can bring about the remedy suggested by Representative SUMNERS.

WHY LIMIT THE TRIBUNAL TO CIRCUIT JUDGES?

If three circuit judges can constitute a court, the bill, with just as much grace and logic, could just as well provide a tribunal, to be appointed by the President or by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, of three ordinary citizens. Why limit the court to circuit judges? It could be three justices of the peace, or three presidents of three chambers of commerce, or three Liberty Leaguers, or the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker? If it is constitutional for us as Members of Congress to set up a court to be composed of three circuit judges, it is equally as constitutional for us to set up a court to be composed of three Daughters of the American Revolution.

FOR 150 YEARS REMOVAL OF DISTRICT JUDGES HAS ONLY BEEN BY IMPEACHMENT

To my mind, the best argument against the validity of this proposed bill is this novelty. Can it for one moment be supposed that the framers of the Constitution intended to vest Congress with an important power and then so skillfully conceal it that it could not be discovered save after 150 years?

THE INDEPENDENCE OF JUDGES

I herewith quote from a very interesting article by Merrill E. Otis, reprinted from the Kansas City Law Review, December 1936 issue:

"'This independence of judges,' Alexander Hamilton wrote long since, 'is equally requisite to guard the Constitution and the rights of individuals. * * * The precautions for their responsibility are comprised in the article respecting impeachments. They are liable to be impeached for malconduct by the House of Representatives, and tried by the Senate, and if convicted may be dismissed from office and disqualified from holding any other. This is the only provision on the point, which is consistent with the necessary independence of the judicial character.'[1] And long since John Marshall said: 'Is it not to the last degree important that he (the judge) should be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence or control him but God and his conscience? * * * I have always thought from my earliest youth till now, that the greatest scourge an angry Heaven ever inflicted upon an ungrateful and a sinning people was an ignorant, a corrupt, or a dependent judiciary.'"[2]

The writings of Hamilton and Madison in the Federalist clearly indicate that limitation of removal or dismissal of judges only by conviction upon impeachment was to insure absolute independence of the judiciary. That theory has never heretofore been questioned. The instant bill flees in the face of the views of Madison, Hamilton, and Marshall.

CONGRESS CANNOT LEGISLATE CONCERNING THE TERMS AND TENURE OF OFFICE OF THE JUDGES

The author of the bill might be on firmer ground if there were nothing in the Constitution concerning inferior Federal courts except section 1 of article III, authorizing Congress to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court. Congress, I think, might under that provision have the right (1) to provide what judges the courts constituted should have, (2) to determine how they should be chosen, (3) to determine the terms and tenure, (4) to provide for removal. But that provision does not stand alone. And there is where the proponent of the bill makes his mistake. It must be read with other provisions concerning the courts. It must be read with the other provisions of section 1 of article III, namely: "The judges * * * of the inferior courts shall hold their offices during good behavior." It must be read with section 2 of article I: "The House of Representatives * * * shall have the sole power of impeachment" and with section 3 of the same article: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments."

Congress does not have the power to legislate concerning the terms of the judges. The Constitution fixes the terms—"life, during good behavior." Removal affects the term of a judge. Removal, therefore, has also been withdrawn from legislative power.

When the Constitution vests the House with the exclusive power to impeach, it prohibits, plainly, as if it said so in so many words, the vesting of that power in an attorney general or in any other entity. When it vests the Senate exclusively with power to try "impeachments" it prohibits, equally, the vesting of that power in some other existing or new tribunal.

"Impeachment" is not defined in the Constitution, yet when that instrument was drawn and adopted all knew what "impeachment" meant. It had a clear, historic meaning. It was the method employed in England and her colonies "to reach those in high places guilty of official delinquencies or maladministration." In other words, it meant "removal for misconduct."

Thus the Constitution provided the exclusive method of "removal." Congress cannot legislate any "removal" changes.

---

[1] The Federalist, No. LXXIX.

[2] From Debates in Virginia Convention, as quoted by Mr. Justice Van Devanter in *Evans* v. *Gore* (253 U. S. 245 (1920)).

SENATE IS THE ONLY TRIBUNAL OF REMOVAL

The Constitution was so carefully drawn, each sentence and phrase so painstakingly reviewed and weighed, that every word of that document was intended to have significance. It must be especially true of the powerful word, "sole." It is used twice significantly: The House shall have the "sole" power of impeachment—the Senate shall have the "sole" power to try all impeachments. The framers were not content to say the House shall have power or the Senate shall have power. They were not content to rely upon the rule expressio unius exclusio alterius est. They wanted to make sure beyond peradventure of a doubt that every other body, group, entity, and official were excluded either to "impeach" or to "try" the "impeachment." They said the House could "solely" institute the charges while the Senate could "solely" hear the charges of removal. They did not even let the matter rest there—so meticulous were they in their choice of words. They wrote, "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments." Thus to the emphasis given the word "sole" they added the further emphasis arising from the word "all."

Is it not idle, therefore, to construe these clauses, "The House of Representatives * * * shall have the sole power of impeachment," and, "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments," as though they read: "The House of Representatives shall * * * have the sole power of impeachment, provided, however, the Congress may vest exactly the same power, called by a different name (court to try issue of good behavior) in a court of three circuit judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States"; and, "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments, provided, however, the Congress may take that power away from the Senate and vest exactly that same power, called by a different name, in a court of three circuit judges or in any kind of a court Congress may establish."

INTENT OF FRAMERS OF CONSTITUTION IN DEBATE CONCERNING OUSTER OF JUDGES

A study of the debates in the Constitutional Convention, and particularly those of Monday, August 27, 1787, clearly indicate that the framers of the Constitution intended only one method of ouster of judges, "impeachment." It was on that day that they discussed the provision that judges should hold office during good behavior. Delegate Dickinson, of Delaware, proposed, as a method for removing judges, additional to impeachment, that they "may be removed by the Executive on the application by the Senate and House of Representatives." (It is not recorded that he argued that what the Congress may do, it may undo.) The champions of an independent judiciary were stirred to vigorous and immediate dissent. The proposal almost unanimously was voted down.[3] Would not the framers of the Constitution have been surprised to learn that, themselves spurning an alternative of impeachment almost identical with it, unwittingly they had empowered Congress to adopt any alternative it chose?

The power to try judges, or remove them from office, would clearly be limited to impeachable offenses, under the general doctrine that where a constitution names certain things as constituting offenses, and gives specific powers with reference to certain subject matter, it is intended to be exclusive. Mr. Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Limitations (8th ed., p. 139), quotes this rule, as follows:

"Another rule of construction is that when the Constitution defines the circumstances under which a right may be exercised or a penalty imposed, the specification is an implied prohibition against legislative interference to add to the condition or to extend the penalty to other cases."

The Supreme Court of Mississippi, in *State* v. *J. J. Henry* (87 Mississippi Reports 125, 40 Southern Reporter 152), under clause (d) of the first syllabus, says:

"Where the Constitution enumerates power granted or denied, it must be held to have named all of the powers so dealt with and as being, with the necessary implications, the sole limit of authority or restriction."

To the same effect is the case of *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts* (12 Pet. 657, 9 L. ed. 1233); and *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 71 L. ed. 160).

CANNOT ISOLATE ANY PARTICULAR PROVISION OF CONSTITUTION

Section 1, article III, of the Constitution, concerning good behavior, and section 4, article II, concerning impeachment, are not unrelated. The majority report holds that the proposed legislation is not dependent on the provision of the Constitution with reference to impeachments, and "has no relationship whatever with impeachment." I cannot accept this interpretation of the Constitution. The one article supplements and defines the others. The "good behavior" mentioned in section 1, article II, means freedom from "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors," as mentioned in section 4 of article II. In addition, the above two sections must be read with section 2, article I, of the Constitution, which provides that "The House of Representatives * * * shall have sole power of impeachment," and with section 3 of article I, which reads: "The Senate shall have sole power to try all impeachments." Therefore, the right to impeach resides solely and exclusively in the House of Representatives, and the right to try the accused judges lies solely and exclusively in the Senate. Shall we say that the Constitution has given exclusive power to the Senate to try the judges in all cases but that Congress, nevertheless, can give this power to some other tribunal merely by calling it some other name, like the "court of ouster"?

I now freely insert passages from an article of the distinguished United States District Judge Merrill E. Otis, entitled "A Proposed Tribunal: Is It Constitutional?"

"We have now available Madison's notes on the debates in the Constitutional Convention, which the then 36-year-old Virginian, thereafter called 'the Father of the Constitution,' daily took down in a sort of shorthand of his own devising and afterward transcribed. He was seldom absent from any session. His transcribed notes fill 550 printed pages. In them are recorded accurate abstracts of the discussions of the framers, as proposal after proposal was presented and considered. Madison heard and marked what was said concerning methods for securing the responsibility of public officers and what was said concerning measures designed to secure the independence of the judges. He heard the greatest lawyers discuss these and related matters on the floor of the Convention, Wilson, Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, lawyers learned in all the English and Colonial precedents. But he did not record as coming from any of his fellow delegates even one suggestion that Congress would be empowered impliedly in the Constitution to provide an easier way to remove from office justices and judges. What was so obvious then to the authors of the Federalist was obvious also to their colleagues, that, under the Constitution, removal of justices and of judges after conviction on 'impeachment' was the 'only' way.

"Elliot's Debates have been almost the only source of our information touching the arguments made in the several State conventions for and against the ratification of the Constitution. A thorough search of that monumental and useful compilation, filling 1,550 printed pages, reveals to the student that in not one of the conventions did a single delegate suggest that the Constitution authorize Congress to provide an easier way to remove justices and judges than the impeachment process. No one in the State conventions suggested that the author of the Federalist was wrong when he said that the impeachment process was the 'only' way.

"But the 1,550 printed pages of Elliot's Debates do contain some things which strongly corroborate the Federalist. One of these is the resolution of the New York State convention, which ratified the Constitution, at the same time recommending the adoption of amendments, among which was this proposed amendment:

" 'That the court for the trial of impeachments shall consist of the Senate, the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the first or senior judge, for the time being, of the highest court of general and ordinary common law jurisdiction in each State; that the Congress shall, by standing laws, designate the courts in the respective States answering this description, and, in States having no courts exactly answering this description, shall designate some other court, preferring such, if any there be, whose judge or judges may hold their places during good behavior: *Provided*, That no more than one judge, other than judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, shall come from one State.

" 'That the Congress be authorized to pass laws for compensating the judges for such services, and for compelling their attendance; and that a majority, at least, of the said judges shall sit as members thereof; that each member shall, previous to the entering upon any trial, take an oath or affirmation honestly and impartially to hear and determine the cause; and that a majority of the members present shall be necessary to a conviction.' "

The New York convention was not satisfied with the Court of Impeachment provided in the Constitution and desired a differently constituted court, a court in which should sit not only the Members of the Senate but also the high-ranking judges, and which more nearly would be a court in fact as well as in theory. But the New York convention realized that only by amendment of the Constitution could any change be effective. How incompatible was the action of the New York convention with a belief that Congress had the power to create any kind of a court for the trial of at least certain public officers, namely, justices and judges, on charges of misconduct brought against them.

Search the writings of the fathers and not a single word will be found supporting the theory that the Constitution impliedly authorizes legislative provision of an easy way to remove or get rid of erring or misbehaving judges. The hard way of "impeachment" is the only way. In all the opinions of all the courts since the beginning of the Republic there is not even one little dictum that supports the Sumners theory of removal.

Not a single bill was ever introduced in either House in all those years providing for an easier legislative method of removal of judges. Of course, measures were offered for changes, but only by way of constitutional amendment.

Jefferson had no use for the Federal courts, and he developed a strong public opinion against them. He and many officials at the time desired changes. Within 2 months after the trial of Aaron Burr a resolution was introduced in Congress (the same resolution was pressed again in 1808, 1811, and 1812), proposing, not the creation by Congress of a court for the trial of judges but a constitutional amendment fixing a limited term of office for Federal judges and for their removal by the President on the address of two-thirds of each House. (See Warren's The Supreme Court in United States History, vol. I, p. 313.)

Jefferson never had the slightest doubt that under the Constitution the judges could be removed only after conviction on "impeachment." His many letters indubitably proved this. (See Works of Jefferson, vol. 15, p. 389; vol. 1, p. 120.)

[3] See Warren's, The Making of the Constitution, 532.

CONCLUSION

If removal of district judges may be set up by act of Congress, a circuit court of appeals judge similarly may be removed; a member of the Supreme Court may be similarly removed; in fact, any civil officer may be removed without trial by jury and with no appeal.

Section 3, article I, of the Constitution imbues the Senate with the sole power to try all impeachments. It was intended to and does place the judges on a high plane of independence, where they could act without fear or favor, subject only to difficult removal by the Senate. The constitutional provision of impeachment does not permit the removal of judges by the method proposed in the instant bill, simply by making a change in the method and in the name of the tribunal set up to hear the impeachment charges. A rose by any other name smells just as sweet. Congress is inhibited from passing bills of attainder. Congress cannot pass bills of attainder by calling them bills of decapitation and exile. Congress could do all that by token of the argument used by the proponents of this bill. Likewise with the instant bill. All they would need to do is to change the name and method of removal.

EMANUEL CELLER.

The Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT LEAGUE OF WOMEN AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made before the Eleanor Roosevelt League of Women at Detroit on June 29, 1940:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Eleanor Roosevelt League of Women, and fellow citizens, I have been asked to speak to you tonight concerning the foreign policy of the United States. In the comparatively short time available to me there will be no time to go into great detail. I shall endeavor merely to touch upon some phases that seem at this time most important for consideration. It is indeed fitting that we should discuss this subject tonight. With much of the world ravaged by war and with forces abroad menacing the security of the United States, it is imperative that we as American citizens be informed about the foreign policy of our great democracy.

At the outset let me call attention to some general principles underlying the foreign policy of the administration. President Roosevelt, in his inaugural address of March 4, 1933, dedicated the United States "to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." The United States considers the good-neighbor policy inherently reciprocal in nature. Our Government endeavors to treat with scrupulous respect the rights of other countries and their nationals, and expects similar consideration from other nations for the rights of the United States and the rights of our people.

In harmony with this policy the Government has endeavored to keep alive and strengthen various principles of order under law among nations. The Government has proclaimed that there should be scrupulous respect for the pledged word in international relations; that nations should respect each other's independence; that disputes among nations should be settled by none but methods of peaceful adjustment; and that trade and other economic relationships among nations should be conducted on the principles of fair dealing and equal treatment. Our Government has persistently endeavored to keep alive these fundamental principles in international relations. It continues to advocate them as principles which should be put into effect, when the present war is over, to make possible a stable international order.

You and I are, of course, aware that these are ominous days for the people of the world. The forces of aggression are on the march, leaving in their path widespread misery, death, and destruction. Millions of people have been forced to give up their liberties; nation after nation has been deprived of independence. Each day brings new and terrifying developments. In the light of these developments we must give vigilant and constant attention to the defense of our own Nation.

Events abroad lately have caused this Government to speed up all defense activities. The Congress has made extensive appropriations for national defense; it has provided for a tremendous increase in our military and naval forces. The Executive has taken steps to coordinate in a broad way the various defense activities of the Nation.

The President said in his address of May 16 to Congress that our defenses must be invulnerable and our security absolute. I agree entirely with the President in this statement. It has been my position in Congress that we should maintain an adequate national defense. In the House of Representatives just 2 years ago I stated my position in these words:

"I am as peaceful by nature as any Member on this floor. I am a practical pacifist who prefers peace to war; one who will make concessions and sacrifices for the sake of maintaining international amity. I am, however, practical enough to see the need of preparation for self-preservation when my neighbor is ill-disposed to be reasonable, when he seeks to misinterpret my every intention, and secretly, even openly, arms against me and mine."

While preparing our national defense to meet any emergency, it should not be assumed that the foreign policy of the United States neglects the cause of peace. I can say to you with assurance that the peace and security of the United States are the fundamental bases of the foreign policy of this administration. In the 7 years since President Roosevelt was first inaugurated there have been many civil and international armed conflicts throughout the world. During these conflicts it has been the policy of this administration to pursue a course of noninvolvement, while protecting with all reasonable means the lives and interests of citizens of the United States. The Government discourages the use of force as an instrument of national policy and, when conflicts have occurred, has endeavored to prevent the spread of hostilities. President Roosevelt recently has said that our ideal, our objective, is still peace at home and peace abroad. Nevertheless, he said "we stand ready not only to spend millions for defense but to give our service and even our lives for the maintenance of our American liberties."

This Government has sought to devise neutrality legislation designed to reduce the risks of involvement in war. The first legislation of this kind was enacted in 1935. It was revised in 1936, in 1937, and again in 1939. Up to the time of the last revision the neutrality legislation contained an inflexible embargo on the export of arms to belligerents.

When this arms embargo was first enacted, Secretary of State Hull warned against the dangers for our national security which were inherent in this type of policy. As time went on, it became increasingly clear that the arms-embargo policy, without adding anything to the security of this country, was an encouragement to heavily arming nations, intent on conquest and aggression.

When, early in 1939, consideration was given to the revision of existing neutrality legislation, the administration took the position that the involvement of the United States in controversies with belligerents was most likely to arise from the destruction of American lives—and not from the sale of arms—and that we could effectively diminish our risks only by keeping American nationals and vessels out of areas of special danger. The administration recommended, therefore, that the arms embargo be repealed and suggested enactment or reenactment of the following provisions: (1) To prohibit American vessels from entering combat areas, (2) to restrict travel by American citizens in combat areas, (3) to provide that the export of goods destined for belligerents should be preceded by transfer of title to the foreign purchaser, (4) to continue the existing legislation respecting loans and credits to nations at war, and (5) to regulate the solicitation and collection of funds for belligerents.

After the outbreak of the European war in September 1939 the public rallied to the support of this neutrality program. The program was substantially enacted by the Congress in a resolution approved by President Roosevelt on November 4, 1939.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 has now been in operation almost 8 months. It has justified the hopes of its proponents. Since its enactment we have been able to avoid dangerous controversies with belligerent nations. No American lives are known to have been lost on the high seas as a result of belligerent operations. Furthermore, no American vessel has been destroyed as a result of belligerent operations, although many vessels of other neutral countries have been sunk in the war areas. Thus, as a consequence of the Neutrality Act, we have avoided the destruction of American lives and American vessels, which in other times has resulted in serious controversies with belligerents.

Let me now turn to the subject of isolation. Throughout this administration the President and the Secretary of State have taken the position that we cannot as a nation isolate ourselves from the rest of the world; that events abroad may have a profund effect upon us; that we must be constantly alert to see that happenings elsewhere do not challenge the security of our own country. In this connection Secretary of State Hull said a few days ago:

"Our American history has not been achieved in isolation from the rest of mankind; there is no more dangerous folly than to think that its achievements can be preserved in isolation. It has been a part of a vast movement—in the Old World, as well as the New—which has opened new vistas in the destiny of man; which has carried human progress to new and exalted heights; which has, through scientific attainment, lessened the tyranny over man of the blind forces of nature; which, as never before, has expanded for the human race as a whole the opportunity for freedom of mind and of spirit. To this great stream of new ideas, new attainments, new cultural values, we have made our contribution; and we ourselves, in turn, have been nourished by it.".

Recent events have acted to vindicate this position, which has been consistently taken by the administration. At the present time the majority of the people of the United States appear to be convinced that we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. As an example I invite attention to the statement on June 25 of former President Hoover that there is no such thing as our isolation from wars which envelop two-thirds of all the people in the world, and that for us there is no such thing as economic, moral, intellectual, or spiritual isolation.

The impossibility of isolating curselves is apparent as a result of the invasion of a number of European countries. You are aware that European countries possess territories in this hemisphere from the Arctic Ocean to the southern part of the Atlantic Ocean. The possible transfer of these lands from one European power to another European power obviously is of real concern to the United States. The Government of the United States is well aware of this danger. A few days ago the Congress passed legislation providing that the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power. The bill further provides that if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States should, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with the other American republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interest.

Those who counsel a policy of isolation should bear in mind that we cannot yet foresee the full effect of changes wrought by the European war. We are not sure of all the policies that will be adopted by the war lords if the British Empire should be destroyed. However, we can expect ruthless commercial competition and exploitation backed by military might and an ever-present threat to force submission to a new order.

In the Far East, Japan seems determined to follow up every possible advantage resulting from the European war and is advancing in a southerly direction with the blessing of the Axis powers. It now seems likely that French Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies will fall within the orbit of Japanese influence or domination. In that event, Japan would control important sources of supply of rubber, tin, and quinine, large quantities of which must be imported into the United States. We in this industrialized country cannot continue to enjoy our present standard of living without the free flow of these and other raw materials.

The invasion of Holland, in my opinion, was designed to orphan her colonies and thus give Japan the necessary excuse for the occupation of the Dutch East Indies. Moreover, this move, so skillfully calculated, was intended to deprive the United States of her ability to acquire these raw materials and to weaken us from a military standpoint. The production and free flow of these materials would be controlled to supply the so-called have nots, to the prejudice of industrialized countries like Great Britain, and particularly the United States. The lowering of the American standard of living in proportion to the loss of business would force our people to admit that after all what goes on in Europe and Asia is really a matter of our concern.

One of the most important phases of the foreign policy of the United States is that relating to the other American republics. I think it may be justly said that the present administration has achieved notable successes in our relations with these republics. We voluntarily renounced our right of intervention in Cuba by abrogating the Platt amendment. We withdrew our marines who had been stationed in Haiti. At the Montevideo Conference in 1933 we signed a convention condemning intervention in the internal or external affairs of other nations. We have sought to make effective the principles of liberal and equitable trade policies unanimously approved at the Montevideo Conference.

We took the initiative in suggesting the convocation of the inter-American conference for the maintenance of peace, which was held at Buenos Aires during December 1936, to give permanent effect to the growing friendship and confidence among the American Republics. At this conference the Republics affirmed the principles which were to guide their relations. There was perfected a mechanism for the avoidance and settlement of disputes which might disturb their peaceful relations and for consultation in the event that the peace of the Western Hemisphere is menaced. The 21 American Republics joined in the following declaration:

"That every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and everyone of them, and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation provided for in the convention for the maintenance, preservation, and reestablishment of peace, executed at this conference."

In December 1938, at Lima, Peru, the American Republics adopted what is known as the Declaration of Lima. By this declaration the Republics pledged themselves to maintain and defend their integrity and independence against any form of aggression from outside this hemisphere.

This Government has developed the ideal of inter-American cooperation in every possible way. Military, naval, or air missions have been sent to a number of American Republics; civilian experts have been loaned to some American Republics to give technical advice, and closer cultural relations are being encouraged by a definite program.

This inter-American cooperation has also been extended to the economic field. In October 1939 the 21 American Republics created the Inter-American Economic and Financial Advisory Committee. This committee, which has recently been meeting in Washington, was set up to study economic problems arising from the war.

All of us now are especially interested in what effect the European war is having upon the Americas. Many new political and economic dangers have been thrust upon the American Republics, singly and collectively. Our Government, in cooperation with the other American Governments, has worked carefully and painstakingly to meet these dangers in order to protect the interests of this hemisphere. Within a few days after the outbreak of the war last September a consultative meeting was convened at Panama. At this meeting various steps were taken to protect this hemisphere from the harmful repercussions of war. Since then, efforts have been unceasing to assure that the Americas present a united front against the forces of aggression. At the present moment, preparations are being made for another meeting of the American Republics to consider problems arising from ominous international developments of recent weeks.

The formulation and execution of foreign policy in a changing world under war conditions are most trying and difficult in a democracy. Under a dictatorship, the will of the dictator is unchallenged and unchallengeable. But it is evident that by the democratic process the people, divided along every conceivable line of thought, give expression to their feeling and even demand alteration of an established policy. In a democracy during a crisis the aims, ideals, and aspirations of the various elements within the nation give expression to those forces within themselves which for years have remained latent or suppressed.

You will realize that these factors make extremely difficult the formulation and execution of foreign policy by our administration, especially in critical times as at present. However, I would not have you believe that there is any weakening of my faith in our representative form of government. These factors are mentioned merely to show the tremendous problems which our Government faces at this time. I am convinced that in the present crisis the divergent elements of the Nation will rise almost solidly to the support of the Government.

Many people in Michigan, as well as in other States, are much concerned lest this country should go to war. You are aware that the Constitution of the United States provides that the power to declare war shall rest with the Congress. As a Member of Congress, I can assure you that neither I, nor any of my colleagues so far as I am aware, would ever vote to declare war unless there was an unmistakable threat to the security of the United States.

The Defense Emergency and the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ABE MURDOCK OF UTAH

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made on the National Labor Relations Act:

The mighty figure of war, stalking across two continents, casts its shadow over our land. Abroad the terrible machinery of destruction is loosed and the earth trembles with the violence of a conflict engaging numbers of men so vast that no one mind can direct them or know what they do; a conflict employing engines of annihilation more terrifying than the world has seen. Man's power and knowledge, slowly accumulated for his benefit, is turned to the ugly business of death—death by violence and treachery, death for the participants and the civilians, death for the aggressor and the peaceful, death from the sky and on the ground and beneath the waters. No longer is a good will toward all men a defense against unbridled aggression; peace pacts and the devices of civilization are no guaranty against the terror. Swift and deadly wings draw nearer our shores; news reaches us with the happening of the events, and the rumble of the battle is heard across the water.

An uneasiness stirs our people, for if these things can happen to others, may they not reach us? Thankful for our protected position, we must secure our country against the fate which has befallen others who would be neutral; must see to it that our land is protected from the lightning which strikes in the night. To this end the President has proposed a program behind which a united people is gathered. That program I support; to huge and unprin-

cipled forces we must oppose an unshakable defense sufficient to guarantee our inviolability. Partisanship is forgotten in striving for that objective and our people rise to make it clear that aggression will be beaten back from this hemisphere.

For on two matters there can be no divergence of opinion; as a people we are agreed in maintaining our independence from hostile powers, and in conserving our democratic way of life. The light of democracy is going out throughout the world; some countries have never known it; others, having know it, have relinquished it in the stress of domestic upheavals; and still others, preferring it, have abandoned it under the stress of their war efforts. Alone among the great countries of the world we maintain the hallmarks of the democratic way of life: civil liberties, religious freedom, democratically elected parliaments, free enterprise, free trade-unions, free elections, and a free press. Here alone among the great countries of the world the fire of democracy burns; we must tend that flame that in a day to come it may serve to light again the fires of democracy throughout the world.

We must guard it against the angry blasts that swirl across the ocean; our Navy, our Army, our air force, must be a shield against the foreign threat. To this end is the President's program directed. But even more we must be watchful that domestic groups—those same interests which have opposed every item of the President's wise and beneficent program—do not, under the specious argument of aiding the preparedness program, succeed in tearing down the liberal structure of legislation which has been so laboriously erected during the past 7 years. It is unhappily true that there are at the present time persons so unpatriotic that they would use the national emergency to further their ends. If they succeed in their aims a large part of the democratic liberties bestowed on the people in the last years will be lost. Shall we take steps to protect our democratic way of life from external aggression, and find that a large part of that democracy has disappeared within our borders? Shall we lose our democracy in preparing to defend it?

In this connection I am particularly concerned with the fate of the National Labor Relations Act, the bulwark of one of our great liberties—the freedom of working people to organize unions of their own choosing. For a hundred years this right has been conceded to exist; only for 3 years has it been effectively protected by law, and I need not point out that a right for which there is no remedy is no right at all. Ever since this guaranty was first incorporated in the codes under the National Industrial Recovery Act in 1933, it has met violent opposition from the forces of reaction. A self-constituted court of Liberty League lawyers declared the Wagner Act unconstitutional when it was first passed; the National Association of Manufacturers urged a continuing fight for its repeal; the law was openly and widely defied, and that defiance justified on the ground that the statute passed by Congress was not the law. That opposition, once so bitter, has not disappeared because of the holdings of the courts which have sustained the validity of the law, but is now seeking to accomplish on the floor of Congress what it could not accomplish at the bar of the Supreme Court. In this statute American workingmen have found a new and valuable liberty—freedom to organize and to bargain collectively—which certain interests would now take from them. No longer do those interests call for repeal of the statute, which they know to be politically impossible, but for its amendment—amendments designed ostensibly to "improve its administration" but actually designed so to weaken it that its promises will be nugatory.

And now, in addition to other arguments, they seek to turn the country's struggle for preparedness to their own account and to argue that the act interferes with that need.

A little history proves them wrong. During the World War it soon appeared that the instrumentalities for dealing with labor problems were inadequate. It was employers who first recognized that there should be a governmental agency with power to handle such matters, for it was the National Industrial Conference Board, an employer organization, which, in September of 1917, first suggested the formation of a War Labor Board, in a letter to the Council of National Defense. To carry out the proposal the Secretary of Labor created a War Labor Conference Board, which contained five employer representatives, five employee representatives, and two representatives of the public. In late March 1918, at the very peak of the war, this group unanimously recommended the appointment of a National War Labor Board, and also unanimously adopted a report stating the principles and policies to govern relations between workers and employers in war industries for the duration of the war.[1] Those principles, which were followed by the National War Labor Board, included the following:

"Right to organize: The right of workers to organize in trades-unions and to bargain collectively through chosen representatives is recognized and affirmed. This right shall not be denied, abridged, or interfered with by the employers in any manner whatsoever.

"Employers shall not discharge workers for membership in trade-unions, nor for legitimate trade-union activities."

The principles which I have just stated, which both employer and employee representatives adopted in March 1918 when the entire country was mobilized for war production, are exactly the principles of the National Labor Relations Act.

Real sanctions were provided to make those guaranties to labor effective; in the event the employer refused to comply with an award of the War Labor Board the Government had the power, which it exercised on at least two occasions,[2] to take over and operate the industry in accordance with the principles laid down by the War Labor Board. Today, before an employer is called on to obey any order of the National Labor Relations Board, the Board must first appeal to the courts for an order enforcing the Board's order; no matter how willful the employer's defiance of the Board there is no possibility of the Government taking over and operating his plant.

A comparison of the situation during the World War and today is instructive. Then we were at the peak of war production with every nerve strained to assure an unimpeded flow of goods abroad; today, while our efforts to assure production are great, the necessities are hardly so immediate. During the World War both industry and labor found it necessary to grant labor freedom to organize, for then, as now, the denial of that freedom led to strikes and interferences with production. In 1918, since the crisis was more serious, sanctions were imposed far more drastic than any which exist or which are proposed today. If anything, both business and labor found that freedom to organize was more essential to uninterrupted production in war than in peacetime.

In the light of that experience, how specious are the claims of those who say that the guaranties of the National Labor Relations Act may interfere with our defense program! If there is a lesson to be drawn from this history, it is that the scheme of the act should be supported by even greater sanctions than it carries at the present time. In facing the situation occasioned by our emergency defense needs, the National Labor Relations Act, and an effective and courageous administration of it, stands as one of the first bulwarks against interruptions through strikes and labor disputes. Nor do I, for one, think that the Government should jeopardize the fulfillment of its orders by assigning contracts to firms and persons whose refusal to accept peaceable methods for the settlement of labor disputes may result in strikes and interrupted production. In awarding contracts to such employers the Government runs a substantial risk that orders may not be promptly filled, for all our experience has shown that refusal to accept the principles of collective bargaining is one of the prolific causes of strikes. More, rather than less, freedom to organize; more, rather than less, collective bargaining; more rather than less, effective enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act is our need in carrying through the President's defense program.

For the better part of a year I have had the honor to be a member of the special committee of the House of Representatives to study the operations of the National Labor Relations Act and the administration of the National Labor Relations Board. The three majority members of the committee, whose sincerity I do not question but whose judgment in this instance seems to me misguided, have recommended certain changes in the National Labor Relations Act. My colleague, Representative HEALEY, of Massachusetts, and I have disagreed with these recommendations, which, it seems to us, would go far to deprive American labor of those rights which were thought to be so essential a part of the scheme for carrying the World War through to victory. Representative HEALEY and I can claim a large measure of sympathy for the objectives of the legislation, for we actively supported it when it was before the House of Representatives for passage, whereas the chairman of the committee, who concurs in the majority report, whatever his reasons or however sound those reasons were, voted against its passage when the act was adopted by the Congress.

I have here no time to discuss in detail each of the changes proposed by the majority, nor our reasons for feeling them unwise. I should like to indicate a few of the major proposals, and the manner in which they weaken the administration of the act or the act itself.

First, let me point out that both the great bodies of organized labor have opposed the amendments proposed by the majority of the committee. Immediately upon publication of the majority's recommendations, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, issued a statement in which he said:

"The amendments offered by the Smith committee as a whole strike in a destructive way at vital, fundamental principles of the Labor Relations Act. The American Federation of Labor has repeatedly stated and emphasized its opposition to any impairment of the fundamental principles of the Labor Relations Act in any way whatsoever. We again urge and insist that its principles and its fundamentals shall be preserved and protected. The Labor Relations Act still remains the magna carta of labor."

On the same day the Congress of Industrial Organizations, acting in behalf of its affiliated unions, gave out a statement which contained the following comment:

"Not a single amendment contained in H. R. 8813 is supported by the record of the hearings of the special committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. No evidence has been produced to justify these emasculatory amendments. The specific proposals are directed toward the destruction of the rights of labor guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act."

The position taken by these two great labor organizations indicates clearly that labor itself does not consider that the proposed amendments are designed to assure more effective collective bargaining and a better protection of the rights of labor.

---

[1] Printed in full at pp. 31–33, National War Labor Board, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 287, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1922.

[2] Western Union Telegraph Co., Docket No. 3, and Smith & Wesson Co., Docket No. 273.

One of the principal recommendations of the majority of the committee is a proposal that the obligation of employers to bargain collectively, which is the very keystone on which the act rests, shall be modified in such a manner as to become meaningless. Historically, the duty to bargain collectively has a well-defined meaning which has been adopted by the courts. As one court has said:

"It (the act) contemplates the making of agreements between employer and employee which will serve as a working basis for the carrying on of the relationship. The act, it is true, does not require that the parties agree; but it does require that they negotiate in good faith with the view of reaching an agreement if possible; and mere discussion with the representatives of employees, with a fixed resolve upon the part of the employer not to enter into any agreement with them, even as to matters as to which there is no disagreement, does not satisfy its provisions."[3]

Other courts have adopted the same interpretation of the act. Now the majority proposes that the act be amended so that the only requirement shall be that "an employer or his representatives meet and confer with his employees or their representatives, listen to their complaints, discuss differences, and make every reasonable effort to compose such differences, but shall not be construed as compelling or coercing either party to reach an agreement or to submit counterproposals." Thus, at one stroke the majority would remove any requirement that the employer attempt in good faith to reach a written agreement covering wages, hours, and working conditions; the statutory mandate would be confined to a mere discussion of grievances, and the essence of collective bargaining includes proposals and counterproposals. In the Consolidated Edison case[4] the Supreme Court held that, "The act contemplates the making of contracts with labor organizations. That is the manifest objective in providing for collective bargaining." For years labor has striven to obtain written agreements assuring that certain wages, hours, and working conditions would be maintained. Such agreements reached as a result of collective bargaining are universally held to be desirable; even the majority of our committee does not challenge the importance of the written trade agreement in our industrial life. The refusal to enter into such agreements is a common cause of strikes and industrial disputes; if labor cannot achieve that objective by peaceful procedures under the National Labor Relations Act, it may be anticipated that it will seek to achieve it through the application of economic pressures, and to this extent the amendment invites the substitution of industrial conflict for the orderly processes of collective bargaining.

In various ways the majority seeks to exclude workers from the protection of the act. The most important respect in which this objective is sought to be achieved is by extending the meaning of the term "agricultural laborer." The present act excludes from the jurisdiction of the Board, agricultural laborers, and it is left to the courts to define who is or who is not an agricultural laborer. The majority has proposed that there be excluded from the act certain classes of employees whom the courts have already found not to be agricultural laborers, notably workers employed in the advanced stages of processing and preparing for market agricultural products. Concerning such workers one court has said,[5] "When the product of the soil leaves the farmer, as such, and enters a factory for processing and marketing it has entered upon the status of industry," and the court further commented, "In this status of this industry there would seem to be as much need for the remedial provisions of the Wagner Act, upon principle, as for any other industrial activity."

These workers employed in large packing and canning factories are no more agricultural employees than is the mechanic in a large automobile factory. The act at present in no sense regulates farmers or farm labor; the majority would adopt a fiction that a worker is engaged in agricultural labor even though working in a factory if he works upon agricultural products.

A second way in which the majority would limit the coverage of the act is found in their proposal that the protection of the law be denied "any employee who is shown by a preponderance of the testimony willfully to have engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any unfair labor dispute or unfair labor practice or in connection with labor organizational activities." This proposal is not wholly indefensible. Both the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have on numerous occasions held that employees guilty of felonies and serious misdemeanors arising out of labor disputes should not be entitled to the protection of the act, and with that principle everyone agrees. The difficulty with the proposal is that it goes too far. During strikes and other labor disputes, tempers rise; scuffles and fist fights may ensue. One of our courts, in considering this problem, used some apt language on the subject:[6]

"We think it must be conceded, however, that some disorder is unfortunately quite usual in any extensive or long-drawn-out strike. A strike is essentially a battle waged with economic weapons. Engaged in it are human beings whose feelings are stirred to the depths. Rising passions call for hot words. Hot words lead to blows on the picket line. The transformation from economic to physical combat by those engaged in the contest is difficult to prevent even when cool heads direct the fight. * * * We accordingly recently held that it was not intended by the act that minor disorders of this nature should deprive the striker of the possibility of reinstatement."

The amendment proposed by the majority would mean that an employee unjustly deprived of his means of employment by an employer for his legitimate union activity could not be reinstated if he had engaged in any kind of violence, however slight, and would, therefore, penalize such an employee not only under the criminal laws of the State and the Nation, but deprive him of the means of earning his living. The work of the Senate Committee on Civil Liberties has shown the extent to which agents provocateurs are used to stir up strife on picket lines in order to discredit the cause of strikers. Such an amendment, proposed by the majority, would mean that an employer could escape his obligation to reinstate men who have gone on strike in protest against the employer's unfair labor practices by the device of hiring agents to stir up trouble with his workers.

Another way in which the majority would withdraw the protection of the act from many workers is by limiting the period for which an employee might receive back pay to 6 months. At the present time, an employee discharged for his legitimate union membership or activity is entitled to receive back pay for the loss he has suffered through the employer's illegal act. While most of these cases are settled by agents of the Board within a short time of their happening, many of them must be decided by the Board after full hearing and, if the employer does not then comply with the order of the Board, must be litigated in the courts. The effect of this proposal would be to transfer the loss in cases lasting more than 6 months from the employer who has violated the law to the employee who is innocent of anything more than exercising his rights under the law. Under such circumstances it is to be expected that employers would fight the Board and their obligations under the law through every step of the courts, since no further liability could accrue while such litigation was pending. Thus labor would be asked to bear the burden of illegal actions by employers. Similar to this proposal is the requirement that charges of unfair labor practices be filed within 6 months after the unfair labor practices have been committed. In many cases employees might not, within the 6-month period, have the evidence which would prove that the employer had acted illegally. This period of 6 months for bringing charges is substantially shorter than the period of limitations for bringing any other kind of legal action, including criminal cases, and would operate to place on labor a burden which no other group in the community is called on to bear.

Section 8 (1) of the act makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer "to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed" them by the act. The majority of the committee proposes an amendment to this section to provide that nothing in the act "shall be construed or interpreted to prohibit any expressions of opinion with respect to any matter which may be of interest to employees or the general public, providing that such expressions of opinion are not accompanied by acts of coercion, intimidation, discrimination, or threats thereof." This is the so-called free-speech amendment. It will not be denied that we should be zealous to protect the rights of free speech of all classes of our people; we have an adequate guarantee that that right will not be infringed in the first amendment to the Constitution. The National Labor Relations Act as it now stands must be interpreted in such a way that it does not interfere with the constitutional mandate of the Bill of Rights. In the more than 100 cases decided by the courts in reviewing orders of the Labor Board there is not one instance where courts have found that the Board has impinged upon this constitutional right. Whether or not particular language does in any particular instance interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees is a question of fact to be determined in the light of all the circumstances. That determination is always subject to review by our circuit courts of appeals, and if in any instance the Board has interfered with the employers' right in that respect, I know that the courts will be zealous to point out the Board's error. The amendment proposed by the majority would go further than merely protecting the employers' constitutional right of free speech; it would allow "expressions of opinion" which actually did interfere with the employees' exercise of their right to self-organization, without regard to the circumstances under which such "expressions of opinion" were given.

It is worth noting that the justification for many of the amendments proposed by the majority is that they write into the statute the holdings of decisions of our courts. Thus, it is argued that the proposed amendment diluting the strength of the obligation to bargain collectively is justified by the language of Chief Justice Hughes in the Jones & Laughlin case;[7] that the limitation upon the reinstatement of employees guilty of any degree of willful violence is required by the Supreme Court's decision in the Fansteel case;[8] and that the amendment with respect to the employer's right

[3] *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Highland Park Manufacturing Co.* (C. C. A. 4th Circuit, March 11, 1940).

[4] *Consolidated Edison Co. of New York* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (305 U. S. 197, 236).

[5] *North Whittier Heights Citrus Association* v. *N. L. R. B.* (C. C. A. 9th, 109 Fed. 2d, 76).

[6] *Republic Steel Corporation* v. *N. L. R. B.* (107 Fed. 2d 472, C. C. A. 3d, 1939).

[7] *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Co.* (301 U. S. 1).

[8] *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Fansteel Metallurgical Co.* (306 U. S. 240).

to express his opinions is made necessary by the first amendment to the Constitution. It is hardly necessary to point out that decisions under a statute interpreting the language of the act become themselves standards for future guidance in determining the effect and operation of the statute. No necessity appears for writing into any statute the controlling decisions of the courts intepreting it; indeed, there is always a serious question whether such amendments are merely declaratory of, or are designed to effect changes in, existing law. The instances I have already cited will suffice to show that these ostensibly declaratory amendments proposed by the majority in fact go further in limiting the effective operation of the statute than the courts have gone. By this time, most of the disputed questions under the act have received a settled judicial interpretation; the effect of the proposed amendments would be to introduce confusion and uncertainty in the law for some time to come.

In addition to the substantive amendments which I have outlined, the majority of the committee proposes certain procedural changes. The most important of these would provide for the appointment of an administrator charged with the duty of investigating charges of unfair labor practices, with the issuance of complaints if he has reasonable grounds for believing the charges to be true, with the prosecution of complaints before the Board, with the enforcement of orders of the Board in the courts, and with certain other duties. The Board would be limited to the holding of hearings, making of findings, the issuance of orders, and the supervision of elections. The result would be a division of functions between an administrator, whose tenure would be subject to political considerations, and a Board impotent either to initiate cases or to enforce its orders. Essentially this proposed amendment, which is justified on the ground that it secures a separation of administrative and judicial functions, is an attack upon the entire administrative process. Courts are invested with powers of enforcement; our administrative agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board, are not, but in enforcing their mandates must first seek an enforcing order of a court. The record before our committee shows that the Board already maintains a separation of functions within its organization which adequately safeguards against the possibility of unfairness and yet permits the advantages of a coordinated policy. The procedure of the Board was patterned after that of the Federal Trade Commission and is similar to that of other administrative agencies. At the present time an able commission, headed by Dean Acheson, known as the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, is making a thorough and elaborate investigation of the entire administrative process. Its studies will relate the work of the National Labor Relations Board to the work of other governmental agencies, and it may be anticipated that this able commission will produce some thoroughly considered and well-documented proposals with respect to our entire administrative procedure. The problem of the separation of administrative and judicial functions is one broader than the National Labor Relations Act and should be considered in the light of our entire administrative experience. There seems to be no good reason for singling out labor problems for hasty and unconsidered experimentation.

There is no showing that the administrative process, as it has functioned through the National Labor Relations Board, has resulted in any unfairness or lack of due process to parties appearing before the Board. In the Jones and Laughlin case,[9] the Supreme Court said of the procedure under the National Labor Relations Act:

"The order of the Board is subject to review by the designated court, and only when sustained by the court may the order be enforced. Upon that review all questions of the jurisdiction of the Board and the regularity of its proceedings, all questions of constitutional right or statutory authority are open to examination by the court. We construe the procedural provisions as affording adequate opportunity to secure judicial protection against arbitrary action in accordance with the well-settled rules applicable to administrative agencies set up by Congress to aid in the enforcement of valid legislation."

In a more recent case[10] the Supreme Court, in a unanimous opinion, said:

"We have carefully scrutinized this entire record. Within the range of our examination has appeared not merely the testimony but also the procedure followed from the filing of the charge before the Board to the final decree of the court of appeals. The Board and its representatives solicitously guarded respondent's and intervenor's right to a full and fair hearing; manifested liberality in ruling upon evidence prepared by both sides; and conducted the proceedings in a manner calculated to bring about a just result."

The majority of the committee has recommended the abolition of the present Board and the setting up of a new board. Representative HEALEY and I, after considering the record of the Board's administration of the act feel that there is no showing of any facts sufficient to warrant the removal of the present Board members. We have felt that there is widespread controversy and disagreement concerning the propriety of certain policies of the Board, and that a better harmony between the administration of the act and those sections of the public with which the Board deals can be promoted by adding to the present Board two new members with a fresh point of view without losing the continuity of administration of the statute which would result from the removal of the present Board members.

The present act provides that the rules of evidence shall not be controlling in hearings conducted by the Board. This provision is to be found in nearly every statute creating an administrative body, and is designed to prevent the setting aside or retrial of matters merely because some technicality of the rules governing the admission of evidence in jury trials has not been followed. For this provision the majority would substitute a requirement that the rules of evidence shall be observed "so far as practicable." Again, this problem is of general application to all administrative agencies and is not confined to the National Labor Relations Board. Recognized experts on the law of evidence: Dean Wigmore, of Northwestern University, and Professor Morgan, of Harvard, favor the relaxation rather than the extension of the rules of evidence. At the present time, orders of the Board, in order to be enforced by the courts, must be supported by substantial evidence and this broad test of review of the facts is sound. It is the same test recently approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee in its report on the Walter-Logan bill. No facts were shown the committee indicating that there had been an abuse of this provision by the Board, nor does any reason appear why the delicate field of labor relations should be singled out for such an experiment. Practically, under the amendment proposed by the majority, there would be no uniform law of evidence applicable to all Board hearings, but various rules depending upon the State in which the hearing happened to take place, imposing an intolerable burden upon the Board's staff in attempting to familiarize itself with the applicable rules of evidence in all the State and Federal courts.

An allied but somewhat different proposal is also made by the majority. At the present time the Board's orders must be supported by substantial evidence. The majority would require that the Board's findings shall be based upon a preponderance of the testimony, which is merely a restatement of the rule under which the Board operates. Again the majority seeks to write into the statute a requirement imposed by the courts in proposing that the Board's findings of fact shall be deemed "conclusive only if supported by substantial evidence;" they would also empower the courts to invalidate Board findings if "clearly erroneous." It is our opinion that the result of these proposed amendments might well be to permit the courts to weigh the evidence in the case de novo and, to this extent, reverse the traditional function of appellate courts in reviewing the determinations of fact-finding tribunals.

The majority proposes certain changes in the act with respect to the power of the Board to investigate and determine the representatives of employees for the purposes of collective bargaining. They propose that the statute be amended to make clear the employer's right to petition for elections. This right is now granted by the rules and regulations of the Board, and the minority of the committee is in accord with the proposal that it be made part of the statute.

A more serious proposal of the majority would remove the Board's power to determine the appropriate unit for the purpose of collective bargaining where two or more bona fide labor organizations are in substantial disagreement or conflict as to the unit. The result of this proposal of the majority would mean that there would be no tribunal to determine the appropriate bargaining unit when two or more unions disagreed as to what that unit should be. The effect of such a proposal would be that unions, instead of seeking a determination by the Board of the appropriate unit, would be forced to resort to economic action, and to this extent the employer, in the absence of a tribunal to determine the question, might be harassed by strikes between contending unions in a situation in which the employer himself is blameless. The determination of the appropriate unit for collective-bargaining purposes is a highly technical and involved problem. While certain decisions of the Board with respect to the unit have offended one or another branch of organized labor, it is our feeling that its decisions on the whole have been wise and consistent. The record before the committee conclusively establishes that the Board has not favored either the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. in determining the appropriate unit, and the protection of employers from unwarranted jurisdictional disputes between unions requires that the Board's powers in this respect not be limited.

After the Board has determined the representatives for collective bargaining among a group of employees, the Board is authorized by the statute to certify to the employer the representative of his employees. At the present time such certification is not subject to judicial review. The reason the Congress did not provide for judicial review lies in the experience of the old National Labor Relations Board, which was created by Public Resolution No. 44 in 1934. Under that resolution, Board election orders were subject to review by the circuit courts of appeals; the provision for judicial review so served to delay Board action that during the year of its existence the Board was unable to conduct a single election which was contested in court proceedings. Since elections frequently involve strike situations or circumstances under which strikes are threatened, it is most undesirable to subject them to the delays of lengthy court proceedings, because these election cases do not result in orders against anyone. They do not require anyone to do or not to do anything.

I have here no adequate opportunity to summarize the work of the Board. Up to April 1, 1940, the Board handled 26,941 cases, involving 5,948,103 workers; 2,678 of these were strike cases, involving 433,693 workers, of which the Board settled almost 75 percent. In addition, the Board has averted many hundreds of strikes and has conducted 2,850 elections, in which more than a million votes were cast. It has rendered hundreds of formal decisions. The bulk of its cases, however, have been settled amicably by agreement of all

[9] *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Corporation* (301 U. S. 1).

[10] *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Radford Dyeing Association* (decided May 20, 1940).

the parties. That it has been fair to employers is attested by the fact that, up to June 30, 1939, 24.3 percent of the charges filed with it have been withdrawn, usually after investigation had shown that the charges had no merit, and that an additional 13.5 percent of the cases have been dismissed by the Board before hearing. Under the protection of the act, organization of workers and the substitution of the orderly process of collective bargaining for industrial strife have made tremendous strides forward. Strikes, and the length and intensity of strikes, have notably decreased since the constitutionality of the act was determined.

The review by the courts of the work of the Board constitutes a very notable record of proof of the general high quality and accuracy of the decisions of the Board.

In the Supreme Court, the Board has been before that Court 26 times in 3 years. The Board's position has been sustained completely 20 times, its orders have been modified four times, and set aside twice, and the principles of the act have been clarified and applied so often by the Board and the courts that there appears no adequate reason for disrupting the increasing pace of acceptance of collective bargaining with its concurrent stabilization of labor relations.

There is this additional observation to be made with respect to the proposals of the majority of our committee. Now, more than at any time in recent years, our national welfare demands national unity. In view of the strong opposition of the organized labor movement to the amendments proposed by the majority of the committee, any adoption of those amendments at this time would be confusing and disquieting.

American workingmen, speaking through the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, have indicated their willingness and readiness to back a program of national defense wholeheartedly. Their patriotism is an unquestioned as is that of the American employers; their love for their country no less. It would be an injustice of the cruelest kind to imply that they are incapable of exercising the freedom granted under the National Labor Relations Act wisely and in the national interest. It would be a delusion to claim that that freedom must be relaxed to speed the defense program. Every consideration of the national welfare, every principle of justice, and every democratic tradition, calls on all fair-minded people to oppose the repeal or unwise amendment of the National Labor Relations Act, or any weakening of its honest administration. The National Labor Relations Act affords a ready and peaceful forum for the adjustment of labor controversies. It is a substitute for strife. It should be upheld and supported—never more than now.

Important Proposals in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

SULPHUR RIVER IMPROVEMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been working on a proposal to improve Sulphur River, Tex., for a number of years. There were three ways that this improvement could be brought about—

First. The commissioners' court in each county affected by this improvement to get together and agree to put up a sufficient amount for the purpose of getting the work done through the W. P. A.

Second. To get the legislature to create a reclamation district for that area and have the State of Texas put up sufficient money to get the W. P. A. to do the work.

Third. To get the War Department to make a survey and get it done through an appropriation in the National Congress.

The first two plans suggested were not effective because the counties did not supply the sponsor's funds and neither did the State provide for the money, although it did create a reclamation district for the area.

Therefore, I have been trying to get the work done through the Congress, and since it is combined with the Red River project, the outlook is much brighter.

On June 22, 1936, I received congressional approval of a bill providing for a survey of this project. It was again approved June 28, 1938. Also, on June 20, 1938, the Rivers and Harbors Act carried a provision for a survey of Sulphur River, Tex., with a view to improvement for navigation, flood control, and water power. This survey has been made and is now in Washington. The Board of Army Engineers, the Chief of Engineers, and the National Resources Committee are now examining it and will make a report soon.

The Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C., in a letter dated June 11, 1940, advised me as follows regarding this project:

The Department is in receipt of your letter of June 6, 1940, in which you inquire as to the status of the proposed improvement of the Sulphur River, Tex.

As you are doubtless aware, the Department is now making a detailed survey of the Sulphur River for flood control pursuant to several congressional authorizations, including those contained in the Flood Control Acts approved June 22, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, and the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938. The field investigations in connection with this survey have been completed, and the report itself will be included in the comprehensive report on the Red River Basin, which is now being prepared by a special board of officers of the Department, in accordance with the authority contained in a resolution adopted February 25, 1938, by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives.

This comprehensive report on the Red River is scheduled to be received in this office on or about August 1, 1940. It will then be reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, as required by law, prior to submission to Congress with the recommendations of the Department relative to improvements for the streams in the Red River Basin.

I am greatly interested in this project, and my efforts will continue until we are successful in getting this wonderful area properly improved.

COTTON-CERTIFICATE BILL

In the early part of 1937 I introduced a bill providing for the payment of the 1935 cotton certificates in full.

January 3, 1939, I reintroduced the bill in the House of Representatives providing for redemption of certain cotton certificates issued under the Bankhead Cotton Act. The bill number is H. R. 193, and provides for the full payment of the 1935 cotton certificates, which were issued under the Cotton Control Act, approved April 21, 1934, upon application being made to the Secretary of Agriculture by any producer of cotton to whom the tax-exemption certificates were issued.

The cotton-certificate bill has been endorsed by the Texas Cotton Growers Association and by many local farm associations, but has not been urged by the other larger associations in the National Congress because they claim it would probably lessen their chances to get large appropriations for other purposes. This fear is being overcome and more support is being cultivated for the cause among these groups. We have a further handicap in that the eastern part of the cotton-growing country is not interested in view of the fact that the Eastern States produced a surplus in 1935, and therefore are not interested in paying the cotton certificates where a shortage occurred.

FIGHT WILL CONTINUE UNTIL DEBT PAID

It sometimes requires years of time to sell a good cause to the American people and to the United States Congress. I experienced the same difficulty with the bill providing for the payment of the veterans' adjusted-service certificates, the so-called bonus bill. It required 7 years to convince the people and Congress that this bill should be paid, but finally we succeeded in doing so. I will continue to fight for the payment of these cotton certificates until this just and honest debt is paid by the United States Government 100 cents on the dollar.

Population of counties in First Congressional District, 1890–1940

[This is inserted in view of the large number of requests]

County	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940
Bowie	20,267	26,676	34,827	39,472	48,563	50,224
Cass	22,554	22,841	27,587	30,041	30,030	33,492
Delta	9,117	15,249	14,566	15,887	13,138	12,826
Franklin	6,481	8,674	9,331	9,304	8,494	8,378
Harrison	26,721	31,878	37,243	43,565	48,937	50,889
Hopkins	20,572	27,950	31,038	34,791	29,410	30,202
Lamar	37,302	48,627	46,544	55,742	48,529	50,406
Marion	10,862	10,754	10,472	10,886	10,371	11,454
Morris	6,580	8,220	10,439	10,289	10,028	9,806
Red River	21,452	29,893	28,564	35,829	30,923	29,771
Titus	8,190	12,292	16,422	18,128	16,003	19,226

Although this the First District of Texas is one of the smallest in the State, it is as large as both Connecticut and Delaware; it is seven-eighths as large as Massachusetts,

seven-eighths as large as New Jersey, seven-ninths as large as Vermont, and six times as large as the State of Rhode Island.

It has 100,000 more people than either of the States of Wyoming and Delaware and 200,000 more people than the State of Nevada.

The total inhabitants per square mile, on an average, of the counties are 40.5, which is more than the average for 19 different States.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

I was one of the supporters of the resolution providing for the investigation of un-American activities. When the resolution passed the House a committee was appointed, of which the Honorable MARTIN DIES is chairman. This committee has made some startling and astounding disclosures, and by reason of the investigation made by the committee, many foreigners have been deported. Many "fifth columnists" have been sent to the penitentiaries, and many laws have been passed for the purpose of curbing, restricting, and preventing "fifth column" and Trojan horse tactics in our country.

The following editorial from the Beacon, Wichita, Kans., of June 20, 1940, is self-explanatory:

HITLER BOASTED OF "FIFTH COLUMNS"

Speaking recently before the members of the lower branch of Congress, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN used Adolf Hitler's own words to describe the "fifth column" tactics that have proved so successful in most of the countries he has invaded and have even helped to hamper the war activities of England and France. Here is what Hitler said many years ago:

"When I wage war, troops will suddenly appear. * * * They will march through the streets in broad daylight. * * * No one will stop them. Everything has been thought out to the last detail. They will march to the headquarters of the general staff. * * * The confusion will be beyond belief. But I shall have had relations with the men who will form a new government—a government to suit me. We will find such men; we shall find them in every country; we shall not need to bribe them. They will come of their own accord. Ambition and delusion, party squabbles, and self-seeking arrogances will drive them. * * * Our strategy is to destroy the enemy from within, to conquer him through himself."

The words of Hitler apply just as much to the United States as to the other countries who have already felt the disastrous tactics of those enemies within the walls. Hitler can find in the United States, also, men driven by ambition and delusion and self-seeking arrogances. There are hundreds of them, many born Americans or naturalized citizens, who admire the Nazi methods and would gladly duplicate them in this country, provided they could be the ones to put such methods into effect.

Representative PATMAN, in his address before Congress, named a man, supposedly a loyal American, who has been in the employ of the Hitler government since 1933, with the avowed purpose of spreading throughout the Nation the accomplishments of the Nazi regime, and who is at the same time an American Reserve officer in the Intelligence Department.

An America strong within can never be defeated by any foe from without. But if the defenses of this Nation are weakened or destroyed, if disloyal men are allowed to sap the strength and destroy the vitality of the United States by lessening her ability to supply the sinews of defense and by spreading confusion among those still loyal to the American ideals, it will be in accord with the tactics Hitler has employed in other countries.

The United States has been amply warned. Holland waited until the enemy was at its gates before it started a purge of "fifth columnists." Then it was too late. This Nation cannot wait, either. The first duty of national defense is to insure the loyalty of every person in this country and then go speedily to the task of providing defense forces sufficient to defeat any foe.

People's Man Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the following comment by Mark Sullivan in the Washington Post under date of June 29, 1940, tells why Wendell Willkie was nominated at the Philadelphia convention. Mr. Sullivan says:

[From the Washington Post of June 29, 1940]

PEOPLE'S MAN WINS

(By Mark Sullivan)

PHILADELPHIA, June 28.—It was a triumph of reality over phoniness. The reality was that the people wanted Mr. Willkie. The phoniness was the presumed handicaps that stood in his way. Mr. Willkie must not be nominated because he had been a Democrat—that was phony boloney. Mr. Willkie must not be nominated because he was a public-utility man. That was phony two ways: First, Mr. Willkie was not a public-utility man—he was a young lawyer from Akron, Ohio, who was hired by some New Yorkers to run a public-utility company that was having various difficulties; second, it was phony to assume that voters will take the public-utility question into account in a Presidential election next November in which the public-utility issue will not figure in the faintest degree.

* * * * * * *

By yielding to the public demand, the convention saved the Republican Party. More than that, it saved the two-party system. And that is important in a time when the forms and institutions of democratic government are everywhere tumbling or threatened.

That America's two-party system is saved is an invaluable thing. Quite probably the two parties are changed in nature. The Democratic Party, taken over by the new dealers as respects leadership, has gone far in the direction of collectivism, it has become cousin to socialism. At the same time the Republican Party now moves in the direction of what was traditional Jeffersonian democracy. There is in Mr. Willkie much of the Jeffersonian Democrat, including especially his emphasis on individualism. In Mr. Willkie's past political associations and activities, in his writings and speeches and in the big robustness of his personality—in all that lies one conspicuous creed. The individual citizen must not be oppressed or frustrated by big business—but, also, neither must the individual be oppressed or limited by big government.

Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, quite often men who hold high office in this Nation permit partisan politics to sway their better judgment respecting their comment regarding their fellow men. Recently the Senator from the State of Florida made quite a speech on the floor of the United States Senate in which he sought to injure Wendell L. Willkie. I doubt if the Senator knows Mr. Willkie, and I am certain he did not know anything concerning his background at the time he made that speech. Other speeches have been made on that same subject by various Members of the House of Representatives. It is a sad commentary we face when men, for the sake of partisan politics, are ready to condemn their fellow man without any investigation of the character of that individual and without any knowledge of or reference to the accomplishments attained in life by the person attacked. Wendell L. Willkie and his attainments stand as a memorial to his eternal struggle in life, and if those who attack him would compare his successive steps from the bottom of the ladder to the top with their own, I am convinced their flimsy speech would be overcome with shame.

Why do these men, all of whom are saturated with the ointment of the New Deal, attack Wendell L. Willkie? They are merely running true to the form of the past; they want to belittle anyone who would seek to restore the American way in our Nation; they believe in the policy of "smear your opponent" regardless of who he is or what he may be.

Who is Wendell L. Willkie? Why do the members of the New Deal make such a vicious attack upon him?

I have known Wendell L. Willkie throughout the major portion of his life, and I know whereof I speak. He was a poor boy; his father and mother were lawyers, practicing in a small rural community. He attended the common and high school, working much of the time at odd jobs to earn his way

as far as possible. After he completed his high-school work he entered Indiana University, from which institution he was later graduated. During the period of his work in college, Wendell worked his way; he waited table; he washed dishes; he worked on farms; he worked in factories; he did any kind of work at which he could earn a little money. He learned the value of a dollar in his early life, and he learned the art of balancing a budget. The days were not too long and the pay was never too small for him; he had the initiative to make his way—and he did it. He was not born with any silver spoon; he was unable to live in luxury; but he learned the lessons of life throughout his struggle to secure an education as he worked and toiled—a poor boy trying to do something in life for his country. His effort was crowned with victory, and he completed his work in college. The lessons he learned during that struggle for an education have remained with him. He learned the full meaning of thrift and economy; he learned the struggle of the people; he learned the value of the dollar; and he learned the full meaning of saving in life.

The World War came on. Wendell Willkie was no laggard when his country called; he responded. He knows all of the hardships, the sacrifices, the anguish, and the heartaches of war. He commanded his battery, and he learned of the tragedy of that great conflict, because he heard the whistle of the shells and the clatter of musketry; the barking of machine guns was a familiar sound to him; he was but an American, serving in the American way, doing his bit for his country. Some of those who now attack him—I wonder where they were in 1917–18? Let them examine the record of Wendell L. Willkie in the World War, and let them compare it with their own record. His record is open; the War Department has that record, and the public is entitled to see it and to know it. Let those who condemn Wendell L. Willkie examine that record that they may know the stability of the subject of their scurrilous attack. He is a true American, one who was unafraid to serve his country in time of need.

What has this man Willkie done since the World War which would arouse the bitter condemnation from those who now attack him?

Wendell L. Willkie started as a struggling lawyer, and from the lessons he had learned throughout his struggle for an education, he applied thrift and economy to his daily habits; he succeeded throughout the years. At last he was hired by a large business concern to help bring it out of disaster and despair. Let us remember that Wendell L. Willkie did not secure his place with the Commonwealth & Southern by reason of his large stock holdings, nor by reason of family succession, nor by and through any favor bestowed, but he earned it by reason of his ability to do the job assigned to him. His rapid rise in the field of the law, and his success in his chosen profession, brought him to the attention of those who sought to hire a man who could and would make that company the success it should have been. Wendell L. Willkie was hired, or employed, for that specific purpose. He accomplished the task assigned to him. May I ask those who have made an atttack upon this lawyer, soldier, businessman, and American what there is in this ultra successful life that warrants such an attack as has been made upon him? Is it wrong for men to succeed in life? Is it ground for an attack upon him if he performs his task well? Is it offensive to those who have attacked Mr. Willkie that he has been a true American? I am confident the sole and only answer for those attacks made is that Mr. Willkie is opposed to the New Deal, and he now seeks to save the United States of America for the people.

Mr. Speaker, Wendell L. Willkie, the man of the hour, will be elected President of the United States in the coming election. He will serve with high honor and with great distinction in that capacity; he knows the life of the common people of our country; he knows the struggles of the poor, because he has passed through that same struggle; he is a true patriot—an American; he is a businessman, and he knows and understands the problems of the men and women who work and toil, because he was one of them; he is cognizant of the problems of our farmers, because he has worked upon the farm, and he now owns a farm; he is a lawyer of great ability, and he is familiar with the rules of equity and the policy of the law. He is equipped with those elements which will make him a great president.

May I say, when this great man—Wendell L. Willkie—said: "I pledge a battle for unity, cooperation, and better national defense," he meant just that. He meant that our national defense program should be entirely honest; that it should be sound; and that those who are responsible for the spending of the people's money should make a true and accurate accounting thereof, and that our Government should receive $1 in value for every dollar spent for national defense. Wendell L. Willkie is grounded in honesty; he believes in the United States of America, and when he speaks, in the future, the people will find every utterance to be truthful. He is but a humble, honest, fearless American who believes in the American way. So we have the man—Wendell L. Willkie—who will go forward to victory in November.

Adjournment Unwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short article by Mark Sullivan in the Washington Post of July 2, 1940:

[From the Washington Post of July 2, 1940]

CONGRESS AND THE CRISIS

(By Mark Sullivan)

It is proposed that Congress adjourn until January.

At a time when all over the world the very existence of parliamentary government—government by a representative elected body—is in question; when it is claimed that parliamentary government must die because it is too cumbersome, too dilatory, too lacking in quick responsiveness; when in country after country parliamentary government is extinguished to make way for totalitarian government—at such a time it is proposed that the American Congress efface itself for 6 months.

If Congress effaces itself for 6 months, especially the 6 months just ahead, Congress should not be surprised to find some of its temporary self-effacement last longer than Congress intended. That is a strong thing to suggest. In face of the present condition of the world, such an apprehension is not too greatly exaggerated. For Congress to go home now would be regular; it is usual for a Congress to adjourn from midsummer to the following January. But for this Congress to adjourn at this time, considering the condition of the world, would have the nature of abdication, or at least of Congress taking its function lightly. The present state of the world is no time for parliamentary bodies to suspend functioning, even temporarily. It is a time for parliamentary bodies to function with especial watchfulness and thoroughness, to prove that they deserve to survive.

During the spring, preceding the dramatic turn which the war abroad took on May 11, it was assumed that Congress would adjourn before the Republican National Convention and remain adjourned until January. With the spirit of crisis which came with the German invasion of Holland, Belgium, and France; with our embarking upon a program of preparedness, question was raised whether Congress should adjourn. President Roosevelt at a press conference expressed the belief there was no imperative necessity for Congress to stay in Washington; he said, rather lightly, that there was little they could do other than speech making, and that if necessity arose, he would call them back in special session.

But in Congress and throughout the country, the conviction grew that Congress should remain in session. When the Republican Convention neared, Congress recessed for the week of the convention, returning Monday of this week. Again it is proposed that as the Democratic Convention approaches, 2 weeks hence, Congress should again either recess or adjourn. If recess, Congress would return after the Democratic Convention; if adjournment, it would be until January.

To many members, adjournment appeals. The whole House and one-third of the Senate are up for reelection (except such as have failed of renomination or are retiring voluntarily). All are conscious of the desirability of making personal campaigns in their States and districts. If constituents understand the desirability of Congress remaining in session, they will not be likely to penalize Members unable to make personal campaigns.

The desirability of Congress remaining in session is suggested by an episode during last week's recess. Our Navy, acting with the best intention, with a disposition shared by much of the country, took a step of a kind likely to be helpful to Britain. Certain vessels under construction for our Navy were turned back to the manufacturer, making it possible for the manufacturer to sell these vessels to Britain. Our Navy, of course, supposed it had the right to do this. But when the action was discovered by a committtee of Congress, the Senate Naval Committee, question was raised about the legality of the transaction. Upon inquiry, the Attorney General reported that the action was not legal. Thereupon President Roosevelt canceled it.

Such incidents, arising in the shadowy area where Executive power and congressional power overlap, are likely to be numerous during a period of hurried preparedness against war. If Congress is here and regards a proposed action as wise, Congress can legalize the action. If Congress is not here, necessity for haste by the Executive department may result in distortion of the relations between Executive and Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely against adjournment as long as the present crisis continues. Only yesterday the President has asked Congress for appropriations about $5,000,000,000 additional money for the Army expansion. Next week the Military Affairs Committee of the House will begin the consideration of a universal military training bill. Other matters of equal importance press upon Congress for immediate attention.

In the face of the necessary action which Congress should take on important legislation, and in the face of this appalling crisis in the world, I believe we should continue in session. I make this statement in spite of the fact that our primary election in Louisiana is set by law for September 10, and I am a candidate for reelection. Should Congress continue in session it will not be possible for me to go home and contact the people of my district in Louisiana. As between politics and a most tragic crisis I make the decision in favor of staying on the job and doing my part in giving this Nation the legislation which is needed so urgently at this critical time. As to my campaign for reelection, the people of Louisiana who know and understand the international situation must and will carry on for me during my absence.

Comprehensive Defense in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE FAIRBANKS DAILY NEWS-MINER

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short editorial from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Thursday, June 6, 1940:

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner of June 6, 1940]

COMPREHENSIVE DEFENSE OF ALASKA

While attention is focused in Kodiak, Dutch Harbor, Sitka, Fairbanks, and Anchorage as key positions in the defensive set-up for Alaska, and millions are being appropriated for the purposes, it is well to keep in mind they are not the only points in this vast Territory to be guarded.

Alaska, with her total area of some 600,000 square miles and 26,000 miles of coast line sprawling crablike from Ketchikan to Point Barrow and from the Rockies to the tip of the far-reaching Aleutians, offers many a vulnerable point that may be regarded as a possible gateway or a strategic location spot for enemy invaders.

Warships may cruise the coastal lines and be prepared to dash from point to point, bombing and pursuit planes may keep poised at the main land bases, and antiaircraft guns be held in readiness, together with troops and heavy guns, but there are numerous other centers to keep in mind—Bethel, Nome, Point Barrow, and others.

Once air fleets are in the air, they may not find it convenient to return to home bases when bad weather or other adverse conditions prevail.

As originally announced the Alaska "air base" contemplated a network or composite set-up of main and auxiliary bases all over the Territory. In carrying out a comprehensive program the auxiliary stations cannot be excluded. Congress has made a good start in the face of menacing conditions, but that is not all-essential in the premises. To complete the task and make Alaska 100 percent safe, many a new unit must be provided in the less conspicuous localities.

And, to coordinate the whole, provide for all units of defense to function in unison, maintain life lines of supply, and means of land, air, and sea transport many other essentials must be kept in mind. Inland highways cannot be ignored as among the essentials. The whole scheme of adequate defense calls for the best that Uncle Sam can provide—and Europe affords the lesson of what it might mean if the matter is neglected.

Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, when the W. P. A. theater project was killed last year, largely because of serious penetration by Communists, Congress assumed that the members of the profession would undertake a house cleaning. Instead, as recently as last May 24, an avowed Communist, Sam Jaffee, was elected to the governing council of Actors' Equity Association. Representatives of this association appeared before House and Senate Appropriation Committees urging the reinstatement of the theater project in the relief program. Jaffee was elected May 24, 1940, in preference to an outstanding American actress, Tallulah Bankhead, at the annual meeting in New York City of Actors' Equity, where according to the official report as published in the June issue of Equity, "a disappointingly small turn-out of scarcely 350 members attended." While only a small minority, the voting power is thus in the hands of Communists and fellow travelers in the New York City area, and there has been a growing rather than a diminishing trend of communistic influence in the theater. Seven Communists are now on the governing council of Equity, Sam Jaffee, Philip Loeb, Emily Marsh, Hiram S. Sherman, Leroy MacLean, Edith L. Van Cleve, and Alan Hewitt.

Other key positions in the profession have been taken over by Communists. George Heller is now executive secretary and treasurer of the Radio Actors Guild. The new executive secretary of the American Guild of Variety Artists is Hoyt Haddock, a former C. I. O. organizer of distinct Communist sympathies, whose appointment was protested by the A. F. of L.

House Joint Resolution 544 strikes Communists and Nazis from the relief rolls, but here is a situation where Communists are occupying high places in a profession which Congress would undoubtedly be glad to help if we had the means of weeding them out. Innocent and deserving actors and actresses all over the country are thus being penalized, and there will be no W. P. A. theater project as long as this condition is permitted to exist. As a member of the subcommittee on this measure, I can see no Federal assistance forthcoming under these conditions.

Charles L. McNary More a Patriot Than a Partisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following brief sketch on the life of my beloved fellow Oregonian appearing in the United States News in the issue of July 5, 1940:

[From the United States News of July 5, 1940]

LIBERAL RUNNING MATE FOR MR. WILLKIE—CHARLES L. M'NARY, VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE MORE A PATRIOT THAN A PARTISAN TO POLITICAL OPPONENT

In the Capitol Barber Shop late last week, smiling, scholarly CHARLES LINZA MCNARY was getting a shave and having his red hair trimmed. Reporters rushed in and asked the Senate minority leader whether he would accept the nomination for Vice President on the Republican ticket. Then, in his slow, easygoing, deliberate way, Oregon's favorite son grinned and answered, "If it is in the nature of a draft, I will be a good soldier and do my part." Three hours later he was nominated.

The Republican vice presidential candidate has spent a score of his 66 years on Capitol Hill. He has, incidentally, never seen nor met Wendell Willkie (People of the Week, United States News, June 28). Today, Senator MCNARY is recognized as one of the ablest and most popular Members of Congress, especially with the newspapermen, for whom he is always a reliable source of news.

He is a silent, undemonstrative tradition-breaker who believes in a liberalized and socialized Republican Party. Senator MCNARY has voted for scores of New Deal laws, but has always turned thumbs down on all tinkering with the monetary and tariff systems. He dislikes, in particular, the reciprocal trade agreements program. Former President Hoover, who was a college chum of "CHARLEY" MCNARY at Stanford University, once dubbed him "a shade too radical"; and Postmaster General James A. Farley, in 1936, characterized the Senator as "more a patriot than a partisan."

As the Senate minority leader, "Mac" has played long-range politics, has turned both cheeks to his enemies. His colleagues have noted and praised his objective, tolerant, even charitable attitude. And they have liked his informality, his lack of pontifical solemnity. Within the Republican Party he has remained a regular—but always in the liberal zone.

A keen observer of human nature, Senator MCNARY has been particularly adept at conciliation and unification. Many times he has been a sharp critic of the New Deal, but he has always made his criticism specific, citing chapter and verse. One of the least bellicose of the minority—he seldom makes a speech—he has been one of the most effective.

The new nominee has summed up his political philosophy as follows: "Regardless of changes of name and shifts within the organization, the party that stands for well-managed public finance, a reasonable and helpful attitude toward business, and a pursuit of social progress through true federalism—not authoritarianism, but cooperation on practical lines—that party has had a fairly continuous history, and that history will continue, I am sure, for a long time to come."

Mr. MCNARY is one of the most urbane figures in the Senate. He is tall, handsome, and assured. Impeccably groomed, he is usually voted the best-dressed Member of the upper House. At the same time, the Senator is a dirt farmer, one of the few who make farming pay. His interest in agriculture is personal, not academic. Between sessions, on his 600-acre fruit ranch near Salem, Oreg., he carries on extensive plant-breeding experiments. To his credit is the development of the "imperial prune"—as well as the introduction of the filbert industry to his State.

Mr. MCNARY was born on a farm outside Salem in 1874, and was educated at the local public schools before entering Stanford, where he remained for 2 years. Then he began a law career, having been admitted to the Oregon bar in 1898. Aside from practicing with his brother, he began to teach, serving as dean of Willamette College of Law from 1908 to 1913. From Willamette University, the University of Oregon, and Linfield College, he received the degree of doctor of laws.

The Senator's entry into politics was as an assistant district attorney. Then for 2 years he served as an associate justice of the Oregon Supreme Court. Before his appointment to the United States Senate in 1917 to fill an unexpired term, Mr. MCNARY acted as chairman of his Republican State central committee.

Once the campaign gets under way, the Republican candidate will have to toss aside his favorite pastimes; romping on the floor with his 5-year-old daughter, cultivating his fruits and flowers; shooting a round of golf; reading on the veranda or before his fireplace with its kettle and 4-foot logs; wandering beneath the huge Douglas firs of his Oregon ranch.

Let Us Have Preparation for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1940:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of June 30, 1940]

THE CROWNING DISSERVICE TO AMERICA

Mr. Roosevelt's crowning disservice to his country may be completed here in Chicago in a little over 2 weeks. He has permitted the time for the Democratic Convention to approach without disavowing an intention to seek a third term. Whatever may be in his mind, he has encouraged the assumption that he will be the first President in an eighth year of office to ask for 4 years more.

This behavior comes at a time when it adds grave domestic uncertainties to the grave problems presented the country from abroad. It offers a political issue which, if pressed to a conclusion by the nomination, will divide the Nation violently.

There is no doubt of the ability of the American democracy to take the accustomed political campaign in the usual stride, regardless of events abroad. The American people are not so unstable as yet that they cannot exercise their political rights and make their decisions even in such calamitous times as the present. They ought not, however, to be presented at this time, for the first time in their experience, with a constitutional issue touching the integrity, as the most thoughtful citizens see it, of their form of government.

We say it is a constitutional question, although the Constitution says nothing about it. In this one respect our Constitution resembles the British. It has had this unwritten stipulation. It has been respected by Mr. Roosevelt's predecessors, none of whom as he finished his second term has ever asked his party for a third, and no party has seriously considered a 12-year stretch for any occupant of the White House for whom it was responsible.

The ambitions of Grant and the ambitions of Theodore Roosevelt did not take this form, and the Republican Party has not created any precedents to which Mr. Roosevelt might appeal. He is the first man who could be accused of the desire to perpetuate himself in office beyond the period to which our understanding of American government confines the aspirations of a man who has been twice elected Chief Executive.

It may be Mr. Roosevelt's intention not to permit the Democratic Convention in Chicago to nominate him. The disservice he has done his country already is to permit the conviction to grow that he will be nominated, that he desires to be, and that he will try by the methods and resources peculiar to his own administration to keep himself in power. It is assumed that he has already so entrenched himself in the extraordinary authority attained during his administration that he can get whatever he commands the convention to give him.

The very misfortunes which the country has suffered under his maladministration of its finances have been converted into political domination. The debt, the deficits, and the increased taxation have built up a political machine by grants and subsidies which is powerful enough to control a delegate convention if the dispenser of the public funds intends to continue in office. It is to be feared that good judgment and the public spirit of Democrats, who oppose the perpetuation of Executive authority at this time as much as any Republican, cannot be made effective in a convention ruled by the beneficiaries of Mr. Roosevelt's ruinous policies.

Mr. Roosevelt could have cleared the atmosphere months ago by the simple statement that he recognized the force of the unwritten constitution and that he respected the sound reasons represented by that tradition and usage. He has been more emphatic than anyone else in the country in speaking of the dangers supposed to be flowing in our direction from the uncontrollable passions and destructive forces which are destroying a large part of the world.

If he were considerate of his country he would recognize that if half he says of this should be true, he could not in good conscience lead the people into a graver doubt as to the permanence of the Government they suppose still exists in the United States. He would not raise the question of a dictatorship at a time when dictators, as he says, menace the liberties of all people.

It is impossible for America to feel secure in its foreign policies and its foreign relations until it can feel more secure in the durability of its form of government here. No patriotic man would add to the confusion in the public mind by allowing his ambitions to give a political campaign an issue of liberty at home when liberties are so threatened abroad.

The third term is promoted by men whose real motive is to change the political and social order here. They seek the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt not only to save their own places of profit and authority but to complete the revolution which they have under way.

The theory of indispensability never arose in circumstances which made it more incongruous or ridiculous. The fact is that even this resourceful Nation, in the most peaceable times, might find it impossible to endure 4 more years which ran the identical course of the other 8. The two terms will prove the indispensability of putting another man in charge of this Nation's affairs. The country must have a change in the White House unless it is to suffer a complete change in its political, social, and economic order.

We doubt very much that the American Republic could pull through another 4 years under Mr. Roosevelt, and we doubt that it is the intention of the third termers that it should. If the convention in Chicago should renominate Mr. Roosevelt, the delegates to that convention will have announced to the country that it is their intention to invite the occurrence in the United States of what happened in Germany and in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, as we flounder hither and thither in our belated preparations for national defense and preparedness, the same old ineptness of the New Deal becomes increasingly apparent.

As we attempted to meet depression by grandiose planning and wishful thinking, and after 7 tragic years of deficit spending find ourselves only deeper in the depression mire, while staggering debts weaken our resources and millions of our people are left with a dependency complex, so we seem to approach this great crisis.

With grandiose talk of "5,000,000 men under arms in 18 months," "50,000 fighting planes" right off the bat, conscription of our women, with training under an acknowledged former "red."

Why can we not have sensible planning to arm our enlarged Regular Army and National Guard with the best mechanical aids in all the world? The expansion of the training of pilots under Army and Navy direction and the expansion of our trained mechanics right in our shops, to properly, sensibly, and economically expand our industrial machine to meet any emergency?

May we not have an administration that believes in American industrial organizations? That will harness the might of America for preparedness for peace?

May we not have an end to this starry-eyed planning that never comes to any fruition except failure and disillusionment? O Mr. Speaker, let us really mobilize the might of this Nation in defense of our homes and our representative government now so seriously threatened.

The Nomination of Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under date of July 3, 1940, the Christian Science Monitor comments editorially on the nomination of Wendell Willkie at Philadelphia, and points out that the people demanded his selection. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 3, 1940]

POPULAR POLITICS

One of the weaknesses of the Republican Party in the past has been the dominance of the old guard in party management and finance. In 1936 the Cleveland convention nominated a genuine liberal and there was hope that Governor Landon would win the independents, the young people and sound liberals. That hope was stifled when reactionary control of the party organization ruined the Landon campaign. This year an even greater hope has been aroused by the Willkie nomination, and the news indicates that old guard control, broken at Philadelphia, will not be reestablished in the campaign.

First is the candidate's insistence that contributions should be limited to $5,000. Second is his tentative plan for a triumvirate, composed of the party's national chairman, a campaign manager, and a personal representative of the candidate, to direct the campaign. Two of these would be selected by Mr. Willkie, who is reported to be looking for a campaign manager who will represent the newer element in politics.

It was this element of enthusiastic young Republicans and people who had never taken much part in politics that won the nomination for Mr. Willkie. They aroused and organized a popular demand that smashed old political machines right and left. It is this element which can win the election. We believe the Republican candidate is wise enough and strong enough to keep it manifestly in control of his campaign.

In his present moves he is in two senses making politics popular.

An Old Book and a Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a few hundred feet from the place where I am standing, in a specially designed ornamental case, rests a book which is one of the most outstanding relics of all of the ages. For this book the Government of the United States in 1930 paid $1,000,000. As the years come and go countless thousands of our people, intermingling with pilgrims from all over the world, pause reverently and admiringly to feast their eyes on this ancient tome.

The book to which I refer is entitled to the high estimation and the special consideration accorded to it in the opinion of mankind for several reasons:

First. It is the Word of God, in which nearly 700,000,000 people on the surface of the earth rest their hope of resurrection and life everlasting.

Second. It is distinctive because it is the first book ever printed. When we contemplate the vast libraries and the countless volumes of printed works now individually owned throughout the world this, the first book ever printed, rivets and holds the imagination. In the Library of Congress alone it is today surrounded by 5,000,000 other books.

Third. It is distinctive because of the place where it was printed.

And where was it printed?

In Germany.

The Germany of the ancient devotion and reverence for the Word of God.

The Germany of Martin Luther.

Walter B. Conkey, of Indiana, one of the greatest of American publishers, once said:

If there is an inanimate object that possesses a living soul, it is a book.

If this may be said of secular books how much more certainly must it hold true with reference to the Word of God?

Is it possible, I wonder, looking through the eyes of faith, to conceive that the Gutenberg Bible may have a soul so powerful that it may inspire emotions and reactions that will rescue the world from the crucible of war and death and destruction into which it has fallen? I would like to imagine that there is such a potentiality about that book. I wish that some afternoon soon Members of Congress, when the news from the shambles of Europe is especially depressing and the

weight of the world is heavy upon their hearts, would adjourn their deliberations, walk across the Capitol lawn to the Library of Congress, place their hands on the old Bible, and pray. Perhaps the magic touch of that Bible would convince them that there is a better way to settle the world's troubles than mass murder. I can suggest a prayer which I think would be appropriate:

"Our Father in Heaven, who created the universe and who taught us the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, who said to us in the book on which our hands rest, 'Thou shall not kill; thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself,' and 'peace be with you,' please, we humbly beseech Thee, curb the reign of tyrants, end the Age of Butchery, and bring the minds and hearts and understandings of men into harmony with Thy divine purpose, to the end that the world, which is leaping toward destruction, may be rescued and saved by Thy divine grace. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen."

America Needs Preparedness, Not Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT HARRISON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on the evening of July 3 the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] discussed over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co. the program of national defense in the light of the declaration of the recent Republican convention and the statements of distinguished members of the Republican Party on that subject. The address is especially pertinent at this time as showing the necessity for divorcing preparedness from politics, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To every one of you—to every American—national defense is not a partisan issue: It is a national necessity.

We all share its costs. We will all share catastrophe if it fails. And so that it may not fail we must all understand, as a part of defense, the truth about defense.

What I shall say from now on I shall say not in the spirit of partisanship but in the spirit of regret. I shall say it not in the spirit of planting poison in the minds of the people from the Democratic point of view, but of neutralizing with the truth poison that unfortunately has been planted with the public for Republican partisan advantage.

The Republican Convention in Philadelphia last week, in the platform approved by its candidates, solemnly declared:

"The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace. We accordingly fasten upon the New Deal full responsibility for our unpreparedness and for the consequent danger of involvement in war."

That charge in another nation would be considered "fifth column" activity. It gives the impression to foreigners and to our own people that America is unprepared to the degree of inviting attack. It thus plays into the hands of those who would follow a policy of defeatist appeasement toward Germany by trying to buy Hitler off rather than manfully holding Hitler off. And it is a serious indictment to bring against the Democratic Party, since it tells the American people that we are in danger of being involved in war because of the policies of the Democratic Party.

Since such an assertion can be sustained only by evidence, it must be refuted by evidence. Let us take up what the Republicans said and then examine the evidence.

Former President Hoover addressed the convention. He asserted that in the 6 years preceding the Roosevelt administration we had spent about $680,000,000 a year on preparedness, and said, "And in 1934 he (Roosevelt) drastically reduced our defense to $550,000,000, lopping off $20,000,000 from the Air Corps alone."

Mr. Hoover, the country in its respect for you as the only living ex-President, has a right to expect more of you. The fact is that it was you and not Mr. Roosevelt who was responsible for this perilous economy of 1934.

You know perfectly well that the fiscal year 1934 began July 1, 1933, and ended June 30, 1934. The Treasury could issue checks during that year only for funds that had been appropriated by the Congress in the appropriation bills. The appropriation bills providing funds for the Army and the Navy for the fiscal year 1934 establishing the reductions you charge to President Roosevelt were signed by you, Mr. Hoover, during your last week in office.

Have you forgotten your own Budget message to the Congress for that fiscal year 1934? Then let me refresh your recollection. This is what you said: "Excluding all items of a nonmilitary nature, the estimate of appropriations contained in this Budget for national defense under the War and Navy Departments amounts to $586,447,000 as compared with appropriations of $632,466,000 for 1933, which indicates a decrease of $46,019,000." And you then proceeded to boast of these reductions for the Navy and the Army, calling attention to the fact that one reduction was made possible by your reducing the number of armory drills for the National Guard from 48 to 24, and another by reducing the amount for the citizens' military training camps.

Now, for charge No. 2.

Mr. Hoover charged that in 1934 President Roosevelt reduced the number of naval commissioned graduates by one-half.

Mr. Hoover, that is a misstatement also.

On May 6, 1932, you, Mr. Hoover, as President, approved a special act specifically authorizing the President to commission all graduates of the 1932 class, but providing for the commissioning of only 50 percent of the graduates in subsequent years. Therefore, President Roosevelt could legally commission only 50 percent of the Annapolis graduates of 1933.

But within the calendar year of 1933 President Roosevelt requested and Congress gave him the power to commission that other 50 percent of the 1933 Annapolis graduates, whom he could not commission by reason of the law which you, Mr. Hoover, approved and created. A man who has been President of the United States may be mistaken about his own mistakes, particularly one who has made many mistakes. But he should not be so mistaken that he attributes them to others.

Mr. Hoover's third charge to the Republican convention:

"Other military leaders say to the Congress we are not organized for modern war. We do not have more than 75,000 fully equipped men."

That was an unfortunate misstatement, Mr. Hoover.

The facts are, according to General Marshall, the Chief of Staff—and not a politician—that we have in the Regular Army, not 75,000, but 236,150 fully equipped men. This does not include the 250,000 men in the National Guard. Recently we provided the funds to increase the Regular Army to 375,000, and each week thousands of young men are being recruited to provide this force.

Mr. Hoover's fourth charge as a spokesman for the Republican Party:

"Despite the growing menace in the air and the expenditure of $350,000,000 on the air force in the last 6 years, General Arnold says not half a dozen of our Army planes are modern."

This is a regrettable twisting of overscrupulous language of the splendid Army officer in charge of our air service.

General Arnold advises me that today we have on hand 2,943 airplanes. Most of these were procured prior to the present world conflict and therefore do not embody all of the very latest improvements proved desirable day by day in the fighting across the sea. By that test there are very few completely up-to-date planes in the world. Our combat planes are being modernized in the light of events abroad. Those being delivered weekly under the expansion program of 1939 are of a type recently used successfully in Europe and are even now being procured by foreign governments from manufacturing establishments in this country, clearly indicating they are of modern combat type.

But this is not all.

The keynoter of the Republican convention, Governor Stassen, charged that the President of the United States, in a speech delivered by him over the radio on May 27, 1940, had attempted to deceive the people by quoting figures as to planes and other matériel "on hand and on order." The following night Mr. Hoover indulged in ridicule of the President for using this phrase and by implication approved of what Governor Stassen said.

Petty, Mr. Hoover; petty.

Governor Stassen did not know better. Never having been President, there was no reason why he should know how records of matériel are kept in the accounting records of the Army and Navy.

But, Mr. Hoover, you knew perfectly well that the accounting records of the Navy classify ships as "built and building." And you knew perfectly well that the accounting records of the Army classify Army supplies, matériel, as "on hand and on order."

So you knew perfectly well that President Roosevelt in referring to planes as "on hand and on order" was reporting to the people in the exact language in which the Army and Navy report to the President and to the Congress.

You knew it because in your Budget message to Congress of your last year in office you asked the Congress for 375 new planes, which you said "will give the Air Corps a total of 1,537 airplanes on hand and on order on June 30, 1934." And as far back as 1931, in your message to the Congress, you said: "This program calls for 1,515 planes to be on hand and on order on June 30, 1931."

When you used the phrase, Mr. Hoover, I am glad that no Democrat charged you with endeavoring to deceive the American people.

When the Republican platform says it "fastens upon the Democratic Party responsibility for our unpreparedness," let us see what are the facts as to party responsibility in this matter of defense.

In the 7 calendar years succeeding 1933 your Government under President Roosevelt has invested $1,292,000,000 more than was spent on the Army the previous 7 years.

In the same 7 years your Government has invested $1,478,000,000 more than was spent on the Navy during the preceding 7 years.

These increases were desperately necessary because during the preceding years under the Republicans our national defense had been neglected.

Bear with me a moment while I go through some figures.

Our naval expenditures in the fiscal year 1921, the last fiscal year for which appropriations were made while Franklin D. Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, amounted to $963,000,000.

In the first year of the succeeding Republican administration it cut them in half—down to $485,000,000. And down they continued to go until in the fiscal year 1934 they reached the low of all time, $266,000,000; approximately one-quarter of what they had been under the Democrats. The appropriations for that fiscal year 1934 were made under the Budget submitted by Herbert Hoover.

What do all those appropriation figures mean in terms of ships?

As a result of limitation of the armament conference in 1922, we destroyed some of our battleships, and we did not lay down a single battleship for construction during the three administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

During these 12 years, we completed only 20 combatant naval vessels, cruisers, submarines, and gunboats.

What is the record of this Democartic administration? During the last 4 fiscal years alone, we have completed 115 combatant naval vessels. We now have built the most powerful single navy in the world.

In addition we have at this very moment actually building 10 battleships, 5 aircraft carriers, 4 heavy cruisers, 17 light cruisers, 61 destroyers, and 41 submarines—a total of 138 additional vessels.

What do those appropriation figures mean in terms of men?

On March 4, 1929, when the last Republican administration came into power, the Navy had 84,986 enlisted men. When Mr. Hoover left the White House, the Navy was down 4,000 men from that. Today we have in the Navy 143,628 enlisted men.

In the Marine Corps, on March 4, 1929, when the last Republican administration took charge, we had 19,790 fighting marines. When Mr. Hoover went out of office March 4, 1933, the marines were down 4,000 men from that. By June 25 of this year we had increased the force to 27,500 men—almost double the 1933 figure.

What about the Army? On February 28, 1929, a few days before Mr. Hoover became President, we had 128,621 enlisted men. During his 4-year administration he reduced this number by approximately 4,000 men. On June 5, 1940, we had increased the Army to 236,150 men, almost twice as many as Mr. Hoover bequeathed us, and we were daily recruiting to reach 375,000.

"Oh, well," the Republicans may say, "what has happened in the past doesn't matter. What has happened since Munich is what counts. And since Munich the Republican Party by its action has justified the claim that it is the party of preparedness."

Well, let us see what is the recent record of the parties. Let me remind you that it is actual votes in Congress, not spread-eagle statements in the press, which pass national-defense bills.

On May 3, 1938, 6 months before Munich, there was a vote in the United States Senate to provide funds to maintain the Navy during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939. Without this bill, not one dollar would have been provided for the Navy. Every naval vessel would have had to leave the sea, every shore establishment would have been closed, and every officer and sailor would have been forced to discard the uniform.

The bill passed by a vote of 56 to 28.

But of the Republicans who voted in the Senate, only 7 voted for the bill and 9 voted against it.

Among those who voted against appropriating funds for the Navy were, believe it or not, two distinguished gentlemen who were placed in nomination at the Republican convention—the Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNARY, and the maker of Wendell Willkie, Senator VANDENBERG. Had the issue been left for decision by the Republicans of the Senate, by a vote of 9 to 7, not one dollar would have been provided for the Navy.

On March 6, 1939, 6 months after Munich, there was a vote in the Senate on increasing the number of Army airplanes from 5,500 to 6,000. Fifteen Republicans voted. Nine were against the increase, only 6 for it. Among the Senators voting against the increase in the number of airplanes were again the Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNARY, and Senator VANDENBERG.

On March 7, 1939, on the final passage in the Senate of the bill providing for the national defense, of 8 votes cast against the bill, 4 were Republican and one was Farmer-Labor.

On May 18, 1939, after Austria had been absorbed and Czechoslovakia invaded, the Navy appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, without which there would be no funds for the Navy, passed the Senate by a vote of 61 to 14. Of the 14 opposed to providing any funds for the Navy, 7 were Republicans, 1 Progressive, and 1 Farmer-Labor. Of the total number of Republicans voting, 10 voted for the passage of the bill and 7 voted against it.

Lest you think that the Republican Senators misrepresented the views of the Republican Party as a whole, let me call attention to some votes in the House.

On May 8, 1939, the Navy appropriations bill, which provided approximately $1,000,000,000 for the Navy, passed the House by a vote of 297 to 58. Of the 58 votes cast against your Navy, 54 were Republicans, 2 Progressives, and 2 Democrats.

When the House was considering the Army appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, four amendments were offered by a Republican Congressman from New Jersey which would have slashed millions of dollars from the appropriations designed to increase the safety of this Nation. One would have cut $6,074,564, almost one-third of the appropriation for the signal service of the Army. Another amendment would have decreased the appropriation for the Air Corps by more than $20,000,000. Another would have cut $13,000,000 from the authority of the Army to contract for new airplanes. The fourth would have reduced a million dollars from the appropriation for supplies for the ordnance department.

The vote was 150 for the reductions and 217 against.

Of the 150 Congressmen who voted to reduce the preparedness appropriations, 145 were Republicans, 2 were Progressives, and 3 Democrats. Only 8 Republican Congressmen voted against the reductions.

This is the record of the Republican Party in Congress before and after Munich, when the armies of Europe were mobilizing for war.

Was there any change in the Republican attitude toward preparedness after the European war actually came? Not in Congress certainly.

On January 1, 1940, President Roosevelt submitted to the Congress his Budget requests, asking that the expenditures for the nonmilitary activities of Government be reduced by approximately half a billion dollars, and that this amount be added to appropriations for national defense. His request was given a cool reception by Republicans in and out of Congress.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who came very near being selected as the Republican nominee for President, urged that there be a 25-percent cut in the estimates for the Army and the Navy. Other Republicans and some Democrats urged that these expenditures be reduced and the appropriations for nonmilitary functions correspondingly increased. The war abroad was called a phony war, and President Roosevelt was charged with being hysterical in his demands for preparedness.

Every fair observer will admit that during the consideration of the defense bills prior to the invasion of Belgium, no Republican in public life urged an appropriation for national defense in excess of that urged by the President of the United States, and few urged that his request be granted.

Did Mr. Willkie, either in 1939 or in 1940, while the Republicans in Congress were opposing increased appropriations for national defense, utter one word urging appropriations in excess of those asked by President Roosevelt? No.

Did he even urge support for the requests of the President? No.

About that time he was talking about balancing the Budget and about the evils of the Tennessee Valley Authority—itself a basic project in our national-defense plan; a project begun by President Wilson to provide power and munitions for war, and brought to completion by President Roosevelt after 12 years of Republican neglect.

I have discussed the record of the Republican Party on the issue of preparedness. I discuss it at this time because I want to take this issue out of partisanship once and for all—because I want Candidate Willkie and the leaders of the Republican Party to realize how futile it will be for them to spend the next 4 months endeavoring to sustain their indictment against the Democratic administration on this issue. They can no more prove their party the party of preparedness than they can prove that black is white, or that day is night.

But they can do untold harm to the American people by trying to make preparedness a partisan political issue.

When we consider the exaggerated and inaccurate statements made by so distinguished a citizen as ex-President Hoover, we can foresee the character of the statements that will during the next 4 months be made by campaign orators having less reason for restraint.

As the election approaches, the heat of the contest will inspire greater exaggeration. Defects will be charged to exist in every ship, in every plane, and in every gun. Political orators will question the efficiency and the integrity of officers of the Army and the Navy, to whom the people of America must look for their safety.

The effort to prove the platform declaration that the Democratic Party is responsible for our unpreparedness and for the consequent danger of involvement in war will result in such speeches that many people of the Nation may lose confidence in their Government and the people abroad must lose respect for this Government.

Since the invasion of Belgium billions of dollars for national defense have been requested by the President. These recent proposals have been supported solidly by the Republicans and the Democrats of the Congress.

The President, seemingly in appreciation of the unity of the two political parties in the Congress, has appointed to direct the expenditure of vast sums of money distinguished industrialists like Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius, who are in no way affiliated with the Democratic Party. He has appointed as Secretaries of War and Navy two Republicans, who, by reason of their positions, will likewise direct the expenditure of the moneys appropriated by the Congress.

There is no excuse even for a partisan Republican to believe that the money so willingly appropriated by the Congress will be spent for political purposes or for any purpose other than the preparedness of the Nation.

Under these circumstances, I plead with the patriotic Republicans of the Nation that the question of preparedness be not made the football of politics.

Let us not tell Hitler and Mussolini that they have no American Army and Navy to fear.

Let us not tell South America that we have no Army and Navy upon which they may rely.

Let us not divert the attention of the Army and the Navy from the important duty of proceeding with all speed to arm for our defense.

Let us stop discussing who was responsible for not appropriating more money at an earlier date for the Army and Navy. Let us admit that we are a peace-loving people, and that it was incredible to all of us that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin would make war upon helpless little nations, destroy the democracies of the Old World, and threaten the safety of the New World.

Instead of discussing the past, let us unite for the future.

For if, instead of uniting for the defense of the Nation, we devote our thought and energies to fighting with each other for control of the Government we may awaken some day to find in control someone who is neither Republican nor Democrat, nor even an American.

Tomorrow we celebrate the birth of this Republic. If to establish this Government and preserve it other men could sacrifice their lives, surely we can sacrifice our ambitions for political power.

On this Fourth of July, America needs preparedness, not politics.

The Future Is Our Own!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered last night by the Secretary of the Interior at Washington's Fourth of July celebration. The subject of the address was The Future Is Our Own.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans used to think that they knew all there was to know about orations. They used to think that they had heard all the orations there were to hear—the nominating orations, the dedicatory orations, the memorial orations, the commencement orations, the Fourth of July orations. For years, for generations, ever since the foundation of the Republic and even way back before that, they had been listening to the orators and to the orations, and they thought that they had heard them all.

They were wrong.

There is a new kind of oration in the world, an oration which has been given again and again and louder and louder and more and more frequently during these last few years.

You have heard it. You have all heard it. You have heard it on the radio, blaring out from eastward over the water. You have read it in the papers. It is always the same oration.

It begins familiarly for you, for all Americans. It begins like the old-fashioned Fourth of July orations, with fine-sounding words about the people, the new people, the superior, forceful, vigorous people who will rule the world, the people of the future.

When you hear these words you sit back in your seats. You relax. You listen.

But as you listen the familiarity of the words disappears. They change. There's a difference. And gradually, listening, you realize what the difference is. It is this: In the past, in the orations that you remember, the superior, forceful, vigorous people the orators were always talking about—the people who would conquer the world—were always you—you, the American people. But now, in this new oration, the fine, new, vigorous people are not you. They are not you at all. They are somebody else.

It is somebody else, somebody different, who is new now; somebody else who is young, and strong, and vigorous.

And what about you? Where do you come in?

You find out soon enough. You find out as you listen. You are told that you are old. You are tired. You are all through. You are a decadent, worn-out nation, full of decadent, outmoded ideas. You are finished. There is no place for you or for your ideas in the world any more. That is what you are told as you listen to this new oration.

And as you listen you become uneasy. You had always thought that democracy and liberty were the new things in the world and that you were the new people in the world, the people of the west. And here is this orator telling you that democracy is all through and that liberty is decadent and that the new people are not the people of the New World in America, but the people of the Old World overseas.

It is a startling idea to you, fellow Americans. And you sit and you listen and you wonder. And you hear the orator talking about the great deeds and the triumphs of this other new and vigorous people, this different people, and you see that there are indeed triumphs. And you say to yourselves, "Maybe he's got something there. Maybe it's true. Let's have a look. Let's have a look at this new, triumphant people boasting of their strength. Let's have a look at the fresh and vigorous people who shout that they are fresher and more vigorous than the American pioneers or their freeborn children."

And you have a look. And you see. And what you see is this:

You see that this new and vigorous people are a people so vigorous, so virile, so energetic, so young, so strong that they have surrendered their wills, their bodies, and their minds to the absolute will of a boss who tells them what to do.

You see that they are people so fresh and so forceful and so determined that they do whatever they are told to do—speak when they are told to speak, listen when they are told to listen—say what they are told to say, shut up when they are told to shut up, eat when they are told to eat, go hungry when they are told to go hungry, die when they are told to die.

You see that they are people whose vigor and force are so great and so overwhelming that they put up with snoopers, accept paid informers, permit themselves to be whipped and mutilated, read what they are permitted to read, salute when they are told to salute, marry when they are told to marry, beget children when they are instructed to beget children.

You see that these so superior and forceful people break their plighted word, rape peaceful lands at the word of their master, destroy the lives of little children, requite gentleness with brutality, reap where they have not sown, victimize helpless minorities.

You see that these superior people of the future who would rule the world abase themselves before new gods set up for them by a dictator.

You see all this. And you listen to the orator. You hear him tell you that freedom is now a mark of inferiority and of incompetence, and that slavery is the badge of pride and of patriotism. You hear him tell you that obedience is the mark of a man, and that independence is characteristic of a weakling.

You listen.

You have been listening now for a long time.

When are you going to laugh, Americans?

When is the big laugh, the coarse, loud laugh, the harsh laugh of Americans going to blurt out and fill the world? When are you going to imagine to yourselves the words that Lincoln would have used if he had listened to this orator?

When are you going to throw at this orator the words of Lincoln that "no man is good enough to govern any other man without that other man's consent"?

When are you going to imagine the words that your fathers would have used and their fathers?

When is the great, hard, angry, shouting, razzberry laugh of the American people going to yell down the west wind of this continent and out to sea and on out past the horizon?

When are you going to say, all as one man, and all together:

"We haven't even yet begun to live."

"We haven't even yet begun to create on this continent the new and untried and never yet realized world of freedom and security and self-respect."

When are you going to shout again to the world the words that our forefathers shouted, that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Tonight, in the Capital of our free and young and great Republic, we are assembled to reaffirm to ourselves and to the world that we in America still hold these truths to be self-evident.

We swear that we will hold fast to the principles upon which this Nation was founded, and that we will never tolerate any seeds of hatred that would raise one American against another.

We reaffirm our belief in freedom—freedom of speech, of worship, of assembly, of press, and of the individual.

We pledge continued allegiance to the eternal principles of truth and of justice.

We united and free Americans declare that we are prepared to defend our principles, our ideals, and our institutions, so that the future may be ours.

Report on Municipal Light Plant Election at Oelwein, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1940

STATEMENT OF JUDSON KING, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL POPULAR GOVERNMENT LEAGUE

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on April 25 this year there was held a municipal election at Oelwein, Iowa, the question being the establishment of a municipal electric-light plant.

The proposition was defeated. Some of the citizens of that Iowa city organized a municipal league, which on July 3, 1940, made a report on that election, calling attention to various irregularities that took place—in fact, picturing an election similar to most elections of that kind which have been held during the last 20 years. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD, and also that there may be printed in the RECORD a short statement by Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, on the general proposition of the control of municipalities by private electric-light plants.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JUDSON KING, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL POPULAR GOVERNMENT LEAGUE

(1) We are being warned against propaganda and political practices destructive of the American way of life, yet the very interests most vociferous are themselves indulging in practices Nation-wide which strike at the very heart of democracy, namely, corruption of elections and false publicity. In this the power trust has been the most notorious offender for the past 20 years—ever since the first World War.

(2) General knowledge that the electrical industry through its trade organization the National Electric Light Association, and through individual companies was spending millions of dollars annually to deceive the public and corrupt elections and legislative bodies, as well as to violate our antitrust laws, led to the Senate resolution of 1928 ordering the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation.

(3) That investigation shocked the Nation. It was shown that the power trust was corrupting the press, big and little, through advertising and other ways; that it was hiring college professors, lawyers, engineers, and other professions, even ministers, to do its propaganda and political work; that it was invading women's clubs, social organizations, labor unions, and political parties; they even did not hesitate to introduce their false propaganda in the universities and public schools, even the grade schools.

REPORT ON MUNICIPAL LIGHT-PLANT ELECTION, OELWEIN, IOWA

JULY 3, 1940.

On April 25, 1940, the city of Oelwein, Iowa, voted on the question of establishing a municipal light plant. The proposition was defeated by a vote of 1,642 to 1,187, as a result of a most vicious and intense campaign conducted in behalf of the Interstate Power Co. The tactics and methods used to defeat this election were similar to the worst type of machine politics and included every device from deliberate misrepresentation, intimidation of voters, and vast expenditures of money, to the hiring of large numbers of workers to an extent that involved practically purchasing the votes. In addition, deals with the largest industry in town and the only newspaper bought their opposition to the project in open disregard of the benefits that might accrue to Oelwein.

The power company's tactics were so brazen and open that there was a spontaneous uprising among the citizens which has resulted in the formation of an Oelwein Municipal League. They have petitioned the city council and have been granted a new election, to be held on July 18, 1940. The objective of the league has been stated in their literature as follows:

1. Presentation of the whole truth on public issues.
2. Assurance of honest elections expressive of the real sentiment of the citizens of Oelwein.
3. Exposing of false propaganda and unsavory tactics of special interests in Oelwein.
4. Reduction of taxes and cost of electric light and power in Oelwein through the sponsorship of a municipal light plant.

The league has dedicated itself to the task of fighting the pernicious tactics of the power company, and feels that the widest publicity must be given to these methods in the hope that something can be done to enable small communities to deal on even terms with the Power Trust.

THE NEGOTIATION LEADING UP TO THE ELECTION

The electric light committee of the City Council of Oelwein submitted a report, on March 18, 1940, to the council which explained why it was necessary to call an election for a municipal light plant in order to get relief from excessive electricity rates in Oelwein. The following quotations from this report describe the negotiations between the city and the power company which led up to the calling of the election:

"On September 10, 1939, the franchise of the Interstate Power Co. expired. The council was faced with the problem of securing lower electricity rates for the citizens of Oelwein and the decision whether or not to grant a new franchise to the Interstate Power Co. * * *

"During the month of September 1939 the city council had meetings with representatives of the Interstate Power Co. and discussed with them the possibility of securing lower electricity rates for the citizens of Oelwein. The situation created by the expiration of the franchise was also discussed. Throughout these discussions the Interstate Power Co. submitted no proposals for reducing electricity rates or to improve the service to the city of Oelwein. Instead of this, its representatives maintained the following:

"1. The power company was in such bad shape financially that, at this time, it could not afford to do much for our community.

"2. The power company could not reduce electricity rates generally in Oelwein, but might possibly be able to make small rate reductions in one or two categories of consumers, specifically those related to direct billing for services rendered the city itself.

"Since these discussions indicated that the power company was unwilling or unable to reduce the burden of high rates to residential, domestic, and business consumers, the council felt that the above was not a satisfactory solution for the citizens of Oelwein. Accordingly, the council decided to make a more complete inquiry into this subject and to get all the information and advice they could obtain from various available sources."

The report discusses the committee's studies and interviewing of a number of engineering firms and the selection of the Hubbard Engineering Co. to make a rate study and also a report on a municipal light plant. The engineers' rate study was submitted first and showed the following for the year 1938 (quoting again from the report):

"(a) The company's income was	$153,300
"(b) The income that the company should have received in order to pay all costs and earn a 6-percent return on the value of its property useful to Oelwein was	109,282
"(c) The income received in excess of what the power company was entitled to was	44,018

(Quoting from the report:)

"When the engineers' report was ready the council notified the power company and also asked them to submit a similar analysis showing the value of their property useful to Oelwein and the net profit. The council desired this information so that they could study the power company's side of the question, together with the report of their engineers, and reach an intelligent conclusion."

Then the report describes a series of meetings at which the company submitted its own reports. The first report of the company stated that the Oelwein distribution system had a present value of $314,000 and that their income was $21,000 less than the amount required to earn a fair return.

After objections raised by the city's engineers and considerable discussion and delay, a new report was submitted by the power company reporting the value as $178,000. The power company also admitted to income of $1,643, as compared with the engineer's figure of $44,000 excess income.

The city then requested the power company to submit a revised rate schedule and provide for increased street lighting, etc. (quoting again from the report):

"The total reductions in residential and commercial lighting which would be effected by the new schedule, based on the company's own estimates, are $8,707. * * * The total reduction, including all classes of consumers, would be 4¾ percent of the total 1939 billing.

"Even this small reduction would not go into effect, however, unless the citizens of Oelwein granted the power company a new franchise. * * *

"While these last discussions were in progress the committee on electric lighting, together with other members of the council, had been studying a second report of our engineers covering other methods of solving the electric-light problems of the city of Oelwein. This report discusses the purchasing or building of a distribution system, the purchasing of electrical energy at wholesale rates, and the feasibility of constructing an electric-light plant. The report studies all these questions in great detail and brings out the following interesting facts:

"1. If the city built its own electric light plant and distribution system, it can earn a gross profit of about $106,000 during any typical year.

"2. Financing charges of approximately $48,700 per year will pay the interest and pay off the entire investment in a period of 15 years. This would leave a balance to surplus of over $57,000 during each year of operation.

"3. These results are based on a program of reducing the average rate each year so that by 1945 the average rate would be 3.05 cents per kilowatt-hour, or 75 percent of the present rate.

"4. In a 20-year period the light plant would earn the citizens of Oelwein a net profit exceeding $1,300,000, in addition to paying off the cost of the original plant."

Following this is a discussion on procedure and the election, and finally the report concludes as follows:

"In conclusion, the city council has been frequently urged by many of our citizens to bring the question of a municipal light plant before the people of our community. Consequently, in view of all the facts presented in this report, the committee on electric lighting are unanimous in the recommendation that the proposition of a city-owned-and-operated electric light and power plant, as described in our engineers' report, be submitted to the voters in the city of Oelwein, and that action on this matter be taken immediately."

An election was therefore called for April 25, 1940, at which the following question was submitted:

"Shall the following public measure be adopted?

"Shall the city of Oelwein, Iowa, be empowered and authorized to establish, erect, maintain, and operate a municipal electric-light and power plant with all the necessary poles, wires, machinery, apparatus, buildings, site, and other requisites for such plant, at a maximum expenditure for the establishment thereof not exceeding the sum of $650,000, said plant to be paid for solely and only out of the earnings of said plant without the incurring of any indebtedness therefor by the said city of Oelwein, Iowa?"

POWER-COMPANY CAMPAIGN

This information was gathered from a number of sources and in many cases direct from Oelwein citizens who worked for the power company during the campaign. Some of these workers admit frankly that they were interested only in the remuneration they received and personally realized that a municipal light plant would be better for Oelwein. Other workers offered their services to the side which would pay them the most, and, of course, there was only one side that could make an appeal to citizens of this type. Again, others admitted they were misled. Since the election they have been helpful in supplying information regarding the power company's tactics.

The names of the majority of the power-company workers are well known to the citizens, and over 200 and probably 300 voters in Oelwein were paid in varying amounts to influence their vote and use their influence against the municipal light plant. These workers were, in general, carefully selected upon the basis of their influence either on groups or families. Wherever possible the greatest secrecy was maintained to make it impossible to expose them until it was too late.

The campaign tactics can be best discussed under the following headings:

NEWSPAPER CAMPAIGN

The Oelwein Daily Register is the only newspaper in the city. About 10 years ago it ran a series of articles favoring a municipal light plant. After the manager of the power company conferred with the paper and arranged to give the paper a substantial contract for newspaper advertising, it switched its policy. Now it is an ardent supporter of the power company.

In the early days of the campaign the newspaper, while professing a neutral attitude, so distorted the story of the rate negotiations that even the power company was obliged to deny responsibility for the so-called facts it published. For example, note the following quotations from the issue of March 21, the day after the election was called.

"The Interstate offered to reduce the rates to a point which would mean a saving of $11,000 per year over present rates."

The power company in its own written report claimed only a saving of $8,700.

"In addition they offered to place almost double the lighting power on the white way and also install 10 more street-crossing lights, all making a total of about $3,000 less than at present."

The power company's report shows that the net cost to the city for this additional lighting would be $1,000 more instead of $3,000 less.

"The Interstate representatives asked the council if they had a report showing the probable cost of a municipal plant for Oelwein and they replied they did not have."

The city had a thorough 200-page report covering this subject. The above was a deliberate attempt to create the impression that the city was going into this matter without considered thought.

At a later date the paper reported briefly on a mass meeting held by the citizens at which over 700 people were in attendance. An example of the twisting of the truth is given in the following quotation:

"Mr. Olson, of the C. & G. W., asked why they had not taken into consideration the supplying of power and light for the C. & G. W. Railroad. He was told that to do this would require about $75,000 additional funds."

This was another deliberate misrepresentation. Mr. Olson was told definitely that $75,000 had been allowed in the bond issue to take care of the railroad load and that every effort would be made to give the railroad whatever service they desired.

"Mr. Smith, of Chicago, with the Hubbard Engineering Co., with which Mr. Spitzglass is connected and has a contract here, said that the company was a new one, only having been organized last year, and this accounted for the fact that they had not built a plant yet."

The above was a part of the campaign to smear the engineers and is a deliberate misrepresentation. Mr. Schmidt described many municipal plants and other projects constructed by the engineers. He described the experience of certain members of the organization dating back 15 to 20 years, and, in his own case, thirty-odd years in the field of municipal plant design.

Toward the end of the campaign the newspaper finally threw off its cloak of neutrality and openly devoted its editorial pages to attacking the municipal light plant project. For example—

"EDITORIAL COMMENT—A DISSENTING OPINION

"Despite the fact that three Oelwein attorneys out of eight here give it as their emphatic opinion that the 'citizens of Oelwein will not be taxed to pay for the municipal plant,' we are still of the opinion that they will be taxed either directly or indirectly to pay for it. They also give their opinion that the rates can never be raised. Analyze this just a little.

"It is our opinion that the court would either order the rates increased or that a tax levy be made on the citizens to meet the obligations. In that case it would be a tax on the citizens of Oelwein, either direct or indirect.

"Hence if the municipal company sells you your requirements at 10 cents a month cheaper than is now being done, the 1,000 kilowatt-hour plant would have to produce it more cheaply than the million-watt plant can do it."

The editor of this paper knew very well that the Iowa Supreme Court has declared many times that under no circumstances could this be done. In the case of *Wyatt* v. *The Town of Manning*, for example, the Iowa Supreme Court stated:

"This is true because the indebtedness contemplated by sections 6134–d1 and 6134–d2 is expressly declared not to constitute a general obligation or be payable in any manner from taxation, or in any other method, except that provided in said sections. Also, section 6134–d2 expressly provides that under no circumstances shall the city in any manner be liable by reason of failure of the net earnings being sufficient for the payment provided in the contract. No taxpayer, therefore, could ever be called upon to pay taxes to discharge the obligation."

The Iowa law has been adjudicated so often that even the power company representatives admit in private that statements like that carried by the paper are ridiculous and false, yet the editor stooped so low as to abuse his privilege of freedom of the press in order to mislead the public.

Altogether about $5,000 was spent by the power company in advertising, general printing, and reprinting of advertisements appearing in the Oelwein Daily Register. Some of this publication activity was in the name of the power company and some in the name of the Oelwein citizens committee, a dummy organization set up for the power company by P. E. Magley, an ex-utility employee now living in Oelwein.

From April 8 to April 25 the Oelwein Daily Register was delivered free to Oelwein residents. The newspapers had a sticker attached carrying the following legend printed in red ink:

"COMPLIMENTARY

"For the next few weeks I will deliver the Oelwein Daily Register to you free."

This free delivery of the newspaper was, of course, to insure subjecting every Oelwein resident to the power company's propaganda.

FALSE ADVERTISEMENTS

(1) Publication of an opinion by Judge Fuller in the district court stating that "There might arise a situation where the city would be bound and obligated to pay by general taxes," a 5-year-old lower court opinion that has been revised by the Supreme Court on many occasions. This misrepresentation was repeated in every form possible.

(2) Advertisement from Chariton Herald stating there is "not an electric plant in Iowa today that has been built and paid for out of earnings." On investigation, the publication was found to have been made 7 years ago, just after the Iowa reserve-bond law was passed.

(3) False statements regarding the success of Iowa municipal plants in Muscatine, Mount Pleasant, Estherville, Waverly, Lennox, Cedar Falls, and many others. In each case the letters and operating statements received from these towns showed those ads to be false and that every one of these plants is a financial success today.

CAMPAIGN TO SMEAR THE ENGINEERS AND COUNCIL

Much of the advertising was directed at the engineers. One particular falsehood was hammered continuously in the advertising and in a well-directed whispering campaign. A typical advertisement of this character is presented below:

"We are asked to accept the figure of a profit of $57,000 plus on a municipal light plant being promoted by a promoting engineer, with a contract to pay him at least $23,050 plus. Let's stop, look, and listen before we turn on the green light.

"OELWEIN CITIZENS' COMMITTEE."

Both the power company and the newspaper were informed that the above was untrue. The engineers were to receive a fee which was as low or lower than any of the several bids received by the council from other engineering firms. The fee would only be $1,000 if the company gave the requested rate reduction and sold its distribution system to the city. The $23,000 figure was the maximum which the engineers were to receive regardless of the amount of work they did for the city. In spite of this the newspaper actually repeated the following in the personal column in a number of issues:

"Do you know that the city engineers will make $23,000 plus if they can promote a municipal light plant in Oelwein?"

Many citizens stated they voted "no" because they were told the whole thing was merely an attempt to get a $23,000 promotional fee.

A well-organized under-cover campaign was directed at the council. A former city official working for the power company insisted that he knew that an engine company was spending $10,000 to promote the light plant. The whispering campaign to smear the city council convinced certain voters that the councilmen were being bribed and that the council and not Oelwein would benefit from the plant.

The fact that the ballot contained a clause stating that the light-plant management be placed in the hands of a board of trustees to make sure that politics did not enter into the picture was submerged by the vast amount of misleading propaganda.

Such stories were spread as the one that "The State auditor was going to examine the city books and show corruption," a malicious fabrication with no foundation. It helped spread the germ of doubt.

It is noteworthy to record that the council contributed financially with the other prominent businessmen to finance the few leaflets and minor expenses of the campaign for the municipal plant. This fund, made up of voluntary contributions ranging from $1 to $25, amounted to less than $500, or about 1 percent of the money spent to defeat the municipal plant.

THE DEAL WITH THE RAILROAD

The Chicago & Great Western Railroad uses about one-third of the energy consumed in Oelwein. At the time of the election campaign its contract with the Interstate Power Co. still had 2 years to run. The railroad company had been trying for some time to have its wholesale electricity rates reduced from the average of 1.4 cents per kilowatt-hour it was paying.

Up to the last few days of the election campaign the railroad officials indicated that they favored the municipal project. Undoubtedly this was because the engineers' report showed that the railroad could obtain energy cheaper from a municipal plant. One of the local officials of the railroad came out openly for the project.

On April 19, at an open mass meeting attended by more than 700 people, the local officials of the railroad company reversed their stand. They openly opposed the municipal plant. Investigation of this reversal in attitude brought to light the fact that the Interstate Power Co. reduced its rates to the railroad company even though the latter's power contract had 2 more years to run, and in return the railroad officials came out in opposition to the municipal project.

THE LABOR-UNION ATTACK

The employees of the Interstate Power Co. happen to be the only members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Oelwein. They took advantage of this to advertise under the name of their local, No. B949, in opposition to the plant. They also persuaded their international representative to sign a letter (which was printed and written in Oelwein but addressed in Austin, Minn.), from which the following quotations are taken:

"Local Union, No. B949, of I. B. E. W. has a union-shop agreement with the Interstate Power Co., and their wages and working conditions are exceptionally good. In fact, we have agreements with practically every large utility company in the country with equally good wages and conditions. We are very sorry to say that we have found it very hard to organize a politically controlled municipal plant, and nearly impossible to get an agreement of any kind. * * *

"We are asking your support in opposing the coming bond issue, because by so doing you are helping our members employed by the Interstate Power Co. keep their jobs and union conditions. With kindest personal regards, I am,

"Fraternally yours,

"J. HARRIS IGOU,
"International Representative, I. B. E. W."

The fact is that the council has definitely agreed to recognize union labor, pay its employees union-scale wages, and employ them under union conditions. This fact was advertised and proclaimed at open meetings, but the newspaper maliciously claimed it could not be accomplished.

As pointed out by Judson King in his paper on T. V. A. labor policies, the electric utilities are endeavoring to use labor as a tool to further their selfish interests. The above is an illustration of how widespread is this policy. In Oelwein the utility boasts of having hired union men to fight for them. These union men apparently do not realize that union labor has consistently endorsed municipal ownership of utilities. Here are a few of the many labor organizations that have affiliated themselves with the Public Ownership League of America: International Brotherhoods of Electrical Workers, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Order of Railway Conductors, International Order of Operating Engineers.

Furthermore the Iowa Federation of Labor endorses municipal ownership in its constitution and bylaws.

Despite this evidence, the local electrical union was coerced by the utility into asking all union workers of Oelwein to sacrifice their common good just to conserve the profits of a bankrupt company.

CAMPAIGN WORKERS

Between 200 and 300 people were hired to campaign against the municipal plant. These workers received various amounts, depending upon their local influence, ranging from $25 per week to $20 per day. Several prominent citizens were hired merely to allow their names and influence to be used against the municipal project. Some of these received from $200 to as much as $1,000 to submerge the city's interest to their personal gain. An important former city official, an influential employee of the railroad company, a well-known gas-station owner and ex-utility employee, a prominent attorney, and others worked actively for the power company.

The case of the railroad employee is of particular interest. He holds an important position in the local office and has a great deal to do with the hiring of railroad workers. He makes use of his "hiring and firing" prerogative to influence the votes of those under his control, and for his personal gain. No practice is more un-American than his use of the fear of job security and his taking advantage of those under his control.

It was generally known that anyone who wanted a job doing this kind of work for the power company got it. There appeared to be no limit to what was to be spent. A conservative estimate indicates that more than $35,000 was spent to defeat the city's best interests. Since a part of this money came from sources outside of Oelwein, the amount spent by Interstate Power Co. itself is indeterminable.

UNDERCOVER ORGANIZATION

In addition to the workers campaigning openly against the municipal plant, an undercover organization was erected during the last week, when the power company's straw vote indicated that sentiment was in favor of the plant. The undercover organization was headed by a prominent State politician, Mr. Martin Cooney, a resident of West Union, Iowa. He was hired for the specific purpose of "delivering the votes," and given a free hand to erect his own organization operating from its own headquarters.

Mr. Cooney's organization consisted of several main lieutenants who received $200 each and had unlimited expense accounts. On election day each hired as many assistants as his or her discretion indicated to be necessary. These assistants received $10 a day. It was learned from one of the lieutenants that the expenses of his group alone amounted to $1,200. What Mr. Cooney received for his services is not known.

Members of this group used every means of personal and private pressure on voters. Voters were even told that their ballots would be examined to check upon their vote. Un-American tactics from every point of view were used in this personal campaign, and appeals to every form of prejudice and coercion were used to cloud the main issue.

WHERE DID THE SLUSH FUND COME FROM?

The Federal Trade Commission investigation (S. Doc. No. 92) brought to light utility practices which shocked the Nation and all thinking people. That these practices have not stopped is evident from what has just taken place in Oelwein.

The power company's private boast is that it can raise even a bigger slush fund next time. From Waterloo, West Union, Des Moines, the money pours in. When will Congress recognize the existence of this evil and erect the machinery to correct these abuses, which undermine the very foundations of our democracy?

Respectfully,

OELWEIN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE,
D. DWYER, *President.*

Land of Hope and Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Richard L. Neuberger, of Portland, Oreg., entitled "Land of Hope and Promise."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My grandparents came westward in search of security and happiness. I am sure that many of yours did, too. Hope of a better life brought our predecessors across the plains. They were looking for freedom and stability. In large measure, they had the vision of President Jefferson, who said, as he sent Lewis and Clark on their historic exploration: "I view a great, free, and independent empire on the Columbia River."

The achievements of those people constitute our heritage. In this mighty region they began the civilization of which Jefferson dreamed. It is our obligation to carry on what they started. The buckskin-clad frontiersmen led by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the trappers and fur traders who came later on, the farm families in their covered wagons, the troopers of the old United States Cavalry, the laborers whose back-breaking toil laid the railroads across the mountains, the loggers and ranchers and miners of a few decades ago—all these people helped carve our present empire out of the wilderness. To us they have handed a matchless legacy. That legacy is the Pacific Northwest.

CAREFUL PLANNING NEEDED

Through this region the Columbia River twists and foams on its swift course to the sea. It has vast potential hydroelectric power. Its reaches could float countless ships and irrigate millions of acres of land. The slopes of the Cascade and Olympic ranges are mantled with thick stands of timber. The flats of the inland empire and the basins of eastern Oregon can feed herds of cattle and nourish fields of wheat. Idaho's valleys give life to rows of potatoes and lanes of fruit trees. Chinook salmon and other fish fill the rivers. The mountains are dotted with rich mineral deposits. Magnificent scenery extends from the Pacific Ocean to the crest of the Rockies.

These resources are ours. With them we can build and maintain a free, democratic society in which the aspirations of all our citizens are fulfilled. We can give reality to Thomas Jefferson's plans. We can insure the maximum of comfort and security for every man, woman, and child. Prof. Charles McKinley, of Reed College, in Portland, has urged that calmly, objectively, and wisely we appraise the possibilities of the Pacific Northwest and proceed to develop them. In that way, and not by any harum-scarum methods, can we realize the full worth and value of the four great States which comprise this region—Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and Montana.

AN IMPREGNABLE AMERICA

We live now in a world in crisis. No discussion of the Columbia River Basin is complete without some analysis of the world around us. Here in America we must arm for defense. President Roosevelt has presented a defense program to the Nation. It should be supported. We must be ready to resist successfully any possible attack against our native land. Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, has said this country can be made impregnable. That is what we must do. The borders of the United States should be barred to any hostile force. The people want this accomplished. They have patriotically and unselfishly urged that higher taxes be levied to help pay for the new weapons of defense. They are willing to make sacrifices to defend the Nation.

The President has asked for 50,000 airplanes. If that many airplanes are required to protect America, they should be constructed. The assembly line should be geared up. We must be ready to repulse any invasion, whether that invasion threatens the stern uplands of the Pacific Northwest or the gentle meadows of the Tennessee Valley. We should prepare for every emergency. And, as Collier's magazine has suggested, we ought to have arms rather than alarms. A great country preparing to defend its shores is no place for fright or fanaticism. Our independence was won in 1776 by men who were level-headed, not hot-headed.

AMERICA FIRST

"Why not face the basic military and economic fact," asked the United States Senate Committee on Naval Affairs several weeks ago, "that it is not within our power or means to create military or naval establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting their wars to this hemisphere? Why not face the fact that American armed forces cannot force permanent peace on a warring world, but that we can maintain peace in our part of the world? If we realize that the important causes of war are in human minds and emotions; that force cannot change materially human nature; give up the illusion that American armed force can bring permanent peace to a warring world and confine our military objectives to the defense of this country, we shall find that our problem of national defense becomes relatively simple."

The Naval Affairs Committee which made that statement consists of prominent Democrats such as DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, and HOMER T. BONE, of Washington, and prominent Republicans such as JAMES J. DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, and HIRAM JOHNSON, of California. They had the benefit of the expert testimony of admirals, fleet commanders, naval technicians, warship designers, and military observes. The statement they made deserves consideration on our part. We also should consider the advice of Jefferson, who said that the countries of Europe "are nations of eternal war." Our first thought should be for the United States of America. This is a time of crisis. Other countries think first of themselves. We should place American interests uppermost.

"FIFTH COLUMNS" MUST BE PUT DOWN

Just as we must defend our Republic against enemies from without so must we safeguard it against enemies from within. In Europe we have seen nations betrayed by spies, traitors, and saboteurs. The "fifth column" has no place in America. Our Government must crack down on groups which owe allegiance to governments other than the Government of the United States. America should not tolerate persons or organizations who want to open us to the inroads of dictatorship and totalitarianism. Our liberties should not be granted men and women who give their loyalty to the swastika of Nazi Germany or the hammer and sickle of Soviet Russia. Fascists and Communists are traitors to the United States.

But let us be sure that no innocent people are persecuted in this drive against traitors. Self-appointed vigilantes do not constitute the American way of doing things. D. E. Nickerson, secretary of the Oregon State Federation of Labor, has pointed out, "Complete suppression of free speech and wholesale witch hunting would make for a condition in which the "fifth column" would thrive. Also it would provide the opportunity for total liquidation of the labor movement." Mr. Nickerson's words find echo in a recent declaration by Senator LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, whom President Roosevelt has just appointed to the Federal judiciary for this district: "Freedom of thought and freedom of speech, with the resulting duties of making up our minds honestly and courageously, are at the very heart of the faith in democracy."

NO WARTIME PERSECUTION

Like Mr. Nickerson and Senator SCHWELLENBACH and every other patriotic American, I want the "fifth column" and other subversive forces rounded up and punished. But I want this done by our law-enforcement agencies—the United States attorney's office, the G-men, the local police force, the sheriff, the Secret Service, the Army and Navy intelligence corps—and not by any mobs. The World War furnished us some sad experiences with fanaticism and high emotions. Senator Harry Lane, of Oregon was one of the few people who said the World War would not make the world safe for democracy. He maintained that American participation in the war was a grave and tragic mistake.

Senator Lane had been a distinguished mayor of the great city of Portland. He was a leader of the Democratic Party in the Northwest. His grandfather, Gen. Joseph Lane, had been the first Territorial Governor of the Oregon country, which then included all of this vast region. Senator Lane was as patriotic and devoted to American institutions as any man who ever breathed. Richard Montague, an illustrious Portland lawyer, described Senator Lane as a man with "an ingrained love of humanity." Yet because he opposed America's entrance into the World War, Senator Lane was denounced as a traitor to his country. He was called a Benedict Arnold. He was burned in effigy. No epithet was too foul to be hurled at him. His great heart broke under this storm of abuse.

My city is not proud of that episode. Each year many citizens of Portland gather at Senator Lane's grave and pay tribute to his memory. This year Paul R. Kelty, former editor of the Oregonian, said that the memory of Senator Lane had become a symbol of greatness. In Montana, at the time Senator Lane was being condemned in Oregon, BURTON K. WHEELER was under suspicion because he would not allow the United States attorney's office in that State to be used for persecuting people. We now can understand how shameful such suspicion was. Senator WHEELER is one of the most notable Members of the United States Senate, and has demonstrated his patriotism and Americanism on many occasions.

STAND FIRM FOR FREEDOM

We in the Pacific Northwest have the heritage of great resources and an expansive, inspiring homeland. But the most precious heritage of every American citizen is liberty. That liberty is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. A little girl in Ohio has just won an essay contest on the Bill of Rights sponsored by the American Legion in her State. Let me read you something she wrote in that prize-winning essay:

"I am especially thankful for the first amendment. As long as that amendment plays the part it now plays in the Government of the United States, I need fear no man. For that first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, 'the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for the redress of grievances.' "

Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Oregonian, has said that if the people of the dictator-dominated countries of Europe could learn what was actually happening in the world the dictators who dominate those countries would fall. Freedom and liberty are the keys to democracy. We must recognize that, because men long ago at Bunker Hill and Yorktown won freedom and liberty, our responsibility has not entirely ceased. We must defend the liberty which those men won. We must recognize that whenever any individual in our country, no matter how humble he may be, loses his liberty, that the liberty of all of us is in danger. The Bill of Rights must be defended and made a living force. The collapse of freedom in the rest of the world should make us all the more sensitive to threats to freedom here.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

In accepting an award from the Nation magazine for her "distinguished service in the cause of American social progress," Mrs. Roosevelt recently said, "We must keep democracy and must make it mean a reality to more people." The President echoed his wife's words in the fireside talk in which he declared that the crisis across the Atlantic must not drag us entirely away from our problems at home. We must not become so preoccupied with events on other continents that we forget or neglect vital considerations right here. And that is where I come back to the problems facing the Pacific Northwest.

In my community of Portland there are certain local problems. I think they should be solved. I hope I can help solve them. The firemen, the men who protect homes and businesses, need an adequate pension system. Their employment is perilous and risky. Several weeks ago two men perished in the line of duty. The firemen and their families are entitled to decent financial protection. Until that protection is provided, the Portland fire department has a wide gap in its equipment. Pensions for the men are as important as hook-and-ladder trucks.

EDUCATION: CORNERSTONE OF PROGRESS

The late Arnold Bennett Hall, president of the University of Oregon, used to say, "Our children come this way but once." He meant that understaffed schools and colleges were direct blows at the welfare and destiny of our young people. My State has educational problems which have to be met. The teachers want their tenure law maintained. They do not want it whittled away by crafty administration. They demand and need security in their profession. Does any American wants his or her children taught by teachers whose jobs are insecure? Teachers also want academic freedom. They want the liberty that is the right of every citizen. They do not want local busybodies infringing their prerogatives.

I also believe that tuition fees in the State institutions of higher education are too high in Oregon. There is no reason why the poor man's son or daughter should have to stop his or her education when high school is completed. The children of the poor and rich alike should be able to attend college. I think the son of a truck driver has as much right to become a physician or a lawyer or a journalist as the son of a bank president. I hope the time will come when college educations will be available to as many young people as grade- and high-school educations are now. That would be a worth-while extension of democracy.

JOBS ARE AS IMPORTANT AS WARSHIPS

Dreadnoughts, howitzers, airplanes, torpedoes, rifles, bayonets—these are not the only defenses of democracy. There are others. Schools, playgrounds, old-age pensions, dams, rich farms, ample pay checks, good working conditions, prosperous businesses, thriving factories—these, too, are bulwarks of freedom. Artillery does comparatively little good if behind it the people are discontented and demoralized. But a free people, living in security and comfort, enjoying democracy and a homogeneous culture, is a line of defense which stands against invasion and aggression like a band of iron and steel.

Barbarous war lords are abroad in the world today. We must rim our coasts with fortresses and dot our oceans with mighty naval squadrons. But we must also find work for people at home. We must see to it that our aged citizens get larger old-age pensions than the pittance they are receiving now. We must see to it that the dinner tables of the Nation's families groan under platters of green vegetables, rich dairy products, and fresh fruits. We have plenty in America for everyone, if only we organize our production and distribution properly. In a region like the Pacific Northwest, for example, there are countless acres which can be put to work growing food for the people of the United States.

POVERTY IS THE ALLY OF DICTATORSHIP

Never for one second should we forget that the dreadful and unspeakable Hitler, whose cruelties have shocked mankind, came to power amidst the poverty and collapse of post-war Germany. Hunger and misery were his confederates. The German people were desperate. Malnutrition plagued child and man alike. This was fertile soil for the Nazis' seed of hate. Fascism flourished like a weed. Communism and the brutal Stalin seized dominance in Russia because the people had been oppressed by the ruthless regime of the Czars. We can keep these evil systems out of America by providing justice, security, and liberty for everyone. Happy citizens do not give hostage to tyranny.

"If we have a contented agriculture," Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS once said, "if those who labor are happy and prosperous, if those who toil get a fair recompense for their labor, if the farms of our country are given the modern advantages of modern times, including the blessings of electricity, then the dangers of communism and dictatorship disappear and fade away as the dews of heaven vanish before the morning sun." You need not accept every word of Senator NORRIS' statement to agree that good wages, adequate education, and ample old-age pensions are part of our defense program against the menace of dictatorship.

FORTRESSES OF PROGRESS

You here in the city of Spokane are interested in Grand Coulee Dam, just as we in Portland and in the State of Oregon are interested in Bonneville. To me these projects symbolize forts in the service of democracy. Bonneville is improving navigation on the great river which is so vital to our region. It also is generating millions of kilowatt-hours of low-cost electricity. Grand Coulee will reclaim and irrigate 1,200,000 acres of dry land. It also will be the biggest single source of hydroelectric power on earth. These things mean comfort and security. President Roosevelt told the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy that he hoped the Grand Coulee project would provide new farm homes for 500,000 Americans from the Dust Bowl, people now destitute and forsaken who could become useful, industrious citizens again if given the opportunity.

I have recently read a speech delivered in the House of Representatives by one of my fellow Democrats, the distinguished Member of Congress from Spokane, CHARLES H. LEAVY. He pointed out that Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more reclamation and land development than any other President. For many years leading men in the Far West have emphasized the importance of diverting water to thirsty acres which need only moisture to bloom. William E. Borah backed irrigation projects for three decades, and now D. WORTH CLARK, his successor as senior Senator from Idaho, carries on where Borah left off.

It is not a partisan proposition in any sense. President Roosevelt, a Democrat, put over the Bonneville Dam undertaking, and Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, the extremely popular leader of the Republicans in the Senate, was the main congressional sponsor of the enterprise. In fact, as the President signed the Bonneville authorization he remarked, "I've got to give 'CHARLIE MAC' his dam." This spirit should prevail among us all. Men of good will should support worth-while objectives, regardless of what political party inaugurated them. I remember meeting a newspaper editor in the East who had read an article I wrote in Harper's magazine about Bonneville and Grand Coulee. He said he thought those projects were utterly worthless because they were stuck out in a lot of wilderness. Of course, he was wrong, but how much better it would be if we in the West and our fellow Americans across the country tried to understand the problems and situations and hopes of each other.

TOLERANCE AND BROTHERHOOD

In these days of crisis we must be as cooperative and helpful as possible. This is an hour for brotherhood and understanding. One of the great stories in the history of the Pacific Northwest concerns the plight of the Lewis and Clark expedition toward the end of the summer of 1805. The frontiersmen were in the mountains. Their food supplies were running low. Ahead of them lofty ridges loomed like a huge, crenelated battlement. They had gone too far to turn back safely. Their solitary hope lay ahead. And their only hope of food lay in establishing friendly relations with the Shoshone Indians.

With the last rations rattling in the bottom of their knapsacks, they had to get help. Captain Lewis and two of the strongest men, one of them a blacksmith from Kentucky, trudged on in advance of the main party. Several times they saw smoke signals hanging ominously on the horizon, but they never met the Indians. Lewis now realized that it was find the Shoshones or die. At each campfire the weary explorers left beads and other trinkets as tokens of their friendship. And finally when the last of their food was gone on the crest of Lemhi Pass, near the headwaters of the Snake River, they encountered the Indians.

A FRIEND IN THE WILDERNESS

Over the crest of the pass rode 60 mounted Shoshones led by young Chief Cameahwait. The chief saw a strange sight. Toward him tottered a lean man with white skin, a man in ragged clothes. In his hand the white man carried a strange banner, a flag of red, white, and blue with stars and stripes. The chief had never seen a white man before, neither had he seen the flag of the new republic along the Atlantic coast. Captain Lewis staggered up to him. The other 2 frontiersmen stood in the rear.

The captain held out his hand in friendship. "Tabba bone! Tabba bone!" (white man, white man) he said.

The chief of the Shoshones clutched his spear. Now, if ever, the fate of American expansion westward hung in the balance. At a signal from the young chief, the Indians could have wiped out the explorers. The course of history might have been changed. But the Indian leader smiled. He slipped from his pony and embraced the ragged, hungry Lewis.

"Ah hi e! Ah hi e!" (I am much pleased, I am much pleased) the warrior said. And he and his tribesmen gave the white men food and horses, which enabled them to cross the mountains to the sea.

Whenever we of today are inclined to be hostile and inhospitable to the drought refugees, I think of that feathered savage of long ago whose hospitality made it possible for our flag to be carried through to the shores of the Pacific. We detest and despise Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin because brotherhood is foreign to their nature. They are men of hate and cruelty. Let us here in America cling to the moral and spiritual values which separate us from the welter of strife that is engulfing Europe and Asia. People must have faith. Our faith should be expressed not in bitterness and jealousy, but in understanding and tolerance and democracy. Long ago brave men and women crossed the Atlantic in tiny ships and landed on a hostile shore. They did so to escape the eternal hatreds shaking Europe. To safeguard their hard-won gains, we must keep that hatred out of the New World.

LAND OF HOPE AND PROMISE

Here in the Pacific Northwest we have an opportunity which confronts no other part of America. Garet Garrett recently described in the Saturday Evening Post the vast and progressive changes which had taken place in the automobile industry in a period of 20 years. I think that changes like that will characterize the forthcoming 20 years in the Pacific Northwest. We are on the threshold of great changes. President Roosevelt wired the 1939 session of the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission: "In your area, through planning, we can avoid some of the mistakes and wasteful exploitation of resources that have caused such serious problems in other parts of the country." The future of the region is bright, indeed. We are not confronted with the broken-down economy which blights many parts of the East and the South. We have a new land, a promised land, a land ready to be developed and improved.

I think all of us here share that hope. We want the Northwest to be a citadel of democracy and security. We are willing to help defend our region and our country. We share a common distaste for the shameless dictatorships overseas, and we share a common determination to keep those dictatorships out of America, whether their encroachments are by stealth or open aggression. And we want to keep our own institutions democratic. We want to respect law and order, and we are against mobs. William D. Browne, the chairman of the American Legion's radical activities committee in Oregon, has said his group will try to get information on any subversive groups in the State, but that it will leave law enforcement to law-enforcing agencies. This shows that people are going to be on guard against emotions and excitement which would destroy the Constitution even while pretending to defend it. We must not burn down the house to roast the pig, as did the gentleman in Mr. Lamb's famous tale.

In the United States we can extend economic security to all citizens, and we can keep the democratic way of life. This opportunity confronts the whole Nation, but most particularly it confronts the final frontier, the Pacific Northwest. The future is one of promise for us, if only we remain level headed and brave. Then we can maintain and protect here a civilization which would make those frontiersmen and migrants of long ago proud of the way we have preserved our heritage.

"I view," said Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, "a great, free and independent empire on the Columbia River."

War Propaganda 1917 and 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, under permission granted me, I present for publication in the RECORD one of the articles

referred to by me at that time as being part of a series entitled "Twenty-five Years Ago."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING THE PROFESSORS

"Enlisted for the duration of the war."

That was the view of the English propaganda directors during the last World War of certain American college and university professors and presidents. They admitted that they had to get them in the "proper frame of mind." This was done by personal contact with English scholars, lecturers, and others, as well as by "the printed word." Books, pamphlets, and all types of literature were sent to these individuals to show them the English side. Once these persons were won over, they became the most active and most zealous propagandists "for the cause."

The Allies were so successful in this drive that they crowed about their victory in the schools.

Again, in 1939 and 1940, the college and university professors and presidents are being won over for English propaganda for the duration of this war. They have become so active that their intervention viewpoint met student reaction. But the work of these individuals was not alone worth while to the viewpoint of students, but particularly for their quoting purpose in newspapers and their ability of writing books and pamphlets.

For instance, when the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies wanted a book, they easily got volunteers in the collegiate circle to aid in the writing of that book. In this way both the inspired propaganda group and the professors were supposed to gain. Many presidents of scholastic institutions have been used as "window dressing" for this committee, a known intervention outfit. Such names as Butler, of Columbia; Seymour, of Yale; Conant, of Harvard; Kingdon, of New York University, are found.

The reasons for activity on the part of professors and presidents are numerous. Some have actually owed allegiance to the Empire of Great Britain. Some have desired to get in with the financial circles, whom they felt would be interested in intervention and some of whom they knew to be active on their college boards and active in their contributions to the school.

LORD LOTHIAN AND COLLEGES

Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador, had made many contacts with these professors and presidents. He was Secretary of the Rhodes Trust and had made approximately 15 trips to the United States as a part of his work with the Rhodes money. He knew President Frank Aydelotte, of Swarthmore, for instance. Aydelotte is on the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. He was a Rhodes scholar, being in Oxford many years ago. In 1918, he was named American secretary of the Rhodes trustees. Four years later, he was named a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation. This is just one of the many contacts Lord Lothian had in this country with the important "intelligentsia." Editors of important papers were Rhodes scholars. For instance when one of them had written a strong editorial for more active interest in the war, the Round Table, founded by Lothian in London, spoke of his being a Rhodes scholar.

However, this point shall be discussed at length in a later article.

Records show in the last war that many college professors were calling for war long before our entrance. Again, the same drive is being made. Thirty individuals, including many professors, have already called for our declaration of war against Germany.

They want to "educate the educators" for our involvement.

But, let us look at the activities in 1914–17:

"BEGIN WITH PROFESSORS"

Sir Gilbert Parker, who did the propaganda work for the English Government preceding the entrance of the United States in the last World War, said:

"We had reports from important Americans constantly and established association by personal correspondence with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors, and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population."

John Masefield said at that time:

"A big application of the idea of the Rhodes scholarships along with public mark of thanks to Yale or Harvard for their sons who have served the Allies might be of great value" (the effort to establish a belief in the identity of interests of Great Britain and the United States).

James Duane Squires, in his informative book, British Propaganda at Home and in the United States, says:

"According to David Lloyd George, almost the first thing that Parker did after assuming his new duties was to make a careful analysis of American press opinion on the war, following that with an equally thorough investigation into American opinion in the colleges and universities. From other sources we know that on the basis of these investigations and on a careful reading of the American Who's Who a mailing list was prepared. It was this mailing list containing thousands of names which was the basis for the distribution of Wellington House propaganda in the United States. The list was complete about the middle of December 1914, and mailing operations began immediately.

"To the persons on this mailing list, and to others whose names were subsequently added, there was sent the propaganda literature which the men in Wellington House believed would be most useful. Sometimes the books and pamphlets had enclosed with them suave and skillfully phrased letters. The enclosure cards which came with the books carried only Sir Gilbert's name and address, never any mention of Wellington House. The whole appearance was that of a kindly, friendly Englishman, who more or less was doing only his simple duty by his many American friends in sending them this literature and inviting their observations on it or on the war in general. Sometimes, to vary the thing, the enclosure cards apparently came from the authors of the books and pamphlets, especially when the authors were well-known men like J. W. Headlam, Viscount Bryce, or John Buchan. But this was generally a ruse de guerre. They usually came from the same place—Wellington House."

PROPAGANDA IN THE SCHOOLS

Prof. H. C. Peterson, who did a real job of research in his excellent book, Propaganda for War, writes:

"Starting as early as August 1914 prominent men of America hastened to join a cause that was intellectually fashionable. Industrialists and financiers, one by one, took up the cudgels for the belligerents with whom they were doing so much profitable business. Preceding them came the imposing array of American society women. They swung into action with great gusto—at long last finding a cause worthy of their talents. Politicians, with the instinct of the chameleon, caught and reflected the popular shades of opinion. College professors and school teachers repeated with a great show of wisdom the arguments which had originated in Wellington House or in la maison de la presse. Close behind the educators came the ministers, and before long the American clergy was preaching a holy war, enlisting God and the Bible in the cause which newspapers told them was righteous. Just as strange as the enlistment of the clergy was the enlistment of liberals throughout the country. Usually such individuals spend most of their time talking about the value of peace. When it came down to hard realities, a large number of these people was found on the popular side assisting in establishing a climate of opinion favorable to war.

"By February 1916 Sir Gilbert Parker was able to report that the articulate people throughout the United States had joined the Allies. The success of the British propagandists corroborates the statement that there are no limits to the field of propaganda. The only restrictions are on the manner of approach. The wealthy can be persuaded to support a cause by getting them to invest their money in it; educators can be controlled simply through controlling their reading matter; liberals and preachers are the easiest of all to enlist by the mere introduction of an idealistic flavor to the propaganda."

"GOT IN TOUCH WITH THE UNIVERSITIES"

Sir Edward Grey wrote in September 1914 that he was sending over J. M. Barrie and A. E. W. Mason "to meet people, particularly those connected with the universities, and explain the British case as regards this war and our view of the issues involved."

It will be recalled that Masaryk came to this country in 1916, and the British report as to his work states that he "got in touch with the universities, particularly with historians and economists."

The central committee of National Patriotic Organizations kept up the drive for the professors, reporting that "practically every professor of every faculty has received * * * private packets of literature in his own language."

It had its effect. Yet Senators who voted for war have tried to say that propaganda had nothing to do with our entrance in that conflict.

Many of us get letters about giving aid. Here is a letter that may be of interest:

"We owe to the Allies whatever moral support and financial assistance it is in the power of this Nation to give. * * * Let us enthusiastically approve supplying the enemies of Germany with financial aid and munitions of war and resist with all our moral strength those who would place an embargo on munitions."

But that is not a letter received in 1939 or 1940. That is a letter written by Josiah Royce, a professor of Harvard University, on January 30, 1916.

The same call is heard today, except in different voices.

The 1940 edition of Josiah Royce may be found in a number of instances. In picking up a New York paper, one could find this heading:

"Historians ask United States to extend Allies all aid."

The article continues that we should give the Allies all aid as advocated in 1916.

Or in the Philadelphia paper one reads this:

"Professors urge help for Allies."

It notes that certain professors in certain Pennsylvania institutions want economic aid given as was advocated 24 years ago. The same type of aid is desired and the same moral front is named as the cause in 1940 as was the case in 1916.

PORTER SARGENT TELLS HOW

Porter Sargent, in his interesting book What Makes Lives, has this to say about universities in the war-propaganda drive:

"HOW COME?

"What does it matter if the universities are hotbeds of war? Only a small percentage of our population goes to the universities. But our lower schools follow their lead, our teachers are trained by their cloistered professors. So it does matter.

"The universities are good propagandists in their own right. They promote themselves as searchers of the truth and preservers of the truth—handing down the wisdom of the ages, they tell us. Actually they are preservers of privilege and the past—time-binders, not time-annihilators.

"How does this come about? Our college presidents, carefully selected after observation, as safe men, are then further conditioned.

For funds they look to the financiers who guard the great reservoirs of accumulated capital. University presidents and other college officials sit on the boards of these foundations with the big men of finance, with agents of the British Empire. They become infected, conditioned, immunized, and intimidated. They have to protect and keep open the sources of income, lest deficits declare them failures. This year their subservience is the same as 22 years ago; they are ready to sacrifice and waste the human resources of the country to preserve the present status in world dominion. This attitude is absorbed by the faculty who look forward to receiving pensions and who must find favor with the administration.

" 'Is this situation due to the moronic ignorance or the satanic machinations of our trustees, presidents, and deans?' asks William Morton Wheeler, who had the most comprehensive mind that has dwelt in Harvard academic shades. 'Is it the fault of the students? Obviously not, for no country produces a greater and more sweetly docile mass of pedagogical cannon fodder'."

STUDENTS DON'T WANT WAR

This is not an indictment against the entire profession but it is a sincere indictment against some within the profession.

One student has written me, "Professors may want war but students don't." I do not say that professors want war—that is, the majority of them—but their statements and speeches are given much space in the intervention newspapers and magazines.

The intervention professor finds an easy access to the intervention newspaper.

Shall the boys of 1960 read of the professors wanting war in 1940 as some of us read of the professors in 1916?

STUDENTS VERSUS PRESIDENT CONANT

A very interesting comparison of the ideas of the students as compared to a president was shown in the story from the Boston Transcript. It quotes from the editorial of Crimson, the Harvard undergraduate paper, as it discusses the prointervention views of President Conant. The Transcript says:

"CRIMSON BITTER AT CONANT FOR ALLIED CAUSE ESPOUSAL—EDITORS PUT HIM AND OTHER COLLEGE HEADS IN 'ROAD GANG' TRYING TO BUILD HIGHWAY TO WAR

"The undergraduate editors of the Harvard Crimson today unleashed a bitter attack on President James B. Conant and other American university and church leaders who have publicly espoused the English and French cause in the European war.

"Asserting that such statements are tending to drive the country into conflict despite its resolve to stay out, the Crimson editors state that 'it is especially disquieting that leaders of youth, the college presidents, should have spoken so scon and so openly the words that may send to destruction the lives in their charge. They are earning an unenviable place in the road gang that is trying to build for the United States a superhighway straight to Armageddon.'

"While singling out for special comment Bishop William T. Manning, of New York; President Charles Seymour, of Yale; and President Conant, the Crimson editorial said: 'These examples are only the most prominent among many that could be pointed out.'

"Presidents Conant and Seymour have separately issued public statements affirming their belief that defeat of the English and French would be disastrous to the world.

"Such statements the Crimson editors described as a 'copious stream of propaganda coming in by the back door.'

"Use lever of prestige

"The editors said:

" 'Within the past few weeks the leaders of religion and education in this country have spoken with an amazing unanimity in strong support of the Allies. If vehemence is any test of sincerity, these men mean what they say. * * *

" 'Still they are not justified in using the lever of their prestige to force the unwilling door of public opinion. The great majority of Americans are determined to stay out of war, and the statements of leading ministers and educators can only tend to drive them into it. * * *

" 'This propaganda is far more dangerous than any emanating from overseas for the very reason that it is accepted as the gospel truth by many more people. The lofty positions of these men give their words weight beyond their worth, so that they should give long and serious thought to the subject before making any statements.' "

The students die in war

This brought from the Boston Herald a very interesting editorial:

"Those who may die

"Undergraduates frequently chide their elders. More often than not their chidings are ignored or their presumptions are smugly set aside as adolescent insolence. We are not certain, however, that either device will serve in the case of the Harvard Crimson's challenge to its own president and other intellectual leaders, as well as religious spokesmen.

"The Crimson editors have charged that many prominent educators and religious leaders are using the great weight of their position to jeopardize American neutrality by publicly and boldly espousing the Allied cause.

"Not only does the Crimson's challenge possess cogency as to its logic, but, in this case, the undergraduates have a special right to be heard, since they are among those who would be called upon first to give their lives if American neutrality should be broken down.

"The Crimson singled out President Conant, of Harvard, President Charles Seymour, of Yale, and Bishop William T. Manning, of New York as typical of prominent men who are using the 'lever of their prestige to force the unwilling door of public opinion.'

"There is a strong element of the ironic in the Crimson's remonstrance. Youth is generally under criticism for its impetuosity. But upon this occasion we find the tables reversed and the undergraduates in the role of the moderate ones. While their academic elders rushed forward and demanded the immediate repeal of the arms embargo, junior has said, 'Not so fast.' While the scholarly men of years and experience have grown somewhat panicky about distant and speculative dangers, junior has cautioned: 'What dangers, and, anyway, what about the dangers here at home if America goes to war or becomes war-minded?'

"We aren't so sure but what the undergraduates win the first decision for sobriety and realism. A nation should be able to look to its intellectual and spiritual leaders for moderating counsel to support, not destroy the neutral temper of a great nation bent on staying at peace. We are inclined to agree with the Crimson that there have been notable failures in this respect.

"To us Walter F. Downey, State commissioner of education, has mapped out a saner and more sober policy for the schools. Recognizing that America is a melting pot in which pressures for partisanship will be strong, he has urged that parents and teachers help in spreading neutrality in the thoughts and hearts of the children.

"Of course, many educators and religious leaders may believe that neutrality is a bad thing for America, but we are happy to match their opinion by that of the group, which, in the final analysis, will have to bear the cruelest blows of war and national bankruptcy, should unneutrality go to its logic extreme of war. We believe that the direct interest of the undergraduates makes them equal in importance as a pressure group to their teachers, for all their prestige."

Future articles will trace the foreign network in the schools, in the newspapers, in the societies, and in our everyday life. Some of our most active propagandists are American volunteers, "enlisted for the duration of the war."

Work To Do To Find a Way for the World To Trade Again

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 4, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, after the high levels to which we have been elevated by the inspirational addresses we have heard today, it may seem rather workaday to come back and suggest that this Congress has some jobs to do.

Since it is apparent that the Congress is responding to the demand of the people that we shall not dissolve but shall stay here in the job, I would call attention to the fact that one of the major jobs that should be undertaken by this Congress is the settlement of the problem of international exchange. Anyone who thinks about the fundamental causes of the present conflict and of the way out must realize that if the world is to achieve real peace again there must be a sound basis for international exchange.

I think the President is thinking seriously about this matter, but, with many others, I have some doubts that a cartel or some such plan to handle the surpluses of two hemispheres is the answer. When we have been unable to solve the problem of surpluses in this country alone, after spending five and one-half billion dollars, it is clear that it will be a difficult task to handle the export crops of two continents. If we cannot buy and dispose of our own surpluses in cotton and wheat, how can we finance the disposition of the products of two continents? The answer is that we must find a way to restore world trade.

We now have something over 70 percent of the world's gold, something over $19,000,000,000 worth of gold in this country. This Congress should seriously address itself to the task of restoring a medium of international exchange. To me that calls for legalizing methods for the possession and use of gold in this country and taking steps to achieve a means of international exchange that will make it possible for the world to function again in a normal way.

Challenge to the Faithful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE E. PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] before the Interfaith Conference in the Temple of Religion, New York World's Fair, on Sunday, June 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Against the wreckful seige of battering days stand the bruised spiritual ramparts of the earth. Hard-pressed and blood-stained are the thinned and thinning ranks of the defenders of the souls of men. Earth is in revolt against heaven. Body demands the mastery of spirit. Matter would enslave mind. Death presses her relentless struggle for victory over life.

Who can explain the paradox of this age? Hunger, when food has been most plentiful; despair, when man has achieved his greatest hopes; God denounced when His blessings have been most immeasurable.

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. He has wrought His miracles into man and through man into the magic earth. His grace has sweetened the waters of life. His love has bound the cruel wounds of hate and strife. Through faith in Him, man has found his way through darkness to an abiding day; His lights are on the towers of time. Yet in this, of all days, pagan gods come back to the seats of power and men fall down before graven images.

Justice is ravaged; mercy scorned; pledges are but the crushed remnants of broken faith. Might walks upon the prostrate body of right. The blood of innocent men flow like flooded rivers. The wail of the widowed, the cry of the orphaned, the anguish of the cringing refugee, falls swordlike upon the ear of the earth.

Man, dethroned from his dignity and debased, his spirit choked, his hopes crushed, his dreams shattered, staggers to his dungeon or his grave. Beauty scarred and scorned, signs out of her last dungeon. Honor is stabbed and slain. Verily it would seem "the earth is given into the hand of the wicked."

But God is still in His Heaven and He has a throne in the hearts of men who yet live. The spirit is not dead. However cruel the blow to the body, it cannot destroy the soul of man. "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." However often she is driven out, justice ever returns upon the wings of God's law to her righteous abode.

It is this faith in the rightness of things which brings us here today. In this edifice is the evidence of man's reverence, the symbolism of the sentiment which has bound together all faiths, all races, all eras, in a fraternity of the spirit. From such an impulse has come the ever upward look of men's eyes. By such invisible forces have men, through the ages, been sustained, brought forward over the hills and the hazards of time. To religion has the needle of the compass of men's hearts ever turned for guidance and assurance. No one has ever followed this guide without gratitude to the great Mariner.

Our world is beset by total war. It is a war fiercely fought upon every front. Assault is made not only upon forts and fortresses, upon frontiers and borders, not only upon imbedded guns and pillboxes, not only upon soldiers in the field; but none the less bitterly does the attack rage against soldiers' homes, loved ones. Sharpest salient of all is against men's wills, men's minds, even men's souls. The "blitzkrieg" is no less fierce against the citadels of the spirit than of the earth.

The fallen angel has challenged the authority of God in His heaven. The demons from below, unabashed, dispute their doctrines with the angels from above. Good and evil contend for mastery of the hearts of men. No premise upon which goodness rests escapes assault. No vice but dares to claim the name of virtue. The very foundations upon which the spiritual edifice of civilization has been built cracks under the pull of these gigantic forces of modern total war.

Things men thought settled by the struggle of immeasurable centuries are found no more secure against these weapons evil men now fight with than were the classically impregnable forts of the Maginot line to the dive bombers and the parachute troops.

This war between good and evil has an unexpected flank movement which respects neither tradition nor logic. This is a war of movement, ruthless, relentless, unimaginably sinister upon every front. The enemy, fantastically armed, is devlish, his energies coordinated with demoniacal thoroughness. Thrusting aside all restraints of tradition, principle, and sentiment, trampling upon all concepts which have marked the boundaries of men's thinking, daring what even the devils have never dared before, he hurls his unfeeling monsters against the hosts of Jehovah.

Surprise has been in the highway upon which a deep salient has been thrust into the ranks of right. Treason has done its part. The spirit, bulwark of our defense, long ago weakened by indulgence or doubt, untoughened by denial, has too often yielded at the first skirmish. Will, paralyzed by inertia, strangled by outworn traditions of strategy, bloodstained from the severed arteries of inspiration, has been a feeble commander.

Hence, the battle goes sorely against the hosts of the Lord.

All time for vacillation is over. The moment has come when men of good will everywhere must take their stand. Lip service to religion, morality, ethics, justice, is no longer more than sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

Those who are not with the spiritual forces of the world are against them. The trenches of Jehovah cannot be held by absent well wishers and sympathetic neutralists. When the monster of force, breathing destructive fire, raises his head to devour the fragile things of life—beauty, charity, mercy, love, virtue—these holy sentiments cannot be defended by spiritual midgets or moral isolationists. The battle of the Lord was never in history won save by the stalwart, the steadfast, the brave. No virtue was ever vindicated, no vice ever throttled but by bold challenge.

A generation of men has grown callous to the impact of spiritual stimuli. They have grown sordid in indulgence. Their moral armor is rusted. The treasurers of the upper world committed to their care, they have neglected. Much has already fallen into the hands of the enemy. This generation of trustees has not been faithful to its great trusts. It has not only defaulted in its obligations, it has cast aside the most challenging opportunity of all time. It is almost now too late to salvage from the wreckage enough to save intact the old structures we loved.

It is now time for all men to ask themselves what store they place in religion; what value they ascribe to a spiritual life; what are they willing to pay to maintain the freedom of the souls of men. It is now high time for men to answer to their own conscience the question whether they really do love God and place Him first in the heavens; whether they really do regard the dignity of human life as worth fighting for; whether they really mean the utterances of their lips that they will die before conscience may be made a slave and justice a mockery in the world.

Every man in private life, in the quiet moments when he communes with his own conscience, has to ask himself what he stands for; what his life is worth in the gold of eternal values. The way he answers that question even to his own conscience fixes the orbit of his whole life; the nature of the impress he makes upon the monuments of time. There are men who are satisfied with indifferent lives; who are not discontented with purposeless lives; who are not miserable with remorse from wasted talents; but such men are not in the halls of spiritual fame.

Nations alike have to ask themselves what they stand for; whether they have a soul; whether they think only of the fleshpots and not the flame upon the altars of God's church.

The immutable law of the spiritual world applies no less to the United States of America than to other nations or peoples. Citizenship in the kingdom of the spirit is conditioned upon unswerving loyalty to that kingdom and its interests. No nation, however great, whatever may have been the previous eminence of its service, can continue upon that roster, can stand among the soldiery of that realm, and shirk a soldier's call. America cannot claim the right to retain the right spiritual inheritance bequeathed by the sturdy soldiery of the past without being willing to defend it.

Every sentiment of religion, every precept of morality, every code of ethics, every plaintive appeal which comes through the strange medium of conscience to the ears of men cries out to the people of America to rededicate themselves to the eternal moral and spiritual values of the world to a brave, unashamed espousal of God's laws. The downtrodden, the oppressed, the crushed turn their faces toward us and be for the succor which good men should give. Whatever may be the national interest of the United States of America, whatever may be the practical limitations upon what she may do abroad, there is one immutable prophecy which I may lay down—that if we lose the militancy and the moral fervor of a crusading nation, if we lose our national soul, all else is but a fragile shell soon to be crushed in time's inexorable sweep.

Here in this temple of religion I pray that you have kindled anew the religious fires of a nation. I pray that you have quickened the consciences of a mighty people. I pray that you have touched the hearts of a just people. I pray that you have lifted the eyes of noble men and women, boys and girls, from the sordid things to the virtuous values of the world. I pray that you have opened the ears of the hosts of the Lord to the plaintive call of the suffering, the mute eloquence of the dead. I pray that from this majestic edifice there may go out a mystic current which shall vitalize those who are apathetic everywhere to a purposeful consecration.

I know that the light I have seen glow in the bruised faces of the beaten was real, and the fire I have seen burn in dying eyes was genuine, and the strong purpose I have seen surge into the face of God's warriors was inspired, so I know that those who defend the citadels of God shall not fight alone.

Keep Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] before the American Anti-War Crusade of the Keep Out of War Congress at the Auditorium Theater, Chicago, Ill., on June 30, 1940. This address was carried over a national hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I have seen war—I hate war," President Roosevelt said in his Chautauqua address in August 1936. I hated war then—and I haven't changed—I hate it now. That is why I am talking to this great audience tonight. That is why I am going to oppose the appointments of Colonel Knox to be Secretary of the Navy and Henry L. Stimson to be Secretary of War. That is why I have said publicly that I shall not hesitate to oppose any attempt to make my party the war party. That is why I have said that I will disavow any candidate who I believe may lead this country down the road to war. That is why I shall go on speaking and fighting to the end of my days against those policies and those actions and those men whom I believe wittingly or unwittingly would plunge this country into war.

In 1776, a little band of liberty-loving Americans declared their independence of European monarchy—their independence of Old World social and economic tyrannies. Under a written Constitution that guaranteed civil rights and justice, these Thirteen Colonies became the 48 United States of today. And in all that period of economic and geographic growth, we were tolerant, fair, just, and dedicated to the ideal of human liberty, and we progressed.

The United States is the last great democracy, and the stronghold of liberty, Christianity, and civilization. We may always be thus—if we remain free, tolerant, democratic, and at peace. War—the deadly enemy of liberty and democracy—rages in Europe and in Asia. We know something of its cost. We are resolved to avoid it—we are resolved to remain at peace and to escape bloody conflict.

Make no mistake about it, I am for preparedness, for building up our defenses, but I am opposed to participation in foreign wars. We want no pork barrel, or politically controlled expenditures of the money spent for defense.

Because you are for keeping out of foreign wars does not mean you have your heads in the sand. It means what President Roosevelt said in 1936—I quote:

"We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war."

That was my position then—that is my position now.

But a truly adequate national defense is dependent on more than armed might. Selfish economic and political forces can menace democracy and its institutions with as devastating a power as any "blitzkrieg" by Hitler. During this administration, the borders of social and economic justice have been extended. Still we have jobless workers—10,000,000 of them—and distressed farmers—it is their economic plight that constitutes more of a danger to the security of this Nation than any fancied or real "fifth column."

To men and women lacking food, clothing, or shelter, the grandeur and beauty of democracy is not clear. They will follow the demagogue who promises most—they are easy prey for the philosophies of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. They are not "fifth columnists"—they are not pro-Stalin or pro-Hitler—as some people who have never suffered the pangs of hunger would have you believe; they are pro-American, but their economic plight is a more real danger to the American way of life than any foreign agent.

Employed workers; a prosperous agriculture; sound business and industry—those will stop the internal growth of any "ism."

In a world gone mad—in a world where the nation with the most guns and bombs and tanks imposes its will on its less powerful neighbor—in such a world it would be obviously the height of folly to sit idly by, unprepared and defenseless. But let us examine this national-defense problem of ours realistically and with common sense.

Consider this: There is not a first-rate military or naval expert here or abroad who will say that this country can be successfully invaded from a military standpoint by any power or combination of powers who have to bring their troops across 3,000 miles of the Atlantic or 5,000 miles of the Pacific. The tragic experience of the Allies in attempting to land troops at Gallipoli is well remembered. More recent is Britain's vain effort to land troops in Norway.

Nazi bombers aren't flying over the Capitol and Nazi submarines aren't plowing through Lake Michigan—and they won't.

Many people believe that the defeat of the Allies would have a depressing effect on our economy. Undoubtedly, the United States would be forced to readjust its foreign trade. Any policy of national defense must encompass defense against economic penetration.

We cannot permit Nazi militarism to follow Nazi economic domination of this or any other nation in the Western Hemisphere. Barter trading employed by Germany is a serious challenge to our pan-American trade. It may become the economic foot in the South American political door. We, as a nation, pride ourselves on our efficiency and ingenuity. Recognizing the problem, we can and will find the solution. We are the richest nation in the world—we can tighten up our belts; we can work a little harder. Some of those who want to get us into war might eat a little less and still preserve democracy—and the lives of our boys.

The important thing about national defense is not to weaken our democratic structure from within in the name of saving America. This country will not be captured from without; it can be delivered to our enemies bloodlessly and almost without our knowing it if we shelve democracy on the sham pretext that in order to combat the totalitarian states we must ourselves become totalitarian.

Do not be misled by these interventionists. Intervention means war for us just as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow morning. And the cost of another war for us can no longer be measured in dollars or cents or even human misery or death and destruction.

Who can measure the economic and social losses incurred by war? Forget, if you can, the $45,000,000,000 cost of the war that was going to make the world safe for democracy; forget, if you can, the 126,000 American boys who were killed; forget, if you can, the 250,000 American boys, many of whom still lie in narrow cots in hospitals that dot our country, men who lie row on row, floor on floor, alive in body but dead in mind; forget, if you can, the hate and brutality and the retrogression of civilization that war brings to the human race; forget, if you can, that the flower of our country, those upon whom we builded our hopes, are gone. How many Edisons, Jeffersons, and Lincolns never lived to serve humanity and their country?

And yet today we are marching down the same road that we traveled in 1916 and 1917—only faster and to more certain destruction. The signs are the same—some of the posts have been repainted in new colors and with more modern catch phrases—but they differ in no respect from what we heard 24 years ago.

Today again, we hear that grimly familiar chant—"The Allies are fighting our battle—the Allies are paying with blood—we would pay only with dollars." Again we are told that this is a war to save democracy and Christianity and civilization. How tragically ironic that phrase is to those of us who remember the purposes and the results of the last war.

But who is it that chants these slogans and catch phrases? Is it any representative leader of American labor? Is it any national figure who speaks for the American farmer? Is it any leading industrialist? Why, no—Alfred Sloan of General Motors says, "Instruments of war create poverty—industrial production will go up, but the Nation becomes poorer." Or is it someone whose services and patriotism during a war will be limited to clipping coupons?

Who are these interventionists who would have us shed American blood and treasure on foreign soil? Just as the Republican Convention was convening in Philadelphia the President sent to the Senate the nominations of two Republicans—Henry L. Stimson to be Secretary of War, and Col. Frank Knox, of Chicago and New Hampshire, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Henry L. Stimson is proposed to head the War Department in these crucial times when the slightest rash act—whether deliberate or not—could easily make it mandatory for the Congress to declare war. I am not opposed to Mr. Stimson because he is a Republican—or because he is a Wall Street lawyer—or because he is almost 73 years of age. I wasn't opposed to members of the Supreme Court because they were over 70 and their work less arduous than the Secretary of War's. But Mr. Stimson is the man who a week ago not only proposed universal compulsory military training for all our people—now, at once—to show the dictators, he said—I quote—"we are in earnest." But he is the man who a few days ago at Yale University also proposed that—and here I quote:

"We should throw open all of our ports to the British and French naval and merchant marine for all repairs and refueling and other naval services—we should accelerate by every means in our power the sending of planes and other munitions to Britain and France on a scale which would be effective; sending them if necessary in our own ships and under convoy."

This, Mr. Stimson knows, is not an act short of war—it is war. No sooner had Mr. Stimson made this statement than he was adopted into the Cabinet. Are his ideas to be adopted by the administration, or would Mr. Stimson have accepted if he knew his ideas were in conflict with the administration?

Even the authoritative Wall Street Journal, commenting editorially on this proposal, upbraided Mr. Stimson, declaring that his recommendation was, in effect, a declaration of war.

And who is Colonel Knox of Chicago, who is proposed to supervise the affairs of our Navy Department in this emergency? Mr. Knox has—in recent years—expressed himself personally and vigorously through the signed editorials in his newspaper. If Mr. Knox goes into the Cabinet—he will have to serve with a group of people whom he has, in times past, put to critical analysis—to say the least.

But let us hear what he thinks of our President—the man who has named Colonel Knox to run the Navy Department.

On September 24, 1936, 1 month after President Roosevelt made an eloquent plea for American neutrality and peace, Colonel Knox wrote—I quote:

"New dealers are trying to work up a war scare. They think it will help them in the campaign. The President is still our shepherd, but from still waters and green pastures he turns now to grim thoughts of foreign dangers. He does not like to leave Washington, he says, for more than 4 days at a time, because of conditions abroad. He is afraid there may be another big war almost any day. And his partisans profess to believe that we may be drawn into it—unless Roosevelt is reelected."

And then Colonel Knox continues—I quote:

"In his negotiations with foreign powers, Mr. Roosevelt has not been fortunate. He muffed his chance with France and Britain in the spring of 1933. He has done nothing about the war debts. Under him our foreign trade, and indeed, our foreign relations, in general, have fallen to a new low. His Russian policy is a fizzle. His far-eastern policy is a naught."

That is Colonel Knox again speaking of our President. But to continue—again this is Colonel Knox—I quote:

"It is bad enough to have for President in time of peace a man who is overconfident, incautious, self-willed, uncertain, and unreliable. In time of war it would be disastrous."

I am not quoting these biting criticisms of the President because they are my views, they are not.

But I ask you, was Mr. Knox appointed to bring about national unity, or because of the views he recently expressed at a bankers convention in Grand Rapids, Mich.?

In that speech he used this language, I quote:

"It is for us to put at the disposal of the British all of the munitions and supplies needed to keep the battle going."

He wants to keep the battle going! Do the American people want to keep the battle going? Do you want to encourage Hitler, Mussolini, and Churchill to keep on bombing cities, killing innocent women and children, filling the hospitals with men made insane by war?

No, you don't want it; and I don't want it. America ought to devote its energies to peace, not to keeping the battle going.

I welcome the idea of a coalition Cabinet in time of emergency. It is not a question of Republicans and Democrats. But if we are to have a coalition, let it be a coalition of peacemakers, not war makers.

Of course, Mr. Stimson and Colonel Knox have a right to their opinions. As Republicans who have vigorously and persistently fought every social and economic advance that this administration has undertaken, you would expect them to criticize. But the important thing to remember is that both these gentlemen are publicly avowed proponents of American intervention.

They ought not to be members of the Cabinet of an administration which has fought the designs of international bankers or an administration that is for peace.

They ought to be members of Mr. Willkie's cabinet.

The past week one of our two major national political parties held its quadrennial convention.

On this vital question of war or peace, what does the Republican platform say? And who have the Republicans nominated? Their platform proclaims a firm opposition to "involving this Nation in war," but in the next breath it proposes to defend "the United States, its possessions, and essential outposts" from foreign attack. Note those words, "essential outposts." What exactly do they mean? I for one would not object to defending the Western Hemisphere from foreign attack. But why did the Republicans not say "Western Hemisphere"? Why the use of such vague and indefinite words as "essential outposts"? What the international bankers who controlled that convention consider essential is something entirely different from what the farmer or white-collar worker or laboring man think essential.

Now that we know what the Republicans put into their platform—let us see what they left out of it.

Last Wednesday the New York Sun, one of the country's leading Republican newspapers, printed on the front page a story with the following headline: "Fight over platform holds up convention.—Antiwar plank again softened at angry demand of interventionists."

The newspaper story then gave some inside information on what was happening. It said, and I quote:

"The platform, most worrisome to the committee since World War days, has aroused bitter travail, controversy, and compromise. Revolt among thoroughly angered interventionist members of the drafting committee—delayed the committee session for more than 3 hours."

What was the revolt about? Simply this. Certain Republicans who want to keep this country out of war had insisted that the platform include the following words—I quote again:

"No drop of blood of an American youth shall be spilled on a foreign shore for the purpose of interfering in any European or Asiatic conflict."

Are not those sensible words? Do not those words express the desire of the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of the Republicans of this country as well as all our citizens? Yet it may astound you to know that these words were stricken out of the Republican platform. The New York Sun tells us that on four separate occasions these words had been written into the platform and four times they were knocked out of it.

Not only did the Republicans dodge this issue, but whom did they nominate, an acknowledged Wall Street lawyer and one who openly espoused the policy of American intervention in Europe's blood baths—until a few weeks, if not days—ago.

A Republican Senator recently stated, after reading some of Mr. Willkie's speeches, that if the Republican Party nominated him, the slogan of his party ought to be "Willkie and War."

Here, then, is unchallenged proof of the position of the Republican Party on the greatest issue facing our country today. Despite all its lip service to the idea of keeping the United States out of war—the Republican Party calmly and carefully refused to pledge itself that no drop of blood of an American youth shall be spilled on a foreign shore for the purpose of interfering in any European or Asiatic conflict.

I do not want you to think that my criticism is made in a partisan spirit. As a matter of fact, nearly every western Republican was for this keep-out-of-foreign-war plank. This issue transcends party lines.

The pledge rejected by the Republicans must be solemnly taken by the Democratic Party. Unless the Democratic Party so pledges itself, there will be no distinction between it and the Republican Party. The war makers have captured one party. They are feverishly working on the other. But they have not completely won their fight as yet. We who want to keep the United States out of war must see to it that the substance of the language rejected by the Republicans is unmistakably accepted by the Democratic Party and incorporated into its platform. If neither party is willing to give this pledge to the American people, then a new and great antiwar party will arise to challenge both the old parties.

Today people are not interested in whether you are a Republican or a Democrat—witness Wendell Willkie—a Democrat, capturing the Republican nomination. The popular followings of both parties are overwhelmingly against our entering the European war. But men working behind the scenes to capture control of the party machinery do not give expression to that sentiment—they are war makers—either openly or secretly. Our problem is to smoke them out for all the country to see.

The issue of 1940 is clearly defined so that all may know. It is not a struggle between two schools of political thought, but a battle whose prize is America's manhood. In this battle you are not a Democrat or a Republican—you are for peace or for war.

The Republican Party has declared itself. Our hope must be pinned on the Democratic convention now only 2 weeks away. At that convention the party control must not fall into the hands of the war leaders. If we fail there will be no peace party in the United States. Both parties will vie with each other in glib assurances of peace while leaving themselves free to act for war. Such a condition will be intolerable.

The American people have given no mandate for war. They must have the chance to give or withhold that mandate. Between a Republican tweedledee and a Democratic tweedledum the issue of war or peace will be deliberately hidden in a smoke screen of oratory—buried under an avalanche of extraneous issues. Let the lines be drawn. If the American people want war after an open and honest debate of the issue, it is their privilege to so declare at the polls. If they want peace, they must not be frustrated. The Democratic Party must be the peace party.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered on July 1, 1940, on the subject National Unity, which was broadcast over the Nation-wide network of the Mutual broadcasting chain.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my privilege now to discuss with you national unity. On the floor of the Senate of the United States, on public forums, and in our journals for many years I have advocated with all the power at my command a five-point

all-American program to develop national unity and if at the present time you have handy a pencil I wish you would jot down these points.

1. Keep America out of war.
2. Register and fingerprint all aliens.
3. Stop all immigration for the next 10 years.
4. Deport all alien criminals and undesirables.
5. Abolish all foreign "isms."

In particular reference to point No. 1, keep America out of war, surely these days none of us need to be reminded of the dreadful horrors developed in modern warfare. Our last venture in Europe cost more than 100,000 lives, and today, 22 years later, our hospitals are insufficient to provide adequate facilities for its victims in our own country. We entered the last war for the purpose of saving Christianity, sparing democracy, and preventing further wars, but we were sadly disillusioned. Therefore, I am profoundly opposed to sending the sons of American mothers to foreign fields to participate in any foreign war.

I am convinced that the best way to turn our minds from war is to look sharply to our own interests by providing work and assuring contentment for American citizens. Of course, I favor a strong national defense, so strong that no nation on the face of the earth, regardless of its location or supposed strength, would be even tempted to penetrate our outposts or to invade or attack our Nation. Such expenditures for defense, however heavy, are abundantly justified since they are the surest means to prevent the ugly head of war being raised in our midst. And I favor in this regard fortifying and strengthening our outposts and continuing to improve our Nation's defensive strength.

Specifically, for several years past I have advocated that we acquire certain islands in the Atlantic; namely, the possessions of Great Britain and France, extending from the island of Trinidad, off the coast of Venezuela, northward through the Leeward and Windward Islands of the Caribbean Sea, Jamaica, Nassau, Bimini, which is only 50 miles from our Florida coast, Bermuda, 500 miles directly off the coast of North Carolina, and St. Pierre and Micquelon, only a stone's throw from the coast of Newfoundland. Herein lies no thought of imperialism, the sole purpose being for our own national defense.

So I have introduced formal resolutions in the Senate of the United States, authorizing the President to bring this about through negotiation. I have suggested that in this way the much controverted debt question can be partially solved.

You will pardon me for saying that I am somewhat gratified to note that now most of us realize the importance of these acquisitions. Although there has been unfortunate delay from the time when first suggested, and although the matter, I am forced to say, was not given the serious consideration it deserved, I express the hope that this project be no longer delayed and that it be now carried into execution before further complications and added difficulties arise.

As to point No. 2: For many years I introduced bills in the United States Senate having as their objectives the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens. Unfortunately, many people took this subject lightly, and as a result I was unable to secure timely passage of this legislation. However, you are aware that only a few days ago the Congress of the United States enacted these provisions into law so that now all aliens within the confines of the United States will be registered and fingerprinted.

In so advocating these measures I had no desire to harm anyone. I had recognized, however, that this country was literally filled with alien enemies; that they had become termites boring from within; that these enemies were definitely bent upon the undermining of our democracy and indeed upon the destruction of our beloved country itself; that the American people were alive to the fact that our country was and is honeycombed with alien enemies which are currently designated as "fifth columnists" and "Trojan horses." Recent activities in European countries have demonstrated to us the dangers therefrom. You will, therefore, understand some feeling of satisfaction on my part in realizing that the position which I have maintained over the years has been vindicated. Now we will know the number of aliens in this country, from whence they came, when they arrived, whether they arrived legally, whether they are now legally in our country. Hereafter there will be no excuse for a failure to deport those who have no right to be in our midst. For should we be visited with the horrors of war we shall be able to identify these aliens and determine where, in their lists, we may find the enemies of our Nation.

Stop all immigration for the next 10 years is the third objective. I respectfully insist upon this so that our own may have an opportunity to secure employment. With more than 10,000,000 Americans unemployed and millions working only part time, we should first provide jobs for American citizens. They should be given the preference. No other nation upon the face of the earth permits aliens to usurp jobs belonging to its citizens. In addition to the millions unemployed and the millions working only part time, we have today 2,700,000 on the W. P. A. rolls, 300,000 young men in our C. C. C. camps, and annually we are graduating from our high schools and colleges 750,000 boys and girls. We are informed that only about 1 out of every 3 of these youngsters will be able to secure remunerative employment for the next several years. We should stop all immigration now until every single employable American has been provided with employment.

With a view to guaranteeing American jobs for American citizens, I recently introduced and had passed an amendment to the La Follette civil-liberties bill. This amendment provides that in industry engaged in interstate commerce, 90 percent of the workers must be American citizens. As to the remaining 10 percent, preference must be given to those aliens who have applied for American citizenship.

My amendment, which was accepted, further provides that no Nazi, Communist, or Fascist may be employed in any industry engaged in interstate commerce. Of course, employers will be given fair opportunity to determine the citizenship of its employees and their subversive activities.

It is the duty of our business people to see that American jobs are provided for American citizens. The least we owe to the American people is to prevent Communists, Fascists, and Nazis from getting an ugly grip upon American industry to carry out sabotage and widespread destruction at the behest of a foreign dictator.

Point No. 4 calls for the deportation of alien criminals and undesirables. As you know, our jails and penitentiaries are crowded with alien criminals, all cared for at the expense of you American taxpayers.

Crime in the United States costs more than $17,000,000,000 annually, according to the Department of Justice. With taxes mounting, why should we continue to bear the burden of maintaining criminal foreigners. Let's empty some of these penal institutions by returning these alien criminals to their native lands.

In reference to objective No. 5, abolish all foreign "isms," the eternal proverb says that a house divided against itself cannot stand. It is high time that we do away with foolish sentiments and softness. Wipe out communism, fascism, and nazi-ism at once. Too long have we been indulgent with those devoted to the cause of destroying our free institutions. Let them go back to the countries where their doctrines flourish. They don't want us, and we don't want them.

On June 10, I introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill providing for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents. This bill provides that it shall be unlawful for any labor organization to have as an officer or agent any person who is not a citizen of the United States, or who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi Bund organization, or who has at any time within the past 2 years been a member of or affiliated with such organizations.

Further, with the purpose of abolishing all foreign "isms," on June 12 I introduced a bill in the United States Senate to outlaw the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and all organizations, groups, or individuals associated therewith who seek to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence through the advocacy of criminal anarchy, criminal communism, criminal nazi-ism, and criminal fascism. The Communist Party, the Nazi Bund organization, any Fascist organization, and similar groups should be outlawed. We want none of them. We should have none of them. We should outlaw them now before it is too late.

If you are interested in this legislation described, then I urge you to immediately write or wire your Congressman and United States Senators, requesting their support of these bills, designated as Senate bill No. 275 and Senate bill No. 4132.

This is the time for united action of all those who revere our American institutions. These times call for national unity. America must determine who are its friends and who are its enemies within the borders of its country and act accordingly.

In the foregoing I have submitted a concrete program to be enacted into law and have stated to you tonight the reasons in support thereof. I earnestly request your cooperation in this legislative program, for only Americans can save America for Americans.

If you are in accord with these sentiments and this program, I should welcome your comments.

War or Peace in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES D. MOONEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. James D. Mooney, vice president of the General Motors Corporation, on the subject War or Peace in America?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR OR PEACE IN AMERICA?

I received your invitation to speak here today on my recent return from Europe after an 8 months' journey in the belligerent countries.

It occured to me that you would like me to speak to you on the subject that is close to everybody's heart, the European war, with its threat of drawing America into its great catastrophic whirlpool.

Further, perhaps I could satisfy your interest most by discussing the European war in relation to the vital question, Shall we have war or peace in America?

I made my first trip abroad in 1918. I had been out of college for 10 years at that time and away from my old Ohio home, but by a spin of the old roulette wheel of life I was assigned to the One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Field Artillery Brigade, of the Eighty-fourth Division just as this division was leaving Camp Sherman, Chillicothe, Ohio, for France.

A year after the war was over, and by another spin of the roulette wheel I went over to Europe on a business trip. And I have been spending half of my life over there ever since.

During this past quarter of a century I have had a front-row seat at the long series of political dramas that have been staged in Europe. Naturally, I know something about European politics, but not enough, I warn you, to have any ready-made, pat answers to the many complicated problems over there.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE EUROPEAN SITUATION

However, my years of experience and observation in Europe and particularly my travels throughout the belligerent countries during the first 8 months of world war No. 2 make it possible for me to present to you the following observations:

1. The war is a colossal tragedy for Europe.

2. Normal economic life in Europe is already badly disintegrated.

3. During the past winter, the very first winter of the war, there were already millions of hungry and freezing people in Europe.

4. Europe is living and doing business on paper money. Public debt is piling up in every country at a staggering rate. This rapid increase in debt is badly weakening the paper moneys. The "black bourses" operating under cover everywhere are already placing heavy discounts on the nominal values of the various paper moneys of Europe. As the war goes on we shall witness successive waves of currency devaluations, and finally a complete collapse of the credit and currency structures of the various European countries.

5. If the war were to come to an end tomorrow, it would take from 5 to 10 years to re-create the ordinary processes of production and the normal channels of distribution.

6. If the war continues for another year or two, Europe is doomed for 20 years to far worse poverty than the present generation has suffered during the past 20 years as a consequence of World War No. 1.

7. The war is making a shambles of Europe. The war is creating the background for increasing the millions of starving men, women, and children in the belligerent and neutral countries. Hungry bellies are powerful generators of social disorder and revolution. If the war goes on very long, we shall have some shocking internal political disturbances in the various European countries.

8. During my recent 8 months' experience in Europe I did not find a single man, from brass hat to taxi driver, who did not consider the present war a colossal mistake in international politics and the consequence of a long series of political and economic blunders.

9. No general emotional background existed in Europe to support the undertaking of the war; memories and griefs from World War No. 1 were still too vivid and poignant. The disillusionment that followed the other war made people everywhere inert and unresponsive to the illusions and slogans projected by the propaganda artists whose job it is to generate hysteria and hatred.

10. If the war continues to gain in military momentum, there will ensue the slaughter of millions of men and the creation of millions of widows and orphans. The frightful tragedy in the situation arises out of the fact that this colossal sacrifice will add nothing valuable to human experience. Nor will the continuation of the destruction of Europe move forward one single step the acceptance of any political principle to enable men and nations to live in a more friendly, neighborly way with one another.

11. Tens of millions of families throughout Europe, men, women, and children, are praying to God every day that He will put some good will into the hearts of their political leaders and inspire them to declare an armistice. Peace would bring a general delirium of joy, a universal escape from fear, terror, horror, despair, and material and spiritual misery and devastation.

THE FUNDAMENTAL WAR AIMS

The time is too short to sketch here the war aims of the belligerents. But, at the risk of seeming to make it all too simple, I shall state the fundamental causes of the war, as follows:

Germany and Italy have felt that the power and control exercised by England and France over the commodities, raw materials, and trade of the world subjected their countries to the unendurable condition that food for their people and materials and markets for their industries had been throttled. Germany and Italy rearmed to eliminate this fear that their food supplies and commerce would be cut off.

England and France have had a growing fear of the military power of Germany and Italy and a growing fear of the challenge of this power to their own security.

England and France are fighting for their lives. Germany and Italy are fighting and striving to keep from being starved to death.

WAR THROWS DEMOCRACY OVERBOARD

These aims of the belligerents, as you see, have nothing to do with making the world safe for democracy. Each country is strengthening its governmental organization and structure in every way that will insure a more efficient conduct of the war. I need hardly remind you that in time of war a nation moves very rapidly in the direction of a highly centralized form of government—a dictatorship if you want to call it that—for the duration of the war. The ordinary peacetime privileges of democracy are very quickly thrown overboard.

WE ARE DRIFTING INTO THE WAR

The isolationists want us to stay out of the war. But during the past 23 years, beginning with our declaration of war on Germany in April 1917, we have very often taken an aggressive position in world politics and particularly in European politics. We have "blown hot," and, later, we have "blown cold" and abandoned our position.

Some of the positions we have taken, particularly in the field of international trade and finance, have had a great deal to do with causing the impoverishment of Europe—and, in turn, the present war.

We have had no compunction at all during the past 20 years about playing with matches in the house of international affairs. Now, that the house is in flames, we can't run out and turn our backs on the whole affair. Americans have too proud a tradition as fighters to endure a national policy that would brand Americans as men who run away from anything.

Isolationism would serve our material interests best, but it is probable that we cannot and will not stay out of the war. Our general drift at the present time is certainly not in the direction of staying out.

We are already conducting an undeclared "economic war" on the countries we have identified as our potential enemies. We have just embarked on a stupendous increase in our armaments. As time goes on, the general hysteria will be increased in our country by the war news and propaganda, a war psychosis will have been generated, and eventually some dramatic incident will be seized upon to precipitate us into the war.

ANOTHER COURSE—COMPEL THE DEFINITION OF THE PEACE

What else could America do about this colossal catastrophe that is degrading and destroying Europe?

I propose to you now another course open to our country.

I propose that before we accept the inevitability of the war in Europe continuing—and the inevitability of our eventually going into the war—we consider another course of action for America. This course contemplates neither the improbable solution of "staying out" nor the emotional and catastrophic course of plunging immediately into the war. I propose to you that we consider the possibility of using America's enormous economic and potential military strength to compel a discussion of peace.

Now that we as a nation have authorized another huge increase in our national defenses, it would be extremely useful to clear the air by establishing exactly what it is that we are preparing to defend.

If we intend to go to war then we ought to publish the conditions that will provoke us into the war.

We ought to quit telling the world that we won't fight under any circumstances. Americans are fighters, too, and in this present situation we ought to begin immediately to discuss what we will fight for and why. If we are to fight because we crave a more peaceful and more orderly world, what are the conditions on which a peace will be negotiated and what terms of peace will insure this more orderly world?

In 1917, when we went over to Europe to fight, we were told that we were taking part in creating the basis for a brave New World. When our sons eventually leave for Europe to fight, can't we be more honest with them? Can't we give our sons a more definite idea of what the brave New World will be like?

Are we sure that our sending men and guns to Europe to help shoot up the place will have anything to do with constructing a more orderly Europe? Is there still an opportunity for us to make it plain that before we join the fight we would like to know what the fight is all about and what the terms of the peace will be when the fighting is finished?

America has a tremendous potential military and economic strength. Before we decide suddenly to add this strength to the forces that are destroying Europe, at least we ought to take one last good look at the possibilities of using this strength in the international situation to compel a discussion of the basis for the peace.

WAR FOR AMERICANS MEANS CATASTROPHE, TOO

I have told you that the war is a colossal catastrophe for Europe. The catastrophe there arises principally out of the economic disorder that existed in Europe at the outbreak of the war and which is being spread and intensified with every day of war.

We have economic disorder in America, too. The South is staggering under the unsolved cotton problem. Because our productive industries in all parts of the country are strangled from one cause or another, we have several million men still out of work. We have slums and frightful housing conditions all over the country. We are continuing our drift into rising prices and inflation because of the rapid rise in our public debt.

Do you think our entry into the war will do anything but make these problems a hundred times worse? Can you escape seeing that when our sons return from the battlefields they will be confronted by a reconstruction problem that will make the social, economic, and political disorder of the past 10 years look like a pink tea?

A NEGOTIATED PEACE WOULD BE DIFFICULT

Negotiating a peace at this time, of course, would be extremely difficult. Peacemakers who interpose themselves between belligerents usually find themselves in the most thankless of jobs. This would be particularly true in the present situation.

It is evident that a formula providing security for the English and French, and removing the threat of starvation for the Germans and Italians, will be very difficult to construct and make acceptable to both sides.

A negotiated peace would require vast patience and persistence to effectuate. Once accomplished it would necessarily contain compromises on both sides that would make it subject to criticism by some of the politicians in the various countries.

But all these difficulties that can be charged against a negotiated peace can be compared with the terrors of a rough, cold sea that a man might be challenged to jump into from a burning ship. The sea is terrible, yes, but staying on the ship means suicide.

AMERICA CANNOT ESCAPE THE IMPACT OF THE WAR

The present war in Europe is suicide for the political, economic, and social order there. The war is dooming the present generation in Europe and their new-born children to long years of unthinkable poverty and social misery.

That America can remain unscathed or unaffected by this appalling misery of her neighbors and her blood kin in England, Germany, France, and Italy is an absurd assumption. The war will make us suffer, too, not only in a material way but in conscience for such of the responsibility as rests on our shoulders for the deep underlying political and economic causes of the war.

The European war fascinates us and worries us. And we shall not sleep well as long as the war burns with a bright flame.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACE

Some opportune moment will come when all of the belligerents will welcome the proposal of an armistice by a neutral country.

Only America with her great economic and potential military strength can act as mediator and facilitate such a discussion of peace.

It will take courage and coolness to seize an opportunity to stay the destruction of Europe. I know you will join me in praying that America will not fail to accept such a challenge in behalf of peace.

Needless Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing under date of Saturday, July 6, in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, under the heading Needless Notes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 6, 1940]

NEEDLESS NOTES

Germany's reply to the American note regarding the Monroe Doctrine will, of course, add to our war jitters. It can be construed as a "challenge," or a "defiance," or as serving notice on the United States that Germany intends to take possession of a portion of the Western Hemisphere, according to the state of one's nerves.

But before going into a mental collapse, one may very well ask what was the purpose of the original note to Germany informing that country of our interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. Germany had given no occasion to suspect that at the moment it had any intention of taking possession of Western Hemisphere territory. That Germany would attempt to do so was a possibility that our Government had every right and duty to consider, and it was this Government's right and duty to take every precaution to meet such a contingency. But a note is a provocation, not a precaution.

The Monroe Doctrine is nothing new. It has been known for 100 years and it is to be assumed that the German Government was not in ignorance of the position of the United States. Germany, therefore, had no need of the warning note sent by our State Department. It was a gratuitous warning on our part, for which there was no justification, beyond the general suspicion that Germany might attempt to gain territory on this hemisphere, and it brought such an answer as might be expected.

It was President Wilson's indulgence in note writing that got us into the last war of inglorious memory and it would be well for President Roosevelt to restrain his pen until there is justfication for its use. Whether it was so intended or not, our note and the German reply can only bring us closer to the brink of war because it has created a wholly suppositious issue in the minds of millions who will read into the incident a declaration of Germany's intention to violate the Monroe Doctrine.

That may well be Hitler's intention and it is certainly the part of wisdom for the United States to gird itself to repel any such attempt. In view of the fact that if Hitler, in his answer, had foresworn any intention of coming to this hemisphere, we would not have believed him and be under the same impelling necessity to reply to him as we now are, what was the use of warning him off the western shores? We do not believe his word is worth the paper on which it is written, so why ask him for his word?

Let us get ready for him and quit writing to him.

The Wide Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times by G. H. Archambault, entitled "The Wide Horizon."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

THE WIDE HORIZON—A FRENCH PEASANT'S MESSAGE

(By G. H. Archambault)

BORDEAUX, FRANCE.

To escape the turmoil of overcrowded Bordeaux, this correspondent wandered out into the suburbs until he reached a famous vineyard some miles out of the city. The gates were open. The correspondent wandered in, watching men spraying the vines. The lark sang blithely on high. All was peace in the dawning sun.

The old vigneron appeared and bade the visitor welcome. Rugged, tanned, and bent by years of labor, he represented that France which is eternal. After the customary courtesies he unburdened himself.

"So you write for an American paper. Then tell the Americans this:

"My father fought the Germans in 1870. I fought them 20 years ago. My son is fighting them now; heaven knows where he is. Of these three wars we have won one and lost two. But we are not beaten. There are very hard times before us. May God in His mercy make us fit to bear them.

"It may surprise you, sir, to hear an old Frenchman invoking God since we have been hitherto an avowedly Godless state. That, indeed, is one of the causes of our misfortune. We have lacked an ideal. I confess that in this matter I have been as guilty as most of my countrymen. We came to imagine that the proper duty of man was to arrange an easy way of life, individualistic to the point of selfishness.

"I am old enough—I shall be 73 next month—to speak plainly without being accused of afterthoughts. I tell you that we followed the wrong road. We were all democratic in spirit, but in reality we were too much concerned with ourselves. It was to a great extent the fault of our institutions which tended to breed politicians instead of statesmen, and which set party interests before those of the Nation. This is not the time to apportion the blame; in truth, we are all responsible.

"We saw no farther than the parish pump, and we were well satisfied when our representatives in Parliament brought home some of the gravy. We looked upon the state as a universal purveyor, and we always spoke of our dues, seldom of our duties.

"I am myself of the Left; here most of us vote Radical-Socialist. But labels are of no account now, and to tell the truth all parties are equally responsible. All of us, in every party, looked upon our representatives as natural intermediaries between ourselves and the Government for the distribution of manna from the state coffers. It reached the point where ministers of finance dared not reveal that they had a surplus; otherwise every party claimed its share.

"Periodically money was asked of us for national defense. We gave it unstintedly. Then we learned that it had been spent for other purposes, and we were asked for more. We gave it again. The

politicians explained that it had all been expended for 'social reforms.' No doubt it was, but it did not help much when it was divided among millions.

"For many years now it had become evident that our parliamentary form of government had failed. Every successive Cabinet had been compelled to ask for dictatorial powers in order to be able to administer the country. But we persisted in our errors. For one thing we persisted in leveling the nation down and in imagining that the State would prove an everlasting milch cow.

"The awakening is rude. A terrific task faces our young generation—what is left of it. We old men must do all we can to help it morally and materially. We are about to become slaves, but I am convinced that adversity will weld the nation. We shall have to bow our heads, but no force on earth will be able to break our hearts.

"Tell all this to the Americans and warn them at the same time of the perils that may befall democracy everywhere when it forgets that free men have duties as well as rights."

Logan-Walter Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. RICHARD A. KAHN

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, the Logan-Walter administrative-law bill, House bill 6324, Seventy-sixth Congress, recently passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 287 in favor of the bill as compared with a vote of 97 against it. The corresponding Senate bill, S. 915, was unanimously recommended by the Senate Judiciary Committee for passage and indeed it did unanimously pass the Senate in July 1939, only to be reconsidered at the request of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON]. The House bill has been considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee which unanimously recommended, one member absent, that such bill be amended in certain minor particulars and instructed the subcommittee in charge thereof to avail itself of every opportunity to get the bill before the Senate for debate and vote.

This bill has been considered by Dr. Richard A. Kahn who has made an address recommending passage of the bill. Dr. Kahn was at one time a professor of law at the famous and ancient University of Heidelberg. Later he was corporation counsel for Berlin and still later he was counsel for the Berlin Electric Power Co. The latter position was held by Dr. Kahn immediately before and during a part of the Hitler regime in Germany. He was proscribed by the Hitler regime and escaped to the United States. Dr. Kahn has experienced totalitarianism at first hand and he knows by experience the evils of such a government system—a rule in the discretion of government officials, as contrasted with a rule of law which the Logan-Walter bill seeks to reestablish and reinforce in America. Dr. Kahn has studied the Logan-Walter administrative-law bill against the background of the German system and he has reduced some of his thoughts on the bill to writing. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When a foreigner enters the harbor of New York he usually is overwhelmed by two impressions: by the significance of the Statue of Liberty and by the majesty of the city itself. The statue seems to emanate encouragement, hope, and enlightenment, the city reflects strength, will power, and industry. Most Americans seem to have had these or similar impressions as they are reflected in their many activities.

But in one point the American seems to distinguish himself from the newcomer. The latter passes through a sort of rebirth or at least of a renewal, he gratefully admires the liberties and opportunities of this great country. The former takes everything for granted.

Should not every American from time to time virtually leave the country and reenter the harbor of New York asking himself, From where do we come, where do we stand, and where do we go?

From where do we come?

Liberty and equality were not among the inborn rights of men. They were and are the result of conquest. Too easily this historic truth is forgotten. The brutal survivorship of the stronger begins with Cain and it does not end with Hitler. The correctives of brutal force, the rules of morality and equality before the law, ever have been attained by fight or by fright or by both of them. The standard bearers of what we consider progress of law, morality, and civilization always had to conquer a new territory. It was not delivered up gratuitously, not in 1215 and not in 1776.

Where do we stand?

The Constitution of the United States with its special guaranty of fundamental human rights is another result of victorious conquest. But we are on the way to lose what was conquered by our forefathers.

The trouble begins with the modifications of the concept of property. This concept during the last 150 years constantly was narrowed. When the Constitution was adopted, people owned not only physical goods but the whole and immense free spheres of their life. We perhaps augmented the number of goods, but we certainly diminished the content of the property rights themselves. Take the case of transportation. At the time of George Washington, post coaches and post traffic were publicly regulated. About 50 years later the railroads came along and they were regulated. About 80 years later the motor carriers came along and they were regulated. We should not forget that nearly all technical progress was followed by another restriction upon the free sphere of our lives. From communication by mail we progressed to communication by telephone and later to communication by radio, but we did not progress adequately in freedom of using the new inventions. One may say that government has entered the new fields by adapting the old principles of public control for new situations. But this is not the whole story. Government regulations were sought in fields of human activity which are older than peoples themselves. Chiropodists, barbers, or plumbers practiced in ancient times, but public regulation of their practice is comparatively new. In recent years economic legislation has resulted in an enormous enlargement of administrative regulation. We may agree or not agree with respect to the merits of such measures, but it is clear that the principle of equality before the law was in no way guarded. The remainder of our property rights was not assured of higher protection as should have been done after years of constant infringement. At least the protection of the rest should extend in the same proportion as the restriction of the whole.

Alexander Hamilton once wrote: "If there are such things as political axioms, the propriety of the judicial power of a government being coextensive with the legislative may be ranked among the number." Since the time of Hamilton numerous fields of a formerly free activity have been delivered from time to time to administrative regulation. Was the judiciary coextensive? The answer is in the negative; the judiciary did not hold pace with the legislative or with the executive.

In many cases of executive and administrative expansion no judicial control was established at all. In other cases a sort of judicial control was established which is a falsification of what commonly is considered as such. In general Federal administrative cases have been hidden away from any controlling jury trial. Equity courts and appellate courts which do not invoke any jury participation do most of the job. It seems to be a juggler's trick in taking away common-law rights (which were protected by jury trial) and in transforming them into statutory rights, if any (which are not subject to a jury trial). But it has been done.

In some cases of administrative control the reviewing court is bound by administrative statements of fact. Such a prerogative of administration must be objectionable to every experienced judge. Evidence is not so much a matter of a transcript as it is a matter of personal impression. A purely indirect procedure can never satisfy the needs of justice. Concluding this part of our consideration we may state that the invasion of the private sphere of our life by public administration was not accompanied by an adequate extension of judicial protection.

There have been fundamental changes in recent years in the interrelations of the individuals themselves. Public administration caused important modifications in the contractual field. Take for example the F. H. A. insurance contracts. Everybody knows that forms and conditions of F. H. A. contracts influence a tremendous part of all building contracts in this country. The E. H. F. A. contracts influence a large part of all the contracts in electric appliances. Economic pressure of the administrative agencies involved is usually so strong that there is only one alternative for the average businessman, either to accept the administrative command or to stay out of business completely. Consequently portions of the former free interrelations between individuals are occupied by forms and conditions of the executive. And these portions, formerly accessible to judicial control, are frozen in a system of equalizing administrative order. Instead of extending the judicial power in the same proportion as the executive has extended its power, we robbed the individual of many spheres of his freedom without even preserving the remaining spheres.

Where do we go?

There is no doubt that the public sphere of our life in the near future will be enlarged at the expenses of the individual sphere.

Necessary defense measures will be adapted; new taxes will follow. Taxation itself is an encroachment on life, liberty, and property. Lower standards of living are inevitable, poverty and the need for social services will increase. All measures to be taken will extend the spheres of the legislative and of the executive. They will enter more fields of human activity and more deeply the fields already entered. Will the judiciary again be neglected?

There is grave danger in the way we go. Lloyd George once said before the House of Commons: "Revolutions never are made by the rich class nor by the poor class. The rich ones are too few and the poor ones never knew of better times. But when the middle class comes to distress, then a revolution is approaching." Lloyd George is right. Hitler's ascent was a revolution of the middle class. The 12,000,000 votes he won in 1932 were votes of the deposed middle class which felt strangulated by an overwhelming socialistic regulative system. Distress must not necessarily mean economic distress, it may be a mental distress. In 1932 such a mental distress of the average businessman was obvious in Germany. Anger and bitter feeling about the socialist confusion was general among businessmen. Which were the wrongs the German democracy had committed? It overdid administrative and executive regulation. The average Mr. Smith could not stand the hundreds of taxes and tax forms; he just could not stand the monopolization by the Government of the main parts of economic life, such as railroads, motor carriers, banks, and insurance corporations; he could not stand the misuses and business practices of a socialized medicine, the arrogance of some labor bosses and the constant decline of an adequate judicial protection. The socialist regime went so far as to exclude lawyers from all German labor courts. Such and similar measures naturally created ill feeling. When Hitler promised betterments I often heard people exclaim: "Give him a chance. If he is not good, we will elect another man." They were shortsighted enough not to see the danger behind Hitler.

If in this country we continue the way we go, I see the same effects and the same development approaching.

I salute the proposed Walter-Logan bill as one of the bulwarks of democracy. It is a moderate approach toward a restoration of the somewhat tattered bill of rights. In some directions it does not go far enough; it does not fully materialize two principles of justice, the directness of procedure and the independence of judges. Still the judicial review as proposed is based upon transcripts instead of a retrial. Still the administrative boards as proposed lack judicial immovability which conditions independence. Still some important administrative actions—as, for example, the denial of a loan or the denial of employment, are exempt from judicial review.

But the Walter-Logan bill as proposed is a tremendous step forward toward the restitution of judicial protection we need for the small sphere of individualism and privacy we still possess. The advantages of the bill are these:

1. The administration will be bound by and to its rules and regulations.

Section 2 (d) of the bill forbids the use and the application of any exemption which was not 30 days in advance published in the Federal Register. The "self-binding duty" of administrative agencies was and still is a precarious chapter in our administrative law. The viewpoint prevailed that "who has the power to rule, has the power to exempt." Such a viewpoint is an open door for mischiefs and favoritism. Closing this door is an eminent and courageous legislative act. It will help to substitute confidence for distrust. It will take away many grounds for suspicion which itself may endanger a highly burdened democratic system.

2. The administration will be greatly simplified and unified. The review of general rules by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the extended prerogative of the Supreme Court of the United States in granting the writ of certiorari in administrative cases will result in a simplification of administration.

We need such a simplification most urgently. Fundamental definitions, words, phrases, and concepts as used in administration are in a lamentable state of confusion. The courts just mentioned will be able to unify the fundamental concepts and to impose their use on all administrative agencies involved. Today we often find what is acknowledged in Pennsylvania Avenue is rejected in Constitution Avenue and vice versa. Social Security Board and National Labor Relations Board differ on the concept of "laborer." Even in the same department two divisions may have two different conceptions of the same word. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Farm Credit Administration likewise differ in these respects.

Who wants to sustain the multifariousness of our administrative phraseology?

There are those who make a business out of it—to administer much but not well. There are those who prefer political superficiality to scientific thoughtfulness. There are those who prefer applause from their ranks rather than intelligent service to the people.

The courts elaborating fundamental concepts and definitions will have the power to deny deviations and to divest deviations, if any, of legal validity. Imposing the same concepts in the same situations upon all administrative agencies, the courts will be able to unify and to simplify our whole administrative system. They will do the preparatory work for the necessary code of public administration and of administrative law. A recent publication praises wide variety of administrative methods and procedures as well as "the vast complex of our administrative institutions." The publication bears the name of the Brookings Institution. Experiences warn me to distrust men who enjoy the pell-mell of public administration; they usually are good fishermen but not more.

Our present system is the result of refined policies in the legislative. A friend of America, Edmund Burke, in his conciliation speech, said: "Refined policies are the parents of confusion." He is right. What we face today is not far from confusion. The average Mr. Smith is unable to distinguish among the hunceds of regulatory administrative orders; to him administration is secret science of the politicians; he demands clearness and cleannes. Not administrative instincts, not administrative interests, but only disinterested courts can and will guarantee both.

3. The judiciary will be restored to its constitutional importance.

As explained above, many spheres of our life in recen years switched from the private side to the public side. By that they have lost most of their judicial protection. The Walter-Logan bill will retake them under the wings of the judiciary.

We cannot turn back the wheels of history. The invasionof the public authority in our life will stay; it probably will be expanded. But the Walter-Logan bill will extend judicial protection to the new interrelations, acknowledging what they are, fixing stablelimits in the interest of the individual, balancing the needs of both; of administration and of the individual, equalizing the applicaton of administrative rules and administrative action, elaborating general definitions and concepts without which dispersion of justice never was or will be possible. One of the most important taks of the newly empowered courts will be to heal the wounds already inflicted by unjust acts of the administration. Unsatisfactory legal situations are equivalent to unsatisfactory physical situations. Considering this, Jeremy Bentham wrote in chapter IV of his Fragment on Government: "God forbids that any disease in the constitution of a state should be without a remedy." We may add that a remedy must exist for any disease of any administrative or Executive decision. The Walter-Logan bill will reopen the way to the remedy, the way of judicial review; and the Walter-Logan bill will give the remedy itself, the judicial judgment. To me the bill is the most encouraging legislative document since the abolition of slavery. It is the abolition of a slavery—a slavery of a free people to a Government bureaucracy.

Time Has Come When the United States Should Sponsor a Peace Movement—Pan American Conference a Good Place To Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which is intended to direct the might of the Western Hemisphere in a movement to bring peace to the world. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Secretary of State is requested to place on the agenda of the Pan American Conference to be held at Habana this month a proposal that the Pan American countries as a unit tender their good offices as a mediator in the disputes which now unhappily threaten to disrupt European civilization.

Mr. Speaker, the Old World, from the Arctic to the Tropics, is aflame with war or blackened with the smoldering ruins of war. Thousands upon thousands of newly made mounds, on which the grass has not yet had time to grow, mark the toll that war already has taken from the flower of Europe's manhood since the terrible conflict began, and while these graves are being watered with the tears of mothers, wives, and sweethearts, the way is being prepared for more graves and more tears. In countless homes there is indescribable agony, the agony that springs from death and suffering on every hand, and that other awful agony which comes from the suspense of not knowing what is in store next. Hell is, indeed, loose in Europe.

What a challenge to the religious and moral forces of the world this situation presents!

George Canning, the British Foreign Minister at the time the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated, said: "We have created a New World to redress the balance of the old."

May we not regard those as words of prophecy now applicable to the world situation? May we not envision the New

World rescuing the Old World from the combination of murder, suicide, and total bankruptcy of moral values with which it is now afflicted? In the American republics we have a composite of European racial elements, a representive picture of the cultures and traditions of the Old World but, unlike the Old World, chastened by contact with the new frontier. Is not the opportunity now afforded for the New World to perform a service of inestimable value to the Old World from whose loins it sprang?

I think the time is at hand when the New World, under the leadership of the United States, may very well take the lead in trying to find a common denominator of peace among the warring nations, and I believe the Pan American Conference to be held at Habana beginning July 20, would afford exactly the setting to make such a move impressive.

If the 21 American states comprising the Pan American Conference were to proceed along the line indicated in this resolution they not only would furnish a most enlightening and challenging exhibition of Pan American solidarity, but they would demonstrate peace sympathies in a way that would appeal powerfully to the peoples of all the countries in the world. It would be a most vivid dramatization of the Western Hemisphere exerting its utmost effort to save civilization from destruction. Such an appeal coming from such an imposing and vital source would be hailed with joy by the peoples of all the countries of the world, who are asking nothing more than to be rescued from the thralldom of war, and intransigent rulers, knowing the sentiment of their peoples, would hardly dare to refuse to assemble around a peace table.

What, then, would be the prospect of success of such a move on the part of the United States? First let me say that, whether it succeeds or not, we would be doing our part as a Christian nation and failure would neither compromise us nor leave the world in any worse condition than it is now. But I really do not believe it would fail. The newspaper reports indicate that undercover peace feelers are being put out from various directions. Britain's position is most perilous, faced as she is by the combined forces of Germany and Italy with their superior armies, and the addition of part of the French fleet to their navies. Sympathetic as we are with Britain one finds it impossible to conceive, considering the tremendous odds against her, that her best interest lies in prolongation of the war, which, if carried to the extreme, might mean the imposition of unbearable sanctions and the dismemberment of her empire. Britain obviously cannot sue for peace without more blood letting, but an invitation to a peace conference coming from friends in the New World might not be unwelcome to her. Then, too, the menacing situation that is developing in the Balkans may make Germany very amenable to the suggestion of a peace conference. There is every reason to believe that Hitler has bit off more than he can masticate and that Stalin is getting uncomfortably on his rump. Hitler would hesitate a long time before he would decline a Pan American invitation to a peace conference.

I would hope that such a peace movement, originating in the New World, would be the first step in a spiritual renaissance, the need of which was so well expressed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when he summarized his views in a statement which in the light of present developments seems born of true inspiration.

No greater thing—

Said he a few years ago—

could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a realization of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and for their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, or economic—that would not melt before the fire of such a spiritual awakening.

America, in cooperation with the other republics comprising the Pan American Conference, has a great opportunity to stabilize the peace of the world. I hope the House will adopt my resolution and thus help to usher in the spiritual awakening so beautifully envisioned by the President. If the Western Hemisphere, under the leadership of the United States, can start a movement that will banish war and restore peace on this terrestrial globe, it will be doing the biggest thing imaginable, and humanity in every land and under every flag will rise to bless us. Congress speaks for the American people and the people want peace. If this resolution is adopted, it will be the voice of America to the world pleading for peace. Let us adopt the resolution and lift some of the pain from the aching heart of the world.

State Indemnity for Errors of Criminal Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ARTICLE BY EDWIN BORCHARD

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State Indemnity for Errors of Criminal Justice," prepared by Prof. Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss Professor of Law, Yale University.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE INDEMNITY FOR ERRORS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(By Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss Professor of Law, Yale University)

All too frequently the public is shocked by the news that Federal or State authorities have convicted and imprisoned a person subsequently proved to have been innocent of any crime. These accidents in the administration of the criminal law happen either through an unfortunate concurrence of circumstances or perjured testimony or are the result of mistaken identity, the conviction having been obtained by zealous prosecuting attorneys on circumstantial evidence.

In an earnest effort to compensate in some measure the victims of these miscarriages of justice, Congress in May 1938 enacted a law "to grant relief to persons erroneously convicted in courts of the United States." Under this law, any person who can prove that he was wrongfully convicted and sentenced for a crime against the United States may bring suit in the Court of Claims for damages of not more than $5,000 against the Federal Government.

The Federal act of May 24, 1938, limits the right of recovery to innocent persons who have been both convicted and served all or a part of their sentence. The innocence must be proved either by appeal or new trial or rehearing in which innocence is established, or by a pardon on the ground of innocence. It must also appear that the erroneously convicted person either committed none of the acts with which he was charged or that those acts constituted no crime against the United States or against any State or Territory. He must also show that he has not either intentionally or by willful misconduct or negligence, such as false, voluntary confession, contributed to bring about his arrest or conviction. On the establishment of all these conditions he may sue in the Court of Claims.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The justice underlying this principle of compensation is apparent. But the law adopted by Congress may not, of course, be resorted to by persons wrongfully convicted under the statutes of the various States. Since the enactment of such legislation was first proposed in 1913, only three States—Wisconsin, North Dakota, and California—have enacted compensatory statutes. Clearly there is need for the legislation in every State of the Union. While the Federal law is exceedingly narrow, I urge it as a model for the State legislatures.

It is true that on occasion several States have by special act granted indemnity to the innocent victim of an erroneous conviction. Parliament in England has sometimes taken similar action. But in the United States, as in England, these special statutes are enacted only spasmodically, and not all persons have the necessary influence to bring about legislation in their own behalf.

In moving for this amendment of the criminal law by the State, we should be guided not solely by a sense of justice but also by the models and precedents in the legislation of most of the countries of western Europe. France, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Italy now have elaborate statutes governing this subject. So do several of the countries of Latin America. Ever since the French Revolution, reformers and criminologists have sought to bring about this amendment of the criminal law, and from 1886 on they have seen

their efforts crowned with success in one country after another. The States of the United States ought not to lag behind any longer.

TYPICAL CASES

To illustrate the need for a corrective when justice stumbles, I would like to tell briefly the stories of several well-known cases. The first is that of a Hungarian immigrant named Toth. An innocent bystander at a saloon brawl in which a man was killed, Toth was arrested for the murder. Rather dull of wit, unable to speak English, and hardly knowing what was happening, he was quickly convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. He continually protested his innocence. After serving 20 years of his sentence his innocence was established beyond a doubt. He was released from prison a physical wreck. The law could only give him his liberty; the State legislature declined to grant him compensation, and finally Andrew Carnegie extended him sufficient charity to take him to Hungary and gave him a small monthly stipend.

A case of pure circumstantial evidence occurred very recently in Georgia. Robert E. Coleman, 22 years old, came home one night from his work as a salesman of picture frames, and, as he claimed, found on the floor of his bedroom the battered body of his 18-year-old wife. The baby was crying in its crib. The police answered his frantic telephone call and promptly placed him under arrest, charged with the murder. His dazed and harassed condition made him a poor witness, badly confused. The fact that the woman was apparently killed about the time that Coleman probably went to work in the morning, that the death-dealing weapons used, a poker, a flatiron, and a piece of wood, were all in the house, the fact that the overalls in which Coleman worked around the house were found newly washed, with suspicious stains clearly visible, that he left the house that day earlier than usual and seemed excited, that he was shaken and nervous when the police questioned him, were sufficient to convince a jury. His violent denials injured rather than helped him. The jury recommended mercy and he was sent to the chain gang for life.

Inasmuch as Coleman could supply no better explanation of the murder than the one essayed by the prosecution, it is perhaps not unnatural that the jury believed the prosecutor's version of the story. It is not always safe to be the first on the scene to find a dead body. But for the fact that a series of new murders were committed in that region over the months and years following, the truth might never have been revealed. But the new murders led to the apprehension of one James Stark, a professional killer, who not only confessed the Coleman murder, but convinced an investigating body appointed by Governor Talmadge that he alone committed it. The Governor not only pardoned Coleman, who had served 4 years, but publicly deplored the miscarriage of justice and recommended to the legislature the appropriation of $2,500 for his relief.

The celebrated Beck case in England arose through mistaken identity in conjunction with gross negligence by the English police, prosecuting officers and the courts. Beck served 7 years on a serious charge and was then released only because the real offender fell into the hands of the police and the mistaken identity was established. As an act of grace, due largely to the unwelcome notoriety of the case, Parliament granted Beck an indemnity. In the vast majority of cases, the poor sufferer receives no second thought from the community or any responsible authority.

FALSE CHARGE OF MURDER

In the South, and possibly elsewhere, girls occasionally leave home and supply no mailing address. Then somebody discovers a rag or a bone or a hank of hair, and a vivid or malignant imagination concocts a tale of murder. The clothes are identified—in a typical case—as those of Jennie Wilson. It is recalled that she had a quarrel with her husband, Bill; possibly he even once threatened her. Bill has none too savory a reputation anyway, and out of these fragments a clever prosecution and an indifferent jury piece together a conviction of murder in the first degree. Only by a lucky accident is the sentence commuted to life imprisonment. Five years later Jennie Wilson is found hale and hearty in a neighboring State, having simply gotten tired of her husband. This case is not at all unique; yet probably in many cases Jennie Wilson, although alive, is not found.

In 1909 the Reverend Ernest Lyons, a Negro preacher of Reids-Ferry, Va., was convicted of the murder of his colleague, the Reverend James Smith. The two were rivals, Smith, the pastor of the flock, having to compete with the growing popularity of his assistant, Lyons. Smith lived in the Lyons house. They were known to quarrel, and Smith was suspected of intimacy with Lyons' sister-in-law. Both were to attend the regional church conference at Suffolk, Va., on August 1, 1908, and Smith was entrusted with the contribution of $45 painfully assembled by the little congregation. It was said that during a quarrel that day Lyons had threatened to kill Smith. They left the church together on the evening of July 31, and the next day Lyons arrived at Suffolk; but not Smith. Lyons stated that he had come alone and that Smith said he would follow, but apparently did not. Nothing more was heard of Smith or of the $45. Lyons became the pastor of the church, but Smith's friends were unconvinced by Lyons' story of their last separation, and when the corpse of a large Negro was found in the river near the church in a state of decomposition, their suspicions were confirmed. The body, about the size of Smith, was buried. Various friends identified articles of clothing found on the body, and, to make it certain, a woman parishioner who had not seen the body stated that if it were Smith's they would find on the little finger of the left hand a ring with a purple setting. The body was exhumed and, sure enough, a ring exactly fitting the description given was found on the little finger of the left hand. The ring could not be gotten off, so they amputated the finger and brought it into court. A doctor testified that the man had died from a blow upon the head and had been thrown into the river dead or dying.

All this evidence of fact, circumstance, and motive was presented to a trial jury, together with testimony that Lyons had told a number of conflicting stories about the disappearance of Smith, some of which were indeed shown to be obviously untrue. Although he had throughout the trial vigorously protested his innocence, after the verdict was rendered Lyons, moved either by hysteria or revenge, told his attorney that he had in fact committed the crime but that the parishioners who had testified against him had participated in it with him. When the resulting panic among the brethren had subsided, the officials again declined to believe Lyons, who was taken to the penitentiary on an 18-year sentence. An amateur sleuth, the clerk of the court, was not satisfied that justice had been done even if the law had spoken the last word. He made it his business to visit the countryside in Virginia and North Carolina, and after some years was rewarded by finding Smith preaching to a congregation in North Carolina. Smith was induced to return to Suffolk, where he was produced before the judge, admitted that the $45 was too much of a temptation, and that he had decided to make tracks for North Carolina. He had a ring exactly like the one on the corpse. "Witnesses may lie but circumstances cannot."

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Herbert Andrews, of Boston, signed a check for goods purchased, but the fact that the merchant failed to deposit it for some weeks resulted in its return from Andrews' bank with a notation "No account." Thus it reached the police. A wave of bad checks was then passing over Boston, and at last a clue was at hand. Andrews was taken from his home; experts agreed that the handwriting on the Andrews' check and on the forged checks was the same; 17 witnesses took the stand and identified Andrews as the bad-check passer. Inspector Conboy insisted that he had not made a mistake in 40 years' police service, and Andrews was duly convicted after spending the little money his family and friends could muster. Only the fact that Earl Barnes, the real forger, continued to pass the same kind of checks after Andrews had reached the penitentiary began to arouse suspicion that perhaps Inspector Conboy had made his first mistake, and a bevy of other people had similarly failed. When the two men, Andrews and Barnes, stood at the bar, the dissimilarity between them was striking. The State admitted its error, but that was all. Andrews was released. Only the thoughtfulness or carelessness of Earl Barnes in continuing to pass bad checks saved Andrews. Those who draw inferences from circumstantial evidence are subject to the same human weaknesses as those who make wrong identifications, and that is the reason why juries occasionally convict the wrong man.

AN EGREGIOUS ERROR

In one of the most sensational cases tried in the South, Will Purvis, of Mississippi, a lad of 19, a member of the Whitecaps, a sort of Ku Klux Klan, was convicted of murdering a fellow Whitecap, Buckley, who had complained to the authorities of the flogging of his Negro servant, and had thereby incurred the enmity of the Whitecaps. Suspicion was thrown upon Purvis by an envious neighbor, who had repeatedly attempted to acquire his land holdings, and 2 days after Buckley's killing in the woods, bloodhounds, after much coaxing, picked up a cold scent which led them in the direction of the Purvis home. That was enough for the mob, and when the victim's brother identified Purvis as one of the assassins, of whom he could have caught only a fleeting glimpse, a jury readily convicted. As Purvis was strung up to be hanged, the rope broke and Purvis fell to the ground unhurt. Whether Purvis had been "hanged," as the law had demanded, became a political question in Mississippi, even after the Supreme Court declared he had not been. Governor McLaurin fought his campaign on that issue. The sentence was commuted, and 25 years later it was established beyond a doubt that Purvis had had nothing whatever to do with the murder. The State of Mississippi granted him $5,000 for its egregious error. Purvis died recently, a respected citizen, the father of 11 children.

A recent case in New York, that of Philip Caruso, involved an erroneous identification by the victim of a robbery. Even the judge advised the mistakenly identified accused to avoid a long trial and confess. This case has been written up entertainingly by Mr. St. Clair McKelway in the New Yorker for November 11, 1939, and awakened renewed interest in the subject. A bill to indemnify innocent, convicted persons was introduced in the New York Legislature but did not pass.

II

The matter with which we are now concerned is to ascertain whether the State, by simply opening the jail door, has completely fulfilled its obligation toward these unfortunate victims of the errors of justice. Let us note what the State has done in these cases. It has taken the man from his daily occupation by mistake, either because circumstances appeared against him or because he looked like the real criminal, or for some other mistaken cause. The State must, of course, prosecute persons suspected of crime; but when the facts subsequently show that it has convicted and

imprisoned the wrong man, an innocent man, does not the State owe the victim of its mistake compensation for the special sacrifice he has been compelled to make in the public interest?

STATE CAN DO NO WRONG?

Our law begins with the assumption that the State can do no wrong, and it is therefore apt to be indifferent when by its own wrong it has injured a private individual. With the progress of time, however, the State has come to make compensation for many of its wrongs, and our Federal Government and practically all the States for many cases now subject themselves to suit at the hands of injured individuals. It was for this purpose that the Federal Court of Claims was established. Again, the State freely admits that, for certain interferences with private rights in the public interest, compensation to the private individual must be made. Thus, when his property is taken for a public use, such as a public building or a road, compensation is made. This is fundamental. Yet when the liberty of an individual is taken for the public use—and the preservation of the public peace through the administration of the criminal law is a public purpose at least equally vital to social welfare as the erection of public buildings—the right to compensation is apparently overlooked. Why? Dean Wigmore has well said:

"Because we have persisted in the self-deceiving assumption that only guilty persons are convicted. We have been ashamed to put into our code of justice any law which per se admits that our justice may err. But let us be realists. Let us confess that, of course, it may and does err occasionally. And when the occasion is plainly seen, let us complete our justice by awarding compensation. This measure must appeal to all our instincts of manhood as the only honorable course, the least that we can do. To ignore such a claim is to make shameful an error which before was pardonable."

THEORIES OF COMPENSATION

Two main theories underlie such compensation. The first is the principle involved in the exercise of eminent domain—that is, that the owner of private property taken for public use shall be compensated. In this case private liberty, a right at least as sacred as that of property, is taken for the public use.

The other theory is the same as that which supports workmen's compensation. The principle is this—that in the operation of any great undertaking, such as the management of a large industry or the administration of the criminal law, there are bound to be a number of accidents. In other words, among the thousands that are annually convicted, some will be wrongfully convicted through mistake. We have recognized, in certain spheres of activity, that it is unfair to the individuals injured that they alone should bear the entire loss resulting from the accident, and therefore society distributes the loss among its members. Where the common interest is joined for a common end—maintaining the public peace by the prosecution of crime—each individual member being subject to the same danger (erroneous conviction), the loss when it occurs should be borne by the community as a whole and not by the injured individual alone.

III

We must distinguish two classes of injustice of the character under discussion. The first is the detention of an erroneously accused innocent person extending up to his acquittal. An injustice has here been done, undoubtedly, in that the accused has been unjustly detained and put to the trouble and expense of defense against a criminal prosecution.

Yet the case of unjust detention pending trial is left aside in order that we may deal with the much more flagrant injustice of a conviction of an innocent person followed by sentence and imprisonment. Where the facts show that the conviction has resulted through no demerit of his own, certainly the State owes the victim compensation for the grievous wrong he has been compelled to suffer. Most of the European countries provide for indemnification in both cases, that is, detention pending trial which results in acquittal, and the still harsher case of unjust conviction and imprisonment. We propose to deal now with the practical features of compensation in the case of erroneous conviction.

RIGHT TO COMPENSATION SHOULD BE LIMITED

A right to relief of this kind might be abused if it were not strictly limited. We propose, therefore, so to limit the right to compensation that its benefits could be obtained only in cases of the grossest injustice and most deserving relief. Here much may be learned from foreign legislation.

It is clear that we cannot compensate every acquitted person. In fact, under our lax administration of the criminal law and the possibility of technicalities producing injustice, we know that many morally guilty persons are legally acquitted.

We would first, therefore, compel the unjustly convicted person claiming the right to relief to prove that he was innocent of the crime with which he was charged and not guilty of any other offense against the law. And here he must satisfactorily show one of two things—that the crime, if committed, was not committed by the accused or that the crime was not committed at all. This at once eliminates from consideration a vast class of possible claimants.

In the second place, the loss indemnified should be confined to the pecuniary injury, that is, loss of income, costs for defense and for securing his ultimate acquittal or pardon, and similar losses. It is true that the pecuniary injury is in these cases the smallest element of loss; the damage to reputation and mental suffering are by far the greater injuries. To compensate this moral injury, however, might entail severe burdens on the State treasury and open the way to speculative claims. For this reason it might be better to exclude from all possibility of claim the moral injury suffered. In any event we would limit the amount of the relief to $5,000, as the highest sum recoverable.

OTHER LIMITATIONS

Again, certain other limitations must be provided for, either specifically, or by consideration of the court awarding the compensation. For example, the accused must not by censurable conduct of his own have caused his arrest, prosecution, or conviction; thus, the concealment of evidence, the voluntary making of a false confession, or any similar reprehensible act should operate as a bar to the claim. This follows the well-known maxims that a claimant must come into court with clean hands, and that no one shall profit by his own wrong. As the award of an indemnity is to be discretionary, the court should take into consideration all the circumstances of the case which may defeat or in any other way affect the right to and the amount of the relief.

There may be some difficulty in the matter of procedure, although this can easily be adjusted. The Federal act leaves the award of indemnity to the Court of Claims. A similar State court having jurisdiction of claims against the State would be the forum most appropriate for this relief, more so than the trial, appellate, or second trial court, even though these courts could perhaps better judge of the intrinsic merits and circumstances of the case. Moreover, an executive pardon is often based on evidence which has never been submitted to a court. We advocate jurisdiction being given to a court of claims in order to maintain the traditions of American judicial procedure. If the jury or trial court were given the right to pronounce on the propriety of an award in a case of acquittal (as is the case in some of the European countries), it would bring into our law a new kind of acquittal in which the jury or judge could acquit with degrees of approval or sympathy, a procedure which might give rise to odious distinctions. While it would be desirable to have the benefit of the special knowledge of the case secured by the trial court or by the jury, it is better to forego this advantage for the sake of conformity with legal custom and to leave the establishment of the damage to a court having jurisdiction of other claims against the State.

INFREQUENCY NOT A VALID OBJECTION

It may be argued as an objection to such a measure that the case is of infrequent occurrence. The very fact, however, that there will be few demands on the State treasury should overcome any hesitation there may be to enact appropriate legislation. The mere infrequency of the case is no reason for a failure to acknowledge the principle and to remedy the wrong. It makes the individual hardship when it does occur seem all the more distressing. Dean Wigmore has explained our previous indifference to the grievous injustice thus inflicted on innocent individuals as follows:

"It is nobody's interest, apparently, to move for such a law. You and I have never suffered in that way; no large business is threatened; no class of persons feel a loss in their pockets; and so nobody exerts himself. Only the casual victims feel the wrong and to expect them to unite in a demand for legislation is absurd."

APPENDIX

[Public, No. 539, 75th Cong., ch. 266, 3d sess., S. 750]

An act to grant relief to persons erroneously convicted in courts of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, having been convicted of any crime or offense against the United States and having been sentenced to imprisonment and having served all or any part of his sentence, shall hereafter, on appeal or on a new trial or rehearing, be found not guilty of the crime of which he was convicted or shall hereafter receive a pardon on the ground of innocence, if it shall appear that such person did not commit any of the acts with which he was charged or that his conduct in connection with such charge did not constitute a crime or offense against the United States or any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, in which the offense or acts are alleged to have been committed, and that he has not, either intentionally, or by willful misconduct, or negligence, contributed to bring about his arrest or conviction, may, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter stated, and in accordance with the provisions of the Judicial Code, maintain suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for damages sustained by him as a result of such conviction and imprisonment.

SEC. 2. The only evidence admissible on the issue of innocence of the plaintiff shall be a certificate of the court in which such person was adjudged not guilty or a pardon or certified copy of a pardon, and such certificate of the court, pardon, or certified copy of a pardon shall contain recitals or findings that—

(a) claimant did not commit any of the acts with which he was charged; or

(b) that his conduct in connection with such charge did not constitute a crime or offense against the United States or any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, in which the offense or acts are alleged to have been committed; and

(c) that he has not, either intentionally, or by willful misconduct, or negligence, contributed to bring about his arrest or conviction.

SEC. 3. No pardon or certified copy of a pardon shall be filed with the Court of Claims unless it contains recitals that the pardon was granted after applicant had exhausted all recourse to the courts and further that the time for any court to exercise its jurisdiction had expired.

SEC. 4. Upon a showing satisfactory to it, the Court may permit the plaintiff to prosecute such action in forma pauperis. In the event that the court shall render judgment for the plaintiff, the amount of damages awarded shall not exceed the sum of $5,000.

Approved, May 24, 1938.

The Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in accordance with the permission granted to me, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, June 7, 1940, entitled "The Third World War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 7, 1940]

George Washington said: "Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."—From the Farewell Address.

THE THIRD WORLD WAR

We're all so close to the awesome events of the second world war that it may seem drawing a long bow to talk about the third world war.

Yet there will be a third world war, though we hope it will be so long a time from now that Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Roosevelt, Petain, Reynaud, Carol, Churchill, and the present writers and readers of this column will be dead when it breaks out.

The reason why we're talking about the third world war is that the United States' participation in the second world war seems already pretty well assured.

When Great Britain and France declared war on Germany last September 3, a wave of isolationism swept the United States. Never, most of us solemnly swore, would we have anything to do with this latest outbreak of Europe's world-old quarrels.

We were very sensible to make those resolutions. Europe is what it has always been—an overpopulated continent, which cannot grow enough food to sustain its own people, and which is further crippled by a multitude of racial, political, and economic hates, many of which trace back to the beginning of human existence in Europe.

When we tried to settle Europe's wars in 1917–18 we failed ingloriously. Our interference only prolonged a state of artificial equilibrium in Europe. The Versailles Treaty makers made that equilibrium more artificial than before, by creating a lot of new countries for political and balance-of-power purposes.

We were so disgusted with what they had done that the United States Senate refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. But the damage had been done. Versailles bred Hitlerism; Versailles' chickens have been coming home to roost in the last couple of months with astounding rapidity and frequency.

WE'RE ON OUR WAY TO WAR

It is now proposed by our interventionists that we go back to Europe and try once more to bolster up an artificial equilibrium; that we refuse to let Europe's various nations find their own proper levels in the scheme of things.

The proposition on its face is fantastic. But that makes it look even more attractive to the interventionists—even as their cries for intervention have become louder and more urgent with each solar plexus blow plunked home to the Allied cause by Adolf Hitler.

Interventionism is on the upgrade in the United States. Those never-again vows of last September have been forgotten by large numbers of Americans and the frightful face of European war is losing much of its hideousness in the eyes of many of our people.

That this is so is best evidenced by the fact that the Republican Party has just nominated for President Wendell L. Willkie, whose public utterances show him to be in sympathy with the interventionists—though it is unlikely that he will come out for an actual A. E. F. II before election day.

On the Democratic side the renomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt becomes more likely each day; and the President is an interventionist up to everything except men, which, of course, in the long run will mean up to everything, including men.

The American people, therefore, are on the way to being cheated of their right to choose for themselves. We're in the war up to our chests now; shortly after next election day or next inauguration day, if the war goes that long, we can expect to be in it up to our necks.

What we started out to say about the third world war is this:

SHALL WE LEARN FROM THIS WAR?

There appears to be no hope that the American people learned from their first World War experience that they cannot settle the problems of Europe. We appear to be on the verge of trying it once more. The isolation cause seems to be almost as completely lost as the cause of France in this war. So the best the isolationists can hope for is that after a second world war misadventure the American people will learn and inwardly digest the lesson thereof, and that when the third world war comes along they will have sense enough to stay out of it.

What Preparedness Involves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Saturday, July 6, 1940. This editorial is entitled "What Preparedness Involves," and it presents a thought-provoking analysis of the factors vital to preparedness.

I wish particularly to direct attention to the thought so well expressed in this article, that preparedness is not only a matter of iron and steel, but also of an infiltration of the spirit of preparedness into the very blood of the citizens.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of July 6, 1940]

WHAT PREPAREDNESS INVOLVES

What does America need to fit itself for possible war?

It needs fast planes, of course, and fine warships, and adequately equipped land forces. It needs a thousand and one items of material. It needs new laws to guard against "fifth column" activities.

These things the thoughtful citizen realizes. But what do we need to make these concrete evidences of preparedness available to us?

The American Institute for Economic Research devotes its current bulletin to a discussion of this question. It finds that fundamentally we need five things—a store of raw materials not produced within our borders, research consciously directed toward the discovery and development of substitutes and improvements in war essentials, an ample national credit, trained and eager labor, and a solid public opinion, fully aware of our needs and the difficulties which stand in the way of supplying them.

Fortunately there are only a few essential raw materials which are not available to us on this continent, the chief being rubber and tin. These we must store, or we must find substitutes for them, which brings us square into research. Research must also give us more and better fighting machines than our enemies can produce. Research must develop new methods in order that needed things may be made faster, and labor must cooperate to make the improvements effective.

All of this will cost money. So long as we are merely preparing, it will be possible to pay our bills as we go; but if war finally comes, credit will be of utmost importance. Preparedness now involves getting our debt structure into such shape that it can withstand the additions which the European war and the peace which follows that war will put on it.

These things, inasmuch as they involve determination on the part of citizens generally, demand a population aroused to needs and willing to sacrifice to achieve them. "This problem [of defense] will never be solved satisfactorily until we, the people, have thought it through."

Thus, in brief, does the Institute for Economic Research analyze our defense background. It is an exceptionally thoughtful analysis, deserving more than passing attention from those who have the prime responsibility for putting America in such condition that no foe can be effective against it. Preparation for defense is not merely a matter of billions. It is also a matter of attitude, a matter of attention to thousands of details, a matter of constant forging ahead.

Preparedness is a matter of iron and steel, forged into arms for defense, of course, but also instilled into the very blood of citizens.

The Philosophy of the Democratic Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a national radio address which I gave July 3, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen, it was at a banquet of the first American round-the-world flyers. A friend of mine asked the leader of the flight what had been the hardest thing on the trip. By way of chewing this cud out loud, the leader mused for a moment that the greatest hardship had not been physical, though there had been some grueling experiences. It had not been mental, though uncertainty of landing in strange parts and the worry of refueling in places unprovided were not soon to be forgotten. "No," said he, "it was neither physical nor mental; the greatest hardship was social, was moral. To be shut up day and night with one's own fellows, ever repeated so, until the mystery of companionship had given way to irritation with naked familiarity—that was the hardest thing to bear."

And so it is, my friends. How to stand one another through thick and thin—that's the hardest thing for human beings—hardest in the air, hardest on the land, hardest under the sea. For delightful as companionship is, sacred as friendship is, too much of friendship makes a sorehead and too much of companionship develops the rash of neighboritis. If you doubt the flyer, if you doubt me, just look around you; look at the divorce rate, that tells the hazards of intimate association; look at the nearest law court or at the policed street corner—they show the ragged edge of neighborliness; or look at the war, any war, ever-recurring war—that tells the traffic tolls of man's continuing efforts to voyage with men.

I

All social philosophies, great and small, are efforts to solve this problem, to help man live with men. Communism tries to solve it, only so far to enhance cruelty by calling it classless comradeship. Nazi-ism tries to solve it through the trampling might or racial pride and the crushing weight of its will to power. Fascism tries to solve it through corporate organization gilded with the pomp of resurrected empire.

That's what democracy is about also. It is a unique effort to lessen the hazards and to increase the joys of living together. Its secret is a proper mixture of solitude and society. Its recipe is to preserve privacy through a bill of respected rights and to rule all else by impartial law. Time was when this democratic way of life was young like fascism, and vibrant like nazi-ism, and devoted like communism. Now they say that democracy is dead or dying, that it is clearly decadent morally and awaits only the butcher's ax or the buzzard's beak. Maybe they are right. I would not know; I'm only an ignorant man and philosopher. You would know, you citizens of the greatest democracy; you alone would know what you are willing to die for, and more important what you are willing to live for. Communists are willing, Fascists are willing, Nazis are willing, all willing to live and to die for their faith.

What life's for and what death's justified, men must decide for themselves. I don't know much save for myself, but as philosopher I know this much for you: Democracy's a noble corpse if it's really done for. As philosopher, I can remember when it was young and vibrant and devoted to every high end. Now communism specializes in fanatical equality, and nazi-ism in frenzied fraternity, and fascism in liberty for leaders alone; but democracy, when it was young and vibrant and devoted, democracy didn't specialize at all—it generalized. It went out in the world to realize all three ideals all at once—liberty, equality, fraternity. Now that was something like. Democracy had then, too, a tongue most inspired. One of its poets, Wordsworth, fresh from democracy's debut in France, sang out in clear key:

"Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive
But to be young was very heaven!"

That in celebration of democratic liberty. And another voice, Shelley's, still more inspired, sang out its fine fraternity and blest equality:

"The loathsome mask * * * fallen, the man remains
Sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed, but man
Equal, unclassed, tribeless, and nationless,
Exempt from awe, worship, degree, the king
Over himself; just, gentle, wise."

Democracy may be dead now; but it certainly was alive then. If we could see what once made it so alive, we might yet think it worth saving. Come, now, and look with me at three pictures of democracy, full size, middle size, and life size.

FIRST PICTURE

Conceive the world as it might be if it were not at all what it is. Wave into existence by magic the brotherhood of man and establish by means magical the ministrations of mercy in all human relations. Give us as best you may a social order in which the material is fully subordinated to the spiritual and one in which justice is the shining light of every life—that's full-size democracy. But that, you say, is a miniature of heaven? So it is. Our democratic fathers were nobly drunk on prospects of the final perfectibility of mankind. Our fathers failed of full fruition. But to fail of perfection, is not wholly to fail. Heaven, lost, earth remains.

SECOND PICTURE

Conceive the world now on a lesser scale of excellence. Let compromise substitute for absolute ideals. Let every cause have its hearing in the legislature before laws are made, and then let every man have his day in court before he is convicted of violating the law thus made. That would be a middle-sized democracy, and it begins to sound something like what we have inherited from all that our fathers would have builded. But stay! There are the Negroes without even these rights; and Jehovah's Witnesses are being persecuted for their queerness in many a community; and there are the poor of every color and class—classless only in need and equal only in necessity—the poor who cannot get to the legislature to lobby and cannot find adequate counsel when charged with crime. When one thinks of all this, democracy shrinks to less than middle sized; it becomes life sized.

As perfection gave way early to gestures of justice, so with full justice lost, not all is lost. Not all of justice could be lost so long as there remains in living men any aspiration to improve themselves and so long as there is at hand the means of a more just justice, the machinery of a more legal law.

THIRD PICTURE

And remain there does with us, and for us, this machinery of self-improvement. That's the democratic way at its lowest ebb, democratic means of achieving democracy. This machinery of impartiality is itself so hard to get going that neither the Communists nor the Fascists nor the Nazis have as yet undertaken it. They boast of no more than "class justice," pure partiality. In our machinery of impartiality, bequeathed us by the fathers, we have a priceless heritage. In aim it's right, dead right; only its operation is creaky.

II

But all of this recounting leaves you cold? So I see. Still I do not repent of reminding you of the dream of the dead and of the legacy that dream has left to us the living. If this warm legacy of human worth leaves you cold, pray, let the philosopher of democracy show you a vision of opposite things to come, which may make even life-sized democracy seem warmer.

Fathers and mothers of America, do you hear that knock at your door? No, that's not the mild milkman dropping the morning bottle. That's the secret police that comes on the heels of your democratic indifference. They come without warrant and without charge, but with the power to tear you fathers from the bosom of your families, even to pull you bodily out of bed, and bustle you off to a concentration camp. Your wife is not told where you're going, nor your children when you'll return, nor are you kept informed of what fate befalls them. You only know somebody doesn't like you, and you'll soon find what it means to be disliked by those who are not obliged to respect any of your democratic rights—rights against illegal search and unlawful seizure; rights to know what you're charged with; rights to trial by a jury of your equals; rights against bodily cruelty or mental torture. Even at its lowest, democracy means protection against these indecencies, of which all other "isms" boast. Such practice of indecencies they call the social revolution, and I can tell you for certain that you aren't going to like it at all.

The philosophy of democracy, on the other side, calls for evolution to save the waste of revolution. It demands good sportsmanship of every citizen, willingness to compromise issues out of such self-respect as respects the equal rights of others. Tom Dewey went down in defeat at Philadelphia before Wendell Willkie, and so did Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. Don't think it didn't hurt, to see the hope of a lifetime and the efforts of years go up in smoke. But Dewey had Willkie on the telephone with congratulations half an hour before it happened; and I myself heard those gracious radio words of Senator TAFT on the man who bested him in "blitzkrieg." That's democracy for you. Why, Hitler shot his dearest friend, Roehm, for less than what Willkie did to Taft and Dewey; and Stalin has liquidated friends and enemies alike.

Democracy, which begets good sportsmanship through discipline, builds institutions of self-government to carry on its will and way. The ballot is our democratic budget. Let us keep it balanced with free speech and tempered minds. Balloting allows men leeway to get fed up on one thing, say liberty, then to try another thing, even its opposite, discipline—and all this without invalidating the processes of peace or surrendering the precious right of self-decision. The philosophy of democracy calls for liberty tempered by equality issuing into a fraternity of the free.

We have institutionalized the very principle of revolution, swinging now from right to left, from left to right without the waste of revolution and without the domestic cruelty of dictatorship. This way of living together makes a virtue of social necessity by preventing neighbors from inviting disgust through mutual encroachment. And it yields the peaceable fruits of variety to those exercised in restraint. To live and let live, to learn and let learn, to love and let love—that is democracy. And to do each of these in turn and each for its own sake—that is the philosophy of the democratic way.

American Defense: Military and Moral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. V. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. T. V. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS, ON JULY 4, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to insert a patriotic address which I gave on July 4 as a national broadcast:

My fellow countrymen, a citizen tasted the brew from the big bowl of totalitarianism, and it was too heady. He sipped from the little bowl of pacifism, and it left him cold. When he tasted from the middle-sized bowl of patriotic preparedness, it was just right—so he drank from it that day and from that bowl every day.

Here at the Nation's capitol, where the thought of preparedness is in every mind and the hum of armament making in every ear, we have been celebrating this Independence Day as solemnly as the occasion requires and as happily as the weather permitted.

But, with all our outer activity, I am deeply aware that our final preparedness is moral rather than military, is patriotic devotion to the deepest realities of our common life. What is everywhere most needed today is a patriotism that is just right—a middle-sized patriotism, if you will, which we can encompass without ourselves being consumed in its livid flame.

The witches' brew which the Nazis boast is too hot, so also that of the Fascists and the Communists. Patriotism so perfervid bursts of its own fermentation and buries itself at horrible last with its world-wide victims. The bowl from which our tired liberals quaff is too cold, so also the bowl of all Democrats who are despondent of democracy. Patriotism so pussillanimous sinks into the silly shame of lukewarmness and plays human loyalty for permanent loss. There is surely, somewhere between, a love of country that neither foregoes respect for the permanent processes of peace nor grovels meantime in fear of that great leviathan, the bloated totalitarian state. That's what we seek in order to make perfect our peace preparedness on this blessed Independence Day—this middle-sized patriotism, the golden mean of democratic citizenship in crisis.

Such bright but not burning flame of devotion to country—it is this in truth which July 4 requires of us: A love of country which lifts us above the belittling bondage to groups too small and invites us yet to love not our country less, but mankind more. Without patriotism we perish in provincialism; with too much patriotism we perish through self-provoked war. What does this golden mean of patriotism require of us?

I

It requires us, first, to be brave. Good citizens must stand four-square against the one-sided. When the ship of state lurches, it's easy to leer to the right or the left. It requires stamina to stand alone, even though one stand in the middle. Vigilanteism is already rearing its ugly head among us.

It's easy to be brave with company, but it's a crowded, suffocating courage which nourishes itself on borrowed strength. To the mob belongs bravado, not bravery. The brave man will have courage to be in the right with a million, or to be in the right with his own more majestic self. Courage is not of the tongue, as some seem to think, but of the heart, as the word itself clearly suggests.

A nation that acts heartlessly as though it did not care for its way of life, is rightly presumed not to care and becomes prey to those who do care and dare. A watchful readiness to defend one's own integrity is expected of a good man and is respected in the good man; and a nation that does not resist inroads upon its territory and upon its morale becomes today of all days a potential victim to brigands that infest the highroads of the world. Let our preparedness, military, symbolize our determination, moral. Only the ready are regarded today, and none is ready who does not know what he's ready for. We Americans are readying ourselves to live on in peace if others let us. We are readying ourselves to defend the continued right to peace of all the Americas.

Patriotism requires today, as it has required in the past, will require in the future as it does today, this readiness to defend what we hold dear and willingness to provide in men and munitions the means for such defense. In this regard, as in others, advance bravery is alone insurance against subsequent bravado and pathos. Middle-sized patriotism requires full-size bravery.

II

Patriotism also requires intelligence. Bravery in the hands of the stupid becomes bravado. "Don't I argue? Don't I sputify?" pleads Sandburg's backwoods preacher to his complaining church board. "Yes; you do argue and you do sputify," replied the dominant deacon, "but you don't tell wherein." In a sputification contest one may sometimes bluff, but "to tell wherein," one must know what he's talking about as well as know how to do more than talk.

Since such knowledge, knowledge of the "wherein," does not grow on trees, patriotism requires the fostering of intelligence as a portion of our preparedness. One might be patriotic in a totalitarian society through dumb devotion to duties already prescribed. But not in a democratic society, for new occasions provoke new duties, and democratic discipline means readiness not for death, as totalitarians are always saying, but for duties, new as well as old. The schools must be kept going, and any universal military service must itself be educative to meet emergencies as they arise. This is the meaning of the Government's new emphasis upon trained skills of a thousand sorts, as valuable in peace as they are necessary in war. This is the meaning of the talk, not yet completely formed, of civic and military service for all the youths of the Nation. Look at it from this angle, and you will be bringing to a difficult subject the light of a marvelous middle-sized patriotism.

This same sized patriotism will see also in the approaching Pan American Conference at Habana the application of civic intelligence to the problem of all-American trade. Military aggression will come upon us only through measures that can be watched and by stages that can be frustrated, given some maturity of our present preparedness program. But totalitarian infiltration by barter is sort of football to those who trust trade. We must be wary and we must be unwearied in wooing our South American neighbors.

It is only common understanding and prudence for us to be prepared to act energetically and resolutely to guarantee that no foreign foe gains any foothold whatever on this hemisphere. Our public opinion ought to be more fully prepared than it is for defense action to the south, at whatever time and to any degree whatsoever. President Monroe was right in proclaiming his famous doctrine as a matter of our own defense, and any energy required to enforce such defense will prevent untold offense measure hereafter. We'd find so intolerable the kind of peace of poison—that is, the war of nerves—to which Mussolini and Hitler have subjected Europe that we'd almost certainly prefer war on this continent at the first overt act of theirs rather than chronically to endure such precarious peace as the dictators press upon every neighbor.

That at the utmost. Short of that, we must meantime get used to buying peace in the market places of our hard-up neighbors. Totalitarians indeed make barter such an instrument of warfare that nations used to civilized trading welcome the Trojan horse of trade for the profit it brings, only to find that such profit is a death trap to their liberties. Any subsidy which South American trade requires of us will probably prove cheaper defense than our subsequent protection against the consequences of their trading one by one with the dictators. We must now in every way possible wage peace in South America to keep from having war waged upon us here at home through the homelands of our neighbors. A new kind of intelligence is required to see and stand this. But patriotism requires readiness to see things as they are. And this is the way trade now is—a wedge to war unless safeguarded through clarity of understanding and unity of all-American action.

III

The final requirement which the golden mean of patriotism makes is tolerance. At one level this quality manifests itself merely as the modesty which makes intelligent voting seem worth while to citizens. Each of us knows that he can count for but a drop in the ocean of the electorate, for but a pebble on the beach of citizenship. But little drops of water, little grains of sand, make the mighty the mighty ocean of democracy and this wondrous land. Modesty is tolerant of other equal units, and is willing to take its place and play its role, however humble. This is a patriotic thought of just the right middle-size during this national election year.

At another level this tolerance is the good sportsmanship which enables us to accept the results of an election that goes against us, or the results of any discussion anywhere in which we are overruled after our case has been put and heard. The real trouble with totalitarian patriotism is that it is puffy with false pride; it is prescribed by those who think they are God and is echoed down the line by those who are rotten sports. Only cowards, or "kamerads," attack the helpless. The psychology of dominance

from above when matched with the philosophy of subserviency from below produces the moral poison brewed from bullying and bootlicking. This it is which they call patriotism. That brand is at least one size too large for any decent American. It constitutes a first refuge of the coward and the last refuge of the scoundrel.

At the highest level, this tolerance becomes good humor and magnanimity which not only puts up with others but learns to prize variety for its own sake. Our Protestant Anglo-Saxon America is richer for having in it the Jews, the Mormons, the Greeks, the Negroes, the Catholics, the Christian Scientists, and any group which does not ostracize itself by trying to exclude some other group. Our land is richer thereby if we only see it so, and will have it so. And what is here said of peoples goes also, and all the more, for variegated ideas. The more of both, the merrier. Under-sized patriotism has for this stirring variety all around us the toleration of indifference; over-sized patriotism has for it the sadism of Satan. The golden mean of patriotism knows no indifference toward anything human and admits intolerance against the intolerant alone—and not against hem—until it becomes necessary as a measure of national defense. It is the cowering, not the brave, who rush the chances to persecute the weak in the name of national unity. Let the F. B. I. do all your early scouting for you and the courts do all the final prosecuting. This is the golden mean of patriotism as touching the present position of the alien and the unliked among us.

To be brave; to be knowing; to be modest, sportsmanlike, appreciative of difference—these are the steps in self-knowledge and in social maturity that lead citizens of a democracy to the magnanimity that makes of patriotism not the treacherous wish-wash of war but the golden mean of peace, if moral preparedness can make military peace possible.

"So he died for his faith? That's fine, more than most of us do!
But stay! Can you add to that line that he lived for it, too?
It's easy to die. Men have died for a wish or a whim,
For bravado or passion or pride—was it harder for him?
But to live, every day to live out all the good that he dreamt,
While his friends met his conduct with doubt and his foes with contempt—
Was it thus that he plodded ahead, never turning aside?
Then we'll talk of the life that he lived, never mind how he died."

As the war drums roll all over our globe on this quiet July 4th, natal day of America, let me commend to you, my fellow countrymen, such peace-intending patriotism as the poet expresses. It blazes a national path which, like the way of the just, will keep America pointed toward its democratic destiny.

Totalitarianism and Administrative Absolutism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY JULIUS C. SMITH

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Julius C. Smith, a member of the special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association, and formerly president of the North Carolina State Bar Association, on November 25, 1939, at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., before the Florida Law Institute, under the auspices of the Florida State Bar Association. The subject of the address is Totalitarianism and Administrative Absolutism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEM TODAY

Man, in the childhood of the race, had his habitation in underground caves. Throughout Europe and even in America these caves bear mute testimony across many centuries of that bygone and crude civilization. Once again, after the lapse of a long period of time which we are unable to measure with any degree of accuracy, highly civilized man in countries of Europe has resorted to caves in the ground, now called dugouts, in an attempt to protect his life. This time, however, the protection sought is not against cold and marauding beasts, but against other so-called civilized men who roam the skies, seas, and land, dealing death and destruction without warning and without discrimination against men, women, and children. No tribe of men in past geologic ages, and no American Indians on the warpath, ever dealt death and destruction any more completely or any more ruthlessly than the Germans dealt to unhappy Poland, or than the bombers from the sky on the battlefronts of the Maginot and Westwall lines who seek to destroy all life below—"to bathe their enemies in a sea of blood."

Truly has there been a reversion in this respect to a way of life many thousands of years ago when men, women, and children must rush to underground and man-made dugouts as the roar of the sirens signal the approach of death; when men, women, and children must go about with gas masks to protect their lives from deadly poisonous gases so elusive that they cannot be detected through the sense of smell. Undoubtedly this reversion is to a primitive way of life which existed, from different causes, in the childhood of civilized man, and even though we are across 3,000 miles of water from the scenes of such savagery, we know not at what time we may become participants in that struggle—even as we did 21 years ago; and if we should become participants, the present development in the airplane and the submarine may this time bring the enemy within our gates. We do know that during the past several years huge sums of the taxpayers' money have been spent by our Government on airplanes, fighting vessels, and munitions of war, including gas masks. I repeat that this is 21 years after we went to war to make the world safe for democracy, and almost everywhere democracy has been dethroned.

But European civilization has not only physically gone back to caves in the ground in an attempt to protect itself from destruction; it has spiritually and culturally gone primitive and, in fact, it was this phenomenon which prepared the way for the return to the caves. Are we in America going to stand idly by and permit the same forces to do their work here? I chose my topic so that I could develop and discuss this fundamental question with you today.

LIFE IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

Historians are not agreed as to where civilization first emerged from the black-out of savagery. It did emerge either in Egypt or in Asia Minor, and for present purposes we need not localize with any more particularity its place of birth. However, all modern historians are agreed that the ancient governments in those lands were totalitarian in character, with all governmental authority concentrated in the king, emperor, or whatever the title of the ruler may have been. In that respect the governments of those lands during the earliest days of civilization were not unlike the governments in the totalitarian countries of today.

They had both law and administration of laws in those days, too. Among ancient peoples law was a part of religion, and the chief administrators were descended from the gods—as is the belief today in Japan as to the Emperor—or the priests of the religions were the chief judges. The ancient codes were a collection of rites, liturgical directions and prayers, joined with legislative regulations. The laws concerning property and those concernng succession were scattered about in the midst of rules for sacrifices, for burial, and for the worship of the dead. "Law and religion were but one,"[1] whether in ancient Egypt, among the Hebrews, the Medes and Persians, Greeks, early Romans or Hindus. If we place these laws among the several peoples of the ancient world by the side of their religions for the worship of the dead and of the sacred fire and compare one with the other, we find that law and religion are in perfect accord. A learned author has said that:

"Man did not need to study his conscience and say 'This is just; this is unjust.' Ancient law was not produced in this way. * * * The ancients said that their laws came from the gods. The Cretans attributed their laws not to Minos but to Jupiter. The Lacedaemonians believed that their legislator was not Lycurgus, but Apollo. The Romans believed that Numa wrote under the dictation of one of the most powerful divinities of ancient Italy—the goddess Egeria. The Etruscans had received their laws from the god Tages. There is truth in all of these traditions. The veritable legislator among the ancients was not a man but a religious belief which men entertained. The laws long remained sacred. Even at the time when it was admitted that the will of a man or the votes of a people might make a law, it was still necessary that religion should be consulted, and at least that its consent should be obtained."[2]

The holy character of law—the common identity of law and religion—had a profound effect upon ancient administration of the law. The law participated in the mysterious character of religion, and the legal formulas, like those of religion, were kept secret, and this accounts for the fact that it was long after the foundation of Rome that the Twelve Tables were published and that Moses, Manu, and Hammurabi claimed divine origin for their codes.[3] Let me interject at this point, for further development, that even in America today we have men in charge of the administration of the Federal laws who seem to think that such administration should

[1] Fustel de Coulanges, Ancient City (Small translation, 1884), p. 250.

[2] Ibid., pp. 251, 252. Maine, Ancient Law; Morgan, Ancient Society (1877). See also Spender, The Government of Mankind (1938).

[3] Coulanges, above cited, pp. 257–258, stated:

"These provisions of ancient laws were perfectly logical. Law was not born of the idea of justice but of religion, and was not conceived as going beyond it. In order that there should be a legal relation between two men, it was necessary that there should already exist a religious relation; that is to say, that they should worship at the same hearth and have the same sacrifices. When this religious community did not exist, it did not seem that there could be any religious relation. * * * Law was nothing more than one phase of religion. Where there was no common religion there was no common law."

remain mysterious. They are actually resisting to the utmost all attempts of the American Bar Association and of both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees to compel them to hold public hearings and to publicly declare in rules and regulations so that all may know what they think the laws mean which they are administering.[4]

As the primitive law was believed to be of divine origin, and as the king was of divine descent, and as the priests were representatives of the divine power, it was a form of sacrilege to question either the law or its administration.[4a] There was administrative absolutism, by which I mean that the will of the ultimate administrator was supreme—whether the exercise of that will was just or unjust. You will exclaim that this was a terrible condition of affairs for the individual—and so it was, but again I may interject at this point a statement made on December 30, 1938, in the city of Chicago by the general counsel of a great Federal agency in the following words:

"Candor compels me to admit, however, that the remedy of judicial review, in most cases, has no practical content. Business transactions cannot wait upon the exigencies of appeal. * * * Time is of the essence. Even appellate procedure within the administrative by no means insures that the unfortunate results of action unwise or arbitrary will be cured. The remedy of appeal is not adequate." [5]

Furthermore, the dean of a great law school—many of whose graduates are in positions of power in the Federal Government—has publicly urged that some administrative agencies are set up to be, are intended to be, partial, and they are not expected to proceed after a full and fair hearing. They are created in the interest of one side only or, as it is put, of a certain policy.[6]

Truly are we not only physically back in the caves of ages ago, but there are those among us who would take us back to that same period in law administration. This is no idle statement. The proof of it lies in a comparison of law administration during antiquity and the law administration which is being urged today in high quarters in America.

It is too clear for serious argument that the genius of the oriental countries and peoples, where civilization originated, was religious and not governmental. All of such countries properly may be classed as theocracies—by which I mean governments believed to be under the immediate direction of some god—or as despotisms based upon the theocratic principle.[7] Contrary to popular belief, the Greeks did not originate democracy. A learned student has stated that:

"* * * the Greeks, as all of the peoples of antiquity, confounded the state with the Government and, because they recognized the state as sovereign, made government almighty. In other words, they recognized in their political science or in their practical politics no sphere of individual immunity against governmental power." [8]

In other words, during all of antiquity the individual existed solely for his government, and the present-day doctrine in America was unknown, namely, that government is the servant, not the master of the individual. As I have briefly indicated, this was due to the generally believed divine origin of both law and rulers, and a classical example of how rapacious rulers could interpret that law to despoil their people is contained in the Bible in the story relating how the king despoiled Naboth of his vineyard when he refused to sell it to the king.

During all of these many thousands of years of human history, the law was in the most primitive condition—depending for its promulgation, interpretation, and administration on the uncontrolled will of the rulers for the time being in the respective countries, whether they were theocratic or merely so in principle. Also, the law was sanctified through popular belief in its divine origin and the divinity of its interpretators, and any conception of liberty for the individual in the modern American sense simply did not exist. The governments of that long period were totalitarian in every sense of the word, and administrative absolutism existed unchecked in all of its glory. I need not remind a group of lawyers that the only possible check which has been developed during the subsequent centuries on law administration is through judicial review in courts not dependent upon the administrative will for their tenure in office or their salaries. As I have shown from the quotations of a prominent Government official, now in office, and from a prominent law-school dean, who has been in public office, we have before us the issue whether we in America shall revert to a primitive system of law administration prevalent in the childhood of civilization, and which we thought we had forever outlawed in Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States.

But make no mistake about it: Even as Mussolini and Hitler rose to absolute power under the forms of law and within the terms of the constitutions of Italy and Germany, respectively, so may administrative absolutism be fastened upon this country within the Constitution and within the forms of the law. No southern man dares to forget that a form of administrative absolutism was fastened upon the entire South in 1865 to about 1877, following the War between the States, when the carpetbaggers ruled supreme through the simple device of depriving the Federal courts of jurisdiction to review certain Federal administrative acts. We then had military rule, enforced at the point of the bayonet. That was administrative absolutism run riot, and it was publicly stated that mixtures of the whites and blacks would be forced under the law, and the entire southern civilization as it existed prior to 1861 should be and would be destroyed. What was attempted once before may be attempted again, but if it is attempted, I feel sure that as much as we would regret the reappearance of the hooded riders, they would ride again.

GREEK AND ROMAN PHILOSOPHERS OF ANTIQUITY

It is not my purpose to attempt any detailed discussion of the philosophy of government held by the Greeks and Romans of antiquity. However, it is necessary to give some attention to them in any serious discussion of government—not because they had any influence on their governments of the day, any more than did Sir Thomas More with his Utopia in 1516 on the English Government of his day, but because they have had much influence with the passing of the centuries. Some of the modern totalitarian governments have sought to justify their suppression of all individual rights and the subjection of their peoples to the exclusive purposes of the governments on the teachings of these philosophers of ancient times.[9] Socrates was tried and executed in 399 B. C. on a charge of corrupting the youth because he taught them to question the reasons for the existence of the current Athenian Government—and Burke, more than 2,000 years later, likewise thundered against the clever intellectuals grubbing away at the foundations of the accepted French morality.[10] Rulers then, as now, took most unkindly to those who were believed to be enemies of such rulers.[11] Plato, in posing his ideal state of experts:

"* * * insofar as he encourages the idea that there is a precise kind of knowledge which can be attained by experts and applied by them to the business of government—in the same way that the engineer applies his mathematical formulas to the building of a bridge or breakwater—lends himself to their (the dictators') pretentions. If there is such knowledge and they are in possession of it, it is absurd that it should be questioned and that they should be tripped up by an inexpert mob. Plato's parable of the navigator who is deposed by the ignorant and unruly crew exactly fits the case." [12]

This same student has stated that both Communists and Fascists have claimed Plato's support for their doctrines, and that either can make a certain play with him by judicious selections and suppressions.[13] But Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero were at one with Sir Thomas More in considering an ideal commonwealth—a government which has never actually existed in practice. Moreover, all Utopian governments which have been attempted, even in modified forms, have failed.[14] I would make it clear, however, that the philosopher Utopians—attempting to establish their ideal commonwealths as a result of speculation in thought—are not to be confused with their direct action successors who have seized the powers of government and purged their opponents. Doubtless most of you know that the ugly word purge, which was so prominently displayed in the public press in our neighboring States of Georgia and South Carolina only recently, did not originate in the campaign of 1938; this word purge was used by Plato more than 300 years before the commencement of the Christian era, or more than 2,000 years ago.[15] Is it not indeed strange that some of the attempted practices in government today in America, and some of the political catchwords were known long before the birth of the gentle Nazarene, and had to give way before the advancing rights of mankind? What breed of men are we of today that we should tolerate from hired servants of the people such primitive thoughts, phrases, and practices? But I would remind you that the final stage of government toward its

---

[4] See hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 6324, the administrative-law bill.

[4a] See note 18.

[5] Chester T. Lane, General Counsel, S. E. C., before the National Lawyers Guild.

[6] Dean James M. Landis, of the Harvard Law School, in a symposium on administrative law at the annual meeting of American Law Schools (December 1938), 9 American Law School Review, 181–184. See Dean Pound's comments thereon in 24 Cornell Law Quarterly (June 1939), 469 at p. 482.

[7] Burgess, The Reconciliation of Government With Liberty (1915), p. 1.

[8] Ibid., pp. 35–36. See also Maine, Spender, and Coulanges, above cited, and Charles W. Eliot, The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism in a Democracy (1910).

[9] Spender, above cited, pp. 72–73, has stated that in the development of the thought in the Republic, vol. 473, that philosophers should be kings and kings philosophers if there is to be obtained an ideal government, Plato has posed most of the questions which were in debate in medieval times and which are at the heart of the controversy about the nature of government in Europe of today. Also, that the modern has the uneasy feeling that behind such thoughts there is looming the ugly apparition of the totalitarian states, with their domineering experts and dictators.

[10] Ibid, p. 65.

[11] See Hazard, John N., Soviet Law; An Introduction, Columbia Law Review.

[12] Spender, above cited, p. 73. See also Mein Kampf, pp. 579–580, note (published by Reynal & Hitchcock, 1939).

[13] Spender, above cited, p. 84.

[14] See summary of this matter in an address by Col. O. R. McGuire, chairman of the special committee on administrative law, American Bar Association, before the Ohio State Bar Association (12 Ohio State Bar Association Report, 84–100).

[15] Republic, B VIII, p. 567 (Shorey's translation).

downfall is reached when the people discover the kind of monster they have been fostering in their bosoms—a discovery which took place in governments of the past after administrative absolutism had taken away their arms and their governmental power, even as has been done within our memories in Germany, Italy, and Russia.[16]

Cicero, the famous Roman lawyer and philosopher, wrote his De Republica, which is but a pale replica of Plato's Republic. For Cicero there was not any relation of religion and government; the two are one. For him there was no boundary between their functions, and this doctrine constituted the unsolved problem of centuries, resulting in incessant conflicts, even in lands which were then entirely unknown. Within our own memories there has arisen such conflicts in Mexico, Russia, and to a certain extent, in Rome. The principal business of ancient Rome was war. The country was an armed camp, and it fattened upon the tributes levied on the conquered provinces. Cicero's philosophy was based, in part, on the practice in Rome as he knew it and, similarly to other governments of antiquity, there were no rights of the individual which could be enforced against the Roman government of the day. Not unlike the other governments of antiquity, administrative absolutism prevailed at Rome throughout her entire history.[17] There is no gainsaying the fact that the Romans builded a great system of private law and laid the foundations of equity, yet in the public law field, that is, in administrative law, no such progress was made because of the union of religion, whether paganism or Christianity, and the state. Whatever was ordered by the head of the State was deemed as having not only the force of law but divine sanction, and Rome finally developed into a dictatorship through the military absolutism of the Caesars.[18] The ancient philosophers failed to suggest any solution in this respect.

MIDDLE AGES TO THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The time finally arrived when heavy taxation, decadence from within, and enemies from without, brought about the fall of the Roman Empire and the long period of darkness, the period of serfdom and slavery and, except for the Catholic Church and the Jewish rabbis, the almost complete disappearance of learning from the world. In the year 800 A. D., Charlemagne knelt on Christmas Day in St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome, and the Pope pressed upon his brow the diadem of the Roman emperors. By that act there was added another 700 years of an uneasy marriage of church and state.[19] This had tremendous consequences for both rulers and ruled. As Lord Bryce has so well said:

"From the fifth to the sixteenth centuries, whoever asked what was the source of legal sovereignty, and what the moral claim of the sovereign to the obedience of subjects, would have been answered that God had appointed certain powers to govern the world, and that it would be a sin to resist His ordinance. From the eleventh century onward, it was admitted in Western Christendom, though less cordially in France, Spain, or England than in Italy and Germany, that there were two legal sovereigns, and according to the view more generally held, each was de jure absolute, the Pope in spiritual, the emperor in temporal matters. Both Pope and emperor were above all positive secular law, but subject to the law of nature and the law of God, these being virtually the same." [20]

Those who are curious may learn from the financial and economic histories of the Middle Ages that this was a period of administrative absolutism when the common man was a slave or a serf; when men had to attach themselves to some armed knight or baron or duke or similar powerful individual for physical protection; and when each strata of the people was cabined and confined within a legal system which was as unyielding as those of antiquity, and largely for the same reasons. Protection of life, liberty, and property was solely by might. With such theories of the law being currently accepted by those in authority, and the people confronted with all the horrors of excommunication and eternal damnation if they contested the exercise of unjust and oppressive administration of the laws, it is no wonder that this period in the world has become known as the Dark Ages!

THE REFORMATION AND THE RISE OF INDUSTRY

The Crusades, revival of learning, the development of the compass, and many other factors resulted in the Reformation and the industrial revolution. It would take me too far afield to discuss these causes at this time, but they had a profound effect upon the relation of the individual to his government,[21] largely originating in England with Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, and the position taken by Lord Coke—all of which brought about a parliamentary system wherein the representatives of the people and of the various classes, such as the clergy and the nobility, made the laws. There also arose contemporaneously a judicial system measurably free from executive domination. The English system was transplanted in part to American shores and further developed under the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. First in England and then in America, there was overturned the idea prevalent since antiquity that both laws and kings were of divine origin. When that was done, or rather in the process of overturning such universally accepted dogmas and beliefs, the avenue of progress was cleared for liberty and freedom of the individual. All of this has been made clear by Roscoe Pound, chairman in 1937–38 of the committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association, in his incomparable Spirit of the Common Law, and in his Interpretations of English Legal History, as well as in numerous papers in law magazines extending over the period of his long and busy life.

It is to be remembered in this connection that Roman law was never as strong in England as on the Continent of Europe, and such influence as it did have came through the Catholic Church, whose power was subsequently broken in England; that is, the Catholic Church was discarded as the State church, and thereafter the chief priests of the English church did not owe their appointments to Rome. Further, England was comparatively free from armed invasion after the Norman Conquest, and like Egypt thousands of years before, the English system of law and administration had freedom to develop without the interference of marauding foes. Similar conditions existed in America, and there is not to be overlooked in this connection the profound influence of Blackstone's Commentaries on both American and English legal development.[22] In this period of development, covering several centuries, both rulers and the law in England lost their divine sanction, and there developed the basic principle that the rights, liberty, and privileges of Englishmen were based on law, and not on the uncontrolled discretion of any man or group of men. Nothing like it existed in either antiquity or the middle ages where the law and rulers were either theocratic or based their authority on theocratic principles and both were supreme. This development in England and America did not come about in a day. It was a matter of centuries—and at the cost of heads, civil wars, and tremendous sacrifices on the part of those who made their contributions to the happiness of mankind by governing the governors and regulating the regulators—all under and by the terms of the law enforced by an independent judiciary aided and protected by an independent legal profession.

No such development took place on the continent of Europe, except in France after the French Revolution. Due to the conception of the unity of law and religion, coming from the days of antiquity, and the great influence of the Roman law on practically all of continental Europe, with the exception of Russia, there did not develop until comparatively recent times any administrative system similar to that in England and America. Further, these continental countries, with the fall of the Roman Empire and with the rise and fall of the Holy Roman Empire, were in more or less constant war. The periods of peace were largely periods of preparation for the next war, and that condition has prevailed right down to our day. Russia has never known a free government. Whether under the Tsars or under the Bolsheviks, there

---

[16] Plato, after writing his Republic, became an adviser to the tyrant Dionysius, of Sicily, which seems to have disillusioned him. He then wrote his Laws and in this study he would make his government all-powerful. It would cover "the whole of life, moral, religious, and material." Spender, above cited, p. 91. See also Carlysle, R. W. and A. J., 1 A History of Medieval Political Theory (1903), 1–18.

[17] Bryce, Two Studies in History and Jurisprudence (1901), pp. 638–662, refers to the deadening effect such a conception of law and religion with respect to Musselman in words as follows:

"Law becomes a set of dry definite rules instead of a living organism. It is a mass of enactments dictated by God or His mouthpiece, instead of a group of principles, each of which possesses the power of growth and variation. * * * Reason gets no fair chance because Authority towers over her. Forbidden to examine the immutable rules, she is reduced to weave a web of casuistry round their application. It is only through the interpretation of the sacred text and of the traditions that the law can be amended or adapted to the needs of a changing world; and one reason why the Musselman world changes so little is to be found in the unchangeability of its sacred law. * * * Such a system will obviously give little scope for the development of the legal profession. Advocacy is unknown in Musselman countries. * * * Its one idea of government is despotism."

[18] Maxey, Political Philosophies (1938), p. 97.

[19] Bryce, Holy Roman Empire (6th ed.), p. 49.

[20] Bryce, Two Studies in History and Jurisprudence, above cited, 529. In Carlyle, above cited, p. 218, it is stated with respect to this point that "God (according to the accepted theory) is the source of all authority; the king, as ruler, derives his power from God, the evil king as much as the good; the former, indeed, as we have seen in the last passage quoted from Incmar, holds his power by God's permission rather than by His appointment, but still he holds it by God's permission for the chastisement and correction of evil. Therefore, they say, we must always obey the king and submit to him, even when unreasonable and unjust, lest we should be found to be resisting God."

[21] Maxey, Political Philosophies, above cited, p. 154, states: "The great revolt which dates from that October day in 1517 when Martin Luther posted his 95 theses on the church door at Wittenberg, turned out in the end to be almost as much a political as a religious rebellion, and the political doctrines to which it gave currency have shaped the course of human events even more than its religious ideology. * * * Politically it completed the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, hastened the proliferation of independent national states, fanned up furious conflagration of warfare and persecution which gutted the entire structure of feudal society, and released a torrent of radical ideas that have defied the most strenuous efforts of constituted authority to choke them down."

[22] See Pollock and Maitland, History of English Law (1895); Bryce, 1 Studies in History and Jurisprudence, above cited, pp. 72–123; Maxey, Legal Philosophies, above cited; Pound, Spirit of the Common Law, and Interpretations of English Legal History.

has been no administrative system developed under which the individual Russian could challenge in an independent tribunal the legality of the acts and decisions of those from time to time in charge of the administration of the law. While Germany and Italy, and to some extent Austria and Hungary, had worked out a system of administrative courts, that system or systems tumbled like a house of cards when the big, bad wolves in the persons of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hogarthy blew upon them. As I shall subsequently show, the administrative systems in Russia, Germany, and to a lesser extent in Italy, are as despotic and all-inclusive as the administrative systems of antiquity and of the Middle Ages.

As I have stated, the French system constitutes an exception for the period, roughly, since the French Revolution. Prior to that time there was no more despotic country in Europe or known to history than the French Government. After the revolution there developed the system of French administrative courts. This system of courts is entirely separate and distinct from the regular French courts, or what roughly corresponds in this country to our constitutional courts. As Dean Pound has stated in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee concerning the American Bar Association's administrative law bill, designed to govern the governors and to regulate the regulators:

"If you will read the modern French books on the subject you will find that they have set aside the old purely administrative review and have what they call the contentien administratrif, review in a true court, which is, however, part of the administrative rather than of the judiciary. We do not need that kind of tribunal, because we have always reviewed administrative action. This development has been rather recent, and those who have read those French books cannot justify their contention for 'administrative absolutism' by what happened in France. The experience has moved them toward the kind of thing that I regard as real judicial review of administrative action.

"You have to discount a good deal you find in the books in our academic circles, because I do not think the nonlawyer or layman has quite appreciated what our legal situation was, on the one hand, or the legal situation behind the development of administration on the other hand. It requires a good deal of understanding of legal history and legal development to appreciate a situation of that sort." [23]

When French administrative absolutism was smashed in the upheavals of the Revolution and the people came to rebuild their legal institutions, they cast about for means to compel French administrative officers to obey the law. They did not have a long period of legal development, which England had, of regular courts reviewing administrative action, and the American system had yet to prove itself. So instead of conferring the jurisdiction on the regular French courts, there was created the administrative courts exclusively to handle appeals from and reviews of the actions and decisions of French administrative officers. As Dean Pound had stated, we do not need such a separate system of courts in this country, and the few such separate courts as we have had for limited administrative controversies—the old Commerce Court, for instance, which was abolished after a few short and turbulent years—have not been a success.

It is no doubt because France has this system of administrative courts to review the administrative acts of its officials that France is today regarded as one of the democracies and has not gone the way of the other three great totalitarian nations on that continent. While the Bolsheviks ascended to power in Russia after a revolution, such revolution was more for the purpose of killing and expelling the Czar and the Russian nobility. Certain it is that the tyranny under a comparatively small group of radical Russians, dominated by Stalin, is even more despotic than under the Czars, and there has been nothing in the history of the world to equal it except in the oriental empires of antiquity. Laborers and farmers have been enslaved, labor unions have been abolished, farmers have been left to die by the millions, capital has been abolished, estates have been confiscated, both resisting laborers and capitalists have been killed or exiled to Siberia at forced labor in the mines and elsewhere, family life has been all but destroyed, and instead of the religion of God there has been enthroned the paganism of the proletariat. This paganism, however disguised, is nothing more than the worship of Lenin and Stalin—a system of combination of law and religion of the most primitive period in the world's history.

Reverting to the doctrine of administrative absolutism which I have mentioned as being advocated in this country, I may quote from an article by John H. Hazard, writing from Moscow, which was recently published in the Columbia Law Review, concerning Soviet law. There is no pretense in the land of the Bolsheviks that the administration of the law shall be impartial. Mr. Hazard says that the rulers of Russia believe with Karl Marx that there are no rights of man in the abstract, and that:

"Each society develops its own conceptions of these rights in harmony with the preservation of the best interests of the dominant class. The method of protecting these rights as defined by the governing class varies in accordance with the danger the governing class faces. While there is still fear of counter revolution and attacks from the ranks of the ousted class, law must retain its revolutionary character. There will be time later for the introduction of a less vigorous phase, but never to the extent of sacrificing any of the principles of the revolution."

[23] Hearings of May 12 and 14, 1938, on S. 3676, pt. 4, p. 177.

In fact, as has been well stated by no less an authority than Dean Pound, there is no law in Russia, but only rules and regulations which may be changed or modified at any time and disregarded at any time. The system is one of administrative absolutism run riot.

Thomas F. Woodlock, in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal, said:

"Give the Soviet regime the benefit of every possible doubt. Charge its millions of starved peasants, its suppression of free speech, its attacks on religion, its wholesale 'purges', its confiscation of private property, etc., to stern necessity in the pursuit of its goal, and then ask what is that goal. Strip off even the 'dictatorship' and call it, also, a temporary necessity. Assume the goal to be a real 'democracy' of the 'people.' And what have you then? You have a totalitarian democracy, a despotism of the majority, the one thing which our Government was established to prevent. Of this kind of 'democracy' de Tocqueville—who foresaw the likelihood of its rise, said: 'If such a government were once established among a democracy, it would not only oppress men, but would eventually strip each of them of several of the highest qualities of humanity.'

"This writer has long insisted that our left-wing intellectuals are all consciously or unconsciously, totalitarians at heart, and that this fact, coupled with the deep-rooted antagonism of left-wing thinking toward the great mass of the 'middle class,' explains their attitude toward Soviet Russia—an attitude totally incompatible with the 'American theory' of democracy."

Unlike Russia, in Italy and in Germany, the current dictators rose to power peacefully and entirely within the form, if not the spirit, of the constitutions of their respective countries. After they had been elevated to power through the endeavors of their party associates, all they had to do to make themselves supreme was to gather into their own hands complete control over administration of the laws, using that control to crush out all opposition. Imprisonment, exile, and castor oil were used by Mussolini while Hitler used the detention camps, courtmartial, the ax head, and the firing squad. Even the men who assisted them to rise to power have been "purged"—and these men might have known such a fate would overtake them, because Cicero pointed out more than 2,000 years ago that such a fate awaited men who assisted tyrants to rise to power.

The Japanese Government has never been, within historical times, anything except a military-theocratic autocracy, and, roughly speaking, the same general system of administrative absolutism prevails in Japan, Germany, and Italy. While totalitarianism in Japan is based upon a military-theocratic principle, the totalitarianism of Germany and Italy is a form of theocratic paganism, if I may be permitted to use the two words in juxtaposition. Supremacy of the Aryan race, "baths in seas of blood," the power of their armies, persecution of the Jews in Germany, and, to a lesser extent, in Italy, veiled hostility to both Protestantism and Catholicism in Germany, and similar catchwords and use of prejudiced minorities have been the stock in trade of these two dictators. The Nazi and Fascist governments are supreme within their jurisdiction. The people exist for their respective governments; labor unions in the American sense have been abolished and receive no legal recognition; forced labor is the rule in Germany and to a lesser extent in Italy; there is no government regulation of the minute details of the life of the laborer; capital has been all but conscripted by these governments; and practically all economic, political, and social life in those countries is under the control and domination of nazi-ism and fascism to an extent similar to that in Soviet Russia or in the empires of antiquity. The great minorities in Germany and Italy who do not subscribe to the political dogmas of the majorities in control of the respective countries are rooted out or suppressed as ruthlessly as in Russia.[24]

The significant thing about all this is that the respective governments of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia—the totalitarian states of today—are based largely on collectivism and dictatorship, that is, the ordering of the economic life of the respective nations and their individuals by the state itself or by its dictators. Yet even these foreign proponents of change cannot agree among themselves as to which is the preferable order, and we find advocates of communism, of socialism, of fascism, of nazi-ism, of syndicalism, and of anarchism. Under whatever name, the rights and liberties of the people are no more in those countries. The legal profession scarcely exists in any of them. "The courts are working as a part of a team" with the dictators in the drivers' seats. Labor is enslaved as it has not been since Russia freed the serfs, and the "economic planners" are having such a royal good time that chicken experts may readily qualify as monetary or any other kind of experts. If anyone in those countries has the temerity to question what qualifications a grower of chickens has to pose as a monetary expert, a professor in a university to pose as a housing, agricultural, or resettlement expert, or

[24] Maxey, Political Philosophies, above cited, pp. 628–639; Spender, Government of Mankind, above cited, pp. 329–371; Hitler, Mein Kampf; Harper, Government of the Soviet Union; Hubbard, Soviet Trade and Distribution; Miller, Soviet Economic Planning; Webb, S. and B., Soviet Communism; Borgese, Goliath; The March of Fascism; Field, The Syndical and Corporative Institutions of Italian Fascism; Salvemini, Under the Axe of Fascism; Welk, Fascist Economic Policy; Spearman, Diana, Modern Dictatorship; Dr. Scacht and the Nazi System, London Economist, Jan. 28, 1939; Economic Review of Foreign Countries (1937), by Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, U. S. Department of Commerce.

in any way to question the expertness, he is conveniently, expeditiously, and effectively "purged."

WHAT OF THE UNITED STATES?

Is there any labor leader, any businessman, any lawyer, or any other citizen of America so blind that he cannot see that this country is drifting at an accelerating pace into administrative absolutism similar to that which prevailed in the governments of antiquity, the governments of the Middle Ages, and in the great totalitarian governments of today?—governments, I may say, in Germany, Japan, and to some extent in Russia and in Italy within the past 3 years which have overrun smaller countries, slaughtered much of the population of such countries, and which are even today driving their peoples to battle on land, sea, and in the sky.

If administrative absolutism had brought the peoples of those totalitarian states a greater measure of peace with their fellow men; if such governments had given them greater prosperity in a physical sense; if the leaders in such countries had not bathed themselves in the blood of their fellow men through the "purging" of opponents; and if life had been made more secure, happy, and contented under totalitarianism and administrative absolutism, we might welcome the drift in this country toward a similar system here. But we know that none of these things are true. On the contrary, the indisputable facts of recorded history, which I have attempted to summarize before you here today, prove beyond doubt that the most miserable state of mankind is that under a system of administrative absolutism.

Why do I say that we are drifting into administrative absolutism? That is a fair question, and I shall endeavor to answer it. The most recent occurrence is the publication by the congressional investigating committee headed by Mr. DIES, of Texas, of a list of over 600 present-day employees of the Federal Government who are members of a reportedly Communist-controlled organization, an organization which is controlled from the Kremlin, in Moscow. Stalin is an admitted enemy of all forms of government except his own tyrannical and despotic one. A most significant fact as to the publication of that list lies in this: That the majority of the Federal Government employees who are members of this communistically controlled organization are in the agencies concerned with public relief—the use of the money of the American taxpayers and their credit for the purpose of bringing the more abundant life to the poor and depressed. You might as well set a wolf to guard a lamb.

Again, the American Bar Association's administrative law bill, otherwise known as the Logan-Walter bill, is being strenuously opposed by a small minority group whose former president threatened to resign—if he did not resign—from the organization because he stated that such organization was controlled by Communists who had worked themselves into key positions therein—the famous boring-from-within policy so much advocated by the Communists. Also, a witness before the Dies committee a few weeks ago testified that this organization is a fellow traveler of the Communists, and this witness admitted that he had been a Communist. The executive vice president of this same organization publicly stated in Los Angeles a few weeks ago that the administrative law bill did not pass at the last session of Congress solely because of the efforts of the members of his organization.

On top of that, the director appointed by the Attorney General of the United States for his committee on Federal administrative agencies is a member of that same organization and a member of its committee on administrative law which submitted a report to the annual meeting of the organization opposing the bill. This director has called privately on one of the authors of the bill in opposition to it, and how many more he may have called upon I do not know. I do not mean to intimate that this director speaks the thoughts of or for a number of the splendid members of the Attorney General's committee—far from it! In addition to that, a considerable number of the Washington members of that organization—whose membership list is not made available—are employees of the United States in various and sundry agencies, and almost without exception these men are in open opposition to the comparatively simple requirements of the proposed legislation.

One of the prominent members of the same organization is likewise the chairman of a prominent Federal commission. At the Cleveland convention of the American Bar Association he publicly attacked Dean Pound and the report which the dean wrote for the committee on administrative law of that association in support of the draft of bill finally approved in Chicago last January. This attack did not meet with the approval of the lawyers of America, and when the dean countered by calling attention to the fact that this man was a proponent of a combination of Marx and Freud in the form of psychological realism, teaching that it is impossible for a judge to decide objectively, that the judge can only do what his temperament and prejudices and predispositions, determined by his bringing up and social surroundings dictate, this individual beat a retreat. A decisive element in such a judicial process was, as he saw it, the Freudian wish.[25]

As Dean Pound pointed out in his hereinbefore referred to testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee and in the 1938 report of the Special Committee on Administrative Law, the advocates of this doctrine of administrative absolutism in America have been largely from publicists and teachers in some of the schools in the colleges and universities. Until within recent years, comparatively few of these men were lawyers. They were politicial scientists and students in other fields than law. They had no textbooks in the earlier years after such courses were installed in the colleges other than translations and other writings of continentals and the philosophers of antiquity, including Plato, Sir Thomas More, and other Utopians. These laymen were and are largely ignorant of legal history and the development of law administration in England and America. They overlooked or ignored that the philosophers of antiquity and the continental scholars were concerned with either ideal states or with states where there was no separation of governmental powers as under the written Constitutions of the United States, Canada, and Australia, or the unwritten constitution of the English parliamentary system. I may remark parenthetically that in England the courts have never been really independent of Parliament; that is, the courts are bound in England to follow the statutes, while in the United States both the courts and the Congress are bound by the Constitution unless and until the people change it in the mode prescribed.

Of course, if you can once deprive the courts of their jurisdiction in controversies between the Federal administrators and the individual, and if you can get a Congress sufficiently subservient to repeal such vestiges as may now exist of jurisdiction in the courts, administrative absolutism is upon us. Two illustrations within the history of the State of Florida prove exactly what I mean. One occurred when General Jackson invaded Florida and hanged two Englishmen without the benefit of a trial by jury—and I remind you that within the shadow of the United States Capitol there have been executions of civilians after a trial by court martial, and when the regular courts were open and functioning in the District of Columbia. The other instance in your State history was during the period immediately following the War between the States when you—along with others in the South—were under carpetbag rule enforced by the Federal bayonet. A radical Congress had at that time deprived the courts of all jurisdiction to consider the validity of either reconstruction statutes or practices thereunder.

This system of administrative absolutism—which is yet in a comparatively weak form when compared with Germany, Italy, and Russia or Japan—has come upon us since 1914. The Federal courts claimed, developed, and exercised the jurisdiction to review many administrative decisions during the first century of our national existence.[26] But taking a leaf out of the practices of the radical Congress during the days of reconstruction, many of the statutes enacted after 1914 establishing new instruments of governmental power have restricted the scope of judicial review of administrative officers and agencies in such instances. Generally it has been sought to restrict the courts to questions of law, leaving the facts to be found by the administrative tribunals.[27] Such a device is quite simple and entirely practical, as is shown by the condition we are in today.

I shall conclude by merely calling your attention to the reports of the special committee on administrative law of the American Bar Association from 1933 to 1939, inclusive; to Senate bill No. 915 and House bill No. 6324, Seventy-sixth Congress, and to the unanimous reports thereon by the Senate and House Judiciary Committees recommending the passage of said bills. The two bills are practically identical, were drafted in large part by this special committee on administrative law, and they have been approved by the board of governors and by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association; the National Association of Women Lawyers; the American Federation of Labor; the National Association of Publishers, Inc.; the Master Plumbers Association of America; the National Ornamental Metal Manufacturers Association; the National Electrical Contractors Association; the National Association of Manufacturers; by the State bar associations of California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia; and by the city bar associations of Boston, Chicago (in principle), Cleveland, Dallas, Philadelphia, Phoenix, and St. Louis, as well as by the Erie County or Buffalo Bar Association.

These bills have not been disapproved except by the National Lawyers Guild, the Federal Bar Association, and two committees of the City Bar Association of New York.

Do not assume for a moment that I have an ounce of pessimism in my make-up. On the contrary, my whole being is permeated with optimism. I have an abiding faith in America and American institutions. This trend toward administrative absolutism can and will be stopped. With the American lawyer in the lead, supported by labor and business interests, the tide can and will be stemmed.

Where is the Florida bar standing in this fight to restore and preserve the American system of law administration from the menacing maw of administrative absolutism which has cursed the world since the beginning of civilization—the exercise of which by unscrupulous dictators has resulted in driving European peoples to

[25] Pound, Public Law and Private Law, 24 Cornell Law Quarterly (June 1939), pp. 469–432 at p. 479. Also Pound Lectures of 1939 at Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

[26] See address of Col. O. R. McGuire, above cited, before the Fourth Judicial Circuit Conference at Asheville, N. C., on June 9, 1939, published in the October 1939 Journal of the Commercial Law League.

[27] See Adele I. Springer, chairman of the Committee on Administrative Law of the National Women Lawyers' Association, in an article, The American Bar's Administrative Law Bill, in the October number of the journal of her association.

caves in the ground at every sound of the siren in order to protect their lives? I know where the Florida lawyers will stand, and I know they will have standing with them both the laboring and business interests of this great State.

Gentlemen, the fight is on, and let us cry with Macduff, "Cursed be him who first cries enough!"

T. V. A. and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERRON PEARSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1940

ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of Congress to the following address recently delivered by David E. Lilienthal, at a public dinner tendered by Mr. Silliman Evans, publisher of the Nashville Tennesseean, at Nashville, Tenn.:

Tonight a single subject holds America's attention. One concern is shared by every citizen: That this Nation must be made safe against the threat of military aggression. Everywhere through the length and breadth of the country, Americans, in all walks of life, are measuring our resources for defense.

We are now in the midst of a great effort to transform our peacetime economic institutions so that the needs of defense shall be met quickly and effectively. America viewed as one great production plant is being geared to that task.

This adjustment to the needs of defense is one that the entire country is facing at this hour. We must face it in the southeast. For new industries, industries essential to the strengthening of our national defenses, are coming to this area. That is inevitable; in fact it has already begun. Remember that this southeastern region has been named by military authorities as one of the most desirable situations in the United States for the location of national-defense production units. Sheltered from hostile aircraft by mountain ranges and inland from the sea and its hazards, crisscrossed by modern highways, served by railroads and by a newly opened navigation channel, this area is also one of nature's depositories for many of the raw materials classified by the Army as essential for military purposes.

It was because of just such facts as these that during the first World War Muscle Shoals, on the Tennessee River in Alabama, was chosen as the site of a giant government munitions plant. It was for those reasons that Wilson Dam was built to furnish power for the factories erected there.

In 1933 the Tennessee Valley Authority was assigned the management of these properties at Muscle Shoals, originally built to serve the needs of war. The people of the country want to know today how T. V. A. has discharged its responsibility, and to determine whether during these 7 years the properties once built for our defense and the six dams newly constructed to serve the needs of peace have both increased the security of the Nation. And businessmen particularly have a right to ask what services, what specific, practical services the T. V. A. is ready to furnish to the existing essential manufacturing plants that must be expanded to meet the Nation's needs, and the new war materials industries which will begin operations.

The Nation has a right to such an accounting of T. V. A.'s stewardship; the Board of Directors is happy to be able in this way to report directly to you and to all of its 130,000,000 stockholders, the people of the United States. Our report tells a story of munitions; of a vast new supply of electric power, electricity that is producing aluminum for aircraft; it is a story of stepped-up construction schedules, and of industrial research that can speed the transformation of raw materials into the arms of defense. Let me sum up the T. V. A.'s part in the national defense—a four-point program—and then supply you with some of the details which as businessmen you may find of chief practical interest.

In brief compass, here is the T. V. A.'s report:

1. The munitions plant at Muscle Shoals is ready as soon as the signal is given to be adapted to the production of ammonium nitrate for high explosives.

2. T. V. A. has developed a huge supply of power that is now of strategic importance to the defense of the Nation, a power supply without which the production of airplanes on the scale needed would be impossible, for today T. V. A. power is a principal reliance in America's production of aluminum.

3. The need for power and ever more power in this emergency has led us to order our dam-construction program to be speeded up by every device: this pressure means the completion of one of T. V. A.'s new dams 10 months ahead of schedule; it will add five new power generators in dams already completed. Speed, the cutting of corners, possible only in a well-seasoned construction force, is the T. V. A. order of the day.

4. The facts about badly needed raw materials essential to the defense program, facts T. V. A. has been developing for 7 years, are ready and have been made available to the country's new Defense Commission, and to businessmen upon whom we must rely for a speedy production of essential defense materials.

So T. V. A. reports its stewardship. It offers its program as an aid to the defense of the Nation.

The T. V. A. munitions plant at Muscle Shoals stands as a symbol of the democratic conception of defense. It was built for war. But in the years of peace it has served the basic needs of a peaceful people. It is producing a phosphate plant food, an aid in the restoration of our soil fertility, a source of strength to the people who live on the land, a safeguard to our supply of foods and fibers. Now once more war is abroad in the world, and that plant is available for adaptation to the production of explosives. Yet at the same time, faithful to the democratic conception that we must conserve our basic resources for the ultimate strength of all our people, the production of plant food can continue. Detailed plans are ready so that concentrated phosphate needed for the land can continue to be produced at Muscle Shoals without jeopardizing the output of war materials. So far as T. V. A. can influence the decision and the results, you may be confident that the bill for our defense will not be paid this time as it was 20 years ago by the exhaustion of the soil. While this country prepares, if necessary, to meet force with force, we can go on with our program of soil enrichment, making our people secure against the hazards of the future, restoring the land from which we draw our health, our strength, our very life.

Power is the life line of modern industry, upon which preparedness depends. For the rapid expansion of private and public enterprise an enormous supply is necessary. All of you will remember that a few years ago it was charged that the T. V. A. was constructing facilities far in excess of any possible power need. Every request for T. V. A. appropriations was vigorously opposed as unbusinesslike because we were providing for a product that had no market. Experience has demonstrated that our judgment was correct and that our critics in this respect were wrong. There is no power surplus. Had the appropriations for the construction of any one of these T. V. A. dams been defeated or delayed, the preparedness program of this Nation would be impeded. If a single generator had been delayed in installation the capacity of essential aluminum production, for example, would be impaired. And remember that aluminum is the principal item in the construction of aircraft. At this moment T. V. A.'s dams are a major source of power supply upon which the aluminum industry depends to provide materials for the goal of 50,000 airplanes a year. Growth of the new airplane factory here at Nashville, the location of a powder factory at Memphis, developments of the past few weeks, call for added power. Other pending expansion requires extensive increases in T. V. A.'s power capacity.

T. V. A. is now operating at capacity a power system ranking seventh or eighth in the United States. What about the future? How much more expansion of war industries can existing power supply support? An unprecedented increase in demand for electric power is occurring in the United States. We believe that action has not been taken rapidly enough in most sections of the country to keep up with this mounting need. Even in the Southeast, where, because of the T. V. A., the increase in electric supply has proceeded at a swifter pace than for the country as a whole, our judgment is that there must be large and immediate expansion of electric supply beyond the plans already approved for the T. V. A. The T. V. A. Board has ordered a speeding up of its construction schedules to shorten the time when new power supplies can be ready. We have just directed that two new generators for Wheeler Dam be set ahead 5 months, to be ready next winter; the completion of Watts Bar Dam with three large generators, has been ordered shortened by 10 months; three new generators have just been ordered for Wilson and Pickwick Dams, to be turning out power during 1941. These additions total 151,000 kilowatts of power capacity. All of this quickening of pace is within current appropriations. It calls for careful planning and harder work for T. V. A.'s staff, but it is characteristic of the mood and purpose of the whole Nation. Even greater acceleration of the T. V. A. job is needed; we are armed with detailed plans to move without delay when the word comes. T. V. A.'s seasoned construction forces, 8,000-strong, are ready.

But more than assurance of an adequate power supply is needed, if private manufacturers are to produce needed war materials speedily. For every new development businessmen need to know in detail about amounts and costs of raw materials available, about transportation facilities and costs, about industrial water supply and markets, and labor supply and housing. Time is pressing these days, and short cuts around costly and time-consuming independent investigations are urgently needed. In many cases months can be saved in the Tennessee Valley region because for seven years the T. V. A.'s staff of technicians has been at work, in cooperation with other research institutions, obtaining information about the region of exactly the kind that is needed now. The T. V. A. is

making the results of these investigations available for immediate use in the national defense program of industry.

About one-third of the commodities classified as strategic and critical by the Army and Navy Munitions Board are available in commercial quantities in the Tennessee Valley area. Already several important industrial plants are turning out large volumes of some of these materials. The problem is simply one of plant expansion. Private business has ample information concerning many of the important materials which are now in production, such as the ores of zinc, iron, copper, and so on. Where, however, such existing commodities are needed in the defense program, there will be a tremendous impact on their present markets, the greater because imports in many cases are cut off and threatened. Many other potentially useful materials in the Southeast, however, are now being used by industry, only to a small extent; much of the T. V. A.'s industrial research has concerned itself with these less used commodities.

For these reasons many materials which heretofore were little used in industry offer important opportunities for development. They may well prevent serious disruption of some of America's key industries. For 7 years now T. V. A.'s industrial engineers, geologists, chemical and mechanical engineers, and technicians in many other fields have been investigating and testing out specific ways through which the income of the area could be raised by the more extensive processing of the raw-material resources now available. The origin of all wealth is the application of technical knowledge, skill, and labor to raw-material resources; hence T. V. A.'s persistent effort over many years in studying the Valley's raw-material resources, and particularly those which could be made more valuable through processing in industry. We have concentrated effort on some of the more promising materials. We have studied amounts available, estimated costs, and we have conducted experiments concerning specific uses in industry. In several cases experiments have been carried to the point of operating pilot plants in which production costs were determined. There have also been a number of practical market investigations.

As a result of this backlog of practical information, we are in a position to render considerable assistance in the present emergency. The T. V. A. and the agencies with which it is cooperating have developed certain new uses for minerals. We have a new method for refining domestic talc so that it could be used as a substitute for imports in both the electrical and ceramic industries. We have information concerning deposits of olivine, which can be used as a refractory in the steel industry. We have studied the extent and locations of kyanite deposits; it can be used as a refractory and as a raw material for airplane spark plugs. Promising preliminary results have been obtained in processing olivine as a source of magnesium, a metal used along with aluminum in airplane construction. And it is worthy of note that the present production of magnesium in this country is very small, 3,600 tons a year. German production is reported to be about 40,000 tons a year.

Businessmen who will carry a heavy responsibility in the expansion of manufacturing for defense will be interested to learn that T. V. A. has developed some substitutes for high-grade raw materials, substitutes which can take their places for certain uses. The supply of cork from Spain, for instance, is largely shut off. Our technicians have tested a method of treating a mineral known as vermiculite so that it will serve as a good substitute for cork insulation. We have obtained promising results in developing a process in our laboratories at Muscle Shoals by which manganese might be produced economically from certain low-grade ores. Most high-grade manganese ores are imported. We have investigated deposits of low-grade short-fibered asbestos, the use of which would make it possible to conserve the limited supply of long-fibered asbestos.

I need not list all the instances here. Suffice it to say that experiments have been made in laboratories and pilot plants, cost records are available, likewise estimates on peacetime markets offering permanent outlets when the emergency is over. The discoveries made in the course of T. V. A.'s industrial research efforts are ready for private enterprise to use as it mobilizes in defense of our country. And to this end we have just made our facilities available to the new Advisory Defense Commission, representing as it does, both industry and government, as one of T. V. A.'s contributions to the defense of the country.

Let me at this point make one matter clear. The T. V. A. area is confined to the Southeast, but it is an agency of the Nation. In assisting the industries of the country to accelerate their activities in this area, in providing them with information on which to act, the T. V. A. is not now and never has been involved in a program designed to encourage the removal of any industry from one community to another, from any other area to this one. We are an impartial agency of the Federal Government. We have obligations to the country as a whole. Our function is to know the facts and make them available wherever they are needed. This is no new activity for the Authority. But its importance now is immeasurably increased. And it is a good example, I think, of the way in which public activity and private enterprise can work together in seeking a common objective, the increase of income of the whole people. This program demonstrates the falsity of the mischievous notion that the governmental and business institutions of America are mutually hostile in their objectives. It stands as a concrete illustration that business and government are both part of the same effort of a united people.

Plans on paper do not produce planes or tanks or munitions. Plans have to be carried out. People have to do the job. Factories decided upon must be built or expanded; ore must be mined and put on cars and ships; figures on paper of how many men are needed to do a job must be translated into men actually employed and actually standing at an assembly line in a particular plant. In a country-wide effort to accelerate production broad-scale plans and decisions must, of course, be made at the top. Experience, and sad experience, has shown, however, that often in the past the serious bottleneck has been in getting those plans and decisions carried out. Fatal delays are likely to occur not so much because of inadequate planning, but because of inadequacies in the executions of those plans. A good plan, a fine blueprint, isn't enough. Those plans and blueprints have to be adapted to suit local conditions. Here, too, the T. V. A. may be of assistance. For as a regional agency we have necessarily been close to the problems we have been charged with administering; we have acquired a habit of getting things done as much as possible through the use of local agencies and regional leadership.

For seven years it has been T. V. A.'s job to know this region, not only the location of its minerals, its forest resources, its transportation and labor supply and housing, but the men who are its leaders—businessmen, teachers, farmers—men in various capacities of the region's life. For seven years now T. V. A. has worked cooperatively with almost every kind of regional and local institution—public and private—the colleges, the farm organizations, the local chambers of commerce, individual local industries and laboratories of industrial research. That knowledge of local resources, that habit of administering a job at the grass roots will enable us to help to accelerate the speed with which the national program is carried out in the Southeast.

To you who live in the area, as well as to the Nation as a whole, it will be a matter of satisfaction that the peacetime program of the Authority can be so immediately effective in this crisis. Of even greater consequence may be the fact that we are determined that all our efforts directed toward defense shall build up, not tear down, the progress we have made. The T. V. A. program is not altered. It is the same. The emergency only accelerates its pace. The T. V. A. is directed toward a constant goal—to aid in widening economic opportunity, to seek to assure a rising standard of living. A democracy will be secure only if it serves its citizens effectively. While T. V. A. takes its part in the national program designed to make our country safe from attack, it will seek to continue its long-time job of helping to make it secure from disaster within.

Guns and bombs and aircraft and munitions we must have if we would be prepared to defend ourselves. But the will, the inner flame, must be there or all the engines of defense will be without avail. We live under a system fashioned out of sacrifice and devotion by free men for free men, and not by robots for robots. This will be our greatest asset of defense; that on the farm, in the mine and factory, in places of business, the people of this country shall feel deep in their hearts that they have a nation, a way of life, a future that is worth every effort to improve and every sacrifice to defend.

Division of Commercial Treaties and Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. CORDELL HULL, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Secretary of State:

The recent creation of a new Division of Commercial Treaties and Agreements was another of a number of steps taken, from time to time, for the purpose of improving and making more effective the administrative machinery of the Department. The new division will provide unified direction for carrying out important functions in the field of commercial policy formerly handled by a number of divisions.

Far from signifying an abandonment or weakening of the trade-agreements program, this administrative change is intended to strengthen and make more efficient our efforts in the direction of the widest practicable implementation of the program and of the basic principles of liberal commercial relations, which underlie that program. Continued advocacy of these principles has been and remains our fixed policy. The only alternative, especially after the war, would be the destructive course of totalitarian autarchy.

I should like to call attention again to the following statement made by the President on June 21, 1940, in connection with some of the emergency features of our current work in the field of inter-American economic cooperation:

"In some of its essential features, this program of cooperative economic action by the American Republics and possibly by other countries is being undertaken in response to new—but, we hope, temporary—developments in international relations. It is not intended to replace the program of reciprocal-trade agreements which has been steadfastly pursued by the Government of the United States. We continue to believe that the basic principles of that program offer the most effective basis for mutually beneficial economic relations among nations, and we are determined to work, as circumstances permit, for their fullest possible application."

Mexican Claims Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill has for its purpose the discharge of an obligation assumed by the Government of the United States. That obligation was assumed by the Government by its voluntary act and for reasons which seemed to it to be good and sufficient and to its own best interests. For the purpose of engaging in trade and commerce with the Republic of Mexico many of our nationals had gone into that Republic, had invested their money, and were engaged in businesses of many kinds. They were perfectly willing to hazard their money in that undertaking and were perfectly willing to abide by the established systems for the protection of those investments.

Unfortunately revolution tore the Republic of Mexico for many years. The period from 1910 to 1920 is generally regarded as the revolutionary period. During much of that period many irritating incidents occurred which strained the relations between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Mexico. These incidents ranged from the seizure or destruction of property of United States citizens to violent border raids in which our citizens were killed or injured. Many Members of this Congress remember the time they served on the Mexican border as members of the National Guard of their respective States. During some of this period war seemed to be imminent, costly border guards were being maintained by the United States and trade and commerce between the two countries were at a standstill.

In 1923 this condition existed. The United States found her trade and commerce stagnated and she was losing all of the revenue of Mexican imports as well as the benefit her citizens would receive from exports to Mexico. In this condition the Government of the United States began negotiations for a restoration of diplomatic relations and the resultant establishment of trade and commerce between the countries.

In September 1923, as a condition precedent to the resumption of relations with Mexico, a treaty was entered into between the two Governments. This treaty called for a commission to hear and determine the claims of United States nationals against Mexico and of Mexican nationals against the United States. This was regarded by the United States as being to her own best interests. So believing, this Government, under the treaty power possessed by it under the Constitution, required that citizens of this country submit their claims to this commission and deprived them of all other instrumentalities for the adjustment and collection of those claims. By so doing this Government agreed that it would pay to its citizens the amount awarded to its citizens by the commission and the Government of Mexico agreed to pay the amount awarded to its citizens and the lesser would operate as an offset against the greater.

That such was the effect of the treaty is acknowledged by the State Department and has been its position from the beginning. To such an extent has the State Department made this holding that it prevented a settlement privately negotiated by one of the claimants who had submitted its claim to the commission on the ground that the treaty removed its management from the hands of the claimant.

This bill is but the discharge of an obligation long delayed.

Representative Plumley, of Vermont, the Entire "Vermont Delegation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER STEARNS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative ALLEN, summer resident of Vermont and a "temporary constituent" of the gentleman from Vermont, Representative PLUMLEY, put in the RECORD an editorial from the Bennington Banner in re certain honorary degrees held by our mutual friend.

I do not propose as a "good neighbor" to be outdone by him, though he was one jump ahead of me, for I now propose, under consent granted, to include an editorial from the Keene Evening Sentinel, of Keene, N. H., in my district, indicative of the fact that Representative Plumley's friendships are not localized or confined by State lines.

The editor of the Sentinel is one of the ablest men in his field in New Hampshire, or elsewhere for that matter, so when Harry Shaw takes time and makes the effort to write such an editorial as that which I include you may know he speaks whereof he knows.

Incidentally, I happen to know that he and the gentleman from Vermont, Representative PLUMLEY, are long and old-time friends. I have heard him relate the fact that back in the early 1900's he was official reporter of the Vermont House of Representatives, by grace of an appointment at the hands of this friend of his, who was then Speaker, if I remember correctly.

Even before that time, after Shaw left Washington where he was secretary to Senator Page of Vermont to return to Vermont to engage in newspaper work he wrote a series of articles for the press covering the officials and prominent Members of the legislature and their idiosyncracies. Legislatime Luminaries it was called, and in his write up of the gentleman from Vermont, Clerk PLUMLEY, back in those days, he suggests that it will be wise to watch his progress.

Anyway, Shaw has watched him, as has most of New England, and he does not overdraw the picture he paints.

I do not, as I said, propose to let Pennsylvania get ahead of me. No summer resident of Vermont has anything on one who has been a long-time permanent neighbor, although there is an imaginary State line between us.

Incidentally it is a pleasure to let the doctor's colleagues know what his neighbors think of him, and to congratulate him on behalf of all of us, who are honored indirectly by reason of his selection for the honor conferred.

I am the more impelled to do this because of the fact that the gentleman from Vermont, Representative PLUMLEY has declined to become a candidate for the Senate to fill out the unexpired term of the late Senator Gibson—a decision that will be enthusiastically welcomed by his friends on both sides of the aisle in this House.

In his statement to the public through the press, the gentleman from Vermont, Representative PLUMLEY, says:

At this critical time in our country's history I would lose the respect of those who have so often and so signally honored me if I were to allow any desire to realize a personal ambition to go to the United States Senate to influence or determine my sense of duty and obligation.

I can do more effective work and render more valuable service to my State, to New England, and the country right where I am.

I am a candidate to succeed myself. It is a sufficient honor to be the sole Representative in the Congress from my native State.

PLUMLEY OF VERMONT

Boston University not only honored Congressman CHARLES A. PLUMLEY but it did a job that reflects honor upon the institution when it conferred the degree of doctor of laws upon the well-known Vermonter. Those who have been associated with Mr. PLUMLEY in educational and public service activities will very generally agree that this honor by the Boston institution has been long deferred.

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, former president of Norwich is a long, and old-time friend of the editor. We have wanted to say a lot of things for some years, or since he left the presidency of Norwich; this affords the desired opportunity.

The writer recalls the days when as official reporter of the Vermont House of Representatives, he was called in to conferences had between the then president of Norwich, Charles H. Spooner, now of Charlestown, N. H., Col. Fred B. Thomas, and the then speaker of the house, Representative PLUMLEY, who were trying to save Norwich University from the Carnegie Foundation attack. "There never would be another war" said the Foundation, "so why continue Norwich? Why not make it a part of U. V. M.?" They saved it, and it proved their wisdom, for war soon came and Norwich men distinguished themselves, as always, in the service of their country.

The editor came to know this man PLUMLEY even before that, as clerk of the Vermont House of Representatives, while he was then a newspaperman on duty at the capitol.

The people of Vermont have shown their appreciation of his services by serving themselves in sending him to represent them in Congress. He has justified their confidence in him.

The people of Vermont and New Hampshire—for that matter all of New England—know of the outstanding record he has made in Congress. He is admittedly one of the leaders of the minority; holds very responsible positions on Appropriations and other committees; is deputy whip, and elsewhere recognized.

What they do not know, but we do, is that the 14 years he was president of Norwich University marks an unprecedented era of progress and advancement of that institution. A friend of mine some time ago sent me the financial statement of the university covering the years of 1920 to 1933.

When PLUMLEY took over the reins in 1920 there were mortgages plastered all over the institution. The buildings (and that was about all there was to the plant) were valued at $297,562. When he resigned he had reerected and newly constructed a plant which was valued at $918,600, or an increase of more than $720,000. And that at depression values, and for insurance purposes, so the books show. The mortgages were burned.

When he took over the management the total endowment was only $169,000. He left it at $800,000 in round numbers. The total physical value of the assets of the university, counting the plant and the endowment, when PLUMLEY resigned as president, amounted to $2,132,557 as against $393,127 when he was elected.

He increased its assets over a million and a half; that is to say, after deducting all indebtedness, and despite all handicaps.

However, the money end of it all is a small factor. During his administration the faculty was increased numerically; the faculty members each had a $100 increase for years; the cadet corps reached its maximum size; new courses were added which raised the academic standing; curriculum requirements and prerequisites of academic and educational standardizing boards were met, which made it possible for the first time for Norwich to be accorded recognition as an accredited college.

He erected new buildings, reconstructed old buildings, constructed an athletic field, a polo field, and furnished a foundation for the growth he envisaged along all lines.

He rendered faithful service under most disadvantageous conditions, oppcsed as he was by some jealous and narrow-minded and shortsighted people, and interfered with as he was by a group of noncooperative and disloyal associates in his administrative staff.

Such service marks the real era of the beginning of Norwich as a university, unappreciated perhaps by those who fought his program, but history will write it so.

Boston University has done well to acknowledge its appreciation of faithful service to his day and generation by one who never made and never would make any claim himself for his achievements.

President Raises Another False Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the press of July 6:

Better, said Mr. Roosevelt, that the United States suffer from the inefficiency of this Nation's democratic form of government and chafe under the "time-lag" which may stall for months and years needed improvement, than submit to the grim power of the dictator nations.

Thus the President sounded the keynote of the New Deal campaign to keep Republican Nominee Willkie out of the White House.

The President, backed by Farley and Bankhead, assumes that once again he can fool the voters by raising a false issue; that is, that an efficient administration under Willkie would destroy American institutions.

The President forgets that we remember that he is the man who, through the past 7 years, has been inordinately eager—crazy, it might be said—to grasp a dictator's power.

He was the one who attempted to destroy a coordinate—the judicial—branch of the Government, with his court-packing scheme. He it was who insisted that Congress follow him so subserviently that it became known as a group of "yes" men, a "rubber stamp" branch of the Government.

He is the one who has deprived industrialists of free speech, as, for example, when his Labor Board convicted Henry Ford because he told his employees they did not need to pay tribute to the President's then "buddy," John Lewis, for the privilege of working for the Ford Motor Co.

The President is the would-be dictator who has demanded and received blank checks for billions of dollars; who attempted to purge those members of his own party who ventured to disagree with him, to assert their independence.

The President's hypocrisy is so well known that this last dose will deceive no one.

Roosevelt is the one who, in violation of a Federal statute, was about to send American ships to a belligerent when his acts were halted by the protest of the gentleman from South Dakota, Congressman CASE.

Roosevelt assumes apparently, that we cannot have efficiency under a democracy. His assumption is correct, if he has in mind the kind of "democracy" that Roosevelt and the New Deal have given us—a pseudo—democracy.

In assuming that we cannot have as high a degree of efficiency in a democracy without loss of liberty, as in a dictatorship, the President must have in mind our Nation's experience with the New Deal, which took from us our "democracy"; gave us dictatorship without efficiency.

Roosevelt has grasped for and seized most of the dictatorial powers exercised by a Hitler, but he lacks Hitler's efficiency. He will fool no one by his attempt to raise the bogey man of fear of dictatorship through Willkie and a Republican administration. The people have taken his measure; they are familiar with his political tricks, his frightening crises, his false emergencies—all staged for political effect.

Roosevelt's fair-haired boy, Tugwell, early in the New Deal, was the one who said:

Business must logically be made to disappear.

The President and his new dealers have gone a long way on that road, but patriotic Americans, with the good Lord's help, will restore business to its rightful place; so that we may adequately prepare for the dangers into which the New Deal is arrogantly shoving us.

The only dictator on our present horizon is Roosevelt, who, contrary to all American tradition, would himself, during a third term, exercise absolute power from the White House or name his successor to do so.

No, Mr. Roosevelt, the people have at last "caught on" and, after January next, they will no longer suffer from the inefficiency of this Nation's New Deal. They will do things in a businesslike way, as our forefathers did in the years gone by. They will strip the Federal Government of some of its arbitrary power and retake for themselves and their representatives the liberties of which you and your political supporters have deprived them.

The days of boondoggling which you praised so highly; of spending for the sake of spending; of the purchasing of political support by the expenditure of Federal money; of the strutting and the bluffing while inadequately prepared, are about over.

Shocked by a knowledge of Hitler's power; of the effect of your foreign policy which has left us without a single friend who would unselfishly assist us; we are going back to work; to the way of life which heretofore has always insured our independence, our safety, and under which we always kept our freedom until you arrived on the scene.

Do not worry, Mr. President, about the loss of our freedom; the establishment of a dictator here in the United States. The only one who has attempted that has been yourself. Pointing an accusing finger at Willkie will get you nowhere.

The Future Is Our Own!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HAROLD L. ICKES, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I herewith insert the address by the very able Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, entitled "The Future Is Our Own!" delivered at Washington's Fourth of July celebration in front of the Washington Monument, Thursday, July 4, 1940. The address was broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Americans used to think that they knew all there was to know about orations. They used to think that they had heard all the orations there were to hear—the nominating orations—the dedicatory orations—the memorial orations—the commencement orations—the Fourth of July orations. For years, for generations, ever since the foundation of the Republic and even way back before that, they had been listening to the orators and to the orations, and they thought that they had heard them all.

They were wrong.

There is a new kind of oration in the world: an oration which has been given again and again, and louder and louder, and more and more frequently during these last few years.

You have heard it. You have all heard it. You have heard it on the radio blaring out from eastward over the water. You have read it in the papers. It is always the same oration.

It begins familiarly for you—for all Americans. It begins like the old-fashioned Fourth of July orations with fine-sounding words about the people, the new people, the superior, forceful, vigorous people who will rule the world—the people of the future.

When you hear these words you sit back in your seats. You relax. You listen.

But, as you listen, the familiarity of the words disappears. They change. There's a difference. And gradually, listening, you realize what the difference is. It is this: In the past, in the orations that you remember, the superior, forceful, vigorous people the orators were always talking about—the people who would conquer the world—were always you—you, the American people. But now, in this new oration, the fine new vigorous people are not you. They are not you at all. They are somebody else.

It is somebody else, somebody different, who is new now; somebody else who is young, and strong, and vigorous.

And what about you? Where do you come in?

You find out soon enough. You find out as you listen. You are told that you are old. You are tired. You are all through. You are a decadent, worn-out nation, full of decadent, outmoded ideas. You are finished. There is no place for you or for your ideas in the world any more. That is what you are told as you listen to this new oration.

And, as you listen, you become uneasy. You had always thought that democracy and liberty were the new things in the world and that you were the new people in the world, the people of the West. And here is this orator telling you that democracy is all through and that liberty is decadent and that the new people are not the people of the new world in America, but the people of the Old World overseas.

It is a startling idea to you, fellow Americans. And you sit and you listen and you wonder. And you hear the orator talking about the great deeds and the triumphs of this other, new and vigorous people, this different people, and you see that there are indeed triumphs. And you say to yourselves, "Maybe he's got something there." "Maybe it's true." "Let's have a look." "Let's have a look at this new, triumphant people boasting of their strength." "Let's have a look at the fresh and vigorous people who shout that they are fresher and more vigorous than the American pioneers or their freeborn children."

And you have a look. And you see. And what you see is this:

You see that this new and vigorous people are a people so vigorous, so virile, so energetic, so young, so strong, that they have surrendered their wills, their bodies, and their minds to the absolute will of a boss who tells them what to do.

You see that they are people so fresh and so forceful and so determined that they do whatever they are told to do—speak when they are told to speak, listen when they are told to listen, say what they are told to say, shut up when they are told to shut up, eat when they are told to eat, go hungry when they are told to go hungry, die when they are told to die.

You see that they are people whose vigor and force are so great and so overwhelming that they put up with snoopers, accept paid informers, permit themselves to be whipped and mutilated, read what they are permitted to read, salute when they are told to salute, marry when they are told to marry, beget children when they are instructed to beget children.

You see that these so superior and forceful people break their plighted word, rape peaceful lands at the word of their master, destroy the lives of little children, requite gentleness with brutality, reap where they have not sown, victimize helpless minorities.

You see that these superior people of the future who would rule the world abase themselves before new gods set up for them by a dictator.

You see all this. And you listen to the orator. You hear him tell you that freedom is now a mark of inferiority and of incompetence and that slavery is the badge of pride and of patriotism. You hear him tell you that obedience is the mark of a man and that independence is characteristic of a weakling.

You listen.

You have been listening now for a long time.

When are you going to laugh, Americans?

When is the big laugh, the coarse, loud laugh, the harsh laugh of Americans going to blurt out and fill the world? When are you going to imagine to yourselves the words that Lincoln would have used if he had listened to this orator?

When are you going to throw at this orator the words of Lincoln that "No man is good enough to govern any other man without that other man's consent"?

When are you going to imagine the words that your fathers would have used, and their fathers?

When is the great, hard, angry, shouting, "razzberry" laugh of the American people going to yell down the west wind of this continent and out to sea and on out past the horizon?

When are you going to say, all as one man and all together: "We haven't even yet begun to live!"

"We haven't even yet begun to create on this continent the new and untried and never yet realized world of freedom and security and self-respect!"

When are you going to shout again to the world the words that our forefathers shouted—that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Tonight, in the Capital of our free and young and great Republic, we are assembled to reaffirm to ourselves and to the world that we in America still hold these truths to be self-evident.

We swear that we will hold fast to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and that we will never tolerate any seeds of hatred that would raise one American against another.

We reaffirm our belief in freedom, freedom of speech, of worship, of assembly, of press, and of the individual.

We pledge continued allegiance to the eternal principles of truth and of justice.

We united and free Americans declare that we are prepared to defend our principles, our ideals, and our institutions, so that the future may be ours.

Pledge Allegiance and Fidelity to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

RESOLUTION BY SYRIAN LEBANESE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF BELMONT COUNTY, OHIO

Mr. LEWIS OF OHIO. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a resolution passed by the Syrian Lebanese American Society of Belmont County, Ohio, pledging allegiance and fidelity to the United States of America. It is with genuine satisfaction that we observe the spontaneous declarations by many of our foreign-born citizens of unswerving allegiance and

fidelity to the United States of America in these troublous times. Their conduct in this connection is an inspiration and I am glad to include in my remarks the resolution which is as follows:

Whereas it is recognized by proper authorities having as their duties the preservation of these United States of America as free and independent States within a great Nation that certain subversive activities directed against the Government of these United States does exist; and

Whereas certain people living within the boundaries of these United States are openly accused and publicly prosecuted for their traitorous acts against this Nation, which they have not denied; and

Whereas many of these individuals are persons formerly holding allegiance to a foreign flag or nation, or are one generation only removed from the influence of foreign demagogs and kings; we

Therefore feel that this activity has brought and is bringing upon the shoulders of all foreign-born citizens of this country and upon their children born in this country unfavorable comment and criticism which is not merited, and to which we as loyal citizens and patriotic Americans do object.

We therefore feel that the accident of birth should not hold against us influence which we find hard to deny except by word. We do, therefore, in an effort to pledge anew our allegiance to the only land we know, and in an effort to forever silence our detractors. offer the following pledge of loyalty:

"We the members of the Syrian Lebanese American Society of Belmont County, Ohio, do hereby declare, on oath, that we absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, and particularly to the country of which we have been heretofore subjects; that we will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that we will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that we take this obligation freely without mental reservation or purpose of evasion, so help me, God."

(Signed) PAUL HANWOOD,
President.
ANTHONY MOSES,
Vice President.
GEARGE KANAAN,
Secretary.

I Love the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HAROLD FLANNERY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

POEM WRITTEN BY JOHN V. HEFFERNAN

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by a constituent and personal friend, John V. Heffernan:

I LOVE THE UNITED STATES

I love the towns of the North,
The song of each vibrant street,
I thrill to the winds as they billow forth
Through the snow and the biting sleet,
And who shall say that they stifle breath
Or weave its mists into shrouds of death?

I love the towns of the East,
Cradled by mountain and sea;
They sprawl on the land like a lazy beast
But they tenderly suckle me.
From merry to mad their moods may range,
But what is life if it is not change?

I love the towns of the South,
Asleep beside slumbrous streams—
The palm trees convene at the river's mouth
And they speak with the voice of dreams:
Manana! Manana! They seem to say,
Tomorrow, lad, is another day.

I love the towns of the West,
Sun chastened and shrived by rain,
Clean-cut as the gems of a necklace dressed
For the goddess of peak and plain.
Their far horizons give man his scope
For the high emprise of dauntless hope.

I love the United States,
Endowed by the best of earth,
And I pray that ever within its gates
Stanch statecraft shall find safe berth.
Our pledge be the cause more right than just,
In God and Country our sacred trust.

—*John V. Heffernan.*

Financing Additions to the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 4, 1940

ADDRESS OF CARL B. ROBBINS, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, TO THE AMERICAN COTTON SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 last, Mr. Carl B. Robbins, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, delivered an address at New Orleans which has excited widespread interest in agricultural circles, an address which he aptly entitled "Financing Additions to the Farm Program."

In the light of the conditions which have developed in the interim, the importance of that which Mr. Robbins then had to say cannot be overemphasized. In view of the plight of many farmers, there are few among us but would agree that a way must be found to increase and stabilize agricultural income.

In his speech, Mr. Robbins argues most persuasively for the adoption of Secretary Henry A. Wallace's marketing certificate program. Having been impressed by the logic of his presentation, I am quite certain that the certificate plan is well worthy of and should be accorded the careful study and painstaking consideration of the farmers of the country as well as the membership of this legislative body. To become informed in respect to the program is to become an enthusiastic advocate of the plan for which he so eloquently pleads. Of this I am quite certain.

Moreover, the promise that the marketing-certificate program holds of bringing about a most substantial and greatly needed increase in the income from several important crops in my State—including raisins, rice, and prunes—as well as such nationally basic crops as cotton and wheat, makes it important that the proposed program be given widespread consideration. This is especially true today in view of the fact that all these crops are threatened with serious injury as a consequence of the disruption by the current war of so many of our foreign export markets.

Because I am thoroughly convinced that Mr. Robbins indicates in the marketing-certificate program a possible escape from the intolerable conditions which in the past have all but overwhelmed the American agriculturist, I am constrained to, and do ask, the unanimous consent of the membership of this body that the text of his splendid address be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And this with the hope that those who may hereafter peruse it will advise me in respect to their reactions.

The unanimous approval of the membership of the House of Representatives to the inclusion of the address hereinbefore referred to having been indicated, Mr. Robbins' speech follows:

OUTLINE

I. Foreword.
II. First question: What are the elements of the farm program and its results to date?
III. Second question: What are the basic needs and desirable requirements of additions to the farm program?
A. The need for increased farm income.
B. The need for permanence of farm income.
C. The need for strengthened-production adjustment.
(1) To compensate for lost markets.
(2) To avert unbalanced production.

D. The need for increased soil conservation.
E. The need for increased consumption of farm products.
F. The need for utilizing the services of the normal channels of trade.
IV. Third question: Should the required additional funds be obtained primarily through the Federal Treasury or the market place?
A. The main choice.
B. General superiority of improved prices over increased appropriations as the principal source of funds.
C. Conclusions on improved prices and increased appropriations as sources of funds.
V. Fourth question: How should the required additional funds be obtained through the market place?
A. First alternative: Fix prices at higher levels by governmental decree.
(1) Invalid theory for sacrificing production adjustment.
(2) Incentive for Government to encroach on business.
B. Second alternative: Adopt high commodity-loan rates.
(1) Functions of commodity loans.
(2) Collateral plans required for financially successful commodity-loan programs.
(3) Problems of high commodity-loan rates.
C. Third alternative: Apply the principle of marketing certificates.
(1) Description of the marketing-certificate program.
(a) Distribution to farmers.
(b) Requirement of manufacturers and importers.
(c) Revolving pool to facilitate the purchase and sale of certificates.
(d) Legal nature of the certificate requirement.
(e) Adaptability of the marketing-certificate program to various crops.
(2) Superiority of the marketing-certificate program.
(a) More nearly adequate income for farmers.
(b) More permanent source of farm income.
(c) Greater contribution to production adjustment and soil conservation.
(d) Less burden on the budget and public debt.
(e) Less burden on foreign trade.
(f) Less accumulation of surplus stocks.
(g) Less encouragement of competitive products.
(h) Less interference with the normal channels of trade.
(3) Invalid objections to the marketing-certificate program.
(a) The contention about competitive products.
(b) The contention about prices to consumers.
VI. Conclusions.

Financing Additions to the Farm Program

I. FOREWORD

It is a pleasure to respond to your invitation and present a comparative analysis of the marketing-certificate program and other alternatives for financing additions to the farm program.

The members of your association are engaged in a long-established and highly useful business that normally performs the necessary functions of classing, buying, holding, shipping, and selling cotton. The structure of your trade gives considerable assurance that cotton growers will receive as much, and cotton manufacturers will pay as little, as supply and demand conditions and keen competition in handling make possible. It is widely recognized that the merchandising services of cotton shippers, including the cooperatives, constitute one of our most efficient and valuable middleman trades.

Under these circumstances, you desire and deserve a continuing opportunity to render your normal services. Some of you, however, have become perhaps unduly apprehensive lest new additions to the farm program should take a form that would tend to cause Government to encroach upon your established business. Various farm plans have been proposed that you fear would jeopardize the cotton trade. You see potential dangers to your business in the numerous proposals which are basically plans for either price fixing or high commodity loan rates; and you are disturbed by the very considerable total support behind such proposals.

There is at least some basis for your present concern and pessimism with respect to possible future developments affecting the cotton trade; but there is also a sound basis for confidence and optimism with respect to the future of your business. Although there is some conflict between the interests of cotton farmers and cotton shippers—with respect to the quantity of cotton to be produced and marketed—there is no basic conflict of interests that would necessarily require your business to suffer. On the contrary, there is a very considerable identity of interests, and an important need for your services. In fact, it is hoped that this discussion will make it clear how, as it so happens, the various current proposals which you fear would threaten the cotton trade are not the most desirable alternatives from the standpoint of cotton growers. It is believed that in the course of this analysis it will become manifest that, fortunately, the plan for making additions to the farm program which the Secretary of Agriculture has developed to serve best the interests of growers is also an alternative that coincides with your own interests.

It may be well to refer briefly to the organization of the discussion which is intended to substantiate these somewhat sweeping and optimistic statements. It has been deemed best to proceed by describing: First, the nature of the farm program and its results to date; second, the basic needs and desirable requirements of additions to the farm program; third, the main choice that must be made between the Federal Treasury and the market place as the two principal sources of funds; and fourth, the various alternatives for obtaining additional funds through the market place.

II. FIRST QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE ELEMENTS OF THE FARM PROGRAM AND ITS RESULTS TO DATE?

The plight of farmers in 1933, when the farm program was adopted, is not pleasant to recall. Farmers were desperately striving to subsist on painfully meager incomes from 5-cent cotton, 32-cent wheat, and 19-cent corn. In 1932 the cash income of farmers had dwindled to the incredibly low figure of approximately $4,500,000,000. Foreclosure of farm mortgages was rife. The markets for farm products, at home and abroad, had been seriously impaired by increasing unemployment and trade barriers. Thousands of country banks and stores had become bankrupt. The fertility of the soil was being mined, and erosion of the land was being spread, in the production of undistributable surpluses. In fact, agriculture was so hard pressed and disorganized that farmers had found themselves driven to the device of local strikes as a last resort in a desperate effort to obtain a subsistence. Thought and order had been replaced by confusion and chaos. At the height of this storm the farm program was born; and it seems truly remarkable that under the stress of such an emergency there was adopted, not a mere temporary and expedient device, but a fundamental and sound program of permanent nature.

During the past 7 years the farm program has been enlarged and improved with the encouraging results that we see today. Agriculture's annual cash income has increased to $8,500,000,000. Soil rebuilding and conservation have been substituted for soil mining and erosion. Production adjustment, ever-normal granary, crop insurance, surplus removal, commodity loan, and tenancy programs have helped to prevent and control the conditions and forces that had impaired the welfare of American agriculture, and with that, the welfare of industry and the Nation. Today, in contrast, we have 10-cent cotton, 90-cent wheat, and 60-cent corn. The principal and interest on farm mortgages are much lower; the balance between agricultural and industrial production has been restored to a substantial extent; farmers are organized to deal effectively with their problems; the country stores and banks have reopened to enjoy an enlarged volume of business; and industry has recovered much of its market in the agricultural areas.

The farm program is not here today, to be gone tomorrow. It is not a trivial and decorative annual; it is a deep-rooted and enduring perennial which is so far-reaching, and so fundamentally sound and necessary that it will yield well-being and security for all the people in the years to come, no matter what may happen in this confused and uncertain world. Those who would attempt to destroy the farm program cannot be well informed; they must be unable to recall the miseries that it relieved and unable to see its crying need for the future. Consequently, as the only suggestion to the members of your association, it is proposed that for your own interests, as well as for the public welfare, you adopt a realistic attitude of reconciliation toward the overwhelming necessity for production adustment, even though it has meant a decrease in the volume of raw cotton for you to merchandise. That is your greatest single problem. If it were done, you would be in a position to cooperate and participate with the farmers, and give them and yourselves the benefit of the accumulated wealth of your technical and trade knowledge, in making additions to the farm program that would simultaneously be of maximum benefit to cotton growers and afford the maximum opportunity for the utilization of your own valuable services.

III. SECOND QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE BASIC NEEDS AND DESIRABLE REQUIREMENTS OF ADDITIONS TO THE FARM PROGRAM?

In order to reduce the problem of appraising the various alternatives for additions to the farm program to a realtively simple task, it is necessary to have definitely in mind the principal objectives to be attained. To that end, it is proposed to review as briefly as possible the basic needs and desirable requirements of new additions to the farm program.

A. The need for increased farm income

The great improvement in agricultural income during the past 7 years should not be misinterpreted as indicating that farmers have obtained an equitable participation in the national income. The worst suffering has been met, but crying needs still remain for increased farm income. It is not necessary to describe to you, whose business brings you into intimate contact with farmers throughout the Cotton Belt, how many farm families are still obliged to endure the privations of insufficient food, clothing, and medical services. The lot of the average share-cropper and tenant has not yet been brought up to the level of urban relief workers. The minimum wage of mill hands is 30 cents per hour but last year the farmer received, including governmental payments, only about 12 cents for the pound of cotton that may have required approximately a man-hour of labor to produce. Let it suffice to summarize the great deficiency and disparity in farm income by those basic statistics: Agriculture today has approximately 24 percent of the total population, and 31 percent of the Nation's children, but only 11 percent of the national income.

B. The need for permanence of farm income

To the extent that farmers are obliged to rely upon appropriations from the Federal Treasury as a principal source of income, their status is uncertain and vulnerable. In contrast, the aid that the Government has extended to industry and labor through such devices as tariffs, quotas, and franchises seems secure and permanent. Every year there has been a brisk struggle to obtain even an irreducible necessary minimum of agricultural appropriations. Last year, as you know, there was difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds to make possible the sale of cotton in foreign markets. You are also acquainted with the problem that has been encountered this year in obtaining appropriations for parity and export payments. With an increased Federal debt, and with a growing need for appropriations for national defense, it is possible that in the future the Congress may curtail rather than increase agricultural appropriations. Agriculture, like industry, is entitled to look for its income from sources that are more reliable than direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

C. The need for strengthened production adjustment

It is readily understandable that a cotton shipper might find it difficult to become enthusiastic about a farm program which had as one objective a reduction in the number of bales of cotton to be handled; but, as has been mentioned, you need to face the facts squarely in order to place yourself in position to act in your own best interest. The need for production adjustment is an overwhelmingly real and stubborn fact. Farmers must have it as the foundation for any successful program for cotton. Let us examine briefly the two fundamental needs for production adjustment.

(1) To Compensate for Lost Markets

Agriculture has lost much of its foreign market since the World War as a consequence of both the change in our position from a debtor to a creditor Nation and the mushroom growth of trade barriers throughout the world. The trade-agreements program is serving to lower old, and curtail the erection of new, trade barriers. The loss in our former foreign market, however, is still equal to the production from thirty to thirty-five million acres of cropland; and the supplanting of the horse by the gasoline motor has reduced the market for feed crops from an additional twenty-five to thirty million acres. The loss of these markets for the products of fifty-five to sixty-five million acres of land, despite increases in population, obviously make it necessary to adjust agricultural production.

(2) To Avert Unbalanced Production

Everyone recognizes that the general welfare of our Nation requires some balanced relationship between agricultural and industrial production. Unfortunately, however, the fundamental fact is not widely recognized that there is a difference between the inherent tendency of agriculture and industry to increase production, with the result that agricultural adjustment becomes necessary. Both agriculture and industry readily expand production under the stimulus of increasing prices, but, taken as a whole, the reactions of agriculture and industry to decreasing prices are quite different. When the general price level of products declines industrial production decreases sharply, but the agricultural production of soil-mining cash crops may even increase, and soil-conserving practices tend to be discontinued, as farmers struggle to maintain an already meager income. Agricultural depression and an imbalance between industrial and agricultural production are the natural results of this greater inherent tendency of agriculture, as compared with industry, to expand production. Lack of knowledge of this fundamental fact has caused farmers to be accused of wanting a scarcity program; whereas, on the contrary, the real situation is that farmers almost invariably possess a keen desire to increase production to the full extent that consuming outlets can be found.

It is a common mistake to interpret farmer recognition of the necessity for balanced production as indicating a desire for underproduction. The great single economic objective of our people is to increase the standard of living; and by the term "standard of living" we mean the total amount of all the various services and agricultural and industrial products consumed. In order to increase the standard of living, therefore, we must increase total consumption; and in order to increase total consumption we must increase total production, because in the long run, with normal spoilage and waste and with imports and exports tending to become equal, it is self-evident not only that we cannot consume a total amount equal to more than we produce but also that we will consume an amount equal to all we produce. Consequently, there is no argument against increasing the total production of the Nation. The total production, so long as it is distributed so as to give consumers the things they need in the proportions they are needed, cannot become too great, notwithstanding variations in the problems of distribution. But we can have, have had, and still have a total production that is not distributed among various products in proportion to the needs of consumers. Nor can we expect to enjoy the fruits of a reasonably balanced distribution of our total production of industrial and agricultural products unless we utilize a production adjustment program to counterbalance the greater inherent tendency of agriculture as compared with industry to expand production. Greater total production is essential to an increased standard of living; and reasonably well balanced industrial and agricultural production is essential to both urban and rural prosperity.

D. The need for increased soil conservation

It was only in recent years that as a nation we were awakened to the fact that we had been permitting the most valuable and fundamental of all our natural resources to be washed and blown away at a rate which, if unchecked, would ultimately have resulted in a great lowering of our standard of living and all the disintegrations of a people that such a major calamity entails. The farm program was so designed, however, that soil conservation is proceeding apace with production adjustment. To date, the task of rebuilding our soils remains uncompleted, but soil-conserving and home-consumption crops have already been substituted for approximately 40,000,000 acres of surplus soil-depleting production. When our soil-conservation program was written into the statutes, a determination was permanently engraved in American policy to discharge fully and faithfully our highest responsibilities as trustees for ourselves and for posterity. The completion of this great work awaits only some means for increasing farm income in a manner that will serve as a strong incentive for increased soil conservation. If any term ever deserved to be recorded in letters of gold it is surely soil conservation.

E. The need for increased consumption of farm products

Our great cruel paradox for many years has been malnutrition, or slow starvation, in the midst of burdensome surpluses of raw foodstuffs. No one has failed to see and feel the pressing need for bridging the gulf between unmarketable surpluses and undernourished people. It has now been demonstrated that the food-stamp plan, and the program of surplus purchases for relief distribution, are exceptionally well adapted to meet this need, provided only that adequate financing can be found.

F. The need for utilizing the services of the normal channels of trade

Changes in industries and trades that meet new needs and increase efficiency may be painful but they are desirable and inevitable. Sailing boats gave way to steamships, buggies to automobiles, phonographs to radios, and railroads to trucks—with probable net gains for the public welfare. Those changes worked themselves out under the free play of openly competitive forces, and in the absence of any external control, so that we may feel confident that they were desirable and economically justifiable. But today, with governments finding themselves compelled to exercise controls in many new directions, it is highly desirable that before any new governmental program is adopted it be scrutinized carefully to determine whether it is so designed that directly or indirectly, immediately or ultimately, it would unnecessarily sacrifice the valuable services of some trade or industry. There is always a possibility that a governmental program, developed quickly and under pressure to meet a critical major condition, may appear to be generally satisfactory here and now, but that upon unfolding into operation it may unavoidably result in some unnecessary and undesirable impairment of an established and valuable activity. Obviously, a sound program with respect to cotton should utilize fully the high efficiency and value of the established services of cotton shippers. It seems reasonable to assume that cotton shippers have as much reason for wanting farmers to appreciate the need for utilizing the services of the normal channels of trade as farmers have for wanting cotton shippers to appreciate the need for production adjustment.

IV. THIRD QUESTION: SHOULD THE REQUIRED ADDITIONAL FUNDS BE OBTAINED PRIMARILY THROUGH THE FEDERAL TREASURY OR THE MARKET PLACE?

A. The main choice

If you should agree that the considerations which have been enumerated constitute the basic needs and desirable requirements of new additions to the farm program, it would not be difficult for you to find by a process of elimination the best alternative for financing their attainment. There are two main sources from which increased farm income may be obtained, namely, through either increased appropriations from the Federal Treasury or improved prices in the domestic market place. To be sure, these two main alternatives are somewhat interrelated rather than mutually exclusive. Most plans which call for increased appropriations would also bring about an increased income from the market place through the use of appropriated funds for strengthened production adjustment; and several of the plans that have been proposed for increasing the income of farmers from the domestic market would ultimately require an increase in appropriations. Nevertheless, it is useful in approaching the general problem to begin by classifying the various proposals for increasing farm income into two groups, depending on whether principal reliance would be placed upon the Federal Treasury or the domestic market place as the source of funds.

B. General superiority of improved prices over increased appropriations as the principal source of funds

Increased appropriations from the Federal Treasury are obviously the only available means for meeting certain needed additions to the farm program such as, for instance, increased surplus-product removal; and in order to meet the special requirements of certain crops which do not pass through a single processing or marketing channel so as to facilitate the administration of another alternative method of aid, increased appropriations must serve as the principal source for obtaining increased income. This means simply that no one method of financing additions to the farm program is well adapted to meet all needs.

In view of the fact that Federal appropriations provide the only practical means of financing some of the basic needs of agriculture, it would be in the public interest if those who decry the size of farm appropriations would go into the problems of agriculture far enough to acquaint themselves with the real situation.

They would soon learn the fact that farmers seldom request appropriations to fill any need for which there is an adequate substitute. They would not be long in recognizing the fact that the farm payments of the past 7 years have been made in ways which not only relieved untold suffering but also served in helping to bring about an increase in farm income of approximately $7 for each $1 of farm payments. They would also learn more about the great need for soil conservation. They would see clearly that the Nation probably never made an investment for the general welfare that has yielded greater returns than these farm payments. They would also acquaint themselves with the fact that the $3,000,000,000 of farm payments during the past 7 years have been inadequate to the extent of $12,000,000,000 in bringing parity income to farmers.

It is manifest that the appropriated funds now being expended for farm payements are yielding returns to the public welfare equal to several times the cost. It is also clear that some of the needs for additions to the farm program must be financed through appropriations; but it is not believed that appropriations should be chosen as the main alternative for bringing about a further increase in farm income. The vast majority of farmers desire that appropriations be employed to increase farm income only under conditions in which no well-adapted and self-financing alternative is available. Some farm critics apparently have given themselves a fantastic notion that the favorite dream of the American farmer is to see the Congress direct the Secretary of Agriculture to sit astride the Federal Treasury and use the Great Dipper to ladle out tons of cash. It would be difficult to imagine anything more unjust or more remote from fact. Farmers deeply believe in the necessity for economy in the affairs of government. A typical farmer does not seek governmental payments except when he considers it the last resort and when he is acting under the compulsion of dire need. Nevertheless, some persons, with an ignorance protected by bulwarks of economic security, and who have never shared with farmers the bitter flavors of privation, seem to take delight in indulging themselves in the convenient cynicism with which all recipients of governmental payments may be tagged as unconscionable Treasury raiders.

The inadequacy of appropriations as the principal source of funds for needed additions to the farm program is not merely a temporary condition that arises at this time on account of special budgetary problems or special needs for national defense. The inadequacy of direct appropriations as the main source of funds is attributable to a more fundamental and permanent phenomenon. It goes back to the deep-rooted feeling of people generally against grants of aid appropriated from a public treasury. The practical reflection of this feeling is that the people generally seem willing to meet a need for, let us say, $2 of governmental aid with a measure that will provide an increase of $2 in selling price; but as an alternative they would be reluctant to support an appropriation of more than $1 from a public treasury to meet the same need. Industry has long been aware of this basic fact. Manufacturers have sought and obtained great amounts of public aid. They were successful in doing so, primarily because they turned away from the alternative of appropriations and sought their grants of public aid in the market place through such arrangements for increasing selling prices as tariffs, quotas, and franchises. This fact is so important that it is worth putting another way: People generally tend to look upon public aid in the form of appropriations as relief grants, and it is expecting too much of human nature to assume that appropriations can be made which would be considered in part relief grants and which would be large enough to do much more than help the recipients keep their chins above the water.

The history of practically all governments demonstrates that prosperity is sometimes legislated but seldom appropriated. In advocating a self-supporting method for financing new additions to the farm program, Secretary Wallace has drawn the attention of farmers to the fact that "the appropriation route, as compared with increased prices, is the hard and disappointing way. * * * This practical situation determines the result to such a great extent that it is impossible to believe that farmers are going to have a fair and equitable share of the national income so long as they are handicapped, as compared to industry, by being obliged to receive increases in their income primarily through appropriations rather than through improved prices. This in no way, however, lessens the importance of appropriations in the absence of other means of increasing farm income.

In addition to the inadequacy of appropriations as the principal means of financing needed additions to the farm program, careful consideration should also be given to the uncertainty of appropriations, to which a reference has already been made. It would hardly seem fair, after having granted industry and labor protective measures of a permanent nature, to oblige agriculture to rely primarily upon greatly enlarged appropriations for increased income, and thus place farmers in an especially vulnerable position because of the uncertainty that increased appropriations of public funds would be maintained under changing conditions.

C. Conclusions on improved prices and increased appropriations as sources of funds

To summarize, certain generalizations can be drawn with respect to the main choice which must be made between increased appropriations and improved prices as the principal method of financing needed additions to the farm program. In the first place, the current appropriations are greatly needed, and they yield returns equal to several times their cost. In the second place, there are certain needed additions to the farm program for which increased appropriations provide the only practical source of funds. In the third place, the special circumstances with respect to certain crops, especially those which do not pass through a single manufacturing or marketing channel so as to facilitate the administration of other alternatives, give rise to requirements that must be met through appropriations. And in the fourth place, if agriculture is to obtain a more nearly fair and equitable share of the national income it will be necessary to look to the market place as the principal source of funds for needed additions to the farm program, because it is impossible to expect to obtain appropriations that would be adequate in either amount or permanency.

V. FOURTH QUESTION: HOW SHOULD THE REQUIRED ADDITIONAL FUNDS BE OBTAINED THROUGH THE MARKET PLACE?

If you recognize that legislatures have an effective preference for increasing selling prices rather than taxes, you will probably agree that in order to obtain a more nearly fair and equitable share of the national income, agriculture is obliged to turn to the market place rather than to the Federal Treasury. A very considerable number of different plans have been proposed by various groups for financing needed improvements to the farm program through the market place. For the purpose of making a comparative analysis of these proposals it is useful to classify them into three principal groupings depending on whether they would place principal reliance upon (a) fixing prices at higher levels by governmental decree, or (b) increasing commodity loan rates, or (c) applying the principle of marketing certificates.

A. First alternative: Fix prices at higher levels by governmental decree

Price-fixing proposals are numerous and variable, and they enjoy considerable support. Some of them are called cost of production plans because they would utilize some so-called cost of production, rather than parity price or parity income, as the standard at which minimum selling prices would be fixed by the Government. One incidental aspect of these proposals is rather interesting. The elusive term "cost of production" appears to have such a peculiar attractiveness that it finds much favor as a price standard even though under most definitions the amount of the cost would be somewhat less than parity. Fixed-price programs have the merit of seeking funds in the market place. But the price-fixing proposals that we have examined seem to have some major disabling characteristics.

(1) Invalid Theory for Sacrificing Production Adjustment

A typical price-fixing plan would (a) undertake to assure farmers a price equal to cost, or parity, on the portion of the crop to be consumed domestically and (b) disregard any arrangement for production adjustment. This sacrificing of production adjustment must rest on the assumed theory that, if a substantially fair price were received on the domestically consumed portion of a crop, the production for export would automatically take place in desirable proportions. That theory hardly seems valid. Except by rare accident, the production for export could not be expected to fall automatically at a practical and desirable level.

The chances are that the quantity produced for export would fall significantly above or below the mark. In either case serious difficulty would be encountered. If production were increased, soil depletion would be increased; and we should also find ourselves confronted with unmarketable surpluses, because it is no longer true that unlimited quantities of products can find a foreign market. In the end, this would give rise to a budgetary problem in taking care of the surplus. If the result should fall in the other direction, that is, if farmers should find it unprofitable to produce an excess over their share for the fixed-price domestic market, which surplus would have to be sold at low world prices, the program would cause an excessive and violent adjustment of production that would give rise to a vast amount of farm unemployment. We cannot make a drastic sacrifice of our foreign outlets. Agriculture is dependent to a very substantial extent on the foreign market. Occasionally we hear voiced the catch phrase, "the American market for the American farmer"; whereas, obviously, the American farmer needs more than the American market. It is also true that the American farmer does not need unmarketable surpluses.

Thus, it will be noted that we have in this invalid theory for sacrificing production adjustment, the first of two great dilemmas presented by price-fixing proposals. The chance is considerable that with fixed prices, and in the absence of production adjustment, we should find that we had either burdened ourselves with an unmarketable surplus or denied ourselves a greatly needed foreign market.

(2) Incentive for Government to Encroach on Business

The second major dilemma presented by price-fixing proposals is encountered upon considering the problem of administration. In order to enforce a governmental decree fixing minimum selling prices it might be necessary either for the Government to undertake a vast project for policing numberless transactions or to engage in the buying and selling, which functions are now performed in the normal channels of trade. In view of the fact that both of these alternatives should so obviously be avoided, it seems desirable to look for some means other than price fixing for obtaining the funds required for the needed additions to the farm program.

B. Second alternative: Adopt high commodity-loan rates

(1) Functions of Commodity Loans

A sound program of governmental commodity loans serves several basic and necessary purposes. Loan programs are necessary to meet

the emergency that arises from an abnormal situation which otherwise would result in ruinously low prices. The exceptionally large crop of cotton in 1937 is a case in point. A farmer who is protected against the emergency of an abnormal crop by a program of commodity loans, and is also protected against the emergency of a subnormal yield by a crop-insurance program, finds himself in a well-protected position. The sudden disappearance of the demand for a large part of the 1939 tobacco crop, upon the withdrawal of foreign buyers from the domestic market last fall, is an example of a situation in which commodity loans may be used to protect farmers against what would otherwise be ruinously low prices as a consequence of temporary decreases in demand. A commodity-loan program is also useful in obtaining the important advantages of an ever-normal granary.

(2) Collateral Plans Required for Financially Successful Commodity-Loan Programs

In order to avoid sacrificing foreign outlets and accumulating unmarketable surpluses, it is obviously necessary that a commodity-loan program on an export crop, whenever the loan rates are in excess of world prices, be accompanied by some form of an export subsidy. It is also obvious that a financially successful commodity-loan program must be supported by adequate production adjustment. The experience of the Federal Farm Board demonstrated rather emphatically that a commodity-loan program will inevitably be swamped by continued excessive production. With these required collateral programs in mind, let us turn to a consideration of the problems of high commodity-loan rates.

(3) Problems of High Commodity Loan Rates

Export subsidies, which are required in connection with commodity-loan rates in excess of world prices, can soon encounter budgetary difficulties. The higher the commodity-loan rates, the greater the funds required for export subsidies. These requirements can mount rapidly. For example, let us assume that a loan rate equal to parity price were adopted for cotton. That would mean that the Government would be in a potential position to acquire a crop of 12,000,000 bales of cotton at a price of approximately 16 cents per pound. Assume further that an export price as low as 8 cents per pound might be required in order to obtain our normal share of the world trade in cotton. The appropriation that would be required to meet a loss of 8 cents per pound on 6,000,000 bales of cotton would be approximately $240,000,000.

The high export subsidies that must accompany a program of high commodity-loan rates might also tend to hamper the trade-agreements program in reopening foreign markets. Unnecessary, long-continued, and high-export subsidies would hardly be in consonance with the principles on which the trade-agreements program rests. It is believed that the payment of large export subsidies should be confined, as it has been, to circumstances in which there is no other practical resort. It was made clear at the time export subsidies were adopted for cotton that their use was intended only to meet an emergency such as we faced at that time. From this standpoint it might be better to adopt some method other than high loans for obtaining an adequate price from the domestic market, and to use the funds that would otherwise be required for export subsidy payments under a high loan program, to make increased payments to farmers for needed additional soil conservation and production adjustment.

A program of high commodity-loan rates not only might tend to give rise to budgetary and foreign trade problems but also might have a tendency, after a certain point, to impinge upon production adjustment and soil conservation. If a high price-pegging program were to be successful, production would have to be decreased and domestic prices thereby advanced to a point that would permit liquidation of the loans without loss. These higher domestic prices, however, which could be brought about at least temporarily through high price-pegging loans, might tend to encourage increased production, and withdrawals from the soil conservation and production-adjustment program, by those who would find irresistable the incentive to forego Government payments in order to produce and market a surplus to take advantage of the greatly increased market prices. But this, in turn, would tend to defeat the loan program by placing a large supply on the market which would drive down prices and thereby make it impossible to liquidate the loans without incurring large losses. Thus, what had started out to be a high-loan program, might have been converted into simply a system of increased governmental payments, through the appropriations that would be required to cover the loan losses; and in the meantime, it might also have impaired the programs for production adjustment and soil conservation.

Some of the advocates of high commodity-loan rates contend that marketing quotas could be used to avoid the increased production that might otherwise accompany and ultimately destroy both a high-loan and production-adjustment program. It may be possible that marketing quotas in the case of a crop like cotton could withstand the stress of high loan rates for at least a short time, but there is at least some doubt that it could be continued indefinitely. Moreover, it seems clear that the high loan approach has no advantage over all other alternatives, except that it alone is readily available, that would justify subjecting farmers to the great hazard that the collapse of a system of high loan rates would entail.

A program of high commodity-loan rates, if continued for any length of time, might also have a potential tendency to cause an encroachment of government on business. Cotton shippers are exceedingly aware of this possible hazard to their trade. The foreboding nightmare that you cotton shippers conjure when you contemplate the possibility of a high loan rate on cotton seems to have a full quota of ghosts, but it cannot be contended that there is not at least some basis for your fears. When the question of a parity-loan rate on cotton is raised, you allege that the Government would be buying the cotton rather than making a loan. You assert that one of your functions disappears when the Government classes the cotton in the process of preparing it to go under loan; that when the loan is made the cotton has been bought, and your buying function has disappeared; that after the loan has been made, the Government will be obliged to store the cotton, and take the risk of loss, so that your holding function has disappeared; and, finally, that if the loan is not repaid, title to the cotton will fall into the hands of the Government, and it may be sold directly to manufacturers so that there would no longer be any need for you to perform the function of selling. Then you summarize the situation by observing that practically all your functions would have disappeared, and that the cotton trade, despite its efficiency and value, would have been supplanted. Although the developments under a high loan program most probably would not be anything like you are inclined to fear, it is not difficult to understand why you assume that a program of high loan rates on cotton would have a definite tendency to cause an encroachment of government on your business.

To recapitulate, it seems clear that this second alternative of adopting high commodity-loan rates, in order to finance the needed additions to the farm program, is open to several serious doubts. It might tend to cause budgetary difficulties, to obstruct progress under the trade-agreements program, to impinge upon strengthened production adjustment and increased soil conservation, and to bring about an encroachment of government on established business and the normal channels of trade. Nevertheless, in the absence of other alternatives, higher loan rates might be found necessary.

C. Third alternative: Apply the principle of marketing certificates

At last, with the somewhat lengthy background having been covered, we are prepared to substantiate the statement made in the beginning that the program which Secretary Wallace is advocating, namely, marketing certificates, would meet best not only the needs of agriculture but also the need for utilizing the services of cotton shippers. Let us begin by describing the marketing-certificate program briefly.

(1) Description of the Marketing-Certificate Program

A marketing-certificate program is essentially a simplified method that could be conveniently administered for achieving the economic advantages of a system of processing taxes without making taxes and appropriations necessary. It would consist of—

(a) Distribution to farmers

First, allotting marketing certificates to farmers who participate in production adjustment and soil conservation under the farm program in such amounts and having such values as would be necessary to cover their allotted normal production and assure them an income equivalent to parity price on the domestically consumed portions of their crops.

(b) Requirement of manufacturers and importers

Second, requiring manufacturers and importers, upon the sale of finished products, to acquire certificates in amounts which would assure a market for the entire supply, and return them to the Government. Manufacturers would be granted an exemption from certificates on sales for export.

(c) Revolving pool to facilitate the purchase and sale of certificates

Third, establishing a governmental revolving pool to purchase certificates from farmers and sell them to manufacturers whenever necessary in order not only to maintain the market price of the certificates at their face values but also to make buying and selling certificates convenient operations and to assure that an adequate supply of certificates would be available for the needs of manufacturers and importers at all times.

(d) Legal nature of the certificate requirement

There is a fundamental legal difference between a marketing-certificate program and a processing-tax program. Under a marketing-certificate program no tax would be levied and no tax proceeds would be appropriated; the program would be based on the power of the Congress to regulate commerce.

(e) Adaptability of the marketing-certificate program to various crops

A marketing-certificate program would be readily adaptable to those products which must be passed through centralized manufacturing or marketing processes in order to prepare and deliver a large majority of the crop for ultimate consumption. As illustrations, such crops would include cotton, peanuts, prunes, raisins, rice, tobacco, and wheat.

(2) Superiority of the Marketing Certificate Program

For those needs and crops to which it is adapted the superiority of marketing certificates, as compared with the other classes of possibilities that have been discussed, may be summarized as follows:

(a) More nearly adequate income for farmers

The marketing certificate program would promise to accomplish more than any of the other alternatives as the principal method for bringing about a fair participation of agriculture in the national income, because it would constitute the most practical arrangement for obtaining the additional income through the market place. It

is evident that there is little likelihood of obtaining even temporarily a commensurate amount of income through increased appropriations. It also seems probable that neither a system of price fixing nor a program of high loans, in view of their inherent weaknesses and vulnerability, could be expected to provide as much income for farmers over even a brief period of a few years as could be obtained through the marketing-certificate program.

(b) More permanent source of farm income

A marketing certificate program would give agriculture a more dependable and permanent form of financing than the other alternatives, and one that would be more nearly comparable to those now enjoyed by industry through such devices as tariffs, quotas, and franchises. Obviously increased appropriations are not a dependable and permanent form of financing; this is also true of price fixing and high-loan programs because, as the analysis has shown, they both possess inherent characteristics that might tend to generate forces of self-destruction.

(c) Greater contribution to production adjustment and soil conservation

The marketing-certificate program would contribute more than any of the other groups of possibilities toward strengthening production adjustment and increasing soil conservation. In view of the fact that the additional funds which could be expected through increased appropriations would be considerably less than the increased income that could be derived through marketing certificates, it is clear that the greater value of the certificates, as compared with any possible increase in appropriations, would serve as a stronger incentive to adjust production and conserve the soil. It has already been pointed out that price-fixing proposals and after a certain point high-loan programs might tend to reduce rather than increase the incentives for production adjustment and soil conservation.

(d) Less burden on the Budget and public debt

The marketing certificate program is obviously superior to the other possibilities from the standpoint of budgetary and public-debt considerations, since it would not require appropriations. The fact has already been mentioned that there is reason to believe that either a price-fixing program or a high-loan program might give rise to budgetary difficulties.

(e) Less burden on foreign trade

The marketing-certificate program would avoid the danger of impairing the trade-agreements program, which would be inherent in the use of export subsidies over a long period, as would be necessary in conjunction with a high-loan program.

(f) Less accumulation of surplus stocks

The marketing-certificates program would avoid the accumulation of unmarketable surpluses which would be a definite possibility under a program of either fixed prices or high loan rates.

(g) Less encouragement of competitive products

The marketing-certificate program can be so designed as largely to avoid the practically inescapable disadvantage under a system of high loans or fixed prices of impairing slightly the competitive position of cotton with other products. It would be a relatively simple matter to accompany a marketing-certificate program with a set of partial or complete exemptions from the certificate requirement with respect to those manufactured products which compete most strongly with other articles on the basis of the cost of raw material, but there seems to be no practical way of applying the principle of exemptions in connection with either a fixed price or a high-loan program; and it would probably be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to establish a fully equivalent system of compensating taxes on competitive products in conjunction with a fixed-price or high-loan program. Briefly, in conjunction with the marketing-certificate program there may be both exemptions and compensating taxes, whereas only the latter are well adapted for use in connection with fixed-price and high-loan programs.

(h) Less interference with the normal channels of trade

The marketing-certificate program would be superior to either a fixed-price program or a system of high loan rates in that it would not increase the investment per unit in privately owned inventories. Manufacturers would not need to purchase the certificates until the finished products were sold. The marketing-certificate program would also tend to keep inventories out of the hands of the Government and in the normal channels of trade, and thus also facilitate and stimulate increased marketing. The marketing-certificate program would also avoid causing inverted prices on futures contracts for commodities, which make it impossible under a system of high loan rates—and most probably a price-fixing program would have the same effect—for manufacturers and dealers to hedge their risks on the exchanges and carry full inventories.

(3) Invalid Objections to the Marketing-Certificate Program

Apparently the objections one may find to the marketing-certificate plan may be reduced to two principal contentions. One relates to competitive products and the other to prices to consumers. It is believed that they are both invalid.

(a) The contention about competitive products

Let us examine first the contention that the seeking of increased farm income through the market place, rather than through increased appropriations from the Federal Treasury, would seriously impair the position of cotton products in competition with other articles.

Both our technical studies and actual experience when the former processing taxes were in effect, show that this objection is not so important as it might seem on first sight. It is largely one of those alarmist arguments that is more impressive than real. The competition among many products is primarily based not on small differences in their raw-material costs, but on greater differences in the degree of their physical adaptability for certain uses. For instance, if a woman should desire the sheen of a synthetic fiber in a dress, she could hardly be expected to shift her purchase to a cotton dress for the sole reason that the marketing-certificate program had not added 3 cents to the cost of the cotton in the dress. If it should be found that for some industrial purpose a new synthetic fiber had considerably more resistance than cotton to heat, friction, or tension, that factor, and not a few cents difference in the cost of cotton, would probably determine which product would be used.

Moreover, the raw-material cost represents an especially small part of the price of products manufactured from such major commodities as cotton, with a result that an adoption of the certificate program would not increase the cost of stockings a cent a pair and would not add more than a fraction of a nickel to such items as dresses, shirts, underwear, or bath towels. The marketing-certificate program would increase the cost of raw material, but it should be borne in mind that the total cost of the raw material represented in the price of such typical articles manufactured from cotton does not account for one-fifth of the total price paid by consumers. Consequently, the consumption of such manufactured articles fluctuates primarily with changes in industrial activity and the general purchasing power of the country rather than in response to variations in the relatively low cost of the raw material.

It seems clear that the only really appreciable effect that the marketing-certificate program might have on cotton would be with respect to coarse, low-grade products, such as bagging and toweling, that compete with those jute and paper products for which the cost of raw material is a substantial item. Whatever merit there may have been originally in this contention against the marketing-certificate program would seem to have disappeared, because exemptions from the certificate requirement would be granted on those coarse cotton products which encounter some competition from paper and jute.

This whole problem is primarily a matter of choosing among alternatives. It should be observed that the competing alternatives of fixed prices and high loan rates, rather than the marketing-certificate program, are the proposals to which should be attached whatever minor merit this competitive product complaint might possess. Finally, it may be pointed out that even if this objection were applicable to the marketing-certificate program, it would only mean that, as with all endeavor, it might be necessary to incur at least a little cost in order to obtain a much greater increase in income.

(b) The contention about prices to consumers

The other principal contention against the marketing-certificate program is that it would be better to seek increased farm income exclusively through enlarged appropriations in order to avoid any increase in the prices of manufactured products to consumers. This objection would, of course, apply equally to a program of fixed prices or high loans. The answers to the objection are rather overwhelming. The contention holds in effect that in their search for equitable income farmers are to be confined to the single alternative of enlarged appropriations. Substantially increased appropriations either could or could not be obtained; but in either event agriculture could not entirely welcome the ultimate result. If the enlarged appropriations could not be obtained—which seems to be quite clearly the case—the position of those who voice this argument would mean that agriculture, having been prohibited from utilizing any of the alternatives for seeking an increased income through the market place, would be permanently assigned a terrifically deficient share of the national income, with the consequence that American farmers would find themselves practically relegated into the position of a peasant class. If the increase in appropriations could be attained, agriculture would find that its position had been pushed over into a category which had the tinge of a relief load. No one who is acquainted with the fair-mindedness of the Congress could believe for a moment that any such things are going to happen. There is good reason to believe that the unrealistic and unjust position that would force them is not going to be sustained, and that in the end farmers will be enabled, as have been manufacturers, to obtain a reasonable income primarily through the market place.

Let us look still further into this objection. In the first place, it will become obvious to anyone who examines the situation that agriculture is receiving a seriously deficient share in the national income. The average income of all consumers in the United States is considerably greater than the average income of all farmers. Likewise, some of the lowest nonfarm-income groups, for instance, workers on urban relief projects, enjoy incomes appreciably greater than some of the low-income farm groups, such as sharecroppers and tenants. In addition, it is difficult to understand how a cotton spinner who pays his employees a minimum of 30 cents per man-hour could consider it fair to take the position that the farmers who produce the cotton itself should not receive for their labor an income equal to even half that much. In the second place, in view of the fact that agriculture's income must be increased in order that farmers may have a fair participation in the national income, and since the way is not open to the greatly enlarged appropriations

that would be required to bring this about, those who insist upon that alternative or nothing are in effect taking the position that it is better for consumers not to pay fair prices than it is for farmers to receive fair prices.

Such persons do not voice the feelings of consumers. They would have you believe that consumers are a special underprivileged group with an unsympathetic and unreasonable attitude toward the plight of farmers. A more misleading impression could hardly be given. Consumers are not a sick and irascible minority; they are all of us; and they are not unfair. In fact, it is practically impossible to find a consumer in the United States who would knowingly object to paying a price that would give producers a fair return. The same persons contend that under the marketing-certificate program consumers would be asked to subsidize farmers. It hardly seems fair to complain that farmers are being subsidized when the truth is that farmers are not receiving, even including Government payments, a fair income or a fair price, and that while this condition remains uncorrected the actual situation is that consumers are being subsidized by farmers.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The farm program has accomplished a great deal for the benefit of agriculture and the national welfare during its first 7 years. It forms a sound foundation for both agricultural and industrial security that will endure through the years. At the present time, certain additions to the farm program are needed. There is need for increased farm income, for more security of farm income, for strengthened production adjustment and increased soil conservation, and for utilizing the services of the normal channels of trade. These needs cannot be met by the route of increased appropriations, and upon turning to the market place as the principal source of increased funds, we find three principal groups of alternatives, namely, fixed prices, high loans, and marketing certificates. Of these, fixed prices and high loans hold the least promise for farmers and they might tend to cause an encroachment of government on business. The marketing-certificate program, in addition to possessing several special advantages over the other alternatives, seems to be the definitely superior choice from the standpoint of meeting most adequately the basic needs for additions to the farm program.

Resolution of Iowa State Convention of Spanish-American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT K. GOODWIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ARTICLE FROM CEDAR RAPIDS (IOWA) GAZETTE

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an article appearing in the Cedar Rapids Gazette of June 18, 1940, covering the Iowa State Convention of Spanish-American War Veterans. Included in this story is a set of resolutions which they have passed. The article is as follows:

A resolution calling for adequate defense of the Western Hemisphere, but condemning the "spilling of the blood of a single American boy on European soil" as endangering our own democratic form of government, was passed by the Iowa Department of the United Spanish War Veterans in session Tuesday at the Memorial Coliseum, with only two negative votes recorded.

The convention officially went on record as opposing intervention in Europe, citing the Monroe Doctrine which forbids European intervention in America. A copy of the resolution is to be forwarded to President Roosevelt.

The anti-intervention resolution was drawn up by H. M. Havner, of Des Moines, and Elmer Johnson, of Cedar Rapids. It was introduced by Hugh L. Stephenson, of Sioux City, chairman of the resolutions committee. Its text is as follows:

"Whereas it has been the fixed policy of the United States to avoid all entangling European alliances since the time of the delivery of President Washington's Farewell Address; and

"Whereas this country is committed to an insistence upon the observance of the Monroe Doctrine, which means that all European nations must leave the control of the Western Hemisphere to the protection of the United States; and

"Whereas we participated in the World War upon the understanding that it would end all wars and make the world safe for democracy; and

"Whereas Europe is now engaged in another and greater war than the former World War, and the existence of democratic government is in greater danger than at any time since the establishment of such government; and

"Whereas if the United States insists upon the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine we would, under the same rule, have no right to interfere in European affairs, but should leave the settlement of the disputes in Europe to the Europeans; and

"Whereas it is our firm belief that an intervention in the present European conflict would endanger our own democratic form of government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we hereby declare ourselves in favor of an adequate defense program and such preparedness as will enable us fully to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, and we hereby volunteer our services to the full extent of our ability to carry forward such a program, but we hereby state we are opposed to the spilling of the blood of a single American boy on European soil;

"*Resolved further*, That we hereby respectfully petition the President and Congress of the United States to at this time avoid any character of intervention in any European controversy which will directly or indirectly involve the United States in any armed military or naval conflict with any European nation."

Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED BRADLEY, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask to have printed a speech which I delivered in Rudyard, Mich., in my district, on the Fourth of July.

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens of Chippewa County, I am indeed glad that, due to a recess in Congress for the balance of the week, I find it possible to join you for a short while today. You can well imagine the tremendously important problems with which we have been wrestling and the strain under which we have been in Washington for the past few months. That is our duty, and that duty we will not shirk. The Congress should remain in session until this international crisis has passed. The Congress should not adjourn to come home and campaign for votes. It must remain in session ready to cope with the ever-new problems arising out of the rapidly changing European and world situation. You, the people, have put your trust in us. We must not fail your trust. One hundred and sixty-four years ago today our forefathers declared their independence from tyranny and oppression. Today the entire world may become oppressed by tyranny and dictatorship. One hundred and sixty-four years ago today we threw off the yoke of collectivism and overgovernment. One hundred and sixty-four years ago today we proclaimed our independence from class hatred and caste hatred, and we ordained that henceforth self-initiative and self-determination, with equal opportunity and freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of press should guide our destiny. Today we must guard that destiny.

Let us, then, take stock of ourselves. Let us, then, see where we are today heading.

In 1776, and for the next 40 years, roughly, we learned that stout hearts and strong wills, honest endeavor, and strong muscles could protect this land against the might and power of Europe. We won our Revolution from the tyranny of the Kings of England because we were mentally alert and were morally strong and because we were physically strong. We had little else in the way of preparedness, but our adversary had a mighty ocean to cross with men and a mighty ocean to cross with material to supply those men on the battlefields.

In the War of 1812 we found that the same problems and same strength prevailed in our favor. Have we that same stock and fiber left in this Nation today? Particularly in the light of world events? Particularly in the light of modern mechanized warfare which has in such ruthless fashion trampled under the heel of the invading dictators, the democracies of Europe? History will never record a more valiant stand against overwhelming odds than that of brave, honest Finland, even a vanquished Finland, who even 2 weeks ago insisted on paying its last war-debt installment, even when reminded that Uncle Sam was willing to pass it up. When has history recorded a nation with such international integrity, honesty, and bravery?

Down in Washington, from such information as is made available to us, and I hope it is more accurate information than sometimes comes to the public at large through the newspapers, over the radios, and from other means of communication, we learn that this Nation is woefully unprepared should it be called upon to face the armies of the European dictators on an equal basis and on their battlegrounds. For example, we know that the valiant English Army which went into Norway, abandoned on the battlefields of

Norway more arms, ammunition, cannon and aircraft than we have in the entire United States Army and National Guard today. We are told that in the debacle of Flanders, the English and French lost more men than we have in our standing Army today. I hope to tell you, 1,325,000 men (per London press). We know, further, that we are more inadequately prepared to send men or equipment to Europe today than we were in 1917, to fight on a comparable basis with the warfare now raging abroad. Therefore I think it behooves us to take stock of ourselves here at home.

First of all let us look to our physical well-being. Are we today, as a people, physically comparable to our forefathers? Have we the moral courage and the physical strength of our forefathers who hewed the pine of this country and who brought therefrom this wonderful farmland that we see about us here today? Have we today the moral courage, have we the physical fiber to face the hardships of the Revolutionary period without flinching? Or have we become a Nation of puddle ducks?

Do you know what a puddle duck is? He is a little duck who found himself a friendly puddle with plenty to eat, fed to him daily, and no one to disturb him. Therefore he soon found that he did not have to fly out across country in search of food. And so he took fewer and fewer trips abroad, and finally ended up with wings that would carry him no further. As his little ducks came along and joined the family their wings grew weaker and weaker and finally they were contented to stick in their own back yard in their own little puddle, until one day along came a drouth and their food supply dried up and lo and behold they perished because they had not the strength to fly afield to search for the staff of life.

Have we as a Nation then, because of a paternalistic philosophy of government, which is stifling self-initiative, become a nation of puddle ducks? Have we become a nation that has grown so soft that it seeks not its own food but instead looks to a great father in Washington to supply him? Have we become a nation that looks forward to nothing more than a bounty to be doled out by some Government bureaucrat? Or, have we as a nation still within our hearts the moral courage and in our bodies the physical strength in these critical days to think for ourselves and act for ourselves and to fight for the traditions which we hold dear and which has made this the greatest Nation on earth?

I personally feel that the American people are at last awake to their danger. I personally feel that the American people realize that if we, the last great democracy is to survive, we must arouse ourselves, we must prepare ourselves. Our greatest danger is not from without, it is from within ourselves. By that, I do not refer to any "fifth column" excepting one. I refer to the "fifth column" in our own mind. If we will arouse ourselves from the lethargy, if we will awaken ourselves to the danger besetting us, if we will restore to this land our moral courage and our physical strength, if we will return to private initiative, if we will return to clear thinking, then America need fear no danger from without nor Trojan horses from within.

Let not yourselves be troubled by the same propaganda which beset this Nation in 1916. America must prepare itself against any foreign invasion. We should be strong enough to have our word respected to the ends of the earth. That is what Congress and the White House is now embarked upon. That will be done as quickly as possible. But do not mistake me when I tell you why it is physically impossible for this Nation, mechanically and industrially great as it is, to get ready to fight a modern day European battle on any other than American shores in less than 2 years. That is the word of our Army General Staff. That is the opinion of our leading industrialists. However, mistake me not, when I say that there is no European nation nor combination of nations strong enough at this moment to overwhelm America on our shores. You veterans in the crowd, well recall the difficulties that this, the greatest industrial nation on the earth, had to supply matériel to our forces in Europe in 1917. Do you for one moment believe that any European nation coming to America would have any less difficulty than we had? Our present danger, however, in this hemisphere is far greater from infiltration and so-called "fifth-column" efforts in Central and South America than it is by any frontal attack. This will be our greatest problem with which to cope when the European conflagration has burnt itself out. And when the democracies might all be subdued, I should not be at all surprised to see a gigantic struggle among the dictators—like a flock of wolves after the spoils.

But I did not intend to go into that international situation today. I started out to confine my speech to ourselves and this being Independence Day—our national birthday—I want to go back into history and I want to talk with you about the Father of our Nation and some advice which he left for us.

Today it is fitting that we should derive fresh inspiration and hope from the life and character of George Washington. From every and any angle his versatility furnishes us an example for emulation. Whether in war or peace, whether as soldier or statesman, whether as businessman or country gentleman, whether as engineer or President, banker or realtor, or any other of the relationships of his many-sided life—in all spheres of which he was most proficient—this generation, whatever our occupation or profession may look to him to guide us and our country in the right way. Because, after all, and I quote this:

"A people is but the attempt of many
To rise to the completer life of one;
And those who live as models for the mass
Are singly more value than they all."

Therefore, and I quote:

"Keep but the model safe;
New men will rise to study it."

Now while we are in the midst of this great world crisis, let us remember that mere politics of the kind that deals only with the ponderables of the situation, is impotent to solve our problems. But that brand of politics from which our first President bore the imprint, was the essence of true statesmanship which took into account the imponderables—that is the spirit of this American Republic. These offer a solution for they were based upon eternal verities, for those were the true principles which our founding fathers chose in the light of mankind's experience in the quest for a stable government of the people. Today, knocking at the very gateway and citadel of the birthplace of freedom, there is a vast military machine seeking to overthrow Christian civilization, the heritage of liberty, and to establish upon their ruins the iron rule of dictatorship. Yet, thank God, there stands in the Harbor of New York, the statue of the Goddess of Liberty. There stands the symbol of a still valient and courageous liberty-loving people with this challenge:

"My name is Liberty
From out a mighty land
I face the ancient sea.
I lift to God my hand;
By day in Heaven's light,
A pillar of fire by night.
At ocean's gate I stand
Nor bend the knee."

My friends, upon what has the foundations of this Nation really rested? Has it not rested upon the Bill of Rights? And yet today, in these critical times, that Bill of Rights is challenged. It is not challenged by those of us who have in our hearts and in our actions a love for America, but it is challenged by a small minority numerically, and far smaller minority mentally by a clique of people whom we have recently come to call the "fifth columnists" or the Trojan horses. But let me say this word about that question. Let no one assume for 1 minute that these Trojan horses are all aliens. We love our loyal aliens. America has always been the beacon light of freedom to aliens from every land on the face of the earth, and praise God it always will remain so. But we have the right to expect that when these aliens come to our shores seeking our protection, seeking the freedom that this Nation alone today can offer them, we have the right to expect that they should live as we want them to live, and as they came over here to live, in accord with our ideals and traditions. When those do not suffice, when they do not like the American way of living, when they are perhaps disappointed in what they found in this country, then, please Heaven, give them the strength to go back where they came from because America does not want them.

But again I say to you, remember this, that America loves, America welcomes, America treasures all those aliens who come here unashamed and unafraid, who want to become one of us and we shall ever welcome them to the bosom of our hearts. May I remind you right now that this past week in Washington there was enacted into law a bill which recently passed both Houses of Congress, practically unanimously, directing the Department of Justice to fingerprint every alien in the United States. Those of you in this audience, who may be aliens, please fear not that act. You have nothing to fear if you came into this country legally and if you have lived honestly and as we asked you to live since you came here. That bill was passed as much for your protection as for ours. I am proud to say that I have my own and my wife's fingerprints in the F. B. I. files in Washington. And I have told all of my friends who have visited me in Washington to go down there and to have the pleasure of going through that remarkable institution and to put their fingerprints on record. It is one of the greatest protections you can have to guard your civil liberties and your civil rights in this country.

I wish that every American citizen and everybody within the protection of these United States could have his fingerprints on file. In many, many cases it has proven of tremendous value to countless numbers of individuals. And I speak not of the criminal cases when I say that; I speak of cases where there have been accidents and the fingerprints have been the only known method of identification. While I am on this subject, let me tell you about the case of a man who was kidnaped, who, while in the hands of the kidnapers and realizing that his fingerprints were on file, took advantage of every possible opportunity to leave his fingerprints behind doors, under tables, under chairs, and so forth, and after the prisoner was turned free and the criminals were finally apprehended it was possible for the Federal Bureau agents to trace every movement of the criminals by his own fingerprints, and a perfect case against the abductors was possible, and they are presently of no menace to society.

So I say to you that all of us, whether citizens or aliens who are law abiding, should regard the fingerprinting of everyone in this Nation, aliens or citizens, as one of the greatest means of protection for ourselves by providing the means for the positive determination of criminals wherever and whenever they happen to appear. And it should be one of our best aids for combating espionage and sabotage. Incidentally, may I tell you this, that our Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington formerly had working agreements with eighty-odd nations for the interchange of fingerprint information. We formerly fingerprinted aliens upon arrival in this country. If a criminal got out of a foreign country

or was suspected of leaving, word and his fingerprints were broadcast throughout the nations of the world. When this alien arrived and was fingerprinted, of course, he was easily apprehended, and, as a known criminal, was placed in custody where he belonged. We stopped this practice in 1934 for some reason, and until recently we were the only nation on the face of the earth, to my knowledge, not fingerprinting aliens on their arrival. And consequently here for the past 6 years we have had no way of positively identifying any criminal who might seek a haven on these shores until they were actually caught committing a crime within this country.

And so, I say to you aliens who may be here, fear not this recently enacted law, because it was put on the statutes entirely for the protection of those whom we want to welcome and whom we want to become citizens of this country. And again may I say this further to you citizens who have not yet been fingerprinted, may I suggest in all sincerity that you take advantage, for your own protection, of our Federal Bureau, and at the earliest opportunity have your fingerprints taken by your nearest police authority and request that they be forwarded to Washington to be placed in the noncriminal files in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

But again, I am getting somewhat beside my point. I want to return now to the Virginia Bill of Rights, the forerunner of our Declaration of Independence and I want to recount to you just one sentence from that historic document which reads as follows: "The blessings of liberty can only be preserved by a firm adherence to justice, moderation and temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles." This was the thought and those were the principles which animated and motivated the founders of this Republic and upon such a foundation we should stand unswervingly against any enemies from without or any enemies from within seeking to undermine us.

Much of the world today is in the hands of a dictator. To this day we in this Nation have never had room for any dictator. Washington himself was tempted to become one. Do you know that a body of army officers attempted to make him a monarch. Those officers planned not only a mutiny of the Army but a coup d'etat in which they aimed to set up a monarchy. They wrote Washington about their intentions and expressed their belief that he would make an ideal monarch. To this offer Washington replied as follows, I quote him: "I must view with abhorance and reprehend with serverity. I am at a loss," he said, "to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to such an address which seems to me to be big with the greatest mischief that could befall our country."

"If I am not deceived in the knowledge of myself, you could not have found a person to whom your schemes are more disagreeable. Let me conjure you, then, if you have any regard for our country, concern for yourself, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind and never communicate as from yourself or anyone else a sentiment of like nature." That Washington wrote to one Col. Lewis Nichols and shortly afterward he wrote to Lafayette as follows: "There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will by any practical intrigue ever be allowed to continue himself in office, much less perpetuate himself in it, but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity; and even then, there is as much danger that any other species of domination would prevail. Though when a people shall become incapable of governing themselves, and fit for a master, it is of little consequence from what quarter it comes."

I am inclined to think that if Washington were alive today, he might perhaps be more specific and he might have changed that last sentence a bit to read as follows: "If the people are incapable of governing themselves, it makes no difference if their master be a Hitler, a Stalin, a Mussolini, or somebody else."

My friends of Chippewa County, this is a great Nation. We live under a great Constitution. Let us ever keep that Constitution. Grover Cleveland was a great President and here is how he spoke of that great Constitution of ours: "To us is delivered this ark of the people's covenant, and to us is given the duty to shield it from impious hands. It has been found sufficient in the past and it will be found sufficient in all the years to come, if the American people are true to their sacred trust."

So let me admonish you thus. Each of us here today is a receptacle of the faith of our fathers. In us, just as in a safety-deposit box, are the securities—security against tyranny, security of our persons and our property, security of our rights, and a due sense of our obligations. Let us therefore go forth from this meeting today with the example of Washington before us, holding fast to our priceless relics and resolved to "keep the securities of the faith intact" by adherence to the principles transmitted to us by Washington, by Cleveland, and by other men who established a great—this great American Republic.

In conclusion let me read to you what I consider one of the finest creeds written in our day. It is called I Am An American, written by Benjamin E. Neal:

"I am an American; the Golden Rule is my rule. In humility and with gratitude I acknowledge my undying debt to the founding fathers, who left me a priceless heritage which now is my responsibility. With steadfast loyalty I will uphold the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I will treasure my birthright of American ideals; I will place moral integrity above worldy possessions. Problems of interest to my country shall be problems of interest to me. I will count my right of suffrage to be a sacred trust, and I will strive diligently to be worthy of that trust. I will give my full support to upright public servants. But those with unclean hands I will firmly oppose. Each obligation that comes to me as a true American I will discharge with honor. My heart is in America and America is in my heart. I am an American."

An Analysis of the Mundt Amendment to the Pollution Bill—What It Does, Why It Is Necessary, and Who Favors and Opposes It

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since the House is to have before it for consideration the first thing tomorrow, July 9, the problem of pollution, I want to take this means of answering some questions which have been put to me concerning the so-called Mundt amendment. Many Members have called my office or talked with me personally concerning the scope of this amendment, its significance, and the reasons why it is favored by all national conservation organizations and opposed by certain commercial or industrial interests. It shall be my purpose to review this situation candidly and fairly at this time, so Members who may have given only cursory study to the pollution problem and the attempts to abate it may be fully informed before the time comes to vote on this important matter tomorrow afternoon.

MUNDT AMENDMENT A COMPROMISE BETWEEN CONSERVATIONISTS AND POLLUTERS

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Seventy-sixth Congress, two types of legislation dealing with pollution were introduced in Congress. One was the legislation from which S. 685 has evolved which appropriates money from the Public Treasury to study the pollution problem, to permit interstate compacts, to create a bureau to deal with the subject of pollution but which studiously and completely avoids setting up any restrictions or regulations to eliminate existing forms of pollution or to curtail or discourage new sources of pollution. It is purely and simply a study bill which was originally drawn to cost the taxpayers $1,000,000 per year for bureaucratic bounties, but which has since been amended to reduce these costs although it continues to be a bill which polluters themselves endorse and conservationists generally oppose because it does positively nothing to outlaw either existing pollution practices or new types and sources of pollution even when discharged into virgin streams. It is more of an anticontrol of pollution bill than an antipollution bill and was actually named by its sponsors, the Water Pollution Act, until its title was amended after the Mundt amendment was adopted on March 1 with the consent and support of the House committee in charge of the bill.

So much for the type of legislation represented by S. 685 before it was amended by this body. The other type of legislation has long had the support of such organizations as the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Audubon Societies, the American Wildlife Federation, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and similar public-spirited groups and was introduced in the House during the present session of Congress by me. Known as the Mundt bill for pollution control, it was modified several times to meet objections raised at committee hearings and to develop a more gradual approach to the problem of eliminating pollution so that this public menace could be corrected by easy stages and in harmony with sound business practices. However, the polluters of America continued to cry "too drastic" in criticism of the pollution bill developed by the conservation organizations and to plead for a still more gradual approach to the problem of correcting the pollution evil.

Consequently, shortly before S. 685 first came before the House for a vote, a compromise formula was agreed upon between the forces of conservation in this country and the commercial interests who claimed that the correction of pollution

would work an unfair hardship on them. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which had previously made some amendments and improvements in S. 685 to the extent of taking out the "premium on pollution" which the bill in its original form actually carried, met with some of the supporters of the conservationists' antipollution bill and an area of agreement was reached. The so-called Mundt amendment embodied this area of agreement and was supported by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee when the bill came up for consideration on March 1. This compromise accepted the contentions of polluters arguing against legislation stopping existing forms of pollution and simply set up restrictions and restraints against the indiscriminate spread of pollution by the discharge of new sources and types of pollution to the extent that such pollution would be deleterious to the public interests. It is now found as section D, paragraphs 1 and 2 of S. 685 in the form in which it passed the House. Section D starts on page 17 of that bill.

JUST WHAT DOES THE MUNDT AMENDMENT ACTUALLY DO?

To the surprise and disappointment of conservation-minded Members of the House, certain determined polluters of American waters then switched their position from support of S. 685 to outright opposition to it because of the Mundt amendment. It thus became clear that the most persistent polluters in this country would favor no legislation which did not actually protect them in their practices even though, as in the case of the Mundt amendment, the approach to the correction of the evil was so gradual and rational that it prescribes no penalties and makes no restrictions against existing forms of pollution.

Much misunderstanding and much misinformation has been developed about the Mundt amendment. For the purpose of clarity, here is what this amendment actually does. It simply prescribes that "after date of enactment of this Act, no new sources of pollution, either by sewage or industrial waste, shall be permitted to be discharged into the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto until and unless approved by the Division (of Water Pollution Control set up in S. 685 itself)." It should be noted that the prohibitions against new sources of pollution apply only to sewage or industrial waste—there are no restrictions against purely incidental types of pollution, occasional pollution, farm wastes, et cetera.

There are no restrictions against the extension or expansion of existing types of pollution—the prohibitions apply only to new sources of pollution. Additional units of existing sewage lines, an expansion of plant facilities in polluting industries are not affected—the language of the amendment is so moderate that no restrictions could be made against pollution of any kind in any more reasonable terms unless the polluters' dream is to be realized and this body is to publicly and openly endorse all pollution practices and declare itself as favorable to the indiscriminate expansion of the pollution evil on all virgin streams and by all devices and systems as yet unknown to man. Ignoring the existing evils entirely, this amendment simply seeks to quarantine America against the spread of the pollution disease and to stop the problem from growing increasingly worse while it is being studied by the other provisions of S. 685. It seems obvious, that it is an inexcusable waste of the public money to provide funds and bureaus for studying the evil aspects of a problem until and unless Congress is ready to take some action to prevent the problem from becoming more and more impossible of solution.

MUNDT AMENDMENT CLEARLY DEFINED BY LAW

In addition to misinformation previously mentioned to the effect that this amendment would stop all new developments in city housing, plant expansions, and so forth, it has been erroneously argued that the amendment would affect every tiny stream or obscure creek in the country. The refutation of this argument is positive and authoritative; it comes from no less a source than the Supreme Court of the United States and from Major General Schley, Chief of Engineers of the War Department. The language "Navigable waters and streams tributary thereto" is used in other legislation conferring authority upon Government departments with regard to stream control for purposes of building bridges, constructing dikes, erecting piers, and other matters. It does not include every inlet which eventually flows into a navigable stream, but describes a well-recognized network of waterways with which the War Department now deals.

In a decision of the United States Supreme Court (21 Pickering 344 and the Montello Case (20 Wallace 430)) it was held:

> It is not to be understood, however, that every ditch or inlet in which the tide ebbs and flows, nor every small creek in which a fishing skiff or gunning canoe can be made to float at high water, is a navigable highway; but to give it the character of a navigable stream it must be generally and commonly useful to some purpose of trade or agriculture.

In fact, the War Department has an established tabulation of streams and rivers affected by the language of this amendment—it is indicated by a series of 507 photostats which I have in my possession, and which are available to every Member of Congress. This amendment does not convey a great undefined authority upon any department of Government, but simply sets up a basis for regulating and restraining new sources of pollution upon the acknowledged public water system of America.

Again the United States Supreme Court—the Daniel Ball case, 10 Wallace 557—held in another memorable decision:

> A river or other waterway that lies wholly within the limits of a State and has no navigable connection with any navigable waters outside the boundaries of the State is a navigable water of the State, subject to regulation and control by State laws, and does not come within the jurisdiction of Congress nor of the laws enacted by Congress for the preservation and protection of navigable waters of the United States. A river or other waterway constitutes a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the aforesaid acts of Congress when it forms by itself or by uniting with other waters a continuous highway over which trade and travel is or may be conducted between the States themselves or between the States and foreign countries.

MUNDT AMENDMENT CONFERS NO UNREGULATED AUTHORITY

Thus the language of the amendment is clear and its purposes are obvious. It would simply prevent the indiscriminate extension of the pollution evil to the established public waters of America until and unless such pollution should be approved by the Bureau of Water Pollution Control or the Public Health Service. With such approval, secured upon the presentation of an adequate case showing the necessity for pollution or the fact that such pollution would be noninjurious to the public welfare, the pollution-producing project could go on. But without such approval the willful and unnecessary contamination of the public waters would be restrained. Surely no conservation-minded and welfare-serving Congress could do less than to take this cautious step toward the eventual correction of one of the most malodorous evils to plague America. Unless we are willing to take this single forward step we might as well surrender entirely to the polluters and deliver the streams of America to their nefarious and selfish purposes.

It is small wonder that among those who favor the Mundt amendment in S. 685 and oppose the passage of the bill without such amendment are to be found all of the national conservation organizations in America. The surprise comes from the fact that a few selfish polluters, a few misguided chambers of commerce, and a few backward States which offer unrestricted pollution as a lure to invite industries to move there from more enlightened commonwealths should oppose such a reasonable approach to the whole problem of pollution control.

SUPPORT FOR MUNDT AMENDMENT TO S. 685, WIDESPREAD AND GENERAL

Mr. Speaker, among the many communications, resolutions, petitions, and letters reaching me in support of this amendment I offer for the RECORD under leave granted to me copies of letters written by Surgeon General Thomas Parran, of the United States Public Health Service, to Mr. Kenneth A. Reid, General Manager of the Izaak Walton League of America, and by Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes to Mr. Tom Wallace, editor of the Louisville Times,

of Louisville, Ky., who is one of the ardent advocates of effective water pollution control.

[Copy of letter from General Parran]

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, April 5, 1940.

Mr. KENNETH A. REID,
Izaak Walton League of America,
Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. REID: Absence from the city has prevented an earlier acknowledgment of your letter of March 16th relative to the stream pollution bill now before a conference committee of the House and Senate.

In my opinion, the bill as passed by the House represents a constructive approach to this important and constantly increasing problem. It affords the opportunity for all agencies and organizations which are interested in cleaning up our streams to work together in accomplishing the purposes of the proposed legislation, and I earnestly hope the legislation will be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

[Copy of wire from Tom Wallace dated April 17, 1940, to Kenneth A. Reid, advising that Secretary Ickes endorses Mundt amendment]

Ickes authorizes me to say he endorses Mundt amendment.

[Copy of letter from Secretary Ickes to Tom Wallace, May 13, 1940]

Mr. TOM WALLACE,
The Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.

MY DEAR MR. WALLACE: I appreciate your sending me, with your letter of April 26, press clippings pertaining to the Barkley water pollution bill which is now in conference.

The anticipated early meeting of the conferees has not yet been held, and I have asked Senator BARKLEY to try to bring about this meeting as soon as possible. I repeated to him that the Mundt amendment to the bill as it passed the House seemed to me to be entirely reasonable, since it would merely prevent new sources of water pollution in connection with a program of Federal aid for the abatement of existing pollution.

I also reminded the Senator that the Mundt amendment represents a considerable concession on the part of the conservationist groups, and suggested that the industrialists should be willing to accept this very reasonable compromise if they have any interest at all in antipollution legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

I also offer for the RECORD an extract from the Louisville Times for April 17, 1940, of which paper Mr. Tom Wallace is the editor. I especially call attention of the House to the last statement in this article which quotes Dr. Arthur T. McCormack, head of the Kentucky State Board of Health, in endorsement of the Mundt amendment. Incidentally, I might add that most of the State boards of public health of the country are in favor of the Mundt amended S. 685.

[From the Louisville Times of April 17, 1940]

ICKES BACKS POLLUTION BILL—TELLS TOM WALLACE HE HOPES IT PASSES

(By Lorenzo Martin)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—Approval of the Mundt amendment to the Barkley-Spence stream-pollution bill was voiced today by Interior Secretary Ickes.

"I see no reason for increasing sources of pollution when we are trying to abate pollution," he told Tom Wallace, editor of the Louisville Times.

Ickes authorized the statement, Wallace said, that while he had liked the original Barkley-Spence bill, he thought the Mundt amendment a good one and hoped the bill as passed with the amendment by the House would become law.

Opposed by the American Mining Congress, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce (Columbus), and the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, the Mundt amendment provides that new sources of pollution affecting waters and tributaries shall not be created without authorization by an agency of the Federal Government.

TIMES EDITORIAL READ

The House adopted the amendment after debate in which an editorial from the Louisville Times in its support was introduced in the RECORD by Representative JENSEN, of Iowa.

The Izaak Walton League of America, of which Wallace is a national director, led the fight against the Barkley-Spence bill until the House adopted the Mundt amendment, but this organization endorses the legislation as passed by the House.

The legislation is now before a conference committee, but action has been delayed because of absence of one of the conferees, Representative MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, one of the conferees, is understood to oppose the Mundt amendment. Conservationists have not procured from Senator BARKLEY, another of the Senate conferees, any statement supporting it, but express hope that he will endorse it.

SUPPORT IS VOICED

The American Planning and Civic Association, headed by Horace M. Albright, former director of the National Park Service, whose board chairmanship is held by Frederic A. Delano, an uncle of President Roosevelt, has addressed a letter for the conferees supporting the Mundt amendment.

Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who was for the Barkley-Spence bill as originally drawn, says, in a letter to Kenneth A. Reid, executive secretary of Izaak Walton League:

"In my opinion, the bill as passed by the House is a constructive approach to this important and constantly increasing problem. It affords the opportunity for all agencies and organizations which are interested in cleaning up our streams to work together in accomplishing the purpose of the proposed legislation, and I earnestly hope the legislation will be enacted."

MINERS DECLARE WAR

In a circular letter to members and to its legislative committee, the American Mining Congress has declared a last-ditch fight against the amendment.

The Izaak Walton League of America charges that lobbyists of polluters are fighting the amendment. Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, says the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce has "dropped its mask of favoring antipollution legislation" and now is "openly advocating defeat of a pending bill to set up a stream pollution control division in the Public Health Service." He asserts the opposition to the revised version of the bill was due to his amendment giving the proposed pollution board the right to grant or refuse permits for establishment of new sources of pollution.

Conservationists say 1 quart of each gallon of water in the Ohio River below Cincinnati has passed through human kidneys or consists of industrial pollution. Surgeon General Parran said sometime ago that "only a thin line of resistance is between Louisville and water-borne epidemics."

Dr. Arthur T. McCormack, head of the Kentucky State Board of Health, endorses the Mundt amendment, and says:

"It is time to begin keeping pollution out of the water instead of trying to take pollution out of the water."

Mr. Speaker, I now offer an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press of Grand Rapids, Mich., entitled "Stand By the Amendment," as typical of much editorial comment throughout America in favor of the Mundt amendment, which gives substance and significance to S. 685 by setting up barriers against the spread of the disease which the bill is destined to study.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of March 28, 1940]

STAND BY THE AMENDMENT

The Barkley antipollution bill, carrying the Mundt amendment prohibiting "new sources" of pollution from discharging waste into the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto, is now in conference between the House and Senate. By refusing to accept the House amendments the Senate made it possible for pollution interests to launch a new attack on effective pollution control, which means an attack on the Mundt amendment, since that is the chief control feature of the measure.

Typical of this attack is a letter sent out by the natural-resources division of the United States Chamber of Commerce, opposing the Mundt amendment, stating:

"The amendment is a departure from the principle to which the chamber is committed, viz, that in any measure to control pollution the basic principle of maintaining State and local initiative and responsibility rather than Federal control should be preserved. Moreover, it creates a situation where part of the pollution problem would be dealt with by the Federal Government and part by the States—an obviously complicated system to impose on any industry or community."

It happens, of course, that the streams of the country, meandering from one State to another and along State borders, actually present a Federal-State problem. The chamber's protest on this score is without substance. More than that, in seeking the elimination of the Mundt amendment, the chamber is saying, in effect, that it favors new sources of pollution.

Conservationists throughout the country dropped their opposition to the Barkley bill in return for this one amendment to ban future pollution. But apparently they can't even have that, if the interests represented in this protest have their way. The Izaak Walton League, which led the fight for the Mundt amendment, meets the United States Chamber of Commerce statement with the words:

"We will let the public be the judge whether the United States Chamber of Commerce is in favor of controlling pollution or whether it is actually in favor of protecting industrial polluters against any control over their pollution, actual or potential."

It is clearly the duty of House conferees on this measure to stand by this amendment. To do otherwise would be to break faith with the real conservation interests of the country.

Americans generally are coming to realize that pure streams, clean water, happy recreational places, healthful environments, and protection against unnecessary pollution are elements of a better society. This is evidenced by the following partial list of organizations and groups endorsing the Mundt amendment to S. 685. I call attention to the variety of the groups which have endorsed this amendment, Mr. Speaker. The list which I am offering for the RECORD is typical, but it is far from exhaustive. A great many more organizations have sent in petitions and requests that the Mundt amendment be retained as a part of S. 685 to the end that this country be not delivered lock, stock, and barrel over to the polluters to do with as they please.

ORGANIZATIONS INDICATING THEIR SUPPORT OF MUNDT AMENDMENT TO S. 685

The Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
American Civic and Planning Association.
American Nature Association.
American Wildlife Institute.
National Wildlife Federation.
National Association of Audubon Societies.
National Council of Garden Clubs.
National Parks Association.
American Fisheries Society.
International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners.
Izaak Walton League of America.
Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois).
Alabama Wildlife Federation
Square Circle Club (Field and Stream magazine).
National Sportsman magazine.
Hunting and Fishing magazine.
Outdoorsman magazine.
Directors, Oyster Growers and Dealers Association.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
Central Labor Union (Kentucky).
Bloomfield Fish and Game Club, Bloomfield, Conn.
Calumet District Clean Streams Committee (a citizen's committee with headquarters in South Holland, Ill.).
Chicago Conservation Council.
Camp Fire Club of Chicago.
Moline (Ill.) Conservation Club.
Union Conservation Club, Wheeler, Ind.
Glen Park Civic Club, Gary, Ind.
Pittman Square Civic League, Gary, Ind.
West Forty-fifth Civic Club, Gary, Ind.
Woods, Waters, and Wildlife Association, Gary, Ind.
Dunes Lodge No. 1009, A. A. of I., S. and T. W. of N. A. (Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, C. I. O.), Gary, Ind.
Iowa Conservation Commission.
Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs.
Maryland State Game and Fish Protective Association.
Maryland Outdoor Life Federation.
Maryland State Game and Inland Fish Commission.
Minnesota Wildlife Federation.
Michigan United Conservation Clubs.
Missouri Wildlife Federation.
Gasconade County League, Missouri.
New Jersey Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.
New Jersey Board of Fish and Game Commissioners.
Forum of Politics, State Teachers College, Albany, N. Y.
Amity Girls, Ellenville, N. Y.
Young Men's Social Club, Ellenville, N. Y.
Marconi Club, Glasco, N. Y.
Discussion Group of Rome, N. Y.
Rome (N. Y.) Men's Club.
Plattsburg Rod and Gun Club, Plattsburg, N. Y.
Tri-Village Rod and Gun Club, Valatie, N. Y.
Village Board of Trustees, Valatie, N. Y.
New York Association of Biology Chairmen (New York City).
Green Mountain Club (New York Section).
Sportsmen's Council of the Marine District of New York.
League of Ohio Sportsmen.
Stillwater (Okla.) Woman's Club.
Western Pennsylvania Sportsmen's Club, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Crafton-Ingram Sportsmen's Association, Crafton, Pa.
Allegheny County Sportsmen's League, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Arnold Sportsmen's Club, Arnold, Pa.
Westmoreland County Sportsmen's Association (Pa.).
Harrisburg (Pa.) Hunters and Anglers Association.
Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.
Gulf Coast Rod and Reel Club, Beaumont, Tex.
Utah Wildlife Federation.
Regional sportsmen's meeting held in Morgantown, W. Va. (attended by delegates from 12 counties).
Aviation Post, No. 651, American Legion, Chicago, Ill.
Lafayette Post, No. 51, American Legion, Uniontown, Pa.
McDermott Post, No. 144, American Legion, Albany, Wis.
Guy Drews Post, No. 88, American Legion, Manitowoc, Wis.
Francis B. Pritchard Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Oil City, Pa.
Fraternal Order of Eagles 493, Connellsville, Pa.
George W. Vroman Post, No. 2, American Legion, Casper, Wyo.
Powder River Post, No. 991, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Casper, Wyo.
Dolton (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.
South Holland (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.
Moline (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.
Columbus (Nebr.) Chamber of Commerce.
Utica, N. Y., Chamber of Commerce.
Associated Fishing Tackle Manufacturers.
Johnson Motor Co., Waukegan, Ill.
Evinrude Motor Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
Century Boat Co., Manistee, Mich.
Champion Motors Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
Muncie Gear Works, Muncie, Ind.
National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, New York City.
National Outboard Association.
Go-Ite Manufacturing Co., Flint, Mich.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to submit for the RECORD a letter I have just received from the American Good Government Society of this city, an organization interested solely in making America better, in which the president of this organization endorsed the Mundt amendment and appends a news release whereby the society he represents gives its reasons for supporting this public-serving legislation.

THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1940.

Hon. KARL MUNDT, M. C.,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUNDT: In many respects America today stands at the crossroads. The topic on everyone's tongue is national defense. Now, what does defense depend upon? It depends in the first instance upon having men of high patriotism and ability as well as adequate fighting weapons. But, what do these in turn depend on?

Men must have food to eat. If streams are too foul, they will have no fish or game to eat, they will find their trees and crops poisoned and killed, and they will even risk typhoid and perishing of thirst. If streams are polluted, it may prevent the establishment of communities at such points as needed to develop manganese or other essential minerals for defense. The killing of fish, trees, and plants will create bottlenecks in industries depending upon products made from such raw materials.

We therefore deem it urgent to national defense that the House of Representatives hold firm to the Mundt amendment for the reasons indicated in the attached statement from our American Good Government Review.

Yours most cordially,

RICHARD A. STADERMAN,
President, the American Good Government Society.

[From the American Good Government Review, Washington, D. C., May 1940]

MUNDT-AMENDED ANTIPOLLUTION BILL URGED—CLEAN STREAMS' LEGISLATION VALUELESS UNLESS PROVISO AGAINST FUTURE POLLUTION IS RETAINED

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The American Good Government Society revealed tonight its endorsement of the House version of the antipollution bill, S. 685, which includes the Mundt amendment. Passed by the House in a form having important differences with respect to the Senate-approved version, the bill is now in the hands of a conference committee composed of Senators and Congressmen representing their respective Chambers.

According to Richard A. Staderman, president of the society, the "unamended Senate version of S. 685 would be a gross waste of funds for mere additional 'study' of pollution, because it does not prevent conditions from becoming worse. In fact, we feel that no legislation at all on the pollution problem would be preferable to a bill which did not outlaw new polluting. We, therefore, hope that the conferees and both branches of Congress will approve S. 685 as amended and passed by the House. By thus retaining Congressman Mundt's amendment barring future polluting, the Congress will have made a big start in preserving a healthful drinking-water supply and sports facilities—fishing, boating, hunting, and photography—for millions of American citizens."

Mr. Staderman, elaborating on his organization's basis for support of the House version, continued:

"It is especially subsection (d) of section 2 of the House-approved bill (p. 17 of March 6 print of S. 685) that we urge be retained.

"This is the section outlawing future polluting. It therefore seems strange to the author of this statement, who was born in Cincinnati, that many Cincinnatians actually opposed this section which is the Mundt amendment to the Barkley bill, S. 685. We fear that the people of that city do not realize that the supporters of the unamended bill are akin to Mark Twain's views on the weather in talking much about pollution but doing little if anything positive about it.

"Cincinnati is cited as just one instance of this national clean-streams problems. In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (daily ed., July 24, 1939, p. 13813; revised ed., vol. 84, pt. 14, p. 3470)

we of the American Good Government Society opposed spending $1,000,000 a year to have bureaucrats warm chairs, talk about pollution, and do little else about it. In that issue of the RECORD we viewed such an appropriation as being an unwarranted drain on 'our already overladen taxpayers.' We therefore note with pleasure that the House version as amended has provided a reasonable authorization of only $250,000 appropriation.

"The preventing of an excessive expansion on top of the already swollen Federal pay roll is important to the American way of things. Several years ago Col. O. R. McGuire, general counsel of our society and chairman of a committee of the American Bar Association, collaborated with the late constitutional authority, James M. Beck, in writing the book, Our Wonderland of Bureaucracy, which pointed out the seriousness of having some 500,000 Federal employees in 1932. If that was serious, what is the present problem of almost 1,000,000 employees?

"Streams are largely of an interstate character. Therefore, pollution control is well within the province of the Federal Government."

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO HELP!

Mr. Speaker, an encouraging indication that America is awakening to the real seriousness of the problem of pollution and that Americans, today, are eager to do something definite to stop the continued rape of our rivers is seen by the fact that so many Members of Congress and so many individual citizens throughout the country have called or written my office asking, "What can I do to be helpful in the drive to stop the indiscriminate extension of the pollution peril?" Let me answer this question specifically and briefly, now, and then I shall conclude these remarks.

Members of Congress can render service to the cause of clean streams, of course, by voting to retain the Mundt amendment in S. 685 when we have a roll call on that decision tomorrow. They can further implement their good intentions by urging the Senators from their respective States to approve the amendment when the bill goes to the Senate as it will if the House reaffirms its support of the Mundt amendment.

Private citizens and public-serving organizations can give effectiveness to their support of the move to regulate future sources of pollution by writing to the Members of the United States Senate urging them to accept the Mundt amendment and then to ratify S. 685 as amended by the House. If the Senate will thus acquiesce in this progressive legislation, the fight against indiscriminate pollution in America will be won and new protection will be given the health and happiness of this great country. Your sentiments should be conveyed to the Senators without delay as it is important that action be taken on this legislation before adjournment.

Should America Sanctify Pollution or Stop Its Spread?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

STATEMENT OF PHIL G. PLATT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of March the House wrote into the Senate bill on pollution (S. 685) an amendment, known as the Mundt amendment, which declared the expansion of pollution to be contrary to the public policy of the United States and which made it illegal to inject new sources of pollution into public waters unless such pollution could be shown to be noninjurious to the public health and national interest and would therefore be approved by the Division of Public Health. This amendment was adopted by an approximate 2-to-1 vote of this House.

Tomorrow, on July 9, this House will be called upon to reaffirm its disapproval of detrimental and deleterious new sources of pollution. On that day this body must vote either to sanctify pollution and to place its official stamp of approval on the sordid business of using the public waters as a private sewer, or it must vote to stop the spread of pollution by reaffirming its approval of the so-called Mundt amendment which would set up restrictions against new forms and new sources of pollution in the public waters of America. July 9 is therefore destined to become one of the most important legislative days in American history from the standpoint of the conservation of our natural resources. It is my sincere hope that this day will be marked by a forward step toward the preservation of the health and happiness of America and not be marred by a backward step, undoing the progress we have made, and reverting to the doctrine that the streams of America belong to the polluters thereof.

I have received a statement from Phil G. Platt, of Wallingford, Pa., which discusses the matter of pollution very effectively and under leave granted me by the House, I wish to include it in the RECORD. Mr. Platt is national vice president of the Izaak Walton League of America, and I am sure members will be interested in his observations in connection with the important decision which we must make tomorrow.

The statement follows:

Back in 1908, the great Theodore Roosevelt said:

"Conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem, it will little avail to solve all others. It is the chief material problem that confronts us, second only—and second always—to the great fundamental questions of morality."

There is meat in those words, yet we wonder if an orderly plan of conservation of natural resources is not a guiding, rather than a secondary, factor to morality? History teaches us that as a nation neglects conservation of natural resources by means of profligate waste, morality declines, unrest and warlike tendencies become rampant, and the nation finally succumbs to the seed sown from within rather than from without.

Two years ago, the Izaak Walton League of America, a nonprofit organization dedicated to the conservation of our renewable natural resources, said:

"Intelligent conservation of natural resources is the most important long-time problem before the Nation today. War scares, labor wars, industrial depression, and the condition of the Budget may be more immediately pressing, but next year or 10 years hence, they will be history, while the problem of intelligent management of natural resources will still be with us—and don't forget that they are the source of all wealth. We cannot endure by a mere balancing of that artificial Budget which is ultimately worth no more than its collateral—the natural resources."

On July 1, 1940, Hon. MARVIN JONES, distinguished Representative from Texas, said on the floor of the House:

"We have adopted a program of conserving and rebuilding the soil. Every man, woman, and child in America, in the long road of the future, is vitally interested in this program. * * * For many years by building levees down near the mouth of great streams, we tried to channel the water into the sea, thus working against nature with the consequent result that the beds of the streams became filled up above the surrounding valleys, and bringing about periodic floods that destroy the homes and properties of many people living in those valleys. By starting at the sources and utilizing the water, holding it where it falls and in the tributary streams, water is being made to serve a great and useful purpose. Thus by working with nature from the time the water falls as rain, following it down through the tributary streams and on to the sea, the double purpose can be served of making use of this great essential of nature and at the same time preventing many of the great floods that have caused broken homes and cost millions of treasure. * * * We have for years treated water as a sort of curse instead of a blessing."

On the same day, Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK, Representative from Arizona, contributed the following:

"We must conserve it and utilize it as if it were lifeblood—and indeed it is very similar to lifeblood."

Well spoken, Mr. JONES and Mr. MURDOCK. In your statements relating to soil conservation and water utilization, you have expressed the views of the Izaak Walton League of America. We especially congratulate you, Mr. JONES, in urging that floods should be corrected at their source rather than at their destination, meanwhile making use of the "lifeblood" to which Mr. MURDOCK refers.

Besides the quantitative factor which was so ably discussed on July 1, there is an equally important consideration which was not touched upon, inasmuch as it is not a part of agricultural administration. I refer to the quality of this "lifeblood" of ours. This may seem relatively unimportant in the wide open spaces of Texas and Arizona, but in the more densely populated industrial States, this problem is at least equal in importance to that of quantity. Our people are clamoring for relief from a "lifeblood" impregnated with disease germs and filth injected into it by those who find a river to be the easiest method of disposal of their wastes in the form of human excrement and poisonous industrial wastes.

On July 9 the House will be requested to reinstruct the conferees appointed to consider the Barkley water-pollution bill; it is anticipated that the House may be asked to recede by eliminating the so-called Mundt amendment which provides that no new sources of pollution on interstate streams shall be permitted unless approved by the United States Public Health Service. The Mundt amendment does not disturb present polluters, but merely places a quarantine upon a nefarious practice of the past and states that we, the people, feel that it is time to call a halt. Opposition to the Mundt amendment can be construed only as favoring unrestrained pollution of the Nation's waterways.

We are embarking upon a great emergency defense program which will mean mobilization of industry and manpower which must result in industrial expansion and water utilization. Let this not be an excuse to expand the heedless policy of water pollution. We have the Dust Bowl as a grim reminder of agricultural overproduction during the last great emergency. The same forces which would use the present emergency as an excuse for increasing water pollution would, in a time of industrial depression, use that fact as a deterrent in taking the initial step. Because of the vilely polluted condition of the waterways from which Americans derive their drinking water, it has been necessary to invest many millions of dollars in complicated waterworks which by some almost miraculous feat of ingenuity, are able to deliver safe drinking water to their patrons. During these times of discussion of an adequate national defense, reference has been made to the vulnerability of strategic points such as canals, arsenals, railway terminals, etc. What would be the result if a well-placed bomb were to be dropped on the waterworks of say, the city of Philadelphia, which derives its drinking water from the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers? Or the city of Cincinnati, drawing from the much publicized pool of the Ohio River?

From the agricultural standpoint, Messrs. JONES and MURDOCK have ably pointed out the necessity of conserving water at the source, rather than the destination. Let the same philosophy apply to the quality of water by correcting pollution at its source, rather than at its destination. In the name of health, fisheries, recreation, aesthetics, and sound economics, this is the only solution. The Mundt amendment to the Barkley bill must be retained. It would be in the nature of a national calamity to eliminate it from the bill.

P. G. PLATT,
Vice President, Izaak Walton League of America.

WALLINGFORD, PA., *July 5, 1940.*

Willkie Gets House To Act on Hatch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article from the Christian Science Monitor of Saturday, July 6:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 6, 1940]

WILLKIE GETS HOUSE TO ACT ON HATCH BILL

WASHINGTON, July 6.—Republican Presidential Nominee Wendell L. Willkie is already getting action out of Congress—a Democratic Congress.

The new Hatch "cleaner politics" bill is now being lifted out of a committee pigeonhole in the House of Representatives, where it was imprisoned by the strong-arm tactics of New Deal Congressmen, and is now receiving the friendly nod of House leaders, who have agreed to call it to the floor of the lower Chamber next Tuesday.

Nothing has happened to bring about this sudden about-face of the Democratic leadership except that Mr. Willkie casually announced in Philadelphia last week in his first interview after his nomination that the Republican Party would be voluntarily bound by the limitations of the Hatch law, regardless of what the Democratic House did with the bill. He hoped that Congress would pass the law so that its restrictions could apply uniformly to all candidates and all parties in the coming campaign.

Evidently the Democratic leaders have taken note of Mr. Willkie's challenge and believe it would be bad politics if they let the Republicans take the ball entirely out of their hands in this matter and confessed to the electorate that they wouldn't let this measure, which has already passed the Senate, come before the House for vote.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF BILL

The new Hatch bill originally was merely an extension of the Hatch Act of last year which prevented Federal employees from engaging in political campaigns and excluded them from financial contributions either to candidates or parties. The new measure extended these restrictions to State employees paid in part or wholly from Federal funds. The objective of the act is to keep the vast Federal bureaucracy from becoming an instrument for perpetually keeping one party in power.

Amendments to the 1940 Hatch bill have now been added to cover the size of campaign contributions from any source and the total amount which any party can spend.

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD (Democrat), of Alabama, first proposed that no individual be allowed to contribute more than $1,000 to political campaign funds. That almost went through, commanding 36 votes in its favor against 45 in opposition. Then another Bankhead amendment to make the limit $5,000, as now urged by Mr. Willkie, did squeeze through the Senate by a margin of 2 votes, 40 to 38. Still another amendment voted by the Senate would forbid State and local officeholders employed on federally financed projects to coerce other employees into making campaign contributions.

DEMOCRATS "NO LIKE"

Finally passed by a nearly unanimous Republican vote in the Senate and against the opposition of fully half of the Democrats, the Hatch bill fell immediately into the clutches of the unsympathetic and unfriendly arms of the House Judiciary Committee, which first voted to table it for the session, then the following week voted to rescind the tabling motion, and at last on May 29 reported it out favorably by a vote of 16 (9 Republicans, 7 Democrats) to 8 (all Democrats). The committee added the new provision that no political committee may spend more than $3,000,000 in any campaign.

The Hatch bill of 1940, like the Hatch Act of 1939, found politics written all over the opposition to it as the measure struggled along its way in Congress. Most old-line Democrats privately abominated the 1939 act, at least while their party was in power, and correspondents heard Senator CARL A. HATCH (Democrat), of New Mexico, roundly booed by his fellow Democrats at the Jackson Day dinner in Washington last January.

Willkie Not a Politician, Therefore He Will Be Engaged in Rebuilding Physical and Moral Forces of This Nation Instead of Playing Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD ON THE CHANCES FOR THE G. O. P. TICKET

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I present herewith my statement last night on the American Forum of the Air program on the subject What Are the Chances for the G. O. P. Ticket, broadcast over the Nation-wide facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

What are the chances for the G. O. P. ticket? Fundamentally, they are the best we have faced during the present century. A grand Scotch father taught me to be a conservative in thought and action, and 6 years' service in the House in the atmosphere of, and under New Deal pressure, has not changed me. Conservatively speaking, I now submit the reasons why the G. O. P.'s chances are so good.

The American people have again discovered themselves. Although they were for a number of years lulled to sleep on the pillow of the state and were led to believe the Government was an everlasting milk cow, they have now come back to themselves.

The present generation has had its splurge of irresponsibility. It has found that parties alone cannot conduct free government. Permitted to do so, parties will demand more and more power, and still more dictatorial power in order to be able to administer the country. If an irresponsible electorate permits, the substance of the people, as the citizen delivers it to the tax box, will be consumed by the politician as a form of manna, to perpetuate himself in office. A sleeping electorate encourages the political procurer to act as a purveyor of public funds back to the local parish, in the form of gravy. This practice dulls the conscience of the voter, destroys the fiscal structure of government, decreases pride in national life, and it leads the people to think only in terms of "local projects" instead of along national lines. And this creates a localized individual selfishness that positively will not support a free government.

Government derives its just powers from the consent of those governed. National defense is much more than social reforms. Permitted to do so, the politician will, under an appropriate catch phrase, make call after call on the people to which they will respond, for more and more tax dollars. In due course, the taxpaying citizen naturally questions the use of the funds, and invariably, will find the substance has been applied to promote more so-called social reforms.

This has happened in most all of the countries of western Europe, particularly in France and England. We are, I trust, quite familiar with the fact of the parallel in our own policies, here in the United States, in recent years.

Free men and women have duties to perform as well as rights to enjoy. For too many years we have had preached to us the "easy way of life." God Almighty has arranged the affairs of mankind so that the idea that "government won't let you down" can remain in control for just about so long a time. Then, there comes an awakening. If it comes too late, the people—like the French—become the slaves of some stronger group.

Now our people are, before it is too late, we hope, participating in a rebirth. The American voter is now in a frame of mind which demands a degree of statesmanship from his legislators. The voter now insists upon the interests of the Nation being placed before those of the individual politician and his party. Those who falsely preach that the proper duty of government is to arrange an easy way of life can no longer lead the voter.

The voters of this Nation have again determined that under God, citizens of both sexes are going to defend their country, preserve its liberties, and bequeath to their children an opportunity to live under a free government.

For a decade, the voters of this country have witnessed a debauch which, like rich food, palls their taste and becomes nauseating. They have had enough of this leveling of the Nation and the people, always down to a lower level. Our awakening is rude. We face terrific tasks. Those who thought they had retired, must now go back to work.

We the people have made colossal errors but we are now anxious to correct them.

The voters will now support the new leader "Win" Willkie and help him transform this country and—

1. Take our natural resources and create jobs for 9,000,000 workers in private industry;

2. Break the spell gold has over us, remove its dangerous inflationary threat, stop its further purchase from foreign countries, prevent the $20,000,000,000 of gold we now hold being dissipated through giving it away to the central banking systems of the world in a futile attempt to restore the so-called international gold standard;

3. Put the $1,000,000,000 worth of foodstuffs and fibers, now cornered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, back into the channels of trade where it can be consumed before it becomes another loss to chalk up against the taxpayer;

4. Restore life to a dying Cotton South which has lost its historical cotton export market;

5. Reinstate order in Government fiscal affairs, raise the necessary funds to provide an adequate peacetime and defense budget, and all without further destroying our private enterprise system with improperly applied taxes and more Government competition.

6. Proceed to collect a large portion of the $14,000,000,000 owed us by European countries.

7. Prevent the dumping in our markets of loot taken from the conquered countries.

8. Lead our people back to active and vigorous participation in representative government and maintain our position as a first-rate world power. Certainly we will support Willkie in making our Nation strong enough to command the fear and respect of every aggressor; stop our growing weakness, and actually provide genuine national defense.

Thoroughly and practically trained in our American enterprise system, "Win" Willkie can weld a sound Pan-American Union either on a triangular-trade basis or, if forced to do so by the totalitarian countries of Europe and Asia, he can place our hemispherical defense in a position to deal blow for blow, until the opposition grows weary and reasonable.

This, I would have you understand, will all be no pink-tea affair operated by "reds." This program, this necessity, demands a leader who has no taint of the wastrel or of the fallacious philosophy of the past decade. "Win" Willkie is a graduate of the school of hard knocks.

Nominee Willkie is not a politician; therefore he will be engaged in rebuilding the physical and moral forces of this Nation instead of just playing politics. That is what the people expect and will get from him—and they will like it.

Our domestic situation is not in order, and capital investment is profoundly missing, and this must be corrected if labor is to be materially increased, costs reduced, and goods improved to get and hold markets, in Latin-American countries, for instance.

A high standard of living is never created by legislation. But it comes from coordinated research, engineering, management, capital, and labor. "Win" Willkie thoroughly appreciates these facts.

The G. O. P. is now the young people's party. The people will support the G. O. P. ticket because they know "it is back to work we go" if there are to be any more "happy days."

Will Be a Two-Way Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CLAY CENTER (KANS.) DISPATCH

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, having been given unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herein a timely editorial by Ray Breitweiser, one of the prominent editors of Kansas—which appeared in the Clay Center Dispatch under date of July 3, 1940.

[From the Clay Center (Kans.) Dispatch of July 3, 1940]

WILL BE A TWO-WAY FIGHT

Wendell Willkie isn't the only person in the United States who owns utility stock. People who have money to invest almost without exception have some utility stock. There is nothing wrong with owning utility stock and personally we can see nothing wrong with a young man starting from scratch and going to the top of a huge concern such as the Commonwealth & Southern in less than 20 years. In fact it is one of the success stories that we like to read about and we admire any man who is a success and we claim that being president of any concern that pays a salary of $75,000 a year is a successful career.

As for Willkie being a rich man or holding utility stock, he is neither as rich as Roosevelt and if the truth were known, we venture the assertion that Franklin D. Roosevelt owns more stock in utility companies than a dozen Willkies.

But there is nothing wrong in holding stock in utility companies. There is nothing wrong in owning a few cattle, a few farms, some bank stock, or even a newspaper. The simple fact that some utility companies went broke, sold a lot of useless stock to innocent people, is no sign that all of the utility heads and all the utility companies are crooks. There are thousands of utility companies in the United States and the crooked ones number only a very small percent.

But the smearers, the scandalmongers will be at work early but this much is certain, it will be a two-way fight and no holds will be barred.

"Fifth Column" Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OSKALOOSA (IOWA) HERALD

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oskaloosa Herald of July 6, 1940:

[From the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald of July 6, 1940]

"FIFTH COLUMN" FOLLY

The howl from American Communistic and Fascistic groups, following the Nation-wide drive against "fifth column" activities, again brought to the fore the question of whether or not groups and individuals seeking to overthrow the present form of government have the right to seek protection under the Constitution they seek to destroy. With democracy on trial and in danger of extinction, United States citizens are at last protesting against the activities of un-American elements.

Under the Constitution, Communistic, Fascistic, and Nazi groups have openly organized, held meetings, and distributed propaganda extolling the totalitarian form of government and discrediting the democratic philosophy. These activities are admittedly carried on at the sufferance of a democratic people, and the subversive elements while taking full advantage of democratic privileges of free speech, assembly, and press, point to this sufferance as one of the great weaknesses of our system.

When the founding fathers set up this Government under the Constitution, they attempted to provide freedom for all. But they did not specify that this freedom should extend to a point where

it could not defend itself from destruction. On this point most Americans agree—any group or individual that conspires to overthrow the Constitution and the freedom it guarantees should not be protected by that Constitution.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many of our best citizens are deeply disturbed by the evident purpose of past and pending moves by the executive branch of our Government that appear to be leading us step by step down the path that leads to war.

There is no group of our citizens more firmly opposed to war, as an instrument of national policy, than is the religious denomination known as the Friends or the Quakers. The members of this religious group are made up of some of the finest people in this Republic.

In my district, the Eighteenth District of Ohio, I have many constituents who belong to this religious group, and I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be their Representative in Congress and to deliver to the Congress a communication which I have received from the Stillwater Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Barnesville, Ohio, which is as follows:

Congressman EARL R. LEWIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: We are much concerned by the recent move of those in control to inaugurate some plan of youth training.

We are very strenuously opposed to any form of compulsory service for youth. It is the very denial of all that our Government has stood for in the past. We hope that we are not thus to lose one of our democratic rights. Cannot this wave of hysteria be stopped?

Can we depend upon you to help in every way to check this steady rush toward war?

Sincerely,

STILLWATER MONTHLY MEETING OF FRIENDS,
ALBERT J. LIVEZEY,
ELIZA F. LEEDS,
Clerks.

England's Prayer and Ours—Ink Versus Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Detroit Free Press carried two very timely editorials which I feel should be called to your attention at this time, and to the attention of other Members of the House. Under leave to extend my remarks I include them herewith: England's prayer and ours, and also ink versus steel. This is once when the pen is not mightier than the sword.

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 8, 1940]

ENGLAND'S PRAYER—AND OURS

We are still getting but glimpses of what went on behind the curtain in France. As far as can now be seen it is a ghastly picture of the failure of democracy to function.

Has Great Britain been much better?

Have we?

At least there is time for us to learn our lesson and, God grant, there is still time for the British to learn theirs.

A strangely prayerful note may be found in a recent editorial in the London Times, generally accepted as the quasi-official organ of the British Government. One pregnant paragraph:

"The European house cannot be put in order until we put our own house in order first. The new order cannot be based on the preservation of privilege, whether privilege be that of a country, or a class, or an individual. * * * The problem of the new order is social as well as international."

This is going a long, long way for the London Times, bulwark of the old established order. One cannot have gone through the mining areas of Wales or the slums of London, Manchester, Liverpool, without acute and ready understanding of the needs of a "new order" if democracy is to prevail after the war on the British Isles.

The "privileged classes" of England have grown to be such an established decadent type that they have been the subject of merrymaking the world over, on stage and screen, in song and story. P. G. Wodehouse, and other writers of his type, owe the tremendous success of their efforts to the fact that they had to do but very little exaggerating to make their satires vivid.

It would be pleasant if we of the United States could point with pride.

But it ill behooves us to dwell upon the sins that have been England's.

For every wretched hovel in Great Britain its counterpart can be found in this land of wealth and opportunity—lush and fresh and at its beginnings, instead of being age-old and weary from the burdens of tradition as is England.

Our sense of shame should be even greater than that of the older countries, hide-bound by habits, for it was to escape from these conditions that most of our people came to these shores.

It is to be hoped that all this silly political poppycock about "our frontier ends at the Rhine" is over, that what has been revealed of the internal picture of France will act as a sobering influence upon those superpatriots who have been insisting America's destiny is to save the world.

Our job is to save ourselves.

Not by grubbingly pinching pennies and counting the costs, not with the idea that out of the woes of other peoples shall we make a profit, but by giving to our own people real equality—political, social, economic, intellectual, spiritual democracy.

You cannot have a Christian nation without Christianity and you cannot have a democratic nation without democracy.

To mention superpatriots again we hear, over the radio and on the platforms, the orators shouting that we should be willing to die for democracy.

Is it not, however, much better to live for it?

As France was yesterday, we are today. The only difference is one of degrees. France so lost the soul of democracy that, if most reliable reports are true, it was a nation divided between extreme left-wing radicals and Tory sympathizers with the Nazis.

The believer in democracy must have been in the wishful and ineffectual minority.

We, too, are a divided people, divided by politically promoted class hates—often made easy because of the plentitude of material on which to base such claims.

Until we get our own house in order we need not look with scorn upon France nor with pity upon England.

"Democracy, as a fighting faith," says Dr. Robert Hutchins, "can only be as strong as the convictions which support it. If these are gone, democracy becomes simply one of the many ways of organized society, and must be tested by efficiency."

If it is the best form of government we have got to prove that it is the best. We must prove that we are capable of governing ourselves as a free people, working for a common cause, each rendering unto the other that which is his by right of justice and not by the might of one class over another—whether that class be called capital or labor.

In a true democracy we are all workers, we are all capitalists, we are all citizens of equality, because we are all Americans.

That must be our real national defense.

INK VERSUS STEEL

We now have "on order" or under contemplation at the White House a $14,000,000,000 emergency preparedness program. Unfortunately, paper ships, paper planes, and paper armies protect no coastal cities, no factories, no homes. A less pretentious program being put through with a hum would make us all feel more comfortable.

This is once when the pen is not mightier than the sword.

Pan-Americanism or War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over the red network of the National Broadcasting Co. from station WRC, in Washington, D. C., on July 8, 1940, on the subject, America Must Choose—Pan-Americanism or War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA MUST CHOOSE—PAN-AMERICANISM OR WAR

Teachers of American history in introducing the subject of the Monroe Doctrine point out that there are two essential parts:

1. A warning to European nations not to establish new colonies in the Western Hemisphere; and

2. Assurance that we would not take part in European wars, nor would we interfere in their internal concerns.

It is this second cardinal principle of the Monroe Doctrine upon which the first rests, which radio commentators, columnists, and editors consistently or purposefully overlook today.

While all true Americans are ready to shed their blood in defense of the Monroe Doctrine, how many have more than a vague idea of its language and import? How many are aware that the only justification for telling Europe to keep hands off our hemisphere lies in the principle of nonintervention in Europe's affairs, stated by President Monroe in his historic message to Congress on December 2, 1823:

"* * * In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers * * *."

In short, we promised hands off Europe and warned Europe that we would not tolerate European interference here. That is the Monroe Doctrine. If we break our promise of nonintervention in Europe, what complaint have we if Europe intervenes in this hemisphere?

In the old West the ranch owner who trespassed on the land of his neighbor waited with drawn six-shooter for the retaliation which was sure to come. We face a deadly parallel today. Continued trespassing in Europe invites retaliation. Meddling is an unwarranted deviation from our traditional policy. It can only lead to war.

We are faced with a crucial choice: "America must choose Pan Americanism or war."

Let us not confuse this issue with our sympathy for one of the belligerent powers. American public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to our entry into the war. In spite of the imminence of the invasion of England, the latest Gallup poll shows that only 14 percent of the people favor intervention. Letters from my constituents are unanimous in expressing a fervent desire to keep America out of war. This preponderance of public opinion is attributable in the main to a deep-rooted and traditional attitude of nonintervention and, second, the full realization by the man in the street that airplanes, tanks, and organization are the decisive factors in war. Sharing the conviction of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that nothing that we can do now will alter the outcome of the coming battle of England, our people are determined to remain at peace.

With these facts before us, we can best appreciate the decision America must make. Either we cease our meddling in Europe and choose the road to peace by the development of our own hemisphere, or we will find ourselves engaged in a long protracted struggle with the totalitarian powers for imperialistic mastery of the world.

During the special session, when the arms embargo was lifted, we still gave lip service to "neutrality"; now we have even abandoned that pretense and are definitely and simply "nonbelligerent." How long will the "non" remain? Do the American people want that precious "non" removed? To preserve that status, Congress must remain in session, and I, for one, will vote against any proposal for adjournment while the situation remains critical, and I warn my colleagues that only disastrous consequences can follow a refusal to heed the plainly expressed will of the people that Congress remain in session.

Misguided patriots assure us that the European democracies are our first line of defense. But what has happened to those first lines of defense?

Events of the past week have presented the grotesque spectacle of the two great nations who were supposedly fighting the battle for democracy exchanging salvos, bombing in reprisal, and severing diplomatic relations. And we were told that this was a different kind of a war. That argument has now been exploded; we know that it is the same age-old game of European power politics, as the late lamented Senator Borah so often described it. It is not our war.

These deluded patriots confuse foreign interests with our own, either through vain personal ambition, sheer stupidity, or corrupt motives.

And now, please pay particular heed to the following quotation:

"So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, or privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation."

This was not said on July 4, 1940, or even last year, but 144 years ago by one whose statements cannot be questioned, for his loyalty and patriotism have never been impugned. Similar statements have been stigmatized as worthy of "Trojan jackasses." But I refer to no "Trojan jackass." No, it is George Washington's Farewell Address, his legacy to the American people, his people, our people, which I have quoted. Old-fashioned perhaps, but it has weathered the acid test of time—true then and just as true now.

Common sense dictates that we follow Washington's advice. But how? By minding our own business and by not letting our sympathies run away with us at the expense of our own true interests and by adopting a constructive program of development in our own hemisphere.

Such a program is sure to be greeted by derisive cries of appeasement. Propagandists have found appeasement a new device against which I must warn, lest they pull a "blitzkrieg" on our firm desire for peace. There can be no appeasement unless a demand has been made. Who, besides interventionists, has made demands upon us? Of course, appeasement, since Chamberlain and Munich, has an unpleasant, or even ominous sound. But appeasement has nothing to do with us except as a convenient term for the interventionists who cannot otherwise circumvent American public opinion which insists on peace.

Our relations to South America in the past have generally been characterized by bungling ineptitude. Though we were the first to recognize the independence of our neighbors to the south, when a call was first issued for a pan-American conference to be held in Panama in 1825, under the sponsorship of the great liberator, Simon Bolivar, our Government was so slow in sending its two delegates that one died before he got there, and the other found that the Congress had adjourned before he arrived.

Some 60 years later pan-Americanism assumed real significance, but unfortunately our policy of Caribbean imperialism exemplified by our war with Spain, the Panama Canal and the landing of the Marines in Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua, and our active hostility toward the ill-fated Central American Court of Justice, created doubt, suspicion, and even hatred in our sister republics.

We were described as the colossus of the north. The United States has intervened some 30 times in Latin America and the fear of Yankee imperialism is an active factor in the Latin American mind today. Our relations with Mexico, Colombia, and Panama are more familiar to the Latin American than parachutists from over seas.

Seven years ago the good-neighbor policy was inaugurated. This sincere effort by the Roosevelt administration to make the responsibility of the Monroe Doctrine a multilateral obligation of all the American Republics rather than a self-assumed obligation of this Nation alone has met favorable response in South America. But more than words are needed to correct the many mistakes of the past.

Now we are proposing a pan-American cartel whereby the United States can control all of the exports from Latin America and bargain with totalitarian Europe, if that is what Europe is to be. What advantage will accrue to Latin America from this arrangement? Perhaps, with their experience with us, that is what they too are wondering, and can we blame them? Now we realize we need them, but more than idle repetition of a desire to be good neighbors

is necessary. Actions speak louder than words, and actions are essential.

Having decided to concentrate our efforts on this hemisphere, we must decide to practice what we preach and carry through a determination to appreciate and understand the temperaments of the Latin American peoples. This will require a complete change of attitude on the part of the people of the United States. The racial doctrines asserted by totalitarian philosophy are constantly decried in the United States, but nothing less has characterized our attitude toward the Latin American. We have been too prone to regard ourselves as superior to our neighbors in this hemisphere. Perhaps this is not done consciously, but nevertheless we will have to change that attitude if we desire their friendship.

I cite an example: In a recent motion picture we were treated to a spectacle of a sawed-off shrimp, portrayed by James Cagney, manhandling with ease 20 to 30 natives of a hypothetical Latin American country. No doubt this example of so-called superiority created a sense of satisfaction and pride, but it represents bad taste and creates ill will.

I mention the problem of our attitude because the success of our efforts in South America will depend upon our sincerity.

In New Mexico, which I represent in the Senate, over half of the people speak Spanish. Racial differences have been solved harmoniously. Public offices in the State are filled by both of the principal races and all are fully conscious, and thank God for it, that they are Americans first, last, and always.

Those of us of Spanish descent in New Mexico are proud of our ancestry. No recent comers to this land, our forefathers have lived in New Mexico in some cases as much as three generations before Plymouth Rock. In New Mexico we have no Sudeten problem. And we won't permit one. There we have mutual respect, tolerance, and understanding. The ideal that prevails in New Mexico must be adopted by the United States in its consideration of the Latin Americans. They must be treated as equals.

A concrete program so that pan-Americanism can become more than a mere catchword should include the development of close cultural ties, the facilitation of travel and intercourse, and, lastly, the erection of a powerful economic hegemony. The exchange of students by the thousands should be inaugurated immediately. Chairs for the teaching of Latin American history and ways of life should be established in our universities and colleges, this to be financed by the Federal Government, just as agricultural schools are sponsored now. Spanish and Portuguese should be required courses in our secondary schools, and a systematic program of educating our commercial and governmental representatives to South America in the language and culture of the country should be undertaken.

Recently Secretary of Agriculture Wallace addressed the delegates to the Eighth American Scientific Congress in Spanish. Secretary Wallace is an exception. It is doubtful if there is another public official in Washington who could make an address in Spanish. But in our Southwest, in the States of Texas, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, we have thousands of educated young men and women of Latin extraction who speak Spanish and English. There are more in Puerto Rico. Their loyalty to this country is unquestioned. Sending our Spanish-speaking citizens as emissaries of good will to combat the "fifth columns" in South America would be more effective than Navy cruisers.

In order to facilitate travel and intercourse, airways and steamship lines should be subsidized with the object of lowering travel costs for the public. The pan-American highway and interlinking roads should be constructed to open the vast continent to our south. News service, cable, and radio facilities should be improved. Since private enterprise has not entered this field, public interest demands that the Government take the lead. It is appalling to think that Germany and Italy, occupied as they are, are still continuing to propagandize by radio in South America and we do nothing.

In the economic field we should concentrate on the development of sources of strategic raw materials, such as tin and rubber, to replace those now derived from Europe and Asia. The promotion of trade and commerce must be made with a view to raising the standard of living, rather than exploitation and economic oppression.

I am convinced that unless a program such as outlined is immediately inaugurated our efforts to promote pan-Americanism will be attended by dismal failure. Without it, the Habana conference, like those preceding it, will produce nothing more than high-sounding resolutions

On August 10, 1937, I advocated in the Senate that we direct our attention to South America, where our natural interests lie; that we cultivate the friendship of Latin America. On March 3, 1938, over a national radio hook-up I urged the construction of a Government short-wave broadcasting station for South America to counteract totalitarian propaganda. I asked then that we immunize ourselves from political destinies of Europe and confine our activities to the American scene. On May 9, 1939, I delivered over N. B. C. a speech entitled "Pan-Americanism Versus European Meddling." I urged political isolation from the border disputes and blood feuds of Europe.

We had time then to make a choice. We may still have time now. Let us decide now and choose the path that leads to peace. Let us build in our hemisphere a mighty stronghold of law and order and peace. Let us choose pan-Americanism.

Statement Concerning Book Written by James H. R. Cromwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SMATHERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8, 1940

STATEMENT FURNISHED BY HON. JOHN E. TOOLAN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement explaining in full certain statements appearing in a book published under the authorship of James H. R. Cromwell.

I make this request at the instance of my good friend and former colleague in the New Jersey State Senate, the Honorable John E. Toolan, of Middlesex County, N. J.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On June 5 last, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] made a statement in the Senate grievously reflecting upon the loyalty and patriotism of James H. R. Cromwell, Democratic candidate for the United States Senate from the State of New Jersey, who will be the opponent of the junior Senator from New Jersey at the election November 5.

In the course of his remarks, the junior Senator from New Jersey made reference in support of his unusual charges to a few fragmentary extracts from a book written in 1932 by Mr. Cromwell. The title of the book is "The Voice of Young America," published by Charles Scribner's Sons. At the time the junior Senator from New Jersey referred to this book many of the statements and conclusions expressed by Mr. Cromwell had been amplified by Mr. Cromwell in speeches made before two sessions of the New Jersey State Democratic convention at Trenton, N. J., on May 28, 1940, and June 4, 1940.

Mr. Cromwell's book was written during the dark days of 1932 when many persons trembled for the fate of our country. Political and economic chaos threatened our most cherished institutions and Mr. Cromwell made an earnest and sincere effort to examine many of the problems pressing for solution. He studied a number of these problems in a scientific and businesslike way, frankly expressing his opinions and offering remedies for many of the ills that then beset the country.

It is worth noting that the Associated Press in an article published by a number of American newspapers on February 4, 1940, listed 10 suggestions for reform made in 1932 by Mr. Cromwell, which have since that time become wholly or partly accomplished. These as listed by the Associated Press were as follows:

1. Repeal of the eighteenth amendment.
2. A national police force.
3. Reduction of tariffs.
4. Separation of underwriting and deposit banking.
5. Guaranteed bank deposits.
6. An embargo on gold withdrawals and inflation of the currency until money averaged the buying power of the prior decade.
7. A system of national employment offices.
8. Compulsory unemployment insurance.
9. Federal-aided public works.
10. Government ownership of public utilities.

Without discussing any of the subjects treated in this book, the junior Senator from New Jersey told the Senate on June 5, 1940, that Mr. Cromwell's 1932 book "verges on the seditious, and gives comfort to 'fifth columnists' in the United States."

Without reading it to the Senate, the junior Senator from New Jersey had inserted in the RECORD the text of a statement which he (the junior Senator from New Jersey) had issued to the press on June 3, 1940.

Mr. Cromwell's public record and his frequent utterances, both as American Minister to Canada and upon the public platform in this country, are sufficient answer in themselves to such allegations, for if he has been criticized by the press and other observers for anything at all, it has been for his repeated and outspoken utterances during the last 6 months in support of democracy and the American system of government as opposed to the autocracies and dictators of Europe.

However, Mr. Cromwell himself had answered the June 3 statement of the junior Senator from New Jersey even before the junior Senator from New Jersey placed the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Speaking before the Democratic State Convention at Trenton, N. J., on June 4, Mr. Cromwell said:

"Senator BARBOUR, after diligent research, has discovered that 8 years ago I wrote and expressed my dissatisfaction with things as

they were and hoped that more efficient government would succeed in remedying these conditions.

"If this is any satisfaction to the Senator, I would tell him, that unlike himself, I am still greatly dissatisfied with conditions that make for unemployment, want, and insecurity in our country, and that I still think that the remedy for such conditions in a democracy is more democracy.

"Senator BARBOUR has wrapped himself in the ample folds of the Constitution of the United States, hoping that thereby his record in the United States Senate will be obscured to the voters of New Jersey. He is wrong. It is not what he wrote 8 years ago, if ne wrote anything, but what he said and did in the United States Senate to the disservice of the people who elected him, that will mark him in this campaign.

"During the country's crisis in the last war, I, with many others, took the oath of allegiance to the Constitution, put on my country's uniform, and was ready to make whatever sacrifice I was called upon for the principles for which our democracy stood. Perhaps Mr. BARBOUR will explain what he did in the same circumstances.

"The Senator is a sadly confused man when he refers to me as of the 'fifth column.' Only recently he attacked me for attacking the interests of the 'fifth column,' in a speech I had made in Toronto, Canada.

"Senator BARBOUR has much less to fear from the 'fifth column,' because of his expressed attitude against anything that might possibly hurt the feeling of such people than he has from the 'first column,' who are the workers of our State, the 'second column,' our patriotic and independently minded businessmen, the 'third column,' the progressive youth of our State, and the 'fourth column,' our social-service workers and educators, who want courageous, efficient, and patriotic government."

In support of his amazing charge of sedition against his opponent for election to the United States Senate, the junior Senator from New Jersey inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of excerpts from Mr. Cromwell's book of 8½ years ago. These excerpts, consisting for the most part of single sentences, and even only parts of sentences, from whole paragraphs, give an incomplete and inadequate view of Mr. Cromwell's view back in 1932.

I find nothing in this book to warrant the charge of the junior Senator from New Jersey that his Democratic opponent for the Senate is guilty now or at any other time of having entertained or expressed sentiments in any degree disloyal to the Constitution or to our system of government or that he is disqualified in any way to take the oath as a United States Senator. On the contrary, a study of his writings, speeches, and his record as American Minister to Canada has convinced me that his presence in this body would be of distinct benefit to this country and to the State of New Jersey.

The fragmentary parts of this book, consisting of nine brief references from a book of 190 pages which the junior Senator from New Jersey caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without even reading them to the Senate, naturally give a very incomplete and inadequate picture of the thesis of this book.

Its theme and purpose is very clearly indicated by a quotation from a poem by James Russell Lowell (who was certainly never accused of sedition) which is printed as a frontispiece in the book. This quotation is as follows:

"Now times demand new measures and new men;
The old advances and in time outgrows
The laws that in our forefathers' day were best,
And doubtless after us some purer scheme will be
Shaped out by wiser men than we,
Made wiser by the steady growth of truth.
My soul is not a palace of the past,
Where outworn creeds like Rome's great Senate quake,
Hearing afar the vandals trumpet hearse
That shakes old systems with a thunder fit.
The time is ripe and rotten ripe for change,
Then let it come; I have no dread
Of what is called for by the instincts of mankind."

To state more adequately his purposes in writing the book, Mr. Cromwell wrote a preface to it and so that his purposes and arguments may be more fully understood I desire to read that preface:

PREFACE

"I do not mean to convey the impression that this book, because it is entitled the 'Voice of Young America,' represents the unanimous opinion of the young men and women of the country, nor do I anticipate that they will coincide with all my deductions or support all my contentions; that is not the point. To me, the voice of young America is a cry of need for knowledge and truth and for such facts and fundamentals as will pierce the dense fog of ignorance, tradition, hypocrisy, and evasion through which our elders are blindly stumbling toward chaos and destruction.

"The book might better be named 'the Economic Education of James Cromwell,' since it is the result of one young American's struggle, following the crash of 1929, to find out what caused this great economic crisis. It represents my apprehension at the selfish, stupid, and suicidal policies of our so-called leaders, and my desire to point out to my contemporaries, in brief and comprehensive form, certain alarming facts about our country and what we can do to save ourselves from ruin. If this book succeeds in dispelling some of the fallacies and some of the ignorance which prevail in America today, it will be because I can understand, thanks to my own former prejudices and misconceptions, what erroneous ideas may still be confusing other young Americans.

"In my endeavor to obtain authentic information I discovered that the authorities were exhaustive specialists upon their own subjects, but that no book existed which concisely described the most important of the many causes which have brought about America's sudden downfall. This book is, therefore, the attempt of an amateur to compile, in sequence, a synopsis of the outstanding evils and errors which afflict our country. It is meant to provoke thought and discussion and not to be a text book. A comprehensive bibliography of references, however, is included for those who wish to secure full information upon subjects which I have barely outlined. I dislike destructive criticism and consequently have avoided railing against those abuses which cannot be corrected by the exercise of ordinary human intelligence.

"This is America's crisis—commerce is at a standstill, the people are panic-stricken, more than 10,000,000 are out of work, the Government is helpless, we face a deficit, this year (1932) of $2,000,000,000, and we cannot continue indefinitely issuing bonds to support an ever-increasing army of unemployed. That is not the worst. These material things could be remedied if Congress would face facts and take action, but Congress will not face facts and will not take action. Our 'leaders,' with a few notable exceptions, are looking backward instead of forward; we must be philosophical, they say, for this is not the first period of depression America has endured—the ancient engine has stalled before, but it has always started up again, somehow, so we must suffer patiently until a kind Providence restores good times. They are blind to the vicious evils and errors of an obsolete form of government and go on hopefully waiting for a new cycle of prosperity which will obliterate the memory of the miseries of today. Will the holocaust of revolution overtake America before these reactionaries realize that the good old days have passed into history and that our psychology and our methods must be adjusted to a new era?

"When such an able and experienced leader as Col. E. M. House publicly states that our continued inability to grasp realities may result in revolution, it is time American citizens awoke to the probability of such a catastrophe. During similar conditions in England, Macaulay declared 'the only possible antidote to revolution is timely and drastic reform.' Revolution is an indictment of the ruling classes of any generation in which it occurs, so America's youth must face facts and adopt a program of drastic reform before it is too late. We have no time to waste discussing the mysteries of socialism, communism, technocracy, and other vague theories, but must at once put to use the possible and practical remedies which lie ready to our hands.

"Those of us who are between the ages of 18 and 45 are going to bear the brunt of future calamities, and this book has, in consequence, been written primarily for my contemporaries. If, through reading it, even a few young Americans are moved to a fuller comprehension of the evils and errors which menace our country's safety and gain a deeper understanding of the infinite possibilities of practical reform, my efforts will have been more than rewarded."

And now, so the fragmentary parts of this book printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but not read to the Senate by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] may be examined in connection with the context of which they are a part, I ask that excerpts placed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] be reprinted in small type and that the complete text immediately preceding and following (or so much of it as may be necessary) be printed in larger type so that a clear picture of the views of Mr. Cromwell, as expressed 8½ years ago, may be presented.

"When, during the war, the American people were faced with a tangible and dangerous issue, there was no lack of courage, initiative, and coordination of effort on the part of the Nation as a whole, and Woodrow Wilson, irrespective of his other qualifications, proved a strong and fearless President. Today, facing an intangible issue which is far more dangerous than the plain and evident issue of 1917, America is a house divided against itself, and not one great leader has appeared who is courageous enough to tell the people of the United States that the antiquated Government of the Constitution has collapsed. A disorganized and purposeless Congress flounders helplessly in a sea of irresponsible minority 'blocs' and seeks to solve the problems of a gigantic machine age with the mental and legislative equipment of 1789. Now, at the eleventh hour, with over 10,000,000 workers unemployed, with mutterings of violence among starving and desperate people, the Nation, leaderless, bewildered, and sorely pressed, turns to its youth in the hope that they can save the country."

* * * * * * *

"The people of the United States are panic stricken and bewildered because depression seems intangible to them; and, being uninformed and misled, they do not know how to defend themselves. Depression is in fact intangible; it is the combination of a multitude of errors and, like an octopus, must be destroyed tentacle by tentacle. Americans of the old order were businessmen first, last, and always, and their primary desire in life was to be let alone and allowed to develop their commercial ventures independent of State or Federal interference. They were living in a fool's paradise—each intent on his own purpose, each without thought of the

future, each selfishly avoiding his responsibilities as a citizen, and, at the same time, trying to load his just burdens upon other people's shoulders. This depression will prove, in the end, a blessing in disguise, and not a calamity, if it compels the youth and best brains of America to consider the common welfare, to tell the truth to the people of the United States, and to reorganize both an iniquitous system of government and an archaic theory of economics."

* * * * * * *

"A true democracy represents the will of the majority of the people; a political system which is based not upon the will of the majority but upon weird and fictitious boundary lines, cannot be termed a democracy; nor was the United States ever intended by the authors of the Constitution to be a democracy. Their political tradition was aristocratic, and a government truly responsive to the will of the people was unthinkable to them; they were distrustful of the very democracy which we ignorantly assume they created and left to us. They therefore devised a balanced and counterbalanced vehicle of government in which the Senate, judiciary, and executive branches were chosen, not by the people but by selected representatives of the people. In the words of John Adams, they wanted 'the well-born to rule.' An ingenious system was finally created which permitted citizens to vote every 2 years to replace the entire House of Representatives but allowed them to replace only one-third of the Senate, which body, therefore, was then, and is now, entirely free to ignore the will of the people. In answer to the need for some form of responsibility, party government, which had never been considered by the Constitution framers, soon appeared, and in the course of years direct election of Senators and a series of other amendments were enacted in vain efforts to dispel chaos and give to the educated and intelligent people of the United States a voice in the administration of their own Government.

"American politics are now based upon a two-party system. These parties are supposed to represent two different schools of thought and policy and to provide, in addition, a satisfactory method of guaranteeing the administrative efficiency and integrity of the party in power. Nobody knows what schools of thought and policy these two parties represent today. The Republican Party is a combination of certain wet industrial cities and dry western farmers, while the Democratic Party combines other wet industrial eastern cities and dry southern farmers. Nothing could be more absurd or illogical, and it is not surprising that the candidates of both parties are compelled to sit on the fence and emit an endless stream of empty platitudes to conceal their complete lack of constructive policies. The discovery that our Government is iniquitous and inefficient is inevitable when the foundations upon which it is built are admittedly illogical and absurd."

* * * * * * *

"Our system of government transforms masters into servants and servants into masters. Imagine, for instance, hiring a laborer, having him refuse to carry out our instructions, and saying to him: 'Very well, since you refuse to carry out our instructions we will discharge you in 6 years.' What an absurdity. And yet this is an exact simile of the relations which exist between the people of the United States and the Senators they hire to represent their rotten-borough districts. Substitute 2 years for 6 and Representatives for Senators, remember that the Senate can veto the wishes of the people's representatives, and it becomes evident that the intent of the constitutional fathers to deprive the people of any voice of their own Government has magnificently and disastrously succeeded.

"Our sacrosanct, outworn, and demoralizing Constitution is a millstone around the necks of the American people and it has delivered our Government into the hands of self-seeking demagogs and politicians. The use of the franchise in a republic is the guaranty of honest and efficient self-government, and the corruption and incapacity which exist in our machine political organizations result from the fact that great masses of citizens seldom vote because they have no compelling issue to vote for. Minorities, who directly or indirectly profit through the use of their franchise, therefore control Government, and the organizers of these minorities or political machines have been, and still are, subject to bribery by unscrupulous men seeking public monopolies or special privilege. The prevalence of political corruption has been, and is now, amply attested by the existence of enormous fortunes in America which have been accumulated, not by superior genius and hard work, but through suborned privilege and the acquisition and shameless exploitation of the sovereign powers of the American people."

* * * * * * *

"Our forefathers created for themselves a new form of self-government which included, and still includes, most of the evils which existed in the British system in 1789; a President was substituted for the King, a Senate for the House of Lords, and a House of Representatives for the House of Commons. In 1832 the British people forced through their famous reform bill; they reorganized their Governament and rectified its evils; they abolished their vicious, rotten boroughs and inaugurated the modern type of flexible and efficient parliamentary government which has made Great Britain a model of self-governing democracies. Since that time practically all civilized nations have evolved similar systems of self-government and have steadily improved and developed the art; while we, with egotistical self-satisfaction, have remained content with the eighteenth-century Constitution conceived by our distinguished forebears. We are not compelled to originate, today, a new and untried theory of Government, but can profit by the experience of our more progressive neighbors and can adopt for ourselves a system which, by trial and error, they have found to be satisfactory and efficient and which will meet our own twentieth-century requirements.

"We will be confronted, however, with determined and organized opposition, for the American people are victimized and held in bondage by a small and controlling group of demagogues and politicians whose power and privilege will be destroyed if the modern and universal system of parliamentary government is substituted for our corrupt and tottering constitutional government. The obstructive tactics of this oligarchy are unwittingly supported by reactionary 'patriots,' who cry 'treason' at the mere suggestion that our ancient and sacred institutions are not 100 percent perfect, but young America must not be diverted by such impediments in the path of progress; we must and will throw out this infamous oligarchy irrespective of Constitution, cults, or any other forms of ancestor worship. We propose to modernize our institutions and will not permit our country to sink into decadence—like China—by setting up as irrefutable religion the mistakes of our progenitors.

"It would be impossible to define more briefly and clearly the organization and operation of a parliamentary form of government than by quoting the words of Newton D. Baker: 'A majority in the British House of Commons elects a prime minister or chooses a prime minister. That prime minister appoints from the House of Commons the government, the executive associates, the Cabinet. They are all members of Parliament. They formulate a policy. As long as the people of England are satisfied with that policy they stay in power. The minute that policy ceases to satisfy the people of Great Britain they go out of power and somebody else comes in who is charged with responsibility for a new policy, and he stays in just so long as he can command a majority of the House of Commons. And the minute he ceases to be able to command a majority, out he goes.

" 'That prime minister appoints from the House of Commons the government, the executive associates, the Cabinet. They are all members of Parliament.' These words are significant. Not only is the life of the government directly dependent upon the approval of the people, but the government itself is composed of the elected representatives of the people. Not only are members of the Cabinet chosen because of their political experience and proved executive ability, but men who embark upon a political career and demonstrate individual fitness are given the opportunity to reach the heights of power and prominence.

"Americans are capable in business, yet we take no action to correct our glaring governmental defects, even when such defects are conspicuously indicated by comparison with competing and infinitely more efficient systems. Every 4 years we see politicians choose new and inexperienced Cabinet heads who, almost invariably, entirely lack any comprehension of political needs and problems. These 'administrators' are supposed to conduct their departments in accordance with the viewpoint of political-minded legislators who entirely lack any comprehension of executive needs and problems. Our Cabinet heads are appointed because they have 'supported the party.' They come from all sorts of occupations—we have had railroad presidents, college presidents, lawyers, doctors, bankers, civil engineers, dry-goods merchants, men of every type except statesmen. We have had very few of these because our system of government does not comprehend that training is essential to statesmanship and to the successful guidance of vast national affairs.

"Let us again quote Mr. Baker: 'They formulate a policy. As long as the people of England are satisfied with that policy they stay in power.' Assume that an American parliamentary administration should adopt a high-tariff policy and that many of the people should be opposed to such a policy. What would happen? Both the administration and the opposition representatives would at once appeal directly to the people to support their respective contentions. If the administration's policy should be objectionable to most of the people, the people would protest to their representatives; numerous representatives, therefore, would refuse to support the administration's policy; the administration would lose its majority, and a general election would become obligatory. The people themselves would then decide, after again hearing the subject thoroughly discussed by opposing factions, whether or not they wished a high tariff. There would be no confusion as to issues, because there would be only one issue at stake; do the voters wish a high tariff or do they not? In England, where the people govern themselves and decide each vital issue, a minimum of about 85 percent of eligible citizens vote. In America, where the voice of the people is rendered inaudible and where there is never any issue, a maximum of about 54 percent of eligible citizens vote."

* * * * * * *

"How can these imperative and drastic changes in our Government be brought about? The Constitution provides that amendments may be proposed by a two-thirds majority in both Houses, or by two-thirds of all State legislatures, and that such amendments must be ratified by three-fourths of all State legislatures or by a special convention convened in three-fourths of the States. Most of the authors of the Constitution were of the privileged, landowning, upper-class minority, and they took every precaution to guarantee the perpetuation of a system which would safeguard the privileges of a fractional minority at the expense of the vast majority. It is inconceivable that our parasite States will volun-

tarily deprive themselves of the graft and special privileges which they enjoy under our present scheme of government, and, therefore, some 'unconstitutional' plan of compelling reform must be found.

"A powerful and dangerous weapon is now being forged upon the anvil of tax oppression, and that weapon is the organization of taxpayers into associations which collectively refuse to meet the inordinate demands made upon them. Taxpayers' associations must be organized and amalgamated in the 10 States which represent 50 percent of the population and pay 80 percent of the Federal income tax. The purpose of such amalgamated associations would be to fight taxation without representation and to compel recalcitrant parasite States to forfeit their graft and special privileges and accept a parliamentary government which would be equitable, just, and fair to all the people. The instrument with which tax associations could accomplish this purpose would be a new 'liberal' or 'young American' political movement which would place one, and only one, issue before the voters of the country—parliamentary government for the United States. Liberal Representatives in Congress could refuse to vote for any Federal appropriations until essential governmental reforms had been agreed upon by over 36 States. It would be difficult to organize a third political party in America, and such a drastic step is probably unnecessary. Liberal candidates could run for office under the banners of our Republican-Democratic coterie, and thus the eggs of the new movement could be hatched in the nests of our two existing and discredited political parties.

"Timid antiquarians will oppose us with the statement that the Constitution has served the national needs for over 143 years, and that a vehicle of government which has endured so long must be meritorious. Our ancestors were satisfied with a horse and buggy, which is a meritorious means of transportation, but we have not, for this reason, hesitated to adopt the automobile or the airplane. A man may for years enjoy apparent health and prosperity while, unknown to him, a cancer is slowly spreading its poison through his system; then in some period of weakness he is struck down by this dread disease. No such man can hope to recover his health until this cancer has been removed, and the same thing is true in America today. We cannot hope to climb up the steep ladder to renewed contentment and prosperity until our fundamental cancer, an undemocratic and incompetent system of government, has been removed.

"The path of progress has never been smooth, and many obstacles, delays, and discouragements must be overcome before success can be achieved. Let us remember that Washington finally had to approve a Constitution which he described as 'the best that can be obtained at this time,' after he had risked his life in battles and had for years suffered extreme privations and anxieties to win for his country the right of self-government. Let us always find new inspiration in the words of Lincoln: 'This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember and overthrow it.'

"Young America will not sit supinely by and watch the ravages of needless depression; we have the courage and intelligence to reorganize our Government; we will develop leaders who can understand the problems of this new era and we can, and will, save our bewildered and sorely pressed country from the perils of unemployment, starvation, and violence.

"It takes more time and more grit to correct the abuses in a nation than to win a nation's wars, but youth has the time, and youth has the grit."

Independence Day Addresses at New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESSES BY HARVEY D. GIBSON; MESSMORE KENDALL; GENERAL NOLAN; LT. GEN. ROBERT LEE BULLARD; HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN, OF VERMONT; AND REAR ADMIRAL C. H. WOODWARD

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD certain patriotic speeches delivered at the New York World's Fair on Independence Day, by Mr. Harvey D. Gibson, chairman of the board, New York World's Fair, 1940; by Mr. Messmore Kendall, chairman, Committee on Patriotic Activities; by General Nolan, introducing Lt. Gen. Robert Lee Bullard, retired; by Lieutenant General Bullard, retired; by Rear Admiral C. H. Woodward, United States Navy; and by me.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HARVEY D. GIBSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1940, COURT OF PEACE, JULY 4, 1940

Ladies and gentlemen, 1 day out of every year is recognized the world over as a distinctly American day.

Every year for more than a century and a half, American citizens have gathered together on that day to remind themselves—and the rest of the world—of the principles for which our founding fathers stood.

This afternoon we are following in that tradition. We have met here in the Court of Peace to observe a time-honored custom. It is fitting that we should do this. It is right that as we engage in these ceremonies our minds should turn to the past, and we should think of those memorable days in 1776 when our Nation was born.

This may well be a day on which we pause and glance back over the years, proud to be inheritors of the Spirit of '76. We should cherish that pride. We should never forget for an instant that to be proud of our country means to be proud of the men who have shaped its course and of the words and achievements they have willed to us.

But we must take care that the honor and reverence we do them is a genuine part of our lives and not merely an observance we go through by habit on this 1 day of the year.

We must realize that this is not only the Fourth of July, but that it is the Fourth of July in the year 1940. What we celebrate here today should be something far more than a train of events and great deeds in our past.

We ourselves are not of the past but of today. Urgently as we need the example and wise counsel of those men of 1776, it is to our own effort we must look for a solution of the problems that lie about us today.

The spirit of liberty and human justice to which we pay tribute today is not an heirloom. It cannot be passed fondly from one generation of ancestor-worshipers to another.

Because we live under the laws and institutions founded by the men of the Revolution does not of itself make us the spiritual descendants of the men of the Revolution. That we meet here and commemorate a brilliant scene in our history is not enough to justify our claiming kinship with those who took part in that scene.

The freedom for which they fought is something no one of us can passively inherit. The sense of tolerance and human justice that has made for peace in our land must be reborn each generation if it is to remain alive.

So today, the deepest tribute we can pay to our Nation's past is to rededicate ourselves to that spirit of peace and freedom which (if we are worthy) we can hope to inherit from our past.

This cannot be done lightly and with words. It cannot be done in a day. It can be done only by a people determined (no matter what the rest of the world may do) to go forward steadily and unflinchingly on a course of genuine human advance.

May we in America today be such a people!

ADDRESS BY MESSMORE KENDALL, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON PATRIOTIC ACTIVITIES, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, COURT OF PEACE, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, JULY 4, 1940

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This quotation, as you know, is from the Declaration of Independence, and was the first formal statement of truths eternal but long unspoken; truths that few had dared to utter, which Providence ordained should be revealed here in America to be the political creed of people all over the earth. Like a trumpet blast in the night, it pealed through the dark abodes of misery, and roused men to thought and hope and action.

It was John Adams, in seconding the motion for a Declaration of Independence in the Continental Congress, used these words:

"Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I give my hand and heart to this vote. It is true, indeed, that, at the beginning, we aimed not at independence. But there's a divinity that shapes our ends. The injustice of England has driven us to arms; and, blinded to her own interest for our good, she has obstinately persisted, till independence is now within our grasp. We have but to reach forth to it, and it is ours. Why, then, should we defer the declaration? * * * Whatever may be our fate, be assured, that this declaration will stand. It may cost treasure and it may cost blood, but it will stand, and it will richly compensate for both. Through the thick gloom of the present I see the brightness of the future, as the sun in heaven. We shall make this a glorious, an immortal day. When we are in our graves, our children will honor it. They will celebrate it with thanksgiving, with festivity, with bonfires, and illuminations. On its annual return, they will shed tears, copious, gushing tears, not of subjection and slavery, not of agony and distress, but of exultation, of gratitude, and of joy. Sir, before God, I believe the hour has come. My judgment approves this measure, and my whole heart is in it. All that I have, and all that I am, and all that I hope in this life, I am now ready here to stake upon

it; and I leave off as I began, that live or die, survive or perish, I am for the declaration. It is my living sentiment, and by the blessing of God, it shall be my dying sentiment; independence, now; and independence forever."

As we meet today, 164 years later in carrying out John Adams' prophesy, we congratulate ourselves that today the Government founded upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence remains the oldest existing form of government. During its existence Europe has had absolute monarchies, limited monarchies, imperialist governments, pure democracies, reigns of terror, Communistic governments, and now ruthless dictatorial governments whose bloody deeds Americans to a man abhor.

We have gone on serene and without change, an example to the world. Our flag has never been carried in conquest and it has never been humiliated by its Nation's surrender.

It is a comforting thought in surveying the history of other nations whose flags are now furled and whose governments have been preempted that whatever their immediate future, the physical, ethnical, and racial character of the countries and their love of freedom which have caused them to endure for decades is a guaranty of their restoration to entity among nations when the storm has passed. Centuries of oppression cannot quench the ideals of liberty when once implanted in a people. The Christian religion has survived its every outrage; its being thrown to the lions. Under oppression it has gained strength. The race and religion of the Jews have survived through centuries of persecution. So those who have tasted the sweets of liberty cannot long endure a master. A truth, a religion, a people of common interest are so much stronger than a mortal power of brief authority that they are certain to survive. So, as we reverently thank our Maker that our flag still flies over the land made free by our forebears, let us treasure the thought that conquerors for centuries have never been able to destroy the language, manners, and customs of peoples who have a will for independence. When these nations, now prostrate, struggle to their rightful place in the world let us see that we are prepared so that the torch of liberty will still be burning here and that the Star-Spangled Banner will be flying over us, the keepers of the faith, the custodians of the spirit of freedom. Should they see the torch flickering and dimming, if we give the slightest occasion for our own doubt or theirs of the stability and integrity of our democracy, it bodes ill for their ultimate peace and freedom or that of those other nations of the world not already under the iron hand of tyranny, dictatorship, and poverty.

GENERAL BULLARD INTRODUCED BY GENERAL NOLAN JULY 4, 1940

It affords me great pleasure to introduce Lt. Gen. Robert Lee Bullard, United States Army, retired.

General Bullard served with distinction in the Spanish War and the Philippine Insurrection. In the World War he commanded with great distinction in battle our First Division, our Third Army Corps, and our Second Army.

For the last 15 years since his retirement he has been president of the National Security League. As he has devoted 60 years of a very active career to military preparedness, he is one of the country's outstanding authorities on this question, which is the subject of his address today.

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR FOURTH OF JULY SPEECH BY ROBERT LEE BULLARD, LIEUTENANT GENERAL, RETIRED

The Fourth of July 1776 this people declared themselves free and independent. They knew the significance of the declaration. To Mother England—then, mark you, ruled over by a German King, George III, who disregarded our people's rights as England's subjects—it said: "We brook no interference in our way of living; we are going to be independent." And then with eye and thought fixed on their purpose they followed their declaration with acts, made good their faith with works.

Today, 164 years later, by the conduct and acts of powers outside ourselves, this people is brought face to face with the necessity of having again to make clear "to whom it may concern" that we are and will still hold ourselves free and independent, with the same meaning as in 1776—no interference in our plan or way of living by any power outside ourselves.

This is the state of affairs in which we today now find ourselves. You know it. The whole country knows it. Then what is next for us? Just one thing, one first and foremost; yes; and for the present, exclusive of all others. About it world conditions permit us no shadow of doubt. The step that our Revolutionary fathers took under exactly like conditions, to arm and strengthen ourselves on land, on and under the sea, and in the air. By the best and all the means that we now have on hand and that we can in further time provide. By compulsory selective military training and service at once, so as to have troops so trained that they will make an enemy fear to attack us or if he does attack will not be defeated and lose to an enemy all our arms and equipment, as did some of the Allies recently in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. With all speed, without any of the least loss of time, prepare. Relying upon ourselves, not others. Nations that have taken their time or turned to others to save them—we see them being wiped out from one week end to another and enslaved to systems not their own.

My fellow countrymen and friends of my fellow countrymen, this, preparedness, excluding until it is accomplished, every other consideration of sympathy, friendship, or hate of other peoples, is the one, the sole thought that my spirit will this day permit me to offer you. You will, I am sure, pardon me, troubled as I am with our utter unpreparedness and driven by the knowledge that comes from 60 years, 19 to 80, devoted all to study and practice solely of arms and of war.

REVITALIZING THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN 1940—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WARREN R. AUSTIN FROM WORLD'S FAIR OF 1940, ON JULY 4, OVER COAST-TO-COAST NETWORK OF THE MUTUAL BROADCASTING CO.

"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," declared on the fourth day of July 1776 to be the object of those governments "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," demands today as high a price of sacrifice and service as it did a century and a half ago.

The slogan of this great exhibition, For Peace and Freedom, is a poignant ideal. But, if it is necessary to sacrifice our peace in order to maintain our freedom, superior strength is necessary to meet the foe. The mortality of pacifist nations, the raping of weak nations, are indisputable witnesses of this truth.

On this Fourth of July we envisage for tomorrow the Americas, and in particular the United States, trained, hardened, equipped for defense of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Indeed, we know that "governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed" would be wiped off the earth by autocratic powers if we should fail to make the sacrifice necessary to adequate preparation on land, sea, and in the air.

Our lines of defense to be fortified are:

1. The moral line.
2. The industrial line.
3. The military line.

CONSIDER THE FIRST LINE—MORAL ARMAMENT

Relative unity of any self-governing people is a prerequisite of effective action. In the United States, Congress does not lead, it follows, public opinion.

National defense, in order to approximate invulnerability, will require the individual to relinquish the tranquillity of pacifism and habits of ease. It will cost him heavy taxes, long hours of work, sacrifice of luxuries, and surrender of the softening and enervating dependence upon Government for jobs, and the more abundant life.

Individuals arm themselves spiritually, and create a national morality, before Congress appropriates huge sums of money, and levies burdensome taxes for the Military Establishment. Here is an initial test of individual responsibility. Is it going to make the moral line impregnable? Will it overcome the subtle propaganda that creates popular distrust of government? Will it educate the deluded isolationist who pitifully insists that nothing menaces the Western Hemisphere, and vaguely inquires "Against whom do you arm?"

I will not identify isolationists and pacifists with Nazi sympathizers. To do so would confuse the issue. There is a bona fide conflict of conviction on principle which ought to be fully and tolerantly debated in order to reach the harmony necessary for speedy, smooth production, and for patriotic enlistment.

Distrust of our purpose to remain a nonbelligerent unless the Americas are endangered must be met.

Skepticism about the cause for which the democracies fight must be destroyed. The fallacy that Hitlerism is the reaction to conduct of France and England must be exposed. The necessity of aiding the Allies by means short of war to stop Hitler on the other side of the ocean must be made plain for those whose preconceived ideas and lack of vision of the unprecedented peril obstruct the giving of such aid.

The individual has the opportunity this year of directly expressing his determination to make invulnerable this moral line by encouraging public officials to place patriotic duty above popularity and higher than partisan objectives.

The ideal cannot be too high; the effort too great.

The men we choose to serve in public office and the men we enlist for leaders in the industrial plant of America shall be of unimpeachable character, of good record, men recognized as essentially honest and faithful, men of proven ability to execute trusts of the most important effect upon human life, and men of special knowledge, experience, and skill.

In this line of defense, national welfare must have supremacy over partisan evaluations.

Herein do we revitalize the Declaration of Independence in 1940.

In the world of today the independence of the United States of America has a new aspect—looking inward and looking outward.

Inwardly it is seen to be independent of "isms" and "fifth columns"; in the will to protect so much of liberty of conscience and freedom of worship as has been gained through the centuries at a tremendous cost of blood and treasure.

It is the will to strive for perfection spiritually, mentally, and industrially.

Looking outward, it is independence, though not isolation, and not intervention. It is the will to keep the Government of the United States of America free from permanent alliances, free from statutes which would cripple this Government in the event of unforeseeable dangers, free from all fixed commitments, so that this Government could take any action which, in the changing circumstances, would forestall, or prevent, aggression in this hemisphere.

This is the first line of defense.

CONSIDER THE SECOND LINE—INDUSTRIAL SOLIDARITY

Experience in the World War established the fact that the industrial line must be consolidated before war. For example, it was not until the last 2 months of 1917, 7 months after the war began, that rifle production began to mount in the United States in any appreciable degree. Thereafter, 3,000,000 rifiles were produced within a period of 15 months. At the end of 1917, only 8,000 American machine guns had been produced. In May of 1918 monthly production exceeded 10,000, and by August reached 35,000.

Consequently, this necessary line of defense for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" is being consolidated now.

This second line of industrial and economic development requires nonpartisan administration of production and procurement of the machinery of defense.

This second line of defense requires the organization of our economy and of our national production plant on a sound basis looking toward the long pull.

Taxes will be heavy. Both capital and labor will need readjustment. Cooperation, in which mutual concessions relating to profits, wages, and hours of service, will be necessary.

Loose talk of warmongering and intervention when vigorous men of vision and deeds are placed in command will be analyzed to determine whether it represents opposition for opposition's sake, or obstruction for obstruction's sake.

This Nation will tighten up its belt and consume less unnecessary food. It will resume its pioneer frugality and require fewer luxuries. It will pay as it goes. It will tune up its industrial plant and turn out in mass production the required machines and munitions for the defense of democracy.

America must not be caught, as England is today, in such unpreparedness that recruits must be armed with broomsticks.

Arming on the new plan and scale is a difficult and complex undertaking, which could not be done effectively if postponed until the United States should again be plunged into war.

Our third line of defense has been in the blueprint stage for years. The need is for well-informed public opinion to recognize that America has the resources, human and material, to secure peace in this hemisphere if only she keeps the weapons free from rust.

A revolution in warfare has occurred. The private soldier is almost helpless without the support of special offensive machines, vessels, planes, tanks, and new forms of armament, and devices related to chemical warfare.

Education of special kind, adapted to the new means of offense and defense, is required.

To borrow an illustration from my distinguished Democratic colleague, Senator CONNALLY, of Texas:

"Bob Toombs, a Georgia Congressman, speaking in an election campaign in Georgia, before the war between the States, said: 'We can lick the Yankees with cornstalks.'

"After the war, he was again on the hustings, when someone in the audience interrupted him: 'Say, Bob, didn't you tell us before the war that we could lick the Yankees with cornstalks?' To which he replied: 'I did. But the "Damyankees" wouldn't fight with cornstalks.'"

We need to realize that dodging the issue, or slow, inadequate, piecemeal rearmament, and postponing conscription, would have the same consequence of helplessness as they had in France and Britain.

For their own personal efficiency and safety the manpower of this country must be enlisted and trained—men for operation of the weapons, and men for maintenance of the basic support.

Justice and protection for all, rich and poor, dictate the application of the principle of compulsory enlistment—selective service conscription.

The main objection thereto springs from the premise that heretofore we have not compelled general military training and service until we have gone to war. Therefore, it has been regarded a war measure, not a peace measure. This is a fallacy of logic. Recent experience of the belligerents convinces that preparedness ought to be fully made in peace, if we are to avoid war. Conscription in actual wartime would not produce an army. It would only bring together an untrained, almost defenseless crowd, who might have to combat well trained, hardened troops.

Men must be trained before we need them; it will be too late after we need them.

A selective-service law is necessary to secure the required personnel for peacetime strength. It is necessary to raise an army for the larger program of emergency.

Passage of such a law would bring to the citizen the reality of his duty to country and the stimulus for speeding up rearmament.

The enemy will not fight with cornstalks.

The only way to have a standing army and an adequate reserve and a home defense strong enough to keep this hemisphere immune from attack is to start now with the organization of compulsory selective military training in time of peace for service in the event of war.

WE UNITE, WE ARM, WE ENLIST

As a free people, aware of certain danger, and aroused to our noblest effort to defend the vital spiritual, political, and economic principles which are the foundation of our civilization, we organize our "powers in such form as (to us) shall seem most likely to effect (our) safety and happiness."

On this anniversary the soul of America is animated by the determination to resist tyranny and to promote freedom—that freedom which the Declaration of Independence rang out to an oppressed world like a bell in the heavens.

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL C. H. WOODWARD, UNITED STATES NAVY, COMMANDANT, THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT, ON THE OCCASION OF NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS DAY CEREMONIES UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, COURT OF PEACE, NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, JULY 4, 1940

Today, throughout the length and breadth of our land, and wherever else our beloved Star-Spangled Banner flies, our fellow American citizens are celebrating the glorious Fourth with patriotic fervor. Thus once more are we and our children reminded of the wonderful achievements of our forefathers and of the great heritage they left for us to enjoy.

This is the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of our independence—that day of days upon which our forbears cast off the tyrannical yoke that had borne so heavily upon them; when they established the democratic Union which has stood for upward of six generations and endured the acid test of its various wars, from Valley Forge to Chateau-Thierry, including a war between the States.

It is not my intention, at this time, to review the patiotic actions of those loyal Americans in the days of 1776 and subsequently, as glorious as they are. I shall speak more pertinently of the present and of the obligation of that great body of patriotic American citizens upon whom after all rests the final responsibility for national security.

Twenty-two years of peace is one of the multitude of blessings bestowed upon the United States since the World War. In fact, viewing what has happened and is now happening in many other countries in the same 22 years, we should count that peace our supreme blessing and attempt to make it permanent.

The average American citizen believes in peace and has a horror of war. I can truthfully say, however, that we, members of the armed forces of our country hate war even more than the average American citizen. And this for the very good reason that we are the first to suffer and to die in any conflict with a foreign power. From our personal experience in war we know its realities. The world knows its consequences. As a matter of fact, we belong to the greatest pacifistic organization in the country—the Army and Navy—our mission in life being to prevent war by preserving peace. To accomplish such a mission, however, requires a proper and efficient national defense, both on shore and on the high seas.

A study of our history shows that it was only through war that we became a free and independent people. It was only through the acid test of subsequent wars that we have endured as a nation and retained that freedom and independence so dearly bought. It was only through a long series of sacrifices and armed conflicts that we secured the peace we now enjoy.

To preserve government in any form—be it a radical dictatorship or a conservative democracy—requires a backing-up by sufficient force to maintain it against opposition from within or invasion from overseas. Today the world is in a most unbalanced and chaotic state. It is filled with increasing distrust and growing alarm for the future, and no one can predict how soon the United States may be called upon to defend itself. We have seen pacts broken, treaties violated, and territories of weaker neighbors attacked and annexed at will by certain powerful aggressive predatory nations.

These latter thrive on war or on threats of war which keep the world in a jittery state of fear for the future. Upon such nations sentimental ideas and soft diplomatic words are of no avail. In this world gone mad, where ever-mounting tension prevails, the cause of peace requires more positive assurance than mere "pieces of paper." It requires the additional safeguard of a proper armed preparedness.

During our 162 years of existence we have engaged in six major wars, including that of the Revolution. In each of these conflicts we entered in an utterly unprepared state, both on land and on sea, despite previous tragic experience. Our experience in the World War was no different. More than half of our soldiers were sent to France in borrowed ships to fight the war with munitions and equipment purchased from the Allies. During our entire participation (except for naval guns) we never fired an American cannon nor flew an American airplane. Further comment regarding our criminal lack of preparedness is superfluous.

Never before, in the history of the world has there been a more difficult period than that which we are now facing. Present conditions should give us a deep and anxious concern, for our enormous stake in the world must be protected at all costs.

Never before, in times of peace, have the American people had greater need for calm consideration of facts and cold precise reasoning regarding our national safety than exists today. The rapid marching events in Europe, particularly during the past few weeks, have been a terrible awakening to us and made us seriously realize that the country must be safeguarded against all potential aggressors, and that as quickly as possible.

Never before have our people been so fully impressed with the value of naval and military preparedness. The appalling sacrifice of blood and treasure, forced without warning upon small and peaceful nations, and their ruthless devastation and dismemberment—because of their inability to protect themselves—have been brought vividly to the consciousness of our citizens and made them take account of our own national security status.

Never before has it been so apparent that we no longer enjoy that splendid isolation once vouchsafed by the oceans to the east and

to the west of us. The constantly increasing radius of submarines and the ever-extending range of airplanes have steadily reduced the defensive value of those previously considered formidable barriers.

An understanding of these facts—vital consideration of which has been brought to us by the present war in Europe, with its measureless horror and suffering—has resulted in a Nation-wide demand that our Government take such steps as will protect our coasts and frontiers against wanton assault.

This demand expressed in other words is that we build and equip a Navy—our first line of defense—powerful enough to defeat the naval force of any single potential enemy nation or combination of nations.

In addition, it means that we must buttress our second line by making our coast and harbor defenses impregnable and raising and training an Army strong enough to adequately defend the lives and property of our citizens in continental United States plus those in such overseas possessions as may be liable to attack.

Today, we are at peace with the world. Nevertheless, it would be mere rashness on our part to assume that the general world situation may not produce our embroilment with dramatic suddenness. It would be criminal negligence for us to close our ears to the warning cry of reason and not prepare for any eventuality.

The world faces militant ambitions of authoritarian states. The war-burdened Far East, in chronic turmoil, has been ablaze with the fury of a life and death struggle for nearly 3 years, while jittery Europe—since the so-called peace of Munich—has been the arena of several successive bloody conflicts for balance of power in the coveted place of desired power of balance. International hatreds and conflicting interests exist everywhere. Nations once more are welding alliances, here and there, and playing the dangerous game of jockeying for position just as they did prior to and after the beginning of World War No. 1. They show no signs of a sincere effort either to maintain or to prolong peace with their neighboring states. The roar of cannon drowns out the sound of peace bells. Wars and rumors of wars fill the earth and the world seems not to know the meaning of peace.

The present European war has indelibly impressed our people and made them think more concerning our future security. Its very rapidity of development has been astounding. Emotional reaction in the United States is one of fear for the future, that unless we be prepared against any eventuality, and on short notice, we might be drawn into the conflict. It is too late to start after war begins.

In this modern age where force is in the ascendancy, the god of battle is with the strong. Though we refuse to accept the dictum that "might makes right," nevertheless we must be prepared to challenge its truth. Therefore, while forces for war remain greater than forces for peace, as we find them today, prudence dictates that we, as a Nation, must continue to build up our national defense to such strength that no aggressor nation dare challenge us. The responsibility of the Army and Navy to the public requires it; our national safety demands it. Only thus can we expect to enforce the respect due us from other nations.

No domestic problem is now, or can ever be, more pressing than the enduring requirements of the country's security. That is why we have seen such a spontaneous, unified, and overwhelming country-wide approbation of the President's recent recommendations for increasing the numbers and efficiency of our armed forces. That is why we have gotten such quick action in Congress.

We cannot afford longer to gamble with fate and national safety through disgraceful unpreparedness, like that of previous decades, and thereby endanger the present generation in another costly and demoralizing war. Being the richest country on earth and with unlimited resources, we must be able to protect these riches and resources from covetous aggressive potential enemies.

As true today as when first uttered by the great Admiral Nelson: "A line of battleships is the best negotiator in the world." Experience, as recorded in history, shows that a strong navy is not only the best protection against the hazards of war, but also the greatest bulwark of peace. No nation having full command of the sea has ever yet lost a war.

Our late beloved Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "A page of history is worth a volume of logic." Therefore, before it is too late, let us profit from the knowledge gained in the past, and at such great cost.

The need for national preparedness is as acute and unquestionable today as ever in our history, perhaps even more so. It is the country's most tangible insurance policy, and the cheapest in the end. One must consider that wars resulting from lack of preparedness are infinitely more costly than the maintenance of a strong and efficient Army and Navy, not only in mere dollars, but more particularly in the needless and tragic loss of the flower of American manhood.

Our country has never been militaristic nor aggressive, and consequently, until recent years, has given little serious thought to maintaining either the sufficiency or the efficiency of our armed forces. This policy—or, more correctly said, inexcusable and criminal lack of policy—has certainly not kept us out of war, as our history shows. Rather, it has caused the needless sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of our menfolk because of their being sent into battle without proper training and without proper equipment.

The loss of battles, whether they be on land or sea, may have been previously effected in the National Congress, by the Cabinet, or in the Departments of the Army or Navy. But wherever lost, it is the people who suffer, and the soldiers and sailors who die with the knowledge and conviction that the national-defense policy of their Nation was a triple crime against life, property, and liberty. In all fairness to those who may be called upon in future national crises to answer the call of duty such policy must be changed.

As a matter of fact it has been materially improved during the past few years. Also, there has been a great change in the country in recent months regarding national preparedness due to awakened public interest. The fast-moving events in Europe, which have so startled, stunned, and bewildered us, have caused our people to think more soberly about our future security.

Anyone who reads the newspapers or listens to the radio today will agree that the United States has become more Navy-conscious, for example, in the last 10 months than in the previous 19 years—since the Washington Naval Conference of 1921—and considerably more so in the past 6 weeks than in the last 10 months.

It is difficult for the mind of the average citizen to realize the definite advantages of national preparedness, or to grasp the importance of his personal aid and cooperation in this momentous subject. Nevertheless, thoughtful citizens, generally, realize now that when guns are rumbling in Europe and Asia it is folly to remain unprepared and thus subject our nationals to the barbaric treatment meted out to the unfortunate peoples of other countries. In this connection every patriotic American must force himself to face facts, however unattractive these may be.

A Navy second to none is the greatest contribution our country can make as a stabilizing factor toward world peace. Undoubtedly, building and maintaining such a Navy will require large annual appropriations from Congress, but as a safety measure and insurance against war the money so spent would be a drop in the bucket in comparison to the cost of another war and its aftermath. Weakness invites aggression. It is a wise precaution to let the world know that we are able to protect ourselves.

In conclusion I desire to quote certain excerpts from the writings of that great American and former President, Theodore Roosevelt, who, by virtue of his studies and intimate knowledge regarding naval affairs, was especially competent to judge our naval needs. He said:

"The strong arm of the Government in enforcing respect for its rights in international matters is the Navy of the United States. * * * It is emphatically the peacemaker. Woe to the country if we permit that right arm to become palsied or even to become flabby and inefficient. * * * I most earnestly recommend that there be no halt in the work of upbuilding the American Navy. There is no more patriotic duty before us as a people than to keep the Navy adequate to the needs of the country's position."

Significance of the Monopoly Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the able and sincere Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] before the National Townsend Club Convention at St. Louis, Mo., on July 1, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When your national secretary, Mr. R. C. Townsend, invited me to speak to this gathering on the work of the so-called monopoly committee, I was prompt to accept because the work of this committee and the movement you represent are both characteristic of the times in which we live. This organization of yours came into existence, because it was obvious to thousands of men and women all over the country that our economic system had completely broken down and that new remedies were clearly needed to restore and stabilize prosperity. The monopoly committee was created because Congress and the President felt that an inquiry of broad scope should be undertaken in a spirit of impartial research in the hope of discovering the causes of the break-down.

The Townsend movement is doubtless better known to a larger number of people than is the work of the committee, but both are manifestations of a new era which can no longer be satisfied by the empty political phrases of the old order. It is significant, I think, that both are national efforts to solve a national problem, and both are wholly independent of outworn political divisions.

Party lines mean little nowadays, because the problem with which we are dealing rises above mere partisan labels, and frank-

ness compels the acknowledgment on the part of any person who pretends to look at conditions as they are that the old political formulae have not been at at all successful in meeting the needs of our time. If any proof of this were needed, it would be found in the fact that within 2 weeks a Democratic President has summoned two outstanding Republicans to his Cabinet, and a Republican Convention has nominated as its candidate for President a man who, until comparatively recently, was a registered Democrat.

The founder of your movement was "ahead of the trend," as the phrase goes, in realizing that there could be no hope of restoring and stabilizing prosperity without first restoring and stabilizing the ability of the masses of the people to purchase and use the products of commerce and industry. He was "ahead of the trend" in realizing that a broad system of old-age pensions would be a necessary and effective means of bringing about this stabilization. He was "ahead of the trend" in realizing and in preaching that society as a whole owes an obligation which it cannot avoid to those of its members who, by reason of the passage of time and the complexities of our industrial system, are no longer positively adjusted to our economic system as self-sufficient units.

OLD-AGE PENSION IDEA HERE TO STAY

The pioneer work has been done and every realistic observer of the present scene knows that the old-age pension idea is here to stay. New proposals are always resisted. Thirty years ago the fight was being waged for workmen's compensation. The suggestion that society owed an obligation to the worker who was injured in modern industry was denounced as a wholly outrageous and unwise extension of public power, as well as an unjustifiable invasion of individual independence and free enterprise. But no one can now be heard to question the wisdom of that social advance and it will not be long before no one will be heard to question the wisdom of a universal national system of old-age pensions.

Workmen's compensation paid by the State came about as a necessary result of the fact that personal contact between a worker and his employer was destroyed when industry became the activity of organized groups instead of the activity of individuals. Old-age pensions are necessary now because the continued expansion of industrial and commercial organizations has likewise destroyed the personal contact between the individual citizen and the organizations which carry on our economic life. Individual independence in the economic field has been greatly weakened by the conditions which have made organization necessary. In self-protection the people must step in through their Government to provide the universal system which will not only prevent unnecessary misery but which will maintain the whole group of older citizens as effective consuming units in the economic system, thus benefiting both the individual and the system.

SECURITY LAW INEFFECTIVE

The present old-age security law is clearly ineffective because it is unequal in its operation among the States and because it is based upon the principle of need instead of age. Gross injustices are unavoidable under a system which places upon persons who themselves are paid by the public the responsibility of determining the good faith and the need of the applicant.

Letters which come to me constantly from all parts of my State indicate that there is lack of uniformity even among counties in the administration of the law. Different welfare boards, though acting with the best of intent, have different standards by which they judge need, so that persons who are given aid in one county are denied it in another. In one State the beneficiaries receive only a few dollars and in another the meager maximum, although the cause of their distress is Nation-wide and the States as States are incapable of curing it.

The modern economic dislocation with which we have been struggling since 1929 is certainly not a local dislocation in any of its aspects. It is wholly national and that is why it is altogether necessary to apply a national remedy. The folly, therefore, of setting up an old-age assistance plan which is dependent upon the ability of the States to contribute to the pension fund is perfectly apparent. This is one principle which, it seems to me, has been clearly demonstrated by the studies of the Monopoly Committee.

During a period of more than 50 years modern business has been growing steadily more and more national in its scope. First, the railroads and the telegraph began to stretch across the continent abolishing State lines. Then came the telephone and the automobile and the good roads and, finally, the airplane and the radio. All of these instrumentalities had the inevitable effect of destroying the local character of much of the business upon which our economic life depends. Because modern industry is thus independent of geographical boundaries and because agriculture is necessarily still local and individual in character, the dislocation between agriculture and industry slowly began to become more and more important. As the agricultural problem grew, it naturally became more and more difficult for the older members of the rural population to maintain themselves in any degree of stability and self-sufficiency in their later years.

ADJUSTMENT OF AGE TO COMPLEX ECONOMY

In the city at the same time the same problem of the adjustment of age to complex industry began to be evident. The factory worker, having been moved from the land to the city, was no longer economically self-sufficient, but was dependent upon his job in industry. The steady advance of industry at the same time made his job more and more uncertain with the result that his ability to provide for his old age was undermined. Thus it is that the problem of old age is firmly tied to the problem of economic development and if we grant, as everyone does grant, that the economic problem must be studied and settled upon a national basis, so it follows that the problem of old-age pensions must likewise be settled upon a national basis.

The great obstacle to the establishment of a satisfactory system sooner than this has been the uncertainty which has been felt among members of Congress with respect to a method by which the payments are to be financed. Legislative bodies never like to levy taxes and except in a great national emergency like that which has been occasioned by the unanimous decision of the people of America to be rearmed for purposes of defense, it is always difficult to secure the enactment of tax bills.

One thing is certain, however, namely, that taxes are paid out of production. If we are to meet the challenge of our time and make possible not only the payment of old-age pensions, but also the reopening of opportunity to every citizen, young and old, we shall first have to discover how to increase production and open the door of opportunity to all.

We have fallen into the unfortunate habit of dividing into minority groups, each seeking what it believes to be its own welfare, without regard to the welfare of all. The consequence has been that in all lines production has been restricted in order to increase price. The practices of monopoly are not confined to the traditional monopolists, but have been adopted on too broad a scale by many other groups. Taxation, therefore, on restricted production cannot be expected to produce results, and even the payment of old-age pensions, like the payment of subsidies and other methods of Government spending, will not operate to restore prosperity. We must completely reverse our thinking, and, instead of trying to raise prices by controlled production, we must undertake to reduce prices and thereby stimulate production and reemployment.

It is for this reason that I have been preaching the adoption of the principle of what is called incentive taxation. I want to see a new tax law which, by the allowance of tax credits, will recognize the social service that is performed by the employer of labor. I want to extend a positive reward to every man and every corporation that creates new opportunities for work by creating new industries. When production and employment have been stimulated, and, I firmly believe, not before, will it be possible to make the universal national system of old-age pensions work.

WORK AND OPPORTUNITY FOR THE MASSES

Let no one imagine that the world crisis diminishes the necessity of solving this purely practical and homely problem of providing work and opportunity for the masses of our people. There can be no permanent profit in war or in preparation for war. Our people are ready to prepare to the utmost to defend themselves because they want to prevent war from coming to our shores in order that we may all engage in the productive enterprises of peace. While they are willing, therefore, to prepare for defense, they are not willing to forego the necessary organization for peace.

If I were to be asked to say, as a result of the work of the Temporary National Economic Committee, what the most essential factor is in organizing for peace, it would be the adoption of what may be called a national economic "constitution," that is to say, a national system which would adjust the privileges and responsibilities of economic organizations to the rights and needs of individuals. This country was founded by men who recognized the fact that people come first, that they have rights which rise above the rights of any organizations of people. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—indeed, the constitution of practically every State in the Union—makes clear our fundamental concept that governments are formed to preserve and retain the inalienable rights which men derive directly from their Creator. In other words, people set up their own governments, if they are self-governing, and governments are set up for them and are imposed upon them when they are not self-governing.

When we talk of political freedom, therefore, we are talking of the right of the people as individuals to participate in governing themselves and to determine the very form of their Government. The trouble in the modern world is that economic freedom has been undermined and, as a result, political liberty is being threatened. Economic freedom has been undermined because economic organizations have superseded individuals in dominating and controlling our economic liberty.

If the people have the right to dominate and control the form and the function of their political organization, surely they have the right to control the form and the powers of all economic organizations. This right is legally and technically recognized, but in practice it is not exercised. Economic organization has escaped regulation in the public interest and the result has been unwise and unworkable efforts at Government control or even the invasion of the field of business by Government.

The elderly citizen knows very well today that he is not a self-sustaining unit. The so-called little-business men and the farmers likewise recognize that they are not self-sustaining units. There was ample testimony before the monopoly committee to show that many economic organizations are self-sufficient. These organizations which display a high degree of efficiency and which make available, on a scale never before known, the benefits of science and invention are, in many instances, financially stronger than most cities and many States. In fact, and it is no criticism of them to make note of the fact, they are economic governments and neither the individual nor small organizations can successfully cope with them.

An economic organization, like a political organization, justifies itself only to the degree that it serves people. The function of a

political organization is governmental. The function of an economic organization is economy and we shall not begin to solve the economic problem of our time until we recognize the fundamental fact that Government invades the function of business and free enterprise only when business and free enterprise fail to provide employment for the masses.

Everyone recognizes that in our time the powers of government have been steadily expanding, but we seem to fail to understand that this expansion of the powers of government has come about as a result of our failure so to adjust the modern world as to enable business to serve people without the intervention of government.

FUNDAMENTAL AMERICANISM

Two principles fundamental to all American thought have been constantly violated throughout the last generation, with the inevitable result that we are faced now with a world catastrophe. These two principles are:

First, that no economic organization and no group of economic organizations have the right or should be permitted to control the Government. The Government speaks for all and is designed to protect the rights of all. It cannot pass into the control of any group or faction or any man without loss to the fundamental democratic ideal.

Second, that the Government has no right and will not be permitted to control or direct the lives and the activities of the people. Its only power is to regulate those activities in the interest of all.

The reason why youth and age are both in a seemingly impossible economic dilemma is that in our time here and throughout the world big business has produced big government.

If I have learned one thing from the studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee, it is that the masses of our citizens, whatever their positions, whether executives in business or officials in public life or citizens in the ordinary walks of life, are all devoted to the fundamental principles of freedom upon which our country was founded. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of these citizens are only seeking the way to revivify and expand our common America heritage. I am convinced that the fight against arbitrary power, whether exercised by business organizations or political organizations, has been won, and that our only task is to proceed at once to the reconstruction of free enterprise by the development of such an economic constitution as will clearly define the powers and responsibilities of all economic organizations and thus release for America and for the world the abundant energy of our people and the unlimited resources of our land.

The lamp of liberty seems to be going out in the Old World. We cannot be indifferent to its extinction because we know that freedom has been the basis of all the progress of civilization. The men and women who left the Old World and came to these shores during the past 300 years were moved by a desire to find a new home in which they would be free to live, to work, to pray, and to speak according to their own individual consciences. If America stands for anything, it stands for that freedom.

Freedom is individual; it is as individual as the human soul. It has been bequeathed to us by ancestors from the Old World whose political and religious concepts were based upon that fundamental doctrine of the responsibility of every man to his Creator and his freedom to meet that responsibility.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM ESSENTIAL

We have been completely blind to the significance of the events of our time if we do not realize that the present tragedy in Europe is the direct result of the failure of Europe to preserve economic freedom for the masses. Precisely the same forces which have abolished the significance of State lines in America have been at work in Europe. Statesmen of one country more concerned about preserving investments in other countries than in preserving liberty were content to endanger freedom in order to preserve what they thought was security. In the totalitarian states millions of unemployed, in the search for security, were content to surrender liberty to the dictators for all their pagan ideals, their dependence upon force and repudiation of every principle of democracy.

We can meet the challenge of the new despotism only by cooperation and sacrifice in the service of American ideals. Not by what we can wrest from others for ourselves but by what we shall share with one another shall we restore the soul of America.

Convention of Affiliated Young Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered before the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York, on Thursday, June 27, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a unique experience for a resident of far-away Montana to be invited to address the young Democrats of America's metropolis. Coming from the great wide spaces of the West I find myself deeply impressed by the fine, alert, well-informed, and loyal young Democrats I have met here today. I have the pleasure of knowing more intimately your energetic State president, Mr. Harold R. Moskovit, who is held in high regard in all democratic circles for his effective and able leadership of your splendid organization. The young folks of this and similar clubs throughout the country will be the leaders and molders of the future of our republic. I congratulate you on the early and active interest you are displaying in our national life.

I must confess that I accepted the invitation to come here tonight with some hesitation. The interests and problems of my Rocky Mountain region in the West and those of the industrial East are, in some respects, extremely divergent. Yet the fundamental issues and problems of our country as a whole affect and influence every section and every group in our population alike. I was urged to come to your convention by my very good friend and colleague in the Senate, your able and distinguished junior Senator, JAMES M. MEAD. He had hoped to be here himself but found it impossible to do so because of circumstances he could not control. He prevailed on me to be your guest tonight and occupy his seat at this session of the convention. In view of our most agreeable associations it is a real pleasure to attend your convention, and I appreciate this opportunity of expressing briefly my views on some of the serious questions affecting the welfare, the security, and the safety of our country.

At the outset, let me say to my young Democratic friends in New York, in this ominous hour, while hysteria runs rampant on every side: You are in a position to set an example to your fellow citizens by retaining your balance and remaining calm and loyal in your support of our great President, Franklin Roosevelt, and his liberal and progressive administration. Your Government needs your loyal support more than ever in its program of national defense and preparedness and in its courageous fight to retain the dearly won economic reforms and social advancements which have been made under the New Deal. The loyal and effective support of young Democratic organizations at this time throughout the Nation will encourage and inspire President Roosevelt in the difficult tasks that lie ahead.

The tragic events now transpiring across the Atlantic, where millions of lives have been blotted out by ruthless and bloody warfare; where age-old governments and democratic institutions are being toppled over almost daily, would seem to raise serious doubt as to the survival of freedom as we have known it in the past. History today seems to be repeating itself. It is recorded that in the fifth century of the Christian era European civilization experienced a long and devastating period of wars, finally resulting in widespread chaos and misery, described in history as the Dark Ages. This happened when the Imperial Roman Empire, through economic stagnation and decay, disintegrated. Confusion, famine, pestilence, and disease spread over the then known world, wrecking and destroying nearly every vestige of civilization and freedom. Today again contemporary conditions seem to indicate that there is a world-wide moral, intellectual, and economic recession intervening in the world. Confusion, bloodshed, and despair spread in every direction.

This brings up the thought in the minds of many that civilization may again be confronted with another period of dissolution and decay such as that memorable one which occurred 1,500 years ago when the Roman Empire declined, staggered, and fell because of its inability to solve its social and economic problems—problems which were strikingly similar to those confronting this country, and, in fact, every country today. History tells us that it was the failure of government—the inability of the rulers of that early period to solve its social and economic problems—which brought on the Dark Ages.

It behooves us in America not to contribute to this threatened world-wide chaos and confusion. Our country, blessed as it is with immeasurable resources and a morally and intellectually advanced citizenship, must preserve the great human progress which has been made on this side of the Atlantic. We in America must not be recorded in history as having supinely contributed to a new period of world-wide retrogression. But what, may I ask, are we attempting to do here to meet these dangerous conditions which confront us?

A few days ago I heard the keynote speech delivered at the Republican Convention at Philadelphia, and the ponderous efforts of an ex-President of our country to stampede the Nation against a liberal, progressive government. I was struck by the hollow ring, the willful insincerity, and the vagueness of their attacks on the splendid economic and social accomplishments of President Roosevelt's administration. These attacks and the pitiful platform they adopted, filled with contradictions and empty phrases, show a carefully planned effort to deceive and befuddle the minds of the American people.

Take, for example, this plank:

"We favor the extension of necessary old-age benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis to the extent that the revenues raised for this purpose will permit."

What do they mean by necessary old-age benefits? What revenue do they propose to raise? This plank offers only a deceptive insinuation. It is nothing but a snare and a delusion. The entire platform is just as vague and uncertain. It offers no consistent, definite, or intelligent program to guide the Nation on any issue. They evidently seek by subterfuge, misrepresentation, and evasion to wangle votes in the coming election to the end that they may destroy the real progress we have made. Their devices do not evidence the slightest semblance of statesmanship. At a time when most of the world has collapsed and the fate of our own country is at stake, they have little to offer except platitudes and generalities. Greed and lust for a return of control seem the impelling forces dictating their program.

They would seek to deceive the people of this country into the notion that the break-down of our economic system, and the mass unemployment, bankruptcy, and distress which we have experienced since 1929, are due exclusively to the necessary economic reforms effected by the present administration. They seek, with all the tricks of the demagog, to shift the responsibility for the economic collapse of 1929, and the destitution and distress which followed, onto the shoulders of President Roosevelt and the New Deal administration. It is the most brazen piece of political pettifoggery ever attempted in any Republican convention. Apparently the leaders of the Republican Party are laboring under the delusion that the American people are so densely ignorant of the facts of life that they may be completely confused and bamboozled. The American farmer or worker will get little encouragement out of this platform. If the Republicans can get away with such political deception and trickery before the American people, then God help the United States.

These so-called responsible leaders offer nothing but criticism, subterfuge, and abuse. They belittle every effort that has been made by President Roosevelt and a humane and progressive Congress to free the Nation from economic exploitation and deliver its citizens from destitution and starvation. They totally ignore the fact, known to every intelligent citizen, that it was the long period of economic manipulation and monopolistic practices of the Hoover and prior Republican administrations which brought our country to the verge of despair and bankruptcy. The history of that corrupt and dishonest period of American life has been indelibly written in the congressional hearings which followed the collapse of 1929. They are anxious now to forget that desperate period in our history; and, of course, not one honest word will they utter in regard to the great, humane record of the Roosevelt administration in rescuing the millions of homeless and jobless victims of the 1929 depression from the destitution and starvation they faced. It is only natural that the Republican Party leaders are bitter in their denunciation of a liberal government. That party, the party of special privilege, represents the substantial, prosperous classes; it represents the financial and industrial interests which dominate and control its national policies. They are, of course, opposed to every economic and social reform which in any manner interferes with their privileges or threatens their profits, regardless of how necessary or essential they may be for the preservation of our democratic system. They would prefer to risk ruin than to support progress and reform.

In his speech the other night, ex-President Hoover undertook to slur the efforts of President Roosevelt to reorganize and reform the Supreme Court of the United States. He described the new justices of the Supreme Court as totalitarian liberals. But all this vilification and abuse will not succeed in deceiving the American people. We realize that today we have a Supreme Court that will no longer arbitrarily block legitimate, constitutional legislation. The old reactionary-controlled Court, dominated by Republicans for half a century, blocked every effort of the people to bring about essential reforms. The Court, under that control, threw out such beneficent legislation as income taxation, child-labor regulation, agricultural adjustment measures, minimum-wage laws for women, measures for the protection of labor, and other like legislation essential to make our democratic system work, as it should, for the general welfare of the Nation as a whole.

The keynoter of the Republican convention the other night said: "The great productive processes of a free people under a system of individual enterprise have made this Nation the great power it is. It has given to our people the highest standard of living in the world." I challenge that statement as a fraud and a deception. The stark, unqualified truth is that the monopolistic practices of our economic system, fostered by Republican administrations, produced only an excessively high standard of living for the few and brought on in this country a low, miserable, wretched standard of living for the many. Uncontrolled, the system created the strange paradox of poverty amidst plenty—millions of free American citizens condemned to a life of destitution and want, while permitting excessive profits and fabulous wealth for the favored few. Every competent economist or student of American government understands this situation and has consistently pointed out its menace to our democratic system.

We all stand for and are anxious to preserve our American system of private enterprise, but we want to make it operate in the interest and welfare of the whole country. We regard it as the best system that has yet been evolved. We propose to correct it, to improve it and preserve it. President Roosevelt and the Democratic administration in Washington have done more to correct and preserve our economic system than all the Republican administrations in the last 40 years. It is not a question of promises or proposals. We have during the present administration produced a long list of actual, solid accomplishments, unmatched by any other administration in our history, for the welfare of the American people. If the keynoter of the Republican convention was sincere, he would confess that the Roosevelt administration has done more toward upholding democracy and improving the country materially, and toward the advancement of the social and economic welfare of the people, than in any half-dozen like periods in the history of our country.

Now let me say a word for national defense. This administration can well ignore all the misrepresentations now being circulated in the country designed to question our national defenses. A great hysteria is sought to be whipped up to frighten the American people into the notion that invasion is imminent and that we are incapable of defending our shores. The critics of the President's defense program aim only to frighten the people and discredit the sound efforts of the present administration to develop and expand our defenses. The people of this country stand solidly behind the President in his program of national defense which proposes to render this country impregnable against invasion or attack from any source in the world.

But let me warn you that the safety and security of the United States does not rest alone in a great mechanized Army or a super-Navy. Without a loyal, patriotic citizenry, armaments will prove to be a futile means of preserving the Nation. A nation, however highly armed, must also have a sound internal policy of economic and social justice. It must correct its economic and social evils or it will find itself at last in mortal peril. The great threat to the security and happiness of our country rests today in the battalions of our unemployed, created by the defective operation of our economic system. It rests in the millions of men, women, and children menaced by poverty and ill health. No powerful combination of warlike nations can threaten the United States half so seriously as these social and economic conditions of the country which are of our own making. Let us arm, therefore, against this dangerous enemy within our own gates which threatens to undermine our democracy.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people want their Congressmen to stay in Washington until the present European situation has been clarified; that they want the preparedness program rushed as fast as it is possible to do so; and that they want us to convert what we now have on paper into actual equipment without delay.

It is my belief that our people are willing to make every necessary sacrifice in order that we may be well prepared to defend this country which, in my opinion, will be the last bulwark of democracy that will remain at the end of the present conflict.

I am convinced that our people would prefer for the Congressmen who remain in Washington to do everything in their power to facilitate and urge the consummation of the preparedness program at the earliest possible moment; and also prefer that we refrain from indulging in partisan politics and the discussion of the merits and demerits of the different candidates for office in the coming November election. The Halls of Congress are no place for us to indulge in political discussions at the present time. Our constituents are more interested in the conflict that is raging in Europe, its outcome, and the effect that that outcome will have on the future of this country than they are in the merits and demerits of any of the candidates.

Our constituents, I am quite sure, are very anxious to have accurate information about how much equipment we have for our Army at the present time. It has been very hard for us to procure accurate information as to just what we had on hand and how much we will have on hand at the completion of our present program.

I will insert here, at this point, a table as of May 1, 1940, given by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and Brig.

Gen. R. C. Moore, Assistant Chief of Staff for Supply, when they appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Item	On hand May 1, 1940	Will be on hand upon completion of program
ANTIAIRCRAFT		
3-inch guns	448	500
90-mm. guns		317
Directors	168	273
Height finders	142	276
Sound locators	194	801
37-mm. guns, antiaircraft	15	1,423
.50 caliber machine guns	1,014	1,682
SMALL ARMS		
Semiautomatic rifles	38,000	240,559
37-mm. antitank guns	228	1,388
60-mm. mortars	3	3,756
81-mm. mortars	183	853
Machine guns, caliber .50 (pack)	83	962
FIELD ARTILLERY MATERIAL		
75-mm. gun, modernized	141	1,432
75-mm. howitzer (field and pack)	90	319
105-mm. howitzer	0	120
155-mm. gun, long range	4	96
8-inch howitzer	0	48
COMBAT VEHICLES		
Scout cars	485	1,346
Combat cars	114	208
Tanks, light M2A4	10	734
Tanks, medium M2	18	194
TRACTORS AND SPECIAL ORDNANCE VEHICLES		
Tractors, light	93	120
Tractors, medium	261	550
Tractors, heavy	65	777
Trucks, small-arms repair	79	146
Trucks, instrument repair		53
RAILWAY ARTILLERY		
8-inch railway gun and carriage		24

In the above table I especially want to call attention to several facts. General Marshall testified that we had only 10 medium tanks, light M2A4, and 18 tanks, medium M2. Of course, it has been stated by some that we had 114 combat cars which were confused with tanks; others confused tractors with tanks. In column 1 you will find listed everything that we have on hand at the present time, and in column 2 what we will have on hand upon completion of our present program. It will require at least 1 year or longer to complete the scheduled program.

I am satisfied that everyone who reads and studies the above table will realize how inadequately prepared we are at the present time, especially when we compare the amount of our equipment to that that the different warring powers of Europe possess.

A majority of the American people I know want us to complete this program, and possibly enlarge it, and to do so just as fast as it can be done.

Our people are looking to the Congressmen to stay on the job and to continue to urge the speeding up of the program, and do away with all unnecessary red tape.

I believe that all of our people should realize their own responsibility and not expect the Congressmen and the Army to do everything that is to be done. The people should cooperate in every possible way, especially by watching out for subversive groups such as "fifth columnists," and whenever they are found they should be immediately reported to the proper authorities.

It is my own opinion that the laws presently on the statute books should be enforced to prevent excessive profits being made by taking advantage of the emergency that exists. If we do this, we will have no so-called war millionaires created.

We should not tolerate strikes in Government munition plants that would hold up the manufacture of war materials, as I believe it will be very dangerous and might prove disastrous in the end.

I think that our people want and expect us to be frank and honest in our reports to them. They want and should have complete information about the condition and size of our Army and Navy; and I further believe it will be advantageous for all of the people to know that we are very inadequately prepared at the present time, both in manpower and equipment, and that it will require many months for us to build up the Army, Navy, and air forces to the point where we will be in good position to cope with a major power should we have war thrust upon us.

I am convinced that an overhelming majority of our people are opposed to our entering war unless it be in defense of our country or the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine.

I have assured my people repeatedly that I will always vote against sending our men away from America to fight on foreign soil, but at the same time I have assured them that I would vote for whatever I thought was necessary to properly prepare us to defend our country.

Facing the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALONZO D. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ADDRESS OF FRANK W. HANCOCK, JR.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Frank W. Hancock, Jr., before the Young Democrat rally of the Fifth Congressional District, Belvidere Hotel, Reidsville, N. C., Saturday, April 27, 1940:

FACING THE ISSUE

I don't have to tell you that I am glad to be back in the old Imperial Fifth again. I have been here many times before, and I have received many honors at your hands. Mostly I have been here in the role of supplicant, seeking your suffrage, in order that, in turn, I might prove worthy of being your Representative.

Now I seek nothing but your continued friendship and good will. That is not too much to ask, because I return both with ample interest and a full measure of genuine affection. I am able to come to you now, therefore, not as your agent who must report on the progress of a mission but rather as your neighbor and friend, whose sole interest is in the continued prosperity, contentment, and happiness of a favored community among the many communities of the Nation.

In 2½ months this Nation of ours will be facing the strain of a Presidential campaign. It will be a campaign in which the effect of the war in Europe will be straining our democracy. It will be a campaign in which men who think they are clever will try to confuse the big issues with a swarm of petty issues.

Those clever men are already at work. But they are going to learn something about our people that they haven't known before.

They are going to learn that our people have become wise to the methods of politics in the last 8 years. They are going to find that today one issue and one alone matters.

That is whether this Government by the people and for the people is under a type of leadership which can give immovable security to that form of government.

If the reactionary and selfish interests which own the Republican Party recapture power, there is nothing in the record to assure us that they would not wreck our national unity and security by refighting all of our domestic accomplishments of the last 8 years. But if the liberal democracy of the Democratic Party retains power, we can advance from where we are in unity and security to even better and finer things.

In 2½ months' time a few decisive days are going to determine the future of our country.

In times like these the nominating conventions that for all practical purposes determine the limits within which the people may choose a President of the United States are just as important as the election itself. For in these days when we desperately need a sense of national unity the candidates of the great parties for the Presidency of the United States must be men for whom the rank and file of the parties and of the country cast their votes willingly and gladly, and with full confidence and acceptance of the personal leadership of whoever is elected.

In the decisive days of the Democratic Convention the men and women from North Carolina who are here tonight are going to play their part.

Will we always be proud of what they do, or will we come to bitterly regret their action? It is for us to determine now.

Great and significant events will take place before and after July 15. There will be a Republican Convention in June, and a campaign will rage through this country in the summer and autumn, but the Republican Convention will be insignificant and the campaign will be won or lost according to what we do in Chicago.

Never before will a Presidential campaign have been fought under such critical and difficult conditions.

Never before will the man sent to the White House have been faced with tasks demanding such mastery of thought and action. Our people know this.

Now everybody is a liberal. Everybody is a liberal because everybody says he is a liberal. If you judged by words alone there would be little to choose from. But we know we cannot judge by words alone. There is a much sounder way to judge—a way which the Republicans do not like. It is better to judge by actions. Actions stand as specific monuments to the way people or a political party thought on a particular question. The actions of the Republican Party, when it was long in power, in defeating social security, the elimination of child labor, the guaranty of bank deposits, and the protection of the home—those were actions which stamped the temper and philosophy of the reactionary element.

They cannot wipe away those monuments to greed by mere words, no matter how smooth and silken their words may be. They are not convincing when they tell us that now, after all their years of obstruction, they have suddenly come to love all the reforms which the New Deal has given to the Nation. They are less convincing when they tell us that they not only intend to keep these reforms but propose to administer them better and with greater justice than Roosevelt has administered them. We know better. We know that social progress is better off in the hands of its friends than in the hands of its enemies.

In the last month those who know our people and have an ear for their voice have heard a great cry rising throughout this country. From the farmers of Wisconsin and Nebraska, from the workers of Pennsylvania and Illinois, this cry has come.

The people who gave Roosevelt a first term, with a mandate to rebuild a social order from the waste land of the country he inherited; the people who gave Roosevelt a second term, with a mandate to carry on his program for reemployment and progress—these people are now part of the great cry rising every day for 4 more years of Roosevelt to carry their program through to national security.

You have seen this movement rising. You know what it is. You know that it is not the sales talk given to you by the agents of a candidacy, or the result of a bargain in a smoke-filled room. It is the demand of a people deeply afraid that they may lose something desperately precious to them. Precious because to them Roosevelt is not merely a name in the papers. Almost every American has by this time actually seen him. Every American has heard his own desires expressed by him. To these people Roosevelt is something of themselves; he is the farmer, the worker, the small-business man. He speaks as they would like to speak because he feels as they feel.

These people want Roosevelt. They're not concerned with the abstract issue of any third term—the issue of whether or not someone said something or other fifty, or a hundred, or a hundred and fifty years ago. This is today. They are very much concerned with today's concrete issue of consolidating the security of 4 more years under the guidance of a man in whom they have confidence.

There may have been times in our history when it made little difference who sat in the White House or whether anyone at all sat in the White House, when the country could bungle along by itself without leadership, except that supplied by the barons of financial selfishness. There are many former Presidents of the United States whose names the average man does not even remember, because they made no difference and in the times in which they served it was not necessary that they should make a difference.

But our times are not and will not be such times. These are times when a second-best President is like a second-best Navy—only an illusion of false security. These are times when the only President we can afford to have is the best President we can possibly get. And that best—and no one denies it—is Franklin D. Roosevelt. That goes for Republicans as well as Democrats. For I am not afraid to prophesy that if we Democrats succeed in drafting Franklin Roosevelt to run for President in November, many of our Republican friends will go to the polls and secretly vote for him.

I am not saying nor even intimating that the Democratic Party does not possess many men able enough and experienced enough to serve in the White House. I believe that our party possesses many men at the moment more able and more experienced than the average of all our Presidents. If we did not possess such leaders, we should be unfit to be a democracy and we, as the Democratic Party, should not be in power today.

But we should also be unfit to be a democracy if we are sufficiently unrealistic to be unable to recognize the perils of the time in which we live. Realistically speaking, we have got to recognize that this is far too dangerous a situation at home and abroad to take any chances which might imperil us during the time that would be required to develop anyone else to do the amazingly skilled and intricate job that the President is doing. We cannot be sure that anyone else, however capable and trusted he may have been in lesser positions, can step into that job overnight and be prepared for any emergency which may arise. And this is a time when we have to be sure; when we cannot take any chance of failure.

Our people know the dangers of this war situation. They know that Roosevelt is the only man they can be sure will carry this country safely through the next 4 years. They know that only ignorance of the true situation would prompt a belief that one man can keep us out of war as well as another.

Our people want Roosevelt because for them the real issue of 1940, the issue of security—of jobs, of profits, of peace—are expressed in him.

They want Roosevelt because he alone has proved his concern for them.

They want Roosevelt because at the time of failure of other leaders they trust him as they trust no one else in our economic and political life.

They know of no other man who has his knowledge of other nations. They know of no other man who has his knowledge of themselves.

They know of no other man who possesses the two vital qualities of leadership which other democracies have lacked—the quality of thinking like a man of action, and the quality of acting like a man of thought.

The lesson of the last 5 years is the lesson of the catastrophes caused by shortsightedness in the leadership of other democracies. And our people have not been blind to that lesson.

They know, too, the lesson of the last 4 weeks. They have seen how, in one swift overnight stroke, great peace-loving nations can be overwhelmed by force of arms and turned into battlefields, because their leaders were paralyzed with doubts. And our people have not missed that lesson either. They know that in a world of democratic statesmen without nerve, they need a man who has nerve.

We don't want to see this country turned into a battlefield. We don't want to see our peace destroyed overnight because we were not awake. We need a President who can see as far ahead and act as fast on the spot as any man in any country in all the world.

We have only one man we are sure can do that. Maybe others might develop. But we are only sure now of this one.

Our people know that, and so they want Roosevelt back.

And I, for one, believe that they are going to get what they want. Surely that would be democracy.

But remember this: For 8 years now, the President has been burdened with a tremendous responsibility. In the next 4 years, his responsibility will be even greater. It will not be easy for him, and I am certain that if he accepts the candidacy at all, it will be only if he is convinced that it is his duty and that his party is united behind him.

This is no time for us to be divided. In crucial times like these, the security of a great nation admits of no dilly-dallying. It is too late now to be setting up rival candidates and quarreling among ourselves, setting up stalking horses on the national scene to serve as chess moves in local politics. If we love our country we have got to admit that the time for political trading is over. The people of this country are watching us and waiting for us; and any deal that we make at their expense, we are going to suffer for for the rest of our days.

In the long run, it pays men in the art of politics to understand what the people want and to give it to them. If we fail to understand that and if we fail to raise our voices in one great unanimous cry so loud that the President cannot refuse, then we alone shall be responsible for the outcome.

There are many candidates in this country and many campaign managers. There is only one man whose real campaign manager today is the people, and the people alone.

Ever since the days of the Constitution it has taken a long time for us in North Carolina to make up our minds. But once our minds are made up, we never turn back.

All that his enemies can say against the President's return is that it has never been done before. That's right. But we never had all the banks closed before. We never had such a challenge to democracy before. We never faced such a dangerous and destructive world war before. And we never had a Franklin Roosevelt for President before.

Subversive and Un-American Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM SOCIAL JUSTICE MAGAZINE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the action of the University of Michigan, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a short

editorial from Social Justice magazine, published by Father Coughlin, of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city, relative to the action of the University of Michigan in notifying several young men of communistic opinions not to return to the university the coming year and other related subjects.

Every thoughtful and loyal American will concur in the action taken in regard to that element in our Nation, which would overthrow this Government by force and violence and even bloodshed if necessary, and undoubtedly the great masses of the American people are of the opinion that drastic action toward these subversive groups is long overdue.

AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS

The University of Michigan has notified six young "reds" not to return to classes next year.

The American Student Union, a Communist-dominated youth organization, is already circulating petitions to demand the students' reinstatement and create a cause celebre for the young martyrs.

A lot of words will be used in speech and print without saying bluntly that the Communist Party is paying the tuition of young Jewish radicals in many Midwestern colleges, in order to recruit young Marxists, through the American Students Union and similar fronts.

Social Justice a year ago disclosed this scandal at the University of Wisconsin. Now, no doubt, Michigan, too has discovered it.

Gene Tunney, exfighter and an activist in Catholic youth groups, is reported plotting to "Trojan horse" the Lake Geneva convention of the American Student Union and convert it away from communism by the fine Christian zeal of his young Trojan horsemen.

The Tunney group is a little late. The American Student Union has been "red" a long time; it was born "red." And Mother Roosevelt has been coddling young Communists in the philosophy that their generation has a "constitutional right" to change a government that doesn't suit them.

We note that the Christian Endeavor Society, a Protestant group, has refused to have anything to do with the American Student Union. They report that observations at a number of conventions has convinced them that "Communist and subversive alien influences were of such a character and so powerful that the conference itself—though the majority of the members were thoroughly fine and representative young people—would be misunderstood, compromised, and its influence for worthy projects destroyed."

The Christian Endeavorers are to be commended for clear-sightedness.

Should a known "red" group be shunned or joined?

The Tunneyites, no doubt, believe that you can cure Communists by joining them. Whether this is courage or misdirected sentimentalism might depend on the result.

The same sort of adventuring in the radical labor movement did not turn out at all well.

Senator Charles L. McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGONIAN, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., published on July 3, 1940:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of July 3, 1940]

STATESMAN, LAWYER, FARMER

Senator MCNARY says that he wants to come home to his farm in Oregon to receive formal notification of his nomination by the Republican Party as its Vice-Presidential candidate. That is what everybody in Oregon wants, too. This State has not had a Vice-Presidential candidate since Joe Lane ran with Breckinridge, and that goes beyond the personal recollection of anybody hereabouts. We know of it only from reading history and biography. Not only do Oregonians wish to be in on the celebration, but they are aware that no setting for the event could be more appropriate than a farm home.

Senator MCNARY is a lawmaker by occupation, a lawyer by profession, and a farmer by avocation. There is nothing political in his interest in agriculture. It is an interest that awoke in him ere he ever thought of politics. His grandfather knew the vicissitudes of pioneering on an Oregon donation claim. His father was a farmer. He himself was born on a farm. He is a farmer by avocation out of love of the soil.

When he went to Washington 23 years ago as the newly named Senator from this State, he carried with him out of personal observation and personal experience a knowledge of the economic injustice that is endured by the tillers of the soil. He recognized the existence of a farm problem and set out to do something practical about it before Henry Wallace became coherent on the subject. He was up and acting about it long before the New Deal was shuffled. His sponsorship of the farm problem taught him his first lesson in congressional strategy. And he won through with a farm bill that bore his name, twice to encounter Executive veto. And it is a fairly common opinion among unprejudiced farm leaders that if the New Deal had, with blushing acknowledgment to Republican authors, accepted the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill and the equalization fee, farming would be better off than it is today under the substitutes that the New Deal contrived.

So it is fitting that the formal notification of his choice by the Republican Party for Vice President should be given down on the farm. It is a goodly farm, the McNary acres. It lies off a secondary paved road 5 miles from Salem. There are no proud portals to announce its presence. The passerby would not notice it unless he were scanning the names on every rural delivery mail box. Over a rise and not in view of the highway stands the attractive low-roofed residence, under tall shade trees, and graced by wide lawns and flower beds. Beyond the dwelling is the well-groomed orchard, and in between there runs a creek confined to pools whereon wild geese rear their young, and make constant conversation—perhaps of adventure in the far north or south and of daring leadership they have known.

It is a spot that invites retirement, and retirement thereto has been an ambition of Oregon's senior Senator. Two years hence that might have come true had he so willed it. It would not be asked of him or wanted of him by his constituents.

But Senator MCNARY is not a one-idea man. What he learned in his fight for better farming conditions he had put to use in a hundred ways. His affability, his poise, his shrewdness, his wisdom, made him a national leader in Congress. In addition to the respect in which he is held, his popularity among his fellows is said to be excelled by that of no other Member.

So when the leaders of the Republican Party told him in all sincerity that he was the perfect balance for the ticket whose head had been named he yielded whatever aspirations he may have had to remain as Republican Senate leader or retire to placid, uneventful, independent life on his Oregon farm when came the end of his term as Senator.

"Oregon is a great State," a revered Governor used to say over and over. It is great in length and in breadth, and many other ways, and far and near within it live the friends of CHARLES L. MCNARY. On that day that the farm calls him home to receive the formal word of his nomination they, too, will find their way to the broad lawn that embellishes the low-roofed residence among the trees, to join in the national acclaim that has come to a native son of Oregon.

The Hatch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this House, under our form of government and under our Constitution, is the one direct representative agency of the people and in that capacity wields a tremendous influence upon the belief or disbelief of the American people in the efficacy of democracy.

Almost from the first days of the Republic the House of Representatives has come in for criticism, which at times has been most bitter and unjust. Yet criticism of public officials and those who hold the public trust is one of the ingredients of democracy. It lies within the power of the Congress to mitigate public criticism of its conduct by speedy recognition of the people's mandate and direction.

From all sides and through every medium of public information—the press, over the radio, and by mail—a storm of protest and condemnation has raged over the heads of this honorable body for many weeks because, until this hour, we have ignored the overwhelming sentiment of the people in refusing consideration of the Hatch bill. Now, however, we

are about to employ one of the cherished first principles of democracy, namely, to heed public will by bringing this highly important measure out onto the floor for full and free discussion. By our action today we are doing much to restore and to strengthen the confidence of those we represent.

Many weeks have passed since this legislation was approved in the other body by an overwhelming majority. During the time the Hatch bill was being fully and freely debated in the Senate the President of the United States let it be known that he believed this to be proper legislation, particularly in view of the original Hatch law which he advocated and approved as highly desirable. The American people stood squarely behind their President in calling for passage of this legislation, which is so necessary and so desirable to rekindle faith in democracy which is now challenged on many fronts.

The public, Mr. Chairman, is fully aware of the identity of those forces which are opposed to this legislation and are seeking at every step to hamper and discredit its program.

The public knows that those same forces have in the past selfishly disregarded the rights of the thousands who earn their livelihood as employees of the Federal Government, the various States of the Union, and the political subdivisions thereof.

The public is fully aware that the foes of this legislation are those who have created and fostered an extreme and reprehensible application of political patronage methods until it can be justly termed the loot-and-spoils system. The public is not deluded into the belief that the foes of this legislation are sincere in their contention that it will deprive anyone of his or her rights as a citizen, because the public knows that those who offer this contention are the very ones who have demanded and received financial tribute from protesting and helpless thousands and have cracked the lash of bossism over the heads of those whom this legislation seeks to free from political peonage.

In these days no believer in democracy hesitates to condemn the ruthlessness of the foreign dictators. Are we to be balked when we attempt to eliminate their sordid methods from our own political picture? In these days when the tide of democracy seems to lower with each succeeding sunrise we seek, by this legislation, to reassure the people of this Nation of the inherent integrity of their political parties and in the sincerity and honesty of their leaders. In passing the original Hatch law by a very substantial majority this House clearly indicates that it will not permit this necessary extension of that law to sink into oblivion.

I am confident that the membership of this House will rise, as it has many times, above anything that savors of political bossism or expediency and pass this legislation, not only because of its vast importance but because we will then prove that the criticism thus far voiced against us for failure to pass this legislation is unfounded and that we are seeking to serve rather than to rule the Nation.

One-Man Head Is Urged for United Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's outstanding military authorities, Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, again appeals for a Department of National Defense as the best means of providing the American people with the security to which they are entitled.

Under date of June 23 the following article by Gen. William C. Rivers appeared in the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1940]

DEFENSE CONTROL—ONE-MAN HEAD IS URGED FOR UNITED SERVICES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am anxious to discuss some features of your several editorials on a defense program. You make it clear that defense is a problem of the Nation and not merely of the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

You state, "At present we do not have any agency whose business it is to study the problem of the national defense as a whole." And, "The heads of the Navy and the Army each makes his separate report and his separate request for appropriations." We can add that each evaluates from his own viewpoint the lessons from the war in Europe.

Some further remarks in your discussions are, "The jealousies and frictions existing between our Army and Navy, and between air and ground officers, must be eradicated." And, "Within the War and Navy Departments there is still a clear need for reorganization in the interest of unity, and the elimination of overlapping functions." Also, "We should do well to follow the example of France and create a war college at which officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps and related civilian officials, could study the problems of unified high command."

COORDINATION A FACTOR

Your suggestion for a war college does not go far enough. Many observers have said that "the secret of Germany's successes is coordination." Among the other lessons from the fighting are the increased power of air bombers over war vessels and ground troops. Also, Britain's great need for a cabinet minister of defense to control the operations of her three services.

I am convinced that no halfway measure can be effective. The dominant task for those responsible for our defense is to establish effective coordination between our three armed services. We need an agency to control the three branches, not merely to coordinate them. Coordination involves—or at least invites—suggestion, advice, compromise, which spell delay.

This control must be by a civilian and not by an Army or a Navy officer at the head of a war college. Also, a civilian must be the principal adviser of the President as to policy making, rather than the military director of the war college. A small national-defense college might well be a part of the staff of the cabinet minister of defense. It is interesting to recall that General Goethals, who built the Panama Canal, said he made use of his assistants to aid him, but that he felt a board or committee was not effective as an executive agency.

ONE CONTROLLING HEAD

Why not allow the President one additional Cabinet officer, a secretary of defense, to aid him in supervising the three armed branches? This controlling minister would not only inspect the relative progress of the three branches but he would be in actual command of them. The three heads of the Army, air force, and Navy would be civilians—assistant secretaries. These ought to be permanent.

Unity of command for the President would be increased, with but one Cabinet member to consult on defense matters. Unity of command of the heads of the Army and Navy would result from having the parts of the Air Corps which go to war with those branches train all the time in peace under Army and Navy command, respectively. Graduates of West Point and Annapolis would enter the Air Corps as at present and be assigned to serve respectively with the Army or with the Navy portion of the Air Corps. The Chief of the Air Corps would control the air force reserve, subject to orders of the secretary of defense, to reinforce either branch. The Chief of the Air Corps would have charge of the research, procurement, and supply services, and of the land schools for preliminary aviation training.

Vicksburg, Pickens, Santiago, Gallipoli, and many other places illustrate the confusion which could have been avoided by coordination of the Army and Navy forces engaged.

John W. Weeks was well trained to be Secretary of War. He was a graduate of Annapolis and had extensive business experience on resigning from the Navy. He was earnestly in favor of a department of national defense. From his own experiences Secretary Weeks said there was at Washington administrative overlapping and administrative conflict, as well as departmental antagonism. Gen. Robert L. Bullard, the late John J. McSwain, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, the late Speaker Byrns, and others have written in favor of a department of defense.

SERVICE OPPOSITION

A natural question is frequently asked, Is it proper to recommend such a department when we know that most of the higher officers of the Army and the Navy are opposed to it? I understand that attitude. However, we are aware that most of the able higher officers are enthusiasts. We know that enthusiasts are likely to make errors in judgment from an excess of zeal. In a major crisis and in a matter of vital importance to our 130,000,000 people we are obliged to examine critically and weigh the views of all—of experts and all others.

Nineteen countries have adopted some form of the single department of national defense. Some gentleman in Congress or the Cabinet will rise up some day and master this subject of the national defense. He will become famous, as did Elihu Root.

Root did not originate the idea of adopting the General Staff for our Army or of creating a War College. However, he had the sagacity to see the value of these ideas and the political skill to get the Congress to pass the necessary laws. Quite a number of our highest Army officers were bitterly in opposition to Secretary Root's plan as to both the above projects.

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

NEW YORK, *June 19, 1940.*

Advantages of Living in a Small Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. GOODWIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY PAUL A. OLSON, EDITOR, STORY CITY (IOWA) HERALD

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention a radio address given by Mr. Paul A. Olson, editor of the Story City Herald, Story City, Iowa. This address is one of the finest expositions that I have ever seen on the advantages of living in a small town. Therefore I ask that this be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

My theme may be said to be cities—big and small.

Man early congregated in cities. The sacred page tells us that Cain built the first city and named it Enoch in honor of his son. It must have been a very modest city, but for that early time sufficed as a center for the development of the arts of a crude civilization. You recall that a grandson of Enoch was the "father of all such as handle the harp and organ." Another grandson was "the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron." Thus we note that the first city on record starts out by giving expression to man's dual nature—the artistic (or spiritual) and the practical (or physical).

In our day, as down through successive generations of peoples in all lands, we have builded cities that are glamorous in size and beauty, filled with great wealth and dire poverty, illuminated by the geniuses of commerce and art, and degraded by graft and racketeering; ennobled by sacrificial living and debased by the lowest forms of sensualism; with high and mighty spires pointing heavenward, and the very portals of the deep pit thronged by thoughtless feet—such are our cities; and no wonder people who give heed to the signs of the times are asking for a way out.

THE SMALLER TOWNS

Now, the making of a smally town such as Story City—and I use this place as typical of many towns in Iowa and other States—actually requires more thought and effort on the part of a greater percentage of its individual citizens than is usually the case in larger centers. This is naturally true. Large cities owe their bigness to certain outstanding industries, managed by comparatively few people, and the common run of citizen paddles his own little canoe without much thought of whether or no he is contributing to the welfare of his community. The case is radically different in the smaller towns. What any one individual—certainly what any one family—does affects the whole community.

We rub shoulders pretty close in a small town. We have our competitions, sometimes leading to unkind words and rash actions, but in the long run the sober sense of the people produces a fellowship of feeling, and a realization of the need of standing together for the best interests of the community as a whole. It is this feeling of individual importance that breeds such slogans as "Trade at home," "Try your home town first," etc. There are, of course, people who have the notion that "the grass is greener" in the next town or city; but people who count in the long run are quick to see that their own interests are intimately bound up with the well-being of the town in which they live—and act accordingly. If they don't they are soon classified as "undesirable citizens." And "undesirable citizens" in this sense simply means folks who are not willing to scratch someone else's back in order that they may have their own back scratched in return.

WE KNOW EACH OTHER

All this leads to the thought that the small town is to be preferred to the big city as a place of residence. Our coming into such close contacts may lead us to see each others' faults, but it also enables us to take note of each others' virtues. Knowing that we are so well known keeps us humble. Each man and woman does his or her little bit in the upbuilding of the community without undue inflation and in the spirit of being glad to do it. When Grady, who later became the great editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, was a young married man he got a job in New York City. One day he noticed there was crepe on the door of the house next to where he lived. He asked his wife who had died. She replied she did not know, as she was not acquainted with the people next door. "That finishes it," exclaimed Grady. "We're going back to Georgia where we know the folks next door!" And that is the difference between the big city and the small; in the former they not only don't know their next door neighbors, and seemingly they don't care to know them; out here, where there is room for grass and trees in every yard and sunshine lights all the windows of the home, there are no barriers of creed or race or station to keep us from being on friendly and neighborly terms with everybody.

KEEP GROWING

Someone asked Lyman Abbott, over 80 years old, yet fresh and vigorous in mind and body, how he managed to keep up his interest in so many things. Mr. Abbott's reply holds a secret not only for individuals but also for communities. He said: "Each year I try to grow a little new wood."

The community that does not frequently "grow some new wood" will infallibly stagnate. New wood is grown by the individual when he broadens his interests in life either by study or work or living contact with his fellow men. A church grows new wood when it "lengthens its cords and strengthens its stakes," in other words, when it aggressively performs its great mission in the world. A school grows new wood when it enlists and holds the attention of the rising generation in matters of the mind, the heart, and the body. Social organizations grow new wood when they persistently hold to the fine ideals that gave them birth.

And thus the community grows—perhaps not so much in population or wealth; but in better homes, better churches, better schools, better social surroundings, and a finer sense of community obligation and privilege.

In closing permit me to express our deep appreciation of his fine evening's program, several numbers of which are yet to come, and then, here's a ditty which expresses a thought I have been trying to put across, though I regret to say that I do not know who wrote it:

I like to live in a little town
  Where the trees meet over the street,
And you wave your hand and say hello
  To everyone you meet.
I like to stop for a minute
  Outside a grocery store
And hear the kindly gossip
  Of the folks moving in next door.

For life is interwoven
  With the friends you learn to know,
And you feel their joys and sorrows
  As they daily come and go.
So I'm glad to live in a little town,
  And I care no more to roam,
For every house in a little town
  Is more than a house—it's home.

Is United States a British Protectorate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article from The Gaelic American, New York, July 6, 1940, on the subject, Is United States a British Protectorate?

[From the New York Gaelic American of July 6, 1940]

IS UNITED STATES A BRITISH PROTECTORATE?

At a luncheon, given on June 27, by the Military Training Camps Association in the Broad Street Club, New York, Governor Lehman, speaking in support of the compulsory-service bill, now before Congress, sounded a note of alarm. He is afraid that America may be deprived of the protection of the British Navy. He said with great solemnity:

"Let us face facts honestly. The only reason we have been safe in the past has been because we always have had the protection of the great fleet of a friendly sister democracy—Great Britain.

"Now France has been destroyed and England is called upon to carry on alone. I pray God that she may be victorious. I hope with all my heart that we will give England all possible material

help and that our help will still be in time to strengthen her hands. She represents the last outpost of democracy in Europe.

"Obviously, we must do everything possible to protect ourselves."

It will be news to most Americans to hear that we now or at any time in the past have been protected by England's fleet. All Americans, irrespective of party lines, are agreed that we should have an adequate army, navy, and air force for safeguarding our country and protecting it against any hostile nation or combination of invaders from the east or the west.

With our population, resources, and wealth we can maintain a military establishment superior to that of any hostile combination of Old World powers. Fortunately Americans are united in the effort to make our forces and equipment so strong that no king or dictator will harbor, even in his wildest dreams, an invasion of the Western Hemisphere. Even at present, in the event of an unexpected emergency, our fleet could dispose of any expedition that would attempt an invasion of any part of the Americas. There is no need for hysteria, haste, or excitement.

What Governor Lehman failed to reveal is the enemy or enemies from whom we have been protected by the English Fleet. It is something new to American ears to hear that the United States is a mere British protectorate.

As far back as 1837, when the population was 17,500,000, Abraham Lincoln, in a speech at Springfield, Ill., said:

"Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

The great Lincoln never thought for a moment that his country was protected by any foreign nation or that it was in need of protection. Today our population is over 130,000,000, with resources that are the envy of all the Old World countries. The American who believes that his country's freedom is safeguarded by the English Fleet cannot be envied for his patriotism.

Let it not be forgotten that the Atlantic and the Pacific are almost insuperable barriers to the invasion of America. Also let it not be ignored that in new inventions we are well ahead of any military nation. The airplane and the submarine, the newest engines of warfare, are American inventions, and in mass production we are ahead of the world

Far from being a protection the English Fleet had at many times been a menace to the United States. In the War of 1812 that fleet attacked Washington and burned the National Capitol. The attack on Fort McHenry, Baltimore, inspired Francis Scott Key's immortal national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner. In boundary and lake disputes between the United States and Canada the English Fleet was always at hand to back her Dominion. During the Civil War the same fleet was unfriendly, and the then Czar sent two fleets to America, one to New York and the other to San Francisco. This was a warning to any hostile powers that it would have to reckon with the Russian Fleets. It was fear of an American Fleet that prevented England from violating the Monroe Doctrine in the Venezuela dispute in which President Cleveland protected the independence of a South American republic.

Governor Lehman's statement may mislead those who are not versed in American history or world affairs. He should withdraw or clarify his remarks. At least he should specify when and where and from whom England protected the United States. Does he believe that America is one of the small nations, like Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, whose independence was guaranteed, but not safeguarded, by Great Britain? When did the United States become a British protectorate?

It is erroneous to link democracy with an imperialist nation like England, which has not extended representative institutions to India, where 350,000,000 people are ruled by a system of bureaucracy having its headquarters in London. The only stronghold of democracy in a world dominated by imperialism and totalitarianism is the United States of America.

The Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, recent events have clearly proven the folly of the recent partial definition of the Monroe Doctrine by legislative enactment. I ask leave to include as part of my remarks a radio address delivered over station WHP, Harrisburg, on June 22, 1940, on this subject. This speech points out some of the dangers and difficulties inherent in a partial, rigid definition of a well-known elastic doctrine, which had been tacitly agreed to by all foreign nations for years previously and which had been hallowed by age.

The maneuvers which are occurring around the French island of Martinique today suggest further serious problems which this enactment may create.

A number of people have asked me why I voted against the so-called and miscalled Monroe Doctrine resolution. I have yet to talk to anyone who did not feel, upon analysis of my reasoning, that my vote was correct, and anyone who takes the time to read the debate on the question on the floor of the House will find that a great many of the Members publicly expressed their disapproval of the measure and others who did not have the time and opportunity to speak on the question also felt that the United States was very probably making a grave mistake by enacting this legislation, despite their vote in favor of it.

Naturally, most people believe in the Monroe Doctrine, and I can assure them that I do so also, and that my vote against the resolution was so cast because I deeply respect, honor, and believe in the Monroe Doctrine and do not want to see it crippled and hamstrung by a partial legislative definition. The Monroe Doctrine has been a formal and integral part of the foreign policy of this Nation since 1823 when James Monroe first enunciated it in a message to Congress. In brief, it is a great "No trespassing" sign posted about the entire area. As the years have passed we have made it clear that the warning contained in it is addressed to all foreign powers, no matter where situated. Every President and every Secretary of State—no matter of what political faith—has adopted it and used it when, as, and if necessary and to the extent necessary. It has never been hampered by legislative definition but has been construed by our able Secretaries of State as each occasion arose, having in mind the particular facts and necessities of the specific occasion before them. It has always received the unanimous support of American people and there has never been during the past 117 years any question of our adherence to it. Consequently, the idea of reaffirming the Monroe Doctrine is ridiculous on its face and this resolution did not affirm it. If there is one element of our foreign policy whose general terms are understood by every nation in Europe and in the Orient, and by every member of every foreign state department, it is the Monroe Doctrine. Why should we attempt to state now in strait-jacket terms, useful for the moment perhaps but very probably harmful many times in the future, a fact which foreign powers have agreed to and tacitly admitted for many, many years? It seems to me to be a definite indication of weakness to even suggest that such a statement is necessary when the continued respect of this doctrine during the past decades has been an admission of its validity by every foreign nation. We take it from the class of things agreed to and admitted and indicate it is something new and not agreed to.

As far as transfer of territory to a foreign power is concerned this particular principle was clearly incorporated in the Monroe Doctrine on May 28, 1870, by a statement by President Grant relating to proposed transfer of Santo Domingo.

The growth and successful application of this policy, in my opinion, has been in great part due to the fact that it has never been specifically defined, that it has never been restricted or made rigid. Its greatest strength has been the very fact that ours at all times was the right and privilege of defining it as necessity directed and applying it as the occasion demanded. The fact that the policy has had a vague and gradual growth through the years has served, time after time, as the means of protecting and extending our sphere of influence peacefully. For with our growth into the greatest power in the world foreign nations carefully refrained from any interference of any nature in any country which might even possibly be construed as an infringement of this somewhat vague but well-established policy.

It is obvious that having defined our course of action so specifically we obligate ourselves to either enforce that course of action or else to lose national prestige by failing to do so.

Even more unfortunate, in my opinion, than the fact that the resolution attempted to define is the fact that it made only a partial definition. The resolution had two parts, the first of which provided that the United States "would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in, any attempt to transfer any geographical area from one non-American power to another non-American power." We can all agree that this is clearly within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine if it becomes necessary to apply it. It is much better stated and much more effectively stated in part of that half page of President Monroe's message of 1823 which gives the Monroe Doctrine. There President Monroe said: "We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers (this refers to the group of European countries with autocratic governments) to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system (the word 'system' here refers back to the political systems of that group of nations) to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." It is generally admitted today that the real danger of extension of totalitarian doctrines into South America lies in their securing the political control of the government of some sovereign South American state. By this I mean that a group who embrace the ideas of the totalitarian powers

may gain effective control of the machinery of the government in some specific South American nation or nations; and then later proceed to put into effect totalitarian political ideas and policies and proceed to grant concessions such as air bases and commercial concessions to various totalitarian powers. When we announce merely and only that we object to transfer from one non-American power to another of geographic areas, do we imply that we will acquiesce in such a situation? Here we have an actual danger to which President Monroe's original statement as to political systems would apply with force, yet which lie outside the scope of the present legislative definition. The present head of the Brazilian Government, President Vargas, recently publicly stated that he preferred the totalitarian ideas to those which we love and adhere to. Reports confirm that this was a concession to the "fifth column" now in Brazil.

Yet in the second proviso of the resolution we bind ourselves to consult with the other South American republics as to what action to take in order to prevent transfer of territory. This second proviso, in my opinion, clearly cuts into and limits our power to use the Monroe Doctrine for our national purposes and as the basis of our national defense and national safety. The Monroe Doctrine rests, in the last analysis, it is agreed by all American statesmen and historians, upon the twin principles of self-protection and self-defense. This being so it is obvious that this country must retain its complete freedom of action and decide what to do in order to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. Nothing could be more clear than that a consultation between this country and the Southern American countries which would not result in a unanimous agreement upon the course of action to be pursued would destroy the very purposes which it was seeking to accomplish—a united action by all. To have held such a consultation and then have failed to reach a unanimous agreement would be a very definite weakening in the eyes of the world of the position which it might well be necessary for us to take. The second proviso of this resolution must be placed in the resolution on the assumption that a unanimous agreement would result from such a consultation. But in view of the known situation in certain South American republics today I cannot agree that such an assumption is a reasonable one even today, let alone in the future. This proviso is very crippling to the whole doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine rests upon the principle of self-protection and is based upon the idea that we won't let anyone get into a position where they may become dangerous to our national safety. Where self-protection and self-defense are involved we can and should consult whomever we please and whomever it is necessary to consult at the time as provocative situations arise, but we must not be obligated to consult with anyone or to permit them to determine our course of action when our national safety is at issue. Our hands must be free. We must not give to others a veto power over matters affecting our vital interest.

Personally I believe that the Monroe Doctrine is one of the greatest and most unique foreign policies that any nation possesses. It has gradually and naturally grown within the years and is cloaked with the authority of age. It has never been rigid. It has always been applied by the Executive as the occasion required. We have never had to consult any other nation as to what it means and as to what it implied when it came to the question of actually applying it. The essence of the doctrine was that the doctrine was vague. I believe that my feelings in regard to the Monroe Doctrine were expressed best by Daniel Webster in a statement he made in the United States Senate some 100 years ago on this subject. He said: "I look on the message of December 1823 as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it or tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted."

It is always a very dangerous thing to legislate on foreign policy or on subjects which affect foreign policy. We have just had some very striking examples of this danger. Some of you were undoubtedly in favor of repeal of the arms embargo, and others were against it. But everyone will admit that it was most unfortunate to have this situation and this change of policy occur during a critical period such as we have been experiencing. When the arms embargo was passed it was passed because it signified to the American people the idea of neutrality, something which they at the time were highly in favor of. It passed by the same almost unanimous vote by which the recent so-called Monroe Doctrine legislation was passed. As time passed and it became apparent that this country was not neutral, in thought at least, a large body of opinion began to favor its repeal on the grounds of sympathy with the Allies and the growing opinion in the minds of many that a victory by the Allies was necessary to our national interests and well being. So it was repealed.

During the debate on the arms embargo I sat in the House and listened to the arguments advanced by Member after Member, who favored repeal of this act, on the point that we should never have crippled our foreign policy and tied our hands when we could not foresee future events. And yet, even before we have forgotten all about this debate and this experience, we see enacted a similar piece of legislation which attempts to set in a strait jacket our foreign policy in a different respect, but in the same manner. This limits our action in the future when conditions as they then exist and which certainly cannot now be predicted may be entirely different from what we now anticipate. We have just had another illustration of this in the agreement between the 21 American Republics setting a 300-mile neutrality zone around North and South America. Hardly was the zone established before the principles of that agreement were broken to pieces by all the belligerent powers in the *Graf Spee* incident. Here was another case of where we had established a definite policy and later ignored its violation. Under the peculiar circumstances under which the violation of that policy had occurred, it was no doubt the part of wisdom to disregard its infringement. Yet to publicly announce a definite policy and then ignore it cannot consistently be done without a loss of national prestige. Why should we take a chance on repeating this process again at this time?

The Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY KENNETH COOK, OF GLENWOOD, IOWA

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a speech delivered at Malvern, Iowa, recently by my good friend, Mr. Kenneth Cook, of Glenwood, Iowa, relative to a subject that is now so vital to the American people, the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. Cook has long been a student of history, and the pertinent points he observes in his speech are so worth while that I thought it only proper that they should be made available to the thousands of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Kenneth Cook, Glenwood, Iowa)

I am very glad to be here. It is always a pleasure to come home, especially on a peaceful errand.

I chose as a subject something which, although very much submerged in our past history, nevertheless something which now has become very vital to our fortunes and to our future because of the sudden happening of affairs in Europe—the Monroe Doctrine.

We all know that for over a hundred years we have had what is called the Monroe Doctrine, but I doubt if very many of us have given it much thought, or considered how, when, and where it might very vitally affect our peace with Europe.

It is said that history repeats itself, and it would seem that that is more true today than ever before. Prior to 1823 for several years people in South and North America had been demanding their independence, and numerous republics had been established in South America following their escape from the rule of Spain. This was not to the liking of the European powers, and these European powers feared that this urge for independence might spread to Europe. So Russia, France, Austria, and Prussia established what was called the Holy Alliance. This alliance pledged these European powers to maintain the monarchical system of government in Europe.

In 1823, when James Monroe was serving his second term as the fifth President of the United States, a bill was introduced in Congress to formally recognize the South American republics. In his annual message to Congress in 1823 President Monroe announced the policy of the United States with respect to the South American republics. It is this policy that has been called the Monroe Doctrine. It was never accepted by Congress, and until recently (the last few days) no action has ever been taken to make it a law, either nationally or internationally—no treaty supports it. The message contained a statement of three principles, which collectively make up the so-called doctrine. They are as follows:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers (France, Russia, Prussia, and Austria) to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere—but with the governments who have declared their independence we have, on great consideration and just principles, acknowledged we do not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or in any other manner controlling their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. It has always been our policy not to interfere in any of the internal concerns of the European powers, but to cultivate friendly relations with them. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness, nor could anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States

are involved, that the American Continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

This policy so commended itself to the people as a wise and proper course—as so absolutely vital to the existence of the United States—that it has been cherished and enforced by all political parties and by all subsequent statesmen of this Republic.

Many times in our history occasions have arisen for the assertion of the principles of this doctrine, and in each instance our Government has firmly adhered to this traditional policy.

Of this policy Thomas Jefferson said:

"Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with affairs this side of the Atlantic."

Daniel Webster, in a speech of April 11, 1826, in defense of the Doctrine, said:

"I look upon the declaration as a part of this country's honor, and for one I intend to guard it; it is a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it nor tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government and I will not diminish that honor."

There are 21 Latin and South American republics—8 of which are in South America. Brazil is the largest, with a population of about 43,000,000.

Our undertaking under the Monroe Doctrine is that we will protect these 21 countries from any intereference by any of the European powers.

In the last few days, in order to make our stand in that respect more definite, there has been introduced in Congress a bill making the policy announced by James Monroe a part of the law of this country. It has passed one of the Houses of Congress. The only other time in recent history that the Monroe Doctrine has entered into our international affairs was in 1919 when, in approving the covenant to the League of Nations, the Senate of the United States specifically provided that the Doctrine should not be abrogated.

So we are, through policy and perhaps law, definitely pledged to the protection of our Pan American neighbors from any interference from Europe. It is about time that we recognized this tremendous responsibility. If for no other reason than for the protection of our own interests, this must necessarily be the case, because we cannot permit the dictators of Europe to gain a foothold on this continent. Now, as in 1823, it would be equally as dangerous to our peace and safety.

So history repeats itself. In 1823 democracies in Europe were banned by the monarchs, as they are today to be banned by the dictators. Then, as now, the question was the danger of interference from the totalitarian forces in Europe—England and France threw out a protectorate around the other democracies of Europe, the same as we have done by the Monroe Doctrine as applied to the small nations of this continent. To protect them they were involved in the present war. To protect the small countries of this continent, we may have to go to war.

France and England have known for years of this present menace in Europe—so have we. They, as we, have trifled with time and are not ready—they, as we, guaranteed to protect the other democracies—yet they, as we, have been unable to forego our customary ways of life, and have been unable to forget internal disputes, and they, as we, have been incapable of bringing their lives, their power and intelligence under discipline of a single grim purpose, as we and they saw Germany doing.

It is not a question of helping England or France. We could not have helped them had we wanted to—our state of unpreparedness, both military and industrial being in the shameful condition in which we now find it.

Another thing—we ourselves are continually violating the policy declared by the Monroe Doctrine. We are continually sending insulting messages to Europe and continually meddling in the internal affairs of Europe, at a time when there is no law except the law of force, and at a time when we, the richest nation in the world, find ourselves disgracefully unprepared. I think that before we invite trouble, we should be prepared. Compared to Germany, we are in the same position as one man with a toy pistol challenging to a duel a man armed with a machine gun.

Perhaps, under the circumstances, we are too generous with our promises. We know that Brazil and other of our pan-American neighbors are overrun with Communists and people who favor the dictators of Europe. It occurs to me that before we stick our necks out too far that we should secure from our pan-American neighbors a promise of faithful cooperation and a united front against the threats of the dictators. Why make the matter such a one-sided affair? It is one thing to idealistically declare that we will protect all of this continent, when we have no written and definite assurances that our protection is wanted. Perhaps they will do as Belgium did and refuse to stand against the power of Hitler.

I, for one, love the United States more than I do France or England. Whether that emotion is universal in this country I sometimes doubt. I notice by the newspapers today that the policy announced by the Monroe Doctrine has now become the written law of this land. If such is the case, it will contain this provision:

"It has always been our policy not to interfere in any of the internal affairs of the European powers."

Of course, this statement is not true today, as it was when James Monroe sent his message to Congress in 1823. We all remember that in 1917 we meddled in the internal concerns of Europe. Such meddling brought us only sorrow and trouble. We are today, and have been for some time past, meddling with internal European affairs. It will again bring us only sorrow and trouble if we don't quit. It seems to me a mockery to declare on the one hand that we want no interference in this continent by any European power, and at the same time keep actively meddling in the affairs in Europe.

The people of this country want peace. They are willing to defend any aggression—but that is all.

Let us be guided by the true letter and spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. We want it to be observed by the European powers; then let us live up to it on our part before we ask the European countries not to violate it. If we follow it, our neutrality will not be questioned, and we will then be in a sound position to demand of Europe that they abide by it.

The Appointment of Henry L. Stimson as Secretary of War Means War for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal for June 21, 1940:

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 21, 1940]

MR. STIMSON SHOULD NOT BE SECRETARY OF WAR

On Tuesday, June 18, 2 days before his nomination to be Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson made a radio address entitled "America's Interest in the British Fleet." Here follows the text of the conclusion of Mr. Stimson's address as transcribed by the National Broadcasting Co., over which the speech was transmitted:

"To put the matter concretely, my recommendation would be that the following steps should immediately be taken:

"First, we should repeal the provisions of our ill-starred so-called neutrality venture which has acted as a shackle to our true interests for over 5 years.

"Second, we should throw open all of our ports to the British and French naval and merchant marine for all repairs and refueling and other services.

"Third, we should accelerate by every means in our power the sending of planes and other munitions to Britain and France on a scale which would be effective, sending them if necessary in our own ships and under convoy.

"Fourth, we should refrain from being fooled by the evident bluff of Hitler's so-called 'fifth column' movements in South America. They are, on the face of them, attempts to frighten us from sending help where it will be most effective.

"Fifth, in order to assist the home front of Britain's defense we should open our lands as a refuge for the children and old people of Britain whose liability to suffering from air raids in Great Britain is a constant inducement to surrender to terms which she would otherwise resist.

"Sixth, we should, everyone of us, combat the defeatist arguments which are being made in this country as to the unconquerable power of Germany. I believe that if we use our brains and curb our prejudices we can, by keeping command of the sea, beat her again as we did in 1918.

"Finally, we should at once adopt a system of universal compulsory training and service which would not only be the most potent evidence that we are in earnest but which is at the present moment imperative if we are to have men ready to operate the planes and other munitions, the creation of which Congress has just authorized by a practically unanimous vote.

"In these ways, and with the old American spirit of courage and leadership behind them, I believe we should find our people ready to take their proper part in this threatened world and carry through to victory, freedom, and reconstruction."

What Mr. Stimson advocates amounts to United States entrance into the war; the assumption of an active role as a belligerent.

We stoutly affirm Mr. Stimson's right to speak for any policy in which he believes. He is an experienced and able statesman and his views deserve respect.

However, we believe that Mr. Stimson's views, insofar as they would lead us to war, are far out of line with what the majority of the American people want.

On that ground we hold that the Senate of the United States should refuse to confirm the nomination of Mr. Stimson as Secretary of War.

We believe that it would be a calamity to put Mr. Stimson in the position where he could open this country to the danger of participation in the war which the American people oppose.

We say this with full recognition of Mr. Stimson's unquestioned integrity and fine ability.

Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL CLARK H. WOODWARD

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein an address delivered by Rear Admiral Clark H. Woodward, United States Navy, commandant, Third Naval District, at the Society of Tammany or Columbian Order at the Independence Day ceremonies in commemoration of the one hundred and sixty-fourth anniversary of American independence at the Great Wigwam, New York City, on Thursday, June 27, 1940. The address is as follows:

Worthy Grand Sachem, honored guests, friends, once more I have the high honor and great privilege to participate in your annual Independence Day ceremonies. This year, particularly, when European, African, and Asiatic peoples are being ground under the heels of ruthless marching legions and then punished with death or slavery, our celebration of American Independence should have a special significance for us.

We of the armed forces join our civilian friends in the sincere hope that the rapidly spreading holocaust abroad will not reach the Western Hemisphere. This for a twofold reason: In the first place, our principal mission is to preserve peace by preventing war; secondly, having had experience in war we know its horrors and want no more of it.

Nevertheless, looking facts in the face, it was only through war that we became a free and independent people; it was only through war that we continued as a united nation; and—though God forbid that it ever be necessary—it may yet be only through war that we are able to retain that freedom and independence so dearly bought and the peace we now enjoy.

General Washington, our first Commander in Chief, learned from experience, gained at frightful cost, that "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Yet throughout the decades following the Revolutionary War, which gave us our liberty and freedom, history shows that we entered each of the five subsequent major conflicts in an utterly unprepared state, despite previous tragic experiences. The World War was no exception and proved again that in our case, at least, the surest road to war lies in being unprepared for war.

President Andrew Jackson, a man of great vision, had clearly foreseen the error of such a course 80 years previously when, on March 4, 1837, he said: "We shall more certainly preserve peace when it is well understood that we are prepared for war." Nevertheless, prior to the World War, because of our ill-founded fear of militarism and false economy in whittling down our Army and Navy, the leaders of our Government had refused to read the signs of the times. In consequence our country was caught napping and totally unprepared as in each previous conflict.

Our penalty for this unpreparedness has been the sacrifice of many thousands of the flower of American manhood—now buried in God's acres on foreign battlefields and in military cemeteries scattered throughout our land. Many of their lives would have been spared had the necessary training and equipment of our forces been provided at the proper time. Furthermore, the Government spent many billions of dollars more in extravagant and hasty forced preparations than would have been expended had the proper systematic planning been done in advance. We criminally wasted both blood and treasure.

Pensions and bonuses which have been paid in the past are in large part due to the "Follies of 1917"—our unwise neglect to learn, from past experience, that continuous preparedness is the price of peace. The evils of that fearful struggle are yet with us to vex and plague our Nation, and will be for generations to come until we liquidate the additional billions which will have to be paid out in the future because of our preposterous unpreparedness.

For 12 years following the World War this Nation, though the greatest and richest on the earth, was the self-elected and voluntary dupe of European politics, alien enemies within our own household, disloyal professional pacifists and their allies the "red" subverters. It was they who, by widespread cunning and treacherous campaigns of lies, deliberate distortion of facts, subtle insinuation, foreign-sponsored peace movements and emotional propaganda, successfully exerted maximum pressure on our Government to cut down military and naval appropriations, thus reducing our Navy from first to third rank among the leading maritime nations of the world and dropping our Army to nineteenth place.

Meanwhile, any effort to increase or improve our national defense produced a spontaneous outburst of antipreparedness oratory and pacifistic machinations, the intensity of which increased as Congress began seriously to consider the matter.

Fortunately, the present administration, realizing the woeful inadequacy of our defense forces, very wisely began in 1933 to correct past mistakes and a preparedness-conscious Congress, under the personal leadership of President Roosevelt, has continued systematically to build up the Army and Navy toward their proper strength. Existing international conditions have made the matter more urgent. Consequently, through recent congressional authorizations and appropriations (and those now under consideration, when finally passed), the efficiency of our armed forces will be greatly increased and to such extent that no nation or combination of nations will dare to challenge us.

Our enormous wealth, unlimited resources, and great freedom are sufficient reasons to engender and promote jealousy among certain covetous, militarily strong, and ruthless predatory nations, whose lust for power and territory is unsatiable. Undoubtedly they would like to see our people, like those of other nations unable to protect themselves, subjugated to totalitarian domination.

But Americans are not suited, either by temperament or tradition, for life under such a regime. It is very important, therefore, for us to consider how best we may defend and preserve our hard-fought-for liberties and independence.

We can no longer depend upon promises, pacts, or treaties, as they have proven to be worthless except as sleeping potions to allay suspicion while getting ready for the kill. Worldly experience has taught us that nothing will stop any gangster, whether of local or international character, from pursuing his nefarious plans except superior force. We should profit by lessons thus learned.

Not since the Civil War has the liberty and independence of these United States been jeopardized as now. The swiftly marching events across the seas, particularly during the past few weeks, have shocked and stunned the American people. Though predicted for several years and with its approach definitely seen, nevertheless it was not until recent months that Europe finally was drawn into the enveloping conflagration of actual war, since when the very rapidity and fury of its progress has been shocking beyond words.

Yet none of this happened by accident. It was the result of long, careful, and efficient planning by experts with an implacable purpose. It was the inevitable result of weakness pitted against might, of unpreparedness against savage force.

The present conflict is really a war between two completely antipathetic and contrary philosophies of government. One, autocratic, based on the worship of force and the will to fight, considers that the dictator is supreme and individuals mere pawns to be used at his desire. The other, democratic, based on moral force and the inalienable and God-given rights of the individual, considers the state is subordinate and to be governed by the will of its people.

Though we may not become embroiled in the present war, nevertheless we must be prepared for a future conflict along the same lines, if and when it comes. Should the challenge be made we must face the struggle without faltering in our faith and with the firm determination to fight for our liberties and independence, backing up our moral force with a superior force of arms. Only thus can we survive and progress.

We of the regular armed forces know, as did General Washington, that to be prepared is one of the most effectual means of preventing war. I wish this truth could be brought home to every citizen. Upon this basis is predicated the present efforts of the Army General Staff and the Navy high command.

Proper preparedness is a colossal job, but an absolutely necessary one. It is also costly, but the cost is infinitely cheaper than the cost of war. It is much easier and saner to prepare in advance and thus keep out of war than to prosecute one successfully if forced upon us, or, in case of defeat, to satisfy the excessive demands of a victorious enemy.

The reaction of Americans to national preparedness during the past 10 months has had an amazing turn. Previously, considerable indifference was displayed by the majority. This was due, in large measure, to lack of knowledge of military and naval affairs and a generally comfortable, though fancied, feeling of security. Since the outbreak of war, however, the people have awakened to the real extent and significance of our unpreparedness. In consequence of the unimaginable progress of the European conflict some have even shown signs of alarm. There is no occasion to become jittery, however, and the greatest service our citizens can render our country at this time is to remain calm and unafraid, and lend every effort—personal, moral, industrial, and political, as needed—to help in the proper arming of our military and naval forces.

We must do this immediately and as a united people. National security is not a political question, but one with which every American is personally concerned. There is no escape from the responsibility which now rests on each individual citizen.

During the past several weeks our Congress has given the right-of-way to national-defense legislation, including appropriations and authorizations for the enlargement and modernization of our Army and for considerable increase in our naval tonnage. Yet appropriations and authorizations as such are not sufficient. They alone cannot win wars.

The funds and authority thus provided must be transformed into actual ships, tanks, planes, guns, and trained personnel. For these it takes a lot of time. Neither an army nor a navy can be improvised. From 1 to 2 years are necessary to produce equipment necessary to approximate the requirements of reasonable national defense,

while from 2 to 4 years are required to build major-caliber guns and naval vessels. Prompt and proper arming of our forces, therefore, calls for the utmost cooperation between the Government, industry, labor, and the public.

"A strong man armed keepeth his house in safety" until there comes one stronger than he. Although it is our fondest hope never again to be engaged in a foreign war, the only way to assure ourselves of future safety and peace is through proper preparedness. This means providing an adequate Army, well equipped and trained, and a Navy second to none. There is no cheap road to either security or peace, and the price of liberty is paid in blood.

As has been truly said, "to stop short of a completely efficient defense is to rest content with an inefficient defense." I would like to add that an inefficient defense spells disaster when put to the test. It is the duty of our Government to insure, beyond question, the safety of our country, and in the present calamitous state of world affairs no policy would prove more disastrous to this Nation than failure in this duty.

We must seriously bear in mind also that our duty is to uphold our great fundamental and traditional foreign policies—one in particular, the preservation of the Western Hemisphere—and by war if necessary. The idea of invasion of the Western Hemisphere by foreign nations is not a new one; one flagrant instance being when Louis Napoleon set up a puppet kingdom in Mexico during our Civil War. Other lesser attempts have been made in more recent times.

Our Monroe Doctrine—in the support of which we have never wavered—assures America for Americans, and views any attempt of foreign powers to colonize or extend their political system to this hemisphere as being dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.

Nevertheless, covetous eyes have been cast by certain European nations on the rich territories of our sister republics to the south. Furthermore, systematic and purposeful propaganda has been spread by these same nations in their aggressive commercial and political activities which are a growing challenge to the trade and influence of the United States and a menace to the preservation of peace.

We cannot trust nations whose word is as poor as their bond. Lawless nations plotting foul mischief can be stopped only by superior force.

The one thing that the people of this country ought to fear more than getting into war is that of going into war unprepared and not coming out victorious. From recent cataclysmic events we have learned that the risk of war is too great not to have done the utmost in preparation for every eventuality.

Only in preparedness is there protection; only in protection is there peace.

"I Am an American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

POEM BY J. FRANK MULLEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by J. Frank Mullen, of 1127 Hyde Park Avenue, Hyde Park, Mass.:

I AM AN AMERICAN

I am an American and I'm proud to say,
" 'Tis the greatest blessing in the world today."
To man, it gives freedom and an equal right,
Since the date of its birth, in the Concord fight.

I am an American, and forever will be
Against all influences, from o'er the sea.
Where justice is bared, by dictators' skill,
Who dream only of slaughter, and new ways to kill.

To be an American, I'm sure it's safe to say,
'Tis an appealing wish of all, in the world today.
Here, in peace we live with our neighbors and God,
And the envy of the world is the American sod.

As a Nation we're ready and willing to fight
For justice and freedom and democracy's right.
The flag of our Nation will always be true,
To the ideals that gave us the red, white, and blue.

—*J. Frank Mullen.*

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. MOUTOUX

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a concise and very fair analysis of the true attitude of Mr. Willkie, and the Republican Party, toward T. V. A. This splendid article was written by John Moutoux, of the Scripps-Howard organization, and published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Sunday, July 7, 1940:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel of July 7, 1940]

WILLKIE CANDIDACY ALREADY LAUNCHING "SMEARING" OF T. V. A.

(By John T. Moutoux)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—It looks very much as if T. V. A. is going to be made the goat of this Presidential campaign.

In order to throw a favorable light on Wendell L. Willkie's fight on the T. V. A., the Willkie supporters seem bent upon painting the Authority's activities in pitch black. And so, even though Mr. Willkie has said he favors giving T. V. A. a fair chance to make good, there is every indication even at this early date that the T. V. A. is in for another smearing.

LAWRENCE SPEAKS

For instance, David Lawrence had a column this week in which he said, in part:

"If the New Deal wants to go to bat on the utility issue it will doubtless find Wendell ready and eager to debate it. Nothing probably would please him more than to go up and down the country telling the people of the millions of dollars that have been wasted on the T. V. A., and of the financial juggling in the T. V. A. which brought criticism from the office of the Comptroller General of the United States."

Those who have followed T. V. A. closely since it began can at once spot the misstatements in the paragraph just quoted.

T. V. A. has not wasted millions of dollars. On the contrary, through its adoption of multiple-purpose dams as well as the timing and manner of their construction, the Authority has saved millions of dollars. No one has ever charged T. V. A. personnel with being incompetent or inefficient; as a matter of fact, even the minority members of the T. V. A. investigating committee were impressed with the high degree of efficiency of the T. V. A.'s engineering department, which spends the bulk of the T. V. A. appropriations.

Nor has there been any financial juggling. That is the time-worn charge that was shown up by the congressional investigating committee but which continues to be used, because those who make the charge are aware of the difficulty of refuting so vague a charge as financial juggling.

The criticisms of former Comptroller General McCarl also were proved baseless by the investigating committee.

TAX LOSS QUESTION

Mr. Lawrence continued:

"Then there is the question of the loss of taxes to the States and municipalities in the T. V. A. area and the vast subsidies paid by taxpayers in the North for the benefit of persons and interests in the South—all of this has never been really opened up on the stump because the American people have never before been ready to listen, and there has been nobody on the anti-T. V. A. side who could get a hearing."

Again the misstatements are apparent.

There has been no loss of taxes to States and municipalities in the T. V. A. area. Knoxville, Memphis, and the other cities serving T. V. A. power are receiving as much in taxes now as they did when the private companies operated in those cities. Under the amendment to the T. V. A. Act just passed by Congress, the States will be reimbursed almost in full for their tax losses. Thus far there have been no losses by States or municipalities.

Mr. Lawrence overlooked the counties, which are the only taxing agencies in the valley that have lost through the flooding of land by T. V. A. reservoirs. But even the counties will be reimbursed up to 40 percent for the loss from the flooding of land, the 40 percent representing the part allocable to power, and they will be reimbursed in full for taxes formerly paid by the private power companies.

Nor have there been any "vast subsidies paid by the taxpayers in the North for the benefit of persons and interests in the South." Even now, with T. V. A. only half completed, the T. V. A. power

operations are on a paying basis—that is, they are returning a profit to the taxpayers. The navigation, flood-control, and national-defense parts of the T. V. A. program, of course, are not on a paying basis, nor are these same activities on a paying basis anywhere else in the country. Mr. Lawrence and other critics of the T. V. A. raised no cry about vast subsidies when, through the years, the Government spent billions on navigation alone—rivers, harbors, and flood control.

The only difference is, this time the South is getting a little of the money that formerly went largely to the eastern seaboard.

The point should also be made that the tax-replacement money is coming from the rate payers of the Tennessee Valley, whose rates include 15 percent as a tax equivalent, and not from the taxpayers of the North, who seem to be Mr. Lawrence's special concern.

MR. DIRKSEN AGAIN

Our friend, Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois), was back at his old game this week attacking the T. V. A. He referred in a speech on the House floor to a "fictitious yardstick that has been contrived down in the Tennessee Valley Authority, where about 30 percent of the $505,000,000 cost of that public project will be allocated to power and the rest of it to navigation and flood control."

Mr. DIRKSEN's figures are not quite correct. In fact, they are far from accurate. The figures, as submitted to the T. V. A. investigating committee, show 56.5 percent of the total cost of T. V. A. allocated to power and the remainder to navigation and flood control. The amount chargeable to power is $279,141,208 out of a total of $494,092,864. The figures for the other two items are $115,801,848 for navigation and $99,149,808 for flood control.

Since the allocation of costs was made, T. V. A. has bought electric properties of Tennessee Electric Power Co., Alabama Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and several smaller systems, all of which will be chargeable 100 percent to power. Of course, the allocation figure is constantly changing with the addition of new property and the construction of dams.

PRAISING WILLKIE

Representative DIRKSEN gave Mr. Willkie credit for reducing electric rates in the valley by 50 percent, and when Representative PIERCE, of Oregon, broke in to say, "The rates came down when the T. V. A. came in, and never before," then Mr. DIRKSEN made a statement that no doubt will be of interest to the electric users of the valley, especially those in the rural areas who never knew the blessings of electricity before T. V. A. brought it to them. Mr. DIRKSEN said:

"Let me say to my good friend from Oregon that it is because of Wendell Willkie that the humble folks of Tennessee can use curling irons today. It is because of him that electric toasters and electric ice boxes and electric facilities of all kinds have been brought into the most humble and obscure homes in Tennessee. Yes; take off your hat and salute a great American who has brought the use of electricity into the homes and to the firesides of humble people by the hundreds of thousands. Salute a great servant of the people who has steadily sought to enrich their lives by bringing to them the comforts of electricity."

World's Fair Japan Day Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. KENSUKE HORINOUCHI, JAPANESE AMBASSADOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Japanese Ambassador, Hon. Kensuke Horinouchi, at the World's Fair Japan Day banquet in the Hotel Astor, New York City, on June 28, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Wakasugi, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, once more we are gathered here on the eve of Japan Day at the New York World's Fair. As always, it is a great pleasure for me to come to New York. In this city I spent several years as consul general, a position now held by our genial and able host of this evening, Mr. Wakasugi. I am grateful to him for giving me this opportunity to see so many old friends and to meet so many distinguished New Yorkers.

When I was here with you a year ago, I expressed my admiration for your city's achievement in creating its magnificent exposition under rather unfavorable circumstances. The decision to continue the fair for another season evokes even greater respect in view of the events of the past year.

Encouraged by this example, Japan has wholeheartedly continued her participation in the fair. Not only has the Japanese Pavilion been reopened, but an attempt has been made, by a general renewal of its contents, to live up to the fair's new 1940 model. I am confident that this year's fair will be even more successful than that of 1939.

No doubt you know that we Japanese are celebrating this year the 2,600th anniversary of the founding of our empire. We are justly proud of the great age of our nation and of the unique position which it holds in world history. Compared with our national life-span of 26 centuries, the period of our association with the western nations has been very short. Yet in all our long history, there is no period which we regard as more auspicious than the 86 years in which we have been the friend of America. It is our earnest hope that American-Japanese amity will continue unbroken until it, too, is measured not by years but by centuries.

The world-shaking events of recent months have greatly increased the importance of strengthening the ties which have held us together since 1854. At a time when all nations are gripped by anxiety and apprehension, the traditionally peaceful relations between America and Japan take on a new significance.

At the end of the first World War, the League of Nations was founded in the hope that it would insure a stable peace based on international justice. The League did not succeed. It failed largely because its membership was never complete, and because it was dominated by European considerations rather than by the interests of the world as a whole.

The present trend of world affairs is toward a new type of international coordination. Apparently there are to be a number of great regional confederations of nations based on geographic and economic mutuality of interests. The nations of this Western Hemisphere are moving toward a stronger kind of Pan American Union. In the Far East, Japan, China, and Manchoukuo are laying the foundation for cooperation and unity among the peoples of East Asia. There will probably be some similar developments in Europe, regardless of the military outcome of the war.

Close cooperation among regional groups of nations can be of great value in securing order and in promoting common interests. But it is vitally necessary that steps should be taken to preserve and to increase the free flow of world trade. If attempts should be made to turn the regional spheres into watertight compartments, each trying to be self-sufficient, the irritations and animosities which now trouble the world would merely be aggravated, and no real progress could be made toward world peace.

America and Japan should meet this problem by doing everything possible to keep the trade channels of the Pacific free and open. We should leave nothing undone which may serve in any measure to dispel such suspicion or misapprehension as may exist between us. We must try to recognize the realities of our situation and to solve our problems in that spirit of mutual confidence which has served us so well in the past.

It is encouraging to see that, despite the expiration of our commercial treaty, American-Japanese trade is going on unhampered. There could be no better proof than this of the fundamental soundness and complementary value of our trade. Last year Japan was again the third best customer of the United States, paying out $230,000,000 for American goods. In exports to the United States, Japan held second position, with a balance of $70,000,000 in your favor.

The relative importance of American-Japanese trade has been greatly increased by the situation in Europe. Many of the world's most important trade routes have been disrupted or completely blocked by the spread of the war. Normal commerce is now possible only with Latin America and the Far East. The United States seems intent on preventing the trade dislocation from spreading to North and South America. Japan has the same desire for her part of the world.

Japan's policy toward the European situation is to keep out of the war, and to keep the war out of East Asia. Her policy of noninvolvement is aimed at securing stability and the peaceful continuation of trade in east Asia. Japan's new treaty of friendship with Thailand is a tangible evidence of our peaceful intentions. So also is Japan's announcement of her keen interest in maintaining the status quo in the Dutch East Indies. The Japanese Foreign Minister's statement to this effect was followed by a similar statement from Secretary of State Hull. America and Japan have thus declared a common policy toward the Dutch East Indies.

It is not too much to say that the United States and Japan have such a common policy with respect to the whole of the Pacific area; that is, to keep the Pacific peaceful and free from the effects of the war in Europe. If each of our two nations works toward that end, it is certain that peace and trade of the Pacific can be preserved.

At last year's Japan Day banquet, I stressed the fact that there was still an "open door" in China. I reaffirm that statement tonight, for it is even more valid now than it was a year ago. Fighting is still going on in China, but the field of military operations is now far in the interior. The new Chinese Government under Wang Ching-wei has begun reconstruction in a large area, which includes all of China's important ports and the great bulk of her resources. The Wang government has announced a policy of friendship for all nations and welcomes a commercial and industrial cooperation. Under these circumstances, the "open door" in

China has a new meaning. American trade with both China and Japan is in a position to increase soundly and steadily.

At this critical stage in world history, America and Japan share a great opportunity and an equally great responsibility. Clear thinking and wise statesmanship on both sides of the Pacific will develop that opportunity and meet that responsibility.

Before I close, I want to tell you again how pleasant it is, in a time like the present, to share in a celebration of the New York World's Fair. In a world of shadows this great fair is a beacon light of courage and hope. It lights the path to a world of tomorrow where the sword shall be sheathed and all men will live as friends.

This is a goal to which all can aspire. It cannot be reached overnight, but let us march together on the road toward it.

Participation in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

LETTER FROM JOSEPH L. CARLTON, OF WINSTON-SALEM, N. C.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have before me, which was addressed to me on May 16, 1940, by one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph L. Carlton, an attorney at law of Winston-Salem, N. C., in which he expresses his views in reference to the war now raging in Europe in so far as our interests are concerned. In the concluding paragraph of the letter he says:

> If you can see any possible need for us to fight in Europe, I hope you will write to me why. As a citizen and voter of North Carolina, I want to urge that you do everything in your power to keep America from taking, for the second time, the awful steps she took during the last war.

I replied to Mr. Carlton that I saw no earthly reason for our mixing up in Europe's wars, and that, insofar as I was concerned, I would never vote to send a single son of an American mother to Europe to settle the differences existing between nations over there.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH L. CARLTON, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Winston-Salem, N. C., May 16, 1940.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: It seems incredible that this country, for a second time, is beginning to take those almost imperceptible little steps which finally resulted, during the last World War, in America's fighting in Europe. Yesterday I was amazed to hear a radio announcer from Washington make the statement that many high officials and even Members of Congress were beginning to say that even now we ought to be in Europe helping the Allies.

Why? Not to make the world safe for democracy, nor to end war, nor to make money—the last war proved that war can do none of those things.

But this radio announcer stated—and I hope he is mistaken—that high officials and Congressmen are saying that we ought to be fighting in Europe because, if we wait until Hitler wins, we will then have to fight him alone, and without the help of the Allies. In other words, if Hitler wins, he will then attack South America or North America.

Is that true?

(1) What would Hitler or Germany want from the Western Hemisphere? Someone will say, two things: raw materials and room for colonization. But if Germany wins from England and France, Hitler would have parts of Africa, Asia, India, and Australia, not to mention the Dutch East Indies for such purposes. From the English and French Empires he could get more raw materials and room than he could possibly use.

(2) Would Hitler be able to attack the Western Hemisphere? Having won from England and France, he would have to keep the people of the British and French Empires in subjection. The British Empire alone has over 500,000,000 people. Germany has approximately 70,000,000 people. If Hitler properly polices the British and French Empires, he will not have ships or men enough with which to attack the Western Hemisphere.

(3) When would Germany attack the Western Hemisphere? Not immediately after conquering England and France, because she would have lost too many men and too much equipment in the European war. In 4 days Holland lost 100,000 men. It is inevitable that Germany also will lose many men before the European war is over. If Germany waits a few years to recover before attacking us, it is likely that her beaten European enemies will also have recovered sufficiently by that time to keep Germany fully occupied at home.

At any rate, after every previous European war the world powers which were defeated have always recovered. It is not unlikely the same thing will happen after this war.

In the face of a perfect balance of power in Europe, the securing of a sufficiency of room and raw materials from the conquered French and British Empires, the presence of two oceans, one each side of us, and most of all our potential strength, it is extremely unlikely that Germany will attack us even if Germany is victorious in the present European war.

As American citizens, we should ask ourselves why we should send our men to fight in Europe when the British Empire itself is not fighting with all its might. The British Empire has approximately 500,000,000 people. If England needs more men with which to fight for her very life, let her get them from the British Empire. England could easily put in the field 10 times as many men as she now has ready to fight. She has more men than she could possibly use. Why should we send more?

Suppose the situation were reversed, and the United States occupied the British Isles and England occupied North America. Would England go to Europe to fight for us? Let Warsaw and Poland, Finland, and Norway answer that question. Even British statesmen admit that England has broken her treaties in which she promised to fight to help her next-door neighbors. No; this question answers itself; in such a situation England would not fight for us.

We are told that the Germans are naturally a warlike people and Hitler insane and that if they win in Europe they will come over here to get us. But when it comes to imperialism, surely the Germans cannot compare to the British; it is the English, and not the German Empire, upon which the sun never sets. If we may judge from history, the German people are no worse than anybody else; Hitlerism is but the scab of a sore on Germany; and it is logical to believe that when the sore is cured the scab will disappear. The venom of revenge which produced the sore was injected at Versailles, because Versailles resulted in the economic want and frustration that defeated democracy and made Hitler possible in Germany.

From these facts, we can draw at least two conclusions. We should have no part in Europe in reaping this whirlwind which the Allies themselves sowed at the end of the last war. It is inconceivable to think that in the event Germany defeats England and France, and thereby gets more room and more raw materials than she can use, that she will then risk fighting the strongest nation on earth in order to get even more.

The young men of America are willing to fight or die, if need be, to defend America in this hemisphere, but not abroad.

If the conclusions I have drawn in this letter are false, I would appreciate very much your pointing out to me wherein I am wrong. If you can see any possible need for us to fight in Europe, I hope you will write to me why. As a citizen and voter of North Carolina, I want to urge that you do everything in your power to keep America from taking, for the second time, the awful steps she took during the last war.

Very truly yours,

JOE L. CARLTON.

Finland's Candle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE FROM PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Portland Oregonian, which is entitled "Finland's Candle."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.]

MIRROR OF WORLD OPINION

FINLAND'S CANDLE

How far that little candle throws his beams!
So shines a good deed in a naughty world.

Honor still has its advocates, decency its practitioners, and gratitude its testimony. The urgent need of the times is to make the

world safe for morality once more. Somehow the brave little country of Finland steadies and fixes our faith in the certainty that it shall be. The way will be hard and not easy, but the way has been hard before and mankind was equal to its tribulations. There is a false light and a true. The false sometimes seems to dwarf the true, yet always it is the one that is extinguished. But the truth, the little candle, shines on.

Nominating Senator Styles Bridges for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. FOSTER STEARNS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Representative FOSTER STEARNS, Republican of New Hampshire, nominating Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, for President of the United States, at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia:

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, America is a bewildered Nation today. Bewildered at what is happening abroad, bewildered at what has been happening at home, bewildered at the confusion that exists in Washington, and bewildered at her own impotency—her own defenselessness—her own inadequacy in a moment of supreme test.

It is not the first time that we have come to a cross road where a momentous decision is necessary. But there has never been a time when more hung on that fateful decision. Those who come after us in the years ahead will see us as we face it, with this country brought by its present national leadership to such a weakened state that its once mighty voice in international affairs has been reduced to an uncertain whisper. Have our centuries of achievement, the lives and sacrifices of our resolute forefathers, brought us finally to this?

The task for us gathered here today, therefore, is plain.

We must provide a leader who is strong, who will inspire America to a recovery of faith in herself, a recovery of confidence in her destiny, a recovery of her will to advance fearlessly and erect along the only right road.

We know that there are still the energy and the ability in America to steer her civilization onward. We have the youth and the strength to respond. But they must be reawakened, the spirit and the will must be rekindled. We must have a rallying point.

I submit to you a man whose very life symbolizes the qualities that have been this Nation's inspiration for 300 years, qualities to which we must rededicate ourselves if we are not to be a people conquered by a more aggressive race, or sinking into a devitalized mental state at home, and there is little choice between the two evils.

I submit a man whose knowledge of life is not confined to the imaginative tales of fiction, but which was gained at first hand from the time he was 9 years old; a man who was his own National Youth Administration before he was out of his teens. And I ask you to focus your minds for a moment on a little farmhouse up in Maine of 30 years ago.

In it lived a family—the mother, a son aged 9, a daughter of 7, and a year-old baby boy, left alone by the death of the father, in whose veins ran the blood of 12 generations of hardy New England stock. He left his family only a small and unproductive farm, and the accumulated, nonnegotiable debts of the village's general store. The sole manpower of this farm, a 9-year-old boy.

If ever there was a civilization threatened, here was one—a New England mother and her brood of three, with the deep snow of a northern winter on the ground and clouds of despair hanging low overhead. "Brain trusters" were manifestly needed; there had to be as intense thinking as any intellectual ever did, even if on a smaller scale. And it took, besides brains, a special quality which we up in New England call spunk.

Out of this evolved a plan—not a national planning, but a planning for the particular part of the world enclosed there in that little New England home. It was a plan that has sustained man down through the centuries, a plan that has given strength to the body and comfort to the soul—simple, too, such as could come only from people of simplicity. It was the plan of hard work.

It was so simple and direct in its conception that it could never possibly have emanated from the brain of a Tommy Corcoran, a Benny Cohen, or a Harold Ickes. It was a plan for a day at a time, and a day which began before dawn. I am giving you this picture in full, and in simple language, because America needs to come out from under its silken puffs and recall the patchwork quilts of yesteryear. It needs to rub the cold cream from its face and dabble in the axle grease if need be. Here was a boy getting up in the dark to water and feed the stock, milk the cows, and deliver the milk to the neighbors before trudging 3 miles to school—because, in spite of all, he didn't propose to go without an education.

There are no vacations on a farm. He had little time to play baseball or go swimming, but he developed a steady competence as he went 4 miles over rocky New England pastures to chop down trees, sledding them back to the house for firewood. He acquired some of his knowledge of commercial values at this time, too, by trapping for muskrats en route and selling their skins.

This man of the family at 9 found that determination and spunk developed as he needed them. He worked his way through college by getting up at 4 o'clock in the morning and milking cows in the university's dairy barn, winning a raise from 15 to 20 cents an hour. As a larger place and opportunity showed itself, he grew in stature to fill it.

A boy of New England's thrifty soil, a man of it, the product of a stock that knew the hardships and uncertainties of life long before a New Deal came to confuse our direction, he was the type of man who made our country. New work took him over the New England States, teaching agriculture, seeking to share his experience with farmers who knew the hard work involved in making a living out of the soil. Probably his teachings of that period were amateurish, but they were classics of wisdom compared with today's theories of scarcity. He had reached the point where he could give help out of the experience he had earned by hard work and his own self-reliance.

This son of New England, coming up the hard way, became secretary of a farmers' insurance organization, then the executive secretary of a State farm bureau federation. Men said he was easy to work with and to work for. He was named to the public service commission of his adopted State.

And then, at the age of 36, his neighbors who admired his pluck, energy, and ability, made him Governor of their State. It had been charged that he was too young. Some said that he was too radical. Others said he was too poor to aspire to the office. But the people of his State are not given to acting blindly or to hasty judgments. They had confidence that he would do the job. He was the youngest Governor the State ever had; at that time he was the youngest Governor in the country. And again, as the larger place was open to him, he grew to fill it. He responded to the opportunity.

In his 2 years as Governor, he balanced the budget—without a sales tax, a direct-inheritance tax, or an income tax. New Hampshire's may be only a small budget, but his record in balancing it puts him at least that far ahead of those who have never come within shouting distance of balancing any budget. He left the State with a new Agricultural Standards Act, a new State Planning and Development Board which rescued tottering old industries and encouraged new industries; strengthened mothers'-aid legislation, and increased old-age benefits.

He brought about the enactment of unemployment-compensation insurance. Under him, New Hampshire was the first State to qualify under the Federal Social Security Act; with the Governor of Massachusetts he put into effect the first interstate compact in the country, establishing minimum wages and maximum hours, and prescribing working conditions in industry. Subsequently, several other States came into the compact. After the disastrous flood of 1936, he set up a citizens' committee, and the stricken areas were rehabilitated, he himself working from 16 to 20 hours a day on the job. At the end of his administration, there was not a family or a home that had not felt, in some measure, the effects of his cooperation. And in America, we are a Nation built up of home units. Out of that rugged little Maine farm had come something constructive, something built on experience—not a tissue woven out of theories.

I submit that this is a record of intelligent liberalism. It reflects a philosophy which recognizes that there are less fortunate people among us, and accepts the obligation to assist them. But, it is also a philosophy that permits the free flow of the energies of the able, the development of initiative and self-reliance—a philosophy as durable and as elemental as the rocks of the Granite State.

Ladies and gentlemen, this man of whom I speak met with you at Cleveland 4 years ago. He was one of seven Republican Governors in the United States at that time. Those of you who were there remember the consideration he was given for the Vice Presidency. He himself caused his name to be withdrawn, and instead placed in nomination the man who was selected as our Vice Presidential candidate.

He went back home, and notwithstanding that the New Deal swept the State, he was elected to the United States Senate.

Then, with the experience learned in a hard school but still with the energy and vision of youth, he moved on to the wider forum of Washington. You know his record there. In January 1937 he joined the group of Republicans who were fighting a disheartening rear-guard action against the onrushing forces of the New Deal. It took courage to lift his voice against them in those days; it took a man of intense convictions and a disregard of personal interest.

There were two courses open to him. The easier way was to keep quiet, keep his head down and hope that in time something would happen to stem the tide. The other way was to set up an incessant counterattack, to lift even one indignant voice against the New Deal chorus, in the hope that in some way, somewhere, it would be heard. This was the hard way—the politically dangerous way. And this is the way he took.

He was the first to make a break in the New Deal armor through an investigation of one of its major agencies. It was his fearlessness in exposing the liberties which strikers were taking with the United States mails which brought about the beginning of the end

of the sit-down strikes. I believe I am justified in saying that he gave new spirit to the little group of Republicans in the Senate.

But he did more than this. He gave unselfishly of time, health, and tremendous energy to going over the country, giving a new vitality to Republican organizations; because he saw that only through a revival of the Republican Party and its principles can the soundness of this country's way of living be preserved. I have known him to leave the Senate after a full day of exacting work, and travel by plane to instill the spirit of fight into some distant group of beleaguered Republicans. And this was not merely to attend great gatherings in metropolitan centers. He gave of his time and strength gladly to small party meetings, from one end of the country to the other, bringing them in contact with Washington, and a realization that Republican leaders were interested in their problems. His own interests were at all times subordinated to the party's welfare, and, therefore, to the interests of his country.

Undoubtedly most of you here on this floor today have seen and heard him and felt his driving power. Some may have disagreed with him, but all must acknowledge his sincerity, and his hope for and confidence in the American people, whom he has come to know and understand so widely.

The country at this moment is in desperate need of leadership. We feel that this son of New England is the embodiment of those American virtues of which we are proudest, and which we feel can combat the flabbiness and cynicism which has been weakening our national stamina. It needs the experience of a man who has had to struggle for everything he got; a man who has served as the Governor of his State, and as a Member of the United States Senate. It needs his sincerity and energy, his youth, and fire.

He is the personification of self-reliance, in strong contrast to dependence on the Government such as we see on all sides. His past record gives him authoritative judgment. He thinks of war in terms of his three sons, one of whom is of military age.

In these times when we hear so much about the workingman, his problems and his needs, there is need for a man in the White House who is, and all his life has been, a working man. He knows how to call out the best in his fellow workers.

It is said that this Nation, along with the other democracies, has become soft. I submit, as the Nation's new leader, and nominate for President of the United States, a man who has hardened himself—and who asks you, in this time of danger, to do the same—to rise to the need for disciplined thought and resolute spirit: STYLES BRIDGES.

"Our Country, Right or Wrong"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT E. AUSTIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY THOMAS RAYMOND BALL

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from Connecticut, THOMAS RAYMOND BALL, at Natchaug Grange, Chaplin, Conn., July 5, 1940:

"OUR COUNTRY! RIGHT OR WRONG"

Fellow Americans, this month of July is full of meaning to us all. Yesterday we celebrated Independence Day. Throughout the length and breadth of this country people put aside their work, groups assembled, bands played, and small boys experimented with explosives. In the evening the eyes of young and old turned upward intent on the path of the rockets, and we captured for a moment the wondrous beauty of the fiery gold in the deepening twilight. The commemoration of the signing of the historic document that is our charter of liberty may well be the occasion for us to pause, take stock of ourselves, and call to mind the stalwart statesmen, brave men and true, that gave us this Nation. Are we worthy of them? Are we alert to our country's needs? Are we ready and willing to do our duty as Americans? Can it be said that we too are patriots?

Later in the month will come to another nation an anniversary that recalls to the world the fall of the Bastille, and has symbolized to millions of French people the spirit of a great republic. It was my privilege to be in Paris 9 years ago this month, and to stand with other veterans of the World War on the terrace overlooking the Place de la Concorde as a great army passed in review. First came the garrison of Paris in their uniforms of horizon blue, then the colonial troops from the far corners of a vast empire, then a pause—and soldiers equipped with the uniforms and accoutrements of the armies of the past moved slowly into the great square to the solemn strains of the ancient music of the march of Maréchal de Saxe—men representing those who fought the wars of a bygone day, like ghosts from another battlefield. The tragic retreat from Moscow—the victory at Yorktown—the military history of a valiant nation was re-enacted for us. And now, less than a decade from that day, that nation is prostrate, her army defeated, her navy destroyed, her people bowed in shame as they feed the heel of the conqueror. Men who only a few months ago harvested their crops, milked their cows, and enjoyed a simple supper after a hard day's work, as their children played, and laughed, and sang, are now lying dead beneath the sod of the battlefield.

Events have moved so swiftly that we find it hard to believe the news we hear over the air or read in our newspapers. But there has been no fiction. It is no dream. We cannot wake up tomorrow morning and find the same pleasant world that was. We are confronted with a new world that is mad, a world that is in imminent danger of domination by those who, crazed with the lust for power, and drunk with conquest, are determined to destroy all who stand in their way. Although we are 3,000 miles from Europe, we cannot through our isolation achieve any immunity from the deadly contagion that is abroad. We cannot run away and hide. We must face the future, and face it bravely. Whatever the outcome of the war across the water this country is bound to be affected by it, and we must make up our minds that it will be a long time before we "being defended from the fear of our enemies may pass our time in rest and quietness."

This part of Connecticut is rich in its traditions. Its hardy pioneers came from good stock in the old country, and they wrought well in the new. Undaunted and unafraid, they fought the battles of their day. The name of Israel Putnam is known from coast to coast, and the dying words of our soldier martyr, Nathan Hale, ring out through the ages their message of patriotism.

Perhaps it is because we, in these hills of Windham County, have held firm to the old traditions that I do not fear for our men and women of today and tomorrow. Here we meet on a common level, discuss our problems in town meeting, work hard, worship God, and hold fast to the things that count.

It is not so elsewhere. The ancient landmarks are no longer cherished. Young people dash madly about at excessive speed in an unworthy attempt to imitate the night life of great cities. They ape the affectations of the moving pictures, and, though physically soft, through contact, though perhaps vicarious, with crime they have become spiritually hardened. They are disdainful of their fathers' way, and unless they get some sense knocked into their heads they will not make good citizens and will never know the essence of patriotism. There is little room for the finer things of life where the mean, the cheap, and the gaudy abound.

Patriotism is the spiritual thing that is symbolized by the Fourth of July. It is a quality that is deep down in the hearts of Americans and, once awakened, it permeates our every thought and deed. It is that intense love of country that admits of no compromise. There can be no "Munich" to an American. We are a people slow to anger but mighty in our wrath.

We are a peaceloving people. We do not want war. We don't hold with war as an instrument of national policy. We don't like being regulated. We don't want to be drilled. We are independent. We like to do things our own way, make our own decisions, settle our own troubles. We hate all forms of that regimentation that is part and parcel of totalitarianism, but for that very reason we will submit to authority when we know that by that submission we shall insure our permanent freedom.

This Nation has reached a point in its history when it must arm to the teeth. Its citizens would prefer not to do it, but, confronted with a war-torn world where might rather than right seems to rule, the American people are determined to meet force with force if necessary. Our national-defense program is stupendous. It calls for billions of dollars for warships, war planes, and war training. It brings with it new and heavy taxes. It very likely will make mandatory restrictions on those luxuries that we have come to consider as necessities. It may possibly mean that our present military system will need to be materially changed. This whole program must be considered by the Congress on its merits, and no partisanship or thought of political gain should influence anyone in his attitude. I respect my colleagues in Congress, and I can assure you that mighty few of them will play politics at your expense. However we may differ about domestic issues, we are one where the safety and security of the Nation is at stake.

You have heard much in the last few months of the sinister activities of certain alien groups in this country, and the remarkable work of the Dies committee—has done much to focus public attention on this problem of a "fifth column." We have seen what happened in Norway and Holland. We are determined to permit no enemy agents to undermine the morale of our people or defeat us from within. May I, however, utter a word of caution in this connection? There are many foreigners in this country. They came here for many different reasons. Some of them can't understand our language and are baffled by our customs. They are our guests, and we should treat them with all courtesy. If we have any reason to suspect that any individual is up to mischief, we should report him promptly to the proper authority, but we should be careful to bridle our tongues and refrain from idle gossip. Undoubtedly there are men who must be dealt with severely to protect the country at this crucial time, but there are also thousands of innocent people who have sought the protection of our flag, who are eager to learn more of our way of life, and who should be reassured of our desire to help them. With the rare exception of those who have American Indian blood, we are all newcomers in this land. Our fathers crossed the seas to help build a new and better civilization, and as we see the older culture of Europe and

the east destroyed we must mark well our own situation. The sacred principles that were enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and the liberties guaranteed under the Constitution must be preserved at all costs; and though they be assailed from within and without, they must ever stand.

When our thoughts dwell on patriotism we are apt to picture the gallant soldier in the heat of battle. We should remember that true patriotism is a peacetime virtue as well. The man who tills the soil, the woman who makes a home a better place, the teacher who gives freely of the accumulated wisdom of the ages, the worker who watches a great machine amidst the noise and clatter of the factory, the doctor in his daily battle with death and disease, and the minister of God in his endeavor to start us right and keep us straight as we make our perilous progress through life—all are patriots.

And we must remember, too, those many men to whom we have entrusted our Government. In every community there are men who have been chosen to handle the common business of their fellow Americans. They serve on the board of selectmen, the school board, the board of assessors, or the city council. They represent their constituencies in the legislature. They may even have the high honor and tremendous responsibility that goes with membership in the greatest legislative assembly in the world. We must remember always that these men are those whom we have chosen, and that they are trying hard to do their best for town, State, and Nation. They, too, are patriots.

True devotion to our country means that her welfare is our own. In the past few years many people have come to look upon their Government with greedy eyes. They seem to assume that because they live within its territorial limits they are entitled to a blank check on its treasury. I want to make it quite plain that I am not talking politics, but patriotism. I am referring to those who seek special privileges, immunities, or benefits, who are intent on getting rather than giving, who have forgotten the lesson of Nathan Hale.

While we may question certain policies of our Government, and it is healthy that we should do so, we must never forget that in time of national need our love for America must supersede all else. We must not think of what we may get, or what we may suffer, we must not hesitate. We must demand of ourselves unstinted devotion. We must keep ever in mind as our watchword the inspiring toast of Commodore Decatur:

"Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right, but 'our country' right or wrong."

Tomorrow's World No Matter Who Wins This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE UMATILLA COUNTY (OREG.) RECORD

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Umatilla County (Oreg.) Record for June 27, 1940:

[From the Umatilla County (Oreg.) Record of June 27, 1940]

TOMORROW'S WORLD NO MATTER WHO WINS THIS WAR

The surrender of Paris, which was followed almost at once by the collapse of French military resistance, was more than a disaster for the French Republic, more than a great victory for Hitler's incredible war machine. It was a symbol of the cataclysmic changes that are taking place at a bewildering speed in the world we live in. For Paris, with London, has long been associated in men's minds with freedom—with all that democracy means. And democracy is what Hitler, as he said and wrote time and again, is out to destroy. Paris is—or used to be—a living example of all that nazi-ism abhors.

Little by little we are coming to realize that this is not a war in the traditional sense. It is, instead, a revolution with the most far-reaching purposes imaginable. There have always been victors and vanquished in war. But, once the peace treaties were drawn, the world went on much as it did before. The victorious powers did not attempt to force a government, a philosophy of life of their own choosing, on the conquered. Few are able to believe that if Hitler wins he will be satisfied with such rewards as financial reparations, the restoration of the pre-war German colonies and similar material gains. For Hitler, as Mein Kampf vividly indicates, is consumed by two ambitions. One is to make the German race master of all Europe and perhaps, in the fullness of time, the world. The other is to destroy the capitalistic system, liberalism in government, and the democratic process.

We have many an object lesson in the countries he has so far taken. In every instance, freedom of press and speech and all rights of protest have been abrogated 100 percent. While the forms of local government are permitted to exist, all important decisions and policies are made in Berlin. Revolt of any kind against Nazi orders is punished with the utmost severity, and racial minorities, especially the Jews, are ruthlessly oppressed.

Men who have had contact with high German circles have lately been describing what they believe a Hitler victory would mean to Europe, and to the balance of the world. They say that the Fuehrer envisions a Germanic Europe in which only the German, the master race, would be permitted to bear arms. A European customs union, completely German controlled, would be established. The smaller nations would disappear, or would exist as mere geographical entities, without power or real meaning. All currencies would be dominated by Germany, and Germany would establish the terms on which trade between peoples could be carried on. The gold standard, of course, would cease to exist. It would be replaced by some sort of a barter system. The superior peoples of Europe—the British, the French, the Scandinavians, etc.—would command a high standard of living, while the inferior peoples, such as the Slavs, would be much in the position of slaves, performing the hard labor and receiving in return just enough food and clothing and lodging and medical attention to keep them alive and able to work.

So far as this hemisphere is concerned, there are two theories. One is that, after Hitler had consolidated Europe, he would attack the Americas with military force. The other is that he has no such plans—which is what he said in his recent interview with an American news correspondent. The second theory has many authoritative adherents. Hitler, they say, feels that the Americas would have to come to terms with him whether they wished to or not, in order to dispose of their surplus commodities and manufactures abroad. The Americas, he reasons, must have foreign trade—and that necessity would drive them to join in whatever system of commerce he establishes. Our gold—and at the moment we have some 60 percent of all the world's monetary gold—would be useful only for filling teeth and manufacturing jewelry.

One note of optimism is occasionally sounded. Even if Hitler wins an overwhelming victory in Europe, some hopefuls say, he will not be able to put his plans into effect. This is based on the fact that all the empires won by conquest in the past have invariably collapsed sooner or later of their own weight. Conquered peoples are not cooperative—a tremendous part of the conqueror's energies and resources and manpower must be given to policing them. And, in time, the conqueror grows rich and soft.

So much for speculation. This seems sure—tomorrow's world no matter who wins this war, will be a vastly different place than the world of today. There will, say the authorities, be famines, depressions, constant social and economic upheavals. The future for all nations is far from bright.

Congress Should Remain in Session During Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1940

RESOLUTION OF FACULTY OF OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

It was moved, seconded, and voted that we, the undersigned members of the faculty of Ohio Wesleyan University, believe that Congress should remain in session during the present emergency and that we communicate this opinion to our Congressmen.

Although deprecating the need of military preparation, we wish to express it as our conviction that, in view of the international situation, nothing short of an adequate-defense program should be developed. Immediate action must be employed in developing this program and we pledge our cooperation to such a program.

Furthermore, recognizing the desperate situation of men and women of high idealism in Europe, as well as the plight of children who must escape persecution, and remembering our tradition as the home of all lovers of freedom, we do hereby petition our Government to offer refuge to such persons through the temporary readjustment of our immigration legislation.

We believe that this present struggle involves an attack upon the ideal of democracy to which this country has been deeply committed, and we therefore reaffirm our faith in the democratic way of life. We recognize that democracy involves both obligations and rights, and that in such a time as this we must not make thoughtless statements which will weaken our stand, but we also remember that involved in democracy is a genuine respect for the conviction of many Americans with whom we may not agree.

In time of national crisis there is grave danger of public hysteria. The state of public opinion is already showing serious symptoms of this. It would be unrealistic and naive to deny the existence of danger from spies and disloyal persons in our midst. But the very

fact that this is widely recognized is itself contributing to increase the present state of emotionalism in our own country. This has led to a second danger—the danger of abuse of sincere persons whose opinions vary perceptibly from the pattern of the community. It is possible that this abuse may reach such proportions as to imperil those values on which democracy itself rests. If so, our reaction to a real danger to our institutions will have produced a second and different danger which likewise threatens them. Enemies of democracy must not be confused with sincere believers in our institutions who merely differ on the policies these institutions should adopt. Differences do not indicate disloyalty, and the sooner this fact gains general acceptance the sooner shall we regain our stability of judgment and be able to proceed once more to meet the many genuine dangers that are ahead.

Herbert J. Burgstahler, Allen C. Conger, Abbie Probasco, J. Allen Hynek, Mary Helen Fretts, Edward L. Rice, Benjamin T. Spencer, L. E. Wiley, Roy G. Bossert, Natalie Shepard, Hastings Eells, Gilbert Barnes, Herrick T. Bawden, Rexford Keller, Bertha Titsworth, Ernest F. Amy, W. Roy Diem, Deckard Ritter, Pearl Lloyd, George H. Hand, Harold J. Sheridan, Laura G. Wagner, Dwight A. Woodbury, George W. Hollister, Chadbourne Dunham, N. T Bobrovnikoff, H. C. Hubbart, Harry E. Wood, Paul Huser, Benjamin DeGraff, R. C. Hunter, Sallie Humphreys.

Wendell Willkie's Position on Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have presented to us a remarkable situation and one which may be considered very significant for the United States of America in view of the developments abroad which are resulting inevitably in an overturning of all the economies as we have been accustomed to them in the past.

The Republican Party is fortunate in that its position on the tariff and with regard to foreign trade in general was very ably and clearly set forth by Wendell L. Willkie, its candidate for President, in an article written by him appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of June 22. The views presented in that article by our candidate are especially significant in that they not only accord with the foreign-trade plank of the platform adopted at Philadelphia but those views most effectively disclose the fallacies of the Roosevelt-Hull technique for foreign trade—a technique which has contributed so greatly to our continuing business depression.

It has come almost to be accepted in the public mind that the Republican Party is opposed to reciprocity and foreign trade. This is distinctly not true, because the Republican Party historically has been the party of reciprocity. It is the disagreement by the Republicans with the technique—the modus operandi—of the Roosevelt-Hull philosophy that has brought about the wide disagreement between the two doctrines.

I say that we are presented here with a remarkable and fortunate situation, because Mr. Willkie's views were written more than a month before the opening of the Republican National Convention which nominated him for the high office of Chief Executive of our Nation. His views can be found in the third column on page 75 of the Saturday Evening Post of June 22.

Let us examine these views somewhat in detail:

Mr. Willkie begins his views on foreign trade with the statement that "Foreign policy includes foreign trade. We want to promote our trade with the rest of the world."

Probably everyone in our Nation, Mr. Speaker, agrees with Mr. Willkie's position. Certainly we produce numerous products which we desire to sell abroad and there are many commodities not grown or fabricated in the United States that we need to maintain or to increase our standard of living.

But Mr. Willkie then makes this significant observation,

We have millions of men looking for jobs.

In times such as these, Mr. Speaker, it is obviously our first duty to look out for our own people. In fact, the Republicans believe there is never an hour when it is not our duty to look out for our own people first. We expect the peoples of other nations to look out for themselves first—and they do. There is no reason in philosophy or economics why we should not do likewise. It cannot be denied that the New Deal administration has been all too careless in opening the doors of our great, rich market to a flood of cheap competitive goods from abroad.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, to apply to this situation is some of the skillful Yankee horse trading of which Wendell Willkie has proved himself past master in the exchange of commodities with other nations. And that is exactly the plan Mr. Willkie discusses in his Saturday Evening Post article.

We have vast quantities of agricultural and industrial products looking for a market.

He says—

We can help the farmer as well as the worker by promoting our trade with other countries.

International trade agreements should be helpful to this objective. In a world where tariffs are so high as to prevent the exchange of goods, and in a world where some tariffs are obviously necessary to protect different wages and price levels, the reciprocal-trade treaty is simply a means whereby two nations sit at a table and say:

"We will agree to reduce the tariff on this product, which does not compete particularly with us, if you will agree to reduce the tariff on our products, which do not compete particularly with you."

Now, please note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Willkie says in his article "two nations." His philosophy is sound. His philosophy is the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln. His philosophy is the philosophy of William McKinley. His philosophy is the philosophy of the Republican Party today. "The reciprocal-trade treaty is simply a means whereby two nations sit at a table and say that they will agree to reduce tariff on the products of each which are not competitive with the other," says Mr. Willkie. This is a realistic approach. Mr. Willkie's feet are on the sound earth when he discusses trade treaties in this fashion, just as his feet were on the sound earth when he was sweating on the wheat farms of Kansas and among the fruit trees of California orchards. We do not find here any of this Roosevelt-Hull most favored-nation sell-out which has resulted merely in giving away, broadcast, the advantages of our home market to producers in other lands in the very hour when they were not only giving us nothing in return but when many, if not most of them, actually were discriminating against us. I say we find none of this give-away attitude in Wendell Willkie's philosophy of foreign trade. Instead, he believes in direct action and in the capacity of America to get things done. In fact, he says as much in the next paragraph of his article, which I quote:

Americans have demonstrated that they are as good businessmen as the people in other countries. They can bargain efficiently in their domestic trade, and they can bargain with equal efficiency in their foreign trade. We had a foreign market worth billions of dollars to us once. To be exact, it was worth $5,240,000,000 in 1929—enough to provide thousands of jobs which the unemployed are now looking for. We may never get all of this trade back, but we certainly can get part of it back. Trade treaties are a step in that direction.

I said a while ago, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Willkie's views on tariff and foreign trade were exactly in line with those of Abraham Lincoln and William McKinley. Let me quote a line or two from Lincoln:

I was an old Henry Clay-Tariff Whig. In the old days I made more speeches on that subject than any other.

I have not since changed my views. I believe yet, if we could have a moderate, carefully adjusted, protective tariff, so far acquiesced in as not to be a perpetual subject of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties, it would be better for us.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, how closely Mr. Willkie's views on reciprocal trade agree with those laid down by President William McKinley, our greatest exponent of such agreements. In his first inaugural address President McKinley said:

The end in view is always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people but tend rather to increase their employment.

Mr. Willkie's position is of course in line with the foreign-trade plank adopted last month by the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia. That plank is short, and I will quote it:

We are threatened by unfair competition in world markets and by the invasion of our home market, especially by the products of State-controlled foreign economies.

We believe in tariff protection for agriculture, labor, and industry as essential to our American standard of living. The measure of the protection shall be determined by a scientific method with due regard to the interest of the consumer.

We shall explore every possibility of reopening the channels of international trade through negotiation so conducted as to produce genuine reciprocity and expand our markets.

We condemn the manner in which the so-called reciprocal trade agreements of the New Deal have been put into effect without adequate hearings, with undue haste, without proper consideration of our domestic producers and without congressional approval. These defects we shall correct.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, but what America will be heartened and infused with new courage when the people consider that next November, when our country shall have registered its approval of the tariff views expressed by Wendell Willkie and in our platform, the United States will be in position to start the return trip to our traditional prosperity and security.

By the Purge, New Deal and the Communists Attempting Defeat of O'Connor and McNaboe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, many recall how, over a period of time, the President received the aid and support of Browder, Communist candidate for President, and his organization. Some have not forgotten the President's opposition to the Dies committee investigation nor how he characterized their proceedings as "sordid."

In the last campaign, the President came to the aid of the Communists in New York and, with their aid, succeeded in defeating a distinguished and valuable Democratic Member of Congress, John O'Connor. O'Connor occupied a high position in Congress. He was chairman of the Committee on Rules. He was honored, respected, and admired by all Members of Congress, regardless of party.

We remember, too, that when certain Communists or Communist sympathizers were called before the Dies committee, Mrs. Roosevelt attended the hearings with them and so gave them encouragement. Nor have we forgotten that she entertained them at her home in Hyde Park and, although she was the First Lady of the Land and the people have a right to have her respect that position, she told us that her entertainment of the Communists was her private affair.

We realize, too, that on many occasions she has, by her presence and her words, given the Communist organization, which teaches the overthrow of our Government by force and adopts a doctrine that there is no God, that religion is a fraud, encouragement and aid.

But, apparently, Franklin Delano Roosevelt has not ceased in his efforts to stab fellow Democrats in the back. Note this editorial from the New York Journal-American of June 28, 1940:

A PERIL TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

When George Washington was President of the United States an attempt was made in Maryland to use his name and prestige to influence a congressional election.

General Washington would not countenance the effort.

Instead, that pure-minded patriot indited an indignant rebuke, affirming the democratic principle that the people should choose their own legislative representatives, without any kind of Executive interference.

New York City can bear witness that the principle which President Washington asserted nearly a century and a half ago is banefully disregarded nowadays.

Such a thing occurred here in the Sixteenth Congressional District when the New Deal—with the help of the Communists—succeeded in purging Representative John O'Connor out of Congress because he had opposed two New Deal measures which he deemed to be inimical to representative and responsive government.

That foray from Washington into New York deprived this entire State of its most influential Congressman, for Representative O'Connor was at the time, by virtue of seniority, chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee.

An even more flagrant invasion of State's rights, of State sovereignty, and of the people's suffrage has now been disclosed within the same congressional district, where the New Deal—in alliance with Tammany Hall—is said to have undertaken to prevent the reelection of John J. McNaboe in the sixteenth State senatorial district.

In Mr. O'Connor's case, the New Deal told the voters whom the New Deal wanted them to send to Congress.

In Mr. McNaboe's, the New Deal is attempting to tell the voters whom the New Deal wants them to send to their State legislature.

As in Mr. O'Connor's case, the New Deal and Tammany will have the hearty aid of the Communists, since Senator McNaboe was among the pioneers in exposing communism as a poisonous corrosive of Americanism.

The Democratic New Deal wants Senator McNaboe's political scalp, however, because he exercised, as a legislator, his democratic right of upholding the no-third-term tradition.

This is extraordinary, because Senator McNaboe—like Mr. O'Connor—is himself a Democrat, and Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party, was—with George Washington—the actual author of the no-third-term tradition.

The voters in the Sixteenth District should think this situation over.

They should realize that whom they want to represent them in their State legislature is certainly none of the New Deal's business, and is certainly their business very much more than it is Tammany Hall's.

In sum, if the voters want John J. McNaboe to continue to represent them at Albany, they have both the right and the power to keep him there.

And let them remember that State and local government will be inevitably weakened, and eventually destroyed, if Federal administrations can use the overwhelming weight of Federal patronage to dominate State and local elections.

Who is Franklin D. Roosevelt that he should characterize the action of anyone as a stab in the back, as he charged was the recent action of Italy? From the beginning of his administration down to the present moment, the President has himself been stabbing in the back, not only his political friends, but our form of Government.

According to this recent editorial, the President is not satisfied in his efforts to defeat prominent Democrats, who might share the honors of his party, but he joins with the Communists in an effort to keep good Democrats who happen to disagree with him, who believe in constitutional government, from serving in a State legislature and in Congress.

John O'Connor is again a candidate for Congress in the Sixteenth New York District, which he so ably represented for 16 years. He deserves the support of every true American.

War or Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. VITO MARCANTONIO, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over the Mutual broadcasting network Saturday, June 22, 1940:

Americans today are faced with making the most fundamental and far-reaching decision in the history of our country—war or peace. This sounds simple, for even the worst warmonger will tell you that he is against war. The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to war. Hence, the real "fifth columnists" in our midst, those who are seeking to get us into war, will not at this time dare openly advocate war. Forcing America into war is a step-by-step process. In 1917 we were forced in at trolley-car pace. In 1940 our war makers attempt to force us in with "blitzkrieg" swiftness. If we acquiesce to these swift movements which are pushing

the American people in the direction of war, we shall find ourselves plunged over the precipice into war by the momentum and speed of these very steps toward war. Therefore, unless the American people halt these movements and steps toward war at the very beginning we shall have no say over the final decision as to our actual entry into war.

At this point let me say, that there is no moral, economic, or social justification for our entry into the war in Europe. It is an imperialist war. While there may be a difference between the contending imperialist powers, that difference is one of degree and the degree is not big enough to warrant the loss of one American life. Our entry into it will bring no gain to the American people but only the loss of the lives of American youth and of our free institutions. The problems that will arise from a victorious Hitler cannot be solved by the grinding of the flower of American manhood on the battlefield.

If this war were a war of ideologies, if it were truly a war on which the outcome of our American way of living depended, if it were truly a war in which the interests of the American farmer, worker, the small-business man were involved, I would unhesitatingly advocate our immediate entry into it, resign my position in Congress, and march with the young men of my district. I am not a pacifist, I am willing to fight for the defense of my country, and in any war in which the interests of our American people are involved. The present war is no such war, and I am therefore resolved not only to oppose our entry into it, but to warn my fellow countrymen against that scheme of things which will make our entry unavoidable.

Let me therefore present in their true character the steps that we have been taking which are hurling us into this war. On May 16, the President addressed a joint session of Congress. We received a geography lesson from Tampico to St. Louis. Tremendous armaments were requested. An onslaught was launched simultaneously against the liberties of the American people. In the name of national defense, we were set forth on a program of preparedness, not for defense of our shores but for participation in this war. In the name of national defense, and under the guise of combating "fifth columnists," we became at once engaged in the hounding and persecuting of all those who dared raise their voices for peace. Since that day those who demanded peace were labeled "fifth columnists" and Trojan horses. The voices of the genuine antiwar forces in America had to be stifled, even though it meant the tearing up of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. I characterized that address as tragically reminiscent of 1916 and 1917, a war hysteria "blitzkrieg" on the peace of the American people. Armaments and hysteria became the order of the day. What followed is history and a black page at that. Suppression of minority groups throughout the country, anti-noncitizen legislation in Congress, Congress for the first time in the history of the country legislating against one individual and passing a bill of attainder and banishment, depriving labor of its economic and social rights by the ripping up of labor's Magna Carta, the National Labor Relations law and a hue and cry raised by reactionary forces throughout America that the social and economic gains of the American people be destroyed. All in the name of national defense defined for us on May 16.

Then came the legislation for armaments. By the time we recess tonight we shall have by authorization and appropriation taken over $10,000,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States for war purposes, and at the same time, we have refused to grant the unemployed of this country more than $975,650,000 for W. P. A. workers. W. P. A. workers are being dismissed all over the country. With over 11,000,000 unemployed, and it being admitted that the armaments program will not make any dent in the number of unemployed, the program for America becomes uniforms, not overalls. I have cast the sole vote against this war-armaments program. I am ready to vote not $10,000,000,000 but $100,000,000,000 for the defense of our shores and our homes. I, however, refuse to vote one cent for an armament program which has become a vehicle for involvement and intervention in the war, for the destruction of the antiwar ideologies which have been built up over the last 23 years, for the abolition of our freedom and for the repeal of the progress that America has made during the last 7 years. Time and events since I registered my sole protest in Congress against this program have demonstrated, I submit, the correctness of my contention.

Witness the pledge at Charlottesville, of full aid short of war to the Allies. Aid short of war only shortens the distance between the peace of the American people and war. A neutral nation cannot remain out of war for long when it permits itself to become a military reservoir for one side of the belligerents.

Witness the turning over of the best dive bombers to the Allies, the attempt to turn over the mosquito fleet to them, and the turning over of the so-called obsolete firearms and munitions. These warlike steps are conducive to war and not peace for America.

At the beginning of this week Americans learned of the shocking proposal of universal compulsory training. According to the United Press, it is contemplated to conscript boys and girls of this country for a period of 1 year to train them for combat service, for duties in uniforms behind fighting lines, such as communication technicians and air-field mechanics, nonuniform technical training for work in industrial production units necessary for the support of a fighting army, and for conservation units trained to conserve natural resources of the Nation in time of war to prevent waste caused by plowing up the prairies or denuding of the forests. There is no difference between this plan and that of the forced military and labor camps of Nazi Germany. It is a page lifted out of the philosophy of Mein Kampf.

I seriously question the constitutionality of this plan. We are not at war. We are still at peace. It definitely constitutes the deprivation of the liberties of the American youth without due process of law.

If Congress were to accept this plan it would bar young people from the opportunity to secure training for permanent peacetime jobs; it would undermine trade-union standards by creating a reservoir of forced labor, thus reducing the American standard of living; it would destroy the vitality and initiative of free young people; and it would create a totalitarian domination over the bodies, minds, and lives of American youth.

Don't you see how this brings war right into your homes? We take the young men and the young women of this country from their homes and we place them in forced military and labor camps. This is the first step. The next step is to throw them into war. It was the first step that Hitler took against the youth in Germany. It is the first step that we take against the youth of America. The second step is war and the third step is death. I implore you to write to your Congressmen and Senators. They are your servants. Talk to your neighbors. Ask them to do the same. Exercise your rights as free Americans. Register your protest with your representatives against the Hitlerizing of American youth.

We are told that all this is necessary in order to preserve our American way of life. How much of that American life will be left to preserve and defend if we permit this "blitzkrieg" against the peace, freedom, and youth of America to succeed?

Remember you cannot preserve American democracy by destroying it, by curtailing it, or by limiting it. American democracy can live only by letting it live. War will destroy completely our American democracy. Forcing our youth into totalitarian existence under the pretext of training destroys most effectively our American way of living as we have known it.

The President once told us that this generation has a rendezvous with destiny. The youth of this generation have a rendezvous with destiny; not a destiny of the forced labor and military camps, not a destiny of unemployment, not a destiny of war and death. Let us resolve to formulate the destiny of our youth to be a destiny of peace, a destiny of jobs, a destiny of security, a destiny of happiness, and a destiny of freedom.

Narragansett Bay Cruise

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on a recent week end in the company of our colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. SANDAGER], we were privileged to enjoy an outing as the guests of a distinguished company of Rhode Island citizens associated together for fraternal and social purposes under the name of the Seaweed Club of Providence, Rhode Island. The event was the annual cruise of the members from Providence down Narragansett Bay and out into the Atlantic Ocean to Block Island.

To those who may not have had the privilege of enjoying such a cruise, and especially under such distinguished auspices, may I state that should the occasion present itself do not fail to accept the opportunity for a most joyous, pleasant, and instructive week-end. The trip from Providence down Narragansett Bay is like turning the pages of history, and events continuously reveal themselves as the boat passes one point of interest after another down the whole length of this famous body of water. Members of Congress should be especially interested because of the large proprietary interest of the Government in the upbuilding and maintenance of all manner of naval bases and equipment.

The trip from the mainland to Block Island offers a short ocean voyage that is particularly attractive. Here the ocean is dotted with fishing boats of all kinds, engaged in the business or sport of battling with the mighty tuna and the elusive swordfish. Game fishing of all kinds abounds at this spot. A choice of two splendid harbors on Block Island is offered as a safe haven for all types of seagoing water craft. In a very short space of time, on the water or in the air, one is removed from the hustle and bustle of modern civilization to a spot thoroughly American but offering a haven of refuge, of peace and quiet from the vicissitudes of ordinary American life on the mainland.

The island itself, being about 4 by 9 miles in size, has a very historic background; and while the record of the birth of the inhabitants of the island can be ascertained, there are no records available as to when or just how this island was created. It is enough to say, however, that records do disclose that it was noted by early explorers in the fifteenth century and that prior to 1636 it was inhabited by Indians. Some time thereafter the authorities of Massachusetts sent one Captain Endicott with a well-armed force onto this island for the purpose of exacting reparation from the Indians on account of the alleged killing of a Bay Colony man who had wandered onto the Indians' ground. It is recorded that the leader of this expedition and three others, in recognition of their meritorious services in dispatching practically the entire Indian population of the island, received it as a grant, and thereafter, in about the year 1661, it was sold to a group of settlers whose names now appear upon a memorial stone placed on the island in the month of September 1911 to commemorate the landing of the first citizens thereon. With their families, they numbered about 75. They were a sturdy lot and worked hard.

The island was heavily wooded, except where the Indians had grown crops. Much of the timber was scrub oak but here and there were clumps of beautiful trees. Deeming the island best suited for agriculture, most of the trees were cut down, and the scenic beauty produced by the forest gave way to fields of potatoes, corn, oats, and other crops. For many years the island supported these original settlers and their descendants and it became an exporter of dairy and agricultural products as well as fish. The island supported thousands of sheep, and exports of wool provided a considerable means of income for the residents there. For years these hearty people maintained themselves and developed churches, schools, and community life and produced a strain of real Americans that have survived right down to the present day. The island is traversed by good roads and the incessant toil of its people can be noted in the hundreds of miles of stone fences which have been built from rock taken out of the soil to make the boundaries of land ownership. For years the fishing industry of the island was one of note and many fishermen have been developed whose skill in fighting the elements of the sea is legendary along that part of the Atlantic seaboard.

As the years passed the attractiveness of the island as a resort impelled the construction of summer hotels and for many years the islanders have profited as a result of the steady stream of tourists who have come there to enjoy the wonderful climate, the splendid ocean beaches, the marvelous sport of fishing and boating, and, above all, the gracious and generous hospitality of the island citizens.

To meet a real Block Islander is to meet a God-fearing gentleman whose courage and hospitality know no bounds. It is not strange, therefore, that the "Seaweed Club of Rhode Island" first referred to should have placed in its constitution a provision that membership in the organization should accrue only as the result of initiation into the order conducted at Block Island.

Mingling with the people of Rhode Island and the citizens of Block Island, I am reassured in the faith that the spirit of the pioneers still lives and that truth and honor and decency and fear of God are to be found among these people as a mighty bulwark against any effort to destroy this Nation either from within or without.

The National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is such a provoking and challenging editorial and has caused so many letters and telegrams to come to me from my own district that I challenge you to help me answer this editorial to my people. I think it is worth reading.

In a fog of red tape the Army and the Navy block immediate defense.

Will you kindly reply in some way in order that I may make my people feel more comfortable?

IN A FOG OF RED TAPE THE ARMY AND NAVY BLOCK IMMEDIATE DEFENSE

We in this country are facing disaster, not economic, but military—a direct attack from Hitler in the event of Great Britain's defeat—and we are doing nothing about it—now.

Billions of dollars are being appropriated, vast armaments provided for. Plans for the Army and Navy stagger the imagination by their scope for the future. But immediate steps to ward off the immediate pressing danger of a Hitler attack are next to zero.

Unbelievable as it sounds, the reason we are doing next to nothing now to meet the immediate defense needs is the Army and the Navy.

Although there is hardly a modern plane in the United States Army today, few, if any, have been ordered since the invasion of the Netherlands and Belgium, since the President's demand for 50,000 airplanes.

This is not because of a shortage of machine tools, vital materials, or parts, nor because of a shortage of capacity in our plants.

The airplane industry today in the United States has a present capacity of military planes of 1,000 per month.

At present manufacture is but 500 a month, mostly for the Allies.

Responsibility for this delay in production lies at the door of the Army and Navy whose "indecision, lack of standardization, insistence on odd sizes, on specifications which do not fit the equipment of industry" have made mass production, or any other kind of production, impossible so far.

In 1 plane factory the Army a year ago ordered approximately 1,000 planes of a type then and now unequaled, but not 1 plane has been produced because it was impossible to satisfy fantastic Army inspection and production requirements. Nor has this anything to do with that other and controversial problem of whether standards should be lowered to permit rapid and sudden mass production, which accounts for the stupendous pace of Hitler's plane supremacy.

The 500 or more military plane-production facilities now available in the United States and unused cover present high-standard precision planes.

But the Army and the Navy cannot make up their minds.

They tie with red tape the hands of hundreds and thousands of loyal and capable workers and officials of the American aircraft industry. These are bewildered to see the crisis at hand and their important tools of defense production unused.

The situation is as bad, or worse, in the fields of tanks, antiaircraft guns, machine guns, artillery, and even rifles.

With hands tied by the frozen standards of the Army, it will be 2 years before production will be sufficient to arm the minimum-sized Army needed for defense with the type of rifle that the Army staff is demanding. Other weapons nearly or actually as good can be produced much quicker.

Knee-deep as both Army and Navy are in traditions and technicalities, there is no agreement between them. Each has its own petty opinions about scores of gingerbread items. Even the type of gasoline specified by the Navy is different from that demanded by the Army.

Why this strange blundering? Why this tragic indifference? Why, of all parties, must the Army and the Navy of this country stand in the way of our immediate needs in defense?

The bald truth is that the Army and Navy, like the American people themselves, have a peacetime psychology. Their plans and systems for procurement—and both the Army and Navy would deny this bitterly—were developed in and are adapted to peace, when time is not the all-important factor. Both have prided themselves on the quality of limited equipment, rather than quantity—a few tailor-made units rather than quantity production.

Starved, as the Army and Navy have been in years past, both have learned that there is a feast or a famine under the democratic system. A period of public-defense anxiety to them is an opportunity to get vast, long-delayed appropriations, a chance to fill the sock for a long time to come.

Judging by the orders actually placed for vital planes and "antiblitzkrieg" equipment to defend the country, the Army and Navy take the peril of immediate military attack no more seriously than might a farmer in the quietude of the Missouri Ozarks.

Yet, if the danger of military attack on this country is not immediate, it probably does not exist at all.

The fact is, the plans for that attack already are completed in the Hitler portfolio, as were those for attacking Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and England. We are having our turn now at the same peace propaganda which lulled these nations into a false feeling of security.

This country is the only country in the world capable of successfully resisting Hitler, economically and in a military way. But Hitler does not wait for an enemy to prepare.

If the United States is not attacked by the armed forces of Hitler in a matter of months, it will be due to one of two things—(1) Successful resistance by England; or (2) Axis war with Russia.

The American people are not to blame for the situation in which they find themselves. They are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to defend their liberties and their country.

They are not demanding long-range socialized war planning, nor do they want the scourge of war perfumed with words about the abundant life.

They want the Army and Navy—to whom they have given the task of their defense—to do this job efficiently and in time; and they want those they have chosen to represent them in government to see that this is done.

They will accept no explanations from Army, Navy, or politicians.

Five weeks ago, in a widely published preparedness platform, we called for:

"Shaking up the Army and Navy personnel, and smashing red tape and cumbersome inspection technique, which throttles mass production of planes and other vital war equipment."

Five weeks have gone and this has not been done.

Meanwhile, this country has announced Monroe Doctrine policies that a victorious Hitler will not accept.

Only the President, as head of the Army and Navy, has power to meet this situation.

Will he do so—in time?

BASIL BREWER,
Publisher, the New Bedford Standard-Times, Mercury.

Elimination of the Tax on Brandy Used in Fortifying Wine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK H. BUCK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1940, the President approved H. R. 9117, which thereby became law. This act eliminates the tax on brandy and wine spirits used in the fortification of sweet wine; to compensate for the loss of revenue by the elimination of this tax, the tax on wines containing more than 14 percent of absolute alcohol was increased. The increase runs as follows:

On wines containing more than 14 percent and not exceeding 21 percent of absolute alcohol, an increase from 10 cents to 15 cents per wine-gallon; on wines containing more than 21 percent and not exceeding 24 percent of absolute alcohol, an increase from 20 cents to 25 cents per wine-gallon; all wines containing more than 24 percent absolute alcohol by volume are to be classed as heretofore, as distilled spirits, and taxed accordingly.

As the author of the bill, which I introduced on March 27, 1940, and which by order of the Ways and Means Committee I reported favorably to the House on June 5, 1940, it seems appropriate that I should make an explanation of just what is to be accomplished by this Act, and why vintners and grape growers desired its enactment.

The tax on brandy used in fortifying sweet wine which has now been repealed amounted to 10 cents per gallon. One gallon of brandy ordinarily takes care of 3 gallons of sweet wine, so that in fact the old fortification tax, which was in effect a processing tax, amounted to about 3⅓ cents per gallon in addition to the excise taxes which are collected by the Government at the time a finished wine is withdrawn from bonded wineries or storerooms for sale. The Government did not collect this tax at the time of fortification, but gave the producer 18 months in which to pay it. The theory of the extension of credit was to give producers an opportunity to hold the wines for aging through this additional time in which to pay the tax.

In reality, the 18-month credit worked out to the disadvantage of practically everyone concerned. S. W. Harkleroad, president of the Wine Institute of California, made the statement that this fortification tax on brandy had been a disturbing factor in the orderly marketing of wine for years. When it became due, underfinanced producers were forced to dump immature wine on the market to raise money for the Government assessment. In many cases, the wine involved had been sold to other producers. In any event, when time came for the payment of the fortification tax, many producers were without sufficient funds, and the dumping that Mr. Harkleroad referred to took place, forcing soundly financed wineries to meet ruinous prices. As a result, the whole industry suffered. The effects of this demoralization were often reflected directly in the prices received by growers for their grapes.

The Treasury Department had no love for this particular tax. Department officials testified that at the time of the passage of this act, delinquent fortification taxes amounted to $3,500,000. There are 29 suits pending against various wineries for delinquent taxes. While there will probably not be any actual loss of taxes to the Government, because it is protected by bonds, the process of collection was costing the Government a considerable sum and extensive effort every year. The consumer likewise suffered from the dumping which I have referred to, of improperly aged wines on the market.

The present act, at the new tax rates, will actually produce to the Government additional revenue annually, besides eliminating the costly collection procedure. This new combined tax will be paid as usual when wine is withdrawn from bonded wineries or storerooms for sale to the consumer.

I should note that the new rates referred to above, of 15 cents and 25 cents per wine-gallon, respectively, are permanent basic rates. To these, as to all other taxes on wines, the recently enacted Revenue Act of 1940 added a special defense tax of 20 percent, so that the rates now payable on withdrawal of sweet wines for sale are, respectively, 18 cents for wine containing 14 percent to 21 percent of alcohol, and 30 cents per gallon for wine from 21 percent to 24 percent alcoholic content.

Appropriate provision is made in the act for the filing with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of a claim by the proprietor of any bonded winery or storeroom in which there was stored, on June 30, 1940, wine previously lawfully fortified with brandy for wine spirits. The Commissioner is authorized to issue to such proprietor documents entitling him to a credit of 5 cents per gallon in respect of each gallon of such fortified wine as the Commissioner shall find was on such proprietor's bonded winery or bonded storeroom premises on June 30, 1940, or in transit thereto. These claims must be filed on or before October 1, 1940.

Long conferences between representatives of the Wine Institute of California, of the Alcoholic Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the Treasury Department, in which I was happy to participate, preceded my introduction of the bill. Technical difficulties had thus been overcome and the Treasury Department offered no objection to the enactment of the law.

This has been a splendid example of cooperation between industry representatives and the Government, which we should have more of. I am personally very happy to have been of some service in connection with the enactment of this law. I sincerely hope that its application will bring about all the beneficial results that its proponents anticipate.

Congress Will Not Adjourn in a Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK H. BUCK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, a goodly number of my constituents have written me urging that Congress forego the usual adjournment that ordinarily comes about this time of year. It is their belief that since admittedly there is a world crisis, changing in its aspects almost from hour to hour, that the country needs Congress here to take such steps as may be

appropriate from time to time to protect our own national interests.

Some of the writers have felt that Congress could be stampeded into adjournment now. Let me set at rest that idea. Congress, except when called into special session, meets on a fixed date annually, January 3. No fixed date is set for adjournment, however. It requires passage of a concurrent resolution of the House and Senate to set an adjournment date. Therefore, once in session, unless such a concurrent resolution is adopted, Congress will remain in session—subject to constitutional 3-day recesses which either house may take independently of the other—until the beginning of the next regular session.

It is not necessary, consequently, to adopt a resolution to remain in session; it is sufficient to refuse assent to any resolution setting an adjournment date.

True, adjournment appeals to many Members. The Members have put in a long and wearying session and are tired. It is election year for all the Members of the House and for one-third of the Senators. Many, and I am one of those, still have both primary and general elections ahead of them. All realize the desirability of campaigning personally at home in their own districts.

Yet, with a knowledge of that desirability, the great majority in Congress has also become acutely conscious of the greater desirability that Congress remain in Washington. One of our leading political commentators recently expressed the view that when the very existence of parliamentary government is in question throughout the world, and when representative government is being extinguished to be replaced, as apparently it is to be now, even in France, the home of liberty, it is no time for this Congress to leave the scene of its activities. With that view I concur.

At the least adjournment would be subject to misinterpretation, perhaps willful, by the totalitarian powers. But more than that, this is a time for the United States to show the world that its legally elected legislative body can and will function in a time of crisis. Those of us who believe, as most Americans do, in our own processes of government, will be reassured by our remaining here, even though our labors are redoubled and even though we must act when we act with unusual care and watchfulness. Our citizens are entitled to know that their elected representatives are on the job and will remain on the job.

Mr. Speaker, as I have intimated I am definitely against any adjournment now. Even our defense program is not yet complete. Some $5,000,000,000 additional has been requested of Congress by the President only last week. These funds, when authorized and later appropriated, will be used for defense purposes, divided between Army and Navy in approximately the ratio of 3 to 2. Hearings are just starting on this request.

Other matters of primary importance are not only before us now, but may be expected to emerge as our plans proceed. For example, the compulsory military training bill. It will take some time to write a bill along this line that will be fair to the men called for training and yet of value and protection to our Nation as a whole.

Furthermore, these defense appropriations must be financed. The tax bill recently passed will not take care of what has been asked for already or what Congress will grant. Our Ways and Means Committee has promised to take up the subject of an excess-profits tax at the earliest possible date and has already requested the Treasury to have its views ready for presentation promptly. Other serious matters press for consideration.

With all this before us, neither I nor the majority of Congress can do otherwise than vote down an adjournment resolution. Despite the fact that the California primary election is set for August 27 and that I am a candidate for renomination and reelection; despite the fact that if we remain in session it will not be possible for me to go home and contact my constituents for more than a few days, if at all, my vote will be cast to stay on the job and complete the legislation indicated and required in this tragic crisis. The international situation is more vital than politics. As to my own campaign, I rely on the people of the Third California Congressional District who understand the dangers lurking in that situation to carry on for me during my absence at Washington.

The Librarian and the Democratic Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENT E. KELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Library Committee, I want to bring to the attention of the Congress an address made by Dr. Archibald MacLeish, the Librarian of Congress, at the general session of the American Library Association in Cincinnati on May 31, 1940. Entitled "The Librarian and the Democratic Process," this searching inquiry into the problems faced by the librarians of our democracy deserves the attention of all, because the special problems of the librarians are but part of the common burden which the revolutionary developments in Europe have recently placed on all Americans. This address is a splendid statement of what librarians must do if they are to preserve and make effective the social institutions in which they and the great majority of Americans believe.

[From the A. L. A. Bulletin for June 1940]

THE LIBRARIAN AND THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

(By Archibald MacLeish)

It would be a brave man and an optimistic man who would suggest at this hour that the events of the past few weeks and months have been anything but evil. Certainly it would be a very foolish librarian who would suggest that there was any countervailing circumstance to balance the armed successes of obscurantism and brutal force. But there is, I think, one consequence of all this evil which may perhaps be turned to good, and not least by those who keep the libraries of this country. No one can look at Spain, at Austria, at Czechoslovakia, at Poland, at Finland, at Denmark, at Norway, at Holland, at Belgium, and at the situation in Europe of France and Great Britain without asking himself with a new intensity, a new determination to be answered, how our own democracy can be preserved.

And no one can ask with earnestness and intelligence how our own democracy can be preserved without asking at the very outset how his own work, his own activity, can be shaped to that end. Librarians will ask that question of themselves as others will. And asking it, they may perhaps arrive at certain conclusions as to themselves and their relations to the life of the country which will be valuable not only to the country but to themselves as well. Specifically they may perhaps arrive at certain conclusions as to the great question which, in speech and in silence, explicitly and implicitly, has troubled them so long—the question of their profession.

The wholly admirable attempt to put librarianship upon a professional basis, has, as I understand it, met this principal difficulty: That it has proved impossible to arrive at a common agreement as to the social end which librarianship exists to serve. Men are bound together in professions not because they speak in professional vocabularies or share professional secrets or graduate from professional schools. Men are bound together in professions because they devote themselves in common to the performance of a function of such social importance—a function so difficult, so particular, and so essential to the welfare of society—that it requires of necessity a discipline, a technique, and even an ethic of its own. The definition of that function in the case of librarianship has not proved easy. The social function of the medical profession is known to every member of that profession. The social function of the profession of the law was well known to lawyers in the years before the law became a business. But the ablest and most distinguished librarians declare without hesitation that they have not themselves arrived at a statement of the function of librarianship

satisfactory to themselves, nor have their colleagues supplied the lack.

AGREEMENTS HAVE BEEN FRAGMENTARY

The literature of the subject, insofar as I have been able to consult it, would seem to bear them out. Librarians have apparently agreed at one time or another upon a description of their social usefulness, but their agreements have been fragmentary and of such a kind as to increase rather than to resolve the doubts of skeptics. At the time of the founding of this association, for example, librarians seem to have thought of themselves as purveyors of a harmless sort of recreation which would entitle the humbler citizens away from "the street, the saloon, and the low amusement places of the poor." (I quote from an article by Mr. Sidney Ditzion in the Library Quarterly.) Twenty years later this same association published a pamphlet called American Library Association Material for a Public Library Campaign, in which the association gave its blessing to a series of quotations which Mr. Ditzion reprints. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is cited as holding the opinion that the purpose of a library is to "improve" the masses. Mr. Henry E. Legler supplies the view that the purpose of a library is to "furnish the ambitious artisan with an opportunity to rise." Mr. F. A. Hutchins is authority for the proposition that the purpose of a library is to give "wholesome employment to all classes for those idle hours which wreck more lives than any other cause." It is at least doubtful to my mind whether librarians would accept these descriptions of their usefulness today. And if they did, it would be even more doubtful that a professional function would have been defined. To provide harmless recreation in competition with the street and the saloon is not a profession; if it were, Hollywood would be a profession from producers and directors down to ticket takers and ushers in plum-colored regimentals. To give wholesome employment for those idle hours which wreck the young is not a profession. And neither, in any realistic and comprehensible sense, is the "improvement of the masses." There are many things essential to the "improvement of the masses," if we are to permit ourselves that patronizing phrase, which have no professional implications whatsoever.

FORCED TO RECONSIDER OUR LIBRARIANSHIP

Definitions such as these do not, of course, exhaust the field. There are many more besides. But definitions such as these taken together with the contemporary state of mind would seem to establish the fact that no generally accepted or acceptable definition of the function of librarianship has yet been found. It is to this situation that the disasters of the last few months and their effects upon the American mind would seem to have application. For the destruction of democratic governments in Europe forces us as librarians to reconsider our librarianship, not in a vacuum, and not in relation to ourselves, but in relation to a democratic society * * * and, more, in relation to a democratic society which stands in the face of very present dangers.

A newcomer entering the library scene cannot avoid the impression that some at least of those who have undertaken in the past the labor of putting librarianship upon a professional basis began not with the inward function of librarianship but with the outward furniture of professionalism—the professional schools and the professional terms and the professional privileges. The kind of reconsideration which danger now forces upon us is a reconsideration which cuts beneath all this to the essentials of our work and of our lives. Today we ask ourselves not how we can prove that our profession is a profession but what we can do to preserve and make effective the social institutions in which we believe. More briefly, we ask ourselves what we as librarians in a democracy can do. And in the answer to that question, if we can find it, we may also find the solution of the difficulty which has plagued us for many years. "Out of this nettle danger" said a brave man once. Out of this nettle danger we may pluck not only for our country but for our life's work a meaning it has never had before.

IMPLICIT IN THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

The relation of librarianship to the present and impending democratic crisis is not, I think, impossible to describe. On the contrary, it is implicit in the nature of the crisis. What democracy as a way of government and a way of life now faces is the threat of a competing form of government, a competing way of life, which is more immediately efficient than democracy because it sacrifices to efficiency—to commercial efficiency and to military efficiency—every other consideration, whether of individual freedom or of moral loyalty or of human decency—which could in any way detract from efficient military or commercial operation. What democracy as a way of government and a way of life now faces, in other words, is this—the question whether it can survive in competition with a more efficient way of government and a more efficient way of life which achieves its efficiency precisely by suppressing and destroying and eliminating all those human values which democracy was created to achieve.

HOW ARE THE PEOPLE TO BE INFORMED?

Can a form of government and a way of life, in which the basic decisions are made by the people themselves, in the people's interest, and after discussion and reflection, survive in competition with a form of government and a way of life in which the basic decisions are made in secret by a single will? This was the question the President of the United States presented to the Eighth Inter-American Scientific Congress. It is a question the events of the last few days have presented with ever-increasing intensity to all Americans—and not least to those who keep the country's libraries. But to us the question is presented with a particularity and a specific meaning which absorbs all our thought. For the question to us is not the question of public action but the question of public information. If the basic decisions are to continue to be made by the people, and if they are now to be made by the people, not in conditions of peace with margin for error, but in conditions of threat and danger and imminent war with no margin of any kind, how are the people to be informed? How are they to be provided not only with knowledge of the new facts creating the specific issue to be decided, but also with knowledge of the relevant parts of the historical record which constitute the precedents for action? How are they to be provided with defenses against the special pleading—the propagandas—the new propaganda which now impudently tells them, with all the lessons of Europe spread out for them to see, that they need not act, that no one wishes to attack them, that if they will only delay, if they will only remain weak and silent and defenseless, they will be safe; that if they will only wish to keep out of war they can keep out of war—as Norway wished, as Holland wished, as Finland wished? How are they to be provided with the facts of record, the chapters of their own experience, the materials they must have and have quickly and in the most useful form if they are to decide well and decide wisely the issues upon which all the future hangs?

These are the questions which present themselves to us when we consider our lives and our work not in abstract but in relation to the danger in which democracy now stands. For it is we who are the keepers—the proud keepers—of these records of the experience of our people, these precedents for decision. And it is we, if it is anyone, who will devise means and establish ways to make these precedents available to those who need them. What means we will devise, what ways we will establish, it is not for me, the youngest in point of service among you, to attempt to say. I have no doubt the leaders of our profession have long considered this most obvious and most desperately pressing problem and have drafted proposals to submit to you. But of one thing I am sure—that however we answer these urgent, these insistent questions—whatever technical procedures we adopt—the necessity of facing this problem in these terms cannot help but advance our understanding of our work and of ourselves. For no one, I believe, can think of librarianship in the terms of this necessity without a reconsideration of its basic purpose. And no one can think of librarianship in these terms without concluding that the notions of librarianship sometimes held are less than adequate. If librarians accept a responsibility for the survival of democracy insofar as they can assure that survival, if librarians accept a responsibility to make available to the people the precedents for decision and for action in order that the people may govern by them—then librarians cannot satisfy that responsibility merely by delivering books from public libraries as books are called for, nor can they satisfy that responsibility in reference libraries merely by supplying scholars with the materials of scholarship. They must do far more.

They must themselves become active and not passive agents of the democratic process. And they must think of their libraries not as patented machines to deliver to the asker the book he wants, their responsibility and obligation ending when the book is delivered to his hands. They must think of their libraries as organizations of intelligent and well-trained men and women qualified to select from the record in their keeping such materials as are relevant to the decisions the people must make and able to provide those materials to the people in a useful form. They must think of their libraries in other words not as books and catalogs with the men to serve them but as expert men to whom the books and catalogs are tools for the performance of a duty. They must think of their libraries as the director of a legislative reference service thinks of the books he uses, not as the director of a circulation service thinks of books—they must think, that is, as the director of a legislative reference service who serves not Congress only or a legislature, but a people.

That such a service would be as difficult to perform as it is difficult to define we must, of course, admit: democracy is difficult and in no aspect more so than in the provision of information and the preparation for action. But that such a service is impossible of accomplishment we will no more admit than we will admit that democracy is impossible of defense. To subject the record of experience to intelligent control so that all parts of that record shall be somewhere deposited; to bring to the servicing of that record the greatest learning and the most responsible intelligence the country can provide; to make available the relevant parts of that record to those who have need of it at the time they have need of it and in a form responsive to their need—surely these are not difficulties beyond the competence of the men and women who have constructed in this country one of the greatest library systems the world has seen.

There are dangers in such an undertaking. But there are dangers also—even greater dangers—in refusing to attempt it. And the rewards of success are rewards worth seeking. Not only would the cause of democracy, the cause we believe to be the cause of civilization, be served; but it is conceivable that the profession to which we belong might find in the process the definition of its function for which it has sought so long—a function as noble as any men have ever served.

The Fourth of July, the Nation's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able and patriotic speech by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], delivered in his home city, Northfield, Minn., on the Fourth of July.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOURTH OF JULY, THE NATION'S BIRTHDAY

One hundred and sixty-four years ago today the foundation of the United States was laid in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. That was the first political document in the history of the human race, expressing the principle that all men are entitled to a position of equality before the law. It recognized that man is endowed by his Creator with certain inherent rights that the government shall not take away from him. It was the first expression of a publicly accepted political principle—a government is the servant of men and not their master.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FOUNDATION OF CONSTITUTION

This document later became the foundation of the Constitution for the purpose of carrying into effect by law the political principles thus enunciated. This theory of equality before the law had been proclaimed before in the teaching of the lowly Nazarene, who came to a world governed by dictators, and an earthly population composed of 90 percent slaves and about 10 percent freemen. The slave had no standing before the law. The Nazarene brought to this earth the doctrine that all men were children of the same Divine Father, and therefore brothers, and that before the judgment seat of divine law, rich and poor, powerful and weak must stand in judgment on a basis of equality.

This was a very revolutionary doctrine. It threatened the very foundation of existing order and resulted in centuries of war and strife until at last the principle of equality was established, the principle that before the judgment seat of God Almighty all men were equal. That principle having been established, men began to question, "Why not equality before the civil courts of the land?" That led to a struggle to achieve political equality, resulting in more centuries of war, until finally that principle was written into the Declaration of Independence.

FREEDOM PROTECTED BY CONSTITUTION

As I have already noted, the adoption of the Constitution followed later and under its protection, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to peacefully assemble, religious liberty, have been preserved in this land until this day. The United States of America from its birth became the haven of refuge for the oppressed and poverty-stricken peoples of all European races. They came here to a land that guaranteed them not only freedom from political and religious persecution, but they came to a land that gave them an opportunity to own land, to own a home, to worship God in their own church according to the dictates of their conscience * * * a land and a government that offered them citizenship, and only asked in return that they help build the Nation, maintain order, and preserve our institutions—as well as enjoy them.

NATION GROWS GREAT IN FREEDOM

In looking back upon these 164 years, it is amazing to contemplate how well they built it, and how loyal to this country's institutions they have remained. And why not? The poorest peasant could come here, and in a few years could have a better farm than the landlord who lorded over him in the old country. No one interfered with his normal way of living. No one interfered with him or his family in attending the same church and worshipping the same God that he had worshipped in the old country. He came to a land that by its Constitution prohibits a religious test for holding office.

He could sing his own folk songs in his own language, he could dance his own folk dances as he danced them in the land from which he came. He could sing the same hymns that he brought with him, in whatever language he could sing them.

As a result we have here a mixture of the culture of all lands, out of which in time will come the true American culture. We can say with the Apostle Paul, "We are the heirs of all ages."

We have escaped from the political and religious persecutions of Europe. There have been comparatively few mild waves of religious and racial prejudice manifested, but they have gained no headway because of the protection of the Constitution and our courts, for all men, regardless of race or creed.

It can be truly said, in view of all the circumstances, that the American people have succeeded to a marked degree in keeping old-country prejudices and bigotry from coming to find a home on American soil. That is the foundation of our freedom. For that our fathers came here from the beginning. To these principles we have remained true.

Under the benign protection of our Constitution we have become more and more a united people. Through the courage, thrift, and industry of our people we have become powerful. With great power come great responsibilities. The administration of that power for good or ill and the general welfare of our people depend upon the intelligence and moral character of every American citizen. Here every citizen is his own ruler—in fact, his own king. All power of government here is inherent in the people, who have delegated limited power with specific restrictions to its local, State, and Federal Government. In no other way can the people be masters of the Government instead of its servant.

As this Government was born out of revolution, so it was preserved by civil war, and it is well to remember that in the war to preserve the Union newly arrived immigrants volunteered and fought as bravely as the descendants of those who came on the *Mayflower*. We have grown and developed in freedom from a narrow strip of scattered settlements along the Atlantic coast to become a great nation—the envy of all the world. We have become great and strong in our own right because we have been true to ourselves. We have, under the guidance of patriotic statesmen, been able to keep out of the political, religious, and military upheavals in Europe and other parts of the world. In this policy our people have, for something like a century and a half, supported men like Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Monroe, Lincoln, and Cleveland because they would have no traffic with the political systems of countries from which they escaped when they came to the United States. They have remained true to the warning of our first President, George Washington, in his Farewell Address, when he said:

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course.

"If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality, we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent natons, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by our justice, shall counsel. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

WE SHOULD RETURN TO POLICY OF NO ENTANGLEMENT IN FOREIGN POLITICS

To this day that doctrine should remain ours. European history through the centuries is one of almost continuous warfare. Large and increasing populations on restricted areas of land beget hunger and cry for more land, more raw material, more food.

Ambitious rulers, determined to hold their position in seats of power by methods of war if necessary, prepare their people for war through the spreading of propaganda of hatred against other nations and peoples until some overt act can be seized upon to lead their people to war. And if the overt act does not occur at the selected hour, overt acts can easily be manufactured to serve as the excuse for precipitating their people into the shambles of war.

The tragedy of Europe has been that in order to have war, hatred must first be engendered in the hearts of men—of people against people, nation against nation—because the dominating force of war is hate. The tragedy of life is that out of this hate engendered in order to conduct war, comes a treaty to so-called peace, enforcing by the conquerer upon the conquered, conditions conceived in hate and revenge, carrying the seeds for the next war.

And so we find that European wars have been a series—one after the other. MacKenzie King, Premier of Canada, said something like this more than a year ago.

"To expect that the people of Canada shall be called upon every 20 years to enter a war in Europe to help restore order in a continent that cannot govern itself seems to many people plain insanity."

We were induced to become a party to the European war in 1917. The aims of the war were made attractive by propaganda. It was said the war was between autocratic dictators of the Central Powers and democracies, and on the side of the democracies were the Czar and his Imperial Government of Russia, and the Emperor of Japan—strange as it may seem. The emotions of our people were whipped to a frenzy. Any citizen who expressed doubts as to the wisdom of our country entering upon that war

was branded as disloyal and a traitor. This was to be a holy crusade to protect and preserve and defend the democratic principles of government. And so we joined with our men and our resources, the forces of the Russian Czar and the Emperor of Japan, in what we were told was the last great war for the ideals and blessings of democracy.

The cost of that experiment has as yet not been estimated or calculated. The cost to the National Government to conduct the Civil War was five billion, not only to conduct the war, but to aid 3 years of reconstruction. The cost of our European experiment in repudiated and accumulated debts can be estimated only in part—but the suffering that resulted from the collapse of our national economy, under which we are still suffering, cannot be calculated because it is still with us. As a reward, we have discovered that there was less democracy in the world after the World War was over than before.

PRESIDENT WILSON DISILLUSIONED

After his great disillusionment, President Wilson, who led us in that crusade, stated in an address in St. Louis after the war was over, that the World War No. 1 was a commercial war for territory and our commerce and trade. As a result of the hatred engendered, a treaty of peace was signed, exposing the war aims of the victorious powers.

Documents in the State Department made public 2 or 3 years ago showed us that the secret treaties made not only by Russia, Italy, France, and England, as well as by Germany and Austria, were to divide the territory of the world among themselves if they should become victors. The records show that these secret treaties on the part of our Allies had been placed in the State Department by Mr. Balfour in 1917, but our President, Woodrow Wilson, upon his return from his first trip to Paris, stated to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that he did not learn of these secret treaties of our Allied Powers until he came to Paris. So much, in brief, for past history of our experiment in European politics.

In 1922, when the people of Minnesota elected me to the United States Senate, I stated at that time: "We are already in danger of being involved in the next World War that seems inevitable as a result of the last war." Time will not permit on this occasion for me to go into the reasons for that statement further than I have already tried to make clear. In 1931 and again in 1938 I was sent to Europe by the Senate of the United States. On both occasions, upon my return, I stated that Europe is a ship sailing with a corpse in the hold. To those who do not understand the meaning of that phrase I will say it comes from an old superstition of sailors that a ship sailing with a corpse in the hold is bound for destruction, and Europe was sailing with the corpse of the last war—and Europe is now sailing the seas of destructive war.

EUROPE GOING TO PIECES

This war is a colossal tragedy for Europe. The economic life of Europe is going to pieces. Last winter there were millions of hungry and freezing people in Europe, and next winter there will be many more. The war is being fought on paper money. Europe is not only sinking in a sea of blood, but in a sea of debt that can only end in a complete collapse of its credit and currency. If the war should stop today it will take many years for Europe to come back to normal production and distribution of food and other products. If the war shall be prolonged human beings, not only in Europe but also here, even if we can muster the will to keep out, will make the depression following the last World War look like summer zephyr as compared to a Kansas cyclone.

The war is wrecking Europe and is preparing it for the early starvation of increasing millions of men, women, and children not only in the warring countries but in the neutral countries as well. Hunger, suffering, and famine furnish the most fertile soil for social disorder and revolution. The statesmen responsible for this war and its continuation may find that they and their people will pay a greater price than they ever dreamed of. There was in no country in Europe amongst the people any desire for this war. They are the victims of their governments. There were too many memories of the griefs and poverty and suffering of the last war on which to build any enthusiasm for the present war. It is only because of the men in high places of the governments of Europe that war is possible, and they have gone to desperate lengths by their propaganda to generate hysteria and hate in order to conduct war at all.

If the war continues as it has started it must be plain to everyone that it will result in the slaughter of millions of men and in the creation of millions of widows and orphans. The frightful tragedy is that this terrible war will add nothing to human happiness, nor will it influence in the least iota the saving of democracy, because war destroys democracy. War destroys democracy because it causes national bankruptcy, and national bankruptcy produces poverty, unemployment, hunger, and suffering, and no democratic form of government can exist in such soil.

The first casualty in war is the truth. The second is democracy and human freedom. National bankruptcy, hunger, and suffering bring more and more centralization of government into dictatorships. If this war continues, I venture to say that instead of saving democracy, it will destroy every democracy that still remains. Tens of millions of families in Europe—men, women, and children—are praying to God every day that He will put some good will into the hearts of our political leaders and inspire them to declare an armistice. A man of wide experience who has spent the last 20 years in Europe as a representative of one of our great corporations and who has spent 8 months since the war started, and has traveled in every belligerent country, says that peace would bring general delirium of joy, a universal escape from fear, terror, horror, despair, and material and spiritual misery and devastation, into this maelstrom of human suffering, brutal and merciless slaughter of millions of men.

There are men and women in the United States who believe that it is the duty of the United States to again intervene. They sneer and malign men and women who do not agree with their point of view. It is said by a famous philosopher that humanity can only learn one thing from history, and that is that they cannot learn anything. As a result, history repeats itself and poor humanity, having forgotten the danger signals along which former generations have traveled, travel the same road. As a result we have already drifted far into the shambles of a World War. It is said we can do that and still not make war.

Since the last World War we have played with matches in the powder house of international affairs, which is filled with dynamite. We have taken varied positions in international affairs and our policies have had a great deal to do with causing the impoverishment of Europe and the present war. How far we have gone in the direction of causing this war is too early at this time to appraise and determine. We have been fed on a propaganda since the last war that it was inevitable that we must enter the next war, which is now upon us. That propaganda has been organized and has been persistent.

DICTATORSHIPS A RETURN TO POLITICAL SLAVERY

We are already conducting an undeclared economic war on the countries we have identified as our potential enemies. Certainly we abhor the theories of dictatorial government prevailing in different parts of the world, and we look upon them as something modern and new, forgetting that there is nothing new under the sun. Dictatorships were repudiated in theory centuries ago. There is nothing new in communism or in the near communism called national socialism. It is only a new name that has been given to them. These systems of government have been revived from the garbage dump heaps of the past, painted up with a new name, and sold to gullible people as new doctrines of human, economic, and political salvation. Humanity, not knowing the history of the past, does not recognize them as systems for reinstating human slavery, under the theory that the government is the master of the people instead of its servant.

In this upheaval of economic and political convulsions shaking the world, what is the best defense that we, the citizens of America, can prepare and assume to defend our national life and our freedom? What can America do for the benefit of its people against becoming contaminated with the colossal catastrophe that is degrading and destroying Europe? In 1917 when our boys went over to Europe to fight, we were told we were taking part in creating a new world and a new order of society.

If we should at this time become induced by policies of our statesmen to enter upon that experiment again, and they shall send our sons eventually to Europe to fight, can't we be more honest with them this time than we were the last time? Can't we give our sons a more definite idea what the brave new world will be like? Are we sure, and are these people who are trying to get us into the war sure, that sending our men and guns to Europe to help shoot up the place will have anything to do with constructing a more orderly Europe? If we are again compelled by our statesmen to enter this World War, which they still do not have the courage to say they want us to enter is there an opportunity that before we join the fight we should like to know what the fight is all about and what the terms of peace will be when the fight is finished? Will our entry into the war help to further destroy Europe and European civilization, including our own, or will the mission of America be to preserve upon the soil of America the last vestige of democracy and freedom by defending the soil of America against all conquest, either military or ideological, so that America shall continue to be a refuge for the oppressed, unfortunate people of the world who suffer from the mistakes and cruel blunders of their statesmen?

I believe that a nation, like men, must remain true to its confession of faith and if our Nation does that, we shall remain true to the traditions we followed for 150 years, during that time when we traveled the road of being true to ourselves, true to our Constitution, true to our institutions.

As a people our forefathers came from Europe to escape the social, economic, and political disorder of the land of their birth to come to the United States as refugees to a haven of safety which we have enjoyed and which we must preserve with our lives, if necessary, under the American flag and on American soil. The slogan of American citizens must be: "These ideas and these forces representing human, economic, and political slavery shall not pass."

On this, the Nation's birthday, it is for us to rededicate ourselves to the principles for which our founders pledged their lives and their sacred honor. Our Nation was born in the baptism of revolution against European dictatorship. Let us remain true to the faith in which our forefathers gave their lives that this Nation might live.

A Joint Debate on the War Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on July 6 the American Forum published simultaneously in various newspapers throughout the country the views of Col. Louis Johnson, the Acting Secretary of War, and myself, on my proposed amendment to the Constitution which would give the people a right to vote on proposals to participate in overseas wars.

The American Forum is an institution for exchange of views which is becoming very well known throughout the country. Theodore Granik, its able founder and director, is careful to select subjects of timely interest, and he chooses as participants in these newspaper debates persons who are especially well identified in the public mind with the subjects that are presented. In this particular case I felt complimented on having as my opponent the very capable and distinguished Acting Secretary of War, Colonel Johnson. He was not a new antagonist. It will be remembered that in December 1937, after a majority of Members of the House had signed a discharge petition to bring my war-referendum proposal before the House for debate and a vote, Colonel Johnson made a tour of the country speaking in opposition to it. His speeches were effective and were an important factor in encompassing its defeat at that time.

In submitting for discussion in the American Forum this question of permitting the people to be the jury to decide whether we shall enter overseas wars, Mr. Granik, the director, made the following introductory statement:

With the problem of national defense uppermost in the mind of every American, considerable attention again has been focused on the resolution introduced by Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, providing for declaration of war only by popular vote.

It recommends an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that, except in the case of invasion, the authority of Congress to declare war should not become effective until confirmed by a majority vote in a Nation-wide referendum.

Considerable controversy has raged over the proposed legislation, as opinion is sharply divided as to the practical effectiveness of a popular vote in the event our country should be faced with deciding whether to go to war overseas. The war crisis abroad has brought this question home to many millions of Americans.

Herewith are presented the views of two outstanding leaders in public life, written exclusively for this page.

Since I am the proponent of the war-referendum resolution, the duty of opening the debate fell to me. My statement, advocating a referendum on overseas wars, was as follows:

The proposal that the people shall have something to say about making war, since they are the ones who have to suffer, and, if need be, to die, and to bear the unspeakable burdens and griefs and costs of war, is not a new idea. Its origin is shrouded in the mists of antiquity. I imagine I can hear the widows of Macedonia cry in anguish, "Oh, why did Alexander the Great send our husbands to die on the spears of Darius' men without allowing them to have anything to say about it?"

Throughout the long train of ages, as far back as human history records, it has been the rulers and not the people who have made war. This unchallengeable truth was graphically expressed by Woodrow Wilson, scholar and statesman, when he said he had known of governments making war on governments, but never within the range of his study and observation had he known of "peoples making war on peoples."

For more than 40 years, in my writings and speeches, I have been trying to bring before the American people the idea that in a democracy, a form of government supposed to be founded on popular rule, the people should have something to say about making war. The proposition I am advocating, a plebiscite on participation in nondefensive overseas wars, is not of sudden inspiration, nor is it suggested by anything now going on in the world.

Long ago, in a time of profound peace, when there were no war clouds in sight, I brought it forward as a proposed long-range program for the future of America. My studies and observations had led me to a very deep and strong conviction that the time had come when we should complete our Bill of Rights by adding one more guaranty, namely, "No participation in overseas wars without the consent of the people." I introduced my first resolution on the subject in January 1935, and by the middle of December 1937 a majority of the House of Representatives had signed a petition to bring the measure up for debate and a vote. Thereupon powerful forces swung into action and the motion for consideration was defeated by a narrow margin.

This sealed the resolution in the catacombs of the Judiciary Committee, where it has remained ever since. I have introduced another discharge petition, to which 64 Members, representing over 18,000,000 people, have attached their signatures, but the petition will not become effective until it is signed by 218 Members, a majority of the House. Further progress toward the achievement of this constitutional reform will be made when constituencies that favor a referendum on foreign wars persuade their Representatives to sign discharge petition No. 4 now at the Speaker's desk.

MOVING TOWARD WAR

The advisability from the Nation's standpoint of having such a permanent provision in the Constitution is, I think, becoming more sharply and clearly indicated all the time. We are moving not precipitately but slowly and gradually, in the direction of war.

If the time comes when a decision is to be made whether our boys shall be sent into war's hell across the sea, who should make that decision? My contention is that the people should be the jury to make the decision. The principal, and not the agent, should decide, and in this case the principal is the American Nation.

I would place on that jury, along with the men, the women of our country and every boy over conscription age. Surely a boy who is subject to conscription as cannon fodder has a right to vote in a plebiscite on war. And why should not women have a vote? Women go down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring our boys into the world. Why should they not have something to say about whether their flesh and blood shall be hurled into the hell of a foreign war? In the present Congress only 7 of the 531 Members are women, so you see how pathetically impotent is the opportunity now afforded to give expression to whatever may be women's viewpoint on any particular war proposal.

The people of America are today overwhelmingly opposed to entering war overseas. They loathe and despise the dictators but it is not the dictators they fear the most. They fear more than anybody else the internationalists and interventionists in our own country. They are afraid they will keep on meddling until they get us into war, and their apprehensions have not been quieted in the least by the appointment of two of the most outspoken interventionists in America as heads of the two departments charged with the responsibility of making war.

WOULD "STABILIZE" PEACE

If there was at this time a provision in our Constitution that the people shall be the jury to decide whether we enter overseas wars, there would be no likelihood that our boys would be sent into the holocaust now raging in Europe. Such a provision would be a stabilizing influence for peace. I believe that if it is written into the Constitution it will keep us out of all foreign wars, and indeed out of all wars, unless occasion should arise to wage a war of self-defense—which I think is very unlikely to happen.

The only tenable argument ever made against a referendum on foreign wars was that too much time would be consumed in obtaining the decision of the people and that this would give the enemy an advantage.

I will grant that in the early days of the Republic, when means of communication were imperfect or nonexistent, this was a valid argument. But now it is all different. The fast trains, airplanes, telephone, telegraph, and radio have annihilated time and space. The President, sitting before a microphone at Washington, addresses the entire Nation. Modern means of communication have made a referendum perfectly practicable and feasible. If my proposed amendment is adopted the general staff will set up the necessary machinery to hold a referendum on short notice, though in the case of entering a foreign war there will be no pressing time limit.

ONLY OVERSEAS WAR AFFECTED

My proposed war referendum has been so often and grievously misconstrued that I would like to make clear the fact that it applies only to overseas wars. In case the United States or any other country in the Western Hemisphere is attacked or invaded, the referendum would not apply. In every way it protects and safeguards the Monroe Doctrine.

The proposition seems to me to be so intrinsically meritorious and so completely in harmony with our democratic philosophy, that I do not see how anyone who believes in democracy can oppose it. The citizen can now vote for constable or dog catcher, but he has no vote on the greatest and most tragic question that can possibly affect him and his loved ones—the question of peace or war.

Such a right would be as precious to the citizen in the ages of the future as any of the sacred rights now guaranteed to him by the Bill of Rights, and the exercise of it would not in any way, shape, or degree impair or weaken our national defense. Rather would it inspire the citizen more than ever with the conviction that he has a country worth fighting and dying for in any war of defense.

I myself believe that a combination of strong national defense coupled with a referendum on foreign wars would be the very best peace insurance our country could have in the years to come.

Colonel Johnson closed the debate and his statement was as follows:

I am unalterably opposed to a war referendum. Its adoption would invite military disaster. Encroachment in the Western Hemisphere by non-American powers would be encouraged. Our continued existence as a free nation would be seriously jeopardized.

We are committed to a policy of hemisphere defense. This course of action is based not only on altruism but, above all, on stern military necessity. The acquisition by aggressive non-American powers of operating bases anywhere in the New World is a definite and serious threat to the safety of the United States.

These are the days of blitzkriegen. An enemy who attacks to gain such footholds will give us little or no warning. The proposed legislation denies our effective opposition to such action until we have first held a national referendum. By the time this procedure has been completed the enemy expeditionary force would be so firmly established as to make its ejection most difficult, if not impossible. Under the terms of the proposed referendum the Government would be free immediately to oppose force with force only in case of direct attack on continental United States.

Greenland is America. Dutch Guiana is America. Martinique is America. Their erstwhile owners are under the domination of the Axis Powers. Any time now these totalitarian nations may demand possession. This we cannot permit. If the Atlantic is spanned, if the aggressor nations are allowed to occupy, organize, and equip advance depots within our very portals, then our days as an independent nation are indeed numbered.

DELAY MEANS DISASTER

To wait for a referendum, to turn ourselves into a debating society at a time when our very existence is threatened, I repeat, would invite disaster. It takes time to phrase the question, to present it to the voters, to allow for its discussion, to provide for the actual voting, and to count the ballots.

Time is the one essence of battle we can least afford to waste. The greatest change in modern warfare is a fuller appreciation of the time element. While England and France debated, Germany acted. While the democracies procrastinated, the Nazi conquered western Europe. If there is any worth-while lesson to be drawn from recent events, it is the vital importance of prompt and concerted action.

The advantage of that initial jump is what we, in America, must fear most. We are so powerful in men, in money, in resources and in raw and manufactured munitions that, given ample time to get under way, we would prove more than a match for any nation. Our potential enemies know that fact. They are familiar with our performance during the World War. They know that once mobilization of men and munitions start in full force, we are unbeatable.

The whole strategy of any power preparing an attack against us must be to cripple us so badly, to surprise us so fully, and to overwhelm us so completely at the outset that we would be unable to make up for our initial losses. Time for training and mobilization lost in discussion and debating would be a welcome gift to the cause of any enemy.

If such an amendment were to become a part of our Constitution, the President of the United States, who has stood out as the rock and refuge for peace in a storm-troubled world, would be reduced to a mere figurehead in international affairs. Our State Department, which time and again by diplomacy has kept wars from invading our shores, would be shorn of its influence. Our Navy, which guards us against the threats of invasion and protects our interests on the high seas, would be scuttled. Our Army, which has led us to victory in every war, would be licked without firing a shot. So far as an industrial mobilization program is concerned, it would be but a futile effort.

WOULD DIVIDE THE NATION

Moreover, it must be recognized that perhaps no ballot that was ever taken resulted in a unanimous vote. No matter how the question is phrased, no matter how great the outrages against our country may be, no matter how overwhelmingly the Nation may vote for war, there will always be a minority to disagree.

That minority would prove a boon to our enemy. The communities, the sections, and the groups that oppose the vote would be marked and defined for his benefit. Seeds of dissatisfaction already present, he would cultivate and develop. Trojan horse activities would be greatly facilitated. Instead of a united Nation, working together for one effective supreme war effort, we would break up into factions and fall prey to our enemies within as well as without our country.

A war referendum is an untried innovation in the orderly governmental processes of our country. On no other question do we ask the people to vote directly on a measure discussed, deliberated, and passed by Congress. It is the very antithesis of representative government. It is based on the simple theory that every citizen is capable of voting on every question that confronts the American people.

DEFENDS REPUBLICAN PROCESS

That theory holds good in town government. It is generally applicable to small, ancient city states. It is wholly incompatible with a large industrial nation. The average citizen has neither the special training nor the experience nor the necessary time to study all the questions that confront the executive and legislative departments. It was the genius of America to discover a system of representative government.

Our present method of declaring war is the very essence of a republican process. The President of the United States is selected by the people. To assist and advise him in foreign affairs he has a Secretary of State, an expert in international matters. Behind the Secretary of State is a permanent corps of professional career diplomats who have made international relations their life's study.

The Members of Congress are elected by the people. In each House there is a Committee on Foreign Affairs whose members, too, have made themselves specialists in international relations.

These are the experts to whom we have entrusted the guidance of our ship of state and they, in turn, never have failed us. In their hands it must remain. We must strengthen, not weaken, our capacity for immediate and concerted action. By this means, and by this alone, can we successfully deny conquest by aggressor nations in this hemisphere.

When France Awoke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of June 14, 1940:

[From Omaha World-Herald of June 14, 1940]

WHEN FRANCE AWOKE

On November 12, 1938, the Republic of France belatedly recognized the peril of Hitlerism. It enacted the now famous decree laws which were intended to put the nation on a war footing and in a position to defend itself.

At the same time, in justification of the decree laws, there was published the general report of MM. Daladier and Reynaud, the man who was then Premier and the man who is now Premier.

In the light of later events that report has become significant to Americans. We print below a series of extracts from a reliable translation:

"It is our profound conviction," said Daladier and Reynaud, "that, fundamentally, the economic question is predominant. But we believe also that unsuccessful policies have profoundly aggravated the consequences of the continuous deterioration of economic activity. * * * Actually that part of the French population which creates wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which, directly or indirectly, lives on the state is constantly growing. * * * There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation. * * *

"That everyone should work more and that the state should spend less—for ourselves we see this as the only formula for salvation; it is elementary, but it is inescapable. * * *

"The 40-hour week * * * limits our capacity to work. * * *

"Sometimes * * * the authorities themselves have intervened to prevent the introduction of new methods designed to lower costs. In every field where activity might be reborn enterprise has been restricted and discouraged. The creative spirit and the willingness to take risks have been weakened. This—let us not fear to say it—is the root of the evil, for it adds a sort of moral abdication to the material difficulties. * * *

"The state must do its utmost to restore the doctrine of risk and profit as well as that of work and output. * * *

"The conclusion of this gloomy survey is that for several years our substance has been melting away. * * *

"Tomorrow, if we do not succeed in achieving a real increase in the production of wealth in France, we shall be unable to prevent the purchasing power of the working class—even if it be indefinitely swollen by the poisoned gift of nominal wage increases, coupled with diminished production—from being indefinitely reduced by a continuous rise of prices, which would implacably adjust the standard

of living of the masses to the persistent inadequacy of the true income of the country.

"The problem then is not to choose between preserving or repealing the recent social reforms, whose generous inspiration nobody disputes. The problem is to prevent them from automatically dwindling to nothing, to prevent their benefits from evaporating in the high cost of living, to prevent employers and employed, in a country which is still poor, from having nothing to share but poverty."

With those words (and others which cannot be repeated here because of space limits) France abandoned the new deal of Leon Blum and began the long, hard trudge back toward economic and military security. Daladier and Reynaud estimated that their program would come to fruition in 3 years.

But France didn't have 3 years. Even while the statemen were writing their sobering report the republic's clock of destiny was preparing to strike.

As this is written the enemy is smashing savage blows at the gates of Paris.

No analogy can be exact.

But can any American read this story of the unintentional sabotage of the might of France without a feeling of black foreboding? Can anyone ignore the threat of that last, grim phrase, "nothing to share but poverty?"

Today we stand where France stood in November of 1938. We have had our warning, and we are unprepared. We are determined to rearm, in both a military and an economic sense. We hope and believe that we shall have more time than France had.

But as yet our leadership has not had the courage or the realism to state, as Daladier and Reynaud did, that the only formula for salvation is "that everyone should work more and that the state should spend less."

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

LETTER FROM WALT NEIBARGER, EDITOR THE TONGANOXIE (KANS.) MIRROR

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE TONGANOXIE MIRROR,
Tonganoxie, Kans., July 8, 1940.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: Never before has it been seriously proposed that this country adopt compulsory military service in time of peace. It will not be approved now if public opinion has time to express itself in Congress.

The country believes in preparedness, and if the Government provides planes and equipment needed, there should be no lack of men in a country with 11,000,000 unemployed.

Putting millions of manpower on paper will provide paper, not real, defense. There will be no lack of volunteers once the people understand that the Government's object is defense and not to involve this country in the wars of other continents.

Yours,

WALT NEIBARGER.

Florence Nightingale and the Nursing Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was largely through the influence of one young Englishwoman, perhaps the most notable of her century, that the first great revolutionary change in the field of nursing took place.

Florence Nightingale was born on May 12, 1820, of good family and aristocratic surroundings. She was beautiful and well educated, but restless and discontented. From girlhood she desired to assist in relieving human suffering and misery by working in a hospital, but it was not until 1851 that she succeeded in gaining the consent of her parents to follow such a calling.

Her opportunity came with the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1854, when the subject of nursing first became a matter of general and most pressing national concern. Sidney Herbert, the Secretary of War, who was an intimate friend, knowing of Miss Nightingale's talents and ability, and the help she might afford to the sick and wounded British soldiers, appointed her to take full charge of a group of women nurses, an experiment which was unheard of prior to that time.

During her period of service she was known to spend hours on her knees dressing wounds, and at other times she was known to engage in such activities as distributing stores, directing her staff, assisting at operations, and so forth. "Before she came," one soldier wrote home, "there was cussin' and swearin', but after that it was holy as church."

Miss Nightingale undoubtedly is identified largely with her services during the Crimean War, but her greatest contribution to the service of mankind was the success she achieved by her earnest desire and work to raise the status of nursing from being a menial occupation to that of a trained calling.

The high calling of the modern nurse is well brought out by the following pledge, which is sometimes ascribed wrongly to Miss Nightingale's authorship, but which is in fact the modified Hippocratic oath:

I solemnly pledge myself before God, and in the presenee of this assembly, to pass my life in purity and to practice my profession faithfully. I will abstain from whatever is deleterious and mischievous, and will not take or knowingly administer any harmful drug. I will do all in my power to maintain and elevate the standard of my profession and will hold in confidence all personal matters committed to my keeping, and all family affairs coming to my knowledge in the practice of my calling. With loyalty will I endeavor to aid the physician in his work and devote myself to the welfare of those committed to my care.

Nurses have proven themselves to be equally as vital to our national welfare in time of peace as in time of war, and it is with that thought in mind that every year thousands of young people throughout our land consecrate themselves anew to the service of humanity.

As a result of the untiring efforts of Florence Nightingale and that great group of faithful followers, we now have throughout our land thousands of nurses on duty in hospital wards and in out-patient departments, in city health centers, and in the public and parochial schools.

We must also remember that large corps of nurses who are known as the visiting nurses, who make their rounds in all kinds of weather, in every section of our country, in aid of the needy ill. These are the nurses who care for patients who are ill in their homes and cannot, in a large number of cases, afford to pay for nursing care. Millions of visits of this kind are made during the course of a year, and the demand for this service is increasing every day. In this connection, there are two points that should especially be borne in mind, as were so ably brought out in an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of May 1, relative to the bill that I have had the privilege of introducing. First, that "no government agency ever has been or ever is likely to be devised to substitute for what, for lack of a better phrase, is called the personal element"; and second, that "in a world afflicted with regimentation, the human spirit is a value deserving of defense wherever democracy still prevails."

The hospital nursing service has become enormous in its scope. Seventy-eight fields of nursing are covered in the New York City program alone, from the fundamental branches of medical and surgical nursing, pediatrics, and obstetrics, to the specialized fields of psychiatry and communicable diseases.

The public-health nurses have also made their influence felt. In fact, neighborhood mothers in many large cities have come to know and depend on the nursing station.

In some of our larger cities these nurses supervise foster homes and day nurseries. They oversee the equipment of

midwives, and seek their cooperation in urging expectant mothers to have regular examinations by a physician. Public-health nurses conduct classes for parents in prenatal health measures and in the care of the baby.

They also help the family in whose home a communicable disease has been reported in preventing the spread of contagion, suggest measures for the patient's comfort, and sometimes go so far as to make arrangements for institutional care.

So, in this time of national emergency, such as we are witnessing today, it seemed only fitting and proper that a memorial to the splendid work of Florence Nightingale and to the members of the entire nursing profession who are giving so wholeheartedly of their very selves, during the night and throughout the day, in ministering to the needs of the poor and sick and in assisting the Divine Healer of all human ills in the greatest work known to man, would be particularly significant, especially in view of the present-day conditions throughout the world. It was with this thought in mind that I was prompted and inspired to introduce House Joint Resolution 520 on April 22, 1940, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Florence Nightingale and the nursing profession, and to make the aforementioned remarks, which, in a general way, show how this noble profession has been stimulated and led to greater and finer achievements by the influence exerted on it by the memory of that fine character.

The History of Our Postal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. ERNENWEIN

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over station WARD Friday, March 29, 1940, by G. E. Ernenwein:

Friends and fellow citizens, as an official of the New York State Federation of Post Office Clerks, it gives me great pleasure to say a few words regarding the Postal Service of our Nation, and thereby at least partially acquaint you with the history and growth of this institution and the prominent part played in its development by our postal employees.

Our Postal Service originated in Colonial times. A postmaster was appointed at Boston in 1639, and the first post road established in 1672, which ran between Boston and New York. A unified postal system was established in 1691 for all the Colonies, under a postmaster general appointed by the British Crown. Prior to the Revolutionary War additional post roads were inaugurated, and the system was gradually extended and improved. In 1753 Benjamin Franklin was appointed Postmaster General. In 1774 he was dismissed for insubordination. During Franklin's administration great improvements had been made. Post roads were running from Maine to Florida, and from New York to Canada, and mail was being carried to the British Isles on a monthly schedule. The post office of this day had much to do with uniting the separate Colonies and creating the national sentiment which later led to the Revolutionary War.

At the time of Washington's inauguration there were post offices in 75 towns, and the mails were carried by post riders over 1,785 miles of post roads, consisting of 1 principal route along the seaboard and a number of cross or feeder routes serving inland towns. Envelopes and stamps were not used in those days. Instead, the sheet or sheets of the letter were folded and sealed, and the address written on the back. The postage was paid in cash and varied from 6 cents a sheet for a distance of not over 30 miles to 25 cents a sheet for distances greater than 450 miles. Rates for newspapers ranged from 1 to 1½ cents, according to the distance.

The service continued to improve under our early Presidents, and by 1815 there were 3,000 post offices in operation and almost 50,000 miles of post roads in use. Newspapers and pamphlets from eastern cities were freely distributed in the West. Residents of inland and western sections were kept in touch with their friends and relatives in the East, and this was a factor second to none in the settlement and development of our Nation prior to the Civil War.

The post office in those days did not function alone in the matter of providing a communication service. It was through the Postal System that we laid the foundations of our national transportation system. First the stage coaches and, later, the railroads and steamship lines received contracts from the Post Office Department to handle the mails, which had as their real object the creation of transportation facilities essential to our commercial development. During the past decade in like manner we have witnessed the development and advancement of the airplane, along with the extension of air-mail service both at home and abroad.

Sixty years after the establishment of our Nation, Congress adopted a law providing for the printing of postage stamps, and in 1847 the first stamps were issued. Stamped envelopes were introduced 6 years later, in 1853. Registered mail was established in 1855, and railway postal cars for the distribution of letters while in transit were first used in 1862. Free delivery in cities was authorized in 1863, and the money-order system was inaugurated in 1864. Postal cards were first placed in use in 1873, and special delivery began in 1885. These added facilities not only aided in the development of our Nation but provided many advantages and greatly increased its usefulness to the general public in every community.

My remarks would not be complete were I not to mention the spectacular Pony Express. The course lay between the Mississippi River and the west coast, running from St. Joseph, Mo., the end of the railway and telegraph lines from the East, to Sacramento, Calif., which was connected by fast stagecoach and telegraph to San Francisco. The first trip was started on April 3, 1860. The time allowed was 10 days for the entire 1,966 miles. Each rider covered from 75 to 125 miles, changing horses every 10 to 20 miles. One to two minutes were allowed for changing horses. Eighty men were selected for their light weight, courage, and endurance. Later the number was increased to 125. Two of the most famous riders were Buffalo Bill and Wild Bill Hickok. Many feats of bravery were performed by these men. Several were killed by Indians or hostile bands of desperadoes while on their run, but seldom were the mails delayed long even by that. In October of 1861 a telegraph line was completed between Omaha and California, and the Pony Express was discontinued after an unforgettable career of 1 year and 5 months. Next Wednesday, April 3, 1940, a special stamp will be issued to commemorate the historic Pony Express, and already thousands of covers are awaiting first-day cancelations at St. Joseph and Sacramento.

Four outstanding additions to our postal facilities have been made within the memory of a great many of the present generation. Rural free delivery was inaugurated on an experimental basis in 1896, and by 1907 was in operation in all parts of our country. Letter carriers bring to 25,000,000 people on our farms the same house-to-house service which is granted those who reside in the larger cities.

In 1911 the Postal Savings System was founded, and the Post Office today is the depository of savings belonging to more than 2,000,000 people and amounting to more than $1,200,000,000.

In 1913 the parcel-post addition was made and this has greatly benefited those who live on farms or in outlying towns.

The last important improvement in postal facilities was the air-mail system, which had its beginning in 1918, and at present embraces routes aggregating over 35,000 miles. There is 24-hour service between the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, and during 1936 we have extended this service to the Orient. Air mail can now be sent to China, Australia or other points in the Pacific at a nominal cost. All South American countries can also be reached in this manner, as well as points in the West Indies, Mexico, and Canada. Air-mail service to Europe and Asia was instituted during the past year via the Atlantic to further serve those who desire to communicate with those nations. There has been an enormous increase in the air-mail volume at the Brooklyn office since the inception of this trans-Atlantic service.

Today, after 200 years of development, the Postal Service is a complete, well-developed system of communication. It is reliable, convenient, and inexpensive. Its development, growth, and efficiency has been made possible principally by a vast army of loyal employees. They have contributed greatly to our successful postal system. At present there are approximately 350,000 employees engaged by the Post Office Department. About 20,000 of these are substitutes. These employees are organized into a number of organizations, among which are the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, National Association of Letter Carriers, Railway Mail Association, National Federation of Rural Carriers, National Association of Post Office and R. M. S. Laborers, and the National Federation of Motor Vehicle Employees. These organizations, most of whom are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, obtain their objectives principally by legislation. At the present time several measures of vital importance to these employees are before Congress. These bills, if enacted into law, would prove of considerable assistance to them, as they are in most instances the paramount legislative objective of the aforementioned groups.

The measures to which I refer are known as the longevity pay bills, S. 487 and H. R. 3649, introduced by Senator JAMES M. MEAD and Representative J. HAROLD FLANNERY, respectively. If enacted, these bills would provide for a $100 increase in pay after 10 years of service, and another $100 after each additional 5 years of service until the thirtieth year. This, in our opinion, is a very reasonable

and conservative way for our Government to reward the faithful, efficient service rendered by this deserving group of public servants.

The New York State Federation of Post Office Clerks are carrying on an aggressive State-wide campaign to secure favorable consideration on the longevity pay bills. We would greatly appreciate any cooperation we may receive from the general public which would assist us in securing enactment of this legislation. You can grant this cooperation by writing your local Congressman and United States Senator, requesting them to support these bills, which are known as S. 487 and H. R. 3649. Postal employees of our entire Nation will deeply appreciate any consideration you may give this matter.

In closing, I trust that what has been said here today will give you a clearer understanding of the workings of our great postal system, with its complex problems, activities, and accomplishments, and the prominent part played in this system by our postal employees. I am also sure that the time will not be far distant when the previously mentioned beneficial legislation will have been enacted into law, in this manner rewarding these employees for the loyal and efficient service rendered the citizens of our Nation.

The Story of Jesuit Missions, 1540–1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY REV. THOMAS B. CANNON, S. J.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under leave unanimously granted me, I am happy to insert a radio address delivered by Rev. Thomas B. Cannon, S. J., on the Church of the Air program over Station WABC on June 23, 1940. I am honored to insert Father Cannon's address because of my interest in the work of the Jesuit Mission Bureau. The headquarters of this bureau are at 51 East Eighty-third Street, New York City, in my neighborhood and serves as a center of a mission band which encircles the globe and ministers to the peoples of the world. The address was a story of Jesuit missions and it is to me a source of inspiration to read of the glories of these outposts of civilization which today, as for hundreds of years, are carrying forward the banner of peace—the emblem of Christ, and we must indeed be conscious of the present need to encourage and promote the message of peace and hope throughout a strife-torn world:

Old legends and fairy tales used to tell us that at the foot of the rainbow there lies a pot of gold. The rainbow ends at the ends of the earth; and countless adventurers have sought treasure there. A hundred thousand Cortezes have overturned pagan monuments all the way from Mexico and Peru to Bangkok and the steppes of Mongolia, in search of gold; a hundred thousand Ponce de Leons have explored primeval forests in search of the fountain of youth. And most of them have been disappointed, disgusted, disillusioned; some dying hideous deaths, racked by fever, torn by hunger, bound by chains.

But today, I'd like to tell you, dear friends, whoever you are and wherever you may be, of other heroes who found at the end of the rainbow a pot of gold and a fountain of youth, in a work that most of the world has not yet begun to understand. They are the heroes of the missions.

This year we are celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Jesuit Order, the Society of Jesus. Comparatively few people understand that in addition to a great educational, parochial, retreat-giving, and preaching program, the past 400 years have witnessed tremendous activity in the foreign missions on the part of Jesuits. At the present day, the Society of Jesus is the largest missionary organization in the Catholic Church.

It may seem strange to pick a day like this to tell the story of these missionary heroes. All of the Old World is at war; the map of Europe is being redrawn every 3 days—sometimes twice a day. Nations are being swallowed up; ships are being sunk at sea; and yet we stop to speak of the missions. Untimely subject, many will comment. We worry whether forces are at work to draw us into the conflict; momentous questions are being argued in Congress; great industrialists are calculating their chances for profiteering in war munitions; the poor wonder about their chances of employment; and yet at a time like this, I bid you to turn your thoughts from war and the harsh terms of conquest, to a spiritual work among far distant pagan places and primitive peoples.

But somehow, I think you will welcome the change, the contrast, striking as it is, between the works of war and this work of peace. For I do not hestitate to say that the work of the missions is the most unselfish work being done in the world today. It is motivated by no political scheming. It has as its purpose nothing less than to bring the world to the feet of Christ. To bring God down to man and to lift man up to God—this is the single-minded aim of the priesthood of the Catholic Church.

And, "Of all the works of the Catholic Church," in the words of our late Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, "the greatest and the holiest is that of the missions." Greatest, because the church in its beginning, is always a mission; greatest because it reminds us of the primitive simplicity of the church as it came from the hand of Christ Himself, and as it endured in the age of the apostles; greatest, too, because the church in the missions is a direct link between savagery and civilization. You cannot study the pages of history without being convinced that all the culture and civilization which the world boasts of today is derived directly from the civilizing influence of the Catholic Church, carried from land to land by missionary heroes, countless thousands of whom laid down their lives as martyrs in giving their message to the barbarian world. And this is the holiest work of the church, because it is most fraught with suffering and self-sacrifice; and most blessed by God.

This is in a very real sense, the missionary age of the church. Never before was there such activity, such organization, such zeal to spread the Gospel, to obey that God-given command to "preach the Gospel to every creature."

Not long ago, in a Mission Sunday lecture, at the Gregorian University in Rome, Archbishop Celso Constantini, formerly Apostolic Delegate to China and now secretary of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, declared that the church is now passing through "its missionary hour, the most interesting and noteworthy that it has experienced in the course of three centuries. Each year," he declared, "the total number of conversions now being made exceeds those made during the whole eighteenth century * * *." And our own country particularly, has only begun of late to be mission minded, to become conscious of a responsibility to share with others less fortunate the priceless treasure of the faith.

But the missionary labors of the Society of Jesus began 400 years ago.

The Society of Jesus owed its foundation to the missionary zeal of Saint Ignatius; its organization was a part of his missionary plans. When at last he turned entirely to God, as a result of the inspirational reading he had done during his forced convalescence after being wounded at Pamplona, his one idea, his only ambition, was to preach the Gospel to the heathens in the Holy Land. When that proved impossible at the time, he and his companions put themselves at the service of the Pope and made a fourth solemn vow of special obedience to the Holy See with regard to missions.

Ignatius of Loyola, nobleman and courtier in the brilliant retinue of King Ferdinand of Aragon, skilled in the tournaments which were the athletic contests of those days, had enlisted to aid his king in uniting the small kingdoms of scattered Spain. Navarre, aided by France, revolted; the crisis of this civil war was the siege of Pamplona. The duke was absent, collecting an army; and Ignatius was left in command of part of the defenses. The city was carried by combined French and Navarrese forces; and the citadel also would have been occupied had not Ignatius, alone of all the Spanish officers, stubbornly refused to surrender.

On Pentecost Tuesday of 1521 the final assault was made upon the fort. Two elder brothers of St. Francis Xavier were, strangely enough, in the front line of the charge that day, as Navarre's shock troops stormed the walls and the French artillery laid down a barrage. The walls were destroyed; and Ignatius, fighting desperately in the breach, trying to hold up the spirit of resistance by the force of his own indomitable will, was struck at last and fell. With him fell the fortress. The Spanish flag was lowered and the Spanish troops surrendered. Ignatius was well cared for by his enemies and carried home to his brother's castle of Loyola to recover. But it was a weary time of torture for him. He had several painful operations to endure, and long months of convalescence to while away. And, finally, because he could not find the books he wished, he began to read the Lives of Christ and the Saints.

Gradually his humiliating injury began to teach him from what a feeble thread his dreams of military glory swung. He lay upon his rough stretcher, his shin splintered, his dreams shattered; and he began to think. And there, tossing impatiently upon his army cot, he had the first faint glimmerings of that vision which was to break upon him in its full splendor many years later.

What was the vision that changed his life? To see it completely we would have to see all the labor that he and his men did for God's glory in the four centuries that followed. What made him leave the little fortress of Pamplona to battle upon the citadels of the world? The cannon shot left him a physical cripple; what made him the spiritual giant that he became in the army of God? What made him forget the petty civil wars of Spain?

It was the same vision that has inspired every missionary—simply the knowledge of God's goodness, of God's nearness, of His presence in us and about us; and the desire to bring others to know Him, to know the dear Christ as He was when He walked upon this earth of ours 2,000 years ago, and as He is today, in heaven and upon our altars.

Ignatius, we might say, was not a man who had visions, but one who lived them. He saw that God wanted him to put at His service his military knowledge, and found an army to do battle for His church, to come and go at the call of the vicar of Christ and carry the Word of God to the ends of the earth. He saw the army that he would enlist. He saw himself marching across Europe, across the face of the earth with an ever-growing host of

men at his back. He would take the hearts of strong men and set them on fire with his own ideals; and through the centuries the world would watch them chance things dearer than life itself at his command.

The soldier has changed his plans, his methods, his hopes, his thoughts, his words, his deeds, his end, his object, the ambitions of his life—but he is still the soldier. All the quick beating of Ignatius' loyal heart, all the driving force of his unswerving will, all the eager actions of his impulsive nature, from now on will be directed, consistently and persistently to serve the King of Kings. Still the man of lofty thoughts, still the man of knightly deeds, the whole purpose of Ignatius' life has become the training of spiritual soldiers, to serve, with a soldier's unquestioning obedience, with a soldier's driving effectiveness, with a soldier's loyalty to the bitter end, in the ranks of God, to save men's souls, not to bomb their cities, to bring peace, not war.

And still the men of Loyola are marching on. All over the world, in these 400 years that are past, you will find traces of them.

Still acknowledged as the greatest missionary since the days of St. Paul, St. Francis Xavier was the first Jesuit inspired by Ignatius "to set the world on fire" with the love of God. The Society of Jesus was scarcely founded before he departed for the East, and in 10 whirlwind years became the Apostle of India, the Apostle of Japan, the Apostle of a thousand islands strung out like the beads of a broken rosary, in the Indian Ocean, and the China Sea—the apostle of half the world. And now in heaven he is the patron of the missions of the church. No knight of Arthur ever flashed more brilliantly across the pages of literature than Xavier in flesh and blood across the edges of the eastern world. All the world loves him for his spirit of eternal youth, his almost reckless adventuresomeness, his courage, his twentieth-century methods, his almost unbelievable miracles, his efficiency and his love of speed. In 1542 he landed in India. Other Jesuits followed him; and soon Goa, the dissolute city that was more beautiful than any city in Spain or Portugal, had been reformed. Missions were erected all along the coast of India; and from Goa to Malacca in the Malay Peninsula, and all through the countless islands of that coast, as far as the Moluccas, and even, they say, as far as Mindanao in the Philippines, the Word of God was preached under the direction of Xavier.

His was the task to plant the church in many different countries; and that he did personally, leaving in innumerable cities and islands the indelible memory of his inspired preaching and miracles. And when his work of foundation was done, he hurried on; but no mission that he ever founded was left unprovided for. His zeal was not blind. He sent for other missionaries to take up the work where he left off; and from his farthest and newest outpost he governed the chain of missions strung out behind him; and from India to Japan, one system was in force, one method employed, one hand at the helm. He had a peculiar genius in the founding of missions. He is the leader of the modern mission movement in the church, and even yet when missionaries are faced with difficulties, they consult the letters of Xavier, to discover what he would have done. Xavier was the father and the inspiration of all Jesuit missionaries.

Xavier died looking forward to the opening of China to the Gospel. But a Jesuit who followed him, Father Matthew Ricci, the great astronomer and mathematician, by his knowledge of science, gained an opening for the church in China and by the scientific wonders which he was able to accomplish, earned the respect of the Chinese Emperor, and became the founder of the Chinese mission. A host of other Jesuit missionaries in China, by their knowledge and learning, earned the right to preach the Word of God.

The first six bishops of Japan were Jesuit missionaries. And many Jesuits died in Japan, as martyrs, the greatest of them Blessed Charles Spinola, and the Jesuits who died as martyrs in the persecution of Hideyoshi Taikosama, the bitterest persecution known to the church since the days of Nero.

In Africa, there were Nunez and Oviedo, the first two patriarchs of Ethiopia; in Brazil, there were the Apostles Anchieta and Norbrega, who spent 40 years converting cannibal tribes; in Paraguay, the blessed martyrs Roch Gonzalez, Alonso Rodriguez, and Juan del Castillo; and anyone acquainted with the history of the church knows well their unprecedented success in the famous Jesuit Reductions of Paraguay—an experiment in democratic government which proved to be perhaps the only perfect government ever enjoyed by any people.

In Peru, Alphonsus Barsena was the pioneer missionary among the Chiquito Indians; and Colombia was blessed by St. Peter Claver's 40 years of labor as the Apostle of the Negroes—the Saint of the Slaves.

Famous Jesuit missionaries labored in our own land—Peter de Smet and Marquette and St. Isaac Jogues among the Indians; Andrew White in Maryland; Salvatierra in California. And in Lower California and Mexico, Kino became famous as the Apostle of the Plains—setting records in horseback travel that have never been equaled by the hardest-riding cowboys. The soil of Canada was sanctified by the blood of Jesuit martyrs—the giant, St. John de Brebeuf, Apostle of the Hurons; the gentle St. Gabriel Lalemant; and those other heroes, St. Charles Garnier and St. Noel Chabanel, and St. Anthony Daniel.

England too had her Jesuit martyrs—the most famous of them the Venerable Thomas Garnet and Blessed Edmund Campion. Ogilvie, one of Scotland's apostles, was martyred at Glasgow.

Few tales of adventure can compare with the story of Robert de Nobili, the Roman Jesuit of distinguished birth, who for 42 years lived the life of a Brahmin in India, isolated by the inexorable barriers of the caste system from his own friends and fellow Jesuits; or with the story of Alexander de Rhodes, first missionary to Tonking and Siam, Indo-China and Persia, who converted 6,000 souls in 3 years, and then, in quest of more missionaries for the gigantic task that he saw opening out before him in the East, walked from Indo-China to Paris, preaching in every town through which he passed, stirring up in thousands of hearts a love for the missions, and leaving behind him sparks of his own zeal that spread like fire in the forest. It was he who in Paris inspired the foundation of the Paris Foreign Mission Society to supply missionaries and bishops for the East; it is now the third largest missionary organization in the church.

Enough for the Jesuit missions of the past. It is a glorious story of missionary zeal that warms the blood to read of it. Every department of human knowledge open to these men was made to help in their work. They studied languages; learned customs of savages; explored rivers, lakes, and wild country. Bancroft, in his famous passage, says that "not a cape was turned, not a river entered but a Jesuit led the way."

Macaulay in his History of England says: "There was no region of the globe, no walk of speculative or of active life, in which Jesuits were not to be found. They wandered to countries which neither mercantile avidity nor liberal curiosity had ever impelled any stranger to explore. * * * Yet whatever might be their residence, whatever might be their employment, their spirit was the same, entire devotion to the common cause. * * * If he was wanted in Lima, the Jesuit was on the Atlantic in the next fleet. If he was wanted in Baghdad, he was toiling through the desert with the next caravan. If his ministry was needed in some country where his life was more insecure than that of a wolf, where it was a crime to harbor him * * * he went without remonstrance or hesitation to his doom * * *."

The story of the Jesuit missions of the past is a thrilling and an heroic tale, which even non-Catholic historians have been proud to relate. Yet not even the most friendly of historians could ever do it justice. God alone knows the full story of the heroic labor done in His name by these unselfish missionaries.

But the world-embracing work of the Jesuit missions did not cease with the persecutions in Japan, or the martyrdoms in England and Scotland and Canada; it is still going on. It is greater now than ever in the history of the society; there is scarcely a land known to explorers which is not being evangelized by Jesuit missionaries today. None of the heroism has been lost; comparatively few of the hardships of mission life have been rendered easy, or entirely removed; from Alaska to the South Seas, Jesuit missionaries are still following in the footsteps of Xavier.

There are now over 4,000—almost 5,000—Jesuits laboring in mission fields, out of a total membership in the society of 25,954. Two hundred million pagans are the object of these missionaries' untiring zeal. Sixty-five great missions are entrusted to their care. The greatest of these is the mission of the Philippines, in which Jesuits from the Maryland-New York Province are at work.

Throughout the length and breadth of the world, from the icy mission fields of the Far North to the scorched plains of Central Africa, from the steppes of China to the Caroline Islands, set in the bosom of the sea, these missionaries are dispensing the charity of Christ. They are managing 41 hospitals, 10 leper colonies, 107 orphanages, 133 dispensaries; 8 universities, 47 colleges, 3,678 high schools and elementary schools, open to a million and a half students of every age and creed; 14 printing presses, 49 periodicals; and 6 astronomical observatories which have done a tremendous work in saving ships from destruction. Twenty seminaries are conducted by Jesuit missionaries for the education of a native clergy, in addition to four novitiates for the native members of the society.

There are Jesuit missionaries today in Africa, Alaska, Albania, Brazil, British Honduras, the Caroline Islands, China, Ceylon, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, British Guiana, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Java, Latvia, Madagascar, the Marianne Islands, Mexico, the Philippine Islands, Poland, Syria, Turkey, New Zealand.

Jesuits conduct 50 mission schools in Egypt alone.

In 1921, Patna Mission in India was entrusted by the Holy See to the Chicago Province of the Society of Jesus which comprises the States of Michigan, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, and northern Illinois. Five priests were sent to Patna Mission in 1921; today there are 1 Jesuit bishop, 46 American priests, 13 Indian priests, 16 American scholastics, 18 Indian scholastics, and 5 lay brothers. While this increase in missionaries represents magnificent growth, it is still entirely inadequate to cope with the teeming pagan population of 27,000,000 Hindus, Mohammedans, and Aboriginals.

There are Jesuit novitiates for native vocations to the society in the Philippines, China, India, Japan, Java, Madagascar, Lebanon.

The work done by Jesuit missionaries has tremendous variety. In the Philippines alone, in which there are now 271 Jesuit missionaries, and 7 more now actually on the Pacific journeying there, or about to leave in another month, Jesuits conduct 2 houses of study for Filipino Jesuit scholastics; 1 seminary for native Filipino priests; 4 colleges attached to the Ateneo de Manila, now practically a university, having 2,090 students; 1 other mission college in Mindanao; 4 high schools; the entire weather bureau of the Philippines; 4 leper colonies, including Culion, the largest in the world; 1 retreat house; and almost numberless missions, counting 43 elementary schools, besides countless catechism schools, and about 300 chapels and churches. It is interesting to note that this year, for the first time, college degrees were granted by the Mindanao college, setting a new mark in missionary history.

This month a new Jesuit high school is opening in Naga, in the Province of Camarines Sur, on the island of Luzon. Six hundred and fifty boys are already enrolled, showing the need in that section of educational work.

Many of those listening to me today, I know, have long been helping me, by their prayers and personal sacrifices, in the work which as mission procurator for the Jesuit Missions of the Philippines, and representative in the United States of our missionaries in the far islands, has fallen to my lot to do. And to them I wish to say a word in gratitude for their aid. They have part in the actual work of the missions.

Their spirit and their purpose in this work is the same as that of the missionaries themselves. All the organization and activity of the church and the missions has been for one end, one object—to make it possible for the Gospel to be preached to the ends of the earth; to save souls, to enlighten ignorance, to teach unknowing hearts to recognize their God, to recall abandoned souls from sin, to snatch the thunderbolt from the hand of God—to save souls from hell. That is the work of Christ and the work of the church, the work of the Apostles, the work of the missions today. And it is one with the work which they accomplish who lend their aid at home. For there is but one work that is important after all—one Lord, one faith, one baptism. You, my dear friends, are helping in a material way in the same work which missionaries have done throughout the ages, in all countries; you help to bring down Christ upon new altars. And it is the same Mass, the same sacrifice, whether it is offered by a forgotten missionary in a bamboo chapel beneath the palms, or by the Pope himself beneath the dome of St. Peter's, surrounded by his cardinals in gleaming red, with the silver trumpets sounding. The sacraments are the same—have been the same since the time of Christ—and you are helping to bring them to the forgotten peoples of the missions. When the missionary speaks the words of consecration over a broken altar mended by your help, you have part in the sacrifice; when he raises his hand in the gesture of forgiveness over his penitent, you have a share in imparting that absolution; when he pours the saving waters of baptism on the head of an infant or a dying old pagan, you have a share in the salvation of that soul; when he kneels beside the makeshift deathbed in a grass hut, and anoints the failing senses of some poor soul with the sacred oils, you may be sure that your names will soon be mentioned before the judgment seat of God, when the trial of that soul takes place. Only God himself can know in how many ways you have been the indirect cause of the missionary arriving in the nick of time. Only God knows, but the knowledge is safe with Him, for He will never forget. He is the cause and the end of all our work—at home and at the front—behind the lines, and in the thick of the battle for souls. He began this work. He ordered it. He commanded it. He wished it. He inspires it. He leads it. It is all for Him, the Lord, the King—Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, today, and forever!

Billions Without Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE JANESVILLE (WIS.) DAILY GAZETTE

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Janesville Daily Gazette, as follows:

President Roosevelt is asking Congress for additional billions for defense, without offering a program, and at a time when there is already ample money appropriated for all defense expenditures which can be made intelligently for many months.

No one doubts that the money requested will be needed. But the problem now is not appropriations; it is coordination of defense plans, and an intelligent, nonpolitical analysis of the relationship between war expenditures and internal economy.

The American people are entitled to a clear picture of what is before them. They should be told, without further stalling, what economizing will be done domestically to ease the burden of armaments.

Nothing is more important to our security than sound national financing. The world's largest navy and "clouds of airplanes" will avail nothing to a nation hollowed out by termites within.

Emphasizing public bewilderment the New York Times declares: "Big monetary appropriations lead many people to believe that we have equally big defenses. But defense is not a matter of monetary appropriations; it is a matter of actual physical production of planes and ships and tanks and guns and the training of men. To put faith in appropriated billions as such is to mistake the shadow for the substance."

What are the facts so thoroughly hidden from the public? Who is making the plans for expenditure of billions on defense? Some things we know.

For one thing, the Navy is launching a program of approximately $2,000,000,000, a little less than one billion being for construction, replacement, alteration, and repair of naval vessels. At the same time, the Bureau of Aeronautics is allotted $161,000,000 plus contract authorizations of one hundred and twenty-five millions.

A news dispatch informs us that our Navy is already the largest in the world, while our air fleet is far below those of several leading powers in everything but long-range bombers. Airplanes can be built in a tenth the time required for battleships. On whose authority, then, are hundreds of warships started, while aviation orders lag?

Who and what are we proposing to defend? And how? The questions were asked months ago; they remain unanswered. Until they are answered, Congress has no plan to follow in appropriations and taxation. It is asked to sign blank checks and turn them over to a President who refuses or neglects to take either Congress or the people into his confidence.

A board of leading experts in all fields of national defense, working independently of the New Deal cabinet, should be appointed and given time and authority to promulgate a program before commitments beyond immediate construction possibilities are made by Congress.

Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY GEN. CHARLES E. DAWES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on preparedness delivered June 19, 1940, by Gen. Charles E. Dawes:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GENERAL DAWES ON PREPAREDNESS, JUNE 19, 1940

In the effort for military preparedness to which the Nation is committed, it is imperatively necessary that we be guided by the bitter lessons learned in 1917 and avoid the colossal mistakes then made.

War, including preparations for war, is the oldest collective activity of man. Certain principles of war through an evolution covering thousands of years have become fixed and must be recognized in our present national preparation for war to prevent disastrous failure.

One of these great principles Napoleon embodied in his sixty-fourth maxim of war, "Nothing is more important than a central command—under one chief." It was in complete disregard of this fundamental principle of war that our Government carried on its war preparations in 1917 so largely through boards and advisory committees.

As a result, although our Government spent in 17 months up to the armistice, billions of dollars on armament, it never got to our front line in France, with the exception of four naval guns, either field guns or ammunition. Our Army in the war fired French artillery loaded with French shells. This delay was caused by an effort of our ordnance department to standardize an American field gun so they could manufacture it in the future in astronomical figures.

NO UNITED STATES PLANES AVAILABLE

Our Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars trying to produce airplanes but was never able during the war to send a single American-made airplane to fight on the front line in France. Our Army aviators flew only foreign planes. This was because those in charge of airplane effort at home, under a committee of manufacturers, endeavored to standardize an American Liberty motor for colossal production in the future.

I hope from the bottom of my heart that it is possible for us, as we are told, to increase the present output of American airplanes to 1,000 per day by standardization, but I beg the President not to put any decisions in this matter into the hands of a committee of manufacturers, as was the case with the Liberty motor.

Of the effort made by our Government to prepare for war, Frederic L. Paxson, the eminent historian, has this to say in his book, America at War: "Every day brought the announcement of new war organizations and more committees. The managers of fresh ven-

tures, virgin to the ways of Washington, worked each as though he were the only bearer of responsibility. The permanent employees of the Government, slowed to the easy stride of civil service, often could not understand new colleagues who did not know there was a time clock. When the new enthusiasts failed, no one had time to eliminate the wreckage. When they succeeded, batteries of desks crowded their gorged offices, overflowed into the corridors, shifted into apartment houses whose occupants were turned into the streets between dawn and bedtime, and migrated soon to mushroom buildings on vacant lots. And the members of the Advisory Commission, responsible for much, and watching it all, fed Congress with so many proposals for helpful legislation that a bewildered Congress wondered whether they or it bore the responsibility."

FATAL TO PREPAREDNESS

Committee management was fatal in 1917 to our proper military preparedness. Committee management in 1940 has been fatal to the Allies. Britain and France went to war under committee control. A cabinet is only a committee.

Each failure of the War Department to respond by shipment to a requisition for supplies from the American Expeditionary Forces registered itself immediately in a new demand on my Army procurement organization in France.

As chief of supply procurement for the American Expeditionary Force, my organization started to work in August 1917, when the Army, then only about 30,000 strong, was suffering from a dearth of essential supplies. There was not a day from that time up to the day of the armistice, November 11, 1918, when our Army had increased to over 2,000,000 men, that my organization did not face a supply emergency. But, thank God, we had a central command in General Pershing and a military coordinating system which worked because it was compulsory.

From a Europe largely stripped of supplies by 3 years of war, my organization, because of that central command and because it was not hampered by committee interference, was able in the war to procure 10,000,000 ship-tons of supplies for the American Expeditionary Force as against only 7,000,000 tons shipped to us from the United States.

NEEDS TOTALITARIAN SPEED

At this time, when our Government is preparing to be able to meet totalitarian attack, it must proceed with totalitarian speed and efficiency under a powerful central control.

Schacht, the former civilian economic dictator and coordinator of Germany, long ago was replaced by an army central command.

German civilian industrialists who have been called upon by the German Government to assist in military preparedness have been coordinated by and made responsible directly to Marshal Goering, of the German Army. By this method Germany has applied Napoleon's sixty-fourth maxim of war—"Nothing is more important than a central command under one chief." This has resulted in remarkably efficient civil cooperation in German military preparedness.

The purpose of this address is to point out the one method by which, in the preparedness work of the United States, both the Government business system and civil collaboration can proceed under guiding military principles, including Napoleon's sixty-fourth maxim of war. It must do so to succeed.

Over the business operations of the 53 departments and independent establishments of the United States Government there exists no central executive and coordinating control, such as exists in all successful private business enterprise and in all successful military enterprises, and as formerly existed in the governmental business systems of the United States.

SYSTEM COORDINATED

When I returned from France after the war, as First Director of the Budget, acting under the authority and with the strong support of President Harding, I imposed in 1921 upon the then 43 decentralized departments and independent establishments of the United States Government, by Executive order, the military central control and coordinating system created over the American Army in France by General Pershing, under which I had operated as chief of supply procurement.

This military system, adjusted to civil administration, was in operation for 11 years in the United States under a chief coordinator responsible to the President, until it was abolished by Executive order on June 10, 1933. For nearly 7 years now, since June 10, 1933, the business of the Government has been carried on without either a coordinating or an Executive control over its routine business.

A comparison of the condition of the Government's business before 1921 and before the establishment of the military executive control and coordinating system with its condition today, after the 1933 junking of the system, demonstrates the necessity of its immediate restoration.

1. The business of our Government—the largest business in the world—was in a disgraceful condition of disorganization and chaos. Thus it is today.

COMPLETELY DECENTRALIZED

2. For 132 years up to that time the departments and independent establishments of government had been completely decentralized. They are operating today also without a central coordinating control.

3. The Government then had no proper machinery such as exists in every properly organized business, public or private, for ascertaining intelligently the difference between what the departments of government want to spend and what they properly can get along on. The Government today has no such machinery.

4. No impartial appraisal of the actual necessity of a department demand was made. The appraisals were in general made by the spenders themselves. This is the case today.

5. Whatever was the public attitude of the heads of the departments and independent establishments, their pressure was always exerted along lines which tended to increase governmental expenditure—to prevent coordination—to decentralize the business of the Government—to increase independent powers—to discourage all teamwork except that designed to increase expenditures or to keep out interlopers who maintained that money could be saved for the Government by the adoption of a proper business system. This is the case today.

6. The administrative heads of the departments were selected, as a rule, with less reference to their business qualifications than to their qualifications as advisers to the President along other lines than governmental business administration. At the inception of their appointment they were introduced to a business with which they were generally unfamiliar, and were compelled to rely largely upon the advice of subordinates who were wedded to the theory of the right of independent operation of a department. As a rule they became the earnest advocates of departmental plans which their inexperience in departmental business prevented them fully comprehending in all their aspects. Being held to no effective responsibility by the President to operate their departments along a unified governmental policy, they became, in general, only a shelter and protection for the independent operation of the departments. This is the case today.

CONDITIONS SAME NOW

7. The departments and independent establishments as individual units were, in many cases, suffering from internal bureaucratic control and lack of proper internal coordination, as would be the case in any private corporation having a succession of executives selected often for political and not business considerations. Especially was this true in departments whose operations involve technical and specialized problems. This is the case today.

8. The monstrosities of the uncoordinated business system arising out of conflicting objectives, the lack of perspective, the duplication of work by the different departments, the wickedly unnecessary waste—may or may not have been seen by them; but no head of a subordinate department of government was willing to give up any portion of his personal power or his appropriations to assist in their removal. This is the case today.

9. After appropriations were made, no departments tried to save money by operating on less than their appropriations, nor was any effort made to compel them to do so. In a private corporation this would be ridiculous, if it were not tragic. Appropriations were regarded always as indicating the minimum of expenditure, not the maximum, as in private enterprise. This is the case today.

If the Government does not set up immediately an effective system of internal coordination as it enters upon an additional and gigantic effort for war preparedness, it will fail, wasting not only enormous resources but what is more important, an incalculable amount of time.

PRINCIPLES MUST BE UPHELD

No matter how great the authority of the President over the routine business system of the United States Government, he cannot properly exercise it unless he adopts immediately the system and principles imposed by necessity on all successful business enterprises—military, public, or private—and upholds them with unwavering strength and determination.

Everything may be lost unless we start military preparedness under a proper governmental business system.

In our present governmental business organization no machinery exists, even for gathering the impartial information necessary to assemble for the President of the United States, or any business leader operating under him in outside and supplemental procurement and transportation, a proper authoritative and coordinated picture of the supply requirements of the Government as a whole.

The leading businessmen directly responsible to the President and placed in sole charge of certain outside procurement efforts, no matter how eminent they be, cannot successfully operate without an authoritative and coordinated statement prepared by a governmental chief coordinator of just what is needed by the departments in these particular lines of procurement. In fact, if these outside businessmen, directly responsible to the President, are not themselves coordinated they will, as their numbers increase, inevitably reach the condition of confusion which now characterizes the decentralized governmental business organization and formerly characterized the 1917 governmental effort for preparedness.

Many eminent business leaders were called into Government service in its preparedness effort in 1917. All of them did their best, but the absence of a central and coordinating control of the effort tangled most of them in a bewildering maze of conflicting purposes and inconsistent attitudes of men and committees with equal but uncoordinated powers.

It is dangerous to substitute outside machinery in the Government's war preparedness effort which in all its major elements must be carried on by the existing governmental machinery.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this fact. We will best prepare for war if, with a central military control and coordinating system again installed over the departments of government, we enlarge, improve, and expedite the procurement and handling processes now being carried on by the departments themselves, chiefly the Army and Navy Departments. It is always possible to improve, amplify and speed the processes of these departments by relieving inefficient officers and substituting others more capable and experienced in the work. But if it is attempted to substitute new and untried machinery, either external or internal, to carry on a given process, a Pandora's box of troubles is generally encountered of which one of the greatest and most damaging is loss of time. Time is of the essence.

There is another basic principle of war supply and war preparation which no government or army commander can disregard without disaster. Its disregard is as fatal in national preparation for war as it is in battle. It is this: In the government business organization preparing to put an army in the field or in the organization of the army itself in the field, nothing must prevent the immediate application of the greatest possible pressure directly from the point of military and emergency need upon an agent of procurement directly responsible to it.

FAILURE SPELLS DISASTER

In war preparations our peacetime organization and business methods if not adjusted to the military principle are always too late, and the failure to apply it in military preparations and in battle itself spells disaster.

Our business system of government in its present disorganized and decentralized state cannot properly distribute over the body of its business organization the emergency pressure which can be imposed only by the responsible and central command on the front line of attack either in war or preparation for it, and which alone brings the response in speed and in material which military necessity always demands from the business organization of a country preparing for war.

In our present military preparedness effort the following should be the procedure:

1. A chief coordinator should be appointed by the President of the United States to act under his authority alone. He should be a leading industrial expert and empowered to issue, with the approval of the President, coordinating orders which will have the force of Executive regulations over the routine business organization of governmental departments and establishments and their heads.

This chief coordinator, operating directly under the President, charged with the coordination of all Government war preparedness, both civil and departmental, carries out the military principle of the central command.

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

2. Experienced business leaders, whose cooperation in the supervision and coordination of general procurement and transportation is essential, should become Government officials and be added by the President to the staff of the Chief Coordinator. Advisory committees composed of such leaders have no place in military preparations and were proved to be disastrous in 1917. They delay decisions, wasting invaluable time, which is always of the essence in war preparations, and cause endless confusion.

3. The chief coordinator should select a corps of coordinators of knowledge and experience in the work of the various departments, who, when detailed for service under him, should be regarded as serving under the President, and should be exempt from control of any kind by the departments or establishments upon whose rolls they are carried. The Federal Coordinating Service, abolished by Executive order of June 10, 1933, should be immediately reconstituted by the Chief Coordinator. Department coordination is never a success unless it is compulsory.

4. The duties of coordinators under the authority and direction of the chief coordinator are to establish contact with and confer with every branch of the executive government for the purpose of imposing the policy of coordination and to instruct them in the use of the coordinating machinery. It is not the function of a coordinator to assume any duties for the performance of which other officials are now responsible, but it is incumbent upon him to point out where improvement in speed, efficiency, and savings may be made by coordination, cooperation, or combination, and to insist that the several officials concerned take positive steps to effect the desired result or show conclusively that it is impracticable.

CALLS FOR SOUND POLICIES

5. To inspect under the authority and direction of the chief coordinator all Government purchasing offices, to see that sound practice and business policies are carried out; to expedite emergency purchases and deliveries; to direct postponement of purchases when no emergency exists, and when it appears that the desired material may be obtained from another branch of the Government; to report improper and inefficient methods to the chief coordinator; to recommend combining of functions whenever it may appear practicable.

6. To inspect, under the authority and direction of the Chief Coordinator, Government activities and operations; manufacturing, repairing, transportation, reporting duplication, waste or inefficient use of material, equipment, or personnel to the Chief Coordinator; and to inspect activities in the sale of surplus material and to see that sound practices in governmental policies are followed.

If America is compelled to go to war, every principle I have outlined will be validated as they have been throughout the history of war.

I pray that in the future it will not be said of the United States as it will be said of Britain and France, "They were not ready for war until too late."

Wake up, Washington! National war preparedness is primarily a military as well as a business effort and will fail unless worked out under guiding military principles as well as correct business principles.

The severest penalties of war are reserved for tardiness, and the greatest single cause of tardiness in war is to start preparedness under faulty systems.

Public Works Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Federal agencies in connection with efforts to combat the unemployment problem of this country was the Public Works Administration. Many Members of Congress, including myself, have advocated that money be appropriated so that this agency, which officially expired June 30, 1940, could be continued. The Administration has seen fit to abandon this sort of work. P. W. A., so far as I can find out, was efficiently administered and furnished employment to many worth-while people who otherwise would have been continued on the unemployment lists. The following editorial from the Evening Star under date of July 9 is of interest and points out the fine work that was done by the Public Works Administration. The editorial says:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 9, 1940]

PASSING OF THE P. W. A.

Unless continued by Congress or utilized in some phase of the national-defense program—alternatives for which there is admittedly only a forlorn hope—the once great Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works is destined before many months to pass finally and completely from the American scene of action.

Abandoned by the New Deal after it had performed effectively for 7 years one of the most important functions of the recovery program, the P. W. A. now is to be relegated to the scrap heap.

The handwriting appeared on the wall a year ago when the P. W. A. was snatched from the protective control of Secretary Harold L. Ickes and was merged, for eventual liquidation, in the newly created Federal Works Agency. No one realized better than Mr. Ickes that the White House had pronounced its death sentence. Prior to the transfer he had tried in vain to obtain an authorization from Congress to continue its existence, in some form or other, beyond June 30, 1941, the final date fixed by law for its expiration. President Roosevelt did nothing to encourage him.

When transferred last summer, the P. W. A. had reached the peak of its second huge construction program. It had a trained and experienced staff of 10,400 employees when the ax fell for the first time. Now its staff is fewer than 2,400. The gigantic task charged to the agency is practically complete. True to the mandate given it by Congress, all but a few of the 6,156 projects in its non-Federal program had been completed before the June 30, 1940, dead line. As the remaining projects are put into public use the process of final liquidation will be speeded up. The end is just around the corner.

The reason for the P. W. A. death sentence a year ago was not so much that it had outlived its usefulness, but rather that the New Deal had decided to abandon its costly and none-too-successful "pump priming" efforts. The death sentence was actually passed when the P. W. A. was excluded from the 1941 Relief Act and ignored in all construction plans for national defense. The Work Projects Administration, on the other hand, is destined to play an important role in defense preparedness.

There is no need to recapitulate the outstanding record of the P. W. A. over these years. It has left monuments of public usefulness in practically every county of the United States, and it is to the credit of Secretary Ickes, who was its guiding spirit for 6 of its 7 years, that the record is one of which the Nation can be justly proud.

Intervention in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. BURTON K. WHEELER, OF MONTANA

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] before the Peace Action Committee of Missouri at the St. Louis Municipal Auditorium, St. Louis, Mo., July 2, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All aid short of war—that is the catch phrase of the day. Behind this smoke screen lies the insidious propaganda of those who do not shrink from leading us down the road to war.

Every organ of propaganda is being employed. Full page ads appear in all the major newspapers. The voices of speakers and commentators blare forth shrilly from the radio. Scare headlines stare at us from the press. America is being bombarded by the interventionists. This is the same barrage that preceded our entry into the last war.

Let us not be deluded by false slogans. We have gone a long way beyond our traditional neutrality. We have even gone so far as to strip our own defenses to provide guns and planes for the Allies in the face of solemn warnings that we are imperiling our own security. And now—Senator PITTMAN—chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee emerging from the White House, hints at pooling of our Navy with that of the Allies.

Yet these measures do not satisfy our warmongers. First they wanted us to do everything short of war. Now it is intervention; soon it will be men as well as materials. What is "short of war"?

As used by Mr. Stimson, it includes opening our ports to the warships of Great Britain. He, as a former Secretary of State, well knows this is not an act short of war—this is war. "Short of war" is like getting your shirt tail caught in the clothes wringer. You can't pull it out suddenly while the wringer keeps turning.

These "measures short of war" satisfy no one. Europe has already begun to upbraid us. Our warmongers tell us that we must take still further steps, "even if we risk war by so doing." This last phrase was used by the President of Harvard University. It does not, however, express the sentiment of the student body, those who will do the fighting. A professor at the same university was more frank. I quote: "Today, more than ever, I ask, why short of war?" This man says openly what his fellow interventionists are thinking.

The pleas of the war-aid committees, of the propagandists, of the amateur strategists, and of the frightened international bankers, all follow the same pattern. Few dare to demand a declaration of war now. First, they say, send planes. Then follows a demand for guns, ships, and munitions. Next, the American taxpayer's money. Having gone this far, they beg us to draft our young men and rush them to the blood-soaked battlefields of Europe. Once having taken the first step—these are the moves that inevitably follow to plunge us into war.

The arguments that are dinned into our ears over and over again have a familiar ring to many of us. They are the same old arguments that were used by those who led us into the last war. Indeed, by a horrible mockery, some of the same men are making the same pleas now that they made in 1917.

I call your attention to a statement made in the Senate about one of the most active propaganda agencies in the United States—the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. This is the committee that has spent thousands of dollars to place full-page advertisements in the leading newspapers of the country. It is now deluging the country with copies of a book full of such propaganda as—I quote:

"At the moment it is the first line in France and England, in vital peril, which we must support * * *. We must * * * repeal the legislative restrictions that impede such help."

A Senator said—I quote:

"Let us see the background of this committee—18 prominent bankers met secretly on the 29th day of April in New York to set up this committee."

The Senator went on to say that this secret meeting was called by the former legal adviser of the British Embassy in the last World War. Among those who attended the secret meeting were a leading member in the House of Morgan and the principal attorneys of the Morgan law firm. Apparently the same millionaires who helped drag us into the last war are back again at the same old stand with the same old slogans.

And who else do you think was there—I am reliably informed it was none other than that great liberal Republican—did I say Republican?—Wendell Willkie.

Incidentally, on May 4 of this year, Mr. Willkie used this language—I quote:

"If the totalitarian states prevail the odds are very substantial that we shall have to meet them in armed conflict * * *."

And on May 28 he added—I quote again:

"England and France constitute our first line of defense * * *."

If England and France are our first line of defense—then, of course, we should be in the war now.

I do not subscribe to the views of this man who is the new leader of the Republican Party—a belief that we must inevitably go to war with any nation. That, to me—is a defeatist attitude—the attitude of a day and age long gone. Why should any nation attack us?

War does not solve any problem—nor correct any injustice—nor build a better human race. War is not inevitable and it is shocking that a great political party now presents as its hope for America one who believes that war is inevitable.

It is significant that these men who are urging war upon us are not young men. They are not the men who will be in the trenches. There is no agitation for war among those who actually did the fighting last time—nor among those who would have to fight this time. Letters and petitions are pouring into Washington from the colleges imploring the Government to take no steps that will put us into war.

This same insistence for peace was recently expressed by the national commander of the American Legion when he told a group of Legionnaires that ex-service men not only believe "we can stay out of this war but we demand of the President and Congress that they keep us out."

A post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently published a pamphlet containing this statement, I quote:

"We will have war if we continue to meddle in Europe's conflict. We know this is true because it happened to us in 1917. Shall we continue to follow our old footprints down the road to war?

"The result of the last war should make us cautious. The sod on the graves of our dead is still fresh and the hospitals are still filled with our wounded. The curses of our ungrateful Allies still ring in our ears when we remind them of their loans. The unemployed are an unsolved problem of the depression caused by the war. The cost of the war is still written in red ink on the ledgers of our Treasury."

It is bad enough when, ignoring the wishes of the people, war hysteria is deliberately whipped up by men of wealth, by men with international financial interests and obligations, by men whose thinking derives from Wall Street rather than Main Street. It is unfortunate indeed that such men are willing to lend their names, prestige, and pocketbooks to campaigns inciting us to war. But it is alarming when members of this group are invited into the Government itself and are entrusted with the grave responsibilities of high Cabinet office.

Ten days ago the President sent to the Senate the nominations of two men—one to be Secretary of War and the other to be Secretary of the Navy. Henry L. Stimson, whose appointment was proposed as Secretary of War, is an eminent Wall Street lawyer of advanced years. Mr. Knox, like Mr. Stimson, is a Republican and was the unsuccessful Vice Presidential candidate in 1936. Those who listened to his speeches during that campaign or who have read his editorials in his newspapers know that he not only has denounced bitterly every single progressive policy and achievement of the present administration, but also our national administration, from the President down.

Since the outbreak of the present war both of these gentlemen, whose personal integrity and honesty are unquestioned, have been leaders of the interventionists. Indeed, Mr. Stimson has been said to have been among that group of bankers and Wall Street men who met in secret to launch the propaganda committee to aid the Allies.

The proposal to place responsibility for preserving our peace and superintending our armed forces in the hands of Messrs. Stimson and Knox cannot be reassuring to those who have watched their participation in propaganda campaigns which are conducting us along the path which leads to war. Peace-loving people cannot fail to take notice of the grave significance of these appointments at this particular time.

I cannot better state the alarm with which many view this apparent change of policy than in the words of Ernest K. Lindley, the Washington writer who has always been close to the administration and has sometimes been considered its newspaper spokesman. He said, when the appointments were announced, "It is by no means certain that their inclusion in the Cabinet will not hinder instead of strengthen national unity; Mr. Stimson is 72 years old. Although he knows the War Department, or knew it 30 years ago, he obviously is not the person to put driving force into the rearmament program or to reorganize the Army. He is not new blood. He is an old symbol. Mr. Stimson symbolizes policies which were, and still are, deeply distrusted by a great regiment of American opinion, policies which could never muster the support of more than a minority of the American people. There is scarcely another man who, because of his past record, would be more likely than Mr. Stimson to reopen old cleavages in the field of foreign policy."

What is the meaning of these appointments? Have these men been summoned from outside the administration because of their peculiar knowledge of the Army and Navy, or because they have been advocating direct intervention? Has our policy of peace been changed to a policy of war?

These appointments ought to be particularly pleasing to the warmongers. But what comfort can they give those of us who are not willing to retreat from a program of aid to the underprivileged—of jobs for the 10,000,000 jobless Americans and assistance for all those who are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed? What is to happen to all our great plans for reconstructing happy and useful lives for these millions of people? Our thoughts are being turned toward war at a time when we ought to be thinking more than ever of making democracy work in America.

A few years ago the Senate munitions investigating committee laid bare not only the sordid, behind-the-scenes story of the last war but revealed plans already formulated for the conduct of the next one. The committee found that "the price of a war may be actual operating dictatorship" in this country.

These predictions are not remote possibilities; they are very real threats to our democracy. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in a public-spirited editorial, called attention to a recently issued report of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. Prepared by a group of hard-headed realists who deal daily with the problem of building battleships and destroyers and guns, this report states that for the United States to go to war would mean a tragic sacrifice of the Nation's liberties and assets.

The committee declared that the United States is not prepared to give concrete help to any nation by intervention and that we would only jeopardize our own welfare by doing so.

This country is the last great democracy, the final outpost of liberty, Christianity, and civilization. We will remain the stronghold of free government in the world if we keep our heads and hold fast to the cardinal principle that our first allegiance is to America and to our own people.

Make no mistake about it—I am for national defense—so strong a national defense that no aggressor would think of challenging us in this hemisphere. In these days when the nation with the most guns and bombs and tanks and planes ruthlessly imposes its will on weaker states, it is the height of folly to sit idly by. But American defense should be based on military and economic protection of the Western Hemisphere—not on the quixotic idea of policing the world.

Many people believe that the defeat of the Allies would have a depressing effect on our economy. Undoubtedly the United States would be forced to readjust its foreign trade. Any wise policy of national defense must encompass defense against economic penetration.

We cannot permit Nazi militarism to follow Nazi economic domination of this or any other nation in the Western Hemisphere. Barter trading employed by Germany is a serious challenge to our Pan-American trade. It may become the economic foot in the South American door. We, as a nation, pride ourselves on our efficiency and ingenuity. Recognizing the problem, we can and will find the solution. We are the richest nation in the world—we can tighten up our belts, we can work a little harder, some of those who want to get us into war might eat a little less and still preserve democracy, and the lives of our boys.

An administration spokesman, Senator PEPPER, of Florida, presented to the Senate a seven-point program, which has an ominous warning. It proposed, in the name of saving democracy, to wipe out everything that justice, freedom, and liberty mean to Americans.

If we accept this, or proposals like it, we would find ourselves in the grip of a dictatorship as complete as any in the world. To one man would be given the absolute power to suspend any law on the statute books; to take persons under custody; to suspend debt limitations; to conscript men, women, and children into a war machine under forced labor; to wipe out labor unions; to commandeer property; and to dispose of our credits, materials, and resources.

Such proposals are repugnant to freedom-loving Americans. They are as dangerous to the principles of democracy as they are to human liberty. We have seen enough of dictatorships in the modern world to look on the creation of a dictatorship in our own country, even in wartime, with abhorrence.

What assurance can be given that power once handed over for the duration of a war, will be returned unabused when the emergency is over? War, as we have seen, creates dictators, it never deposes them. We must ask ourselves, Is this war our war?

Who is better qualified to answer than our American Ambassador to Great Britain, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy. He has said—I quote:

"There is no place in this fight for us. It's going to be bad enough as it is. As you love America, don't let anything that comes out of any country in the world make you believe you can make a situation one whit better by getting into war. * * * There is no reason—economic, financial, or social—to justify the United States entering the war."

If Ambassador Kennedy's words are not authoritative enough, let us look at the words of our President himself. At Chautauqua on August 14, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt stated:

"If war should break out again in another continent let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality."

If this was true in 1936 it certainly is true today. Those who attempt to break down or evade our neutrality may be doing it for love of democracy, but I agree with the President that they are seeking fools' gold instead. In 1936 the President said:

"The effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

"Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men," the President added, "but for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas. It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed."

The President has said these things well. Let us not now depart from his injunction.

The time has come to call a halt. The people of this country either want war or they do not want war. There is no sentiment in this country in favor of the United States entering this war. Therefore, I say, let not those in positions of authority—whether public or private—justify warlike acts and statements by the hollow and meaningless cry "short of war." Let us be done with these "Yes" and "No" gentleman who say "No" to war but "Yes" to provocative acts which lead to war. Bellicose statement after bellicose statement—belligerent step after belligerent step—these lead down the rungs of the ladder into the awful abyss of war as certainly as night follows day.

The greatest defense against nazi-ism is a working democracy. (Just as a nation, so a world cannot remain half free and half slave.) Europe will rise to throw off the shackles of nazi-ism if we preserve ourselves as the living example of civilization and humanity. An inspiration in the mind of man is worth a million troops. Let us make this hemisphere economically sound and immune to insidious economic penetration and we need not fear any eventuality.

After Europe has settled its bloody quarrels, and we have put our defenses in order, the world will look to and need the contribution which we can make toward the job of reconstruction. In the meanwhile, if we must make war, let us not make war on men, but let us make war on poverty.

Plain Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article written by John T. Flynn, entitled "Plain Economics." The article deals with the matter of the slowness of naval expansion, and refers to the bill introduced in 1937 by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] for the immediate expansion of Government arsenals, and so forth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, July 10.—The day does not pass that someone in Washington does not blame someone else for America's being defenseless. In fact, almost every day some Democratic statesman rises to damn the Republicans for opposing the President's armament plans.

And now former Navy Secretary Edison uncorks a blast that Congress was responsible for the slowness of naval expansion and the lack of proper facilities to that end.

Now, as a matter of fact, there is a little history here worth repeating. In 1931–32 the Hoover administration appropriated $707,500,000 for national defense and in 1932–33 provided $667,000,000. But this seemed a tremendous menace to the Democrats.

In the platform of 1932, on which the President was elected, appeared a plank declaring for national defense but only on a careful survey of all the facts in order "that the people in time of

peace may not be burdened with an expenditure fast approaching $1,000,000,000 a year."

In other words, the expenditures of President Hoover, which never got beyond $707,000,000 in a year, seemed a menace to the Democrats and they pledged themselves to protect the people from the growing burden.

Now of course a candidate runs on his party's platform without approving everything in it. But in this case Mr. Roosevelt, running for President, read this plank with approval—singled it out—in several of his national addresses during the campaign. I am informed by men who were then on the inside that he wrote that plank and had it put into the platform.

To make good on that pledge, one of his first acts was to cut defense appropriations to $479,000,000 in 1933–34 and $533,000,000 in 1935. Thus, 2 years after Hitler came into power the President himself, whom many consider a militarist, was holding defense expenditures below the Hoover level. Now, the Democrats, who denounced the Republicans for spending too much on national defense, are denouncing them for not spending enough.

This is recalled, of course, not in support of either the Democratic or Republican position, but merely to emphasize the amount of purely political twaddle that makes its way into this talk.

Now as to Mr. Edison. Back in 1937 Senator BONE—who has bitterly opposed the administration's policy of foreign meddling, but has believed in the defense of this country—introduced a bill for the immediate expansion of Government arsenals and for the creation of a huge stock of jigs, dies, tools, and machine fixtures sufficient to tool up private plants in case of emergency. He recognized then that the machine-tool industry—at that time idle—was a bottleneck.

This bill went to the Army and Navy, where it was turned down. Private industry, they said, could take care of the situation if an emergency arose. Now it appears neither private nor Government facilities are adequate to arming this country in less than several years.

The Annenberg Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Annenberg case by Mr. Westbrook Pegler, appearing in his column Fair Enough, published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 10, 1940]

FAIR ENOUGH—THE ANNENBERG CASE

(By Westbrook Pegler)

It will be hard to find anywhere in the underworld of the United States a more vicious and dangerous example of ingratitude to the generous Nation which opened her arms to the oppressed peoples of the Old World than Moses L. Annenberg, who has just been sentenced to 3 years in a Federal prison for failure to pay the income tax on the greatest individual easy income in the country.

Annenberg came to America from East Prussia as a little boy, the son of an immigrant refugee from the persecution and limitation of opportunity which drove millions to the United States. His father became a peddler and junk dealer, and Moe himself, as a boy, sold papers on the corners of the turbulent, uncouth prairie capital, Chicago. He had a talent, carelessly described as genius, for organizing business and became rich in more or less legitimate activities in the circulation and publishing departments of the newspaper industry.

But his character was low, cunning, and criminal, and, not satisfied with the wealth that poured in from his newspaper activities, he organized a monopoly over the dissemination of horse-race results in league with the underworld of crime and politics. This monopoly fed race results to a vast illegal system of gambling joints in more than 200 cities of the United States and Canada, and these joints corrupted government and the courts, worst of all in that Chicago where he had first sampled freedom of opportunity which he never would have enjoyed in Germany.

Moe Annenberg's greed for money and his cynical ingratitude to the United States were such that he was willing to corrupt the form of government which gave him his chance to become a rich and powerful man. He was so greedy and ungrateful that, having participated in that corruption of the system which endowed him with unaccustomed rights and human dignity, having undermined the stability of that system, he even stole, by withholding them, the taxes which he knew he should have paid into the National Treasury for the support of that system and its defense against foreign enemies, including the very nation which now has reduced his people to subhuman status. It has been argued in his defense that he did not know he was withholding his taxes. His affairs were so large and the interrelations of his companies were so entangled that his business outgrew his bookkeeping.

That, however, is only his squeal. He was shrewd enough to form those corporations, and to outwit the underworld in building his monopoly, and the very character of this dirty business of his was such as to prove that he had no feeling of respect or gratitude for the form of government which had suffered day by day and year after year from his activities. Not merely from the added burden of taxes which was placed on other Americans but from the very real and perceptible impairment of the democratic system, all Americans suffered from the greedy rascality of this ruthless master ingrate.

His worst offense was one that cannot be charged in an indictment under the American laws. It is a moral offense. His worst offense was the damage to public confidence in the city government and faith in the courts and in the efficiency of democratic government which was wrought by the operation of his evil business.

Of the thousands of clients who subscribed to the race news purveyed by his racket only a negligible few legitimate news publications were legal. Generally speaking, his news service existed for and by corruption. Most of his clients were bookmakers or poolrooms operating in violation of the law and by the connivance of corrupt mayors, judges, prosecutors, city councilors and State legislators.

In Chicago, where he first practiced the freedom of opportunity which America gave an oppressed immigrant, Moe's influence was most destructive, for in Chicago the outlaw gamblers came to have an influential if not dominant voice in the city government. And in proportion to the rise of their influence so the faith of the people in popular government declined.

No bigot ranting from pulpit or soapbox—not Fritz Kuhn himself, of the anti-American bund—has been a worse enemy to the dignity and well-being of the Jews in the United States than Moe Annenberg. He could have been a conspicuous example of decency and gratitude to America, but it just wasn't in him.

Quo Vadis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Quo Vadis?" published in the July 13, 1940, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 13, 1940]

QUO VADIS?

This is written on June 10. With no notice to the American people or to the Congress that is supposed to interpret their will, this country entered the war 4 days ago. Stranger than the fact was the passive acceptance of it.

While the Senate was debating, with intent to kill it, a resolution that would have conferred upon the President of the United States certain extraordinary powers, the President seized those powers and involved this country in the European conflict by an act of physical intervention.

This he did by sanction of his own will. The Congress did not know what he was going to do and debated it after the fact. The people, whose war it will be, first read it in newspaper headlines.

What we now write is to complete the record. We have no idea what the next consequences will be or what will have happened by the time these words appear. But as in time to come it may be bitterly remembered, so now be it said that in the one hundred and fifty-first year of its existence the house of constitutional republican government was betrayed, even as the builders feared. Unawares to the people, the exalted Executive principle could involve them in war. We dare to look at the truth and to ask why the house of our fathers had to be half surrendered before it was attacked. We do not here touch the question of whether or not we should go to the side of the Allies. What we are saying is that if the American people may be involved in a world war unawares and without a

specific act of Congress, then much else has happened to them of which also they are unaware.

We do not believe the people had ever thought of going again to the battlefields of Europe. They had been misled to think this country somehow could put forth its economic strength and not itself become involved. That is what they were thinking when they were polled on whether we should be giving more aid to the Allies. The idea that we could help to destroy the aggressor in Europe and not get hurt was a propagated phantasy and produced on many minds the hypnotic effect that may or may not have been intended.

To accomplish his purpose, it was necessary for the President to outwit the law. First was a statute, enacted in time of peace, permitting the Military Establishment to sell to any foreign government with whom we were at peace on a certain date surplus munitions and war materials for which there was no other market, and to exchange motor vehicles, airplanes, engines, and parts for new and similar equipment. When that statute was written, nobody could have dreamed that it would ever be used by the President as a pretext for opening this country's arsenals to either side in another World War.

Secondly, it was necessary to beat the prohibitions of international law and especially article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907, to which this country put its name, which is still in force, and which reads: "The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever is forbidden."

Observe here the very strict distinction. The private citizen of a neutral country may sell arms and war material to a belligerent power; that is permitted. American industry, acting privately, could sell airplanes and guns to the Allies. But for a government to do it is an act of intervention. The government that does it is no longer neutral. It has taken part. It is in fact at war.

The President of the United States could not himself, of his own will, declare war. Only the Congress has the constitutional power to declare war. But he hit upon a device for getting the country into the conflict without declaring war.

As Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, he declared the Navy to have a surplus of airplanes at a moment when there was a panic of anxiety over the shocking inadequacy of the country's air defenses. As Commander in Chief, he ordered the Navy to deliver this alleged surplus of planes back to the factory they came from in exchange for new planes yet to be made—and this under a previous stipulation with the airplane factory that as fast as it received the planes from the Navy it would hand them over to the Allies.

We had no surplus of airplanes; so far otherwise, we very urgently want more than we are yet able to make for ourselves. Nor were these obsolete planes, for if they were, of what use could they be to the Allies in battle? Thirdly, then, the make-believe that in the end it became simply a transaction between the private American airplane industry and the Allies, because the Navy, on delivering the planes to the factory, quit title to them, was only clever, and far beneath the dignity of a great people.

The next day it was guns. As Commander in Chief, the President would declare obsolete or surplus a lot of United States Army guns, including thousands of the 75 mm.'s the French were greatly in need of, sell them to American gun makers, who would sell them at once to the Allies, undertaking to replace them later in the American armory out of new manufacture.

That day, as reported in the New York Times, "In his press-conference discussion of national-defense plans President Roosevelt refused the role of prophet when asked how far this Government was prepared to go in supplying the Allied Powers with guns, ammunition, and aircraft." And how about bombs to go with the bombing planes? That question was asked because only the Government itself manufactures the bombs. Therefore there could be no subterfuge of turning back bombs to private manufacturers in exchange for new and better bombs later. The reporters could not quote the President directly at this point. The New York Times reporter wrote: "It was remarked, however, that the law does not require surplus munitions to be returned to the factory whence they came, but merely specifies that they may be exchanged for other munitions." Which means, if it means anything, that the President was thinking the Government could manufacture bombs to go with the airplanes, sell them to somebody who would sell them to the Allies, and itself take anything in exchange.

Then what of warships? What of turning warships back to the shipyards that made them on an undertaking by the shipbuilders to sell them to the Allies and make new ones for the United States Navy? The reporters asked the President that question. The New York Times reporter wrote: "He explained that he had been unable to get to that question, so far."

How far on this line would the Government go? Only the President could say, and he declined to be prophet.

What else might the Government do? If the people would know that, let them read the cryptic words of newspaper reporters writing under the censorship imposed upon the White House press conference.

What a text is there. Government by Executive inspiration. War by Executive impulse.

We shall survive the war. But how? As a government of the people, by the people, for the people? Or as a state that has embraced in the New World what it had wished to destroy in the old?

For it is war. Since the first week of June this country has been in fact at war with Germany. Take it in simple fact. Suppose we were at war and a government that had been neutral in form, but not in feeling, suddenly opened its arsenals to our enemy, exactly as we have opened ours to the Allies.

Would we regard it as an act of war? We would. What would we do about it? We would declare war on that government, and if for strategic reasons not actually at once, then certainly in our hearts and minds, for a future settlement.

If it should turn out that to strip this country of armaments and send them to Europe at a moment in history when our existing power of national defense was pitifully inadequate and the crisis in Europe was such that no one could say how many hours remained of the British Empire, or that the aggressor might not win, capture the Allied fleet and dictate a peace before enough American aid to turn the battle against him could possibly arrive—if it should turn out that this had been a tragic blunder, beyond recall, then the leader who had done it might wish that his page in the book of fame would refuse to receive ink, for it would be written of him there that in his passionate zeal to save civilization in Europe he had forgotten his own country.

Idaho—the Rocky Road to Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE FROM FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY BOOKLET PUBLISHED AS PART OF GOLDEN JUBILEE OBSERVANCE

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, on July 3 this year, 1940, my State, the grand State of Idaho, celebrated its fiftieth anniversary of statehood, following a half century of steady growth and progress of which the people of Idaho are justly proud.

In view of this important commemoration of a proud and historic occasion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief historical sketch of Idaho during the years between 1860, when gold was discovered, and 1890, when President Harrison signed the admission bill. This sketch is taken from a fiftieth anniversary booklet recently published in Idaho as a part of the golden jubilee observance.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROCKY ROAD TO STATEHOOD

On July 3, 1890, word flashed across the country that Idaho had been admitted to the Union. President Harrison had affixed his signature to the admission bill. Idaho belonged to that great family of commonwealths which are united to constitute the world's most progressive and enlightened Nation.

There was mighty and thankful rejoicing in that year of 1890. A dream of many years was being realized. A new star was being added to the Stars and Stripes.

There is rejoicing again in this year of 1940—the golden jubilee year. Fifty years of glorious statehood! Half a century of progress and advancement! All sections of the State have ample cause to celebrate.

The much-desired goal of statehood was not easily won. The path traveled by the Territory was long and rocky. Worth and merit had to be fully established before admission could be had to the sovereign family of States.

Idaho's march toward an importance which was ultimately to demand the attention of the Statehood Committee began in the year 1860, or 30 long years before the dream of statehood was realized.

In that momentous year Capt. E. D. Pierce, a stout-willed man with the courage to brave wilderness dangers, led a group of hardy gold-seekers into the Nez Perce Indian country along the Clearwater River and founded an industry that was to lead the way in Idaho's march to statehood.

For some years prior to 1860 rumors of gold had been drifting out of the Clearwater region. Trappers and fur traders reported gold in the hands of the Indians, used for bead work and ornaments. Members of Capt. John Mullan's road-building crew started whispers moving, causing the brave captain much anxiety lest they desert him.

Gold, gold, gold! In carefully guarded tones men passed the information on. The Indians frowned, but there was no halting the whispers. Gold in Idaho; gold in the Clearwater; gold on the Salmon; gold!

The Nez Perce met the white men at the border of their country and turned them back. They kept the region free of gold-seekers until 1860, when Pierce's party arrived. They met Pierce and turned him back, too, threatening him and his men.

Pierce turned back, down the Clearwater, but he did not give up. From a friendly group of Indians camped at the water's edge, he learned that there was a secret route by which he could avoid the Nez Perce and reach the country he wished to visit.

A romantic and appealing story is told of how, after all the braves of the friendly group had refused to act as guide because of fear of tribal reprisals, a young woman who knew the country well volunteered to lead Pierce's party by the secret route. Her offer was accepted, and she comes down to us in history under the name of Jane Silcott.

Eluding the Indians, Pierce's party gained the Clearwater country and wintered at Canal Gulch, where traces of yellow metal were found. The following spring the gravel bars of that section began their astonishing yield of the golden harvest which was to make the Idaho Territory known over the world as the new bonanza of the West.

Pierce's discovery might well be said to constitute the first step of the fledgling territory toward statehood. Golden Jubilee is indeed an appropriate name for our 1940 celebration.

As frequently happens in gold stampedes, important events fairly tumbled over each other in the lusty hectic era following Pierce's discovery.

Lewiston sprang into being at the junction of the Snake and Clearwater, and by the summer of 1861 had a 3,000 population, mostly miners, teamsters, soldiers, tinhorn gamblers, and the camp followers who flock to every gold find. Five hundred gold-mad men were in the Pierce camp.

From all points of the compass the rush to Idaho started. Gold was there and men would have it.

Having tasted success at Canal Gulch, the prospectors swept aside the objections of the Indians and launched a hundred different searching parties into the surrounding wilderness. Gold had been found and they were confident that more could be found. Nothing could keep them from searching, not even the warnings of Army officers who feared Indian uprisings.

In quick succession came the cries of additional discoveries. Overnight magical new names arose from the wilderness—Orofino, Elk City, Baboon Gulch, Florence, Warren, Idaho City, Placerville, Pioneerville, Oro Grande, and others. And those who were determined to be first on the new diggings charged like mad from place to place through the rugged mountains.

Thus it was that within the space of a few roaring, lusty years the Idaho Territory developed from an unknown wilderness to the scene of a thriving industry which brought the area into a rank of first importance among the Nation's gold-producing districts. A sturdy, bold people, the type needed to conquer a harsh, wild land, had been attracted to the region.

Idaho's gold was doubly important to the Nation because of the opportune time at which it became available. When Pierce made his discovery, the country was tight locked in a deadly rending Civil War.

Gold pouring into the mints of any young, growing country is always welcome, but doubly so if it happens that the treasury of that nation is depleted by the necessities of an army in the field of combat.

The theory had been advanced by more than one historian that the gold from Idaho during the Civil War was an important factor in turning the tide of battle in favor of the Union. If so, certainly Idaho's statehood was richly deserved.

But the roaring decade of the sixties was one in which the residents of the Territory thought about little besides gold. Money in the form of yellow dust flowed freely. There was no law except that which the miners made for themselves, no judgments save those of the rough-and-ready miners' courts. A ready gun was the first and frequently the last authority. Possession was 10 points of law. Life as a whole was of such intensity that the citizens had little time to worry about such things as recognition and statehood.

The Civil War ended. The period of reconstruction in the South began. One year rolled by on the heels of another. Then the miners awoke one day to the realization that the supply of gold which only a short time before had seemed inexhaustible was steadily diminishing. Camps were being worked out and abandoned. Lusty, roaring villages became deserted clusters of silent, empty buildings. The noisy, boisterous placer miners, who needed to see the color of gold in each day's work, took themselves away, rushing on in the endless search for new El Doradoes.

The doldrums of the Idaho gold boom had arrived. As is inevitable with all gold booms, it had collapsed. Word went around through the camps and to the world that Idaho was worked out; that the gravel bars had been harvested of their golden treasures and nothing was left.

Worked out. For them, yes. The sun was setting on the hectic, unstable day of the gold pan and rocker. Electric power, dredges, deep shafts, and treatment of complex ores were in the future. The day of lode mining as a long-life stable industry had not yet dawned.

The gold hunters began to depart. The streams of people that had been coming into the Territory dwindled to mere trickles. Streams and gulches that had been teeming with activity became deserted save for the vanguard of Chinese and prospectors who still pottered around, clinging to hope deep-rooted by the fabulous finds of the past.

Business suffered seriously during this period, the decade of the seventies. Farmers, attracted to the fertile valleys by the demand for fresh vegetables, found their markets, yesterday so clamoring and insistent, disappearing. Merchandise was soon rusting on merchants' shelves. Teamsters and packers found their services no longer required. For a period, during these quiet years, the Idaho Territory seemed likely to slip back into the state of uninhabited wilderness that had maintained prior to Pierce's discovery.

During these years the importance of Idaho as a State diminished. The stream of precious metal no longer poured from her gravel bars and hillsides. The crisis of the Civil War was over and the problems of reconstruction crowded the fate of the distant western Territory out of the Washington scene. The popular theory was that all that was left in Idaho was bears, Indians, and abandoned gold camps—and Congress had no use for any of them. No one except the farmers and merchants and sawmill operators left stranded by the receding wave of placer miners was interested in what became of the Territory.

Thus we find that for a few years around 1880, after placer mining had practically ceased and before ore mining had gained stability, the Idaho Territory was on the verge of lapsing into its original state of wilderness.

But fate had other things in store for the Gem State. In 1882 a militant free-thinker by the name of A. J. Prichard made new gold discoveries on what is now Prichard Creek, a tributary of the north fork of the Coeur d'Alene River.

Prichard hit upon the idea of using his new-found wealth to establish a colony of friends who had similar ideas with regard to religion. He therefore wrote letters describing his find and inviting other free-thinkers to the Territory to share in his discovery.

"I would like," he wrote, "to see as much of this go into the hands of liberals as possible, and also to see them build a city where they can have their own laws and enough of this vast mining region to support it, which they can do if they will go at it cool and work together."

But regardless of religious beliefs men are all much alike underneath, and knowledge of a new gold discovery does not long remain secret. Soon the miners of the northwest and Canada heard of the Prichard Creek find and the rush began. Once more Idaho began to assume her rightful place of importance in the eyes of the Nation.

When the miners learned that most of the valuable claims at the new diggings were in the hands of the liberals, who were mostly wheat farmers from the East and Middle West, they revolted against Pritchard's scheme of colonizing the area and wholesale claim-jumping began. Pitched battles between the miners and the free-thinkers served to further accentuate the need for duly-constituted authority. Congress began to take notice again. Law and order were necessary if the region was to produce its fullness of wealth, and gold was the one thing that could make an impression upon the harassed lawmakers in Washington.

Although considerable gold was taken from the Coeur d'Alene region in the eighties, the real importance of Pritchard's discovery was not the yellow flakes in the gravel bars, but rather the general impetus to mining which, within the decade, was to result in the finding of lead, zinc, and silver ores.

Discovery of these lode deposits marked the beginning of great underground enterprises which have yielded up hundreds of millions of dollars to be poured into the channels of Idaho industry and commerce. It proved the foundation for a mining industry which has been of tremendous economic importance to the State for 60 years.

The famous Bunker Hill & Sullivan mine was discovered in 1885. The gross value of its ores during the succeeding 55 years has been some two hundred million dollars. Its operations are one of the foremost industrial assets of the State.

Credit for the Bunker Hill discovery is given, in a romantic and novel story, to a truant Spanish burro, afterward known as Kellogg's Jack, and to this day looked upon as a sort of a patron saint of the Coeur d'Alene mining industry.

The importance of the Bunker Hill was obvious at a glance. Men began to look less for gold and more for the dark galena ores. Other finds were made, in other places. Silver City grew into a mining camp of importance. Veins of high-grade galena were located in the Wood River district near the towns of Ketchum and Bellevue.

Now that men knew what they were looking for, discoveries came thick and fast, not of gold but of rugged galena outcroppings—hard, dark quartz in which the lead silver minerals glistened. It was obvious then that Idaho was to be the scene of a great mining industry and men began to build for permanence. In this rock there was the wealth that would provide pay rolls, that would build homes and communities and cities, that would pay taxes and stimulate trade and commerce.

Mines started making names for themselves. In addition to the Bunker Hill & Sullivan, there were the Tiger, the Poorman, the Hercules, the Frisco, the Morning, the Minnie Moore, the Hecla. These mines and others were to continue as steady producers for decades to come, and the income from them was put to work developing the district.

Once more feeling the glow of prosperity, the residents of the Territory began to yearn for the respectability of statehood and a strong insistence for recognition developed. They believed that Idaho merited full membership in the Union.

Back in 1890 any district producing ten to fifteen million dollars annually in valuable metals could demand respect and attention. Congress began to listen. Idaho asked for statehood, and she backed her request with a showing of industrial responsibility that could not be disputed. Her great mines hummed with activity; her agricultural and lumbering industries were prospering; her people were alert and vigorous. The future was bright. Idaho was ready for the duties and responsibilities of a State.

At last the Congress agreed. The bill was signed. Thus it was on July 3, 1890, that the end of the rocky Territorial road was reached and Idaho, fortified by 30 years of mining importance, was admitted to the Union, a free and sovereign State.

Third Term for President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an open letter addressed to the President of the United States by the Philadelphia Record under the heading, "You are drafted, Mr. President."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

YOU ARE DRAFTED, MR. PRESIDENT

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You are drafted for defense.

You must obey the call of your country, just as must millions of your fellow citizens, who stand ready to give whatever service they are best fitted to perform.

You are best fitted to be Chief Executive in this emergency. By your great ability, your high courage, and fine humanity you have won the confidence and love of the overwhelming majority of us who are eager to help you protect this country in the present crisis.

But above and beyond your outstanding qualification for the Presidency are two special and immediate reasons why your retirement at this time would be dangerous not only to the safety of the Nation but to civilization throughout the world.

Strengthening defense is the most pressing task which faces this Nation. A change of administration is bound to slow up this program.

If you accept the nomination at the Democratic convention, your reelection will be assured, as will the uninterrupted continuance of the defense projects which you have initiated. The American people are too wise to change horses in the middle of a stream.

On the other hand, if you should refuse to accept the nomination, the candidate who had your endorsement would probably be elected. But there would be enough doubt as to the outcome to slow up all planning for the future, not only in Congress but also in the War and Navy Departments, where your Secretaries must assume the responsibility of many vital and momentous decisions.

If you were not as well qualified as you are, still it would be the most obvious wisdom that you should continue in office so that this country could concentrate on defense rather than on politics during the next 5 months

Your nomination, and your nomination alone, would give the people as well as your executives the assurance to carry on without fear of change in policy and personnel

Of course, the Republicans will put on a spirited opposition campaign, as they should But with you as a candidate the political temperature of the Nation will be normal no matter how much ballyhoo the utility lobby generates

Important as are the practical advantages of an uninterrupted Federal administration, there is a still more compelling reason for your candidacy.

Ideals of human dignity and decency which have been developed through the ages are now threatened. Perhaps because we have not lived up to those ideals, the world is engulfed by a scourge the like of which has not visited it since Genghis Khan laid waste half of Europe.

You have become world's champion of civilization.

The civilized world looks to you for spiritual leadership. To retire now would be to chill the hearts of liberty-loving people in every corner of the globe. It would be to play right into the hands of the powers of darkness which afflict mankind today. No matter who took your place it would be a let-down which might prove disastrous.

We believe Republican candidate Wendell L. Willkie to be a sincere and patriotic citizen. We believe he thinks he is telling the truth when he says he is under no obligations.

But, we also know that no one can take high office without having his policies pulled and hauled by his supporters. The men who gave money and were personally active in Willkie's pre-convention campaign, the same men who will lavish money on his coming campaign, are bitter foes of the principles and purposes of the New Deal.

Judging by its platform and keynote speeches, the Republican Party is swallowing the whole New Deal program hook, line, and sinker. Ostensibly candidate Willkie will carry on where you left off, only adding a little Republican efficiency in administration of collective bargaining, wage and hour regulations, work relief, etc.

But, even if Willkie is sincere, can we expect him to withstand pressure of the friends who put him into office—men who have expressed vindictive hatred of you and all for which you stand?

No camouflage in Willkie's support. Wall Street, which heretofore played politics by proxy, comes out in the open for direct action. Through Willkie, Wall Street wants to control the Federal Government.

This financial element places profit before principle. The same elements in Great Britain preached appeasement and in France accepted the totalitarian yoke.

Much as we respect Wendell Willkie, the interests which are backing him, and which ultimately will dominate him, give lip service to democracy while they secretly yearn for return to the plutocracy which controlled the United States before you took office. This plutocracy would undo all you have accomplished for the forgotten man.

More than 8 years ago the Record called for your nomination by the Democratic Party. Since then we have given you loyal, though sometimes critical, support. Therefore we believe the Record has earned the right to call itself your friend.

As a friend, we are loath to demand from you this further sacrifice. You have earned a rest. We cannot blame you for desiring return to private life. Eight long years of complex problems and mounting crises has weighed heavily upon you.

Yet there are times in the lives of both men and nations when personal preference, even individual right, should give way to national need.

If the United States of America needed you 8 years ago—it needs you even more today.

We need your experience and your wisdom. We need your sanity and your courage. We need the leadership which you alone can give us.

That the American people want you for a third term is demonstrated by every index of public opinion. No American since Abraham Lincoln has so won the hearts of his countrymen.

Mr. President, the Nation waits your word.

PHILADELPHIA RECORD.

Why I Am An American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on May 29, 1940, by the former Under Secretary of State J. Reuben Clark, Jr., under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution over radio station KSL at Salt Lake City, Utah, and printed in the Children's Friend for July 1940. I make this request because the address echoes the soul's aspiration of every true American who from study or experience has learned to know his Government and to appreciate its worth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am an American because I believe in a government of law and not of men, and in a national allegiance to high principle and lofty ideal instead of to a personal sovereign.

I am an American because I believe in a government with three distinct, separate branches, each mutually independent of the other

with no power of delegation or appropriation of rights or powers by any one to or from any other.

I am an American because I believe that government must derive its just powers from the consent of the governed and that branches of government and officers shall have such powers and such only as shall be given by the people, because I believe that the assumption by branches of government or by officers of rights or powers not specifically conferred upon them is usurpation, and because impeachment or other trial lies against any officer who so usurps rights or powers not specifically conferred.

I am an American because I believe in the greatest possible measure of self-government, and because I believe in a federal system of government which keeps local affairs in the hands of local governments.

I am an American because I believe in a Bill of Rights which places wholly beyond the reach of lawful government certain matters affecting life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and specifically the right of freedom of conscience and worship, the right of free speech and a free press, the right peaceably to assemble and petition government, and the right to gain and hold property without molestation except by due process of law.

I am an American because under our form of government the people of the United States have made a progress never before made by any other people in the world in an equal time during the whole period of recorded history.

I am an American because standards of life and of living of the entire American people are far beyond those enjoyed by any other people in any part of the world, either now or at any other time, which is a living testimony and evidence of the kindly beneficence of our free institutions.

I am an American because this Nation has no scheme or plan of conquest, because it has respect for the rights of other peoples and of other nations, because it promotes justice and honor in the relationships of nations, because it loves the ways of peace as against war, as shown by the repeated peaceful adjustment of its own international disputes, because it has conquered the land greed which so afflicts the nations of the world, as demonstrated in Cuba and the Philippines.

I am an American because my country abolished slavery after it had become deep-rooted and because men still are free to work, and are secure in the enjoyment of the products of their labor.

I am an American because I firmly and earnestly believe that the Constitution is an inspired document designed by our Maker to set up a government which would make sure and secure the rights set forth in the Bill of Rights, and particularly the right of freedom of conscience and worship.

I am an American because I believe that the destiny of America is to be the abiding place of liberty and free institutions and that its own practice and enjoyment of these blessings shall be to the world a beacon light which shall radiate its influence by peaceful means to the uttermost parts of the world, to the uplifting of all humanity.

Trade Treaties and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY JOHN H. CONNAUGHTON

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, sponsored by the National Grange, delivered over the National Broadcasting System, in a Nation-wide hook-up, on July 9, 1940, by the Honorable John H. Connaughton, general counsel for the National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers and special counsel for the Vegetable Growers Association of America:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, as general counsel of the National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, and as special counsel for the Vegetable Growers Association of America, and speaking under the auspices of the National Grange, I desire to publicly challenge a statement made by Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, in his address over this radio network; May 19. Upon this occasion, Mr. Hull said of reciprocal-trade agreements:

"It has brought marked benefits to all groups of our population, and to all sections of the country, without inflicting injury on any one."

This statement was made in connection with a purported analysis of the reciprocal trade agreement policy, and upon the occasion of the celebration of Foreign Trade Week. Mr. Hull beclouded the issue by misinterpretation of the facts and the conclusiveness of the proof which was produced at the hearings on the continuance of these reciprocal-trade treaties, which were held before House and Senate committees of the Congress, to which he referred, and sought to detract the attention of the American people by the use of war hysteria.

As a lawyer representing the great American vegetable-growing industry, I filed for consideration of the appropriate committees of the Congress, in opposition to the resolution to extend this reciprocal trade agreement authority, many sworn affidavits of responsible persons and American concerns who are actively engaged in the vegetable-growing industry.

These affidavits clearly and definitely stated that vegetable-growing concerns, with a long history of successful operation in the vegetable-farming industry, had lost large sums of money since the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Act and negotiation of the Cuban trade agreement. Their loss ran into millions of dollars. These affidavits recited a history of struggle of vegetable growers, long in business, and how they had lost to the Cuban vegetable grower using cheap peon labor. Some vegetable concerns filed affidavits showing that the import of Cuban tomatoes had driven them out of the tomato-growing business entirely. Large hothouse-vegetable plants have been abandoned and torn down because they could not compete with imported tomatoes from Cuba.

Instead of analyzing the evidence produced before these committees, which Mr. Hull might have concluded supported his statements, he spent most of his broadcasting time in discussing the present unnatural trade situation resulting from the present European conflict. This needs no proof; it is a self-evident fact. To undertake to shape a trade-agreement policy on such unstable and unchanging conditions would be abject folly. When these hearings were being conducted in the Congress, we were led to believe that this would not be done, and that no treaties were contemplated under present conditions. We were told that we should be ready when this war is over, "to make treaties right and left," to avoid another war.

It now seems that this intention has been abandoned. Referring to the trade agreement power delegated to the President, Mr. Hull says:

"The renewal of the Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years was an immensely important step from the viewpoint of both the immediate and the long-range interests of our country."

We vegetable growers do not believe that the negotiation of trade agreements should be considered at all during the present world war. There are other and more effective methods of dealing with the trade problems incident to this situation, which it is not my intention to discuss. The demand for war materials, food products, and so forth, is an unnatural one and cannot be the basis of lasting treaties. These problems should be dealt with by the elected representatives of the people in the Congress in a temporary manner and not by the executive department alone.

We feel that it is of immediate importance for the American Nation to prepare through an adequate defense program and it should be done honestly. We should give a dollar in genuine defense for every dollar spent and pledge to the American people that the program will be free from political logrolling and political job juggling. It is rank lack of patriotism to mix politics with a national-defense program.

We American vegetable growers and American farmers are interested in the manner in which national-defense money is expended, as we bear a large share of the tax burden, which goes into it. We do not begrudge one dollar honestly spent for national defense, but we do deplore the expenditure of $7,000,000,000 for national defense and nothing to show for it.

The vegetable-growing industry and the agricultural industry in general constitute the first line of defense in any war. No war can be successfully conducted without sufficient food and clothing for both the soldiers in the field and the civilian population at home. We cannot prepare for national defense by creating conditions which build up agriculture in Cuba and other foreign countries, and stifle the American farmer. We cannot give our American market to the Cuban vegetable grower and expect to have vegetables to feed our soldiers in the event of war. Nor can we expect to take our own people off the pauper, beggar, and the relief rolls of the Federal Government if we destroy our American farmer through unfair peon competition. Unless we protect agriculture in peacetime, by giving it the American market, the American farmer will be a pauper or on the beggar and relief rolls of the Federal Government when you need him to raise food in an emergency. Other American food-producing industries are also suffering from this disregard of facts by our treaty and tariff makers.

Through a wide difference in the cost of production and a most unfair low tariff, canners of crab meat in Russia and Japan are taking the American canned crab meat market away from the crab meat canning industry in the United States.

Then, since Secretary Hull has said that "no one is injured by this program," we assume that he means agriculture also. We say that the present reciprocal trade agreement program has penalized agriculture more than any other industry. The executive department of the Government entrusted with this authority, has reduced tariffs on agricultural products which we are already producing in this country in large quantities and upon some of which we already have a large surplus.

There was a conflict of testimony, as Mr. Hull infers. When this condition arises, we must then analyze the testimony to determine

the proper conclusion. In analyzing testimony, we first must appraise our witnesses and determine their fairness or lack of fairness, if any such appear, their interest in the subject matter, their ability to testify upon the matter under investigation, and from all of these considerations determine where the greater weight lies and give credit accordingly.

Who said no one was injured by reciprocal-trade agreements? Cabinet members, Government department heads, and lesser subordinates of the administration, which administration was determined that this authority should be renewed. In fact they consumed one-third of the printed record of these congressional hearings.

Now, let us see who testified against the reciprocal trade agreement program. They were large reputable farmer organizations, representing millions of men who make their livelihood in this pursuit; stock raisers, vegetable growers, citrus growers, and others who bear on their economic bodies the scars made by these reciprocal-trade treaties.

The National Grange, one of the largest and most reputable general farm organizations in the United States, vigorously protested against this policy. Mr. L. J. Taber, master of the National Grange, said in part before the Finance Committee of the United States Senate:

"Since the act was passed, the exports of agricultural products have been reduced and the importation of competitive farm products has been increased. The general effect of reciprocal treaties, and the legislation itself has had a depressing effect on the agricultural price level, and reduced farm income."

Mr. O. Keith Owen, president of the National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, said:

"The reciprocal-trade agreement with Cuba has flooded the United States with cheaply grown tomatoes and cucumbers and has caused enormous losses to the hot house and outdoor vegetable-growing industry. Many hot-house plants throughout the United States have been torn down or abandoned during this period."

Who is entitled to the greater credit under such conditions? Is it the academic technical adviser under pay of the administration asking for the enactment of this program, or the men who feed you and me, and supply our daily needs?

These men, fresh from the fields of honest toil, may not be able to analyze technical figures and statistics, but they know the relationship of cause to effect, as it touches their lives and pocketbooks.

Our American farmers may not be able to put a "doctor of science" description upon the injury he has received from competing with cheap peon labor that wears only a breech cloth, and no shoes, and lives on a few cents a day, but he knows that he cannot compete with peon and coolie labor and win, he is concerned with the health of his American employees and with feeding Americans clean wholesome vegetables, but the employees of the Federal Government are the authority for the statement that we do not know what the health conditions of the vegetable workers in Cuba are. Our Federal authorities tell us that they rely on inspection of tomatoes and other vegetables at the port of entry in the United States. We believe that the American people do not care to eat vegetables handled by syphilitic peons even if they are purified a hundred times. Consumer organizations and women's clubs should look into the health conditions under which imported vegetables are raised at the source, and if that cannot be done, exclude these foreign food products entirely.

Then, to further analyze the conclusiveness of this evidence as to the effect of trade agreements, 25 Democrats and 3 Farm-Labor Members of the House of Representatives joined the Republicans in voting against reciprocal-trade agreements, believing that many groups had been injured. In the Senate, 18 Democrats, 2 Farm-Labor, and 1 Progressive joined the solid Republican vote against this unfair treaty program. This treaty legislation only carried by 5 votes in the Senate, and 48 votes in the House.

A change of 3 votes in the Senate, or 25 votes in the House would have defeated this. When you consider that there are 261 Democrat votes in the House, and the administration with all of its patronage and other political power could hold but 236 of them for this policy, and that there are 69 Democrat votes in the Senate, and this same force could only hold 51 of them for this pet impractical administration program, this certainly indicates that Congress did not believe that the evidence was as conclusive as Secretary of State Cordell Hull said it was.

The Vegetable Growers Association of America will hold their thirty-second annual convention in Philadelphia, Pa., August 26 to 29, 1940, at the Hotel Bellevue-Stratford. I urge every vegetable grower and every vegetable consumer to attend this convention and hear further discussion of this important subject.

In conclusion, let me suggest to the American farmer, vegetable grower, fruit grower, stockman, wool grower, and others who were ignored by the Congress when you testified before their committees that this reciprocal trade treaty program has seriously injured you, that you demand an accounting of your Senator and Representative as to how he voted on this trade-treaty legislation. If they do not believe you when you testify before their Congressional committees, then it is time to get someone in Congress in their places who will respect what you say you need to prevent going bankrupt and making your employees clients of the Federal beggar and relief rolls.

Show these candidates for election to the Congress, by your vote, that you do not forget, and cannot, and will not be deceived. If you believe you are right, then organize yourselves to vote to protect your rights.

American Industry Speeds Up To Meet Totalitarian Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I receive many letters decrying our slowness in preparing for any armed attack that might be made upon us. The writers of many of these letters seem to feel that proper efforts are not being made to prepare ourselves as rapidly as possible.

A day or two ago the Associated Press printed an article showing what efforts are being made by our private war industries in the matter of preparation, and I ask that this article may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SPEEDS UP INDUSTRY TO MEET TOTALITARIAN PACE—MEN, MONEY, AND MACHINES POURED INTO GIGANTIC TASK OF REARMAMENT

American enterprise is beginning to give the world its answer to these questions:

Can the United States, by democratic methods, accomplish what the totalitarian nations have done by conscription?

How fast can men, money, machines, and mass production do the job of rearmament?

Joplin, Mo., replies: "Powder plant doubling capacity by August 1." Minneapolis says: "Machine manufacturer increasing capacity 100 percent." Indianapolis reports: "Tank manufacturing firm starting to expand." Buffalo says, "Aircraft plant doubling floor space and pay roll."

Washington responds with an outpouring of millions in cash, and lays aside billions more for the job. Big business, in the person of Big Bill Knudsen, takes command of spending.

Army arsenals plan a 7-day week. Navy yards start hiring 15,000 men.

Taxis jam the avenue in front of the War and Navy Departments and the Federal Reserve Building where the Defense Commissioners are housed.

Businessmen, brief cases ready, crowd around the information desk of the Commission, roam the limitless corridors of the War and Navy buildings.

Four groups confer interminably—Army, Navy, Defense Commission, and businessmen.

"We are now in the what-do-we-need stage," says a Defense Commission aide. "How far are we going? Will it be preparedness or total effort? Our basis of action is not completely defined."

Meanwhile, buying begins. In 10 days the Commission places $360,000,000 worth of Army and Navy contracts—$36,000,000 a day—with more to come.

Gen. George G. Marshall, Chief of Staff, says, "Each order for critical items of matériel, where it can be absorbed by industry, promotes the broadening of the base of production and stimulates the rapidity with which such articles can be turned out."

ARMY STARTED WITH $47,000,000

Here are some of the things which the Army, Navy, and industry, without waiting on the recently created Defense Commission, have done in broadening the production base:

First, the Army. It started the congressional season with a modest grant of $47,000,000 for critical supplies.

In the list were such things as 131,789 semiautomatic rifles which it hoped to acquire by June 1942; 744 new antitank guns, to be delivered in June 1941; 144 new 90-millimeter antiaircraft guns, September 1940; and 392 light tanks, June 1941.

That list was compiled only last May 1. Today it's wholly out of date. Congress has since provided nearly a billion dollars for new Army equipment, not including planes, for which a 50,000 goal has been set.

Col. James H. Burns, procurement expert in the War Department, says: "Three important steps have been taken to increase productive capacity:

"1. The placing of large orders with arsenals and commercial plants. * * * (Congress has provided millions for 'large orders.')

"2. Creation of additional capacity to fill the gaps and deficiencies of present productive capacity. * * * (The Government is putting up perhaps $432,000,000 to expedite arms production.)

"3. Preparation of existing industries through planning and through educational orders and factory plans for the further pro-

duction needed for a more extensive effort. (Thirty million dollars is forthcoming for industrial mobilization.)

ADDITIONAL CAPACITY NEEDED

"But," says Colonel Burns, "if we intend to prepare this country for a major national-defense effort within the next 2 years, a further step is vitally necessary, we must start at once the creation of additional capacity * * *."

Capacity is "negligible," he says, in such items as ammunition, fire control, tanks, armor, airplanes, and engines. Capacity for high explosives is twenty to thirty million pounds a year, as compared with one hundred million at the end of the World War. Aircraft capacity, doubled in the last year, must be doubled again or trebled to reach 50,000 planes a year.

For such a major effort, Colonel Burns told Congress, $558,000,000 should be spent on ordnance plants, $35,500,000 on chemical warfare plants, $5,500,000 on Quartermaster Corps plants, and $364,000,000 on aircraft factories, a total of $963,000,000, of which $597,000,000 would be needed for tools and equipment.

The moment Congress passed an 11-percent naval expansion bill this spring, the Navy was ready to launch the program. It was given 68 ships to build and expects to see them all afloat early in 1944.

MONEY BOTTLENECK ELIMINATED

Now the program has been expanded again, and Congress has approved a plan for nearly doubling the Navy's tonnage and making it in 6 years the greatest fleet the world has ever seen.

When asked by Congress what the principal bottleneck in naval shipbuilding was, Rear Admiral Samuel M. Robinson promptly said, "Money." Next he put labor, and third, facilities.

The money is assured now by a $4,000,000,000 authorization for doubling of the fleet.

Before that stunning amount was even whispered navy yards were ordered to proceed to a two-shift basis, with three shifts in view, and to add 15,000 men to their civilian forces of 28,800 within 3 months.

It would take 9 months "to get the full effect" of three shifts, said Admiral Robinson, but "we will be feeling the effect of it from the beginning."

DUPLICATION SAVES BUILDING TIME

With ample money, he said, the Navy could cut 6 or 7 months from the 4 years it takes to build a battleship. On some ships, he added, it also could save 8 months by duplicating ships already built. Duplication, he added, "is an integral part of the new program."

Also an integral part was the authority to negotiate contracts for ships without waiting months for competitive bids—authority which retiring Secretary of the Navy Edison gained from Congress in the last week of his term, after 3 years of trying.

As for facilities, the 8 navy yards and 7 civilian yards in the United States now have 62 ways which are being or have been used for the construction of warships. There are 11 for battleships, which take 4 years to build; 17 for cruisers, 3 years; 25 for destroyers, 2 to 3 years; and 9 for submarines, 2 to 2½ years.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS PLANNED

Among the 200 ships in the $4,000,000,000 program might be 9 battleships, 5 aircraft carriers (which require battleship ways), 24 cruisers, 122 destroyers, and 22 submarines.

Present yards cannot now build so many ships in 6 years. However, the Navy soon expects to have $250,000,000 to stimulate ship production by purchasing and financing new equipment for yards.

In addition, the naval expansion bill was planned to provide for new gun factories placed safely inland and for increased armor plate construction.

President Roosevelt indicated that some of the construction money itself would go into expanding facilities.

Private industry was tied up with the Government activity in a thousand ways. War orders from Britain and France had given it a head start in expanding to meet military and naval needs.

Striding through the ice-cool corridors of the white marble palace that the Federal Reserve occupies, tall, broad, and ruddy William Knudsen symbolized the new link between Washington and the industrial cities with their smoke-smudged plants.

SELF-SEALING TANKS TO BE BUILT

From those cities last week came messages like these:

Baltimore: Glenn Martin division just equipped to manufacture self-sealing gasoline tanks for airplanes.

Indianapolis: Marmon-Herrington, makers of all-wheel-drive vehicles, tractors, and tanks, to double floor space. Allison Engineering erecting large airplane-motor plant.

Milwaukee: Kearney & Trecker, milling-machine firm, sending much of its output to aviation factories, has finished $1,500,000 expansion, increasing capacity 100 percent; doubling pay roll.

Joplin, Mo.: Atlas powder plant to double capacity August 1.

Buffalo, N. Y.: Bell Aircraft doubling floor space and pay roll for manufacture of interceptor airplanes. Curtiss Aeroplane manpower doubled in past year; further expansion expected.

Cincinnati: Durable-goods and machine-tool industries, centering in this area and lower Miami Valley, spending upward of $1,000,000. Aeronautical Corporation of America, which moved from Cincinnati to Middletown to gain 100 percent more floor space less than a month ago, planning another 100-percent increase to permit output of 2,500 light planes a year.

WATCH PLANT MAKES FUZES

Newport News, Va.: Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock expects additions to its 11,000-man pay roll.

Chicago: Elgin Watch tooling to produce time fuzes for shells, beginning at end of year.

Detroit: Automobile men study airplane engines for production-line handling.

Charleston, W. Va.: Renovating naval ordnance plant. Expanding Kanawha Valley chemical plants. International Nickel adding $250,000 machine shop at Huntington.

Nashville, Tenn.—New $1,000,000 aviation manufacturing corporation plant now employs 400, with 300 in training and expects to increase to 1,000; can make 90 light observation planes a month, besides commercial ships.

Chicago—Twenty-six plants start enlargements costing $6,500,000.

FORGING FACILITIES INCREASED

Newark, N. J.—Wright Aeronautical Corporation newly opened plant to turn out 1,000 plane motors monthly now employs about 10,000.

Pittsburgh—Mesta Machine Co. completing $1,000,000 enlargement of forging facilities.

Memphis, Tenn.—Du Pont $20,000,000 powder plant, financed by Allies, under construction; to include 100 buildings covering 2,400 acres.

Hartford, Conn.—Pratt & Whitney (engine) division of United Aircraft spending $8,000,000 on expansion. Pratt & Whitney division of Niles-Bement-Pond Co., machine-tool firm of Hartford, recently built $2,000,000 building, adding 1,200 new workers. Colt Fire Arms just leased 100,000 square feet at Hartford to accommodate increased business.

Seattle—Navy pushing $4,500,000 drydock at Puget Sound to completion within a month. Builders working around the clock also on another drydock there.

Los Angeles—Aluminum Co. of America tripling plant to turn out castings, forgings, and rivets for airplanes. Aircraft factories expanding.

The Kind of Man Willkie Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of July 2, 1940, entitled "The Kind of Man Willkie Is." The editorial follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of July 2, 1940]

THE KIND OF MAN WILLKIE IS

The invaluable asset in politics is a personality that clicks with the citizenry. More than all else this was the advantage in recent years of that Federal administration which has been called, though lately with weary disillusionment, the New Deal.

The Republicans now have one of these rare and effective vote getters as their own in the person of Wendell Willkie. Party leaders did their best to avoid taking him over, but the enormous personal popularity of the candidate, so recently developed, was not to be evaded. And Wendell Willkie took them over, horse and foot, at Philadelphia.

Some of us think he is going to take over the country, too. Drop a spark in a ripened prairie, and the swift flame races to the skyline in an incredibly short space of time. Such fires have been stopped by plowing and backfiring, sometimes, but where is the furrow to be plowed against Wendell Willkie, and what is the backfire? Already we have witnessed a political phenomenon without parallel in major American history. It will sweep on.

It will sweep on because—to mix metaphor a trifle—the Republican nominee is as natural and easy as an old shoe. He entered our political life, and unwittingly, by a side door, talking American common sense in language direct, simple, and friendly. They hustled him up to the front, not unwillingly, and it was the voice of the people that spoke through the final party ballots in the convention.

It isn't often that the people find a candidate entirely after their own hearts. Even an honest nature will be tempted to strike a pose for political effect. Less fortunate sincerity frequently seeks to assist its ends by phrase-making intended to excite or gratify the popular ear. But the popular eye is critical and the popular ear acute, and something lacks in the process of utter conviction. Nothing lacks in the instance of Wendell Willkie. This nominee radiates naturalness and sincerity that are unmistakably genuine.

By the dog-eared usages of precedent some candidates in the past have retired for the night as the ballots were being counted, pro-

fessing a serenity, come what might, that could have been suspected as arrant flapdoodle. Wendell Willkie did not dissemble his lively and virtually boyish interest in what was happening in the convention hall. He stayed up to listen to the radio, while he followed the balloting in his room in the Benjamin Franklin. There was an entire absence of pretense.

When he knew that he was nominated someone asked him where he would choose to receive the formal notification. And he said that he wanted this honor to come to him on the steps of the Indiana high school where he used to lead a debating team. He wanted to taste the experience to the full, and the way to do that, in his opinion, is to be notified at the old high school among the folks of his boyhood. Being natural beats political sagacity all hollow sometimes.

General Johnson is said to have pioneered with the observation that the secret of Wendell Willkie's charm—yet "charm" isn't the word at all; "likability" is better—is that Willkie likes everybody. It is a trait which few men of vigorous character and worth-while opinion ever possess. Usually its possessor is penalized by a lamentable lack of force of character. But that isn't true of the Republican nominee, who has this encompassing liking for people without any sacrifice of individual force, and who always has had it. Nor is it anything that can be imitated convincingly or counterfeited so that it will pass current. One has it or one does not have it. And Wendell Willkie has it.

You can think of one other American political figure who had it and who became President—but you shall think of him for yourself. Of late years there has been too much of this comparison of the public men of the present, and flatteringly, with the great public men of the past. But still every pot stands on its own bottom. We are willing to wager that the Republican nominee has in his own right, and abundantly, the quality we call "what it takes."

The best thing about Wendell Willkie, the attribute that should and may make him our next President—it being conceded that he has the requisite qualifications—is that he rings true. He is sound as a dollar. Maybe that phrase is a little unfortunate. Anyhow, the Republican nominee is sound as a dollar used to be.

I ask leave to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, July 3, 1940, on the subject of the Democratic candidate and the third-term mystery. The editorial follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of July 3, 1940]

WHO'S TO BE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENCY CANNOT BE ANSWERED WHILE THIRD TERM REMAINS MYSTERY

Less than 2 weeks intervene until the Democratic national convention opens in Chicago, and the country faces a political situation that may be unprecedented.

There can be no dominant candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination while President Roosevelt keeps his attitude toward the third term a mystery. The longer the time goes, the nearer the 15th, opening date of the convention, approaches, the less is the mystery, but not the shadow on other candidates.

A whole group of factors are combining to push the President toward a third-term nomination. Let's list them, briefly:

The pressure of international emergency.

The formidability of the Republican ticket.

The personal challenge by Republican nominee Willkie that he will be satisfied, only, to "meet the champ."

The President's solicitude to expand and continue the New Deal program, and his lack of confidence in any leadership but his own.

Put these together, and then add another that may be as impelling as any, namely, that by playing the sphinx the situation has got out of Roosevelt's control. He has waited too long.

Only a little while ago it appeared that the Republicans must wait until at least 1944 for any real hope of victory. Now, with the swift focusing of events that characterizes the times, the lines are being drawn for major conflict, not only between parties but between ideas of government. And the gauntlet lies at the feet of "the champ."

I also wish to extend, as a part of my remarks, the article written by Walter Lippmann under date of July 3, in which he comments on the nomination of Mr. Willkie and its bearing on the third-term controversy. Mr. Lippmann's article follows:

AS WALTER LIPPMANN SEES IT—WILLKIE NOMINATION SHATTERS ALL THIRD-TERM ARGUMENT

WASHINGTON, July 3.—By the nomination of Wendell Willkie the Republicans have removed foreign policy and national defense from the arena of partisan politics; therefore, there has disappeared the reason which would have compelled Mr. Roosevelt to run for a third term and the only reason which would have justified this departure from American tradition.

It will soon be evident, I believe, that the Nation has been saved from an internal disaster of disunion and demoralization which would have paralyzed the Government in the face of the mounting external dangers in the Pacific, in South America, and in Europe. For had the country been subjected to a 4 months' campaign fought on the issue of foreign policy and the third term the result could only have been tragic and ruinous.

Nothing was plainer after the first 3 days at Philadelphia than that only the nomination of Willkie could unite the Republican Party and provide a means by which the Nation could be united. The struggle over the platform proved that conclusively. The platform is a hash of meaningless words because Willkie's opponents tried to draft a platform which would make it impossible for the convention to nominate him.

Thus the platform had to be meaningless because the party was divided and the opposing factions were deadlocked. If, then, the convention had failed to break the deadlock by nominating Willkie, his supporters would have been profoundly disaffected and in one way or another great masses of them would have turned silently away from the party and even openly to the Democratic Party.

Under these circumstances the stage would have been set perfectly for a third-term nomination at Chicago. It would have been evident that Mr. Roosevelt was by far the strongest candidate that the Democrats could nominate. He would have had behind him not only almost the whole of the Democratic Party, but to a very large number of Republicans he would have represented, whatever their other feelings about him, the only available candidate who understands the world we are living in.

The rule against the third term is a rule which ought never to be broken except when the vital interests of the Nation are at stake. There would have been a very large number of Republicans and conservative Democrats who would have felt that the vital interests of the Nation are at stake, and that the rule had to be broken because the alternative to Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate who could not be depended upon to understand and then to protect the vital interests of the country.

Yet obviously it would have been appallingly dangerous to enter a campaign which saw Mr. Roosevelt running for a third term against a disrupted Republican Party and amidst partisan clamor about the most delicate and explosive issues in foreign affairs That is what the country has escaped because of Mr. Willkie's nomination.

Now it is no longer necessary for Mr. Roosevelt to accept the nomination which the Chicago convention will offer him. No one can now pretend that Mr. Roosevelt is the only Presidential candidate available who understands the national interest and is determined to organize the country to protect its national interest. On the other hand, it is evident that if Mr. Roosevelt now accepts a third nomination, he will have injected into the campaign an issue which will divert and divide the Nation at a time when unity is indispensable.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the logic of the new situation will be clear to Mr. Roosevelt, and that as a matter of principle and of personal inclination he will choose not to run again. As a matter of principle how could he justify a campaign for a third term against a candidate who, on the paramount issues of the day, has the same fundamental principles and convictions?

To run again now would be to descend from being President in a great moment of history to being a partisan candidate.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, writing in his daily column, had the following to say with reference to the Democratic nomination for President, which I ask leave to extend in these remarks:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

This nominating speech could, but won't, be delivered at Chicago.

My friends and fellow Democrats as our peerless leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has so often urged, what this country most needs in this world crisis is national unity. It needs a declaration like that of another great Democratic President in a similar peril. Said Woodrow Wilson: "Politics is adjourned." This principle of our party began with its beginnings.

Thomas Jefferson said at another time, when Europe's wars threatened us: "During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonized spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; and should divide opinions as to measures of safety; but every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans (Democrats); we are all Federalists (Republicans)."

Fellow Democrats, in our great defensive preparations we need as never before that ancient democratic principle of political unity against a peril to us all.

But the forms of unity alone are not enough. United action requires great leadership of all Americans—not leadership merely of a hodgepodge of differing pressure groups, made bitter against other groups by real or fancied grievances or made servile by lavish special privileges or threats to withdraw them.

No. We must have a leadership on which all men of good will and high patriotism can unite and follow willingly and enthusiastically—not for group fear or favor but to draw us all close in one compact and mental appeal to Americans of all ranks and conditions that, when his standard is raised, people will flock to it because they cannot find it in their hearts or minds to do otherwise.

We need something more. Our battle front in this phase is in our fields and factories, in our arsenals and shipyards. Our front-line soldiers are now industrial workers and industrial management. We need a leader, proved in practice, who can manage our unparalleled economic strength for the greatest effort in its history in defense of our native land. We cannot command confidence in this on any uninterrupted record of failure in this field. We need a great liberal with an uninterrupted record of success.

Our party has done its best in its two-term fight toward progress and social justice. We have accomplished wonders. But we have made great blunders and left grievous wounds rankling. We have sown some crops of class hatreds and sectional resentments. These may have been unavoidable, but our leadership in this somber hour cannot be designed to aggravate or fail to cure them. It must be competent to hold the principles of all our proved advances and at the same time to soothe and heal the scars of our fratricidal wars.

This party has a Democrat who fits these specifications of our greater need as a glove fits a hand. I propose a Democrat who has a shining record as a great liberal in a post where being a liberal was far more difficult than it ever was for any of us—a Democrat with an unbroken record of managerial success in all great undertakings and not an unbroken record of failure; a Democrat who has just been given the most spontaneous and universal expression of mass popular confidence, approval, and affection in our time; a Democrat of proved justice, fairness, sympathy, and understanding of the problems of all our peoples; a Democrat of the most typically American career, philosophy, conduct, and achievement since Abraham Lincoln. I propose a Democrat by heredity and conviction, Wendell Willkie.

If the Republicans had sense enough to nominate such a Democrat, why haven't the Democrats?

The Forest Service In the State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

LETTER FROM LYLE F. WATTS, REGIONAL FORESTER FOR THE NORTH PACIFIC REGION

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including a letter from Lyle F. Watts, regional forester for the North Pacific region, addressed to me under date of March 16, 1940, setting forth the work of the Forest Service in my section of the country. The letter follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE, NORTH PACIFIC REGION,
Portland, Oreg., March 16, 1940.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I take pleasure in transmitting to you a copy of the Report for 1939 of the Chief of the Forest Service. In this report Mr. Silcox mentioned briefly the responsibilities which have been assigned to the Forest Service and the activities in which it is engaged. I should like to amplify his statements insofar as they refer to the Pacific Northwest and the State of Oregon.

The four Columbia River Basin States have about half the softwood saw timber in the country. Two-thirds of this timber is west of the Cascades. Over 348,000,000,000 feet of it are in Oregon, which has more timber than any other State. In 1938 its production for the first time was ahead of that of any other State, although the cut of 3,790,896,000 board feet was less than that in 1929, the peak year. Washington was second. Oregon and Washington supply the United States with about one-third of its wood products. The wood supply in this area is a matter of national, as well as local, importance.

The timber supply in northern Oregon is also a matter of local concern. Logs tributary to the Columbia River market are becoming scarce. Clatsop and Columbia Counties are getting cut out. The Tillamook fire was a heavy blow to mills in the Portland area. Logs are being brought from more distant sources, and the mills around Portland face the disadvantage of a log haul that is continually getting longer.

This local shortage of timber cannot now be prevented, but a good deal can be done to keep the timber industry in Oregon supplied with raw material. The 10-year average for area burned annually on State and private lands is 265,796 acres, which would make a strip of townships reaching from Portland nearly to Jefferson. The State and private protection agencies have been strengthened, but the hazard is also being increased by public use and the growth of the area of logged-off lands. A much stronger protective effort seems to be a requirement.

In 1938, protection of State and private forest areas cost $790,672. Of this amount, $126,336, or 16 percent, was contributed by the Federal Government under the terms of the Clarke-McNary Act. It has been suggested that 16 percent participation by no means expresses public interest and obligation in forest protection in Oregon.

During the past two decades the western pine beetle killed about 15,000,000,000 feet of ponderosa pine in Washington and Oregon, chiefly in Oregon. During the same period losses of pine from fire and windthrow were less than 1,000,000,000 feet; the cut of all the mills in the pine type was about 17,000,000,000 feet. About 1919 the hemlock looper killed a township of old growth fir in Tillamook County; in 1929 to 1932 it killed 200,000,000 feet of timber in Pacific County before it was stopped. In 1934 the hemlock sawfly damaged about 60,000 acres of timber in the Santiam drainage. Other big losses can be mentioned. These epidemics can be controlled or modified, but they are beyond individual effort and are a public matter. The proposal that protection from insects and disease should receive Federal cooperation like that given protection from fire under the Clarke-McNary Act has merit.

Forest lands in Oregon are held by about 27,000 different owners. Most of these lands have little or no value for any purpose other than raising timber, and holding small tracts after they have been logged while the new crop acquires value does not attract many owners. It is understood that over a million and one-half acres have reverted to the counties for taxes, in spite of the forest-tax law. State law provides for the acquisition of this land by the State Board of Forestry and a small start has been made. This land is definitely off the tax rolls and is not of a kind that is likely to reenter private ownership. The counties are seldom in a position to manage it advantageously. Its acquisition and management as State forest is probably the best way of disposing of it. The Fulmer Act is intended to give Federal assistance to States in assembling and managing State forests, but there is no provision to make it effective.

State, private, and Federal agencies are pioneering in the conversion of virgin forests to managed forests. It is a project of the highest importance to the residents of the region. The work of the Forest and Range Experiment Stations is indispensable in developing the methods that are most likely to be successful. Their work covers every phase of land use—logging and milling practice, forest protection, range management, flood control, and so on.

For several years the Forest Service has been studying the possibility of sustained-yield management in each of the major operating areas in the North Pacific region. Seventeen analyses have been made and in seven instances private concerns have taken the action appropriate for putting their operations on a sustained-yield basis.

Along the national-forest boundaries in a number of localities, private and public stands make logical units capable of sustaining continuous operations advantageous to both parties. Assurance of access to national-forest timber would be a strong inducement to owners to plan stable operations, but under present legal restrictions this assurance cannot be given.

The forest survey was authorized by the McSweeney-McNary Act in 1928 and started about 10 years ago. It is intended to be an inventory of the national timber supply, dependent industries, depletion and growth. The field work is about half finished; compilation of the data that has been gathered, about one-half finished. Many years will be required to complete the project at the present rate.

The 1939 fire season was difficult. Spring and part of the summer were drier than any on record; some of the driest periods were accompanied by strong winds; a number of violent lightning storms occurred. In one 48-hour period 822 fires were started on 19 of the national forests in the region. The area of national-forest land burned was held to about 49,000 acres in Oregon, 58,000 in the region.

The use of crews of experienced woodsmen, selected for endurance and skill with woods tools and trained in what is known as the progressive method of fire-line construction, was developed. The crew traverses the location selected and at intervals each member makes a short sector of fire line, then moves ahead. With proper organization the line is completed when the last man has passed. The construction of held line per man-day was greatly increased, and I believe that this method, if extended, will decrease suppression costs and area burned.

Experiments were also made in delivering one or more skilled fire fighters by airplane to fires so located that ordinary means of travel will consume several hours. Especial training and equipment to prevent accidents are, of course, employed. Airplanes were used to deliver supplies to camps when other transportation was too slow. The radio laboratory has built several types of portable instruments that have been adopted by many other protective agencies. The smoke chaser's two-way unit weighs 9 pounds.

The drought which has continued for over a decade has decreased the national forest ranges' grazing capacity and the number of permitted stock has of necessity been correspondingly reduced. In 1939, the number of cattle grazed was 71,926; of horses, 2,468; of sheep, 460,622. The number of permits issued was 1,252 in Oregon, 1,722 for the entire region. In 1935 the number of

cattle was 84,081; of horses, 2,762; and of sheep, 569,111. Undoubtedly more intensive management of the range would increase its capacity.

Wildlife management is conducted in cooperation with the State game commission and the Biological Survey. Overstocking of the Murderers Creek winter range is being corrected by adjustment of the bag limit. Mule deer overpopulation on the Fremont Forest along the California line is receiving attention. Some areas in the national forests are being stocked with beaver.

The use of the national forests for recreation is increasing. The latest reports show 1,078,049 visits. Their average duration is 2.6 days. About 100,000 of these visits were for hunting, 350,000 for fishing, 130,000 for winter sports. Use for recreation has about doubled in 5 years. Interest in winter sports has shown the greatest growth. In the same period the number of visits increased from 3.3 percent to 13.1 percent of the total attendance. A great majority of the campers and picnickers use the forest camps built by the Forest Service and the C. C. C. Without these camps, which are made safe from fire, use of the woods during the summer would be restricted, and accommodating such great numbers of people without pure water supplies and sanitary facilities would be impracticable. Under the office of lands, 2,421 special-use permits were in effect, 1,120 of them free.

Timber sales have not yet returned to the high point of 1929, but are increasing. The cut in 1939 was 217,371,000 board feet. Receipts were $503,136. The average price per thousand feet was $2.34. Of the 1,561 sales, 892 were to residents at cost, 669 were commercial sales. There were 3,735 free-use permits issued. Land acquired by exchange for timber amounted to 27,315 acres.

Timber in private ownership is more accessible and of better quality than that on the national forests and pressure to realize on it is heavy. The cut on the national forests is small in comparison to that in the rest of the State, but as the private stands are depleted this public timber will be of greater importance in the States' economy. Private forest lands, of better quality and greater production capacity than that on the national forests, will probably be of major importance, both in the local and the national forestry program. No doubt recognition of this situation prompted the Secretary of Agriculture in his statement to the joint congressional committee to advocate increased public cooperation with the owners of private forest land, and forest regulations to the extent that the public interest requires it.

A complete account of the forest situation in the Northwest cannot be given in one letter, but if I can be of assistance in furnishing additional information on any phase of this subject, I shall be most glad to do so.

Very sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS,
Regional Forester.

[Enclosure.]

Quo Vadis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, appearing in the July 13, 1940, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 13, 1940]

QUO VADIS?

This is written on June 10. With no notice to the American people or to the Congress that is supposed to interpret their will, this country entered the war 4 days ago. Stranger than the fact was the passive acceptance of it.

While the Senate was debating, with intent to kill it, a resolution that would have conferred upon the President of the United States certain extraordinary powers, the President seized those powers and involved this country in the European conflict by an act of physical intervention.

This he did by sanction of his own will. The Congress did not know what he was going to do and debated it after the fact. The people, whose war it will be, first read it in newspaper headlines.

What we now write is to complete the record. We have no idea what the next consequences will be or what will have happened by the time these words appear. But as in time to come it may be bitterly remembered, so now be it said that in the one hundred and fifty-first year of its existence the house of constitutional republican government was betrayed, even as the builders feared. Unawares to the people, the exalted Executive principle could involve them in war. We dare to look at the truth and to ask why the house of our fathers had to be half surrendered before it was attacked. We do not here touch the question of whether or not we should go to the side of the Allies. What we are saying is that if the American people may be involved in a world war unawares and without a specific act of Congress, then much else has happened to them of which also they are unaware.

We do not believe the people had ever thought of going again to the battlefields of Europe. They had been misled to think this country somehow could put forth its economic strength and not itself become involved. That is what they were thinking when they were polled on whether we should be giving more aid to the Allies. The idea that we could help to destroy the aggressor in Europe and not get hurt was a propagated phantasy and produced on many minds the hypnotic effect that may or may not have been intended.

To accomplish his purpose, it was necessary for the President to outwit the law. First was a statute, enacted in time of peace, permitting the Military Establishment to sell to any foreign government with whom we were at peace on a certain date surplus munitions and war materials for which there was no other market, and to exchange motor vehicles, airplanes, engines and parts for new and similar equipment. When that statute was written, nobody could have dreamed that it would ever be used by the President as a pretext for opening this country's arsenals to either side in another world war.

Secondly, it was necessary to beat the prohibitions of international law and especially article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907, to which this country put its name, which is still in force, and which reads: "The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden."

Observe here the very strict distinction. The private citizen of a neutral country may sell arms and war material to a belligerent power; that is permitted. American industry, acting privately, could sell airplanes and guns to the Allies. But for a government to do it is an act of intervention. The government that does it is no longer neutral. It has taken part. It is, in fact, at war.

The President of the United States could not himself, of his own will, declare war. Only the Congress has the constitutional power to declare war. But he hit upon a device for getting the country into the conflict without declaring war.

As Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States he declared the Navy to have a surplus of airplanes, at a moment when there was a panic of anxiety over the shocking inadequacy of the country's air defenses. As Commander in Chief he ordered the Navy to deliver this alleged surplus of planes back to the factory they came from, in exchange for new planes yet to be made—and this under a previous stipulation with the airplane factory that as fast as it received the planes from the Navy, it would hand them over to the Allies.

We had no surplus of airplanes; so far otherwise, we very urgently want more than we are yet able to make for ourselves. Nor were these obsolete planes, for if they were, of what use could they be to the Allies in battle? Thirdly, then, the make-believe that in the end it became simply a transaction between the private American airplane industry and the Allies, because the Navy, on delivering the planes to the factory, quit title to them, was only clever, and far beneath the dignity of a great people.

The next day it was guns. As Commander in Chief, the President would declare obsolete or surplus a lot of United States Army guns, including thousands of the 75 mm.'s the French were greatly in need of, sell them to American gun makers, who would sell them at once to the Allies, undertaking to replace them later in the American armory out of new manufacture.

That day, as reported in the New York Times, "In his press-conference discussion of national-defense plans, President Roosevelt refused the role of prophet when asked how far this Government was prepared to go in supplying the Allied Powers with guns, ammunition, and aircraft." And how about bombs to go with the bombing planes? That question was asked because only the Government itself manufactures the bombs. Therefore there could be no subterfuge of turning back bombs to private manufacturers in exchange for new and better bombs later. The reporters could not quote the President directly at this point. The New York Times reporter wrote: "It was remarked, however, that the law does not require surplus munitions to be returned to the factory whence they came, but merely specifies that they may be exchanged for other munitions." Which means, if it means anything, that the President was thinking the Government could manufacture bombs to go with the airplanes, sell them to somebody who would sell them to the Allies, and itself take anything in exchange.

Then what of warships? What of turning warships back to the shipyards that made them on an undertaking by the shipbuilders to sell them to the Allies and make new ones for the United States Navy? The reporters asked the President that question. The New York Times reporter wrote: "He explained that he had been unable to get to that question, so far."

How far on this line would the Government go? Only the President could say, and he declined to be prophet.

What else might the Government do? If the people would know that, let them read the cryptic words of newspaper reporters writing under the censorship imposed upon the White House press conference.

What a text is there! Government by Executive inspiration. War by Executive impulse.

We shall survive the war. But how? As a government of the people, by the people, for the people? Or as a state that has embraced in the New World what it had wished to destroy in the Old?

For it is war. Since the first week of June this country has been in fact at war with Germany. Take it in simple fact. Suppose we were at war and a government that had been neutral in form, but not in feeling, suddenly opened its arsenals to our enemy, exactly as we have opened ours to the Allies.

Would we regard it as an act of war? We would. What would we do about it? We would declare war on that government, and if for strategic reasons not actually at once, then certainly in our hearts and minds, for a future settlement.

If it should turn out that to strip this country of armaments and send them to Europe at a moment in history when our existing power of national defense was pitifully inadequate and the crisis in Europe was such that no one could say how many hours remained of the British Empire, or that the aggressor might not win, capture the allied fleet and dictate a peace before enough American aid to turn the battle against him could possibly arrive—if it should turn out that this had been a tragic blunder, beyond recall, then the leader who had done it might wish that his page in the book of fame would refuse to receive ink, for it would be written of him there that in his passionate zeal to save civilization in Europe he had forgotten his own country.

Are We Benefited by Trade Agreements in South America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State recently created a new Division of Commercial Treaties and Agreements in place of the former Committee on Trade Agreements. In a statement announcing this change the Secretary stated:

> Far from signifying an abandonment or weakening of the trade-agreements program, this administrative change is intended to strengthen and make more efficient our efforts.

Is it not about time we face the facts as to how beneficial these treaties are?

I am submitting a table showing the increase in export trade in four trade-agreement countries and four non-trade-agreement countries of South America. It is interesting to note that our trade to the four trade-agreement countries for the first 5 months of 1940, as compared to 1939, increased 47 percent, while our export trade to the nonagreement countries increased 114 percent.

Exports to South America

Exports including reexports	5 months ending May—		Increase	Percent
	1939	1940		
Total exports to South America	$114,528,000	$194,413,000	$79,885,000	69.7
Trade-agreement countries:				
Brazil	28,173,000	50,444,000		
Colombia	20,399,000	23,083,000		
Venezuela	23,069,000	31,161,000		
Ecuador	1,772,000	3,269,000		
Total	73,413,000	107,957,000	34,544,000	47.0
Nonagreement countries:				
Argentina	21,448,000	49,217,000		
Chile	8,504,000	17,779,000		
Uruguay	1,252,000	4,165,000		
Peru	6,733,000	10,029,000		
Total	37,937,000	81,190,000	43,253,000	114.0

National Aviation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1940

SUGGESTED PROGRAM BY NATIONAL AVIATION DAY ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to present the following which is a suggested program for celebration on National Aviation Day, and which in my opinion is a very splendid program that should be supported throughout the entire Nation.

SUGGESTED PROGRAM FOR CELEBRATIONS ON NATIONAL AVIATION DAY
AUGUST 19, 1940

When Congress, at the suggestion of the National Aviation Day Association, Inc., by Public Resolution No. 14, passed on May 11, 1939, recognized and designated August 19, of each year, as National Aviation Day, it not only commemorated the invention of the airplane, but also the birthdate of Orville Wright, only living father of aviation.

Since the historic flight of the Wright Brothers, at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903, it cannot be denied that aviation has made tremendous progress. It is true that military necessity, perhaps, spurred research and technical advances, but aviation has made great strides in civil life as well, and now air transportation is rapidly blanketing the entire earth. Indeed, it is not unreasonable to assert that aviation today is at about the same stage, industrially, as was the automobile in 1910—on the threshold of its greatest period of development.

The growth of the industry now is being greatly accelerated. The manufacture and maintenance of giant air liners, undoubtedly, will be greatly increased and expanded, and with greater speed and more safety factors. Every nation will be covered by a criss-cross of air-transportation lines and stratoplane clippers will navigate the trackless lanes of all oceans.

AMERICA'S STAKE IN AVIATION DEVELOPMENTS

As this is written America is making titanic efforts to recapture supremacy in manufacture of planes. Because of war clouds and threats therefrom stern necessity dictates that the United States immediately construct essential factories and equipment and train personnel, so as to be on equal footing, at least, with any and all other nations.

At this time of uncertainty it is perhaps unwise to venture predictions but, on the basis of present conditions, it seems reasonable that from $500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 will be expended in the United States within the next year or two for aviation.

(NOTE.—As this goes to press the Army, Navy, and civil-aviation appropriation bills, alone, authorize expenditures of $543,413,779.)

Giant factories are being built, or, are in the blueprint stages, and all present aviation facilities are being greatly expanded. Modern airports, dotting every State, and touching every important city, are being built, or, will be built, and, surely, these will be laid out with a view to establishing a distinct pattern of closely knit air line communications, from coast to coast.

Other industries—manufacturing tools, dies, parts, and other matériel, are, and will also expand activities, in direct ratio of aviation requirements of the moment, including road building machinery, the rubber industry, radio and telephone communications, building material, including glass, brick, stone, concrete, wood, sheet iron, steel, etc. All these, and others, will share in the impetus of aviation's forward thrust.

AVIATION'S BIRTHDAY

The National Aviation Day Association, Inc., has communicated with all Governors of States and Territorial possessions, advising them of the official nature of the celebration of National Aviation Day, and, also has conferred with many organizations, and individuals, including Members of Congress, heads of patriotic and veterans' organizations; civic, trade, technical, and other groups, as well as representatives of women's organizations.

All have expressed approval of the general purposes for which National Aviation Day was created, by Congress, and an overwhelming majority pledged their active support to make these celebrations nationally significant.

Members of Congress have assured our association that they will, gladly, avail themselves of the opportunity to participate in local celebrations, and are holding themselves ready, on call.

For the purpose of suggesting possible means of making their assistance effective, the National Aviation Day Association, Inc., respectfully tenders its program to all those interested, including

Governors of States and Territorial possessions, mayors and other national and local public figures.

PROCLAMATIONS

We suggest that the President's proclamation, outlined below, be given wide publicity by release through the offices of Governors, mayors, and other public officials:

"National Aviation Day

"By the President of the United States of America—A proclamation:

"Whereas the development of aeronautics in recent years has been so rapid that aviation in its many phases has come to exert a profound influence on the course of events throughout the world; and

"Whereas American initiative and industry have contributed greatly to this development and should be encouraged to continue such contribution in order that the United States may retain its outstanding position in the field of aeronautics; and

"Whereas Public Resolution No. 14, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved May 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 739), provides:

" 'That the President of the United States is authorized to designate August 19 of each year as National Aviation Day, and to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate exercises to further and stimulate interest in aviation in the United States': Now, therefore,

"I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate August 19, 1939, and August 19 of each succeeding year, as National Aviation Day, and call upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day, and invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate exercises to further and stimulate interest in aviation in this country.

"In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this 25th day of July in the year of our Lord 1939, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-fourth.

[SEAL] "FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

"By the President:

"CORDELL HULL,

"Secretary of State."

Governors of States and mayors of cities may well issue an official proclamation, declaratory of the day. For illustration, below is copy of the proclamation issued by Gov. E. D. Rivers, of Georgia:

"STATE OF GEORGIA,

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

"Atlanta.

"By the Governor:

"Whereas the United States Congress, by joint resolution passed on May 11, 1939, recognized and designated August 19, 1940, the birth date of Orville Wright, to commemorate the invention of the airplane, and to provide for Nation-wide celebration of that date as National Aviation Day; and

"Whereas the invention of the airplane, and its development throughout the years, have meant much to the progress of our Nation and our State; and

"Whereas Inventor Orville Wright has made a great contribution to economic development by giving to the world its fastest mode of transportation, and deserves much credit for this feat: Now, therefore,

"I, E. D. Rivers, Governor of Georgia, do designate August 19, 1940, as National Aviation Day in the State of Georgia, and I call upon all citizens of our State to participate, wherever possible, in events scheduled for that day sponsored by the National Aviation Day Association, Inc., or by other groups of individuals interested in aviation, for the purpose of honoring a great American through expressing appreciation of his contribution to the world.

"And it is so ordered this the 2d day of May 1940.

"(Signed) E. D. RIVERS,

"Governor."

MILITARY UNITS

Where desirable, Governors, or other public officials, may call upon commandants of Federal Army posts, or naval, marine, or Coast Guard establishments, requesting detail of service bands or other units of our armed forces to participate in such celebrations.

This also applies to the National Guard, which, of course, is under jurisdiction of the Governors themselves. If the National Guard has an aviation corps, then, a still more appropriate demonstration may be staged, including forms of mock combats or other aero exhibitions.

PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

The G. A. R., U. C. V., Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, United Spanish War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Army and Navy Union, Military Order of the World War, Society of the Cincinnati, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and other organizations and auxiliaries thereof are naturally interested in a patriotic celebration of the type of National Aviation Day and would no doubt respond to any official call.

Fraternal orders, including B. P. O. E., L. O. O. M., F. O. E., the Shrine, Knights Templars, and other Masonic orders, the Knights of Columbus and affiliated bodies, B'nai B'rith and other organizations interested in the preservation and advancement of American interests also would likely participate if called upon.

CIVIC, TRADE, AND OTHER GROUPS

Chambers of commerce, both senior and junior, boards of trade, commercial clubs, Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Civitans, and other similar groups doubtless would support local celebrations.

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

The interest of women in aviation is very keen, and is growing daily. Congress itself has taken note of this fact, as evidenced by the joint resolution recently introduced in the Senate by Senator HATTIE CARAWAY, of Arkansas, and in the House by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and which reads as follows:

"National Aviation Day

"[Remarks of Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, in the House of Representatives, April 23, 1940]

"Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution authorizing the recognition of American women's interest in aviation, and directing their attention to, and urging their cooperation with, the coming Nation-wide celebration of National Aviation Day on August 19, 1940, and for other purposes.

"Whereas the development of aviation, both as an important industrial asset and as a strong arm of our national defense, is vitally essential to the welfare of our country; and

"Whereas by Public Resolution No. 14, approved May 11, 1939, at the suggestion of the National Aviation Day Association, Congress recognized and designated August 19, 1940, the birth date of Orville Wright, as National Aviation Day, and further provided for Nation-wide celebration of that date; and

"Whereas the patriotism of American women from the very inception of our Republic has been the inspiration of lovers of liberty—respected and admired the entire world over; and

"Whereas today American women have a double interest in the advancement of aviation: First as a potent means of defending their homes against invaders; second, as an increasingly important industrial factor, contributing to the pay rolls and thus aiding recovery and maintaining prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That in recognition of American women's interest in aviation, Congress directs their attention to and urges their cooperation with the coming Nation-wide celebrations of National Aviation Day on August 19, 1940."

By all means Governors, mayors, and other public officials should call the foregoing to the attention of all women's organizations in their respective States, and cities, including local units, General Federation of Women's Clubs, National League of Women Voters, National Woman's Party, Business and Professional Women, American Association of University Women, etc.

COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES, HIGH SCHOOLS, ETC.

August 19 falls during the vacation period, when most students are away from school. But, by calling upon the heads of institutions of learning, it may be possible to bring about some sort of celebration in which school units take part.

In this connection, it is suggested that it would be very appropriate if such schools would undertake essay contests relative to the progress of aviation. Data is available in most school libraries on the historical aspects, at least, and there might be, in some instances, opportunities for reenactment of the scenes attendant upon the first flight, at Kitty Hawk, or other feats worthy of commemoration.

HIGH-SCHOOL CADETS AND BOY AND GIRL SCOUTS

Unquestionably, aviation has first place in the hearts of the younger generation today, and if high-school cadets, Boy Scouts, and Girl Scouts are called upon to participate in National Aviation Day no doubt they would enthusiastically accept the invitation. A number of ways are open for their activities, among which might be model airplane contests, including flights of both motored planes and gliders; demonstrations of radio communications, heliographing, etc.

DEDICATION OR REDEDICATION OF AIRPORTS

The attention of Governors and mayors is respectfully directed to the possibilities of dedication of various airports. In view of the large number of fields now under construction, doubtless, it would be possible to arrange dedication ceremonies for these on National Aviation Day—next August 19.

It does not matter whether or not these are entirely new airports, or old ones simply being enlarged and improved to fit the needs of the times. In many instances, as yet, no official name has been bestowed upon such fields, or perhaps the fields might appropriately, be renamed. In any event, it would be eminently appropriate to hold dedication rites, on August 19.

This should be done in all States, and we respectfully suggest to Governors, mayors, and other public officials that they immediately investigate and determine what fields could be thus covered, and arrange suitable programs for each.

AIR-MAIL CACHETS, ETC.

In many instances, in view of the great public interest in philately, the foregoing suggested dedications, or rededications of airports, on August 19 might well be made the means of having a cachet. The expense of this is practically negligible, it being only the cost of the rubber stamps itself, and publicity for such cachets can be easily arranged through the various philatelic societies, and their official organs.

Our association will gladly furnish additional information on above, if requested.

NEWSPAPERS

It is especially requested that all newspapers be advised as to any and all activities undertaken by public officials, pertaining to Aviation Day celebrations, and the National Aviation Day Association would appreciate copies of any such statements furnished the press.

RADIO

National Aviation Day, as a means of radio celebration, is a "natural." Interested sponsors at local stations could well arrange skits of, say, 15 minutes' duration, in which the characters enact the Kitty Hawk flight, or other stirring recollections of aviation history.

Ace flyers, including air-mail pilots, could be brought before the microphones and interviewed as to "My Greatest Thrill in the Air," etc.

AIR MAIL AND POSTMASTERS

All postmasters are requested to give special attention to air-mail phases in the period leading up to and culminating in National Aviation Day. In this connection, the National Aviation Day Association has requested Postmaster General Farley to declare and proclaim the period from August 18 to August 24, inclusive, as National Aviation Week, and it is possible that this action will be taken.

Mailing associations should be contacted through postmasters and advised to participate in air-mail week and National Aviation Day celebrations.

AIR EXPRESS

The growing importance of air express as an important means of transport also offers opportunities for cooperation on the parts of interested groups. They can well point out to the public, as well as business groups, the desirability, for example, of shipping certain types of perishables and other commodities which must have quick handling and marketing.

CONCLUSION

The National Aviation Day Association wishes to take this opportunity to thank all those who have pledged their support. Herein the association has endeavored to suggest practicable ways and means of successfully enlisting public interest in National Aviation Day by providing celebrations therefor.

Naturally many other means of education and entertainment will present themselves. In certain cities, local groups are already planning the holding of monster air expositions, air races, and other forms of aerial entertainment, on National Aviation Day.

It is hoped the foregoing will enable those interested to coordinate their plans and activities, so that every State in the Nation will be represented in this all-American observance and commemoration of what our association believes to be:

"Aviation—the greatest mechanical art since the Age of Pericles."

Youth's Opportunity and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY JAMES SCOTT KEMPER, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by James S. Kemper, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, delivered June 20, 1940, before the annual meeting of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

YOUTH'S OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

I was very happy to accept your invitation to be with you today. I had the pleasure of introducing your immediate past president, Phil Ebeling, at our annual meeting. I thoroughly enjoyed what he had to say and I hope I shall fare as well at his hands and yours today. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has a very real interest in what you are doing. And I have a deep personal interest in the young men of America and in the part they play in the topsy-turvy world in which we live.

At the moment our thought of domestic problems is shadowed and diverted by the grim specter of the war abroad. The French capitulation has shocked and upset all of us. But we do have some very important and serious American problems of which we cannot afford to lose sight. There are dangers from within that threaten our way of living quite as much as dangers from without.

Materially, we have prospered greatly. We enjoy more comforts and more luxuries, have better educational and recreational facilities than any nation in the world.

The humblest citizen, if American-born, still can aspire to the Presidency. The mechanic of yesterday is the head of a great automobile industry of today. The steerage passenger of yesterday now heads a great radio business. The clerk in the insurance office rises to the presidency of his company. The student who worked his way through school becomes the head of a great university. And so it is through all the ramifications of our national life. It is your job and my job to protect the system that made these things possible just as it is our job to protect against the invader from without.

You will have come here to attend this meeting have evidenced by your attendance and by your support of the junior chambers that you do have a real interest in public questions. You have taken advantage of the opportunity your organization and its constituent members affords to do something unselfishly for your fellows.

The acceptance of this opportunity carries with it a very definite responsibility. If your leadership is not intelligent, if your decisions are not sound, if your thinking is not calm and sane, then your leadership will be worse than of no avail.

RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP

To me the saddest picture in national life is that of a person in a responsible public position who has the qualities of leadership, who has the ability to influence the thinking of his countrymen but who uses that power and that ability in a way that is unworthy of the high trust his position implies.

There has been this type of leadership in our country. Leadership which has made personal or political-party advantage a primary consideration. Leadership which has encouraged class consciousness and class hatred. Leadership which has deliberately confused issues to achieve selfish ends. Leadership which posed as liberal but which actually was illiberal and intolerant.

Thinking about this talk and in an effort to forget for the moment the problems that currently beset us, I sat down the other evening and read some pages from the diary of my grandfather's grandfather. He was a young itinerant minister who in 1783 went from Virginia to Ohio to preach the gospel to the widely scattered settlers of the Ohio Valley. I always am moved by the simple story of his day-by-day work riding on horseback, as he did, 15 miles or more daily, stopping along the road to visit a sick settler, or to baptize a baby, or to have a word of evening prayer with such neighbors as could be brought together. But what stirred me most was the evidence of his complete lack of discrimination with respect to race or creed. For days at a time he did not see a single member of his own denomination, and yet in his errand of mercy and comfort he served where opportunity offered or need existed.

To him as in the eyes of his Maker each had a soul and all were equal. That indeed was the view of the signers of the Declaration of Independence when just a few years before they declared: "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Nothing there to suggest domination of one class by another. Nothing there to suggest that an employer should not be permitted to counsel with his men on any problem that may concern them. Nothing there to suggest that the state and not its people should be supreme.

Abraham Lincoln understood this. The other day when I was in the capitol of the State of Illinois I stood before his statue and on it read these words of Lincoln's: "If there is anything that the whole people cannot entrust to anyone but themselves, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their liberty and their institutions."

THREAT OF ABSOLUTISM

Do you think that if we had followed Lincoln's advice we should have accepted the increasing amount of regimentation that now so vitally affects our freedom of opportunity? I don't. And I say to you that unless we are alert to the dangers that face the people, if this Government which is supposed to be our servant, becomes our master, then we may find on a day not so far distant as we might assume, that the state has become the absolute ruler of our lives and our destinies.

Some have spoken slightingly of the "horse and buggy" days. My view is that the philosophies of those days well might be our guide today. I never have believed that honesty, fair play, or good sense could be achieved by legislation. On the contrary, I hold to the view that there should be in our laws no "musts" and only those few "must nots" which are necessary for the protection of life and property and the maintenance of an orderly government.

We cannot allow our public thinking to be distorted to the view that a more highly authoritative control by the Government is the means of bringing about a greater good for a greater number. Indeed, history records countless evidences that there is no good for the number or for the individual, if the liberty of the individual is taken away.

With all your vision and with all your energy, I urge that you enlist yourselves, as members of junior chambers of commerce, to the protection of that ideal.

In this connection it is important to remember that Hitlerism was and is a youth movement. Its Italian counterpart likewise was organized around especially trained and fanatically devoted groups under 25 years of age. It was the domination of new blood that has made the German army in the last few months such a formidable machine. Youth training, youth discipline, and youth abstinence from indulgence made possible not only the fighting machine but the organization behind it which provided equipment and supplies. One cannot but speculate on what that same energy and enthusiasm could have produced if directed along constructive lines.

YOUTH'S NEW ROLE

In my judgment, but in a totally different way, the youth of our country has an equally significant role to play in the years that lie immediately ahead.

As I see it, to us of the business world has been committed the giant task of reorganizing and battling for those spiritual and intellectual ideals that feed and sustain our whole American way of life from its forms of government to its methods of free economic enterprise. On the political front it is clear to every thinking person that American Government is functioning in city, State, and Nation with about the same efficiency in relation to its problems that might be expected of an army equipped with bows and arrows, fighting against a body of men armed with machine guns.

We businessmen as a group have been subjected to some rather severe criticism in recent years. Much of it was deserved. But if American business as a whole was as honeycombed with graft or shot through with screwball schemes as is much of our so-called democratic government, then America never could have reached its present world position.

The conclusion of all this is clear. We must join political parties, help write political platforms, and seek to get men in public office who will provide us with something better than "Model T" efficiency in government.

BUSINESS AND POLITICS

I care not to what party you belong. The important thing is to do something about the political situation in your community. It is easy enough to write letters of protest to Congress when something is proposed to which you object. But remember that the place to correct government you don't like is in your own precinct. If you will take an interest in the men who run your party in your own home neighborhood and in the men who are selected as candidates, you will have demonstrated that your activity in an organization like this springs from hearts that believe in America and in American institutions and in our representative form of government.

I'll admit that some of these things seem unimportant in contrast to the immediate vital issues of preparedness and of the effect upon us of the swift-moving scene in Europe. But for that very reason they should be mentioned because history repeatedly has shown that it is in time of war or threat of war that democratic peoples must be particularly on the alert to protect their rights.

Complaining about water that has flowed over the dam ordinarily doesn't do much good, but I think it can be said and properly, too, that if those in control of our Government had given one-tenth of the time to a wise expenditure of the billions we have voted for preparedness that they have to building up political machines through Government spending, our Nation today would be in an infinitely better position. And this without reference to the fact that a large part of the billions we have spent for work relief easily could have been used for preparedness and with a much better effect on the morale of our citizenry.

LESS TALK, MORE ARMS

The events of the past few weeks have made it perfectly clear that any assistance we have given or could have given the Allies probably would have had little if any effect upon the outcome of the present hostilities. That being the case, I submit to you that ordinary prudence would seem to indicate that you and I well might say: "Let's have done with saber rattling at least until we have removed the dust and cobwebs and rust from our sabers."

In this situation, the position of the chamber is that we should have adequate defense against any aggressor. For many years our committee on national defense, in cooperation with the military authorities in the Government, has urged the importance of preparedness. We believe that in proceeding with this new program we should act sanely and that means taking full advantage of the mistakes made at the time of the last war and in our more recent military program.

Supplementing our committee on national defense, I shall report to the board of directors of the senior chamber at its meeting tomorrow, the organization of a national-policy council. The personnel of this council largely has been determined with a selection of outstanding men in each field. This council will cover those important aspects beyond the purely military phase.

Amongst these are production, finance, construction, transportation, subversive activities, national economy, taxation, merchant marine, natural resources, price levels, agriculture and flow of capital. Barring handicaps of Government creation, this committee and others associated with it can promptly and effectively put into motion the great business machine of America in full and hearty cooperation with agencies of Government.

NONPOLITICAL DEFENSE

But business and industry cannot do its part of the job unless Government will clear the track of bureaucratic red tape, selfishness, and the desire for independent action. Our great need, particularly as applied to the Army, is equipment and supplies. Their procurement is not a political job. What the situation requires is business ability, initiative, and common sense, backed by authority that will permit immediate action.

You will agree that we cannot afford to be niggardly about the cost of preparedness. But, we do have the right to know that these added costs will not be wasted. And we can insist also that the objectives be made clear to all of us.

For the past few weeks we all have been shocked and distressed by what is going on across the Atlantic.

We entered the last World War with the highest of motives. We wanted nothing for ourselves and made that perfectly clear to everyone. We thought we were entering a war to outlaw wars and rule by force. We were going to make the world safe for our kind of government.

RECURRING EUROPEAN WARS

Let's consider for a moment just what happened. Forty-three years had elapsed following the conclusion of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870–71. During that period there were 12 comparatively minor conflicts. Since the conclusion of the last World War, 1914–18, there has been no period of a year when the nations of the world all were at peace. Almost before the ink was dry on the Treaty of Versailles, Europe's age-old struggle was resumed.

And now the thought in the mind of every American is, What part, if any, should we play?

It seems to me that in endeavoring to find the answer we well might go back to Washington's advice in his Farewell Address, and, in the light of our experience since his day, endeavor to determine the course we now should pursue. I quote:

"Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side.

"Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote, relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns."

Until 1917 we followed Washington's advice except for the War of 1812, when we were not the aggressor. And because we followed his advice, our forefathers were able to devote their thought and energy to building America.

CALM JUDGMENT ESSENTIAL

But it is difficult when we read the stories that come to us daily from Europe not to let our emotions overpower our reasoning. Much will be said on the radio, and much will be printed in the newspapers that unless we are careful will inflame our passions and cloud our judgment.

Here's a simple example of the sort of thing that goes on. A few days ago one of the leading American newspapers under its first page war news summary carried this press dispatch entitled "Seize Spy with United States Maps." The article read, "Arrest of a spy suspect possessing United States maps of potential military value was disclosed today by Atlanta police." Just as a matter of curiosity I wrote to a friend in Atlanta and asked him for the facts. This was his reply: "I have investigated the attached through Government sources and find that there is nothing to it. Actually, while the man did have a foreign accent, the only maps he possessed were ordinary road maps which he had picked up at a nearby oil station."

MASS PSYCHOLOGY

I yield to no one in my devotion to this country and to the principles for which it stands. But there comes a time when the test of good citizenship is not determined by whether one follows the crowd. My Scotch grandfather indelibly impressed upon my memory this philosophy: "When you see most of your associates or most of your contemporaries or competitors in business or most of the people in the country headed in one direction, go off by yourself in some quiet place, preferably the sort of place where you can commune with nature, and ask yourself this question—'Why are they going in that direction?—Is it the right direction?' And then he added, 'My boy, you will be surprised to find how often it is not.'"

And because I never since childhood have forgotten that advice, I now, in considering with you the serious problems that confront us, ask myself and ask you, "Are those who think the preservation of our country is dependent upon American participation in this war properly appraising the situation and would such participation best serve the interests not only of our own country, which always should be our primary concern, but the interests of the world in which we live?"

As I get the picture, opinion is divided on the question as to whether eventual American participation is inevitable. But the great mass of our countrymen are not convinced that war for us cannot be avoided.

OUR FIRST DUTY

One thing is certain. We must be calm. That will be no easy task, because the tug on our heartstrings is strong. But it is not too great a task, if we dedicate ourselves to the proposition that our first responsibility is the preservation of this, our country.

Arm we must, and in such a way that no aggressor will dare attack us. But never must we lose sight of the fact that history, and our children and grandchildren will hold us to strict account for any unnecessary spilling of American blood.

Speaking for myself, I can conceive nothing more destructive to America and to American institutions than for us to engage in Europe's present war. Participation by us would add to our already staggering debt—a burden that would so adversely affect our national economy that we would closely approach, if indeed not actually experience, complete economic collapse.

If national bankruptcy which resulted in many countries of central Europe after the World War were repeated here, it surely would open the door for one-man government, call it dictatorship or receivership, as you will.

And if we did this unthinkable thing—destroying the flower of our youth and wasting the savings of our citizens—who would there be to bind the wounds, who would there be to extend aid and help of the type we so generously gave after the last war, who would provide food for those who were hungry, who would fight pestilence and disease, and who would have the means with which to reestablish business and industry and agriculture and provide jobs for labor in the countries whose normal functions were completely disorganized by the ravages of war?

No, my young friends, sympathize though we all do with the Allies, our answer to the saving of representative government is not through American participation in this war. It is more likely that for us it might bring exactly the opposite result.

You young men gathered here today are the flower of the crop of American youth. In your hands lies in a large measure the destiny of America. You are devoted to your country and to its institutions. You would rise as a man to defend America against foreign aggression. You will not be so influenced by emotional appeals that it will be impossible for you to appraise the really vital issues of the situation.

Thank God that you are realistic—that you do require the reasons behind the policies that are suggested to you. And thank God that you have ability and clearness of vision.

Hysteria has no place in this picture. America is not at war. If we think and act calmly and sanely we may be saved its awful toll. That is my prayer today.

Poetic Arguments for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. T. BUCKLER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1940

STATEMENT AND POEM FROM THE MOORHEAD (MINN.) COUNTRY PRESS

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and poem which was inserted in the Country Press of Moorhead, Minn., by Mr. Peter Nordby, in its issue of Thursday, June 27, 1940. It is as follows:

[From the Moorhead (Minn.) Country Press of June 27, 1940]

MOORHEAD, MINN., *June 26, 1940.*

DEAR EDITOR: According to magazine reports, Princess Juliana, from Holland, made the following statement after she arrived in Canada with her children: "Speak not to me of pity. Pity is only for the weak."

Will you please make room in your paper for the following poem under the title "Pity and Preparedness"?

PITY AND PREPAREDNESS

Speak not to me of Pity. Pity is for the weak.
The maimed, the crippled, the helpless, the unprotected, the meek.
The lone lamb bleats for its mother,
Devoured at the Gray Wolf's Feast.
The Battle rages throughout the world,
By man. by Bird and Beast.
The lion leaps at the tall Giraffe,
The snake at the fledgling lark;
And at night you can hear the Jackal laugh
As he stalks through the forest dark.
Mars strikes at the tear-stained cheek of Christ,
Then pierces His gentle side.
The things of Life we most highly prize
Are shackled and crucified.
Speak not to me of pity,
For pity I do not crave.
If I cringe or yield but a dying inch,
Then pity a weakling and slave.
Speak not to me of pity,
The world does not understand.
It forgets the weakling who loses
And covers his blood with sand.
Speak not to me of pity,
Of pity the world has none.
An empty pail in an empty well,
Under a desert sun.

But speak to me of the blessing
And strength of the cold blue steel,
And the driving power in a steady hand
That a tyrant's beast may feel.
Yes, speak to me of power,
And the will to strike if I must,
For home, for Beauty, for childhood,
For Liberty's sacred trust.
And if I go down by the ruffian's hand,
And my breast by assassin is bared,
Then Pity me not, but rather say,
"He was weak and caught unprepared."

—*Peter Nordby.*

National Aviation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1940

OPEN LETTER FROM AVIATION DEFENSE ASSOCIATION

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter of the Aviation Defense Association:

AVIATION DEFENSE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 4, 1940.

To all Patriotic Citizens of America:

Dr. Orville Wright, the first man to fly a heavier-than-air power machine, acknowledged receipt with thanks of the Honorable J. RANDOLPH'S extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1939, in his letter acceeding to our request to use his birthday, August 19, for the national observance of Aviation Day, and expressed regrets that the anniversary of his brother Wilbur could not be used.

Out of respect to his desire, we hope that National Aviation Day will be celebrated in his honor and in memory of his brother "the fathers of flight."

It is fitting and proper on this Fourth Day of July to extend our greetings to Dr. Wright and to Senator Claude Pepper and Representative J. H. Peterson for placing our original resolutions, Senate Joint Resolution 53 and House Joint Resolution 134, and later Senate Joint Resolution 111, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, to establish August 19 as National Aviation Day, as well as to the following Representatives who sponsored similar resolutions: A. C. Anderson, William A. Ashbrook; [1] Frank Carlson, N. M. Mason, M. J. Maas, J. A. Martin,[1] M. J. Merritt, J. Randolph, J. A. Shanley, J. H. Peterson, H. R. Sheppard, R. M. Simpson, J. J. Sparkman, J. Voorhis, and M. C. Wallgren.

We also desire to thank Senators R. R. Reynolds and M. Sheppard and Representatives H. N. Routzohn, T. A. Jenkins for their able assistance and more especially Col. John H. Jouett, president, Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, as well as the 66 Senators and 215 Representatives who signed our congressional petition for August 19.

One hundred and sixty-five members of the National Aviation Forum signed similar petitions last February and Mr. G. R. Wilson, chairman, and Mr. Charles F. Horner, president, N. A. A., assured me that they would lend their full support for the celebration; later on March 12, Mr. Wilson wrote: "You have a thoroughly comprehensive view of what measures are sound and necessary and patriotic," and urged me to take the lead to launch my own individual campaign "to make America first in the air in every respect."

The future peace and safety of our Nation demands that we all unite to meet this requirement.

AVIATION DEFENSE ASSOCIATION,
By J. E. MYERS,
Colonel, U. S. A., Retired, President.

Sponsors of the return of the original Wright aeroplane to the United States. Sponsors of annual issue of commemorative stamps for our pioneers of the air.

[1] Deceased.

The Passage of the Hatch Clean-Politics Bill Will Strengthen Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. McLEOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I am wholly in favor of the proposal to extend the Hatch Act, and I urge that it be made a law without delay.

It is repugnant to every principle of a free people that a public officer be permitted to use his official authority to influence the outcome of any political campaign. When a public official uses his official authority as a means of influencing the electorate, he is using the power vested in him by the law for the service of all the people, and this power should never be diverted for a partisan purpose. He holds that office to serve the people, not his own selfish ends.

During the first session of this Congress we enacted legislation which prohibited pernicious political activity on the part of employees of the Federal Government. The purpose of the pending bill is to extend those same provisions to State employees whose employment is made possible through the use of funds from the Federal Treasury.

The law prohibiting pernicious political activity among Federal employees, although it has been in effect little over a year, has proven itself to be a real and potent safeguard against nefarious political practices. It should by all means now be extended to State employees.

The merits of this bill have been widely discussed, both in and out of Congress. Throughout these discussions and arguments it has been quite obvious that there is nothing objectionable in the entire bill for those who are sincerely interested in good government. There is not a single Member of this body who can, in sincerity, get up here and say that the American people do not want shameful political evils abolished from cur elections.

May I ask why a little group within the New Deal has continuously fought the passage of the Hatch bill? The measure is admitted by all students of government to be a notable step in the direction of free government by the people. Yet this group exerted great effort to keep this bill from even reaching the floor of the House.

There should be no question of partisanship on this issue. Surely it cannot be that the two great political parties of our country will refuse to join in protecting our polling places. Can it be that a little coterie of New Dealers realize that their position is so insecure with the American people that they must resort to questionable methods at the polls to perpetuate themselves in power? Must they browbeat the electorate with the threat of withholding public-works funds, threaten employees with loss of their job if they don't vote as directed, or literally blackmail Federal and State employees in order to keep themselves in office?

Surely the elections of 1938 have not been so soon forgotten. You surely recall when purging with public funds was the order of the day. If you do not remember, let me assure you that the American people, not only remember, but are insistent that it not occur again.

And as for the misuse of public office in the 1936 elections, let me quote the distinguished Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia. He said:

> The last election was carried by people who were getting favors from the Government, people who were subsidized by the Government, people who were on relief rolls.

When a man's livelihood is affected by his political convictions there can be no denying that these convictions will be tempered, consciously or otherwise, to the pleasure of those who are dispensing favors from the Public Treasury. This tyrannical hold on a large part of our population who must look either to the State or Federal Government for assistance is the antithesis of democracy. It is actually destroying the process of democracy, and when you have destroyed the process you have destroyed the country.

We must be more alert than ever during these trying times for those things which will in any way tend to obstruct or destroy the operation of our American institutions.

It seems incredible, but it is manifestly true, that certain groups within the administration refuse to place the welfare of our country above their selfish political aims. The passage of the second Hatch bill will go far in curtailing pernicious political activity and will allow the electorate to have full and complete freedom at the polls without fear of reprisal from some entrenched bureaucrat.

During the past few days we have heard much about cooperation, coalition, joint action, harmony, common cause, and unity. It appears that those who cry so loudly for cooperation can only see the need for cooperation when their own selfish political interests are served. All of the grave problems facing the American people are not found in the sphere of foreign affairs and national defense. There is also a home front. There is ever present the task of preserving and protecting our American institutions.

We are dealing with a fundamental problem of our form of government. It is a question of the right of those who do not hold public office to be free from the domination and control of those who hold administrative public office. It is a question whether a man may cast his ballot as he chooses and answer to his conscience, or cast his ballot at the direction of some political overlord.

We have seen the way whereby Hitler received 98 percent of the votes of the so-called electorate of Germany. As I recall, that was quite some time ago, and it was the last election that has been held there. We know also the manner in which Stalin receives his overwhelming votes of confidence. We know, in both instances, it has been due to pressure upon the populace by their government officials. It is this procedure and this process that I am fighting against. We want no army of petty officeholders directing the people of this country as to how they shall cast their ballots.

The very idea of citizens receiving ultimatums as to how they were to vote was so repugnant to the principles of American freedom that the people demanded and got action. The Congress in response to the will of the people enacted a bill prohibiting those pernicious practices among Federal officeholders. Now, the people are asking that the act be extended to State employees who are paid from Federal funds.

You will, indeed, mistake the feeling of the people on this question if we do not clear up this situation by passing this bill.

At this time, as never before, we must fight relentlessly for the protection of those democratic processes which are the very lifeblood of our Republic.

The force that will most certainly destroy the foundations of our democracy and pollute the stream from which it flows is the corrupt use of public funds in the attempt to control and affect the source of our freedom. Officials in Federal and State positions should execute the duties of their offices and let the public—not the political officeholders—run elections. Let the people, not the political stooges, determine the elections.

Surplus-Profits Tax

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record as unqualifiedly supporting the proposed surplus-profits tax. For Congress to adjourn without passing this legislation would be a breach of trust. With billions voted for national defense, to make this country and this hemisphere

safe from attack by Hitler or any European combination, unequaled opportunities for profiteering at the expense of the public become possible. Only by prompt and decisive action can this be prevented.

PREVENT DEFENSE PROFITEERING

To make our defense program the means of creating a new horde of millionaires, while the people sweat to pay for their profiteering, would be a national disgrace. Nothing would tend more to undermine the faith of the people in their own democracy. In preventing such profiteering, we shall also strengthen the confidence of the rank and file of Americans in our Government and in our system. And we shall help to undermine the principal appeal of the subversive groups and "fifth columnists" in our country.

I have actively supported the President's defense program and have unhesitatingly voted for every appropriation and every tax bill necessitated by this defense. I am convinced that it is essential for the United States to build up such impregnable defenses as will enable us to prevent aggression on this hemisphere. I favor spending billions for this. It is unthinkable that we should expose ourselves to attack by Hitler and his system. The speedier we can prepare the more secure we shall be against attack. In the meantime I favor aiding the Allies by all methods short of war.

TWO-OCEAN NAVY IMPERATIVE

We have good reason to believe that our Navy before the summer closes will be the largest and most effective single Navy in the world. When our defense program is completed, we intend having two such navies, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific. I am strongly advocating the construction of the most powerful coast defenses that engineering skill can devise for the Pacific coast.

Frankly, while I am opposed to war, I shall enthusiastically support the expenditure of billions for our national defense, but I shall never vote to send an American expeditionary force to fight in Europe.

JOBS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

I consider there is a second line of defense, as important as that which is giving us tanks and aircraft, bombers and naval vessels, fortifications, and munitions of every kind. This second line of defense is the expansion of the social-welfare program. Spending enormous sums of money for defense while leaving enormous numbers of our people in poverty and despair is unthinkable. If we can afford armament, we can afford an expanded program for social betterment. The fact is we can afford both.

A major objective of the defense program should be to open jobs for our unemployed. This can be done, not by lengthening the workweek of those regularly employed but by shortening it. This can be done, not by introducing more and more labor-saving machinery, but by using our manpower to its fullest capacity, including men of middle age.

The first objective in a democracy is certainly to promote the general welfare. That is why at this time all who hate poverty, in the midst of plenty, slums crowded with unhappy and hungry Americans, the existence of surplus foods that our people need and cannot have because they have not the money—all who hate these and who believe, as I do, that such things are a denial of democracy—are determined to march forward and not back along the social front.

EXPLOITATION MUST NOT RETURN

Of course the people are not going to turn the country over to a corporation executive whose only interest throughout his strikingly successful career has been profits for the few at the expense of the many. It seems incredible that we who have fought for the Tennessee Valley power enterprise should live to see a great political party nominate the ringleader of the opposition to that enterprise. Yes, a utilities tycoon is actually nominated and is actually asking the rank and file of Americans to vote for him for President of the United States.

It is unthinkable that the people will "fall" for this. They know that under such a leader all New Deal measures would be thrown into the discard. Once more business would be free. To do what? To profiteer, to exploit, to issue watered stocks and sell them on a stock market "freed" from restraints; to create a boom followed by a panic in which once more the middle class would lose their savings and their security.

We will have nothing of this. We must go forward in creating a better America. We must continue the effort to make democracy really work for the benefit of all.

We can do it. We can bring about a far more reasonable distribution of income; we can cut out most of the profiteering and still make business worth while; we can pay decent wages and cut the workweek; we can give better training to our young people and then see to it that they get jobs; we can take on some real responsibility for our middle-aged people whom industry rejects; we can provide adequate old-age pensions—and we can do all this without making our people soft, despite former President Hoover's fears on this score.

SOCIAL PROGRAM MUST BE EXPANDED

We must not let the defense program stop the equally important progressive program for the opening of opportunity. There is just one way to safeguard all that we have won and to insure other and greater advances against unemployment and poverty.

That way is to continue an administration that can be depended upon not to let the common people down.

I have in my four terms in Congress supported all progressive legislation. I have supported the W. P. A., the C. C. C., the N. Y. A., the increase of Federal aid to the blind and handicapped, and I have opposed all cuts in these activities so essential to our welfare. I think we should spend more money for adult education, for child welfare (including provision of school lunches) and for public health. By increasing such services we reduce poverty and disease, which are just as costly, and we add to the happiness and efficiency of the people.

To defend our country against the aggressors, we need national unity and faith in our leaders. We need a President who can be depended upon to protect the Nation against foreign and domestic enemies, to uphold our civil rights and to continue the attack on poverty and unemployment. Such a President will have to march under the Democratic banner.

Of course, the one best man for President is the one whom the American people have twice elected by overwhelming majorities, first in 1932 and again in 1936.

Under Franklin Delano Roosevelt we can move forward with confidence and with a renewed feeling of faith in democracy and its greatest exponent, the United States of America.

Britons Call Americans Yellow, United States Woman Engineer Relates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, July 10, 1940, entitled "Britons Call Americans Yellow, United States Woman Engineer Relates."

This, in my opinion, is a very timely observation and should serve as a warning to the pro-British propagandists in the United States, who are not satisfied with stripping our national defense by way of aid to carry on their blood business, but boldly and emphatically insist that American boys be sent across the ocean to fight their battles.

The observation of this American business woman corroborates the impression many of us have formed from actual

contact with the aristocrats of Britain in this country and abroad.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 10, 1940]

BRITONS CALL AMERICANS YELLOW, UNITED STATES WOMAN ENGINEER RELATES

NEW YORK, July 9.—Vivien Kellems, woman electrical engineer, was back today from a tour of Europe, convinced that the best course for the United States is noninvolvement in a war which she sees as purely a bloody dispute between business rivals.

Miss Kellems is a $50,000-a-year president of a firm which manufactures a shell lifter, and it was to discuss an order from the British that she went to London. She found, she said, that the British upper classes hate Americans and yet are trying desperately to get us into the war.

"The English caste system is as hide-bound as that of India," she said, "but it is cracking. For the first time the lower classes are beginning to murmur. This has scared the upper classes to death. They are fighting for their lives, and they despise us for not helping them."

She said that in London she frequently heard the remark:

"We'll hold out as long as we can, and then we'll let the two yellow races, Americans and Japanese, fight it out."

At a luncheon attended by Lady Chamberlain, sister-in-law of former Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, she heard Lady Kemsley read letters from persons replying to a request for contributions to war charities.

Miss Kellems said she remembered most strikingly a letter which said the writer felt no obligation to contribute to alleviate a situation caused by an incompetent government.

After the luncheon, several persons asked Lady Chamberlain:

"How does your brother-in-law feel about conditions now?"

"When Lady Chamberlain replied," said Miss Kellems, "her voice was dangerously sweet. 'I don't know,' she said, 'I haven't seen him in a long time.'"

France's surrender cost Miss Kellems' firm hundreds of thousands of dollars, but she said her only regret was that France had been defeated.

"War isn't my business," she said. "I came home convinced the European war was none of America's business. Why should we shed blood for a people who hold us in contempt? They call us yellow. England says she is fighting for democracy. Believe me, there are no lofty ideals to save.

"The issues are mixed, but they are far from being quixotic. It's for money, for trade, and not for democracy, that they are killing one another, on the one hand. On the other, there is this battle of the classes, this frantic struggle on the part of the aristocrats to survive."

Ambition Which Didn't Quibble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PONTIAC (MICH.) PRESS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of July 1, 1940:

[From the Pontiac (Mich.) Press of July 1, 1940]

AMBITION WHICH DIDN'T QUIBBLE

An Associated Press dispatch yesterday from Aberdeen, S. Dak., shed an illuminating light on the character of Wendell Willkie. It also lent emphasis to the oft-repeated contention that there are chances left in America for the boy who will work at any kind of labor and at any kind of a price, so long as the job is on the square. While he was locating a chance to work in the Dakota harvest fields, Willkie, big, powerful, willing, and possessing a smile that made an immediate hit, supported himself by washing dishes in an Aberdeen restaurant.

Willkie hasn't been afraid to get dirt on his hands, nor timid about grease on his overalls. As a youth he was a worker, with never an idle hour in his day. He wasn't maintained in luxury by a millionaire father while he was getting his law-school education. He made his own way by indomitable traits of character that made his later extraordinary rise in the business world possible. He possesses force and character and virility in a most amazing degree. Standing six feet one with a massive head and muscular body he is a striking example of perfect physical manhood. He radiates strength and determination and his unconquering spirit is disclosed by the tossing back of his tousled black hair when he starts to speak, and by the sparkle in his eye and the firm set of his determined jaw.

The American people always have admired a boy who wasn't afraid to wash dishes.

America's Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS BIDDLE

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Francis Biddle, before the Philadelphia Forum, March 7, 1940:

We are, of course, still a very young race measured in the years of our national existence; and young, comparatively speaking, in the years of our existence on American soil as a people. And in considering this question of national age, we are unique among nations, for our racial roots are as ancient as any, and far more varied. They run back into the origin of peoples young and old. Yet our American characteristics are youthful and recent, not dissolved in any dim prehistoric mist, or confused and untraceable; but, as it were, set down before us as fresh as yesterday and as definite as we have insight to understand them. Of course, only some have formed with clear enough outline to permit satisfactory generalization. Most perhaps are inchoate, seen in present direction, but not at all certain in outline. But that will always be as long as this new Nation is fresh and vigorous and, therefore, too uncertain and expansive to catch or to retain in any mold of definition, full of ferment and the stirring and effervescence of changing life.

I have spoken of us as a young nation, and that is almost a sort of sanctified form, to speak of us as a "young" nation. But tonight I should like to speculate from another and less obvious approach. It is so easy to skim from this placid assumption of youth the vaguely irritating virtues and vices which have for so many years, sometimes a little awkwardly, formed an all too transparent cloak to a pervasive sense of inferiority, our naïveté, our pioneer resourcefulness, our practicality, our sentimentality, passion for written morality, contempt for art, nervous tension, idealism. The list is more familiar than it is accurate. But it will be more interesting, I venture to think, to leave these easy clichés and consider whether there are signs that we are maturing, which involves a comparison of values, dipped, as it were, in history. I do not propose to be tiresome by first seeking a definition of maturity. The outline of my meaning will appear as we begin to consult our preferences. But I have definitely in mind a conception which can be read only in terms of national aspiration and a national approach to that aspiration—not European maturity, or that of any race whose dreams run in our blood, but the growth and flowering of our own racehood into a stuff which is ours—American.

I have come to a conviction that recently we have matured with singular rapidity as a race. There are, I am inclined to think, evidences of this maturing in several and widely diversified fields. Whether it has come fast—suddenly and in the last few years—or merely seems to us to have done so, so that the quickness of the change lies only in our consciousness, I am not sure. The war has accelerated it. The time would appear to be no longer than a generation, or at most two—I suppose it has been gradual. But, looking back over a period of time, say 30 years ago, the change seems to me to be very great. I shall try to describe as accurately as possible what I have in mind.

It is a little difficult to find a word for one striking quality of this new maturity. Sophistication perhaps suggests it, but is neither complete nor quite accurate. Nor has it the sound of an American word. I can discover the best example of what I mean in the turn our humor has taken. I don't mean because it is streamlined; that is a matter of fashion, and changes with the times. But I suspect that it is riper, perhaps, even if more incisive, also more tolerant. It is altogether a more finished product than it was 30 years ago. A comparison of the New Yorker to Life or Judge, vintage of 1910, will illustrate. The range is broader and more deep. There is a more complete understanding of the American self that is being laughed at. The fun is in the situation itself, in the drawing which hardly needs a text and is no longer merely an illustration of a story. We may sigh a little that it has lost a kind of funny innocence, but at least it has grown up.

And how humor tells the story of change strikes the very note of race itself. Could anyone but an Englishman have given us that famous drawing in Punch, during the Great War, where two charwomen are talking, one with a great black eye, and the other says to her: "Yer calls yerself a 'onest woman, with that black eye and yer 'usband at the front!" Or that priceless expression of the essence of the Irish approach, when, after a scuffle with the Black and Tans, an old woman had been knocked down in the crowd, and a young sergeant picked her up in his arms, carried her to a bench, and set her down gently to rest. You can almost see her, looking up gratefully, crying a little, as she stutters out her thanks to the Protestant: "Sure and when you are roasting in hell I'll be

giving you a drop of water!" For what is altogether French, universal perhaps, but French in its import and human cynicism, there is Daumier's famous lithograph of the wretched, emaciated prisoner in the dock before the judge, who asks him: "You had means of existence; what did you do with them?" And the poor defendant answers, "Mon Dieu, Your Honor, I existed with them."

To illustrate what I mean about American humor, take the drawings a few years ago in the New Yorker of two heads sticking out of manholes, or perhaps truck drivers, and one head says to the other, "Did you read H. L. Mencken's article in the Mercury this month?" Of course, you cannot do that justice without seeing the two heads. Julian Huxley told me, a few years ago, that behind every Punch in each London club at breakfast was now propped a New Yorker. What a relief that must have been to get all that lovely American fun, safely ensconced, as it were, behind the good, solid, English humor about housemaids, and rich Jews from the city trying to hunt, and fresh young subalterns, and crusty old recruiting sergeants, and all the rest of it.

A little on the same order was Art Young's famous drawing in the Masses of a workman talking to his wife at the end of a hard day, and she says: "I don't see why you should kick, working in a nice, cool sewer all day, and me bending over this hot stove." The old Masses and the Liberator and the New Yorker had the quality in common of laughing at real foibles. Mr. Peter Arno's types are no less a savage attack on the smugness of our particular American bourgeois than Boardman Robinson's lampoons of 20 years ago, even if they stem from very different social convictions.

A consciousness of our own national strength and integrity, the self-confidence of maturity, has become evident, particularly since the Great War. That is shown in a number of ways. The inspiration for American painting today lies no longer in Rome or in Paris, but in America herself. American themes fill American canvases—the hard foreground of our industrial civilization, drab, perhaps, but none the less powerful, elevated railroads, factories, the cruel rush and violence of strikes, the pealing death of great, ugly American-Victorian houses, angular cattle starving in the Dust Bowl, the lean and arid American types, sharecroppers, hunkies, dagoes, wops, our tremendous skies and horizons, barrooms, and the human, vulgar sprawling of the beaches. You get, I like to imagine, not only our American theme, but the angle of the shrewd American eye watching it all, no longer turning inwardly to find only the reflection of a pale European classicism, but looking steadily at the sights at its own door.

Young students today want to spend their Guggenheims in Chicago, or New Orleans, or in the Indian land of the Southwest, not in the countries of Europe, which once were their inspiration. Then you heard it said, and not so many years ago, that no artist could live in America. Today no American artist can afford to live elsewhere. For we have discovered that art thrives and is nourished not on art, however great, but in life itself, and that an artist can best express the struggle of his own race and the feeling and shape of his own hills. Turgenev, who lived so many years in Paris, used to say that at certain intervals he had to go back to Russia to keep his genius from drying up.

This awareness of our own power I count as a sign of maturity. It is as if we had suddenly stopped imitating others, content to find our own ways by ourselves. It has given us a definite national consciousness, integrated us as a people, banished a lurking sense of inferiority which had always been accompanied by a defensive impulse to brag, and to raise our voices. Of course, I do not mean that the boasting and stridency has disappeared. But I think we are less callous, less conscious of our sprouting manhood, surer of ourselves and therefore less imitative of others. The very tone of our national voice has stopped changing.

"Live your life"—thus runs a western motto—"so that you can look every damn man each day in the eye and tell him to go to hell." Colonel Streamer was laughing at the same sort of provincial but sturdy pride, when he wrote:

> "The land of the brave and of the free,
> Where you're as good a man as me
> And I'm a better man than you * * *"

It is an ancient quality, this pride of independence. Lewis Mumford quotes the oath sworn by the subjects of the King of Aragon: "We, who are as good as you, swear to you, who are not better than we, to accept you as our king and sovereign lord, provided that you observe all our liberties and laws; but if not, then not."

In letters, too, as well as in painting, we turn to American themes and to our own story. There has been an immense revival of interest in American history, and American biography is devoured by the public. For a number of years the form and structure of our plays have broken away from the classic French influences and from a rather feeble imitation of contemporary English. Today the American theater is a vigorous expression of national themes and aspirations. And we have learned to laugh publicly at the funny people who govern us. Witness Of Thee I Sing, and more recently Leave It To Me. And if the ability to laugh at ourselves is an indication of growing up, surely those lovely lady garment workers have proved it to the hilt in Pins and Needles.

The novel, I venture to think, is on the whole an accurate index of modern life, and in the contemporary novel today we find the same indication of a more developed consciousness of our own environment and problems. We have but to compare the mild correctness of William Dean Howells to Look Homeward Angel or the Grapes of Wrath, with the intense awareness implicit in these two books of the American destiny.

American artists are no longer day-dreaming, building little sentimental arcadias in which to escape the tough and ugly facts littered about their feet. The impulse of the American artist to escape did not, I am convinced, arise so much from the crudity and ugliness of those same facts as from his own inability to face them. His ancestor had come to the new country to be free from the ancient culture which bound him to Europe. But as the trees were felled and the pastures cleared and the frontiers pushed away the memory of that culture took an unsubstantial but dear place in his mind. The longing of the spirit was in retrospect, feeding on memories. The standard was of the past, looking back to the form since the substance was too dim for memory to recreate. Pioneer thinking, American thinking, necessarily became timid and conservative, based on a culture of which the roots had been cut, and replaced by a violent and adventurous foreground, and no relief of familiar racial background.

How could the artist help suffering? He remembered, or remembered what he had been told, and imitated and tried to get away; and his nostalgia produced little that was native or vigorous. There were of course many striking exceptions, men who found inspiration in their own present, who were free from the influence of a past which was never really their own—Walt Whitman, Melville, Eakins, Winslow Homer, Mark Twain. And even they often felt the influence of an alien and disturbing culture which would not let them be themselves. Van Wycke Brooks has pointed out Mark Twain's dependence upon the point of view as to what was correct, expressed by his wife and by William Dean Howells, who tried to prevent him from publishing Huckleberry Finn as something common and unworthy of his genius. What kept Twain from becoming a greater, more universal satirist, Brooks felt, was his timorous pioneer fear of middle-class public opinion.

Since the rise of Fascist Germany, and more particularly during these last months of the war, I detect another characteristic of our national attitude which has flowered up quickly to the surface, but which for that reason is no less permanent. I refer to the passionate hatred of authoritarian creeds, and the profound insistence on freedom to speak and to vote and to live as we please. This is far more than lip service to an outworn creed, or the repetition of some ancient dogma. We have been profoundly shaken and troubled by what has occurred in the totalitarian states, although there is much confusion as to the causes which have brought these things about. We ourselves are engaged in an immensely important struggle to offset the inequalities and disharmonies which a blind and ruthless industrial development has apparently caused. We have come to realize that the democratic processes, negatively conceived, left to themselves, will solve nothing, but will themselves disappear before the directed forces which today oppose them, and which, like evil genii spring from the monstrous confusion of mechanistic living which we have permitted to surround and dominate our lives. We should not identify the increase of Government power with the loss of individual liberty. One may, but need not, accompany the other. It is not the power in itself that is the test, but the fields in which it is exercised and the ends for which it is used. For the strong arm of government may be thrust out to protect freedom of worship, of the press, of assemblage—or it may be used to suppress and destroy those things which we hold precious. An authority cannot be held oppressive which is drawn against crimes that the community has declared to be such, if that community is itself based on an honest suffrage and a respect for minorities. But where the police of the state is used, under cover of the protection of property or keeping the peace, to give expression to class prejudices or religious hatreds, government becomes a vehicle of suppression and death. Democracy must be a tool, a way of living, as well as an ideal. It cannot be passive in an active world.

Our growth to maturity in what I shall call social thinking, for want of a more convenient phrase, is still chaotic and undisciplined. We are too near the frontier to rid ourselves of the dislike of control and the contempt for community activity which most of the rest of the civilized world has long ago accepted. The test of our growth, the mark of our manhood as a Nation in the immediate future, will be, in my opinion, our ability to accept as an inevitable condition of our world today the certainty that more freedom for the human spirit must and inevitably will be accompanied by a greater regulation and control of those things which tend to smother that freedom; and that our problem is not to resist government, but to use it for our own ends and for whatever common purpose we can build together. For government, however it is expressed—National, State-wide, local, or regional—is but a common purpose and a common will. It is not something outside ourselves, or alien to our ideals. It is what we make it. We can despise our Government, and make it feeble, and a thing of contempt, incapable of coping with these forces which we have bred, and watch them destroy our society because we are not strong enough for united effort. Or we can knit it into something strong and honest, and subservient to our own desires. But we may be sure of this that whatever way we treat it, our attitude toward our Government will do much to condition its quality and to shape its course. If we were not always calling it inefficient, in a sort of scornful game, it would have less chance of becoming so. If we were prouder of its great achievements, more would be wrought to meet our pride. We can create in it a splendid living energy from our own insistent dreams; or we can narrow it to as small a compass as the definition of our own dislike.

Lewis Mumford in The Culture of Cities has spoken of the most critical problem of human society today as that of diminishing the role of the power state and enlarging the role of the service state. "The real alternative to the empty political patterns of the nineteenth century lies," he writes, "not in totalitarianism, but in just the opposite of this: the restoration of the human scale in government, the multiplication of the units of autonomous service, the widening of the cooperative processes of government, the general reduction of the area of arbitrary compulsion, the restoration of the processes of persuasion and rational agreement." Examples of service government today are found in the work among farmers by the Department of Agriculture to effect crop control; the widely diversified services of the T. V. A. in the Tennessee Valley basin; and, in the international field, reciprocal-trade agreements.

I have discussed our national maturing in terms of an individual, but the analogy is an over-simplification and may be misleading. By maturity I do not mean to imply any particular level of civilization, but simply the sloughing off of a childish state of mind, the emergence from the day dreaming of magic formulates into a world of reality. Nor do I wish to imply that we are living in that world today. But we are nearer to it, and our youth, disillusioned about the past, skeptical of the present, are nearer to maturity than the older generations. I do not see signs that they have lost any of the zest for life which is sometimes the price of aging. On the contrary, they see better than we did what they want, they are more conscious of realities, the threadbare ancient symbols like patriotism and honor and humanity will no longer betray them as they betrayed us. They are perhaps tragically dislocated, but they are far better equipped than we for making over the world as it must be made over.

In the maturing process to which I have referred, I do not think that the homespun American virtues have been lost or forgotten; they have been cleansed, no doubt, and have emerged tougher, more universal, less literary as we have grown into a nation. And of late we have become doubly conscious of them. In a poem called Plain Chant for America, published last August in the Ladies Home Journal, Katherine Garrison Chapin has beautifully expressed something of the American dream:

"For the dream unfinished
Out of which we came,
We stand together,
While a hemisphere darkens
And the nations flame.

No dark signs close the doors of our speaking,
No bayonets bar the door to our prayers,
No gun butts shadow our children's eyes.

Freedom is salt in our blood and its bone shape;
If freedom fails, we'll fight for more freedom—
This is the land, and there are the years.
When freedom's a whisper above their ashes
An absolute word cut on their graves.

Let them remember that here on the western
Horizon a star, once acclaimed, has not set;
And the strength of a hope, and the shape of a vision
Died for and sung for and fought for,
And worked for,
Is living yet."

Urge United States Aid Britain With Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. BEN GIBBS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

RESOLUTION OF ALTAMAHA POST, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Be it resolved by the Altamaha Post, No. 26, American Legion, Department of Georgia,

First. That the United States of America furnish the British all necessary aid in the form of supplies such as food, ammunition, airplanes, destroyers, and tanks, or anything they need except our Army or Navy.

Second. That this Government refrain from sending men to fight on foreign soil unless the United States becomes in danger from invasion.

Third. That our Army and Navy be increased to sufficient strength to protect the Western Hemisphere.

Fourth. That the sale of arms and ammunition to aliens be stopped and that all aliens be forbidden to possess arms or ammunition.

Submitted by C. C. Padgett and S. Allen Middleton.

Amendment: By Walter Hardee to the above, second by Rev. John Godfrey.

To have all American citizens put in the positions that are now held by people that are partial to any foreign governments who want to undermine our form of government; also not to allow anyone to speak over the radio that tries to undermine our Government because it does not correspond to the government of foreign nations that they believe in.

Read and adopted by Altamaha Post, No. 26, American Legion, Department of Georgia in open session this 25th day of June 1940.

CHARLES A. HARDY, *Adjutant.*

The Geyer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for me to discuss this amendment in full. However, the limited time does not permit such a discussion. If the time were available, I would be glad to go into the constitutionality of this infamous piece of legislation. I think it is sufficient to say that the proponents hope that if the amendment is enacted into law that the Supreme Court of the United States will uphold it on the theory that it is a so-called liberal measure. I do not agree with this, because the qualification of voters is a matter that rests entirely in the hands of the sovereign States.

Voting is not a right, it is a privilege that can be granted or withheld by the States. Regardless of the constitutionality of this measure, we should look to its motives and see what is behind it. I think that we will all agree that it is a thrust at the South. I am not arguing the right or feasibility of poll tax, but the American doctrine of State rights. Of course, the proponents may claim that any means to obtain an end is proper. If poll taxes should be abolished in the States where they are now required, why not let each State settle its own internal affairs? Several of the Southern States have abolished the poll tax. Talk about this being a democratic measure, I say that it is very undemocratic. It has no place in a republican form of government. Let us here and now decide whether we want to abolish all States and have a totalitarian form of government where every citizen must look to Washington.

The proponents of this amendment are unsound in their argument. They talk about a democracy. Does Germany, Russia, Italy, and many other countries that might be named, have a poll tax? No, they do not.

Let us see just how fair the proponents of this measure are in attempting to put this amendment across. A charge has been made upon this floor from time to time that some Members from the South were elected by a small number of votes. Anyone with any degree of intelligence about political history in this Nation knows that elections in the South are decided in the primaries. Few of the Democrats go to the polls in general elections except Presidential elections. Yet a Democrat has offered this amendment.

How many times have you found the Democrats of the South attempting to interfere in the local affairs of other States? In my own State, for instance, there is a requirement that a nominee receive a majority of the votes cast in an election. Some of the States in other parts of the Nation nominate and elect their Congressmen upon a plurality basis. It is possible that many of the Representatives here today are here because they received a plurality vote. It is entirely possible that Members can be elected from those States where they only receive a small part of the total vote cast. Yet do you hear any of us trying to change your method of election? You do not.

This amendment is introduced at this time under the guise of having something to do with clean politics. It has nothing whatsoever to do with it. Politics are as clean in States where the poll tax is collected as in States where it is not. The

privilege of voting is not derived from the Federal Government but from the respective State governments. No one has claimed before this measure came up that voting is a right. Voting is a privilege, and it is a privilege that the respective States can grant or withhold at their discretion.

If you pass this amendment, why in the not-too-far distance cannot Washington say we have decided that the States have no say-so and let us abolish voting altogether? I love my State; I am not afraid of all of its citizens voting, but I am afraid of the motives behind this bill. These crusaders who take a holier-than-thou attitude should first sweep the yard around their own front door.

Why this amendment at this time? I will tell you the reason. The sponsor of this amendment has a bill now pending of like nature before the House Judiciary Committee. Hearings have been held upon this bill, and it is realized that the type of testimony given by witnesses before that committee was not any too impressive. I do not say that this applies to all of these witnesses, as there were some well-intentioned and misled witnesses, but I do say that many of the witnesses were members of radical organizations. The spokesman for one organization saw fit to attack southern Members of Congress and to charge that if this bill were law that they would not be in Congress. He made a most uncalled-for attack upon the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who heads the Merchant Marine and Fishery Committee of the House, because this gentleman has dared to take the stand that this Government of ours has some right in its own ships. This same organization has recently condemned the President and charged him with preparing to make a "blitzkrieg" because he proposed that the Immigration and Naturalization Service be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice. This organization has also charged that the Department of Justice is notoriously antilabor in all of its actions. It has also condemned Congress because it dared bar certain people from W. P. A. relief. It also condemns the registration and fingerprinting of aliens, or any conscription plan.

What other organizations are favoring this plan? The National Youth Congress and its allied organizations, including the Young Communist Movement. I could name other radical organizations that are demanding that the Federal Government attempt to punish the South.

Who else is taking the lead in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi for this notorious un-American bill? It is the Communist Party of district 17 comprising these three States. The only letter that I have received from my State requesting that this measure be enacted is from the Communist Party.

What other Member of Congress was attacked in the Judiciary Committee? The distinguished gentleman from Texas who heads the committee on un-American activities. Why? Because he dared to take the lead in a crusade against un-American elements several years ago before many of us realized the condition that we were in. A distinguished gentleman from Georgia was also attacked because he dared rise upon the floor of this House and condemn un-American activities in this Nation. The charge was made before the committee that if the Federal Government would abolish poll taxes in these States these gentlemen would not serve in Congress. I want to say here and now that this is untrue. These gentlemen are rendering a patriotic duty to their country, and I would have no fear of their being elected from any State in the Nation.

This to me is one thing that this Congress should take note of. That witnesses came before a committee of this House and asked that a bill of this nature be passed in order to get rid of Members of this body. If any of you want to vote for this amendment with this idea in view, let me tell you now that these gentlemen will continue to serve their districts, States, and Nation as long as they wish, regardless of any poll-tax measure.

I am not here to argue that the amounts charged for poll tax are the correct amounts that should be charged, but if they are not, there is a way to remedy this, and that is by State legislation. If this measure were adopted, some supporters would later come back and make objection to any educational requirement that the State might set up. They would, also, make objection against any requirements as to residence in the State before voting. The question of voting is a matter of education and not one of poll-tax requirement.

While men and women are dying and being driven from their homes in other lands and their destinies being brought under a government farther away from home, it is time that we carefully analyze any measure that would further invade our States.

Some people are so afraid that others will not think that they are liberal, they want to say that "I am more liberal than you." I say to you as one who is deeply interested in the future of this great Nation that the adoption of this amendment will not aid the South.

Those from afar who wish to further penalize the South and take this great section under their protective wings would be rendering a greater service to their country during this emergency if they would confine their activities to matters in their own districts, and lend a helping hand in driving from these shores those who do not believe in our form of government.

Mr. Willkie's Repudiation of Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee on Trade Agreements

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I can well understand why my genial friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] opposed the nomination of Mr. Wendell Willkie, and, according to newspaper accounts, signed a petition against his nomination. Mr. Willkie, in two recent articles, the April issue of Fortune Magazine, and the Saturday Evening Post of June 22, came out strongly for the trade-agreements program, which some minority members of my committee stated would be an important issue this fall. As a matter of fact, in the Fortune Magazine article Mr. Willkie pays Secretary Hull a compliment on account of his methods of carrying out the trade-agreements program. According to newspaper accounts some of my Republican friends have characterized Mr. Willkie as "just a free-trade Democrat." That might help to elect him President if he did not have so many Republican handicaps.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] should not feel lonesome, for the position on trade agreements of everyone of his Republican colleagues on our committee have likewise been repudiated by Mr. Willkie. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] said, according to press reports, that a number of Republicans would be defeated on trade agreements if Mr. Willkie should be nominated. I think the gentleman is right about it.

Of course, they have already begun to squirm and twist and console themselves because they think, and possibly hope, that Mr. Hitler has made trade agreements a dead issue. The reactionary G. O. P. Press has already begun to rationalize that Mr. Willkie sees eye to eye with opponents of reciprocity.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] has also attempted to rationalize and explain away Mr. Willkie's known and recorded approval of Secretary Hull's trade-agreements program. He states:

> It has come almost to be accepted in the public mind that the Republican Party is opposed to reciprocity and foreign trade.

I think the public is exactly right in concluding that the Republican Party is opposed to real reciprocity. Only five Republican Members of the House stood with Mr. Willkie when the continuation of reciprocity was last voted upon.

In the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF, appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4377, he attempts to indicate that Mr. Willkie is opposed to the most-favored-nation principle of those

agreements. He emphasized Mr. Willkie's statement regarding "two nations." I want to call attention to Mr. Willkie's statement in Fortune Magazine for April 1940—and I hope he has not shifted his position on such a fundamental question since that time—for he spoke of two countries negotiating an agreement and then significantly said:

This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries too. What could be simpler or more in accordance with common sense? What could be better qualified to benefit us, the people, as a whole?

For the benefit of my colleague and others, I insert the following statement of Mr. Willkie from Fortune Magazine:

Now, obviously, it will not do for one great nation to become a free-trade country by itself. For the United States to erase its tariffs all at once would be ruinous to our people and many of our industries. The present Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is wise and temperate, realizes this. And so he adopted the reciprocal-trade agreements as a step toward increasing our foreign business gradually. Under this policy the United States takes up the problem of tariffs with each country separately; lists the products that it would like to export; studies a similar list submitted by the other country; and then a deal is arranged, each country making such concessions as it can with the least possible harm and the most possible benefit to its own people. This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries, too. What could be simpler or more in accord with common sense? What could be better qualified to benefit us, the people, as a whole? Of course, we have to make sacrifices. But the point is that, owing to the way the agreements are negotiated, the sacrifices are always, and should always be, less than the benefits gained. That is, we, the people, profit.

I want to remind those who take the position that trade agreements are out the window, that agreements are still wholly or partially in effect with Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. I want to remind them that the agreement is still in effect with Canada, as well as all of those which have been negotiated with Latin-American countries.

I should like to further remind them that there are still obvious possibilities of opening up trade and lowering tariff barriers in keeping with the principles of this program. Furthermore, the principles of trade agreements will serve as a basis for a better economic peace than was indicated in the Fordney-McCumber and Hawley-Smoot Tariff Acts. So it is a little early to relegate trade agreements to the "heaven of forgotten issues," as Mr. Hoover stated in his speech which apparently relegated him to the "heaven of forgotten politicians."

I challenge the good sense and patriotism of those who are ready to concede a complete world victory to Hitler and who seem willing to surrender, without a fight, to his totalitarian system of trade for America. Secretary Hull, who is not so easily bluffed out of our American system of trade, is taking steps to protect our commerce.

I am glad that my colleague from Michigan inserted at least a part of the foreign trade and tariff plank of the Republican platform in the RECORD. I want to call attention to what a Republican newspaper, the Washington Post, said of this plank which was particularly critical of the way trade agreements have been negotiated.

Particularly inaccurate is the reference to "one-man tariff making." Anyone familiar with the Hull reciprocal trade agreements knows that they were carefully negotiated by experts after hearings and extensive analyses of domestic industries affected. The cause of intelligent debate on vital issues would have been better served if the resolutions committee had concentrated its attention on clarification of its own position on tariffs and foreign trade.

Return of the Wright Airplane to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am introducing a resolution which, in my opinion, has much merit and I feel that the entire membership of this House is vitally interested in aviation, its past, present, and future.

I further wish to call to your attention the notice of an association meeting held in Washington, D. C., Friday, May 31, 1940, by the Wilbur Wright Federal Hangar No. 1, National Aviation Day Association, Inc., which have unanimously endorsed the following resolution with respectful request that favorable consideration be given the contents thereof and signed by Walter Moore Royal, Jr., president, Wilbur Wright Federal Hangar No. 1:

SATURDAY, JUNE 1, 1940.

The national body concurred unanimously with Wilbur Wright Federal Hangar No. 1, and also respectfully request that favorable consideration be given this resolution.

JOHN J. CRIM,
Chairman, National Aviation Day Association, Inc.

Joint resolution

Return of the Wright airplane to the United States of America, to be placed on permanent exhibition, under such conditions as may be jointly approved by Mr. Wright and the Congress.

Whereas the American public has, long since, come to an acceptance of the fact that the Wright brothers were the first to successfully fly a heavier-than-air machine, and

Whereas the symbol of American aviation supremacy—the Wright airplane which made the first flight at Kitty Hawk—now reposes, on exhibition, in a British Museum, and

Whereas war-time conditions abroad, today, render it possible that this plane may be destroyed, or damaged irreparably, by air raids, or other acts of war, and

Whereas American pride requests that this plane be returned to the United States, in order that the present generation and posterity, may have visible proof of the marvelous progress made in aviation, since the historic flight at Kitty Hawk on December 17, 1903: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled request Mr. Orville Wright—only living founder of aviation—to arrange to have this first-to-fly plane restored to the United States; to be placed on permanent exhibition, under such conditions as may be jointly approved by Mr. Wright and the Congress.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. JOSEPH SMITH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

RESOLUTION OF THE CONNECTICUT NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Connecticut National Guard at their annual convention held Saturday, June 15, at Hartford, Conn.:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn., June 15, 1940.

Whereas the present international situation clearly indicates the immediate necessity for expansion of our national-defense program, and

Whereas the availability of the National Guard to serve has sometimes been the subject of comment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Guard Association of Connecticut assembled in its annual convention at Hartford, June 15, 1940, reiterates its entire willingness to render whatever service, wherein competent authority may require; this in keeping with the history and tradition of the Connecticut National Guard.

Service in the Guard has always entailed personal sacrifice on the part of its members but we stand ready now as always and cheerfully to make whatever personal sacrifice this situation may demand.

We respectfully urge that immediate authority be given the National Guard to recruit to peace strength; that every step possible be taken to expedite the full and complete equipment of the National Guard; and if active service is contemplated, the National Guard be given an extended period of field training in preparation for such contingency.

We respectfully urge the Adjutant General of Connecticut to transmit this resolution to all proper persons.

J. M. QUINN,
Lieutenant Colonel, One Hundred and Second Infantry.
RAYMOND WATT,
Lieutenant Colonel, Two Hundred and Forty-second Coast Artillery (Headquarters).
KENNETH F. CRAMER,
Lieutenant Colonel, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry.

The within and foregoing is a true copy of the resolution passed by the National Guard Association in convention assembled at Hartford, Conn., June 15, 1940.

(Signed) WILLIAM P. BRAY,
Captain, Two Hundred and Forty-second Coast Artillery (Headquarters), Secretary.

A Few Thoughts on Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1940

CONSCRIPTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to Congress shortly will come a compulsory military training bill. It requires the registration of all male citizens between 18 and 65. It directs the President "as soon as possible to select for training and service, such number of men as in his judgment, whether a state of war exists or not, are required in the national interest."

Read that again. Authority in peacetime to draft anyone and everyone between 18 and 65. The first to be drafted undoubtedly will be those between 21 and 31, to serve for such time and in such places and manner as the President may direct.

LOOKING FOR TROUBLE

Do you get what that means? The national administration has been threatening and blustering, warning European nations to stay out of the Western Hemisphere. The press reports Germany has a submarine base in Uruguay. Great Britain is blockading Martinique in the Caribbean. Are soldiers, marines, and the Navy to be sent to drive them out?

With Hitler winning in the Old World and the President pointing out the ease with which even Omaha might be blown to dust, there is every need for preparedness for national defense. Inevitably, that means not only the industrial production of munitions of war, but the training of men.

MILITARY TRAINING

Training of some sort, both industrial and military, we must have. The kind and the amount of training should under no circumstances be left to Franklin D. Roosevelt. He and his advisers are too closely affiliated with subversive groups. Communists and those sympathetic to Communists are no safe teachers for American youth nor guardians of our freedom.

MARCHING OFF TO WAR

First to be conscripted would be the white-collar men, professional men, accountants, clerks; then farmer boys. Under the present plan, the last—workers in essential industries. And here is the viciousness of the present scheme. Many essential industries have been organized by the C. I. O., which, in turn, has many leaders who are either Communists or lean in that direction. They would be the last to go.

While loyal Americans are conscripted, serve for $30 a month and keep, the Communists, their "red" sympathizers and workers in industry would be safe at home, drawing pay as high as $2 an hour, with time and a half for overtime.

JUSTICE TO ALL

If we are to have conscription let us make it universal, and, if you, a doctor, a lawyer, a clerk, a merchant, a farm worker, are to be drafted for military training, then add to the law a provision that will require every factory worker—yes, and every public official, including Congressmen—to serve at their jobs for a like period and for the same pay the conscript draws during his time of service.

NONSENSE? ABSURD?

Do I hear you say? Perhaps. But think it over. It is not as silly as it seems and it certainly would be just and equitable. Neither justice nor patriotism requires the drafting of one man from his home, his business, his community life, to serve this Government, protecting the rest of us, giving him but a nominal wage, while permitting all others to profiteer, either through excessive wages or excessive profits.

SOMETHING OF A SHOCK, ISN'T IT?

To suggest that you and I, who will not be drafted, should take $30 a month and "keep," while our friends and neighbors are taking compulsory military training? But, at that, many of us would prefer to stay at home rather than to endure the hardships of training and the danger of fighting.

PLANLESS SPENDING

Apparently the New Deal theory of spending for the sake of spending is to apply to our national-defense program. The expenditure of $5,000,000,000 has been authorized. This week will see the authorization of another $4,000,000,000 and another request for $5,000,000,000 more is coming. Fourteen billion dollars—fourteen thousand million. Everyone familiar with the situation knows that sum cannot be wisely and intelligently spent within the next 6 years.

The authorization of such expenditures is a sort of a bluff. What we need, before we either authorize or spend additional millions, is a sane plan for spending, which will give us results.

Speaking figuratively, leaves can be raked under a defense program as well as under a "more abundant life" program. The difference is that the latter just wasted our money. Boondoggling with the defense program may cost us our national existence.

That we have already swallowed more than we can digest is evidenced by a multitude of instances. Just one from home. The Benton Harbor Chamber of Commerce writes that it has young men ready for apprenticeship training in aviation; that its many requests to Mr. C. E. Cox, of Chicago, Ill., upon instructions of the Civil Aeronautics Authority have gone unanswered.

Nothing is gained by frightening the Nation, stirring our people up to a high pitch of patriotic endeavor and then leaving them dangling in the air for the want of adequate facilities for training.

OUR DUTY

It is the duty of Republican and conservative Democratic Congressmen to insist that they be advised of what is proposed; that the proposed program be sensible, capable of being carried out, and that those entrusted with its execution be patriotic Americans with but one idea in mind—service to the Nation. To such a duty it is my purpose as a Representative to devote myself.

Greenland From 1898 to Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT A. BARTLETT

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, in connection with our national defense, I find a very able article in the National Geographic Magazine of July 1940, written by Capt. Robert A. Bartlett, who went north with Admiral Peary. The article is entitled "Greenland From 1898 to Now." In the article

appears a discussion of this great island in connection with our national defense. Among other things the following statement is made:

The present war (the first World War) has shown us most strikingly how far flung may be the regions having a bearing on the struggle.

Great Britain's coaling station in the Falklands spelled destruction for Germany's squadron of commerce destroyers. Russia's port of Archangel (Arkhangelsk) has been an invaluable gateway for her. Greenland in our hands may be a valuable piece of our defensive armor. In the hands of a hostile interest it could be a serious menace.

This article is written by an explorer who has personally been over the ground with Admiral Peary. I think it ought to be given close attention in connection with our coast defenses. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From National Geographic Magazine for July 1940]

GREENLAND FROM 1898 TO NOW—"CAPTAIN BOB," WHO WENT NORTH WITH PEARY, TELLS OF 42 YEARS OF EXPLORATION IN THE ORPHAN ISLAND OF NEW AERIAL AND NAVAL INTEREST

(By Robert A. Bartlett)

The first voyage I made to Greenland was in 1898 with Admiral, then Commander, Robert E. Peary in the old *Windward*. At that time the "island of desolation," as people used to call it, was just a jumping-off place for the North Pole, and I hardly expected to see the day when it would be anything else.

Since that first visit I have made more than 30 exploratory trips to Greenland in the last 15 years, taking with me on my schooner *Effie M. Morrissey* lads from the preparatory schools and colleges and gathering data and specimens for the Smithsonian Institution and other scientific societies, as well as birds and animals for zoos.

I have observed the development of the country's resources under the intelligent management of Denmark; have seen the Eskimos gradually adopting white men's ways of living; and have learned that the snow fields of the ice cap, the open land along the shore, and the sheltered fjords provide excellent landing fields for airplanes and hide-outs for war vessels.

Each summer Danish ships have brought tools, foodstuffs, and clothing to the people of Greenland. Who will furnish these supplies now?

To keep the United States Government informed on conditions on the "orphan island," Mr. James K. Penfield has been appointed the first American consul to Greenland. On May 10 last, accompanied by Mr. George L. West as vice consul, he sailed on the U. S. cutter *Comanche* for Godthaab.

AN ISLAND WITHOUT A COUNTRY

When Germany entered Denmark, the question arose whether this "protectorate" extends to Denmark's island of Greenland, and, if it does, what the effect will be on North Americans.

The answer, it seems to me, is found in geography. If military forces come to Greenland, they will find a diverse island, beautiful, amazing, difficult, icebound; yet a place which might very well serve as a year-round base for air operations and in summer for maneuvers by sea and land.

The distance from the west coast of Greenland to Cape Dyer, Canada, is less than 200 miles, and northern Greenland is only 12 to 14 miles from Ellesmere Island. It is only 200 miles as the sea bird flies from Greenland to Iceland, and from there 500 miles to the British Isles, 625 to Norway.

Thus, while Greenland belongs to North America, it is actually a convenient stepping-stone for airplanes flying to this continent from Europe.

Before I set down my notes of specific voyages, I wish I could put on paper the wonder and bafflement I felt when, as a newcomer to the north, on my original Peary expedition, I saw the picture of just what Greenland comprises.

First, it is an island, the largest in the world, and one of the most sparsely inhabited. In the interior is the vast, forbidding waste of ice which has been accumulating in mystery and splendor since the beginning of time, or, at any rate, since blind Nature in the glacial period set her inscrutable machinery to work.

A MAMMOTH ICE CAKE

It is more than three times as big as Texas. But a good four-fifths of its 827,300 square miles lies mute and frozen beneath the ice cap which has filled the dead valleys and made them level with the mountain tops.

All the visible land of Greenland is a sort of uncovered band, stretching about the coast, 4 to 20 miles wide, but in a few places widening to as much as 112 miles on the west coast and to 180 or so on the east coast.

Interior Greenland today is a majestic plateau of ice. Over this plateau in the old Peary days, we made our sledge journeys across the icecap a full 6,000 feet above the level of the sea. What sleds from the sky may alight there soon I can only conjecture.

The snow of the Arctic has not changed, nor have the ice-locked mountains of Greenland; but the changes which have come over the Eskimos are profound.

In the old days Peary compared the Greenland Eskimos as he had found them on his first trips, with the Eskimos as he left them when the great venture of the North Pole had been won. Peary said that on his arrival in Greenland few Eskimo men had a knife and few women a needle—a steel needle, of course, he meant. Bone needles they fashioned for themselves from animal bones.

Few of these isolated Cape York, Greenland, Eskimos had kayaks, or skin boats, and the man who had a spear or a harpoon shaft made of a single piece of wood was rich. But when Peary said good-bye to Cape York and his Eskimo friends, he left them almost miraculously wealthy—for Cape York.

There were knives and needles of steel, and almost every man and half-grown boy had a kayak. They also had seal spears and sledges and wood for lance making. The wealth that Peary scattered in tools produced other wealth, until the Cape York Eskimos were improved in every phase of their lives.

They had all the food they could use; their better weapons saw to that. They had many more dogs and better dogs. And the improved diet showed, in the years during which Peary took observations, a marked decrease in the death rate and a sharp rise in the birth rate.

All of this Peary noted with pride and a warm heart, for he loved these sturdy, independent men of his North.

WHITE MEN'S WAYS AND THE ESKIMOS

What, I often wonder, would the great Peary say if he could observe the Greenland Eskimos we see each summer when the boys of the *Morrissey* fare forth again along the water highways sailed by him?

In place of the old-fashioned stone igloos of the early expeditions, he would see Eskimo houses of wood. In them he would hear the blare of the radio and the monotonous droning of the gramophone.

Where, 40 years ago, Peary saw Eskimos eating a soup of seal meat and seal innards, with a porridge composed of the ground bones of animals—happily smacking their lips and rubbing their bellies—today he would see them in store clothes dropping in at the trading post to buy the white man's tea and coffee and imported biscuit.

Instead of the old animal-skin boots, patiently sewed by Eskimo women from skins their men had taken from the animals they had killed, the Admiral would see his brown friends pull on knee-high rubber boots on a wet day, or store-made leather boots for dry weather.

One of my boys, R. F. Dove, during the 1936 expedition, made a rather careful study of the Smith Sound Eskimo, who lives between Greenland and Ellesmere Island, with special regard to "tuberculosis and the sun." Sadly enough, this white man's disease has come to Peary's Eskimos, together with the white man's tobacco and devitalized flour.

DRIFTWOOD FOR HOUSES

The kind of house an Eskimo builds depends almost entirely on its location. In east Greenland, the section we studied in 1939, native homes are built of Canadian driftwood. Rivers draining down from the Canadian northwest, a richly forested section, bring quantities of driftwood dancing along the tides. These rivers empty into the Polar Basin and their water is carried around the north of Greenland, thence down the east coast by the Arctic current.

Thus, the east Greenland Eskimo has plenty of lumber for his house, though the houses we studied used only a small amount in the roof.

But only a little driftwood travels along the currents around Cape Farewell, or up the west coast. Consequently, the Smith Sound Eskimo builds for his house a stone igloo.

The roof is made of flat stones, with a back slope. The house is about 12 feet wide in front. The height just permits a man not too tall to stand upright. A narrow house passage 8 feet long or so forms the entrance. A low platform of stone fills the back of the house completely.

Dry grass is laid on the stone and on this are piled many soft bear or reindeer skins.

Then, above the passage, at the front of the house, is the single "window" made of gut. Through this the light filters weakly.

This Eskimo house is a jolly, familiar, sociable affair. As in the Bible, the Eskimo father may explain, "My children are with me in bed," for the platform is the family bed by night, and the family chair, table, and drawing room by day. I nearly omitted ventilation—a puncture in the roof about the size of a man's arm, in which in time of storm or high wind is placed a sod which stops all chance of air circulation.

In Smith Sound the Eskimos who live in houses like this have 4 months of almost continual sunshine. Then 2 months of alternating sun and twilight preface the winter darkness.

During this third period, for 3½ months, they see no sun at all. And, in these months, the white man's germs and the white man's tuberculosis arise and flourish.

HOUSEHOLD HEAT—AND SMELLS

Certain rather interesting facts turned up as the Danish doctors considered the rise of tuberculosis among the Eskimos. First, the investigators exploded our old idea that the Eskimo by nature is capable of bearing more intense cold than white men. If he does so, the authorities concluded, it is because he dresses for the cold and eats fat, fuel-charged foods to stand him in stead during his extreme winter.

When this theory seemed to be established, however, the contradictory fact was revealed that the Eskimo can stand a degree of heat in which white men wilt and suffer.

Nobody can fully imagine the heat and the smells of an Eskimo house quite so realistically as the man who has borne the heat and smelled the smells. The houses are heated by seal-oil lamps. These are rather flat stone vessels with wide moss wicks which, when properly trimmed, burn the seal oil with a wide, white flame. The heat in the house becomes tropic—and so hygiene perishes in the midst of food scattered about among the fur skins, of dogs here and there, of all too little attention to sanitation. When tuberculosis comes into an Eskimo settlement, it runs rampant.

In the old Peary days such a germ would not have been so serious, for the Eskimos then lived in stone igloos which they abandoned from season to season; or in houses which, grown damp in spring, could have their roofs lifted to let in all the bright and cleansing sunlight from the generous heavens.

But when wood was substituted for stone blocks, making the house a permanent year-round dwelling, the evil was done. Deterioration and disease clamped down upon men who were experiencing a particular scourge for the first time in the history of their race.

For this reason the Danish Government barred all visitors to Greenland except reputable scientific expeditions.

In the Peary days no wild animal was beyond the skill of the Eskimo, though the hunter was armed only with the most primitive weapons.

Then came firearms. One result was the destruction of herds of animals—needless and wasteful destruction. Initiative, independence, the old upstanding qualities of the Peary Eskimo, seemed to pass.

RESOURCES OF GREENLAND

Probably nobody yet knows the economic possibilities of Greenland, but the known resources, for 900 years since the outlaw Eric visited the island, have kept merchants and traders busy with a fairly rich commerce plying between Europe and the largest ice-locked island in the world.

On my first trip to Greenland, Admiral Peary told me that when men set out on the Crusades, ivory from walrus and narwhal tusks was sent to Europe as the pious gift of Greenland Christians.

Salt fish, seal, and cod oil, sealskins, eider down, ivory (the tusks of walrus and narwhal) and furs, blue and white fox, have for long years formed a large part of the trade between Greenland and Denmark. Later, cryolite mines were developed in southwest Greenland. The town of Ivigtut came into being, as did many a boom town and city of our own mining West.

Ivigtut, the port, is near the cryolite mines, and cryolite is one of the most unusual minerals in nature. Chemists tell us that cryolite is a sodium-aluminum fluoride. It looks like hard-packed snow. And where it is found, almost exclusively at Ivigtut in Greenland, other bright-tinted minerals more or less nameless occur along with the cryolite.

The known mineral wealth of Greenland is not extensive. In addition to cryolite, there are coal mines on Disko Island; also some coal has turned up recently on the east coast. Graphite is abundant near Upernavik, and copper has been observed in a few places.

FRONT PORCH OF NORTH AMERICA

But I must come back to Greenland as the next stop to North America. Peary told me this one, too, one night when we were gathered in his cabin aboard the *Hope* after we of the *Windward* had made rendezvous with him at Cape York.

Leif, he said, son of Eric the Outlaw, the real discoverer of Greenland, used the island as a base for his visit to North America.

In the early days of Greenland's history the far-venturing Norsemen had seemingly colonized Greenland in fairly large numbers. Old records tell us how, after the black death in Europe, a brace of enemy ships bore down upon Greenland and spirited away many colonists to make up for Europeans laid low by the terrible scourge.

Whether this is fact or fable, the ancient Norse who possessed Greenland before the Danes came in left behind the remains of stables, churches, and houses, and seemingly some sort of Nordic town meeting house to bear witness to that first colonization.

The watchful Danish Government has guarded the old ruins with antiquarian jealousy; but the ruins may still be visited—or could be up to the 1939 trip of the *Morrissey*.

In southern Greenland near Julianehaab are the ruins of Eriksfjord, now called Tunugdliarfik.

Beyond a high range of hills separating two sides of a fjord the ancient town of Brattahlid had its day not so far from its sister town of Gardar. To this day the boys of my little *Morrissey* may see the aged church—its walls, at any rate—hoary and in rather good repair, gray against the green hillside of southern Greenland.

On shore the remains take on more of the appearance of ruin. Up and about the sturdy stone walls the whortleberry, the juniper shrub, small willow trees, and many species of vine and weed, entangled, keep company with such familiar American wild flowers as buttercups and dandelions.

TRACKS OF NORSE CIVILIZATION

When I went exploring, years ago, about the ruins of the hoary old Norse town of Kakortok at Julianehaab, it wasn't so hard to grasp the picture of an old and orderly life under the Norse back in the days when all the implements of the "blitzkrieg" still slept in the limbo of evil things not yet conceived.

Stumbling about among the ruins, in that year at the turn of the century, and, later, with my boys on one of the *Morrissey* expeditions, I examined the remnants of the church and two other buildings, wall enclosed, whose outlines were no vague imagination. They were there for us to trace.

Some of the walls rise to fully 10 feet. I imagined a triangular bit standing above the main wall had probably been a gable. And here and there I was sure the cement used to put the stones of the walls together had been made of native blue clay. Even today that cement has a blue tinge.

Much could be written of these interesting remains, but I'll hurry on, merely adding that some of the boys, recalling their history books, had a hot discussion when at night we were all snug again in the cabin of the *Morrissey*.

The boys said they had made out an "almonry"—whatever that may be; they vowed one house near the church ruins had belonged to some ancient bishop of the pious Norsemen. Other remains farther up the hill, they said, were plainly houses of old-time governors and other officials.

The walls of some of the ruins were 4 feet thick. One ruin had been, almost certainly, a round tower. Its diameter was 48 feet, by measurement of the ruler brought from the *Morrissey*.

Last of all, we lingered over the old, gray, crumbling churchyard. Only one stone showed traces of its inscription. We tried hard to make out what was carved on that stone, but it defied even the bright eyes of my boys. However, an old book I once came across states that within recent years this inscription was found on one stone:

"Vigdis, daughter of M—, rests here. May God rejoice her soul."

This, the books say, was carved in runic characters. It is just as well; for even had we made out that inscription, none of the boys, not even the lad from Dartmouth, could translate runic.

I put in this bit about the ruins for what it is worth. It may not be exploration exactly—or, again, it may be. But if I had ever had more time to spare from the actual job of sailing the ship in my jaunts about Greenland, I should have given those ruins around and about more thorough observation than I have yet managed.

A QUESTION SETTLES A DISPUTE

Several years ago Norway and Denmark got into an argument about which country had the better claim to parts of eastern Greenland. I received a cable from The Hague asking me to come there to testify before the arbitration committee.

I cabled back, "Impossible to come. Were modern Norwegians ever in Greenland?"

This question on my part was merely a request for information; and I was astonished to receive in reply a letter from the authorities at The Hague thanking me for settling the question.

The Norwegian claim, based on colonization so far in the past that it has left only a few scattered ruins, was overruled, and Denmark was given the decision.

My most recent voyage in the *Morrissey* was in the summer of 1939. Late in June we sailed from the McWilliams shipyard on Staten Island bound for Nantucket, Mass.; Brigus, Newfoundland; an Kejser Franz Josephs fjord, on the east coast of Greenland.

Our party consisted of 11 boys, a radio operator, and a doctor. We have a completely equipped hospital to provide for proper care and treatment of the boys. We even have X-ray equipment.

We are in constant radio communication with New York. The folks at home know what we are doing, and we get the news of the outside world. On our broadcasts the boys can send messages to their homes.

Some of the boys have been with us for four or five trips and have become so interested in certain subjects that they make collections. In likely places they go ashore with their camping outfit and canoe, putting in a day or two gathering birds, eggs, and nests of the migratory fowl. While in the field they make a picture record of their work.

We always get permission to do this through the State Department in Washington. Sometimes the bird specimens go to the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, the United States National Museum, the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, or the American Museum of Natural History, New York.

Frank Foster, of Phoenixville, Pa., who has fine dairy cattle, gave us a fresh heifer and a young Guernsey bull which we were glad to take along.

Seven thousand gallons of Diesel oil, a thousand gallons of gasoline, two 24-foot whaleboats, two dorries, two canoes, and the equipment which we use for shoving about the ice when we are in the North leave very little room on deck.

We carry a Frigidaire which takes 1,200 pounds of meat and a couple of hundred pounds of fish. We also take along several cases of oranges, apples, and grapefruit. These are put on board an hour or two before we sail and, since we soon reach cool weather, they keep nearly to the end of the voyage.

The night we left New York, going out of the Sound, the wind was strong from the east, and a heavy rain was falling. With the ebb tide against the easterly wind, there was quite a sea in the Sound. Some of the lads had been celebrating commencement with too much rich food, and, although they had good sea legs, they were soon blue around the gills.

I shall never forget the anxiety of that night. The clouds seemed almost to rest on the spars of the *Morrissey*, and it was as black as an asphalt street. The rain fell in a veritable tropic downpour.

About midnight, when I made my hourly call of the names of the boys on duty, one of them did not answer.

A BOY LOST—AND FOUND

You can imagine my worry. We searched all over the vessel, from one end to the other, but could not find him. Fortunately I caught our radio operator in time to prevent him from sending out the news.

Just at dawn my brother Will happened to look down into the box where the heifer and bull were kept, and there was the missing boy, fast asleep. He had evidently felt cold and seasick and crawled down there for warmth and comfort.

We stopped for a couple of days at Nantucket, and there, through the generosity of Bassett Jones, electrical engineer in charge of the lighting at the New York World's Fair, we acquired an otter trawl, which later enabled us to bring back a wealth of specimens from the floor of the ocean.

From Nantucket to Brigus, Newfoundland, is about 1,200 miles, and by the time we got there our boys were almost as good sailors as the seasoned fishermen who leave T Wharf in Boston to go to the Grand Banks.

Of course, the boys are not all my crew. In the 15 years that I have had the *Morrissey*, I have always employed a few men chosen from the fishermen and seal hunters around my native village of Brigus.

People ask me, "Bob, how is it that you still look in good physical condition, mentally active, and always keen to go on these trips?"

My dear mother, who is now 88 years of age and still retains a glorious crown of white hair and a figure which any debutante would envy, and who reads without glasses the small print in newspapers or the Bible better than I can with my lenses, told me to associate with young people, get their sentiments on the way to live.

"In this fast-changing modern world," she said, "you have just got to move with the times."

This is why I carry the boys on the *Morrissey*. I want to go as long as I can; I really hate to think that the day will come when I can no longer go to the north. We always stop to pay mother a visit, and she waves good-bye to us from her garden as we turn our faces toward another adventure.

Before leaving Brigus, we put on our extra whaleboat, sent aloft our crow's-nest, filled up with Diesel oil, and also filled our tanks and extra barrels with water.

A REMARKABLE POLAR MIRAGE

Our next stop after Brigus would be Kejser Franz Josephs Fjord on the east coast of Greenland. From Newfoundland to Cape Farewell we had adverse winds and some rough water. Nearing Cape Farewell in the fog, we suddenly found ourselves among heavy ice, but luckily for us it was not very wide.

I had been many times to the north and had never before seen such open conditions. The east coast of Greenland is a difficult place to reach and in some years ships cannot get in at all. I had been worried about whether or not we could get in. However, everything was fine and, although it was foggy and we could not tell our position exactly, we knew we were close to land.

We saw a remarkable phenomenon in Denmark Strait, midway between the tip of southern Greenland and Iceland. The date was July 17, and all our observations were made in brilliant sunshine. Our position was latitude 63°42′ N., longitude 33°42′ W. The ship's three chronometers had been checked daily by Naval Observatory signal. The air was calm and the sea smooth. At 4 p. m., with the sun in the southwest, an amazing polar mirage appeared in the direction of southwest Iceland, showing clearly the Snaefells Jökull (4,715 feet).

There were other well-known landmarks, all of which were familiar to me as well as to any ship's officer. At the time, I asked him how far he thought we were from this land. He replied, from 25 to 30 nautical miles. As a matter of fact, the position of the *Morrissey* showed that these features were some 300 statute miles distant.

One of our boys, Doran Warren, had a birthday on July 6, and I presented him with a very fat envelope which his mother had given me for the occasion. He had already borrowed against its contents in Brigus. We had a party for him, all of us giving him some foolish present.

David Nutt and the cook made a cake, a really professional job with all the fixings. David had experience which prepared him for this job, he once made a cake for President Hoover in Cleveland.

One of the most interesting phases of our activities is the job of tossing drift bottles overboard. This is done for the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department, to gather data on currents. The drift bottles are picked up all over the world; one of ours, in fact, was recovered on the coast of Africa. We also gathered data on temperatures and ice conditions, as I have done on all other trips.

Coming into a school of porpoises, we took some excellent pictures and shot two of the creatures to obtain their skeletons for the Smithsonian. At latitude 58° 41′ N., longitude 44° 15′ W., we got into tide rips and found numerous hagdons, noddies, kittiwakes, parasitic and pomarine jaegers, and Arctic terns and murres.

Each lad who is interested in the birds has a card with the names of all the species likely to appear. During his watch, armed with binoculars, he will put down the names of birds seen, with latitude, longitude, weather, wind, conditions of sea, and other data. His notes are entered in a book at the end of the watch.

Late one afternoon we saw a purple sandpiper, a phalarope, and a turnstone. Two lads went out in a canoe and brought in fulmars and gulls.

We were now near the fishing banks between the northwest coast of Iceland and the east coast of Greenland; the fish smell told us that as plainly as if it were written on the water. We got good hauls with the plankton net; sounded 100 fathoms, no bottom; saw a large school of bottlenose whales.

A BIT OF ROUGH WEATHER

Next day the barometer began dropping fast and the wind was strong from the northeast, with a heavy sea coming from the southeast. The barometer went to 29.44, very low for this time of the year, and the ceiling was also very low.

At noon we lowered the mainsail and jib, making them fast, and hoisted the storm trysail. At 5 p. m. we were near ice. There was a big swell on the weather edge. As we gradually worked in through the ice, the water became smoother, and the wind was going down among the ice but still blowing a gale outside in open water. The sky was dark with heavy, ominous clouds.

In the fast-diminishing light we saw a schooner, two-masted, with a barrel on her foremast. When we got close to her, we saw that she was loaded with seals, deck to water. She lay there as if anchored. Hunting hooded seals—the Norwegians call them bladder nose—is a profitable industry as carried on in normal times by the Norwegian motor-driven vessels.

In a gale among the ice we lost our foresail and had to bend a new hemp sail. Nevertheless, we obtained specimens of hooded seals for the Smithsonian.

The morning after the gale was beautiful, the sky blue as the Arctic, bluer even than in California.

Steaming along by Blosseville coast in a mist which the sun was quickly dispelling, we saw mountains capped with new-fallen snow thrusting up through haze, touched with blue and purple tints. The colors were gorgeous.

On July 23, 17 days from Brigus, we anchored in a fjord at Manby Peninsula. Here we collected birds and flowers and discovered a hot spring.

RED AND GREEN SNOW

As we crossed Scoresby Sound—named after old English whalers—there was no ice. The sound was almost as free as the Potomac is today. We steamed close by the coast of Liverpool Land and saw the red snow, about which Dr. Erzsebet Kol of the University of Szeged, Hungary, had asked us to procure information. The color is due to the presence of a plant. I have also seen green snow in the north.

Along the Liverpool coast thousands of little auks were enjoying the warm, brilliant sunshine. Exquisite colors brightened the face of the cliffs. Marble from similar cliffs on the west coast of Greenland has been used for buildings in Copenhagen.

Because we found the fjords were still icebound on July 26, we could not get into Kejser Franz Josephs Fjord. The ice was close in to Cape Hold with Hope, named by Henry Hudson; and we went eastward for 10 miles, meeting slack ice.

We worked through this and into Loch Fyne near Eskimonaes. It was here that we captured our musk ox calves—four of them for the New York Bronx Zoo.

Going in, we shot two polar bears, also several squareflippers, as we Newfoundlanders call bearded seals, for specimens. The meat of young polar bears is almost as good as pork, and we used it for our meals. Some of the boys stored a quantity of the meat in the Frigidaire and took it home as a treat for their families.

We passed Eskimonaes, on the southernmost point of Clavering Island, a base of Dr. Lauge Koch, who for several years has carried on extensive scientific research both with ships and with airplanes along the east coast of Greenland.

FLOWERS AND BIRDS OF THE NORTH

Steaming in the sound, we saw musk oxen roaming the hills and valleys. Here in this beautiful country, only 1,100 miles from the North Pole, flowers bloom and the grass grows knee deep. We saw barnacle and pink-footed geese, plovers, and songbirds.

The slopes of the mountains were green, black, dun, russet, and brown. Newly fallen snow capped the mountains and a blue haze made a symphony of color.

The boys scattered far and near, collecting birds and flowers. In 10 days we obtained for the Smithsonian thousands of plants, representing several hundred species.

I had been wanting to use the otter trawl on the Belgica Bank and hoped with the good ice conditions that we might be successful. The weather changed and became warm and rainy, with poor visibility.

We passed the Bass Rock close, later catching a sight of Shannon Island. It began to get really foggy; but there was no ice, and we kept going. The water temperature showed around 39° to 40° F.

In fog the thermometer is the seeing eye and feeler. We watch the readings carefully, and when the mercury goes to 35° or lower, we know that we are getting close to the ice. At such times we haul out until we get thermometer readings up to 38° or thereabout, then continue on our course.

Guided thus, we followed the straight edge of ice which parallels the east Greenland coast. It was provoking and tantalizing to have fog, for we had hoped to see the land and ice, polar bears, birds, seals, and so forth.

About midnight, when the light was not so sharp, I saw a polar bear asleep on a sheet of ice. Since the wind was blowing away from him, he did not get our scent. We shot by so near that I could almost kiss him from the quarter of the *Morrissey*. The slaty color of the bear and the ice blended into one.

In a locality where we expect to see bears, lots are drawn among the boys for a shot at one of the animals. This was John Howard's chance, and he was fortunate in having his watch on deck. Before the bear reached the opposite side of his ice refuge, we headed him off, and John, being a good shot, got his trophy for a museum.

ICE IN BIG SHEETS

As we worked north, we found the ice heavy and in big sheets. The wind veered to the northeast, driving the ice upon the land. For this reason we had to work to the eastward and try for open water.

Once in the clear, with the wind blowing a gale, we reluctantly abandoned the trip to the Belgica Bank. The season was getting well along into August, and by the look of things we might be several days waiting for the wind to let up.

We squared away for Angmagssalik, and off Shannon Island procured for the Smithsonian two magnificent specimens of the hooded seal. Around midnight of August 15, we steamed close to the Liverpool coast.

On our trip north much of the coast below Scoresby had been covered in fog and mist. Now it was clear and free of ice. We kept close to the shore and saw some of the most beautiful scenery in the world—cliffs going up straight from the water 3,000 to 5,000 feet, glaciers, ravines, cascades.

Bird rookeries filled the air with life and noise. The sun, coming out at times behind the clouds, would strike the white breasts of the auks and murres so that they looked like big snowflakes. Around us were huge icebergs of all shapes and sizes. We wormed our way in and out through a galaxy of white and blue cathedral spires, Lincoln Memorials, and Chrysler and Woolworth buildings.

My chart of the Angmagssalik coast was on a small scale, and the approach to it was in fog. The next morning with the rising sun the heavy fog began to disappear. First we saw the peaks and contours of its ranges, then the glaciers and deep ravines, and finally the shore line.

Cape Dan enveloped in fog, and the autumnal tints—russet, brown, yellow, and some places red—were a real joy and drew from us loud expressions of pleasure. Somehow I could not find the opening into Angmagssalik Fjord. I realized afterward that in the fog I had passed it.

As the day wore on, the clouds broke away and we had a deep-blue sky; the brilliant sun, warm and comfortable, cheered us up mightily.

ESKIMOS WELCOME FRIEND MORRISSEY

Moving up the fjord, we saw kayaks belonging to the Eskimos of Kûngmiut; they were seal hunting. We were delighted to see them, and they caused considerable excitement among the boys when they came alongside.

Presently more and more left the village and soon we were being escorted to our anchorage in a welcome that would make the greeting of a conquering hero entering the gateway to New York a minor affair.

As we came to anchor, the shores were lined with men, women, children, and dogs. The clothes were all colors of the rainbow—reds, blues, yellows, and greens, with red predominating.

We were invited ashore, and the boys went with a bountiful supply of sweets, colored ribbons, bright shirts, and gaudy handkerchiefs for gifts.

The whole village was in a holiday mood that fine Sunday. We invited the Eskimos on board later in the afternoon and treated them to biscuits, cakes, tea, coffee, and grape juice. They showed their deep appreciation in their peals of laughter and self-abandonment.

In the early hours of the following morning we sailed away and arrived at Angmagssalik around 11 a. m.

There we took advantage of a chance to get some codfish, the Eskimo boys bringing it to us in their kayaks. We also sent off our own whaleboat with lines and hooks and a trout net. The net we set at the mouth of one of the small rivers and procured a lot of salmon trout. The Eskimos also speared a number, picking them out of the pools farther up the river.

Because of the lateness of the season, our stay in Angmagssalik was short. This was my fourth visit to the charming and prosperous village. Many of its old people have gone to the happy hunting grounds since my first visit 10 years ago.

From Angmagssalik to Cape Farewell we had fine weather and good visibility, no drift ice. We kept in with the shore.

Along the King Frederik VI Land one does not see the towering, saw-toothed peaks. Much of the inland ice comes close to the water, where it forms the glacial front and, breaking off, becomes floating icebergs. There are hundreds and thousands of bergs along this coast, especially when strong offshore winds send the ice to the eastward.

An onshore wind blowing hard creates a big sea, which rolls in and lifts up the glacial front. This releases the bergs, which come south with the south-bound Arctic Stream from the Polar Basin. The glacial streams for months send vast rivers of water into this same south-bound current.

Last summer I saw bergs 50 miles distant from the south end of Cape Farewell. Some of these bergs swing around the cape and get into the north-bound branch of the Gulf Stream, following or paralleling the coast and moving up with the bergs that come out of the big fjords of south Greenland.

As they work north, they begin to leave the coast and move across Davis Strait to Baffin Island and southbound Arctic currents. It would be interesting to tag these bergs as we do birds and fishes. There is no question that they come, many of them, right down to the banks of Newfoundland.

We put in a very busy day in one of the fjords running in from Cape Farewell, catching many fine cod with the jigger, and then lowering the otter trawl and obtaining a good lot of rich specimens. Some of these, while not unknown, were the first ever delivered to the Smithsonian.

In 7 days we crossed the North Atlantic to Brigus and every 3 hours we made plankton hauls. We kept our thermometer readings of the surface water and put overboard bottle papers for the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department at Washington.

During the morning of August 28 we ran into a heavy gale. The vessel was shipping much water. Our musk ox calves became uncomfortable as water began coming into their box. We wrapped them up with plenty of sail canvas, cut up strands of rope, and made them a comfortable bedding. Water on their long, heavy hair is bad for musk ox calves; it may cause pneumonia.

Sunday, September 3, we heard that England and France had declared war upon Germany.

PEARY'S ESTIMATE OF GREENLAND

My old commander, Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary, wrote in 1916 an article advising Greenland's purchase by the United States, and from this document it seems fitting here to quote a part:

"Geographically, Greenland belongs to North America and the Western Hemisphere, over which we have formally declared a sphere of influence by our Monroe Doctrine. Its possession by us will be in line with the Monroe Doctrine and will eliminate one more possible source of future complications for us from European possession of territory in the Western Hemisphere.

"Greenland is comparatively near to us. For years American ships have conveyed cryolite from the Ivigut mines to Philadelphia. There are coal and cryolite, graphite and mica, possibly gold, in its rocks. With our unlimited means it may, like Alaska, prove a sound and most valuable business investment.

"The abundance of native coal and the numerous glacial streams which come tumbling into the southern fjords from the great interior ice sheet represent enormous potential energy which might be translated into nitrate and electrical energy to make Greenland a powerhouse for the United States. Greenland represents ice, coal, and power in inexhaustible quantities.

BASE FOR AIRSHIPS AND NAVY

"And stranger things have happened than that Greenland, in our hands, might furnish an important North Atlantic naval and aeronautical base. A North Pacific naval base for the United States in the Aleutian Archipelago is a recognized possibility. Why not a similar base in the North Atlantic?

"Cape Farewell in Greenland is but little north of Sitka. It is in the same latitude as St. Petersburg (now Leningrad); Christiania (now Oslo); Great Britain's naval base in the Orkneys; and the northern entrance to the North Sea, which Great Britain has patrolled with her ships, incessantly now, summer and winter, for 2 years.

"There are fjords in southern Greenland which would hold the entire Navy, with deep, narrow, impregnable entrances. Thirty hours' steaming due south from Cape Farewell by 35-knot war craft would put them in the trans-Atlantic lanes midway between New York and the British Channel. With the rapid shrinking of distance in this age of speed and invention, Greenland may be of crucial importance to us in the future.

"The present war (the first World War) has shown us most strikingly how far-flung may be the regions having a bearing on the struggle.

"Great Britain's coaling station in the Falklands spelled destruction for Germany's squadron of commerce destroyers. Russia's port of Archangel (Arkhangelsk) has been an invaluable gateway for her. Greenland in our hands may be a valuable piece of our defensive armor. In the hands of a hostile interest it could be a serious menace."

Railroad Unemployment Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

LETTER FROM INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF FIREMEN AND OILERS, LOCAL NO. 515

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
FIREMEN AND OILERS, LOCAL NO. 515,
Ironwood, Mich., July 5, 1940.

The Honorable FRANK E. HOOK,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The railroad unemployment insurance bill is before a committee in the House, and from what information we have, those workers who are making the most now are to have their rates raised, while those who work a short time or whose wages are low, get nothing, except more days, which those earning more get, too.

The average wage of most of us for our part-time work is from $300 to $500 per year.

We would like to see our bill at least as good as the best State bill, and reading the statement in Labor of twelve and one-half millions paid out and one hundred and twenty-five million taken in taxes, we see no reason why it shouldn't be.

Therefore, we are asking you to do all you can to have the rates raised for those workers earning less than $1,000 a year as well as those earning more.

We believe that our rates should be as good as the best State bill, and better if we can get it.

We should also like to know why, under our bill, we must report every other day and sometimes every day, while under the State bill, we report once a week? Aren't we to be trusted to tell the truth about what work we do?

We are sending you a copy of the Michigan bill, and we hope that you will do all you can for those workers in the lower earning class, that they may get at least as much as they would under that bill.

We know that you will now, as you have in the past, do all you can for us, and we hope you will have the help of all the good friends we have in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL WYZLU,
President.
RUDOLPH WESTERBERG,
Chairman.

Hon. Clyde H. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

RESOLUTION BY MAINE STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has deemed it necessary to take from our midst the Honorable CLYDE H. SMITH, and

Whereas the sympathetic understanding and recognition of human rights prevailed in the thoughts and actions of our departed friend throughout his entire private and public life, and

Whereas all toilers have suffered an immeasurable loss through being deprived of his militant, loyal, and sincere service in the Congress of the United States, and

Whereas the problems and advocacies of organized labor have been long championed and espoused by him both as a State and National governmental Representative: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this, the thirty-sixth annual convention of the Maine State Federation of Labor, stand for 1 minute in silent reverence and tribute to this man who enjoyed the respect, admiration, and love of Maine workers, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to his widow, Congresswoman MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy be sent to the Maine Congressional Delegation urging that it be read on the floor of Congress and made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that a copy be released to the press.

Adopted by the thirty-sixth annual convention of the Maine State Federation of Labor, at Portland, Maine, June 14, 1940.

CHARLES O. DINTON, *Secretary.*

God Keep America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

SONG COMPOSED BY MARTIN BRANDON, J. V. DECIMBER, AND WOODY DREYFUSS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the words of an exceptionally fine song entitled "God Keep America," which was written and composed by Martin Brandon, J. V. DeCimber, and Woody Dreyfuss, program director for radio station WISN, Milwaukee, Wis.:

GOD, KEEP AMERICA!

(By Woody Dreyfuss, program director, WISN; Martin Brandon, J. V. DeCimber)

God, keep America from wanton hands.
God, keep America, land of freedom—keep it so,
With every man a king, his home a throne,
Forever keep it so. God, keep America!

God, keep America, land of the free,
Land of democracy; we Americans love it so.
Let no one take away our heritage,
Though there are those who would. God, keep America!

God, keep America free from all pain;
God, keep America singing Freedom's own refrain;
Free it from wanton hands, where'er they be—
Keep singing Freedom's call. God, keep America!

Do Congressmen Pay Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

LETTER BY HON. U. S. GUYER OF KANSAS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER]:

HE PAYS TAXES

I was surprised to find on the editorial page of the Times-Herald for Saturday, July 6, a cartoon, based either on gross ignorance or mendacity, which represents our "Uncle Sam" as saying to a Congressman:

"While the spirit of taxation for defense is strong, wouldn't it be large and admirable if Federal officeholders paid taxes too?"

After paying thousands of dollars of income taxes on my salary as a Member of Congress during the past 16 years, and also income tax to my State on my salary, I confess a desire to express myself in unprintable terms. Federal officials down to the underpaid clerks and secretaries have paid income taxes just like anyone else.

While there are a limited number of people who, through ignorance or malice, peddle this palpable prevarication, it must have been oversight or inadvertence that permitted the Times-Herald to give it currency by publication.

U. S. GUYER,
Member of Congress, Second Kansas District.

National Advertising and the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY RAYMOND RUBICAM

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, James S. Milloy, of the Washington office of the Minneapolis Tribune, has brought to my attention an address delivered to the recent Business-Consumer Relations Conference held in New York City by Raymond Rubicam, chairman of the board, Young & Rubicam, Inc. Mr. Rubicam's firm is one of the Nation's leading advertising agencies, and because of his outstanding leadership in advertising his comments on business-consumer relations are of distinct importance. Because of widespread interest on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, there is much more to the consumer movement than a consideration of advertising alone. And the questions concerning advertising involve more than national advertising alone. But national advertising is important, and it is the branch of advertising in which I work; therefore most of my remarks will be concerned with it.

WHAT DOES NATIONAL ADVERTISING OWE THE CONSUMER?

In my opinion, the first obligation that national advertising owes the consumer is the same as that which it owes the manufacturer—namely, success in selling honest goods and services to a mass market at a low cost.

If an advertisement does not succeed in commanding the attention of a large number of people, it fails in its first test. Even if it gives all the information in the world about a product, if it does not command such attention, it is a failure. If every statement in it were hailed as incontrovertible fact by Consumers' Union, it would still be a failure. And if it won the enthusiastic approval of every guardian of public welfare in the land, its classification would not change.

The only reason for the existence of advertising is that it sells goods to the many simultaneously, the way personal salesmen sell goods to people individually. It has no other justification worth mentioning. It reaches where sales forces cannot reach, and does it at a lower cost than any other method yet tried.

Why is all this of primary interest to the consumer? Certainly it is of interest to the consumer to have worthy goods and services offered to the largest possible number of people. Only in that way can the national standard of living be raised. Only because that job has been well done does the average American have more of the goods and services that make life enjoyable than any other average man in the world. And only because so many Americans use so many products and services are they available at all or at their present prices.

And there is still another reason why it is of primary interest to the consumer to have advertising highly effective in its ability to influence the consumer. The additional reason is that consumers are not only consumers, they are also producers and wage earners, and their ability to buy depends in part upon the success with which advertising helps to keep factories busy and wage earners earning.

ADVERTISING MUST BE INTERESTING

The first requirements which advertising must meet, or else cease to exist, are the requirements of people's tastes and habits regarding what they will and will not read in magazines and newspapers and what they will and will not listen to on the air. If these requirements are ignored, people will in turn ignore the advertisements, and they will fail.

If you will study the editorial contents of the magazines which are most popular, the newspapers which are most in demand, the radio programs which are listened to by the greatest number of people, the movies which people flock to see, there is one conclusion that you will come to rather easily—namely, that people do not want dry facts served to them in a dry way. Critics complain that the best books are not read, that the best plays are not popular, the best movies not even produced. Perhaps this is so. Authors and playwrights can afford, if they wish, to appeal to a judicious minority, but the advertiser and the advertisement have no choice. They must meet popular taste and appeal to it in terms which will win broad response or they lose their justification.

Advertising is divided into two main branches—national advertising and retail advertising. In a broad way it is the job of national advertising to stimulate desire and demand; it is the job of retail advertising to fill it. It is reasonably well known that you cannot create desire or demand in any field of human activity simply by a recitation of facts. Equally as useful as the facts is the art of persuasion, which I have yet to hear called a crime except by some critics of advertising. Preachers use it not only to save sinners, but, competitively, to win converts to their sect. Educators use it to convince the indifferent young that it pays to study, and alumni use it to recruit talent for the football teams. Democratic governments use it to win people to their policies, but dictators don't bother with it; they just tell you what to do.

ADVERTISING SHOULD HAVE LIBERTY WITHIN LIMITS

Effective national advertising is made up of a combination of facts and persuasion. It should not be exerted in behalf of fraudulent products; it should not resort to unjustified claims; it should not violate or evade the laws whose purpose is to prevent the consumer from being cheated.

On the other hand, advertising should be given as much liberty as possible within the limits of honesty. It should not be required to become an encyclopedia of factual information about the product. It should not be asked to employ standards of public taste which apply only to a minority. If it is compelled to do so, it will fail to interest enough people to perform its primary job of selling goods at low cost.

Studies of public reading habits and preferences show that the picture page of the newspaper will be looked at by 90 percent of the women readers and the leading comic will be read by 70 percent, whereas the leading editorial will be read by only 10 percent. Although fiction is not nearly so popular in newspapers as it is in magazines, even in a newspaper the love stories will be read by more women than the leading news story on page 1. The Hollywood columns far outrank the book columns in popularity, and the columns on beauty, etiquette, and society outrank columns on health.

Critics sometimes question advertising as an effective and economical selling tool; the same critics will criticize it for lack of factual dignity. Certainly advertising cannot lower its cost without reaching the masses of the people, and certainly it cannot reach the masses of the people by a very great preoccupation with dignity.

EMOTIONAL AND DRAMATIC TOUCH NECESSARY

In both newspapers and magazines research proves over and over again that people want information served to them with a light and entertaining touch, or else with an emotional and dramatic touch which mirrors their own lives. Particularly is this true of women. In a woman's magazine, articles of serious import must be highly personalized, or they are likely to get scant reading. In national advertising an advertisement about an electrical appliance which featured for a woman the technical details of the product would be a complete and utter failure, according to all past experience; but an advertisement which dramatized for her the contribution which that appliance could make to her life, if it hit the truth of the matter, would be a huge success.

The most effective advertisements are not written about products; they are written about people and their relationship to the product advertised. Dramatic selling and free use of the imagination are clearly recognized by the critics of advertising, or they would never have taken such titles for their books as One Hundred Million Guinea Pigs, Forty Million Guinea Pig Children, Skin Deep, and Partners in Plunder. How much circulation do you suppose these popular books would have had if they had been given conservative titles and been written in factual language?

Imaginative persuasion is a crime only when it is used by your opponents.

Advertising is not to be likened to an impartial consumers' information service. An advertisement is a salesman; it exercises any man's right to advocate openly and honorably his own goods and his own work. It does not pretend to be disinterested, as so often happens in propaganda outside of advertising. It is as partial to the product it advertises as the doctor to his own diagnosis, the lawyer to his own brief, the architect to his own building plan, the economist to his own theory of a depression or a boom. Its partiality can do no more harm than these other partialities. Its departures from fact are out where they can be seen, challenged, and corrected, and where the parties responsible are known and can be held responsible.

It is not an offense against the consumer if the advertiser is in favor of his own products and says so enthusiastically. It is not an offense against the consumer if he tries to make a place in her life for the goods he sells. And he must be allowed liberty and latitude, it seems to me, in the choice of methods by which he sells.

If he makes honest goods, prices them fairly, puts all vital information about them on product or label and in service literature,

it seems to me that he should be allowed to advertise them with nursery rhymes if nursery rhymes carry the good product to the greatest number of consumers at the lowest cost.

Let me hasten to say at this point that I am not arguing that advertisers should not give more information to the consumer. I am not arguing against grade labeling. I am not arguing against full information on labels, products, or in service literature. I am arguing that national advertising's primary job is to sell, without misrepresentation, the largest number of people at the lowest possible cost, and that everything else about it must be secondary to that.

Readers of national advertising are frequently repelled, instead of attracted, by a mass of literal facts about the product. They are frequently repelled by informative headlines. They are usually repelled by lots of words and small type. They are usually attracted by pictures of generous size or by sequences of pictures. They are generally attracted by pictures of people rather than pictures of products alone. More often than not there is some one fact about a product or some one appeal for its use that is of supreme interest and importance to people, and so far outweighs all others that emphasis upon it is the best, and perhaps the only way of effecting low-cost selling.

CONTACT BETWEEN CONSUMER AND PRODUCER

Perhaps in saying these things I am, as the phrase goes, sticking my neck out. But, as I see it, the value of consumer-business conferences lies in hearing all views. I am distinctly in favor of greater contact between consumer and producer. Nothing but good for both can come from it if the contact is frequent enough, is continued long enough, if the consumer representatives and the business representatives really represent the forces behind them, and if there is an honest and cooperative effort in both groups to understand the needs and problems of the other.

Human beings always find it hard to make sudden changes and adjustments. Businessmen and advertising men are no exception to this. Changes in procedure which are suggested from the outside sometimes look harder to make than they are. Changes that are restrictive in nature, sometimes look more dangerous than they are to the freedoms which we in this country so rightfully guard today.

It is true, at the same time, that this American freedom is, or should be, based upon a willingness of the individual to accept such limitations on his personal freedom as will serve the rights and interests of all. There is no question that business and its instrument, advertising, must serve the great consuming public to its satisfaction or that the public will find ways of compelling that satisfaction.

It is important that we, who are in business, see and accept that fact. It is likewise important that the leaders of the consumer movement truly represent the views, needs, and desire of the great mass of consumers, and that the measures which they advocate will permit business to serve the consumer in his role as producer, too.

In the short run it may not always be true that what is good for business is good for the consumer and wage earner, but in the long run it has got to be true, and in my experience, businessmen have never seen and understood this as clearly as they do today.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE FOR CONSUMER

The most precious possession we have in this country is freedom of choice. The average American has more latitude with regard to everything in his life than any citizen of any great nation in the world. We cannot blind ourselves to the fact that millions are without jobs, but we must strive for the restoration of those jobs without the loss of the freedoms—spiritual, mental, and material—which make us the most fortunate great people in the world today.

The most important consideration before us is that we shall use well and thus retain the freedoms which we now have.

Reasonable and fair freedom for business in its methods must be guarded as carefully as freedom for the people whom business serves. For violation of freedom in one field leads to violation in others.

Business, heedless of consumer needs and desires, might bring upon itself new restrictions to shrink its area of freedom; but consumers must look out that, in imposing too severe restrictions on business, they do not, in the end, restrict themselves.

Today, business suggests through advertising and salesmanship, but the consumer decides. Because of the freedoms which business enjoys, the consumer is offered an almost limitless range of goods and services to choose from.

What difference does it make if 2 or 10 or 50 different manufacturers market and advertise goods which have many like characteristics? Why shouldn't 2 or 10 or 50 manufacturers have the right to make and market resembling products? Is it not important to preserve their right to do so in order to preserve the whole principle of right of choice—whether for a man to choose to go in business or for a woman to choose what hat or automobile or brand of peas strikes her fancy?

We must all be careful that a movement which starts with the reasonable desire of consumers to get what they want from business, does not end with the dictation of an individual empowered to decide what everybody wants.

Shall Roosevelt Have a Third Term?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE GET-TOGETHER CLUB, OF HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address made by myself some months ago before the Get-Together Club of Hartford, Conn. At that time I debated with Mr. Jay Franklin the issue Shall Roosevelt Have a Third Term?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL ROOSEVELT HAVE A THIRD TERM?

(Debate between Jay Franklin and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to be the guest of the Get-together Club of Hartford. I am grateful for the opportunity to visit in your city and for the opportunity of exchanging ideas in this forum.

Until tonight I have not had the privilege of meeting my distinguished opponent. I read his column and I must say that he is consistent in his hero worship of the President. Just the other day he came out with a very beautifully written column comparing the President most favorably with the great men, living and dead.

His column might have stimulated a paraphrase of one of the Confucius sayings which are so much in vogue today:

"Me lik-ee President, as man.
Me no lik-ee, as politician.
Me no lik-ee, as God, at all.
Too much baloney, no good, no good."
Confucius say.

I am also happy to be in Hartford to pay my respects to your two Senators, JOHN DANAHER and FRANCIS T. MALONEY. I have learned to know and admire them both.

But to the subject of the debate: Shall Roosevelt Have a Third Term?

The answer, as I see it, is "No."

In arriving at that conclusion, I do not want to indulge in personalities; nor do I want to permit bias, prejudice, or political partisanship to influence my answer. Why? Because the question has more significance than appears on the face of it. It really implies—Shall we impose upon this country 4 more years, and perhaps more years after that, of the political leadership and the political philosophy of the New Deal?

In answering that question, we have to arrive at our individual conclusions from an investigation made by ourselves as trustees—trustees of the great American freedoms, the great American political concepts. Mere personal regard for, or prejudice against, the individual concerned should not influence our judgment in this matter.

Putting it bluntly, the personal appeal of the President—and we must admit he has such an appeal—his ability to overcome his physical handicap, his pleasing smile and voice, and his incessant activity make a personal appeal of tremendous proportions, all of which, among judicially minded folks, should have no great significance in determining the answer to this question. Likewise, the mere prejudice of a Republican against a Democrat should have no influence either in our decision this evening.

I repeat that we are trustees, you and I, of great values. Every 4 years the American people choose anew the leadership which will carry on for 4 more years. Tonight we debate whether we want to move in the same direction we have in the last 7 years, and whether America can take the chance of pursuing the course we have been traveling, under the same leadership.

I do not believe Mr. Roosevelt should have a third term. I have many reasons for that belief. My reasons fall into two groups:

1. Reasons why no President should be given a third term.

2. Reasons why Mr. Roosevelt specifically should not be given a third term.

First, let us consider the reasons why no President should be given a third term.

At the outset of our discussion on this point, let me state that I am not going to present the intolerant idea that there is a hard-and-fast rock-ribbed American doctrine absolutely forbidding a third term. There is no constitutional prohibition against a third term.

There are 150 years of tradition and precedent which have almost created an unwritten law on the subject. This historical tradition

is so deeply rooted and so well known that it is hardly necessary for us to discuss it at great length. The question goes back to the Constitutional Convention itself. It was discussed at great length. It was discussed in July of 1787 and again in August. It wasn't until September 15 that the final plan for a 4-year term was agreed upon.

It was just 2 days later that the Constitutional Convention concluded its work and adjourned. The Convention omitted the question of reeligibility about which Thomas Jefferson was greatly concerned.

The men in that Convention who believed that the President should serve as many terms as the people wished were in the minority. Alexander Hamilton was one of that group and I might add that he was generally suspected of being a monarchist at heart.

The Committee on Detail for the Constitutional Convention was the committee which attacked the naming of the President by Congress. Then the delegates referred the whole question to a special committee of one representative each from each of the 11 States represented. That committee settled on election by an electoral college and a term of 4 years. They ignored the question of how many terms might be permissible.

Jefferson worried about this question. On May 2, 1788, when he was our diplomatic representative in Paris, he wrote to George Washington about this matter. He said:

"This I fear, will make an office for life. * * * I shall hope that before there is danger of this change taking place in the office of President (referring to perpetuating a President in office) the good sense and free spirit of our countrymen will make the change necessary to prevent it."

In all honesty it must be admitted that Washington did not entirely agree with Jefferson. The fact remains, however, that he did not accept the office for a third term. That set a precedent even though his decision had been made upon entirely personal grounds.

That precedent was really established, oddly enough, by the two fathers of the Democratic Party—Jefferson and Jackson. Immediately after Jefferson's second inauguration as President in 1805 he announced that he would not be a candidate again. His reasons boiled down to his aversion to "perpetuation of power." He didn't want the office to degenerate into an inheritance so that the power of Federal Washington would be used to keep a man in Washington year after year.

That wasn't his idea of democracy. In 1807 the legislatures of five States asked him to reconsider his action. On December 10, 1807, he wrote his famous letter to the Vermont Legislature. In it he said:

"That I should lay down my charge at a proper season is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully."

In that one golden line he set a test for all succeeding Presidents.

Jefferson was succeeded by Madison who was followed by Monroe.

Each of these men served two terms and voluntarily retired at the end of their second terms. Meanwhile, Jefferson believed that his own decision coupled with those of Washington, Madison, and Monroe, had firmly nailed down the precedent that a President should retire after a second term.

Most Presidents have followed the precedent. Only one President has actually been a candidate for a third term. That man was Theodore Roosevelt. Grant almost became another exception when he permitted his friends to attempt to secure the candidacy for him.

Andrew Jackson is another classic example of a man who refused a third term. This man—the $100-a-plate patron saint of the New Deal—was militantly opposed to a third term.

He stood for new movements in American life fully as much as the New Deal claims it does. His friends wanted him to break the third-term tradition but he didn't because he subscribed to Jefferson's belief in the necessity of rotation in office "to secure in all contingencies that important right of sovereignty to the direct control of the people."

After the Civil War there were many Presidents who discussed this question. Rutherford B. Hayes advocated a single term and kept his pledge not to seek reelection. William McKinley squelched a third-term boom which began 3 months after he entered on his second term. Cleveland advocated a single term though he later battled for a second term. Teddy Roosevelt was against a third term until he got the Bull Moose urge. Wilson in his 1912 platform pledged himself to a single term though he did not keep that pledge.

As a matter of fact the Democratic convention in Baltimore in 1912 adopted a plank which favored a single Presidential term. The following year an amendment to that effect actually passed the United States Senate though it never became a law.

But, my friends, I am not as concerned with the force of historic precedent as I am with the reasons behind it. Calvin Coolidge gave the best reasons why any man should not stand for a third term. Coolidge said that the drain on an incumbent makes 8 years the full span in which a man can give his best. In support of that idea he cited the fact that each two-termer in his last 2 years had had a serious let-down.

The canny New Englander saw other reasons for not having a third term. He said that men in high office are always in danger of "self-delusion"; "that they live in an artificial atmosphere of adulation and exaltation which sooner or later impair their judgment."

My friends, it serves little purpose for me to discuss at great length the history of the third-term tradition. I do not contend that this is a closed issue decided by dead hands stretching across the span of many decades.

I do contend that there is a sound basis for opposition to a third term to be found in the historical discussions on this matter. Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Coolidge, all considered this matter and found compelling reasons against granting a third term to any man.

All of their reasons simmer down to one important thought. That thought is just this:

It is necessary that there be a change of power at reasonable intervals in order to perpetuate the rule of the people. It is the perpetuation of this principle which constitutes the tradition which must be observed today. Let us know for once and for all that no individual is indispensable in a democracy. That is the lesson of 150 years during which no emergency from the time the Nation was in swaddling clothes to the present day has ever justified one man in regarding himself as a Messiah who is indispensable.

I might add that my belief on the principle involved in this matter is not at all partisan. On May 31, 1939, I introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and restricting the terms of both the President and the Vice President to a single 6-year term. Here is what President Roosevelt himself has said on the subject.

President Roosevelt, on November 3, 1932, repeated a statement made by former President Calvin Coolidge on October 31, 1920, relative to the third term. His statements (President Roosevelt's) were printed in the November 4, 1932, issue of the New York Times, page 14:

"Let me propose a text which, in my opinion, expresses a sentiment that is widely held this year. It is presented so clearly, so distinctly, and so admirably that I would not change a word of it, even though it was spoken 12 years ago. Coming from a great figure in our national life, it deserves serious consideration; and coming from a great Republican, it deserves particularly consideration from Republicans: 'For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people; and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of Government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of Government. This condition appears to have arrived in America.'

"That, my friends, is the sober conclusion of a cautious public man, not long ago President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. With every word of it I heartily agree."

Thus far, my friends, we have only discussed the reasons why no President should be given a third term.

Now let us consider why Mr. Roosevelt specifically should not be given a third term.

1. He should not be given a third term because he has failed to do the job he promised. It is inconceivable that he should be given a third term as a reward for his two administrations which will leave us a heritage of debts, deficit, unemployment, relief, less gold in our dollar, and growing Executive power.

What was that job?

I take it from the platform under which Roosevelt was elected and which he endorsed.

The job to be done was—

(a) A drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, eliminating extravagances.

(b) A Federal Budget annually balanced.

(c) A fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference.

(d) The restoration of agriculture.

(e) The removal of Government from our fields of private enterprise, except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources.

(f) No interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

(g) Condemnation of improper and excessive use of money in political affairs.

(h) Create jobs for the unemployed.

It will be remembered that the great depression of 1929 was in full swing in the fall of 1932. It will also be remembered that President Roosevelt himself said that this condition—world-wide depression—was the result of the World War. Of course, he didn't so argue in 1932. He blamed Hoover and the Republicans for everything then, and he said he could remedy the situation. He diagnosed the ills as I have shown above, and he said, "Give me the job and I and my party will do that job." And we gave him what he asked.

After 7 years of the New Deal, the people realize that the present leadership cannot coordinate the various forces in America, which coordination is necessary in order to bring America out of the depression. As we look at the balance sheet we know why the American people are saying: "This leadership with its psychological and human appeal cannot do the job."

We have:

(a) More than 10,000,000 Americans unemployed.

(b) A lower standard of living than a decade ago.

(c) The creation of new enterprises virtually at a standstill. The modernization and expansion of existing enterprises deferred.

(d) Labor involved in extensive and costly disputes with its organized ranks torn by civil war and its annual income lower despite higher hourly wage rates.

(e) Farm prices neither stable nor satisfactory and the basic problems of agriculture no nearer solution than before the administration's exercise of sweeping controls over farms and farmers.

(f) The doors of economic opportunity barricaded to youth by the sluggish condition of American enterprise.

(g) Government expenditures, excluding postal receipts and debt retirement, of $9,210,091,000 in 1939 against $3,863,544,000 in 1933.

(h) The heaviest tax burden in the Nation's history.

(i) A national debt doubled by the end of 1939—increased from less than twenty-one billions at the beginning of the New Deal administration to approximately $42,000,000,000, not including nearly $6,000,000,000 of obligations guaranteed by the Federal Government.

I have quoted from a program for a dynamic America, the same being the report of the Republican program committee. I continue by showing you 6 years before the New Deal and 6 years of the New Deal. The record is revealing.

(a) The average annual pay roll in all industries for the 6 years preceding the New Deal was $38,760,000,000; for the first 6 years of the New Deal, $30,446,000,000.

(b) The average number of strikes annually for the 6 years preceding the New Deal was 753, the average number of workers involved was 296,954, and man-days idle, 10,819,019; for the first 6 years of the New Deal the average number of strikes annually was 2,541, the average number of workers involved 1,181,637, and man-days idle, 17,232,583.

(c) The average index of farm prices of all agricultural products for the 6 years preceding the New Deal was 118.7; for the first 6 years of the New Deal, 99.7.

(d) The average index of department-store sales for the 6 years preceding the New Deal was 98.16; for the first 6 years of the New Deal, 81.

(e) The average annual value of construction for the 6 years preceding the New Deal was $4,608,000,000; for the first 6 years of the New Deal, $2,239,200,000.

(f) The average annual volume of new domestic corporate issues for the 6 years preceding the New Deal was $4,060,000,000; for the first 6 years of the New Deal, $672,000,000.

Now, my friends, you will remember that the New Deal leadership promised to get results by planned economy, or planned political action; and after 7 years of such spending as the world has never seen, we have uncertainty, confusion, doubt, and nobody knows where we are going.

Let me tell you several incidents that illustrate how the average man reacts to the dilemma that America is in and why he says there is going to be a change.

THE STORY OF HANS, THE SMALL-TOWN CARPENTER

The story of the old German who said: "You can't dig yourself out of a hole by digging deeper."

Granted that the New Deal hasn't done the job that it started out to do—and, I repeat, it stated pretty well in its platform of 1932 what the job was and what the Democrats were going to do—you will remember that they were to balance the Budget, reemploy the idle, cut down the expenses of government, protect the farmer and the laborer and the businessman—why didn't the New Deal succeed? It had every opportunity. It had more money, more power than any other administration.

Well, the old German said: "You can't dig yourself out of a hole by digging deeper." The New Deal tried to do that very thing. Besides this, it was also guilty of errors in legislation, administration, and selection of personnel, with the result that, as I said before, there was lack of coordination. By that I mean lack of pulling together. Labor and capital pulled apart. There was dissension, fear, distrust, and no one seemed to get all the factors interested in going in one direction. It was like a team of horses—one going one way and one another. And that condition has continued now for a long spell, and the leadership asks for a new lease of life to carry out its plans and policies. Can America afford to give this extension? The answer must be an emphatic "No." We cannot go along this highway we have been traveling for another 5 years, because if we do the national indebtedness will be sixty-five billion, and undoubtedly more men unemployed, business and agriculture stagnant.

2. The President should not be given a third term—aye, more, if he were running for a second term he should not be given it, because in the Democratic platform and in his speeches, until his Chicago speech, he promised the country that there should be no interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Right now my distinguished opponent and others have been trying to claim that the President has a superknowledge in foreign affairs, which should equip him for continuity in office. What we need in America now is men who know the domestic situation and who can coordinate all the various factions in America. We need in America someone who can discriminate between "showmanship and statesmanship."

I am sure the President does not want to get us into war. Wilson didn't want to get us into war, either. But ever since Roosevelt's Chicago speech the 48 States and Territories haven't been big enough for his efforts. He must have more worlds to conquer. He has forgotten the advice of Washington and Jefferson—not to become entangled in foreign affairs or alliances. He may be sincere in the conviction that we should try to exercise a dominant position in world problems, but I say that in that attitude he goes beyond the established rule of America. He becomes a meddler. In fact, just recently the papers in Europe said that our unofficial representative over there was a meddler. I say it is most important to this people and to future generations that we keep our fingers out of that European fire. We have seen how his administration has sought to centralize virtually all power over the enterprise of the Nation. If war should come, then we would go the way of Europe and become a totalitarian state. We cannot afford to take the chances of a restless mind like his remaining in the saddle another 4 years.

3. The American people are realizing that mere activity is not synonymous with constructive action. The American people are realizing that there is just one thing that is sure about Washington, and that is that no one knows what the administration will attempt to do tomorrow, because the leader himself does not know, as Moley says, what he will do tomorrow.

Under ordinary circumstances these might be considered harsh words, but the circumstances are not ordinary—and, I repeat, you and I are trustees of the great American values, and we want to make sure that we can turn them over to the next generation unimpaired.

Many a good-intentioned banker has wrecked the bank. Many a good-intentioned, but reckless, driver has killed a pedestrian. Hell is paved with those who have good intentions. America needs someone in the saddle now who will "go slowly," think the problem through, and before he takes a step in a certain direction, make sure that his foot is on solid ground.

Because of his apparent attitude toward foreign affairs which tends toward involvement, we should by all means keep President Roosevelt or any of his political kin who may think the way he does out of the Executive chair for the next 4 years.

There are certain minds in America today which speak glibly, use sonorous phrases, but who have little or no time for the Constitution of the United States. The President's attitude toward sit-down strikes; toward men of means; toward the Constitution; toward the Supreme Court; the President's attitude toward men who dared to oppose him in the Senate—he went into their States to purge them—all of these indicate a mental quirk. The same quirk now is manifested in foreign affairs. He ignores the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate and of the House. Such a quirk, during these perilous war years, should not be present in the Chief Executive of this great Nation. He has a national job, not a personal job, to tend to. He is not the state. He is still the servant with limited powers.

He and others of his philosophy knew that the loaning of money directly or indirectly by this Government to a belligerent while this Government was at peace was violation of international law. They knew also that the people had never conferred upon the Congress the right to spend the people's money by loaning it to a belligerent while this Nation was at peace. But these minds are the same autocratic minds that fill the pages of history in which we have heard said, "I am the state"; "to hell with the people." Their attitude is now "to hell with the Constitution," if it runs contra to what they think.

In all seriousness, I present this phase of the subject because, to me, unless an individual or a nation has a principle to go by—a guide post to follow—such an individual or nation will make his own principle and set up his own guide post, and that is just what these new dealers have been doing. There has been too much experimentation with fundamental values. There has been too much experimentation with the people's money. There have been too many broken pledges strewn along the highways of the last 7 years.

Yes, this Nation needs a new leadership—a leadership that can and will straighten out its domestic affairs. Under the stranglehold of New Deal philosophy, capital is dormant, or partially so. If we have 4 more years of Roosevelt, it will mean that Government will have its clutching hands on all the wealth of the Nation. The only real market for the people's money now is to be found in Government securities. Excessive taxation, war-torn labor, coupled with Government interference, have partially strangled the initiative of our people. If initiative were all that were gone or dormant, it would be bad enough, but under this new policy which we have had now for 7 years, a large segment of our society has had its morale seriously impaired. Why? Because we used to think it was the business of the people to sustain Government. Now millions of our people believe it is the business of Government to sustain the people. You can lay that new principle to the people in power.

It is time that the Nation awakens to this danger—this danger of growing bureaucracy and growing dependency of millions of men on the state.

Because someone might say, "Senator WILEY can see no good in anything that has been done by this administration," I hasten to say that this is not my position. I am willing to give credit for palliative measures and willing to say that whoever takes over the next administration will, of necessity, have to carry along some of the ideas that have been put into effect by the present administration. Yes, the new administration will have to continue for a while the C. C. C., W. P. A., and P. W. A., and some of the relief and agriculture policies. But these are no part of the permanent patterns of our American life.

Yes; Roosevelt will go down as the great "palliativeator," but not the builder, not the coordinator, not the leader that united a great people in a great crisis. Why? Because he builded on the false god of legislation. By and through legislation only his fertile-minded hero worshipers thought a nation could be rebuilt, and proceeded to carry out a revolution. He was elected on a platform and pledges different from what he proceeded to put into action 6 months after he was elected. Norman Thomas was defeated on that platform. Roosevelt took his platform—socialism.

Every problem—labor and capital, the unemployed, the farm, excessive taxation, centralization of power in Washington, the railroads, the increased cost of government, bureaucracy, dormant national initiative, dormant capital, fear of government, relief, State barriers, Government overregulation, loss of capital values, increasing national indebtedness—all these are still with us. Why? Because the leadership did not bind us together to solve these problems. It divided us. It never admitted any mistakes. It flittered back and forth constantly, always in action, never quiescent. Fundamentals in economics, law, and politics were disregarded under the plea of emergency and justified by highly sounding and plausible statements.

But the job was not done.

America knows now that magic and false economies are no substitutes for thrift, industry, honesty, and square dealing.

4. What kind of leadership do we need? (Let me tell you a story—the story of a football team and a coach.)

The story in brief is this:

A western college some years ago had a football team which could not win. It had great individual players, great punters, sprinters, throwers of the ball, but the team couldn't win. Then the college got a new coach. The coach never appeared in the limelight, but he got that team to win.

How did he do it? He got each individual player to forget self. He got 11 men to play as 1, not as 11. In other words, he unified the team. Wherever there was friction, he ironed it out. Wherever there was dissention, he did away with the cause. Wherever there was lack of team play, he found what was the trouble and got team play. It was a case of "all for one and one for all."

That's the leadership this Nation needs, and we have not had it.

My friends, in the last analysis this question of whether Roosevelt shall seek a third term resolves itself into a question vastly more important.

Franklin Roosevelt is merely a symbol in this larger question. That question is just this: "Which way of life will the American people select in the forthcoming election?"

Make no mistake about it. The year 1940 will mark a significant milestone—a crucial milestone—a milestone marking a turning point in American and world history.

Selection of Franklin Roosevelt for a third term would mean that the die would be cast for an extension of an "American fascism." I make that statement advisedly. The cloven hoof of authoritarianism beats stronger in Washington today than at any time in world history.

Selection of Franklin Roosevelt for a third term would mean scrapping the unwritten law against the third term and further impairing our constitutional democracy. It would mean a continuance of bureaucracy, babel, and bankruptcy.

It would mean that your children's children would be paying for horses they never rode. It would mean that future generations would be unable to enjoy the privileges which we have come to regard as traditional American rights. It would mean that your son could never expect to operate a business unfettered and uncircumscribed by government.

It would mean that your children would never be able to cast a free American ballot unhampered by a financial dependence on government. It would mean that the independence which has characterized every free-born American would be slaughtered on an altar of paternalistic pap.

It will mean that the man with the hoe will be guided not by the dictates of a munificent nature but by the ironclad heel of bureaucracy drawn across his land in a line that says "Thus far you shall plant and no farther."

It will mean that more and more you will be dependent on government just as in other lands. It will mean that government will no longer be dependent on the people. It will mean that American youth, just as has been the case in other lands, will be placed more and more under the guidance of a kindly paternalism which may some day turn to crack the whiplash of regimentation over them.

It will mean that every dollar of American money will be worth just what the President says it is worth. It will mean that the cost of government will mount to such ungodly heights that no man will be able to save, secure in the knowledge that his savings will not be subject to the confiscatory blackjack of ruinous taxation.

It will mean the further sapping of American virility, and with a nation of weak men, the yoke of dictatorship is easily applied.

It will mean that the same social forces which are now hailed as beneficent may be turned to other ends. The power to set a bottom to wages and hours is the same power which may be used to set a ceiling to wages and hours. Witness Europe—labor take notice.

In short, the question of whether Franklin Roosevelt is to be retained for a third term resolves itself into the question of whether we continue American or whether we go to the dreary way of European totalitarian governments. That is the momentuous issue we discuss tonight.

Viewpoints on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY H. WOODRING

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, very recently there retired from the President's Cabinet an official whom I regard as one of the most valuable public servants who has held a Cabinet position during my lifetime, a man who gave up his Cabinet position rather than sacrifice his views as to the intervention of the United States in foreign quarrels, and as to the matériel which the United States could afford to part with. Night before last at Topeka, Kans., in response to a testimonial dinner which was tendered him by his fellow citizens of the State of Kansas, the Honorable Harry H. Woodring delivered a magnificent address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWPOINTS ON THE NATIONAL ISSUES

My fellow Kansans, it will soon be 10 years since I came to Topeka, our State capital, and lived among you as Kansas' twenty-fifth Governor, and the second native-born Kansan to serve as chief executive. With that tenure of office and my service in Washington, I have finished a decade of full, broad, and rich experiences. As a banker in a small Kansas town, I had daily contact with the city, the township, and the county officials. I studied and helped them with their financial problems, helped them solve those problems of local government which are probably the most important to the average citizen and the taxpayer.

Now, as a Democratic Governor of this great State, I worked with the Republican legislature to solve the serious problems pressed upon us by the great depression which had but a year before paralyzed the economic life of our entire Nation. As a member of the President's Cabinet, I have tried to do my part in the great national effort to solve the social, the economic, and the political problems which were threatening our form of government, and, yes, the very existence of our Republic.

In recent years, I have had the further opportunity to observe with anxious eyes the development of other forms of government in other nations, and to consider the possible effects of the impact of new political philosophies upon our American way of life, and to consider the possibility of a resort to force of arms to defend our own institutions.

In this decade, I have first-hand and intimately observed some of the problems of democracy. I have seen local officials without the advantage of special training from the farm or the corner store go into local office and discharge the function of local government in such a way that the community thrived. Local taxpayers received full value for their taxes, and even the thought of oppression by the local government was unheard of. I saw a legislature, composed mostly of farmers, merchants, and lawyers, pass wise legislation for the conduct of the impressively large business of this State.

I saw them improve the tax laws, provide for the educational system, and do their part in meeting the crises of unemployment and agricultural distress brought on us by the depression.

I then went to Washington at the close of an ominous era in our history, the golden age of big business. There had to be a clean-up of the debris left by years of maladministration, by men who forgot the interests of the common citizen, the common stockholders of this democracy. I learned again what I already knew, that no government can survive which is a government only of businessmen, or a government only of labor, or a government only of farmers. That golden decade of the twenties left agriculture prostrate, left labor destitute, and businessmen confused and helpless.

I saw a determined leader and, yes, an equally determined Congress, void of all partisanship, attack the problems as statesmen, dispel fear, and bring confidence again to the common stockholders of our country, and to know that our democracy worked and that it would pay dividends.

The main point that impressed me was that regardless of partisanship, those problems were approached as human and social problems as well as economic problems.

I saw the organized farmers come to Washington, demanding legislation for the relief of agriculture. The laws they demanded were modified and passed.

Organized labor came to Washington demanding the legal right to bargain on equal terms with capital and they also were given laws which did not fully meet but satisfied their demands.

Business came to Washington demanding banking and securities reform and other legislation to protect the depositor and the investor and the honest, able businessman. They, too, received the reform they asked, but like the laborer and the farmer, were refused the right to completely dictate to the Government.

The result was a broad program of social, political, and economic reforms which are today the accepted principles of both major political parties, and which have made our National Government an intimate part of the daily life of every American citizen.

This, briefly, my friends, is the intimate scene that has passed my eyes during the past decade of public life. My observations convince me that the people of this great democracy can rule themselves and that common men can become statesmen and solve their own problems, but that no one class, whether it be labor, farmer, or businessman, can govern any other class, and that the Government must remain a part of every class but not partial to any class.

Democracy should be intelligent coordination and cooperation of government, of business, and of labor combined.

Simply because some things have been done in the name of the Democratic Party does not mean that I have always approved of many of the methods used in Washington to reach objectives, and I have not approved of some of the brainless, impractical advisers that think our democracy must be tinkered with and made over, some of the young ideologists who subscribe to more liberal social and economic viewpoints than I myself hold. I think they should realize that our democracy and the capitalistic system are synonymous, and that America has grown great under this system even before they graduated from Harvard. [Applause.]

I want to say to Americans that no democracy can succeed riding two horses going in different directions. It cannot have one foot planted on the capitalistic private enterprise system and the other planted on a horse harnessed to a state socialism program. They must realize that their unsound economics cannot be transferred into wisdom by legislation and that legislation will not make unsound economy sound.

The primary objectives of a democracy of enlightened progressive peoples, free peoples, is in my mind, and always should be, the constant raising of the social and economic standard of living of each individual and each family that comprise that democracy. But there frequently comes a period of indigestion in the cycle of progress, especially after heavy social reform legislation and expenditures, that were necessary for huge national defense preparedness and modernization expenses now upon us.

With increasing public debt and large annual deficits, it is imprudent and unwise to further introduce new reform projects. Further reform legislation when men need jobs and homes is like giving caviar to the hungry.

I have had a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that my stay and my experience in Washington, my observation of the economic developments in this and other countries, has not changed nor scarcely modified my convictions which were founded and formed in Kansas. [Applause.]

Many leaders of both parties in Kansas and the Middle West have many times expressed the thought which I as spokesman of the Kansas delegation expressed in my address at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1932, when I said that the North, the South, the West, the East recognize agriculture as the basic industry of our country.

Agriculture in all sections is prostrate, and every farm product is today selling below the cost of production. Such conditions have brought failure and ruin to the homes of thousands, yes, millions of homes of American farmers.

Prosperity will never return to this Nation until purchasing power is returned to the American farmer, and we want no radical program. We only want agriculture to sell its wheat and its corn and its cotton and its hogs and its cattle above the cost of production, and it will in turn then buy from the industrialists their farm machinery, their automobiles, their radios, their clothing, and the shoes, and the very necessities and the comforts of American farm life.

The West and the South plead for the rehabilitation of the American farmer, his home, and his family. We plead for economic stability and social justice. We know that real relief to agriculture must come through a liberal program, of course, based, though, on sound business principles. We do not ask to tear down business and industry to help the farmer. We want to restore business and industry through the revival of the basic industry of the Middle West.

And so I said that at Chicago, and now I have only become more convinced today of my then convictions. I have watched our national prosperity rise and fall with the rise and fall of the national farm income, and I am as firmly convinced today as I was in 1932 that permanent prosperity cannot come, that a balanced National Budget which is supposed to follow an increase in national income will never come until we balance the budget of the middle-western farmer.

We have found no permanent solution of our agricultural program. There may be no satisfactory solution under present changing world conditions today. A Secretary of Agriculture from the Middle West has made a tremendous effort, with a measure of success, to bring temporary relief, and we in Kansas have cause to be grateful to our Government for the aid without which the drought years might have wholly destroyed the value of large sections of our great State of Kansas.

Yet the Middle West must still be vigilant to protect our agricultural interest. We must convince the Nation of our conviction that when the Middle West is sick the Nation cannot get well.

At this time, there is consideration of a proposition which may be far reaching in its effect upon the whole economy of the Middle West as well as upon Middle West agriculture. The proposed Pan-American Cartel may be sound from the standpoint of its effect upon our international relations. I agree that measures must be taken to prevent economic penetration of South America by nations whose purposes and economic policies are inimical to ours. But we should not be a party to any cartel or any other proposal which will sacrifice the interests of the Middle Western farmer.

For instance, if it is proposed to pool the surplus wheat of South America and that of the United States and sell it on the world market, we should have assurances that the price paid to the United States farmers will not be the same as that paid to the farmer of Argentina. We have had one sad experience in which the surplus agricultural products of this country were held by the Government in the showcase of trade and depressed the market price almost to zero, and we don't want another Hoover board.

In connection with just such a proposal, we want and will insist upon subsidies or price guaranties which will bring to the United States farmer not only the cost of production but that part which will enable him to have his fair share of our national income and to maintain the American standard of living for all American farmers.

In stating that nations whose purposes and economic policies are inimical to ours should be kept out of the Western Hemisphere I do not for one moment want to be understood that I am advocating that it is any business of ours what form of government any European or Oriental nations may choose.

I EXPECT TO REMAIN A NONINTERVENTIONIST

It is, after all, none of our business if certain European nations choose one form of government over another. May I take this occasion to say to many friends whose inquiries have come from all sections of the country, that I have always been, I am now, and I expect to remain a noninterventionist, a noninterventionist in both the military and political controversies of Europe, and I am a strong advocate of keeping this country out of recurring European wars.

I hold that it is not necessary for America to provoke antagonism with any peoples because their nations choose one form of government over another. We naturally believe and are sympathetic to the democracies of the world, but as they wage war our aid should not be determined upon the issue of whether it be a defensive war to maintain their war-won empires, or an offensive one to maintain a European balance of power, or, no, not even if moral and social problems of European peoples be involved.

Our aid should be generous, and upon a strict basis of cash and carry—wheat, pork, arms, and airplanes alike, but only aid to that point that the sale of products to foreign nations does not jeopardize the defenses of our own country. There need be no first line of defense beyond our own possessions if we refrain from provoking belligerencies with any of the warring nations of this world. What is our quarrel with any power in the Orient? What is our quarrel with any nation in the Far or the Near East? What is our quarrel with any nation of Europe or Asia?

WE HAVE ALL WE CAN DO TO MIND OUR OWN BUSINESS

We have all we can do to mind our own business and prepare like hell to insulate this hemisphere from war. A neutral America with a friendly attitude to all nations, backed up by a powerful, prepared army and navy, is an America that has anticipated the path of wisdom and has anticipated the path of peace. It is the only path that America may wisely follow if honestly in search of peace, if honestly determined to keep out of war.

Some say this formula did not guarantee peace for some other major nations of the world, but I want to remind you that our antecedency does not involve us in the power and the imperialistic controversies of the Old World. We must and we are going to spend billions to insulate the Americas against war and to assure our position of speaking with authority for peace.

I believe this policy of nonprovocative attitude and billions for preparedness is the best insurance for peace in America. No insurance, however, can guarantee absolutely that there will be no fire, yet we can only pay premiums as a safeguard for peace.

Billions appropriated today cannot be converted into preparedness tomorrow, and anyone who provokes belligerency, a near state of war for this Nation, must do so with the knowledge that we are not and will not soon be prepared for a major conflict.

The real decision that confronts our Nation today is whether we have responsibilities or obligations to any warring nations sufficient to cause us to assume an increasing provocative position that eventually will involve us in their war.

Our will to peace is the first guaranty. Our force is the supreme guaranty. The human conscience of all the Americas, of all of us, cannot remain unsympathetic to those Europeans who also only ask and wish to be free people, and yet no honest, conscientious citizen need insist on involving 130,000,000 free Americans in century-old European conflicts.

If it be any encouragement to them, I trust that our friends so sorely tried in the democracies of the world will remember that physical force rarely conquers free peoples, although it may defeat their armies.

If reaction from my leaving the War Department as a known noninterventionist has caused modification of some policies, and has sobered some of those provocative and meddling advisers of the administration who would strip our own defenses, then I regret that I have only one set of guts to sacrifice on the altar of public service.

Whether I remained as Secretary of War or continued in the service at another post, is unimportant. Whether I continued to serve or return to Kansas as a private citizen is of no consequence, in comparison to the real issues confronting our Nation at this time.

However, I am grateful, I am appreciative, and I am humble before the President of the United States for the privilege of having served my country to the best of my ability. The fact that a Kansas country boy, without previously seeking or holding public office. could be elected Governor of this great commonwealth of ours, and subsequently serve in the Cabinet of the President, is further evidence that our great democracy does work.

There is another proof that demccracy works. It can meet emergencies when the time comes. In this great hour of need for accomplishment, the wisdom of President Roosevelt in calling to Washington the Knudsens, the Stettiniuses, and other successful men of industry will be proven to be wise. The National Government, I have said, must be above business but have the confidence of businessmen so that it can call upon them to carry their part of the obligations of preparedness. It must be above labor and yet be able to call with confidence upon labor leaders to also do their share.

There is a big job to be done. Besides constant consideration for the solution of domestic problems we must prepare to insulate against war coming to this Western Hemisphere. As an advocate of peace I have consistently for the past 8 years in Washington been an advocate of preparedness.

You will recall that in January 1934 many who now criticize and offer criticism for failure to prepare are the same ones who wanted to hang my hide on the fence because I wrote an article for a national magazine suggesting that the boys from the C. C. C. camps receive elementary military training.

If my suggestion had been followed then, today we would have over one and one-half million military-trained young men as Reservists for this great Nation of ours in its emergency.

Now, as a private citizen, I continue my plea for preparedness by advocating that all of us serve our country in its time of need. As taxpayers we must all dig a little deeper. Our young men must face the problems of real training. Some of our industries must turn from making the comforts and luxuries of ordinary life to fabricating the instruments of destruction.

We face this stern necessity of preparedness with sorrow, but I hope also with firmness and with realism, for I have faith in our democracy and know that under it in times of peace we have in the past and will in the future raise our people to the highest standards of culture and of prosperity.

If our democracy is to survive, we must then be willing to sacrifice to maintain it, to maintain our institutions, our homes, and our families.

And now, my fellow Kansans and Topekans, Mrs. Woodring and I again take our places as private citizens in Kansas. It has been a great experience for me in Washington. A Kansas boy has dined with kings and queens, with princes and princesses, ambassadors and foreign diplomats, and has sat at the right hand of the President. But, truly, a Kansas boy has seen Utopia from the mountaintops. But today a Kansas boy returns to heaven; he returns to Kansas.

Dedication of American Flag at Office of Carolina Process Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY R. C. ANDERSON, PRESIDENT, CAROLINA PROCESS CO.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a description of an impressive service held at the Carolina Process Co. on the morning of July 4 for the dedication of the American flag.

The private ceremony, attended only by the personnel of the office and employees of the company, took place at 7 o'clock on the lawn directly in front of the main office building.

The patriotic speech for the flag-raising exercises was made by R. C. Anderson, president and treasurer of the Carolina Process Co. and a former officer of the United States Army. Immediately following the speech W. P. Rhodes, employee of the main office, raised the flag, where it will remain for permanent display at the top of the 50-foot pole recently erected for the purpose.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FLAG DEDICATED IN IMPRESSIVE SERVICE AT CAROLINA PROCESS CO.—R. C. ANDERSON DELIVERS ADDRESS AT DEDICATION CEREMONY HERE

An impressive service was held at the Carolina Process Co. this morning (Thursday) for the dedication of the American flag.

The private ceremony, attended only by the personnel of the office and employees of the company, took place at 7 o'clock on the lawn directly in front of the main office building.

The patriotic speech for the flag-raising exercises was made by R. C. Anderson, president and treasurer of the Carolina Process Co. and a former officer of the United States Army. Immediately following the speech, W. P. Rhodes, employee of the main office, raised the flag where it will remain for permanent display at the top of the 50-foot pole recently erected for the purpose.

Mr. Anderson's dedication is quoted as follows:

"We, in the security of our land, this day pay tribute by memory to the historical Declaration of Independence that, sealed by blood sacrificed on the battlefield, provided the privilege of individual freedom it has been our good fortune to enjoy. That liberty is now threatened. The battle of might against right across the sea will determine the future of democracy. We may soon stand alone in the defense of that people's form of government, and courage is essential in this hour of peril. This Fourth of July should have greater significance in the heart of every American than at any time since the Declaration of Independence was approved by the people.

Democracy has served this country well and deserves energetic support of every American. The United States, still a youngster, has grown from a courageous beginning to an envied, important place in the world by the development of our vast resources. That was encouraged by freedom of individual action limited only by the rights of others. That progress must, and can be, continued without change of Government. There are those who believe they know best what is good for the people, but the American conviction that people can better govern themselves than be governed, if the will of the majority is recognized, stands unchallenged.

The requisite of government is to provide adequate progress for a contented society. Absolute social tranquillity is not possible under any conceived form of government. Democracy offers the best possible solution for the elimination of social distress, but like all other forms of government it provides no reward without effort, and to the satisfaction of foreign interest ambitious to obtain the vast wealth of this Nation, too many of our people have not availed themselves of the opportunity for progress. There are those among us who are susceptible to foreign influence destructive to democracy because, unfortunately, they have but their lifeblood to protect and would possibly fare as well under any form of government. Unselfish Americans among them, however, must certainly realize, even in their misfortune, that the unlimited opportunity provided for every individual by our Constitution is available for their children and if necessary would fight for the protection of that birthright. Most of our successful citizens have come from humble families. The mayor of our largest city is of immigrant parentage. Negroes have advanced from slavery to prominent positions in life in less than a hundred years.

That is evidence of opportunity unknown in most countries, particularly in totalitarian states, regardless of false claims made for sympathy and support of selfish ambitions. Immigrants in this country, except those in the propaganda service of their homeland, have praise for the liberty enjoyed here, and, having known the disadvantages of restricted opportunity, most of them are taking full advantage of freedom to acquire material possessions in this country. Their success should not be envied by born Americans, for we are privileged to spend our lives as seen fit, and if opportunity is unkind due to lack of preparation or effort we should not complain. In this country, thanks to democracy, death alone eliminates individual opportunity, and it is never too late to start converting wasted time to preparation for a more abundant life.

Nazi-ism, fascism, and communism are natural enemies of democracy. Much hatred is now rightly directed against nazi-ism and fascism, but, unmindful in the heat of anger, communism, our most eminent danger, has been temporarily overlooked. The threat of nazi-ism and fascism is contingent upon the result of the battle overseas, but for too many years communism has been organized in our land to promote discontent and class hatred in preparation for revolution. The undermining influence goes on daily. That organization is a "fifth column" not dependent upon war material. Its most effective weapon is propaganda. The people, deceived by false promises, are expected to take over the helpless Government and surrender the country—victory without battle.

Democracy is our only hope for continued progress and must be preserved at all cost. We must not shackle our children to our

position in life. They, too, must be free to live their own lives. We have no right to sell out their birthright—unrestricted opportunity. It is current information that the "fifth columns" of foreign nations eager for the wealth and resources of our country—the result of unrestricted opportunity—are organized here to destroy all means of resisting infringement on our independence. It is the duty of such organizations to convert to their cause as many as possible—government officials, military leaders, educators, and captains of industry. Their activity also includes the spreading of class hatred by influencing the less fortunate to believe they have been mistreated. The procedure is modern-type warfare and the organizations are enemies in disguise. In our country this freedom of speech and assembly shields the destructive forces; that is our constitutional right; but it is difficult to imagine the privilege was provided to protect organized effort publicly directed to destroy other rights provided by the safe Constitution. We can no longer be indifferent to "fifth column" activities. The vanguard of all "isms" must be exposed and deported without delay.

The administration of our Government is responsible to us for the preservation of our Constitution, and it is our duty to select only the most conscientious Americans for public office, regardless of party. Every aspirant for public office should be required to publicly denounce nazi-ism, fascism, and communism—not one or two but all three—and pledge themselves to the complete support of our Constitution, as is, unless revised by the majority of our people. More important at this time, they must be required to pledge every ounce of their effort to free the United States of all foreign influences destructive to democracy. It is time to take inventory of American loyalty, and the vast number of citizens indifferent to politics in the past must now join in the voice of the people.

It is a profound privilege to dedicate the raising of Old Glory here today to wave in all its significant splendor, and while it is being hoisted to its rightful place above our land, let us now pause a moment to thank God for America.

Compulsory Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. GIBSON

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

EDITORIAL IN THE RUTLAND (VT.) HERALD

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on compulsory training which appeared in the Rutland (Vt.) Herald on July 2.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of July 2, 1940]

COMPULSORY TRAINING

A good many people shy away from conscription, compulsory military training, or selective service (call it what we may) on the same grounds put forth by Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, that it invades personal liberty. This is a catch phrase that does not mean very much when the Nation is faced by a military emergency, for personal liberty must be merged with the interests of the whole or the liberty of all may be lost.

Compulsory training seems to be essential if the United States is to be prepared for self-defense. The old hokum about a million citizens springing to arms overnight will not work, never has worked, is pure rhetoric and wishful thinking. Neither is it enough for young men to be given a little perfunctory drill in the manual of arms and close formation. As things stand now, they may be much more useful to the Nation as truck drivers or mechanics than as riflemen.

Military training then may get down to training a million men as fighters who actually handle weapons and 5,000,000 men and women who are essential to defense. If we had sufficient time, the whole economy of training and military service might get down to judicious selection of citizens for certain industrial as well as military jobs, for we know, in the light of the experience of France and England, that it takes more than a year or two to put a nation in position to defend itself adequately.

If the cry of regimentation is raised let us declare such an emergency as will fuse all such objections in the defense of the Nation.

The military part of it would come in the fact that such conscription of industry would also be a conscription of labor, notwithstanding Mr. Roosevelt's pious assertion that national defense can be achieved without the surrender of the hardly won advantage which labor now possesses. France, defeated and prostrate, knows now that it can't be done. The people of Great Britain may discover to their sorrow that national safety cannot be won without national sacrifice.

So we are facing in this country not only the need of more soldiers, sailors, and mechanics, but for a great many more people in industry who are working, not for a 6-hour day or a minimum wage but to save the Nation as possibly the last bulwark betweeen liberty and the way of life (if it can be called living) under a dictatorship. So the artificial issue of infringing personal liberty in time of peace must yield to the larger, universal issue of preserving the Nation.

Selective Compulsory Military Training and Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

STATEMENT BY GRENVILLE CLARK

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from Mr. Grenville Clark, chairman of the national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States, which is supporting the Burke-Wadsworth bill for selective compulsory military training and service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this morning's press there appeared two sharply contrasting statements with reference to the Burke-Wadsworth bill for selective compulsory military training and service. One of these recounts the action of 23 college presidents, who, at a conference in New York yesterday, endorsed the principles of this bill.

These men took a clear-sighted and realistic view. They understand what every well-informed person willing to face the facts is rapidly coming to understand:

1. That our integrity and institutions are gravely and imminently threatened by the sweep of the Nazi power.

2. That selective compulsory military training and service is the only measure that can provide any assurance of our ability to resist that threat. The kind of vision and leadership exhibited by these leading educators is more needed now than at any time in our history if we are to survive as a free country.

In sharp contrast, the same newspapers reported a statement issued by a "committee on militarism in education" flatly opposing what they term "military conscription in peacetime." Their long statement contains so many misconceptions as to the purpose and effect of the Burke-Wadsworth bill that I am constrained to point out a few of these errors.

The statement refers to the proposed "military regimentation of the entire manpower of our Nation." This characterization is utterly without basis as applied to the Burke-Wadsworth bill which is the only measure now pending on the subject. Such a statement could not have been made by anyone who had carefully read the Burke-Wadsworth bill or followed the testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee concerning its purposes.

The fact is that this bill does no more than provide a flexible instrument whereby such military manpower as is needed, whether in large numbers or small, may be chosen under the fair selective system adopted during the World War with the consent and approval of the vast majority of the Nation.

The bill does not prescribe any particular number of men to be called out but leaves the determination of that matter solely to the judgment of the President, acting in accordance with the national need and subject to appropriations by the Congress. It may be that the present crisis will call for the mobilization of large numbers of men or it may be that relatively small numbers will be sufficient. To represent the bill as a proposal to raise a vast Army whether needed or not, is therefore a total misconception.

The statement does not deny the need for compulsory service if and when we enter a technical state of war but seeks to distinguish between the necessity of compulsory training and service in what they call peacetime from the situation now existing. The sponsors of this bill deny that this distinction is sound.

Our present situation is unique in the history of the country in that although we are technically at peace we are faced with a graver and possibly more imminent threat of foreign aggression than we have ever been under in our history. The position taken by these

gentlemen amounts to this—that we would have to adopt a declaration of war before we take the necessary steps to prepare for war and thus safeguard our national existence. They are willing to gamble our country's future upon the possibility of being able to raise and train enough men after war is formally declared. As a matter of common sense and prudence, in these days of lightning war, we are simply unwilling to take that gamble.

The statement wholly ignores the fact that, as repeatedly shown in our history and shown again in recent months, voluntary recruiting is impotent to obtain enough men or anything like it. The figures tell the story. These show that in the 6-month period ending July 1, 1940, the Regular Army recruited only enough men to make a net increase of about 32,000.

There is no evidence whatever that voluntary recruiting can possibly give us sufficient men to resist Hitler if he attacks us. The evidence is exactly to the contrary. In the face of these facts the vote on the passage of this bill will constitute the acid test as to whether or not the American people really wish to stand up to Nazi aggression. If they do, this bill is essential, because in no other way can a sufficient number of adequately trained men be obtained.

If the American people do not wish to resist Hitler, no better way could be found to insure our surrender after a brief and helpless struggle than to follow the advice of the Committee on Militarism in Education—that we refrain from any compulsory military training until war is actually declared.

The statement further asserts that compulsory training and service before war is declared "is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy." There will be few Americans to agree with this proposition because, as the vast majority well know, nothing could be more consistent with American democracy than the sharing of the risks and obligations of military service by all able-bodied citizens under a justly administered selective system.

Moreover, such a statement is bad history. As General John McAuley Palmer (our leading authority on American military policy) pointed out in the Senate hearings on the Burke-Wadsworth bill, in the first year of Washington's administration he transmitted a proposal to Congress that all able-bodied young men should receive military training, and that after such training they should all serve in units of a Nation-wide army.

Among the members of the committee which signed the statement opposing compulsory training in the present juncture there are doubtless some conscientious nonresistants. These persons acted consistently in opposing any adequate preparation to resist the Nazi menace because if it comes, they would not wish to have any resistance made.

However, there are many others signing the statement who are among the most violent advocates of resistance to dictatorial aggression from abroad. These persons are, we believe, simply making the old error of wanting to have it both ways. They do not wish to be dominated by Hitler and yet they oppose the only measure which in the judgment of our military authorities will suffice to repel this threat.

The old motto still holds that "he who wills not the means, wills not the end."

America Continues to Support Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM APPLETON (WIS.) POST CRESCENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Post Crescent, published at Appleton, Wis., under date of June 5, 1940, entitled "America Continues to Support Mexico."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA CONTINUES TO SUPPORT MEXICO

We have now about a million Mexicans in this country. We have no immigration quota in respect to that country so that any Mexicans who want to come here just come.

Refugees from the Spanish war, particularly the "reds" who dare not return to Spain, have emigrated to Mexico in great numbers. As Spaniards they cannot get into America but as Mexicans they can. So they first become Mexicans. Then with their propaganda under their arms and a knife in their belts they enter America to show us how to improve our country.

Senator REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, recently introduced in the Senate a stack of evidence to show that thousands of Mexicans, lazy, indolent, diseased, and pauperized, have come into this country apparently to get upon relief. And they get there, too.

A recent survey of the city of San Antonio, Tex., showed that there were more Mexicans working, and on relief, in that city alone than the total number of Americans in the entire Republic of Mexico. Since Americans have generally been stripped of their property in Mexico they have quite naturally left that country, but even before the stripping began there were 50 Mexicans in this country to every American below the border.

Meantime, Mr. DIES, gathering information from many reliable sources, declares that already 10,000 Communists have moved into Mexico from France and Spain. California sheriffs are banding together to protect that State from a "definite Communist-front organization" working from the other side of the Mexican border.

While there are exceptions, of course, the general run of Mexicans—that is the mixture of Negro, native, and white—presents a backward mental development, a type of citizen quite low in intelligence.

To solve this problem Senator REYNOLDS has proposed that the number of Mexicans in this country be limited to the number of Americans who reside in Mexico. What chance has his proposal? What chance has any proposal whose purpose is the reasonable and intelligent protection of basic American rights?

We are very critical about admitting through our gates the high type of refugees from Europe we might obtain but our door is wide open to what may justly and accurately be placed near the scum of humanity. We don't seem to believe in locking the door until the bandits have stolen everything in the barn.

Under the existing circumstances we not only turn over millions of the created wealth of this country to Mexico by purchasing unneeded silver at an artificial price but we also continue to tax ourselves and borrow the Nation black in the face to raise funds to support on relief an endless stream of Mexican immigrants.

Admission to the United States of Children From War-Affected Countries

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SANDAGER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, headlines in the morning newspapers indicate that Great Britain, which Hitler has been strafing from the air with increasing intensity, expects an attempted Nazi invasion at any hour.

After reading of the plight of the refugees in the Low Countries and in France many Americans are concerned as to what fate awaits the children of England if an invasion takes place. Bills have been introduced in the House, among which is one of my own, providing for the admission without regard to quota for the duration of hostilities, of children from Great Britain and other war-affected countries.

In the meanwhile thousands of generous and warmhearted people are ready to assume the sponsorship without cost to our Government of these children and are actively organizing in the various States to provide for their reception, their adequate care, protection, and education. I regret that parliamentary paralysis and convention convulsions have prevented early passage of these measures. They are still in committee, and while the gentleman from New York, Chairman DICKSTEIN, is sympathetic and willing to hold hearings on them, the recesses for the two conventions have prevented prompt action. Of course, I am not blaming anybody for this; it is a condition that just seems to defy immediate solution, but the only thing that worries me terribly is that by the time we get ready to take care of these youngsters it may be too late.

I hope that when we get back here later in the month we can get prompt action on one of these measures—I do not care which one, for I have no pride of authorship—but for the sake of humanity and Christianity, let us promptly extend a helping hand to these unfortunate and innocent victims of the new World War. Already the delay in considering these bills is arousing the resentment of the press. On Tuesday there appeared simultaneously in the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Daily Mirror editorials criticising the delay, and red tape and the Christian Science

Monitor of Boston has taken a similar position in a news item dated July 10.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include these press comments as part of my remarks. The editorials follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

BRITAIN'S CHILDREN

Another 350 British children arrived in New York yesterday, and there is something deeply moving in their greeting to these strange but safe and friendly shores. All these little travelers, however, make up only a tiny group; they are children of well-to-do families with relatives or friends here who would no doubt have invited them in any event. The mass evacuation of Britain's youngsters from under the imminent threat of Hitlerian savagery has as yet not even begun. That great task of human conservation has gripped the American imagination. Americans by the tens of thousands are flocking to help with offers of money and hospitality. Fully envisaged, it is a task not only overwhelming in its humanitarian appeal; it not only offers one way at least in which this country could, without the slightest question of military commitment, lend a tremendous moral aid to the heroic British defense of the last line between ourselves and Hitler-Europe; it is also a task on that great scale for which Americans have always believed themselves peculiarly fitted.

Yet American assistance in the project is still tangled in yards of red tape, official conservatism, and plain inertia. The worst immediate obstacles do not even lie in the immigration or neutrality laws; they lie only in the regulatory interpretations which have been given to them and in the difficulty of getting official action to modify rules which, while no doubt necessary under normal conditions, are absurdities when applied against a unique and challenging situation such as this. It is simply another case—but a particularly pressing and appealing case—in which energy, imagination, and coordination are so badly needed in Washington to give effect to policies in which the public will and enthusiasm are already far ahead of the administrative direction. With every request to the volunteer committees for advice as to how one may help the children of Britain there should go an appeal to Washington—to one's Congressman or to the departments concerned—for action that will count. For here is at least one way in which the United States can do something—if we do it, and do it now, while there is still time.

[From the New York Daily Mirror]

Nazi bombs are already dropping like explosive hail on England. Not just on London. Every English town is a target. Hitler has decreed that the British people must be hammered to their knees. The men and women of England are not afraid. They ask no mercy. But they do beseech those nations free from war to "take our children * * * spare them the horror that is almost upon us." And thousands of Americans have answered that plea * * * "Yes, yes! Send us your children!" But cutting across this eager desire to help, this desperate need for rescue, is a maze of legal red tape, a stony barrier of State Department regulations, which keep the children of England within range of Nazi bombs.

The slowness with which official Washington is moving to permit Americans to take in England's refugee children is shocking.

There is a shortage of boats to carry England's children to these safe shores. American boats cannot carry them, because the Neutrality Act says that no British subjects may travel on United States ships.

If President Roosevelt asked Congress to, that law could be changed within 24 hours, to permit children to travel to safety on this Nation's ships.

A United States law prevents the British Government from paying the passage of her children, either "directly or indirectly." That is why you read only of rich English children coming to America.

Still another law—which was passed 50 years ago to prevent the United States Steel Corporation from importing Carpathian labor—prevents a corporation like the United States Committee for Refugee Children from guaranteeing that England's children will not become a public charge in America.

There is a move now under way to get the State Department to change its rulings, and classify England's children as temporary visitors, to permit as many as 100,000 to come in under that classification.

But there is a lamentable lack of support for that measure in Congress. Congress must be asleep. They should listen to the multitudes of Americans, crying: "Let them in! Now! Before Hitler strikes them down!"

The law (which could be changed by Executive ruling) says that only 65,720 British subjects can come into this country during the next 12 months. The law further decrees that only 10 percent of that total, or only 6,572 of those children can come in each month.

That law is an accomplice of Hitler. It is holding England's children where he can strike at them, and by killing children, he can break the will to resist of the men and women of England.

Mrs. Roosevelt addresses a plea for action to the people of America, she asks for pressure on Washington (she should persuade her husband to exert that pressure).

Her arguments are less angry than the Mirror would like them to be; but they are convincing:

"The red tape, the thorny regulations, the worst difficulties can all be swept aside, if you, if I, and everyone else will only insist on it.

"I say the children have been classed as immigrants. But why? They are not immigrants.

"They do not wish to settle and work and make their homes in this country. Their parents do not wish to part with them forever. When the danger has passed, they will go back overseas.

"If, instead of being classed as immigrants, the children can be classed as temporary visitors, most of the difficulties can be overcome.

"New and simpler arrangements can be made for the guaranties that will still be necessary. Visas can be issued freely.

"The children can come in, not in sad little bands, but as they ought to come, by the thousands, until every American ready to do his bit for the children has had his opportunity to do it. Change the children's classification.

"The time is very short. The battle of England is at hand, and if the children are to be saved, we must act now."

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES AT ODDS ON REFUGEE TRANSPORTATION

WASHINGTON, July 10.—President Roosevelt and the British Government were tossing back and forth today the responsibility for getting Britain's army of child refugees to the United States, where thousands of homes have been offered them.

Transportation is the problem that now threatens to sidetrack the large-scale migration of British children promoted at this end by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and others.

Unable to provide the necessary armed convoys for conducting refugee ships to this country, the British today were proposing that the United States furnish the ships to bring British children to its shores.

Such suggestions have thus far received an official "cold shoulder" here. President Roosevelt, at a press conference, yesterday indicated the transportation problems belong to the British since the United States neutrality law forbids American ships traveling in belligerent waters. The question of enlarging United States immigration quotas to allow admission of additional children, he said, will not be an issue until the present British quota of 6,500 a month is filled.

The possibility of using Red Cross supply ships to bring children across has been considered, but because of British blockade and German occupation of France, these ships have quit sailing for the time being.

The United States Children's Bureau, meanwhile, went ahead with its job of finding proper homes for young refugees. Forms are being sent out to State welfare departments for the listing of certified foster homes and child-placing services. This list will be forwarded to the United States Committee for Care of European Children, in New York, for its use.

The National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS R. BALL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have at last been awakened to their problem of national defense. It has been a rude awakening. Although many conscientious citizens have been trying for years to arouse our slumbering Nation, their attempts have been in vain, and it has taken the terrible impact of a merciless military machine upon western Europe to call us from our peaceful dreams. Americans everywhere are now awake and alert, and eager to demonstrate their loyalty and devotion.

From coast to coast and from Canada to the Gulf our people read anxiously the news from Europe and the despatches from Washington. They listen daily to the cultured commentators attempt to interpret the news, and they hear again and again the voices of their Representatives in Congress raised in praise or censure. In thousands of American homes the soft and seductive tones of the "fireside chats" receive courteous consideration. Our people listen, they read, and they ponder.

We are not subjects of a proud potentate. We are not mere cogs in a great machine. We are American citizens, devoted to our country, each of us determined to defend our Nation against all enemies foreign and domestic, willing to submit to new and heavy taxes, able to give up worldly things to preserve those of the spirit, but we are going to stand on

our own feet, think things through in our own way, and make absolutely sure that the path we are treading, no matter how hard, is the true one. Once we are convinced that we are right, there will be no holding back.

The one thing that this country demands is that its elected servants do their part. I know that we here in the House, no matter how we may differ as to means and methods, are unanimous in our resolve to insure the protection of our people in the sanctity of their homes, and we are doggedly determined that no invader shall ever set foot on the free soil of America.

By virtue of his office the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. This is no mean responsibility. It calls for high courage, common sense, and absolute integrity. I have stated many times that when I believed the President to be right I should back him up, and that when I thought him wrong I should oppose him. Last summer, and again last autumn, I supported the Bloom bill, which was the chief cornerstone in the structure of his foreign policy. I have even voted to sustain his vetoes when to do so was most unpopular. You who know me will, I am sure, believe me when I say that the story I am about to tell you is not told in any spirit of political prejudice or personal pique. I am obliged to tell it, however, and I shall not mince my words.

There is in my district, the Second District of Connecticut, the United States submarine base at New London. We have within the past few days set aside huge sums for the further development of this station. It is a vital link in our chain of national defense.

The board of naval officers headed by Admiral Hepburn, which was appointed in accordance with the act of Congress of May 17, 1938, said this in its report:

> The strategic location of a permanent base of any sort within continental limits is determined more by the requirements of protecting the continental coast as a whole than by the necessity of local protection in any particular limited area.

The board then emphasized the importance of this submarine base to the entire eastern seaboard, and mentioned New London with the following specific recommendation:

> NEW LONDON, CONN.
>
> 124. This base is the only training station for all submarine personnel, and is especially equipped for this purpose. Facilities which will be available upon completion of approved projects will be adequate, except that river channel should be widened to accommodate, as necessary, the larger submarines. This station also is a component part of the New York-Narragansett main fleet base and should at all times be readily available to fulfill its mission as such.

For some time before my election to Congress it had been evident that this widening of the channel of the Thames River opposite the submarine base was imperative. The larger submarines were being berthed with great difficulty and were in constant peril. At my request the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, with his customary courtesy, scheduled a hearing for the Rivers and Harbors Committee to consider a resolution to request a review of the reports on the Thames River and the resolution was adopted by that committee on January 24, 1939.

Soon afterward the division engineer at Providence, an officer of the highest integrity, under whom I was privileged to serve in France in the last war, held a public hearing at which representatives of the Navy Department testified. I quote from his report of the hearing:

> The expressed purpose of the improvement is to provide safe navigation for naval craft going alongside and leaving the base. In recent years considerable damage has occurred to both vessels and docks.

And again—

> Material benefit of the desired improvement from the point of view of the Navy would consist of adding to the military value of the base for current and future use in peace and in war.

And still further on—

> The proposed widening of the Thames River in the vicinity of the submarine base as desired by the local naval authorities is necessary to permit appropriate use of the facilities at that station. The required expense is warranted by the resultant benefits to the national defense and to avoid congestion and delay to commercial traffic as the base is further developed.

This report was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, a board made up of senior officers of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, selected for their engineering knowledge and technical ability, as well as for their military skill and unswerving devotion, the very cream of the Army. It was then given the careful consideration of the distinguished Chief of Engineers of the Army and approved by him. It was transmitted to the Speaker of the House by the Secretary of War.

Because of the great interest of everyone in eastern Connecticut in the submarine base and prompted, too, by my own feeling that within a short time our country would become aware of its need for greater national defense, I kept in constant touch with the progress of this project. I corresponded with the commandant of the base. I talked repeatedly with the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Both these officers stressed again and again the necessity of the work. The senior Senator from Connecticut, as a member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, was untiring in his efforts to get the work approved. As late as March 24 of this year the Assistant Secretary of the Navy stated in a letter to me:

> The dredging project to which you refer is an extremely important project, and we have been attempting to obtain funds for it both through the Army and by means of a Navy appropriation for some time.

The widening of this channel was incorporated in the Rivers and Harbors bill by the Senate Committee on Commerce, it was agreed to by the House, and then the bill was vetoed by the President, who in his veto message said:

> With respect to the few items in the bill that are of a national-defense value, I would be glad to approve separate legislation covering these projects.

Taking him at his word, a bill was introduced which covered specifically those projects that everyone had agreed were of prime importance. In this bill was this project which had been urged as vitally necessary to national defense by every officer in both Army and Navy who had anything to do with it, and approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Then the other day the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce submitted a report which was ordered printed, and is public property. In it is incorporated the following letter from the President to the distinguished and able Senator:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, June 15, 1940.*
>
> Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
> *Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce,*
> *United States Senate.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my message to the Congress of May 21, 1940, vetoing H. R. 6264, a bill authorizing new river and harbor improvements, I stated that I would be glad to approve separate legislation covering the few projects in the bill that were of national-defense value.
>
> Based upon this statement, there has been introduced, and is now pending before Congress, H. R. 9972, a bill which would authorize 23 projects of river and harbor improvement estimated to cost a total of $24,823,000. I have carefully reviewed the projects contained in this bill and have reached the conclusion that the following items are not of sufficient value to national defense as to warrant my approval of them at this time:

Kennebec River, Maine	$2,000,000
Boston Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. 362, 76th Cong.)	2,300,000
Nantasket (Hull) Gut and Weymouth Fore River, Mass.	141,000
Thames River, Conn.	120,000
Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.	45,000
Silver Lake Harbor, N. C.	60,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	465,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.	1,000,000
Total	6,131,000

> It would be my desire that the above items be deleted from the bill H. R. 9972, in view of the necessity at this time of restricting the nonmilitary activities of the War Department in the interest of military preparedness.
>
> Sincerely yours, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Now here is a situation that should receive wide attention. The President has long prided himself on his attachment to

the Navy. His experience during the World War should have taught him that the officers of the Navy know their needs, and can justify their demands. Yet he states in his letter that this project is not of sufficient value to national defense to warrant his approval. Think of it, sir, he has seen fit to dismiss lightly the carefully considered judgment of the highest officers of the Navy and of the Chief of Engineers of the Army. He is not only endangering the submarines, many of which are brand new and very costly, but the lives of their gallant officers and men as well. He is playing fast and loose with the protection of the entire Atlantic coast. I am not blaming the senior Senator from Connecticut who has labored unceasingly for the project, I am not blaming the Acting Secretary of the Navy who is a capable, energetic, and fearless man temporarily receiving the censure of my colleagues for "taking the rap" for his superior, and for refusing to "pass the buck" upstairs. I lay the responsibility on the very threshold of the White House, and I ask in all sincerity if a man who cannot show common sense in little things should be trusted with big things. This is no time for playing lead soldiers. This is no time to dismiss the advice of wise officers who have been tried and found true. This is no time to drop the pilot.

This beloved country of ours needs a President who can lead us in the path of peace. It needs, too, a Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy who can display the qualities needed in time of war. There can be no toying with the destiny of America.

Expert Training or Universal Service?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, which I very earnestly commend to the attention of the Senate. The title is "Expert Training or Universal Service?" I believe the article is in support of the bill which I introduced yesterday by which I seek to build up a standing army, relatively small, which is highly trained, rather than go in for a mass conscription of the entire population, with all the delay and all the confusion which inevitably flows from such course.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERT TRAINING OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE?—MAJOR ELIOT REPLIES TO GENERAL PALMER'S ARGUMENT FOR THE BURKE-WADSWORTH BILL

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I feel a natural hesitation in expressing a difference of opinion with so distinguished an officer and so profound a military student as Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer. In the drafting of the National Defense Act of 1920 General Palmer bore a great share, and that admirable piece of military legislation, based on the lessons of the war then just ended, marked a tremendous step forward in the formulation of American military policy. Yet times change and with them, methods; and I do not think that any proposed system of organization or training may be properly criticized on the sole ground that it does not accord with the principles of the National Defense Act. In his book, The United States Army in War and Peace, Col. Oliver L. Spaulding says:

"The National Defense Act has sometimes been said to be the embodiment of a new military policy; it is even spoken of as the first enunciation of an American military policy. This view is perhaps in part justified; the precise form of combination of all the elements is new, but we have seen that each element is old, some as old as the Nation. The policy formulated is remarkably complete, and it is difficult to see how anything more comprehensive could be worked out by combinations of these same elements.

"Without presuming to predict, it may be suggested that future progress is more likely to come by adoption of some new system than by further elaboration of this. The most evident tendencies that may lead to a change are to be found in the increasing use of mechanical power. The airplane, the armored car, the tank, even the humble motortruck, are increasing the complication of operations and their speed. Simpler and more rapid methods of execution are being sought. There are indications that the use of power may enable fewer and smaller troop units to do the work of the many larger ones which we now plan to use. This will hardly mean reduction in the number of men used, but it will mean their redistribution—fewer but more highly trained soldiers at the front, using the new material; more men in the rear supplying it; and more skilled workmen at home manufacturing it."

It is precisely this situation which now confronts us; and my hope is that our Military Establishment may be recast along lines which will take into account these changed conditions. I do not, as General Palmer says, consider that the principle of universal and compulsory military training is absurd. The duty of every citizen to defend his country in time of need cannot be too strongly emphasized. But it is also the duty of those charged with translating this effort into military power to see to it that each citizen does his duty where he can be most effective.

General Palmer thinks that it is wrong to determine the size of a military establishment by any other means than a plan to expand to the full limit of the national manpower. I cannot agree. I think the distribution of national effort between the Army and Navy, including the allocation to those forces and to the industries which support them not only of fighting men but of labor, raw materials, power, and transportation should be the subject of the most careful study, with the missions which the forces may be called on to perform clearly in mind. Unless we can foresee a practical use for a great citizen army of millions, we have no right to allocate to it the disproportionate share of the national resources which its creation would demand; indeed, to do so would be dangerous, the almost certain prelude to disaster.

General Palmer deprecates the study of military geography as a basis for military policy; my own view is that national strategy can have no other basis and that military policy must necessarily conform to strategical decisions. There is a limit to our resources. We cannot have everything. The instruments of defense which we create must be adapted to the conditions under which they will be employed.

While I did not quite ascribe training as the sole cause of the German victories in France, I would not be so far afield in doing so as is General Palmer in stating that the invulnerability of the German tanks was the primary ingredient of those victories. The German success was due, as much as anything, to coordination of effort, giving a tactical, battlefield superiority which the French could not withstand. This coordination sprang not only from the training of the individual soldier, but also of commanders and staffs, and of units in the field; coordination of air with ground forces, and of every element of both with each other. This is not to be achieved by half-trained troops.

It was the misfortune of France that the decisive German blow on the Meuse fell upon the French Ninth Army, composed largely of reservists who had had only 1 year's training during the period (1930-35) when a complacent French government reduced the period of service to that length of time. Only fully trained soldiers and a fully trained army, seasoned, smooth-working, confident in itself and in its leadership, can meet the terrific exigencies of modern war.

General Palmer does not reply to the most serious criticism that I offered of the proposed Burke-Wadsworth bill, and that is its effect on the average citizen, who is all too prone to think that the mere passage of legislation or the appropriation of money ipso facto creates military power. If this bill were to be enacted into law, the average American would immediately begin to delude himself with visions of a great army which would give us complete security. In fact, there would be no security; there would be only masses of partially trained men whom we could not arm, equip or provide leaders for in any reasonable time, and if we tried to do so we would inevitably fatally handicap other elements of our defense forces which are of even greater importance.

By all basic considerations we are a sea power. Sea power is our first dependence in war, our first insurance against war. Appreciation of this fact by all our people is vital to our military security. The type of army we require is one which will be an adequate and immediately ready support to maritime operations; a vast universal service army can be really useful to us only if we are again to undertake large-scale operations in Europe or Asia (in which case we shall have time to create it) or if we are foolish enough to scatter our effort and our resources over too wide a field and thus bring about a weakening of our naval strength that will make it necessary for us to defend ourselves on our own soil.

Time is of the first importance in preparation for an emergency; it is the time element in war and in preparation for war which demands of us that we shall put first things first. War in this year of 1940 is a different matter than war in 1861, or in 1920, for that matter; the study of military history is the only useful guide to the future, but the lessons of military history must be applied to present conditions, not confined within the rigid limits of outworn conceptions or outmoded legislation.

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT.

NEW YORK, June 28, 1940.

Administration of National Labor Relations Act

REMARKS
OF
HON. B. FRANK WHELCHEL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, some features of the National Labor Relations Act are oppressive to manufacturers and ought to be modified.

Under the act, the National Labor Relations Board has such vast authority that the manufacturer is deprived of any control of his business.

Representatives of the Board are sent into plants to investigate the minute phases of the businesses. They have little or no knowledge of local conditions or the reason for apparent deviations from the letter of the law, or rather the letter of the rules promulgated under the law, and they act without consideration for the welfare of either the employer or the employee.

Small plants are closing down and larger ones are in serious danger of closing because of these conditions.

A number of plants have been distressed by the application of a recess rule.

At the request of the employees, manufacturers were giving brief recesses for recreation, refreshment and so on, to break the monotony of the work day. The Board ruled that these recesses were illegal unless approved by the Board, and must be 20 minutes in any event.

Mind you, the plants were observing the hours provisions that applied to them. The workers were simply allowed a definite recess time, some 10, some 15, and some 20 minutes or more, as the employees desired, depending often on distance and other conditions that are not uniform or subject to control.

The Board made its ruling: That any recess must be 20 minutes or more and must be granted then only on the Board's approval.

Orders were issued to numerous plants that they must pay wages for the back time on these recesses. In some cases the amounts ranged up to $500 or more for a small plant of around 150 workers. Some plants unable to pay shut down, I am reliably informed.

Since that time the order has been modified. Now the provision is that after June 10 any unauthorized recesses must be paid. Yet many manufacturers may yet be ignorant of that order and may effect the technical violation of it, without knowing about it, and later have to pay or shut down.

Information is lacking now as to what resulted when some plants did shut down shortly after the order to pay retroactively for such recesses. Doubtless some of them will be able to reopen. Others may not. But the damage is done whether they do open again or not.

Another feature of the order was that the employers were required to pay in cash in the presence of a member of the Board. That was in effect telling the employees, "Your employer will pay you what is your due only when we come and stand over him and make him do it." It destroys all confidence, and I believe it is designed to destroy confidence of the employee in the employer.

In this same connection, representatives of the Board have ordered the employers to provide for private interviews between N. L. R. B. agents and employees, individual conferences, on the employer's time.

Reports of some of these conferences indicate an active effort to antagonize the employers.

"Are you satisfied with your work and pay?" might be a fair question.

"You are satisfied, aren't you?" might be leading, but still fair. Neither method of questioning is used.

Instead, the question is phrased so it is highly leading, as against the employer, in this wise: "You aren't satisfied, are you?"

And if the employee indicates satisfaction, this is thrown in: "Well, if you are not satisfied at any time, let me know, confidentially and secretly, and you will be protected in every way. We'll look after your interests, no matter how unfair your employer is."

Now I submit that such methods should be used only when it is evident that unfair treatment is being used. Under present methods, it seems to be used in all cases.

The method is designed to put the honest employer in a false light and to find the ever-present disgruntled employee who is ready to agree to anything that will injure the interests of the business that pays him his check.

Such methods ought to be stopped. If the agents cannot find there is something wrong at a plant without himself planting the seed of discord in the mind of the employee, then you may be pretty sure there is nothing wrong.

If the employer is found to be wrong and agrees to give his employees back pay that may be due through a technical error, he ought to be permitted to do so without having an agent stand over him to make it appear he is paying under compulsion.

To go into all the phases of the injustice that is being done both labor and employers would require too much time.

The great injustice in the whole thing is that there is no appeal. There is a method of appeal open to some who have much wealth with which to pay the cost, but to many, especially to small factories trying to get under the belt of unemployment, the method is beyond reach.

For them it is pay up or go to jail. They are considered guilty until they are proved innocent. That is the tenor of all the discussions the agents have with the employers and with the employees—that the employer is guilty; that the employee is abused.

And the agent sets the fine, and there is no escape, except by a costly appeal in an effort to show innocence, the guilt already having been established without a hearing.

The foregoing practices are not in keeping with the purpose and intent of the law being administered by this Board, and I submit that the administrative feature or enforcement of this is bringing about dissatisfaction among all that it touches, and should be stopped.

On New Deal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBIA (S. C.) STATE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial carried in the Columbia (S. C.) State paper Wednesday, July 10, 1940, entitled "On New Deal Spending."

This editorial is so sensible and convincing, or should be to those who are almost daily talking about what the President and the Congress should have done, and so forth, that it is my belief that it should be very helpful to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to get the views of this editorial writer.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of July 10, 1940]

ON NEW DEAL SPENDING

Roosevelt haters are saying, "If that fellow hadn't squandered so much money, we'd be all right now. But look at us. We've got to

spend billions for defense, and already we are up to our necks in debt." And so on.

That criticism is inevitable, and easy to offer. Most criticisms are easy to present. The habitual critic just lets his mind run along in accustomed channels. He need not think a subject through. His task is the simple one of faultfinding—at times an essential task.

But let's try to think this spending matter through. In 1932 and in 1933 this Nation was in economic distress. That's the kind of situation from which revolution develops. Revolution is not characteristic of people who have enough to eat, adequate shelter, and certain other requirements for tolerable existence. The Russian revolution grew from distress. The Nazi revolution grew from distress. Major movements against democracy today have resulted, in part anyway, from the failure of democracy to work; that is, from its failure to supply the minimum requirements for contentment.

Back in 1933, and thereabout, nearly everyone was saying that democracy wasn't working, but that democracy must be made to work. The New Deal plunged boldly in and tried to make it work. The President seemed to see, almost immediately after taking office in 1933, that he was dealing not with a depression merely but with the makings of a revolution.

In other nations revolution developed. In this Nation revolution has not developed. On the contrary, this Nation stands today as the last remaining great nation in which democracy is likely to survive. Perhaps the big spending advocated by "that fellow" has had something to do with the survival of democracy and of liberty in the United States.

Of course, money has been wasted. There was no adequate experience for disbursing such sums as the Government of the United States spent for defense against domestic distress and its consequences. And some of the spending has been tainted by a too-close contact with low politics. There were, too, Passamaquoddy and the Florida ship canal and quite a lot of minor "boondoggling" (minor as to individual "projects," but not minor in aggregate cost). But policies must be, or should be, appraised by major accomplishments, or by major failures, not by minor slips.

Democracy in the United States has not failed. Would it have failed if the New Deal had remained narrowly thrifty and conserved public dollars without much regard for the general distress, and for the revolutionary rumblings of the early 1930's? No one can answer and prove his answer to be correct. What would have happened under different conditions is an opinion, not a provable fact.

P. S.—The State anticipates this comment: "Yes, but why didn't Roosevelt spend all those billions for armament?" Because no one foresaw the power of the Nazi machine except Hitler and his associates, and perhaps a few revolutionary Russians. The conduct of democratic, representative government in any era, or in any period of several years, is determined by the popular will, or by popular indolence concerning public matters. Only since the beginning of 1940 have the people of the United States realized the necessity for great fighting forces. A proposal of billions for defense a few years ago would have created a popular storm of indignation.

The Hatch Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote in favor of the enactment of this legislation. I know it contains many imperfections; some of them seem quite patent to me at the present time. Doubtless others will be likewise discernible as time goes on and the law is put in effect. We cannot expect to attain perfection in initiating legislation of this character, but experience will point out the defects and succeeding Congresses can make the necessary corrections. I was an enthusiastic supporter of the original Hatch Act because I saw in my own State how Federal funds were prostituted by unscrupulous politicians in lining up unfortunate persons on the relief rolls to vote as directed. That such unfair tactics had a potent influence on what had heretofore been free elections cannot be successfully denied. Those tactics have not been eliminated by the passage of the original law. By that act only Federal employees were affected. Pay rollers of the State, whose salaries are provided out of Federal funds, are still free to coerce and unduly influence their subordinates with immunity from prosecution. It is to correct this evil that the present legislation is offered.

It has been said that "Federal control follows the Federal dollar." For many years the United States has given Federal aid to States for the construction of highways. Prudence, uniformity, and economy required that certain conditions must be complied with by such States if they wished to avail themselves of this money, and rightfully so. The same situation has developed in the allotment of relief funds and in every other activity of the States wherein the Federal Government has lent a helping hand.

It has been amply demonstrated in the past few years that these moneys have been manipulated in such a manner that an immense army of pay rollers has been recruited whose members are naturally subservient to those vested with authority to allot these funds. If unchecked, it means an oligarchy of Federal and State pay rollers ruled by those in authority at Washington whose sole ambition would be to perpetuate themselves in power. The measure before us today seeks to protect State employees from coercion, just as the original act protects Federal employees.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the scholarly addresses of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], and the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who oppose this bill. While conceding merit to a great many of their contentions, I believe that their criticisms are directed more forcibly against the measure as it came to us from the Senate than against it in its present form, as amended by the Committee on the Judiciary. As a member of that committee, I, too, objected to the original Senate bill. It went far beyond reason when it prohibited political activity by any employee of a State or local government who exercised "any function in connection with any activity" financed by Federal loans or grants. I concede that it would have been difficult to ascertain how far such a provision would reach, and, had it remained in the bill, a citizen occupying a remote and obscure relationship to Federal appropriations might in the performance of what he considered a highly commendable civic duty have found himself a violator of a Federal statute. The Committee on the Judiciary considered this legislation for many weeks. It finally struck out all of the Senate bill, including the above obnoxious clause, and then wrote an entirely new bill as an amendment. The prohibition in the pending measure is directed only to those employees of a State or local agency "whose principal employment" is in connection with any activity financed in whole or in part by Federal loans or grants. This limitation brings under the act only those who ought to be there. The others must be dealt with as each individual State sees fit.

Without doubt, there are some just criticisms that can be directed against this measure. In my judgment, however, it is not an unreasonable condition to be attached to the use of Federal funds and its merits outweigh its imperfections. It is directed at an evil in American politics that has been growing by leaps and bounds. It will not purify politics, but it will make them less impure. It will not eliminate corrupt political machines, but it will render less opportunity for them to become more corrupt. It will not make bad politicians good, but it will give honest politically minded citizens a fair opportunity to have their voices heard in the affairs of their Nation. It will not destroy the States. It will prevent them from destroying themselves by surrendering their rights and prerogatives to those who control the purse strings at Washington.

Better Not To Have Any Preparation Than To Be Half Prepared To Defend Our Country or Our Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include what I think is a

conservative estimate for national-defense equipment and installations if we are to think in terms of protecting our country and the Western Hemisphere against foreign foes during the years to come. It goes without saying that the Government and industry must, and I feel sure will, speed up production at a rapid rate such as was never attempted or accomplished in this country. I hope I am wrong, but I am compelled to take into account recent acts and achievements of foreign powers who could and might be knocking on our back door, demanding admission to disturb our freedom and liberty-loving institutions as well as our very lives. I say I hope I am wrong, but taking these factors into consideration we must be prepared and keep prepared until such time that the war lords and conquerors across the water show us by their actions over a space of years that they no longer desire to disturb us. It will take at least five decades for them to show us this. Therefore, we must prepare in a big way. I recommend that we equip the Nation with at least the following:

A. That we manufacture and have on hand by July 1, 1943, 100,000 airplanes of different types and kinds.

B. By July 1, 1943, we should have manufacturing facilities and plants in perfect maintenance and upkeep in order to be able to manufacture 1,000 airplanes a day if an emergency would arise—or by putting on full shifts, 2,000 a day if necessary.

C. We should have manufactured by July 1, 1943, 4 million rifles, and facilities to manufacture 2,000 of them a day—or 4,000 by putting on full shifts.

D. We should have by July 1, 1943, 4 million machine guns of different types and kinds, with facilities to manufacture 2,000 a day—or 4,000 with full shifts.

E. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, 75,000 tanks and armored cars of different types and description, with manufacturing facilities to produce 500 a day if necessary in an emergency.

F. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, 2 million anti-aircraft guns of the finest and best type, with facilities to manufacture 1,000 a day—or 2,000 with full shifts.

G. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, 100,000 anti-tank guns, with a certain percent of them capable of piercing 3-inch armor plate, with facilities to manufacture 500 a day.

H. We should have on hand by July 1, 1943, clothing, tentage, shoes, and full field-service equipment for 4 million men.

I. We should have by July 1, 1943, manufacturing facilities scattered throughout the Nation to manufacture sufficient replacements for all these commodities at a speed necessary to assure equipment on hand in case of an emergency invasion of our shores or institutions.

J. By July 1, 1943, we should have completed at least three transcontinental superhighways as outlined in my bill, H. R. 8503. That is, an 8-lane highway following the general route of the Old National Pike or Route 40 across the Nation, built as straight as possible, and with a grade of not more than 4 percent at any one place. The same type of highway should be built up and down each coast some 30 to 60 miles from each coast. Of course, the other six highways embodied in my bill should be, and will be built in time—but these three should be built without fail, to be used for the transportation of the commodities of commerce as well as a military road in case of necessity. Experts think this would be the cheapest national-defense installation, looking to the conservation of our whole Nation, that we could build. These three highways would cost about $4,000,000,000 to build them eight lanes, or 100 feet wide, with proper facilities along the highways.

K. We should have by July 1, 1943, about 2,000 air bases or air fields developed. In the interim the United States Army Engineers should select throughout the Nation about 15,000 landing fields. That is, fields that if an emergency day came, could be put into condition for landing planes within 48, or 120, or 168 hours. These should be circled within a radius of so many miles outside of each city that is considered a large industrial and manufacturing center.

L. By July 1, 1943, we should have several scores of underground hangars along our main highways, as well as underground storage facilities for our munitions. The hangars, in time of battle, are very essential as discovered in the war now going on across the sea.

M. And finally, we should have by July 1, 1943, sufficient munitions of all kinds in storage to use these guns and weapons for months if necessary, without running out of munitions. The two things that hampered the French the most were traitors within her own ranks, and, second, a shortage of munitions.

I have no doubt that some who read this will think that my estimates are exaggerated—that the program is too ambitious. Some will think it is not necessary to make such provisions. Others will think it is too expensive, and so forth.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all of us are convinced that our way of life is worth preserving. We are convinced that our schools, our churches, and our homes, are worth preserving.

We are convinced that this blessed endowment that we received from our forefathers called freedom of speech, freedom of press, and religious freedom, is worth fighting for. Yes, we are convinced that if we wish our children and our children's children to enjoy these blessings, we will have to build up a national defense that will insure their preservation. The partial recommendations that I enumerated above I think we will find absolutely essential within the next score of years to defend our precious institutions. Yes; Mr. Speaker, we will have to eat fewer ice-cream cones, chew less chewing gum, burn less gasoline, deprive ourselves of a lot more things we classify as semiessential or pleasure and recreational adjustments, to provide this equipment. But it is better to have no equipment at all than to be one-fourth, one-half prepared.

We learned the lesson over and over again in the last year. We saw nation after nation in Europe that was one-fourth or one-half or one-tenth prepared, being ruthlessly run over—and, my fellow citizens, whenever a barbarious ruler directs his forces to run over a peaceful, God-fearing people like the people of Holland, Belgium, or similar nations, then it is time for us to prepare in a big way to see to it that no force will be able to run over us or to fly over us and destroy us.

The trouble is, my friends, that we here in America do not realize the horrors and hardships that result when a dictator takes over a country such as Poland, Czechslovakia, and so forth. We do not seem to realize that they kill off the educated and intelligent people. We do not seem to be aroused over the fact that they close all of the schools except the very elementary schools. We do not seem to understand that all the precious things that are near and dear to us would be wiped out under a dictatorship such as now reigns over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and so forth. We do not seem to realize that our Negro slavery was heaven compared with the slavery that these conquered people have to endure.

Yes, my friends, I believe if you were in possession of the facts and background that I have as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for National Defense, you would agree with me that my suggestions or recommendations, if you please, enumerated above are moderate compared with the value of our liberties and our free country.

National Defense and "Fifth Columnists"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

RESOLUTION BY LIONS CLUB OF WAXAHACHIE, TEX.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the resolution unanimously passed on July 2, 1940, by the Lions Club of Waxahachie, Tex., relative to national defense and also subversive activities commonly known as "fifth columnist" activities.

This resolution reflects not only the sentiment of the Lions Club of Waxahachie, but of the entire population of the Sixth Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent, and of which Waxahachie is a part, and I believe that it also reflects the sentiment of the American people at this time.

Unpreparedness and "fifth columnist" activities were largely responsible for the downfall of a number of democracies in Europe, and we must not permit such to be the case here.

Whereas the slogan of the International Association of Lions Clubs is "Liberty, intelligence, our Nation's safety;" and

Whereas the Lions of the Waxahachie, Tex., Club are vitally interested in, and deeply concerned for, the safety of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lions of this club, assembled in Waxahachie, Tex., on July 2, 1940, hereby assure the President of the United States, and the Congress, of their approval of legislation enacted, and proposed to be enacted, to keep the United States safe in a world being consumed by war; and that we respectfully but earnestly urge further immediate and positive action to assure a degree of preparedness such as will safeguard our free democracy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Waxahachie, Tex., urge the immediate enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to put an end to the subversive activities of agents of foreign powers, paid or otherwise, who are plotting and working against our democracy; and that the Congress enact further legislation to inflict drastic punishment on any citizen or any alien, working in the interests of any foreign power, who may willfully engage in any activity whose purpose is to defeat or overthrow our democratic form of government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Waxahachie, Tex., stands resolutely for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of thought and individual liberty; that to this end we believe in adequate and substantial preparedness; and that the Lions Club of Waxahachie, Tex., ask for a definite part in carrying out the program of preparedness and stopping the subversive activities of aliens and of all who would hamper the task of the Government in making this country fully prepared to defend its liberties and rights; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Waxahachie, Tex., heartily endorse the work of the Dies congressional investigating committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, and emphatically urge that their powers be broadened and that ample appropriations be made to enable them to combat all subversive activities, thereby further guaranteeing our Nation's safety; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and other leaders in Congress.

LIONS CLUB OF WAXAHACHIE, TEX.,
NEIL RICE, *Presider*

Waxahachie, Tex., July 2, 1940.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., Speaks on "July 4, 1776"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1940

BROADCAST MADE BY FULTON LEWIS, JR., OVER THE MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, THURSDAY EVENING, JULY 4, 1940, SPEAKING AS FROM PHILADELPHIA, ON JULY 4, 1776.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following text of the broadcast made by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the Mutual Broadcasting System, Thursday evening, July 4, 1940, speaking as from Philadelphia, on July 4, 1776:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Fulton Lewis, Jr., bringing you, as usual at this time, the news of the day.

And there is very vital and memorable news tonight. It may have terrific impact on the future of the world.

This afternoon, July 4, 1776, the Continental Congress, which is sitting here in Philadelphia, has finally taken the irretraceable step. At a very tense and momentous session this afternoon they adopted and issued a formal proclamation, that these Thirteen Colonies of ours, here in the New World, are no longer colonies of the British Crown. We no longer recognize the sovereignty of King George the Third. It was what you might call a declaration of independence, telling the world that, beginning immediately, we are a free and separate Nation, a union of States, and we request the other nations of the world to accord us all rights and privileges as such.

As you know, Congress has been debating this question for some days now, exactly 5 weeks ago tomorrow. On June 7, Mr. Richard Henry Lee, who is a Member of Congress from Virginia, introduced a resolution declaring—to use the exact words of the resolution "that these united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States," and that they are hereby "absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown."

As you well know, that caused a terrific controversy in Congress. There are two widely separated factions. One is what you might call the isolationist group. They believe that we should break with the Old World; we should live our own life, and we should not involve ourselves in affairs across the Atlantic, and we should not submit to dictation and interference and meddling from across the Atlantic. These isolationists say that we should govern ourselves, and make our own place in the world, and they were the ones who have been supporting Mr. Lee of Virginia.

The other faction is what might be called the appeasement group. It is the Tory Party, really. They believe that we should try to reach a peaceful settlement with King George, and should remain under the British Crown. They are not sure we are strong enough to stand on our own feet, and fight off the British troops that are now here.

And so, through all of these weeks, the gentlemen of Congress have been considering the points at issue, pro and con. The discussion has been very heated, at times, and it has gone on day after day and evening after evening, in the lobbies and the taverns in Philadelphia. Everything has been done in executive session, behind closed doors as usual, and day before yesterday, as you may know, they finally brought the issue to a vote. They approved the Lee resolution by a rather large majority. The actual vote, of course, has been kept a secret, but I was told on good authority that it passed by a very comfortable margin.

President John Hancock, who comes from Massachusetts, you know, appointed a special committee to draft a formal proclamation, this one that was issued today. Perhaps you'd like to have the names of the gentlemen.

The members were the distinguished publisher and editor of Philadelphia, Mr. Benjamin Franklin; Mr. Robert R. Livingston, the young lawyer from New York; Mr. Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, who had begun life as a shoemaker; another young lawyer from Virginia, who has been in Congress only a short while, Mr. Thomas Jefferson; and the able lawyer from Massachusetts, Mr. John Adams. Supposedly, Mr. Adams was to have drafted this momentous document, but when the facts leak out, as they probably will some day, it will be discovered that young Mr. Jefferson really was the one who did it, and there was a rather interestesting reason for that.

As you know, Mr. Adams has been one of the leading advocates, behind the scenes, in this movement to declare our independence, but he felt that he was unpopular and so that a document which he might draft might not be so well received. He felt that young Mr. Jefferson had a much better flare for writing, and a much greater ability to express himself, anyway, so, after they all had adjourned to a quiet back room, in a little private house near the statehouse, the committee insisted that Mr. Jefferson do the actual drafting.

Incidentally, in spite of Mr. Jefferson's youth, he is attracting considerable attention in Philadelphia. If his constituents allow him to remain in Congress a while, and get a little seniority, you may hear quite a little from him, in the future.

On June 28, the final draft was ready, the committee laid it before the entire Congress; it was amended and passed after 3 days of discussion. This afternoon President John Hancock signed his name at the bottom, and so did the secretary of Congress, Mr. Thomson, and that made it official.

It's too lengthy to read in full, but the first part is particularly important. It says:

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands, which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station—to which the laws of nature and of nature's God, entitle them—a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold those truths to be self-evident:

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it, or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes, and accord-

ingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer—while evils are sufferable—than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

Then it goes on to list the various grievances that we have against our King, or rather against the man who was our King, until this afternoon. The oppression, the interference, the taxation, the arrogance, and finally it closes with the actual declaration to the world that from now on we are free and independent States, and we have renounced all allegiance to the British Crown.

The document was then taken to the local printing shop of Mr. John Dunlap, and copies of it are being struck off, to be distributed to the public, and it will be interesting to see the reaction of the average citizen, when he reads it. Even some of the aristocrats, the best social families of Philadelphia, who, you know, took the attitude in the beginning of this fight for liberty that this was a movement of hoodlums and rowdies, even they will nod their approval, as they read. in a great many cases.

Of course, it was impossible to get any wide circulation of this document this afternoon or this evening, so there was no demonstration or celebration. But Mr. Franklin has given orders that the entire document be printed in the next edition of his newspaper, the Pennsylvania Evening Post, which comes out Saturday—day after tomorrow—and in that way the public will have an opportunity to read and digest it, and the city officials have planned a general celebration in front of the statehouse on Monday. There will be music; there probably will be a huge crowd. You know the population of Philadelphia is almost 20,000 people, and it's quite conceivable that several thousand might be on hand. The plan is to read this Declaration of Independence, from the steps of the statehouse, and then to ring the huge bell in the steeple, to announce to the world the new-found liberty of the New World.

To be entirely objective, it's very difficult to stand off and evaluate a development of this kind today. It's hard to see, at the moment, whether this means the beginning of a great and powerful nation, based on the principle of peace and justice and freedom, or whether the Tories are right when they say that people cannot rule themselves. Only time will tell that. If the Tories are right, 10 years from now may find this proclamation of today a forgotten scrap of paper, but if these young men of Congress—and most of them are young—the chief support behind Mr. Adams on this move for independence has come from the younger men, most of them still in their thirties, like this young Mr. Jefferson—if they are right, who knows? Some day this country may grow to have as many as a million people, and this 4th day of July may be celebrated as Independence Day, and the statehouse may go down in history as Independence Hall, and the big bell there which will ring in honor of American liberty next Monday may be known the world over as Liberty Bell.

Now, about our national defense, the dispatches from New York are not too encouraging. General Washington is building up his army as much as he can, you know, and he has a tremendous force at the present time. He has over 10,000 men to defend the city from the British, but the military experts are rather fearful that even that is not enough to hold off the invading fleet under the command of Lord Howe. To be entirely candid, they're afraid that General Washington's defense of New York is dictated more by political considerations than it is by military advisability. The public wants New York defended, but the military men say that that defense is almost impossible, and they rather expect that General Washington will have to withdraw within the next few days. Sir William Howe, the brother of Lord Howe, is ready to begin landing troops at any moment.

One of the greatest difficulties is that public sentiment in New York City is not in support of this revolution. The internationalist sentiment there is very strong indeed. There is very serious fear that most of the population of the city will help the enemy instead of helping our own forces when Sir William Howe does begin his attack. And in that connection, there is a special dispatch from Paris which says that Portugal has adopted something similar to that as a deliberate plan of warfare against Spain.

Portugal, you know, is very much in need of colonies. She wants sources of raw materials, and she has had hungry eyes for the Spanish colony of Brazil.

It seems that Portuguese ships have been visiting the ports of Brazil for many months, leaving soldiers who are disguised as travelers and businessmen. No one suspected them but when the Portuguese Fleet arrived and began to attack from the water these soldiers suddenly threw off their disguises and brought out their firearms and attacked from inside, and the result was that a large part of Brazil has been lost to Portugal by Spain in the last few months.

There is one encouraging angle, from the point of view of our own American prospects, and that is that we have developed a secret weapon that is far superior to anything the British have. It's a new form of rifle with a very long barrel that can shoot nearly three times as far as the British muskets can shoot, and so General Washington's men are able to kill the British before they can get in shooting range. Lord Howe has offered a reward of 5 pounds to anyone who will capture one of these weapons for him. He wants to send it back to England, presumably to be copied for his own men.

So there's the story, ladies and gentlemen. That's the top of the news, on this 4th day of July 1776, that may be very momentous in world history.

And if this thing that we Americans have done today does live, if this theory that you and I can rule ourselves is sound and is able to continue, I wonder whether those who come after us will understand what we're going through to achieve this freedom.

Let's pray that in 1800 and 1900, and even further—say in 1940—the American people whoever they are and whatever they have and however great and wealthy and comfortable they may be—let's hope that for their own good, they will understand their freedom and appreciate what it means, and keep themselves strong enough to protect it.

It's a bitter and bloody job getting it, once it is gone.

And now, until tomorrow evening, good night.

Amendment of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 3:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 3, 1940]

DUTY FOR THE SENATE

Almost 4 weeks ago—on June 7—the Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act were adopted by the House. The vote was 258 to 129, a large number of Democrats joining with Republicans in support of the amendments.

(On that same day—how remote it seems now—General Weygand went from Paris to the Somme front and ordered a withdrawal of Allied advance units before furious German attacks. France, still hoping against hope, was revealing her fatal weakness, her lack of weapons to resist Hitler's mechanized might.)

All that has happened since that day has emphasized the need for enacting the Smith amendments. We know, now, that we must prepare as France did not. We know that our Government, while protecting the rights of labor, must stop inciting ill will between workers and employers; must promote industrial peace in order that production may be unimpeded.

Yet one motive behind the renewed administration drive for an early adjournment of Congress is a desire to prevent these Labor Act reforms from coming to a vote in the Senate.

The Smith amendments are aimed directly at that spirit of zealotry which has controlled the present National Labor Relations Board and brought the Labor Act into disrepute.

They were drafted by a special House committee, after long and thorough investigation of the Board's record of maladministration, bias, and incompetence.

They are approved by the American Federation of Labor, but bitterly opposed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, whose president, John L. Lewis, aspires to dominate all labor and all industry.

Their most important provisions would:

1. Abolish the present Labor Board and create a new one, also of three members. That would eliminate the two men who have failed as administrators. For, if the President were unwise enough to renominate J. Warren Madden and Edwin S. Smith, their stewardship would have to be submitted to the test of Senate examination, and by that test their names would be blacked out.

2. Separate the functions of prosecutor, judge, and jury, now combined and grossly abused in the present Board. That would remove opportunity for unfairness even if, which seems almost impossible, the new Board should prove to be as lacking in fairmindedness as Messrs. Madden and Smith have been.

We do not contend that the amendments, as passed by the House, are perfect. We do contend that it is the Senate's duty to get them out of the pigeonhole where the Senate Labor Committee is trying to keep them, to debate them fully, to improve them if need is shown, and to bring them promptly to a vote.

And we repeat: Any Member of Congress who votes to adjourn and go home before this and other items of important unfinished business are cleared should be ordered by his constituents to stay home.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

STATEMENT BY THE METAL TRADES DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement recently made by the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor:

The international presidents and their representatives affiliated with the metal trades department, A. F. of L., in national conference, Thursday, June 20, 1940, gave earnest consideration to the problems presented by the urgent necessity for rapidly developing the Nation's equipment for national defense.

It was the unanimous conviction of these international unions that they should give every possible assistance to the rapid production of material for national defense. While their membership records indicate a large number of skilled mechanics now unemployed, or working at some other occupation, it was recognized that the requirements for adequate national defense may, in the near future, make necessary the special training or retraining of skilled workers for some of the industries which will be engaged in the production of material the Nation's defense necessities require.

It will be the immediate purpose of these international unions to investigate the present supply of skilled labor available in all classifications in the metal-working trades, and from the data secured from the membership throughout the United States, to determine where retraining or special training will be advantageous.

There are two well-established Federal agencies which must play an active part.

From the time, in 1935, when the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training, Department of Labor, established equal representation of management and labor on the committee, the international unions affiliated with the metal trades department, have annually gone on record in support and in approval of the purpose, the policies, and the rules and regulations adopted by the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training, for the purpose of establishing bona fide apprentice training in the United States.

The present national emergency makes it mandatory that apprentice training should not be neglected, but instead, should be extended so as to adequately maintain the supply of skilled craftsmen required in the manufacturing industries.

As an immediate contribution to production, apprentices cannot play an important part, for it will require from 3 to 4 years' training before an apprentice becomes a competent journeyman, equipped by training and practical experience in industry, to do the work required of a craftsman.

Since 1935 the international unions, comprising the metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, have taken an active interest in the work of the Federal Bureau for Vocational Education.

In 1935 an advisory committee to the Federal Bureau for Vocational Education was created, this committee having equal representation of management, of labor, and of vocational teachers. On this committee the metal trades have had continuous representation.

In the present national emergency vocational teachers will play a prominent part, in some instances to teach skilled workmen to do work requiring special skill, but principally to train large numbers of inexperienced workers to enter the industries for national defense as specialists, those who must be taught the knowledge and skill to perform a few operations in connection with manufacturing under mass-production methods.

The purpose of the international unions constituting the metal trades department will be to assist in the maintenance and further development of the genuine apprenticeship system as defined by the program, rules, and regulations of the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training, and to give every assistance to vocational education under the Federal Bureau for Vocational Education in the training of the lesser skilled to perform those operations which are so definite a feature of modern mass production.

The international unions in the metal trades department pledge the Nation to give every assistance within their power to place skilled workmen where they are required for national-emergency production. In connection with these and all other trade-union activities, the international unions will protect the right of labor to voluntarily organize into trade-unions, to bargain collectively with their employers, and to make use of those basic rights of all American citizens—freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and to voluntary collective action for lawful purposes.

The international unions in making their pledge to give the Nation every possible support, must take into consideration the fact that there are at present some 10,000,000 unemployed in the United States, and that a goodly number of these are skilled craftsmen. While fully realizing the part that training must play, the international unions believe first consideration for employment should be given to the present unemployed and those skilled workers now employed in less satisfactory occupations. At present a large number of the most highly skilled mechanics are being denied employment because of unsound and unjustified age-limit barriers.

When the Nation entered the World War in 1917, these international unions gave their pledge to give every possible support to the Nation in the winning of the war. Their record during this period is an evidence of how loyally and patriotically that pledge was honored.

In the present national emergency these international unions again pledge their loyal, active, and cooperative support to the Nation in the effort to speed production required for national defense. These international unions pledge themselves to the Nation with an understanding of their responsibility to contribute their full share to the Nation's defense, and the protection and perpetuation of those institutions of freedom which are now menaced by totalitarian powers.

Letter to Senator Wagner in Reference to Democratic Platform Declaration on War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

LETTER BY HON. LOUIS LUDLOW, OF INDIANA, TO SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following letter to Senator WAGNER:

JULY 11, 1940.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Convention Committee on Resolutions,
Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I am writing to invite your attention, and through you the attention of your committee, to the advisability of including in the platform of our Democratic National Convention a clean-cut, forthright declaration in favor of giving the people a right to vote on proposals to send our boys into war overseas.

The time is particularly appropriate for the adoption of such a declaration by our convention, and I do not have the slightest hesitation in predicting that on that plank alone we would sweep the Nation.

Not only should we, in my opinion, adopt such a plank, because of its righteousness and its conformance with the principles of democracy for which our party stands, but it would be politically wise and advisable to do so, because it would positively remove in advance all doubt about the outcome of the November election.

I do not speak from conjecture, because I know the sentiment of the people of the United States on this subject. I have been in touch with countless thousands of the folks, and I have an enormous volume of correspondence, filling many file cases, that has been built up over a period of many years when I have been advocating the adoption of a constitutional amendment that would give the people who have to suffer and, if need be, to die and to bear the awful burdens and costs and griefs of war the right to vote on sending our boys into the hell of foreign wars. This very direct and first-hand evidence of public sentiment has been supplemented by five Gallup polls, which have shown the American people to be overwhelmingly for the principle of this proposed constitutional amendment.

I say without hesitation that if we Democrats are looking for a winning issue that would be both right and effective, this is the one. No other issue half as popular as this one could be found. It would sweep the country.

This is an issue made to order for us by the Republican national platform, which adopted a weasel plank on foreign relations, a plank that faces all ways and means nothing. Never was a platform constructed more scientifically to dodge the issue than the Philadelphia platform. It is a typical politicians' platform made to get in on and leaving it to the party to stand any way it wants to after it gets in. If our Democratic National Convention has the vision and straightforwardness to adopt an unevasive declaration that the people shall have something to say as to whether our country shall enter foreign wars that are not of our creation, we shall see one of the most notable exhibitions of a political platform backfiring that was ever witnessed in this country and the politicians who drafted the Philadelphia platform will

be taught the lesson that mere cleverness and slickness does not win votes in times of extreme seriousness such as we are passing through at present.

That the plank I propose for a referendum on foreign wars is in harmony with true Democratic thought is shown by the fact that the Young Democrats of America, 5,000,000 strong, in their national convention at Indianapolis in 1937, with James Roosevelt presiding, unanimously and with great enthusiasm adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we favor a Nation-wide referendum before declaration of war except in case of invasion or internal rebellion."

In conclusion let me say that the war referendum plank which I propose would be strictly limited to a declaration for a referendum on taking part in overseas wars. If the United States or any other country in the Western Hemisphere is attacked or invaded the referendum would not apply. The proposal would not impair our national defense in any way, shape, form, or degree, and the Monroe Doctrine would be fully safeguarded and protected. We who advocate a referendum on foreign wars believe in the strongest possible national defense.

I enclose for your information a copy of my war referendum resolution which in the past has had the support of a majority of the House of Representatives who signed a discharge petition asking for its consideration. I am sure that many Members of both branches of Congress would be immensely pleased if your committee, in its wisdom, sees fit to endorse the principle of this proposal in the platform to be submitted to the Democratic national convention next week. Will you kindly give the matter your thoughtful consideration?

Very sincerely,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered recently at Pottsville, Pa.

The great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is represented and the Federal Government of the United States is symbolized more truly by your convention here in Pottsville today than by any assembly of lawmakers at Harrisburg, or by any conference of businessmen in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh at any time. For, as our distinguished Postmaster General, the Honorable James A. Farley, has said with characteristic wisdom and simplicity:

The Postal Service is "the most effective instrument of human democracy that exists in this country today."

General Farley quoted the inscription which I have often observed and read with appreciation upon the walls of the postoffice of the city of Washington in the District of Columbia:

"Messenger of sympathy and love, servant of parted friends, consoler of the lonely, bond of the scattered family, enlarger of the common life. Carrier of news and knowledge, instrument of trade and industry, promoter of mutual acquaintance, of peace and good will among men and nations."

These words are indeed rich with the meaning of democracy and, at the same time, expressive in a realistic way of the mission of the service to which you are dedicated.

You are familiar with the history of the development of the post, and you have long since realized that it has run parallel to the development of our country. The history of postal communication is a history of the growth of the American Nation because without the former, we would not have had the latter.

From 1672, when Governor Lovelace of New York decreed that there be a monthly post between New York and Boston, until 1691, when William and Mary granted to Thomas Neale, by letters patent, power and authority to establish a postal system for the American Colonies, there had been many short-lived postal routes. Thereafter, the postal system under successive Postmasters General continued to unite and expand the life of the Colonies—until 1753 when the British possessions in North America were divided into a northern and a southern district, with a Postmaster General for each district. The Mason and Dixon line began in that year, marking the division between Pennsylvania and Maryland, between the northern and southern postal districts. Thereafter could be seen the divergent tendencies which culminated more than a century later in the Civil War.

It is interesting to us that one of the Postmasters General of the northern district was Benjamin Franklin, who was dismissed from office by King George in 1774 for insubordination.

Not until 1789, following the adoption of the Constitution, was the first Postmaster General of the United States appointed in the person of Samuel Osgood, of Massachusetts. When our Nation began, it was the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, who foresaw the part that the postal system would play in the expansion and unification of these United States. Constantly he stressed the need for speed and dependability of the post, which he visualized as the artery of the States, the bond of communication between those who were living in the States, and those who were pioneering westward. That is why Jefferson was known as the father of fast mails, and that is why, when he became President, the Post Office Department achieved a new record for the efficiency of its service and of its administration.

Another great Democrat gave deserved recognition to the Post Office Department in 1829, when President Andrew Jackson invited the Postmaster General to become a member of his Cabinet.

Through the following decades the Postal Service continued to occupy a more and more important part in the life of the Republic, just as it did in the lives of Americans whether they lived in the cities, on farms, or in small communities.

It is not surprising that the great American who was to heal the breach between the North and the South had in the beginning of his career the opportunity of serving in the post office, that civic center where his neighbors were wont to gather to greet each other and chat, where they solved their personal and local and national problems as they sought letters from friends and kin. On May 7, 1883, Abraham Lincoln was appointed postmaster of New Salem, Ill., by President Andrew Jackson. And Lincoln continued as postmaster until 1836, when that post office was closed.

Undoubtedly the experience that Lincoln there obtained prepared him, as no other experience could, for the task of leadership that was later to be his. He had come to know men and women and their view of life in an intimate way, in the American way, as you do who see them day by day in their friendly moments. The informal, kindly manner with which he spoke to his neighbors then was his ever afterward.

You, too, have learned that never varying courtesy and accommodating service from a firm and lasting foundation of good will in your communities.

In New Salem, Ill., Lincoln was the representative of the Government of the United States in a more actual, intimate fashion, than later when he lived in the White House, remote from the men and women who are Americans. Yet, the knowledge that he acquired in New Salem was invaluable when the crisis of our Republic came.

Today, the United States is facing a world crisis, more fundamentally menacing than that which rocked our Government during the Civil War.

Across the seas war and chaos have destroyed the many countries that gave birth to the ancestors of our fellow citizens and to many of our fellow citizens themselves. There are, in our country, today many aliens recently come from the lands transformed by nazi-ism, fascism, communism, into totalitarian states.

With war hysteria ravaging Europe, it is not surprising that the dread of the rapacious, gluttonous power of the totalitarian state should cause an emotional reaction here—even among lovers of democracy.

Strangely enough, that dread has, in many instances, taken the form of imitation of the Nazi persecutors. The treasured civil liberties for which the founders of our Nation fought and bled in the revolution are now being threatened by many who call themselves Americans.

The Attorney General's Department has called our attention to the outbreaks of mob violence against Jehovah's Witnesses whose religious beliefs forbid them to bow to anyone but their creator, and hence, to salute the flag. The F. B. I. has investigated these cases to protect the civil rights of these religious people and to prevent the continuation of Nazi methods of persecution.

Recently, the House of Representatives passed a bill to deport one Harry Bridges, "notwithstanding any other provision of law."

The Attorney General, the Honorable Robert H. Jackson, has expressed his opinion of this bill as a direct violation of the constitutional provisions for due process of law and against any bill of attainder.

It is important that the country be protected against dangerous aliens; but it is equally important that the proper legal methods be used to this end. We cannot violate our Constitution to accomplish even a good purpose. Democracy is more vital than the expedient suppression of one of its enemies.

Our administration has a true and sincere reverence for the Constitution, the life spirit of the Republic, as this opinion of the Attorney General well indicates.

The administration under our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has labored long and silently to make possible in our country the continuance of the democratic way of life.

All the progressive reforms advocated and brought into being by Roosevelt have served to bind Americans together into a more justly ordered community.

During this administration, and for the past 7 years, our country has been at the same time building up a defense Army and Navy, both of which had been sadly neglected during the previous administrations. At the present time our Navy is greater than that of any other single country in the world. And on Saturday last the House of Representatives authorized the building of a

second Navy equal in size and power to that which we now have, in order that adequate defenses be maintained for the Atlantic and the Pacific coast lines.

The wheels of industry have begun to turn in cooperation with the Government to provide for the mechanized defense of our Nation.

All that, however, will not suffice—unless we can maintain the spirit of democracy here. It is possible, indeed, it is necessary to have union and tolerance living side by side. Intolerance breeds disunion, disruption, and mob disorder.

The "fifth column" wants first of all to stimulate mutual distrust among Americans. The Government agencies of the F. B. I. are adequate to police the "fifth column."

Another Government agency, the most influential of all—the post-office system—can accomplish more by quieting the temper of the men and women in local communities than could any other organized group. As the artery through which flows the lifeblood of communication, as the bond among the townspeople, each local post office is still a civic center just as it was in Lincoln's New Salem. To many Americans the postmaster is the only representative of the United States Government whom he knows or will ever know.

A word of calm, a message of faith in the stability and durability of the Republic, a reassurance of the necessity for tolerance—these can be effective in keeping the citizens of our country neighborly.

The preservation of the Nation's integrity is indeed certain and safe today, as it has always been in the hands of men and women who are worthy successors of Franklin and Lincoln and the equally great and patriotic, if nameless, members of the Postal Service, of whom it was said:

"Neither snows nor rain nor gloom of night stayed these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

Why the Securities Acts Were Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ADDRESS OF FORMER NEW YORK SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM HARMAN BLACK

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I reproduce a speech delivered by a former New York Supreme Court justice. We may all study this with profit.

REMARKS OF FORMER NEW YORK SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM HARMAN BLACK AT THE MEETING OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. Chairman, the subject we are here to discuss briefly falls under six questions:

The first is why the Securities Act and the Securities Exchange Act were passed; second, was there an evil to be cured; third, was the remedy set forth in the acts properly devised; fourth, have the acts been successfully administered; fifth, are they adequate to their purpose; and sixth, if they are not adequate should they be amended.

If the acts were not the result of what they were designed to remedy they should be repealed or amended, but if they were necessary the only other question is whether or not they have been properly administered. If they have been properly administered, and if they were needed they should be continued upon the statute books, and every effort should be made to perfect them by any amendment that may be necessary.

Certainly, the passage of the acts fulfilled the classical requisites Blackstone laid down for the passage of any law; i. e., that there was a situation fraught with evil potentialities, that the public thought that legislation was necessary, and that the legislation offered a remedy, if not a cure, for the evils.

The Securities Act has been on the statute books about 7 years, and the Securities Exchange Act has been on the statute books about 6 years. There has been no demand to repeal them, certainly no demand considerable enough to cause any change further than amendments which sought to strengthen the acts. We must presume, therefore, that they were demanded by the state of affairs that existed when they were passed, that they were adequately drawn to effect their purpose, and that they have been not only honestly administered but administered with a fair measure of success considering the changes that they effected in our systems of selling securities, and in conducting the exchanges that sold them.

It should be a matter of congratulation that the stock exchanges, which have a habit of being blamed for all the acts of all their members, and are usually accorded but little credit for the good things they do, have had practically no part in attacking in the ccurts the Securities and the Securities Exchange Acts.

There is a strange timidity that is the curse of every innovation or any attempt to improve any branch of our Government. The people, acting through our Representatives and our Executive, first boldly crystallize their opinions into laws. But often before the laws have had a chance to be tested some of the people begin to fear that maybe they were not necessary, and maybe they are not perfect, and maybe they can never be made perfect. As history goes, 6 or 7 years is too short a period to test any law of importance. There must be the trial and error born only of experience to see what the result of any law is, and only the average of years suffices to determine whether or not the result can be successful. Patience is required to correct defects, and the lack of patience or the lack of ccurage to be patient is fatal to progress. Frequently, too, this patience is requisite because what cannot be accomplished in 1 year or in one decade may be easy of success in the next year or the next decade. But success is never attained unless within a reasonable time there is enough progress to encourage the faltering and enough results to warrant the hope of final fulfillment. During such a period of definite experimentation many nostrums are sure to be suggested, usually not long enough after the experiment has started to enable those who would perfect a statute or a system to effectively gage its course or to amend it to correct its defects. These are truisms that every statesman knows, but every statesman is further perplexed because, before a reasonable experimentation period elapses there are frequent appeals to the courts that embarrass, and are intended to embarrass, the officials who are trying to succeed. Some of these appeals to the courts go to the very heart of a measure by attacking its constitutionality. Others attack the administration of laws because they give too much "judicial" power to administrators. The Securities and Exchange Commission and the two acts have not escaped some of the attacks, but they have weathered them all.

As to attacks on constitutionality, I am quite content to follow in the then wake of John Marshall, who is quoted in the case of Ware against Hylton in the Third Dallas United States Reports at page 210 as saying:

"The legislative authority of any country can only be restrained by its own municipal constitution. This is a principle that springs from the very nature of society, and the judicial authority can have no right to question the validity of a law unless such a jurisdiction is expressly given by the Constitution."

If I read American history right, it is barren of any dire results from enforcing any statute properly drawn, and called forth by a demanding situation, if that law was properly drawn and properly enforced. Certainly no law as sorely needed as the two acts I am discussing ever brought evil days upon the country. The people of the United States have never visited their wrath upon the men who adopted these laws, and as such matters go, there have been few amendments. Indeed, some of the amendments passed to the Securities Acts have been additions rather than amendments.

The people of the United States, I must assume therefore, are satisfied that the laws were needed; that they were carefully framed; and that they have been judiciously administered.

But having failed to have these two acts declared unconstitutional, it is not beyond the bounds of probability that they may be attacked in other ways. One of these ways would be to demand that there be administrative courts to supervise, control, or set aside the decisions of the Commission that enforces these laws on the ground that the acts give to the officials enforcing them too much judicial power.

Speaking for myself, and with some experience on the bench and 50 years' experience at the bar, I have no misgiving as to the enforcement of any properly drawn acts by competent and honest officials. Neither am I afraid that any act of theirs may be improper because it is called judicial; that is to say, because it is an act involving the exercise of discretion or anything like judgment. To my mind, the turning off or on of an electrical switch frequently involves a higher and more discriminating discretion than is required to construe a statute or declare that it is or is not constitutional.

A good many years ago England began jitters on this fear that administrators would try to be judges. The author of one of the first books to be written on the subject, Lord Hewart, seemed greatly disturbed because he feared that government officials, both national and local, who had been vested with administrative discretion had overstepped the powers which had been so liberally vested in them. But he seemed to have forgotten that if the official had not exercised the powers he had he would have been impotent to accomplish anything. Lord Hewart and the men before him and the men who followed him therefore suggested administrative courts which should have the power to set aside and nullify what the official had done.

Germany has gone further on this sidetrack of administrative courts than any other country. The theory of that country is that if an official authorized to do certain things exercised his discretion in a manner that was satisfactory to any party to a controversy the only cure was to establish over him a series of verboten courts, either courts of temporary relief or courts of last resort. It was argued that if the administrative courts were to be of last resort they would save the time of other courts which would have otherwise had to consider the sins of the administrators.

If this was true, which I do not believe, that would have been some excuse for administrative courts, but if they were to be merely stepping stones to another court of final decision, they are totally useless.

The history of Germany in such courts has been that their judges floundered in such an overlapping maze, and have so frequently changed their entire legal concept, that they have, in my opinion, proved utter failures. Mr. Rudolph Uhlman, in the Illinois Law Review, while not going to the length I do in criticizing these German courts, has pointed out in elaborate articles the difficulties that beset administrative courts.

As far as these two securities acts are concerned, and as far as any similar reform of any kind is concerned, I am opposed to trying to cure it by sieving all their work through administrative courts. They are not necessary to enforce these acts, and they would clog the splendid work that has been done by the Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, who have labored with conspicuous success in administering these acts, and whose work will long be appreciated.

Every attempt by legislation to give judicial control over administrative action has to take into account the vital fact that in modern society the administrative branch of the Government must be given a wide scope of discretion uncontrolled and unhindered by judicial supervision. Before we can find a satisfactory solution of the problem we must recognize clearly that discretion is the most important attribute of administration and that without discretion administration cannot function. Any legislative reform should, therefore, be based on the principle that all discretionary acts of administrative tribunals and officers should be final and not open to judicial inquiry and control. Such administrative finality in the realm of administrative discretion would enable the administrative authorities to act with the necessary swiftness and efficiency which are required by present day social and economic conditions. Only true and genuine administrative discretion should be final and not open to a review by the courts. Where an administrative officer or tribunal exceeds or abuses its discretion the courts must be of course free to set aside such administrative excess or abuse. In a given situation the court will inquire whether a certain administrative act is the exercise of the free discretion of the administrative tribunal; if so the court has no power to set aside such act regardless of whether or not it likes the underlying policy through which such discretion was exercised. On the other hand if the court finds that the discretion was abused or exceeded by the administrative authority the court must be free to set aside such action.

The last administrative court bill introduced in Congress, the Walter-Logan bill, passed the House, but since the critique of it by Dean Landis, it has not passed the Senate.

I am of the opinion that it is a shortcoming of the Walter-Logan bill that it completely ignores the fact that modern administration can function only if it is clothed with the power of discretionary action which is not open to judicial inquiry. That bill, by attempting to give to the courts the power to review each and every action taken by administrative organs and tribunals and by substituting judicial for administrative action not only ignores the necessities and exigencies of a sound administration but also violates the principle of separation of powers which is embedded in our Constitution.

My first suggestion regarding the Securities Acts is that there be made an adequate analytical index of the various acts under which the Securities and Exchange Commission operates. For my own use, and in an effort to be helpful, I have spent the last 3 months in making such an index to the Securities Exchange Act. I have not yet finished similar indexes for the Securities Act and the other acts, nor have I finished an index of the rules and regulations issued by the Commission. This is not nearly as necessary as the indexes to the acts themselves. In order to avoid complications with my publisher, I can only agree at present that the Commissioners may use this index, as it will become part of an annual supplement. I have concluded that I am not the first man to write a perfect analytical index, but I have done my best to put enough into each of the 750 catchwords for a lawyer to determine whether it refers to what he is looking for. In addition to the alphabetical index, there will be a duplicate which will follow the same order as the acts themselves.

To reply to the questions I put at the start, I answer that the acts were needed. The history of other forward-looking countries had already approved them in principle or had actually proved the value of such laws. They were demanded by a situation that I need not call your minds back to. There were evils that had to be corrected, and the remedies sought by the passage of these acts were properly devised. If I believed they were not necessary, I should be running counter to the best judgment of the country at large and the best opinion of the exchanges themselves. Even a cursory reading of the acts shows that with the short time at their disposal not even the clever minds which devised these acts could as an original proposition have covered the vast detail that they contain.

Further, I answer that these acts have been successfully administered and that they are adequate to the purposes for which they were passed by Congress. As to whether they require amendment, I prefer to withhold opinion until I have had more time to study the monograph.

I shall start with the premise then that these laws simply crystallized public opinion regarding their necessity and the remedies that the situation required. If they are perfect, they are probably the only things in the world that are. Every other law has had to be tried and studied and perfected.

And it cannot be claimed that their administration has been absolutely flawless. But, considering the importance of the subject, the highly technical nature of the work that had to be done, and the traditional and almost insurmountable difficulties encountered, it can be said that much more than a fair share of success has been achieved by the men of high intellectual attainments, tireless industry, and undoubted honor who have composed the Securities and Exchange Commission. From as intensive study as I have had time to make, I think the people are to be congratulated upon the outstanding results they have achieved.

In the interest of time I have listed some of the things the Securities and Exchange Commission has done, in a note at the end of this paper.

Let me say that the monograph your committee has prepared, which I have only had time to read once, is a monumental piece of work that reflects credit on its authors. It is exceedingly informative and understandable. In the few suggestions I shall make regarding it, I hope you will agree that I have tried to approach the subject in a spirit of constructive criticism.

First, I think the Securities and Exchange Commission is to be congratulated in that it never avoids responsibility by refusing to write opinions, and dissenting opinions as well. It is not afraid to give reasons for its faith. Such a course can only result in warnings to those who do not or cannot see what they should have done or should have left undone. If I may comment on their work, I believe it has been practical, courageous, and time saving. They seem to desire to substitute conference for conflict, and they seem to be quick to acknowledge slight errors that have been corrected by experience. The Commission does not seem to have sought to participate in anything except what the law commands them to take part in.

I congratulate the Commission upon its progress in attempting by conference to get together with the other side in modifying the law regulating the effective date for the registration of securities.

I think the acts should be so amended that political affiliation should be irrelevant to the performance of the tasks of the Commission, because certainly so far there has been no tendency to split along political lines.

I recommend that your committee ask the Securities and Exchange Commission for further data regarding short sales and how they are or should be reported, and the subject of pegging, fixing, and stabilizing registered securities to facilitate their distribution.

I am not in entire agreement with the statement on page 29 of the monograph that "as the assimilation of the field staffs to the organization as a whole becomes complete and as the Commission's policies become crystallized, there will be some shift of intermediate if not ultimate control from Washington to the field. The field should be confined to investigation and recommendation, but the final decision of all important questions should be made in Washington.

Having in mind the report of the Commission on the Whitney matter that the banking business done by brokers involves customers' funds and securities estimated at totaling more than $3,000,000,000, I believe that there should be every effort to cooperate with the exchanges to try to work out a segregation of the chief functions of dealer and broker, under section 11 of the Securities Exchange Act.

Former Chairman William O. Douglas, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, urged the establishment of a central trust institution which would take over from the brokers the banking and credit functions they now exercise, and the present Chairman of the Commission, Hon. Jerome Frank, has urged that the problem of establishing "brokerage banks" or providing equally effective substitute safeguards for customers be immediately attacked and solved by the financial community. But this has not yet been accomplished. The beginning of these changes begun under the present administration of the New York Stock Exchange under Mr. William McC. Martin "constitute at least an interim (and cooperative) approach toward these objectives of customer protection." This approach has been regarded by the Commission as a liberal one, and "the Commission has withheld its own rules and regulations in the hope that the financial community would itself undertake thoroughgoing measures to achieve greater flexibility." While nothing final has been achieved, let us hope that there may be a mutual spirit of conciliation on both sides that will lead us back to that prosperity which is only possible in the restoration of full confidence between the Government and the exchanges and their members.

I have not had time to give the monograph so ably prepared by this committee sufficient study to take its points up in detail, and I respectfully ask that I may have the privilege of supplementing this general statement by a detailed comment on this monograph at the earliest possible date. In the meantime, if I may formulate my views in a few words, I believe that the objects set out in the preamble to the act, and in the avowed "purposes" of the Securities Act should be carried out with the greatest fairness to both sides, and if these objects could be effected with no harm to either side. I favor such modification as the subject is capable of. I favor the greatest power of the Commissioners with the least appeal from their decisions consistent with justice, and I favor detailed and definite study by real experts of each of the subjects covered by the monograph—all of which

will redound to the credit of the Government, and most surely result in a restoration of confidence in the exchange and a resulting increase of the legitimate business of the exchange, and especially do I bespeak the maximum of frankness and a minimum of any friction between all sides to every controversy.

The remedy for the present situation is to strengthen the hands of the Securities and Exchange Commission in every way, keep good men on the Commission, and trust to their ability and integrity to administer the law for the best interests of the customers, brokers, and the exchanges and their subsidiaries. As a citizen who has given some five years' study to this subject, I again express my appreciation of the splendid work of the Chairman and of every member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SOME OF THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION

For the past 5 years, ending with the fiscal year of 1939, the proposed new issues of securities totaled $14,500,000,000.

At the end of the fiscal year of 1939 there were subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission registered companies representing 51 separate utility systems comprising 142 registered holding companies and including 1,524 individual holding, subholding, and operating companies, whose consolidated assets represented a book value of $14,097,000,000.

Since the passage of the Public Utility Holding Act of 1935, $2,637,718,000 of securities have been issued under its provisions, of which $1,449,810,000 were issued during the year of 1939.

In the last 5 years the Commission has stopped the issuance of 119 security issues, and 14 issues have been delisted because they did not make the required disclosures. The Commission has revoked or suspended the registration of 60 brokers and dealers in over-the-counter securities.

The Commission in the last 5 years has brought 312 suits in the United States courts to prevent the violation of its rules. Two hundred and eighty-eight of these are concluded and 657 defendants have been permanently enjoined from violation of the law.

During the 4 years from 1935 to the end of the fiscal year of 1939 over two billions five hundred millions of securities were issued. Nearly a billion and a half of these were issued during 1939.

Of the 49 orders considered by the United States Court of Appeals, 39 against the Commission were withdrawn or dismissed, in 2 the orders of the Commission were affirmed, and in only 1 was an order of the Commission vacated.

ORDERS REVIEWED

Up to the end of the fiscal year 1936, 1,096 persons had been indicted in 158 cases. In the 98 cases disposed of so far, 403 defendants were convicted.

During 1939 national securities exchanges filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission 265 amendments to the applications for registration.

Sweeney Versus Pearson and Allen, Authors of the Washington Merry-Go-Round, and Other Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives may recall that on May 25, 1939, I addressed the House in reference to actions for libel I proposed to bring against Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, authors of the Washington Merry-Go-Round, and other newspapers, for falsely publishing about me that I opposed the nomination of an attorney of Cleveland, Ohio, to the Federal bench for the reason that the gentleman was a Jew.

Of course, anybody who knows me knows the charges were absolute made out of whole cloth and that I have never in my life entertained an anti-Semitic feeling.

Through my counsel, Hon. John O'Connor, former chairman of the Rules Committee of this House, over 70 actions have already been brought throughout this country against Pearson and Allen and newspapers which carried the libel in question and more suits will be filed within the near future. Beginning in the fall of this year, many of these actions will be brought to trial. In the meantime the defendants in a number of the actions have filed motions or demurrers to my complaint on the ground that the article in question was not libelous, and that I could not recover in my actions. In the following jurisdictions the courts have already decided in my favor that the article was libelous and that I have a cause of action.

United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

United States District Court for the District of Kansas.

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

In the action against the Burlington Daily News, Inc. (Vermont) settlement has been effected.

I intend to pursue the matter to the very end because I believe that all persons in public life are concerned with the extent to which a "free press" may go in attributing to public officials false actions or un-American motives. It is for that reason I again call the matter to the attention of this House.

Fixing the Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE UNITED STATES NEWS

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the United States News, as follows:

American public opinion has shifted so rapidly in the last few weeks that many observers regard the change as phenomenal. But it isn't. The change from a state of indifferent isolation to a state of alert awareness of the dangers that face American security is the result of a simple and natural process—the conquest of fallacy by truth.

For several years now we have been fed fantastic propaganda about the origin of war. Sincere though misguided men among us, so-called liberals, have been insisting that only munitions makers bring on wars. Or else the contention has been seriously advanced that profiteers contrive in diabolical ways to involve our sons in war.

The blame for the present plight of France and Britain must be placed on those statesmen who refused to face the truth and to drive fallacy to the wall. We in America contributed our share to the debacle. Even the Senate of the United States by its widely publicized munitions investigation gave credence to the doctrine that munitions making makes wars. All over the world the charges and counter charges were exploited. And what was the result? The democracies, including ourselves, stifled the making of munitions by private industry and coincidentally failed to build up the Government plants which were urged so eloquently as the proper alternative.

What powder-making factories do we have today? We haven't a first class plant available to make munitions. We have been misled just as were the British and French before 1937. It takes a long time to build up a supply of munitions and to develop the technique of munition making. Only last week a few of the "educational orders" designed to give private industry the stimulus for an expanding production were let by our Government. This should have been done 2 and 3 years ago.

INDIFFERENCE TO SECURITY IS INEXCUSABLE

The same group of men who smeared the private munitions-makers smeared also a President of the United States on the ground that he dragged America into war to protect our credits and trade. This libel on the character of Woodrow Wilson was widely disseminated so as to bolster the theory that wars are made for gain and not for the defense of ideals or human liberty.

Public opinion became antiwar but at the same time public opinion became antidefense. Indifference to security is inexcusable. The names of the men who have been responsible for failing to permit America's defenses to be built up should be written plainly on the tablets of American history so that this generation may know who it was that conceived the plot to weaken the war defenses of democratic nations.

BLAME FOR OUR UNPREPAREDNESS MUST BE FIXED

It is not too late to institute an inquiry into what influences were at work in the United States between 1934 and 1940 to sap the economic vitality of the Nation on the production side and to frustrate the granting of the requests of the Army and the Navy for new weapons and adequate supplies.

The blame for unpreparedness must be fixed, and fixed soon. America today has very few airplanes, hardly any mechanized weapons for the Army's use, and not enough transports or patrol vessels to take care of contingencies on our long seacoasts. Why have our defenses been neglected?

Certainly the facts about the world situation have been known to our Government. Our military and naval intelligence representatives abroad have told their superior officers in Washington for 3 years just what Germany has been doing. President Roosevelt has had detailed reports from diplomatic representatives of the United States stationed in foreign capitals. The danger that faced the democracies has been well known to the President. Why did he fail to tell the American people so that the Congress would respond by appropriating the necessary sums to build up our airplane industry for defense purposes?

The most commonly advanced explanation is that if Mr. Roosevelt had attempted to arouse the Nation he would have been called a warmonger and that he would have been refused by Congress the grants of funds. But this is no answer. Leadership based on revelation of the facts may fail temporarily; but if the debate is begun soon enough, truth will in time prevail.

What would have happened had Mr. Roosevelt tried in January 1937 to advise the people of the United States of the need for enlarged defenses? He might have been balked by public opinion for the time being; but if it were clear to the people that Mr. Roosevelt wanted nothing for himself, that he had no third-term ambitions, the people would have accepted his argument as a disinterested expression.

Mr. Roosevelt even in 1938 and 1939 had nothing to lose by urging preparedness—nothing except possibly a third term. And many a fair-minded person will say that as between a political loss for oneself and the development of a policy which in the long run looks to the protection of the people against foreign aggression, the doubt should have been resolved in favor of an uncompromising campaign for national defense.

Ambition has ruined many a statesman in history. Consideration of self has beclouded the vision of many a would-be leader of democracy. Conversely, the heroes of centuries of human achievement have been men who have cast aside all thought of self in the sacrifices that bring spiritual rather than material compensations.

We are on the verge of war. No man can foretell how soon we will realize that all democracy faces a threat of extinction and that we must recognize a state of war exists now against our own democracy. These are not times when wars are declared. They simply happen overnight and only the democracies insist on taking time for the formalities, while the aggressors bomb airdromes and render defenses impotent.

The President's duty is very plain. He must sacrifice his political ambitions for the good of the Nation. He might well consider the recommendation to the Congress of a program putting America immediately on a war basis. At the same moment the President ought to announce that he will respect the American tradition and refuse to run for a third term.

NATIONAL UNITY CANNOT BE BUILT ON DISTRUST

A change in the Presidency is not likely to cause any dislocation in industry, especially if Mr. Roosevelt will appoint now or give power to men already appointed to accelerate the industrial production of the Nation for defense. Whether another Democrat is chosen—and there are many capable leaders in the Democratic Party—or whether the country chooses a Republican, the fact remains that at this, of all times, democracy must prove the worth of its institutions. In the middle of a critical period, Britain changed Prime Ministers last month, and so did France.

If America is to go into war, it must be with a leadership that is freed from the handicaps that would face a third-term President. National unity cannot be built upon foundations of distrust. And, unhappily, industry today does not feel that the President is as concerned about the national defense as he should be, or else he would not be temporizing with advisory councils and insisting on maintaining the restrictions and barriers that have hamstrung industry for the last 7 years.

ALL POLITICAL AMBITIONS MUST BE SACRIFICED

Mr. Roosevelt cannot do the job of directing industrial operations himself. He must delegate authority and do so promptly. He must also tell the people the truth about the need for a modification in the restrictions imposed by the New Deal on business management and industrial production. If this is not done, it will be said with emphasis on every side that the administration is more interested in saving the New Deal than in saving America.

To attain the desired end—national unity—the third-term issue must be disposed of by the President himself. To refuse a third-term nomination would, to be sure, disappoint the selfish politicians and parasites who infest Washington and who have imposed long enough on the good nature of a generous-minded President.

But to refuse a third term would put the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt alongside that of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. The excuse of a war emergency, offered by the proponents of a third term, is a shallow one. To surrender the democratic process in the face of a challenge to democracy itself is to misconstrue the innate capacity of the American people to govern themselves and to give their lives and their properties for an ideal.

The time has come for men in public life to raise the quality of statesmanship by sacrificing the political ego for the common good. Only by such an example can the thousands of men young and old in our midst be encouraged to make the supreme sacrifice of self. For such sacrifices will have to be made if the women and children in our cities are to be protected from the bombs that can be so readily dropped by aircraft operating from nearby ocean bases left unprotected by the defeat of Britain and France.

Will America learn the lesson of her neglect of defenses of these last few years or will historians fix the blame for America's downfall on the blindness and selfishness of her political leaders of today?

No Reason for Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) TELEGRAM

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of July 10:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of July 10, 1940]

NO REASON FOR THIRD TERM

It is universally agreed that the all-important issue before the American people is the preservation of a free and democratic United States against the totalitarian threat from Europe. The issue is so important that it dwarfs all other issues and reduces some of them to negligibility. We must build up our national defenses to a point where we can defy the totalitarian fury. We must aid in every way consistent with law and our own defense those who are now at war against that fury.

It happens that the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration is based upon a lively appreciation of this situation. Prior to the Republican Convention at Philadelphia, it was felt by many Republicans as well as Democrats that world events demanded the continuance of Mr. Roosevelt in office. Columist Dorothy Thompson, who up until then had evinced no great admiration for Mr. Roosevelt or his ways, cried out hysterically from Paris during the battle of Flanders that the Republicans should not nominate anyone against Mr. Roosevelt.

The candidates for the Republican nomination, with one exception, were frighteningly casual about what was happening in Europe—frighteningly casual and bewilderingly indefinite; their opinions reflected more or less strongly the discredited doctrine of isolationism. Mr. Vandenberg, for example, began the campaign as an old-fashioned provincial isolationist and wound up as an "insulationist," whatever that may be. Mr. Dewey, in one of his first speeches, seemed to display some understanding of the portentousness of events abroad and then, in mid-career in the West, misled apparently by the isolationist sentiment then articulate in that region, went overboard for isolationism. Mr. Taft, in his robot-like progress, moved on inexorably, undisturbed, it would seem, by anything outside the domestic scene.

But the exception we mentioned a moment ago was Mr. Willkie. He understood the implications for us in the European war and he emphasized them boldly and clearly. He abhorred isolationism and warned the Republican Party over and over that, if it embraced isolationism, it might as well close up shop as far as this 1940 campaign is concerned. He accepted the Roosevelt foreign policy in all essential particulars, and said so. And now Mr. Willkie is the Republican candidate for President. Regardless of what the sweating platform-makers labored forth at Philadelphia, Mr. Willkie is his own platform.

Thus, when it comes to the foreign policy of the United States, the Willkie formula and the Roosevelt formula virtually coincide. Mr. Willkie sees the totalitarian threat as vividly as Mr. Roosevelt sees it. Mr. Willkie is as anxious to preserve a free and democratic America as Mr. Roosevelt is anxious. Mr. Willkie is as convinced of the need of building up adequate national defenses as Mr. Roosevelt is convinced. Mr. Willkie is as confident of the wisdom of giving all aid consistent with law and our own defense to those at war against the totalitarians as Mr. Roosevelt is confident. And in achieving these aims, Mr. Willkie promises to be more effective than Mr. Roosevelt would be.

Therefore, in the range of American foreign policy, there is no longer any reason for urging a third term for Mr. Roosevelt. The New York Times, which used to be known as an independent Democratic newspaper and now, significantly, wishes to be known as independent without any Democratic qualifications, yesterday, in its leading editorial, called upon the President to abjure a third nomination in view of Mr. Willkie's concurrence in foreign affairs. In this way the third term issue, said the Times, could be kept out of the campaign.

The Times seems to be unduly wrought up about the third-term issue. To our mind, the Willkie nomination has shot that issue down into the realm of the academic. For us, the main point is that there is no longer the slightest reason for giving a third term to Mr. Roosevelt. On their domestic record, he and his party richly deserve repudiation. If it weren't for the European war repudiation would be recognized by all as inevitable, ever since the 1938 elections disclosed the popular trend away from the New Deal. For a time Republican fumbling with the problems created by the war gave substance to the third-term argument. Willkie has ended that fumbling. If the President's grasp of foreign affairs is "masterly," to use Dorothy Thompson's word, so is Mr. Willkie's. The one offsets the other.

We are confident the American people recognize this, and are preparing to act accordingly.

Roads and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ARTICLES BY CHARLES M. UPHAM AND HAL G. SOURS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Charles M. Upham, engineer-director of the American Road Builders' Association, which appeared in a recent issue of the Road Builder Magazine, regarding the importance of road building in our national-defense program.

The article referred to is as follows:

ROADS AND FREEDOM

"The rockets' red glare,
The bombs bursting in air,
Gave proof through the night
That our flag was still there."

More than a century and a half has passed since Francis Scott Key penned these immortal words. His song, which so eloquently expressed the spirit of '76, has never been more meaningful than in 1940. Today a United States at peace is firm in its hard-won right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, free from control by any nation across the sea. An ocean lies between us and the bombs bursting in Europe. The rockets whose red glare painted the skies on the Fourth of July were set off by the hands of peaceful celebrants of America's successful fight for independence.

Americans celebrated Independence Day this year with more than usual thought for the significance of the occasion. July Fourth orators found new meaning in the phrases "freedom of speech," "freedom of the press," and "freedom of worship." These constitutional guaranties can no longer be taken for granted and forgotten. The citizen's rights are being destroyed with alarming speed in the Old World. The United States is forced to embark on a gigantic preparedness program. The Nation must make ready to defend its rights if the need arises.

The possibility of foreign invasion of these shores is no pleasant consideration. America has in the past rested secure in the confidence that two oceans are protection enough. Today, that confidence is shaken. Adequate defense has become one of the Nation's most important needs. We must now be prepared to meet attack on either coast. Although we are speedily taking steps to increase the size of our armed forces, we cannot expect to build up an Army large enough to defend our long eastern coastline, plus a duplicate force that can always be stationed in the West.

Instead, we must have a mobile Army that can quickly move from place to place. If we are attacked on the west coast, when our main forces are stationed in the East, it must be possible to send help to the invaded area with the least possible delay. The United States Army is doing its best to make rapid transportation possible. Every branch is speeding up the addition of motorized units. The growth of rapid, mechanized fighting equipment has been phenomenal. Our men, arms, and supplies are today carried on rubber-tired wheels. Unfortunately, however, rubber wheels and gasoline and Diesel engines are not the only requirements for rapid movement. Our hopes for the future may some day be in the hands of America's armed forces. Their ability to fulfill these hopes may in turn rest on America's highway system.

How well are our highways prepared to meet the test of modern warfare? You received a striking answer to that question if you, like thousands of other Americans, celebrated the Fourth of July with a motor trip. You found the highways congested and incapable of meeting the demands of modern traffic. You lost many minutes in traffic tie-ups, minutes that might be priceless to an army in wartime. If you left the main highways you found many miles of unimproved dirt roads, roads over which foodstuffs must be transported from the farms to the Army in the event of war. You probably experienced at least one narrow escape from accident at a sharp curve, railroad grade crossing, or some other highway hazard. You returned home at night with darkness added to the other dangers of driving. And you found reports of hundreds of deaths and injuries due to holiday traffic in your morning newspaper.

The traffic that you found on the roads on July 4 was small in comparison to the numbers that must use these same roads in wartime. The inadequacy of our highways becomes increasingly apparent as we consider the need for speed in the transportation of troops, arms, and supplies. We must strengthen our Army, Navy, and air force. We must also perfect our highway system that we may be always certain of an affirmative answer to the query—

"Oh, say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

Also, I include an article from the same magazine on the subject of military roads by Mr. Hal G. Sours, chief engineer of the Ohio Department of Highways and president of the American Road Builders' Association.

The article referred to is as follows:

Progressive thinking in highway circles can well look to the subject of military roads as a means of rationally driving home the message of need for highway improvements. Judging from present dispatches from the war theater and from activity in this country, the subject of war and war preparation is likely to be with us for several years, no matter what the immediate outcome. It is not within my province or desire to attempt to be a prophet on military subjects. However, without our solicitation, the problem of military preparedness is upon us. We can do ourselves and the world a service by thinking in the same terms regarding highways.

As industry gears itself for wartime production, highways will be subjected to a vast tonnage increase in both commercial and noncommercial vehicular travel. The cost of highway depreciation during such times is a bill against war which can neither be anticipated nor calculated, but the toll will nevertheless be taken and it will hasten obsolescence. One of the outstanding lessons of the war to date has been the success of mechanized units. In this new type of warfare highway construction and maintenance will probably be put to its greatest test. From it road builders can learn the greatest lessons.

As is well known, one of Germany's earliest steps was to build new highways to provide for the rapid movement of mechanized units. We saw pictures and read much about German road building before we received information concerning the mechanized units themselves. So Germany apparently prepared for war in a logical manner by first preparing the tracks for the rapid movement of its mechanized units. The practicability of such forethought is indicated by the speed with which attacks have been made and their results.

Military highways designated as such by the War Department constitute only a small percentage of our total mileage, but preparation of such highways for military purposes furnishes an excellent vehicle for driving home the economics of highways in a field of public opinion that is now ready-made, so far as home defense is concerned. In other words, attention is being increasingly focused on military highways and this public interest will grow as mechanized military equipment is augmented. The opportunity of revealing the highway story under such auspices is a necessity and a patriotic endeavor.

Needs of military units of the mechanized type are scarcely greater than requirements for our ordinary vehicular travel. Well-located highways of sufficient and safe widths, with ample sight distances, bypassing many of the small, closely spaced communities to provide the expeditious movement of units are the ruling needs of the day in peace as well as in wartime. In wartime, however, quick action is expected. During the last World War, in some instances, the army had to take over road building under unfavorable circumstances where civil authorities were unable to provide the necessary routes. Highways produced under emergency conditions no doubt served the immediate purpose, but long-time engineering and sound road-building practice were lacking under the force of circumstances that demanded haste. The road-building industry can serve the Nation in this present situation by encouraging farsightedness in military needs that automatically link up with the modernization of highways. The waste of funds and effort encountered in the World War can thus be saved.

By standing by and moving in an orderly manner the road-building industry can at least aid in setting the pace of business sanity during the approach to wartime conditions. Two problems, therefore, confront the industry: First, to make highway military preparedness consistent with peacetime needs, with the long-range viewpoint uppermost; and, second, an orderly approach and self-regulation of conditions which may change deliveries, wage scales, and other road-construction factors.

War Industries Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

EXTRACT FROM WAR REPORT TO PRESIDENT WILSON IN 1919

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much talk about a war industries board that I am taking advantage of my privileges to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several salient extracts from the war report to President Wilson in 1919. It is contained in the rapidly vanishing House Document, Volume 97 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, and is a monument to a great chairman, Bernard Baruch, and his assistants.

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN OF THE WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD

NEW YORK, *December 15, 1919.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: An estimate of the spirit of service and the success that characterized the work of the Board's members, with whom I had the honor of being associated, is generously expressed in your own words when you said, with reference to them, that they had "turned aside from every private interest of their own and devoted the whole of their trained capacity to the tasks that supplied the sinews of the whole great undertaking. * * *

To American industry, to employer and employee, to capital and labor, to each of whom is due a large share of such success as the War Industries Board has achieved; to their spirit of service, of patriotism, and of cooperation, I make acknowledgment and dedicate this booklet, which is largely a record of their own activities and of achievements their support made possible.

In measuring our victory the importance of the battle line at home must ever be a great factor. The mobilization of America's industrial forces and conversion from peace and construction to war and destruction was a gigantic task and responded to in a gigantic manner. Its value in the final outcome rates second only to the mobilization of the Nation's manpower, and in that enterprise, the War Industries Board, which commanded, under you, the forces of industry, was likewise of aid by indicating those trades from which the workers could be more readily spared than from others, the continuation of which were essential to the war's development.

The needs of the Army and Navy and the other war agencies of our country and our associates changed and expanded over night. It was no part of our work to make the program; our duty was to help execute it by supplying the materials that make success attainable. To be able to do this, to know what we had to do and then to plan to do it, to coordinate and synchronize the multiplicity of national and international efforts and make them effective in supplying the war demands so that our armies and navies could discharge their duty of fighting and winning, the War Industries Board evolved a general formula, which is herewith appended because it contains its theory of organization and policy of procedure—because it shows what the board was and what it tried to do. It read:

"Wars are fought and won—or lost—on the land, on the water, in the air, and on those battle lines behind the front where the civilian forces stand.

"It is not enough to mobilize the Nation's military strength; there must be a mobilization of her full economic resources—industrial, agricultural, and financial. These must be organized, coordinated, and directed with the same strategy that governs the operations of the purely military arms of the service.

"The prodigious strain upon the world's productive capacity must be met and balanced to provide the means of warfare and to maintain the civilian population as well as to preserve the economic fabric.

"America today is the chief source of strength to the forces engaged in the conflict against German world domination. That strength is expressed in terms of manpower and of material—the one military, the second industrial.

"To control and regulate industry in all its direct and indirect relations to the war and to the Nation, the President has created the War Industries Board and placed the responsibility for its operation in the hands of the chairman."

Also, the Board provides supplies necessary to the military needs of our associates in the war, and those commodities required by neutrals in exchange for materials essential to us.

Finally, and of paramount importance, the Board, in alliance with the food, fuel, and labor administrations, provides for the country's civilian needs, the protection of which is a particular duty of the organization.

It is not only the duty of the War Industries Board to stimulate and expand production in those industries making war essentials, it is equally the Board's duty to protect, as far as may be, those industries not immediately essential to the war program.

The War Industries Board is a method of control devised by the President to equalize the strain placed upon the American industrial structure by the war.

It stimulates and expands the production of those materials essential to the war program and at the same time it depresses and curtails the production of those things not of a necessitous nature. This is done by regulation, in consonance with other executive branches of the basic economic elements: (a) Facilities, (b) materials, (c) fuel, (d) transportation, (e) labor, and (f) capital.

The method of control is through a preference list, on which are placed those industries whose output is essential to the war's progress. The priority indicated by the preference list is the master key to the six elements named.

Further, the Board regulates all and controls certain other industries of first-rate war importance, it fixes prices through the price-fixing committee, it creates new and converts old facilities, it clears the national business requirements, and it leads to conservation, which is needed to bridge the gap between the extraordinary demand and the available supply—a gap which exists in almost all the great commercial staples.

The War Industries Board embraces all and each of the Nation. Food and fuel are separately administered, but with every other article of military need and of ordinary life the Board has a direct connection, and it has a basic relationship which the War Industries Board provides.

The abnormal conditions of the war demand sacrifices. It is the price of victory.

Only actual needs, not fancied wants, should and can be satisfied.

To save heavy and long privation, temporary deprivation must be the rule.

America's willingness to accept these conditions marks her ability to quicken the end of the conflict.

It is with great pride I inform you that there was not a slacker to be found among the industries. Not one had to be coerced. They governed themselves by the answer to a single question, namely, Do the continuation of our enterprises help or hurt the war program?

The choice was unanimous for service rather than profit—for national need instead of the individual expediency. In every way they thoroughly responded to the test. Not a single business from the greatest business organization to the smallest merchant but was affected by the war; but was called upon to make some sacrifice. But because of them—their brains, their workers, and their money—added to the indomitable spirit of our soldiers and sailors, and to the general public's readiness for sacrifice, America was not found wanting; because of them America was able to supply the men and materials without which victory, at the time it came, could not have been won.

It is impossible to estimate the value of America's industrial efforts in terms of dollars but it is safe to say the total ran into the billions.

In my associates chosen from the whole Nation because of their ability, I found my support to come as quickly from the Republicans as from the Democrats; from the man of German extraction as from the one whose antecedents were English. In the spirit of service because of the world crisis and the national emergency, there were fused all differences of politics, of ancestry, of religion; all were Americans and as such soldiers of the common good. To these men on the board, and to the American employer and employee, goes such praise as the organization may have earned.

With these beside him he was able to render service; without their support he could not have succeeded.

Because every member of the War Industries Board from the top to the bottom is deserving of the attention of yourself and their fellow citizens, I will append a complete roster of those devoted fellow citizens, men and women who discharged their duty to their country by earnest service in this vital organization. To them I again express my thanks and for them I express the gratitude we all of us feel in having been vouchsafed this great opportunity to which we sought, as best we could, greatly to rise.

Between the time of the signing of the armistice and the discontinuance of the War Industries Board the problem was faced of reversing the Board's machinery in order to demobilize industry from war service and assist it back to its normal channels. The German collapse had been spectacular in its suddenness. When fighting ceased, war production in the United States was reaching its peak. Every unit of the vast machinery was keyed up to high speed. There is no doubt but that knowledge of this fact contributed materially to Germany's sudden realization to the hopelessness of her position. The Board did all that was possible to prevent any injury to industry as it was put back on a peace basis. The price-fixing committee of the Board determined as a general policy that price agreements should continue for the period originally fixed. The President directed the various departments of the Government not to market, in competition with private producers, materials in which there was no shortage and which were not of a perishable nature. The Board, through recommendations and advice, aided in cancelation of contracts so as to stabilize as far as possible the flow of materials, labor, and plant facilities back to peace channels. It was arranged with all of the war-making agencies of the Government that the Board should be advised of revisions and adjustments of all Government contracts in excess of $100,000. The Board's facilities section, for a brief time, remained as the clearing house for all information relating to contract adjustment. Contact also was maintained with the Labor

Department so that as labor was released from war work it was distributed to peacetime industries needing it. If the proper authority had been at hand, it would have been possible for the War Industries Board to have continued its functions during the period of readjustment. Much good could have been accomplished. But with the signing of the armistice, the purchases by the Allies and our own great departments coming to an end, the power of the Board, without further additional legislative authority, ceased, and it was possible to do only what was done—to wind up its work as quickly as possible.

A similar emergency may arise in the future, and it can more easily be coped with if the experiences of the last 2 years are profited by, the writer believes.

1. There should be created a peacetime skeleton organization based on the experience of the war-making agencies. It should be headed by a chairman who, when the emergency arises, should be granted the powers necessary to cooperate and synchronize the economic resources of the country. With him should be associated the representative of the Army and the Navy, or any other department. There also should be in the skeletonized organization a vice chairman, a secretary, a council, and members in charge of raw materials, finished products, facilities, prices, labor, planning, and statistics (during peace, under the Department of Commerce), priority, and conservation. Under these there should be also the various section or commodity heads. The peacetime organization would meet at least once a year to discuss and outline plans and to keep in touch with the general world situation and with one another. Each sectional head would name committees in each industry, in order that, in the event of an impending crisis, it would be possible within a few days to create an organization which immediately would mobilize all of the industries of the Nation and quickly make available for the Government all of its resources. These men, with the exception of the secretary, who would keep the records, would serve without compensation, and the actual expense of maintaining such an organization would be small. I would further recommend that all priorities, including those of shipping, would be centralized in the chairman.

2. Through a system of stimulation by a protective tariff, a bonus, an exemption from taxation for a limited period, licensing, or any other effective means, every possible effort should be made to develop production of manganese, chrome, tungsten, dyestuff, byproducts of coal, and all such raw materials usually imported, but which can be produced in quantity in this country. Above all, immediate and persistent effort must be made to develop production of nitrogen and its substitutes, not alone for war but for agricultural purposes.

3. Under the supervision of the proper departments of the Government, some industries must be given encouragement to maintain a skeleton organization through which can be developed the rapid manufacture of guns, munitions, airplanes, etc. Some facilities already developed might be kept alive through outright purchase or by small orders for munitions and airplanes, while at all times there must be kept on hand the necessary dies, jigs, fixtures, etc., needed for the manufacture of munitions. The expert personnel of the War and Navy Departments, in addition to keeping abreast of the times in the new war-making agencies, should keep the industries of the Nation attuned to a skeleton form to meet immediately that enlarged demand which would come through war.

Very sincerely yours,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

Hon. WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

An Interventionist With a Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY LAWRENCE DENNIS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article concerning the appointment of Henry L. Stimson, as Secretary of War, appeared July 7, 1940, in the National Whirligig, one of America's outstanding newspaper columns. The writer of this article is a well-known author and lecturer and was formerly in the United States Diplomatic Service.

The record of a real interventionist should be read by every Member of Congress and is as follows:

INTERVENTIONIST WITH A RECORD

(By Lawrence Dennis, author and lecturer; formerly United States Diplomatic Service)

A dogmatic man of 73 may be expected to run true to his record and convictions. Henry L. Stimson's major dogma through the years has been that the United States should not miss opportunities to intervene in foreign wars. And now he is Secretary of War.

The chief episodes in Mr. Stimson's interventionist record are Nicaragua in 1927 and Japan in 1931. In Nicaragua he had a success, in Japan a failure. His success in Nicaragua made him Secretary of State and cost the lives of 116 United States marines and of some 3,000 Nicaraguans in a 4-year war which took an American expeditionary force of over 5,000 marines and bluejackets to fight. His failure to get Britain and the United States into a war with Japan in 1931 doubtless saved tens of thousands of American and British lives. American patriots, mothers, wives, and children should now be praying for the failure of Wrong Horse Harry's next design for American intervention in a foreign broil. Germany, Italy, and Japan will be tougher nuts than Nicaraguans for the American fighting man, though not for Stimson's legalistic mind and crusading (in a Washington desk chair) spirit.

Mr. Stimson, as a legalist, a moralist, and a propagandist of commercial international interests, stands for all that has been most foolish and proved most disastrous in foreign relations for both America and Britain over the past quarter of a century. It was this ideology that prevented a realistic policy in Mexico after the overthrow of Diaz in 1910, with results costly to our relations there. It was this same ideology that got us into war in April 1917 and got Britain and France into war in September 1939.

Mr. Stimson was of no use in carrying out the military phases of the Nicaragua intervention. A tired old attorney who can work only with legal papers and only for a few hours at a time, he will now be of little use in connection with any purely military problems America may have to face as a result of his interventionist policy. But, for committing American soldiers to fighting on foreign shores without a congressional declaration of war for tricking Congress and the American people into a war they don't want, and for making out a case for such intervention based on misrepresentation of facts and disregard for the plainest imperatives of the Constitution, no better legal mind or moral propagandist could have been mobilized by our war-minded President. Moreover, his powerful personal claque, carefully cultivated in each of the 48 States, has long been accustomed to endorse by phone, wire, cable, mail and political pressure the plans of "Mr. Secretary."

This writer was United States chargé d'affaires in Nicaragua from August 1926 to the beginning of 1927. I am, therefore, qualified by the possession of much unpublished information to discuss both Mr. Stimson as a diplomat and Mr. Stimson's interventionist record in Nicaragua. In the eight months of 1926–27 during which I was in charge of the American Legation in Managua, I carried out with full approval the instructions of our State Department to get Adolfo Diaz designated President of Nicaragua so Washington could recognize him; I presided over an unsuccessful peace conference held aboard an American warship between the Managua Government and the rebels who called themselves the legal government; and I sent the inaccurate telegram, as instructed by Washington, saying that American marines were needed to protect American lives and property in Nicaragua.

On my return to Washington in early April 1927 I was at once rushed into the palsied presence of old Secretary Kellogg and his hard-boiled Under Secretary of State, R. E. Olds, both of whom complimented me on my handling of the Nicaraguan situation. But they said that the Nicaraguan developments had become so grave that it required the talents of the biggest man they could find. Accordingly, President Coolidge had drafted Mr. Stimson to go to Nicaragua as his personal representative to make peace—something Admiral Latimer with the Special Service Squadron and I with the Legation had failed to achieve. The Admiral and I, when asked our opinions, had told Washington that our only alternatives were: (1) To let the Nicaraguans fight it out, with every probability that the rebels would win and oust our puppet president; or (2) to take over all Nicaragua with a force of 5,000 marines, which we said would probably involve a long-drawn-out war similar to our 4-year pacification of the Philippines after the Spanish-American War. Washington turned from its professional fighting man and diplomat to the high-priced Wall Street corporation lawyer who was supposed to possess a magic formula for making peace with legal words and legal contracts.

Stimson reached Nicaragua in early May 1927. Under a marine-arranged truce, he entered at once into negotiations with President Diaz and rebel General Moncada. The latter saw no reason to quit with victory in sight. Stimson told him that Washington, having recognized Diaz, could not allow our picked man to be ousted. Moncada quickly came to the point. If the honorable special emissary of the White House would put it in writing, so Moncada could prove to his generals that American armed forces would be used against the rebels to force compliance with the Stimson terms, he, Moncada, would lay down his arms and try to get his men to do likewise, fully realizing the futility of a little Nicaraguan Army defying the mighty United States. Stimson, to avoid a return to Washington in failure, reluctantly put this threat in writing. When he advised Washington by cable in a code message that he was doing so, Secretary Kellogg shot back instructions not to do it. But Stimson had already proceeded and, going over Kellogg's head to President Coolidge, was upheld. Meanwhile, just after the ultimatum had been delivered, against Kellogg's instructions, the State Department permanent officials had publicly denied its delivery, assuming that Stimson had not exceeded his authority.

Once Moncada and his generals had signed on the Stimson dotted line, the Wall Street attorney wired back to a waiting America that he had brought peace to Nicaragua. Shortly thereafter, one of Moncada's generals, Sandino by name, refused to lay down his arms to Yankee imperialism, as he called it, with a resulting loss of the 3,000 Nicaraguan and 116 American lives. But this minor sequel, engaging over 5,000 American naval forces in the Nicaraguan jungle for several years, was not allowed to tarnish the luster of Stimson's peace. Sandino was merely labeled a bandit. Actually, he was an exalted if foolish patriot and no more of a bandit than George Washington or Garibaldi.

Stimson had no legal authority and President Coolidge had not a shadow of constitutional right, without a congressional declaration of war or sanction, to authorize Stimson to pledge the armed forces of the United States to a war on Nicaraguans on Nicaraguan soil in enforcement of Stimson's ultimatum. Several Senators, including Borah, said publicly that the President of the United States was properly impeachable for this excess of authority. Stimson, as Secretary of State, made out a Philadelphia lawyer's case for his Presidential client. The difficulty was met largely by euphemisms and name calling. It was not a war but cooperation with the Nicaraguans to put down banditry. Sandino was not a rebel but a bandit.

With that precedent, how easy it would be now for Mr. Stimson to call an American expeditionary force to Europe a mere matter of cooperating with the British in stamping out the banditry of Hitler et al. Stimson will be no good for the military aspects of the enterprise, but his record proves him an expert at putting over a foreign war by the President without congressional authorization. He can put it over in a legal, propaganda, and moral way. The task of putting it over in a practical way, of course, will fall to younger fighting men and executives, the age limit even for generals being 64.

Hatch Bill No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW A. DUNN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, my main reason for not supporting S. 3046 was because I believed it to be undemocratic. I did not support the original Hatch bill, which passed the House last year.

I do not question the sincerity of the sponsors of this legislation, nor those who support it; however, it seems to me that we are getting away from the principles of democracy when we deprive Federal employees of the right to seek office and to publicly support candidates in whom they are interested.

Roosevelt's Decision Cannot Be Delayed Longer—The Real Fight Now Looms Between Two New Deals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGON JOURNAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Journal of July 5, 1940:

[From the Oregon Journal of July 5, 1940]

ROOSEVELT'S DECISION CANNOT BE DELAYED LONGER; THE REAL FIGHT NOW LOOMS BETWEEN TWO NEW DEALS

Four months from today the people of the United States will vote on Presidential nominees.

A week ago, in a surprise move, the Republican Convention proclaimed a New Deal for its party and went before the country with its strongest possible ticket—Wendell Willkie, of New York, and Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon.

A week from Monday the Democratic convention will meet to name its ticket, and there is no reason why it, too, may not be featured by a surprise move. It is possible that President Roosevelt may decline the nomination of his party for a third term.

Until the invasion of the Low Countries by the Nazis, in early May, political wiseacres the country over chorused assurance that the President would not accept the nomination but would undertake to dictate his successor as head of the ticket.

From mid-May until late June the grim specter of war and the overnight demand for large-scale national defense shadowed all political considerations, and again the acceptance of a third-term nomination by Roosevelt was taken for granted.

Now, America is aware of the gravity of the war situation, public opinion, on record for preparedness, shifts back to politics, again to ask the question: "Is he or isn't he?"

Only the President knows the answer to that question. For months he has maintained the silence of the sphinx. His name appeared on the primary ballots in many States with no word from the White House. Accordingly, an overwhelming majority of delegates will converge on Chicago pledged to his renomination. The people who want Roosevelt for a third term expect him to accept the nomination and do not believe that he will let them down. The nomination will be difficult to decline.

Only the President knows his own mind and heart. Only he can appraise for himself whether he cares to undertake the campaign that would be a fight from start to finish. And it is certain that he would not care to risk defeat with the issues drawn as they appear to be at the moment.

At present no one can forecast with any certainty the outcome of a Willkie-Roosevelt race, beyond the probable election of a Republican House of Representatives.

Both men have personal appeal. Both men have liberal ideals. Willkie previously had indorsed the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration and had approved its reciprocal trade treaty policy.

Either candidate would suffer much if tainted as an interventionist, because, regardless of party, the people of this country do not want the United States to become embroiled in a foreign war.

To date, there has been no mass sentiment against Roosevelt. The belief that in Roosevelt the average man has a President who cares and who has done something for his material welfare pretty generally prevails.

If Willkie today is not widely known, he soon will be, and his ideas, too. He is that kind of person. There is nothing in his record to indicate other than frankness, candor, and the capacity of making himself understood. The average man may have confidence that Willkie, also, will not overlook him. He may be expected to win many by his own program of social justice.

The Willkie candidacy, too, has appeal to those ardent supporters of Roosevelt's first term who cooled early in 1937 and are now cold to him. There is the businessman, large and small, who has seen himself cuffed around far more than he deserves and who is sick and tired of bureaucratic regimentation that glories in making him do the goosestep.

There are those who well remember how the administration condoned the sit-down strike, ultimately outlawed by the Supreme Court; there are those who cannot forget the effort to enlarge the Supreme Court, and everyone will feel for years the lavish expenditure of money that raised the public debt to an all-time high. Whether there are enough of them who have soured on the New Deal, for these and other reasons, to turn the tide to Willkie in a contest with Roosevelt, no one knows. In brief, the Willkie candidacy has not had time to jell.

Business, large and small, feels that, if given the opportunity, it could relieve the Government of much of the burden of unemployment, which an economic system of free enterprise should facilitate.

All of these and many other important considerations confront the President if he contemplates rejection of the nomination.

On the other hand, last week's Gallup poll showed that 92 percent of the Democratic voters want Roosevelt for a third term, and that is quite an overwhelming percentage.

At long last, Roosevelt must make his decision.

Preparedness Plus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR D. HEALEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ADDRESS BY ROLAND L. MACDONALD

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Roland L. MacDonald, State commandant, Massachusetts Department Marine Corps League:

Fellow citizens, ladies, and gentlemen, in these dark and dreadful days, when ruthless despotism is ravaging and seeking to destroy

the democracies of the world, and when civilization itself hovers on the brink of chaos, America can ill afford to dally with defense.

Lulled into a false sense of security in the belief that the Nation was inviolate, the shocking disclosures of our unpreparedness to meet aggression or invasion struck the national conscience like a Hitler "blitzkrieg." Every American is now fully aware that adequate defense is not only imperative but it must be immediate and efficient if we are to be spared the fate of unprepared European democracies.

What does adequate and efficient preparedness mean? It means more than expanding our military, naval, and air forces. It means more than the accumulation of unlimited men, munitions, and modern mechanized equipment. It means more than the concentration of huge reserves of supplies and material to bolster the combined armed forces defending our democracy.

Adequate preparedness means that the Nation as a whole, individually and collectively, must patriotically support the defense program and be ready and willing to make sacrifices far beyond any the people have been called upon to make in any previous crisis.

Adequate preparedness means that courage and high resolve in themselves are not sufficient, but that courage must be backed by training and efficiency of the highest degree to cope with a super-trained and merciless foe. Of what avail are huge armies, imposing navies, or impressive air armadas if they who man them lack the training necessary for them to withstand a superior force.

To illustrate this, let me relate one of the outstanding episodes of the last World War which, but for the superior training and physical stamina of the American forces involved, might have ended in disaster for the Allied cause. As one who was privileged to participate in that crucial encounter, I believe I am qualified to appraise it at its true value.

It was just 22 years ago, June 6, 1918, to be exact, when the events I am about to describe began. A few days previously the Germans had launched a surprise attack against the Allied forces on the Chemin des Dames sector, northwest of Rheims. The French and British soldiers, exhausted after weeks of heavy fighting, were completely unprepared for a lightning major drive by the enemy, and in a comparatively short time they were forced to retire. The German push continued until they reached the Marne at Chateau-Thierry and then to Belleau Woods on the Paris-Metz road.

Now, Paris was definitely menaced. The sound of the battle could be heard in the city streets. The civilian population began moving out. More than a million fled the city. The Government itself made preparations for a hasty exit, planning to establish headquarters in southern France.

The Germans had established artillery stations and machine-gun nests on rocky eminences concealed in the woods, giving them a commanding sweep of the open wheatfields and roads in the low terrain.

At that time, my own marine machine-gun battalion, attached to the Second Division of the Regular Army of the A. E. F., had just been relieved from the front line at Verdun. On Memorial Day word was received that the Allied line had been broken and we were ordered to reinforce the position and stop the German advance. At daybreak the next morning we started out to join our Allies and help stem the enemy drive. Traveling in lorries, our progress was hampered by the hordes of refugees fleeing Paris, then under bombardment by Big Berthas and bombing planes. As we advanced we came upon other refugees, lowly peasants from the country, old men and women who probably had never been more than 10 miles from home in their lives. Pitiful creatures, trundling what they had salvaged of personal belongings, hurrying they knew not where.

During the nighttime, proceeding without lights or guidance, we several times drove through the German lines, which were in snakelike formation, only to reappear in Allied territory. All this time we were under constant aerial attacks and artillery fire. How we managed to reach our objective without disaster is one of war's miracles which only Divine Providence can explain.

We took up our position in the low-lying wheatfields, unaware of the enemy concealed in the woods and also unaware that we had marched into what the Germans believed was a death trap. We were met by hordes of French soldiers and refugees retreating under rear-guard protection, who had apparently given up all hope and conceded victory to the Germans. "Finis le Guerre,"—the war is over—they cried despairingly. "Finished, bah," was the rejoinder of the marines as they prepared to meet the onslaught.

Unexpectedly there came an order from the commanding French general for the Second Division to retire to Meaux. We were then only 25 miles from Paris and the order to retreat caused dismay to the Americans. One Marine officer refused to heed the order and flung back the famous, "Retreat be hanged, we've only just got here."

For 26 days the marines and the equally trained soldiers of the Second Division resisted the full force of the enemy's fury and refused to give ground. Fierce hand-to-hand fighting finally cleared the Germans from their woodland positions and with their collapse the whole German line began falling back. It was the turning point in the war. Paris was saved and Allied victory was assured.

Unfortunately there are many sincere and well-intentioned persons in America who believe that we will not be obliged to defend this country only in the event of actual invasion. We regret that this is not true. Should the Allies lose this war, which God forbid, the totalitarian victors could bring this Nation to its knees by economic pressure exerted through the South American republics. Under the terms of the Monroe Doctrine the United States is bound to defend the Western Hemisphere against any and all forms of aggression, and it is possible that we may have to wage war outside of our own territory to protect our economic structure.

But it is not only against outside enemies that we need adequate defense. There are enemies within who desire the downfall of the American stronghold of democracy. Make no mistake about it, my friends, we have a "fifth column" in this country that would plunge the treacherous knife into Uncle Sam's back at the first opportunity.

As a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, so will any defense program be no stronger than the weakest effort to support it. There must be united effort to guarantee security. Rich and poor, industry and labor, big business and agriculture must all pull together for the sake of America. There must not be any racial, religious, or political difference on this vital issue. United we stand, divided we fall, must be the guiding motto of every true American through this national crisis.

The Marine Corps League, of which I have the honor to be State commandant of the Massachusetts Department, stands four-square for preparedness in the realization that adequate defense is the best guaranty of peace. We are ready to aid in any way possible in bringing our country's defense to such strength that no foreign aggressor dare attempt to challenge our supremacy.

When that objective has been attained, America will be in a position to lead a war-weary world into the paths of peace, a peace founded on justice and self-respect, that lasting peace which will give to all peoples the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To that end our national-defense program is aimed. With such an objective, we cannot fail.

President's Demand for More Money Constitutes Apology to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago when some of us Members were protesting against the demand that Congress adjourn promptly for the summer, when a few of us who realized the pitiable state of our defenses insisted that this Congress stay on the job and remedy this condition, we met with scorn from the White House.

President Roosevelt at that time told his press conference that Congress should go home. He said that if we stayed here all we would do would be to make speeches—speeches which impliedly were useless.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the President sent to this Congress an urgent message asking that we appropriate or authorize a total of five billions of dollars in appropriations for national defense. The need, he said, was immediate, and the objective was total defense.

It is a matter upon which the country is to be congratulated, that the President has at last seen the urgency of our defense needs. And further congratulations are due the country that the President has found that under the American form of Government Congress serves a different purpose than merely making speeches—that we are a part of the Government and that under the Constitution which still prevails we have a duty and a responsibility to the people who send us here.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this message of the President constitutes an apology for his former sneering remarks as well as an indication that the President is willing to concede that there are other branches in our form of government besides the executive.

Theater Must Be Purged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great furor over my remarks of July 4 on the demise of the W. P. A.

theater project. Such terms as "bigotry," "witch's hunt," "liberty," and "red" baiting have been employed in the usual "party line" manner. On the other hand, many warm messages of approval have reached me.

There is nothing so new in all this. The sad thing is that there is not something new—the ridding of the theater of this communistic crowd. When the theater project was debated in the House on May 23 last we were warned against the continued dominance of the Communists and the Workers Alliance in theatrical affairs, yet on the very next day Actors' Equity, at the annual election of council members, showed its preference for leaders of that stripe by electing Sam Jaffe, as I previously pointed out.

The official report of this annual meeting mentions "a disappointingly small turn-out of scarcely 350 members" out of a total membership of over 4,000.

Except for a couple of emotional flare-ups toward the end of the meeting—

The report states—

this was generally a quiet and amicable meeting, which received the reports of officers and committees, cast ballots which elected the entire regular ticket of officers and councilors, and sustained the Chair in its ruling that a resolution which would have committed Equity to nonparticipation in any aspect of the war, or preparation for it, was out of order.

Note that this indicates that the "slate" was "streamlined" through. The emotional flare-ups mentioned in the report were later described. It seems that Philip Loeb has quite a lot to say at these policy meetings. The Dies committee has him cataloged as belonging to or participating in the following communistic projects:

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; Theater Arts Committee; National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights; American League for Peace and Democracy; in defense of the Bill of Rights; New Masses letter to the President; statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials, volume 1, page 375, hearings of this committee.

Let us see what this last tag refers to. I will quote from page 374 of the sworn testimony of Walter S. Steele, representing the National Republic, and chairman of the American Coalition Committee on National Security, representing various organizations:

There has grown up in the United States quite a vast group referred to freely in non-Communist circles as Russians' and communism's "antiseptic squad," meaning small groups devoting its efforts toward ridiculing the idea of a "red" menace and attempting to discredit anyone who charges that there is such a menace. This group also protests attempts of Congress and State legislatures to advance laws to deal with revolutionists and their activities. It carried on a vocal and "in the paper" campaign for recognition of Russia. It condemns the releasing of radicals from college and other professional and political positions. It comes to the front in event of attempted deportations of alien "reds" and for the advancement of citizenship to aliens who refuse to swear allegiance to our country. In other words, its job is to defend Russia and communism and to coo our people into calmness in face of the reality of a "red" menace in the United States, which they claim is but a myth.

In November 1937 over 500,000 of such individuals are reported to have affixed their signatures to what the "reds" entitled the "Golden Book" which was a book of eulogies to the Communist Government of Russia on the event of its 20 years of rule and ruin of the Russian people. This book was dispatched to Mr. Stalin, the dictator, through the Russian Ambassador in the United States.

In April 1938 some of this type even went so far as to declare their support and approval of the widespread epidemic of Government killings of individuals whom Stalin claims were deserters and enemies of his regime. They said:

"The measures taken by the Soviet Union to preserve and extend its gains and its strength find echoes here, where we are staking the future of the American people on the preservation of progressive democracy and the unification of our efforts to prevent Fascists from strangling the rights of our people. American liberals must not permit their outlook on these questions to be confused, nor allow recognition of the place of the Soviet Union in the international fight for democracy against fascism to be destroyed. We call upon them to support the efforts of the Soviet Union to free itself from insidious internal dangers * * *."

And there, among two columns of signatures, is that of Philip Loeb, this spokesman of the Council of Actors' Equity Association. Going back to the official report of this latest annual meeting, Loeb is described as being "particularly disturbed over the campaign against Sam Jaffe, nominated for the council on the regular ticket, whom Mr. Loeb described as 'one of the finest, noblest creatures in the theatrical professional, a man of culture and an asset to the profession.' "

Anyone sufficiently interested in this question to read my remarks will readily recognize in them a constructive suggestion to the theater and to the great majority of patriotic members of the profession to clean house. I challenge the Actors' Equity Council to go publicly on record that the seven members of its governing council that I have named are not Communist "fellow travelers" or Communist members. As to demands for proof, the council may rest assured that the appropriate branches of the United States Government will adequately care for that in due time. It is significant that Sam Jaffe, one of those I named, has issued a statement offering Congress a "swap." He, with others of his ilk, "will resign from Equity Council the day Congress restores the Federal Theater to full activity." That is exceedingly generous of a man who signed, last August 10, a manifesto addressed to many publications in this country, which was characterized by The Nation in its issue of September 2, 1939, as "an unqualified endorsement of the Soviet system."

Perhaps Mr. Jaffe would like to explain also, his membership in the Theater Arts Committee, and the League Against War and Fascism, later known as the League for Peace and Democracy, which the Dies committee has officially designated as a front organization of the Communist Party. He could also amplify his public statement that I would have been entirely incorrect had I offered as an excuse for killing the W. P. A. theater project the fact of his election to Equity's Council. He states he was "not on the council of Actors' Equity when the project was killed."

The United States Senate had restored the theater project in House Joint Resolution 544. Senator ADAMS, in charge of the legislation, stated to the Senate that no inquiry had been made by his committee as to whether or not any Communists were still on Equity's Council, and the Senate was willing to give the profession another chance. It voted the theater project back into the appropriation. This would have given the deserving people in the profession the same status as those in other W. P. A. projects. Local sponsorship is required for all W. P. A. projects, and the Senate's action would have revived the theater project and put it on a par with the others. However, the conferees, 4 weeks after Jaffe's election, struck down the project again.

Mr. Louis Schaffer of the Garment Workers Union, director of the Labor Stage in New York City, has published a booklet entitled "Stalin's Fifth Column on Broadway." He gives convincing proof that T. A. C.—Theater Arts Committee—is a Communist Front organization. To quote a short passage:

To trail in the wake of T. A. C. is to uphold the hands of those who helped wreck the Federal Theater by pursuing the factional ends of the Stalin machine and who will discredit any effort at reconstruction because the world knows them for what they are; the friends of the Soviet Army which invaded Finland, slanderers and demagogue in the service of an alien national interest.

Contrast that quotation with the very brief résumé of Philip Loeb's championship of T. A. C., in the report of Equity's annual meeting of May 24, page 17 of Equity for June. The report represents Mr. Loeb as resenting "the ruling adopted by Equity in April, forbidding the Equity membership to resort to other organizations, and specifically T. A. C., on matters of obtaining Federal relief for actors."

"I do not think it incompatible to be a good member of T. A. C. and a good member of Equity," he declared.

Mr. Loeb, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Sherman, Miss Marsh, Mr. MacLean, Mr. Hewitt, Miss Van Cleve, and Mr. Heller, mentioned in my July 4 remarks, are all members of T. A. C. and have fought tenaciously to aline Equity with that organization.

Loeb also offers Congress a swap, and has the temerity to utter the word "bigotry." Another swapper is Hiram Sherman. On what meat do these our Caesars feed, who offer

to stop their communistic activities in exchange for congressional acquiescence in their demands?

It is my hope that the entertainment professions will weed out the Communists occupying key positions in their organizations. I am convinced that only by doing so, can they hope for the assistance of Congress which they have sought.

Mr. Speaker, let me close these remarks with the reading of two of the communications on this subject I have received representing two viewpoints. Here is a letter from a woman who has seen and experienced the under-cover workings of these Communists. For obvious reasons, I am omitting her name:

Representative LAMBERTSON of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: Thank God you see through the Federal Theater Project. There are those of us who are compelled to sit by and see the Communists strangle worthy actors and our profession. It is a horrible feeling. This situation has been going on for such a long time that the stench has finally reached high Heaven and I hope you will personally see that there is a thorough clean-up. I know your job won't be easy for the Communist clings with a tenaciousness that refuses to let go. I only wish I could jump in and help free the theater of this pestilence. These have been hard times for me, but managed to get along somehow without W. P. A. Sometimes I didn't know which way to turn, but I wasn't born in good old Illinois for nothing. I kept my chin up. So it is with a profound feeling of gratitude that I write to thank you for taking your stand against these vultures who not only seek to destroy my profession but all professions, our families, our homes, and finally our Nation.

Perhaps you won't even read this letter, but it gives me courage to write my feelings to a man who has grasped the situation, especially in this hour when we need so much courage to go on.

Thanks to you and God bless you.

Sincerely.

The following is the way in which Horace Casselberry views the situation:

45 WEST 47.

LAMMY:

Ignorance is about the loosest thing that bigotry ever uses to defeat itself. Yours is no exception. We confidently expect your congressional demise in due order. Kansas is John Brown's old stamping ground and the spiritual distance between you and old John Brown is as great as the black bottomless abyss between the young Jew Jesus, and the Pope of Rome. Equity will still be Equity when you are laid out cold by your own Kansas constituents and not a single actor to mourn you. You may fatuously believe that you are "ganging up" on Equity, but you are actually "ganging up" on yourself. "Red" baiting is a thing that comes home to roost, especially when it is as viciously ignorant as yours. What Congress needs just now more than anything else is a few intelligent Communists in seats close to yours. That will come in time. We are glad you used the RECORD to expose yourself so neatly. We earnestly hope to hear more from you of the same high order of ignorance.

HORACE CASSELBERRY.

The Leaf and the Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1940

ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE W. TRUETT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the special leave granted me, I am including as a part of my remarks a very unusual, eloquent, and inspiring address delivered some 38 years ago by Dr. George W. Truett, who for about a third of a century has been pastor of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Tex., and for 5 years was president of the Baptist World Alliance.

May I add that this address made such a profound and lasting impression upon my mind when I first read it as a small lad that I feel it will be of genuine interest to citizens of all ages, creeds, or political faiths. It is a literary gem.

This memorable address, delivered by one of the world's greatest pulpit orators, and outstanding religious leader, follows:

THE LEAF AND THE LIFE

The topic upon which I am to speak is, The Leaf and the Life. It at once suggests the wide influence of the printed page upon all human life, whether upon the individual, the home, the state, or the church.

In thinking upon this subject a scene of the olden days passes before me. An old man is confined in the dark, cold, noisome Mamertine prison. Upon him are marks of feebleness by reason of advancing age and also the scars of many a hard-fought battle. The time of his departure is almost at hand. He has fought a good fight and is now complacently awaiting the summons to go hence. But before he goes he must write to his son in the ministry, Timothy, the gifted young pastor of the church at Ephesus. It is all a very realistic picture. See the old man as he slowly writes, "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me." Poor, old, lonely soldier, while the shadows are so heavily gathering about him, it is no wonder that he yearns for the companionship of his dear young friend. He goes on to write, "The cloak that I left at Troas, with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee." You see, Paul was no Christian Scientist. He was just a plain sensible man, recognizing that he had a physical body, and that he needed his cloak in order that he might be somewhat protected against the cold. Then he added these significant words: "Bring with thee the books, but especially the parchments." Just what these books and parchments were, of course, we may not positively say, but it is probable that they were the Holy Scriptures, together with other noble books that had wrought mightily in their influence over Paul, and were unspeakably precious to his great heart.

Though he was first and foremost in all the works and triumphs of Christianity, though he was marvelously endowed by nature and by grace for his incomparable work as an apostle, yet Paul prized beyond all human computation his books. They were his constant companions and fellow helpers through all the eventful years of his matchless ministry. Paul was not only a flaming evangelist, he was a glorious teacher of doctrine as well. The two should always go together. In his far-reaching outlook for the work of the kingdom, Paul employed the leaf as well as the voice. Indeed, the crowning work of his life was the writing of his Epistles.

This scene of the olden days suggests some lessons of measureless moment to the people of God. Prominent among these lessons is that of the possibility of preserving and disseminating truth by means of the printed page. The printing press is man's greatest mechanical triumph. By this means we not only become the heirs of the thoughts of the wisest and best men of all the ages but we have also the transcription of the very thoughts of God. This is a triumph beside which none other of man can begin to compare. Though one may be poor, seeing never the wise and great of the earth, yet by means of the printed page they enter his humble home and become his personal companions and friends. Thus Franklin enriches him with his practical wisdom. Shakespeare reveals to him the worlds of imagination, and Milton sings to him of paradise. Nobly has Milton said of a good book that "It is the precious life blood of a master spirit treasured up unto a life beyond." And strongly does Emerson say, in his great Essay on Books, that "there are books which take rank in our life with parents and lovers and passionate experiences, so medicinal, so stringent, so revolutionary, so authoritative."

We are never to lose sight of the truth that it is utterly impossible for the printed page to take the place of the preacher. The progress of civilization, the vast increase of schools and learning, the amazing triumphs of the press, mighty as are all these agencies, they can never supersede the divinely sent preacher. "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Let not Christ's minister for one moment lose sight of the divineness of his mission. Of him it has been truly said: "He holds a divine commission, he proclaims a divine revelation, he is animated by a divine purpose, he accomplishes a divine result, he is dependent upon a divine Spirit." As in the past, so shall it ever be in the future, that God's foremost instrument in both the evangelization and civilization of the world is His preacher.

But it is just as true that the preacher can never take the place of the printed page. The preacher and the printed page are correlatives. Hand in hand they always need go, and their union should be as vital and as indissoluble as was that of the Siamese twins. Their conjoined influence finds striking illustration in the rise of Protestantism. The preacher alone did not bring about the great Reformation, and could not have brought it about. The printer had to come in. Luther was the preacher, Erasmus was the writer.

This truth is still more strikingly illustrated in the union of Christ the incarnate word and Christ the written word. The incarnate word was not enough; neither was the written word enough. Therefore, the word "incarnate" and the word "written" stand or fall together. The two storm centers of all religious history and controversy have been Christ and the Bible. The Bible is the complement and counterpart of Christ. They are one and inseparable—the binomial word of God. The porch of Solomon's temple was upheld by two mighty pillars of brass, the names of which were Jachin, meaning strength, and Boaz, meaning continuance. When the ancient Jew went to the temple, though faint and weary from his

journey, the sight of those two pillars always brought confidence to his heart and strength to his arm. The leaf and the life, the word "written" and the word "incarnate," are the Jachin and Boaz in the whole scheme of the Christian religion. They must stand or fall together, for the veracity of the one stands pledged for the perpetuity of the other. We do not have one iota of fear as to the destiny of either, but our deepest conviction is that if Jesus Christ is to reign throughout all the world—an ultimate triumph of which we have not a doubt—to a marvelous degree the propaganda must be carried on by the dissemination of the word of God. Its leaves, like the leaves of the tree of life, are for the healing of the nations. Those leaves are to be sent upon the four winds of heaven, bearing the tidings of salvation to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death.

Would you see the influence of the leaf upon national life? Then you have only to open your eyes to behold illustrations without number. The circulation of the Bible in France, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, and England, in the several stages of Protestant development, exercised an immeasurable influence. The iron preacher, the press, could go where the flesh and blood preacher could not go. And when assemblies were unlawful and speakers would be arrested and imprisoned, the leaves from the press were being silently carried from country to country, from city to city, and from house to house.

Take the nations of the earth, and the dividing line between barbarism and civilization, between slavery and liberty, between the shadow of death and the light of life, is the open Bible. In the coronation exercises of Edward VI, three swords were brought to him, the signs of the three kingdoms under his rule. The young ruler demanded that they bring him still another sword, and, when his nobles asked him what it was, he answered that it was the Bible, the Sword of the Spirit, which he preferred to all other swords. That demand of Edward VI was the precursor and prophecy of the coming Reformation. Of this Reformation Carlyle has truly said: "The period of the Reformation was a judgment day for Europe, when all the nations were presented with an open Bible, and all the emancipation of heart and intellect which an open Bible involves. England, North Germany, and other powers, accepted the boon, and they have been steadily growing in national greatness and moral influence ever since. France rejected it, and in its place has had the gospel of Voltaire, with all the anarchy, misery, and bloodshed of the revolutions of which that gospel is the harvest." France would not recognize the indisputable fact that the Bible is the franchise of all civil and religious liberty, and by the same token the security of all national perpetuity. In her Corps Legislatif she condemned the Divine Book, and by resolution said that God should no more have a recognition at the nation's hands. Instead of the Bible, Chambers Encyclopedia, with infidel interpretations by Diderot and others of similar views, was scattered all over the land. A tidal wave was thus and then set in motion that has left its disastrous blight upon France, even to this hour. The Reign of Terror was an inevitable consequence, when mobs marched through the streets of Paris, and the heads of the bravest and the best fell under the guillotine, and the people were plunged into unutterable woe, and their ill-founded temple of freedom went down in fire and blood. All that the leaf can do for a nation's life or a nation's death.

The Reformation began when Luther, rummaging through the library of Erfurt, came upon a dusty copy of the Scriptures and opened it. There he read, "The just shall live by faith," and again he read, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." He had read enough to change the whole of his life. Here was the search warrant which God himself had put into his hands, entitling him to read for himself, and, without the intervention of priest, pope, or church to interpret for himself God's revealed word. From that came the Reformation. Hitherto the Scriptures had long been hidden away in monasteries, while monks swung their censers and chanted their prayers. But Luther unchained the book, and lo, the truth flew abroad like Milton's angel with the flaming torch. The flying abroad of that truth set tyrants trembling, and thrones tottering, and led to the banishment of the dark night of the Middle Ages, and the mental and moral reformation of all Christendom.

England's noble queen, when she was asked the secret of her country's greatness, explicitly and instantly avowed that it was the Bible. The preamble of our Declaration of Independence was unquestionably borrowed from Paul's sermon on Areopagus, and our whole political fabric is permeated with the teachings of the Bible. Put it down as an inevitable and unalterable truth that wherever God's book has been honored, there national life has been glorious. Wherever it has been dishonored, upon such people have fallen blight and shame and death.

Not only is it true that national life is very largely directed and molded by the printed page, but it is equally true of social life. Do you not recall the influence that was wrought upon London by Thomas Hood, as he wrote in simple verse of the wrongs inflicted upon the seamstresses of that great city:

"Stitch, stitch, stitch,
With fingers weary and worn,
With eyelids heavy and red,
A woman sat in unwomanly rags,
Plying her needle and thread.

"Stitch, stitch, stitch,
O men with sisters dear,
O men with mothers and wives;
It is not linen you're wearing out,
But human creatures' lives."

Those simple words fastened upon the printed page stirred the world's greatest city to its deepest depths. And the leaf has wrought this same result, in greater or lesser degree, in the social life of every community.

None the less true is it in individual life. The word is filled with illustrations of the truth that individual life is often shaped and its destiny determined by the reading of just one book, or even a tract. Let us dwell for a moment upon some well-known instances. Take this oft-mentioned one: An old puritan doctor wrote a book on the bruised reed, which fell into the hands of Richard Baster, and led him to the saving knowledge of eternal life, and thus was begun a ministry of world-wide power. Then Baster wrote a book, the Call of the Unconverted, which speaks on and on to uncounted millions, though the author's lips have long been silent in the dust. Baster's book got into the hands of Philip Doddridge, and was the means of leading him to a broader knowledge and a richer faith and a deeper experience of the things of God. Then Doddridge wrote a book called the Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, which book fell into the hands of William Wilberforce, and so impressed him that he wrote a book called Practical Christianity. And this book in turn made its way far down into the sunny Isle of Wight, and there thrilled the heart of Leigh Richmond. Then Richmond wrote the Dairyman's Daughter, which book has been translated into more than 50 languages of the earth, working, wherever it goes, an immeasurable influence for the extension of the Gospel. Still again this book of Wilberforce made its way far down into a secluded parish in Scotland, and its reading worked an epoch in the life of a young man who was afterward to thrill the world with his glorious ministry—the eloquent Thomas Chalmers. There it is, not a break in the chain, Baster, Doddridge, Wilberforce, Richmond, Chalmers, and after these names another word needs to be added—eternity.

Note again the example of Peter Waldo with his great cargo of tracts, which he scattered in the Piedmontese valleys, the outcome of which was the Waldensian churches, which through 35 persecutions, held fast to the truth of the Bible, although "Gashed by the spear of Savoy and scorched by the fagot of Rome."

Look again at John Wycliff, the great tract writer and distributor, one of whose tracts was carried by a Bohemian nobleman into Bohemia, and loaned by him to a man who would read it and be converted to God, and fill the world with his glorious testimony and service, the immortal John Huss.

Notice that it was a little leaf written by Luther that reached the heart of the Bedfordshire tinker, Bunyan, who was later to write an allegory unmatched and forever matchless.

Take this fact also in the history of French Protestantism: Admiral Coligny was dangerously wounded at the siege of St. Quentin, and during his illness his brother brought him some tracts, the reading of which led him to the acceptance of Christ's gospel, and to become one of its greatest Huguenot champions.

Then, again, some of these tracts went off and somehow made their way into a convent where the lady abbess, Charlotte de Bourbon, was converted to God by reading just one of them, and so thoroughly converted was she, that she fled from France and took refuge at Heidelberg, in the court of Frederick III, of the Palatinate. By and by this good woman did the sensible thing to get married, and her husband was the famous Prince William of Orange. Who knows but that a vast deal of the positive, glorious stubbornness of William of Orange of the Revolution, was inherited from the blood of his ancestress, who was led to God by the reading of this one little tract?

Take a nearer illustration: Yonder upon the upper banks of the Delaware, more than a hundred years ago, a lonely missionary to the Indians, David Brainerd, daily jotted down in his diary the struggles and hopes and triumphs of his checkered experiences. This was probably not written for any other eyes than his own; but after the body of that heroic missionary had been laid away in the grave, that simple diary crossed the ocean, reached England's great university at Cambridge, and was there read by a most gifted student. The student was Henry Martyn, who, through the reading of that little diary, was led to the winning of a wide immortality as a foreign missionary.

You do not have to go beyond your own experiences to observe the measureless influences of the printed page. A tract, dropped into a man's hands between scenes at a theater, led to his salvation. A tract, put into the hands of a humble plowboy, shaped the destiny of the great preacher and editor, Jeremiah Bell Jeter, of Virginia. A tract on Stewardship and Foreign Missions, enclosed in a letter to a plain businessman in his own State, led him to realize for the first time his duty as God's steward, and, at once, out of only a modest income, he gave $5,000 to foreign missions. So little a thing as a tract led to the founding of the great Bible Society in England. If I mistake not, the founding of this great American Baptist Publication Society was suggested by so little a thing as the dropping of a tract from the hat of Samuel Cornelius, which even suggested to Noah Davis the need and power of a great tract

society which should send throughout the land a wholesome, God-honoring literature. Ah, it is true that:

"Many a shaft at random sent,
Finds marks the archer never meant."

Mr. Spurgeon tells the incident that one day a cabman drove him home, and when the great preacher paid his fare, the cabman said, "A long time since I drove you home, sir." "But," said Mr. Spurgeon, "I do not recollect you." "Well," said the cabman, "I think it was about 14 years ago," and then he pulled from his pocket a little worn and faded copy of the New Testament, and holding it up to the preacher he said, "Perhaps you will remember this. You gave it to me and asked me to read it, and I read it and it led me to the Saviour, and I have been trying to serve Him through all these years." Ah, a simple deed was that; who could not do it? And yet, by service as easy and simple, we may daily batter down the strongholds of sin and Satan, and enthrone righteousness and the Lord of life.

These simple illustrations reveal to us the amazing expansion of thought by means of the printed page. The reproductiveness of truth, by means of the press, may never, even approximately, be measured. Truth may thus be looked upon as a seed, with limitless powers of self-propagation. The author of a good book may die but his thoughts, being fastened on the printed page, live on to cheer and inspire the reader to noblest endeavor. Milton was therefore right when he said: "For books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a progeny of life in them, as active as that soul whose progeny they are; nay, they do preserve as in a vial the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that held them."

The printed page embalms thought. Homer, though dead these hundreds of years, lives far more widely today than when first he wrote his poems. Milton and Dante still sing on to the succeeding generations through the Paradise Lost and the Inferno, though their bodies have long since returned to the dust whence they came. Shakespeare passed away nearly 300 years ago, but his thoughts breathe on and influence today with an incomparably greater power than they did in the days of the Tudors. Longfellow sleeps yonder beneath the blooming flowers, but his beautiful songs of Indian life and Puritan history live on with undiminished power.

Tersely has Dr. Strong declared: "A book is the greatest leveler. It is utterly democratic. As Shakespeare makes Buckingham say in scorn of Wolsey, 'A begger's book outweighs a noble's blood.' The book cover is a door without bolt or bar, which swings open to all alike, admitting the ploughboy and the shop girl to intimacy with the world's four hundred." Dr. Pierson has nobly said of the power of the printed page that, "It unlocks the doors to the treasure houses of the race. It introduces all readers, without invidious distinctions, into the inner circle of authors, admitting all alike to the privilege of communing with them. In other ways we may seek in vain their acquaintance and audience, hindered by the forms of polite society, or their own seclusive and exclusive habits. Many authors are dead and therefore are out of reach; others, yet living, are too remote to be accessible. But the intelligent reader finds himself shut out by no wall of exclusion. He has the right of entrance and of converse, and none can forbid him. The palaces of the kings of letters stand with open gates, and there are no sentries or guards. The beggar's attire, the slave's bonds, or even the taint of crime prevents no seeker after knowledge from this instructive and elevating communion with the good and the great." He goes on to say that: "Books are the undying bodies in which authors continue to live and breathe, speak and act, and so find a sort of perpetual and potential incarnation, moving among men with immortal life."

The destiny-shaping power of the printed page is almost miraculous. The temporal and eternal destiny of many a boy has been determined by 1 hour's reading. A book fell into his hands, the reading of which charmed his mind and gave him a distinct and sublime purpose for all his after life. He rose up from the reading of its pages, to follow after his ideal as a lawyer, or statesman, or teacher, or preacher. No influence will ever undo the work of those few pages. They have given the boy his bow of hope and nothing will ever turn him away from their enchanting influences. It was this that led Henry Drummond to say:

To fall in love with a good book is one of the greatest events that can befall us. It is to have a new influence pouring itself into our life, a new teacher to inspire and refine us, a new friend to be by our side always who, when life grows narrow and weary, will take us into his wider and calmer and higher world. Whether it be biography, introducing us to some humble life made great by duty done; or history opening vistas into movements and destinies of nations that have passed away; or poetry, making music of all the common things around us and filling the fields and skies and the works of the city and the cottage with eternal meanings; whether it be these, or story books, or science, no one can become the friend of even one good book without being made wiser and better."

No tongue is among us that is able adequately to describe the epoch-making influence of the leaf upon the life. Let it be repeated, a good book put into a boy's hands at a certain hour saves him for time and eternity. Another book of opposite character leaves the boy a skeptic and sends him through life a foe to men and a hater of God and into eternity with soul unclothed and doomed. Franklin traced his entire career to the reading of Cotton Mather's Essays To Do Good, which fell into his hands while he was yet a boy. Faraday attributed the arousing of his genius to the reading of a few books when he was an apprentice to a bookbinder. Carey's great decision to be a missionary was made as he read The Voyages of Captain Cook. Emerson's book on Nature made Tyndall a naturalist. Samuel Drew tells us that Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding transformed him from low and groveling views of life to just the opposite. And English tanner of great excellence ascribed the pre-eminent value of his leather to the reading of Carlyle. The book of Proverbs, used as a first reader in the schools of Scotland, has largely made that people the practical, virile, stalwart people that they are. Who can ever measure the influence of one little American leaf, the Declaration of Independence? It is a model unapproachable in its simplicity, its fearless arraignment of tyranny, and its bold assertion and wise limitation of the rights of men. The echoes of that paper, that all men are created free and equal, with certain inalienable rights, have reverberated throughout all the earth, and will yet, please God, find an acceptance by every government in the world.

Just in proportion as good literature has the power to uplift and ennoble and transform does bad literature have the power to corrupt and drag down and destroy. The assassin of Lord Russell said that the reading of one bad book had made him a criminal and a murderer. John Angell James, one of England's greatest and noblest Christians, said, when an old man, that he had never fully recovered from the ill effects of 15 minutes' reading of a bad pamphlet when he was a boy.

The great thing about the leaf is not so much the information it gives as the effect it leaves upon character. Every stream has what is called its residuum. For instance, where iron is in solution it is seen in the reddish hue of the stone in the bed of the stream. Or, where sulfur is deposited there the green tints may be seen. So it is with the leaf—it leaves its residuum on the life. A strong, stalwart body cannot remain so if it be fed on dainty viands, with here and there a bit of poison impregnated in them. Neither can the mental and moral nature flourish when it is fed on corrupt food, however attractive and sugar-coated it may be. "Let it be observed and remembered," says Noah Porter, "that a book is always written by a man, and that it is never by any magic or mystery any better than its author makes it to be." Holy Writ has told us that "evil communications corrupt good manners." And, again, "He that walketh with wise men shall be wise, but the companion of fools shall be destroyed." There is a companionship of books as real as is the companionship of men. And a man's character may be judged as much, if not more, by the books he reads as by the men with whom he associates. If it be deleterious in the formation and training of noble character to keep company with people who are vicious and bad, equally, if not more deleterious, is it to read bad books.

There is a psychological reason for this, which is, that impressions made upon the eye are much more lasting than those made upon the ear. Impressions made upon the ear are transient. It is not so with those made upon the eye, for the reason that sight appeals strongly to the imagination, while sound does not. The written word abides because it is seen, while the spoken word soon passes because it is only heard. That is not only an amusing incident, but also an exceedingly instructive one, which H. Clay Robinson tells us in his diary. When a little boy he was corrected for misspelling a word. He appealed to his spelling book and proved that he had spelled the word according to the book. When told that it had been printed incorrectly, he said, "I was quite confounded. I believed as firmly in the infallibility of print as any good Catholic can in the infallibility of his church. I knew that naughty boys would tell stories, but how a book could contain a falsehood was quite incomprehensible." That a revelation and testimony this is to the power of the printed page. Oh, ye editors of papers and ye authors of books, with what scrupulous care should you seek ever to write the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, since the printed falsehood, whether subtle or glaring, never fails to get in its diabolical impression. It is well nigh impossible for the young especially not to be impressed by what they see in print, however ridiculous or wicked the printed statement may be. There is a kind of sacredness about the printed page that is the foster child of faith. Who does not know that the most glaring immoralities have been clothed in poems of enchanting beauty, and that the most deadly infidelity has been so deftly presented as to corrupt the morals of a whole generation? There is not the shadow of a doubt that bad reading furnishes the leading instruction in the school of plunder, licentiousness, and all manner of lawlessness.

My heart is heavy here. Oh, if parents and teachers and preachers would but realize as they ought what the young people of our land are reading. A very flood of false and foul literature, much of it worthy to have been edited in the depths of perdition, is by all sorts of devilish ingenuity being pressed upon the people. There are popular books abroad today, without number that are pestiferous in their influences, damaging in their tendencies, and harmful only in their results. They ought never to be seen on a lady's table or tolerated in a decent home. I am ready to affirm that women had far better spend their time fondling poodles and playing with kittens, than to give it to the reading of such soul-stupefying, mind-enervating, jaundice-hued, false-colored, sin-besmirched literature. As one cannot touch pitch without being defiled, or take

fire into his bosom without being burned, so neither can he read fouled literature with impunity.

Agitators and reformers tell us much about the drink traffic. They tell us that it is filling our reformatories and prisons with the victims of drunkenness and crime, and I am sure that they speak the truth. But the multiform, corrupting literature of the day, schools the reader for every vice in the whole catalog of crime. Off by themselves, unsuspected boys and girls are reading these subtle and foul productions, thus feeding their minds upon corrupt visions of life, and hopelessly poisoning their lives at the very fountain head.

No other question is fraught with the tithe of the possibilities, both for good and for evil, as is the question of the literature of the people. And the devil knows this and takes every possible advantage of it. Somehow he always finds plenty of money with which to print every species of false and corrupting literature and plenty of agents to see that it is widely circulated. In this way, more than in any other, he poisons the minds and hearts of all classes against the highest and noblest and best. He even gets in his work in Sunday-school libraries. If you have not carefully examined into your Sunday-school library, there is probably quite a surprise awaiting you.

It was the marvelous possibilities of the press that led Cowper to write his ode to it:

"How shall I speak thee, or thy power address,
How god of our idolatry, the press?
By thee religion, liberty, and laws
Exert their influence and advance their cause.
By thee, worse plagues than Pharaoh's land befell,
Diffused, make earth the vestibule of hell.
Thou fountain, at which drink the good and wise,
Thou ever-bubbling spring of endless lies.
Like Eden's dread probationary tree,
Knowledge of good and evil is from thee."

The only antidote for a bad press is a good one. The only cure for bad and cheap literature is to make good literature and much of it, and give it to the people as cheaply as possible. This is the only way that a scavenger press can be suppressed and overcome. It is God's way, for His word to us is, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." You have read the dream that Gutenberg had of the power of the press. He once dreamed that as he wrought in his cell in the St. Aborsgot Monastery, he heard a voice warning him that the power of his invention would enable bad men to propagate their wickedneess and sow dragon's teeth. The voice further told him that the time would come when men would profane the art of printing and posterity would curse the inventor. And then Gutenberg hurriedly took a hammer and broke the type into pieces. But then another voice was heard, and this voice bade him desist from the work of destruction and to persist in perfecting his invention. The voice went on to tell him that though his invention should be the occasion of much evil, God would make it the fountain of infinite good, and finally give the right the ultimate triumph in all the earth.

A passing word needs to be said about our religious and denominational papers. Who can estimate their meaning to the home? The home may be ever so humble and far removed from the madding crowd's ignoble strife, but the weekly visit of a noble religious paper, supplemented by the occasional visit of a good book, shapes the life and determines the destiny of that home. The picture of such a home passes before me now. Its inmates were poor and lived in a section where they must toil through all the seasons in order to provide a livelihood. But though all thus had to toil, from the oldest to the youngest, and though the home in which they lived was exceedingly humble, yet they held converse with the men and movements of the great, wide world. The parents turned every extra dollar into good literature for their children.

They believed with Erasmus when he said: "I buy books first; after that, if I have any money, I buy clothes." They believed with a great theological teacher, who said to his class, "Young gentlemen, shirts are necessary, but books are indispensable." And so into that home a choice book came as often as it could be afforded, and several of the great religious papers came every week. Those papers and books silently wrought their destiny-shaping power upon all that large family of children, and though far removed from the scenes of the world's great movements, yet they thus became vitally real to all those children and entered into their lives. And when they went forth to the work and warfare of the world all of them had been won to Christ and do joyfully walk in His blessed service to this day. Is this a mean or ordinary result? Nay, it is the sublimest result possible in the history of an earthly home. And more than all things else, the literature provided out of a scant purse for those children, during the plastic years of their childhood and youth, shaped their characters and determined their destiny. Oh, how can parents and teachers and preachers be oblivious to this transcendently important matter of right literature? Carelessness here is worse than being foolish, it is wicked.

A further word needs to be said about the denominational paper, and a plain word it needs to be. It is the bane of some so-called religious and denominational papers that they have lost their great religious purpose and have gone off after matters sociological and semipolitical. I could name such papers that were once as Samson for religious strength, but like him later when his locks were shorn. Once they wrought mightily for the distinctly religious welfare of the churches, but now they are religiously nerveless and palsied and their power is gone. You ask the reason why. There is but one answer—they have lost their distinctively religious passion and purpose. A denominational paper ought to be the counterpart in spirit and purpose of the Acts of the Apostles. Instead of a little missionary corner in the paper there ought to be a pulse beat in every line for missions. The supreme trouble with the missionary work now is that it is crowded off into a little corner. We want a missionary literature that will enthrone the one great passion and purpose of Jesus Christ, and do this in every issue of the paper and in every column of every issue. Until that is done by our papers, our preachers, and our churches, the continuing black plague upon all our religious efforts will be the antimissionary spirit. We are not here primarily to cultivate sociology or to build up civilization. Our primary business is to give the Gospel to the whole world. On no other basis has a church the moral right to the plot of ground on which her building stands. What was our Lord's conception of His church? For what did He build it? His church, He tells us, was to be His body, the instrument of His will, the medium through which He would manifest Himself to the world. It is the business of the body to execute the purpose of the head.

Christ's church is His body, and it is His purpose that the body shall carry forward the work that brought him from heaven to earth. For what did He come? "It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." This was His supreme mission, and that of His churches is identical with that of their divine founder and King. For this cause He brought them into the world, and for this cause He keeps them here. Our supreme danger is that we shall perish, not so much from our wickedness as from the littleness of our conceptions and efforts for God's kingdom in the earth. It was Archimedes who said, "Give me a lever sufficiently long, and a fulcrum upon which to rest it, and I'll turn the world over." Yes, and let the hosts of our Baptist people enthrone as their dominant purpose and passion the salvation of this whole world for Christ, and sound this forth, in every possible way, by leaf and by voice, and ere long the banner of Emmanuel will wave over every acre of this earth's soil.

May I refer for a moment to colportage work? It suggests a prospect that is thrillingly glorious. It is getting back to first principles. It is the gospel way of going into the highways and hedges to reach the people. Brethren, the wheels of the chariot will drag on, oh, so slowly, and the coming of the kingdom will be so long delayed, unless we go back to the Christ-appointed way of reaching the people. The colporter has this opportunity as has no other man. Therefore, every Christian ought to be a self-appointed colporter. Every church ought to be lighthouse for the constant distribution of life-giving literature. It is indeed a sad day for Christianity when churches of individuals become too dignified to do this work.

All hail to the colporters! They are doing for God and for men a work the greatness and glory of which may only be read in the golden glory of the land and life eternal. In the congested populations of our great cities, they are silently scattering the leaves of life. Out yonder in the quiet country places, whence come the men who are to dominate the world's thought and life, there the colporter is getting in his glorious work. One of his books will mark the destiny of that eager, awkward country boy. Pass over a few years and you may see that same boy in a great city, where the black tides of worldliness and sin surge against every life, and as a flaming herald for Christ he will rally the tempted, wavering people to the standards of truth and righteousness. Another one of those boys will preside over the destinies of a great railroad. Another will stand at the head of a great institution of learning. And still another will shape the religious life of uncounted thousands through a great paper. O brothers, isn't this kind of work worth our while? Is not this the transcendent question before our churches? If the vendors of foul literature can find money to print it and agents to scatter it, will not Christ's blood-bought people see to it, by the grace of God, that all needed moneys are provided for the printing of life-giving God-honoring literature, and that every man of us shall be an unceasing colporter in its widest distribution? In one of our Southern cities there lives a cultured and wealthy woman, who travels much, and whenever she travels she scatters seeds from the multitude of packages she carries with her. In a few months the fruitage of this sowing may be seen in the upspringing of beautiful flowers in all the wake of her travels. Why should not every Christian thus daily scatter the leaves of life?

Some earnest words need also be said about the circulation of the word of God. The fields of such opportunity today are surely white unto the harvest. We marvel at the progress of Christianity in the early days, when few individuals owned a copy of the Holy Scriptures. The multitudes could not own it. It took years to write out one complete copy. Even 100 years ago the printing of the Bible was amazingly expensive, and its circulation was therefore correspondingly limited. A copy of Carey's Bengali Bible cost about $20. Now it may be had for a few cents. The Red Seas of difficulty to the circulation of the Bible, so far as mechanical or financial considerations go, have all parted asunder, and it is now easily possible, so far as cost is concerned, for the speedy putting of the Bible into every home in all the earth.

What is to be our reply to all the attacks made upon the old Book? It is just to print and scatter it all the more. When men tell us that it is not inspired, or if inspired it is only in spots, and nobody knows where the spots are, we are not to waste our lives in cavilling with them. We are not called upon to answer every fool who has escaped from the mortar in which he was brayed. When the old Book is attacked, we are just to go on putting and scattering it all the more, and God will see to it that it will survive every conflict.

To be sure, it has been unceasingly attacked through all the passing generations, and is sorely attacked today. Foes without and within have plotted for its destruction. The Trojan horse is sometimes carried within our own gates, and a company of clever gentlemen, some of whom even wear the garb of theological leaders, and call themselves ministers of the word of the New Testament, have been attempting to draw the bolts of the citadel gates. Numbers of these clever gentlemen have sought to play the role of Jehoiakim; but the old Book has not been harmed. Its bonfires may be red throughout the passing centuries, but out of them all it has come without the smell of fire upon its garments. Voltaire said that he would pass through the forest of Scriptures and girdle all the trees, so that in 100 years Christianity would be only a vanishing memory. The hundred years are gone, poor Voltaire also is gone, with none so poor to do him reverence, while Christianity is still here, and the leaves of the forest of Scriptures are filling all the earth. The very press upon which Voltaire printed that direful prophecy is now used for the printing of Bibles, and the very house in which he lived has become a great depository from which is scattered the word of God. On the very spot in London where the council condemned the bones of Wycliffe to be dug up and burned, there the great British and Foreign Bible Society has its central offices.

The old citadel stands, though every stone in the wall has been attacked. Like Eddystone, despite all the swirling tides and buffeting storms, the old Book stands to cast its steady light over all the broad and storm-swept seas. Like Gibraltar it stands, while the wreck of uncounted hostile fleets lies shivered about its base. Gloriously does Cumming speak of its triumph: "The empire of Caesar is gone; the legions of Rome are mouldering in the dust; the avalanches that Napoleon hurled upon Europe have passed away; the pride of the Pharaohs is fallen; the pyramids they raised to be their tombs are sinking every day in their desert sands; Tyre is a rock for bleaching fishermen's nets; Sidon has scarcely left a wrack behind; but the word of God still survives. All things that threatened to extinguish it have only aided it; and it proves every day how transcient is the noble monument that man can build, how enduring is the least word that God has spoken. Tradition has dug for it many a grave, intolerance has lighted for it many a fagot, many a Judas has betrayed it with a kiss, many a Peter has denied it with an oath, many a Demas has forsaken it, but the word of God still survives." All flesh is as grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever. The mouth of the Lord has declared it:

"A glory gilds the sacred page,
Majestic as the sun,
It gives a light to every age,
It gives and borrows none.

The hand that gave it still supplies
The gracious light and heat.
Its truths upon the nations rise;
They rise, but never set."

After her departure, as well as while she lived, many beautiful incidents are told of England's world-famed Queen Victoria. But this one, more than any other, has thrilled my heart. When the time came, while she was yet a girl, for her to be crowned queen of England, among the many other arrangements for the coronation exercises, it was arranged that the climax of those exercises should be the singing of Handel's Messiah. The young queen had been reared in modest seclusion, and, therefore, did not understand the dignified ways of the court. And so she was informed by the court ladies that though everyone else should rise during the singing of that great oratorio, she must not rise, it would not be proper for royalty, her position was too dignified. The exercises began and went on until the concluding moments, when the great oratorio should be sung. This was begun, and the sublime strains swept on, thrilling every heart. "He shall reign forever and forever." At those words the young queen was seen to tremble with deep emotion, but according to instructions she did not rise. Then the singers reached those all-glorious words, "King of kings, and Lord of lords, King of kings, and Lord of lords." The young queen could no longer remain seated, but, against all the instructions given her as to the proprieties, she rose, lifted her eyes heavenward, then bowed her head and wept. Wasn't it appropriate and beautiful and glorious?

"Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown him Lord of all."

Oh, brothers, I pray Almighty God that your heart and mine from this hour may be bound under a spell, from which we shall have neither the wish nor the power to be disenchanted, and which spell shall hold us until we pass into eternity, that we will give and pray and toil and lay our every power under tribute to enthrone Jesus Christ in the realm of all the literature of this whole broad earth.

Magnus Johnson—The Man and His Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial speech which I delivered on the occasion of the dedicatory exercises for a memorial monument to the late United States Senator from Minnesota, Magnus Johnson, at Dassel, Minn., June 30, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAGNUS JOHNSON—THE MAN AND HIS CAUSE

In dedicating this memorial today to the memory of Magnus Johnson, we are paying tribute not only to the memory of a man who succeeded, by dint of perseverance, hard work, application, and ability in overcoming great handicaps and in reaching the top, but even more so in paying tribute to a man who truly lived to serve his fellowman.

Magnus, as he was familiarly known to all of us, was a true representative of the people. They placed their trust in him, and that trust was never violated. Magnus never compromised the people's interest. He was severely tested and he was found not wanting.

A study of the life of Magnus Johnson is both inspiring and stimulating. It fills us with hope for the future—hope that the common people can and will find leaders from their own ranks who will carry on the battle for them until victory is won.

BORN IN SWEDEN

MAGNUS JOHNSON was born in Sweden, where so many of the fine pioneers who built this great Northwest came from. He was born on September 19, 1871. His birthplace was a cottage in a rural parish of Varmland Province, on the northern shore of rugged Lake Vanern, about 10 miles west of the city of Karlstad. It is interesting to note that the mother of Minnesota's and America's first Farmer-Labor Governor, the late Floyd B. Olson, was born in a nearby parish in the same province.

Magnus was the son of a Swedish sea captain, and when he was not attending school he went on voyages with his father. He thus came in contact with the world and its cold realities at a very early age. The elder Johnson died when the boy was only 12 years old, and Magnus' mother followed his father 5 years later. His schooling thus came to an abrupt end. From then on he had to obtain his knowledge largely from the school of hard knocks.

JOINS SWEDISH LABOR MOVEMENT

Confronted with the need of earning a livelihood, MAGNUS soon found work as a glass blower and bottle maker in the factory town of Liljedahl, Sweden. It was here that he first came into contact with the rising labor movement. Of this movement he soon became an enthusiastic adherent. It was during this period, also, that he came to know and to work with the great Hjalmar Branting, who later was to become Labor Party premier of Sweden.

This influence had a lasting and wholesome effect on Magnus' life.

The nineties were the final years of the large migration of Scandinavians to America's West, and Magnus was one of those caught up. He was then nearly 20 years of age—and he set out for the new land, his belongings packed into a single trunk.

In the United States, Johnson made his way directly to the pine forests of northern Wisconsin and upper Michigan. There he worked as a lumberjack. And once again he found himself in the midst of a union-labor movement. He joined the woodworkers' branch of the Knights of Labor, which was the forerunner of the present American Federation of Labor. That was in 1891.

AIDED POPULIST MOVEMENT

America at that time was seething with political ferment. The Populists, under the leadership of Minnesota's famous Ignatius Donnelly, Iowa's Gen. James Weaver, and Kansas' Mary Lease and Jerry Simpson, were preparing their historic test of strength with the forces of finance capital in the election of 1892.

Johnson became greatly interested in this movement. As a member of the organized-labor wing officially supporting the Populist crusade, he was directly involved in the exciting drive for popular government. Even though he lacked the privileges of a voter, he, however, participated actively in the campaign in favor of the Weaver-Donnelly forces. Although American politics might then have been strange to him, Magnus did grasp the underlying

economic forces involved in the struggle, and he chose his side without hesitation. He chose the side of the people.

BECOMES A FARMER

The young lumberjack worked in the woods scarcely more than a year before he had saved the grubstake necessary to carry him to the next step. Having saved $400, he moved on west to Meeker County, Minn., where in 1893 he purchased 40 acres of woodland and pasture in Kingston Township. Here he made his lifetime home.

The first year Magnus had to cut the wood from his small place and haul it by sledge and wagon 14 miles to the county seat, Litchfield. That was during the black depression days of 1893–94, which made so desperate the condition of millions of American workers and farmers.

While the bankers of Wall Street ferociously struggled for control of the country's expanding enterprises, and the great trusts were in their first flush of organization, the common people were paying in hunger and suffering the costs of economic dislocations.

The wood which Johnson sold that winter brought little more than a dollar a cord. So, with characteristic energy, the young woodcutter organized a local strike protest which won for the farmers a desired raise in prices.

KNEW WORKER-FARMER PROBLEMS

Thus did the early life shape the public man to come. He began as a worker, at hard tasks, and learned what the worker thought and desired. He knew at first hand the valiant spirit of the union-labor movement. His knowledge was deep rooted. He himself had these desires and struggled for their realization.

Further, he was coming to know well the problems of the farmer. He was equipped fully to speak with authority and to champion the cause of the great army of people who toil in the cities and on the farm.

MAGNUS THE COMMONER

Magnus Johnson's early life made him impatient with artificial niceties of public life. Magnus, as he grew into manhood, was not a person of slick pretensions. On the contrary, he was rugged, hearty, a man of rough-hewn language, and salty good nature. He was a commoner and wanted everyone to know it. No one ever called him Mr. Johnson if he could help it. He was Magnus both to his friends and to the entire world.

He gloried in being of the common people, of having had to fight stubbornly for the chances to step out of the harness of daily labor in order to improve his intelligence and take the offered places of leadership.

What he learned he learned at night by the kerosene lamp, taking in slowly the words of a foreign language and forming his opinions from them. He was never afraid of books—but life in the lumber camps and behind the plows leaves little time for them.

Nevertheless, he read and he studied. If he was no polished scholar, he did know instinctively what was progressive and what was reactionary, what was right and what was wrong. That is the true test of knowledge, after all. It is the acid test of clear thinking. And always there was a deep well of common sense—the common sense of the people—which served to nourish his mind. That, and his Viking courage and abundant energy, were the qualities he brought with him into manhood.

BECOMES LOCAL LEADER

Because of these early qualities and training, Magnus was looked upon as a leader in many things. It was not long, for example, before he was elected justice of the peace in his locality; next he became clerk of his school district. At one time he held no less than 12 such positions in his community,

Born with the quality of leadership, it was natural that he become a leader in the new cooperative movement at that time sweeping over the Corn Belt.

Magnus had gone through the Populist uprising and had seen its substance stolen and distorted by the large conservative parties. Progressive farmers became discouraged. "No more politics," they said. Of what avail? To them the farmer's cause seemed hopeless. And it was then that the cooperative movement came forward to take the place of politics in the farmer's struggle for better conditions. It was a natural development.

GROWTH OF COOPERATIVES

By 1900 there had already been organized in Minnesota more than 600 cooperative creameries and cheese factories. Mutual telephones also were becoming common. Insurance mutuals were springing up in increasing number.

Marketing cooperatives dealing in poultry, wool, eggs, and livestock could be found here and there, and in some respects most important of all the consumer's cooperative movement now took great strides forward with the need of farmers and workers to reduce their costs of living. These continued to rise higher and higher with the pressure of the great trusts and monopolies ushered in by the McKinley-Roosevelt-Taft Republicans.

By 1910 two-thirds of the State's creameries had become cooperatives. Magnus Johnson was named president of his local creamery. In 1919, 45 percent of the State's farm families could report sales or purchases through their own cooperatives. Minnesota was the great banner State of the Union in this progressive economic development.

MAGNUS IN FRONT RANKS

And in this tremendous forward movement of cooperation place must be made in the honor rank for Magnus Johnson. It was Magnus and his neighbors around the town of Litchfield who developed one of the most successful types of cooperatives of the period—the livestock shipping association.

This type of cooperative accounted for a large share of the cooperative business reported in the years 1913–19.

Litchfield's was the first livestock-shipping cooperative in the State. The Johnson group of farmers, already owners of a creamery and an elevator, organized it in 1908. Within 5 years there were at least 115 of these groups in Minnesota, handling 12 percent of all the animals then being sent to the packers; and by 1920 these shipping associations handled $300,000,000 worth of animals yearly.

SOCIETY OF EQUITY

The great new cooperative movement also had an education group, the now largely forgotten Society of Equity. This group had a strong nucleus in Minnesota; its grain-department offices were in Minneapolis.

The late George Loftus, of St. Paul, Progressive and farm leader, was engaged as manager of the Equity Cooperative Grain Exchange, the society's commission brokerage. This group came into rapid prominence in the years before the advent of the Nonpartisan League.

And again we find Magnus Johnson in the leadership, but now as a State-wide figure. He became the first president of the Minnesota Union, American Society of Equity. Likewise he was elected vice president of the Equity Exchange. The latter position he held until the merger of the exchange 10 years later, in 1923, with other groups that eventually helped build the famous Farmers Union cooperative group.

THE NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE

The Non-Partisan League afforded an outlet for Magnus Johnson's urge to accomplish something for the worker and the farmer through political action, in which he always believed. With its coming to Minnesota in 1916, he leaped into the work of organization with his customary drive and did much to build the league in his section and throughout the State.

This set the stage for Magnus to move into political life, in which he won for himself an envious position in the Northwest's and the Nation's progressive political history. He was to become one of the founders of a political movement, the Farmer-Labor Party, which already has done great things and still has places to go in these United States.

ENTERS THE POLITICAL SCENE

In the days before the last World War the cooperative movement had to fight bitterly for every inch of ground gained. Friends of the movement were needed in high places. So Magnus was urged by his neighbors to make the race for the lower house of the State legislature. He did, in 1914, and was elected; in 1916 he was reelected.

In 1918 the Non-Partisan League farmers and the organized city workers entered the political struggle independent of the two old political parties. They realized, rightly, that if social and economic emancipation were ever to be achieved through political action, it must come through a movement of their own, a movement really representative of the common people and of their aspirations. Political parties that get their campaign chests from Wall Street can hardly be depended upon to wage the battle for those who earn their livelihood by honest toil.

LABOR AND FARMER UNITE

In the primary election, the League-endorsed candidates were defeated, but by a margin so breath-taking that it brought terror into the hearts of their enemies. The workers and farmers realized their potential strength. Immediately after the primaries the labor unions, in conjunction with their political comrades on the farm, held their historic political convention to map out a program for the future. That was on August 25, and 125 unions sent representatives. That State committee of the Non-Partisan League named a committee to meet with the union representatives to map strategy for the fall campaign.

History will record the fact that out of the parleys of the farm and city worker representatives was formed a political party destined to play a vital role in the destiny of our State and of our Nation. That was the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. A slate of candidates was selected for the coming campaign and they were designated on the ballot as "Farmer-Labor," the ticket headed by that wonderful liberal, Dave Evans.

JOHNSON, ONE OF FOUNDERS

Magnus Johnson, representing the Non-Partisan League, was one of that committee of ten that launched the Farmer-Labor Party. He was one of those who saw clearly the need for such a party. He was one of its real founders. The others on that committee, some now dead, some still carrying forward the banner, were: A. C. Welch, David Evans, Tom Davis, Ray C. Smelker, Fred Pike, Fred Tillquist, William Mahoney, Thomas Fraser, and Julius Reiter.

And thus, in its very first campaign under the name "Farmer-Labor," this political movement of the workers and the farmers, who also invited the independent merchants, the professional groups,

and all those who believed in social and economic justice to join them in a great crusade for economic justice, moved into the position of the chief threat to the domination of the Republican Party of this State.

ELECTED TO STATE SENATE

In that election Magnus Johnson, who was urged by some to make the race for Governor, was sent by the adherents of the new party to the State senate, where he served with untiring energy for 4 years.

These years as State legislator, first in the house and then in the senate, fulfilled the hopes of his supporters. He was one of the hard-working members of the legislature, constantly raising his voice for a square deal, as he frequently called it, for the working and the farm population. To Magnus Johnson a square deal was another word for justice. Naturally, he was a leader of the farmers' bloc. This first fight was for laws legalizing cooperatives—something that the conservative State administrations of those days refused to grant. He also demanded more taxation of the well-protected Steel Trust. He fought and voted for woman suffrage and for those cherished reforms of the earlier Progressives—the initiative, referendum, and recall. He called for closer control by the State of public utilities. He favored county option of the dry question when the problem was a real one in Minnesota, due to the unsavory alliance between the wealthy liquor interests and the old political parties.

VOTING RECORD 100 PERCENT

Above all, knowing that the farmer paid twice and thrice as much taxes in relation to his income as the rest of the State, he demanded tax reforms based upon the ability to pay.

Johnson's fight in the State legislature for the common people of the State gave him a commanding position of leadership. His 8 years' voting record was pronounced as 100 percent progressive by the late Carl J. Buell, legislative expert. Few were placed in that distinguished honor role by Mr. Buell. The labor unions likewise proclaimed this dirt farmer's labor legislation record flawless.

FAMILY AIDED HIM

It must not be overlooked that during those busy years Magnus had the sympathy and support of his family, without which the farm home, now grown to include 200 well-developed acres, could not have been maintained. The lady he married in 1897, Harriet Dorman, and the three sons and the three daughters who had blessed that union helped make his public career possible by their assistance on the home front.

With his legislative background and personal popularity over the State, it was only natural that the workers and the farmers should consider Magnus for nomination for Governor in 1922. The league farmers endorsed him, the workers, on a basis of complete agreement with the farmers, also gladly accepted him.

RACE FOR GOVERNORSHIP

Magnus made the race for the governorship against a Harding Republican, in the midst of the frenzy of Harding's so-called good times. But the workers and the farmers felt little of the good times they talked about and were determined to elect their man. To have done so, however, would have been regarded as almost tantamount to performing a political miracle. As it was, the result of the election was almost a miracle. Magnus came within 14,000 votes of defeating his Republican opponent. In the same election the Farmer-Labor Party sent to Washington its first United States Senator. The Progressive movement in Minnesota, which Magnus Johnson helped to found, has very definitely gained national attention.

CAMPAIGN FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR

The following year the workers and farmers of Minnesota again girded themselves for battle, with Magnus Johnson leading the fight. The sudden death of United States Senator Knute Nelson on April 28, 1923, left a vacancy for that high office. Who else should the workers and farmers of Minnesota call forth to make that race than their true and tried warrior. And who else should the Republicans call out than the man who had defeated Magnus for the governorship by a small margin. Both put their best foot forward.

The campaign which followed will go down in Minnesota history as one of the most exciting and most astounding ever witnessed. Because Magnus was a genuine plow-handle farmer, a real representative of the common people, and because the Republican Party determined to win at all costs to maintain their fast-slipping hold on the State, the contest assumed intense national interest.

A huge fund was amassed for the Republican candidate. Here was a contest, they determined, they could not afford to lose; they could not permit a fire that would set the prairies aflame.

AID FROM PROGRESSIVES

But the Progressives of the Nation were not asleep. They lent a helping hand. Old "Fighting Bob" La Follette entered the State with an appeal to the voters. Said he, "We in the United States Senate need Magnus Johnson—his vigorous personality, his integrity, his courage, his voice, and his vote." It was a crucial time in Congress; every vote counted against the flood of special-privilege legislation loosed by the Republican majority.

Into the State also came other distinguished Progressives as volunteers—Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Senator Lynn Frazier, the Progressive Congressmen from Wisconsin, Beck, Voigt, and Schneider.

It was a forward-looking, progressive platform upon which Magnus Johnson campaigned for the senatorship. It included such planks as Government control of the Federal Reserve banking system; Government control of coal mines, water-power sites, and other natural resources; a graduated tax on incomes, inheritances, and excess profits; cash bonuses for ex-service men; restriction of courts in the use of injunctions in labor disputes and in nullifying acts of Congress; friendly relations with all nations and entangling alliances with none; stabilization of prices of farm products through Federal legislation and legislation making constitutional the rights of free speech, free press, and peaceful assembly effective.

I submit that this program is still a fine program today, and its achievement would mark a new era of progressive advancement. Relatively little of that program has since been realized.

The president of the State federation of labor, the late Edward G. Hall, willingly took the stump for his farmer friend.

CAMPAIGN A CRUSADE

The tone of the campaign became that of a crusade. Over the rural areas spread a network of county boosters—farmers or their wives who sent word down the party telephones whenever a Magnus rally was to be held. The railroad workers, always the stanchest of progressives, contributed needed funds. Their paper, Labor, covered the State in a special edition.

And, on the other side, the campaign was most furious. The Republican candidate had seemingly unlimited funds to spend for sound trucks, billboards, brass bands, and newspaper space. In desperation one of his backers broadcast the slogan, "Send Magnus back to the pasture." That remark was most unfortunate for the Republican candidate.

MAGNUS—UNITED STATES SENATOR

The results of that memorable election brought gladness to the heart of every liberal and Progressive not only in Minnesota but in every other State of the Union. It likewise brought gloom to the camps of the reactionaries—a deep impenetrable gloom.

Magnus was elected United States Senator by an overwhelming vote of the people. His majority over his principal opponent was 95,000 in a total of about 500,000 votes. He became Minnesota's second Farmer-Labor Senator. In his own township he received 334 of the 339 votes cast, a tribute such as few men in America ever receive at the hands of their neighbors, at the hands of those people who know him best.

PRESS COMMENTS

The Minneapolis Star, at that time owned by the workers and farmers of the Northwest, hailed the election as "a shot that will be heard around the world." The late Samuel Gompers, leader of the American workers, joyfully greeted the election as "a sign in the sky." Commented the Freeman, a national liberal publication of those days, "the Republican-Democratic debacle in Minnesota is a symbol and a sign that the farmer is exceedingly low in his mind about the old parties and their respective styles of trumpery and gimcrackery. The farmer has been scalped so often by old-line Republican and Democratic politicians that he is at last becoming wary of both breeds.

The Progressive magazine, the New Republic, while laying the result of the election largely to economic conditions that ruined the farmers, pointed out that it also was the "reward of the last 6 or 8 years of organization and education by the Non-Partisan League and the more recent efforts to effect an alliance with labor, to the success of which there is good testimony in the fact that in Minneapolis the vote was practically a tie."

One of the large, conservative Minneapolis dailies attempted to explain away the election by saying that it was a temporary political phase, "an act of protest inspired primarily by dissatisfaction with economic conditions." My answer to that is that it not only was inspired by dissatisfaction with economic conditions but, even more significantly, by a feeling on the part of the masses that they could not look to the old political parties to correct existing economic injustices.

One of the other conservative Twin City dailies accepted the Republican defeat even less gracefully, but nevertheless grudgingly paid the new Senator a tribute by saying that he was "not a 'rubber stamp' type of radical."

The tone of the press throughout the country ran all the way from downright abuse and indignation in the conserative publications to the prediction of liberal writers that it meant the dawning of a new age.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE

In Washington they didn't know how to receive the man who had the reputation of wearing no collar and who, when out campaigning, did not hesitate to remove his own collar if comfort demanded it. They didn't know how to receive a Senator who had never worn a "swallowtail" and who told them in advance that he never intended to wear one.

They didn't know how to receive a real dirt farmer who came to the Halls of Congress to serve the farmers of the country, and the honest toilers everywhere, rather than the bankers of Wall Street and the coupon clippers of the Nation.

Many of the newspapermen in Washington, representing conservative papers, attempted to make capital out of the fact that Magnus, because he had to shift for himself very early in life, had not acquired a college education. They thought that they would find an unlettered man. But they were surprised, when

they came to know him, for he had acquired knowledge on many subjects through reading, through study, and through application. They found him to be a man who sought out all available information on all questions, and who arrived independently at conclusions based upon these facts.

COMMANDED HIS FACTS

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with references when Magnus Johnson arose in the Senate to call some learned Senator to task for presenting erroneous facts to substantiate his assertions. During one of these debates—and I may say by way of observation that nobody ever got the best of Magnus in a debate—he remarked, "I am neither a scholar nor a lawyer, but I thank God I have some common sense."

On another occasion he remarked, "I saw in the papers a couple of days ago that the Senator from New York made a speech in Washington informing us that 90 percent of the Senators are lawyers. Why is it, then, that these able lawyers, lawmakers, have not provided in the laws which they have for years and years been putting on the statute books some means of giving a leeway to certain officials of this Government to use common horse sense?"

Magnus took his seat in the United States Senate in December 1923. His easy good nature and his rugged manners won for him the admiration of everybody in Washington who appreciated genuineness and not sham. Here he at once lined himself up with that sterling group of Progressives led by the elder La Follette and Senator GEORGE NORRIS, whose voice is still being raised in the battle for human justice.

PLEADS FOR FARMER

"I have been here for nearly 3 months," he said in his first long speech in the Senate, "and I have been thinking about that member of the American family who is sick, namely, the American farmer. In a family the sick one should be taken care of first. I know what the common people want, and I want to say so that every Senator may hear it that there is today among the people of this country a great suspicion of government."

In joining discussion on the agricultural-diversification bill and further extension of credit to the farmers, Johnson reminded the elite Senators that what the farmer really needed was not further credit in order to solve his problems, but rather stabilization of prices of farm products.

On another occasion, he told a Senator from North Carolina that "if we had the opportunity to set the price [of agricultural products] as the owners of spinneries in the Senator's section of the United States have had for years, we would have been in a position to pay a living wage to the people who work for us. The reason we [the farmers] are hard up today is that we have not had the opportunity to set the price."

FAVORED TAX PUBLICITY

In speaking against the Mellon tax plan and in favor of publicity on personal-property taxes, he said: "Some of us do not need to pay any more because we lost everything we paid taxes on, but I want to say that the Steel Trust of this country, which was forced to pay three or four million dollars into the treasury of a State like Minnesota, will not help the people of the great United States if under the laws of this country it will have a right to take back the taxes paid from those who buy the things it produces. God knows we need more publicity and there is going to be more publicity if the progressive forces of this country have anything to say about it at this session of Congress."

SPIRIT OF CHARITY

If all people had the spirit of charity in their hearts that Magnus Johnson had, this world would be a much happier place for all in which to live. There wouldn't be so much rancor, bitterness, and prejudice. He was one of those who pleaded fervently to aid the war sufferers in Germany after the World War. "Professor Patterson," Magnus told the Senate, "testified that the total number of people in Germany that are in need of more or less relief is approximately 20,000,000, or one-third of the population. Let us not forget the words of Abraham Lincoln, 'with malice toward none and charity for all.' We should look upon this relief measure as a matter of humanity and civilization, having a direct bearing on peace and good will throughout the world."

Study of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates the rugged championship of Magnus Johnson. When he spoke on agricultural conditions, diversified farming, farm mortgages and foreclosures, he spoke of something close to his heart and indelibly imprinted in his mind after his years in Minnesota. He never got so far from the farm that he could not speak vigorously in the behalf of his fellow farmers.

Nor was he bound to discuss only the problems of the farmer. He remembered the Chippewa Indians who needed justice to right the wrongs done them in the early days of America. He submitted a resolution for the furtherance of world peace and submitted a bill in behalf of the independence of the Philippine Islands. Freedom for them was for him the only consistent course for America.

Mr. Johnson's common sense made him wary of foreign junkets. He opposed spending $48,500 for United States participation in the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy. He raised this query: "Does the gentleman know that we have a group of people in this country today informing us farmers how to raise more, and that we also have another group who are telling us to raise less and even destroy the things that we have planted and tried to raise in this country?"

He never forgot the needs of his constituency—farmers and laborers. Any study of his record reveals his thoroughgoing liberalism untainted by any regard for red tape or bureaucracy. He was a fighter. He did not sleep on his job. He was wide awake at all times. He lived close to his people and proved a tried-and-true spokesman. Their best interest was always uppermost in his mind. He was not always dabbling in foreign wrangles and disputes. He was a dirt farmer and he remembered them in Washington. He fought for them and he died in the harness talking cooperatives, Farmer Labor, and the square deal for all men.

RETURN TO THE DISK AND HARROW

In 1924, Magnus Johnson was the Farmer-Labor candidate to succeed himself to the United States Senate. It was a Presidential year, and the independent Progressives of the country ran La Follette for President. Magnus waged an excellent campaign. He told the voters he stood firmly for Government ownership of railroads, mines, water power, and forests. While the national Progressive slate lost Minnesota by some 80,000 votes, Magnus Johnson came within 8,000 votes of winning.

Defeated, Magnus returned quietly to the disk and harrow. The interlude, however, was brief.

CAMPAIGN FOR GOVERNOR—1926

In 1926, his party again made him its nominee for Governor, as it had done 4 years before. His continued popularity was evident in the result. The contest was conducted in the height of the Coolidge stock-market prosperity—a prosperity which eventually brought the Nation to ruin. Nevertheless, Johnson's vote of 266,000 in a light election revealed that the ranks of the Minnesota Progressives were holding. It also cast a warning shadow over the glittering results of the wild stock-market boom.

HEADS FARMER-LABOR ASSOCIATION

That year also saw the reorganization of the liberal forces of Minnesota into the Farmer-Labor Association. Magnus became its first chairman. It was a well-deserved honor.

Another organization also claimed much of his attention and much of his time. That was the Farmers Union, with which the Equity Society and its cooperatives had lately been merged. Addressing groups of his own kind, explaining in his own inimitable manner, salting with hearty stories his lessons of cooperation, politics, reform—this was work that Magnus liked.

As one of the veteran liberal leaders who worked closely with Magnus has pointed out, he was a man of such abundant bounce and energy that it is likely he talked to more people than many public figures address in their lifetime.

His work with the organizers of the Farmers Union was as effective as the work he had done 15 years before in the building of the equity exchange.

In 1930 his old seat in the United States Senate was again to be contested. Many of his friends urged him to make the race, certain that he could win. He decided against it, however, and the chance to return to that body passed forever.

WINS SEAT IN LOWER HOUSE

But 2 years later, with the congressional elections of the entire State thrown into an open contest, Magnus filed for a seat in the House. He led every other candidate for the 10 available seats. His total was 388,000 votes, the finest tribute from the voters that any man had ever received. His popularity had increased year by year.

In the first New Deal Congress he was considered a stalwart of the reform forces. He fought for the common people with the same force and the same fearless energy that he displayed in the Senate.

Politicians who talked glibly about solving the problems of the farmer, the laborer, and of social security but did nothing by their votes to do something constructive didn't fool Magnus. "It is disheartening, indeed," he told the House, "to be a participant of the actions of the present Congress when Members will rise and take the floor denouncing some of the parts of these farm bills and pleading the cause of the farmer and the desire to once again see the farmer get better prices for his products, and then watch these same Members when the roll is called and have them vote against the farmer's interest."

COST OF PRODUCTION

A remark quite typical of Johnson was when he arose in debate on the question of adjournment and said, "If you attorneys and other professional and business men will see that we farmers get the cost of production plus a little profit, you can go home with the satisfaction that the farmers are going to produce enough so that the people of this country will live."

His views on social security were expressed when he told Congress, "Government owes all its citizens, who are willing and able, the right to work, and in fulfilling this obligation to its people it must also promote the public good and public welfare. To this end it must, and I am sure that it will, establish in carrying out the public welfare, a broad and adequate system of old-age pensions."

Johnson's love of liberty was neither narrow nor restricted. He wanted it extended to everybody. It was an ideal. Pleading for granting freedom to the Philippine Islands he declared, "Ever since the United States signed the treaty with Spain and took over the

Philippine Islands it has pledged these people their freedom, and President after President has repeatedly made the statement that, when the Philippine Islands were ready, they would be granted their independence. The Filipinos have been ready for this for many years, and yet the past administrations have failed to grant them their freedom that they are so deserving of."

ENTERS STATE SERVICE

Johnson's Congressional career ended in March 1935. But he was not to relax on the farm very long. A new post in the State service, during the second administration of the late Governor Olson, opened with the creation of the department of livestock, weighing, and inspection. Magnus became supervisor—a job he held until his death. A primary campaign for Governor in 1936 was his last political effort.

Magnus was now past 60 years of age. His life had been full; his public service long, faithful, and fruitful. A weaker man might have been tired. Johnson's family in vain urged him to rest. But early and late he attended to his job.

A LEADER PASSES

In the spring of the year he had suffered both an automobile accident and a siege of pneumonia. Afterward his health was not of the best. Suddenly—on the day following the death of his great friend, Floyd Olson—Magnus came down with a chest cold which quickly developed into pneumonia. Both lungs were soon badly affected. For several weeks he fought off the attack, hovering between life and death. He got better. His friends, who had made the Litchfield hospital their headquarters, began to breathe easier. But the change for the better was brief. On September 14, 1936, he died. In 5 days he would have been 65 years old.

THE FARMER-LABOR CAUSE

I mentioned that Magnus Johnson was one of the founders of the Farmer-Labor Party. When we dedicate this monument to his memory we at the same time dedicate the monument to the cause he represented. The two—the man and his cause—go together; they cannot be separated. Has the Farmer-Labor cause justified its existence? What of its future? Will it continue, performing the tasks that Magnus Johnson and its founders set for it? Will it go forward to reach its goal, adding luster to the memory of those men of vision and idealism who gave their lives to the cause?

The Farmer-Labor Party campaigned for social security long before the New Deal was ever heard of. The party demanded adequate pensions for the aged, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right; opportunity for our youth; cost of production for the farmer and placing agriculture on a parity with industry; the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively; unemployment-insurance compensation, a proper return to all who labor of the wealth that they create; release of the public from the tightening shackles of monopoly; Government ownership of power; management and control of our natural resources in the interest of all the people, to whom they rightfully belong, rather than in the interest of a privileged few; care of the unfortunates; social security for all; government of, for, and by the people in actuality as well as in name.

PARTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In conformity with its principles and its ideals, the Farmer-Labor Party, during its short period of control of the executive branch of the State government, without at any time having the aid of a sympathetic State legislature, accomplished, among other things, such outstanding reforms as tax revision based on ability to pay, which included passage of a graduated income tax; the homestead tax preferential law; the homestead exemption law and increased taxes upon wealth; passage of the mortgage-moratorium law, which saved thousands of city homes and farms to their rightful owners; State-wide old-age pension; pensions for the blind, crippled children, and care of other unfortunates; a youth program upon which the National Youth Administration was patterned; a State public-works program to relieve unemployment; adequate relief appropriations; seed and feed loans for the farmers through the Federal Government; higher educational standards and equalization of educational opportunities through State aid to schools, particularly schools in rural districts and in poor sections where local taxes were not sufficient to maintain decent educational standards; an anti-injunction law in labor disputes; prison reform; human treatment of the State's wards; outlawry of detective agencies that had maintained spy systems in labor unions; use of the National Guard for the first time in this country to protect the civil rights of the workers and the public rather than as a strike-breaking agency during strikes; and innumerable other far-reaching and enlightening reforms.

SAME OBJECTIVES TODAY

The objective of the Farmer-Labor Party today is the same as it was when Magnus Johnson and that militant group of champions for human rights gathered and laid the cornerstone of the people's political movement.

The late Floyd B. Olson defined this objective in its broad terms when he said that it was to make government serve "in the interest of the common happiness of the people."

Is there need for such government today? I say that there is just as much need for it now as there was when Magnus Johnson raised his powerful voice for a square deal for all who labor. Let us look into the present plight of agriculture.

CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE

In 1910 the debt of owner-operated farms in the United States, according to United States census figures, was $1,700,000,000. By 1920 it had risen to the staggering total of $4,000,000,000. The 1935 figure is $3,700,000,000, which is the latest figure available, but estimates now place it at approximately $3,500,000,000.

This farm debt, you can thus see, has been reduced but very little in recent years. But the true picture is worse than even appears on the surface. Fact is that whatever slight reduction there has been in the Nation's owner-operated farm debt was brought about through mortgage foreclosure and not by reduction of principal through farm income. The heavy debt load of the farmer lies as heavily upon him today as it did in 1930. Delinquency on farm loans by the Federal Government today is 26 percent. This means that any time that the Federal Government decides on a rigid policy of debt collection, one-fourth of these farmers would lose their farms.

But let us pursue that picture a little further. It is not a pleasant one, to be sure, but sometimes we have to face unpleasant facts if we are to do something about relieving the unpleasant situations.

FARM REFUGEES

The refugees of farming are on the march. Every year thousands of farmers flee the land to the city, to the West, to other States—if possible, other jobs. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that 1,315,000 persons in recent years have migrated from the land to other parts.

But what is happening to those who stay on the farms? Government statistics show that big farms—corporate farms—are getting bigger and bigger, small farms, smaller and smaller. Of the increase in the number of farms from 1930 to 1935, only 1½ percent were large-scale farms, but it is significant that nearly one-half of the increased acreage of all farms in the country was on large-scale farms.

And the number of tenant farmers within recent years has been increasing by approximately 40,000 yearly. Government estimates for the number of farm tenants in 1939 was considerably in excess of 3,000,000. Almost one-half of the farmers of the United States today do not own their own farms. That certainly means that agriculture in this country is in a perilous condition.

SAME GENERAL PICTURE

The same thing holds true for other important classes of our population. It is not necessary to go into detail. The picture is quite clear. Unemployment, despite Government efforts to bring relief, is variously estimated at from ten to twelve million. Our young people, devoting themselves to years of study to prepare themselves for life, leave college only to find the door of opportunity closed to them.

Of the total number of unemployed, more than 30 percent are youths. They are tramping our city pavements walking about aimlessly looking for something to do, losing their morale, their grip on life. There is need for serious ponder. When we destroy the spirit of our youth we destroy the future of our Nation. It is upon our young men and our young women that the future of America depends. We can still say that one-third of the Nation is ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed.

And in this state of affairs we have resorted to an economy of scarcity instead of an economy of abundance. What a travesty for a country that can produce enough wealth to provide every conceivable need and comfort for every man, woman, and child in the land.

TASK STILL LIES AHEAD

The need of a Farmer-Labor Party today is as great as it ever was. The big task lies ahead, the big job is yet to be done. Magnus Johnson and his fellow workers gave us the start. Theirs was the work of pioneering, the hardest work. Our's is the work of completing the job. That we must do, or we will prove faithless to our trust; we will have proved unworthy of carrying on in their name and under their banner.

This is not merely a State job. Whatever good can come to the people through a progressive State government; whatever benefits can be derived, social reform and economic emancipation can come only through a national movement. Magnus Johnson realized this. On February 14, 1924, he arose in the United States Senate and told the country that eventually there would be a national Farmer-Labor Party, to which the common people of America could turn.

The common people of America need a national political party of their own as much as the common people of Minnesota need a State political party of their own. They have nothing to gain from political movements directed from the offices of big business.

Today we dedicate this monument in the memory of our beloved Magnus Johnson. Let us also resolve to perpetuate his memory in another way—a way that he would want us to if he could speak to us now—by dedicating ourselves to the task of making the Farmer-Labor movement a vital, living force in this State and Nation.

"The heights by great men scaled and kept
Were not obtained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night."

ARTICLES ON MAGNUS JOHNSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA, 1923–25; UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE, 1933–35

Election of Magnus Johnson. Outlook, vol. 134: 448, July 25, 1923.
Impression of Magnus. J. B. Burkhardt, Outlook, vol. 136: 196–197, January 30, 1924.
Lame Duck No. 3. Independent, vol. 113: 471, December 6, 1924.
Magnus at Home. R. Littell, New Republic, vol. 35: 250–252, August 1, 1923.
Magnus Johnson Will Be Heard. S. High, Outlook, vol. 135: 723–725, December 26, 1923.
Magnus the Unbluffable, of Minnesota. Literary Digest, vol. 78: 50–55, September 8, 1923.
Meet Magnus of Minnesota. C. P. Cushing, Colliers, vol. 72: 21, August 11, 1923.
Minnesota Political Twister. Literary Digest, vol. 78: 8–10, July 28, 1923.
Minnesota Sends a Bull of Bashan to the United States Senate. Current Opinion, vol. 75: 267–290, September 1923.
Portrait. Review of Reviews, vol. 68: 125, August 1923; World's Work, vol. 46: 446, September 1923; Saturday Evening Post, vol. 196: 7, October 6, 1923; Current History magazine, New York Times, vol. 19: 534, January 1924; Colliers, vol. 73: 14, May 24, 1924.
'Tis the Voice of the Farmer. Freeman, vol. 7: 484–485, August 1, 1923.
Obituary. News Week 8: 43, September 19, 1936; Time, 28: 72, September 21, 1936.

CHRONOLOGY OF MAGNUS JOHNSON

September 19, 1871: Born in Varmland Province, Sweden.
1883: Left school after the death of his father and went to work as glass blower and bottlemaker in the factory of Liljedahl, Sweden.
1891: Came to America and started working as a lumberjack in northern Wisconsin and Michigan.
1893: Moved to Meeker County, Minn., and purchased 40 acres in Kingston Township, 14 miles from Litchfield.
1897: Married Harriet Dorman; to them were born three sons and three daughters.
1899: Became naturalized citizen of the United States.
1899: From this time on he was very active in his community and the State. He served as justice of the peace and clerk of the school district and in many other civic capacities.
1910: Headed his local cooperative creamery.
1914: Was elected to Minnesota House of Representatives.
1916: Reelected to Minnesota House.
1916: Worked energetically for the Nonpartisan League.
1918: Organized with other leaders the Farmer-Labor Party.
1918: Elected to Minnesota Senate, 1918–22.
1922: Ran for Governor on Farmer-Labor ticket and lost.
1923: Ran for United States Senate to fill unexpired term of Senator Knute Nelson and won.
1924: Ran to succeed himself and lost.
1926: Ran for Governor and lost.
1932: Entered open congressional race and led all the candidates by receiving a total of 388,000 votes.
1935: Appointed supervisor of department of livestock, weighing, and inspection.
1936: Lost in primary campaign for Governor.
September 13, 1936: Death at Litchfield, Minn.

Congress Recesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I received a rather significant letter yesterday. A friend of mine in Minnesota wrote me to the effect that Europe was on fire and that, after all, Congress in this country was a part of the fire department. Headlines in today's papers indicate additional world-war developments in Europe. I make this comment in connection with the fact that a recess of Congress is planned which will continue for some time to come. In my opinion, this is a mistake. I say this in spite of the fact that it will be my purpose to return to my district if this recess plan becomes effective. Naturally, we want to find out what is going on at home, but it seems to me that the national-defense program is too important to justify these time-out periods when Congress apparently is doing nothing. We have in this country a system of government which is a little different from that in any other country. We have the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, and it seems to me that the legislative branch of the Government should be in session, ready to do its part in connection with any world-wide developments and in connection with the grave domestic problems which confront our Government in the United States.

Highways in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Monday, July 8), 1940

ARTICLE BY THOMAS P. HENRY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the Military Engineer for March-April 1940, there appears an article by Thomas P. Henry, president of the Automobile Association, entitled "United States Highways in Peace and War." I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the article under the heading Highways in War be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Military Engineer of March-April, 1940]

HIGHWAYS IN WAR

America has been at war only once since the beginning of the motor era. When it was called on for the first time to do its share for the Nation in time of war, America's highway system failed dismally. The winter of 1917–18 was unusually severe and the subsoil under the black-top roads of the period loosened; freight traffic, unable to move by railroad, took to the highways, and heavy Army trucks added their share to the work of destruction. It was more than the roads, built for light vehicles and a small flow of traffic, could stand. In many sections of the country, the highways broke down completely, and both military and civil operations were dangerously impaired. The roads in the first place were poorly located for military purposes, but even those that could be utilized failed when the unexpected burden was placed upon them.

Said a highway engineer of the period, explaining the breakdown of the roads in his State: "From horse-drawn vehicles with a concentrated load of 3 or 4 tons at most traveling at the rate of 4 miles per hour, there has sprung almost overnight the heavy motortruck with its concentrated load of from 8 to 12 tons, thundering along at a speed of 20 miles per hour."

To us, who are becoming accustomed to loads ranging up as high as 100,000 pounds moving at 60 miles per hour or more, the tribulations of this engineer 12 years ago seem almost quaint. But it was a real enough problem in those days, and there is no question that the breakdown in highway transportation reduced our speed if not our efficiency as a warring Nation.

The highway failure of the World War was just one part of our general unpreparedness. There had been little or no effort to devise a highway system that would be useful in wartime and correspondingly little effort to adjust the Army's transportation equipment to the highway facilities of the period. From the failures due to highway unpreparedness we have learned valuable lessons.

Every citizen should feel infinitely more safe and infinitely more secure because of the fact that our highway system, although it possibly may not measure up in every respect to the demands placed upon it, will never again fail to perform its proper function in a time of national emergency. At the present time, the American highway system is geared within at least a reasonable degree of the needs of national defense.

There would be little more than historical interest in a study of the reasons why so little attention was paid to our highway needs before we became involved in the World War. It has long been axiomatic that in order to achieve victory, men and material must go through on schedule to their proper destinations. Caesar's succeses based on the excellent system of Roman roads, the difficulties of defending our Western frontiers because of the lack of roads, the axiom that engineers build the roads over which the armies march to glory—all these, to name but a few, were there for everyone to see and consider. But it was not until our highway system had demonstrated its inadequacy in time of war, and a war far removed from our shores, that effort was made to bring our highway system in line with the needs of military operations.

The fact that our present highway system will meet, to a large extent, practically every military demand that can be made upon it is due to a very fortunate circumstance. When civil and military experts gathered about the conference table after the conflict was over and considered the highway needs of the Nation in times of war and in times of peace they found that the two needs were almost identical.

Although it has been widely publicized recently. I should like to highlight briefly the terms of the agreement reached by representatives of the War Department, and the Bureau of Public Roads (now the Public Roads Administration) at that time. They agreed, first, that highways constructed for commerce and national development are, in general, the same as those required for military operations; second, that the War Department in ordinary circumstances would refrain from recommending specific highway routes except in the most critical strategic areas; third, that general networks connecting important depots, mobilization centers, and industrial centers are more important than transcontinental roads; and, fourth, that while civil authorities would have principal say in highway matters during times of peace, they would give due consideration to the National-defense needs of the Nation.

When it was seen that the military and civil highway needs of the Nation were almost identical, it was easy enough to work out a program of highway development suitable for both war and peace.

There were other fortunate circumstances. Shortly after the war the gasoline tax was invented. On its twenty-first anniversary in February of this year, this tax had collected some $8,000,000,000, the major portion of which had been spent on road development. As was foreseen, many of the roads built by this golden flood followed along the major routes most needed for military operations as indicated by the so-called Pershing map of military priority roads.

The military priority roads, as indicated by the latest revision of this map are sometimes thought of by the public as military roads. Of course, they are not. They are primarily national-development roads, following the routes of peacetime traffic needs. But the roads built for peacetime needs fit the Pershing map as the hand fits the glove.

Moreover, the standards desired by the War Department for the military priority roads are well within the standards demanded by modern private and commercial traffic. All the War Department asks of its priority roads is that they have a hard surface capable of sustaining a 9,000-pound wheel load; be at least 20 feet wide; have a grade of not more than 5 percent for distances greater than 500 feet; have a curvature of 6 degrees or less, a vertical clearance of 14 feet and a sight distance of 1,000 feet. Less rigorous standards are established for mountainous territory. And of bridges, all that is asked in the priority requirements is that they be capable of sustaining an H–15 loading and be at least 4 feet wider than the approach road. In many respects, these standards are far short of those established by highway engineers and planners in meeting the needs of today's motor vehicles and making preparation for tomorrow's traffic movements.

The recent difficulties encountered by Admiral Byrd's ponderous snow cruiser in moving along the highways might naturally raise the question whether or not heavy ordnance might experience the same difficulties. The answer is that, while highways are being built up to the agreed-upon standards, equipment that will use the highways are being designed to fit within those standards. Through this two-way planning—building highways up to wartime needs and keeping military machines within the range of highway facilities—we now have a road plan that will be in large degree capable of measuring up to any demands that may be placed on it.

But while stating that the road system will never again fail in time of need, it would be idle and untrue to intimate that the system is adequate to meet every requirement in times of either war or peace.

The principal peacetime needs can be briefly summarized: We need a system of nationally planned interregional highways; for the most part these should be of the highest-type construction, with limited access and with opposing traffic streams divided. Intersecting streams of highway or other traffic should go under or over the main route. Such highways are particularly needed into and through urban areas, where such a large proportion of traffic now moves and where congestion is most prevalent.

From the military standpoint, the principal highway deficiencies are in grade and alinement and in the inadequacy of bridges. It is widely recognized that bridges are the weakest link in our highway system, with authoritative estimates placing the number of substandard bridges on main highway systems in the neighborhood of 20,000. To widen or rebuild these "horse-and-buggy" bridges will cost about $400,000,000—a large enough figure, but one that can be amply justified by the removal of danger from those that must now use these unsafe facilities, to say nothing of the military requirements.

In urban districts main highway routes already are highly congested. During time of war congestion on these routes would be tremendously increased, particularly in the industrial mobilization centers. Access roads leading to military posts and garrisons are at present inadequate, but these special roads constitute only 2,000 miles of the 80.000-mile military priority system.

Despite these shortcomings, the highway plant appears on the whole to be in good shape to meet any military emergency. Fortunately for the security of us all, the more the highway system is built up to meet normal peacetime needs, the more nearly it will comply with military recommendations. And in planning for possibility of war, surely no General Staff ever had at its disposal a greater highway system than is offered in the United States. There are 1,000,000 miles of surfaced highways spanning the Nation in every direction. In addition there are some 2,000,000 miles of unsurfaced highways that could be utilized in maneuvers if conflict were ever brought to our shores. In the event of need for evacuation, the high degree of automobile ownership—about one car to every five persons—would help greatly to solve such a problem.

With increasing mechanization of armies, roads are assuming increasing importance in the military scheme of things. Railroads, of course, will continue to be a prime mover of men and supplies over long distances. But highways were important back in the days when horses were the swiftest transportation and a division could be moved only 20 miles a day. Today, when staff cars can travel at 70 miles per hour or more, and when divisions equipped with over a thousand vehicles can go more than 300 miles in a day, highways of necessity will play an increasingly important role.

With the major part of the globe now in the grip of conflict, threatening to draw in those neutrals still enjoying a more or less precarious peace, a stronger sense of security is brought by the knowledge that an immense system of roadways is backing up the program for national defense. These roads, built so laboriously and at such tremendous expenditure, will not again falter in an hour of need.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

LETTER FROM DR. ALEXANDER GUERRY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from Dr. Alexander Guerry, vice chancelor of the University of the South, at Sewanee, Tenn. Dr. Guerry is one of the South's foremost citizens, and has given a great deal of study to our national defense. His suggestion merits close scrutiny.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH,
Sewanee, Tenn., July 1, 1940.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: The United States should have a larger and better Army, Navy, and air force. That is our immediate need in order that we may meet the crisis of the world situation, the threat of war, and the danger of economic, political, and physical aggression of the totalitarian states against us.

We should provide for an expanded Army, Navy, and air force, modern equipment in ample quantity and of the best quality—rifles, machine guns, antiaircraft and antitank guns, artillery, and tanks for the Army, and munitions and supplies of every sort for our military forces.

We should provide for this expanded Army, Navy, and air force a personnel sufficient in numbers and exceedingly well-trained soldiers, sailors, pilots, officers, and noncommissioned officers, mechanics, and men qualified for every post and every duty.

If men do not volunteer in sufficient numbers for an Army, Navy, and air force of the size deemed necessary for the present crisis, Congress should pass a selective draft law which will make it possible for the Nation to secure the men desired and needed. Such a law would carry, of course, reasonable exemptions for married men, men in particularly useful or necessary occupations, and boys in school and college.

Having taken the steps necessary for a stronger and more effective Army, Navy, and air force, Congress should make provisions for the expansion of the National Guard, the R. O. T. C. and the C. M. T. C. These three organizations present an excellent opportunity for an increase in the number of available soldiers and officers and for enlargement of the program of military preparedness.

There is a large number of men who would join the National Guard at this time to take military training and to be ready to respond to a call to the colors in the event of war. A number of schools and colleges desire to obtain R. O. T. C. units, and these should be able to secure an Army officer and the necessary equipment. The C. M. T. C. could train many thousands more boys and men than it trains now if the C. M. T. C. had more facilities, more funds, and doubled its training period. I have been civilian

aide to the Secretary of War for Tennessee for 12 years, and my chief responsibility has been the enrollment of the C. M. T. C. and the support of the C. M. T. C. as an important part of a program of military preparedness. The C. M. T. C. can play an increasingly vital role.

Congress should not pass, in my opinion, a universal compulsory military training law. It would be a most stupendous undertaking for a Nation of 130,000,000 people to embark upon a program of compulsory training for all males between certain ages. To carry out effectively the steps which I have outlined in the preceding paragraphs and to launch a program of compulsory universal training at the same time would be a task impossible of accomplishment. To attempt both courses now would result in confusion and inefficiency.

What this Nation needs at this time is a modern, mechanized, perfectly equipped Army, Navy, and air force of sufficient size with a capable and trained personnel, and not millions of men taking a hastily provided program of military training, in many cases under very unsatisfactory conditions. As a matter of fact, there are not enough Regular officers and competent Reserve officers for a program of universal military training and a program of a stronger Army, Navy, and air force and an expanded National Guard, R. O. T. C., and C. M. T. C.

Furthermore, the strength of a Nation at war or facing the possibility of war lies not alone in its military forces but in the strength of its economic order, in industry, agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing. To enlarge and equip our Army, Navy, and air force, to expand the National Guard, R. O. T. C., and C. M. T. C., and then to call all other men of certain ages not in these units to universal training will dislocate industry and agriculture and cause confusion to an extent that will be harmful to the general strength and general preparedness of the Nation.

With best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

ALEXANDER GUERRY,
Vice Chancellor.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS ON COAST DEFENSES

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON COAST DEFENSES

Like every other component of our system of national defense, our coast defenses, if they are to be effective, must keep step with the progress in armament. It should be quite obvious to anyone that guns suitable to cope with battleships at the time of the Spanish-American War, would be inadequate when matched against the guns of a modern dreadnought. It should be equally obvious that the advent of the airplane in warfare would make many changes and additions necessary in order to bring our coast defenses up to date. Coast defenses are strictly protective installations. They must stay on our shores and cannot be used offensively. Their mission is to protect the vital sea coast centers and thus leave the Navy free to be used on other missions.

The coast defenses of the Atlantic Northeast are in a deplorably weak condition. They protect, insofar as they are effective, the area of this Nation nearest Europe on the Great Circle course of both ships and planes. This area is most vital to our national security, in that in it are situated great manufacturing centers, especially valuable to the munitions industry, as well as the harbors and installations vital to the maintenance and operation of our fleet. If we are to prepare to protect this Nation on land, on sea, or in the air, the factories, transportation facilities and skilled workmen of the Northeast must be permitted to perform their tasks without interruptions. The loss of this vital area to an invader would be an irreparable blow to this Nation in time of war. Here, also, is the strategic point for an entering wedge to separate this Nation and Canada.

There is no O. A. H. U. offshore to hang as a threat on the flank or the rear of an invading force. Even if bases were strongly fortified and securely held in Nova Scotia and Bermuda, the harbors of the Northeast must be denied to any enemy seeking to land mechanized forces on destructive raids or full-scale invasions.

Full protection calls for long-range gun batteries to protect the harbors from penetrations by hostile surface ships, to secure the docking and servicing facilities for our own fleet and to deny these services to the enemy. These defenses must be sufficient to protect the entrance or debauchment of the fleet to and from its anchorage bases. This is the mission of the Army, since at these times the fleet cannot protect itself. These gun batteries must be supplemented by bombing planes, motor torpedo boats, and mine fields, both controlled and contact.

The harbor facilities, defensive works and naval service installations, must be protected against attack from the air by our own planes and by antiaircraft batteries. Airfields must be available in the near vicinity to service and facilitate the operation of our own planes.

Mobile land forces must be on hand to prevent any landing, between coast fortifications, for the purpose of attacks on the flank or rear. High-speed modern mechanized divisions, reinforced by aircraft and by heavy mobile road and railroad artillery are best adapted to this mission. Their operations can, of course, be expedited by a system of well-constructed roadways.

Our coast defenses were located and constructed before the airplane became a weapon in warfare. They are especially prominent from the air, to planes on mission of observation or reconnaissance, either visual or photographic. Because they were located and constructed to withstand fire from ships at sea, they are very vulnerable to attack from the air.

We find the coast defenses of the Northeast deficient in the following respects:

Guns: Heavy gun batteries of limited range exist in considerable numbers. These are generally in good mechanical condition. Some would require a few days to be placed in firing condition. Some few are in need of new parts. Many of them are of short range, but even so, the range is equal to the probable visibility generally existing in this region. A few long-range modern batteries exist.

Ammunition: In general, the guns are well supplied with ammunition, which is stored in well-protected magazines.

Protection: The guns are in general, well protected from fire from the sea, but not at all from bombs from planes. The latest types of guns are almost unprotected from fire from either sea or air.

Camouflage: One particularly noticeable feature connected with the coast defenses included in our itinerary was the almost total absence of any attempt at camouflage. From the air these concrete scars on the landscape are very noticeable and we believe are unnecessary. We believe every effort should be made to conceal the gun emplacements, magazines, tracks, observation points, etc. We believe in this connection, dummy emplacements, only partially hidden should be employed and that the position of the guns and other installations should be kept masked as long as possible.

Observation and fire control: The observation posts were in no case protected from attack from either sea or air. Some of the most modern guns are lacking in equipment to direct and control their fire.

Antiaircraft: Except for a very few mobile regiments stationed at the harbor defenses at this time, the antiaircraft defense of the gun batteries consists of obsolescent guns, poorly placed to meet modern attack methods and totally lacking in modern fire-control equipment. Air fields in the area are few in number and, except those in the larger metropolitan areas of Boston and New York, are too small to accommodate large planes.

Mines: The control mines to be planted and operated by the Army exist in fair quantities, but cable and other control equipment are in poor condition or nonexistent. There is need for more mine planters.

Personnel: In very few of these forts is there any force except a caretaking force, which is inadequate even for this purpose. Provisions are made for this force to be supplemented, in case of an emergency, by National Guard troops, but if the emergency were not preceded by a 2-week notice, it is extremely doubtful if these troops would be of much value.

Quarters: In most of these posts any additional personnel or equipment would have to be quartered in tents, as there is a dearth of quarters for existing personnel and equipment.

W. P. A.: We were somewhat surprised and much gratified to learn that a great deal of assistance had been rendered these posts by the W. P. A. program. Many buildings had been and were being constructed and many old buildings had been repaired by W. P. A. labor. Those in command reported that in general the local authorities had been cooperating splendidly in this respect.

It is recommended that the present program be supplemented and speeded up to provide the following, most of which has been many times recommended, by those in charge of the various posts in reports, now on file.

1. Immediate additions to the personnel sufficient to provide a full complement of enlisted men and officers to man the existing harbor defenses, the antiaircraft batteries, both for protection of the gun batteries and vital harbor installations, less the National Guard personnel assigned for wartime duty.

2. Immediate rehabilitation of all serviceable guns, regardless of caliber or character and construction of such protection as is possible for all batteries and other installations against bombs or bomb splinters. It seems to us that the mechanism for elevating and traversing the guns are particularly vulnerable to bomb splinters.

3. Improvement of existing and construction of new air fields for use of larger air force. We believe these fields should be sod throughout, with the buildings of the type of ordinary farm buildings. The field at New London, Conn., is a good example of

an inconspicuous landing field. More airplanes and airplane personnel should be assigned to these units to operate with and be trained with them.

4. Speed up acquisition of mobile antiaircraft matériel, aircraft, motor torpedo boats of the Navy, mines, fire-control equipment and heavy, modern, long-range seacoast batteries.

5. Procurement of equipment and organization and training of personnel for fixing antiaircraft batteries of large caliber around cities containing vital installations. This personnel can come from additional National Guard or State militia units, but the equipment should be constructed at once by the Federal Government.

6. Organization and equipment as rapidly as possible, of additional mechanized divisions of the Regular Army. At least one corps, consisting of two armored divisions with medium and mobile artillery, should be maintained at all times in the New England area, in addition to the present National Guard forces, which are only partly trained and partly immobilized and immobile, is New England's only present protection.

7. The training in mine planting of former Army mine planters, now in the service of the Coast Guard in this area for use in servicing the lighthouses.

8. An immediate study of the matter of camouflage with the idea of adopting the same to whatever may be the natural surroundings and a constant system of inspection of same from the air, both by observation and photography.

9. The acquisition and fortification of bases for our fleet and air bases in Nova Scotia and Bermuda.

10. Program of progressive replacement of obsolescent guns and equipment to begin as soon as possible.

Conclusion. Although we have not visited the other coastal areas of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, from what we have seen and from what we know of the general subject, we have no doubt but that the same general conditions prevail in other areas. We therefore make the above recommendations for our entire system of coast defenses on continental United States.

CHAS. I. FADDIS.
J. JOSEPH SMITH.
JOSEPH BYRNS.

Burke-Wadsworth Military Training Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. LEE E. GEYER, OF CALIFORNIA, DELIVERED JULY 4

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by myself over KFVD on July 4, 1940:

My friends, this is Congressman LEE E. GEYER reporting to you by transcription directly from Washington, D. C.

Today we celebrate Independence Day. How thankful we should all be that we still have that independence with all it means to us. Think of the countries of the world who in the last few months have lost the privilege of celebrating Independence Day.

And, by the way, in speaking of privileges, how fortunate are we to have such a radio station as KFVD. There is no station in these entire United States that is giving such service as this one. This station is absolutely uncontrolled. All sides of all questions may be discussed over this wave length. I personally am very grateful for the opportunity afforded me by this station to bring to you each week the news from Washington, D. C.

Last Sunday evening I had the pleasure of speaking on the American Forum of the Air. This is a program that comes to the west coast each Sunday at 4 p. m. There are always six persons to participate. There are two main speakers, who present the two sides of some live topic. After both sides have been presented, the other four persons carry on an informal discussion of the topic. This is always an interesting part of the program, as the four are not allowed to have prepared speeches but must match wits extemporaneously. No doubt many who are listening now heard the program last Sunday. We discussed the Burke-Wadsworth bill, providing for compulsory military training.

The speakers presenting the case were Senator BURKE, of Nebraska, author of the bill, who spoke in favor of it, and Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, who spoke against it.

The four members on the panel were Col. John Taylor and Col. William Donovan, of the famous "Fighting Sixty-ninth," who supported Senator BURKE in advocating the passage of the bill; and opposing these three, on the side of Senator CAPPER, were Congressman HAMILTON FISH, Republican, of New York, and myself.

This was indeed a strange line-up. So far as I know, there is but one other major controversial issue upon which Mr. FISH and I are in agreement. That is the right of the people to vote on a declaration of war.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me say at the outset of my discussion of this bill that I do not hold that some form of universal military training might not be necessary at some time. Whether or not we have reached that place now in our history I have not definitely decided.

I might be induced to support a bill if it were correctly written, provided I could be convinced this was the only way to continue the existence of our free Nation. But of one thing I am sure, the bill would need to be very, very different from the one we discussed last Sunday afternoon.

Let us examine briefly the provisions of the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

It provides first for the registration for training of all males between the ages of 18 and 65. After registration these persons shall be divided into 2 great classes. Into one class are put all persons between the ages of 21 and 45. Into the other class—let us call them the "home guard"—are put all persons between the ages of 18 and 21 and between the ages of 45 and 65. Thus, we have the one class of 21 to 45 who are to serve in the armed forces of the United States—that is, the Army and Navy. These lads are to be the backbone of our Nation's defense.

Let us see what ages will be used mostly in this Nation's defense and from what walks in life they are to be taken.

The bill which I have here before me says that "not more than 87 percent nor less than 78 percent of the men selected shall be between the ages of 21 and 31."

Thus, you see this Army backbone shall in the main be between 21 and 31 years of age. Now, that sounds fine. But from what classes of society shall these youngsters come?

The way to arrive at this is to see who is left after those whom the law exempts are removed.

(These exemptions apply for the "home guards" as well as the class we are now considering.)

The bill allows the following to remain at home for no training—those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine, dentistry, or other occupations found necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

To this group, the bill adds those physically, mentally, or morally unfit, ministers of the gospel, and conscientious objectors. Also all those with dependents are exempt.

Oh, yes, lest we forget—there is another class made safe from service either at the front or at home. Whom do you think that group is?—Why, Congressmen. Isn't that nice?)

If you will review the list carefully, you will note that about the only ones that may be called for service are the single men between 21 and 31 who do not have jobs. Thus by this bill we will establish an army from the ranks of those whom industry and government no longer have use for. These men who have been denied the right of a family and a home and job to which they have a right under our form of government are forced to defend the interests of Congressmen, industrialists, businessmen, farmers, professional men, and their more fortunate brothers who really have something to be defended.

Now that we have chosen as our defenders the stepchildren of this great country, how are we going to treat them?

Each one forced into the service must serve a "sentence" of at least 8 months and may be kept there indefinitely if the powers that be so desire. Then, if he is so fortunate as to get his discharge, lest he might get back at a permanent job in civilian life, he is to be interrupted for a period of 1 month each year for further training.

Now, what shall he receive as pay for this service of defending the persons and property of his more fortunate fellows? Why, the beneficient sum of $5 per month. About enough to buy his cigarettes.

How high do you think the morale of such an army would be? You know an army is only as strong as its spirit. Do you think our young people are dumb? Don't you suppose that they'll know that they are the ones protecting those who are making millions out of this defense program because this Congress refused to tax those war profits? They know that out of the last war this Nation got 18,000 new millionaires. Will they be anxious to give their lives to protect such a system that means only exploitation for them?

I, for one, do not expect to place my stamp of approval on this "war slave" plan.

Yes, and I, for one, will not be content to have the security of my country based on such an army recruited in this manner and so shamefully treated.

The President, to my knowledge at least, has not put his stamp of approval on this bill either, and I don't think he ever will. No, this proposed Burke-Wadsworth bill is most decidedly undemocratic and un-American. It is not a military-training bill. It is a bill to make cannon fodder out of our unemployed youth so that jobs need not be provided for them.

Now, let me repeat for those who may have tuned in late—I might be induced to support some universal-training bill, but it will need to be much different from this one and I'll have to be convinced the danger to the Nation is greater than I believe it to be now.

Audi Partem Alteram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ARTICLE BY A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to every question and because of this bilateral truth we should have an open mind toward the other side of the Japanese problem. If we do we can employ the Latin statement "audi partem alteram." We can then say that we have heard both sides of the question.

This article, entitled "Facing Facts About a New Japanese-American Treaty," by a distinguished scholar of the Far East, Prof. A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale University, is a study based on deep and profound research and worthy of the utmost reflection.

FACING FACTS ABOUT A NEW JAPANESE-AMERICAN TREATY

(By A. Whitney Griswold)

The European war, together with the upheaval of world politics that preceded it, has offered the United States an exceptional opportunity to settle some of the issues with Japan that conflict with the fundamental national interests of the United States in the Pacific area.

The history of American relations with Japan reveals certain recurring patterns of conflict emerging from time to time as American diplomacy pursued its objectives in eastern Asia. These objectives may be summarized briefly as follows: (1) The security of the Philippines, Guam, Samoa, and all other American possessions in or bordering the Pacific Ocean; (2) peaceful commercial and diplomatic relations with all Pacific nations, including both China and Japan, on terms of equal opportunity; (3) strict regulation of Oriental immigration into the United States and its Territories; (4) maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine in the Pacific as in the Atlantic; (5) enforcement of laws and regulations governing American coastal fisheries; (6) respect for the lives and property of American citizens resident or traveling in China, Japan, and all other nations in Asia as in Europe, Africa, North and South America. Americans may disagree as to the means or relative urgency of attempting to realize these objectives. They may regard them as more or less vital to the United States than, say, the Mexican oil question, the revision of the neutrality laws, or the Temporary National Economic Committee's investigation of the building trades. But within the single perspective of our Pacific relations they have accepted them with unfailing regularity as the fundamental ideals and interests of American diplomacy.

On July 26, 1939, the United States brought to an end a treaty relationship with Japan of 45 years' standing. The 1911 treaty of commerce and navigation, now scheduled to expire January 26, 1940, revised and superseded an earlier treaty concluded in 1894, in which the United States renounced the right of extraterritoriality in Japan. Attached to both instruments, on American initiative, were clauses protecting the right of each signatory to enact and enforce "laws, ordinances, and regulations" governing immigration. Indeed, Japan's chief motive in negotiating the 1911 treaty was to fend off statutory exclusion by reaffirming the most-favored-nation principle and reinforcing it with a promise to uphold the "gentlemen's agreement." Together the two treaties systematically laid down the legal basis for the commerce, navigation, residence, travel, property rights, protection of laws, and access to courts of each party's nationals within the other's territories.

The motives underlying the abrogation of the 1911 treaty were mixed, as they always are in practical diplomacy. There was no double entendre in Secretary Hull's assertion that the treaty contained "provisions which need new consideration." The "gentlemen's agreement" has been gathering archives' dust since the passing of the immigration law of 1924. The most-favored-nation clause of the 1911 treaty was conditional in character, and hence out of line with the unconditional most-favored-nation principle of the Hull trade-agreements program. Since 1911 Japan has added to the territories originally covered by the treaty new conquests over which her sovereignty is ambiguous, and to which the application of the treaty was therefore in doubt. Here, within the treaty itself, were at least three good reasons for revision.

World politics supplied the others. Ever since the beginning of the China incident there has been agitation within the United States for an embargo of the sale of war materials to Japan. By the spring of 1939 American sympathies for China had expressed themselves in the form of an official loan to the Chinese Government and an unofficial and yet fairly effective embargo of the sale of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Japan. Needless to say, no such loan had been offered to Japan, and weapons and war materials of all kinds continued to be sold to China. But the demand was growing for more stringent measures, for an extension of the unofficial munitions embargo to include the sale to Japan of materials that could be put to military usage—oil, trucks, steel, scrap iron, and so on. The measure found its popular support among individuals and organizations into whose motives it is not our present purpose to inquire. One broad, publicly acknowledged purpose commended the project to all, and lent it strength even in the eyes of persons who had no particular knowledge of, or interest in, far eastern affairs. This was to attack the collaboration of Japan with the Rome-Berlin axis and so redress the balance of world power in favor of Great Britain, France, and, it was hoped, peace. The United States could not honorably impose an embargo on Japan while still a party to the 1911 treaty. Hence it was abrogated. The action was immediately acclaimed as a step toward breaking up the axis and averting a world war.

Soon after it was taken, however, a revolution in world politics and a long-dreaded European war intervened to shatter these hopes and to modify, perhaps fundamentally, the premises from which they sprang. Like a series of earthquakes, the Nazi-Soviet pact, the Russo-Japanese truce in Outer Mongolia, and the "red" army's invasion of Poland shook pre-war political alinements to their foundations and toppled their ideological superstructures. As the dust cleared, two things became apparent: First, the German-Japanese partnership was, at least momentarily, dissolved; second, a balance of power had been restored to the Far East that had not existed there since 1931, perhaps not since 1914. Stalin did not, as was at first expected, turn his back on Europe. But, even if his Polish adventure should whet his appetite for further conquests along the Baltic, in the Balkans, or in the Near East, the very fact of his treaty with Germany, added to the fact of Germany's preoccupation with Britain and France, increases his freedom of action in the Far East as it decreases Japan's. The Outer Mongolian truce immediately inspired rumors that a much more comprehensive Soviet-Japanese understanding would follow. Suppose it does? Japan will now have to reckon with a vastly more potent Russia than the former butt of the anti-Comintern pact. She will have to concentrate on maintaining a strong front against her old antagonist. That is the only way to keep such an international friendship. And, as Mussolini could testify, it requires considerable concentration.

Will Stalin assume the role of honest broker between China and Japan? Will he treat China as he did Poland? Has he fixed his eyes on the ice-free harbors lost by the Czar to Admiral Togo and General Nogi? For the first time since the rise of Hitler Russia is free enough, and for the first time since the World War strong enough, to move in any of these directions with impressive chances of success. Whatever bargain may be struck by Russia and Japan will be more Russian than heretofore—perhaps more Russian than Japanese. Meanwhile, what plans is Britain making? Will Britain, Japan's ally from 1902 to 1922, and since then ever watchful of her entree in Tokyo, find a basis for reviving, in some form, her old association with Japan? Or will Japan pursue an opportunist neutrality, poised between Russia and Britain and awaiting only the chance—or provocation—to overrun the latter's far eastern possessions? Until these murky elements settle themselves into more definite patterns, an anti-Japanese move in the Far East might acquire an anti-British significance in Europe. An effective American economic sanction, directed exclusively against Japan, might prove a shot in the dark that struck a friend instead of a foe.

The possibilities are raised not to prove the unwisdom of abrogating the 1911 treaty but rather to suggest that present circumstances, unforeseen at the moment of abrogation, may call for a broader, more constructive American policy than the mere imposition of an embargo—something in addition to, if not instead of, an embargo. In the first place, if the neutrality laws are revised so as to permit the sale of war materials to Britain and France, there will be little or none available for sale to Japan. Even with the laws unchanged, domestic needs will probably be increased by the exigencies of national defense. Secondly, the war must inevitably enhance the importance to Japan of her commerce with the United States. Normally not less than 64 percent of her exports and 53 percent of her imports are bought and sold in the United States and the British Empire. With the entire resources not only of the British Empire but also of France and Germany concentrated on the war in Europe, Japan's dependence on American raw materials and heavy industries should increase proportionately. As the belligerents progressively restrict their imports to war necessities, in which Japan is herself deficient, her dependence on the American export market should increase even more drastically. Add to these economic factors the return of Russia as a far eastern power and you may perceive the enormously improved bargaining position enjoyed by the United States vis-à-vis Japan as compared with last July.

How shall we make use of it? On the practical answer to that question hinge many historic issues. It is always easier to define the objectives than it is the conduct of a policy. The latter falls necessarily within the sphere of professional diplomacy, into which public knowledge rarely penetrates. So much depends on the timing of diplomacy, on the opportune relation of apparently unrelated factors, that the most thoroughgoing democracy must delegate vast administrative responsibility to its diplomats. Not even in peacetime, much less in wartime,

can the American public know the exact current details of international relations, no matter how far inside Europe or inside Asia its enterprising reporters manage to crawl. What the public can know, and use at least for its own instruction, is the always important, often decisive, historical background that produced the events concealed in the diplomatic pouches.

It seems inevitable that the two predominant powers of the Pacific, whose trade with each other is voluminous, should redefine their commercial-treaty relations. Could they not, at the same time at least, break ground for a settlement of some of their outstanding political differences? For 40 years Japan and the United States have been drawn together by powerful economic forces, despite almost constant friction in the realm of politics. Though at odds over the integrity of China, naval ratios, salmon fisheries, and immigration laws, Japan is our third best customer and we are Japan's best customer. Contrary to the sanguine prophecies of a century, China's share of our foreign trade—a polar magnet of our far eastern policy—has, since 1900, averaged less than one-half (often one-third) of Japan's share. Three decades of diplomatic bickering with Japan have not reversed this stubborn trend. May it not now serve as a bridge over certain hitherto insurmountable political obstacles? Would it not, in short, further the immediate, material interests of the United States and lead to a political dispensation in which others besides the United States might profit, to negotiate with Japan a new, unconditional most-favored-nation agreement identical with the trade agreements of the Hull program?

The project has long been under discussion. Two primary objections have been raised against it. Protectionists warned of a deluge of cheap Japanese-manufactured goods, and the public identified Japan as a partner of Germany and a member of the aggressor bloc with which no such agreement was desirable—the first objection has been encountered in the negotiation of every one of the existing score of trade agreements. For a detailed consideration of it we must look to the State Department experts, who have doubtless made the most thorough analysis of the commodities and regions likely to be involved. The validity of the whole underlying assumption of the trade-agreements program is likewise a matter for special discussion. It is here taken for granted that, although the program has not proved a wonder-working providence in the furtherance of American prosperity or world peace, it is a practicable and eminently desirable means of promoting American commerce. In particular, it affords one possible approach to the immediate problem at hand.

Japanese competition in domestic and world markets has become a favorite American nightmare. Let us snap the light on and see if it goes away. Since 1937 Japan's chief threat to the American market, cotton textiles, has been dispelled by voluntary quota agreements between Japanese and American producers. Since 1930 the trade balance between the two countries has been in favor of the United States. In 1936 the United States accounted for 11 percent of the world's total imports, 11.9 percent of its exports. Japan's corresponding percentages were 3.6 and 3.8 percent. In Latin America, where she is thought to have been making inroads on our business, Japan's sales in 1938 amounted to a mere 2.6 percent of that region's total imports. The United States' share (twice as large as our nearest competitor's) was 36.1 percent. Japan must sell somewhere to raise the exchange from which to buy from the United States, especially in view of Japan's unfavorable trade balance. Her cheap labor and low standard of living can scarcely compensate for her lack of capital and natural resources. They should hold no terrors for the United States, infinitely richer not only in capital and natural resources, but in technical proficiency and per capita productivity—the true qualities of success in foreign trade. In any case, a trade agreement admits of quota limitations, and the chief supplier formula has been used in most of the pacts to insure American producers against an inundation of competitive goods.

What about Japan's efforts to build up an imperial autarchy? What about Manchukuo and the Yen bloc? Great Britain, possessed of the oldest, largest, and richest empire in the world, has not freed herself from dependence on American markets, industries, and raw materials. The United Kingdom is our best customer today, with a British Dominion, Canada, ranking second. Japan's changing needs may periodically alter the type and quality of her imports from the United States. But can she ever dispense with them entirely? A trade agreement might help to induce her not to try.

Is not the very elasticity of such an agreement a point in its favor? It could be extended to cover not only Japan proper but also all Japanese-controlled areas on the Asiatic mainland, that is, all areas in which Japan maintains garrisons, regulates the currency, or collects the customs. Or it could be limited to the Japanese Empire as it existed, say, in 1931. We could match its expansion or contraction by including or excluding our own colonies and areas of special influence. For example, we maintain a preferential trade agreement with Cuba that is an exception to the unconditional most-favored-nation rule. Moreover, we protect our trade with our own colonies (the Philippines, Guam, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands) and the Panama Canal Zone by specific exemptions in the trade pacts. That is, we place all third parties on an equal footing before the tariff applying to the colonies, with which we ourselves maintain free trade. The open door to colonial trade on equal terms with the mother country is practically nonexistent in the present world. The not-quite-so-open door to colonial trade on terms of equality with all other third parties via the unconditional most-favored-nation clause is the only kind worth talking about today.

Actually, this is the only open door that has ever existed in China. John Hay's famous notes of 1899 failed to elicit any more generous treatment from the various powers holding territorial concessions in China. Even in their spheres of influence, areas over which they had no legal sovereignty, one and all employed a variety of means to discriminate against competitors in favor of their own nationals. A Japanese guaranty of unconditional most-favored bloc would, therefore, come very close to approximating the historical open door in China. If it would not place American exporters on an equal footing with Japanese, it would at least place them on an equal footing with all other foreign exporters. This in itself would be an advantage. Even should the scope of the pact be limited to the Japanese homeland, the latter could be regarded as a funnel for imports destined for Manchukuo, and commodity categories could be drawn up accordingly.

As for the political dividends the pact might be expected to yield, as well as the political objections heretofore confronting it, the new alinement of the powers may have increased the former as it appears to have decreased the latter. As compared with Japan's economic relations to the United States and the British Empire, Germany normally takes only 1.3 percent of Japan's exports and supplies but 4.2 percent of her imports. Japan's membership in the axis did little to increase her German trade. Do these relations not speak for themselves? An economic affinity that defied the most impressive ideological barrier in modern history served as a cornerstone of the Nazi-Soviet pact. Why should not the same factor lead Japan into better relations with Great Britain and the United States?

A trade agreement could not, obviously, end all the earthly woes to which the American Embassy is witness. The time seems scarcely ripe to discuss American recognition of Japan's "new order," on the one hand, or Japan's repudiation of it, on the other. There may never be peace in our time in China because our time is finite. Japan and China may only have entered the second quarter of a modern hundred years' war, in which it will take the Chinese as long to drive the Japanese across the Yellow Sea as it did the French to drive the British across the Channel. And even though the Hundred Years' War came to an end in 1453, the British and French did not really make peace until 1904, the year of the Entente Cordiale. Two things only appear to be certain: Japan's attack on the Chinese people has blasted the pan-Asia myth in all its aspects—the yellow peril massing its legions against the west—as high as Napoleon or Hitler blasted pan-Europeanism. That Japan will gain by her imperialism in China the military resources with which to assault the United States in the Western Hemisphere is one with the ideas the Kaiser tried unsuccessfully to sell to even so ready a customer as Theodore Roosevelt.

These problematical vistas of the future do not, however, exclude breathing spells during which China could, if she would, gain strength. The United States has no political ambitions nor any primary national interests that need draw her into China's wars. A powerful China is not likely to be much more hospitable to the foreigners of the treaty ports than is a victorious Japan. On the other hand, the American people will always sympathize with the victims of oppression, and as long as there is fighting in east Asia, there will always be dynamite for American diplomats to handle. To sever ourselves from all trade and commerce with the Far East until the last battle is fought is another chimerical notion. Why should we not continue to do business there, holding fast to the objectives outlined as our national interests, pursuing a flexible policy that seizes the advantages of the moment and places all American national interests in their true proportions? If we cannot cure all China's ills with a trade pact, the latter might provide the atmosphere, possibly even the occasion, for armistice proposals to both China and Japan.

If this possibility proves to be Utopian, there are few less complicated problems that might be solved. An exchange of nonaggression pledges covering the islands of the Pacific should be not more difficult now than it was in 1908, the year of the Root-Takahira agreement, or in 1924, the year of the Four-Power Treaty. Would it be worth any more? If accompanied by a renewal of the nonfortification agreement (art. XIX of the Five Power Naval Treaty) even though restricted in geographical scope, but including provisions for systematic joint inspection of the territories covered, it certainly would be. This would require a concession from Japan. So would a definitive settlement of the Alaska salmon fisheries dispute, a source of acute infection of the diplomatic blood stream. Japanese floating canneries operating off the mouths of Alaskan rivers have given rise to Alaskan and west coast demands for legislation reminiscent of the immigration and alien land laws. Japan would have as hard a time bucking these currents today as she had in 1924. She might better yield to them. Another Japanese offering that would win both popular and official approval in the United States would be a firm disavowal of political ambitions in Latin America.

Such Japanese concessions as these, we suggest, are not Utopian. With what could the United States meet them? We are in no mood for appeasement. Fortunately, we are not confronted with that melancholy alternative. A trade pact of equal value to both parties would not be appeasement. Neither, in the historical context of our far eastern policy, would certain other concessions. A nonfortification agreement would save us money and perhaps, if the European islands of the Caribbean are any sample, prove the most secure defense of Guam and the Philippines. Recognition of racial

equality, no more than a formality to the United States, would still win confidence from the nation that has always looked in somewhat baffled friendship to the American people. Placing Japanese immigration under the quota system (the mere fulfillment of an old intention) would imrove the consistency of our most-favored-nation claims on Japan. The volume of immigration could thus be maintained at its present level and, at the same time, an ancient blight on Japanese-American friendship be removed. Were this done, Japanese students might reappear in American universities, from which they have tended to absent themselves since 1924. By the process of example and emulation they might then take home to Japan ideas and principles that we have not been able to impart to them by diplomatic notes and maneuvers. The United States may some day awake to the realization that example is often a better teacher than coercion—especially ineffective coercion.

We have said nothing of naval limitation, for at the moment this appears definitely Utopian. It might only stir futile controversy to remove it from that shadowy realm. A navy is a tool, not an objective. Larger and wealthier than Japan, faced by more widespread and more exacting needs, we cannot, in the nature of things, accept a treaty obligation of complete equality. Moreover, we should not forget that, whatever the future holds for Japan, she remains the world's third greatest naval power and the Pacific's second greatest, with no other power on earth capable of serious menace to her maritime security except ourselves. China and Russia might defeat Japan's armies. They cannot sink her navy. While we can, and must, maintain superiority, it should be clear to Japan that we desire no war in the Far East and are not maintaining our fleet for any such purpose. A restoration of more amicable commercial and diplomatic relations would help to convince Japan of this.

Here, then, is the outline of a Japanese-American settlement that seems real enough to deserve consideration. It is submitted in the belief that any effective policy must offer encouragement as well as admonishment to the nation from which concessions are sought. It costs the United States no sacrifice of national interest or national honor. It is consistent with American neutrality. Might it not bring stability to an increasingly important part of an otherwise unstable world? If the Germans had any such opportunity thrust into their hands, it is not hard to imagine how they would use it. We may have scruples against taking even an imaginary cue from the Wilhelmstrasse; we should be quixotic to ignore a tangible advantage it has let slip our way. We should at least be ready to examine it critically. With peace in Europe apparently a forbidden fruit, we should be grateful for any far eastern windfall.

The Cigarette Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege given to me to extend my remarks, I desire to make reference to a bill which I introduced today, at the request of the American Federation of Labor, amending section 811 (a) (2), title 26, of the Federal Code.

The above section is amended by adding the words "eighteen and nineteen."

In view of the recent increase in the Federal internal-revenue tax on cigarettes from $3 to $3.25 a thousand, it is no longer possible for cigarette manufacturers to manufacture and sell cigarettes at a price which would enable the public to purchase a package of 20 cigarettes for 10 cents. It thus appears that the so-called 10-cent cigarettes can no longer exist, but must sell for 11 cents. It is the firm conviction of the Department of Agriculture, and it is believed of the farmers and of the consumers, that the sale of a package of cigarettes at 10 cents has been of great advantage to farmers and consumers in moving and bringing about the consumption of large amounts of tobacco that would not otherwise have been consumed and in bringing to the consumer a good cigarette within his purchasing power.

The internal-revenue collections have been increased by the increased consumption brought about by there being on the market 10-cent cigarettes, as many cigarettes which would not otherwise have been sold have been sold and revenues collected thereon. It is estimated that the 10-cent cigarettes constitute from 15 to 20 percent of all the cigarettes sold, and that if there be no 10-cent cigarettes, which would be the case with the present increase in tax, a great majority of all the persons now smoking 10-cent cigarettes will probably smoke roll-your-own tobacco or pipes taxed at 18 cents a pound as against a tax on cigarettes of approximately $1.25 a pound.

It would appear from the Treasury Department's estimate that the increased revenue collections from the increased tax of 25 cents would only be approximately $34,000,000, whereas, if the normal rate of increase in consumption of cigarettes for the last 5 years were had in the year 1940–41, the increased collections of revenue should be $46,256,000. It thus appears that the Department of Revenue estimates a decrease of about $12,500,000 over what the cigarettes would be if there had not been any increase in internal-revenue tax. It is fairly estimated that all of this decrease in business will come out of the 10-cent cigarettes. It is proposed that a good 10-cent cigarette to retail for 10 cents a package could be sold if there were a provision in the statute for statutory packages containing 18 and 19 cigarettes, respectively.

To effect this, it is suggested that section 811 (a) (2), title 26, be amended to provide for statutory packages of 18 and 19 cigarettes. This amendment could be effected by inserting after the word "sixteen" and before the word "twenty" in section 811 (a) (2) the words "eighteen, nineteen." Such an amendment to the law would enable manufacturers to sell and give the greatest value possible in a package of cigarettes for the 10-cent price. It is difficult to see how there could be any argument against any such amendment.

The information is that the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, has stated there would be no objection to any such amendment. With such an amendment a manufacturer would thus be able to sell the greatest possible value in cigarettes for 10 cents. It is believed that the farmer would be aided by increased consumption in tobacco, the consumer would get the greatest possible value, and the Federal revenue would be increased.

Money Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, neither the President nor his political supporters, combined with the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees and with the Army and the Navy officials, can make cannons, airplanes, trucks, warships in sufficient quantity and of a quality that will insure our national safety. This country needs peace between industry and labor, and first of all a definite, constructive program which at this time the President does not have. The country needs, and it will undoubtedly cheerfully get, the best efforts of those the President has been pleased to call economic royalists; but before industry can swing into the full peak of production, the President and the Congress must see to it that organizations controlled by Communists, by public enemies, shall not stand in the way of a preparedness program.

Along that line let me here read an editorial in the New York World-Herald of May 15, 1940:

THE FIRST LESSON

President Roosevelt, most Congressmen, and most American citizens have come to the conclusion that the time has come to strengthen our national defenses. That is wise.

But thus far only two important proposals have been made.

The first, coming from the President, is a request for an extraordinary defense fund of, perhaps, a half-billion dollars. The other, coming from various congressional leaders, is that the authorized national debt "ceiling" be increased, in order to allow more deficits for defense purposes.

In other words: Borrow more money, hand it to our generals to buy a few defense knickknacks, and then settle back in our chairs for another snooze. That, for the moment, seems to be the Government's program for chinking up the holes in our security.

It is a program which ignores one of the principal lessons of the European war.

For years France, England, and the Scandinavian countries, like the United States, have been concentrating on "the more abundant life, with mandolin accompaniments." They have been struggling to achieve a 40-hour week, 3 weeks vacation with pay, unemployment insurance, pensions, and housing projects.

That is all very pleasant. But it happened that the natural enemy of those countries was engaged in other pursuits. Germany wasn't on a 40-hour week. It wasn't even on a 50-hour week. People worked until the Fuehrer said they could quit—or until they dropped.

As a result Germany is today, without doubt, the most productive nation on earth. If it is beaten in war it will be only after other nations have matched its productivity.

For in these days of mechanized warfare it should be plain to anyone that no country can be stronger than its productive industries.

Nazi labor is slave labor.

We who live in a democratic country believe that free labor is better—that in the long run it will produce more than forced labor. That may be true. At any rate the war may test the theory.

But it has already been proved that a nation which works—under whatever compulsion—is stronger than a nation which dreams about living without work.

In this country we have taken it for granted that our way of life would not be challenged, that we would never again have to exercise our national strength in a physical encounter. We have turned soft. Our Government has spent tremendous sums for various good purposes, but still our industry staggers. There is still unemployment, still overproduction in some lines, underconsumption in many. Even if our coasts were lined with forts we could not say that our Nation is strong, for we are not using our strength.

We don't know when, if ever, the World War will come to this hemisphere. But we do know that a cruel and dangerous enemy is marching against civilization, and that America's test may come within our times.

If we are to meet that test successfully we will need not only a first-rank Army and Navy, but a hard-hitting industry capable of matching any in the world. That can't be obtained by passing a bill. It can come only from the friendly, effective cooperation of an intelligent government with a patriotic people.

The time has come to examine, not only our national practices, but also the frame of mind into which we have drifted in recent peaceful years.

Many editorials from other national publications have expressed the same thought and the President will do well to listen to their advice.

The President's Defense Message and Newly Announced Antiwar Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANCIS HARTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the President's message asking for appropriations and authorizations totaling $4,848,171,957. Unlike previous messages accompanying similar requests, significantly he has spoken words indicating a desire to defend administration defense activities of the past 7 years. He says he foresaw the danger of a great war, but does not explain failure to make definite recommendations for plugging the glaring holes in our defense.

He gives Congress credit for granting his previous requests but admits his inability to foresee our great needs. His piecemeal upping of defense appropriations apparently is because "the changes in the world situation are so great and so profound" and to him and his State Department so unexpected. If unexpected to him, with all of the confidential information at his disposal, unexpected is a mild word to describe results of world events to the ordinary citizen and Congressman as well. We lack the information of the executive department. Yes; we were refused information concerning foreign affairs when the House majority, at the instance of the State Department, defeated the resolution of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. Had her resolution passed, our Foreign Affairs Committee at least might have such little from day-to-day information on foreign affairs as would not interfere with the Department's handling of foreign relations. Consequently, we are in the dark and are quite thoroughly in the dark on what has really been accomplished to date in plugging our defense holes.

We have every reason to expect that thorough and complete information will be obtained by our House committees in charge of legislation intended to translate the President's request of yesterday into recommendation form for our consideration. The American people who are to be defended, do the defending, and who will have to pay the $10,000,000,000 new burden are entitled to have facts showing just what is being done and what is to be done. We are glad to have the President "take this occasion to report the excellent progress being made for the procurement of the equipment already ordered," but we should know how much and what has been delivered, how much is on order, and when delivery of various on orders will be made.

After war-framed words and actions of the past, we were happy to note for the first time in Presidential utterances some assurance, in his definite statement, that "we will not send our men to take part in European wars." The favorable public reaction to the positive position in the Republican platform, "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war," indicates almost universal American opposition to sending our soldiers "over there." I sincerely hope that the Democratic platform, when it is adopted, will also take the cue from the foreign-war stand in the Republican platform.

So, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, when we get legislative translation into dollars of the President's July 10 request let us hope that a concise picture of progress—not in mere words but facts—can and will accompany committee reports.

The Progress of Barberry Eradication in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a cut was made this year in the appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the work of the Bureau of Plant Entomology. The application of that cut means that the work in barberry eradication in South Dakota will be interrupted.

I shall not maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this of itself will be a national calamity; I recognize that when appropriations are cut they have to be applied somewhere. This happens to be our turn, perhaps, because very good progress has been made in the barberry work in my State. The only question is whether it should be stopped until the program has been completed. There will be some lost ground when it is resumed.

In order, however, that the stopping of the work at this time will not be regarded as an invitation to stop it permanently, and in order that the work thus far done may be properly evaluated, I wrote to Mr. A. M. Eberle, director of extension at South Dakota State College, and from him secured the facts on which this report is made. I respectfully call it to the attention of the Members of the House and to the Bureau of Agriculture.

The records indicate that for a small expenditure, the barberry crew reduced an average annual loss of more than $8,000,000 to an average annual loss of approximately one and a half millions, by eradicating the plants which were the home of the rust that destroyed and reduced yields of wheat. The story of the barberry eradication in South Dakota is interesting indeed.

Barberry eradication for the control of stem rust has made marked progress since its start in South Dakota in 1918. At the close of 1939 a total of 135,921 rust-spreading barberries had been located and destroyed on 1,484 different properties. Bushes were found in 59 of the counties in the State; however, the larger number was in the eastern and southeastern part of the State and in the Black Hills territory. Various allotments of emergency funds since 1933, together with the limited regular appropriation made it possible to recheck numerous areas in the State where barberries had escaped from cultivation and to clean up a number of areas of native timber.

It is estimated that between 75 and 80 percent of the work toward completion of this program in South Dakota has been accomplished, but additional work remains to be completed.

A considerable amount of rechecking must be done, particularly in those areas that have yielded escaped barberries in the past. These areas clearly show that seeds were scattered by birds from the original planted bushes. In order to accomplish a thorough job of eradication, it is necessary to recheck such areas at 5- to 6-year intervals until no more bushes are located. Barberry seeds have a thick seed coat and may lie dormant for at least 10 years. This accounts for the needed reinspection of properties.

As the eradication program nears completion, the use of labor crews obtained from relief rolls is impractical and uneconomical. The final clean-up work must be done by well-trained and competent individuals.

Occasionally situations arise where labor is needed, particularly in limited areas like those in and near Hot Springs in Fall River County, Hermosa in Custer County, Sturgis and Piedmont in Meade County, Spearfish in Lawrence County, Yangton in Yankton County, and Vermillion in Clay County. When such is the case, if trained men are on the job, the needed manpower can be secured in the community and the area of bushes eradicated.

Other counties where barberries have escaped from cultivation and some rechecking of areas will be necessary are: Brookings, Deuel, Grant, Kingsbury, Lake, Lincoln, Minnehaha, Moody, Turner, and Union. All of the 1,484 properties upon which bushes have been found should be given at least one more recheck.

Two trained agents have been working in Fall River County, using 17 laborers to intensively survey the territory. During the past few weeks these men have located and destroyed a total of 41 barberries, thereby eliminating these sources of stem-rust inoculum. Because of lack of funds, this work stopped on June 30, 1940, before the area had been completed. Additional work will be needed in this area about 1945.

It would be unwise and false economy to stop the program now when the end of the job is in sight. One individual in charge of the work, aided by at least three trained men, should be able to bring the program to the stage of limited maintenance within 6 years. This would call for funds amounting to between $8,500 and $10,000 per year. This would also take care of any local labor that would be required in some areas.

There has been a decided reduction in the amount of damage because of the various control practices, namely, eradication of rust-spreading barberries, development of rust-resistant varieties of grain, early sowing of spring grains, and properly prepared and well-drained seed beds. From 1915 to 1926, inclusive, the average annual loss to wheat alone in South Dakota because of stem rust amounted to approximately $8,404,500. From 1924 to 1938, inclusive, the average annual loss to wheat in the State was approximately $1,520,700. Stem rust also causes damage to oats, barley, and rye.

The eradication of barberry bushes in South Dakota has practically eliminated stem rust on rye, and the damage to oats has not been more than a trace since 1929.

The total average annual valuation of wheat, oats, barley, and rye produced in the State during the period 1930–38, inclusive, based on December prices each year, was in excess of $33,000,000. One should remember that this includes several bad crop years and low prices, but the fact still remains that crops of such value must be protected from the ravages of insects and plant diseases.

Although the work is interrupted at this time, I feel sure that with the splendid record of results obtained, the work will be resumed in good time and carried to completion. The barberry can be eradicated. Rust can be reduced. The job is nearly done, and it should be completed.

Our Diocese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ADDRESS OF REV. JOHN J. CAREY, OF HEARTWELL, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a speech made by a distinguished constituent of mine, the Very Reverend John J. Carey, of Heartwell, Nebr., which contains considerable historical data.

OUR DIOCESE

(A toast given by Very Rev. John J. Carey, Heartwell, Nebr., on the occasion of the sacerdotal silver jubilee of the Most Rev. Louis B. Kucera, bishop of Lincoln, Nebr., June 10, 1940)

There is a joy in our hearts as our bishop celebrates today a landmark in his career. His ordination was like a view for the first time from a mountain peak; his consecration and installation as bishop of Lincoln was like a lifting-up that gave experienced eyes a greater range for greater service; and now this sacerdotal jubilee crowns the ambition of his youth with a quarter of a century of service. These years saw many cares, many worries, many victories; but with him it was always onward and onward. Today, however, he takes a little time off to say a word or two amid the greetings of friends.

The toast assigned me is Our Diocese. Three years ago this diocese celebrated its golden jubilee. The record then showed Bishop Kucera the fifth to rule over the see of Lincoln. In looking back through these five administrations, we observe a differentiating note in each of them, due to either the conditions of the time or the quality of soul of him at the helm. Touching only the high points, we begin with the first.

The more the passing of the years puts us older priests away from the time of Bishop Bonacum the greater he looms up before us. Perhaps this may be a variation of the fact that the nearer one gets to his second childhood the more glorious are the days of the long past. Be this as it may, we, however, choose to think that men and things appear in their true light only when tested in the tube of the years. Bishop Bonacum was truly a pioneer bishop. In saying that, we hardly need add anything more. He was a builder. He knew his duty and loved it. He thought not of himself, only of the work to be done. He put a mission wherever possible, he located a resident priest as soon as he was able, he established a school where it was at all feasible, and he insisted on the priests grasping every opportunity to improve their parishes. He was fully aware of the peculiar needs of each parish and personally knew the committeemen of every church. Let us remember, too, this was in the "horse and buggy" days. With his unusual sense of values, he wisely guided each pastor while building, and that is why such operations were always successful. In building St. Thomas' Orphanage, he visited a number of farmers in south Nebraska and asked each one who owned 320 acres for a donation of $100. That is how he built and paid for the orphanage. Taking all in all, Bishop Bonacum's 22 years in Lincoln was just 1 long working day.

The second bishop was the Most Reverend J. Henry Tihen. He was a lecturer on the Chautauqua platform when that institution was at its best. At the time Lincoln was a prominent town on the circuit, and immediately after the announcement of the new appointee a flood of recommendations inundated the city. As a result, no new bishop anywhere came to a more friendly people than Bishop Tihen did when he first arrived in Lincoln. During his 6 years' stay in the diocese, he was always the lecturer. At the time of his coming, 11 churches and 2 schools were nearing completion; and the dedicating of these brought him out almost immediately amongst his people. Everyone everywhere just wanted to see the new bishop. Between these dedications and soon thereafter he visited many other parishes with his lecture, "Social Conditions." These various trips, together with his Knights of Columbus activities, made him a popular figure all over the diocese. Not counting replacements on account of fire losses, Bishop Tihen built 5 churches, 4 schools, and 8 rectories. This showed he kept up the good work so well begun by his predecessor.

With the transfer of Bishop Tihen to Denver, Bishop O'Reilly came here from Baker City, Oreg. He had been a bishop for 15 years at the time of the change, and his health was not what it used to be. Five years in Nebraska brought an end to his labors. During this short time, however, he took hold of the helm with a determination worthy of a man in his prime. His main idea was to put schools in places that had none. In this he was quite successful. He also handled the finances of the diocese very ably. But what we remember him most for was his tender devotion to both priests and people—in a word, a kind-hearted pastor's pastor.

The next bishop to come was none other than the present archbishop of Dubuque. His chosen work was that of the missions. As head of the seminary at Cincinnati he organized the Mission Crusaders. This cause was always dear to his heart, and its needs took him away from the diocese quite frequently. He never, however, neglected his work here.

Thus far, next to Bishop Bonacum, the present incumbent has been the longest in Lincoln. Just as he assumed charge of the diocese a general change in the affairs of men was in the making. A new epoch in economic world history was gradually opening up. Whether we knew it or not or whether we like it or not, a changed condition was upon us. Communism thought they had the green light but the church noticed it was all red. The result was danger, especially to our youth. So to prevent there being empty pews in churches and vacant desks in our schools of tomorrow, the church said, "Save the youth." Thus the youth movement became Bishop Kucera's grand objective. Even in spite of the greatest depression of the years and the greatest drought in our history, the Bishop threw his whole soul into this work. The enthusiastic response from the parishes shows that success is almost within his grasp For this we desire to felicitate His Excellency.

A bishop rules a diocese, but he always operates through his priests. He commands; they execute orders. Consequently, it is within the scope of the present remarks to say a word about the priests of the diocese. Pardon a personal allusion. At the time of my ordination the diocese was 15 years old. My impression of those early priests who built up or were laying the foundations for future building up of the diocese was one of childlike admiration. They were hard-headed, two-fisted men. Without attempting a eulogy let us merely say that not one of them would ever tolerate it to be said that he failed in any way in the care and management of his parish. They were all pastors but whether young or old they were just one body, standard bearers of the greatest banner that ever appeared on the horizon, adjutants of Christ the King.

With the youth movement so important a part of the priest's work today, more is now necessarily demanded of the younger priests. We older priests wish them every success. Our fervent hope is that when they become the older priests their work with the youth shall have been so successful that, with eyes upon the cross, they will be able to sing with pride that soul-stirring song, God Bless America, My Home Sweet Home.

Production in Spite of Communists

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday June 5, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just how does the President expect to get production of aircraft or other munitions of war with the Communist adherents of the C. I. O. in strategic positions in essential industries?

Note the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 21:

THE "FIFTH COLUMN" HERE

While the third terms talk of national defense in Washington they are harboring aliens, radical enemies of the existing order, and communist saboteurs not only on the Government pay roll but in industries and services upon which the country is dependent. Nearly every country in Europe took alarm when the "fifth column" arose in the Netherlands to meet the Nazi invaders. No internal enemy has been removed from a place of vantage here.

Harry Bridges, Communist in everything but name, remains in control of west coast shipping and as a consultant of the Labor Board. That is to the satisfaction of Mme. Perkins who kept him there but it would scare anyone responsible for military services on the Pacific side. John Lewis allowed Communist activists to go into the major industries along with his C. I. O. organizers and they are still there where they can wreck tools and tie up production at a word from Moscow headquarters. It would be obeyed instantly.

There is another section of the "fifth column" in this country which is trying to wreck the peace. It consists of those American citizens whose hearts are in foreign countries and who use their American citizenship to help the land of their choice at the sacrifice of the land in which they live. Many of these internal enemies in the various sections are political allies of the third termers. They trade support for protection, an alliance which the American people cannot afford to ignore. They must rally in self-defense.

Many similar articles have appeared in other papers. Everyone except the New Dealers seem to be aware of the weakness of our present industrial system, due to the failure of the President to protect industry from subversive influences.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON OF MISSISSIPPI, JULY 4, 1940, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, POST NO. 2, INDIANOLA, MISS.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on Thursday, July 4, 1940, under the auspices of the American Legion, Post No. 2, Indianola, Miss., to wit:

PREPAREDNESS

This is Independence Day and Congress is in recess. I am, therefore, privileged to accept the invitation of the American Legion Post No. 2, Indianola, to speak to you on this occasion.

On this, the anniversary of our independence, our thoughts turn to our country. We are thinking of freedom and democracy. We know that democracy is not merely something to be inherited. We know that every generation must earn the privilege of enjoying democracy. We know that every generation must practice democracy. We renew our loyalty to our country. We pledge anew fealty to our flag.

On this day we recall the high purposes of the American Legion. For more than 20 years, as a voice crying in the wilderness, it has stood for adequate national defense. It has advocated universal service. It has insisted upon equal service for all and special privileges for none. It has fought subversive influences, and it has opposed foreign ideologies. It has stood for country and for God. As your Representative, and as your spokesman in the Halls of Congress, I have been heartened and strengthened by the spirit of the messages and resolutions that have come to me from every post in the district that I have the honor to represent.

DEMOCRACY

The twentieth century began with democracy challenging dictators. Man has made unparalleled progress in science and in industry. It is a paradox of the ages that with all of man's boasted progress, nations cannot live in peace with other nations. It is a lamentable fact that while the century is not half gone, today dictators are challenging democracy. This is a dark hour in civilization. Democracy and totalitarianism are in death grips in the second world war.

Democracy is not a mere form; it is not wishful thinking; it is a way of life; and the democratic way of life is in danger in our own and all other countries.

Small and peaceful nations have been ravaged by dictators. Millions in Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France have been driven from their homes and their country by the ruthless hordes of the unspeakable Hitler. Beautiful Paris has been deserted, and the rivers of France have run red with the blood of patriots; and, as the most unkind and despicable cut of all, Italy, under Mussolini, has blackened the character of her civilization for centuries by attacking France, her former ally and protector, while she was down and almost out. Treaties have been broken and compacts, solemnly agreed to, have been ignored. Brave and heroic France has surrendered to the invaders, and today democracy in Europe is paying tribute to totalitarianism. England has her back to the wall while the hordes of the monstrous Hitler and the ghoulish Mussolini are howling and attacking at her gates and shores.

Ruthless war has been waged for more than 3 years by militaristic Japan against peace-loving China. Totalitarianism is on the march the world over, and democracy is threatened today as it has not been threatened for 164 years and since the Liberty Bell pealed forth independence for the Thirteen Colonies on July 4, 1776.

THINKING

It is time for sane thinking. The people of Mississippi and of the United States are more serious on this day than they have been

since 1917. This is no occasion for mere words, for high-sounding phrases, for vain glory, or for patriotic boasting. This is no occasion for grandstand patriotism. It is time for reflection; it is time for zeal; it is time for morale; it is time for reverence for the ideals of democracy that were meat and drink for our forefathers; it is time for a rededication to the ideals of government that constitute the very warp and woof of our institutions; it is time for action; it is time for determination; it is time for high ideals and for sacrificial living.

We have been bred to ease and comfort. We have boasted of our rights. We have thought that we were secure. We have acted as if liberties grew on trees. We have forgotten that our fathers paid a high price in both blood and sacrifice for the freedom that we enjoy.

Free speech has been perverted. Freedom of speech has never included the right to advocate the overthrow of the Republic by force. The collapse of heroic France shows that no nation, no matter what its potential might may be, can ride two horses going in the opposite directions at the same time. No nation can practice self-indulgence and expect self-preservation. No nation can preach soft economics and practice preparedness. No nation can surrender to groups or blocs and be strong. No nation can serve two masters. There can be no exceptions. If there be false security, or if there be false economics, there will be national decay and loss of freedom.

In assuming the Premiership of France in her darkest hour, Marshal Petain, the hero of Verdun, said: "Since our victory 22 years ago the spirit of enjoyment took precedence over the spirit of sacrifice. We thought more of our personal claims than of personal sacrifice. Our desire was to avoid effort. Today we face misfortune."

Freeman, in his biography of Robert E. Lee, chose this incident for the last paragraph of his four volumes: "A woman, whose husband had been a soldier in the army of northern Virginia, brought in a baby, a boy child, for Lee's blessing. He took the child in his arms and spoke these sacred words as he handed him back to her, 'Teach him to deny himself.'"

We have come to the cross roads. The United States must travel the straight road ahead. There must be no turning to the right nor to the left. The Government of Washington and of Jefferson must and shall be preserved.

YOUTH

The youth of America do not lack courage, either moral or physical. They are different from the youth of 25 years ago. They have often lived the easy life; they have been misguided; they have often listened to the cynics and they have often destroyed the moral values. The elders are frequently to blame. The youth of today has been taught by post World War writers that that war was fought for the munition makers and the international bankers. The truth has not been emphasized. The youth is not altogether to blame. There has been much in our books and literature in contempt of the high purpose that animated the United States in going to war in 1917. Defenseless men, women, and children were murdered and American ships were sunk without warning. It is time for youth and age to know the truth.

The youth of today must realize, as did the patriots of 1776, that a free government is worth fighting for, and citizens of the Republic must show to the youth that the Government for which the youth is asked to die is worth living for.

No liberty that is unwilling to fight can survive. Freedom must be strong to defend itself. There must be conviction; there must be faith. There are some things for which democracy will fight. The strength of Germany today is the youth of Germany. They have been bred with a passion for the state. They have been taught that the state is supreme; they have a zeal for the Fatherland. The youth of America will do no less for their country than the youth of Germany is doing for the government of Hitler.

The American youth will be unworthy of its high heritage and of its noble traditions if in this hour it does not rededicate itself to the high ideals and to the noble convictions of liberty and of freedom. A country that is not worth dying for is not worth living for and living in. Unless the youth of today finds itself, unless the youth of today reconsecrates and rededicates itself to the high ideals of the founders and defenders of the Republic, we might as well leave our planes unbuilt and our battleships on paper.

I have journeyed from Washington to Mississippi to tell the people whom I have been permitted to serve and, I trust, to lead, that their country needs the service of all her sons and daughters. I call young men and old men to high and noble living, to service, and to sacrifice, and to live the life that retains its savor.

Leopold of Belgium is a pitiable figure. He is an example of the decay in moral values. He overlooked the essentials of character; he was confused and uncertain when the decisive hour came. Germany invaded Belgium and he pled with France and England for help. Three hundred thousand English and French men responded. They were fighting by his side. Without warning he laid down his arms and left his allies and protectors to their fate. It is not for me to judge him; he will be judged by history. There is a lesson for us in his surrender. His real tragedy was 4 years ago. There was moral decay in the King of the Belgians. In times of peace, when there was tranquillity, he canceled and refused to renew the treaty that his heroic father had written in blood with France and England. Leopold could see no difference between right and wrong in government; he could not distinguish between democracy and despotism; he could not tell the difference between the patriot and the dictator. The decay of morals, the lack or character resulting from ease, and the indulgence in peace and tranquillity were fatal to him. in the day of his decision.

It takes a crisis to bring out the best in our civilization. I believe in the youth of today. They are trained. I envy the youth of today. Great men are always developed in crises. It takes a crisis to develop leadership; it takes a crisis to bring forth the best that is in our manhood. We are large or small in an emergency. Our fathers sacrificed for liberty; our fathers bled for freedom.

The youth of today is the hope of tomorrow, our institutions are in their hands. They will not fail. They will be worthy of the rich heritage that they enjoy and will transmit to posterity the United States a better and more glorious country than they found it. May it always be said of the youth of today: This was their finest hour.

NEUTRALITY

A year ago we heard much of neutrality. I advocated then and I advocate now the neutrality that is based upon international law, the neutrality that has obtained through the centuries. I have never advocated a neutrality that was indifferent to right or wrong, a neutrality that made no distinction between godless and rapacious governments and democracies, a neutrality that made no distinction between oppressors and those who love justice and mercy. I have never favored a neutrality that could not hear and heed the piteous cry of thousands of innocent people in peaceful nations, that were attacked without cause and without warning. There can never be neutrality in fact in the face of oppression. We must not engage in foreign wars, we must not participate in the wars between other nations, but we can and should as patriots always stand for the right and oppose the wrong, on moral issues. Notwithstanding the neutrality laws of our country, we can never be neutral between justice and injustice except at the loss of our immortal souls.

It is said that the war in Europe is none of ours. Since when can patriots stand by and see the soul ripped from a quivering land without a protest? Since when can patriots acquiesce as a monstrous tyrant, with lust to kill, murders, and destroys? Since when did it become no concern of ours that freedom die and truth and justice perish from the earth? Freedom is in the blood stream of the world organism. We are a part of that organism. A disease that attacks the blood stream cannot be localized. If freedom die in other lands, freedom will decay in our own.

ISOLATION

There is a word in the vocabulary of many. We hear it often; it is "isolation." We are Americans first and we are Americans always, but we are also today, as we have ever been, conscious that we are our brother's keeper. We are interested in peace in the United States. We are opposed to war in this and other countries. At the same time, we are citizens of the world; we are our brother's keeper.

I oppose foreign alliances, but I also oppose a national isolation that does not abhor the sufferings and cannot hear the pleadings of the innocent dead and dying of other lands.

America cannot escape the impact of the European war. We cannot remain unscathed or unaffected by the misery of Europe. We will suffer not only in a material way but our conscience will suffer for any part we have played in the underlying political and economic causes of war. We cannot sleep well as long as the flame of war burns in Europe. We must play well our part as a Nation. I believe that all of us will do well to turn to the classics and recall the noble lines of Juvenal's Eighth Satire which, in English paraphrase, is:

> "Count it a baseness if your soul prefer
> Safety to that which honor asks of her;
> And hold it manly life itself to give
> Rather than lose the things for which we live."

In our own land and in our own country, Theodore Roosevelt put it another way when he said:

"Only by putting honor and glory ahead of safety shall we stand erect before the world, high of heart and master of our souls."

Today we have forgotten all other "isms." In our vocabulary there is but one—we stand for Americanism as the first line of defense and the American way of life.

We are interested not only in keeping America out of war, but in keeping war out of the world.

UNPREPAREDNESS

There is one lesson above all others that we have learned from the second world war: America is neither prepared to defend itself nor to wage war. We might as well be frank; it is best to face the facts. It can serve no good purpose to find fault for the state of unpreparedness. Nothing can result from criticizing political parties or administrations for unpreparedness. We are all responsible.

I have always stood for adequate national defense. I have voted for all appropriations through the years for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

There is no occasion for hysteria. We are not actually at war. We should be calm, but at the same time we should be resolute. We must arm, not for offense but for defense. Our national defense, however, is not as bad as some have pictured it. On the other hand, it is not as good as it should be. It must be strengthened. Now is the time. We are better prepared than we were a year ago. We are much stronger than we were 10 years ago. We have a stronger Army, we have a better Air Corps and I think we have the very best Navy in all of the world. There is not much comfort,

however, from these facts, for if we are lulled into a state of ignorance or of false security, national suicide will result.

PREPAREDNESS

Preparedness is as old as the Government itself. In his fifth annual message to Congress at Philadelphia on December 3, 1793, George Washington said:

"If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, it must be known that at all times we are ready for war."

I am not an alarmist; I am not a belligerent, but I believe that preparedness is necessary to preserve and to promote peace.

Let us review the past 20 years. When the World War ended we had the most powerful Army in the history of the world. Our Army numbered 5,000,000 men, fully trained, and almost one-half of them were battle-seasoned troops. Our Navy was the most powerful on the high seas. Our industry was geared to wartime production. The armistice brought victory; and with victory the thoughts of the victor turned to peace. There was no enemy capable of marching against us. The Army was demobilized, and we gave away enormous quantities of important supplies and munitions. Industry undertook to adjust itself to peacetime production. Then came the Washington Arms Conference. It was noble in conception, but it was deadly in its results. We sank American battleships; we destroyed those under construction. Our Navy dropped from first to second place.

Our Army slipped from first place down to eighteenth place among the nations, smaller even than that of little Greece. There was clamor on all sides for subsidies, for gratuities, for relief, for unemployment. The lobbies of Congress were infested by men and women who urged that all Army and Navy appropriations be further reduced. The battle cry in 1917 was a noble one. After the armistice we turned aside from high resolution and noble endeavor and we wandered far into the wilderness of selfishness. We substituted the dollar for sacrifice; we were bent on ease and security. He who dances must pay the piper. The day of reckoning is come.

Life is a contest and a conquest. If there is to be liberty, there must always be preparedness. We now know that the time is come to pay the piper. Congress has appropriated $5,000,000,000 in recent weeks to enlarge and strengthen our Army, to equip from five hundred thousand to a million men with mechanized and modernized tanks, machine guns, antiaircraft guns; to modernize our Navy and to make our air forces better than the best.

All must do their part. There must be military training. We are coming to compulsory military training. The volunteer system has failed. Volunteers mean that the finest of our youth respond, as a general rule, to the call of country. But if there is to be the compulsory military training of our youth; if there is to be the conscription on land and sea and air, there must be the conscription of wealth and labor. We are determined that no war millionaires shall result from the sacrifices of war or of preparedness. If men are conscripted to die for their country, they should be conscripted to work for their country.

INDUSTRY

The industrial organizations and resources of the United States are unsurpassed. We recall the World War accomplishments. In 1917, 55 planes were being produced per year. In 12 months the annual production was increased from 55 to 22,000 planes. There has been marvelous expansion in industrial plants in America since 1918. If in 1918 we could produce 22,000 planes in a year, in 1941 we can produce 100,000 planes a year. If America can build 2,973,775 automobiles and 754,197 trucks annually as in 1939 it can build, if necessary, 500,000 planes per year.

Germany is producing 4,000 planes a month. Within the next 3 months Germany will be producing 72,000 planes a year. Is there any patriotic American who will rise in his place and say that with our vast industrial plants, with our raw materials, and with our resources, we cannot surpass Germany in the production of planes, just as we surpass Germany and all other countries combined in the manufacture of automobiles?

No country in this or in any other age has ever equaled or can equal the United States in the production of machines. Our industrial plants far outstrip those of Germany or any other country. Red tape should be eliminated; labor restrictions should be removed. The genius of American organization and the possibilities of American industry should be utilized. The administration has called into service the leading industrialists of the country. They should be given a free hand.

STRIKES

The laborer is worthy of his hire. I always sympathize with those who toil, but France and England owe much of their unpreparedness to the regimentation of labor and to a socialistic endeavor to help the laboring man by regimenting wages and hours. I can never forget that the sit-down strike originated in France. I can never forget that when Germany was working night and day France embarked upon a socialistic dream. Today England and France are paying the penalty for clinging to the wage and hour law. They ignored the truth that labor's only road to plenty lies in increased productivity. As we prepare, as we manufacture tanks and airplanes, as we build guns and construct battleships, there must be no strikes in our industrial plants. Whatever may be said respecting wages and hours and similar legislation in times of peace, all of which I have opposed consistently, they should now be suspended or repealed for the duration of the second world war. They should not hinder or delay as we prepare to defend our country.

ENEMIES

Democracy has its enemies within and they are more dangerous than the enemies without. There must be no sabotage in industry. Modern warfare is not being fought by tanks and airplanes alone. The "fifth column," the parachutists, and the Trojan horse have preceded the tanks and the flame throwers.

I advocated the creation of the Dies committee. I have sponsored it from the beginning; it has rendered a conspicuous service; it has located the "fifth columns"; it has found the Trojan horse; it has located subversive influences in our industrial plants; it has exposed undesirable aliens.

I say to all who do not honor the American flag and pay tribute to the Stars and Stripes that there is no place in this broad land of ours for the undesirable or subversive alien. In the future, as in the past, I shall advocate his prompt deportation.

Punishment for sabotage and for traitors and subversive activities must be swift and commensurate. Death only is fit for the traitors. It is far better for a few traitors to die promptly than for many patriots to be ultimately murdered. There is no time for compromise. We are either for our country or we are against it.

RELIEF

The Government has been most generous the past 7 years. All have been aided and helped. We have borrowed to give. A generous country that has helped those in distress now calls upon her sons and daughters to help her. In war-torn nations in Europe, jewelry, coins, and iron of all descriptions are being laid upon the altars of the country. An opportunity will be given to all able-bodied men and women to work in the preparedness program. The opportunity is here for all to show their gratitude. Relief was to enable people to help themselves—it was in an emergency; it was to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked. It is now time for all to support their country; it is time for all to give to country rather than ask country to give to us. Today the beneficiaries of the social programs of the liberal government of France are the most pitiable sufferers. In free France the laborer was free, but in a subjugated France, the laborer and the poor man will be enslaved. If one class above another in the United States is more interested in freedom and liberty, it is the laborer.

RESPONSIBILITIES

In the soft and easy security of the past 20 years, we have been speaking too much of our rights, and we have thought too little of our obligations. We have neglected our duties; we have overlooked our responsibilities. It is now high time for us to discharge our responsibilities as citizens of the greatest of all Republics.

COSTS

The costs of preparedness will be high. Congress has just passed a defense tax bill. It is the largest single tax bill ever passed in peacetimes. It taxes largely those who are already taxed but the citizen who is able is willing to pay taxes for his defense; he is determined that the costs of his defense shall not be passed on to his descendants. They will have to defend in their own day.

Thoughtful citizens know that economic preparedness is essential to military preparedness; they know that borrowing must cease; they know that the United States should place her financial house in order. No one can foresee the perils of tomorrow. No one can tell what a day will bring forth. All know, however, that credit is essential both in preparedness and in war. If we exhaust our credit in peace, all of our preparedness will be in vain. No appropriation should be made in excess of the income of the Government.

WAR AND MEN

Some have thoughtlessly advocated a declaration of war. I oppose engaging in a foreign war. I will vote for billions for defense, but I will not vote to send a single youth to fight in a foreign war. I say again, as I said in the beginning, that it is time for clear thinking. There is not the semblance of the justification for our entering the present second world war that there was in 1917. In the first place, we are not prepared to defend, much less to attack. We are not prepared to declare or wage war. For my part I agree with the sentiment of Theodore Roosevelt: "It is better to speak softly and carry a big stick." It is no time to speak loudly and to carry an empty gun.

My central thought today is preparedness. To be prepared is to prevent attack; to be unprepared is to invite attack. After all, our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force are the police forces of the Nation, just as police protect towns and cities. Weapons are the only language that Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini can understand; they have no regard for ideals, and they have only contempt for democracy. They cannot hear the groans of the dead and dying; they can only hear the whirring noises of airplanes, they can only see the advance of flaming tanks, and they can only understand the thunders of mighty battleships.

Our forefathers came to these shores to escape the intermittent wars that have characterized Europe for a thousand years. They came to America to avoid the old hatreds and the old quarrels of Europe. We must arm; we must be prepared; we must escape the horrors of war. At the same time, if we are attacked we must be prepared to defend not only the United States but the Western Hemisphere and maintain battleships in the two oceans surrounding it.

The United States must be prepared to salvage civilization following the world war. Some day America's opportunity for peace will come. Some day America can save civilization from destruction as a result of the second world war. Only America will be strong enough to act as a mediator.

Men after all are the determining factors in war. Machines cannot think. Guns without men who love their country and without men who believe that their country is worth saving, are not sufficient. Men are more essential than guns, tanks, or airplanes. In the last analysis, there can be no substitute for trained and disciplined men in war as in peace.

I said in the beginning that we lived in the darkest hour of civilization, but it is always darkest just before the dawn. We must banish pessimism; we must face our tasks with confidence and with determination. There will be rough sailing. The need of the hour is men who, notwithstanding rough waters, will bring their ships and their cargoes into safe ports. They will make mistakes, but they will serve; they will navigate both large and small ships, but they will know the hardship and the sacrifice; they will dare and they will risk on the seven seas. The supreme need in preparedness is men of tough fiber.

Walter Scott, in Old Mortality, tells of one who spent all of his days and years in going from graveyard to graveyard throughout Scotland with his mallet and chisel, deepening the inscriptions on the tombs of her great. The names were being erased by the erosions of time. His purpose was to make legible the worthy names so that the youth might read and emulate their deeds of heroism.

Today let us think deeply, let us search profoundly our souls so that we may emulate the heroic deeds of the good and great of our country. May we never forget the advice of George Washington:

"If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

UNITY

Above all, it is time for unity and cooperation. We must all join hands for the defense and for the progress of the Republic.

A father and mother, with their darling boy, walking through the golden wheat fields of southern Canada on a beautiful evening just at sunset in the harvest time were so entranced by the marvelous view of the ripening and golden wheat and the wonderful golden glow of the evening that father and mother did not observe their little child had disappeared. A search was immediately instituted. All night long the father, mother, and neighbors walked and searched through the wheat fields. The next day the search was continued. Through the second night the vigil went on. Finally on the morning of the third day a neighbor suggested that all join hands and thus walk from one end of the field to the other. With hands joined the search was continued. Finally one of the searchers stumbled upon an object. Closer view revealed the glassy eyes and the pallid face of the dead boy. The searcher handed the little child to his parents, whereupon the father exclaimed, "Why did we not join hands before?"

In France, in devastated cities and in destroyed countryside, dejected and discouraged patriots, industrialists, and laborers, statesmen and citizens, rich and poor, high and low, are now exclaiming, "Why did we not prepare before? Why did we not join hands before to prepare?"

Today England, our mother country, the bankers and the workers, the captains of industry and the laborers have their backs to the wall. I can hear them say over and over again, "Why did we not all join hands to prepare the defense of the noblest and oldest of all democracies?"

It is now time, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, for all, the rich and the poor, the young and the old, to join hands to prepare to defend with their lives and to promote with their service the greatest and the best country in all of the world. May it always be said of us as Marvell said of Cromwell:

"He nothing common did, or mean
Upon that memorable scene."

Lest We Forget, Mr. Speaker, Lest We Forget!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, no government in the history of the world has ever accomplished so much for the uplift of mankind in the same length of time—indeed, over any period of time—as has the Government of the United States under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To appreciate the real significance of the fortunate conditions under which we in the United States live today, and to fully realize the extent to which this great President has made our land a better place in which to live—to live in peace and security—truly a God-send at this time when half the world is resounding with the thundering of cannon and the roar of bombs, it is necessary to turn the clock backward to March 4, 1933. That was the day—momentous for America—that Franklin Roosevelt took over the reins of a then stricken and tottering Government.

No President save possibly Abraham Lincoln ever was sworn into office under more threatening skies or a darker outlook for the future of his Nation than the new President faced that day. It is easy and convenient now when the sun of prosperity is high in the heavens—due to his foresight, courage, and administrative genius—for those hordes of paid claquers at the Republican convention in Philadelphia who haranged the delegates with chants of "We want Willkie" to black-out from their sight and memory recollections of the calamitous conditions that existed when he took office on the fateful 4th of March 7 years ago. But it is not playing the game the American way, it is not fair to that brave and noble man in the White House to do so, and I do not propose to allow anyone, unreminded, to do it.

BANKS STILL REMAINING OPEN WERE CLOSED FOR BENEFIT OF DEPOSITORS

Mr. Speaker, even as Mr. Roosevelt was riding down historic Pennsylvania Avenue—the tired, weary President Hoover at his side—on his way to the Capitol to take the oath of office, long lines of haggard, anxious-faced men and women might have been seen standing at the doors of the banks in every town, city, and hamlet throughout the United States. Many banks had indeed already failed. Before each timid, frightened depositor in the crowds about the banks still remaining open, was the specter of the loss of his life's savings, his all, the tragic fear that nothing would be left with which to feed his wife and children.

The late inimitable Will Rogers, America's all-time greatest, wisest, and tenderest humorist, referring to these people gathered before the banks, with that characteristic sly smile of his, whimsically declared:

> You've got to hand it to this man Roosevelt. He sure is a mighty fast worker. He had only reached the Peace Monument on the way back to the White House, after being sworn in, when he closed every bank in America, every single one of them. And it's a good thing for the country he did work fast. If he had waited until he got back to the White House, the depositors would have beat him to it and closed the banks for him, and millions still in line, who hadn't had time to get their money out, would have lost every penny of their life's savings.

What Will Rogers said was only too true. Realizing that most of the banks still remaining open were in straitened circumstances and that very few banks, even if solvent, can withstand a sudden run of their depositors, the far-seeing President-to-be had made all necessary advance arrangements for the immediate, temporary closing of all banks to avoid a national catastrophe that was at his very heels as he stepped down from the inaugural stand on the front portico of the Capitol Building at Washington, D. C., on March 4, 1933. Treasury officials, at Roosevelt's behest, had in the meantime worked out a plan to go to the relief of the beleaguered banks, and while all could not be rescued—the hopelessly insolvent ones were never permitted to reopen—millions upon millions of depositors were, thanks to President Roosevelt, ultimately saved from ruin.

THE UNITED STATES WAS NEVER CLOSER TO A REVOLUTION

The shaky banks, however, were but one detail of the complete picture of despair that hovered like impending doom over America the day Franklin Delano Roosevelt was sworn in. Sixteen million people were out of work. Hundreds of thousands of hungry; yes, starving men and women marched through our streets to city halls, county institutions, and to the State capitals, demanding work and food. More than 75 percent of the plants and factories were closed, and those that remained open worked only 2 or 3 days a week. Those fortunate enough to get work were paid $1 a day, and thousands of women were glad to receive $3 a week. More than 50 percent of the stores were closed, thousands of manufacturing businesses were thrown into receivers' hands in bankruptcy. Insurance companies were insolvent. Homes were being foreclosed on everywhere throughout the land, tenants evicted. Robberies, burglaries, hold-ups, suicides, even murders, increased at an alarming rate. Angry mobs congregated in the big cities, smashed the windows of grocery, hardware, and clothing stores, raiding the interiors, carrying their loot home

in triumph to their wives and children, who, hungry and cold, condoned their lawless acts as justifiable, and even heroic. Vagrants in large cities like Chicago, New York, St. Louis defied the police to arrest them, considering it would be a luxury to get into a warm station house where they knew that at least they would be fed, and not freeze to death. The police could not arrest half those that desired to be arrested, for the jails were filled to overflowing.

Sheriffs attempting to serve farmers with dispossession papers were met by groups of armed men, and ordered to leave the premises under threats of death. Municipalities were unable to pay their school teachers, classes were discontinued, children turned out on the streets. Destitute families living in huts on the dumps at the edge of cities were a common sight throughout the land. In many places court orders were ignored, or resisted. Discontent, resentment, chagrin over inability to obtain work of even the most menial kind turned into near anarchy. A pall of hopelessness and despair hung ominously over the entire Nation.

PRESIDENT HOOVER REFUSED TO RAISE A FINGER TO HELP

An attempt was made to appeal to President Hoover time and again. But his answer had been always the same, "Prosperity is just around the corner." But it was not prosperity, it was revolution that was just around the corner on March 4, 1933, the day Franklin Delano Roosevelt moved into the White House. The American people, the American voters, should take these facts into consideration. They should give their President due credit for the fact that he saved the Nation when it was on the very brink of revolution and disaster.

But those terrible days, reminiscent of nothing American but of the bread riots of the great capitals of Europe centuries ago, are no more. They marked the end of the trail of desolation and despair following the "old deal" administrations of Republicans Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

Soup kitchens and bread lines—long to be remembered as symbols of the Hoover administration—disappeared from the American picture as Franklin Roosevelt stepped into it. He had not resided in the White House very long before new and strange sights began to make their appearances in the poorer sections of large American cities. A truck would draw up before the most dilapidated row of tenement houses. Two or three men would leap out, each carrying a box on his shoulders, and disappear inside the worn and weather-beaten homes. I happened to be present on the occasion of one of these at first mysterious deliveries, and I saw first hand what each of those crates contained. I took careful note of each article, and can enumerate them now without, I am certain, having overlooked a single item: 2 dozen oranges, 2 dozen apples, 2 pounds raisins, 2 pounds prunes, 6 tins corned beef, 2 dozen eggs, 12 pounds flour, 5 pounds corn meal, 2 pounds oatmeal, 15 pounds potatoes, and beets and cabbages. That was for 4 persons, a mother and 3 children, and was to last 2 weeks. Milk was to come separately. There was no father in that particular home. The mother was ill; she had tried to get work, but after several efforts had been obliged to surrender from sheer weakness. I could not help but wonder what, in God's name, would have happened to this needy and deserving family if it had not been for Uncle Sam's new New Deal policy of seeing to it that no person in this rich Nation shall hereafter starve for the want of food or freeze for the lack of clothing, heat, and shelter.

I am afraid you and I, Mr. Speaker, and our colleagues here, do not know what the word "relief" really means. But the man out of work, who has had nothing to eat for as long as 3 days—he knows. And, make no mistake, there have been many such in this country, even rich and bountiful as it is.

And the mother, whose children nonchalantly ask for food, as if the cupboard were full of it, but it is empty—she knows.

O Mr. Speaker; shame on those wealthy heads of the power and utility and other great corporations whose salaries alone run from $25,000 to $450,000 a year; who have, from the very first, fought us and maligned us for voting for relief and other humane social-security legislation in the interests of men, women, and children and who, right at this very moment, are scheming and planning and plotting to strike down the man who has led us in this all-too-long-delayed effort to do something for the poor.

The irony of it all is that these great corporation heads and Wall Street speculators were themselves saved from disaster at the end of the Hoover reign by the increased prosperity resulting from the policies of the very man they seek now to destroy. Today they are making greater profits than even during the palmy days of 1928 and 1929. That the greed of these men who are already rich beyond the dreams of avarice knows absolutely no bounds is evidenced by their cries of anguish at being asked to pay but a fair share of taxation on their enormous profits toward the support of the President's just and reasonable social reforms, his new big preparedness program, and the always-necessary cost of government. This, in spite of the fact that the general rate of taxation in the United States is not within 50 percent of that of any other country in the world.

THERE ARE SOME WHO WILL NOT FORGET FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT

Mr. Speaker, I admit it is true that Mr. Roosevelt is unpopular, quite unpopular, in some quarters, especially in the very highest quarters, Mr. Speaker. Corrupt, greedy, rich, and powerful big business does not want him. Wall Street financiers do not want him. And the power interests especially do not want him, Mr. Speaker. They want to get him out of the White House so that they may move their Mr. Willkie in.

But not everyone, not quite everyone, I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, is against Franklin Roosevelt. For instance, it is difficult to imagine that poor widow and the multitude of other similarly afflicted—the aged, the destitute, all without hope then and knowing not which way to turn, who had plenty of reason to fall to their knees and thank God for their very real friend Franklin Roosevelt and his New Deal—it is difficult, very difficult, I repeat, to imagine that all these, Mr. Speaker, recalling now as they must that they were rescued at the very edge of the precipice of destruction, will be able very vigorously, very enthusiastically, to take up the chant, "We want Willkie."

Adequate National Defense Calls for Universal Educational Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, America is now embarking upon a vast program of national defense. We have heard it said time after time that this great rich country of ours has never properly given itself over to the problem of adequate preparedness. It is pointed out from our history that every war which we have ever entered upon has found this Nation unprepared. But apparently at this moment the Nation is thoroughly aroused and determined to see that it can never again be said we are unprepared. How much better it is to be prepared and not need it—which is our hope—than to need preparation and not have it. No doubt it has been the startling suddenness and the overwhelming completeness with which democratic and free peoples have crumbled before a war machine in recent weeks that has keyed our Nation up to its present determination. This is not to be a mere paper program of defense for us but the real thing.

What ought to be the nature of this total national preparedness for our country? Because war today is fought by machines and relatively fewer men, but men of a different and more technical training, it may be answered briefly that our first-line defense should consist of a sufficient number of highly trained men to handle an adequate supply of every type

of machine needed in modern warfare. It is plainly evident that former equipment, the best and standard for its day, is now obsolete. We must change both the type of equipment and manner of training for our men.

I recall that when I went before the Appropriations subcommittee on the military appropriation bill on February 18, 1938, that there were before the committee just ahead of me a Congressman from Pennsylvania who pled for motorization of our artillery, and also a Congressman from Springfield, Mass., who put in a plea for the Garand semiautomatic rifle. When my turn came, before putting in my plea for Fort Huachuca and for other defenses along our border, and for additional funds for C. M. T. C., I joined my plea with the colleagues who preceded me for motorization of our artillery and for a very generous appropriation for the new rifle. It makes the Springfield rifle as antiquated now as the Springfield did the flintlock rifles of Revolutionary days. At that time it was plainly evident that motorization, mechanization, and the most modern equipment would be necessary in any adequate defense scheme. I merely mention this because it occurred before the outbreak of the present World War. However, I do know that some of my colleagues, who have been here many years before I came, have worked strenuously for modernizing of our military equipment.

THE TRADITIONAL IS OBSOLETE

Much that was traditional in our Army will have to go by the board. It is to be earnestly hoped that our military authorities will not be too conservative or so bound by tradition as to hesitate to make this readjustment. A sufficient number of men is still important, but not to the degree that it was in the first World War. Relatively fewer men and more machines is the order of the day, with a still larger number of men to serve those machines. If the German forces under Hitler have been built up in spite of the restrictions placed upon Germany's permitted army, it must be that a comparatively few men were trained by him openly and directly for military service, and a vast majority of men were trained secretly and indirectly, but no less effectively, to play a basic part in the functioning of that war machine as it functions today. Perhaps America should take note of one part of that procedure.

Since wars of the present and future will be wars of machines, one essential step will be to build and provide all necessary machines. We should have no trouble in doing this. America has always been a Nation of inventors and mechanics and our people are outstanding in the production and use of machinery. It may be that we gained that preeminence in peace, but we ought to be able to hold that preeminence in war or in preparation for war. No nation has the facilities for manufacture of every kind of machine that we have. In fact the major part of the world's productive capacity in machine tools and in machines is in this country. We can outstrip the world in mass production. Regrettable as it is that our peace-loving Nation must dedicate so much of its wealth and energy to such production, we ought to enter into it with no misgivings as to our capability or as to the ultimate outcome. Surely the men who have put us in the lead in the manufacture of automobiles, airplanes, and tractors and all other power machinery can also put us in the lead in regard to war machinery, both as to quantity and quality. Of course, we shall increase our plants and the number of workers in them.

MEN ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN MACHINES

The question of furnishing men to man these machines and to service them is not second to the building and furnishing the machines themselves, for we have not yet been able to make monsters of steel which will fight our battles for us without a human crew. In addition to highly trained and expert men to operate these machines and a much larger number of equally trained men to service these machines, we must have a still larger number of highly trained technicians to manufacture these machines in a continuous quantity production. All of which means as high a degree of mechanical training for young men, with a sufficiently thorough scientific background for each of them, as our schools and other training agencies can give.

We hear talk these days about universal training. Sometimes we speak of universal compulsory training and still again we hear mentioned universal compulsory military training. All of these suggestions have to do with our plan for national defense. I am not competent to speak on all of these, but as a school man of years of experience, I would like to speak on a part of this program. While universal compulsory military training would be new to our people, universal compulsory educational training is not new. We have had it for a number of years to a sufficient degree to say that it is a characteristic of our educational system. All children are now compelled to go to school and a certain minimum of instruction is required to be offered. Therefore, if adequate national defense seems to require it, we might resort to compulsory mechanical or vocational training as a part of our educational plan without breaking with any accepted American ways.

THE NEWLY NEEDED TRAINING IS POSSIBLE

Difficult as it would be to give scientific, mathematical, mechanical training, say to all young men, it would not be as difficult as some fields of instruction which we have attempted to make universal. And if our very safety as a nation depends on this type of universal training, I believe it could be carried on with remarkable success, partly in our present schools and partly in factories. I am thinking of no new educational agency but an intensified use of what we now have. Of course, not all individuals have the same ability to acquire scientific information or develop manual skill. Therefore, they could not be all trained to the same degree of proficiency. However, educators have devised fairly accurate testing means to determine beforehand mechanical aptitude and also later the acquired skills, and thus the degree of fitness for defense of each young defender, and some fairly accurate classification can now be made. Since ours must employ a selective plan by which the most expert are used to man the war machines, the less expert to service those same machines, and the still less expert to build those machines, it would seem that every young man could receive some degree of this mechanical, vocational education with benefit to himself and to the general welfare and safety of his country.

I can see no objection to some such general plan of compulsory, mechanical, educational training, universally applied in this country to whatever degree the individual may be capable of receiving it. A passenger on board an ocean liner might not be able to read the compass, or fuel the engine, or plot the course for the vessel, but at least he might be able to put a life belt on himself or on a fellow passenger. Safety requires him to know a few things and be able to do them. If he knew how to lower the lifeboats, so much the better. However, even if it were ideal and possible for our training system to take every young man and give him all the scientific training of which he is capable, and require that this be done in the interests of national defense, we would still be far from our desired goal.

TRAINING OF MIND AND HAND IS NOT ENOUGH

What else would be needed? We need, in addition to this scientific training, a cultivation of heart and spirit which will make these defenders of our land not only the best fighting men in the world but the best citizens in the world. Before a man can be a good soldier he must be a good citizen. The type of training I have in mind now cannot be made compulsory, but it can and should be made universal.

Pericles in ancient Athens explained that the Athenians were better soldiers than the Spartans because the Athenians had a city worth fighting for, and appreciating that truth they were willing to live and to die for it. If we could engender that same spirit in our defenders, added to their efficient scientific training, it would make their preparation complete and their power irresistible. This is the more difficult part of the training of an American soldier.

Flag saluting and formal study of the Constitution are important, but alone will not suffice. The object here is

to appeal to the emotion and fix a loyalty and affection upon our country and its institutions so that every defender will feel it worth while to spend himself in its defense. Such a loyalty can be inspired and grounded upon an intimate knowledge of American history, for surely no nation in the world has had a more unique, thrilling, and inspiring past than has our own country.

In the training of young men in mechanical knowledge and skill the process is canceling the difference between the mind of the teacher and the mind of the student, or between the high skill of the hands of one and the low skill of the hands of the other. But in engendering true loyalty and patriotism it must be a canceling of the difference between two spirits—the spirit of our greatest teachers and writers and the emotional spirit of our young defenders. Surely our religious leaders, our social-science teachers, our best statesmen can tell us how this final and higher type of preparation may be had.

As a nation, then, we are embarking upon the most extensive and thoroughgoing programs of national defense ever planned within the realm of probable reality. It is true our leaders of thought have heretofore conceived and from time to time suggested ideal and thorough plans for adequate national preparedness, but—like all human planning—there has heretofore been a wide gulf between conception and realization. In this very critical period we must eliminate that gulf of difference between plan and accomplishment. The very seriousness of our present situation demands our very best planning for defense and our highest possible average of attainment of defense objectives. Can we today surpass all previous plans and efforts at adequate national defense? We know we can. Let us not "sell America short" even by doubts or in our thoughts.

Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Herbert Hoover at the Republican National Convention on June 25, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Republican National Convention, we are here faced with the task of saving America for free men. Two-thirds of the world has become the stamping ground of militant despotisms. Almost everywhere in the Old World the light of liberty for which men have struggled and died has gone into a long night. Men and nations have lost their moral and spiritual moorings. Even in America our system of liberty has been weakened. We are divided in mind and fearful. And confusion in liberal nations is made worse by the spread of incompetence in government. The whole world is in confusion.

The world has survived confusion before. And men have grown in soul and safety. But how? Because some organizations of men have stood solid. They stood not because they knew the solutions to all these confusions, not even because they have the power to find solution. They stood firm and they held the light of civilization—until the furies passed, because they held to certain positive principles of life, of morals, of spiritual values.

In a time of confusion and crisis the action of a Republican convention 80 years ago saved this Nation for free men. And free men of two generations built it into unparalleled greatness.

Upon this party again rests the responsibility for the freedom and prosperity of men for the next two generations. The Republican Party again accepts that responsibility here and now.

Our party is not concerned here with petty or factional issues or minor criticisms.

This crisis in America is not to be obscured by any events abroad. We have witnessed a steady sapping of our system of liberty and the mismanagement of government for the last 7 years. During all this time we have had 10,000,000 chronically unemployed, 18,000,000 of our fellow Americans have been continuously on relief. Agriculture has been held afloat by Government subsidies. Unending deficits and huge increases in debt threaten the financial stability of the Government. Our industry and business are hesitant and are afraid. In this decade, we have actually decreased in national income and national wealth for the first time in 150 years. America has gone backward. The human consequence is that one-third of our people are frozen to poverty.

This condition is not an inheritance from the inevitable world depression which followed the last World War. It is the result of incompetence in Government. We were on the way to recovery in 1932. Every other democracy had recovered from that depression long before the outbreak of this war.

Now, economically weakened for the past 7 years, we are faced with mismanaged national defense.

And this new World War is no sudden blow. It comes from the destruction of systems of liberty in the Old World. Since the last World War over a billion human beings in Europe and Asia have been shaken by revolutions. The insidious poisons of men's minds from this caldron sweep over us.

And now with this war one liberty-loving country after another has been submerged. Our indignation, our sympathies, and our fears are desperately involved in their heroic struggles for freedom.

Whatever the outcome of this world cataclysm, whatever the solution of our domestic crisis, the pattern of this world will not again be the same. Dictatorships, totalitarian economics, and militarism will long continue over a large part of the earth. New economic and political forces will be loosened upon the world.

PART II. OUR TASKS

To be prepared, we must at once undertake seven stern tasks.

First. We must restore and revitalize liberty in America.

Second. We must restore and rebuild morals in government.

Third. We must restore decent life and living to one-third of our farmers and workers, who have been chronically submerged by the New Deal.

Fourth. We must restore competence to government.

Fifth. We must prepare this Nation to defend the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. We must develop and maintain foreign policies that keep us out of these wars unless we are attacked. We should facilitate all nations fighting for their freedom in procuring materials and munitions, but subject to definite limitations which keep us out of war.

Seventh. We must recall our people from the flabbiness of the New Deal. We must reestablish stamina, character, and ideals. We must regenerate hope and confidence in America.

PART III. WEAKENING THE STRUCTURE OF LIBERTY

Let us first examine the weakening of the structure of liberty in the United States. That is but part of a far larger war in the world today than a war of tanks and airplanes. It is even more dangerous to America. This is a war of hostile ideas, philosophies, and systems of government. There are no neutrals in that war. That is where we have to fight.

We have to fight not only "fifth columns" and insidious poisons of men's minds, but we have to fight those failures of government which drive democracies upon the rocks.

The battle for liberty has been about lost in the Old World. But right ideas never die. Nevertheless, from this seething cauldron of revolutions and wars of ideas there are many lessons for us.

Let me recite a little history.

For more than a century and a half before the war of 1914 the whole continent of Europe up to the Russian border had been struggling upward toward liberty. These people in 20 races had attained a large degree of free government—free speech, free worship, orderly justice, and free enterprise. After that war, liberty and peace seemed assured to the world.

And then in less than 20 years hundreds of millions of these people surrendered freedom for bondage under totalitarian government. This abandonment of liberty has been the most gigantic revolution in history.

Two years ago I was the invited guest of some 12 European countries. That gave to me a unique opportunity to inquire into some things that might help the American people.

I wanted to know more of what ideas and pressures had plunged these nations into dictatorships.

There will flash into your minds that it was communism, fascism, or nazi-ism. That is not what I refer to. They were the effect. I was seeking the cause. Liberty had been weakened long before the dictators rose under those banners. There was a long poignant drama before the last act in this gigantic tragedy of civilization.

There were many disintegrating forces. But also in every single case before the rise of dictatorships there had been a period dominated by economic planners. Each of these nations had an era under starry-eyed men who believed that they could plan and force the economic life of the people. They believed that was the way to correct abuse or to meet emergencies in systems of free enterprise. They exalted the state as the solvent of all economic problems.

These men thought they were liberals. But they also thought they could have economic dictatorship by bureaucracy and at the same time preserve free speech, orderly justice, and free government. They can be called the totalitarian liberals. They were the spiritual fathers of the New Deal.

These men were not Communists or Fascists. But they mixed these ideas into free systems. It is true that Communists and Fascists were round about. They formed popular fronts and gave the applause.

These so-called liberals shifted the relation of government to free enterprise from that of umpire to controller. Directly or indirectly they politically controlled credit, prices, and production of industry, farmer, and labor. They devalued, pump-primed, and inflated. They controlled private business by government competition, by regulation and by taxes. They met every failure with demands for more and more power of control. And they employed that handmaiden of power, named "Gimme a Billion, Quick."

These leaders ignored the fact that the driving power of free economic life is the initiative and enterprise of men.

When it was too late they discovered that every time they stretched the arm of government into private enterprise, except to correct abuse, then, somehow, somewhere, men's minds and judgments became confused. At once men became hesitant and fearful. Initiative slackened, production in industry slowed down.

Then came chronic unemployment and frantic Government spending in effort to support the unemployed. Government debts mounted. And finally government credit was undermined. Out of the miseries of their people there grew pressure groups—business, labor, farmers—demanding relief or special privilege. Class hate poisoned cooperation.

Does this sound unfamiliar to you?

It was all these confusions which rang down the curtain upon liberty. Frustrated and despairing, these hundreds of millions of people voluntarily voted the powers of government to the man on horseback as the only way out. They did it in the hope of preserving themselves from want and poverty. They did it in hope of preserving their national independence.

And that blight of totalitarian liberalism even spread to Great Britain in 1929. But that liberty-loving people overthrew it in 1931. The British fully recovered prosperity in 1934. The blight swept over France in 1936 under Premier Blum, and the French attempted to escape collapse by voting his government out in 1938. But their morale and their productive life was so injured that they are paying in blood, in tears, and defeat.

Need I carry this analogy further?

This is a battle which Americans had better not lose.

Our totalitarian liberals

We have now had 7 years of experience with our own totalitarian liberals. Battling against all the natural forces of recovery they succeeded in stabilizing depression.

What is more, in forcing their economic measures upon us they have given even deeper wounds to liberty. Their headlines in history would be: Vast Powers to President, Vast Extension of Bureaucracy, Supreme Court Decides Against New Deal, Attack on Supreme Court, Court Loaded With Totalitarian Liberals, Congress Surrenders Power of Purse by Blank Checks to President, Will of Legislators Weakened by Patronage and Political Pie, Attacks on Business, Stirring Class Hate, Pressure Groups Stimulated, Men's Rights Disregarded by Boards and Investigations, Resentment at Free Opposition, Attempt To Discredit Free Press.

Certainly the New Deal has not been allergic to power. And now fed fat on power, they demand a third term for Mr. Roosevelt. That is not a mere violation of tradition. It is a violation of a fundamental restraint on power in this Republic.

But we Republicans would welcome Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate. For this battle must be fought out under the guns of debate. And that debate will be done best with the man who is responsible for it.

PART IV. RESTORATION OF AMERICAN LIVING

One of our Republican tasks is to restore security of living and hope to those 40,000,000 Americans—farmers and workers—who are today plunged into insecurity or destitution. Restoration of jobs to 10,000,000 unemployed is the first step to lift this mass of poverty. It is the first step to relief of farmers. It is the first step to balancing our Budget. It is the first step to preparedness.

Unemployment is not a chronic disease of a free system. It is a disease of governmental interference with that system. These jobs can be restored alone by the restoration of the vitality of free enterprise.

Let me say at once I am not interested in free enterprise because it is a property system. I am interested in it because intellectual and spiritual liberty can be sustained only by economic liberty. They are indissolubly bound in a common fate. I am interested in free enterprise because it is the one dynamic force by which we can restore productive jobs to our people.

It was dynamic individual enterprise which raised the country from insignificance to greatness. It was not government that put these prairies under the plow. It was not government that flung these railways across a continent. It was not government that built these great factories or cities. It was not government that brought forth these great inventions. It was not government that builded these millions of churches, or added this wealth of music, art, and literature.

Is this Nation to be a great national workshop or a vast eleemosynary institution? We cannot exist two-thirds workers and one-third dependents.

It is easy to prove that the people are fearful of the New Deal. The evidence of their fears and loss of confidence is when they postpone the building of homes. It shows when they fail to improve and construct factories to produce the new goods to which science and invention beckon our energies. Let me give you just one figure.

The New Deal points with pride to its housing schemes. In the 7 years before the New Deal, and with no subsidies a free America built 3,400,000 new family units of housing. A part of those years were depression years. During the whole New Deal with all its subsidies, America has built 1,700,000 new units. They no doubt have some more "on order."

There can be a free economy in America which releases the productive energies of men. Or there can be a dictated economy. These cannot be mixed. A free economy means sweat, turmoil, competition—hard at times if you choose. It means ever-new wrongs that must be righted, but it means also resistless growth and resistless progress.

The restoration of confidence does not require exploitation or monopoly. A free people can no more tolerate private economic power without checks and balances than we can tolerate political power without balances and checks. But in effecting great reforms there is a dividing line. Upon the right of this line is cure of abuse and solution of marginal problems. On the left of it is dictation and tyranny and discouragement of production. We must now reform the reforms.

A confident, alert, alive, and free people can quickly repair losses, repay debts, and bury mistakes.

In the meantime while we are getting our economic machine back to work we must care for those who suffer. It was a Republican administration in 1930 that first announced we cannot allow Americans to go hungry and cold from no fault of their own. We organized and prevented it. It was a Republican administration which first started relief for farmers.

But wholesale relief cannot go on forever. No government can carry this deficit indefinitely. We must restore these people to self-support before the money fails. These people want to work and to produce. The Nation needs their work. They want their self-respect restored through productive jobs.

That can come only through a change of administration.

PART V. MORALS IN GOVERNMENT

And that brings me to restoration of morals in government.

Does anyone in the United States doubt that the New Deal has built up the most gigantic political machine to control the vote ever known in this country?

What of the abundantly proved misuse of relief for politics?

What of this shady substitution of political patronage for the merit system?

What of this vicious building of city machines through handing them gigantic Federal funds to expend?

What of the use of taxpayers' money for partisan propaganda?

The whole business stank to an extent that the Jeffersonian Democrats joined with the Republicans in Congress in passing new laws trying to stop this political corruption.

The effect of the new law on the New Deal has probably been to increase the use of the telephone instead of the typewriter.

Today there are three or four hundred thousand New Deal political office-holders who are the officers over an army of 10,000,000 voters who receive Government benefits. A modern explanation of this New Deal method would be that elections have been taken into protective custody.

There is no time tonight to go into the whole field of intellectual and financial morals of the New Deal. They will be amplified in this campaign.

At the end of this debate we ought to have an election, not an auction.

Is all this liberalism? Liberals fought these things for centuries.

Does not the citizen lose faith in moral standards when he sees such Government dealings?

There can be no double standard of morals in a republic. For ideals must be served with clean hands.

PART VI. COMPETENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Let us for a moment explore the question of competence in government, as distinguished from philosophy and morals.

There can be monstrosities in broad policies of government beyond those that merely cost money. They can jeopardize the Republic. I may mention a few samples. You will have others.

Competent men

My first comment is that competence in government is not alone laws and policies. It is the capable administration of them. That means the quality and experience of the men and women doing the job. Many a good objective has gone wrong up that alley.

For 50 years the American people have fought to dig out the spoils system. Our people built a great dike of competence through nonpolitical selection by merit. At one time 80 percent of Federal servants were employed that way. Today one-half of its officials have never passed a merit examination. That is, however, a minor part of the subject. I cannot discuss its major aspects because I do not wish to deal in personalities.

Fiscal policies

My second example of the consequences of incompetence in government relates to continued deficits and mounting national debt in peacetime. It is a dull subject. And like any chronic disease we "sort of get used to it." Deficits, debts, inflations, and their spawn of managed currency have been the curse of the earth ever since the last war. They are inscribed on the tombstones of every fallen democracy.

We are still alive and therefore I make two mild suggestions. These deficits are partly the natural results of pressures that arise from stabilized depression.

Therefore I suggest that we release national energies that make productive jobs.

Thereby we would restore the national income from the present 70 billions to the 100 billions it ought to be today. Thereby the revenues of the Government would increase automatically. Thereby the billions of dollars for relief would decrease automatically.

These deficits are partly due to men who, no matter what they say, show no comprehension that the money which they spend comes from the sweat of people who toil and produce. Now, the ordinary peacetime expenses of the Government have increased from about 4,000,000,000 under Republicans to nine billions under the abundant life. My other suggestion is that somehow, somewhere, we might pare a little off the abundance without hurting anybody but officeholders. But these men cannot stop spending. It is in their blood. And it is part of the new economics.

Our national debt is now long past the danger sign and its speed is increasing. It already weakens our national defense.

Mr. Roosevelt gaily dismisses his fantastic national debt by the idea that Americans do not owe it, because we owe it to Americans. That idea is one source of the intellectual depression today.

You and your grocer are both Americans. You might ask your grocer if he would not concede the same idea. The fact is this debt represents the self denial of those who have toiled and saved. They have a large part of their savings in that debt. Their 125,000,000 insurance policies, and their 30 millions savings and bank accounts are in it. Our children will have to pay it. And they will pay it with toil and bitterness toward our generation. They will be working to pay for the follies of the New Deal instead of their own living.

And in another direction these deficits and debts are becoming the explosives which will destroy the whole of our social reforms. During these 8 years the New Deal has given hourly advertising to their advances in the social field. There have been advances. We sorely needed them. We always will need them. Republicans builded them over years. We have no quarrel with the principle of protection for labor, the farmers, the old, and the destitute. Our quarrel is with method and incompetence in administration. But the torpedo prepared for these services is that the Nation is not allowed to produce enough goods and wealth to foot the bill. They cannot be long paid by the magic of borrowed money. Unless the whole direction of this Government is changed these humanitarian measures will go into the New Deal embroidered wastebasket called bankruptcy.

Currency

My third sample of the higher incompetence is the purchase of three-quarters of the whole world's gold supply. We bought it by giving foreigners our commodities and our investments. We have buried nineteen billions mostly in a hole at Fort Knox.

The foreigners got our property at depression prices. We paid a high price for this metal.

You have often been reminded of the legend of King Midas. Today that legend bears more careful examination. Midas also had the starry-eyed notion that he could benefit the kingdom if he had the power to turn his commodities into gold. The gods gave him the power. And when he finished he had a great pile of gold but no commodities. Then he assembled another commission for advice. The God Bacchus advised him to jump in a certain river. The legend says he came out with donkey's ears.

Even Midas did not undertake to operate on silver. He left that to the New Deal.

Unless we quickly restore the vitality of this pile of dead gold, this Nation will face a loss of the whole nineteen billion of it. We should start by putting it in circulation at home. We should start putting it in circulation abroad by swapping it for useful metals which we do not ourselves produce. We would far better have many years' stock of manganese, nickel, tungsten, and tin than the so-called precious metals. These we may need for national defense.

Preparedness

There are other major incompetences in Government which I could well discuss. There are agriculture and relief. But tonight my last example is national defense, for this incompetence strikes at our national safety.

Mr. Roosevelt recently broadcast an alibi that preparedness had been neglected by Republican administrations.

In the 6 years of peaceful world outlook before the New Deal we had spent about six hundred and eighty million a year on our military services. As a matter of fact, Mr. Roosevelt considered we were spending too much on it. He supported the Democratic platform in 1932 which implied that—and other things. And in 1934 he drasticaly reduced our defense to five hundred and fifty million, lopping of twenty millions from the Air Corps alone. And that year he reduced the number of commissioned naval graduates by one-half.

The interlude in conduct would seem to weaken the alibi.

Nazi-ism in Germany and our New Deal both rose to power in 1933. During these dangerous years our Republicans in Congress supported repeated increases in defense appropriations until they reached $1,400,000,000 a year. In these 6 years the New Deal has spent 6.2 billions.

What have we got for that enormous sum?

After all that expenditure we are told we are wholly unprepared to defend ourselves.

Our military leaders say to the Congress we are not organized for modern war; we do not have more than 75,000 fully equipped men.

Despite the growing menace in the air, and the expenditure of $350,000,000 on the air force in the last 6 years, General Arnold says not half a dozen of our Army planes are modern.

If we spend another 6.2 billions and get no more actual defense than from the last 6.2 billions nobody will be afraid of us.

Yet the lives of our children, the fate of our Nation, the future of our civilization are at stake. We cannot risk failure. This is another battle which America better not lose. If we are to achieve preparedness we must have a change in our national administration.

PART VII. AND WHAT OF OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS

The first line of our national defense is clear, realistic, and sober foreign policies directed to secure respect, good will, and peace.

To realize that ideal, during the whole 12 years of Republican Administration after the last armistice we strove to keep the face of civilization turned toward good will and peace. Americans saved Europe and Russia from collapse in famine. Americans led the advance on methods of settlement of international controversy by peaceful means. We led the world to reduce naval arms and lifted billions from the backs of all who toil. We led in constructive proposals for land disarmament. We set a moral standard in the world by refusal to recognize the murderous regime in Russia. We refused to issue a Communist license to undermine our institutions. We had organized a world conference to stabilize currencies and by removing trade barriers to give the world a chance. That conference was scuttled by Mr. Roosevelt. That killed the last hope of world cooperation.

This war

The immense task now is to shape our foreign policies to protect us from the conflagration in Europe and Asia.

There is no such thing as our isolation from wars which envelop two-thirds of all the people in the world. The Monroe Doctrine alone is the negation of that. There is no such thing as economic isolation. Those shocks jam through the doors of our farmers and our workers every hour. There is no such thing as moral isolation. These violations of treaties and agreements raise dangers to the reign of law everywhere. There is no such thing as intellectual and spiritual isolation. Emotions come through the air in every telegraphed and printed word.

From all this there are shifting dangers in which the Nation should have common council that we may have national unity. In a few days this convention will have chosen our national leader. The President will be able to secure from him the views of our party upon those transcendent questions.

Conference and agreement are the roads to a solid front to the world.

Today a thousand tragedies to mankind crash one after another. One heroic people after another has been submerged. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and now France, who cradled our liberties. But the spirits of great races do not die. They will rise again.

We resent these aggressions. The brutality of it arouses our indignation. Their sufferings cry out to the sympathy of every decent man and woman.

But here and now America must summon reason to control emotion. The greatest quality of men in danger, second only to courage, is cool, deliberate action. That is equally the necessity in a nation. And idealism as never before must keep its feet on the ground of realism.

The first policy of calm realism is not to exaggerate our immediate dangers. Every whale that spouts is not a submarine. The 3,000 miles of ocean is still a protection. The air forces, tanks, and armies of Europe are useless to attack us unless they establish bases in the Western Hemisphere. To do that they must first pass our Navy. It can stop anything in sight now. In any event, this ocean and our magnificent Navy give time for sober preparation. But we have no time to waste.

We must be armed so that no foreign nation will entertain the dangerous thought of starting over these 3,000 miles of ocean. We must be so prepared that we can rely solely upon our own right arm.

We need a Navy powerful as never before. Rather than a vast accumulation of arms, we must have an industry tuned up to make war machines faster and better than any nation on earth. We need a trained personnel of key men in reserve. We have the resources, the genius, the industry to make us impregnable.

But preparedness is not only making armies and navies. It must be supported by a sound national finance, national economy, and a restored productivity of our people.

And before we can have preparedness we must have competent organization in Washington.

New Deal politics will never "make tyranny tremble." I suppose we might frighten tyrants by appointing another board to advise the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense.

The third of realistic policies bears upon supplies of materials and munitions to those nations who are fighting for their freedom. My belief is that we should facilitate them in every way subject to two limitations: First, that it involves no action which takes us to war; and second, that as liberty lives by law we must act within the law.

PART VIII: PEACE OR WAR

Today many of our citizens consciously or unconsciously are considering peace or war with the totalitarian governments.

The most vital realism in all our relations with the world today requires that we keep out of these wars unless the Western Hemisphere is attacked.

It is a solemn determination. One price of war is the lives of our sons and the poverty of our grandchildren. But we are here also considering the fate of our Nation and the fate of liberty in the world.

It is nonsense that we cannot defend freedom here even if the Old World fails. Our ancestors, with sparse population and resources for the first 50 years of this Republic sustained liberty here when most of the world was ruled by despots. We can do it again if we have to.

And the spirits of American boys buried in Flanders 22 years ago rise before us today to warn us that we can make war but we cannot assure liberty in the Old World.

The hope of mankind and the hope of civilization is that democracy survive on this continent. Those who advocate war should never forget one thing. The first necessity of any great war is to set up dictatorship. France and England were compelled to do so. But with our already weakened structure of liberty and the fabulous national debt we shall have, and the mania for power of the New Deal, we would be generations in restoring free men in America. We should be sacrificing the last sanctuary of liberty in the world in the belief that we are defending liberty.

Those who feel we should intervene in this war should take note of other realistic reasons why we should keep out. If we join, we shall in our own unpreparedness require 2 or 3 years to make ourselves effective. That will be too late. In the meantime we should require the whole energies of American industry to arm ourselves. For us to declare war would do the Allies more harm than good.

The final realism is that if we are to keep cool and not stimulate war, there must be an end to provocative speech by our officials. Expressions of indignation or regret do not require insults. The first responsibility of the President of the United States is to abate war, not to stimulate it. It is not the province of the President of the United States to create hate. Irresponsible talk in explosive times may bring danger. And we need remember that the day will come when we might be of service to humanity in dealing with these same men for peace.

And there is an infinite service that America can bring to the world. After this struggle we shall see hate sitting at the peace table. We might with our moral force and council abate its dread consequences. I know the famine, disease, and suffering that is yet to come with this war. With our economic strength and our compassion we can save millions of lives, give aid to reconstruction. We might inspire tolerance and hope again to the world.

And after the war, what then?

After this war our foreign trade will meet an impoverished Europe, reduced in its standards of living, and above all armed with totalitarian-directed exports and imports. All that points in three directions. American workers and farmers will require more protection than ever from imports. We shall need mobilize counter action on exports. We shall need develop self-sufficiency in our own industrial production. Under these impacts the Hull treaties will go to the heaven of forgotten issues.

I have said whatever the outcome of this war, whatever the solution of our domestic crisis, the form of this world will not be the same. We must meet great change. And we will meet with moral and spiritual degeneration in the world.

In time these world storms will blow themselves out. Perhaps it will be a long time. But the spirit of Luther, Goethe, Schiller, Mazzini, and Garibaldi still live, and here upon our soil the temple of liberty must stand that men may be inspired to return to its worship.

PART IX: THE REGENERATION OF AMERICA

Finally, the greatest task of all deals with the intangibles of national life. It is to stiffen the stamina and the morals of our people. It is to unify their ideals and lift their spirits.

Truly we have been following the suicide road for liberty that led to disaster in Europe. But let me give you a word of encouragement. Those countries were economically lean from the last war. We still have economic fat on our national bones. Those countries were weaker in their fidelities to liberty. We are tougher in our fidelities.

Our ability to meet these storms and these changes will abide in the qualities of our people.

There is in every nation some quality distilled from its racial life. Those are the mores of the race. Ours is a belief in God—a belief in the dignity of the common man. Ours is a spirit of independence—a vigorous assertion of self-reliance, of devotion to duty. Ours is a high sense of cooperation in time of stress. We have always fought tyranny in any form. We have not in the past been deterred by difficulty or defeated by disaster. We have sought new frontiers—new obstacles to surmount. We have been resilient, courageous, fearless, and unconquerable. The New Deal has contributed to sap our stamina and make us soft.

In quest of security we have retreated from liberty. In quest of reform we have abandoned justice and stirred class hate. In quest of economic power they have impoverished the people. In quest of relief we have injured self-reliance. In quest of an easy way out we have lessened the vision of America.

The road of regeneration is burdensome and hard. It is straight and simple. It is a road paved with work and with sacrifice and consecration to the indefinable spirit that is America.

Centuries ago, alone under the stars, contrasting his own insignificance with the immensity of God's universe, there sprang to the lips of the psalmist the question "What is man, that Thou are mindful of him? And the son of man that Thou visitest him?" Was man created a little lower than the angels, a being for whom the abundance of life consists of justice, liberty, and opportunity? Does he possess the right from the Creator to plan his own life, to dare his own adventure, to earn his own reward so long as he does no harm to his fellows? Or must he submerge his life, his liberties, and his independent personality in an omnipotent government?

If man is merely one of the herd, running with the pack, Stalin is right, Hitler is right, and—God help us for our follies and our greeds—the New Deal is right.

But if man is an inviolable human soul, possessed of dignity, endowed with unalienable rights, America is right. And this is a war that Americans dare not lose.

Republicans, you go into battle for the greatest cause entrusted to the government of mankind.

With steadfastness to these ideals, you can put this house in order. You can defend this Nation. You can demonstrate that self-governing, free people can solve the problems imposed by the industrial revolution. You can restore employment and agriculture, and end their sufferings. You can wipe out coercion and corruption. You can make this a classless country devoted to equal opportunity for all. You can build up humane measures of security, of increasing standards of living for all of the people. You can remove their fears. You can inspire their devotion to American ideals. You can, and you will, hold alight to a confused world the lamp of liberty. Republicans, are you prepared to fight?

Will Reorganization Plan No. IV Create Two Soil Conservation Services?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, most of the debate, if not practically all of it, on Reorganization Plan No. IV has centered on the proposed transfer of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. That is a serious matter, attended by grave uncertainty. There is another part of the plan, however, which in its field may be quite as important. I refer to the part that will transfer the functions of the Soil Conservation Service on public lands from the Department of the Agriculture to the Department of the Interior.

This transfer, it seems to me, entirely overlooks the fact that in a given watershed you have both private- and public-owned lands. The problems of soil conservation do not stop on section lines.

In areas with which I am familiar, you have privately owned lands checkerboarded with public lands in the national forest, in a national monument, in a grazing area, in an Indian reservation. Is it sound to say that while a raindrop is rolling down a hillside the Department of Agriculture shall watch its course until it reaches a fence line, where it rolls on to public domain and a Department of Interior ranger takes over? That may sound facetious, but it is not so intended. It is intended merely to bring home the situation that will exist. Indeed, it will be worse than that, for at a half dozen places in its course, that raindrop may go from private to public land, from public land to private, and back again.

That will be the complicated, duplicated picture of soil conservation administered by two different departments in the lands of intermingled ownership.

PROBLEM CROSSES FENCE LINES

The soil-erosion problem in this country is national in scope. Worn-out farm lands, dust storms, mounting flood crests, the silting of streams and reservoirs, tax delinquency, increasing relief loads, and a host of attendant evils are rooted in a destructive type of land use which is equally prevalent on public as well as private lands. Moreover, the nature of the problem is such that a solution cannot be achieved on private lands independently of a solution on public lands, or vice versa.

Congress recognized this fact in passing legislation which authorized the creation of the Soil Conservation Service. It seems clear Congress intended a single agency to tackle the

erosion problem and deal with it on a national scale without regard for regional interests, ownership prerogatives, or sectional spheres of influence. Following are excerpts from the Soil Conservation Act (Public, No. 46) of 1935, to support this belief:

That it is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare, and that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors, protect public health, public lands, and relieve unemployment, and the Secretary of Agriculture, from now on, shall coordinate and direct all activities with relation to soil erosion. * * *

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an agency to be known as the Soil Conservation Service, to exercise the powers conferred on him by this act. * * *

HIT-AND-MISS TREATMENT FUTILE

Effective soil conservation requires the treatment of all lands in a given watershed or type of farming region in accordance with the inherent needs and adaptabilities of each tract of public land, as well as each field of each farm. Experience in dealing with millions of acres has shown conclusively that little value comes from any piecemeal, hit-and-miss program of land treatment. Soil-conserving practices must be applied to all lands in a natural area in such a way that the protection of uplands from erosion also safeguards the lowlands from floodwaters and excessive deposits of silt.

Congress recognized the essential soundness of this principle in passing the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. It has repeatedly recognized the principle in subsequent legislation. The Omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936, for example, specifically authorizes the Department of Agriculture to carry out watershed-land treatment concurrently with downstream flood control operations by the Corps of Army Engineers. At no time in the relatively brief history of the Soil Conservation Service has there been any departure from this policy of coordinated land defense.

Under the proposed reorganization plan, however, such a departure seems inevitable. In those areas containing considerable acreages of public land, the Soil Conservation Service will automatically be barred from carrying out a complete program.

Of course, it is possible that arrangements could be made with the Department of the Interior whereby the Service and Interior would carry out concurrent, interlocking operations. But without unified direction and a common understanding of basic objectives there would be little assurance that such a joint undertaking would succeed.

It might even be better for the Soil Conservation Service to withdraw completely from areas containing public land and turn the entire job of soil and water conservation, on public and private lands alike, over to the Department of the Interior—over to another Soil Conservation Service, or some such extra agency that would have to be set up if erosion is really going to be checked. While such a course would hardly be sound, in view of the decidedly agricultural interests involved, it might be the wiser under the circumstances. From the standpoint of cost alone, it would be difficult to justify the existence of two separate and distinct field organizations to deal with a single problem. Inevitable conflicts as to method and policy will further complicate and hamper any joint undertaking on a basis which fails to recognize unified direction.

Looking at the problem from the standpoint of cold logic, it seems both scientifically and administratively sound that a single agency, whether it be the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture or some other agency set up in the Department of the Interior, should be in a position to plan and carry out a completely coordinated program in a given watershed if there is to be any real or lasting progress made in the field of soil conservation.

PUBLIC LANDS IN 11 STATES

Public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior are largely confined to 11 Western States in an area bounded on the west by the Cascade and Sierra Nevada Ranges, and extending eastward to the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains. In this large area the land is used predominantly for grazing and irrigation agriculture. The economy of the region depends primarily upon maintenance of grazing resources and a reliable supply of water. Soil and water conservation in these western watersheds is vital to the welfare of a third of the continental area of the Nation. Land ownership in this vast region, however, does not conform to watershed or other natural boundaries but invariably involves intermingled private, State, county, and Federal interests.

This complex pattern of ownership creates serious problems. In a great many instances the owners of private lands in the West supplement their holdings by leasing public lands. Under such conditions it is doubly important that soil conservation have unified direction. Since the users of public lands share the responsibility for conservation, they rightfully feel there should be no distinction between public and private holdings. For one agency to prescribe conservation practices for public lands which differ from those prescribed by another agency for private lands would create chaotic conditions which in themselves would suffice to defeat conservation objectives.

The Soil Conservation Service has demonstrated a practical and effective method for dealing with problems brought on by complex ownership. Through agreements with Federal agencies which lease public lands to private owners, the Service deals directly with the operators who use the land. Soil- and water-conservation practices are put into use, as needed, without distinction between public and private lands. Soil conservation becomes something tangible and personal to those most directly concerned. Proper land use on all units, whether public or private, goes hand in hand with the necessary erosion control and moisture-conservation operations. The authority of each land-administering agency to manage its own lands and to supplement the efforts of the Soil Conservation Service by its own development and conservation measures is fully recognized. Positive action on the part of the Service includes research, surveys, planning, technical supervision, and actual work on many millions of acres.

In view of the demonstrated merit and success of this approach, there seems little need for a policy limiting the authority of one agency to work on public lands and another agency to work on private lands. Such a policy will endanger the entire conservation program in the West.

S. C. S. IS AN ACTION AGENCY

From the start, the Soil Conservation Service has been recognized as a so-called action agency. Without the enormous labor reserves of the C. C. C. and W. P. A., tractors, terracing equipment, and specialized field technicians to guide the application of conservation measures, it is highly improbable that there would be a network of great demonstration areas across the country today. If the Soil Conservation Service had been content to serve as a consultant to the American farmer, soil conservation would still be nothing more than a visionary idea tucked away in some remote corner of the Department of Agriculture. The Service must continue to act if the Nation is to consolidate and hold its soil-conservation gains.

In recent years the Service has begun to move into the broader field of cooperation with soil-conservation districts.

Soil conservation is more than an intangible idea that can be planted in the mind of a farmer and fertilized with how-to-do-it bulletins. It requires careful study and survey of slopes, soils, and rainfall; it frequently calls for more labor, equipment, and materials than the average farmer can provide; and, most important, it requires leadership to direct the use of all these conservation tools into a coordinated single farm plan that will work.

While farmers in districts naturally should provide more of these necessities than in the early days of demonstration, the Soil Conservation Service must be in a position to furnish those things which are beyond the immediate reach of soil-conservation districts—and to see to it that soil-conservation practices are actually put into use on the lands of those who are willing to do their part in the most important job this country ever faced.

SPECIAL PROBLEM IN SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

If limited to private lands, how will the Soil Conservation Service cooperate with the hundreds of soil-conservation districts in the West, which include large and small acreages of public land?

The Service has encouraged the formation of such districts with promises of assistance within the limit of available resources. Many of these districts have already asked for and are receiving assistance. Others will undoubtedly ask for aid in the future.

Must the Soil Conservation Service tell these districts that it can provide assistance only for those lands not under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior? Must its work be carried right up to a public-land boundary line and dropped?

Or will a soil-conservation district with a considerable acreage of Interior land within its boundaries ask two agencies to help solve a single problem? If so, the Soil Conservation Service will probably be expected to provide funds and personnel for surveys, planning, and operations on some three-way cooperative basis.

There is still a third possibility for solving the problem of the unfortunate district with Interior lands inside its boundaries. Perhaps the "agency or agencies, as the Secretary of the Interior may designate" to carry out soil-conserving activities on Interior lands will assume full responsibility for cooperation with the district; furnish C. C. C. or W. P. A. labor, field technicians, equipment, and so forth. That would mean that another "soil-conservation service" has been established.

A WATERSHED IS A UNIT—SO S. C. S. SHOULD BE

This feature of Reorganization Plan No. IV, in my opinion, has not been properly considered. Instead of economy, this will increase expenditures. Instead of efficiency, it will create duplication of effort. Instead of simplifying governmental activities, it will make them more complex. The net result will be a reduction in the total good accomplished.

Patrick Henry in 1777, before the Virginia Assembly, said: "Since the achievement of our independence he is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies."

Certainly the nation that loses its soil loses its life. It seems unfortunate that the framers of Reorganization Plan No. IV did not realize that gullies do not respect the lines that mark where private lands leave off and public lands begin, or where a watercourse moves from public lands to private and back again. In effective soil conservation, a watershed must be treated as a unit, and the Soil Conservation Service, in my estimation, should be continued as a unit, no matter what department houses it.

Present Members Should Be Kept in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COUSHATTA, LA., *June 26, 1940.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: It is my opinion that the present Members of the lower House as well as the Senate, regardless of party, should be sent back to Washington. We need experienced men and they should not be swapped in the middle of this ocean of hell.

Should the people of the country at large think as we do here in Red River Parish, it would not be necessary for our Representatives and Senators in Congress to make an active campaign. We believe it their patriotic duty to stick to their post at Washington.

Your ability and influence on the important Military Affairs Committee, alone, entitles you to be returned to the Nation's Capital without opposition.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRED WILSON.

Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address to the Democratic National Convention delivered by the President of the United States and broadcast from the White House on July 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the convention, my friends, it is very late tonight, but I have felt that you would rather that I speak to you now than wait until tomorrow.

It is with a very full heart that I speak tonight. I must confess that I do so with mixed feelings—because I find myself, as almost everyone does sooner or later in his lifetime, in a conflict between deep personal desire for retirement on the one hand and that quiet, invisible thing called conscience on the other.

Because there are self-appointed commentators and interpreters who will seek to misinterpret or question motives, I speak in a somewhat personal vein; and I must trust to the good faith and common sense of the American people to accept my own good faith—and to do their own interpreting.

When, in 1936, I was chosen by the voters for a second time as President, it was my firm intention to turn over the responsibilities of government to other hands at the end of my term. That conviction remained with me. Eight years in the Presidency, following a period of bleak depression, and covering one world crisis after another, would normally entitle any man to the relaxation that comes from honorable retirement.

During the spring of 1939 world events made it clear to all but the blind or the partisan that a great war in Europe had become not merely a possibility but a probability, and that such a war would of necessity deeply affect the future of this Nation.

When the conflict first broke out last September it was still my intention to announce clearly and simply, at an early date, that under no conditions would I accept reelection. This fact was well known to my friends, and I think was understood by many citizens.

It soon became evident, however, that such a public statement on my part would be unwise from the point of view of sheer public duty. As President of the United States, it was my clear duty, with the aid of the Congress, to preserve our neutrality, to shape our program of defense to meet rapid changes, to keep our domestic affairs adjusted to shifting world conditions, and to sustain the policy of the good neighbor.

It was also my obvious duty to maintain to the utmost the influence of this mighty Nation in our effort to prevent the spread of war, and to sustain by all legal means those governments threatened by other governments which had rejected the principles of democracy.

Swiftly moving foreign events made necessary swift action at home and beyond the seas. Plans for national defense had to be expanded and adjusted to meet new forms of warfare. American citizens and their welfare had to be safeguarded in many foreign zones of danger. National unity in the United States became a crying essential in the face of the development of unbelievable types of espionage and international treachery.

Every day that passed called for the postponement of personal plans and partisan debate until the latest possible moment. The normal conditions under which I would have made public declaration of my personal desires were wholly gone.

And so, thinking solely of the national good and of the international scene, I came to the reluctant conclusion that such declaration should not be made before the national convention. It was accordingly made to you within an hour after the permanent organization of this convention.

Like any other man, I am complimented by the honor you have done me. But I know you will understand the spirit in which I say that no call of party alone would prevail upon me to accept reelection to the Presidency.

The real decision to be made in these circumstances is not the acceptance of a nomination, but rather an ultimate willingness to serve if chosen by the electorate of the United States. Many considerations enter into this decision.

During the past few months, with due congressional approval we, in the United States, have been taking steps to implement the total defense of America. I cannot forget that in carrying out this program I have drafted into the service of the Nation many men and women, taking them away from important private affairs, calling them suddenly from their homes and their businesses. I have asked them to leave their own work, and to contribute their skill and experience to the cause of their Nation.

I, as the head of their Government, have asked them to do this. Regardless of party, regardless of personal convenience, they came—they answered the call. Every single one of them, with one exception, has come to the Nation's Capital to serve the Nation.

These people, who have placed patriotism above all else, represent those who have made their way to what might be called the top of their professions or industries through their proven skill and experience.

But they alone could not be enough to meet the needs of the times.

Just as a system of national defense based on manpower alone, without the mechanized equipment of modern warfare, is totally insufficient for adequate national defense, so also planes and guns and tanks are wholly insufficient unless they are implemented by the power of men trained to use them.

Such manpower consists not only of pilots and gunners and infantry and those who operate tanks. For every individual in actual combat service, it is necessary for adequate defense that we have ready at hand at least four or five other trained individuals organized for noncombat services.

Because of the millions of citizens involved in the conduct of defense, most right-thinking persons are agreed that some form of selection by draft is as necessary and fair today as it was in 1917 and 1918.

Nearly every American is willing to do his share or her share to defend the United States. It is neither just nor efficient to permit that task to fall upon any one section or any one group. For every section and every group depend for their existence upon the survival of the Nation as a whole.

Lying awake, as I have, on many nights, I have asked myself whether I have the right, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to call on men and women to serve their country or to train themselves to serve and, at the same time, decline to serve my country in my own personal capacity, if I am called upon to do so by the people of my country.

In times like these—in times of great tension, of great crisis—the compass of the world narrows to a single fact. The fact which dominates our world is the fact of armed aggression, the fact of successful armed aggression, aimed at the form of government, the kind of society that we in the United States have chosen and established for ourselves. It is a fact which no one longer doubts—which no one is longer able to ignore.

It is not an ordinary war. It is a revolution imposed by force of arms, which threatens all men everywhere. It is a revolution which proposes not to set men free but to reduce them to slavery—to reduce them to slavery in the interest of a dictatorship which has already shown the nature and the extent of the advantage which it hopes to obtain.

That is the fact which dominates our world and which dominates the lives of all of us, each and every one of us. In the face of the danger which confronts our time, no individual retains or can hope to retain, the right of personal choice which free men enjoy in times of peace. He has a first obligation to serve in the defense of our institutions of freedom—a first obligation to serve his country in whatever capacity his country finds him useful.

Like most men of my age, I had made plans for myself, plans for a private life of my own choice and for my own satisfaction, a life of that kind to begin in January 1941. These plans, like so many other plans, had been made in a world which now seems as distant as another planet. Today all private plans, all private lives have been in a sense repealed by an overriding public danger. In the face of that public danger all those who can be of service to the Republic have no choice but to offer themselves for service in those capacities for which they may be fitted.

These, my friends, are the reasons why I have had to admit to myself, and now to state to you, that my conscience will not let me turn my back upon a call to service.

The right to make that call rests with the people through the American method of a free election. Only the people themselves can draft a President. If such a draft should be made upon me, I say to you, in the utmost simplicity, I will, with God's help, continue to serve with the best of my ability and with the fullness of my strength.

To you, the delegates to this convention, I express my gratitude for the selection of Henry Wallace for the high office of Vice President of the United States. His first-hand knowledge of the problems of government in every sphere of life and in every single part of the Nation—and indeed of the whole world—qualifies him without reservation. His practical idealism will be of great service to me individually and to the Nation as a whole.

And to the Chairman of the National Committee, the Postmaster General of the United States—my old friend, Jim Farley—I send, as I have often before and will many times again, my most affectionate greetings. All of us are sure that he will continue to give all the leadership and support that he possibly can to the cause of American democracy.

In some respects, as I think my good wife suggested an hour or so ago—in some respects the next few months will be different, different from the usual national campaigns of recent years.

Most of you know how important it is that the President of the United States in these days remain close to the seat of Government. Since last summer I have been compelled to abandon proposed journeys to inspect many of our great national projects from the Alleghanies to the Pacific coast.

Events move so fast in other parts of the world that it has become my duty to remain either in the White House itself or at some nearby point where I can reach Washington and even Europe and Asia by direct telephone—where, if need be, I can be back at my desk in the space of a very few hours. And in addition, the splendid work of the new defense machinery will require me to spend vastly more time in conference with the responsible administrative heads under me. Finally, the added task which the present crisis has imposed also upon the Congress, compelling them to forego their usual adjournment, calls for constant cooperation between the executive and legislative branches, to the efficiency of which I am glad indeed now to pay tribute.

I do expect, of course, during the coming months to make my usual periodic reports to the country through the medium of press conferences and radio talks. I shall not have the time or the inclination to engage in purely political debate. But I shall never be loathe to call the attention of the Nation to deliberate or unwitting falsifications of fact, which are sometimes made by political candidates.

I have spoken to you in a very informal and personal way. The exigencies of the day require, however, that I also talk with you about things which transcend any personality and go very deeply to the roots of American civilization.

Our lives have been based on those fundamental freedoms and liberties which we Americans have cherished for a century and a half. The establishment of them and the preservation of them in each succeeding generation have been accomplished through the processes of free elective government—the Democratic-Republican form, based on the representative system and the coordination of the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judicial branches.

The task of safeguarding our institutions seems to me to be twofold. One must be accomplished, if it becomes necessary, by the armed defense forces of the Nation; the other, by the united effort of the men and women of the country, to make our Federal and State and local governments responsive to the growing requirements of modern democracy.

There have been occasions as we remember when reactions in the march of democracy have set in, and forward-looking progress has seemed to stop.

But such periods have been followed by liberal and progressive times which have enabled the Nation to catch up with new developments in fulfilling new human needs. Such a time has been the past seven years. Because we had seemed to lag in previous years, we have had to develop, speedily and efficiently, the answers to aspirations which had come from every State and every family in the land.

We have sometimes called it social legislation; we have sometimes called it legislation to end the abuses of the past; we have sometimes called it legislation for human security; we have sometimes called it legislation to better the condition of life of the many millions of our fellow citizens, who could not have the essentials of life or hope for an American standard of living.

Some of us have labeled it a wider and more equitable distribution of wealth in our land. It has included among its aims, to liberalize and broaden the control of vast industries—lodged today in the hands of a relatively small group of individuals of very great financial power.

But all of these definitions and labels are essentially the expression of one consistent thought. They represent a constantly growing sense of human decency, human decency throughout our nation.

This sense of human decency is happily confined to no group or class. You find it in the humblest home. You find it among those who toil and among the shopkeepers and the farmers of the Nation. You find it, to a growing degree, even among those who are listed in that top group which has so much control over the industrial and financial structure of the Nation. Therefore this urge of humanity can by no means be labeled a war of class against class. It is, rather, a war against poverty and suffering and ill health and insecurity—a war in which all classes are joining in the interest of a sound and enduring democracy.

I do not believe for a moment, and I know that you do not believe either that we have fully answered all of the needs of human secu-

rity. But we have covered much of the road. I need not catalog the milestones of 7 years. For every individual and every family in the whole land knows that the average of their personal lives has been made safer and sounder and happier than it has ever been before. I do not think they want the gains in these directions to be repealed or even to be placed in the charge of those who would give them mere lip service with no heart service.

Yes; very much more remains to be done; and I think the voters want the task entrusted to those who believe that the words "human betterment" apply to poor and rich alike.

And I have a sneaking suspicion, too, that voters will smile at charges of inefficiency against a government which has boldly met the enormous problems of banking and finance and industry which the great efficient bankers and industrialists of the Republican Party left in such hopeless chaos in the famous year 1933.

But we all know that our progress at home and in the other American nations toward this realization of a better human decency—progress along free lines—is gravely endangered by what is happening on other continents. In Europe many nations, through dictatorships or invasions, have been compelled to abandon normal democratic processes. They have been compelled to adopt forms of government which some call new and efficient.

They are not new, my friends, they are only a relapse—a relapse into ancient history. The omnipotent rulers of the greater part of modern Europe have guaranteed efficiency, and work, and a type of security.

But the slaves who built the pyramids for the glory of the dictator Pharaohs of Egypt had that kind of security, that kind of efficiency, that kind of corporative state.

So did the inhabitants of that world which extended from Britain to Persia under the undisputed rule of the proconsuls sent out from Rome.

So did the henchmen, the tradesmen, the mercenaries, and the slaves of the feudal system which dominated Europe a thousand years ago.

So did the people of those nations of Europe who received their kings and their government at the whim of the conquering Napoleon.

Whatever its new trappings and new slogans, tyranny is the oldest and most discredited rule known to history. And whenever tyranny has replaced a more human form of government it has been due more to internal causes than external. Democracy can thrive only when it enlists the devotion of those whom Lincoln called the common people. Democracy can hold that devotion only when it adequately respects their dignity by so ordering society as to assure to the masses of men and women reasonable security and hope for themselves and for their children.

We in our democracy, and those who live in still unconquered democracies, will never willingly descend to any form of this so-called security of efficiency which calls for the abandonment of other securities more vital to the dignity of man. It is our credo—unshakable to the end—that we must live under the liberties that were first heralded by Magna Carta and placed into glorious operation through the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights.

The Government of the United States for the past 7 years has had the courage openly to oppose by every peaceful means the spread of the dictator form of government. If our Government should pass to other hands next January—untried hands, inexperienced hands—we can merely hope and pray that they will not substitute appeasement and compromise with those who seek to destroy all democracies everywhere, including here.

I would not undo, if I could, the efforts I made to prevent war from the moment it was threatened and to restrict the area of carnage, down to the last minute. I do not now soften the condemnation expressed by Secretary Hull and myself from time to time for the acts of aggression that have wiped out ancient liberty-loving, peace-pursuing countries which had scrupulously maintained neutrality. I do not recant the sentiments of sympathy with all free peoples resisting such aggression, or begrudge the material aid that we have given to them. I do not regret my consistent endeavor to awaken this country to the menace for us and for all we hold dear.

I have pursued these efforts in the face of appeaser fifth columnists who charged me with hysteria and warmongering. But I felt it my duty, my simple, plain, unescapable duty, to arouse my countrymen to the danger of the new forces let loose in the world.

So long as I am President, I will do all I can to insure that that foreign policy remain our foreign policy.

All that I have done to maintain the peace of this country and to prepare it morally, as well as physically, for whatever contingencies may be in store, I submit to the judgment of my countrymen.

We face one of the great choices of history.

It is not alone a choice of government by the people versus dictatorship.

It is not alone a choice of freedom versus slavery.

It is not alone a choice between moving forward or falling back.

It is all of these rolled into one.

It is the continuance of civilization as we know it versus the ultimate destruction of all that we have held dear—religion against godlessness; the ideal of justice against the practice of force, moral decency versus the firing squad; courage to speak out, and to act, versus the false lullaby of appeasement.

But it has been well said that a selfish and greedy people cannot be free.

The American people must decide whether these things are worth making sacrifices of money, of energy, and of self. They will not decide by listening to mere words or by reading mere pledges, interpretations and claims. They will decide on the record—the record as it has been made—the record of things as they are.

The American people will sustain the progress of a representative democracy, asking the divine blessing as they face the future with courage and with faith.

Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as permanent chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at Chicago, Ill., on July 16, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 17, 1940]

STADIUM, CHICAGO, July 16.—The text of the address of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, permanent chairman of the Democratic National Convention, was as follows:

"Fellow Democrats, to the national committee, which recommended, and to this convention, which has chosen me as permanent chairman, I express my profound appreciation.

"I shall endeavor to preside over your deliberations with promptness and fairness to the end that you may consummate your task in dignity and good order.

"We assemble here in circumstances so uncommon, in the midst of world disorders so unprecedented and surrounded by domestic obligations so compulsive as to charge us with the duty of preparing our Nation to meet consequences which will project themselves indefinitely into the unpredictable future.

"The Democratic Party has faced one crisis after another during its long and glorious history.

"It has been tested in the crucible of faith and achievement. It has never faltered in its devotion to the higher interests of the people of America. It will not falter now.

"MAKING OF A CLEAR RECORD

"But we do not come together in any vain glorious spirit prompted by the mere desire for a partisan or personal victory. Unless by our record in the past and our concept of duty for the future we are equipped for the tasks of statesmanship, we have no claim on the American people for further preferment.

"The record we have made is written in the history of the Republic. While we lay no claim to perfection and fulminate no pretensions that this record contains no errors, nevertheless we contemplate with pride the great tasks we have undertaken and accomplished in behalf of democracy and those who believe in it and strive to advance it.

"Let us be equally unequivocal in the program we shall here announce, so that the American people and the world will know what we think and what we propose to do.

"The chief, if not the only, reason for the existence of political parties is to afford a vehicle for the molding and expression of public opinion and for the fixation of responsibility in the conduct of the public business.

"There have been occasions when political organizations were afraid to speak plainly or intelligently on problems of transcendent importance to this Nation, when language was employed not to convey but to conceal thought; when each pronouncement made a frontal attack on all others, and the whole appeared to have been written in mud by the migratory feet of a weasel.

"'COLORS' OF RIVAL PLATFORMS

"Such is the platform adopted by the Republican Party at Philadelphia 3 weeks ago. It is the perfect example of the uncertainties and ambiguities of men who do not know where they are going or what they will do when they arrive. The day on which it was written was described by Walter Lippman as 'black Tuesday in Philadelphia.'

"Having assembled this political ragout and found it without form and void, its fabricators concluded that what it lacked and needed was color. They wanted not only color but they wanted a variety of colors. But while they wanted color, they did not desire fast color.

"They desired a color whose changing shades and shadows would be determined by the degree of regulation which a fearless Government saw fit to impose upon a vast empire of power hitherto uncontrolled in its exercise of dominion over the social, industrial, and economic life of millions of Americans.

"They seemed unwilling or afraid to nominate any man who had been a Republican for more than 2 years. Hence, they chose a political chameleon.

"The Philadelphia convention constituted the second charge of the Light Brigade, in the heroic Battle of Kilowatt.

"DEALING WITH 'INHERITED CHAOS'

"It is not my province or my purpose on this occasion to attempt any detailed review of the history of the world or our own country during the past 8 years. Much of that history has been spread before our eyes with such kaleidoscopic rapidity as to render the succession of events a little vague to all but the meticulous historian.

"It is no exaggeration to assert that no similar period in our history has been so crowded with engrossing spectacularity or fraught with such consequences to our institutions or our methods of life.

"Our efforts here at home have not been inspired by the punitive desire to set group against group or to array section against section.

"We inherited chaos 8 years ago. We inherited fear, which was almost universal. We inherited lack of confidence, not only in private enterprise, but in our public institutions.

"The American people had been led to the brink of a precipice by the fallacies of a smug and blind regime, which found itself impotent to draw back or to avert the disaster which it had contrived.

"SPREAD OF 'DEVASTATION'

"This impotence had wrought its devastation not only in the field of business and industry but had set a blight on all financial activiities.

"Banks and confidence in them collapsed. Wheels of industry were motionless. The market places for both money and commodities were bereft of constructive or profitable activities.

"Agriculture dropped and died from a dry rot inflicted by legislative and administrative incompetence, while the feet of 15,000,000 American laborers wandered in vagrant anxiety over the question of tomorrow's food and shelter.

"Homes and firesides, millions of them, which must be the sanctuary of the true spirit of America, were on the verge of permanent loss through the cry of the auctioneer.

"Abuses of the financial, economic, and social realms of our existence had grown so chronic that the Nation despaired of any constructive or effective remedy against them.

"The status quo became the law of our being, and the Government imitated that backward-flying bird which never knows where it is going but can only see where it has been.

"BLOCKING OF WORLD TRADE

"American commerce with the world, which in every great industrial nation has been and must be a substantial portion of the yardstick of its prosperity, had fled from the seas and the marts of trade.

"Encouraged by our own example of folly, insurmountable barriers had been erected by nation against nation through the effort of provincial minds to set metes and bounds to the genius and initiative of man.

"In our own hemisphere, peopled by the children of those who had fought for the creation of a new ideal of democratic thought and conduct, suspicion and fear, political and economic, retarded the efforts to consummate a solidarity essential to the preservation and protection of the common interests of all the Americas.

"The effort of the past 7 years on the part of our Government has been devoted to the task of remolding the faith of our people in their own brand of democracy under the leadership of one of the world's outstanding Democrats, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"A CHALLENGE ON FREEDOMS

"We have heard much from complacent threats in recent years about free enterprise. The spokesmen of the Philadelphia assemblage invoked the spirits of the departed in behalf of free enterprise, and ex-President Hoover began his diatribe by proclaiming it the duty of his party to save America for free men.

"He, of all men, ought to cry for the return of freedom, because he and his regime fastened more shackles on the physical, economic, and spiritual aspirations of the American people than any other group who ever mismanaged the affairs of this Republic.

"What freedom is it that we have destroyed, and, by the same token, what freedom is it that the platform and nominees of the Philadelphia convention will restore?

"Is it the freedom to juggle and manipulate and determine the value of the securities of American corporations in which millions of our people have invested their savings?

"Do they propose to destroy the freedom we have guaranteed to labor in the United States to sit across a table from its employer on terms of equality and bargain collectively over wages, hours, and working conditions?

"Do they propose to restore the uncontrolled freedom of some employers to exploit employees by long hours and low wages?

"Do they propose to remove from agriculture the freedom to cooperate within itself and with the Government of the United States in securing a larger portion of the national income for the service they render to society?

"Do they propose to return the American farmer to the income of 1932 instead of twice that income which he has received under the New Deal?

"Mr. Hoover, who constitutes the remaining living symbol of Republican wisdom, in his speech at the convention, said the Republican Party was the first to bring relief to the American farmer. What he no doubt meant to say was that Republican leadership was the first to bring the need for relief to the American farmer.

"Will they restore the freedom of vast holding companies, drawing their substance from local utilities and their consumers to continue their depredations upon the public, to prevent which the Utility Holding Company Act was passed over the vehement protest of the present Republican candidate for President?

"In truth, the reason for the shifting of his political robes was the enactment of this legislation, plus the completion and development of a great natural resource in the Tennessee Valley, begun during the first World War in the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

"Will they destroy or undermine the laws we have enacted for the aged and unemployed?

"Will they restore the freedom as well as the compulsion of old age to descend to the grave in penury and want?

"Will they restore the freedom as well as the compulsion of unemployed men to walk the streets in search of work or take their places in bread lines where they stood in 1932?

"STRONGER SECURITY LAW URGED

"We have made but a beginning in this great field of social security. It is my opinion that we must strengthen and simplify the law not only to provide greater assistance but also to provide greater uniformity in the benefits accruing to those entitled to them under the social security law.

"There ought to be greater uniformity throughout the Nation in the provisions for old-age pensions; and I am convinced that this uniformity can be secured only when the Federal Government assumes greater responsibility for the administration of the benefits which the law accords.

"What is this freedom which we have driven out and which they will entice back to this land of the free?

"Do the Philadelphia guarantors of a return of freedom propose to abolish the Civilian Conservation Corps or the National Youth Administration which have prepared more than 3,000,000 young men and women for responsibilities in life and given them a new conception of the relationship between them and their Government?

"Mr. Hoover, in his Philadelphia exegesis, announced that the New Deal had stabilized unemployment. Having himself multiplied it beyond all previous calculations, even he ought to welcome some degree of stabilization.

"During this pretended eclipse of free enterprise in America the national income has increased from $38,000,000,000 to $71,000,000,000 per annum. The last Republican administration had reduced it from eighty billions to thirty-eight billions and had inaugurated that succession of annual deficits which they now proclaim as the peculiar patent of the Roosevelt administration.

"The fundamental difference between the two situations is that Roosevelt deficits have been reflected in vast improvements and additions to the values of property and life in every community in the United States, while there cannot be found in any part of the Nation any evidence of value or increased enjoyment of life that previous deficit spending had accomplished.

"In this same period during which they believe freedom has fled from our shores and the credit of the Government has been jeopardized the price of Government bonds on the markets of the Nation and the world rose from 80 cents on the dollar to nearly $1.20, notwithstanding a substantial decrease in the rate of interest which these obligations bear.

"During this same period the total indebtedness of the American people has decreased by more than $10,000,000,000, which does not indicate that they are headed toward predicted bankruptcy.

"IMPROVEMENTS HAVE COST MONEY

"These improvements, these aids to industry and to labor, and the general restoration of the morale of our people have cost money. We do not deny that. They have made it necessary for us to borrow money and levy taxes which under normal conditions would have been unnecessary and undesirable.

"But the American people are not and will not be frightened into panic when they realize that during the past 7 years, while the debt of the National Government has increased by $22,000,000,000, their total other public and private debts have decreased by more than $30,000,000,000, and that during this same 7-year period their aggregate income has increased four times as much as has the indebtedness of the Federal Government.

"All this has been done in order to restore the faith of the American people in their Government and to emphasize the fact that our Government is not an austere, unapproachable, inanimate thing off yonder in Washington, taking no account of or interest in the affairs of those who support it.

"All this has been done to demonstrate that the processes of democracy can be made to respond to the needs of men and women. It has been done in order to prove that under our Constitution and without changing or undermining our form of government it can be made an instrument of service under the stress of a great crisis.

"It cannot be denied that democracy was in sore need of this proof of its efficacy and its power.

"Never before in our history has democracy been under attack on a wider front than during the last decade.

"MARCH TOWARD FREEDOM

"For a century and more prior to the World War, the races of men were moving toward the goal of freedom and self-government.

Beginning with our own Revolution and a little later with the French Revolution, the theory of democratic institutions found acceptance in all parts of the world.

"During this century most of South America established its freedom from Spain and other foreign dominations under republican forms of government, patterned largely after our own. France drove the last Bonaparte from the throne and established the French Republic.

"China proclaimed a republic throughout her vast territory, and among the far-flung elements of the British Empire a commonwealth of nations emerged, in which the people strengthened their local institutions and extended their privileges of independent action.

"In the smaller nations of Europe, even those which clung to the traditions of monarchy, the people increased their power over and participation in their governments.

"In Russia the Czar and all that he represented were unhorsed in what was supposed to be a revolution for the people. In Germany the Kaiser abdicated and fled his country following the establishment of a republic.

"In England the House of Lords was shorn of some of its ancient prerogatives. In Italy the King became a puppet, and in South Africa the principles of self-government became an established fact following the Boer War.

"Everywhere it seemed that the doctrine, proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson that all governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed, was on the march and would at length cover the earth like the waters cover the sea.

"PROCESS SENT INTO REVERSE

"But in the past decade or two this process seems to have gone in reverse. Whether as the result of some evil spirit loosed by the agonies of the World War, or in consequence of the impotence of existing regimes to understand or respond to the needs of the people, we need not here undertake to determine.

"But we do know that autocracy rears its ugly face in larger portions of the world today than at any time since the formation of the American Republic, and we do know that we are confronted with the alternative of defending and preserving our democratic institutions, as we have built them and enjoyed them, or seeing them confounded by the convergence of antagonistic ideologies in a world dedicated not to the proposition that all men are created equal but that all men are created to feed the maw of greedy, grasping totalitarian states.

"In the midst of these alternatives there is but one choice that the American people can make with honor to themselves and fidelity to traditions and principles for which the Nation was created and to which it is dedicated.

"That choice is to fight against those who would assault our territory, our independence, our ideals, or our vital interests, or anything which we are committed or pledged to defend and preserve, whether that assault is launched from a foreign source or is instigated by disloyal or subversive influence within our own borders.

"We are charged with the responsibility of determining for ourselves whether this democracy which we have instituted and developed is, first, worth preserving; and, second, whether we have the courage, the fortitude, and the intelligence to exert the effort and make the sacrifice essential to its preservation.

"We must determine whether the restoration of confidence in the American system for which we have labored the last 8 years, after all, was worth the effort, and whether we are ready to announce to all the world that not only the United States but the entire Western Hemisphere has been dedicated as a sanctuary for free men, and that any effort from any outside source to encroach upon it territorially, politically, or by any other form of insidious penetration will be met by the total impact of all our resources of men, money, and material, until the encroachment and those who undertake it shall have been broken and driven back.

"This does not mean that we desire war. It does not mean that we do not cherish peace and goodwill among all nations and all races. It does not mean that we propose to become involved in the military conflicts among foreign nations. It does not mean that we propose or intend to send the armed forces of this nation to the battlefields of Europe or Asia for the purpose of determining military superiority among the nations involved.

"But it does mean that we propose to see that at least one continent on this earth shall be kept free for the account of the individual and collective rights and privileges of free men.

"It means that we propose to hold fast to the doctrine that the State is created for the service of the people and not that the people are created for the exploitation of the State.

"For this task we must be prepared, morally, spiritually, physically, mechanically, economically.

"In the inept conglomeration, called the Republican platform, adopted at Philadelphia, we find the following brilliant piece of fiction:

"'The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace. We accordingly fasten upon the New Deal full responsibility for our unpreparedness and for the consequent danger of involvement in war.'

"No responsible political party ever promulgated a more deceitful alibi in all the history of political parties in the United States.

"I do not relish the necessity to indulge in partisan dispute over the question of preparedness. It ought not to be a partisan question. But, in view of the fact that the Republican platform seeks to make it a partisan question, I am not afraid to discuss it on that basis.

"EFFECTS OF TREATIES ON DEFENSE

"Following the World War the nations sincerely sought peace and disarmament.

"The United States, in the early days of the Harding administration, called the Washington Disarmament Conference. This conference was hailed as a great step toward lifting the burden of armaments from the people of the nations involved. War vessels were sunk. Blueprints were torn to pieces; and ships under construction were ordered scrapped.

"But following this conference it turned out that under the administrations of Republican Presidents, our naval building program did not approximate the ratio allowed by the agreement entered into.

"Then came the so-called nine-power pact, entered into by nine nations during the control of our Government by the Republican Party under which the construction and maintenance of an adequate Army and Navy were still further retarded.

"Then came the so-called Briand-Kellogg Pact, by which nearly all of the nations of the world agreed to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. This hope for world peace was made the excuse for further reductions in appropriations and in construction for our national defense.

"I do not decry these efforts for world peace. The American people, in common with most of the peoples of the world, sincerely hoped and prayed that war would not again drench the earth in human blood.

"But it cannot be claimed by those who were then in power in this Nation that anything substantial was done to build up or even maintain the minimum requirements of our national-defense equipment.

"Instead of having only 75,000 we have 241,000 equipped soldiers in the United States Army, and the present Congress, on the recommendation and under the leadership of the President has authorized an increase to 375,000 men and will authorize further increases as fully and as rapidly as may be required.

"In view of the abortive effort of the Republican convention to fasten on the New Deal the responsibility for any lack of preparedness that may now exist and to elude any portion of that responsibility, let us make some comparisons.

"During the 7 years since 1933 our Government has expended $1,300,000,000 more on the Army than was expended during the previous 7 years.

"In these same 7 years the United States has expended $1,500,000,000 more on the Navy than was expended during the previous 7 years.

"These expenditures were recommended and appropriated under President Roosevelt and they were made necessary largely because Republican administrations had sorely neglected both arms of our national defense.

"During the last year of Woodrow Wilson's administration, when Franklin Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, appropriations for the Navy amounted to $960,000,000. In the first year of the Harding administration they were reduced to $485,000,000. During the 12 years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover they continued to decline until the fiscal year of 1934 when they reached the insignificant sum of $266,000,000, which was the last naval appropriation enacted as Mr. Hoover was about to retire from office.

"During those 12 years not a single battleship was laid down for construction and only 20 other types of combatant vessels, such as cruisers, submarines, and gunboats, were constructed.

"During the past 4 years we have completed 115 combatant naval vessels. We have under construction now 138 additional vessels, consisting of 10 battleships, 5 aircraft carriers, 4 heavy cruisers, 17 light cruisers, 61 destroyers, and 41 submarines.

"In addition to these vessels now under construction we have provided for the construction of enough naval war craft to give us the largest navy in the world, sufficiently strong to protect our interests in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans against any aggressor from any source in any part of this world.

"What else does the record reveal?

"When the naval appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1939 was passed in the Senate a majority of Republican Senators, including the Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNARY, voted against it.

"When in the spring of 1939 there came before the Senate the bill increasing the number of Army airplanes from 5,500 to 6,000, a majority of Republican Senators, including their present candidate for Vice President, voted against it.

"When in the Senate the Naval appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1940 was adopted, nearly half the Republican Members voted against it.

"When, in May 1939, the Naval Appropriations Bill carrying a billion dollars for the Navy was before the House of Representatives, of the 58 votes cast against it 54 were Republicans.

"When the House of Representatives was considering the Army appropriations bill for 1940, 4 amendments were offered by Republicans to reduce the sums for signal service, ordnance, and airplanes. Of the 150 Members voting for these reductions 145 were Republicans.

"Only eight Republicans voted against the reductions. In the United States Senate one of the Republican candidates for President, Mr. TAFT, urged an amendment reducing appropriations for the Army and Navy by 25 percent; and, so far as I have been able to learn, the man who nosed him out for the Republican nomination,

Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, uttered no warning or advice to his newly made Republican brethren on the subject of national defense.

"He was probably too busy talking about balancing the Budget and trying to prevent the efforts of the Securities and Exchange Commission to unscramble his billion-dollar utility holding company omelet, and endeavoring to thwart the objectives of the great Tennessee Valley project which was begun 22 years ago as a part of our national-defense program.

"And as late as last Thursday in the House of Representatives, when, at the urgent request and recommendation of William R. Knudsen and Edward Stettinius, members of the Advisory Committee on National Defense, and also at the urgent solicitation of Mr. Dunn, a member of the engineering firm which Mr. Willkie consulted in his fight against the Tennessee Valley Authority, an effort was made to provide for the construction of an additional dam for the purpose of inaugurating the speedy manufacture of necessary aluminum for the construction of airplanes, the effort was blocked by Republican Members of the House of Representatives.

"PRESIDENT'S WORK FOR PEACE

"But what of our involvement in war?

"No man who ever occupied the Presidency of the United States ever strove more valiantly to avert the present war in Europe before its outbreak than did Mr. Roosevelt. No man ever condemned in more unmeasured terms the wicked determination to resort to the brutal force of arms in conquering peaceful and friendly nations, or in settling any legitimate controversies among the nations of Europe.

"No political party or administration in the history of this or any Nation ever made greater sacrifices to avoid involvement in war than have been made by the Democratic Party and its present administration.

"For more than a century we, as a Nation, have insisted on the freedom of the seas. We have insisted that our flag and every flag had the right to sail the seas in time of war, subject to certain rights of search and seizure. We have insisted on the right of Americans to trade and travel under an international law that had been recognized for centuries.

"It was our insistence on the observance of these rights that finally drew us into the World War in 1917.

"But in order to avoid the possibility or likelihood of our involvement in this war through incidents incapable of being foreseen, we have, in the neutrality law, recommended by the President and enacted by a Democratic Congress over the protest of the Republicans, prohibited American ships to sail in belligerent or dangerous waters or American citizens to travel there; and we have prohibited even the granting of credit to belligerent nations and required them to pay cash for what they buy and to transport it in their own or other foreign vessels.

"If the Republicans in Congress had been successful in defeating this legislation, we might already be involved in the war which they pretend so much to fear.

"In these days of peril and uncertainty, we invoke the spirit of a united America.

"We shall expect to make sacrifices. We shall expect to forego some luxuries and conveniences. Already the impact of world conditions has colored our thoughts and remolded some of our conceptions and methods of life.

"But it has not lessened our resolution. It has not made us afraid. It has not cowed the spirit which discovered, populated, developed, and civilized this America of ours. It has but served to strengthen our determination and fortify our resistance.

"In the midst of these threats we call on our people for unity. The relationship between a people and their government is not a one-way thoroughfare. The obligations are reciprocal. They call for that concert of soul and purpose which knows no distinction of race, origin, color, or religion.

"We know that Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, white and colored, rich and poor, native born and foreign born will rise in all their might and holy zeal to guard these portals against the fate which has wrecked other peoples and other civilizations.

"To this high commitment we pledge ourselves and all that we shall here undertake.

"In its consummation we invoke the guidance of God, who, we believe, still sits upon His throne, still rules in earth and heaven, and still holds in the hollow of His hand the destiny of nations and of men."

The 1940 Platform of Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

PLATFORM ADOPTED AT THE CHICAGO CONVENTION

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the platform adopted by the Democratic Party at its national convention recently held in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREAMBLE

The world is undergoing violent changes. Humanity, uneasy in this machine age, is demanding a sense of security and dignity based on human values. No democratic government, which fails to recognize this trend—and take appropriate action—can survive.

That is why the Government of this Nation has moved to keep ahead of this trend; has moved with speed inexplicable to those who do not see this trend.

Outside the Americas, established institutions are being overthrown and democratic philosophies are being repudiated by those whose creed recognizes no power higher than military force, no values other than a false efficiency.

What the founding fathers realized upon this continent was a daring dream that men could have not only physical security, not only efficiency, but something else in addition that men had never had before—the security of the heart that comes with freedom, the peace of mind that comes from a sense of justice.

To this generation of Americans it is given to defend this democratic faith as it is challenged by social maladjustment within and totalitarian greed without. The world revolution against which we prepare our defense is so threatening that not until it has burned itself out in the last corner of the earth will our democracy be able to relax its guard.

In this world crisis, the purpose of the Democratic Party is to defend against external attack and to justify by internal progress the system of government and way of life from which the Democratic Party takes its name.

Toward the modern fulfillment of the American ideal, the Democratic Party, during the last 7 years, has labored successfully—

1. To strengthen democracy by defensive preparedness against aggression, whether by open attack or secret infiltration;

2. To strengthen democracy by increasing our economic efficiency; and

3. To strengthen democracy by improving the welfare of the people.

These three objectives are one and inseparable. No nation can be strong by armaments alone. It must possess and use all the necessary resources for producing goods plentifully and distributing them effectively.

It must add to these factors of material strength the unconquerable spirit and energy of a contented people convinced that there are no boundaries to human progress and happiness in a land of liberty.

Our faith that these objectives can be attained is made unshakable by what has already been done by the present administration—in stopping the waste and exploitation of our national resources, in restoring to the average man and woman a stake in the preservation of our democracy, in enlarging our national armaments, and in achieving national unity.

We shall hold fast to these gains. We are proud of our record. Therefore the party in convention assembled endorses wholeheartedly the brilliant and courageous leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his statesmanship and that of the Congress for the past 7 trying years. And to our President and great leader we send our cordial greetings.

The American people are determined that war, raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa, shall not come to America.

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

For years our President has warned the Nation that organized assaults against religion, democracy, and international good faith threatened our own peace and security.

Men blinded by partisanship brushed aside these warnings as war mongering and officious intermeddling. The fall of 12 nations was necessary to bring their belated approval of legislative and Executive action that the President had urged and undertaken with the full support of the people.

It is a tribute to the President's foresight and action that our defense forces are today at the peak of their peacetime effectiveness.

Weakness and unpreparedness invite aggression. We must be so strong that no possible combination of powers would dare to attack us. We propose to provide America with an invincible air force, a Navy strong enough to protect all our seacoasts and our national interests, and a fully equipped and mechanized Army.

We shall continue to coordinate these implements of defense with the necessary expansion of industrial capacity and with the training of appropriate personnel. Outstanding leaders of industry and labor have already been enlisted by the Government to harness our mighty economic forces for national defense.

Experience of other nations gives warning that total defense is necessary to repel attack and that partial defense is no defense.

We have seen the downfall of nations accomplished through international dissension provoked from without.

We denounce and will do all in our power to destroy the treasonable activities of disguised antidemocratic and un-American agencies which would sap our strength, paralyze our will to defend ourselves, and destroy our unity by inciting race against race, class

against class, religion against religion, and the people against their free institutions.

To make America strong and to keep America free, every American must give of his talents and treasure in accordance with his ability and his country's needs. We must have democracy of sacrifice as well as democracy of opportunity.

To insure that our armaments shall be implements of peace rather than war, we shall continue our traditional policies of the good neighbor, observe and advocate international respect for the rights of others and for treaty obligations, cultivate foreign trade through desirable trade agreements, and foster economic collaboration with the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

In self-defense and in good conscience, the world's greatest democracy cannot afford heartlessly or in a spirit of appeasement to ignore the peace-loving and liberty-loving peoples wantonly attacked by ruthless aggressors.

We pledge to extend to these peoples all the material aid at our command, consistent with law and not inconsistent with the interests of our own national self-defense, all to the end that peace and international good faith may yet emerge triumphant.

We do not regard the need for preparedness a warrant for infringement upon our civil liberties, but, on the contrary, we shall continue to protect them, in the keen realization that the vivid contrast between the freedom we enjoy and the dark repression which prevails in the lands where liberty is dead affords warning and example to our people to confirm their faith in democracy.

We must strengthen democracy by increasing our economic efficiency.

THE LAND AND THE FARMER

The well-being of the land and those who work upon it is basic to the real defense and security of America.

The Republican Party gives its promises to the farmer and its allegiance to those who exploit him.

Since 1932 farm income has been doubled; 6,000,000 farmers, representing more than 80 percent of all farm families, have participated in an effective soil conservation program; the farm debt and the interest rate on farm debt have been reduced and farm foreclosures have been drastically curtailed; rural highways and farm-to-market roads have been vastly improved and extended; the surpluses on the farms have been used to feed the needy; low-cost electricity has been brought to 5,000,000 farm people as a result of the rural electrification program; thousands of impoverished farm families have been rehabilitated, and steps have been taken to stop the alarming growth of farm tenancy, to increase land ownership, and to mitigate the hardships of migratory farm labor.

We pledge ourselves:

To make parity as well as soil-conservation payments until such time as the goal of parity income for agriculture is realized.

To extend and enlarge the tenant-purchase program until every deserving tenant farmer has a real opportunity to have a farm of his own.

To refinance existing farm debts at lower interest rates and on longer and more flexible terms.

To continue to provide for adjustment of production through democratic processes to the extent that excess surpluses are capable of control.

To continue the program of rehabilitation of farmers who need and merit aid.

To preserve and strengthen the ever-normal granary on behalf of the national defense, the consumer at home and abroad, and the American farmer.

To continue to make commodity loans, to maintain the ever-normal granary, and to prevent destructively low prices.

To expand the domestic consumption of our surpluses by the food and cotton stamp plan, the free school lunch, low-cost milk, and other plans for bringing surplus farm commodities to needy consumers.

To continue our substantially increased appropriations for research and extension work through the land-grant colleges and for research laboratories established to develop new outlets for farm products.

To conserve the soil and water resources for the benefit of farmers and the Nation. In such conservation programs we shall, so far as practicable, bring about that development in forests and other permanent crops as will not unduly expand livestock and dairy products.

To safeguard the farmer's foreign markets and expand his domestic market for all domestic crops.

To enlarge the rural-electrification program.

To encourage farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives.

To continue the broad program launched by this administration for the coordinated development of our river basins through reclamation and irrigation, flood control, reforestation and soil conservation, stream purification, recreation, fish and game protection, low-cost power, and rural industry.

To encourage marketing agreements in aid of producers of dairy products, vegetables, fruits, and special types for the purpose of orderly marketing and the avoidance of unfair and wasteful practices.

To extend crop insurance from wheat to other crops as rapidly as experience justifies such extension.

To safeguard the family-sized farm in all our programs.

To finance these programs adequately in order that they may be effective.

In settling new lands reclaimed from the desert by projects like Grand Coulee, we shall give priority to homeless families who have lost their farms. As these new lands are brought into use, we shall continue by Federal purchase to retire from the plow submarginal lands, so that an increased percentage of our farmers may be able to live and work on good land.

These programs will continue to be in the hands of locally elected farmer committees to the largest extent possible. In this truly democratic way we will continue to bring economic security to the farmer and his family, while recognizing the dignity and freedom of American farm life.

INDUSTRY AND THE WORKER

Under Democratic auspices more has been done in the last 7 years to foster the essential freedom, dignity, and opportunity of the American worker than in any other administration in the Nation's history. In consequence, labor is today taking its rightful place as a partner of management in the common cause of higher earnings, industrial efficiency, national unity, and national defense.

A far-flung system of employment exchanges has brought together millions of idle workers and available jobs. The workers' right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing is being enforced. We have enlarged the Federal machinery for the mediation of labor disputes. We have enacted an effective wage and hour law. Child labor in factories has been outlawed. Prevailing wages to workers employed on Government contracts have been assured.

We pledge to continue to enforce fair labor standards; to maintain the principles of the National Labor Relations Act; to expand employment training and opportunity for our youth, older workers, and workers displaced by technological changes; to strengthen the orderly processes of collective bargaining and peaceful settlement of labor disputes; and to work always for a just distribution of our national income among those who labor.

We will continue our efforts to achieve equality of opportunity for men and women without impairing the social legislation which promotes true equality by safeguarding the health, safety, and economic welfare of women workers. The right to work for compensation in both public and private employment is an inalienable privilege of women as well as men, without distinction as to marital status.

The production of coal is one of our most important basic industries. Stability of production, employment, distribution, and price are indispensable to the public welfare.

We pledge continuation of the Federal Bituminous Coal Stabilization Act, and sympathetic consideration of the application of similar legislation to the anthracite-coal industry, in order to provide additional protection for the owners, miners, and consumers of hard coal.

We shall continue to emphasize the human element in industry and strive toward increasingly whole-hearted cooperation between labor and industrial management.

CAPITAL AND THE BUSINESSMAN

To make democracy strong, our system of business enterprise and individual initiative must be free to gear its tremendous productive capacity to serve the greatest good of the greatest number.

We have defended and will continue to defend all legitimate business.

We have attacked and will continue to attack unbridled concentration of economic power and the exploitation of the consumer and the investor.

We have attacked the kind of banking which treated America as a colonial empire to exploit; the kind of securities business which regarded the stock exchange as a private gambling club for wagering other people's money; the kind of public utility holding companies which used consumers' and investors' money to suborn a free press, bludgeon legislatures and political conventions and control elections against the interest of their customers and their surety holders.

We have attacked the kind of business which levied tribute on all the rest of American business by the extortionate methods of monopoly.

We did not stop with attack; we followed through the remedy. The American people found in themselves, through the democratic process, ability to meet the economic problems of average American business where concentrated power had failed.

We found a broken and prostrate banking and financial system. We restored it to health by strengthening banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions. We have insured $62,000,000 bank accounts and protected millions of small investors in the security and commodity markets. We have thus revived confidence, safeguarded thrift and opened the road to all honorable business.

We have made credit at low interest rates available to small-business men, thus unfastening the oppressive yoke of a money monopoly and giving the ordinary citizen a chance to go into business and stay in business.

We recognize the importance of small-business concerns and new enterprises in our national economy, and favor the enactment of constructive legislation to safeguard the welfare of small business. Independent small-scale enterprise, no less than big business, should be adequately represented on appropriate governmental boards and commissions, and its interests should be examined and fostered by a continuous research program.

We have provided an important outlet for private capital by stimulating home building and low-rent housing projects. More new homes were built throughout the Nation last year than in any year since 1929.

We have fostered a well-balanced American merchant marine and the world's finest system of civil aeronautics to promote our commerce and our national defense.

We have steered a steady course between a bankruptcy-producing deflation and a thrift-destroying inflation, so that today the dollar is the most stable and sought after currency in the world—a factor of immeasurable benefit in our foreign and domestic commerce.

We shall continue to oppose barriers which impede trade among the several States. We pledge our best efforts in strengthening our home markets, and to this end we favor the adjustment of freight rates so that no section or State will have undue advantage over any other.

To encourage investment in productive enterprise, the tax-exempt privileges of future Federal, State, and local bonds should be removed.

We have enforced the antitrust laws more vigorously than at any time in our history, thus affording the maximum protection to the competitive system.

We favor strict supervision of all forms of the insurance business by the several States for the protection of policyholders and the public.

The full force of our policies, by raising the national income by $30,000,000,000 from the low of 1932, by encouraging vast reemployment, and by elevating the level of consumer demand, has quickened the flow of buying and selling through every artery of industry and trade.

With mass purchasing power restored and many abuses eliminated, American business stands at the threshold of a great new era richer in promise than any we have witnessed—an era of pioneering and progress beyond the present frontiers of economic activity—in transportation, in housing, in industrial expansion, and in the new utilization of the products of the farm and the factory.

We shall aid business in redeeming America's promise.

ELECTRIC POWER

During the past 7 years the Democratic Party has won the first major victories for the people of the Nation in their generation-old contest with the power monopoly.

These victories have resulted in the recognition of certain self-evident principles and the realization of vast benefits by the people. These principles, long opposed by the Republican Party, are:

That the power of falling water is a gift from God, and consequently belongs not to a privileged few, but to all the people, who are entitled to enjoy its benefits;

That the people have the right through their Government to develop their own power sites and bring low-cost electricity to their homes, farms, and factories;

That public-utility holding companies must not be permitted to serve as the means by which a few men can pyramid stocks upon stocks for the sole purpose of controlling vast power empires.

We condemn the Republican policies which permitted the victimizing of investors in the securities of private power corporations, and the exploitation of the people by unnecessarily high utility costs.

We condemn the opposition of utility power interests which delayed for years the development of national defense projects in the Tennessee Valley, and which obstructed river-basin improvements and other public projects bringing low-cost electric power to the people.

The successful power developments in the Tennessee and Columbia River Basins show the wisdom of the Democratic Party in establishing Government-owned and operated hydroelectric plants in the interests of power and light consumers.

Through these Democratic victories, whole regions have been revived and restored to prosperous habitation. Production costs have been reduced. Industries have been established which employ men and capital. Cheaper electricity has brought vast economic benefits to thousands of homes and communities.

These victories of the people must be safeguarded. They will be turned to defeat if the Republican Party should be returned to power. We pledge our party militantly to oppose every effort to encroach upon the inherent right of our people to be provided with this primary essential of life at the lowest possible cost.

The nomination of an utility executive by the Republican Party as its Presidential candidate raises squarely the issue, whether the Nation's water power shall be used for all the people or the selfish interests of a few. We accept that issue.

DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN RESOURCES

We take satisfaction in pointing out the incomparable development of the public-land States under the wise and constructive legislation of this administration. Mining has been revived, agriculture fostered, reclamation extended, and natural resources developed as never before in a similar period.

We pledge the continuance of such policies, based primarily on the expansion of opportunity for the people, as will encourage the full development, free from financial exploitation, of the great resources—mineral, agricultural, livestock, fishing, and lumber—which the West affords.

RADIO

Radio has become an integral part of the democratically accepted doctrine of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion. We urge such legislative steps as may be required to afford the same protection from censorship that is now afforded the press under the Constitution of the United States.

We must strengthen democracy by improving the welfare of the people. We place human resources first among the assets of a democratic society.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Democratic Party wages war on unemployment, one of the gravest problems of our times, inherited at its worst from the last Republican administration. Since we assumed office, 9,000,000 additional persons have gained regular employment in normal private enterprise. All our policies—financial, industrial, and agricultural—will continue to accelerate the rate of this progress.

By public action, where necessary to supplement private reemployment, we have rescued millions from idleness that breeds weakness and given them a real stake in their country's well-being. We shall continue to recognize the obligation of government to provide work for deserving workers who cannot be absorbed by private industry.

We are opposed to vesting in the States and local authorities the control of federally financed work relief. We belief that this Republican proposal is a thinly disguised plan to put the unemployed back on the dole.

We will continue energetically to direct our efforts toward the employment in private industry of all those willing to work, as well as the fullest employment of money and machines. This we pledge as our primary objective.

To further implement this objective, we favor calling, under the direction of the President, a national unemployment conference of leaders of government, industry, labor, and farm groups. There is work in our factories, mines, fields, forests, and river basins; on our coasts, highways, railroads, and inland waterways. There are houses to be built to shelter our people. Building a better America means work and a higher standard of living for every family and a richer and more secure heritage for every American.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Democratic Party, which established social security for the Nation, is dedicated to its extension. We pledge to make the Social Security Act increasingly effective by covering millions of persons not now protected under its terms; by strengthening our unemployment-insurance system and establishing more adequate and uniform benefits, through the Federal equalization fund principle, by progressively extending and increasing the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance system, including protection of the permanently disabled, and by the early realization of a minimum pension for all who have reached the age of retirement and are not gainfully employed.

HEALTH

Good health for all the people is a prime requisite of national preparedness in its broadest sense. We have advanced public health, industrial hygiene, and maternal and child care. We are coordinating the health functions of the Federal Government. We pledge to expand these efforts and to provide more hospitals and health centers and better health protection wherever the need exists in rural and urban areas, all through the cooperative efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, the medical, dental, nursing, and other scientific professions and the voluntary agencies.

YOUTH AND EDUCATION

Today, when the youth of other lands is being sacrificed in war, this Nation recognizes the full value of the sound youth program established by the administration. The National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps have enabled our youths to complete their education, have maintained their health, trained them for useful citizenship and aided them to secure employment.

Our public works have modernized and greatly expanded the Nation's schools. We have increased Federal aid for vocational education and rehabilitation and undertaken a comprehensive program of defense-industry training. We shall continue to bring to millions of children, youths, and adults the educational and economic opportunities otherwise beyond their reach.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND LOW-RENT HOUSING

We have launched a soundly conceived plan of loans and contributions to rid America of overcrowded slum dwellings that breed disease and crime, and to replace them by low-cost housing projects within the means of low-income families.

We will extend and accelerate this plan not only in the congested city districts, but also in the small towns and farm areas, and we will make a powerful arm of national defense by supplying housing for the families of enlisted personnel and for workers in areas where industry is expanding to meet defense needs.

CONSUMERS

We are taking effective steps to insure that, in this period of stress, the cost of living shall not be increased by speculation and unjustified price rises.

NEGROES

Our Negro citizens have participated actively in the economic and social advances launched by this Administration, including fair labor standards, social security benefits, health protection, work relief projects, decent housing, aid to education, and the rehabilitation of low-income farm families. We have aided more than half a million Negro youths in vocational training education and employment.

We shall continue to strive for complete legislative safeguards against discrimination in Government service and benefits, and in the national defense forces. We pledge to uphold due process and the equal protection of the laws for every citizen, regardless of race, creed, or color.

VETERANS

We pledge to continue our policy of fair treatment of America's war veterans and their dependents, in just tribute to their sacrifices and their devotion to the cause of liberty.

INDIANS

We favor and pledge the enactment of legislation creating an Indian Claims Commission for the special purpose of entertaining and investigating claims presented by Indian groups, bands, and tribes, in order that our Indian citizens may have their claims against the Government considered, adjusted, and finally settled at the earliest possible date.

CIVIL SERVICE

We pledge the immediate extension of a genuine system of merit to all positions in the executive branch of the Federal Government except actual bona fide policy-making positions. The competitive method of selecting employees shall be improved until experience and qualification shall be the sole test in determining fitness for employment in the Federal service. Promotion and tenure in Federal service shall likewise depend upon fitness, experience, and qualification. Arbitrary and unreasonable rules as to academic training shall be abolished, all to the end that a genuine system of efficiency and merit shall prevail throughout the entire Federal service.

TERRITORIES AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

We favor a larger measure of self-government leading to statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We favor the appointment of residents to office, and equal treatment of the citizens of each of these three Territories. We favor the prompt determination and payment of any just claims by Indian and Eskimo citizens of Alaska against the United States.

We also favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia.

We pledge to continue to stand guard on our true first line of defense—the security and welfare of the men, women, and children of America.

OUR DEMOCRATIC FAITH

Democracy is more than a political system for the government of a people. It is the expression of a people's faith in themselves as human beings. If this faith is permitted to die, human progress will die with it.

We believe that a mechanized existence, lacking the spiritual quality of democracy, is intolerable to the free people of this country.

We therefore pledge ourselves to fight, as your fathers fought, for the right of every American to enjoy freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, petition, and security in his home.

It is America's destiny, in these days of rampant despotism, to be the guardian of the world heritage of liberty and to hold aloft and aflame the torch of western civilization.

The Democratic Party rededicates itself to this faith in democracy, to the defense of the American system of government, the only system under which men are masters of their own souls, the only system under which the American people, composed of many races and creeds, can live and work, play and worship in peace, security, and freedom.

Firmly relying upon a continuation of the blessings of Divine Providence upon all our righteous endeavors to preserve forever the priceless heritage of American liberty and peace, we appeal to all the liberal-minded men and women of the Nation to approve this platform and to go forward with us by wholeheartedly supporting the candidates who subscribe to the principles which it proclaims.

Nominating Hon. Henry A. Wallace for the Vice Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY FRANK O'CONNOR, OF IOWA

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the able and eloquent address delivered at the Democratic National Convention by Hon. Frank O'Connor, of Iowa, in which he nominated for the Vice Presidency Hon. Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, in my trial heat this afternoon my time was 5 minutes and 20 seconds, and I hope I may beat that tonight.

Last night this convention, responsive to the demands of the hour, named for the Presidential nomination America's great humanitarian, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We come now to a duty of almost equal importance—the selection of a candidate for Vice President. So let us as loyal Americans, conscious of the grave responsibilities resting upon us in this eventful hour, invoke Divine guidance that we may give to the solemn task the best that is in our hearts and in our minds.

Iowa presents to you a man who possesses every quality and virtue essential in the high office of the Vice President and, by that same token, equipped for the office of President of these United States.

In addition to his natural and acquired qualifications, it would seem the hand of destiny has fashioned him for leadership in this tragic hour.

For 50 years prior to 1932 the Republican Party sat in conclave within its sanctified precincts, to which few were admitted, and wrote off as safely Republican the agricultural States of this Union, and rarely were they disappointed. For this unequaled contribution it paid no price except in words. Retribution, however, may not always be swift, but that it is sure is inevitable.

For many years the organized farmers of all parties sought congressional action under Republican control, only to be thwarted and scorned by contemptuous party leaders who declined to share the profits of labor and sacrifice with those who toil on the farms of America.

The forces in that crucial conflict came to desperate grips in the memorable campaign of 1928 when the brave and the weaklings were separated and counted. Leading the band of warriors who fought and bled for the cause of agriculture was the candidate whose name I shall presently submit.

Our candidate, the best mind, I think, in that great contest, marched behind the banner of Alfred E. Smith who with his party espoused the farmer's cause in this Republic. That banner trailed in defeat, but it was lifted again to victory under the leadership of President Roosevelt in 1932 and it still flutters triumphantly, an inspiration to the millions who live on the farms of America.

The President called to his Cabinet the outstanding exponent of agricultural rights in America as Secretary of Agriculture—our candidate and, I hope, your candidate.

For 8 years he sat beside the President and I know, as I think you do, he has been the trusted adviser of the President, not alone in matters of agriculture, but in the broader field of national and international action. Need I remind you that already the economic forces which are certain to follow this tragic war are to meet in conflict in the Western Hemisphere?

Our relations with the great republics of the south are of transcendent importance. Our foreign trade so vital to national welfare may be largely shifted to the Western Hemisphere.

Our candidate is as well if not better informed in this field than any other American statesman. He has worked in close association with that honored American statesman, the Honorable Cordell Hull, and I know he enjoys the confidence and friendship of the great Secretary of State.

May I in passing, delegates, remind you that our candiate, busy as you know he is, has mastered the Spanish language and has on different occasions over the radio spoken to our actual and potential customers in South America in their own tongue. Our candidate is not alone the symbol of agricultural aspirations. He is a scholar, a student of international affairs, a profound statesman of conviction and courage. He is in intimate touch not alone with agricultural leaders, but is, and for many years has been, in constant touch with those who guide the destinies of labor and industry. It is his mind to unify these groups in the interests of a greater and more secure United States—a task from which many others have shrunk, but not the resolute candidate for whom I speak.

The supreme modesty of our candidate is an index of his greatness. Underneath a quiet, simple demeanor, beats a heart aflame for every human right and a mind trained and hardened and equipped to meet any problem of government within or without the Presidency in the light of the best American traditions.

Does the Democratic Party need such a man in this epochal hour? Let me reply in a word.

The Republican Party after 8 years of meditation, lean and hungry and craving for a return of its glorious days of the past, took prayerful stock at Philadelphia and, facing with synthetic smiles the farmers of America, played their trump card to bring agricultural States back to their thin-clad fold. The ace is the leader, not of agriculture, but the Republican minority leader of the United States Senate.

This man in the years ago gave his name to a bill for agricultural relief, but the owners of his party repudiated it and crucified agriculture and this candidate complacently bowed his head in that tragic hour of crucifixion. Now the destroyers in their day of agriculture carefully lift the drooping head of the Republican Senate leader and across his noble brow they write in easily erasable chalk-white letters, "The Farmers' Friend."

Against this devious deceptive thrust let this convention give to the Nation, not simply a name, but a man who has given his heart to the cause of American agriculture and to social and economic justice; one who has been the field marshal for two decades of tens of millions of American citizens on the farms of our country.

A man of rare and unexcelled integrity of the very highest intelligence; a man who in his public and private life has never betrayed a friend or a principle; a man of ripe experience for

these ominous times; one who holds the unquestioned respect of all groups within the party. A God-fearing, modest American of the highest character, worthy of and equipped superbly to meet the responsibilities of any public trust.

Iowa, the greatest agricultural State in the Union, gives to this convention and to the Democratic Party its illustrious, distinguished son, Henry Wallace, for the nomination of Vice President of the United States.

Nominating Hon. James A. Farley for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CARTER GLASS, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] at the recent Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Ill., placing in nomination for the Presidency Hon. James A. Farley, of New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Democratic Convention, there is no material consideration and few spiritual reasons that can draw me from a sick room halfway across the continent to speak a brief word to this national convention of the great Democratic Party. But among these spiritual considerations, first of all, is a desire to present to this convention the name of an incomparable Democrat who has conducted the affairs of the Democratic Party for 7 years in a way that no other man within my recollection of 40 years of public service has ever done.

Always eager to be an intense partisan, always eager to have his party win, nevertheless, he was a man of such a type of patriotism as always to put his country above party considerations, a genius in matters of a political nature, so thoroughly well versed in the sentiment and observance of the action of the people of the United States as to have twice predicted the success in this party so accurately as that he claimed but two States in the Union would go against his party.

He is not only a man of loyal attachment to the Democratic Party, but there is no manner of personal or political reward that would sufficiently secure him for the sacrifices he has made to his party. A man of character and intelligence, a man on whose word every human being can always rely, a man who never in all his lifetime ever violated a pledge once given, a man who believes in the unwritten law and the traditions of the Democratic Party as advocated ever since the day of Thomas Jefferson, who less than 3 years before his death appealed to the party which he established never to nominate a man for the third term for the Presidency; and Virginia, always mindful of the principles enunciated by Thomas Jefferson as immortal, stands today unmoved, from any source, from the principles advocated by the founder of the Democratic Party; and through consideration for the party itself, for its success and perpetuity, I have come from a sickbed to present to this convention the name of a great Democrat, James A. Farley, of New York. If nominated by this convention there will not be a shadow of doubt as to his election next November.

Let me say this word in conclusion, since I have been sitting on this platform I have had two anonymous communications objecting to Jim Farley because he is a Catholic. When I reflect that one of the three achievements of Thomas Jefferson which he most valued was the Virginia statute in favor of religious freedom, it made me more determined to present his name than I otherwise would be.

SECONDING SPEECH OF HON. PAT DOYLE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the national convention, ladies and gentlemen, I promise that I shall be very brief. [Applause and cheers.] As a member of the Massachusetts delegation, the only delegation in this Nation pledged to James A. Farley, I am proud to have been chosen to second his nomination. [Applause and cheers.]

There is no need for me to stand upon this platform and to extol the virtues, the loyalty, and the tremendously effective work that has been done by Jim Farley for the Democratic Party. [Applause and cheers.] All those things are known to everyone in this assemblage, to every Democrat in this Nation, to every American whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. [Applause.]

The Massachusetts delegation pledged itself to Jim Farley because it had an abounding faith in his ability, his integrity, his unselfish devotion to the splendid cause of our great democracy. [Applause.] No other State in this great Nation has any more admiration, respect, or understanding of the great achievements of our great national leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, than have the members of the Massachusetts delegation. We know that his administration will go down in American history as among the greatest and most beneficial ever enjoyed by our people. None can challenge our deep sentiment of appreciation for the magnificent work which President Roosevelt has accomplished. [Applause.]

But we of Massachusetts have pledged our word to Farley. [Applause.] The name of Farley in this country is synonymous with straight shooting. [Applause.] We who have given our word, we who have been elected by the Democrats of Massachusetts to come to the Democratic Convention to vote for Jim Farley, want to show him, our true friend and outstanding leader, that we in the old Bay State know what it means to make a pledge and keep it [applause] even in the face of a difficult situation.

Therefore, in the name of those men and women who went to the polls and instructed us to cast our vote for Jim Farley, and in the name of those delegates from Massachusetts who are with Farley, I stand here tonight honored and privileged to second the nomination for President of the United States of a great and true Democrat, beloved by everyone, the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York. [Applause.]

SECONDING SPEECH OF HON. RAYMOND M. FISHER, OF NEW YORK

Senator BARKLEY, fellow delegates, and your guests, it is a distinct privilege to second the nomination of my friend and yours. For upward of a quarter of a century I have been associated with him in public life. He and I are neighbors. We are Rockland County home-town boys. I have watched his advancement step by step from town clerk of the town of Stony Point to the office of the Postmaster General of the United States in the Cabinet of our President [applause], from a district committeeman in his district at Grassy Point to the chairmanship of this great national organization. Back home he has long since been known for an unflinching loyalty, a thorough application to duty, and a genial personality.

You, too, over the years, have grown to love him for these splendid attributes of character. To say more to any group of Democrats assembled at any place at any time is, in my opinion, unnecessary. It is therefore my honor to second the nomination for the Presidency of the United States of the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York. [Applause.]

SECONDING SPEECH OF PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. Chairman, the delegation representing the district of the Canal Zone, down low in the roll call, but high up in the admiration of the unsurpassed administration of our beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in obedience to our unit rule, directs me to inform this convention and the outstanding organizer who has marshalled perhaps the friendliest, the most loyal, and the strongest political family in the history of our great party, that they affectionately put their arms around him in the old way, the American way, the only way, by seconding the nomination for President of the United States that upstanding American statesman, the distinguished Postmaster General, James A. Farley. [Applause.]

Second Session Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the second session of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Ill., on July 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I stand here facing the representatives of democracy, I am overwhelmed by a flood of recollections. It was here 8 years ago we met in the midst of a great emergency with a mission to save America. I need not detail to you, my friends and colleagues, how grave were the conditions of our country. We reached here through a lane of idle factories; farm products were rotting on the farms and in the market places; the great banks of this city were struggling to head off the menace of financial panic, as were the banks in every other city, town, and hamlet of the country. The riot of unbridled speculation had brought its day of reckoning. Nobody knew what tomorrow would bring forth. We did our job then and

I am sure we will do it today, fearlessly, patriotically, and with the single purpose of continuing the onward march of progress which was started in this hall 8 years ago.

We meet again in the face of another vast emergency. It is a different crisis that confronts us now, and one perhaps as grave or even graver than the other. The next administration must continue the wise policy undertaken by the government now in power at Washington—the policy of keeping this Nation at peace in a war-mad world while building up a national defense so stout, so strong that no combination of foreign foes will dare to attack us. I am sure that this convention will realize its responsibilities. I am sure of this because I see hundreds of familitr faces, the faces of men and women who have been tried and who have shown themselves worthy of the high trust imposed on them by their party. Nor is there any doubt about the new people who are serving as delegates to this convention. Every one of you whose history I know has labored shoulder to shoulder with the party veterans. You are all loyal soldiers gathered here to defend a worthy cause.

A short time ago an effort was made to pin the odious label of "war party" on the Democratic Party. Like all misguided political actions, the effort fell of its own weight. The people of America still possess their critical faculties; they know the difference between leaders who face realities with courage and frankness and leaders who are so blinded by partisanship that they mistake one of the great tragedies of history for a phony war.

This administration has given its solemn pledge that no American boy will be sent to die on the battlefields of Europe, and this compact will be kept. There may be differences of opinion among Democrats on other issues, but on this determination there is absolute unity.

I esteem it an honor and a high privilege to open this convention and to present to you your temporary organization. That is one of the functions of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the proudest post I ever held. I have been given credit for many elements in Democratic success during the past 8 years. Let me tell you now that our success was not due to me but to the loyal work of the national committee members, the State organizations, the county organizations, and the workers under them.

We won a glorious victory in 1932. That victory was due to the splendid efforts mainly of men and women without title, without official place, and with no incentive beyond their faith in our nominees and in the principles of the party.

We won another great national victory in 1936, and again let me bestow the credit for the achievement on the precinct and district captains and the people who, under their leadership, labored day and night to spread the doctrine of democracy and to see to it that the people who shared their views came to the polls and voted their convictions. It was possible that we might have won without such strenuous work, but that proud record of carrying 46 of the 48 States could never have been attained except for the unstinted service of those whose sole reward was the glow of victory and the feeling that they had done their part in continuing the progress of the country.

I shall never cease to be grateful to these faithful folks.

When the history of this troubled period is written the two administrations in which we have been privileged to play a part will be given their rightful place among the bright pages of national achievement. Posterity will understand and appreciate the record of these administrations. It is a story of high purpose and worthy action, untarnished by breach of trust or sordid scandals. A program of liberal policies has been written into law dedicated to the well-being of all the people, which had its roots in the everlasting principles of just government laid down by Jefferson and by Jackson. You will hear these accomplishments discussed in detail by the able speakers who follow me on this platform. These achievements constitute the record on which we propose to wage the coming campaign. The choice lies between a party still unable to cope with the conditions and problems of the twentieth century and a party which has made this Nation the last stronghold of genuine democracy in a world of violence and ruthless force. That is the issue, and the whole issue.

In this tribute to the administration that saved the country from complete collapse and started it anew on the road to prosperity, we must not forget the Democratic Congresses which have done their part. True, there have been some issues on which the Members of the national legislative bodies have divided. That is democracy. If there was not this liberty of opinion and the freedom to exercise individual judgment, then indeed we would have a dictatorship. But so long as all of us have the privilege of saying what we think and the right to maintain and work for the enactment of our own ideas and ideals, there can be no threat to our representative form of government.

Our Congresses during the past 8 years have worked sincerely for the betterment of the country, and the results stand as a monument to the sincere patriotism of those who make our laws, representing the combined wisdom of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

We have heard sharp debates when differences of opinion have arisen. We have heard charges of dictatorship, but actually the total that has gone on the statute books has been the will of the country expressed through the representatives elected by the people to express that will. These differences have no more significance than the ripples on the sea or even the storm waves that rise and pass, leaving the ocean still a great international highway.

For a measure of the service done by the Democratic administration we have only to compare our domestic situation today with what it was when we put a great President in office to repair the damages inflicted by inept and incompetent Republican administrations and elected with him a Democratic Congress that did not falter at the magnitude of the task with which it was entrusted. That task is by no means completed, and when we consider the additional burden imposed by the course of the war overseas, we must realize to the full the responsibilities of this convention. We cannot, of course, ignore what is happening on the other continents. It is going to take the best there is in statesmanship to preserve our liberties. We have not wished for the conditions that have forced us to fashion the greatest navy in the world or to recruit an army of wartime strength.

We have committed ourselves, not only to protect our own continental territory and its outlying possessions, but circumstances have compelled us to pledge a defense of the Monroe Doctrine, which forbids foreign aggression to our sister nations on the American continent. A hundred years ago, when we were still small and weak in comparison with the great military nations, we adopted a doctrine as part of our own defensive system and policy to keep all America American. This course we deemed necessary for our own well-being, and for a century we have kept this hemisphere safe from colonization or conquest by any predatory power. Whether we like it or not, we must continue that policy.

Under these circumstances, is there a man on this floor, or a real American within the sound of my voice, who should be willing to take the Government out of the hands of the party that has kept the faith and place it in the inexperienced hands of those who aspire to regain control of the Government?

We cannot afford to assume that the efforts of the minority party can be ignored or dismissed as futile. It may well be that we may look forward to a victory in November as great as that we won 4 years ago, but we cannot take anything for granted. The opposition is not only hungry for power, but it has enormous resources and will fight desperately and with every political weapon to win. We know, of course, that we have a vast majority of the country with us, but unless we give the country a ticket and a platform that will satisfy the majority, we have no certainty of victory. Moreover, though the Nation's sentiment may be on our side, that sentiment will not be expressed unless we get our people, and all our people, to the polls. More than one election has been lost because of over-confidence. That over-confidence causes lack of organization, and impels people to think of their private grudges rather than of their public duty. A united Democracy with such a record as we have made in the past 8 years can only be defeated by itself. I mean by that that a lukewarm campaign, a belief on the part of one citizen that his vote isn't needed because the other voters will take care of the situation, constitutes our only danger. So I want to urge here on the delegates who will name the standard-bearers of the party, and adopt the party platform, that their duties as citizens will not end with this convention.

They have been given great responsibility as the peoples' representatives to choose the government under which we shall live for the next 4 years. They are men of standing in their communities and of influence in their States. I ask every one of them when they leave this hall, when their work here is done, to take up with enthusiasm and devotion the job that they as leading Democrats must do. They have been honored by their party. They can only repay this favor by devoting themselves to the completion of the task of which the convention's program is only the first step. It devolves on them to be the leaders of democracy in this campaign.

And now, men and women of the Democratic National Convention, it becomes my duty to relinquish the gavel and present to you the temporary officers who will guide your proceedings until you have expressed your views as to the permanent organization. Mine has been a happy service. I have had the hearty support and cooperation of the national committee, which now goes out of existence, and I want to thank the members from the bottom of my heart, on my own behalf and on behalf of the Democratic Party whose interests they have so sincerely guarded. Let me thank also the delegates to this convention who have done everything possible to expedite and make easier the business of this meeting. I know that your new organization will not let the Democratic Party down, and I firmly believe that every member of this great gathering will give our successors and the new national party organization the same support that was accorded to the national committees in 1932 and 1936; and, if that is so, let me promise you now another triumph next November.

Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

PRECONVENTION RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a preconvention radio address

delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on the evening of July 14, 1940, from Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A national convention is one of the great political institutions of America. This is especially true of the Democratic Convention which opens here tomorrow.

The Democratic Party is the oldest continuing political body in the United States. More than a century ago it was founded by Thomas Jefferson, who saw the need of welding the mass of citizens into a compact organization for the expression of their views on public questions. In Jefferson's day, the task of choosing Presidential and Vice-Presidential nominees was delegated to a caucus of party members in the House of Representatives. The method was changed some years later under the leadership of Andrew Jackson and his supporters, who wished to give the people a more direct voice in the selection of candidates. The convention system was adopted as the best method for accomplishing this purpose and from that time onward, almost without exception, it has been practiced by all parties in selecting their nominees.

The people of this country look forward to these conventions with eager anticipation, first, because of their interest in the selection of the party standard bearers, and second, because by the new methods of communication, they are able to get such an intimate and complete picture of the workings of an important phase of democratic government. The average citizen may now sit comfortably in the family living room and listen to the deliberations as they take place in the convention hall.

The convention system, of course, is not perfect. But it has become a permanent fixture of popular government, and I honestly think that any attempt to substitute another method of selecting Presidential nominees would be a mistake.

The interest in the convention now assembling here is perhaps greater than usual because of the third-term question. I regret that it is impossible for me, for obvious reasons, to comment on what may or may not take place. I can only counsel patience even though we Americans are seldom patient when events of great magnitude are about to take place. In any event, I can assure you that the proceedings of the convention will be well worth hearing.

Although the formal opening of the convention takes place at noon tomorrow, actually the work of preparation has been going on for months. A group of committee employees has been out here since April studying the facilities of Chicago Stadium and drawing plans to make use of every available inch of space. This past week, however, the preliminary work really began in earnest. The platform committee started its deliberations under the direction of Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, and the other pre-convention details were disposed of by the national committee at a meeting on Friday. Everything is in readiness for the fall of the gavel tomorrow.

I have been active in party affairs for many years now, and for one who has an interest in politics there is no thrill like that afforded by a national convention. For the brief period of a few days, the convention city becomes the crossroads of America. The delegates come from huge cities, from towns, and villages, and from rural areas. They know what the people of America are thinking about, and they are able to give a cross section of opinion better than any other group that could be brought together. I try to visit with as many delegates as possible in order to learn their views and to find what the people of America really want.

This year the interest in foreign affairs is greater than ever because of the tragic events which are taking place across the ocean in Europe. There is some minor difference of opinion as to the stand which the party should take in relation to the party declaration on foreign policy, but there is no division on the vital question of building up the defenses of the United States. I think that, without exception, the people are behind the efforts of the administration to provide a defense force which will be adequate to meet the challenge of any possible combination of foreign powers.

In advance of the party platform and the choice of nominees it would be an act of presumption on my part to predict the course of the coming campaign. However, there is no question that the Democratic Party will make its bid on the record of the Roosevelt administration during the past 8 years in office. There is a crisis at hand today which calls for the highest order of statesmanship to bring this country safely through. There was a crisis of a different character in 1932 and the Democratic Party was given the task of finding a way out. There would be no purpose in my telling you that everything which has been done since then by the Roosevelt administration is perfect. But I think every fair-minded person should be ready to agree that many excellent things have been accomplished and that the Democratic Party did the job better than it could have been done by any other party. The basic reforms written into law at Washington for the benefit of all the people will not be undone in our lifetime.

The next 4 years will be crucial for the welfare of the United States. The peaceful world of a few years ago has disappeared and a long time may elapse before normal trade relations between nations are resumed. The man elected by the people to guide the destinies of the Nation will find himself facing problems of tremendous importance. He will be required to move with caution, prudence, and wise understanding to safeguard the interests of the country in the atmosphere of hatred and suspicion which will come after this war as it has after every war in the past.

Under these circumstances partisan considerations will carry less weight with the voters than they have in the past. The one problem for all of us, as loyal Americans, is to find the man best equipped to conduct the affairs of the Nation in such a time.

The first question for the voters to decide is whether the men charged with the conduct of foreign affairs for the past few years have lived up to their responsibilities in adequate fashion. It is my opinion that they have. The administration foresaw the coming of the European war and did everything possible to cushion the national economy against the expected shock. Without becoming involved in any way, the administration spokesmen from first to last raised a mighty voice for peace in an effort to prevent the dreadful carnage which has since taken place. The spokesmen for the opposition party were less farseeing in their attitude. They refused to believe that war was coming, and when it did break out they failed to understand the frightful course which it was about to take. They called it a phony war and made the fatal blunder of assuming that it would be fought to a stalemate on the battlefields of Europe with no possible danger to this country.

The speed with which the new defense program was gotten under way was due in large measure to the fact that the administration had been laying a solid groundwork for such expansion throughout the past 7 years. President Roosevelt has always had a deep and sympathetic interest in the Navy. When he took over in March 1933 the Nation's first line of defense was far weaker than it should have been in ships and men. The construction of battleships had stopped completely and many of the vessels of the line were becoming obsolete. The personnel had been cut so drastically that ships were laid up in drydock because there were too few men to operate them. All this was done in the name of economy.

The task of rebuilding was begun at once. This is a slow process, because naval vessels cannot be constructed in a hurry. The work was carried out so well, however, that when the present emergency occurred this spring more than 130 new ships were either completed or well on their way. As a result of this wise program, undertaken in time, the United States Navy is now generally looked upon as the equal of any in the world, and in many respects the best of all.

It should be borne in mind that we want armaments primarily for defense and that the Navy is still our first line of protection against an invading foe. A hostile force, coming across the Atlantic, and attempting to land here, would find the rebuilt Navy standing squarely across its path. The air forces of the Army and Navy have also been expanded, giving us a double line of protection.

The Democratic Party will wage this campaign on its record in foreign and domestic affairs. The problems of the past 7½ years have been numerous and difficult. It has been a time of chaos and upheaval all over the world. The administration does not claim to have achieved perfection. Yet it has brought this Nation safely through in better shape than any other country in the world. The cause of democracy and popular government has been served because the average citizen appreciates that the administration has tried to safeguard his economic and social needs.

A solemn duty rests upon the Democratic convention which opens tomorrow. I think the last few years have shown that the party leadership is capable of living up to that duty.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

CONVENTION RESOLUTION THANKING CHAIRMAN FARLEY FOR HIS SERVICES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following matters relative to Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee:

A resolution adopted by the Democratic National Convention on July 16, thanking Mr. Farley for his services.

A motion made by Mr. Farley on July 17 to make unanimous the nomination of President Roosevelt.

A statement issued by Mr. Farley on July 19.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That this convention take this occasion to testify our sense of obligation to the chairman of the Democratic National

Committee, whose service to his party and to his country is unparalleled in the history of political organizations.

James A. Farley has for 8 years given himself unreservedly to the interests of good government. He told us yesterday that the credit belonged not to him for our unfailing successes during his regime but to the workers of the party. We wish to go on record that without derogation of the value of the loyal support that has been accorded him by the rank and file of our organization—from the high officers to the unnamed workers in the field—that it was the leadership of our organization chief that made their efforts effective, and that therefore we feel that the credit he disclaims still belongs to him.

For his patience, his urbanity, his willingness to listen and to heed the counsel and advice of every member of the party, high and low, he has endeared himself to the whole personnel of the Democratic Party, and as a tribute to the affection and regard for James A. Farley as a friend, as a leader, and as a magnificent administrator of a great and difficult office, we hereby move that the delegates of this convention stand and put this resolution into the annals of our history.

MOTION OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY TO MAKE NOMINATION OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT UNANIMOUS

Senator BARKLEY and fellow Democrats, you have given me on two occasions the highest honor within your gift, chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. I ask you now for a further courtesy. I ask your indulgence so that I may deliver without interruption a brief message to this great convention.

I have pursued a course here that has been dictated by the deepest convictions, and when a man fails to follow his sincere convictions, no matter how unpleasant the consequences, he is false to himself, false to his party, and false to his country.

I wanted this convention to proceed as Democrats should proceed, to nominate its standard bearers in keeping with the high traditions of our party. That is the only Democratic method and that has been observed.

My name was placed in nomination for the Presidency of the United States by a great and noble American. As long as I live I shall be grateful to Senator CARTER GLASS of Virginia. I am grateful to those delegates to this great convention who voted for me and for those delegates who would have voted for me if they had not been otherwise pledged.

Down through the years I have always given my best efforts to advance the cause of democracy, and I want this great convention of Democrats to know that I will give that same support to the nominees of this convention.

It is therefore a great pleasure for me, Senator BARKLEY, to move to suspend the rules and declare President Franklin D. Roosevelt nominated for President of the United States by acclamation.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Eight years ago in this city I was elected chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In the intervening years I have had the happiest associations with Democrats all over the country, and my debt to the party can never be repaid.

I have remained in public life at great financial sacrifice, because I love politics. I have an opportunity now to accept an attractive offer in business and in justice to my family, because of my financial situation, I am going to accept.

Before leaving, I shall cooperate to the fullest extent with my successor as national chairman in setting up the machinery for the coming campaign. I have said repeatedly that the American people want the Democratic Party to remain in power. My opinion has not changed, and again I pledge my full support to the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket.

Location of National Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

LETTER FROM GOVERNOR PAYNE RATNER OF KANSAS TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND LETTER FROM HON. ARTHUR CAPPER OF KANSAS TO WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Payne Ratner, Governor of Kansas, to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, relative to the location of national-defense industries.

Governor Ratner, very properly, takes the position that the national interest will be best served if a fair proportion of these industries be allocated to the interior of the United States. Governor Ratner also points out that cheap fuel, high-type labor, and adequate transportation facilities are available in Kansas and the Midwest.

Governor Ratner further points to the dangers of a national defense policy which would tend to accentuate still further the present lack of economic balance between agriculture and industry.

In this connection, Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed, immediately following Governor Ratner's letter, a letter from myself to Mr. William S. Knudsen, of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, on the same subject. I send both letters to the desk to be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *July 8, 1940.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Through representatives of the Kansas Industrial Development Commission now in Washington, I learn that the National Defense Commission will soon make decisions as to the geographical allocation of new and expanding defense industries. These decisions will have a profound effect not only upon the military security of this country but upon the economic future of the United States for years to come, particularly in Midwestern States such as Kansas.

You have expressed the importance of locating industrial defense plants in the interior for military reasons. However, there appears to be a tendency, in the haste for defense armament, to concentrate defense industries in those seaboard regions already highly industrialized. I know your administrative staff and Defense Commission have given expert consideration to the location of defense industries for the military reasons which you have pointed out. As Governor of one State in the great Midwestern area, I wish to urge that you also give additional serious thought to the economic questions involved in the location of these industries.

We in the Midwest, as all other patriotic Americans, are deeply concerned that our national-defense program goes forward with the greatest possible speed. That is paramount, of course, to our national security. But we are also concerned that the preparation of our defense and the expansion and construction of new industries involved do not permanently damage our national economy.

I represent one of many States whose chief industry is agriculture. We produce a great abundance of raw materials, chiefly agricultural, but in addition our production includes great mineral and other natural resources valuable for defense. Cheap fuel, high-type labor, and adequate transportation facilities are all available in Kansas and the Midwest. We hope that our resources in this great Midwest area can be utilized for the greatest possible national good during this critical period.

We stand at the crossroads of the Nation's economic and industrial future. One road—marked by the proper distribution of industrial-defense expansion—leads to speedy and efficient national defense, with proper protection of our national economic structure. The other road—along which proper thought is not given to the location of defense industries—may lead to an equally speedy defense program, but it also leads to grave military and economic perils. Overcentralization of defense industries will increase vulnerability to concentrated attack and endanger the economic and social structures of the Middle West area should it not share in the expansion.

Of highest importance is the problem of getting the national-defense program under way as speedily as possible. We must use all available plants capable of producing defense needs to their fullest capacity. They should be expanded where such expansion can be made swiftly. But this is a long-range program, too great for present industries alone. New plants must be built and new locations selected. For both military and economic reasons, I urge that this expansion include the Midwest.

Weeks ago I requested representatives of the Kansas Industrial Development Commission to go to Washington to offer the resources of Kansas to the Nation in the preparedness program then getting under way. Since then, the commission representatives have been contacting officials in Washington, making known the resources which are available in Kansas, and pointing out the advantages of locating defense industries in the Midwest.

If the expansion of defense industries is confined to the east and west coasts, the Midwest will be drained of its young men who will seek jobs in established industrial centers. Thousands will join a great migration from central United States to the coasts, leaving Midwest States without the manpower required for agricultural and industrial work. Here in Kansas and the Midwest we rely on agriculture as our basic industry and we hope that it will always remain so but we do need a sufficient industrial economy to make a proper balance so this region can be reasonably prosperous.

Those sections of the country where industry and agriculture have been in proper balance have always made economic progress. Here in the great agricultural producing area of the United States there is now an opportunity to establish an industrial future which

should greatly relieve the serious farm problem and its attendant economic ills. This can be done in harmony with proper military defense plans which constitute our immediate need.

Extension of defense industries into the Midwest area would afford the opportunity for decentralizing defense production into sufficiently widespread units to assure maximum safety against attack. The cities and towns of the Midwest are so close to the sources of supplies and natural resources that efficiency in production would be maintained.

I realize that detailed and specific information as to the material and natural advantages of this area is of vital importance. Kansas is ready to supply pertinent information pertaining to our own State. I am sure that other Midwestern States are prepared to do the same. Representatives of Kansas who are now in Washington have much such information with them, and agencies such as the Kansas Industrial Development Commission and the Kansas Planning Board are now securing other data which will be presented. This information can be checked against the data available as a result of previous studies made by the National Resources Planning Board and other Federal agencies.

I urge that the National Defense Commission give every possible consideration to the vital relationship existing between the Midwest and the Nation as a whole in determining the military and economic policies of our national defense.

Sincerely,

PAYNE RATNER,
Governor of Kansas.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1940.

Mr. WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN,
Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNUDSEN: I realize how busy you are these days, and will make this letter as brief as I can. I do feel that the interests of the Middle West, and of the Nation as a whole, require that I lay before you some things which I believe ought to be seriously considered by yourself and others who are working on the national-defense program authorized by Congress and the President.

The paramount interest is to develop an impregnable national defense. I realize that. I realize also that the time may be short, and that certain considerations which otherwise might be given more weight will have to be slighted in the interest of speed and immediate efficiency.

However, it also seems to me that a national-defense program which tends to destroy still further the balance between agriculture and industry, and between the interior of the Nation and the coastal regions, will in the long run defeat its purpose by seriously weakening the national economic structure, the foundation on which an adequate and impregnable national defense must rest in the end.

I believe you will agree with me that too heavy a concentration of industry in the already congested centers of the Atlantic coast is not a healthy thing for the Nation as a whole. Similarly if the concentration is carried too far on the Pacific coast.

As I understand it, President Roosevelt himself realizes this, and has publicly advocated several times that to as great an extent as feasible under emergency conditions, national-defense industries be built up also in the interior—beyond and between the mountains.

It would be a serious disservice to the future of the Nation, as well as of the Middle West, as I see it, to allow the national-defense program to set back or hamper a healthy industrial expansion in the Middle West. The point that concentration of all national-defense industries too close to the seacoast, in view of the rapid and promised more rapid increase in the range of bombing planes, also should be considered.

But, very frankly, what I am immediately concerned about is the threatened loss of economic balance between different sections of the country through undue concentration of industrial plants along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

In setting up this great national-defense program, on which billions of the public funds will be spent, you are initiating and directing what may turn out to be the greatest industrial expansion program the country ever has known. I am writing to urge you to continue your efforts to keep this industrial expansion as much in balance as possible. And it seems to me that means a well-planned and well-carried-out program of locating new industrial plants as much as possible in the Middle West.

If you do not, the Middle West not only is going to be impoverished but also you are going to drain us of our young manpower as well as of our purchasing power. In the past few weeks, I am informed, more than 1,000 young men who have been trained as mechanics have been shipped from Kansas City territory to the Pacific coast. This is very disturbing to me as a middle westerner. It also is disturbing to me as, what I trust I am, a middle westerner who tries to have a national viewpoint.

Unless the Middle West is developed to some considerable extent industrially, unless some considerable portion of our most enterprising and vigorous young men and women are encouraged to remain in the Middle West, the Nation faces the danger of having a vast interior of backward peoples, so to speak, and probably also of impoverished peoples.

That will be a most unhealthy national situation when the time comes, as it will, to switch back part of our hugely expanded industrial plant from a war to a peace basis. That is going to be a shock to our entire economic system. It will be more of a shock if there is too much concentration of population in certain areas.

It does seem to me that, as much as possible, the national-defense program should attempt to diffuse rather than to concentrate still further the industrial development of the United States.

What the future of our relationship to the South American republics may be I cannot attempt to say at this time. But it seems fairly plain that these nations are going to be more agricultural than industrial for several generations to come, at least. Also that the United States already is in an industrial stage of development.

What arrangements we may be compelled to make for trade with the South American nations cannot be exactly foreseen, but these arrangements may include the importation into the United States of more of their agricultural products. If our Middle West is forced to retain an agricultural status, instead of being developed along industrial lines with the rest of the Nation, such a change in trade relationships with South America might fall with crushing force on the Middle West.

An impoverished Middle West would have very disastrous results on the entire Nation, as I see it. I believe this point I have just mentioned is one of several that should be seriously considered by the National Defense Commission.

I suppose I could write a lot more along these same lines, but I have taken up too much of your time already. But I think the problem is a most serious one, and I also feel that I would be remiss in my public duty if I had not called to your attention the way not only myself, but many others who have been giving the matter serious attention, feel about it.

I would be much interested in your views on this subject; also would be much pleased if there is anything I can do to be of assistance to you at any time.

Very respectfully.

Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY MRS. ROOSEVELT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago on July 18, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the convention, visitors, friends, it is a great pleasure for me to be here and to have an opportunity to say a word to you.

First of all, I think I want to say a word to our National Chairman, James A. Farley. For many years I have worked under Jim Farley and with Jim Farley, and I think nobody could appreciate more what he has done for the party, what he has given in work and loyalty, and I want to give him here my thanks and devotion.

I think that I should say to you that I am conscious that I cannot possibly bring you a message from the President because he will give you his own message, but as I am here, I want you to know that no one could not be conscious of the confidence which you have expressed in him.

I know and you know that any man who is in an office of great responsibility today faces a heavier responsibility perhaps than any man has ever faced before in this country. Therefore, to be a candidate of either great political party is a very serious and a very solemn thing.

You cannot treat it as you would treat an ordinary nomination in an ordinary time.

We people in the United States have got to realize today that we face now a grave and serious situation. Therefore, this year the candidate who is the President of the United States cannot make a campaign in the usual sense of the word. He must be on his job. So each and every one of you who give him this responsibility, in giving it to him assume for yourselves a very grave responsibility because you will make the campaign. You will have to rise above considerations which are narrow and partisan. You must know that this is the time when all good men and women give every bit of service and strength to their country that they have to give. This is a time when it is the United States that we fight for, the domestic policies that we have established as a party, that we must believe in, that we must carry forward, and in the world we have a position of great responsibility. We cannot tell from day to day what may come. This is no ordinary time, no time for thinking about any-

thing except what we can best do for the country as a whole, and that responsibility is on each and every one of us as individuals. No man who is a candidate, or who is President, can carry this situation alone. This is only carried by a united people who love their country and who will live for it to the fullest of their ability with the highest ideals, with a determination that their party shall be absolutely devoted to the good of the Nation as a whole, and to doing what this country can to bring the world to a safer and happier condition.

Proposed Peace Plank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Chicago, Ill., on July 14, 1940, entitled "A Plea for a Peace Plank."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA FOR A PEACE PLANK

Every day during the past 6 weeks I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters from persons living in every State in the Union, asking what they might do to help keep the United States out of the European war. This afternoon I am going to make a concrete suggestion to those interested in accomplishing such a worthy objective. If they will devote a few pennies and a few minutes to the good cause of peace, they can play an important part in shaping the history of mankind in this uncertain crisis.

Recent polls have indicated that 86 percent of the American people are against entering the European war, while only 14 percent are in favor of so desperate an adventure. With such an overwhelming majority opposed, it does not seem reasonable that the platform makers of either of the great political parties would waste 5 minutes debating a peace plank. Yet, at Philadelphia the master minds of the Republican Party worked frantically, day and night, for 6 days, before that monstrosity known as their foreign-policy plank finally was agreed upon. Four times they are said to have written into that plank a provision that no American blood should be spilled in Europe and four times that provision was stricken from their platform. No one can read the war plank finally adopted by them and know what the war policy of the Republican Party really is. In it they solemnly declare for a defense of the essential outposts of the United States from foreign attack. But where are these essential outposts? Some contend that they are on the Rhine. Others that they abide with the British Navy. Apparently this ensnaring declaration satisfied the well-paid voice of the interventionist, William Allen White, who gave this ambiguous platform his unqualified approval and blessing.

William Allen White and his crowd of international meddlers never permitted the Republican platform committee to get out of their sight in Philadelphia. They were on the job night and day while the platform was being written, while the people who place America first were conspicuous by their absence and their silence. It is really not surprising that the people lost the battle nor that the interventionists won it.

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, is chairman of the platform committee of the Democratic Convention. In a few hours his committee will report to the convention the platform of this historic party. What will it say on the question of national defense? What will it say as to our foreign policy? And what will it say about the greatest issue of all current issues—the issue of intervention? This is where my listeners who desire to help can play an important part. If you would have in the Democratic platform a peace plank in which there are no reservations, no quibbling, no evasion, wire Senator WAGNER right now what you have in your mind. Let your voice be heard where it should be heard.

The Democratic Party, the common people's party for 150 years, must not permit its leaders to make it the war party in the year 1940. The two purposes are diametrically opposed. The Democratic Party must be one or the other. It must be the people's party or the war party. It is my fervent wish that we have two peace parties in the United States in this crisis. Certainly we have no need for even one war party. As a nation we lost the first battle when the Republican platform was adopted, and if we lose this fight for a vigorous peace plank all will be lost.

There is no issue before the American people so important as peace. All other questions, however serious, are relegated far to the rear by this one overshadowing issue. The farm problem, unemployment, old-age security, social justice, free enterprise, public debts, civil rights, and all great human problems which are demanding solution must be considered in the light of whether or not we are going to war. No businessman knows how to plan his future, no citizen his life, until all doubt concerning this one issue of war or peace has been completely and absolutely removed from the scene of action.

That is why the Democratic Convention in Chicago takes on so much importance today. What is done here will determine whether or not the destiny of America is to be involved in Europe's quarrel. If 100,000 citizens who realize the importance of this vital matter will urge Senator WAGNER to adopt a strong peace plank, the first step toward stability will be taken.

During the last year we have been stepping closer and closer to the European war. Halt this dangerous march! About face! Turn in the other direction, and take America down the "road to peace" instead of down the "road to war." Naturally, we understand that the victory will not be entirely won by the adoption of a strongly worded peace plank, but that, at least, will be one very definite step toward peace—one that cannot be taken too quickly nor too firmly if this Nation is not to be pulled into the whirlpool of the European war. Such a plank will change the whole complexion of the forthcoming political campaign.

I hope that every mother who hears my voice will not let the hour pass without dispatching an urgent telegram to Senator WAGNER and his committee to write a positive plank against entering the European war. I hope the patriots who won the last war on Europe's battlefield, only to lose the victory at the conference table, will not hesitate to wire Senator WAGNER and his committee and forcefully outline the veterans' position on further European bloodletting. The Democratic Party must not write a straddling, pussyfooting, all-things-to-all-men peace platform. No mincing of words. Come right out and say that "no American lives will be sacrificed in the European war and that no American blood will be spilled over there."

Our Democratic leaders assure us we are not going to get into war. Why not say so in language that cannot be misunderstood? It would be an American tragedy if William Allen White and the interventionist crowd of international bankers should place the stamp of approval on the Democratic platform as they approved the Republican platform. I want a peace plank written into the Democratic platform which will shock William Allen White and all of his big-moneyed backers. If you feel as I do about this, make your wishes known to Senator WAGNER. Now. Within the hour. Tomorrow may be too late.

As America builds her national defenses on the scale upon which she has embarked, no vulture from other continents will cast his greedy eyes upon any portion of the Western Hemisphere. The Democratic Party has a splendid record in this matter of national defense. America possesses the strongest navy in the world. When the authorized additions to our Navy are completed we will have fleets equal to the combined ocean power of all of our potential enemies. We can defend ourselves against the whole world when our fighting-plane strength has been brought to that same high standard.

And when our antiaircraft guns, tanks, submarines, modern artillery—when these now on order are in production, then our country will be safe from attack and invasion. These defenses must be speeded up and completed. The Democratic administration has done a fine job of providing for national defense. While America is in no shape at the present time to engage in a modern war against a well-equipped foe on another continent, yet in a few short years we will be able to repel any attack on our soil from any quarter from any combination of powers. However, if we are building these gigantic machines to engage in foreign wars, the future of civilization is dark indeed. We must take steps to see that this vast military power of the United States shall never be used to wage war other than for defense of the liberties we hold dear. The burden is squarely upon the shoulders of our political leaders. Our Military Establishment will shortly be ready to do its part. What of our statesmen?

When the Democratic Party met in Philadelphia in 1936, just 4 years ago, it was generally believed a war in Europe was inevitable. No one knew exactly where it would strike, nor did they predict its extent or the nations likely to become involved. But everyone sensed that another European war was on the horizon.

That year the Democratic Party adopted a strong peace plank. Its candidates took the platform to the country and were elected to office on their word that the United States would not be involved in the approaching European catastrophe.

All during this campaign of 4 years ago, I made many speeches every day, and reiterated over and over my solemn pledge to vote and work diligently against war. Almost every candidate on the Democratic ticket made the same pledge. Did we mean it, or were we merely trying to fool the voters? The anticipated war has already been raging for almost a year and the Democratic administration has played perilously close to the precipice of that war. Too many of them have conveniently forgotten the Democratic peace plank of 1936. Now, we are met to write another platform.

It is my fervent hope that the Democratic Party will not only write a strong peace platform, but that it will nominate for President a man who is known as a noninterventionist. Platforms are important, but it is far more important that the right person

be selected to see that the platform is carried out. Within the memory of all of us we have seen platforms set aside after the votes have been counted. If you believe, as I believe, that Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, the great liberal leader from Montana, is the man to lead our Nation to peace, wire the delegates from your State to keep this great statesman in mind for President.

I can say to you, with complete confidence, if Senator WHEELER is elected President, you can be sure the United States will not be drawn into any European or Asiatic war, nor will our Nation engage in any war, except to protect our rights and policies in the Western Hemisphere. The worry about fighting in Europe or Asia will be over, and he will turn his vigorous mind and matchless talents of constructive leadership to our domestic problems, which, God knows, need his attention.

And now, a last word about your part in this important enterprise. Please do not overlook wiring Senator WAGNER and wiring the Resolution Committee to adopt a straight-from-the-shoulder pledge that the United States will not enter the European conflict. Wire Senator WAGNER, care of the Democratic convention in Chicago. Wire right now and urge your friends to do the same before they repeat their prayers tonight. God will bless your efforts.

Is There a Spy Menace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the pen of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, entitled "Is There a Spy Menace?" Mr. Hoover says "Yes." This is a brief article. I happened to observe it recently in the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "This Week." I thought the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would find interest in the article, because we hear so much about the "fifth column" and alien enemies and spies and saboteurs, and so forth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE A SPY MENACE?

"Yes"; says the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, "and here is what every American should know about it." Mr. Hoover, leader in the Nation's drive against spies and saboteurs, here reveals for the first time since the world crisis what America is doing and can do to protect itself against the "fifth column."

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

Not a day has gone by during the past several months that I have not been asked, "Is there a spy menace in America?"

The answer is emphatically "Yes!" It is a menace in every sense of the word, and it will be my endeavor in this series of articles to acquaint the law-abiding, patriotic citizens of our Nation with the details of this menace and how best to check it.

If there were only one foreign spy operating in our midst, it would still be a menace. If he should secure even one official secret and place it in the wrong hands at the wrong time, irreparable damage could be done, menacing the safety of thousands of our citizens. As a matter of fact, Napoleon Bonaparte's espionage service consisted of one man. Naturally, his contacts were far reaching. But that is true of all spies. It has been the case since the dawn of time—it is the case in this modern era.

Yet it appears to be the fashion in some oversophisticated circles to deprecate all talk of a spy menace. In these same circles un-American activities are often scoffed at. But if there were not a spy menace, would secret airplane plans be stolen? Would a renegade naval officer find a sale for naval secrets? Would a glamorous adventuress establish a salon in Washington to maneuver official secrets away from persons holding positions of public trust?

I could go on without end, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, since September 1939, has received many complaints of alleged acts of espionage and sabotage every day. Some of these complaints, it is true, have been found to be without foundation. Some are fantastic, and many are the figments of imagination; but others have revealed facts that are indeed stranger than fiction.

For 5 years prior to 1938, the Federal Bureau of Investigation handled each year an average of 35 espionage, sabotage, and national-defense complaints. In 1938 there were 250, and in 1939 that figure jumped to 1,651. Now, complaints are flowing into the F. B. I.'s 50 field divisions. This is not a comforting fact.

THE REAL TEST

The success of this type of investigation cannot possibly be gaged by prosecutions. An ill-timed arrest invariably will do more harm than good. The real test of successful counterespionage, and that is our task, is locating the spy, ascertaining his contacts and methods of communication—and then closing off his sources of information.

Espionage and sabotage go hand in hand. Invariably, where you find one, you will find the other. Both employ subversion in some form. Espionage goes much further than merely dealing with military secrets. The successful espionage agent reaches out into every phase of a nation's industrial, commercial, and social life. So it is with sabotage. The destruction of 500,000 shoestrings could be as important to a foreign adversary as the destruction of a gun works. Shoestrings are as necessary as shoes in outfitting an army.

Our greatest dangers arise from within. Any army, regardless of its size, becomes vulnerable once it is disorganized and not properly supported by the people it protects. An internal upheaval in time of war could be as disastrous as a forced retreat from the front.

Our military and naval forces must be supported to the utmost. Unity of civilian forces is as important as unified armed forces.

Everyone knows the story of the Dutch boy who held off the wrath of the Zuider Zee by plugging a leak in the dikes with his hand. Today, we must plug the leaks against the growing threat of a "fifth column" in America. A "fifth column" with its destructive principles and objectives is capable of more damage to our national defense than a huge invading force. In fact, a foreign invasion would be practically impossible without the aid of an internal upheaval incited by outside forces.

The files of the F. B. I. attest to the fact that we have treacherous guests in our midst who have returned hospitality with hostility. It is against these forces that we must arm ourselves. There is only one possible explanation for the recent unauthorized consignment of several hundred feet of film to a foreign country: A visitor had arranged, in some manner, to have the tactical maneuvers of our flying fortresses photographed. In detail, scene after scene appeared on the film, showing the accuracy with which bombs were dropped from aloft on a designated target. These pictures, which I am glad to say were recovered, speak louder than words of the dangers with which we are confronted. And this is only one warning example. There are others that I cannot discuss, for obvious reasons.

EVERY SECRET VITAL

Espionage agents and their co-conspirators untiringly seek details regarding developments in our plans for national defense. One successful attempt might enable a potential enemy to counter with devices that would render our best efforts ineffective. In modern warfare, advance information can turn an expected victory into defeat.

Now is the time for us to protect America. Now is the time for us to build our national defense and to insure our internal security. Defending America demands that it be made invulnerable. With this single thought in mind, the intelligence branches of the War and Navy Departments and representatives of the F. B. I. have been working hand in hand for years.

President Roosevelt on September 6, 1939, in declaring the Nation to be in a state of limited emergency, called upon America's law-enforcement officers and agencies to cooperate with the F. B. I. by referring to it any information which they might obtain "relating to espionage, counterespionage, sabotage, and subversive activities, and violations of the neutrality laws."

BIG INCREASE OF AGENTS

At that time he ordered the F. B. I. "to take charge of investigative work" in these matters. He authorized an increase of 150 special agents in the F. B. I. to handle this added responsibility and recommended increased appropriations so that additional field offices might be established to assist in the work. Since then the President has requested appropriations for several hundred more special agents. This new task of the F. B. I. will be successful only to the extent of the cooperation received from peace-loving Americans in every field of activity.

We of the F. B. I. have been criticized for some of our more recent activities. Were that criticism not forthcoming, the Nation could well be alarmed, knowing full well that we were not doing our duty.

When the first World War broke, the American intelligence services were woefully unprepared. The F. B. I. was in its embryonic stage. Today that has changed. Both military and naval intelligence are well organized and efficiently operated. The F. B. I. has developed into a far-flung force known for its versatility. Working hand in hand, the combined forces of these three agencies are competent to meet emergencies as they arise. Almost daily there are meetings of officials of these three agencies, furthering the splendid spirit of cooperation.

At no time has there been more effective coordination than we find today. The resources of each of these agencies are pooled in the interests of a common cause. This coordination exists not only between the headquarters staffs of the intelligence agencies, but extends into the field as well. There is a free exchange of information between officers of military intelligence, naval intelligence, and

special agents of the F. B. I. No day or night passes but that these men are tirelessly working shoulder to shoulder on mutual problems.

To meet effectively the situations which have arisen in the present emergency, investigators have been assigned to Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. These outposts of national defense have been particularly active. There, as within our continental confines, every effort is being made by members of military intelligence, naval intelligence, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to preserve our internal security.

Offices have been opened by the F. B. I. in six new cities, so that strategic points may have the aid of additional special agents, who will be closer to the scenes of possible activity.

SAFEGUARDING INDUSTRIES

As early as last summer a special, intensive course of instruction in espionage and sabotage investigation was inaugurated for our investigative staff. Beyond that we were called upon by the War and Navy Departments to survey the protective facilities of hundreds of industrial establishments which had contracts to supply the materials for building the national defense. A course of instruction which had previously been prepared for just such an emergency was given to additional specially qualified special agents.

The lessons of the first World War are too fresh in our minds for us again to be unprepared. During that period several thousand enemy aliens were taken into custody in the United States. But many foreign foes were not even known, with the result that almost every day there were reports of internal disasters—of fires of mysterious origin, explosions, and other acts of violence designed to cripple our mobilization plans. Since then several million persons have immigrated to America. Most of these have lived up to the expectations we held for them. There are others, however, who are seeking to undermine our democracy.

These facts point to the need for unity in bulwarking our national defense against insidious forces that are alien to everything that is American. Vigilance and action of the proper type are essential if the overt acts of our national foes are to be met and countered.

I know how that citizen on the west coast must have felt when his brother attempted to sell to a foreign power confidential plans for the construction of airplanes. He never wavered, however, when the interests of his country were at issue. As a result of his aid the brother was indicted, tried, and convicted for violation of the espionage statutes. But, more important, the apprehension of this traitor helped prevent additional confidential secrets from being bartered over the counter of spydom.

The maintenance of a high morale on the part of our citizens is an essential phase of national defense. In maintaining this we are defending the essential spirit of Americanism against inimical agents; we are making our main line of defense impregnable.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY FREDERIC WILLIAM WILE

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, during the past month I have received a number of letters asking me to explain in detail just what is being done about our national defense. I have waited until I could get evidence which seemed to me to be impartial.

On Wednesday, July 17, the Washington Evening Star printed an article on that subject by a distinguished writer, Frederic William Wile. Certainly it must be admitted that neither the newspaper nor the writer of the article is prejudiced in favor of the administration. I ask consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article insofar as it relates to the subject of defense was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON OBSERVATIONS—PROGRAM FOR MATERIAL PREPAREDNESS PROGRESSES AT UNPARALLELED RATE

(By Frederic William Wile)

National defense is not a partisan proposition. It may not be a proper subject for glorification in a political party's national convention. But if the uninspiring Democratic jamboree at Chicago could be acquainted with the brass tacks of what is happening at Washington these days to arm the United States on land, at sea, and in the air for the emergencies of an unpredictable future, Mayor Kelly's stadium would ring with wilder enthusiasm than so far has been provoked by any of the stereotyped political claptrap which has shivered its rafters.

A DEFINITE OBJECTIVE

Authentic information just made available to this observer indicates the program for matériel preparedness has been developed at a rate believed to be without parallel in any country's history. It has been put in motion on the theory that before success in any endeavor can be effected there must be a clearly defined objective. The National Defense Advisory Commission, acting in closest liaison and harmony with the War and Navy Departments, is proceeding on what it believes to be both a sound and sufficient program. It is geared not only for speeding execution but for flexibility. What is adequate defense today may be inadequate tomorrow. "Blitzkrieg" has taught us that. It was on this basis that the present unprecedented Army and Navy appropriations were granted, providing approximately (apart from naval construction) for $1,200,000,000 for munitions preparedness. That is a gigantic sum for our peacetime Army, but relatively small for a fighting army.

CHANGING CONDITIONS

Lightning changes in world conditions have made it apparent that we need not only a two-ocean Navy, but vastly augmented provisions for an Army that may one day be called upon to cooperate in hemisphere defense. Designed to meet altered conditions the supplementary munitions program of June 30 was submitted to Congress, specifying the numbers of airplanes, guns, tanks, ammunition, etc., that must be produced. If approved, it will provide approximately $3,800,000,000 more for military preparedness. Thus, a grand total of about $5,000,000,000 would be provided with which to put industry to work in a big way to produce the machine power necessary to the defense of America.

WHAT THE PLAN IS

This program was not formulated at random. It is based upon plans under consideration by the Army for years. It was outlined by the President in his July 10 message to Congress. It provides (1) for the total equipment of a land force of approximately 1,200,000 men; (2) for procurement of reserve stocks of tanks, guns, artillery, ammunition, etc., for another 800,000 men, or a total of 2,000,000, if mobilization of such a war-time force should become necessary; (3) for provision of manufacturing facilities, public and private, necessary to produce critical items of equipment required for 2,000,000 men, and for production of the ordnance items needed for the Army aircraft program—guns, bombs, armor, bomb sights, and ammunition; and (4) for procurement of 15,000 additional Army planes, complete with necessary spare engines, armament, and the most modern equipment.

QUARTER OF PROGRAM IN WORKS

Although funds have been available only since June 26—exactly 3 weeks—contract awards have already been made to the extent of roundly $300,000,000, or about one-fourth of the program. Another $100,000,000 is represented by a contract for 1,900 planes, which will be signed presently. This record has been accomplished in spite of inevitable difficulties attendant upon an expanding personnel, crowded offices, changed laws, and the necessity of modifying procedure in countless directions. It is the sleepless effort of all concerned to expedite awards for the remainder of appropriated funds, not only to get industry to work as rapidly as possible, but also to clear the decks for the larger program. While the latter cannot be executed until approved by Congress, arrangements are already in the making to place the business with industry and to eliminate the bottlenecks which are sure to develop in the execution of contracts.

ROME NOT BUILT IN DAY

Anxious as the country is for visible preparedness results, and urgent as these are, it has to be remembered that Rome was not built in a day. By the acid tests of both the objective and the start made toward its execution, there is ample evidence that the program of supply preparedness is proceeding satisfactorily, even if not at the dizzy pace which the uninformed may have expected. We are facing a long battle. On the average, quantity production of difficult munitions, even in high-speeded America, cannot be obtained in less than a year.

The creation of stocks will require several months more. But it is highly gratifying to be assured, on authority, that even these long-time factors are less than half those required by Great Britain, France, and Germany.

WE ARE ON THE WAY

Messrs. Stettinius, Knudsen and their associates, seasoned men of industrial affairs, feel that the Nation has every right to be reassured by what has so far been accomplished. Their confidence on this score should convince the country that everything that can conceivably be done to pave the way to strengthened national defense efficiently and promptly is being tackled with a minimum of wasted time and effort. There is healthy respect beyond our shores for America's mighty industrial potentialities. These are now being harnessed on a truly prodigious scale. Their purpose is to make the United States invincible against external attack. That is the alpha and omega of the national-defense program, and it is on the way.

The Political Situation and World Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on July 19, 1940, over WIBW at Topeka, Kans., on the political situation and world problems.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, it is my sincere hope and prayer that war never comes to America. We have lived in peace with all the world, and must not become involved in any war. Only in the event we are attacked should we fight to preserve our democratic way of living.

We can all be gratified that the Democratic convention in Chicago adopted a strong antiwar plank in the party's platform. It is not so strong a stand as the Republicans took at Philadelphia. But Senator WHEELER, for whom I have the greatest respect, fought valiantly to force an anti-interventionist plank into the platform.

Senator WHEELER deserves the compliments of all people who oppose sending our American boys to fight in foreign wars. I have always opposed any measures that would lead the United States into Europe's war, and will never vote for any measure designed to send our young men to fight on foreign soil.

I believe the people of the United States are overwhelmingly opposed to intervention in any wars abroad.

Current war scares have uncovered the sort of situation we didn't know existed. We have bumped into a very real problem of protecting our country and we find ourselves unprepared, to say the least. God grant that all of this insane killing soon will cease. But regardless of when or how it ends, we in the United States must see that we are not caught napping again.

Congress must stay in session to enact a defense tax bill. We must pour out billions of dollars for national defense. As American citizens, we must demand that this money be spent for defense measures and equipment in a businesslike manner.

We are all going to be called upon to sacrifice, and sacrifice beyond anything we have dreamed of in the past, to attain the goal of national security.

So I want Congress to put through with the least possible delay an excess-profits tax provision that will guarantee against the creation of another batch of war millionaires in this country.

I am utterly opposed to any program that will give huge war profits to greedy people who would grow rich out of the miseries of their fellow men.

We have no time, nor can we afford, to play politics at such a serious time when the welfare of our country is endangered.

I am backing defense measures to the limit. But I am going to demand a strict accounting for every dollar spent.

And you Kansas folks should demand a strict accounting for the money that is being spent. Part of it is going to be your money.

This problem of unpreparedness, important as it is just now, isn't the only one we need to watch. While war has overshadowed everything else, we still have our domestic problems of fair prices for agriculture, jobs for those willing to work, and countless other problems.

This war has brought us face to face with the unpleasant fact that we have been pretty slipshod in many things. But if it teaches us to demand efficient, businesslike Government we will have made a definite gain.

If we are to be adequately prepared, we must encourage our farmers to produce an abundance of food. The pending famine in Europe should be a lesson to us. Food supplies in time of emergency are as important as planes, battleships, and antiaircraft guns.

We don't want another plow-up campaign such as we had during the World War. And this is not necessary. We now have enough acres under cultivation to supply our own needs, and still have plenty for export in the world market.

To accomplish this requires long-time planning. It does not call for curtailment of production, under guise of keeping down surpluses. Unless we build up food supplies for 1 or 2 years' needs, we might, in time of crisis, find ourselves traveling on empty stomachs.

I don't believe food preparedness means skimping our supplies down to a point where they could be exhausted in 6 months, not when we already have hungry people in this land of so-called food surpluses, not when a great emergency army might demand enormous quantities of foods.

If we are smart in our food preparedness, our men, if they are called to active war service, will have plenty to eat. And, just as important, they will not have to worry about their loved ones at home going hungry. We must not be found, at some crucial period, frantically urging our farmers to produce a miracle of food supplies for emergency needs.

Now, I want to talk briefly about the Democratic Convention. Both of the major parties have nominated their tickets and adopted their platforms. It is now up to the voters to make their choice.

They can either accept the New Deal ideas, which in 7 years have not solved our domestic problems, or they can vote for Wendell Willkie and Senator MCNARY, both of whom are serious, efficient businessmen.

This is going to be a most interesting campaign. The nomination of President Roosevelt for a third term was no surprise. He has been planning it that way for more than a year. No other Democrat had a chance to break through the barriers set up by the bureaucratic bosses.

The contrast between the Democratic and Republican Conventions is worth noting. At Philadelphia, the bosses or would-be bosses, had nothing to do with the nomination of Wendell Willkie for President. At Chicago the big machine politicians and the Democratic bosses, headed by Kelly and Hague, did not allow the rank-and-file delegates to have anything to say about who would be nominated.

It is my opinion that a majority of voters will express their opposition to a third term when they go to the polls next November. Things have not come to a pass in the United States where one man, and one man only, is capable of directing the Government.

The President's message to Senator BARKLEY, releasing all the delegates pledged to him, was a dramatic play intended for public consumption, and to give the convention proceedings a "draft Roosevelt" flavor. The lack of enthusiasm among the delegates had alarmed the bosses in charge of the convention. It took a lot of maneuvering, and no little organization on the floor, to stage the noisy demonstration Tuesday night.

At Philadelphia, the demonstrations for Willkie were unorganized and uncontrolled. They were the spontaneous outbursts of enthusiasm for a man who had sold himself and his theories to the whole country.

Acceptance of the third-term nomination by the President violates traditions held sacred by the American people for more than 100 years. His argument that he doesn't want to quit and turn his work over to inexperienced hands scarcely holds up. There are many men in both major parties capable of continuing the defense program. In fact, the alarming state of unpreparedness in which we now find this country indicates that a change in management is essential to national safety.

It is doubly important that Congress remain in session during the present emergency; we can do much to prevent the waste and maladministration of defense funds by vigorous protests, if not by official action.

The nomination by the Democrats of Henry A. Wallace for Vice President was somewhat of a surprise. Henry is admittedly a friend of the farmer. He has tried for 7 years to do something for agriculture. His administration of the A. A. A. program has helped many farmers.

But I am going to support Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY for Vice President, along with Wendell L. Willkie for President. For 22 years I have served with Senator MCNARY on the Senate Committee on Agriculture. He is a farmer at heart and in practice. He lives on one of the best farms in Oregon.

I believe the farmers have a better chance of getting their problems solved the MCNARY way than they do under the Wallace program.

The McNary-Haugen bill would have come nearer solving the problems of agriculture than the present A. A. A. law. I supported the McNary-Haugen bill and voted to pass it over the veto of a Republican President—Coolidge. It should have become a law. I am very sorry that President Coolidge refused to sign it, and that we couldn't pass it over his veto.

However, the farmers need have no fear—whether MCNARY or Wallace becomes Vice President. Both of the Vice Presidential candidates are friendly to agriculture, and as presiding officer of the Senate, either will continue to work for the farmers.

However, a vote for Wallace also is a vote for a third term for President Roosevelt. As I said before, we cannot afford to break the sacred traditions of our Government.

The two major parties have put up their best men for the highest offices in the land. It is up to the voters to decide whether they want Roosevelt for a third term, or change to an administration that is not controlled by a lot of New Deal bosses. Wendell Willkie is not under obligation to any boss, or set of bosses. He is a capable businessman, who has liberal leanings and has caught the imagination of the people.

I have always opposed the third-term idea. I voted for the La Follette resolution against a third term for President Coolidge, who was one of my close friends. Though he was a Republican, I did not believe he should run for a third term. It is not the American way, but is too much like the practices of the European dictators, who deprive their people of liberty and freedom of speech under one pretext or another—and often without any pretext at all.

The motive which impelled President Roosevelt to seek—he says he merely accepted after being drafted—reelection are mysterious. It is my belief that having centralized more power in the Federal Government than any President ever had, he is reluctant to give up that power. Certainly his persuasive appeal in his acceptance speech does not satisfactorily explain his reasons.

I am of the opinion that the fiction of a "draft" movement will not be accepted by the people, if they realize the serious implications involved.

It always is pleasant to get home and to live among my own people. Kansas is the best State in the Union—it is the best place on earth. We folks out here in the Middle West sometimes do not realize all our blessings.

We have no fear of death-dealing bombs falling on our homes or in our streets. We have everything that makes life worth living, and get along together more amicably than those living anywhere else.

But we cannot forget, nor ignore, the emergency which today confronts the whole Nation, indeed, the whole of the Western Hemisphere. It is our duty to help prepare to ward off aggressors. The present state of the world brings serious problems right to our own doorsteps. In common with all Americans, we must make sacrifices, work for unity of purpose, if we are to continue the enjoyment of our liberties and our American way of life.

We can only do our part by being ready at all times to share whatever sacrifices are necessary. I have faith in the American people as a whole—but my faith in my Kansas neighbors is unbounded.

As I leave for Washington to resume my duties in the United States Senate, I ask your prayers and your continued cooperation. I would love to stay here, but duty calls. Congress must not adjourn so long as this present emergency exists. To do so would, in my opinion, be one of the worst things that could happen to this country—short of actual invasion by an enemy. Good-bye, and good luck.

Is There Tragedy in Investment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the speech by the able gentleman from California, Mr. VOORHIS, which was printed in the Appendix to the RECORD for May 8. The gentleman is citing the words of Mrs. Joan Robinson, an English economist:

> The tragedy of investment is that it can never remain at a constant level. If the rate of investment one year is the same as the last, then, generally speaking, the level of employment and income and therefore the level of the demand for goods will be the same in the second year as in the first. But all the time capital is accumulating and in the second year there is a larger amount of equipment available to meet the same demand for commodities. The rate of profit consequently falls off, future prospects are dimmed by the decline in present receipts and in the third year new investment appears less attractive to entrepreneurs than in the second.
>
> New investment—

Says the gentleman in comment—

> implies that somehow the community has made a corresponding sacrifice of current consumption.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the backbone of a speech of much earnestness, sincerity, and candor. But in this quotation and comment, exemplifying the British-born concept of savings and investment that has sprung chiefly from the work of J. Maynard Keynes, there is also introduced, it seems to me, much confusion of thought. In this connection Mr. Keynes himself, in a recent comment on a report of a committee of the League of Nations dealing with Statistics Relating to Capital Formation, said:

> We have been, all of us, brought up, like the members of this committee, in deep confusion of mind between the demand and supply of savings, and until we rid ourselves of it, we cannot think correctly.

So while Mr. Keynes waxes rueful over savings, we find Mrs. Robinson reflecting upon the tragedy of investment. What, then, is the deep confusion between the two that is creating an intellectual blind spot even for trained minds? What is their true interrelationship?

I offer here, Mr. Speaker, an attempt to answer these questions that is based on long personal experience in professional and business accounting coupled with some careful consideration of current economic and monetary theory. I hope it may serve in some measure to reduce the confusion.

Money may be saved or hoarded, of course; but only, I think, for spending or lending to spend. That is, money is never itself invested; for a productive investment consists, not of money, but of what money buys.

It is, indeed, well recognized that money develops velocity and is being continuously respent on investments of all kinds; for of course money is only a medium of exchange and is no more tied up when used to make an investment than it is consumed when spent for food. The purchase of productive or capital goods that are not consumed but may be resold, does not immobilize any money; nor is money, once spent or lent, thereafter in itself serving the investor or lender in any way whatsoever. In the proper course it is, as a circulating medium, always being respent or reinvested by others.

It is to be said, then, that since there is nothing about the use of money for making investments that can be connected by any necessity with the amount of money available as purchasing power, there is necessitated the assumption that generally speaking means, to Mrs. Robinson, that on the one hand the velocity and quantity of money does not change, and that, on the other hand, there is no change in either the amount of speculative trading and/or the levels of pricing in an intricately interdependent and kaleidoscopic pricing process, or in the number of sales involved in both speculation and in processing raw materials.

This theory of investment assumes also that investment refers only to such additions to capital as are not new in type and efficiency and so self-generating; for new technical efficiencies are able to expand production and real income, not by sacrificing current consumption, but by lowering the cost of their products. Moreover, as they serve to curtail the number of steps in processing, they curtail also the need for money—including, of course, bank credit—to conduct industry.

In fine, we find ourselves speaking so generally with Mrs. Robinson and the gentleman from California as to make logical inferences almost impossible. Hadn't we better reexamine the assumptions upon which we have been basing our ideas of capitalism in industry?

THE FORMATION OF NEW INVESTMENTS.

Whence cometh new investment, Mr. Speaker? Is it really possible so to diagram the processes of capitalism on the one hand, and of trading with money on the other, as to make it certain that tragedy lurks in new investment unless a correspondingly expanding money supply is forthcoming? At a time when financial stability is of critical importance, a seriously inflationary policy may lurk in this assumption if it be based on a fallacy, that is, if it is not true that new investment implies the necessity for new money or expansion of purchasing power in its sum total.

Let us start the criticism of Mrs. Robinson's flare for the Marxian belief in the self-strangulating propensity of the processes of capitalistic investment in mechanized industry, by pointing out that if a constant level of new investment is suicidal, the same must be true of all new investment. Under this theory of automatic industrial frustration, discontinuity in the formation of capital could delay but not obviate the arrival of the tragedy of investment which the able gentleman is asking us to accept as a logical premise in our thinking. Unless assumptions are changed, the arrival of tragedy would merely be delayed by discontinuity in new investment. But is such a tragic impasse inherent in new investment? I think not.

For our analysis of this assumption let us turn to the able gentleman's assertion that sacrifice of current consumption is implied in new investment, and ask: If capital can continuously contribute a stream of net, consumption income, by what logic is it held that it cannot continuously do some of the consuming itself, in its own growth, so that no prior relation of capital-creating income to consumption—which must therefore be discontinued or sacrificed—need exist? Must

we assume that all factors of production are fully employed in producing for consumption, so that they neither have been nor can be producing for the formation of capital? Is it true that expanded production by capital can occur only by added capital expenditure out of net income, that is, by sacrifice of current consumption?

It is, of course, not to be denied that saving—diversion of expenditure from other ends—may be used to develop capital. But this by no means implies that the formation of productive capital must ensue upon saving and investment of either real or money savings, nor yet that productive investment can only arise from saving or sacrifice. If new investment can, in fact, be developed from maintenance or depreciation reserve funds, then assuredly no sacrifice of current consumption is implied.

Is it, then, quite contrary to the principles of sound investment that new capital income should arise by drawing on depreciation reserve funds? If a type of mechanism becomes obsolete, is it good business to use the depreciation fund to maintain it? If not, then if a new technical efficiency results from expenditure of this fund on improved equipment, will not the net income produced exceed that which such a fund had been properly calculated to maintain? And can depreciation allowances so invested be called savings out of current consumption?

Is not new efficiency, indeed, more than likely to shorten the chain of processes and disemploy old types of both machinery and skill, thus calling for less, rather than more, money in the operation of the processes of mechanized production?

The difficulty, then, in such technological unemployment, is not a matter solely of monetary quantity, important though that be. It seems rather to arise in faulty distribution of ownership—and so of capital income—than in any inequity of distribution of income to labor as such.

Certainly, America has a tradition of opportunity in free enterprise which, until recently, we have striven to maintain. But have our institutions actually afforded full equality of opportunity, through savings, to share in industrial ownership? I think not. Despite the formal separation of banking from investment by the Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935, honest savings appear still to be short-circuited by the participation of commercial banking institutions in investment. Most dangerous, indeed, is the fact that we depend almost entirely on this very displacement of earned savings by bank credit, for that expansion of money supply necessary to prevent monetary stringency.

MARXIAN CONFUSION OVER SAVINGS AND INVESTMENT

I fear there are still some of the cobwebs of Marxian fallacy lurking in this confusion over saving and investment. Because of a failure clearly to see just how income and value develop from investment, there is a strong tendency among many of our so-called liberals, to impute all income to labor. Ignoring the productivity of capital goods, it is too often alleged that technology merely increases the productivity of labor. But, as Thomas Edison observed, the ultimate aim of mechanized production is complete freedom from any production by labor, and hence no employment or payment of wages by owners.

In approaching such a theoretical ideal, purchasing power must be increasingly generated, not by labor, but by investment, and be paid, not as wages, but to owners as interest or as dividends at the interest ratio on invested value. Except as a matter of bad financing, therefore, there can be no impasse generated by surplus value or profit. Indeed, consumption through mass purchasing power must develop, not through the largesse, willing or coerced, of concentrated ownership toward wage earners, but through the dispersion of ownership as a source of income.

It should be clear, then, that there is no necessary relation between the rate of investment and the level of employment and incomes—no determinate multiplier, to put it in the Keynesian vernacular. Ideally, as in Edison's concept, there simply is no employment income, no wage fund, Mr. Speaker; no payroll. Far from being a tragedy, investment, if it were operating under an intelligent system of finance, could and would, as it largely does, automatically generate precisely the purchasing power requisite to continuous operation of industry, irrespective of whether the recipients of income chose to devote it to consumption or to new investment. Why, indeed, must we suppose that a rationally organized society would ever invest for an unneeded consumption? Can there be any logic in the notion that society cannot keep its investments automatically in balance with consumption needs, quite as any sane individual would do in creating his own equipment on a frontier? Why should the moneyed age of steel be less rational than the moneyless age of stone? Is there, indeed, no rational basis for the system of capitalistic free enterprise we have practiced?

That employment has no definite relation to these problems may be seen also in the fact that, as in the ideally and fully unemployed, capitalized, industrial society, the primitive situation was also one involving no employment for paid wages even though all income was a return for labor and no one was unemployed in the sense of having no productive work to do. Though unemployed, men were always occupied as long as natural resources in hunting and fishing were available.

Between these two extremes of total unemployment, then, there stands, obviously, the existing situation which is a period of transition in which the evolution of human society is now at the point where the more capable element does and should, in the interest of all, obtain much of their purchasing power, not by labor, but by thrift and intelligent investment while employing labor—often their own labor. Hence, by the logic of reductio ad absurdum, we must look elsewhere than to an inherent tragedy of investment for the explanation, and so the means of prevention, of that lack of purchasing power from which arises poverty-ridden unemployment for employable labor. Prevention of the paradox of underconsumption must take the form of preparation for the time when the industrial payroll has been reduced, technologically, almost to the vanishing point.

The problems of modern industry do not, therefore, in the final analysis, involve any arbitrary determination of wages and hours or any other labor relations, by coercion of employers and abrogation of free enterprise. They involve rather the issue of maldistribution of ownership by financial methods which, as a whole, are decidedly questionable and are, in effect, a system of forced and unrewarded saving and wage slavery.

Here, then, we have the true picture of industrial evolution; two totally unemployed extremes which belong to the past and to the future, and the actually existing transition period of social and industrial evolution in which owners of capital equipment employ not only each other but also the decreasing proportion of the people who have no property of productive value other than their own brain and brawn. In this transition it is clear that there must be an increasing trend toward dependence upon income from dividends, that is, from ownership, to keep capital income absorbed in consumption.

The primary problem, therefore, is not one of any fixed or necessary relation between a rate of saving and a rate of investment, nor indeed of the existence of any new investment at all, for in truth, capital can come into existence without ever being actually constructed by human effort. It appears to me that this is universally the case with the development of that costless income from land tenure which is called rent. Let us briefly analyze this approach to a very old dispute as to the nature of land values and rent.

LAND RENT

It seems clearly evident that as better land requires less investment, i. e., less cost in both capital and labor, it offers the owners of such resources a cost-free income which is capitalized, at the reciprocal of the interest ratio, to determine land value. It is therefore only as interest on such land value as does not have to be maintained by expenditure, for example on fertilizer, that land rent is paid. (Let me say, urban land rentals are largely not land rent, but are simply the net return, or interest, on capital investment in streets and other public improvements which have been paid for by the holders of title to land, by taxation.)

With land, then, new capital value arises cost-free as fast as population increase forces the obsolescence, through sci-

ence and invention, of old machines and methods. For though new efficiencies are the very essence of economic progress, their total benefits are not, except under patent laws, returned to the technological improvements which originate them usually out of depreciation reserves. Technological benefits do become, in large measure, cost-free income to owners of the source of raw materials. Chiefly that source is simply, and literally, a place in the sun; for life arises, as everyone knows, from the plant's photosynthesis of food supplies without which animal life could not exist. As capital equipment increases, and with it population, submarginal lands are brought into production and better land develops added rental value as a gift from nature.

Again let us ask, then, what becomes of the idea that new investment implies that somehow the community has made a corresponding sacrifice of current consumption? If land rent develops cost-free and arises from the cutting of costs by technological improvements which actually cost less per unit of net income than had previously been the case in maintaining investment against expected depreciation, then sacrifice must consist, where growth and progress are involved, in enjoying an actual and direct gain in available income for consumption purposes!

INTEREST AND BANK CREDIT IN INVESTMENT

We see, then, that in a proper distribution of income it is not technically true, as alleged by the able gentleman from California, that value invested necessarily comprises any diversion of current income in a sacrificial sense. Balance between investment costs and net income is continuously, in a proper financial set-up, maintained at a natural ratio between the two streams—cost and income—which is determined by conditions, inherent in the human economy, that are related to the normal rate of interest. Thus ratio may not be disturbed by law if investment and trade are to function rationally.

That it has been disturbed by the pump-priming fiscal policies of this Administration has given rise to the opinion, recently advanced by the Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System, that an easy money policy will have disastrous results if persisted in. With too low interest rates cash balances are sure to develop into liquidity preferences—to use the Keynesian language again—and be hoarded so as to raise a threat of sudden liquidation or spending speculatively if a stimulus to spending, real or imaginary, develops. This is the state of affairs for which the Reserve Board has itself stated that control is wholly lacking. In this respect we are quite unprepared to handle emergency financing, as of a war budget, without a serious inflationary trend.

The fault lies primarily in the existing system of banking with partial reserves so that real savings are short-circuited and sabotaged by bank credit which becomes, though a debt with interest charges attached, our circulating medium of exchange. I could hardly put this more strongly than it has been stated by Dr. Slichter of the Harvard School of Business Administration in his book, Toward Stability, page 22:

> Credit greatly accentuates the fluctuations in business which are produced by other causes and, in addition, it is itself an independent cause of maladjustment. * * * Indeed, if we were living in a cash economy and desired for some strange reason to make an economy highly susceptible to violent fluctuations, we could scarcely do better than to invent the present credit system.
>
> Under a credit system such as ours * * *, by going into debt at the banks we expand the currency and by paying bank loans we contract it. This is a result of the fact that bank loans are made, not by transferring money from one person to another, but by creating credit dollars.

It is, then, most urgently necessary that American thought should reject without reserve the Robinson notion, implied by the Keynesian school of thought, that there is an inherent tragedy in investment. In a neutral money system, which allows a natural interest ratio to develop, the division of the stream of gross capital income is automatically controlled so as to be continuously allocated, on the one hand and chiefly, to investment costs of depreciation, and on the other hand to the smaller stream of net income to owners—including lenders.—No impasse can possibly develop. The difficulties which are attributed, by the specious analyses of socialistic liberals, to the profit system and capitalism, are due wholly to faulty finance.

This division of the gross income stream has been noted by the distinguished student, Alfred Marshall, in the following words—Principles of Economics, 1925 edition, page 592:

> The flow of investment of resources from their common source in production consists of two streams. The smaller consists of new additions to the accumulated stock. The larger merely replaces that which is destroyed; whether by immediate consumption, as in the case of food, fuel, etc.; by wear and tear, as in that of railway irons; by the lapse of time, as in that of a thatched roof * * *; or by all of these combined. * * * It is therefore not unreasonable to assume * * * that the owners of capital in general have been able in the main to adapt its form to the normal conditions of the time, so as to derive as good a net income from their investments in one way as another.

The Robinson theory that all the time capital is accumulating for an impasse, is no possible part of investment as thus pictured by Marshall. The rate of profit—net income, or interest—cannot decline and destroy employment of capital and labor, for it is automatically adjusted as a continuous process of apportionment. I should say, rather, that it would be so adjusted if we would stop our formation of capital by forced savings through the use of bank credit to purchase bond issues and extend credit, often and most freely to business so big that its collateral is nothing but a note. Indeed, in Mrs. Robinson's homeland the 60 families afford themselves overdraft facilities with no formalities at all.

There can be no economic stability where the rate of interest is thus undermined by what amounts to counterfeiting of savings. Under a system of chartering banks to extend credit, interest, no matter how low the rate as set by so-called supervision, will at times be excessive simply because it must be indefinitely compounded by reinvestment of what are nothing but bank debts, if those debts are to continue in circulation as the medium of exchange. When those investments become frozen and reinvestment is impossible, then, indeed, is there tragedy in investment. Then, indeed, not even our money supply can remain at a constant level either in quantity or velocity, and collapse is inevitable.

A few years ago an editor of the Wall Street Journal expressed this situation most pointedly. I quote from the Journal of September, 1933, page 224:

> Until very recently it has been generally assumed that, in our modern economic system, there was practically no assignable limit to the capacity of new capital invested in productive plant, to fructify; that is, to yield a return out of which interest could be properly paid. * * * The world assumed that nature could be made to yield compound interest at a reasonably generous rate, and therefore, it could safely go into debt in continually increasing amounts. I suggest that one of the great lessons of this depression is that this assumption is not true, and that one of the principal causes of the depression—perhaps the dominant cause—is the weight of sterile debt accumulated during the Great War and afterwards. It seems to me that nature—by which I mean the general order of things—is more severe upon usury than was the Church. The Church merely condemned the interest * * * but nature condemns as well such use of the principle. * * * Recurring panics and depressions represent periodical audits, when we stop to take account of our position. One notable feature of all such audits is the wiping out of a mass of debt. This we call liquidation. Never in the history of the modern world has there been outstanding so enormous a volume of debt and probably never has so large a portion of that debt been in fact barren (because it represents no fructifying capacity) as is the case today.

Free enterprise and liberty may not long endure when government either charters banks to lend unsaved funds or performs that function through agencies otherwise chartered or set up in bureaucracy. If monetary stability and social justice are to be served, I submit there must be no material distortion of the universal human process of capitalization of real income at the natural interest ratio in the development of economic value or investment. In a sound monetary system every cent of money loaned should first have been privately earned and saved, and then be loaned privately and free from constraint as to interest rates. No bank of issue should be free from the discipline of interest charges; nor should any recipients of loaned funds be so freed to any degree whatever—except only the Government itself. Here the expenditure of debt-free funds may be equitably arranged in the interest of society as a whole by a representative assembly.

In the words of Dr. Lauchlin Currie, the Supply and Control of Money in the United States, chapter XV:

The merit of this proposal—

That money shall be created exclusively for the public budget—

lies in the fact that it divorces the supply of money from the loaning of money.

This is a situation, a financial procedure, to which we can go forward, but not back to any previously perfected system. Such procedure leaves the interest rate free from any governmental interference and sets up the heretofore unrealized but truly free enterprise system without which democracy cannot function—except as it may have a landed frontier taken from others in the struggle of the fit to survive.

It should be obvious now that there could be no more disastrous proposal for reform than that which contemplates public debt, as is proposed in H. R. 4931, sponsored by the gentleman from California. A public debt inevitably develops arbitrary political influences in the money market, quite as it is doing right now. Similarly, the entrance of the Government into the lending or investing of money in competitive enterprise, such as is contemplated in the Jones-Wheeler bill for agriculture, or, indeed, as is now being done by a multiplicity of Government agencies, can only be described as a destruction of the very basis of free enterprise through sabotaging the normal return on investments.

There can be nothing new under the sun, Mr. Speaker, except straight thinking free from prejudice masqueraded as human sympathy. Straight thinking tells us that voluntary insurance against mishaps and even old age has its proper place; but pensions are a matter not of obtaining a payment of earned income but of charity only. There can be no proper social obligation to provide for private misfortune or old age. If public charity be undertaken, it cannot be presented as anything but an unfortunate expedient in redistributing by taxation what has been needlessly maldistributed. More accurately, it should be described as a makeshift in distributing what is being produced as against what should be produced in a proper set-up and properly distributed in the first place. At best, it is the pound of cure administered in place of the ounce of prevention. Even though paid justifiably, as to war veterans, a public pension system cannot represent actually earned income belonging to pensioners by any actual production through either labor or investment. It cannot fail, therefore, to become a political pork barrel and a constant threat to liberal, democratic institutions.

PRIDE GOETH BEFORE A FALL

Many of the most active and sincere advocates of intellectual freedom—

Says Public Policy Pamphlet No. 29 of the University of Chicago, entitled "Freedom and the Economic System"—

are, in effect, its worst enemies, much more dangerous than its avowed opponents, because they bring to the collectivist movement * * * the support of those who would recoil in horror if they understood these consequences.

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the situation, created by public subsidies and the pump-priming social measures, which we are today boastfully told is a new deal in Americanism and democracy. But pride, Mr. Speaker, goeth before a fall. No more arrantly fatuous nonsense was ever spewed by the denizens of Rome in the days of her decline than that which bespeaks the alleged efficiency of the American way of exploiting our frontier. Never in history has a more wasteful exploitation of human and natural resources been so effectively implemented as in this Nation, here and now. It is in no spirit of sentimentalism over poverty and unemployment, nor even of loyalty to democratic ideals, that I raise a feeble voice in protest. Rather is it in realization that a race which lacks the intelligence to erect a financial system commensurate with the ideals of liberty cannot hope to maintain, much less defend, the institutions of democracy. The attempt can only spell ultimate doom for the race and surrender of the new frontiers to those who will be no less ruthless with modern inefficiency than were we when, at the inception of the industrial revolution, we colonized America over the bitter opposition of the original Americans who sought to defend their land and their liberty.

What they lacked, among other things, we also lack—a workable and sound money system operating outside the control of political administrations.

Isaiah Speaks to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

SERMON BY CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON, PREACHED IN ROCKEFELLER MEMORIAL CHAPEL, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, JUNE 2, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Charles Clayton Morrison, editor, entitled "Isaiah Speaks to America," as follows:

O Assyria, rod of my anger, and staff of my fury! * * * O people of mine, be not afraid of Assyria * * * for in a very little while my fury shall cease and my anger shall come to an end. (Isaiah 10:5; 24, 25. Smith-Goodspeed translation.)

We have all come to this place of prayer with solemn and disquieted hearts. You expect me to speak on the tragedy that is called Europe, and on America's relation to it. For this hour we have laid aside our newspapers and tuned out the chatter of reporters and commentators, hoping to find some light and cheer in the message of religion. All of us long for a word from a prophet of God. I propose that we listen to the prophet Isaiah. He stood in a situation strikingly like that in which we stand. And he spoke to it. If we hear again this prophet's word, it may help us to orient our hearts in the scene in which we find ourselves.

Extreme peril threatened the little kingdom of Judah. The Assyrian king, Sargon, with his army on its way to Egypt, had invaded and crushed Syria and Samaria and was within 2 days' march of the borders of Judah. For years, Isaiah had been preaching to his countrymen that Assyria would one day come down upon them like a wolf on the fold, and that there could be no protection for Judah if Judah did not mend its way, reform its injustices, purify the state, and especially rid Zion of its idolatry, which was an offense to Jehovah. The politicans and priests gave no heed to his prophesyings, save to leer at them from couches of drunkenness and wantonness, the while they kept on oppressing the people with injustice and robbery. But now the Assyrian king was marching across Syria and Palestine. The little countries to the north had fallen before the conqueror, and the people of Judah, whose turn was next, were in a panic of hysteria.

Isaiah saw in this historical scene the hand of God. Judah is to suffer—there could be no doubt of that. Now that the invasion is imminent, what has Isaiah to say? He speaks both a stern word of judgment and a comforting word of hope. God, he says, is using Assyria as the rod of his wrath against Judah. You would not listen to God's prophet, he tells his countrymen. You would not reform your wanton ways. You would not give up your power to oppress. You would not rectify the internal injustices of the nation. Therefore God is about to use Sargon as the only instrument of reform which you will heed. Your land shall be laid waste, your wealth confiscated, your children and women led captive.

Let us read this ancient prophecy with some literary and historical imagination. It is not necessary for us to accept Isaiah's oversimplification of events. A literalistic mind can raise many questions and thereby miss the great truth. Make allowances for the period in which Isaiah lived. Allow also for what may seem like a naive and narrow perspective determined by Isaiah's total preoccupation with the interests of the tiny kingdom of Judah. But when you have made all such allowances, two majestic truths stand out. One of these is the truth that the process of history contains a punitive principle, that men and nations are punished for their sins by the unescapable operation of the forces which are immanent in history itself. These punitive forces which attack human sin may themselves be even more evil than the men and nations whose sin they punish. Evil attacks evil. It was no part of Sargon's intention to punish Judah because of any evils that were there. Certainly he was no reformer, nor was the Assyrian army a better government association. Sargon curled his lip at Judah's God. A ruthless aggressor, he was out for power, for exploitation, for aggrandizement. He had even made a treaty of alliance with Judah, but his word could not be trusted. He was a notorious breaker of treaties, a veritable Adolf Hitler. Yet Isaiah said he would serve God's purpose. He would be the unwitting rod of God's judgment against Judah because of Judah's disobedience. That was the first truth which Isaiah sought to impress upon his people.

But Isaiah did not stop at prophesying disaster. He went on to speak a word of hope. There is a limit, he declared, beyond which the conqueror will not be allowed to go. Mount Zion, the hill of the Lord's house, is inviolable. God will protect and preserve it. Assyria is only God's instrument. Sargon is not omnipotent. God still reigns. He has not abdicated. If the Assyrian is a rod in the hand of Jehovah, used by him for the punishment of Judah, he will also be restrained by that same divine hand from destroying the Holy City. This man who boasts that he will overrun the whole world, and harrow Judah as one might harry a bird's nest, who believes in nothing but his own might, who says, "By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my shrewdness, for I am a great military genius, and none can stand before me"—this man is only the rod in God's hand. His boasting is as if the ax boasted over the man that hews with it, and as if the saw boasted against him that plies it.

Suppose, now, that Isaiah stood in this pulpit this morning. What would he say to us, to America, to the stricken and devastated Low Countries of Europe, to Great Britain and France, the remnant of whose maimed and tattered armies has just made a precarious and tragic retreat from the awful holocaust of Flanders? I think Isaiah would say precisely what he said to Judah. The circumstances under which he spoke to Judah were strikingly like the pattern of events spread out before us in this morning's newspaper. He would first say a harsh thing: "Hitler is the rod of God's wrath to punish you for your sin." And then he would say a reassuring thing: "The power of the invader is limited; God still reigns. Hitler is the rod of His anger, but he is only a rod—a rod held fast in God's hand. He can go so far, but no farther. There is a fortress, a holy hill, which he cannot take."

There is a holy hill in every land—in Holland, in Belgium, in Britain, in France, in America—which is forever inviolable, which can be destroyed only if we destroy it ourselves or abandon it. It is the citadel, the holy hill, where a nation's righteous cause, its spiritual treasures, its essential freedom, its democracy—in a word, its civilization—are enshrined. Against this holy city of civilization Sargon has no power, Hitler has no power; it is safe if we treasure it, because its security is backed by the power of God. This, I think, is what Isaiah would say to us if he were here.

Some of you, listening to Isaiah, may complain that you cannot follow his argument. You are not accustomed to see the hand of God in history. You have had all that nonsense blown out of you by your liberal education. For myself, I must say that I stand with Isaiah and Judaism, with Jesus and Christianity, in seeing history as the field of God's action. But I do not wish you to stumble over words. The truth which Isaiah speaks to us is too important to be missed merely because one has trouble with Isaiah's vocabulary or his ideology. What he says can be said without the use of a single theological word. Perhaps your mind will meet his if I put his message in other terms. Let me try to do so.

In the process of history, Isaiah would say, evil strikes against evil to destroy it; but the destroying evil, in its turn, strikes at last against the power which holds the structure of history together, and is itself destroyed. Isaiah calls this power God, and I call it God. But let us not bother about words. By whatever name you call this power, it is moral power, because by definition moral power is that which holds history together. I ask you, therefore, to bring a large and open mind to Isaiah and try to understand his meaning, even if you have difficulty with his vocabulary.

In the situation in which Isaiah stood we have a small-scale picture of the scene in which we of America stand today. The parallelism is little short of astonishing. As the nation of Judah confronted the audacious and arrogant and ruthless Sargon, so today America confronts another Sargon in the person of Adolf Hitler. Like Judah, we have not yet been invaded, but we do not know the ultimate intention of the conqueror, and our minds are inflamed with the possibility that our country may stand in the pathway of his purpose. So long as the countries of Syria and Samaria were secure, Judah felt secure. But when they were crushed Judah's sense of security vanished. So long as Holland and Belgium were secure, America felt secure. But with the crushing of Holland and Belgium and the confounding of France and Britain, America finds herself looking out upon a future the possibility of which she has never envisaged before.

Almost overnight the mood of the country has been transformed. Security has given place to a sense of insecurity. Confidence in a calculable future has given place to wild and fantastic imaginings as to what may be in store for us. Complacency has vanished. Our isolation is gone. True, the oceans are still there—the geography is still the same. But our isolation was never a bare fact of geography. In the modern world America has derived confidence and freedom not only from the fact that the oceans were there but that Great Britain was there. Her Empire stood between us and whatever menace to our national life might arise in other parts of the world. It was no benevolent intention on Britain's part to shield us; I am not attributing motives; I am only stating a fact. The British Empire was a fact and its existence as a fact contributed to America's isolation. Britain, together with France, formed a great buffer between us and all the totalitarian states, so formidable that it was impossible to see ourselves as responsibly involved while these strong powers remained strong.

We of the United States formed the habit of taking the British Empire for granted. Its steel ribs determined the world order in which we moved. The world was organized on the basis of a Pax Britannica. Without examining the character of this world order, it did at least afford a dependable basis for calculating our future. All our policies presupposed its existence and a high degree of unlikelihood that its interests would conflict seriously with our national interests. The power of that empire is now in the balance. Its alliance with France may any day be shattered. We face the possibility that its mighty Navy, its Gibraltar, its Suez, its Singapore, may soon pass into the control of Germany, which is in the control of a messianic dictator bent upon gaining for Germany the place long held by Great Britain in world dominion.

Today America looks at Europe no longer through the protecting screen of British might. For the first time in its history our country is conscious of the stark necessity of independently orienting itself, politically and psychologically, to a world order bristling with incalculable possibilities, between which and our national destiny there may be no such mighty buffer as the British Empire has always been. That is what I mean when I say our isolation is gone. America now looks out upon a world which offers her neither assured enemies nor calculable allies. Our feeling of freedom has suddenly congealed. The veil of our security has been lifted, and America now sees Hitler as Judah saw Sargon. Where shall we find our cue for action ?

Two alternative courses lie open to us. In the first place, we may find our cue for action in our traditional relationship with Great Britain. If Britain goes down, we can move up to and occupy the position which Britain has been compelled to abdicate. We can become another Great Britain, and take upon ourselves the colossal task of policing the world as the British Empire has policed it for generations. This does not mean our adoption of Britain's imperial possessions, or the taking over of the apparatus of imperialism. But it does mean the thrusting of the United States into the world system of power politics, where we shall measure our strength against the strength of other powers, seeking alliances with certain powers against other powers, in the hope of guaranteeing peace by an equilibrium of military force. From all this America has been shielded in the past by the simple fact that Britain, compelled by the exigencies of her imperial position, has assumed this role.

It is this conception of America's role which animates the hectic and hysterical preparedness policy now gripping our Government and our people. True, this policy is proclaimed in the name of national defense, the defense of democracy, and the preservation of civilization, but it implies a role for the United States analogous to that which Great Britain has taken in the past. I am bound to say that the adoption of such a course would be based upon a tragic incomprehension of the crisis to which both America and the world have come.

Unquestionably, America must accept henceforth a responsibility to world civilization in a degree which our most passionate idealism has never yet envisaged. But that this responsibility is to be discharged within the system of power politics, and by war or the threat of war, seems to me, in the hideous light of a Europe bombing itself to destruction, to be a policy not of reason but of suicide. A reasonable armament of the United States is no doubt inevitable, and I am not concerned to offer any criticism of it as an interim measure while the world is aflame and the future is incalculable. But an America armed to the teeth, an America with her industrial economy transformed into an armament economy, with her youth educated in the atmosphere of war psychology and trained in the technique of war as a permanent vocation of patriotism; an America with her whole political and cultural life oriented toward war—such an America presents a tragically insane figure as a defender of civilization.

How much longer must the hell of fire burn in Europe before we learn that all our talk of defending civilization by war is irrational? How could civilization be more utterly destroyed than by modern war? To prepare America for a gratuitous entrance into this scene because, forsooth, Great Britain may be about to fall, is to act like a silly moth drawn into the flame or like dumb sheep following other sheep to the slaughter.

For America to conceive her role in civilization as that of an inheritor of Great Britain's role in the power politics of empire capitalism is only to court the same fate which we now fear is about to overtake Great Britain. America's entrance into the world scene, panoplied with armament, and with no other spirit or policy than that of war and alliances for war in the framework of the old order, will only prolong the death agony of an order that is already doomed.

Yet America must act. Where shall America find a cue for her action? From the order that is dying in Europe, or from the new order that is struggling to be born? Before we act, let us take counsel of Britain and France as they now face the possibility of ruin. Suppose they stood today where we stand—their armies undefeated; no war yet declared; the channels of negotiation still open; Hitler demanding the Sudetenland, the corridor, and Danzig, but Czechoslovakia and Poland still intact. What would Britain and France do? Obviously they would not do again what they did at Munich. Obviously they could not imagine that a policy of piecemeal appeasement would satisfy the German dictator. Obviously they would seek some more comprehensive and cooperative way of meeting the situation than to risk the treasures of civilization on the irrational gamble of war.

Even today, before it is yet determined that Britain and France will lose the war, Mr. Chamberlain must wish to God that he could go back and do it all over again. Would he not like to go back to Munich and do it all over again—and differently? Instead of offering Hitler a sop to keep the peace of Europe—that is, instead of taking his cue for action from an imperial order which he hoped

to perpetuate but which he now sees could not be perpetuated—would he not like to say to Hitler and the German people something like this: "We of Great Britain are ready to unroll the whole map of Europe and to explore the possibility of a total new order of economic and political life for all our peoples, including Germany; if you will join us and our neighbors in such an undertaking, I promise you that Great Britain will participate in such a total reconstruction at whatever sacrifice of national and imperial privilege its accomplishment will call upon us to make." Would not Mr. Chamberlain like to be in a position today to say just that to the German people? Would Hitler have arisen to such an offer? I believe the German people would have demanded that he accept it.

But suppose I am wrong in this confident faith. Suppose Munich was too late to make such an offer. Suppose Hitler would have taken it as an evidence of military weakness and pressed his claim for power still more relentlessly. Then go back further. Go back to the moment when the Weimar Republic was tottering. Or go back to the date when the Dawes plan of reparations was adopted. Or go all the way back to Versailles. Go back as far as may be necessary to find the German people in a mood to respond to a sincere offer of justice. Would not Great Britain and France like to go back there and do it all over again? Mr. Lloyd George sees it clearly. He declared in the House of Commons that Hitler and the Nazi regime are the product of British and French policy, and that the war was brought on in its less immediate but more controlling causes by conditions which Allied blindness and narrow national and imperial self-interest created.

There is not a French or British statesman who would not go back and do it all over again—and, oh, how differently! But they cannot go back. The processes of history are irreversible. The dead lie strewn upon the Flanders battlefield. Holland is out, Belgium is out. The demonic robots of Hitler's mechanized army crash their way toward Paris and the Channel ports.

No; they cannot go back. But we of America are already back! We stand where Britain and France once stood—at the beginning of a sequence of national decisions whose end proved, in their case, to be war and devastation and destruction of everything precious in civilization. We are where Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier would like to be, that is, at the point where they or their predecessors could do it all over again and do it differently. To take our cue from the old order in which they acted, to rush to its support with our flesh and blood and our resources of military might, would at best only prolong its death agony, and at worst carry us down with it.

It is in America's power to find a better way. We can choose either to contribute to the prolongation of the old order that carries within itself the inevitability of war, or to the constructive liberation of the new order which is struggling to be born. If Isaiah were here he would hold that choice sternly before America's eyes. War, he would say, is the fruit of sin, and if you cherish your sin and will not repent of it and remove it from your midst, devastation will come upon you, as it has upon Europe. Hitler, like Sargon, is the rod of God's wrath. But because Hitler is himself evil, do not become so obsessed with his evil that you cannot see the evil in your own nations! Judah's house must be cleansed of the evils against which God's wrath hurls the ruthless Assyrian. Western civilization, which quakes under the conqueror's foot, must cleanse its own house of the evils which have produced Hitler.

We know what these evils are in Western civilization. There is nothing obscure or merely theological about them. They are the punitive measures imposed on defeated peoples in previous wars, and the economic injustice in the distribution of the world's goods. The evils that cause war are not ideological. Nor are they inherent in human nature as such. Nor yet is modern war due to original sin, as some of our theologians are insisting.

Mankind does not want war. The German people in their normal state hate war as you and I hate it. For 20 years the nations have been trying to get rid of war by making promises to one another not to engage in it—nonaggression pacts, the League of Nations covenant, the Kellogg Pact. Solemn promises, all! Why were they not kept? Did the governments act in bad faith? Were the statesmen hypocrites? Did they sign with their fingers crossed? No. They devoutly desired peace. But the governments of the nations are not the real governors of the nations. The governments are themselves governed. Their peace plans were a house of cards superimposed upon an economic system that governs the governments and that holds war as Vesuvius holds molten lava.

The housekeeping of mankind is organized as a system of both domestic and imperial greed. This greed is an expression of both human need and human sin. The perennial tragedy to which it leads inheres in the fact that this need and this sin are forced to live together in an economic system which falsifies human dignity by tying up the satisfaction of elemental human needs with the necessity of injuring or oppressing or even killing others. This is why the nations fight. We cannot hope for peace while the nations cherish the unjust privileges upon which their economic life is based.

This, then, I think, would be Isaiah's first message to America: Take the lead in removing the evils which breed war, the evils which you share with all other nations, and which cause the rod of God's wrath to fall smitingly upon them and threateningly upon you. And his second message would likewise be the same as his message to Judah: "Trust God, for God will not let his holy hill be destroyed."

When Isaiah says "trust God," he does not have in mind a supernatural deity who from outside of history will in his own good time intervene in history to change things and save man. When Isaiah says "trust God," he has history itself in mind. For Isaiah's God was no deus ex machina, but the God of the concrete historical process. In this process of history, let me repeat, evil attacks evil to destroy it; but the destroying evil, in its turn, strikes at last against the power which holds history together, and is itself destroyed. There are three words—time, history, and God—which all point to the same reality. Time, history, God—there is healing in them, there is reconstruction in them, there is justice and peace in them—if only man would cooperate with them instead of trying to force them to serve his selfish and sin-cherishing privileges.

Do not fear the Assyrian, said Isaiah to Judah. Sargon's power is limited. Do not fear Hitler, he would say to us, even if he conquers Europe. His power is limited. It is limited by the normal processes of history. It is America's supreme duty now to adopt a course which will keep these processes open and active. We must not let them be choked by the insane violence of further war. War is the arrogant human attempt to take the control of history out of the Hand that rules history. It is man's supremely insolent defiance of God by attempting to force God's hand. Only in the open processes of history can civilization emerge, and in them only can it be preserved. Thus would Isaiah speak to America.

The world has long waited for a nation to arise which will act upon Isaiah's counsel—a nation willing to trust the pacific processes of history and to pay the price of peace by surrendering its own unfair privileges and taking potluck with the rest of mankind. No other nation is now in sight which can do so much to open the way for a new order for humanity as can our own. Our detached position between two great oceans is not merely a piece of geographical good luck. It is a gift of divine Providence. It lays upon us a unique responsibility for a service to mankind whose depth and reach our leaders have not yet taken to heart. But we cannot render this service or preserve our own treasures of civilization by taking over the military apparatus and the political entanglements of nations which are so caught in the coils of the old order that they can see no way out but the way of violence.

Peace is America's task, not war. Civilization is America's responsibility, not the destruction of civilization. The world we have known is passing away. Our nationalistic civilization, undergirded by empire capitalism, is on the way to the limbo where slavery and feudalism have long since gone. We have come to a vast crisis in world history. Perhaps our kind of civilization had to be destroyed by cataclysm and tragedy before the evils so deeply entrenched in it could be seen for what they are and before a new order could emerge. The rod of God's anger is clearing old things away. Let us believe that the wand of His creative mercy is making all things new.

Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never failing skill,
He treasures up His vast designs,
And works His sovereign will.

A Prophet in His Own Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 3, 1940

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, recent world events have caused much confusion in our foreign trade and commercial relations. Much of our foreign commerce has already been interrupted. A number of countries with which we had negotiated trade agreements have been swallowed up by more powerful nations. Those European nations not swallowed up have had to invoke wartime trade controls similar to those practiced by totalitarian states. During the continuance of the present war this confusion is apt to increase. It is extremely difficult to calculate the trade and commercial conditions which will prevail when the struggle on the other side has subsided. We do know that it is time for us to analyze our own position if we are to retain a place as a great producer and seller of products.

Arrangements are already being made throughout the world which severely interfere with foreign trade as it has been carried on in the United States. Individual businessmen are being replaced with Government bureaus and agencies. We realize that the reciprocal trade agreements program has been temporarily shattered. If the worst comes to the worst, its operation may have to be modified. This does not mean, however, that the principles of the program are not sound nor that the world will not eventually go back to trading on those fundamental principles.

Whatever nations are victors in the conflict, efforts will be made such as were displayed after the last war to establish nationalistic advantages in certain trading areas or spheres of influence. There will again be strong nationalistic feelings. Tariffs and all sorts of self-sufficiency movements will envelop the world. Thus the economic stage is apt to be set for another trade war which will inevitably lead to physical combat such as is now occurring. There should remain somewhere a framework of principles to which the world may turn in the future. Someone should sound a warning against the repetition of the sort of peace which was made in 1918.

It was the 1918 type of peace that Secretary Hull inveighed against more than 20 years ago and developed his philosophy of the proper commercial relations for the United States. His program represented a middle course between excessive nationalism and internationalism. If the war has demonstrated anything it has shown Secretary Hull to be a real prophet. He recognized before the last peace was made that political amity among nations frequently rests upon trade amity. He has preached that philosophy in and out of season for more than 20 years. His trade program has been based on the fundamental principle that friendly and fair trade practices at home or abroad make for good neighbors. His trade philosophy is well epitomized in the following homely illustration given by Secretary Hull himself—The Country Home magazine, July 1939:

When I was a boy growing up on a Tennessee farm, we had two neighbors—Jenkins and Jones, I will call them—who were enemies of each other. For many years there had been bad feeling between them—I don't know why—and when they met on the road or in town or at church, they stared at each other coldly and didn't speak.

Then, one spring, one of Jenkins' mules went lame just when he needed the animal most for plowing, and Jones ran short of corn for his hogs. Now, it so happened that Jones was through with his own plowing and had a mule to spare, and Jenkins had a bin filled with corn. A friendly third party brought the two men together, and Jones let Jenkins use a mule in exchange for corn for the hogs. As a result of this transaction, it wasn't long before the two ancient enemies were the best of friends. A common-sense trade and ordinary neighborliness had made them aware of the need of each other and brought them peace.

We will do well to consider the whole picture of our foreign relations, both political and economic, in the light of past experience. Just at this time some irresponsible individuals are circulating propaganda about the imports of a relatively few thousand pounds or bushels of farm products coming from Latin American countries. This administration has taken vital steps in an attempt to create an American solidarity in this hemisphere. Such inciting of ill will makes it difficult to arrive at any "hemispheric amity" which is needed at this juncture of world events.

I want to review a few statements and their underlying philosophy which Secretary Hull made years ago, and indicate their application to present-day situations. Although some of these statements were made more than two decades ago, they are as true today as they were then. These statements now may be a warning for the future. They stand out today as the words of a prophet.

Mr. Hull, as a Member of the House of Representatives on February 21, 1919, spoke on Removal of Economic Barriers in International Finance and Commerce. In that address he quoted point 3 of President Wilson's famous 14 points, calling for the removal of economic barriers and for establishing equality of trade conditions. Historically this statement is a basis of Secretary Hull's trade-agreements program. Mr. Hull then said of point 3:

* * * Upon the solution of the extremely vital problems it presents measurably depends the permanent peace and friendship of nations. Instead of vainly striving to prevent wars after the causes have once arisen, this proposal has for its purpose the prevention of many causes of war.

If a real economic peace can now be effected, it must afford the greatest possible assurance of permanent world peace. The accomplishment of this is most desirable and would in nowise conflict with any suitable plan for a league of nations that may be devised, but, on the contrary, would supplement, strengthen, and make easier its operations, in that there would be far fewer commercial and trade controversies for settlement.

This has been the theme song of Secretary Hull since that time. He has frequently reiterated this philosophy from time to time in his public utterances both in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and elsewhere. In that particular speech he pointed out that the United States had become a greater creditor nation. He realized that a creditor nation, with large surpluses available for export, should not follow the same trade-restrictive policy as a debtor nation which had to sell to pay interest and other charges abroad. He realized that the situation called for a moderation in tariffs. He realized how inconsistent it was for a great creditor nation, on the one hand needing to sell its surplus products abroad, and on the other hand raising tariff walls which throttle exports as well as imports.

Secretary Hull referred to the treaties and agreements which would be broken during the conflict. He then said :

* * * There will naturally be a readjustment of tariffs everywhere, in the light of after-war conditions. This general rearrangement of tariffs will offer a strong incentive to the renewal of tariff wars. Every nation will be disposed to adopt all the accustomed devices and methods calculated to give each some commercial advantage through preference or other means not justifiable except upon the theory that other countries are doing likewise. * * *

Secretary Hull ended that speech by significantly stating:

* * * In any event the world cannot hope to embark upon an era of permanent peace unless it first makes up its mind thus to secure the abandonment of some of the principal underlying causes of most wars in the past.

This speech was not an isolated case where Secretary Hull just happened to hit upon this subject. It was fundamental in his philosophy of government. I find similar statements in his speech in the House of Representatives May 13, 1929, about 10 years later. He was then speaking on the tariff revision, warning of the consequences of the then tariff bill which ended with the disastrous Hawley-Smoot Act. He said:

Instead of a new policy of moderate tariffs with fair and liberal commercial or trade policy based on the favored-nation doctrine in its unconditional form, it is now proposed further to build all our economic policies around the doctrine of extreme nationalism or isolation, with discrimination or retaliation as our chief commercial policy, ignoring the patent fact that the future progress and prosperity of this country requires expanding production and expansion of foreign markets. * * * For each country thus to surround itself with insurmountable trade barriers and pursue the philosophy that it must consume only home-made products, but at the same time sell its surplus to its neighbors and expect to do so indefinitely, is to live in a fool's paradise.

Later on in the Senate and after the Tariff Act of 1930 had been in effect about 2 years, we find the following statement in a speech of Mr. Hull:

Tragic to relate, our national leadership proceeded to perpetrate a colossal and epochal mistake of judgment by complacently pursuing the former course of aloofness with the result that they have not enunciated a single new economic truth since 1920 nor achieved a single major accomplishment; and it is not unfair to charge that their wild and mad pursuit of economic isolation, which contemplates that every nation shall become more and more a hermit nation, constituted the greatest single underlying cause of the awful panic which burst upon our country in 1929.

I denounce this narrow and selfish spirit of economic nationalism as the greatest danger to world peace today. Furthermore, it more seriously threatens the world bankruptcy than war itself. When each country uses every means to block each other's exports, peoples can neither sell nor buy each other's surpluses, so that both trade and purchasing power is dried up. But the theory is that we are to get rich by fencing ourselves off from the world and proceeding industriously to collecting off of each other subsidies, bounties, taxes, rebates, bonuses, profits, and every other sort of gain out of which one person can fleece another.

In this speech Secretary Hull recommended tariff revision authorizing the President to negotiate trade agreements based upon mutual tariff concessions and the unconditional most-favored-nation doctrine.

As Secretary Hull warned in 1919, we realize that after the peace of Versailles the movement for economic nationalism struck Germany, Italy, and southeastern European states. These countries were limited in natural resources contained within their own boundaries. These countries were impeded, in purchasing the things that they needed to purchase, by artificial restrictions and barriers. The very thing which

Secretary Hull warned against took place, and, as he pointed out, our own increase of tariffs played an important part in the events which led to the present struggle in Europe.

So much for this purely historical angle of Secretary Hull's program. He continued to argue along the same lines in and out of season, when it was unpopular to do so. Finally, in 1933, he became Secretary of State. In 1934, under his influence, Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act, which has been twice extended for 3-year periods. So the United States belatedly started to lead the way in liberalizing trade to world recovery. Agreements were negotiated with 21 countries. Sad to say, we were at least a decade too late to save the situation. The program was not completed and had too short a time to operate before chaos broke upon the world. While there were many tangible results of increased trade, the important tangible factor, aid in the prevention of war, was ineffective. The program had too short a time to undo the harm which had already been done, the harm which Secretary Hull warned against. For one thing, England held off too long, for it was not until late in 1938 that she finally joined with the United States in a trade-liberalizing program.

Secretary Hull, with very strong backing of the administration, has made special efforts to reach a better understanding with the 21 Latin American countries. The good-neighbor policy is closely tied up with Secretary Hull's foreign policy and deserves special attention.

It is generally recognized that the Montevideo Conference of 1933 was a turning point in the history of pan-Americanism. The real good-neighbor policy had been inaugurated by the withdrawal of marines from Nicaragua and Haiti and the abrogation of the Platt amendment. Secretary Hull, chairman of the United States delegation to the Montevideo Conference, convinced Latin Americans that this country had no desire to dominate them. The desire for cooperation changed public sentiment in those countries toward us. It has been said that for the first time in the history of pan-American conferences the delegates of the United States left with the esteem and friendship of the Latin American delegates.

Mr. Hull, in his trade-agreements program and in other matters, has clearly indicated that the good-neighbor policy was more than a friendly gesture. Cuba was the first country with which a trade agreement was concluded under the Trade Agreements Act. The act was passed in June 1934, and by September of that year a trade agreement went into effect with Cuba. In addition, agreements have been concluded with Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa Rica. Unfortunately, the negotiations between the United States and Argentina and Uruguay were terminated; and I say this with the full understanding that those countries raise pretty much the same kind of agricultural products as the United States. Nevertheless, without opening up our markets to the detriment of American farmers, we could have considerably expanded our commerce with these Latin American neighbors. Now is the time when all possible points of trade friction should be mollified. By a more liberal trade policy we might have prevented the influence of "fifth columns" in some of those countries. Those opponents of expanded trade stirred up misunderstandings which may cost us far more than increased imports of a few thousand pounds of this or that product. Cheap politics in this connection should have been abated long ago. We now need the cooperation of other countries of the Western Hemisphere. At a time when we hope to gain inter-American solidarity and security, partisan propaganda ought to be discontinued by irresponsible politicians. Every possible method of trade cooperation should be explored.

As another step in Pan American cooperation Secretary Hull consolidated his good-neighbor policy at the Convention for the Maintenance and Preservation of Peace at Buenos Aires in 1936. He strengthened it again at the Conference of the Declaration of Principles of American Solidarity at Lima in 1938.

Although Secretary Hull did not attend the Panama Conference in 1939 regarding the transfer of sovereignty of geographical regions of the Americas held by non-American states, this conference further evidenced the cooperative spirit of the 21 American Republics. In a recent letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House, the Honorable SOL BLOOM, Secretary Hull indicated that all the American states were the guardians of the Monroe Doctrine. These are a few illustrations of Mr. Hull's sound realistic foreign policy which have been accepted by a great majority of the American people.

The trend of events have more than justified Secretary Hull's life-long position of the widest sort of trade on sound principles which increases prosperity and eliminates the causes of war. Those immediately before him went too far and too fast in the opposite direction. The United States unfortunately set an unwholesome example with its inconsistent high-tariff-creditor-nation position. When our foreign loans ended in the late twenties our post-war commercial policy helped to produce an unexampled international crisis. This led to the depression of 1929 and made possible the conditions which brought forth dictators, who are now playing such an important role in world history.

One of the first things Secretary Hull did when he came into office was to revise our high-tariff policy. His trade-agreements program was a moderate tariff course. In spite of spirited opposition at home and abroad, that program made important progress. It was a belated attempt to stem the tide against totalitarian methods of barter trade and bilateralism, which eventually brought the weaker states under both the economic and political domination of the dictators.

The original principles of the trade-agreements program remain sound, although at the end of the present war we are apt to find ourselves in a position where it is necessary to engage in "barbaric methods"—bilateral balancing—of foreign trade. Opponents of trade agreements have frequently stated that foreign trade is not important to the United States; that it can be given up without serious injury to the United States; that we are largely self-sufficient. If we are going to produce at anything like capacity, it will be necessary to trade some of our surpluses to foreign countries. The real importance of foreign trade will become clear to those who say it is not important to our economy. The importance of trade as it relates to the program, however, may be largely academic until the war ends. But the administration is carefully considering the situation, particularly with respect to the Western Hemisphere. If it becomes necessary to engage in a program of general barter, we ought to be able to hold advantages in some lines. If we can drive some hard bargains, this in itself may have a tendency to influence other countries to go back to a policy of freer competitive trading, such as was adopted in our trade-agreements program.

Quo Vadis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, I submit the following from the Saturday Evening Post. I most earnestly commend a careful reading thereof to every Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, and to every American citizen having a proper veneration for the fundamentals of our Government:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, July 13, 1940]

This is written on June 10. With no notice to the American people or to the Congress that is supposed to interpret their will, this country entered the war 4 days ago. Stranger than the fact was the passive acceptance of it.

While the Senate was debating, with intent to kill it, a resolution that would have conferred upon the President of the United States certain extraordinary powers, the President seized those

powers and involved this country in the European conflict by an act of physical intervention.

This he did by sanction of his own will. The Congress did not know what he was going to do and debated it after the fact. The people, whose war it will be, first read it in newspaper headlines.

What we now write is to complete the record. We have no idea what the next consequences will be or what will have happened by the time these words appear. But as in time to come it may be bitterly remembered, so now be it said that in the one hundred and fifty-first year of its existence the house of constitutional republican government was betrayed, even as the builders feared. Unawares to the people, the exalted Executive principle could involve them in war. We dare to look at the truth and to ask why the house of our fathers had to be half surrendered before it was attacked. We do not here touch the question of whether or not we should go to the side of the Allies. What we are saying is that if the American people may be involved in a world war unawares and without a specific act of Congress, then much else has happened to them of which also they are unaware.

We do not believe the people had ever thought of going again to the battlefields of Europe. They had been misled to think this country somehow could put forth its economic strength and not itself become involved. That is what they were thinking when they were polled on whether we should be giving more aid to the Allies. The idea that we could help to destoy the aggressor in Europe and not get hurt was a propagated phantasy and produced on many minds the hypnotic effect that may or may not have been intended.

To accomplish his purpose, it was necessary for the President to outwit the law. First was a statute, enacted in time of peace, permitting the Military Establishment to sell to any foreign government with whom we were at peace on a certain date surplus munitions and war materials for which there was no other market, and to exchange motor vehicles, airplanes, engines, and parts for new and similar equipment. When that statute was written, nobody could have dreamed that it would ever be used by the President as a pretext for opening this country's arsenals to either side in another world war.

Secondly, it was necessary to beat the prohibitions of international law and especially Article VI of The Hague Convention of 1907, to which this country put its name, which is still in force, and which reads: "The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden."

Observe here the very strict distinction. The private citizen of a neutral country may sell arms and war material to a belligerent power; that is permitted. American industry, acting privately, could sell airplanes and guns to the Allies. But for a government to do it is an act of intervention. The government that does it is no longer neutral. It has taken part. It is, in fact, at war.

The President of the United States could not himself, of his own will, declare war. Only the Congress has the constitutional power to declare war. But he hit upon a device for getting the country into the conflict without declaring war.

As Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States he declared the Navy to have a surplus of airplanes, at a moment when there was a panic of anxiety over the shocking inadequacy of the country's air defenses. As Commander in Chief he ordered the Navy to deliver this alleged surplus of planes back to the factory they came from, in exchange for new planes yet to be made—and this under a previous stipulation with the airplane factory that as fast as it received the planes from the Navy, it would hand them over to the Allies.

We had no surplus of airplanes; so far otherwise, we very urgently want more than we are yet able to make for ourselves. Nor were these obsolete planes, for if they were, of what use could they be to the Allies in battle? Thirdly, then, the make-believe that in the end it became simply a transaction between the private American airplane industry and the Allies, because the Navy, on delivering the planes to the factory, quit title to them, was only clever, and far beneath the dignity of a great people.

The next day it was guns. As Commander in Chief, the President would declare obsolete or surplus a lot of United States Army guns, including thousands of the 75 mm.'s the French were greatly in need of, sell them to American gun makers, who would sell them at once to the Allies, undertaking to replace them later in the American armory out of new manufacture.

That day, as reported in the New York Times, "In his press-conference discussion of national-defense plans, President Roosevelt refused the role of prophet when asked how far this Government was prepared to go in supplying the Allied powers with guns, ammunition, and aircraft." And how about bombs to go with the bombing planes? That question was asked because only the Government itself manufactures the bombs. Therefore there could be no subterfuge of turning back bombs to private manufacturers in exchange for new and better bombs later. The reporters could not quote the President directly at this point. The New York Times reporter wrote: "It was remarked, however, that the law does not require surplus munitions to be returned to the factory whence they came, but merely specifies that they may be exchanged for other munitions." Which means, if it means anything, that the President was thinking the Government could manufacture bombs to go with the airplanes, sell them to somebody who would sell them to the Allies, and itself take anything in exchange.

Then what of warships? What of turning warships back to the shipyards that made them on an undertaking by the shipbuilders to sell them to the Allies and make new ones for the United States Navy? The reporters asked the President that question. The New York Times reporter wrote: "He explained that he had been unable to get to that question so far."

How far on this line would the Government go? Only the President could say, and he declined to be prophet.

What else might the Government do? If the people would know that, let them read the cryptic words of newspaper reporters writing under the censorship imposed upon the White House press conference.

What a text is there. Government by Executive inspiration. War by Executive impulse.

We shall survive the war. But how? As a government of the people, by the people, for the people? Or as a state that has embraced in the New World what it had wished to destroy in the old?

For it is war. Since the first week of June this country has been in fact at war with Germany. Take it in simple fact. Suppose we were at war and a government that had been neutral in form, but not in feeling, suddenly opened its arsenals to our enemy, exactly as we have opened ours to the Allies.

Would we regard it as an act of war? We would. What would we do about it? We would declare war on that government, and if for strategic reasons not actually at once, then certainly in our hearts and minds, for a future settlement.

If it should turn out that to strip this country of armaments and send them to Europe at a moment in history when our existing power of national defense was pitifully inadequate and the crisis in Europe was such that no one could say how many hours remained of the British Empire, or that the aggressor might not win, capture the Allied fleet, and dictate a peace before enough American aid to turn the battle against him could possibly arrive—if it should turn out that this had been a tragic blunder, beyond recall, then the leader who had done it might wish that his page in the book of fame would refuse to receive ink, for it would be written of him there that in his passionate zeal to save civilization in Europe he had forgotten his own country.

Mr. Speaker, the implications of the Presidential actions referred to in the editorial above are plain indeed and they constitute further reasons why this Congress should not adjourn.

If the President of the United States can, while the Congress is in Washington and in session, covertly transfer to a country at war the very best airplanes, ordnance, and other military equipment of our armed forces, all of which we desperately need for our own defense, and which cannot in the immediate future be replaced; and, if he can do this with no authority of domestic law other than that arrogated unto himself; and if he can, in violation of international law, and especially of article VI of the Hague Convention of 1907 which we still are legally and morally bound to observe, then what in the name of common sense may we expect from him if the Congress adjourns and thus relieves him of all restraint?

Mr. Speaker, we still have the ships of the fleet, or at least all that have not been declared obsolete and disposed of. Our Navy constitutes our only first line of defense notwithstanding recent mouthings to the effect that this first line is in France or on the Rhine. Let it remain our Navy. Let us maintain and strengthen it for our defense. Further, let us see to it if we can that the Executive Department of this Government cease its muddling and meddling in the affairs of the Old World and that it refrain from doing those things which inevitably will push us completely into the present European war.

Intelligence Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Finally Receives Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for years, many times I have taken the floor and pleaded for an increase in the appropriation for the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. A few months ago when it became evident we would have a tax bill, I appealed to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue when the time arrived to apply for additional funds

to enforce our tax laws that an item be included for additional help for the Intelligence Unit. I am happy to say that money was appropriated in the last deficiency bill. Five million dollars of the five million eight hundred thousand dollars asked by the Secretary of the Treasury and approved by the Bureau of the Budget was allowed. As a result Hon. Elmer L. Irey, Chief of the Intelligence, will be able to increase his force by about 80 agents and 20 clerks and accountants. Every additional employee will be required to qualify through the civil service. Irey's office alone will bring to the Treasury many times the $5,000,000 that has been allowed.

A very interesting article concerning the activities of this Government agency appeared in the New York Times of July 14, and under permission granted me, I include that article as part of my remarks. It follows:

ON THE TRAIL OF THE TAX DODGER

(By L. H. Robbins)

WASHINGTON.

Another eminent tax dodger confesses the error of his way, parts with a million dollars or so, and prepares for a chastening stay at Fort Leavenworth. In his reluctance to pay his dues in the democracy that gave him his golden opportunity he reckoned without the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Elmer Lincoln Irey.

Mr. Irey, Chief of the Intelligence Unit of the Treasury, says he is only a cog in the mill that grinds tax evaders fine. He hands the bulk of the credit to others—to the revenue accountants who trace truth through mazes of mendacious bookkeeping, the Attorney General's people who try the cases, and the Treasury higher-ups who stand firm against the pressure that powerful culprits bring to bear.

All the same you may notice that Mr. Irey is usually mentioned as among those present at the show-down. His unit assembles and organizes most of the evidence. It got 103 convictions last year in 104 cases brought to trial. Often it is so thorough in its work that the haughtiest violators have nothing to do but to come into court, flanked by embattled lawyers, and meekly plead guilty.

The genial Mr. Irey at his desk, with his free-and-easy air, his ready smile, and his buoyant way of talking, seems like anything but a man hunter. But when his telephone brings him a problem for quick decision and you see how his eyes sharpen and his mind concentrates you conclude that he would be a bad one to cross.

Capone and Pendergast and Annenberg found him so. Scores of self-elected tax exempts, including lords of big business, sweatily puffing their jowls, and queens of Hollywood, registering disdain fading into hysterics, have sat in this very chair and made the same discovery about him. He is not impressed by any of them.

He would as soon wreck the richest as not. He routs organized crime when no one else can. He fills the Federal prisons, from Lewisburg to Alcatraz, with fuehrers, political czars, and other money-making celebrities who dislike to help the rest of us support the Government. In their home towns they may be above the law, or perhaps they themselves are the law, but when they don't do right by Uncle Sam about their income taxes, Mr. Irey gathers them in.

Since 1920 he has gathered in 12,000 such ingrates, many of them as illustrious, in their way as our day can boast—liquor kings, match kings, sewer kings, circus kings, moguls of the narcotics and the slot-machine industries, Senators and Governors, predatory bankers, evangelists and college presidents, labor leaders and big-time gamblers. There's no end of distinguished scalps hanging from his belt.

Convicting 92 percent of his prey, he has thrown the fear of the United States of America into hundreds of other dodgers. They may not be suspect, but, reading of Mr. Irey's big kills, they come running to make first returns or to amend returns falsely made. In the year after the Capone conviction delinquent tax collections in the Chicago district doubled. The hesitant American taxpayer is honest at heart, especially when he is scared.

If excuses are good enough, Mr. Irey remarks, or if criminal prosecution seems uncompromising, the late comers are allowed to pay principal, interest, and penalties and go at large. Nine in ten are lucky that way. But if deliberate fraud is clear they are out of luck. The Government settles no case of fraud privately. It turned down a proffered million and a half from Al Capone. It is leery of all free-will disclosures of understated income or offers of settlement, magnanimous or remorseful. When a citizen walks in under his own power and begs to shell out $200,000, the Government has the instantaneous hunch, born of experience, that he owes $400,000 at least.

To check on the veracity of all the taxpayers in this great, rich country is such a large order and the crooked ones are so slick it seems an awesome mystery to the layman that Mr. Irey and his agents should be able to nail so many. How, in the first place, do they get wind of a tax dodger, and how, then, do they proceed to run him to earth? Mr. Irey replies that it might undermine the wholesome awe in which the public has learned to hold the Revenue Bureau if he should give away his stuff. Nevertheless, he mentions some general principles.

The first line of defense against tax avoiders is inspection of returns at local offices of collection, where the avoiders are known. People who indulge in riotous living, make big winnings in the market, sport low license numbers, contribute lavishly to campaign funds, train with shady gangs, or stand in with political machines are naturally looked over. Most of them get their names in print and collectors read the newspapers.

Informers help to put the Government wise. Hundreds of letters from them, signed or not, are open-mindedly investigated. Says Mr. Irey: "People who cheat the Government are not likely to stop there; they go on and cheat their partners and their helpers, and these victims, being human, get square by turning them in. Dishonest people, too, tend to be cruel. A half-starved old bookkeeper or a mistreated typist may be driven to squeal on the man who lies to the tax collector.

"Good citizenship also does its bit. A public-spirited soul who pays his tax like a man points to a prosperous neighbor who is holding out. A man of wealth puts us on the trail of people who offer to show him how to doctor his return or bribe a tax official. But common report is the best tipster."

An officeholder is protecting vice. A contractor on public work buys a racing stable. A corporation does a rushing business in hot oil. An architect in the Whoozie Ring is piling up a fortune in kickbacks. The bargaining agent of a trade union acquires a Park Avenue penthouse. When rumor turns the spotlight on these fortunates and their returns seem fishy, or there are no returns at all, Mr. Irey's special agents go to work.

They need Job's patience. They may have to march around an extra-clever tax dodger for weeks to find the first chink in his armor. If he has filed a return, they have something to start with. His deductions for expenses, losses, depreciation, and lowered inventory can be scrutinized. It is no great trick to discover that an expense item of $25,000 for a "salesmen's convention" represents the cost of a week-long private carouse at a leased hotel. It is a simple matter to learn that he has incorporated his steam yacht, chartered it for a week to friends and run it himself the rest of the season at a heavy loss, said loss duly deducted in his tax return.

When he owns many corporations and shuttles his income back and forth among them till all possibility of tracing it seems lost, the investigation brings in expert bookkeepers, cost accountants, and auditors of the Revenue Bureau to toil over the baffling records. Often the records are intentionally incomplete. Perhaps the man has two sets of books, one for Government inspection, the other for private use—and for quick removal across a handy international boundary in time of stress. One recent notorious case of concealing income through fake bookkeeping had 45 Treasury men busy for 5 years.

Still harder is the problem of the tax dodger who gains his income nefariously and makes no report of it. When, on top of that, he collects and spends it in cash, or when he delegates his banking, along with his murdering, to his pals, then the going is tough. In such a case the banks are circularized for signs of his invisible deposits. The Government men establish airtight surveillance of him. They get in with his gang, risking their lives. By and by, after devious search, the deposits turn up. Then Uncle Sam's bank wizards and handwriting experts are called in.

The case against many a foxy miscreant is broken a thousand miles from his lair. A malefactor of sudden wealth may be too smart to splurge in his home town. Perhaps he lives as humbly as his neighbors. But what are his habits and his scale of living at Whoopee-by-the-Sea, Fla., or Steamy Waters, Ark.? Through watching his spending his pursuers form a fair estimate of his hidden income.

Bit by bit they assemble their evidence—"it is like putting a jigsaw puzzle together," says Mr. Irey—and almost always, at last, they get their man. "You can't win" against the Federal Treasury. They have had their little disappointments, of course, as when the honest and trusting associates of a labor-union executive who has been caught with an undeclared couple of millions bump him off before his trial. That sort of slip will happen.

The Annenberg case, lately concluded, Mr. Irey regards as his second most difficult. The one harder case is still in the courts. The Annenberg settlement of $9,500,000 was the largest in any fraud case. There have been civil settlements still larger. In 20 years Mr. Irey's unit has helped to recapture close to a half-billion dollars.

Commissioner Guy T. Helvering, of the Internal Revenue Bureau, who dislikes tax dodgers as wholeheartedly as Mr. Irey, agrees that their successful prosecution has had a salutary effect on the general public. "But there are always new tricks," he says. "As soon as the loopholes in the tax law are stopped with a new law, the tax advisers study to find loopholes in the new one." You gather also that he expects that the imminent broadening of the tax base to admit new classes of taxpayers will only add gray hairs to his head.

"But won't the new classes of taxpayers be conscientious in reporting their incomes and proud to do their share? Isn't tax dodging confined pretty much to the criminal elements? Wise people, respectable people, they don't gyp the Government, as a rule, do they?"

Mr. Helvering gives his questioner a look as hard as nails and answers, "You'd be surprised!"

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., on becoming Secretary of the Treasury, declared that the day was over when the rich, the wise, and the

good, or anybody else, could stay the Revenue Bureau from the completion of its appointed job. There would be, he said, no more favors to the elite. That defiance of privileged tax dodgers has made the work easier for Mr. Helvering and Mr. Irey, though Mr. Helvering says the pressure is still strong.

Not expecting to become the terror of tax dodgers, Mr. Irey, born in Kansas City, grew up and went to school here in Washington; his father worked in the Government Printing Office. Young Irey's first job was stenographer in the Post Office Department. By and by he was a post-office inspector. In 1919, when war profits were high, the income-tax law was still young and taxpayers hadn't learned to take it seriously. Irey was chosen to form an intelligence unit in the revenue office and called in six other post-office inspectors to help.

From that start his unit has grown to include 245 special agents. They serve the Government in many ways; they check on applicants for Treasury jobs, for one thing, and they investigate tax officials as diligently as they do taxpayers; but they are concerned mainly with income-tax violations. It is said that for every $2 they cost they bring $100 into the Treasury.

Mr. Irey has still another job. Under this administration the six law-enforcement agencies in the Treasury—the Secret Service, the Customs, Coast Guard, Narcotics, and Alcohol-tax services, and the Intelligence Unit—have been coordinated both at Washington and in the field. And Elmer Irey, with his gift for seeing conclusions in clues and for putting two and two together, is the coordinator.

The adventures he has had would fill a detective-story library. To mention just one, he flew with Colonel Lindbergh over Vineyard Sound on a bleak day in 1932, looking for the boat *Nellie* in which Lindbergh had been told his kidnaped child would be found. Nothing came of that flight; but it was Mr. Irey who insisted, against the wish of the anxious father, that the serial numbers of the banknotes in the ransom money should be recorded, and that precaution led at last to the kidnaper's capture, as the world knows.

Mr. Irey's home is on the West River, down Chesapeake Bay way. There, in slacks, he sails a smart little knockabout with his two tall and lively sons—when the tax dodgers give him a day off for it.

A Timely Word From a Patriotic American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

QUOTATION FROM BOOK BY FRED TAYLOR WILSON

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, I attempted to outline my own views as to what constitutes adequate educational preparation of the defenders of America and also the nature of such training. After indicating the scientific, industrial, technical character of service which the machine wars of today require, I pointed out the need of another type of education, not so much of the head and hand as of the heart. We desire a loyalty and patriotism born of a knowledge of our glorious history, together with a deep respect for American institutions based on an understanding of them. All this develops that love of country which we would like every citizen to have, and which we want especially to be the motivating force actuating our defenders.

This zeal, loyalty, and faith may be inspired by a study of our best literature, as well as gleaned from our greatest educational and spiritual guides. As a teacher I have often turned for inspiration to the writings of Fred Taylor Wilson, having used his books in my classes for many years. Today I was privileged to read a manuscript of a new book of his which will soon be off the press under the title of These Three Alone. To my mind it conveys a message for all the American people in this dark hour. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief quotation from this forthcoming book.

FAITH IN OUR OWN COUNTRY

Believe in your own country. If you are not pleased with your native land or adopted country, and think that better conditions obtain beyond the seas, why not go there? Just at present, at least, the situation is not inviting. Sir Walter Scott exclaimed:

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!"

Later on in the poem he makes known the fate of such a man.

Everyone should have pride in his own town, city, or rural community and work to make such the most ideal place possible. The writer will always remember a conversation he once heard in a little east Texas town called Corrigan, a typical American village, with hogs running freely in the streets, and either mud or dust always everywhere. An old colored man who had been living for awhile in Lufkin, a nearby county seat, was being heartily welcomed back home by a white friend. In replying, the old Negro said, "I have been over the world a good deal, but I have concluded that Corrigan is the best place in the world.'" And no doubt it was to this much-traveled son of Ham. He was back home, "the best place in the world" to him.

We should love America, our homeland. It is the land beautiful. Two great oceans and one wide gulf wash its picturesque shores on our east, west, and south. Three thousand miles of boundary line lie between us and a friendly rival on the north, with not a single soldier or gun needed as defense. We are at peace, with a common language, a common democracy, and a mutual desire to live in peace and harmony. To our own land come the people of all nations in search of freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly—blessings which we ourselves do not always fully appreciate. The mayor of New York, in a fiery speech, once denounced Hitler. So outraged was the German nation that its authorities appealed to our Department of State to disavow the accusing outburst of the New York mayor. This calm reply was sent back to Germany: "In America we have freedom of speech."

Nothing is lost by the fullest discussion of any subject. If foolish, it will die when it reaches fresh air, like plants which grow in the dark. If it deserves to be heard, it should and will be heard in time. To forcibly suppress any man or movement not openly seditious simply makes way for a plausible excuse to seek martyrdom. A cursory review of our history as a nation will reveal the bleached bones of countless causes killed by the power of pitiless publicity.

Every loyal American loves his native land. We are properly proud of America. Our territory may not equal that of Russia, nor our population be that of China, yet we have inherent in our people that which excels both plains and population. We have a just pride in our material progress. The United States, with only 6 percent of the area of the world and 7 percent of its population, owns 80 percent of the automobiles in the world, produces 70 percent of the world's oil, raises 60 percent of its wheat and cotton, and mines more than 50 percent of all the world's gold. Nearly 70 percent of the world's banking is under American direction and 60 percent of all telephones are ours. We also supply 69 percent of all the crude petroleum in the world and 36 percent of its coal. As consumers, America uses 48 percent of the world's coffee, 58 percent of its tin, 53 percent of its sugar, 56 percent of its rubber, 42 percent of its pig iron, 47 percent of the copper, 36 percent of the coal, and 72 percent of all its silk.

We, Midas-like, now have buried in a grave of marble in Kentucky and elsewhere 80 percent of all the world's gold.

Perhaps we boast too much of our material greatness. We need often to remind ourselves that a nation's greatness, like the greatness of an individual, is not measured by the things which it possesses, but by the extent that it is possessed by the real values of life. Real values are moral not material. Our permanent gain is a gain in goodness and not in goods. Freedom of spirit is more to be desired than financial supremacy and to be devoted to truth is a nobler aim than a desire for world trade.

This volume appears at an anxious hour in our history. Sinister shadows steal across our skies. Gray's line, "kept the noiseless tenor of their way," has applied to us. For a long time we have kept the noiseless tenor of our way, as we saw the changing flags of other nations torn by the cruel winds of war.

We have felt ourselves secure thus far from the ignoble strife abroad. But unlooked-for events may force us to put aside our flutes and search again for fifes. Our debates may be silenced by drum beats. But whatever the future may bring, we will be true to our own flag.

Where we have been weak we will become strong. Where we have been indifferent we will become alert. As we see the lamps of liberty lowered in other lands we will lift still higher our own. As "the lovely brow of Freedom grows cold, in trampled muds," across the seas, we will keep our own freedom more alive than ever. As democracy, bleeding, elsewhere retreats we will put to the quivering lips of our own the wine of a new faith. As justice and righteousness flee in fear from other lands we here will hold them to our hearts with an increasing devotion. We will sing anew,

America! America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea!

Nomination of Hon. William B. Bankhead for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, please let me at this time come forward and present to you the speech of the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, presenting the name of Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD at Chicago:

Mr. Chairman and members of the convention, at no time in our history have Democrats had more cause for rejoicing than at this good hour. No national convention of any party ever assembled under auspices so inspiring or with a record of accomplishments so far reaching and enduring. Every member of this convention was thrilled with emotions of patriotism and pride as he listened to the masterly address of our Temporary Chairman in his eloquent portrayal of the achievements of our party during the seven and one-half years of the present Democratic Administration. The Democratic Party has never failed to provide leadership adequate to any task confronting the Nation. The path of our history from this hour back to its beginning shines bright with the contributions of Democratic leadership to human progress.

It was the world's greatest Democrat who flung into the face of his king the challenge that all men are created free and equal and entitled to equal opportunity in the pursuit of happiness. It was he who taught that the inalienable rights of individuals and minorities should be placed forever above and beyond the edicts of rulers or legislative enactments.

Our Constitution was written under the guidance of Democratic leadership. Under this Constitution has been developed the greatest republic the world has ever known. It was a great Democrat, who, as Chief Executive of the Nation, proclaimed the doctrine that this republic should forever stand guard over the freedom of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and against encroachment of any foreign power threatening inroads affecting our free institutions.

It was a great Democrat who redeemed and restored the sovereign right of the Government to control the Nation's supply of credit and currency free from the domination of selfish, greedy, private interests.

It was a Democrat, the great Commoner, who as Secretary of State, sought to have the nations of the world covenant to allow time for the settlement of their controversies by peaceful solution before resort to force. If this proposal had been adopted it would have averted the World War.

It was another great Democratic leader, who, following the World War, sought to establish a power to put an end to international anarchy and provide for the adjudication of problems affecting international relationships in a common council and upon principles of justice. If this plan had been consummated, the conflict that now threatens civilization would have been averted.

In every crisis confronting the Nation our party has met its responsibility and furnished leadership suited to the demands of the the time. We can never forget the conditions faced by the present Democratic administration on the 4th of March, 1933. No such challenge to leadership had ever been presented in time of peace. Every business interest—agricultural, industrial, and commercial—was threatened by bankruptcy and paralysis. Our banking system had collapsed. Millions of citizens were unable to find employment for the support of their loved ones. The chaos and confusion of that dark hour had become a source of alarm to every thoughtful citizen in the land. With masterly courage and capability the Administration turned its hand to the task. The banking system was reestablished, bank deposits insured, and bank failures ended. The system was never on a sounder basis nor so well prepared to serve the public as now. The rights of labor have been secured and strengthened. Agriculture has been given unprecedented consideration and the income of our farmers doubled. The challenge of that hour was met heroically, constructively, and with gratification to the people of the United States. They recorded their approval 4 years later by a verdict without parallel in our political history.

Again the people of the United States face a crisis threatening established order and the cherished institutions that represent the growth and advancement of centuries of civilization. Our heritage, our achievements, our safety, our future demand of all citizens, whether in private or public life, the fullest measure of patriotic service.

The selection of candidates for President and Vice President by either of our great political parties at any time involves stupendous responsibility. In the midst of the disturbed conditions now existing this responsibility is felt more keenly than ever before by all who have part in what we are doing here. As delegates to this convention we propose to meet our responsibility to the people of the Nation. No man will be selected here for a place on our ticket who does not have the background, the experience, the training in public life that fit him for the service that will be required of the next President and Vice President of the United States. I bespeak the sentiment of every delegate here when I declare that no one lacking these qualifications need expect favorable consideration by this convention.

Alabama offers for the nomination by this convention as candidate for Vice President her most brilliant and beloved son—a man whose unquestioned fitness meets every requirement. His record of distinguished public service extends over a period of more than a quarter of a century. He has been tested and tried. Soon after graduation from the University of Alabama he was elected to the legislature of the State and filled the position with distinction. He was next elected prosecuting attorney for his district. In that office he displayed rare legal attainments, superb courage, and a sense of fairness and soon was recognized as one of the State's ablest advocates and most gifted solicitors.

In 1916 he was elected to Congress following his nomination in the primary election of that year as a victorious candidate over Richmond Pearson Hobson, the hero of Santiago—a national character, a great orator, and masterly campaigner. That contest for the Democratic nomination for Congress was one of the most brilliant ever staged in any State in the Union. Since then the tenure of the victor in that campaign has never been seriously challenged.

In the House of Representatives his industry, tact, and ability in debate soon gave him a place as one of the leaders of that body. He was assigned to membership on the Committee on Rules and became chairman of that most important committee. An accomplished parliamentarian—he became the highest authority in all matters of parliamentary procedure in the House. In 1935 he was elected majority leader of the House. As majority leader he employed remarkable political sagacity and understanding, superb tact and diplomacy, and brilliant gifts of oratory. He commanded the unfailing loyalty and support of his party associates and enjoyed the profound esteem of the opposition. Neither party ever had an abler or more successful leader in the House of Representatives.

In 1936 he was elected Speaker of the House. I have had the honor of serving in the House of Representatives under Speaker Clark, of Missouri, Speaker Gillette, of Massachusetts, Speaker Longworth, of Ohio, Speaker Garner, of Texas, Speaker Rainey, of Illinois, and Speaker Byrns, of Tennessee, all of whom, regardless of party affiliation, like those who preceded them in that high office, were eminent statesmen and great Americans. Each was regarded as worthy of any honor his party could bestow. The Speakership of the House is the greatest office of the Nation next to that of President and Vice President. No man has ever been elected to that position by accident. It has never been reached except by merit. The present Speaker was elected because of his demonstrated ability and fitness. No Speaker of the House ever displayed a higher order of ability, a more profound grasp of parliamentary procedure, or enjoyed a larger measure of admiration and affectionate regard of his associates in Congress than our present Speaker.

No man was ever called to any office within the gift of the people of the Nation with a finer background. He bears a name long honored and cherished in Alabama and throughout the Nation. His honored father was for 20 years a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress and ended his career in the Senate of the United States after 13 years of service in that body. He was leader of the movement for Federal aid for roads and became known as the "father of good roads." His name will be forever linked with the legislation establishing our great road-construction program.

A brother, now senior Senator from Alabama, ranks among the ablest Members of the Senate. He is a recognized leader in that body in all matters of legislation touching agriculture and enjoys a popularity among the farmers of the United States not surpassed by anyone in public life.

In the Democratic primary in Alabama this year the Speaker was accorded unanimous endorsement for President of the United States. He is fully equipped for the creditable discharge of the duties of any office, however exalted. He is ripe in experience and rich in learning. He has a knowledge of Government affairs not excelled by any. He possesses high culture and intellectual attainments combined with rugged common sense. He is cautious and constructive—prudent and progressive. He understands political and economic conditions in the United States and is familiar with international affairs. He has a national viewpoint and a sympathetic heart free from prejudice and as broad as humanity. He embodies all the refinements of a brilliant mind and a knightly soul, a Christian gentleman who walks with God. He has rare personal charm and gifts of speech unsurpassed by any man in national public life. He is an ideal American statesman with all the qualities of leadership required to unite the advanced forces of the Nation and point the way to another triumphant victory for the Democratic Party. This convention has chosen for first place on our ticket the greatest living Democrat—the most invincible leader known during the lifetime of this Republic.

Our party is going before the country upon the record of the present Democratic administration. In all the great constructive and humanitarian legislative program of this administration, the Speaker of the House, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, as

majority leader, and as Speaker, has borne a responsibility second only to that of the President. Every great measure was submitted to his enlightened judgment and entrusted to his skillful leadership. During these years he has been at all times the President's strong right arm. Surely no nomination for Vice President could be more logical or give greater assurance of harmonious and successful administration than that of the Speaker of the House. It is certain that no selection could supply better promise of party success or the Nation's welfare. His nomination would complete the fulfillment of the duty of this convention to supply leadership representing all that is best in the ideals, the aspirations, and the hopes of the people of this Republic.

We stand upon the mount where rests the ark of the covenant of human freedom. It is ours to preserve what is left. From this will come a rebirth and broader life for the priceless treasures now undergoing destruction. The clouds that cast their shadows over other lands lie beneath us. We live in the blessed sunlight of liberty—the liberty to think, the liberty to speak, the libery to print, the liberty to worship, the liberty to find truth—the truth that makes men free. The nominees of this convention will for 4 years hold in their hands the colors of civilization upon which will be fixed the gaze of all men everywhere who are struggling to be free. These colors can never rest in safer or more worthy hands than when entrusted to the great leader chosen by this convention and the strong right arm on which he has relied during these recent trying years. It is now my great pleasure to present as our candidate for Vice President the name of WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, of Alabama.

The Negro and the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered at the National Democratic Convention on last Tuesday in Chicago:

Mr. Chairman, members of the convention, my fellow countrymen, in these tragic days when the lives of nations and races are being ruthlessly crushed out and when conferences are being held between leaders of conquering nations for the purpose of directing further attacks upon small and defenseless nations and groups, it is most important and significant that the greatest political party in the greatest and freest Nation in the world, assembled in convention, should include among those whose voices are raised in behalf of human freedom, justice, and good government, that of its largest and, without question, its most loyal and dependable minority group, the Negro.

At the very outset, permit me to say that I bring to this great Democratic conclave greetings from the hearts and souls of 15,000,000 loyal Americans who are deeply conscious of the gravity of our present situation, and who pledge to our country a continuance of that unbroken loyalty of spirit and action which have characterized our conduct in this country since 1619, when the first Negro settlement was made on the banks of the historic James River in the great State of Virginia. There have been no "fifth column" soldiers on our side. There will be none. We know no country besides America. There has not been, and there will be no room for disloyalty in our hearts.

Just a few days ago I was honored to be one of the Independence Day speakers at Williamsburg, Va., a quaint old colonial town situated near the spot where Capt. John Smith, with his party of English settlers, landed May 13, 1607. This landing of white men became the first permanent English settlement in our country.

In my speech at Williamsburg, July 4, I took occasion to call attention to the significant fact that just 12 years after Captain Smith made his landing at Jamestown, another history-making vessel anchored at the same spot and brought to the American shores the first Negro settlers. These 20 Negro settlers joined the white settlers who had preceded them by only 12 years and together these two groups of men, white men from the cold, bleak shores of England, and these black settlers from the great sunny continent of Africa, joined hands, battled and worked successfully for the establishment of this Government which we here represent today.

The Negro is no imposter in this country as some would seem to think. May I remind you that he came here and took up his abode in America in response to a most urgent invitation extended to him by the white settlers of this country, an invitation which he could not refuse to accept? We take pride in the fact that like you we grew up with the country and have gone side by side with you in making it what it is today. After spending more than 300 years on this continent and increasing our numbers from 20 to 15,000,000, we are constrained to call this our country. Together we cleared the forest, we subdued every foe and force which rose to obstruct our patn leading to independence, freedom, liberty, and prosperity. Today, 321 years after the setting up of the first Negro settlement in our country, we look around us and see that here has been founded the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world. A Nation with the richest resources in minerals, materials, and men. Richest in opportunity for growth, development, freedom, and for service to mankind. The Negro has played his part on the battlefield and in every bloody conflict in which we have engaged from the Battle of Bunker Hill to that on Flanders Field where we, two decades ago, along with you, met the enemy and defeated him in this effort to destroy world-wide democracy. We have built here a country and a Government which rightly challenges the admiration of the world. This achievement was made possible only by cooperation between the races in all constructive matters. It will be maintained in the future, as it was achieved in the past only by the two races working harmoniously together for the common good of the country and Nation.

The Nation has passed through many crises, but God has blessed us and enabled us to continue our march upward and onward. It seems to me, today we are face to face with the greatest threat our country has encountered, certainly the greatest since the Civil War. At this crucial moment the duty and responsibility of protecting and maintaining this Government rests upon the shoulders of every true American regardless of race, color, or creed. At the same time the program by which we are to continue our march is in our hands and must be prepared and executed under the leadership of the Democratic Party which has held the reins of government during the past 8 years, and which has demonstrated its ability to bring order and prosperity out of chaos and confusion, such as held the country in its grip March 4, 1933. The Democratic Party saved the country in that crisis; it will save the country in this crisis.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm opinion that it was through the wise and courageous leadership of this Democratic administration that the Nation has been able to emerge from our long period of depression. The Democratic Party, because of its achievements in saving our Nation, and bringing the real and practical benefits of government to the people of the Nation, the humble as well as the powerful, all racial elements of the nation must feel that we owe a debt of lasting gratitude to our leaders, and especially to our great President. It is for others to speak more at length touching these affairs. I think I should use the brief time allotted me in speaking of what this Democratic administration has done for my group. Especially is this necessary on this occasion because of false propaganda being spread by paid leaders of my race who are engaged in a country-wide effort to deceive Negro voters and to bring them again into the Republican fold.

It is a known fact that because of the burden of slavery sustained by the Negro that he has not been able to share as fully and as largely in the blessings of our great country as has shared the members of the majority group, namely, the white people. For a half century the Negro had been last and least of all groups to come in for favorable consideration at the hands of the National Government. Under this present administration a new day has dawned for the American Negro, and under this administration have come the first real rays of hope for the Negro.

The good-neighbor movement enunciated by this administration is being put into practical operation, with the result that improvements of social conditions are noticeable on every hand. Racial injustices and antagonisms are disappearing as never before, and there is being ushered in an era of good will between the races in all parts of our country heretofore unknown. Only a few days ago I sat in the House of Representatives and heard a distinguished Member of Congress, from the State of Alabama, call to the attention of that body and the world the fact that the first 6 months of 1940 had passed without being marred by a single lynching in our country. He closed his remarks by saying that it was the earnest prayer of every true American that the crime of lynching should be speedily and everlastingly wiped out in our country. Every Member of the House applauded this announcement.

While this administration has worked incessantly to advance the spirit of good will among the nations of the world, and especially among the South American countries, it has done a remarkable job in cultivating friendly relations between the white and the Negro races in the United States. The President has taken the initiative in seeing to it that the Negro, America's most forgotten man, is included in our program.

Whatever others may say about this administration falling down on its platform promises—and it is my contention that there has been no falling down on promises—the Negro certainly cannot say this administration has made him promises which it has refused or failed to keep. This has been a standing and true indictment against the Republican Party for the last 40 years. The Republicans have inserted in their platform such words and promises as they thought would capture the Negro vote, and as soon as they got into power they conveniently forgot those promises until another platform-making day came around. When this administration said it would seek to help the forgotten man of America, it included the Negro as well as the poor of all other races. What are the practical benefits coming from this administration to the Negro? Passing over much of the general benefits coming to all the people and shared by the Negro, I wish to speak specifically of a few of the most outstanding things done by the Democratic Party during this administration. These things I shall mention are only the high

points and are known by all the people of the country. I shall not spend any time pointing out the high positions held under this administration by Negroes. I hail these appointments, which are larger in number and higher in degree than those enjoyed by the race at any time in its history, with approval and joy. But, Mr. Chairman, I am far more interested in what this administration has done for common members of the race. I know it is far better to lift the race to a higher level of living than a dozen or two of select members of the race to a few high offices. I want to see my race rise as a race and take its rightful place in our great Nation.

More than 300,000 Negroes have been employed by W. P. A. and through this employment it is estimated that a million and a half of my people have been saved from actual starvation. From the employment of W. P. A. alone, the Negro has received $15,000,000 in monthly wages, and although we constitute only 10 percent of the total population of the country, we constitute 14 percent of the W. P. A. workers.

Of the nearly $35,000,000 spent for the erection of school buildings under this administration, about $8,000,000 have gone to Negro colleges. This does not include appropriations made for Howard University amounting to more than three and a half millions. Hospital buildings and furnishings for Negroes have amounted to several million dollars. Recreation and health centers such as we have never known have been built and provided for my people. Seven thousand, two hundred and forty-two new hospital beds have been made available for Negro patients. At present there is one hospital bed available for one out of every 999 Negroes, while for the whites there is one hospital bed available for one out of every 110 persons.

Through the N. Y. A. the Negro youth stranded in the effort to continue in school has been provided for. Out of a total of 708,000 youths helped through N. Y. A. there were 78,300 Negroes. That is to say that although the Negro constitutes only 9.7 percent of the total population he received 11.1 percent of the aid given through the facilities of the N. Y. A.

About 300,000 colored youth have been enrolled in the C. C. C. camps of the country. The Negro boys have allotted about $700,000 monthly to their parents and needy ones at home. This means that over a period of a year these boys through the C. C. C. have contributed nearly nine millions of dollars to the upkeep and the support of their dependents at home. While this is more than any previous administration has done for the Negro, it is not the largest benefit Negro boys have derived from C. C. C. camps. Thousands of these boys have been taught to read and write. All of them have been given an opportunity to further their training, both in books and in useful trades, and have greatly improved their health and their physical, as well as their moral condition; thus, they are being developed into useful and substantial citizens.

This administration found the Negro on the farm and in the city so poorly housed that his health and morals were being seriously undermined and destroyed. A long step forward has been taken by the Government in providing decent housing for the Negro. In almost every city slum, clearance projects fostered by the Government are providing decent quarters and wholesome environments for the poor and needy of the race; while in the rural section conditions on the farm are being rapidly improved. Tens of thousands of city homes have been saved to the race through Government loans, and in the rural sections hundreds of thousands of Negro farmers are being aided in the purchase and in the operation of farms. These things of which I speak are a reality and are known by the people; they are not platform promises made by a party seeking Negro votes.

If time would permit, I could point out thousands of instances in which the condition of the Negro has been made better by this administration, but, Mr. Chairman, have I not already pointed out such facts as would show beyond all question that the Negro of all groups has no quarrel with the Democratic Party and its program?

You need not become alarmed because of the paid Negro propagandists who are now carrying out part of the Republican program, spreading propaganda throughout the country in an effort to shake the confidence of the Negro voters in the program and principles of the Democratic Party.

The Negro lived with the Republican Party long enough to know it. He has learned to discriminate between election promises and actual promises. No longer, thank God, can the Republican Party boast that it has the Negro vote in its vest pocket.

I venture to say that 8 out of every 10 Negroes who vote in November will cast their votes for the New Deal party, whose banner, we hope and pray, will be carried by that greatest of all humanitarians, the greatest of all leaders of this day, that great American—loved, trusted, and honored by the American people—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

My final word to the Negroes all over the country listening in is this:

Let us continue to give to our country the best we have, ever keeping in mind the words of that great writer who said:

"Give to the world the best you have
And the best will come back to you."

Text of the Cuban President's Welcoming Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1940

TEXT OF THE WELCOMING SPEECH BY PRESIDENT FEDERICO LAREDO BRU OF CUBA, AT THE OPENING OF THE PAN AMERICAN CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE, HABANA, CUBA, JULY 21, 1940

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the text of the welcoming speech of President Federico Laredo Bru of Cuba, opening the Pan American Consultative Conference at Habana, Cuba, July 21, 1940:

Excellencies, for the second time the unusual responsibility that places in your worthy hands the destiny of 21 nations entreats you urgently to put solemnly into words the anxious but firm will of free America.

The first [pan-American consultative] meeting, held in Panama following the agreements of Buenos Aires and Lima, was an important landmark in inter-American relations. The records of that conference bear witness that the momentous agreements, strengthened by continental friendship, binding us to each other and maintaining our countries in their traditional adherence to laws and rules, have given life and success to their democratic institutions, and, even now in the midst of disconcerting events, make our relations with other countries peaceful, decent, and respectable.

This time you have elected to meet in Habana, capital of one of the last republics to constitute itself in this hemisphere, but one which never was remiss in asserting characteristically American ideals, based on liberty, peace, and international justice. These very same ideals inspired the heroic decisions and immortal exploits of our illustrious men—companions of Washington, Bolivar, Hidalgo, San Martin, Sucre, Artigas, Petio, and Duarte among others—who fought indefatigably to the end for the independence of the Cuban people.

Certainly, this great assembly does not evoke the historical memories lent to your first meeting in Panama by the fact that that occurred in the legendary city where was held the very first conference of American countries, called by Simon Bolivar to resist the designs of foreign regimes anxious to reestablish their lordship over these lands, where, eventually, right would triumph.

This historic coincidence was happily pointed out by the late illustrious President Arosemena, whose recent death was so deeply mourned by the whole continent.

But if in Habana you do not find an opportunity for such prestigious recollection, you will find at least a people the apostles of whose political faith exerted themselves to stress the necessity of promoting international common feeling; a people whose independence was kneaded not only by the blood of its sons but also by the blood and the encouragements of other continental peoples.

Marti was one of the forerunners of this movement, and this sentence of his was fittingly selected by his countrymen to be engraved on the bronze fence encircling the tree of American fraternity: "This is the hour of recounting and united march, and we must go forward closely pressed together, silver ore in the roots of the Andes."

America is constituted by States of similar political organization hatched in the warmth of the same afflictions. Its analogous enthusiasms had created, by living together in a sympathetic neighborhood, an atmosphere of fraternal regionalisms which would have permitted our hemisphere to keep itself within its geographical unity and its peaceful traditions, away from conflicts not directly affecting it. We lived decorously in peace and aimed at keeping that peace. Our aspirations could not have been nobler nor our behavior more specifically transparent.

We envied nobody anything; our sole preoccupation was thriving on our democratic institutions, which we considered good enough to consolidate our well-being in safety. We endeavored to succeed in our own behalf and also to become serviceable to others. We proclaimed the worthiness of lawful acquisitions over brittle conquests by force and violence.

Unfortunately this regime of quiescence and confidence does not seem assured of further continuance. Nobody with an honorable conscience can deny that the Western Hemisphere is entering a new life of alarms and threats. From October of last year—the date of your former meeting—to the present time, humanity has gone through on its march, gradually becoming dizzy and senseless,

toward the destruction of whatever constituted the highest aims of civilized man.

It seems as if divine predestination forces us Americans, the heirs of western culture, to be definitely the sole custodians of an international morale which becomes dim and deteriorates with the ruin of great peoples and the dramatic, contemptuous silence of the highest virtues, of which yesterday mankind was proud.

This sacred mission that the American continent assumes through setting itself up as trustee for the remainder of betrayed civilization—civilization pushed to the edge of the precipice—is the aim that reunites you today in order to defend and harbor it, relieving it from the utter rejection that might harass it to its last corners in the New World.

The dangers you know well, Excellencies, increase day by day, and our America will be lucky if, due to its miraculous isolation, it can continue to avoid profound reactions to the distressing events we are living through. The fiendish fate which has befallen scientific instruments created by human wisdom for friendlier, more effective intercourse between individuals and peoples turns them into a tragic admonition of our countries, which trusted that their remoteness and manifest lack of interest in illegitimate ambitions would keep them out of the roving conflict that respects no right which is weakly claimed nor forgives the justified abstentions of those who have not made out of covetousness for another's possessions their ideals for national aggrandizement.

Upon this bleak present reality, that nevertheless cannot, withal, cloud the hopes of daybreak in the hearts of its men of good will, America has made itself ready for a protective preparedness and for a progressive defense of its common rights, which is the only policy proper to maintain it in its own peaceful life and insure it permanent enjoyment of its own felicity.

Men from the north, the south, and the center, solidly joined together and consecrated every one by the blessed equalizing religion of America, welcome! The government and people of Cuba, in stretching toward you sincerely hospitable arms, earnestly hope for the success of your difficult task.

So, while other countries may vegetate around the margins of the law of nations, trusting only in force, we Americans proceed perfectly renewed within our traditional concepts of regional independence, reciprocal consideration, and fraternal solidarity, the indestructible bases of the relations of this hemisphere.

Excellencies, I have the honor to proclaim inaugurated the second meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics.

Announcement of Candidacy for Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOACHIM O. FERNANDEZ
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1940

LETTER OF HON. J. O. FERNANDEZ OF LOUISIANA

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I addressed recently to one of my constituents.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have formally announced and have qualified as a candidate for reelection to Congress from the First Congressional District of New Orleans, a post I have held for the past 10 years. During that time I have given faithful service to the people of my congressional district, my city, my State, and my Nation. My record is one of tremendous accomplishment, due solely to my own ability and initiative.

I am a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee and ranking member of the subcommittee on naval appropriations, which membership was only acquired after years of seniority. Membership on this influential committee constitutes one of the most important reasons for the State of Louisiana and for the city of New Orleans why I should be reelected to Congress, particularly at this critical time.

I deem it my privilege to number you amongst my friends and call on you at this time to render me a distinct service in my campaign for reelection. I therefore shall consider it a personal favor if you will consent to become one of my active supporters and workers.

As I will need commissioners and official watchers at the polls on election day, which has been fixed for Tuesday, September 10, 1940, kindly advise me if you will serve for me in either of these capacities. You can either telephone me at Franklin 4114 or write to me at my residence, 3501 St. Claude Avenue.

I wish to assure you that after I am reelected I will continue to serve you and the people of my congressional district in the future as I have in the past.

Sincerely yours,

J. O. FERNANDEZ.

P. S.: Announcement as to the location of my campaign headquarters will shortly be made.

The "Fifth Column" on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the red network of the N. B. C. from Chicago, Ill., on July 13, 1940:

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight in every nook and corner of these United States the American people are enjoying the blessings of a real democracy. While, on the other hand, many of our neighbors in the Old World have experienced the destruction of their various forms of government and have been reduced to a state of virtual slavery at the hands of ruthless dictators.

For more than 150 years America has existed as a nation of liberty-loving people, under a form of government that represents a masterpiece of statesmanship and one which belongs exclusively to the people of the United States. In our form of government the American people have a priceless heritage. It is not shared by the people of any other nation. This inheritance sets the American people apart from all other people in the world. It has given them advantages so great that most minds fail to comprehend them.

By virtue of this greatest of all gifts, 130,000,000 Americans have more than twice as many automobiles as are owned by the other 2,000,000,000 human beings that inhabit the earth.

By virtue of it, with 1 hour of labor, an American workman can buy twice as much bread as can an English or French workman and four times as much as can a German workman.

By virtue of it, a child born into the home of an average family will live years longer than will a child born into a similar home in any other great nation in the world.

In the short span of 150 years it has brought to the American people nine twentieths—45 percent—of all the tangible wealth in the entire world.

Surely, this is a priceless heritage.

Yet, because the American people do not fully understand its workings—because they are unable properly to appraise its value—there is the prospect, or at least the possibility, of its forfeiture.

This gift of the American people made it possible for them to take the great discovery of Bessemer and gird this continent with tens of thousands of miles of railways. It made possible every suspension bridge, every ocean liner and every great battleship.

By virtue of this priceless heritage it became possible to know electricity, to harness it and to utilize it as light and as power.

To this inheritance goes the credit for the invention of the mower, the reaper and the steel plow which, with the farm tractor, created an agriculture figured in terms of billions of bushels and tens of millions of bales. To it goes the credit for a vast manufacturing industry that produces billions of dollars worth of products that add to the convenience and comforts of men.

Countless centuries had passed and all of these accomplishments were unimagined only 150 years ago. They constitute the world we know. The credit goes to this priceless heritage of the American people.

What is it?

This priceless heritage was—and is—a right.

This greatest of all gifts, the advantage that belongs almost exclusively to the American people is:

"The right to think without restraint and to voice thoughts with words without limitation or restriction."

This priceless right, this most potent of all forces, was given to the American people by the Constitution. Prior to its adoption,

governments, all governments, to a greater or lesser degree, controlled the thinking of men.

There are two kinds of government:

(1) Governments that are amenable to and that fear the people. These governments are creatures of the people.

(2) Governments which dominate the people and which the people fear. These people are creatures of their government.

For the first time in the history of the world, the American Constitution established a government subject to the will of the people. It removed fear from the hearts of men. It freed men's minds. Men began to imagine limitlessly, to strive and to achieve.

Self-reliance was born. The only true security is the absence of fear. For the first time in the history of the world—security became a reality.

Many times since the founding of this Nation our country has been severely tried, but on all occasions has successfully united against the common enemy.

At this very moment another crisis confronts us with democracy being put to its greatest test. Since the close of the World War one democracy after another has been wiped out and dictatorial forms of government substituted.

From the side lines we have witnessed in the past few months the mad rush of power-crazed dictators in subduing peaceful nations. We have seen demonstrated the havoc wrought by a highly mechanized German military machine the like of which the world has never known. The efficiency of this motorized military monster has dazed and horrified the world. Constructed at a cost of $40,000,000,000 it consumed the energies of Europe's greatest industrial country for a period of 7 years.

Every energy, talent, and resource of the industrious and talented German people was harnessed in producing a modern, balanced, and amazingly effective striking force.

In the world today there is nothing superior to this Hitler war machine. In the short space of 21 days Hitler conquered Poland, destroyed a half million soldiers, and took 700,000 prisoners.

In spite of the British blockade Hitler invaded and mastered Norway in 8 days. In similar fashion he crushed Holland in 4 days and vanquished Belgium in 17 days. In like manner he required but 21 days to destroy or capture the British Expeditionary Force in France, together with three entire French armies.

Following the surrender of Belgium it required Hitler but 17 days to conquer Paris, capture the Maginot Line, drive the French Army more than 100 miles south of Paris, and reduce the French people to servitude.

In 2 months of active military operations Hitler has conquered a territory as great as New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. He has conquered more than a hundred million people, possibly destroyed 2,000,000 soldiers, and taken as prisoners 3,000,000 more.

With the exception of Norway and Denmark, each of the nations subdued was of the opinion that they had set up a real defense against German aggression.

The stark reality of the desolation wrought by these enemies of democracy has aroused the American people to the realization that if we are to preserve our priceless heritage we must have an adequate national defense without further delay.

Congress, as the mouthpiece of the American people, has discarded partisan politics, and rightly so, in appropriating billions of dollars to streamline our national defense. With the executive branch of our Government rests the responsibility for building our defenses to a degree never before attained. The industries of our Nation are alive to their responsibility and with citizens in every walk of life making their daily contributions in the form of defense taxes America goes forward as one happy family determined that our priceless heritage be preserved.

If this objective is to be attained, our national unity must be above suspicion. America will not countenance the presence of those who harbor a desire for other forms of government. Such deluded individuals with their warped minds and false political philosophies are the scum of creation and unfit to associate with liberty-loving Americans. These breeders of international hatred and disrupters of the American way of life are the tools of Stalin and Hitler and form the backbone of the "fifth column" in America.

Despite the love of Americans for national unity, it is a known fact that the "fifth column" is running hog-wild throughout the country. Yes, the "fifth column" is on the march.

No city in this great land is immune to the workings of these disciples of Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler. They preach and practice their un-American doctrines with a sneer on their faces and a song of hate in their black hearts.

With reckless abandon and unmitigated gall they have invaded Government departments in the Nation's Capital, enlisting Federal employees in their determined drive to undermine this Government.

Make no mistake about it—the "fifth column" is on the march.

Daily the corridors of many Government buildings in Washington resound to the footsteps of hundreds of Federal employees known to harbor un-American doctrines.

I hold in my hand a printed membership list of the Washington, D. C., branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy containing the names of 563 Government employees known to be members of this organization branded by the Dies committee as a Communist front organization. The salaries of this group range from $1,080 to $10,000 annually, which are paid from the pockets of the taxpayers of America. Since this list was published in the official hearings of the Dies committee on October 5, 1939, only 20 persons named therein have notified the Dies committee that they have renounced their membership. During the month of June the House of Representatives was informed that this group of employees was still on the Federal pay roll. One week later specific attention was directed to a fellow traveler in the Department of Labor, who, while occupying a $7,000-a-year position, finds time to carry on at the expense of the American taxpayer the program of another Communist front organization.

A week later I had called to my attention that the acting chairman of the Federal Advisory Council for Employment Security, when asked to consider a motion granting preference to American citizens, publicly confessed the fact that he was an alien.

The climax in this parade of "fifth columnists" was reached several days ago when there arrived in Washington a man who, from his own lips, asserted that he was a delegate to the twentieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution in Moscow. This individual is daily awaiting an appointment to a key position in our national-defense program concerning the training of the youth of America.

Yes, the "fifth column" is truly on the march in this great Nation.

Congress has enacted the necessary laws to suppress the "fifth column" if only those high in authority would recognize this menace and move promptly to exterminate it.

America cannot afford to allow this parade of "fifth columnists" to go on unmolested. With the entire country working at a feverish pace to attain the objectives of our national-defense program, it is not difficult to realize how the "fifth columnists" or, as they are more appropriately termed, "filth columnists," can disrupt our well-organized plans.

Every loyal American will find no difficulty in recognizing the real threat of the "fifth column" to our national unity and likewise to our priceless heritage—a free democracy.

It is unthinkable that the taxpayers of America should be called upon to pay the salaries of Federal employees who have "fifth column" tendencies. Nor should the mothers and fathers of America be asked to entrust the training of their sons to Moscow-minded individuals. We have only to recall the sad fate of France and other countries of Europe betrayed by the "fifth columnists" who were permitted to thrive unmolested at the expense of the people.

Let the message of the American people to these alien agitators be phrased in plain language—if you don't like the American form of government, get out and stay out.

We have heard a lot recently of purging political officeholders for differences in opinion. If we are to attain the required solidarity of this Nation, let us witness those in high authority conducting a worth-while purge in ousting from Government circles known enemies to the American way of life.

America has a gigantic task in building a national defense to preserve our priceless heritage of liberty and freedom. But we can never accomplish our task while there lurks in the shadows of the Nation's Capitol a group of alien-minded ingrates who, like vultures, are bent on destroying this Nation.

America is at the crossroads. If we are to proceed in the right direction, let us with a firm hand and a stout heart inform the "fifth columnists" that their heyday is over and that they will be no longer coddled, nursed, or tolerated.

In short, there is no choice. You are either an American or not an American.

Let our actions and our words convey to these "fifth columnists" in blunt language the command of all liberty-loving Americans—if you don't like America, get out and stay out.

Legislators' Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of July 22, 1940]

LEGISLATORS' BURDEN

Congress resumes its work today with a heavy legislative burden hanging over it. In the hectic weeks preceding the national party conventions Congress passed numerous defense bills with extraordinary haste. Yet it left unanswered many questions vital to our domestic welfare as well as to our national security.

In some respects the respite provided by the political conventions should be an advantage to the legislators who are shaping our national policies. It has given many of them an opportunity to consult with representative men and women from their home States. And a considerable number have probably taken advantage

of this breathing spell to analyze afresh the problems that are crowding upon Congress for solution.

When an emergency in national defense suddenly loomed up on the European horizon Congress acted with commendable dispatch to strengthen our inadequate naval and military forces. Both the Senate and House demonstrated their responsiveness to changing conditions and to the public will. In addition to voting enormous sums for new defense weapons, they loosened restrictions upon the Army and Navy so that those agencies may now move full speed ahead with their program designed to secure the entire Western Hemisphere against attack.

It is no disparagement of this record to point out that only the easiest part of the task has been performed. Congressmen are now returning to Washington to face more baffling problems: How shall the defense program be financed? How shall the manpower of the Nation be organized for defense without encroachment upon rights and privileges that the people have long cherished? How far should the United States go in extending economic ties with Latin America in the interest of hemispheric solidarity?

It is not to be supposed that these and similar difficult issues will be fully explored and disposed of at the present session. But they ought to be faced realistically by this Congress as well as its successors. Congress has been bold in authorizing expenditures. It will have to be courageous, too, in voting new taxes and expanding available reserves of trained men. And, if grave mistakes are to be avoided, that courage will have to be tempered by a large measure of good judgment.

A few weeks ago Congress was warmly applauded for enactment of a billion-dollar tax bill in an election year. But that sum now seems insignificant beside the enormous expenditures approved and contemplated. Representative DANIEL A. REED says that Congress has already voted at this session to spend more than $15,500,000,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations. Requests still before Congress, he notes, bring this total to more than $20,000,000,000.

Senator WALSH estimates that the two-ocean navy bill signed by the President on Saturday will cost taxpayers $10,000,000,000 over a number of years. To raise the enormous sums required for adequate national defense will require sacrifices of every man and woman in the United States. Is Congress willing to face that fact and enact tax and economy bills accordingly? This issue is likely to provide one of the severest tests to which American democracy has ever been subjected.

So it is well that Congress has had a breathing spell. It faces a dilemma of enormous proportions. The people demand national security without the accompaniment of either bankruptcy or totalitarianism. If Congress at its present and future sessions fails to solve this basic problem, nothing else it may do will be of much consequence.

Swiss System of Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

LETTER FROM THE LEGATION OF SWITZERLAND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks, I am inserting the letter received from the Legation of Switzerland, under date of July 15, which is in reply to my inquiry for details on the compulsory military training program of Switzerland.

In the closing paragraph of his letter, the Minister of Switzerland refers to two books which will undoubtedly be of interest to Members of the House.

The fact that during the World War Switzerland was able to keep out of hostilities and, during the recent war, her territory is respected, indicates that there must be some real merit to her preparedness program.

LEGATION OF SWITZERLAND;
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1940.

The Honorable WILLIAM J. MILLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of June 20 in which you express the wish to be furnished with information concerning the Swiss system of compulsory military training. I regret very much that due to an accumulation of urgent affairs I have not been able to reply to your letter at an earlier date.

I have made several attempts to obtain a recent and comprehensive study of the Swiss military system with a view to putting it at your disposal, but failed to get such a publication in English. I hope, however, that the following information will serve your purpose.

Switzerland was the first nation in modern times to introduce compulsory military service. The Federal Constitution adopted in 1848 and revised in 1874, provides in its article 18: "Every Swiss is bound to do military service." The federal law concerning the organization of the Swiss Army of April 12, 1907, called the Military Constitution of the Swiss Confederation, amended in 1927 and subsequent dates, provides that the army shall consist of 3 classes, namely, the elite or first line: Men from 20 to 32 years old; the "landwehr" or second line: Men from 33 to 40 years, and the "landsturm" or territorial troops: men from the age of 41 to 48.

Every male Swiss, when reaching the age of 19, must submit to a mental and physical examination. The mental test includes reading, arithmetic, geography, history of the Government, and composition. For physical examination he performs various gymnastic exercises. Some Cantons (States) compel the youths from 17 to 19 years of age to go to night school for 64 hours during winter to prepare for the examination.

When accepted in his twentieth year, the infantry recruit enters the recruiting school of his territorial division, or, if he is to become an artilleryman, or a cavalryman, or a pilot, etc., he joins his respective school, of which there are several for each branch.

The length of time devoted to the first year's training of the recruit (recruiting school) is for all branches of the army (infantry, artillery, sanitary troops, supply trains, etc.)—day of entrance and day of discharge included—116 days, for the cavalry 130 days. The pilot has to undergo an additional training of 6 months.

At the time the recruit reports for his service he is given a complete equipment and regulation rifle, all of which he takes home after finishing the course. For yearly inspection and active duty he must turn out with his full equipment, which finally becomes his private property upon his discharge from active duty at the age of 48.

The recruiting school course is hard work, as each day means 8 strenuous hours, with night work, such as patrolling, entrenching, and maneuvers probably twice a week.

The completion of the course promotes the recruit to a full-fledged soldier, assigned to a battalion in his home district, which is a unit of the division of which his Canton is a territorial part. As a member of his unit, he serves each year a so-called repetition course of 19 days, until he is 26. He belongs to the first line for 6 years longer, until he is 32, but in these 6 years he is bound to serve only every second year for a period of 3 weeks. A private of the first-line troops must therefore undergo within a period of 12 years after completion of the recruiting school a military training of eight repetition courses of 19 days each.

The repetition courses of the first-line troops are so arranged that an adequate change in smaller tactical units with training in army units will take place.

From 32 to 40 years, the Swiss soldier belongs to the seccond line or "landwehr." In this capacity he serves two repetition courses of 19 days each. For the next 8 years, until he is 48, he serves in the "landsturm" or territorial troops and is called to the colors only under special orders. In addition, every "landwehr" soldier presents himself for annual inspection, at which time he must account for the care of his uniform and arms.

A recent decree of the Swiss Government extended the army age limit to 60 years, thus keeping every able-bodied man up to 60 years of age subject to military service in case of general mobilization.

The figures of the time of instruction for a Swiss infantry private are therefore:

	Days
Recruiting school at his twentieth year	116
First line or "auszug," up to his thirty-second year, 8 repetition courses at 19 days each	152
Second line, "landwehr," up to his fortieth year, 2 repetition courses of 19 days each	38
Plus annual inspection	6
Territorial troops or "landsturm" up to his forty-eighth year, annual inspection and subject to service under special orders	8
Territorial troops from the age of 48–60, subject to special services only in case of general mobilization.	
Total	320

Specialists, like for instance gunsmiths, farriers, etc., receive their necessary professional training in special courses. Those belonging to the ambulance corps take besides the recruiting school a hospital training course.

Part of the military training of the Swiss soldier is the obligatory and voluntary rifle practice which he attends in civil life under the auspices of a rifle club. Every community is compelled by the Federal Government to build and maintain a rifle range in the open field. Enlisted men and noncommissioned officers of the first line and the "landwehr" armed with rifles or carbines, as well as subaltern officers of the troops, must pass a yearly rifle practice test. Such tests, as well as the rifle practices, are conducted by the rifle clubs according to the military regulations. Those who neglect this test must take a special course without pay. The federal government refunds the cost of the ammunition used to all those who pass the test and subsidizes the rifle clubs. The federal government encourages and aids financially any movement toward preparatory military training.

Those Swiss who are found physically unfit to serve in the regular army are assigned to certain of the auxiliary branches, as for instance the ambulance corps, commissary department, information department, transportation department, and, more recently, are trained in the air defense of the civil population and as antiparachutists, etc. Members assigned to the auxiliary service attend instruction services of much shorter periods than do the regular soldiers.

Citizens who for physical reasons are not serving personally in the army, as well as those incorporated in the auxiliary service, must pay an annual tax of exemption. Swiss citizens living in foreign countries are also obliged to pay this tax, and with few exceptions they do so.

The foregoing concerns privates in the Swiss Army. The officers and noncommissioned officers naturally are subject to additional instructions and training. Every Swiss who has the ambition and possesses intelligence and ability, can become an officer in the army. After completing the 116, or as the case may be, 130 days in the regular recruiting school, if his conduct warrants the recommendation from his superiors, he will be called to attend a school for noncommissioned officers lasting 3 weeks, for those in the artillery, in the air corps, engineering and fortress troops, 4 weeks, after which he receives the rank of a corporal. As such he attends another recruiting school a year later and the corporal with a good record and the ambition to become an officer enters the school for officers. The duration of this school varies between 60 and 120 days, according to the branch of service (for instance infantry 88, artillery and air corps 102 days). For practical and training purposes a school for noncommissioned officers is connected with the school for officers.

The newly appointed lieutenant must pass a recruiting school as instructor to qualify and thereafter he serves the regular annual repetition course of 19 days with his unit. If qualified, he will be promoted to the rank of first lieutenant after the completion of three or four repetition courses. To advance to the rank of captain he must take a 30-day course in the Central Military School No. 1, and attend several other special courses. Officers above the rank of captain devote a considerable part of their time to special courses in tactics, information, etc.

Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the Swiss military constitution provides for a small corps of instructors. They are professional or career officers and conduct the instruction of recruits and the training of noncommissioned and commissioned officers in the respective courses. A fixed number of instructors are assigned to each of the different branches of the Army. The commanders of division and Army corps are chosen from among the professional officers.

The military training program is not coordinated with the educational institutions. There are projects to make preparatory training for boys of the age of 17–19 compulsory. This program would be conducted by educational institutions as well as by gymnastic societies.

The Swiss military system, which has been functioning most satisfactorily and efficiently for many decades, is described in the booklet, Right and Duty, or Citizen and Soldier, Switzerland Prepared and at Peace, by Frederick A. Kuenzli, assistant appraiser of the port of New York, formerly an officer of the Swiss Army, published by the National Defense Institute in New York, selling agents, G. E. Stechert & Co., New York, 1916.

The booklet contains in its annex an English translation of the military constitution of the Swiss Confederation of April 12, 1907. This act is the basic law for the organization of the Swiss Army and is, with few amendments, specially pertaining to the extension of the training periods still in force.

I trust that you will be able to obtain this excellent publication from the Library of Congress; otherwise I shall be glad to lend it to you for your perusal.

The book Civic Training in Switzerland—A Study of Democratic Life, by Robert C. Brooks (1930), also contains some information on the Swiss militia system and its functioning.

Very truly yours,

C. BRUGGMANN,
Minister of Switzerland.

National Party Shifts Not News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was published recently in the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal:

NATIONAL PARTY SHIFTS NOT NEWS—GRANT WAS DEMOCRAT—LINCOLN NOT REPUBLICAN—WILLKIE, WALLACE CONVERSIONS HAVE MANY PRECEDENTS—CLEVELAND FOUGHT BRYAN DESPITE NOMINATION

(By E. E. Patton)

The recent Republican Convention nominated Wendell Willkie as their candidate for President. Until 1938 he had been a Democrat. The Democratic Convention renominated President Roosevelt and named Henry Wallace as the candidate for Vice President. He was a Republican until he went into the President's Cabinet 8 years ago; his father was Secretary of Agriculture under Mr. Harding.

There is plenty of historical precedent for all of this as I shall show in the following paragraphs.

In 1840, the Whigs passed over their long-time candidate and hero, Henry Clay, and nominated William Henry Harrison because he had a war record. On the ticket with him was John Tyler, a State-rights Democrat from Virginia. Harrison died after only 1 month in office; Tyler succeeded to the Presidency.

He showed that he had no disposition to go along with the Whigs, so all the members of his Cabinet resigned with the exception of Daniel Webster, who remained for patriotic reasons; he was negotiating a treaty with Britain over our boundary line between Canada and Maine. He stayed until he consummated this treaty and he took to the woods. Tyler was afterward a member of the Confederate Congress from Virginia, but died before he was sworn in.

HARRISON UNIQUE

It might be mentioned in this connection that Harrison had been the unsuccessful candidate against Van Buren in 1836, the only instance in American history where a man was defeated for the Presidency and came back. Of course, I know that Cleveland's defeat by Harrison will be marched out, but it should be remembered that Cleveland had already had one term when Harrison defeated him.

When Mr. Lincoln was renominated in Baltimore in 1864, Andrew Johnson was named as the Vice Presidential candidate with him. Johnson was then, had always been, an uncompromising Democrat and remained one as long as he lived. However, it should not be forgotten that this convention was not listed as a Republican convention, but as the National Union Convention.

U. S. Grant is the only man elected as a Republican to the Presidency that ever served two full terms, yet the fact remains that the only vote Grant had ever cast, nationally, before he became a candidate himself was for James Buchanan, a Democrat, in 1856.

His father, Jesse Grant, visited his illustrious son while he occupied the White House and is said to have criticized him openly to visitors. The old gentleman was a Democrat then. We will admit that this was not quite fair for the old gentleman to eat his son's food and sleep in his beds and criticize him openly, but he could not get away from his democracy.

LOGAN CHANGED

Then there are other precedents for these two strange proceedings in the recent conventions. When the Republicans named James G. Blaine, the "plumed knight," as Bob Ingersoll dubbed him, they chose as his running mate none other than John A. Logan, a man who had been elected as a Democrat from southern Illinois to the House of Representatives in 1858. There was a great deal of secession sentiment in southern Illinois by reason of the fact that that section of the State had been settled by people from many of the Southern States. Mr. Lincoln asked Representative Logan to go back to southern Illinois and make some speeches for the Union.

He served through the war and became a major general, was elected in 1868 to the House of Representatives as a Republican and remained one the remainder of his life, was sent as a Republican to the United States Senate from Illinois.

There used to be an old saying in England that "no gentleman ever changes his politics or his religion," but we have seen many instances in this country to the contrary. Grover Cleveland was not for Mr. Bryan, the Democratic nominee for President in 1896, and we have President Roosevelt's word for it that he voted for Theodore Roosevelt in 1904.

This is not being written from the standpoint of political bias or partisan prejudice but merely to keep the record straight. Al Smith always wanted to "look at the record"; here it is.

The President Drafts Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has decided he is the only logical Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party. All other candidacies have been submerged and he virtually forces himself upon the American people for a third term. But the people will speak with their votes in November and they will retire him from office. The follow-

ing editorial from the Milwaukee Journal discusses the self-deception practiced by Roosevelt:

WHO DRAFTED THE PRESIDENT?

The President's speech to the Democratic Convention was both masterly and Rooseveltian. It was masterly in the sense of marshaling a line of reasoning that carries people along. There is no denying Mr. Roosevelt's powers of presentation. It was Rooseveltian in this—that its success depended on the listener's willingness not to analyze or ask questions. A few well-put questions in any man's mind and the reasoning fails.

The President says, in effect, that world events drafted him. He was seeking to escape the burdensome office for retirement to the Hudson—was all set to do this when the war in Europe broke. Then, day by day, month by month, he had to put off his announcement. So great was the crisis that he could find no opportunity to make a statement up to the very time that the convention was permanently organized. Then he spoke through his mouthpiece, Senator BARKLEY.

At this point you have to make the assumption that Mr. Roosevelt believes no other man than himself could carry the work of the Presidency through these times. Of the one hundred and thirty-odd millions, he is the only one fitted for the job.

Out of that assumption you come to a conclusion—and it is inescapable—that the President was drafted but that he drafted himself. He alone made the decision. He alone decided that he could not make a statement, even in the face of the political manipulations by the inner circle New Dealers who were gathering in the delegates to hand him a third nomination he did not want.

We give Franklin D. Roosevelt more credit than this, more than he gives himself by this self-deception. So we seek further in his speech to find the real reasons for his third-term aspirations. They are not long hidden. One finds them in that part where the President talks of the program, the accomplishments, and the aspirations of the New Deal. He is running for the third term because he does not believe that this program would be safe as to its future in any other hands. He wants 4 more years to perfect and make the New Deal permanent American policy.

Whether this thought originated in the President's mind or was planted there by that inner circle controlled by Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes, and Mme. Perkins is beside the point. The President believes it and he is sincere about it. It would have been a sincere, valid reason for him to put forward for his decision.

Evidently he did not think that it was quite big enough. It would have been a political reason instead of a reason founded on a world crisis—there must always be a crisis. Besides, there was that awkward third-term tradition.

So you come down to this, as you so often do in the President's speeches: Mr. Roosevelt gives you a reason and with a marvelous marshaling of statement carries you along as he builds a bridge of rhetorical support. But when you probe into it all, you discover that the reason he gave could not have been the real reason in his mind.

It isn't legerdemain and it isn't a conscious effort at deception. But it is something to question—unless you want to be fooled.

No Dictatorship for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the remark is made that this country needs a dictatorship. Only yesterday I talked with a man who expressed that thought. I disagree entirely with those who are willing to abandon our form of government and our institutions for something new and, so far as we are concerned, filled with the dangers of enslavement of the American people. The following editorial from the International Falls Daily Journal of Minnesota expresses very aptly what would happen if we did away with our form of government and pursued the experiment which has been tried in foreign countries. Says the editorial:

IF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE QUIT

Speculate for 5 long minutes on what would happen in this country if personal enterprise and ambition gave way to a general willingness to climb up on the lap of some high official, a fuehrer, a duce, or a commissar. Suppose he—but you would think of him with a capital "H"—suppose He said to you:

"All your childish ideas of right and wrong are out. The old fairy tales about honor, chivalry, integrity, and kindness are dead. There is no such thing as personal progress. There is no such thing as private property. All your effort must be subordinated to the good of the state. And the state is Me. Do as I tell you. Exercise at dawn, chop wood in the forenoon, drill in the afternoon, and read My books and speeches at night. Then you will be saved."

That is what extreme conceit, backed by the supreme authority of a dictator, would tell you, says Nation's Business. It would be sugar-coated. You would be given the most becoming of work pants to wear while you chopped; the most gorgeous of helmets and puttees for your drill. You would sing. If you couldn't sing cheerfully your vocal chords would be lubricated with castor oil. And your day would be filled much too full for the practice of any business, unless you had manual dexterity enough to run a complicated machine, or mental training enough to do the work of a government scientist.

Would you be paid for this work? Oh, yes. You would be paid what the dictator saw fit. Would you be allowed to invest your wages? Yes; as the dictator saw fit. Would you be called on for foreign service? Yes; if the dictator saw the propriety of placing Mexico, Guatemala, Costa Rica, or some other country under the dictator's flag.

None can deny the facts set forth in this editorial or the dangers that would result to the American people if we did away with our system, which has grown up under a Constitution that was adopted in 1789, just 151 years ago. That document guarantees the right of personal enterprise and ambition. It guarantees to our people every fundamental political concept that has made it possible for America to become a great and powerful nation.

One hundred and fifty years ago the first meeting of the Supreme Court of the United States was held. The founders of the Republic intended for this Court to protect the people against aggressions from either or both of the other branches of our Government. It has carried out its work as was intended.

For those who indulge in idle talk and gossip, let me commend to them a study of the Constitution. Then let them give attention to this history of the Supreme Court; let them make comparisons with the despotic governments of the Old World; and, in my opinion, there will come about a greater appreciation of this country of ours.

National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have supported the national-defense program and this means, of course, that our votes were in favor of Army and Navy and aircraft expansion in the interests of national defense. Likewise, we voted for the tax bill which is to produce revenue to pay for the national defense weapons. Congress should tender its services to the National Defense Council, and instead of taking a 3-day recess, we should go into this question of how the national defense funds are to be expended. Newspaper releases indicate that the Midwest is being ignored in connection with the manufacture of war materials. It may or may not be significant that the new $25,000,000 powder plant is to be built by the Du Ponts in the State of Indiana. Think it over. I hope there are no politics in this procedure.

We noted with considerable interest the announcement from The Assistant Secretary of War some 3 or 4 days ago, to the effect that contracts were concluded between July 1 and July 13 for $150,000,000 worth of new war planes; also that $200,000,000 in contracts was awarded for small arms, artillery, ammunition, tanks, and educational orders. The Assistant Secretary further explained that contracts for $38,000,000 worth of motor transports had been let. All announcements up to date would indicate that various factories and plants, and particularly in sections of the country far removed from the Midwest, intend to expand and increase their productive capacities.

If such a development is to take place, it means, to quote a man in the Midwest who would like to have a chance to make some of these war materials, that sections of the Midwest, including northern Minnesota, will be raked by scouts seeking skilled labor. It also means that shop machines,

tools, and equipment, which are suitable for the manufacture of war materials, will be transferred to eastern locations.

Such a program will result in the Midwest going backward industrially, and its factories will be closed and its skilled mechanics located in the East and the South.

The Government should not so injure and cripple our inland empire. The manufacturers in the Midwest and in Duluth and northern Minnesota seek an opportunity to bid on these various contracts for the production of war materials. The only fair policy that the Government can pursue is a policy that will make it possible for our section of the country to receive its share of these orders for war materials.

I believe that all existing factories and plants should be utilized before there is an expansion of existing plants in the East and in other sections of the United States. There is plenty of unemployment in northern Minnesota, and much of it can be relieved if proper consideration to our section is given in the placing of Government contracts.

Constitution of Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22, 1940

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS ADOPTED AT EIGHTH AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I present for insertion in the RECORD the constitution of the Inter-American Bar Association with certain accompanying papers.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I. NAME AND PURPOSE

There is hereby established the Inter-American Bar Association. Its purposes are:

To establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchanges of views.

To advance the science of jurisprudence in all its phases and particularly the study of comparative law; to promote uniformity of commercial legislation; to further the diffusion of knowledge of the laws of the various countries throughout the Americas.

To uphold the honor of the profession of the law; and to encourage cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere.

To meet in conference from time to time for discussion and for the purposes of the association.

ARTICLE II. MEMBERSHIP

The association is composed of national associations and constituent geographical (State, Provincial, Territorial, city, and local) organizations and groups of lawyers throughout the Americas that have been admitted to membership pursuant to article XI.

(a) "National association" signifies a Nation-wide professional organization of lawyers in any independent nation or self-governing dominion, or, where no such national association exists, a combination for the purpose of representation of constituent geographical organizations or groups.

(b) "Constituent geographical association" signifies a professional organization of lawyers in a constituent State or Province or Territory or city or other subdivision of an independent nation or self-governing dominion or colony.

(c) Professional associations of lawyers devoted to particular branches of the law, whether nation-wide or local, may be admitted to membership, but shall be entitled to representation and vote in the conference and to representation in the council only on the basis of constituent geographical associations.

(d) If at any time in any nation or self-governing dominion there is no national association, the bar organization of the capital city may be deemed to be a national association, or, if more than one, that which may be selected in such manner as the bylaws may provide.

ARTICLE III. DIRECTING BODIES AND OFFICERS

Subordinate to the association assembled in conference, the directing bodies and the officers are the council, the executive committee, the president, the vice presidents, the secretary general and any assistant secretaries general, the treasurer, and such other officers as may be prescribed by the bylaws.

ARTICLE IV. THE COUNCIL

The council consists of one councilor chosen on behalf of each independent nation or self-governing dominion from a participating national association, or, where there is no participating national association, in such a manner as may be locally determined from nominations of the largest nation-wide association or from other associations recognized by the council or by the conference assembled, together with such number of other councilors, elected at large by the conference, as may be provided by the bylaws. All councilors shall hold office until the close of the next conference following that at which they are severally recognized or elected, and until their respective successors are recognized or elected and qualified.

ARTICLE V. OFFICERS

SECTION 1. There shall be a President, the number of Vice Presidents as hereinafter provided for, a Secretary General, and a Treasurer. There may be such Assistant Secretaries General and such other officers and employees as the bylaws may prescribe.

SEC. 2. The President shall be the chief officer, and shall have all the usual powers of the chief executive officer of similar associations. The President shall be ineligible to succeed himself.

SEC. 3. There shall be one Vice President elected by the conference from each independent nation or self-governing dominion.

SEC. 4. The Secretary General shall have an office at the executive headquarters of the association. He shall have custody of the records, and shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the bylaws. Assistant Secretaries General may have such offices in such countries and perform such duties under the general direction of the Secretary General as may be prescribed by the bylaws. Other officers and employees may have such offices in such countries and perform such duties as the bylaws may prescribe.

SEC. 5. The Treasurer, subject to the direction of the council, shall have the management of the moneys and properties of the association, shall receive and disburse the subscriptions of members and other funds, shall attend to the keeping of the accounts, and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the bylaws.

ARTICLE VI. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The executive committee shall be the managing directorate. It shall be composed of (a) the president, the secretary general, and the treasurer, together with (b) four additional councilors, to be chosen by the council at its first meeting following each meeting of the conference, as the bylaws may prescribe. The committee shall hold such meetings and at such places as may be designated by the president or by a majority of the members of the committee, if he fails to act, and shall have such powers and duties (in addition to those fixed by this constitution) as shall be prescribed by the bylaws. The committee shall keep a record of its proceedings.

ARTICLE VII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The president, the secretary general, assistant secretaries general, the treasurer and such other officers as may be designated by the bylaws from time to time, shall be elected by the council at its first meeting following the close of each conference. They shall hold office until the close of the first meeting of the council following the next conference. Vacancies in any such offices, and any vacancy in the executive committee (other than ex officio), occurring at any other time, either by the creation of new offices or otherwise, shall be filled by the executive committee at its next meeting, to hold office until the next regular election of officers and until their respective successors shall be elected and qualified. Interim vacancies in the council itself shall be filled by the executive committee, to hold office until the next conference. A majority of the council (or of the councilors remaining in office) shall constitute a quorum for elections and for all other purposes.

ARTICLE VIII. SECTIONS AND COMMITTEES

Sections and committees to further the purposes of the association may be established, with such powers, functions, and duties, as the council may determine subject to the approval of the conference, or as may be provided by the bylaws.

ARTICLE IX. CONFERENCES

SECTION 1. The association shall meet in conference at a date and place to be fixed by the preceding conference; except that the initial conference shall meet at the city of Panama, at such time as may be fixed by the original signers of this constitution who, together with such other persons as they may invite to join them as representatives of national and other associations, of the categories mentioned in article II, shall constitute the first council, shall effectuate the initial organization, and shall hold office until the close of the first conference.

SEC. 2. Transitional provisions: Any delegate in attendance at the Eighth American Scientific Congress, may sign this constitution provisionally, such signature to be binding only if and when ratified by competent authority of any national or constituent geographical association. By adding after or underneath any such signature the word "provisional" or "conditional," it will be understood that such signing will not be operative to bind the association until written notice, signed by the chief officer of the association that such association has ratified the act of the delegate in signing the constitution has been received by the secretary general of the Inter-American Bar Association. When written notice shall have been received by the secretary general that any association disaffirms the act of the delegate, then the signature shall thereafter be for naught held, and there shall be no obligation whatever

resting upon such association by reason of the provisional signature.

When five such associations shall have signified their ratification or adherence, then the conference of the Inter-American Bar Association shall come into existence, and the provisional Secretary General shall be authorized to call the initial conference in the city of Panama.

SEC. 3. If a conference at any time fails to fix the date or the place of the next conference, then it shall be the duty of the council to do so. In any such case, notices stating both date and place shall be sent to member associations as may be provided in the bylaws, which may provide for the council to ballot by mail upon any proposition.

SEC. 4. The conference shall consist, in addition to the members of the council and the officers, of as many delegates from each member association as it may desire, such delegates to be designated by the respective member associations. But the council or the executive committee may from time to time, by notice at least 5 months in advance, limit the maximum number of delegates from member associations (except national associations), including the local association at whose home the conference meets.

SEC. 5. Voting: Each member association shall have but one vote when the association is assembled in conference, irrespective of the number of its delegates; except as expressly otherwise provided elsewhere in this constitution; and all motions, resolutions, and elections shall be decided by a majority of the votes cast, a quorum of the conference being present.

SEC. 6. Quorum: A quorum of the conference shall consist of the delegates representing at least a majority of the national associations who are members; together with such delegates as may be present representing constituent geographical associations as defined in article II.

SEC. 7. The agenda for each conference will be prepared by the council or, if the council so directs, by the executive committee. The secretary general shall duly notify all member associations or groups of the proposed agenda to be discussed at any meeting of the conference.

ARTICLE X. OBSERVERS

The council or the executive committee may invite associations of lawyers not members of the association to be represented at any particular conference by observers who shall have no vote.

ARTICLE XI. ADMISSIONS, RESIGNATIONS, AND EXPULSION

SECTION 1. Admission of members: Applications for membership will be made and acted upon in the manner prescribed by the bylaws.

SEC. 2. Any member may resign from the association by mailing to the secretary general a written notice of intention to resign, stating the date when the resignation will take effect. Such notice must be mailed at least 1 month before the effective date of the resignation so stated. On and after the effective date of the resignation the member so resigning shall stand relieved of all obligations to the association except for the amount of dues of such member due and unpaid prior to the effective date of the resignation.

SEC. 3. Expulsion: Expulsion may be voted by the conference on the proposal of the council. The conference need not state its reasons; but before action on the council's recommendation, the member association involved shall be notified and given an opportunity to furnish explanations to the executive committee and to be heard before the conference.

SEC. 4. In case of resignation or expulsion the former member association concerned shall be deemed to have renounced all rights to any share in the assets or privileges of the association.

ARTICLE XII. LANGUAGES

The official languages of the association shall be English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French. All documents printed shall be distributed to member associations in any or all of these languages on request.

ARTICLE XIII. DUES; CONTRIBUTIONS

SECTION 1. The general expenses of the association shall be met by dues from the member associations. The membership dues shall be fixed by the council and shall be due and payable annually in advance on or before January 1 of each year. In fixing such dues the council need not fix uniform dues for all members, but shall be authorized to graduate the dues of the various members upon such basis as to the council may appear to be equitable. The dues thus fixed may be changed from time to time, but no such change shall become effective until at least 6 months after written notice thereof has been mailed to each member.

SEC. 2. Contributions may be received by the secretary general at any time, with the approval of the council.

ARTICLE XIV. BYLAWS

SECTION 1. The bylaws shall be adopted, and may be amended, by the council of the conference subject to change or modification by the conference.

SEC. 2. The bylaws shall provide for the location of the executive headquarters and may provide for the publication of the proceedings of the association and of any journal or other periodical publication that may be deemed desirable.

SEC. 3. The bylaws may provide for the delegation by the council of any of its powers to the executive committee.

ARTICLE XV. AMENDMENTS, DISSOLUTION

SECTION 1. Amendments to the constitution may be proposed at any conference, on motion either of the council, or of any three of the national associations who are members, or of one-tenth of all of the member associations, but shall be placed on the agenda only if received by the secretary general at least 6 months before the date of the opening of the conference.

SEC. 2. A proposal to dissolve the association may be entertained only upon notice to the members given at least 3 months before the date of the next ensuing conference, and after prior approval by the council; and may be carried only by the votes of at least two-thirds of the members, including at least two-thirds of the member national associations. In case of dissolution the assets shall be distributed under the direction of the executive committee holding office at the time it is ordered; which shall likewise make provision for the custody and preservation of the records and proceedings.

SEC. 3. Failure of the conference to convene at the scheduled time shall not dissolve the association, nor affect its life or status in any way; but the next conference shall be called as promptly as practicable.

SEC. 4. No member of the association shall by reason of membership in the association, be liable for any debt or obligation of the association. Nor shall the fact that any member shall have contributed moneys or services to or on behalf of the association at any time, or shall have paid at any time any expenses of the Association incident to promoting or maintaining the association or furthering its purposes or any of them, obligate any such member, in the absence of an express promise or agreement in writing to that effect, for any debt, service, or obligation of the association.

Done at the Eighth American Scientific Congress, Washington, D. C., May 16, 1940.

United States: William Roy Vallance, American Bar Association, section of international and comparative law (provisional); Costa Rica: Luis Anderson, Colegio de Abogados de Costa Rica; J. Blanco Uztáriz, Venezuela; Brazil: Instituto da Ordem dos Advogados Brasileiros (Brazilian Bar Association), Edmundo de Miranda Jordão; Eduardo Zuleta-Angel, delegado de Colombia; Camilo de Brigard Silva, delegado del Gobierno de Colombia; Rogelio Pina, Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Natalio Chediak, delegado oficial y del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Association of the Bar of the City of New York (provisional): Phanor J. Eder, chairman, foreign law committee; American Foreign Law Association: Phanor J. Eder (specially authorized by board of directors); Puerto Rico: Puerto Rican Bar Association, William Cattron Rigby, authorized by the president of the association; Missouri Bar Association: by Hugh Carnes Smith, provisional, authorized by the president of the association; Federal Bar Association: by Heber H. Rice, president; République de Haïti: Ad referendum pour le Conseil de l'Ordre des Avocats de Port-au-Prince et du Cap Haïtien, Dantès Bellegarde; Pedro A. Gómez Naranjo, delegado de la Academia Colombiana de Jurisprudencia; Alejandro Copete Mafla, presidente del Tribunal Superior de Bogotá, Colombia; Cuba: Juan Clemente Zamora, delegado del Gobierno de Cuba, miembro del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Philadelpho Azevedo, Brasil; República Dominicana: Ad referendum, Julio Vega Batlle, A. Pastoriza, Jr.; Julián R. Cáceres, ad referendum, official delegate of Honduras and for Society of Lawyers of Honduras; H. F. Alfaro, Panama delegado por invitación de la Fundación Carnegie; Pedro G. de Medina y Sobrado, delegado oficial del Gobierno de Cuba, miembro del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Ernesto Freyre, delegado del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana, Cuba; R. Beteta, delegado oficial de México; J. A. Correa, delegado oficial del Ecuador, Alberto Ulloa, delegado oficial del Perú; Chicago Bar Association by John Henry Wigmore, authorized by the President of the Association, New York County Lawyers Association (by authority of Board of Directors, meeting June 10, 1940) by Curtis Shears.

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION BYLAWS

ARTICLE I. NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

If at any time, in any nation or self-governing dominion there is no national association, the bar organization of the capital city may be deemed, if so determined by the council, to be a national association; or, if there be more than one, or where there is no participating national association, then the representation of that nation or self-governing dominion in the conference and in the council shall be determined and chosen in the same manner prescribed by article IV of the constitution for choosing a councilor for such nation or self-governing dominion.

ARTICLE II. OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SECTION 1. Five assistant secretaries-general shall be elected by the council, on the nomination of the secretary general, to serve for the same term as the secretary general himself; and such other officers and employees may be elected or appointed from time to time as may be determined by the council or by the executive committee to serve for such term and at such compensation as the council or the executive committee may from time to time prescribe.

SEC. 2. One of the assistant secretaries general shall have his office at the executive headquarters of the association. The other assistant secretaries general shall have their offices at such places

as may be determined by the council or the executive committee from time to time. The secretary general, in addition to the duties prescribed by the constitution, shall perform the usual duties of that officer in similar organizations, together with such other duties as the council or the executive committee may prescribe from time to time. The assistant secretaries general shall each, under the general direction of the secretary general, perform such duties as the secretary general, the council, or the executive committee may from time to time prescribe.

SEC. 3. The treasurer, in addition to the duties prescribed by the constitution, shall perform such duties and have such powers as may be prescribed from time to time by the council or by the executive committee. He may, by the direction either of the council or of the executive committee, be required to give surety bond in such amount as may be prescribed, the expense of which shall be paid from the funds of the association.

SEC. 4. Inferior officers and employees appointed by the council or by the executive committee or by any one of the officers in accordance with authority from the council or the executive committee shall have such powers and duties as may be prescribed from time to time by the appointing authority. The council or the executive committee may from time to time, on the recommendation of the treasurer, determine the depository of the association's funds and securities.

ARTICLE III. COUNCIL

Councilors elected at large: There shall be 15 councilors elected at large in accordance with article IV of the constitution.

ARTICLE IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The executive committee shall be chosen by the council at a meeting of the council to be convened immediately after its election at each conference, and at the same city where the conference is held, but may be adjourned to any other place or time. The executive committee shall, as prescribed in the constitution, be the managing directorate of the association, and shall have such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by the council from time to time. The council may delegate any or all of its powers to the executive committee; and may provide that, between sessions of the council, the executive committee may exercise all of the powers of the council, except those in relation to admission and expulsion of members under article XI of the constitution and those relating to amendments to the constitution or dissolution of the association under article XV of the constitution; but the executive committee shall report all its acts to the next succeeding meeting of the council.

ARTICLE V. SECTIONS AND COMMITTEES

Pursuant to article VIII of the constitution the council, or the executive committee as the delegate of the council, shall establish such sections and committees as it may determine in order to further the purposes of the association, but always subject to the approval of the conference.

ARTICLE VI. CONFERENCE

Failure of any conference to fix the time or place of the next succeeding conference: If a conference at any time fails to fix the date or the place of the next conference, or if for any reason the plans for holding the next conference need to be changed or fail to materialize, then in any such case the council may fix the date or place for the next conference, and upon fixing such date or place, or both, in accordance with article IX of the constitution, shall give notice thereof in such manner and for such length of time as the council may determine; and such determination, as well as the determination of the time or place, or both, for the next conference, may, as provided in section 3 of article IX of the constitution, be made by the councilors by ballot by mail upon any or all of such propositions.

ARTICLE VII. DUES

Membership dues shall be as follows:

(a) National associations, $ per annum.

(b) Constituent geographical associations:

(1) Having more than 3,000 members, $ per annum.

(2) Having more than 1,000 members but not more than 3,000 members, $ per annum.

(3) Having more than 500 members but not more than 1,000 members, $ per annum.

(4) Having not more than 500 members, $ per annum.

Dues are payable either in dollars or in the currency of the country of the association, at the current rate of dollar exchange.

An association in default for 6 months or more in the payment of its dues shall not be entitled to exercise its privileges of membership, nor shall its delegates be recognized at the conference. Nevertheless the council or the executive committee may, at discretion, remit or postpone the payment of the dues of any member association, under special circumstances.

ARTICLE VIII. EXECUTIVE HEADQUARTERS

The initial executive headquarters of the association shall be in the city of Washington, D. C., at the offices of the Pan American Union, until the first conference of the association to be held at Habana, and until otherwise fixed by the council.

ARTICLE IX. PUBLICATION OF PROCEEDINGS

Journal. The council or the executive committee shall from time to time provide for the publication of the proceedings of the association, and shall determine as to the publication of any journal either by the association alone or in conjunction with any other organization.

ARTICLE X. MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL

Notices: A stated meeting of the council shall always be held immediately after the election of a new council at each conference of the association, and at the same city where the conference is being held, upon the call of the secretary general, but may be adjourned to any other place or time.

Other meetings of the council shall be held at such times and places and upon such notice as the council or the executive committee shall from time to time prescribe.

ARTICLE XI. TAKING EFFECT OF BYLAWS

Provisional officers: These bylaws shall take effect immediately upon their adoption by the managing committee of six appointed by the initial signers of the constitution of the association, in accordance with the resolutions adopted by such original signers and with the provisions of article IX of the constitution; but the officers and the managing committee of six initially elected hereunder by such signers shall be designated as "provisional officers," and "provisional executive committee" respectively, for the purpose of effectuating the initial organization of the association and providing for the holding of its first conference at Habana; and shall hold office only until the close of the first conference and until their respective successors shall be elected and qualified.

PRESS NEWS FROM THE PAN AMERICAN UNION

LAWYERS OF CONTINENT UNITE

WASHINGTON, June 16.—An inter-American bar association, long a dream of lawyers all over the continent, reflecting their desire for effective Western Hemisphere solidarity in the field of law, has at last become a reality.

The organization was created at the eighth American Scientific Congress, held in Washington last month, and an organizing committee is now making plans for the first meeting of the association to be held sometime next year, probably at Habana, Cuba, it was learned today at the Pan American Union.

The purposes of the new entity are "to establish and maintain relations between associations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchanges of views, to advance the science of jurisprudence in all its phases and particularly the study of comparative law." Also "to promote uniformity of commercial legislation, to further the diffusion of knowledge of the laws of the various countries throughout the Americas, and to encourage cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere."

Three types of legal organizations are eligible for membership in the association: 1. National bar associations; 2. Municipal and State bar associations; and 3. Societies, local or national, dedicated to a special phase of jurisprudence.

Delegates representing local and national bar associations in 13 different American republics signed the constitution of the association when it was first opened for signature last month. Adherence of bar associations in the other eight American republics and Canada is expected to follow shortly.

United States organizations which have already signed up for membership in the association are: American Bar Association, New York City Bar Association, American Foreign Law Association, Puerto Rican Bar Association, Missouri Bar Association, and Federal Bar Association.

The government of the association will consist of a council, executive committee, president, vice presidents, secretary general, assistant secretaries, and treasurer. Pending the election of permanent officials to fill these posts, the administration of the association is in the hands of an organizing committee composed of Natalio Chediak, of Cuba; J. Blanco Uztáriz, of Venezuela; Luis Anderson, of Costa Rica; Dantès Bellegarde, of Haiti; and Camilo de Brigard, of Colombia. Col. William C. Rigby, of Washington, D. C., is chairman of the committee.

Manuel Fernández Supervielle, dean of the Bar Association of Habana, Cuba, is the provisional president of the association, and Mr. William Roy Vallance, of the State Department, the provisional secretary general.

THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM CATTRON RIGBY [1]

Mr. President, fellow members of the Federal Bar Association, and guests: I have been asked to say a word about the Inter-American Bar Association organized last month during the sessions of the Eighth American Scientific Congress. Its constitution was signed on May 16, 1940, pursuant to a resolution of the ninth section of the congress, the section on international law, public law, and jurisprudence. It was signed by representatives of the American Bar Association for the United States, as well as by representatives of 12 Latin American countries, and was also signed on behalf of a number of State and Territorial and city bar associations in the United States and in other countries in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of the association. A representative of the Canadian Bar Association was present and expressed approval, but did not have sufficient authority to sign on behalf of his association. It is understood it is to be presented to the governing body of that association at an early meeting. The signers are:

---

[1] Made at the luncheon of the Federal Bar Association, June 26, 1940.

United States: William Roy Vallance, American Bar Association, section of international and comparative law; Costa Rica: Luis Anderson, Colegio de Abogados de Costa Rica; J. Blanco Uztáriz, Venezuela; Brazil: Instituto da Ordem dos Advogados Brasileiros (Brazilian Bar Association), Edmundo de Miranda Jordão; Eduardo Zuleta-Angel, delgado de Colombia; Camilo de Brigard Silva, delegado del Gobierno de Colombia; Dr. Natalio Chediak, delegado oficial y del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Rogelio Pina, Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Association of the Bar of the City of New York (provisional), Phanor J. Eder, chairman, foreign law committee; American Foreign Law Association, Phanor J. Eder (specially authorized by board of directors); Puerto Rico: Puerto Rican Bar Association, William Cattron Rigby—authorized by the president of the association; Missouri Bar Association, by Hugh Carnes Smith, provisional, authorized by the president of the association; Federal Bar Association, by Heber H. Rice, president; République de Haiti; conseil de l'Ordre des Avocats de Port-au-Prince et due Cap Haitien, Dantès Bellegarde, ad referendum; Pedro A. Gómez Naranjo, delegado de la Academia Colombiana de Jurisprudencia; Alejandro Copete Mafla, presidente del Tribunal Superior de Bogotá, Colombia; Cuba: Juan Clemente Zamora, delegado del Gobierno de Cuba, miembro del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Philadelpho Azevedo, Brazil; Julián R. Cáceres (ad referendum), delegado oficial de Honduras y por la Sociedad de Abogados de Honduras; H. F. Alfaro, Panama, delegado por invitación de la Fundación Carnegie; Republica Dominicana, ad referendum, Julio Vega Batlle, A. Pastoriza, Jr.; Pedro G. de Medina y Sobrado, delegado oficial del Gobierno de Cuba, miembro del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana; Ernesto Freyre, delegado del Colegio de Abogados de la Habana, Cuba; R. Beteta, delegado oficial de México; J. A. Correa, delegado oficial del Ecuador; Alberto Ulloa, delegado oficial del Perú.

Adherence of bar associations in the other eight American republics and Canada is expected to follow shortly.

The Inter-American Bar Association is a new departure in this hemisphere among associations of lawyers. Its primary object is to develop friendly contacts among the lawyers of the different countries the whole length of the North and South American Continents, from Canada all the way down to the tip of Argentina and Chile. In this respect its purpose is directly in harmony with the good-neighbor policy of the administration of the United States. It is a remarkable fact that, as was noted, back in 1934, in the report of the American Bar Association's special committee on international bar relations at the Milwaukee meeting of the American Bar Association (59 Am. Bar Reports, 621):

"Ours is the only profession—almost the only occupation, indeed—that thus far has developed no form of affiliation between all the national organizations in its own field. It stands alone in that respect, and it should stand alone no longer."

That special committee of the Bar Association comprised a very distinguished membership, and was headed by our revered and world renowned Col. John H. Wigmore. The committee went on to say (Reports of American Bar Association, vol. 59, pp. 621–622):

"The legal profession throughout the world has the strongest ties that ought to bind—ties of sentiment, ties of public duty, ties of common experience in human nature. One is apt to think of foreign law as something alien and irrelevant. And the law sometimes may be that—at least, to many of us; but not the lawyers. Cicero, our great predecessor, long ago told us, 'Quibus autem Lex at Jus sunt inter eos communia, et civitatis eiusdem habendi sunt.' (Those whose common interest is law and justice should be regarded as belonging to the same civic fellowship.) It is the personal side of our profession that draws us together inevitably. The fact is that all who belong in the legal profession have a common fund of tradition and experience in all countries. Whenever a lawyer from abroad visits our bar associations, we treat him like a brother. His views and his anecdotes confirm the fraternal feeling.

"And there is a material reason for some sort of better personal acquaintance, in view of the constantly multiplying relations of international litigation. A natural and inherent trait in our profession, at its best, is mutual trust and confidence. Practice at the bar is most agreeable, most efficient, and most normal in those communities where bench and bar know each other best and where trust and confidence can be placed where it is merited. It is important that the organized bars of all nations should be so connected as to afford some formal means of mutual acquaintance, especially in a world where every occupation represented by their clients has a network of international connections.

"That the organized bars of the various nations are ready, in their latent sentiments, to be drawn together in some form of affiliation for personal contacts is evident from the correspondence held by this committee during the last 2 years. Those sentiments are well typified in the concluding remarks of the president of the Brazilian Bar Association on the occasion of his interview with the president of this association in Chicago in December, 1933:

"'A greater approximation between the bars of Brazil and other countries of the Americas and their colleagues in this country should be sought, as a desirable and necessary step to bring about a more complete understanding of the many questions presented by the complexity of our present civilization. There is a very sincere and wholehearted wish on the part of the Brazilian attorneys to build up a closer relationship with their fellow colleagues in this country.'

"Therefore, we deem ourselves amply justified, as an abstract proposition, in the conclusion that some sort of affiliation ought to exist, and that we ought to be found taking our part in it."

That report of that special committee of the American Bar Association 6 years ago had in mind some broad association of the organized bars of the whole world, without special reference to any separate association of the bars of the Western Hemisphere. The committee envisaged a prototype in the International Union of Advocates (Union Internationale des Avocats), founded in 1928, and organized under a Belgian charter of 1930. The committee appended to its report a copy of the constitution of that international union. (Reports of the American Bar Association, vol. 59, 1934, pp. 629–633.)

Affiliation of the American Bar Association with the Union Internationale des Avocats was approved at Boston, in 1936 (61 Am. Bar Reports, 273–277, 846–847).

But since that time rapid developments in the world, and the closer drawing of the ties of friendship and commerce in many directions among the countries of this hemisphere, have increasingly indicated the value of an association here in this hemisphere, of the lawyers of the different countries of the New World, among themselves, without regard to the Old World, for all of the purposes outlined for general world association in the American Bar Association committee's 1934 report; and for the cultivation of the spirit of good neighborliness and friendliness among the lawyers in the different countries of this hemisphere, in these emergent times—bearing in mind always that the lawyers comprise so large a part of the intellectual and administrative and legislative leadership of the various countries—leadership that both reflects and leads the currents of thought.

The American Bar Association soon fell in with this trend toward a separate intercontinental association in the Americas. In line with the Brazilian idea expressed by the president of the bar association of that country back in 1933, as already quoted from the report of the committee of the American Bar Association in 1934, that "a greater approximation between the bars of Brazil and the other countries of the Americas and their colleagues in this country should be sought," the American Bar Association, at its meeting in 1937, adopted through its house of delegates a resolution reading (62 Am. Bar Reports, 393)—

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association, in its sixtieth annual meeting, held in Kansas City, in the State of Missouri, expresses itself in favor of cooperation with the other 21 national bar associations of the American continents in promoting uniformity of law in the Americas through the study and investigation of mutual problems of comparative law, and for this purpose it is recommended that, on the occasion of the forthcoming session of the Eighth International Conference of American States, to be held at Lima, Peru, in 1938, delegates or representatives of the said bar associations of the Americas meet with a view to taking appropriate steps for the preparation at subsequent meetings, to be held in connection with later inter-American conferences, of projects on certain phases of comparative law problems pertaining to the Americas."

Following that 1937 resolution, studies were made in the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association of methods for carrying its purpose into practical effect, and at the sixty-second annual meeting of the association at San Francisco in 1939, the section presented two resolutions, one relating to an inter-American bar association, and the other to an institute of comparative law for the Americas. Those resolutions were referred to the house of delegates, and by it back to the section on international and comparative law, for further exploration of means for putting their purposes into effect. The resolution with relation to an inter-American bar association read (64 Am. Bar Reports, 399):

"Whereas the American Bar Association adopted at its annual session in 1937 a resolution in favor of cooperation with other national bar associations in the Americas with a view to promoting uniformity of law in the Western Hemisphere;

"Whereas such cooperation would be greatly facilitated by the establishment of a central organization in which all the national bar associations in the Americas were represented:

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association with due regard to the membership of the American Bar Association in the international union of advocates favors the establishment of an inter-American bar association, authorizes the section of international and comparative law to explore fully the possibility of establishing such an association, and directs the said section to submit a report on the subject and recommendations as to future steps which should be taken for the realization of this project."

The section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association continued its studies through its committee on Latin American law, and the matter was presented to the Eighth American Scientific Congress when it convened in the city of Washington in May 1940, and, as I have already said, was considered by the ninth section of that congress and approved, and the constitution was signed. A number of drafts for such a project were presented by representatives of different countries taking part in the congress, showing widespread international interest in the idea. The different projects were harmonized in a committee of the ninth section of the congress of distinguished representatives of various countries, headed by the Honorable William S. Culbertson, former Ambassador of the United States to Chile, so that the constitution as finally adopted, while it follows in the main the draft prepared by the committee on Latin-American law of the American Bar Association's section, yet also embodies some features taken from drafts prepared by eminent lawyers from other American countries, and truly reflects the composite thought and the results of the joint labors of representatives of the bar associations of all of the countries taking part in the congress.

The constitution of the Inter-American Bar Association is molded broadly upon the underlying principles of that of the International Union of Advocates, to which reference has already been made. Like that of the International Union of Advocates, it adheres to a basic

principle which the distinguished special committee of the American Bar Association in its 1934 report "deems to be vital," that "the basis of the affiliation should be representative, i. e., by delegates from organized bars of the respective nations and not by individual membership. By this means alone could the affiliation become truly comprehensive and typical of the respective bars.[2] Experience in other professional fields makes this so plain that it needs no argument."

Accordingly the membership of the new Inter-American Bar Association is composed of delegates of two classes of associations:

1. "National associations": Nation-wide professional organizations of lawyers in independent nations and self-governing dominions in the Americas.

2. "Constituent geographical associations": Professional organizations of lawyers in constituent States, provinces, territories, cities, and other subdivisions of independent nations, self-governing dominions, and colonies in the Americas.

Professional associations of lawyers devoted to particular branches of the law, such, for example, as an association of patent lawyers, or as this Federal Bar Association, whether Nation-wide or local, may be admitted to membership but, as the constitution of the association provides, "shall be entitled to representation and to vote in the conference and to representation in the council, only on the basis of constituent geographical associations."

The purposes of the Inter-American Bar Association are stated by its constitution to be—

"To establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchanges of views."

"To advance the science of jurisprudence in all its phases and particularly the study of comparative law; to promote uniformity of commercial legislation; to further the diffusion of knowledge of the laws of the various countries throughout the Americas.

"To uphold the honor of the profession of the law, and to encourage cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere.

"To meet in conference from time to time for discussion and for the purposes of the association."

The provisional officers of the Inter-American Bar Association, elected to serve until the first conference at Habana, are:

President, Dr. Manuel Fernandez Supervielle (president [dean] of the Habana Bar Association).

Vice presidents (one to be named by each country).

Secretary general, William Roy Vallance.

Assistant secretary general, Curtis Shears.

Treasurer, William Cattron Rigby.

Organization committee (provisional executive committee): Natalio Chediak (Cuba); J. Blanco Uztariz (Venezuela); Luis Anderson (Costa Rica); Dantès Bellegarde (Haiti); Camilo de Brigard Silva (Colombia); William Cattron Rigby (United States), chairman.

In these troubled times the value of such an intercontinental association among the lawyers of the democratic countries of this hemisphere seems doubly clear. Democracy is truly on trial. It is needful for the peoples of these countries who have it, and believe in it, to take every opportunity to manifest their belief, and to show its value to the world. The lawyers of every country have always been numbered among the foremost exponents of liberty. There was a time when it seemed unnecessary to defend the theory of democracy. Throughout the nineteenth century the tide ran strongly in its favor. It was apparently assumed everywhere, even in countries under monarchic forms of government, that the democratic form was ideally the best. But that is no longer the case. Our forefathers thought it sufficient to set every man on his own feet, and to leave him free to run his own race. But we are coming to be compelled to recognize that that alone is not sufficient; that there are other forms of freedom that apparently appeal even more strongly to a great portion of mankind than do the traditional ideals of freedom of action and liberty of speech of the democratic form of government. Predominant among these other forms is freedom from economic insecurity. That is the deep basis of the appeal of Nazi and Fascist forms of government; an appeal which we must recognize is making intellectual headway throughout the world. It is our job, the job of the democratic peoples, to preserve our established traditional forms of liberty, liberty of speech, liberty of individual action, liberty of individual enterprise; and at the same time to work out and to secure this additional new kind of liberty which the needs of our time demand, the liberty from economic insecurity; to harmonize this additional form with our traditional forms of freedom; and to preserve and to restore the crusading faith of our fathers and of all the democratic peoples in their ideals of government. That is the job, primarily, of the lawyers of democratic countries. It rests on them, more than on any other one group among the peoples; more than on any other profession. It demands their best brains, and their best efforts. It requires association among the lawyers of the different countries; acquaintance with each other; knowledge of each other's trends of thought; personal contacts; intercommunication of all sorts. To aid, even a little, in that great work, is among the primary tasks of the Inter-American Bar Association.

[2]A proposed amendment to the constitution of the Inter-American Bar Association, offered by Mr. Phanor J. Eder, a distinguished international lawyer of New York, who was a member of the American Bar Association committee to which reference has heretofore been made, now pending for consideration at the association's first conference, to be held in Habana, would permit admission of distinguished individuals as "honorary members." That, however, if adopted, would not change the essential character of the organization as a delegated body, representative of the organized bars of the different countries.

Selective Training and Service Act of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

STATEMENT BY GEN. CLAUDE V. BIRKHEAD, MAJOR GENERAL COMMANDING THE TEXAS NATIONAL GUARD, ON THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks and include therein statement made by Gen. Claude V. Birkhead, major general commanding the Texas National Guard, I submit herewith General Birkhead's statement made to committee hearing on the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Several members of the Texas delegation in the House have requested me, as chairman of the Texas delegation, to have General Birkhead's statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CLAUDE V. BIRKHEAD, MAJOR GENERAL, TEXAS NATIONAL GUARD—STATEMENT TO COMMITTEE HEARINGS, SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Gentlemen, I thank you for the opportunity to appear at this hearing. I strongly oppose the bill under consideration because it carries provisions for a peacetime draft and from a practical standpoint I do not believe it is one that will work except in war. I do not believe that mothers and fathers will support any system which contemplates the drafting of their sons in peacetime nor one which contemplates retaining the right to call their boy to service over a period of years. At this time national defense requires consideration of action in (a) emergency when (as now) we should have selective service to last for the emergency, and (b) peacetime training that will keep us prepared. In 1919 I made a study of preparedness for our country and compiled a long-range plan of peacetime preparedness under which military training would be popular and which could be successfully administered to the youth of our land without excessive expense.

The outline of that plan is as follows:

1. The establishment and maintenance of a thorough national system of universal military training to be administered locally by citizen soldiers. (This is now R. O. T. C.-C. M. T. C. system.)

2. The establishment and maintenance of an organized militia, a citizens' army (National Guard), controlled and coordinated by its own citizen-soldier staff corps, and entirely aside from the control of the Regular Army (in peacetime, but at command in war) a coordinate corps, not a subordinate.

3. The establishment and maintenance of a trained and organized reserve of officers and men, who shall be passed into this reserve as a result of the universal training system and the citizen army.

4. A small Regular Army, large enough to garrison the Philippines, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and our continental posts, plus, say, 100,000 men (for fighting units), plus the personnel necessary for a chemical warfare service and an air service, would be ample; total, about 400,000.

That plan was presented to the Members of Congress in 1919 and 1920.

You will note that all three of the basic elements in this plan were then adopted either in whole or in part. No. 1, the plan of training in schools and colleges and field training camps proposed then was partially adopted and is in our present law, and is represented by the R. O. T. C. and the C. M. T. C. systems. No. 3, the trained organized Reserve of officers and men, was adopted insofar as the officers were concerned, and today there are more than 100,000 Reserve officers who are subject to call in a national emergency. The Reserve of enlisted men was not adopted until 20 years later, and then partially only. The Chief of Staff, General Marshall, testified a few days ago that there are now 30,000 men in the enlisted Reserve who had formerly had military training who could be called to fill in the Regular Army. Had that been adopted in 1920, together with the system of universal military training, this Reserve would have numbered many times 30,000, and, besides, there would not be a young man in this country physically fit, under 36 years of age who had not received good military training during the five junior-high and high-school years that would enable him quickly to take his place in the defense lines of our country and to efficiently fill it. Point 2 in that plan, the citizens' army, was adopted with provisions to increase its numbers to about

500,000 and is now known as the National Guard. It, like the others, has only been partially supported, and the National Defense Act has not been carried out.

On June 30, 1940, the week before last, the authorized strength of the National Guard of the United States was 251,195 instead of about 500,000, as it should be, and it had an aggregate of 252,698. The shortage in the present authorized strength of officers in the guard is 1,134 and in the enlisted strength 7,363. I mention this because there has been considerable discussion about the inability to get enlistments. Seven thousand three hundred and sixty-three sounds big, but I point out that there are about 3,700 units in the guard, so that the officer shortage is less than one-third of an officer for each unit and less than two enlisted men for each unit. There is a maximum above which a company commander must not enlist, so you realize that if his company is at full strength, he must go under maximum before he dares add another enlistment. This, together with the mechanics of processing men in and out and other small factors, makes it impossible for a company to be anything but under strength, and two per unit under strength is nothing. The guard recently was increased in strength. They have absorbed that. In the Thirty-Sixth Division, Texas National Guard, which I have the honor to command, we had 1,499 additional authorized. On June 30, my division was short 36 officers out of a total of 752, or about one-fifth of an officer per unit, and 177 enlisted men, or about one man per unit. Raise the authority to whatever you will and and we will still be short of maximum for the reasons stated. At this time, every day we are required to discarge men who have been recruited for the Army and Navy. We have to replace them. I do not believe that the guard has had any great difficulty in enlisting, except that which arises from the present uncertainty about what is going to happen to the guard and the continuous loss to the regular services.

Last week I received a telegram from headquarters, Thirty-sixth Division, that 96 towns in Texas have applied for new National Guard units.

This and the demand for R. O. T. C. units in schools show the people are sold on the present system.

What I have said about enlistments in the National Guard and the strength thereof makes apropos a discussion of the ability of the Regular Army to sustain itself by voluntary enlistment.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, than whom no officer in the Army stands higher with the National Guard, as I understand it, indicated recently in the hearing on first supplemental national defense appropriation bill that a strength of 375,000 men in the Regular Army at this time, peace strength, with the authority to bring the Army up to war strength was satisfactory from his point of view, and in respect to the enlistments to meet that strength General Marshall stated on June 15 of this year, "I do not anticipate any trouble." The trouble he anticipated was too great a number in the Regular Army at this time because of the difficulty of training and supplying them. In this connection he stated:

"Another factor which convinces me that our policy is a correct one is the matérial problem. If we should continue to expand the Regular Army, we would be forced to obtain equipment for the new units by taking it from the National Guard. That would be a very unfortunate, a very unwise thing to do. We would have to strip the National Guard and certainly destroy its morale. Then, instead of its being the nucleus of a very valuable force, it would be seriously weakened, if not fatally emasculated."

The outline I shall submit for perfecting our present national-defense system, if adopted, will I think eliminate all difficulty in obtaining enlistments in the Regular Army.

The chance for an enlisted man to become an officer in the Army may be as much as 1 in 100 and 99 to 1 that the best he can do is to retire after 30 years' service as a technical sergeant or a warrant officer. Change this and give the qualified boy a 50-50 chance to become an officer through the simple process of enlisting and making good, and you will find no difficulty in enlistments, and while the enlisted personnel of the Army is of a pretty high type now, such change will bring a much higher average personnel to the Army. With such a change, your boy and mine could get our approval to enlistment. At present you and I will not approve. Only yesterday I was told an instance exactly of this and the boy did not enlist.

There has been talk of Swiss systems and of this and that, but why talk of copying the Swiss or other foreign systems? There is nothing the matter with our own defense system except that it has not been put into full effect.

There is needed:

(1) A sufficient Navy for each side of the continent. It seems that is now being provided for.

(2) Increase the officer and noncommissioned officer personnel of the National Guard to war strength so as to now provide and train the necessary key men to handle expanded numbers and added equipment. This is preferable to increasing the number of organizations. The Guard is an emergency organization. If a national emergency is threatened, then there should be no hesitancy in calling them for such service as the emergency seems to require. (And do it now.)

(3) Increase the Regular Army to about 400,000 to provide at least 10 thoroughly mechanized divisions now, and in addition meet the necessities of a superior air force. The Regular Army should be big enough to take care of sporadic necessities arising in connection with the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, provide the air force, and to garrison our possessions and our continental stations. (Apparently done.)

(4) Make junior and senior R. O. T. C. effective in every junior high and every high school, and in every college and university in the land. Heretofore many schools could not get R. O. T. C. because of lack of funds. This training should not be compulsory, but be a "required" course for promotion or graduation just as mathematics is now a required course. Administer this as a normal school activity, not extracurricular, through capable officers drawn from local officers of the Reserve Corps and National Guard so as to preserve home acquaintance and atmosphere. (And do it now in time for September opening.)

(5) Provide training camps for field training of all R. O. T. C. boys, as well as C. M. T. C. and others. (And do it now.)

(6) Increase and amplify the Officers Reserve Corps (and do it now). This is a basic element of our national-defense system and, in comparison to this opportunity for training, its members are well-trained and efficient. They compare very favorably with officers of the Army and the Guard. Right now it can probably furnish all of the officers needed for the immediate emergency. Provisions should be made for annual field training of the entire corps. As time goes on, the increase in this corps would be the natural result of the increase in the R. O. T. C. and C. M. T. C. under Nos. (4) and (5) above.

(7) West Point is a wonderful school, and its fine traditions, history, and efficiency should be turned into a school for training officers, not cadets. Increase it to the extent necessary, or establish similar officer schools as may be needed for the education of officers aside from that furnished by the various service schools.

(8) Provide material for these schools from officers made from selected graduates from the R. O. T. C.-C. M. T. C. systems and our great military schools, many of which administer practically the same education as West Point now does. Others would conform as need be.

(9) Divide the commissions in the Regular Army between those mentioned in No. (8) above and the enlisted personnel of the Army and National Guard, so that an Army career will be available to any qualified man simply by enlistment and then winning his way. This is the American way. (And do it now.)

(10) Provide for field training of the Army, all of the Guard, and all of the O. R. C. annually, in large bodies similar to the training that was done in the Third Army in the Texas-Louisiana maneuvers. (And do it now.) That training was, in my opinion, extremely valuable, value far above the cost. It demonstrated the bitter need of such training.

Had the system outlined above been put into effect in 1920 (see Aims and Purposes of the National Guard Association, published September 1919), practically every physically capable man under 36 years of age in this country would now be fairly well trained, and the development of officer personnel thereby would now furnish plenty of qualified officers.

Don't look to foreign countries for your system of training and national defense. Improve and perfect our own. It has demonstrated that it is successful. A compulsory system adopted now will not be supported by the people when security again returns to us.

This plan avoids the dangers of centralization and of militarism. It democratizes our entire military establishment.

The promotion of a major portion of the officers from the ranks would open a military career to any capable young man which he could adopt simply by enlisting in the Army and making good as officer material. It should result in the selection of officers because of demonstrated aptitude and qualities of leadership.

It preserves the local civilian military organization, and the local esprit de corps and morale.

It will prove a national asset because of the production of a better manhood physically, mentally, and morally.

As a measure of preparedness against war it will be entirely adequate.

It furnishes an immense reservoir of trained men, officers, and officer material, both in the organized and unorganized reserve.

Its cost is vastly less than any other system proposed, less than one-third as costly as the bill proposed.

Training as it does without taking the boy away from school or from business pursuits after he has entered them, its saving in economic loss is almost beyond calculation.

It provides an active, equipped organization and a ready organized reserve of great numbers that would be immediately available for any emergency.

This plan renders a large standing army unnecessary. A small Regular Army, large enough to garrison the Philippines, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and our continental posts, plus say 100,000 men (for fighting units), plus the personnel necessary for a Chemical Warfare Service and an Air Service, would be ample.

Our present system insofar as it has been permitted to operate has proved itself to be a success and has the hearty support of the people.

Now as to the basic training system, I think you gentlemen know that in your respective States there are many schools clamoring for R. O. T. C. (I know that Chairman SHEPPARD knows because I have, through him, tried to get R. O. T. C. for many schools in Texas.) They would all have had them had the R. O. T. C.-C. M. T. C. system been supported properly, and instead of the few thousands, there would have been 10 times those few thousands now receiving training.

A few public and a few private schools have R. O. T. C. or Junior R. O. T. C. Literally hundreds of schools, public and private, want R. O. T. C. and will pay all of the extra costs and expenses. To grant these applications means practically nothing

except the authority to call their school an R. O. T. C. Junior or an R. O. T. C. school, and the loan of a few of the thousands of the rifles now in cosmoline and a little supervision. I understand we have a presently sufficient supply of Springfields and a reserve of about 600,000 Enfields, plenty of rifles to lend for training. If needed, they could be gotten back in 48 hours. Another answer is made that there are not sufficient officers to allot to this training. It seems that by law or regulation it requires 1 Regular Army major for each private school so that in my own town, San Antonio, there are 2 private military schools, each having a major to supervise 150 or 200 R. O. T. C. each, while in the public schools there are 5 or 6 different schools that have these units with 1,200 or 1,500 cadets and 1 major supervises all of them. This 1 major instructor-inspector could take on every private school in San Antonio without loss of efficiency in the instruction. I understand that each public school furnishes the commandant of cadets and assistants at its own expense and the private schools furnish their own uniforms. In the public schools the Government does issue some uniform equipment. I think under the present system the private schools get the exclusive use of the Regular officer free. If true, that is basically wrong. Amend and authorize Junior R. O. T. C. to take boys from 12 years up and amend so it will not require so many Regular Army officers to supervise these schools. The Officers' Reserve Corps now can and will furnish all the officers needed as instructor-inspectors, commandants, and assistant commandants of these schools.

Let no one tell you that our Reserve officers are not capable of administering this training either with or without the supervision of a regular officer. Let no one say that the Army has so failed in its mission of training the Officers Reserve Corps. I think no one will dare say to the more than 100,000 Reserve officers all over America that they are failures and the system that produced them is a failure. I know better. I have had hundreds of them serve under me, and I know that they average up mighty well. I understand that the Army takes this same attitude and feels that the system has ready for their use at this time all of the Reserve officers they now need except possibly second lieutenants, and that they don't want to amplify and increase the Reserve system. If the system doesn't produce enough second lieutenants, obviously it is because the many hundreds of schools wanting them have been and are today unable to obtain R. O. T. C. Junior units covering boys from 12 years old up. The schools are clamoring, and the boys themselves are clamoring, for the training. Witnesses before this committee have said we were so woefully short in training. We are short in that type of training but not so short as we are so pitifully short in large unit field training for our Army and our Guard.

If a real war emergency comes, the present O. R. C. would be exhausted with the first million men. This Congress should issue a mandate to the Army to increase and perfect the R. O. T. C.-C. M. T. C.-O. R. C. system to where it will produce officers for at least 4,000,000 men.

Anyone who witnessed the Louisiana maneuvers had demonstrated to him, especially by comparison with the Second Division and a few other longer trained units, the glaring need of more of such training, and yet the quarter of a million men of the guard remain at home in uncertainty, wondering why all this "march them up the hill and march them down again" and months lost that might have been devoted to that essential training. I do not know what those maneuvers cost, but I will say that our Army never got more value out of money spent than was gotten in those maneuvers. They were well conceived, planned, and executed, and the Army is to be congratulated on them.

If there is an emergency, a real emergency, it is almost criminal not to have had that quarter of a million men and officers and the sixty or seventy thousand of the Regular Army in the new organizations in intensive field training. If there is no emergency or threatened emergency, we should say so and tell the guard to stay at home and tell the Regular Army they need neither men, more training, nor equipment.

The National Guard is an emergency force. It should not be called or ordered except in an emergency or a threatened emergency, but if such exists it should be inducted without hesitation. They are ready and willing. There are 22 divisions in the National Guard, and the commanding generals of all 22 divisions of the guard, and a great many of the adjutant generals of the State, and a great many of the commanding officers of separate regiments and brigades have voiced the willingness of the National Guard as a whole to perform the mission for which it has trained for 20 years. I believe they feel that the emergency now threatened is a serious one. The morale of the National Guard is of the highest and its equipment for intensive training is greater than it ever has been since the World War.

No projectiles are fired in maneuvers; training for the use of the high-powered weapons, with which we shall later be equipped, can be administered practically as well by simulation as with the actual weapons. Hitler trained with vehicles camouflaged as tanks and many other such. A truck can simulate a tank, a trailer a gun, etc., etc.—the mechanics of movement and of battle can thus be taught nearly as well as with the real thing. The truth is that troops in large bodies require more training in the mechanics of movement and the mechanics of battle, coordination, cooperation, liaison, etc., than they do in the actual handling of their weapons; or, to put it another way, to attain efficiency in the mechanics of movement and of battle requires a longer time of training than does the handling of the weapons, for, after all, whatever weapons we may be equipped with in the future, they are very similar to weapons now in the hands of our troops. We now have automatic pistols and semiautomatic guns, 30- and 50-caliber machine guns, 37-millimeter guns, and 75-millimeter mortars, etc., the shooting of which the great body of our troops understand. New equipment will not so much differ in type and methods of handling as it will differ in the number of such weapons allotted to the units.

Our military experts have not, so far as I know, proposed that we abandon the system which has demonstrated itself to be a success even in its partial use. Though talked of by others, none has proposed the adoption of the Swiss or other foreign system, but they may desire to superimpose something on it such as draft for peacetime.

The draft law is all right in war or for a major emergency, and we should now have one ready for use when needed, but if because we are now intense about national defense, a proposal which provides for peacetime draft of our boys and our men for peace service (as distinguished from training), you will find that when the piping times of peace come again it will fail because you gentlemen then, and practically all the rest of your citizenship, will refuse to permit your sons to be drafted into a peacetime Army.

Adopt a peacetime draft system and your people will not support you in it when peacetime comes.

Perfect your own system and do it now. Your people will support you.

CLAUDE V. BIRKHEAD,
San Antonio, Tex.

Why Wallace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, considerable uncertainty and confusion seem to exist among commentators, editors, and even among many of the Democratic delegates to the Chicago convention, themselves, as to why President Roosevelt personally insisted on the selection of Henry Wallace as his running mate in the forthcoming election. Judging from the jeers and boos which greeted every mention of Secretary Wallace's name during the nominating roll call, many of the rapidly diminishing contingent of Jeffersonian Democrats left in the New Deal party which has come to replace the traditional Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson hoped up until the very last that they might be permitted by the boss in the White House to have something to say about the convention which bore their party label but which booed their party heroes, traditions, and elder statesmen. Their hopes were in vain.

The man upon whom the party had heaped too many superlatives had captured their party and did a superlative job of dictating its every action from beginning to end.

BUT—WHY WALLACE?

However, even though the influence and inspiration of regular Democrats like Carter Glass, Millard Tydings, Speaker Bankhead, Jim Farley, Jack Garner, and other war horses of democracy were thrown into the proverbial ashcan of discarded disciples along with the philosophy and preachments of Andrew Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, William Jennings Bryan, and other Democratic statesmen of a more glorious era of that late-lamented party, some still ask the question of "Why Wallace?" It was the Republican Wallace against the field of Democratic entries, and the Republican won. Why? I think it is an ill-considered question to which the answer is as obvious as the cunning with which the President planned and promoted his own renomination. Robert C. Albright, Washington Post columnist, suggests the complete answer in a one-sentence paragraph in last Sunday's Post.

President Roosevelt may forget his party platforms before the ink on them is dry or renounce them completely as he did in the case of the foreign-affairs plank of the platform adopted in Chicago, but his memory is superb in remembering whom among his associates deserve the lash of punishment or the touch of royal reward. He rewards his flatterers and punishes his critics with equal gusto and determination. Witness the attempt to drive from public life and

into obscurity such obstructionists—as he denominated them—as Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa; Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland; Senator "COTTON" ED SMITH, of South Carolina; Senator GEORGE, of Georgia; and others who dared to criticize or oppose his drive for enhanced Executive power. And his affection for such unquestioning followers as Frank Murphy, Harry Hopkins, Robert Jackson, Sidney Hillman, and others of the inner circle of the undemocratic party of the New Deal has been equally demonstrated by his repeated promotion of these new patron saints of what was one time the party of democracy.

To anyone who has followed the manner in which the President has swung the lash or awarded the toga, his insistence that it must be none but Wallace is not surprising. It is found in the following short but significant paragraph from Robert C. Albright's article analyzing the recent Chicago puppet show:

He (Wallace) was the first important administration figure ever to propose the President for a third term in a public speech.

Mr. Speaker, there you have the answer to the President's drive for Wallace in the potent story of 20 words. Wallace was the first man in the President's Cabinet to suggest openly that the President be given the goal which he coveted above all else. And Mr. Wallace followed through. The President got the nomination which he craved. My friends, the President is no piker. He rewards his idolaters. He named the Secretary as his running mate.

"Drafted" by Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SAYRE (PA.) EVENING TIMES

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the so-called drafting of President Roosevelt for a third term by the Democratic Convention at Chicago last week fools no one. It was premeditated by the President and his close political friends and was the result of many months' hard work before the convention. As stated in an editorial in the Evening Times of Sayre, Pa., which follows, the issue is clear and simple. It is Roosevelt—Roosevelt, his record and his ambition. His record for real achievement during the past 7 years is bad but his desire for more and greater power is still unsatisfied. I believe, as does the editor of the Times, that in November the people of this country will overwhelmingly decide that we want no Hitler here in this country and that there is more than one man in this country able to run the affairs of this Nation.

"DRAFTED" BY HIMSELF

That the campaign now under way will be hard fought and perhaps unparalleled in bitterness in the history of American politics seems certain.

Having succeeded in "drafting" himself for a third term at the Roosevelt one-man convention in Chicago, Franklin D. Roosevelt now attempts to perpetuate himself in office by shattering the third-term tradition, faithfully observed by the Nation since the days of Washington.

The issue thus becomes clear. The issue is Roosevelt—Roooosevelt, his record and his ambition.

The manner in which the President has completely assimilated what was once the Democratic party and converted it to his own ends reeks of totalitarianism. That he wants to continue in the White House after the expiration of the two-term limit which has been the tradition of America since the beginning of independence, has an ominous meaning to the people of this Republic.

Mr. Roosevelt's record in the White House is too well known to require repetition. Debt, taxes, more debt, more taxes, experimentation, defenselessness, and a steady, planned drift to centralization of all power of government in the White House.

With Harry Hopkins at the Chicago end of a private telephone line to the White House and easily 90 percent of the delegates living off taxpayers' money under the New Deal, the stage was set from the opening day of the Roosevelt convention in Chicago for the ratification of Roosevelt's third term ambitions. This was not a great, deliberative political convention in the American manner. It more closely resembled a Hitler Nazi Party congress.

It might well be a preview, however, of American political conventions in the future, should Roosevelt be elected to a third term.

Thus, then, the campaign gets under way. Wendell Willkie, nominated by the overwhelming demand of public opinion as the Republican standard bearer, pledged to a free America for free people; Franklin D. Roosevelt, seeking to perpetuate himself in office with all the dangers to liberty and the future of this Nation that that implies.

When this issue is made clear to the voters, as it will be, the third term will be dealt the death blow at the polls it so richly deserves. The decision should be so overwhelming that no man will ever again have the temerity to aspire to life tenure in the White House.

What Goes On in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on July 14, 1940:

Good afternoon. This is another of my 30-minute broadcasts on the subject of what is going on in Congress. Once each month since January 1939 I have enjoyed the opportunity of reporting to my constituents. Judging from the mail I receive following each of these broadcasts, I am convinced that there is an increasing interest in this subject. That statement should not be surprising when we realize that the decisions made by Congress during the past 2 years will affect the well-being of every citizen, as well as the happiness of generations yet unborn.

At this time of crises our thoughts and our every effort should be directed toward solving the problem of how we can speedily build up and properly equip an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force of sufficient size and strength to convince any aggressor that he could not successfully attack the United States. At the same time we must remain firm in our desire to maintain an honorable peace.

Before I go into a discussion of our national-defense problems, and I use the plural advisedly because our problems are numerous, I would like to refer briefly to a few other subjects on which the House of Representatives has taken action since I last reported to you.

Two things have happened recently in Washington which I think indicate a very healthy condition. The first is that Congress did not adjourn on June 22, as originally planned. The second is the approval of the Hatch "clean politics" bill.

The reason that Congress did not adjourn last month is due solely to the fact that the people of this country made it known in no uncertain terms that they wanted Congress to stay in session throughout the present emergency. That we face a very real emergency cannot be denied by anyone who has voted for, or approved of, the huge appropriations recently made by Congress for the use of the Army and Navy. Early in June the President stated at a regular press conference that Congress could pass the necessary legislation and adjourn by June 22. He further stated that if Congress stayed in session after that date it would only be for the purpose of making political speeches. Mr. RAYBURN, majority floor leader of the House, stated on the floor of the House that he would offer an adjournment resolution on or before June 22 and that it would be adopted.

The idea of insisting on the adjournment of Congress was forgotten when it was discovered by the House leadership that more than 100 Democratic members were ready to join with the solid Republican minority to defeat any adjournment resolution. Thus it was again proven that Congress will respond to the wishes of the people back home, if only they will make their wishes known clearly as they did in this case.

The second healthy situation recently apparent was the passage by the House of the Hatch bill. This bill passed the Senate several weeks ago, following 3 weeks of rather bitter debate. During that debate it was opposed by every Senator who represents a State from which we have heard much of corrupt political organizations, and voting with them were a few Senators who were honestly alarmed to see the Federal Government inject itself into purely State matters. After every effort had been made to load the bill down with undesirable amendments, and it had been sent

to the House for action, an effort was made to kill it in committee. In fact, it was at one time reported in the press that a motion made in the Judiciary Committee to table the bill had been adopted. That vote was reconsidered and last Tuesday the Hatch Act was approved in the House by a vote of 243 to 122. The following day the Senate agreed to the few changes made in the bill by the House and it now lies on the President's desk awaiting his signature or veto.

Inasmuch as I discussed the provisions of the Hatch Act in quite some detail during my May broadcast, I will not go into its provisions again.

It would perhaps be worth while to take a few minutes to discuss the so-called Bridges bill. This bill was recently passed by the House in an effort to get rid of an alleged undesirable alien. The bill itself was very brief, simply stating that the Attorney General should proceed forthwith to deport Harry Bridges, without regard to any other provision of law. From all I have read in the newspapers there is no doubt in my mind but that Harry Bridges is an undesirable alien and that he should be deported. But at this particular time it seems more important than ever before that we hold fast, not only to the Constitution, but to the Bill of Rights, and that we insure that no person shall be denied his or her right to proper trial. The only evidence before the House was the statement contained in the committee report which simply said that the proponents of the bill felt that Mr. Bridges was an undesirable alien and that further than that he was known to have associated with Communists. Mr. Bridges himself was denied a hearing before the House Committee and no evidence was offered that he was or ever had been a member of the Communist Party. It seems to me that if our immigration laws are so weak that we cannot deport an undesirable alien without passing a deportation bill for each case, we should certainly revise our deportation laws so that we can get rid of every undesirable alien, Mr. Bridges included.

I imagine that most of my listeners are familiar with the provisions of the so-called Smith bill, a bill amending the National Labor Relations Act. The press covered the debate on this bill rather thoroughly because of the interest of both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. in these proposed amendments. I have stated on numerous occasions that I would not vote for any amendment to the National Labor Relations Act that would weaken the declared purposes of the act as expressed in its preamble. I considered each of the amendments proposed with that thought in mind, and I am thoroughly convinced that rather than weakening the act these amendments will in fact strengthen it and make it more workable, and at the same time increase the chances for industrial peace. As finally approved by the House, the Smith bill had the support of the American Federation of Labor, according to a letter sent to each Member by Mr. William Green, president of that organization.

Now to the subject in which I know you are all interested—the efforts that are being made to improve and strengthen our national defense. In this regard I would like to go back to 1919 and review briefly what has taken place between then and the present time.

At the close of the World War, those who had been responsible for the maintenance of our Army and Navy felt that there were certain lessons that we should have learned from our experience in the World War. General Pershing expressed the thought of most military men when he said that never again should this country allow itself to reach such a state of unpreparedness as had prevailed in 1916 and 1917. After much study and the taking of a great deal of testimony from ranking officers of the Army and Navy, Congress enacted what has since been known as the National Defense Act of 1920. It was felt by those who wrote this National Defense Act that we should follow the time-honored American custom of maintaining a small standing Army, composed of professional soldiers, with a substantial reserve of both officers and enlisted men. Provision was made for the establishment of citizens' military training camps with the thought in mind that young men of high-school age could go to camp for at least 1 month each summer for a period of not less than 4 years. Our officer reserve was to be built up by the establishment of Reserve Officers' Training Corps in our various colleges. Unfortunately, Congress has never provided sufficient money to carry out this idea. Each year about twice the number who could be accommodated applied for training in the C. M. T. C. Instead of carrying out the provisions of the National Defense Act, the United States was intrigued by various disarmament plans. We signed a naval treaty with the other naval powers of the world and actually sank perfectly good battleships while other nations simply tore up blueprints. We signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war as a method of settling international disputes. I do not regret that we signed these treaties or that we made every possible effort to bring about disarmament and the maintenance of peace through such agreements. But we must now admit that this method has failed and that in a world such as we live in we must maintain an Army and Navy strong enough to protect our own shores.

If, in order to make secure our own liberties we must protect the entire Western Hemisphere, then certainly that should be done. I consider that a military question, and I am willing to follow the advice of men who have devoted their whole lives to the study of military and naval problems.

It may be a dangerous prediction to make, but I am thoroughly convinced that this phase of tremendous armament will be only temporary. The day will come, perhaps not in 5 years or even in 10 years, when the world will go back to the idea of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, for the simple reason that the countries of the world cannot afford to maintain the huge armies most of them are maintaining today. This period of attempting to bring about world peace through disarmament and treaties extended from 1919 to 1933. In 1933 two events took place that have had a tremendous effect on the lives of all of us. It was in 1933 that we saw the start of the Hitler regime and here in the United States the beginning of what we have come to know as the New Deal. And I certainly do not intend to imply that there is any connection between these two events. Hitler immediately started to rearm Germany with just one thought in mind—to avenge the defeat of Germany by the Allies in 1918. Here in the United States we continued to coast along, spending less money each year on our Army and Navy. It is a matter of record that during the campaign of 1932, President Roosevelt criticized the Hoover administration for spending too much money on national defense. And when he became President he proceeded to reduce Army and Navy appropriations by 35 percent below the previous year.

One thing that has puzzled me greatly in watching the developments of the past few months is the fact that we apparently knew very little of what was going on in Germany. Somebody fell down on the job. We maintain military attachés in every part of the world, and it was certainly the duty of our military representatives in Germany and elsewhere to advise our Government as to just what was taking place. One of two things is true: either our representatives in Europe failed to advise us, and if that is true they should be discharged from their posts, or else the President was aware of developments in Germany and failed to inform the Congress and the country.

From March 4, 1933, until May 16, 1940, Congress was given no intimation of the need for increased national defense. On May 16 the President called to the attention of the Congress the need for huge appropriations for our Army and Navy. That message to Congress was followed by a fireside chat the following Sunday evening. During the fireside chat the President contended that there was no need for alarm and that the situation was not as bad as the country apparently felt it was from reading his message on the 16th.

I have made every effort to find out just what the true picture is at the present time. General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army and a fine officer, testified that we could put into the field 75,000 fully equipped men. Under present conditions an army of 75,000 men is just a drop in the bucket in comparison to the numbers needed for a major conflict.

You may be interested to know just what equipment the Army actually has on hand at the present time. Starting with the large 90-millimeter guns, we have ordered 317 but we do not have a single one on hand at the present time. We have only 15 of the 37-millimeter antiaircraft guns, while we have on order 1,423. We have actually on hand 228 of the 37-millimeter antitank guns with 1,388 on order. We have 83 of the .50 caliber machine-gun packs with 962 on order. We have 16,264 of the 500–1,000-pound bombs with 49,000 on order. We have only 400,000 gas masks in the possession of the Army with one and one-half million on order. We have only 4,600 rounds of ammunition for our 37-millimeter guns, and we have recently ordered two and one-half million rounds. Important as tanks have proven themselves to be in modern warfare, we possess only 28 light or heavy tanks with 928 on order and delivery date uncertain. We haven't a single yard of woolen cloth out of which we could make army uniforms, while we actually need at the present time five and one-half million yards. That hardly seems believable when we think of the amount of money that has been spent on relief in those industrial cities of the country which are dependent upon the textile industry for their prosperity. We actually have on hand 38,000 of the new semiautomatic Garand rifles, and General Marshall stated that we should have a minimum of 240,000. And we have 141 of the 75-millimeter guns with 1,400 on order.

There has been a lot of misinformation circulated regarding the strength of our Army Air Service. General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, testified before a congressional committee that the Army has in its possession only 1,965 planes of all kinds—bombing, observation, and combat—but in response to a question he replied that every one was obsolete according to present standards. That statement is not quite as bad as it sounds, as General Arnold further explained that many of these ships were obsolete only because they did not have self-sealing gasoline tanks and because they were without armor protection.

I cannot understand where the engineering officers of the Air Service have been for the past 20 years. As a matter of fact, self-sealing gasoline tanks were known during the World War. I recall that a captain serving in France with the Army Air Service designed a self-sealing tank by making use of stretched rubber on the inside of the tank. This method was used quite successfully in several of the planes used at the front during the World War. In another case the pilots of one squadron took up a collection and bought armor from the French Government with which to protect the planes they were then using. It seems almost criminal that such important developments should have been overlooked during the past 20 years.

I have had several letters urging Congress to pass all needed legislation with the least possible delay and with a minimum of debate. Certainly no fair-minded person can criticize the way Congress has handled the national-defense legislation presented to it since May 16. The first request made by the administration was authority to increase the tonnage of the Navy by 11 percent. This bill was speedily passed, and almost before the ink was dry a second request was made to increase the strength of the Navy

by 70 percent. This second request was speedily granted. On May 16 the Navy was limited to the possession of not more than 3,000 planes. This limit was immediately raised to 4,500, and a few weeks later to 10,000. All limit has been removed from the number of planes the Army can possess, the only limitation being the size of the appropriation made by Congress for that purpose.

Recently I read in a letter appearing in the Hartford Courant Forum the statement that the President had requested a $4,000,000,000 expansion program originally but that the Congress had refused to grant that request. I immediately consulted the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee and the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee and both of these gentlemen have assured me that no such request was made by the President or anyone else.

This past week the President sent to Congress a message asking for an additional $5,000,000,000, approximately four billions to be used for the Army and the other billion for the Navy. Practically all of these funds will be used for the purchase of modern equipment, such as tanks, antiaircraft guns, planes, et cetera. It is apparent that we are embarking upon what will amount to practically a $15,000,000,000 national-defense program. This is a huge sum of money and it is going to mean a lot of sacrifice on the part of a lot of our citizens. I am sure that we are all willing to make the necessary sacrifice in order that we will be in a position to protect ourselves.

You may be interested to know that the $4,000,000,000 naval expansion bill passed the House with only 20 minutes of debate and not even a record vote. If anything, this is undue speed. I have pledged myself not to permit partisanship to influence any vote that I might cast on these various defense proposals. I do not believe, however, that that means every request should be granted without even studying the proposal. We need at this time a strong minority, not to harass the administration, but simply to serve as a check.

A study of the various bills passed by Congress since May 16 indicates that there is liable to be a great overlapping of effort. For example, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been empowered to loan money to existing industries and to create Government-owned corporations that are empowered to build and operate plants for the manufacture of material needed for the Army and Navy. In the Army appropriation bill, the Secretary of War is authorized to acquire factories or to build new factories for the manufacture of equipment needed by the Army, and the same authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy in the naval appropriation bill. No one can question the necessity of the Government building and operating so-called stand-by plants for the manufacture of 16-inch cannon, for example, or for other items that private industry is not equipped to turn out speedily. But I do not believe that it is necessary for the Government to enter into competition with private industries which can turn out needed materal at reasonable prices and with all possible speed. Somewhere in Washington there has been a bogging down of this expansion program. The necessary appropriations have been passed by Congress, the War and Navy Departments say that they have their plans ready, but for some reason actual contracts have not been awarded. I am informed that 14 contracts have been on the President's desk for more than a week awaiting his signature.

From every indication, private industry is making all possible efforts to cooperate with the Government in this emergency. We want to be sure that we profit by our experience during the last war and make certain that we will not have another crop of war millionaires as a result of this program. If excess profits are made on any of the contracts awarded you can rest assured that any unreasonable profits will be recaptured through tax legislation.

In addition to the procurement of needed supplies we face a problem, in the training of personnel. We can spend as much as $15,000,000,000 on the expansion of the Army and Navy but if we do not train men to operate this equipment we will not be much better off a year from now than we are at the present time.

The National Guard in each State is an important component of our Army. It is known that if we should face an invasion, the National Guard would be immediately mobilized and taken into the Army as a part of the Regular Army. Men who have enlisted in the National Guard have proven their patriotism and demonstrated their willingness to equip themselves so that they will be a valuable asset to their country in time of emergency. Certainly the least a grateful Government can do is to provide them with the best possible equipment and an opportunity for adequate training. You may be surprised to learn that money has not yet been requested by the War Department or the President to bring the National Guard units even up to peacetime strength. We now have 280,000 men in the guard and peace strength is 330,000. Justifiable criticism can be directed toward the administration of the War Department. Two months have elapsed since the President's message and in the meantime practically nothing has been done toward improving the efficiency of National Guard units except what has been done by the officers of the guard in the various States. It is nothing short of criminal not to give the National Guard the advantage of all possible training. In my humble opinion, the National Guard should be recruited to peace strength at once. They should be given 2 nights of drill each week instead of 1, along with week-end training occasionally. At least a few of the new Garand automatic rifles and a battery of the latest antiaircraft guns, and at least one of each of the latest weapons, together with competent instructors, should be sent into each State at once for training purposes. Following that the guard should have a reasonable period of intensive field training.

Officers with whom I have talked who went through the World War dread more than anything else the thought of ever having to lead untrained men into battle. We have an example right here in Connecticut of the serious lack of equipment. The War Department recently authorized the organization of an antiaircraft regiment. That regiment is now in camp undergoing a 3 weeks' training program, but as a matter of fact it has little or no equipment with which to train. Governor Baldwin and General DeLacour spent a day in Washington last week in an effort to get needed equipment, only to be told that none was available.

A few weeks ago the President requested authority to federalize and mobilize the National Guard and if necessary send them overseas. The use of the word "overseas" was unfortunate as it was later explained by General Marshall that what the War Department had in mind was the possibility of some South American Republic requesting troops from us to put down anticipated Nazi uprisings. The House Military Affairs Committee reported favorably a bill empowering the President to call out the National Guard for service in the United States, our island possessions, and the Panama Canal Zone. No action has been taken on this measure inasmuch as the request was predicated on the idea that Congress would adjourn in June. As long as Congress stays in session there is no need for enacting such authority to be used at some time in the future. If the need should arise to mobilize the National Guard the necessary legislation would be enacted by Congress within a few hours.

Again, judging from my mail, there is a great deal of interest in the question of compulsory military training. The proposal for universal military training has passed the academic stage. Hearings are now being held in both the Senate and the House on the Burke-Wadsworth bill, sponsored by the Military Training Camps Association and approved in principle by many high ranking Army officers. It is to be hoped that this plan will not be confused with the President's Youth Training Program. I am definitely opposed to the suggested plan of giving every young man and young woman a year's training under the direction of the Federal Government, in either military or nonmilitary capacities. The phrase "disciplinary training" by the Government does not sound American to me. The home, churches, and schools are still capable of training our youth without supervision or interference by the Federal Government. Universal military training, however, is something else again. In view of world conditions we must do one of two things—either build up a huge standing army of professional soldiers, and by huge I mean an army of one and one-half to two million men, or adopt a plan that will give us the needed backlog of well-trained civilian soldiers. I am not prepared to express approval or disapproval of any particular bill. Prompt study must, however, be given to the various proposals now before Congress.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill requires the registration of all male citizens between the ages of 18 and 65, but provides that military training shall be given only to those between the ages of 21 and 45, those in the other age groups to be trained for noncombatant services. I believe that for the next year or two we will have our hands full in carrying through to completion a program limited strictly to military training. It is undoubtedly true that men between 45 and 65 would be valuable serving as mechanics, chauffeurs, radio operators, and so forth, but certainly such men should have, at least, a minimum of military training. Imagine the confusion that would exist if we had some 600 or 800 civilian mechanics working in an airdrome which happened to come into the zone of fire—without some military training these men would become simply a mob. We must have some plan of military training that will disrupt the civilian careers of our young men to the very minimum. We do not want the United States to go militaristic. That was one of the things that we held against the Kaiser's regime in 1914. Unless some training program is speedily adopted, either by tremendous expansion of the C. M. T. C. idea, the expansion of the National Guard, or the requirement of 8 months to a year of training for a large number of men each year, we will find the real bottle neck of our preparedness effort will be trained personnel.

Much has been written about the wisdom of transferring our aircraft and munitions factories to a spot between the Alleghenies and the Rockies. At first thought such a suggestion seems to have merit. If such a move was necessary for a proper defense of the United States, no loyal citizen of Connecticut would object. But such is not the case. We have here in Connecticut the largest reservoir of skilled mechanics to be found anywhere in the United States. Further, if we take the 10 most likely points of attack on the United States, we find that from 5 of them Chicago, Ill., or Indianapolis, Ind., are nearer to the possible point of attack than is Hartford, Conn. Taking opinions expressed by a high-ranking Army officer well versed in defense measures, particularly from the air, we find that the terrain of central Connecticut, with its hills, trees, and numerous roads, would be an ideal territory to protect from hostile aircraft. If any of my listeners are particularly interested in this subject, I will be glad to send them more detailed information.

Recently I received from the Hartford Chapter of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies a letter asking me to answer 12 specific questions. I wish I had time this afternoon to go into detail concerning these 12 questions. But I think I have time to discuss briefly the aims and purposes of this organization. No one can question the patriotism of those who are sponsoring this organization or those who have enrolled as members. In addition to rendering aid to the Allies, or to Great Britain as matters now stand, they have made many valuable suggestions to Congress. No one can doubt that it is an asset to the United

States to have the British Navy between us and the aggressors in Europe, and, as I understand the committee's request, it is that all possible aid be sent Great Britain without violating international law, our domestic laws, or weakening our own national defense. Within those limitations there is little or nothing we can do to aid Great Britain. It is a matter of record that we have a shortage in every category of national defense. Take, for example, the recent shipment of 50 SBC4 dive bombers. No one can successfully maintain that these ships were either old or obsolete. As a matter of fact, no dive bomber has yet been designed that is an improvement on this particular model. A few of these planes were 10 months old while some of them had been delivered to the Marine Corps just 6 weeks before they were ordered shipped to Europe. We had in the United States 96 of these bombers before this order was issued, which leaves us now with only 46 on hand. Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, testified that it would take from 13 to 17 months to replace these ships. It seems to me that it is a tremendous responsibility for anyone to take when orders are issued permitting the export from the United States of military equipment that we may some day badly need right here. Supposing we go further than we should go in our efforts to aid Great Britain and wake up some morning to find that we are being subjected to attack from the other side of the world. Then, too, there is the question of international law. No one can question that it would be a violation of international law to turn over to any belligerent nation vessels owned and operated by our Navy. The suggestion was recently made that we sell to Great Britain 20 submarine chasers now being built for the United States. It is my understanding that these vessels are nearing completion. After the necessary authorization had been issued it was discovered that not only would it be a violation of international law, but of our domestic law, to allow these vessels to get into the possession of a belligerent nation. In addition to that is the fact that if we should have to defend ourselves, submarine chasers would be among the most important vessels operated by the Navy. Without the formality of any declaration of war we might find foreign submarines off our shores.

My sympathies, like the sympathies of the vast majority of our people, are, of course, with the victims of Europe's aggressors, and there are many ways by which we can aid these nations. We can and should ship to them huge quantities of surplus foods. We can and should immediately offer refuge to women and children now residing in Great Britain who are being subjected to cruel attack from the air. I believe that ships of the United States lines should be permitted to go to the ports of Great Britain and bring to the United States the refugees who want to come here. This could be done either by securing safe convoy from the belligerent powers or under the protection of the Red Cross. I am advised that much has been done to cut the red tape and to make possible the bringing of these refugees to the United States. I hope that all possible action will be speedily taken to increase the number that can come here. Before I leave the question of aiding Great Britain, I would like to point out that Great Britain is getting a great deal of help from the United States at this time. They are getting a majority of the output of our munitions factories and of our aircraft factories. They are getting more help than it would be possible to give them if we were actual participants in the war. At least at the present time there is no shortage of manpower in Great Britain nor is Great Britain short of credit or money. The day may come when we can do a great deal more good toward restoring peace permanently in the world as a nonbelligerent than we could ever do as a formal belligerent sitting at a peace-conference table.

Before I bring this broadcast to a close, may I again thank those of you who have written to me as these various proposals have been before the House? It is most helpful to receive the point of view of numerous constituents, and you can rest assured that your letters are always welcome.

The Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 18:

[From the New York Times of July 18, 1940]

HISTORICAL NOTE—SUBJECT: THIRD TERM

On February 10, 1928, the Senate of the United States adopted the following resolution:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from the Presidental office after their second term has become by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions.

Among those who voted to approve this denunciation of the third term as "unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions," were Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, permanent chairman and second keynoter of the convention now in progress at Chicago; Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, chairman of the platform committee of the same convention; Senator KEY PITTMAN, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate; Senator PAT HARRISON, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; Senator HENRY F. ASHURST, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate; and the following other distinguished Democrats, all Members of the present Senate: GERRY, GLASS, HAYDEN, KING, MCKELLAR, NEELY, SHEPPARD, SMITH, THOMAS of Oklahoma, TYDINGS, and WHEELER.

Resolutions of Fifth National Townsend Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE TOWNSEND NATIONAL WEEKLY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the resolutions adopted by the delegates at the Fifth National Townsend Convention, recently held in St. Louis, as follows:

[From the Townsend National Weekly of July 20, 1940]

TEXT OF CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS

St. Louis: The text of every resolution adopted by delegates at the Fifth National Townsend Convention in St. Louis follow:

DR. TOWNSEND

"Whereas Almighty God has blessed the Townsend Clubs of America in the preservation and protection of our beloved leader during this past year, and has given him the strength and health to carry on in this mighty work; and

"Whereas we of this great convention are duly grateful for the services of this great man, Dr. Francis E. Townsend: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Townsend clubs of America in this fifth national convention assembled, recommend that Dr. Francis E. Townsend shall continue as the president and leader of the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., but if, for any reason, Dr. Townsend is unable to serve in such capacity, his son, Robert C. Townsend, shall become his successor as national leader and president of the Townsend organization, thereby perpetuating the name of Townsend, which has come to mean justice, security, courage, and recovery."

AMENDED MANUAL

"Whereas the 1939 amended Townsend Club manual is definite and certain in its structure and provides a real form of organization that will ultimately lead to complete democratization of the Townsend organization; and

"Whereas its system of club government is so complete that it stimulates each individual club to greater activity and greater unity; and

"Whereas this form of club government has not been in operation long enough to give it a fair trial and give it a sufficient opportunity to answer the objections which have been raised against it: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this convention go on record as accepting the 1939 amended Townsend Club manual with such corrections as imposed by the resolutions committee, if such corrections are acceptable to the convention, as the official Townsend Club manual for the ensuing year."

FINANCES

"Whereas the national headquarters is in need of funds to keep it in efficient operation, and

"Whereas funds are needed for extension of our Townsend Plan throughout the Nation by field workers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That wherever possible each club make a voluntary monthly contribution of not less than $5."

CONVENTION MANAGEMENT

"Whereas the fifth annual convention of the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., has reached the high mark thus far in the life of our organization and movement, furthered by the splendid work of the convention committee: Be it

"*Resolved by the delegates in convention assembled*, That we extend to this fifth annual convention committee and convention manager our heartiest congratulations upon the splendid success achieved here and extend to them our sincerest thanks for their efforts."

COURTESY

"Whereas the delegates to this convention have received the most courteous treatment at the hands of the citizens of the city of St. Louis: Therefore, be it unanimously

"Resolved by the delegates to this fifth annual convention, That we extend to the citizens of this beautiful city our sincere thanks for their great kindness."

THIRD TERM

"Resolved, That this organization go on record as being irrevocably opposed to a third consecutive term for any President of the United States."

MANUAL INDEX

"Whereas in the procedure of a meeting matters occur which must be settled by the manual, and although the president may be familiar with the manual, it is oftentimes difficult to find a particular section of the manual which is needed to rule on the situation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the manual issued as a result of this convention be completely indexed in such a manner that it will enable any club president to quickly discover any rule contained therein."

CONVENTION MANUAL

"Whereas the Townsend organization can function more effectively under one national program: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That one manual only be adopted at the national convention, which manual remain in effect throughout the year and can be changed only by a majority vote and national referendum of our membership."

TOWNSEND FLAG

"Be it resolved, That the Townsend national recovery plan have a flag with appropriate design that will signify our belief in security, democracy, and Americanism; be it further

"Resolved, That such a flag be displayed along with the United States flag at all of our Townsend Club meetings and rallies; and be it further

"Resolved, That Dr. Francis E. Townsend appoint a committee to design said flag."

TOWNSEND PLEDGE

"Whereas the term 'America' represents all of the territory in the continents of North and South America; and

"Whereas the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., as an organization, is specifically interested in obtaining the Townsend plan as a law in the United States: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the last clause of the Townsend pledge be changed to read: 'and rededicate myself to maintain the Democratic spirit and form of government in the United States of America.'"

MEMBERSHIP CARD

"Whereas all Townsend Club members should be required to accept the Townsend pledge: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That there be printed on the reverse side of the Townsend membership card a copy of the Townsend pledge and that under such a pledge there shall be a space provided for the member's signature."

TOWNSEND LITERATURE

"Whereas, many people who join Townsend Clubs are unable to attend club meetings thereby giving them no opportunity to enjoy a complete understanding of the principles of the Townsend plan, and

"Whereas, it is our desire that each new member be armed with sufficient information to enable him to spread the Townsend philosophy in the community and convert his friends and neighbors to become members of a Townsend Club: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Townsend national headquarters issue an attractive pocket-size booklet bearing the facsimile signature of Dr. Francis E. Townsend, explaining the fundamental principles of the Townsend plan, the method that we intend to use to procure the Townsend plan as a law, the organization of our clubs including such items as the Townsend creed, Townsend pledge, and the pledge of allegiance to the flag."

UNIFORM RECORD SYSTEM

"Whereas, it is important to the welfare of our movement to have a uniformity of records throughout our Townsend Clubs in order to avoid confusion and complications that often lead us into serious difficulties: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That national headquarters devise a uniform system of recording membership, finance (income and expenditure), and secretary's minutes of all club activities; and be it further

"Resolved, That proper membership, finance and secretary books be prepared for sale at a nominal price to all Townsend Clubs and Townsend youth associations."

SOCIAL-SERVICE COMMITTEE

"Whereas there are many Townsend club members eligible for State pensions in their respective States; and

"Whereas the administration of this old-age assistance and of relief is oftentimes unjust; and

"Whereas there is no reliable person or group of persons to which these people can go to ask for advice and counsel concerning the numerous problems that arise regarding this matter: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we recommend to the Townsend clubs of America that wherever possible the local clubs set up a social-service committee of well-informed people of tested integrity for the purpose of aiding these unfortunate people."

IN HONOR OF THOSE WHO HAVE SACRIFICED

"Whereas many devoted Townsendites who have sacrificed of their time, of their fortunes, and of their life have passed away since last convention time, and that this does occur in the period between conventions: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That at each national convention we set aside a minute of meditation and prayer in the memory of these folks who have passed away during the time since the last convention."

T. Y. A. PAGE IN TOWNSEND WEEKLY

"We, the members of the MacGlad Club 31, Cleveland, Ohio, in approval of the services and leadership of Dr. Townsend, national headquarters and the Townsend National Weekly, desire to call attention to the fact that the Townsend Youth Associations are not receiving through the columns of the Townsend National Weekly the publicity necessary to encourage its continuation and growth; and

"Whereas we well know and understand the Townsend organization has achieved its great success by reason of our national leadership and publicity accorded through our own Townsend National Weekly: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we request that recognition be given to the Townsend Youth Association through the columns of the Townsend National Weekly; and be it further

"Resolved, That this convention go on record as favoring a separate and distinct department for the Townsend Youth Association through the columns of the Townsend Weekly."

T. Y. A. RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Townsend Youth Association has proved to be an effective way of bringing youth into the Townsend movement, and

"Whereas the Townsend Youth Association is becoming a great asset to the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc.: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Townsend Youth Association become a permanent division of the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., and that the T. Y. A. continue to operate in accordance with the present T. Y. A. Manual."

RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Townsend bill now before Congress, unless it is made a law before this Seventy-sixth Congress adjourns, will become null and void: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Fifth Townsend National Convention delegates assembled in St. Louis authorize Dr. Francis E. Townsend to appoint a committee of members of our organization, to work in conjunction with a similar committee to be selected by our friends and supporters in the United States Congress, to properly draft, prepare, and present at the earliest opportune moment a bill embodying the principles of the Townsend plan."

PEACE RESOLUTION

"Whereas the people of any nation are best served by a democratic form of government; and

"Whereas the only way to preserve life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is through democracy; and

"Whereas it is probable such democracy cannot survive in war: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Fifth National Townsend Convention go on record as recommending to our people and our Government that in order to preserve our democratic form of government the United States must stay out of the European war and that we stand unequivocally opposed to the use of any of our manpower to fight any war apart from the Western Hemisphere and the defense of our Nation."

AMERICANISM

"Whereas proper adequate defense of the United States is of great importance at this hour when the rest of the world is at war; and

"Whereas it is imperative that we have a united Nation; and

"Whereas the members of the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., are true, loyal, and patriotic citizens of these United States: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we as delegates to the Fifth Townsend National Convention condemn all un-American activities; and be it further

"Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to aid a program of adequate defense to establish unity among our people, give our allegiance to the United States flag and to maintain a democratic spirit and form of government in America."

RESOLUTION

"Whereas the most indispensable first line of national defense is a people contented and happy because they are prosperous and secure, and who, therefore, feel a satisfaction and pride in their country, its traditions and institutions, and are willing to fight and, if necessary, to die for its preservation and perpetuation; and

"Whereas millions of our people have no such feeling toward our country because they have been steadily reduced to want, poverty, and the degradation of the dole, through no fault of their own, while, all of the time, they have been eager to find employment of their talents and abilities sufficiently productive to assure to them and their dependents a decent, American standard of living; and

"Whereas the situation in which these people find themselves, as well as that of our millions of poverty-stricken elderly citizens, can be speedily changed, and our entire national economy rapidly restored to conditions of stable prosperity, making possible provision of all necessary national defense goods and services without increasing our national debt, through the prompt enactment into

law of H. R. 8264, now pending before the House of Representatives of the United States Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this Fifth Annual National Convention of the Townsend Clubs of the United States goes on record as condemning in the most severe terms the totalitarian and dictatorial procedure whereby a handful of 13 Members of the House—the majority of the Ways and Means Committee—have been permitted to flout and thwart the will and desires of the millions of our citizens who live and vote in the districts of more than 180 of their colleagues, who have petitioned to withdraw this bill from the Ways and Means Committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we demand that the House of Representatives proceed to an early and affirmative vote on this bill, as a primary national defense measure, subject to further corrective amendment, if and when experience with the operation of the legislation indicates the same to be necessary or desirable, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched immediately from the convention to each of the Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States.

CONGRESSMEN

"*Be it resolved*, That all clubs and club members in any congressional district whose Congressman gave his vote to the Townsend bill on the floor of the House and has repledged himself to our program pledge to work for that Congressman in the coming election campaign to show that reciprocity and loyalty to those who have supported the Townsend movement will be observed by the entire organization."

"FIFTH COLUMNS"

"Whereas the delegates to this, the Fifth Townsend National Convention, do hereby acclaim to the whole world that our Townsend organization is fundamentally an American institution; and

"Whereas we Townsendites believe in the United States of America as a government 'of the people, by the people, and for the people,' whose just powers are derived from the consent of our citizens; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseperable; established upon the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity; and

"Whereas we Townsendites know it is our duty to our great country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to love and respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies from within and without; and

"Whereas we believe that the very first step necessary to get our Nation ready to defend itself against all foes, either domestic or foreign, is to make the American people happy and secure in those American principles which guarantee to all citizens, as a right of citizenship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to vote, the right to peacefully assemble, and the right to petition the Government of the United States for the redress of grievances; with the opportunity of securing economic freedom unto all citizens who but do their part; and

"Whereas we hereby take cognizance of the present dangers that tend toward the destruction of a government 'of the people, by the people, and for the people'; and

"Whereas free government and free men, in order to preserve those inalienable rights of religious liberty, political liberty, and economic freedom, and to protect our democracy against all enemies of liberty, self-government, and economic security in America demand the prompt consideration and earliest possible enactment of laws in each and every State of our Nation with respect to 'fifth column' activities: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this convention of the Townsend Clubs of America, duly assembled at St. Louis, Mo., that our national headquarters instruct the Townsend Clubs to sponsor the enactment of a uniform law in each State of the Nation defining 'fifth column' activities and providing penalties therefor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the attached proposed act be offered as the contribution of this convention in the safeguarding of our Nation from all acts of subversion, sabotage, and other un-American activities; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this convention, and that a copy be sent to the Governor of each State and to all Members of the Congress of the United States of America."

War Propaganda, 1917 and 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, under permission granted me, I present for publication in the RECORD another of the articles referred to by me at that time as being part of a series entitled "Twenty-five Years Ago."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The same propaganda technique that proved so valuable in 1915 and 1916 is being used today. That technique is to get our own native Americans, our own American businessmen, our own American clergymen (some like Bishop Manning are English, however they have lived here long enough that they are not listed as English), our own American officials, our own American writers to be propagandists. Some of these have reasons to be interested in the financial side of the war. Others are conscientious in their belief that the war is a life-and-death struggle for civilization. The latter group are the 1940 edition of the people who believed the last World War was a "war to save democracy" and a "war to end all wars."

England praised the work of our own American propagandists in the last World War. They did their work well and they were not suspected. They were the Trojan horses of their day. It was their work that aided America to get "educated"—as they used that word—for our entrance in that terrible conflict in 1917.

Many of those in official life are like J. P. Morgan, who told the Senate Munitions Investigating Committee that he was not neutral from the first day of the war. They chase a hope that we can be unneutral and stay out. They want to get part way in the war and stay part way out.

They have forgotten that many swimmers felt they could swim above Niagara Falls by defying the strong current. We have officials who feel the country can defy a like current in international affairs. The result will be that we cannot get back to the shore of neutrality, neither can we reach the other side of peace, but that we will go over, over into war, its death, and destruction.

Some know we can't defy the current if we get into the stream. Others feel we can. History shows we cannot.

Some of the same names are found behind the war-propaganda drive in 1940 that were active in the war-propaganda drive of 1914–17.

Some of the same international bankers, lawyers, and industrialists who financed the propaganda preceding the 1914–18 World War are financing the war propaganda of today.

They are using many of the same slogans, many of the same reasons, many of the same atrocity stories, many of the hysteria-inciting fears. All are not identical. Some have been given a present-day renovation, but the same base is found.

LORD LOTHIAN SAYS "BE CAREFUL"

But the schemers say "Be careful. Do the work but don't be caught." In the words of Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador:

"If American sentiment became persuaded that the United States was being maneuvered into commitment to war by foreign intrigue or for reasons of politics or finance, it might swing back violently to the ultraisolationism of the Ludlow amendment requiring a referendum before the United States entered a war."

He brought that up to date in a speech at Chicago when he said:

"The British Government is not trying to drag you into this war," and "if you are ever driven to action it will not be because of propaganda but because of the relentless march of events."

This same sentiment was echoed by Duff Cooper, Lord Marley, and by many others who have tried to convince the American people that this war is our war.

When commenting upon the appointment of Knox and Stimson to the President's Cabinet, the London press said:

"Further comment could not be obtained in responsible British circles, chiefly because they were reluctant to speak on American policy.

"There is a shrinking here from any pronouncement which might be considered as propaganda, and almost all estimates of American policies nowadays might come under that head."

SOFT PEDAL PRESSURE

It will be recalled that Attorney General Conant, of Canada, had said that it was Canada's duty to "do everything within our power to enlist the active support of the United States in the cause of the Allies." This created a bad impression in the United States and brought reprimand from England.

Don Campbell, writing from London, said this in his dispatch:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, April 6, 1940]

"BRITISH 'HUSH' IDEA IT'S UNITED STATES DUTY TO FIGHT—WANT FACTS TO SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

"(By Don Campbell)

"LONDON, April 5.—On the eve of the twenty-third anniversary of the United States' entrance into the World War the British Government tonight put the 'hush-hush' on any suggestions it is America's duty to enter the present war on the side of the Allies.

"Nevertheless American sentiment on the question of entering or staying out of the war is one of the chief topics of discussion, and that is why thousands of Britons are following the course of the Presidential race in the United States with almost as much interest as if they were electing their own Prime Minister.

"SOFT PEDAL ON PRESSURE

"They want to know whether President Roosevelt will seek a third term, whether an Allied sympathizer will get the nomination, and whether the American isolationists will come out on top.

"But the government, in accordance with Downing Street instructions, is soft-pedaling arguments on the question of whether

the United States is bound by moral and humanitarian responsibilities to line up with Britain and France.

"Too much high-pressure salesmanship of the Allied cause, the British have found, only generates sales resistance among the American people.

"Agitation along the lines of America's 'duty' have backfired in too many instances.

"The new British policy is that the Allies have an excellent case, strong enough to win American support, and the facts should be allowed to speak for themselves.

"In this connection the Ontario speech of Attorney General Gordon Conant saying it was the duty of Canada to do everything to draw the United States into the war on the Allied side was at odds with the official British policy. Britain has no power to dictate the policy of a Canadian or Ontario official.

"FIGHTING FOR DEMOCRACY

"Nevertheless, there is no reason to suppose Conant's speech was unwelcome because it provided a further opportunity to sound out American opinion without incurring any official British responsibility.

"Furthermore, the Canadians are in a far better position to urge the United States to join the war than the British because, as Britons say of the Canadians, 'they, too, are Americans helping the cause of the democracies in Europe.

" 'We are fighting for democracy and therefore we are fighting the war for the United States as well as for ourselves,' many Britons complain.

"HOPE UNITED STATES WILL FIGHT

"The British hope that if the war becomes a long struggle and the Allies are hard pressed the United States will join in to prevent a German victory. They eagerly seize upon any suggestions or indications supporting this hope.

"It is admitted generally in London that so long as the war remains unsettled, there is scant chance of bringing about any shift in American isolationist opinion.

"Nevertheless the British frequently draw a parallel between now and 1916, in the days before the United States' entrance into the war 23 years ago tomorrow."

Lord Lloyd's book, The British Case, has been circulated in America to get America to believe in the cause. However, it will be noted that this same Lord Lloyd was in the same school as that of Lothian, Cooper, Marley, and others. He did not want United States to be conscious that we were being propagandized. He so stated in 1939. His sentiment about this was almost identical with that expressed by Cecil Spring Rice, the British Ambassador to the United States preceding the World War.

Sir Fredrick Whyte, of the English Ministry of Information, hastens to assure the correspondents that England is not trying to propagandize America.

Two reports from the New York Times are interesting:

[From the New York Times of October 13, 1939]

"ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIVE ARRIVE HERE ON THE 'WASHINGTON'—LINER DELAYED AT LE VERDON AND SOUTHAMPTON—MEETS STORMS ON CROSSING—BRINGS FIFTY-FOUR BLOODED DOGS—LORD MARLEY, A PASSENGER, SEES LONG WAR, WITH ALLIES FINALLY BREAKING GERMANY

"The United States liner *Washington*, with 1,535 passengers from Southampton and Le Verdon arrived here yesterday after a prolonged voyage caused by delays in both ports. In addition to a number of notables, the vessel carried a large cargo of Bordeaux wines and French cheese, and 54 dogs, including several champions shipped here from England to prevent their possible destruction in the war.

"One passenger was Lord Marley, deputy speaker of the British House of Lords, who is here to fulfill a lecture engagement arranged several months ago. He predicted a long war, but one that eventually would break Germany. The present conflict he described as 'a war of machines—not men,' and said that Britain would settle only for 'a peace with honor.' "

[From the New York Times of October 23, 1939]

DUFF COOPER SEES REVOLT ENDING WAR—EX LORD OF BRITISH ADMIRALTY, HERE, PREDICTS CONSERVATIVE INSURRECTION IN REICH—HOLDS MONARCHY LIKELY—OTTO VON HAPSBURG MAY RULE, HE SAYS UPON ARRIVAL ON THE MANHATTAN TO LECTURE—ASTOUNDED AT SUBMARINE FEAT

"He was accompanied by his wife, the former Lady Diana Manners, who, as an actress, played the virgin in The Miracle. They will stay at the Hotel Ambassador and will go to the west coast before beginning their tour. He will speak here on The Survival of Liberty and The World We Live In.

"S. K. Ratcliff, British writer and lecturer, another passenger, said that fear of public opinion was dominating the strategy of all commands. 'All governments are afraid of launching a great air war,' he said. 'They can't see what it will lead to and neither side wants the responsibility for starting it.'

"Besides Mr. Duff Cooper and Mr. Ratcliff, there were four other visiting British lecturers aboard the Manhattan. The others were Cecil Roberts, former war correspondent and novelist; I. O. Richards, lecturer at Cambridge University; R. Ellis Roberts, journalist and author; and Miss Phyllis Bottome, novelist.

"NOT SENT BY GOVERNMENT

"All refused to discuss what course the United States should take in regard to the war. They had agreed in advance among themselves not to do so, as a course of conduct out of place for a visiting alien. Mr. Ratcliff, who will lecture on Why Britain Went to War, said that while most of them would discuss war issues, none had been sent by the British Government. 'The British Government isn't sending any speakers,' he added. 'They are coming on their own steam.' "

ENGLISH INCREASE PROPAGANDA EFFORT

Ralph Barnes, writing in the New York Herald Tribune, shows the English viewpoint in the dispatch from London.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 11, 1940]

"BRITONS CHAFE AT WARINESS IN WOOING OF UNITED STATES. DEMAND RISES FOR LONDON TO INTENSIFY PROPAGANDA DESIGNED TO AID THE ALLIES

"(By Ralph W. Barnes)

"LONDON, February 10.—Strong pressure is being put on the British authorities by certain quarters in Great Britain to intensify their propaganda by publicity in the United States as a means of swinging the United States into closer line with the Allied cause. According to these authorities, even some Americans are complaining that Britain is not doing what she might do to put over her case in the great American Republic.

"When he assumed the post of Minister of Information last month Sir John Reith himself is understood to have had some doubts as to whether the officials charged with propagandizing the United States were doing their job.

"Sir John is understood to have seen the light when the policy being pursued with respect to the American Nation was explained to him by Sir Frederick Whyte, head of the American section, former director of the British version of the English-Speaking Union, and an authority on the United States. Sir Frederick and the powers that be at the British Foreign Office are working under the assumption that anything like an extensive campaign to bring the United States into camp would prove a boomerang.

"WARY OF CRITICISM

"Whatever the facts may be, the American public has been told, even by conservative students of the subject, that British propaganda had much to do with the entry of the United States into the last war. Therefore the authorities here insist that in whatever propaganda is fed across the Atlantic there shall be little or no trace that could be pointed to by those Americans who desire to raise the cry, 'British propaganda.'

"It may be argued by some Americans that the American section at the Ministry of Information, about whose existence there is no secret, is simply a facade to screen some insidious institution run on lines similar to those of the American section at the Wellington House Propaganda Department in the early years of the last war. From this 'hush-hush' section, Sir Gilbert Parker carried on an under-cover campaign which, according to the experts, was highly effective in influencing American opinion. But if there is such a bureau, this correspondent is being badly taken in.

"SIR FREDERICK'S SPECIALISTS

"Sir Frederick's three specialists, all of whom are British subjects and experts on the United States in one phase or another, are:

"Frank Darvall, 33 years old, who serves as deputy director of the section. Darvall has a master's degree from Columbia University and is the author of books and articles on the United States. His wife is an American. Before the war he was an official of the English-Speaking Union in Britain.

"Professor Basil Mathews, 61 years old, who also serves as deputy director. Holding a degree from Oxford, Mathews is the author of many books. Until the war he was serving as professor of Christian world relations at Boston University and Andover-Newton Theological Seminary. He is the only member of the staff of the American section who was in the British Ministry of Information during the last war.

"Arthur Hope-Jones, 28 years old, an economic historian and a research fellow at Christ College, Cambridge. Hope-Jones has studied in several colleges in the United States. His wife is an American.

"At the request of this correspondent, the American section prepared a list of activities which were undertaken by official propaganda agencies of the British Government in the last war and which are said to be banned under the existing policy. The list reads:

" '1. The dispatch to the United States of official lecturers.

" '2. Payment of the expenses to the United States of distinguished British visitors (at present only the members of diplomatic and consular services and of various purchasing missions have their expenses paid out of public funds).

" '3. The dispatch of propaganda leaflets to large American mailing lists.

" '4. The issuance of news, pictures, etc., by British agents in the United States and efforts by these agents to persuade American newspapers and magazines to publish them.

" '5. The assembling for publication in the United States—or with that country largely in mind—of stories of enemy action which have an atrocity angle and are designed to create the maximum hostility toward Germany.

" '6. The maintenance in the United States of official representatives of British propaganda agencies.'

"BUT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

"Inquiry by this correspondent has produced another list covering activities which are being conducted today by the Ministry of Information in neutral countries other than the United States. The list reads:

" '1. The appointment of press attachés in the capitals of neutral countries and sometimes also in other cities of those countries.

" '2. Positive efforts through the press attachés and otherwise to provide free or at a nominal charge, articles, photographs, and so forth, to the press in those countries.

" '3. Dispatch of official lecturers, chiefly through the so-called "British Council" which is not allowed to function in or in relation to the United States.

" '4. The dispatch and exhibition of posters and other pictorial matter without waiting for local requests and in some cases at British public expense.

" '5. Special radio broadcasts in the language of the country concerned and planned with its needs in mind—through British short-wave broadcasts, including those to the Empire, which can be and are picked up in the United States.

" '6. The dispatch of films, including newsreels, without waiting for requests—in some cases through other than normal commercial channels and where commercially there would be no justification for showing the films.' "

PETERSON EXPOSES SECRECY

No one can be properly versed in the story of our involvement in the World War without reading the excellent book Propaganda for War by Prof. H. C. Peterson, of the University of Oklahoma. He shows the real story. I desire to note two brief excerpts as to the secrecy of that propaganda:

"BRITISH PROPAGANDA ORGANIZATIONS

"The operations of Wellington House were kept amazingly secret from Englishmen as well as Americans. When the Prime Minister was asked about the activities of Mr. Masterman, he replied that the latter was 'continuing certain work which he was requested by the Government to undertake at the beginning of the war. The work is of a highly confidential nature, and much of its efficiency depends upon its being conducted in secret * * *.' Even many officials in the English Government did not realize that there was such a thing as British propaganda."

"STIMSON SAYS NO PROPAGANDA IN EVIDENCE

"When questioned as to the use of propaganda in the United States, Col. Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, said:

" 'I have not come in contact with a single instance of propaganda.'

"Certainly the Secretary had read the papers, had some contact with the outside world. His statement must have given Lord Lothian and all other English propagandists much satisfaction. It is just what they are working for. They want to give America propaganda but do not want America to believe it to be such. It is in that group there is danger. The job, as Rogerson said, of having propaganda properly applied, must have worked with some.

"Could Secretary Stimson be in 1940 as the English officials were in 1917, that he did not recognize there was such a thing as British propaganda?"

Continuing Professor Peterson's exposé, I quote:

"Perhaps the most interesting procedure of this particular organization was its system of exploiting the friendships and business connections of leading Britishers. It obtained lists of important Americans who had dealings with people in England and sent propaganda to them. The Americans naturally thought the material was from their friends in England. The committee's report states that by 'this means very many important communities—philosophical, educational, religious, scientific, philanthropic, artistic, legal, medical, commercial, industrial, mining, agricultural, engineering, banking, athletic, etc.—have been reached.' "

"COVER UP THEIR TRACKS"

Sidney Rogerson has told us how in his book for the English series. It is interesting to note these passages:

"In the next war, as in the last, the result will probably depend upon the way in which the United States acts, and her attitude will reflect the reaction of her public to propaganda properly applied."

And he says further:

"For some time the issue as to which side the United States would take hung in the balance and if the final result was a credit to our propaganda, we were helped by the carelessness of the Germans. They continually overreached themselves and, with all their native tendency to overorganization, forgot to cover up their tracks. Their propaganda was as obvious as it was energetic."

That is the real story behind much of this protest against the statement that we are being propagandized by England. They want to be certain that they are covering up their tracks.

Later, Mr. Rogerson, in his book after discussing the "substratum of suspicion of Great Britain in the United States" and how much of this had been eliminated says:

"At the moment we have a strong section of American opinion against us, but if war were to break out tomorrow between England and Germany this mass of opinion would have to come down on one side or the other and it will be marvelous indeed if German propaganda could succeed in bringing it down on theirs.

"In general the situation in the United States is more favorable to Great Britain than in 1914, in that the obvious centers of infection have been removed, but less favorable in that we have temporarily at any rate lost caste as a 'democratic' state because of the propaganda which represents us as truckling to, or at least having truck with 'dictators.' Though we are not unfavorably placed, we shall require to do much propaganda to keep the United States benevolently neutral. To persuade her to take our part will be much more difficult, so difficult as to be unlikely to succeed. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the Republic will again take arms in an external quarrel. The position will naturally be considerably eased if Japan were involved, and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany.

"Fortunately, with America our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere, as our main plank will be the old democratic one. We must clearly enunciate our belief in the democratic form of government and our firm resolve to adhere to it."

PARKER TELLS HOW

Sir Gilbert Parker has written how the English propaganda was given to the United States from 1914 to 1917. It is worth repeating:

"Perhaps here I may be permitted to say a few words concerning my own work, since the beginning of the war. It is in a way a story by itself, but I feel justified in writing one or two paragraphs about it. Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive, and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister, Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Runciman, the Lord Chancelor, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and fully a hundred others.

"Among other things, we supplied 360 newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gives a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlets, etc.; and by letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspapers of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighboring States. We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association, by personal correspondence, with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors, and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers.

"It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, but I was fortunate in having a wide acquaintance in the United States and in knowing that a great many people had read my books and were not prejudiced against me. I believe that the American people could not be driven, preached to, or shoved into the war, and that when they did enter it would be the result of their own judgment and not the result of exhortation, eloquence, or fanatical pressure of Britishers."

THE PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE FACTS

Now, after reading it, do you not see the same methods being used in 1939 and 1940?

Sir Gilbert said in 1917 that the work was "one of extreme difficulty and delicacy." It is more so in 1940. Rogerson had stated that the great mistake of German propaganda was that they had failed "to cover up their tracks."

Lord Lothian wants to be sure that American sentiment does not become persuaded that it is being maneuvered into involvement. He is exercising all care that the people cannot trace back these propaganda attempts to England.

Why should our own people fight an investigation of all foreign propaganda in America? Why should high Government officials fight the move to give the people of our country the truth about this drive to get us into the war?

American boys who have to die in war should know the story of the attempt to involve us in the battle. They should know it now, not 20 years later as they lie in the beds of the veterans' hospitals.

Wanted: An Oregon Coast National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following story written by Richard L. Neuberger in the Oregonian of July 14, 1940, entitled, "Wanted: An Oregon Coast National Park." Mr. Neuberger has detailed the reasons for creation of this new national park in Oregon, legislation for which is being sponsored by Oregon's senior Senator, the Honorable CHARLES L. MCNARY. Mr. Neuberger's story follows:

[From the Oregonian (Portland, Oreg.) of July 14, 1940]

WANTED: AN OREGON COAST NATIONAL PARK—PROPOSED PLAYGROUND TAKES IN 30,000 ACRES IN CURRY COUNTY—SENATOR CHARLES L. MCNARY HAS INTRODUCED BILL TO ESTABLISH PARK—WILDERNESS COULD BE TURNED INTO RECREATIONAL AREA SECOND TO NONE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

White men first saw Oregon from the sea. Four centuries ago a Spanish mariner, Bartolome Ferrelo, sailed north of the forty-second parallel and from the poop deck of his frigate sighted a majestic coast line.

Capes jutted into the ocean like huge paws. Grim headlands frowned down on the water, Mediterranean-blue, where it dashed against the rocks. Breakers greeted the silent wilderness with a dull roar. Grassy swales and dark hills framed the horizon. Fir trees fringed the ridges. Here and there the verdure was pocked with broad meadows.

This spectacle that the swarthy navigator saw is still to be seen, outliving the maritime dominance of the country which discovered it. Today it is the most impressive stretch of seacoast along the western rim of the United States. Nothing between Puget Sound and the Mexican border matches it. Soon it may be the major national park in the Nation bordering exclusively on the ocean.

America has many great national parks, and practically all of them are in mountain and upland regions. They enshrine lofty peaks, deep canyons, and tumbling waterfalls. The two newest parks are also of this type—the Olympic Peninsula Park, just west of Puget Sound, and the Kings Canyon Park in the high Sierras of California.

The Oregon Coast National Park would be virtually unique. Now only two parks touch either ocean. A narrow strip of the Olympic Park has been extended to the Pacific, and the small Acadia Park in Maine encompasses some beaches which border on the Atlantic. The Oregon park would take precedence over both of these in the magnitude of its seacoast vistas.

The proposed park has been tentatively outlined to include 30,000 acres of land in Curry County, which forms the extreme southwest corner of the State. It would be approximately 21 miles long and 4 miles wide at the broadest point. It would start just south of the town of Gold Beach, and would end slightly north of the town of Brookings, which is only 6 miles from the Oregon-California interstate boundary.

This is the story of a motor-log trip to the area which may become a Federal playground for people from all over America. The motor-log, sponsored by the Oregonian and the Oregon State Motor Association, numbered as travelers Wallace Sprague, secretary of the Oregon Statesman; Ralph Gifford, photographer for the Oregon State Highway Commission; Glen O. Stevenson, landscape architect for the State department of parks, and the writer of this article.

An unofficial participant in the journey was Sam H. Boardman, the veteran State superintendent of parks, who went along as far as Gold Beach. There he met Miss Harlean James of the American Civic and Planning Association, one of the country's noted authorities on national parks, and conveyed her about the area by car. While he did this, the rest of us invaded the wilderness portions on foot. Mr. Boardman spent the evenings listening to the Republican National Convention on the radio, while we doused our creaking joints with rubbing alcohol.

The national parks of the United States are inspiring to see. The Grand Canyon and Yosemite Falls make the heart beat faster. The one criticism of these magnificent regions is that there is not sufficient recreational activity to keep the average American occupied. The contemplated Oregon Coast Park would remedy this deficiency if any park could. It would have virtually all the recreational facilities available in the outdoors.

There would be surf bathing, of course. At several places the slopes level out into enough flat land to make a golf links possible. The ocean is generally smooth and tranquil and boating would be safe. Easy trails would be suitable both for hiking and horseback riding. Beaches and grassy hillsides would make ideal spots for picnicking. Above the steep headlands are open areas where hotels, inns, tourist cabins, tennis courts, and other structures might be built.

The proposed park is ribbed with numerous creeks. Some of these splash off the capes and empty almost directly into the ocean. Several waterfalls plummet right onto the sand. A few miles north of the park the Rogue River rushes out of the highlands. This is a fisherman's Canaan. Beyond the edges of the park are dales and forests dotted with deer tracks; no hunting is allowed within the borders of national parks.

Mighty convolutions of the earth occurred when the seacoast of Curry County originally was twisted and buckled into existence. Then the ocean went to work. For countless epochs the Pacific clawed at the shore with talons of white-capped water. Breakers bit into the rocks and wore down hillsides. Trees and foliage began to mat the ridges. Where the sea had snapped most sharply, caves and natural bridges appeared.

This was the scene that awaited Ferrelo, when his ship the *Victoria* stood offshore in 1542. This was the scene that awaited us, on our recent pilgrimage to Curry County. And this is the scene which awaits Americans who eventually will visit the Oregon Coast National Park. The park may not be established immediately, but it is definitely next on the list of areas to be added to the country's far-flung park domain.

We reached the region easily. In the white motoring car of the motor association, we drove down the picturesque coast highway to Gold Beach. We ensconced ourselves at the Sunset Inn, ate a steak dinner and prepared to trek into the seacoast area. "You fellows better get to bed early," warned Sam Boardman with a suspicious twinkle in his blue eyes. "You may have quite a walk tomorrow." We thought he said this a little sanctimoniously, in view of the fact that his own inspection would be done in the automobile.

From the tiny hamlet of Carpenterville, 1,700 feet above the ocean, we trudged all the way down to the sea. Going down was not so bad.

The beach near Whale's Head and Cape Ferrelo on which we finally found ourselves was an ideal spot. Crags hemmed it in on both sides. Behind us the hill loomed up almost perpendicularly. Caves, natural bridges, and grotesque rock formations were legion. Wally Sprague observed that it was a perfect smugglers' cove; and so it was. One could almost imagine cutlass-wearing seafarers hauling loot out of boats concealed behind those majestic promontories.

Down to the beach a brook trickled, pausing once in a bathtub-like pool and then making the final drop to the sand. We gobbled sandwiches and drank the coffee Stevenson had concocted in a battered can, and wondered how civilization had passed by so idyllic a scene. The tortured rocks, looming in grotto formations above the tossing sea, were like the background of some painting by Maxfield Parrish. Out in the ocean, waves swirled against offshore rocks and now and then shot skyward in tall geysers.

Slowly the sun made its hegira across the heavens. The time had come for us to leave. Gifford, who had shot dozens of pictures, hoisted the heavy photographic equipment into his pack. The other knapsack was picked up by Stevenson. The tripod and camera case were carried by Wally Sprague. Your correspondent packed the extra roll of films. Thus burdened, we set out. Somehow, going back was not as easy as coming down had been. The grass on the slopes was dry and slippery and we longed for crampons.

TORTURED ROCKS FORM MANY GROTTOS NEAR SEA

Up a narrow gully we trudged, and then across a green swale. The fir-mantled hills were before us now, and we started up them. The ocean receded in the distance. The hills became steeper. Still we kept on. Had we come this far in the morning? Gifford's heavy pack was bogging him down. Your correspondent seized the roll of films more firmly and refused to let anyone share the burden. The sun touched the western horizon and we yet had not attained the summit. When at last we reached Carpenterville, we vowed that all the wilderness is not in the mountains and that plenty of it is along the seacoast.

After buying all the soda pop in the community and reluctantly permitting Sprague to purchase a pound of goat's milk cheese, we returned to Gold Beach. Your correspondent, with ruined trousers, aching joints, stiff muscles, dirty face, and tousled hair, was dragged through the lobby of the Sunset Inn and up to his room. Several children, frightened at the apparition, were soothed by the placid Mr. Boardman, who sat calmly in a wicker rocking chair, not in the least fatigued from his long automobile ride.

After wrapping ourselves around double T-bones, supplemented with hot biscuits and blackberry pie, we took stock of the situation and decided that not only would the Oregon coast area make an excellent national park, but that it has an excellent chance to become a national park. Occasionally national park controversies drag on for years. The Grand Canyon National Park, for example, was first proposed in 1887, yet did not develop into a reality until 1910.

More favorable circumstances confront the Oregon coast park. A bill providing for a national park along the coast of Curry County, not to exceed 30,000 acres in size, has been introduced by Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, Oregon's distinguished senior Senator. His measure has been approved by Secretary Harold L. Ickes and other officials of the Department of the Interior, according to A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service. "In my opinion," adds Demaray, "it is altogether fitting to give the Nation another national park in the magnificent region under consideration."

Violent bickering has shaken recent efforts to establish new parks. The Washington State Planning Council claimed the new Olympic park would fortify too much timber. The California Legislature protested that the Kings Canyon park would lock up valuable mineral and water resources. Ranchers in Idaho and eastern Oregon are afraid that a park at Hell's Canyon would starve the grazing industry by taking the high pastures out of use. Settlers on the Hoh and Queets Rivers are now claiming that extension of the Olympic park will root them out of their homes.

SMALL IN COMPARISON TO OTHER PARKS

The Oregon Coast Park, however, is menaced by none of this grumbling. The park would encompass comparatively little land of economic importance. And it would be only 30,000 acres in extent, as contrasted with the 452,000 acres of Kings Canyon and 898,000 acres of the Olympic. There is scarcely any local objection to the idea. Governor Charles A. Sprague favors the proposal. Nor is the scheme confused by the long-standing and extremely bitter dispute between the National Park Service and the United States Forest Service.

This dispute has intruded into nearly every attempt to create new parks. This is because the bulk of the new parks have been areas taken from the jurisdiction of the Forest Service and placed under the sovereignty of the Park Service. Rivalry has been intense. The Oregon coast area, although only a short distance west of the Siskiyou National Forest, is not within the forest proper. Thus the controversy between the two Government Bureaus is escaped.

STRATEGIC REGION MIDWAY BETWEEN COLUMBIA, GOLDEN GATE

Sam Boardman estimates it would cost in the neighborhood of $500,000 to buy out the private land holdings in the park area. This includes the upper slopes and the meadows above the capes. The tidal lands along the ocean, thanks to precautions taken many years ago by Oswald West when he was governor, belong to the State of Oregon. For half a million dollars. Boardman believes the National Government can acquire a playground of matchless grandeur.

The region is strategically located. It is midway between the Columbia River and the Golden Gate on the coast highway. The speedometer on the motorlog car showed 315 miles from Portland to Gold Beach. It is approximately that distance from Gold Beach to San Francisco. The new bridges on the coast highway, spanning bays and inlets formerly navigated by ferry boats, have made the road one of the main thoroughfares along the Pacific slope. Certainly it is the most picturesque thoroughfare, now clinging to massive headlands, now winding through dense forests. Its beauty is varied and eternal.

The climate is mild. The Acadia Park on the Maine seacoast is ice-locked in winter. Snow is an oddity in Curry County, at least along the ocean. Rainfall is about 60 inches annually. This is less than half the colossal 126 inches of rainfall which drench the western slopes and ridges of the Olympic National Park. Not a drop of rain disturbed our 4 days in the park area. On only one of those days was the ocean shrouded in fog. The rest of the time the weather was clear and sharp, outlining the cliffs and ridges in sharp relief.

The new park in the Sierras is called the John Muir-Kings Canyon Park, and perhaps the name of Sam Boardman should be linked with the Oregon coast park. It is his idea. Sam, who looks something like the late F. A. Silcox, beloved Chief of the Forest Service, is white-haired and easy-going. As are all men who love the woods and open spaces, he is a zealot. Setting aside wilderness areas and scenic plots in State and Federal parks is a crusade with him. He believes the $500,000 put up for the coast park would be an investment in the future, the establishing of a heritage for the people of succeeding generations.

WRITER HAS GOOD WORD FOR THE PROJECT

A requirement of any complete national park is that part of it be adaptable to preservation in its original untouched condition. The Curry County seacoast meets this prerequisite. Glen Stevenson says that the coves and beaches which we visited might remain as a primeval area, while the gentler slopes on both sides could be penetrated by roads and wide trails. The core of the coast park could be a patch of frontier. This, in turn, would be surrounded by areas developed for scenic and recreational purposes.

Harlean James, author of The Romance of the National Parks and numerous other books, is one of the main forces in the American conservation movement. She was the principal lobbyist for the vast park on the Olympic peninsula. Evidently Sam Boardman's tour of the Curry County seacoast convinced her that the Oregon park requires her attention, too.

"Oregon has been wise," Miss James wired the Oregonian last week, "in securing for public use a greater proportion of its ocean frontage than any other State. The southern Oregon coast of high headlands, virgin forests, and sandy beaches should offer a fine opportunity for a national seashore park." Incidentally, the national park would be directly adjacent to the small but picturesque State park on the rocky crest of Cape Sebastian.

The journey ended, we headed toward home. Our car twisted around the shore line near the mouth of the Rogue and we looked back. In row on row, capes forked out to sea. They resembled the prows of monstrous dreadnoughts. In the soft light of the late afternoon ocean and hillsides blended. The headlands Ferrelo had seen in 1542 and Drake had seen three decades later were tall and stern. Guardians of the Oregon country, they lifted their tree-cloaked summits toward the sky. Perhaps this scene, we thought, may soon be a landmark familiar to the multitude of our countrymen who each year pilgrimage to the national parks of the far West.

Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, OF ALABAMA

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, as temporary chairman, Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Ill., July 15, 1940:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, I am, of course, very deeply and profoundly grateful for the honor and privilege of being named as temporary chairman of this great convention. It is a great personal gratification to be introduced by the man who has been of such inestimable value and service to the Democratic Party for two terms as our national chairman, and who likewise has served with great success, ability, and distinction as Postmaster General of the United States—your friend and mine, the Honorable James A. Farley.

It is a heartening and inspiring spectacle to look out upon this vast assemblage of the representatives of the Democratic Party of our Nation, as well as the thousands of loyal guests who will be so deeply interested in our actions and deliberations. We are justified in our loyalty and devotion to a great political party, which, over a period of years almost as great as the life of our Republic itself, in victory or defeat, in power or removed from power, has, during all the decades of its existence, proclaimed its allegiance to that fundamental political maxim announced by Thomas Jefferson, "equal rights to all men and special privileges to none." That means, in essence, that our party in the ancient days as well as on this night, believes in and fights for the basic and irreducible human rights of the American citizen. We are here assembled to pledge renewed allegiance to that cherished creed, and to send forth to the people the assurance that if continued in power we shall not depart from the faith of our fathers.

Under our system of government, it is just and equitable for the electorate to judge, and to reward or punish a national party, not upon the basis of its platform promises alone, but strictly upon the record of its performance and accomplishments as an instrumentality of public service. It is my purpose to make that principle the straightedge and yardstick of this address.

If we do not gravely misapprehend the present temper and disposition of the American people, they are now in no mood to be moved or influenced by petty and vindictive exaggerations of issues or events that are of no vital concern to the safety and security of the United States of America as possibly the last surviving outpost of democracy upon the face of the earth. The minds of the American people are now so deeply engrossed in matters of grave and profound concern with reference to the preservation of our established order of life and institutions, that they will have no tolerance for the superficial banalities of politics. An election must be held, but aside from legitimate discussions of the records of the two parties and their candidates and platforms, the major objective of both parties must be unity and solidarity of purpose in preserving inviolate the structure of our Government and the perpetual freedom of its people.

We all recognize that ours is a government by political parties and that, as instrumentalities of government, they are entitled to the largest possible measure of freedom in carrying legitimately disputed issues to the people. But such issues should be fairly presented. They should be clothed in the garments of truth and tolerance and reason. Neither our party nor the opposition can, in terrible times like these, profit by a departure from this principle.

THE RECORD OF ROOSEVELT'S ADMINISTRATION

The Democratic Party has now been in absolute control of the Government for 7½ years. In order to get back to the postulate of party responsibility to the people and in order that the people might have a fair basis of appraisal as to whether or not we have done, on the whole, a good or an evil job under that responsibility, it is just and even necessary to look back to the conditions which

prevailed in our social and economic status when, under the overwhelming mandate of the American people, a Democratic administration took charge of the Government on March 4, 1933. I think it is proper that it be said, in all candor, that none of us who have had part in formulating and administering the policies that have been enacted into law under this administration can justly claim that no mistakes have been made. Temporary errors in policy and in the administration of policies were inevitable in undertaking to cure and correct a situation that had attained the phase of national disaster and social and economic chaos. It is too much to hope that there will ever be infallibility in the arena of political action and the American people fully understand the fairness and justice of that statement.

No other administration in peacetimes since the establishment of the Republic had ever confronted such a desperate situation as that which we inherited on March 4, 1933, nor one which called for the instant exercise of greater genius of leadership and courage. It was without precedent in its forebodings of disaster to our democratic institutions. The American people have not forgotten that period of total collapse and desperation in all branches of human endeavor.

A decent respect for your indulgence will not permit me to attempt a detailed synopsis of the outstanding legislation that the Democratic Party has enacted into law to meet the staggering social and economic conditions which we had inherited. The people themselves are now familiar with the operations and purposes of that program.

The first heroic remedy adopted was to declare a national bank holiday which involved the temporary closing of our National and State banks which, until more adequate security for them could be obtained, was a most effective remedy against the total collapse of the entire banking system of our people, although, unfortunately, many thousands of them had already closed their doors, bringing heartbreak and immeasurable distress to millions of the American people.

Steps were then taken to provide for the reopening of the yet solvent banking institutions, and many hundreds of them and their depositors were saved. This administration enacted what, in my opinion, will forever be regarded as one of the major outstanding legislative achievements in our history, and that is the passage of the law guaranteeing the absolute safety of deposits up to $5,000 in all national banks and State banks which were affiliated with the Federal system and that constitutes 98 percent of all deposits. And, now, instead of the American people having constant and daily apprehension as to the safety of their savings and deposits, they can always be assured that if any of such banks, either through bad business management or corruption, closes its doors, that every single dime of their money will be paid to them across the teller's cage within 48 hours.

Recognizing the terrible truth that millions of our people had been robbed and defrauded out of their investments by an unbridled and unregulated system of corporate manipulation which permitted crooked promoters, stock jobbers, and holding-company tycoons, we passed the Securities and Exchange Commission Act under the operation of which those robbers of the people's investments are now checked, restrained, and regulated. We broke up for all time the ruthless and unconscionable holding companies allowed to flourish in all their ugly and wanton plundering of decent citizens under former Republican administrations. I wonder if any of you people in this section of the country recall the collapse of the billion Insull utility empire, and the devastation is brought to thousands of your hopes and homes?

We provided for the organization and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, one of the most popular and successful instruments of government ever devised. It has acted not only as a medium of relief for the destitute families of millions of American youth but at the same time has been of inestimable value in conserving the natural resources of the country and of giving to these young men a fine system of moral and physical discipline which they would not otherwise ever have achieved.

When this administration took over the reins of power there were from twelve to fifteen million men and women of employable age without any opportunity whatsoever to secure jobs that would enable them to support themselves and their hungry and naked families. It would have been a heartless and cruel omission of duty to have been indifferent to their necessities. It would have shown a wanton and reckless indifference to the fundamental duties of a great democracy had we not taken adequate steps to feed and clothe and shelter these men, women, and children, our own people, who, without their fault, had been made the victims of the national catastrophe.

The Democratic administration has met that duty without fear and without wavering and, in addition thereto, contributed immeasurably to the permanent wealth of the Nation by the improvements and benefits that have resulted from its operation. Every single community in America has been prospered and benefited by this program and the expenditure of the Federal funds required to effectuate it. These are not fugitive and evanescent benefits, but they are tangible and enduring for future generations, who will praise our foresight in establishing them.

This administration conceived and set up for all time a humane and necessary program for the softening of the hardships of the aged and infirm of the rigors of illness and the despair of unemployment and for the support of widows and dependent children and the blind.

We established, financed, and set up on a firm and enduring foundation the great Tennessee Valley Authority which, for all time, will furnish a great vehicle for the development and conservation of the commerce and resources of that great geographical area which it serves which will be a potential factor in flood control and navigation and which offers now ready assistance in our preparedness program for the manufacture of many of the essential ingredients of national defense.

As a yardstick for the control of excessive power and light rates, it has been largely instrumental in forcing the reduction of charges to consumers in the United States of $500,000,000 since its construction. We have taken the position that the waters in our rivers are the God-given heritage of the people and that private utility companies have no vested right to monopolize their exploitation.

We established and made actively effective, through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the possibility of saving hundreds of thousands of our most deserving citizens from the agony and ignominy of being evicted from their rooftrees and firesides. We have constructed innumerable slum-clearance projects, especially in the great cities, to provide decent homesteads for the poor and underprivileged, white and colored alike, and through the Federal Housing Administration have afforded credit and facilities to hundreds of thousands of our citizens to finance and build their own homes.

We have guaranteed for the first time in our history by law the basic principle of giving to labor in this country the right to organize and bargain with employers for the betterment of their wages and working conditions, and through the wage and hour law have assured to every man and woman who toils in the industries of the country a decent wage scale and fair hours of labor, and I predict here and now that the great masses of labor in this country, organized and unorganized, will, when they go to the polls next November, not forget that the Democratic Party has been their friend and not their oppressor.

Upon that partial record of social and economic legislative action, we propose to wage the coming battle without any spirit of time-serving or apology, but, upon the contrary, with an agressive justification of the record of this Democratic administration.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

We have now had opportunity to examine the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia, which is supposed to represent the deliberate judgment of the best minds in the Republican Party. If that be the case, it reminds me of an incident that occurred in a southern border State during the 1896 Presidential campaign, when, as you remember, the vital issue was free silver versus the gold standard. A certain shrewd old politician was running for reelection. He was to make a speech in a community where he was very doubtful as to the sentiment of the people on that issue. During the course of his speech, he was pressed many times by a bewhiskered spectator in the crowd to define his views on the money question, and finally, seeing that he was driven to make an answer, he replied: "My friend has asked me to state my position on the money question, and I will do it with entire frankness and without equivocation whatever and here it is. I believe in the gold standard. I believe in the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. I believe in a large circulation of greenback money, and a right smart little sprinkling of counterfeit." The Frank committee and their platform committee were in labor a long long time, and they finally brought forth a weasel.

It is a document filled with equivocation and political subterfuge, but the most remarkable significance of that platform is the fact that despite their clamorous and bitter denunciation of the legislative program of this administration, they did not have the confidence or courage to demand the repeal or abolition of any single one of the major laws we have passed for liberal government and a better state of life for the masses of the American people. No greater compliment could be paid to the wisdom and soundness of the legislative and executive program of this administration. How can the Republican Party go before the electorate in November, urging the removal from power of that party whose wisdom and progressive policies they were compelled, even if by indirection, to endorse.

In national conventions heretofore there has been a vast amount of pointing with pride and viewing with alarm, but at Philadelphia, while there was much viewing with alarm, there was no pointing with pride, for the obvious reason that they could remember nothing at which to point. That platform is a perfect example of the aphorism that "language was invented to conceal thoughts."

FARM PROGRAM

It is contended by Republican leaders that the farmers of the country will not support our party in November on the basis of the record of this administration. I refute that assertion. I do it because those farmers are men of intelligence and with a high capacity for the appraisal of legislative action as it affects their personal and community welfare. At the end of a Hoover administration, the farmers of America had on their hands an unprecedented panic and the Hoover Farm Board. The effects of the panic were immeasurable and the results of such Farm Board activities were worse, as our farmers will remember.

They also well remember the prices they were receiving for their products in that fateful hour. Since we came into power we have progressively enacted for their benefit the soil and water conservation program; the lowest farm interest rates in our entire history; the benefits of rural electrification of their homes; marketing agreements; commodity loans; research into new uses and new markets; the stamp plan for distribution of surplus commodities; the long-range farm-tenant program whereby such tenants may acquire, under reasonable terms, and on long payments, the benefits of owning their own homes; and the immeasurable benefits to them of the policy of parity payments. I particularly call to the attention of the farmers of this country the attitude of the Republicans in

Congress with reference to the parity-payment program, and remember that this was a direct and vital issue as to whether or not the Government should undertake by this means to equalize, at least in part, the prices which the farmers secured for their products as compared to the cost of their production, or the things they had to buy in the open market.

On March 28, 1939, the House of Representatives, on a vote to appropriate $250,000,000 to provide for such parity payments, the Democrats voted for the proposition, 168, and Republicans voted for, 20, and against, 135. On May 9 of this year the vote on the proposal for $212,000,000 for parity payments to farmers was for, Democrats 183, Republicans for, 22, and against, 131. You there have a concrete example of the deep and abiding interest which the Republican membership of the House took upon this most vital question for the benefit of agriculture. By their votes shall ye know them.

DEMOCRATIC WORLD PEACE PROGRAM

One of the most remarkable, as well as discreditable, efforts ever made by a political party to fabricate out of the whole cloth and without a shred of evidence to support it is the charge of some Republican leaders that the Democratic Party and administration are attempting slyly and covertly to lead the United States into the shambles of a foreign war.

I here and now denounce that calumny, and assert that not only is this Administration opposed absolutely to a participation in any European war, but, upon the contrary, both the President and our able Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and a Democratic Congress have done everything possible within the bounds of reason not only to preserve peace in Europe and in the entire world, but to so conduct our foreign relations that every precaution would be taken to keep us out of involvement in a foreign war. He has especially and consistently addressed his activities to the consolidation of that policy in this hemisphere, and especially with our sister republics in Latin America.

When the President signed the first neutrality resolution on August 31, 1935, he did so with this statement:

"I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict."

The only so-called meddling in European affairs by the Executive has been based entirely upon an appeal for the preservation of peace against the spread of war, and in behalf of humanity and adherence to treaty obligations and international law. As the head of a great peace-loving Republic, and as a great humanitarian, he could have done no less. Just a few days ago, on Wednesday of last week, he sent a memorable message to the Congress in which he specifically and definitely gave this assurance of policy to the American people, and I quote his language:

"That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American, but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in the way of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars."

In addition to all this, he called a special session of Congress last year after the war broke out in Europe, recommended, and the Democratic Party passed, amendments to the existing neutrality law which prohibited the shipment in American vessels of cargoes into the waters of the belligerent nations, which, if it had not been done, would doubtless long before this have inevitably drawn us into the conflict for the same reasons which induced America to go to war against the Central Powers in 1917. On the vote in the House of Representatives on this most vital proposal for keeping out of the European war, on the final roll call on the conference report of the neutrality bill, there were, yeas, Democrats 223, Republicans 18; nays, Democrats 29, Republicans 141.

SHADOW OF HITLER

My fellow countrymen, we are assembled at the most fateful moment in the history of mankind. The sinister shadow of a cruel, savage, and ruthless despotism hangs like a pall of doom over the homes and the lives of every citizen of democratic and liberty-loving peoples. Already this juggernaut of physical force and brutal power has laid its blighting hand upon the freedom and sovereignty of eight small and defenseless nations, and now France also lies in the agony and ashes of the totalitarian destruction, and only Great Britain alone stands against the hurricane of the "blitzkrieg." And now Hitler and Mussolini have sworn her total annihilation. They have furthermore sworn eternal enmity against all so-called decadent democracries, and that includes us.

I do not know what attitude this convention may take on that subject, but I know that it is the attitude of the American people that we will resist to the death any compromise of our democratic principles with those malignant disturbers of the peace of the world; that we do not propose to appease those aggressors whose doctrines wage war upon every sacred principle of liberty for a free people that our Declaration of Independence proclaimed and our Federal Constitution preserved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I now propose to expose another flagrant piece of Republican propaganda by which they are endeavoring during this campaign, as they have already done, to make the American people believe that this administration has been indifferent to and neglectful of the necessary steps to prepare and make instantly available an adequate system of national defense at sea, on land, and in the air. National defense is a sacred trust. When a matter involving the safety of our beloved country is at stake we should all be united, both Democrats and Republicans, because we are all Americans. In critical times such as these we should be thinking less of the political differences that divide us and more of the national interests that unite us. Until the invasion just 2 months ago of Norway, Belgium, Denmark, and the Netherlands, how many of us realized the full portent of events overseas? Prior to that invasion, I heard no Republicans urging a national-defense program such as we have now launched. During the 12 years of Republican administration the national-defense record was one of continual retrogression. During the 11-year period between 1922, the year of the Washington Arms Conference, and 1934, the year following Democratic charge of Government, they laid down a total of only 35 combatant ships. During the last 3 years of the Hoover administration not one single vessel of war was laid down by our Government. During this administration there has been laid down, up to June 1940, 8 new battleships, 12 new cruisers, 2 new aircraft carriers, 65 new destroyers, and 36 new submarines, a grand total of 153 new units in 7 years, as contrasted with 35 new units under the 12-year Republican regime.

This Congress has, in addition, authorized 267 ships of war to give us a two-ocean Navy, a sea force of such magnitude and power, including its air force, as will make reasonably certain our continued dominance of this hemisphere and the perpetuation of our cherished institutions.

When we came into power the authorized strength of our standing army had been reduced to 118,000 men. During this administration it has been constantly increased until the present authorized enlisted strength of the Army is 375,000 men and the National Guard 251,000. Our air force has been increased in like proportion, with the ultimate objective, if necessary, of 50,000 planes, manned by the most efficient flyers on the face of the earth. That, my friends, is the cold record. Let the opposition make the most of it.

THE ENEMY WITHIN

There has been presented a summary of our program for a tremendous increase in our defense against an enemy from overseas. But such danger is not the only menace to our national security. There is abundant proof that lurking within the shadows of our Government's edifice, laying their mischievous plans at the opportune time to sap and mine it, or to put the red torch of revolution and disunion against our democratic form of government, are those forces of evil, now commonly called the "fifth column." No one knows how great are their numbers, but evidence already produced shows that they run into tens of thousands, all of them sworn enemies of our form of government. However great or small may be their number, there is no place in the United States for a single one of them to abide in freedom. Congressional legislation has already been enacted and approved by the President providing every possible restraint upon and punishment of these enemies of our institutions that could be devised within the limits of our Constitution.

* * * * * * *

At the conclusion of his speech to the recent Republican Convention at Philadelphia former President Hoover posed this question: "Republicans, are you ready to fight?" No such question will be propounded to the Democrats of this convention or those of the country. We began to fight in the election of 1932; we carried on the battle in 1936 to a magnificent victory, and we are already enlisted for the duration of the coming conflict to preserve to the people the advances we have made in liberal government for the benefit and protection of the average man. Fighting by our side will again be millions of Republicans and independent voters who have forever forsworn allegiance to the forces of reaction.

SPIRITUAL REDEDICATION

Sentiments and emotions and alarms of profound significance are stirring the minds and hearts of the American people as a result of the welter and destruction of the foreign wars, and they are in deep apprehension of the dangers to our own processes of liberty. We can all somehow sense and feel a new consecration to the priceless patrimony bequeathed to us by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and their associates in a time remote. It is an indefinable patriotic incursion that is touching the souls of men here in our country. While this is no time or place for one to invoke the prerogatives of an ecclesiastic, I venture far enough to assert that there is no armament so potent and enduring as that of the observance of moral, spiritual, and religious obligations of a great people. Without that sanctuary, there can be no perpetuation of the decencies and securities of any type of civilization. With that Great Comforter as shield and buckler, our wealth, our power, our preparedness, our love of liberty will forever make America unconquered and unconquerable.

Power Plank in 1940 Democratic Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Republican Party, in their national convention, after solemn and deliberate consideration, named for their standard bearer Wendell L. Will-

kie, a utility executive. This is what might have been expected of the economic royalists who dominate the Republican Party and who stand for reactionary policies and ultra-conservative and monopolistic theories. The Republican nominee peculiarly and fittingly epitomizes concentrated wealth, selfish interests, corporation and utility control, and interests uniformly antagonistic to the public welfare. In this connection I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the plank in the Democratic platform on the subject of electric power. This declaration succinctly shows the long-established and the present illicit connection between the power monopoly and the Republican Party, and the firm and continuing purpose of the Democratic Party to use nationally owned water power for the benefit of all the people.

There being no objection, the plank was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER

During the past 7 years the Democratic Party has won the first major victories for the people of the Nation in their generation-old contest with the power monopoly.

These victories have resulted in the recognition of certain self-evident principles and the realization of vast benefits by the people. These principles, long opposed by the Republican Party, are:

That the power of falling water is a gift from God, and consequently belongs not to a privileged few but to all the people, who are entitled to enjoy its benefits;

That the people have the right through their Government to develop their own power sites and bring low-cost electricity to their homes, farms, and factories;

That public-utility holding companies must not be permitted to serve as the means by which a few men can pyramid stocks upon stocks for the sole purpose of controlling vast power empires.

We have condemned the Republican policies which permitted the victimizing of investors in the securities of private power corporations and the exploitation of the people by unnecessarily high utility costs.

We have condemned the opposition of utility power interests which delayed for years the development of national-defense projects in the Tennessee Valley, and which obstructed river-basin improvements and other public projects bringing low-cost electric power to the people.

The successful power developments in the Tennessee and Columbia River basins show the wisdom of the Democratic Party in establishing Government owned and operated hydroelectric plants in the interests of power and light consumers.

Through these Democratic victories whole regions have been revived and restored to prosperous habitation. Production costs have been reduced. Industries have been reestablished which employ men and capital. Cheaper electricity has brought vast economic benefits to thousands of homes and communities.

These victories of the people must be safeguarded. They will be turned to defeat if the Republican Party should be returned to power. We pledge our party militantly to oppose every effort to encroach upon the inherent right of our people to be provided with this primary essential of life at the lowest possible cost.

The nomination of a utility executive by the Republican Party as its Presidential candidate raises squarely the issue whether the Nation's water power shall be used for all the people or for the selfish interests of a few. We accept that issue.

National Agricultural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE FROM DEMOCRATIC DIGEST

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from The Democratic Digest for June–July 1940 entitled "National Agricultural Progress."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Democratic Digest of June–July 1940]

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS

One of the very first problems attacked by the Roosevelt administration was the farm problem. Because the President knew that farm prosperity was vital to recovery, he called in agricultural leaders even before he reopened the banks. In two months' time, farm legislation was enacted and the farm program began to take shape.

Throughout the 7 years since, the farm program has continued to grow and develop. It has had striking results. There has been increased income to the farmers and higher price levels for their products. Their increased purchasing power has been a tremendous aid to business and employment in the cities. Millions of farmers have cooperated for the conservation of soil, water, and trees.

The program provides measures for the protection of foreign markets and the expansion of domestic markets. It provides assistance for unfortunate farm families needing opportunity to get a new start. It is building a permanent, more prosperous agriculture with long-range benefits not only for those on the land, but for the entire Nation.

FARM INCOME HIGHER

In New Deal years, cash farm income has increased about 65 percent, rising from $4,682,000,000 in 1932 to $7,711,000,000 in 1939. Including farm-benefit payments, the total was $8,518,000,000 in 1939. Cash income of the Nation's wheat producers at the end of 1939 had increased by 98 percent; cash income of cotton producers by 32 percent; tobacco growers by more than 100 percent; dairy farmers by 37 percent; and growers of meat animals by 95 percent.

PURCHASING POWER INCREASED

Farm prices as a whole increased 43 percent between 1932 and 1939, rising from 65 percent of the pre-World War level to 93 percent. Other prices also increased, but farm prices increased more proportionately, practically doubling the farmer's purchasing power.

In 1932, just before the New Deal took over, farmers were able to purchase only about 58 percent as much of city goods as they had in 1929. By 1939, their purchasing power had increased to 99 percent of the 1929 level.

REAL-ESTATE VALUES HIGHER

By 1938, the renewed earning power of farms, as measured by increased agricultural income, was reflected in a substantial increase in farm real-estate values. Total value of farm lands and buildings had increased by $5,000,000,000, $30,500,000,000 to $35,500,000,000.

Forced sales of farms declined 69 percent; voluntary sales increased 68 percent. Since 1930, the Nation's total farm-mortgage debt has been reduced by more than $2,000,000,000. Since 1933, the number of farm bankruptcies has decreased 76 percent.

CONSERVATION ADVANCED

Under the New Deal, conservation has made the greatest advance in the Nation's history, on cropland and in forest. This means not only conservation of soil, but of water essential for growth, and timber essential for protection.

Soil-conserving agreements cover about 82 percent of the Nation's cropland. Farmers cooperating with the Federal farm program all employ farming practices which build up rather than deplete their acres.

Soil Conservation Service operations are in progress on 6,000,000 acres of private land and 54,000,000 acres of public land. This is an intensive demonstration program to show farmers the most progressive methods of land use.

Forest conservation is one of the New Deal's proudest records. National forest-land area has increased two and one-half times as much as in the preceding 22 years. Forest Service nurseries have provided 125,000,000 trees for planting on 131,000 acres of national forest land. Eleven thousand miles of planting in the shelterbelt provide badly needed protection for 3,000,000 acres of land, a great success, although ridiculed at its outset. Fifty-five million trees were distributed for farm plantings from Federal-State cooperative nurseries.

The C. C. C. boys made a great permanent contribution to the wealth of the Nation's resources. Outstanding accomplishments include the planting of 2,000,000,000 trees, forestry improvement on 3,000,000 acres, erosion-control work on more than a million acres of farm land.

FARM PRODUCTION STABILIZED

Bridging the gap between surpluses and scarcity has been the outstanding aim of the New Deal farm program. All farmers have been encouraged to reduce acreage on crops on which the Nation had been producing an oversupply, and increase production of crops for which there was a greater need. Production on the whole has remained at approximately the 1924–29 average.

Stabilization has gone forward on many fronts:

The ever-normal granary provides for storage of reserves in good years for use in years of crop failure. It operates through (1) commodity storage loans and (2) crop insurance for wheat. In 1938, the wheat crop was unusually large, and about 80,000,000 bushels were stored under loans. Of the 1938 corn crop, 227,000,000 bushels were stored on farms under loans.

The Surplus Marketing program buys up the farm surpluses of perishable and semiperishable foods and uses them for distribution to needy city families. Since October 1933 this program has been responsible for the purchase and distribution of five and one-half billion pounds of surplus farm products. Part of this surplus went to the school-lunch program, providing free lunches daily to two and one-half million undernourished children. The recently introduced food-stamp plan routes the surplus food through commercial channels, making it possible for low-income families to

obtain this food at its corner grocery. A low-cost milk program is also under way.

Surpluses other than foods, such as W. P. A. made cotton clothing, and the home-made mattress program, also help to bridge the gap between surplus and need.

The export-subsidy program protects United States producers' share of the world market by buying wheat, cotton, and corn at domestic prices and selling it to exporters at a price which enables them to sell on the world market.

Agricultural credit services: One of the essential elements necessary to agricultural stability and security is adequate credit at reasonable rates. This the New Deal has provided through the Farm Credit Administration. Since 1933, individual farmers and farm cooperatives have obtained almost $6,000,000,000 in loans and discounts from institutions under F. C. A. supervision.

FARM POVERTY ATTACKED

The extreme farm poverty of the depression had brought special problems to the dust and drought areas of the Midwest, the migratory workers' areas of the far West, and the sharecropper sections of the South. Farm poverty in general and these particular problems were attacked along the following lines:

Rehabilitation loans have been made to 600,000 farmers who were on relief or near relief status to assist them to again become self-supporting. These families have repaid nearly a third of the money loaned to them.

Debt adjustment has been made between more than 100,000 farmers and their creditors, scaling down debts totaling more than $300,000,000. This has enabled farmers to pay more than $4,500,000 in back taxes.

Homestead projects, now numbering 159, furnish homes to 14,000 low-income farm families.

Migratory camps will accommodate 13,000 families annually when the present program is completed.

The farm-tenancy program has provided loans for more than 13,000 tenant families to become owners. Written leases replacing vague oral agreements have been arranged for more than 130,000 tenant farmers.

Low cost medical care has been made available to more than 65,000 families in 26 States.

Community-service loans fostered almost 12,000 small cooperatives.

ELECTRICITY BROUGHT TO FARMS

Since the New Deal rural-electrification program began in 1935, 5,000,000 people on American farms have electric service newly at their command. Before R. E. A., 1 farm in 10 was served. Now 1 farm in 4 has electricity.

FARMERS ENDORSE NEW DEAL

The farm program has been attacked in the courts, in the press, and on the air. The enemies of the program have looked upon it as a good political target and attacked it for the sake of a political advantage. But try as they might, they were never able to turn the farmers against it, and farm support grew stronger. A recent poll showed 66 percent of the farmers in favor of the New Deal farm program.

Participation in the farm program increased from three million in 1934 to nearly six million in 1939. That's the farmers' answer to these attacks.

Farmers are still short of their goal of economic equality with other groups, but they now have, in the national farm program, the means for continued progress toward that goal.

Ireland's Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM IRISH WORLD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the great world war now raging in Europe there remains within the radius of the conflict one small democratic nation which is seeking to maintain its neutrality and preserve its peace. That nation is Ireland, concerning which much propaganda is now being spread in an attempt to justify an invasion by the British on the assumption that such strategy is necessary in order to protect England from a back-door invasion by Hitler through Ireland. Articles are appearing every day in this country seeking to misrepresent the facts and support the notion that a violation of Ireland's neutrality is essential for the protection of England.

A very able editorial appeared in the Irish World of Saturday, July 27, 1940, discussing this problem. This editorial demonstrates that there can be no justification for a violation of Ireland's neutrality by any of the belligerent powers in the present conflict. If such invasion occurs it will immediately result in dangerous political repercussions in this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the people of this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Irish World of July 27, 1940]

IRELAND'S NEUTRALITY

Of late, hardly a day passes without some newspaper reference to the possibility of Ireland's neutrality in the war between England and Germany being ended under pressure from one or the other or both.

The position is rendered more difficult by the fact that in the northeastern counties Irish territory is held to be part of the possession of one of the parties to the war, and so not neutral. That part of Ireland is held to be Irish, and to be defended as part of Ireland, if invaded. But it is held to be part of England in another sense, and the condition is made that help rendered by the rest of Ireland must be in the form of avowed support of England, which would mean the abandonment of neutrality. The alternative that England withdraw from northern Ireland, leaving Ireland to shoulder its own responsibilities as a unit, has been rejected.

The dangers resulting from this situation are three: The north of Ireland, as enemy country, might be invaded by the Germans. The Germans might invade neutral Ireland with a view to securing an advantage in its war on England. England might invade neutral Ireland from her own island or from the north of Ireland to secure advantages in the war against Germany.

Meantime, the prayer that comes in letters from Ireland is: "God send that the peace of this island may still be preserved."

It is evident that the rights of neutrals are not a safeguard to nations which occupy parts of the field of battle. Germany, as it happens, broke through neutral countries to get around and behind the defenses of France. War being what it is, no surprise would have been excited if the attack had been in the opposite direction, through the neutral countries to take the French and English Armies around and behind the German defenses. The mining of neutral Norwegian waters demonstrated that the will to overcome objection by a neutral was not lacking. What was lacking in the Norwegian instance was the power to give effect to the purpose. The power was not lacking when it came from the other direction through Holland and Belgium. The test of power is the only one accepted in war conditions.

Under that test, none of these countries could be certain of their neutrality, or the peace contingent on neutrality, being respected by both belligerents, between whom they stood. If one or other did not, peace must be at an end.

The question for Ireland, which only events can answer, is whether she stands in the way of the combatants to an extent that each has a war object in keeping the other out, and a consequent motive for getting in first. The entry of one would mean an end of that peace that goes with neutrality. The entry of the other, to contest the occupation, as happened in Norway, would bring even greater losses.

The feeling in England, a feeling shared by some in this country who are greatly concerned about England, and who have very little, if any, concern about what may happen to Ireland except as it may adversely affect England, is that Ireland ought to abandon its neutrality and enter the war on the side of England. Not much attention is paid to the thought that this would be to invite invasion by Germany, something that Ireland has good reason to avoid, if she can.

There is, however, more to it than that. This is the first time Ireland has been able to stay out of England's wars, and as she looks back on her history she is acutely aware that none of England's many wars have brought her any good. On the contrary, every one of them has brought harm to her. Her whole "distressful" history is identified with them. Ireland was repesented in the wars against Scotland, and when Bruce defeated the English there he sent his brother to conquer Ireland. They did not succeed, but the conflict on Irish soil brought ruin to Ireland. There were Irish troops at Crecy and at Agincourt, and the reward was the Poynings law, designed to destroy their nationality. When York and Lancashire fought for the throne, Ireland took the side of York and paid heavily when the Lancastrians won—so heavily that all leadership in Ireland was struck down. Irish troops went with Henry VIII to war in France, and when it was over he subdued their chiefs and proscribed their religion. Elizabeth, when she went to war with Spain, started by giving Sir Humphrey Gilbert a monopoly of commerce in the adjacent seas that destroyed Ireland's shipping; and when this provoked resentment and the Irish looked to Spain for help, Ireland's population was all but exterminated by England. When Ireland aided King Charles I, against the Parliament, Cromwell came to massacre, destroy, and confiscate. When she stood by another English king, James II, what it brought her was the migration of the flower of her men and a century and more under the infamous penal laws. Ireland's sympathy was with the American Colonies in the War of the Revolution, for which action England massacred the Irish in the

north of Ireland, which at that time was the stronghold of nationalist leadership, as well as in the south. Irish troops were the backbone of Wellington's armies in another war with France and, after that war was over, England destroyed what were left of Ireland's industries and reduced her people to beggary.

The revolutionary period of 1848, which extended to all Europe, brought to Ireland the expulsion of her people from the land, to make way for the flocks and herds needed to feed Englishmen, and with it the transportation as felons of all her leaders to what are now known as the British Commonwealth of Nations. When the last war started, reservists flocked to France from every Irish town, the English Prime Minister called Ireland the "one bright spot," and a few years later the Black and Tans and pound-a-day cadets were hunting down those Irishmen who wore medals for their bravery. And yet it is held to be natural to ask the very men who survived the Maxwell blood purge in 1916, and who drove English garrisons and English armed constabulary out of 26 counties afterward, to take Ireland into war for England again, even though England insists on keeping her garrisons in the other 6 counties, and wants to return her garrisons to the other 26.

If ever a country had reason to declare her neutrality in the hope of preserving her peace and the prospect of going on with the orderly development of her resources, Ireland in the present circumstances is that country in respect of the demands made upon her by her nearest neighbor.

Equally is this true of her desire to be free of invasion by England's enemy. Her experience with England's enemies has not been happy. Spain, for her own purposes, landed armies in Ireland, which Ireland welcomed. France, for her own purposes, landed armies in Ireland, which Ireland welcomed. Both forgot Ireland when their wars with England ended, but England did not forget, and Ireland paid in loss of life and lands and inalienable human rights.

Ireland wants no enemy of England on her shores, either on her own account or because England's possession of a part of Ireland is an invitation to such enemy, or because England's enemy of the present, as with England's enemies in the past, might plan to attack England from Ireland.

She wants to be free of the devil she knows and equally of the devil she doesn't know, and to be free of both she has to take the risk of what may happen by maintaining her neutrality in a war that was not in any way of her making, for whose outbreak she has not the most remote responsibility, and into which only through the conflict of others can she be drawn against her will.

Her statesmen hold to their purpose even though threat comes from both sides. In that she should have the sympathy of the United States, which at this time is adjusting her present and future to the possible approach of enemies from two sides. There are those among us in whose eyes England bulks so large that Ireland can scarcely be seen at all. But there are those also in whose hearts there is echo of the prayer of Ireland: "God send that the peace of this island may still be preserved."

To these comes the realization that, in the times in which we live, if the understanding and sympathy essential to Ireland in her time of trial are not found in the United States they will be found nowhere else in the wide world. Nowhere, if not through the Government and the Congress of the United States, can effective expression be given to that understanding in terms that will be comprehended by those who may be tempted to drag Ireland into this war. It may be that this influence can be helpfully exerted while the war continues. It can be hoped that the same influence for good can be made available when the war ends. But it does seem that the chances of such helpful assistance to the preservation of Ireland's peace, now and in the future, must depend to some extent upon the measure in which that assistance is invoked by those of us here who now join in Ireland's prayer and who treasure the hope of seeing her united and free. The Congress may be excused if it waits until it is asked. If the asking is to be in sufficient volume to be heeded while the clamor of others is loud in the ears of Senators and Congressmen, considerable effort must be made. The demand for justice and peace for Ireland speaks now in Washington in but a still, small voice. It should be amplified. If the storm were to break on Ireland it would be. All hope of preventing that is bound up in making known the depth of our sentiments now, without a day's loss of time.

Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

GOVERNOR STASSEN'S KEYNOTE ADDRESS AND SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN AS PERMANENT CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1940

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Governor Stassen's keynote address to the Republican National Convention, as well as the speech by Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts, the permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention of 1940.

I am advised that the speech made by former President Hoover has already been placed in the RECORD by a Member of the House of Representatives. Therefore I do not ask that former President Hoover's speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF GOVERNOR STASSEN'S KEYNOTE ADDRESS TO REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Our forefathers erected here a great lighthouse of liberty.

They showed a new way for men to live. At last men and women could stand erect. They were free—free to think for themselves, to speak and to work and to worship for themselves. Free to use their hands and their brains to build homes for themselves. And free to choose from among themselves their own rulers.

When those founders of our Nation met in this historic city a century and a half ago, the dark shadow of despotic government covered most of the earth. The wealth, the traditions, and the power of the Old World all were arrayed against them.

Yet they succeeded. The framework for a government of free men which they drafted here became a beacon of liberty and progress for the entire world. The people of 13 struggling States adopted their work, and made of it the living Constitution of these United States. The people took from their number a great leader and made of him, George Washington, their first President.

Their task was well done. Let us strive to do as well in this our time of crisis.

COUNTRY PUT ABOVE PARTY

For once again the black shadow of despotism falls over the world. Fellow Republican delegates, even as we meet lights are going out in Europe. Black-outs of dictators take the place of lighthouses of free men. It is our grave responsibility to keep burning brightly the light of liberty.

If we meet that responsibility well, the people of this great Nation of 48 States will make the program and principles that we here set forth their program and their principles next November.

If we meet the challenge before us, we will here nominate a man the people of these United States will make their President next November.

The challenge of the hour clearly calls for our Republican Party to rise above narrow partisanship. Ours is the high duty to place the future of this Nation above all other considerations, including our own desire to win.

Let us face with calm courage the task that is before us.

REALISTIC INVENTORY ASKED

The press and the radio on this very day have brought to us added news of the horrors and tragedies of the war across the sea as ruthless rulers crush free men. Our Army Chief of Staff reports a tragic lack of preparedness for our own defense.

All about us moves the discouraged evidence that we still have 10,000,000 unemployed men and women. A heavy blanket of forty-five billions of indebtedness weighs down over all of our people. Back on the farms millions of rural families face their burdens with shrunken incomes.

This would indeed be a dark picture if we did not also see the great potentialities of a free people, talented sons and daughters of every nation in the world, having in their possession natural resources unequaled by any other nation.

Let us announce here and now that we have faith in the future of this Nation and its way of life.

It is for us realistically to take inventory, to draw heavily from the lessons of the past, and resolutely to turn our eyes to the future. Our first task is to cut through the clouds of confusion and of petty superficial political issues and present to the people, crystal clear, the great underlying problems and principles upon which our real future progress must be made.

We must brush aside the brambles of prejudice, bitterness, and hatred and lead through to national unity based upon understanding, tolerance, and confidence.

TWO RESPONSIBILITIES FACED

Every citizen of this Nation, regardless of his station in life, his political party, his nationality background, his creed, or his race, faces two great responsibilities during these next months.

First, he faces the responsibility of supporting his Government, as now constituted, in every measure for the public good.

So long as the now President of these United States is in the White House, so long as the now Senators and Representatives are in the Capitol, they are our President and our Congress, and when they together take action of vital public concern they are entitled to have, and they will have, the support of all men and women, including in full measure the support of the Republicans of this Nation.

But there is a second and even greater responsibility facing every man and woman of this country. That is the duty of deciding quietly and calmly who shall exercise the leadership of this Nation in the next 4 years of its existence. Then in keeping with that decision each citizen should go to his ballot box next November and cast his precious vote.

These two responsibilities are both of major importance, and each is distinct and separate. He who would confuse them and would withhold support of such action now because of the conviction that there should be a change in November is guilty of a disservice to the future of this country. And he who seeks to claim that support now must carry with it the surrender of the right to change in November, is equally guilty of a disservice to the future of this Nation.

CRITICISM IN A DEMOCRACY

It is not a pleasant task to criticize those in positions of governmental authority. Yet it is absolutely essential to the functioning of democracy.

It was not easy for the people of England to criticize their prewar government, yet how essential—in fact, how belated—was their change. It was not easy for the people of France to criticize their prewar government or their prewar generals, yet how necessary and how fatally delayed was their change.

When democracies face a crisis, their first step must be an extremely frank and fair analysis of their leadership as they prepare to meet their hours of peril.

I consider it to be the patriotic duty of my party to analyze frankly and fairly, from the facts and the records, the leadership this country now has, and that which it should have.

Let nothing that this convention may do or say be construed or distorted by the enemies of democracies as a reflection upon our form of government.

The constructive criticism in which we must indulge, the vigorous debate in which we propose to engage, the severe condemnation we intend deliberately to visit upon those who deserve it—these are not the signs that democracy is not working. They are the living evidence that here, in the last refuge of liberal government, democracy still is working.

FOUR FRONTS FOR ADVANCE

As we face the future we see plainly that if this Nation is to fulfill its high destiny, if we are to make America strong, and our way of life secure, whether the next years be years of peace or of conflict, we must advance with a decisive and determined step upon four major fronts:

The front of national preparedness.

The front of "fifth column" defense.

The front of domestic economic welfare.

The front of governmental effectiveness and integrity.

What shall be the salients of our advance? What shall be the character of our leadership? These are questions, the answer to which our Republican Party must suggest, and our people must decide.

Everyone recognizes the vital necessity for this Nation to advance rapidly and effectively upon the front of national preparedness. We need more than millions of men and women willing to spring to the defense of the country. We need the physical and mechanical means of answering the challenge of those who seek to turn the great benefits of machine development into a mechanical Frankenstein of destruction.

A PROGRAM FOR REARMING

We must develop our air force to take its place beside the Army and the Navy. We need large quantities of the most modern airplanes and antiaircraft guns, the most modern tanks and antitank guns, the most modern ships and coast defense.

We need highly mobile trained fighting units with bases for air, water, and land defense strategically located in this hemisphere. These bases must be protected as far as the ingenuity of man can do so against destruction from the air. We must be constantly alert in research and invention of the means of defense against new weapons of aggression.

To accomplish these ends we must fully utilize our mass production system, we must marshal and conserve our great credit resources, we must have executive direction and responsibility, we must cut through red tape and bureaucratic delays.

We must have a united people, with each citizen willing to make sacrifices and ready to stand shoulder to shoulder in the interests of national defense. We need that pioneering spirit that characterized the days of the covered wagon.

DEFENSE FAILURE CHARGED

And what shall be our leadership as we move forward upon this tremendous task? Shall it be that group of men who for 7 years have been in complete charge of our Government, using the Democratic label? Let us examine their record.

For 7 years they have had not only the Presidency and the Cabinet, but strong majorities in both Houses of Congress. They have had complete authority and they must take full responsibility for what has happened so far as Government is concerned during these past 7 years.

During these 7 years ruthless dictators in other lands built the diabolical machines of destruction now crushing Europe. During these 7 years cruel acts of aggression occurred in rapid succession. With full knowledge of these dangerous developments, what did our national leadership do to meet the threats?

It is a fact today, well known by the heads of every other government in the world, and belatedly coming to the knowledge of the people of this Nation, that we are tragically unprepared. We are too woefully weak to give the Allies that material assistance this Nation wants to give them. We are sadly wanting in the state of our defenses of this hemisphere.

The Army Chief of Staff and the chief of the air force have testified to this serious lack of modern equipment for our defense. They have specifically stated that we lack almost entirely the mechanical means vital to our security.

PRESIDENT'S DATA DISPUTED

As this news swept across the country the President went on the radio and in an extremely clever, but dangerously deceptive manner, lumped together the equipment that was "on hand" and "on order" in an effort to smooth over the failure to fulfill the trust that the American people placed in his administration.

The cold facts are that in many instances the totals the President gave "on hand" and "on order" were about one-fifth "on hand" and four-fifths "on order" and those orders sadly delayed in their fulfillment.

Even then he tried to give the American people the impression that they need not sacrifice, that they could move along with a shrug of the shoulders and that he would take care of things "on order."

He first placed some of the bungling members of his administration in charge of the vital problem of production.

We can be thankful today that the overwhelming demand of the people drove him, begrudgingly, to turn some portions of the task over to tried and experienced men of industry who gladly stepped forward to aid their country.

But he has still failed to put a single competent experienced man in charge of the entire job of production for defense. He insists upon maintaining an unwieldly board of seven with himself in charge. No man, fulfilling the responsibilities of the position of the Presidency, can in addition direct the diverse and highly important work of this committee.

CABINET SHIFT "A CONFESSION"

This failure to understand executive responsibility and coordination, and the primary rules of production and of getting a job done, has been one of the greatest weaknesses of this administration.

It is a terrific indictment that for many crucial months the important War Department has been disrupted by a tragic conflict of authority, with a Secretary of War and an Assistant Secretary hardly on speaking terms with each other, each conferring with the President, each playing his favorites within the Department.

And during the same crisis the Navy Department has been adrift without a real head, first headed by a man physically unable to carry on his task, and then by a Secretary who was submerged in a political campaign for the Governorship of one of our States.

By the politically timed appointment on the eve of this convention of two men of our party to these two Cabinet posts, the President made an eleventh-hour confession of failure in his national-defense administration. We are pleased that the prospect of our convention caused this sudden improvement over New Deal incompetence, and it is only regrettable that we cannot change the entire Cabinet and the man who heads it with equal abruptness.

YOUTH CAMP IDEA ASSAILED

The most dangerous example of the wrong way to prepare was the startling proposal of the President last week that all boys and girls in this country between the ages of 18 and 20 be compelled by the Government to enter Federal training camps.

That was the method of Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin. It is not the American way. We need more skilled and trained mechanics and technicians, but the American way to get them is through the vocational training system of this country, and through private industry.

The Federal Government should furnish the funds for the immediate expansion of these skilled training and apprentice programs. We should repeal the restrictions that make it almost impossible for industry to train young men. This part of our preparedness program should be coordinated under the officers of the Army and Navy and directed by a man who has had practical experience in training skilled men. It should be kept away from the impractical dreamers.

Give our young men and our young women the chance to train themselves for the opportunities and duties that are opening up and you will not have to herd them by compulsion to a Government camp.

When we need more men in our armed forces we should secure them in accordance with the program of the Army and Navy officials and we should not turn this task over to the New Deal social experimenters.

The President said these camps would teach discipline and keep these young people away from foreign isms. I would much rather trust our churches, our schools, and our homes to teach discipline and love of America than I would a compulsory Government camp.

NEGLECT AND WASTE DENOUNCED

Facing these facts, dare this Nation continue for the next four years under such leadership? For too long a time industry has been hobbled by bureaucratic interference and dreamy-eyed governmental delays at every turn while the Army and Navy plead in vain for the release of restrictions so they can speed up defense.

They seriously disrupted and retarded the entire aircraft industry by the ill-considered cancelation of the air-mail contracts, and Army pilots crashed to the earth, just when every encouragement should have been given to build up our air industry.

It is hardly believable, but it is true, that because of New Deal restrictions our aircraft manufacturers have turned to foreign financial centers speedily to secure new capital for plant expansion while idle capital and idle men are all about us.

For too long a time we have wasted millions and millions of dollars on Passamaquoddies and Florida Canals, while neglecting needed defenses.

For too long a time our leaders have strutted down the avenues of the world jauntily knocking chips off shoulders without even preparing to raise our arms in self-defense.

For too long a time we have talked boldly of quarantining aggressors in order to protect other nations, and now find we are not even prepared to protect ourselves.

For too long a time our foreign policy has been one of a big noise and a little stick, and even that little stick "on order." We need again a calm, resolute voice and a big stick.

It is one of the primary challenges to the Republican Party today to furnish the leadership for the calm, determined, rapid advance of this Nation on the front of national preparedness.

STEPS AGAINST "FIFTH COLUMN"

Our citizens also know that we must defend ourselves against the "fifth column." They have heard and read the almost unbelievable stories of boring from within, of treachery, and of treason in one nation after another.

They have seen how this "fifth column" of traitors within has joined hands with enemies from without to cause the speedy downfall and ruthless destruction of sturdy little nations. They have observed how men have taken advantage of the liberties of democracy to aid in cutting out the very heart of freedom itself.

We must prepare our defense against similar actions here, carefully and vigorously but without any ill-considered witch hunts. We should take determined steps through our democratic processes to keep these borers from within away from the pillars of our Capitol.

First and foremost, there must be the determination that no one supporting communism, nazi-ism, or fascism shall be permitted upon the public pay rolls of this Nation.

Second, we must encourage the trade-union movement, manned as it is by loyal American citizens, to divest its organizations, in its own way, of all officers and organizers who are sympathetic to either fascism, communism, or nazi-ism.

Third, we must unmask and expose those un-American organizations that are parading under false fronts.

Fourth, we must proceed vigorously to seek out and to punish by due process every violation of law committed by the "fifth columnists."

And above all, by a sound and progressive advance, fair and friendly to labor, we must open new opportunities, correct maladjustments in our social and economic structure, and take away the grounds of discontent upon which these "fifth columnists" seek to flourish.

CODDLING OF SUBVERSION ALLEGED

And to whom shall this Nation advancing upon this front look for leadership? To those now in charge of our Government? Certainly not. Under their leadership these past 7 years we have seen manifold examples of "fifth column" activities in time of peace within this Nation.

These subversive elements have incited hatred between groups of our people. They have thrown the first stone, causing outbreaks of violence in labor disputes. They have split the ranks of organized labor. They have encouraged the destruction of agricultural products. They have advocated loose fiscal policies. They have stirred up and led relief demonstrations on full stomachs. They have sabotaged and stopped in many ways our great productive organization.

Sincere leaders of labor have made many protests. The clergy of our churches have sounded many alarms. Men of industry have made many pleas for help. Public-spirited men and women of all walks of life have cried out against them. Committees of Congress have brought out clear evidence of their activities.

And yet, so far as our present national leadership has been concerned, these cries have all been of no avail. In fact, as these protests arose, the new dealers just smiled and reached over and patted the flanks of the Trojan horse.

Members of the Democratic Party itself cried out against these subversive activities only to find themselves derided and belittled from the highest places and to find directed at them a vicious purge, ruthlessly using all the peacetime weapons of a powerful administration in endeavoring to line them up against the wall for political oblivion.

No, the New Deal cannot lead our advance upon this front. It is a responsibility and a challenge to the Republican Party to furnish the leadership and the program to defend this Nation that we cherish against the borers from within.

WAY TO WIDEN EMPLOYMENT

What of our advance upon the front of domestic economic welfare? First, let us make clear the general features of this advance. No one shall suffer for want of food, shelter, or clothing. The needs of that portion of our population who have no other means of livelihood shall be met by society as a whole acting through its government.

But it must be equally clear that this is not the answer to our problem. After meeting the immediate need, the great challenge before the Nation shall be to furnish more real jobs for the unemployed in private industry.

We must recognize that, in a free economy, government in meeting the need of its people who are unemployed is not solving a problem, but is only temporarily easing the consequences of an unsolved problem.

We must recognize that the answer to all of our problems of a domestic nature is not to shrug our shoulders and say, "Let the Government do it." The role of government must be that of an aid to private enterprise, and not of a substitute for it. More and better jobs, better housing, and improved living conditions can best be secured through recognition of this principle.

INCENTIVES TO INDUSTRY

There has been talk to the Nation of a more abundant life. In a vain attempt to secure it they have gone from a greedy contest over the division of past accumulations of production to an irresponsible squandering of mortgages on the future.

Those great revenues which our Government must raise, to be financially sound, should be raised in that manner which shall to the least degree restrict and hamper the flow of idle money into the creation of new products and new jobs for idle men. Incentive taxes must take the place of punitive taxes.

We must exercise to the least possible degree the powers of government, to meet definite abuses, rather than using abuses as an excuse for the Government to reach out and grab all the power in the name of regulation. Those powers which government takes must be clearly divided as to legislative, executive, and judicial.

There is hardly any greater deterrent to private capital in its desire to develop more jobs than the morass of uncertainty which arises when great autocratic powers to be, rule maker and investigator, witness and prosecutor, judge and jury are all lodged in the same bureaucratic hands.

STABLE LABOR RELATIONS

For too long a time American enterprise has been subjected to the strafing of dive-bombing demagogs.

To advance upon the domestic field we must unite our forces. The flames of industrial warfare, of strikes and lock-outs and violence, have levied the staggering roll of 80,000,000 days of labor in the past 5 years.

The loss doubled in 1939 over 1938.

The New Deal has helped to stoke these flames of industrial warfare. The present role of government in industrial disputes must be revised. Instead of cracking down here, there, and everywhere it should exercise as little arbitrary power as possible.

Its chief aim should be to aid the working out of peaceful solutions of these difficulties around the conference table before they break out in strikes and lock-outs. Placing in the hands of any governmental agency the power to decide who was wrong after the loss has occurred is not a solution.

We should draw lessons from the Railway Labor Act, adopted in 1926, which we in Minnesota have used as a model, with its waiting periods and emphasis upon conciliation before strikes and lock-outs occur, and its protection of the basic rights of labor.

These simple principles have met with marked success wherever used. They are in keeping with the fundamental principles of the relationship of a democratic government to a free economy.

MEASURES FOR AGRICULTURE

We must recognize further on the domestic front that the farmers are the very backbone of America. We must raise their income and their buying power. The maintenance of millions of free farm families living on soil that they can call their own is one of the greatest bulwarks for future freedom.

When, as now, with extremely low agricultural prices, the natural economic processes do not permit them to maintain their status on the farm they must be aided. This should be as a reward for their production of the food supplies for the Nation and as an incentive to their conservation of the soil upon which they live.

These aids again must not be looked upon as a solution to the agricultural problem but only as a temporary expedient to ease the maladjustment that exists. We must seek real solutions in keeping with the natural economic forces that are involved in our system.

We must step by step take out of production marginal land that it is economically unsound to cultivate and that only adds to surpluses. We must increase the acreage in woodlots and timber tracts; we must aggressively market surpluses at home and abroad. Millions of European refugees should be fed with our surplus agricultural products.

Through development of more jobs and more purchasing power for our consuming public, we must expand the domestic market. We must advance in research and discovery of new uses for agricultural products. We must furnish new jobs for the excess population upon our lands so that instead of being a burden upon agriculture they become production portions of our population and new units of consumption. We must preserve as far as it is economically sound to do so our own markets for our own farmers.

"CUSHIONING" OF DEPRESSIONS

The tragic unemployment of the young men and young women of our Nation has been one of the very great losses of this depression. They have not wanted the dole. They have not wanted aimless month-by-month subsistence. They want opportunities to prepare for a life of productive activity.

The great productive processes of a free people under a system of individual enterprise have made this Nation the great power that it is. It has given to our people the highest standard of living in the world. This system has been and will be subject to its depressions and its recessions, its maladjustments and readjustments as the years roll by.

We must recognize that Government should furnish a cushion against the sharper fluctuations of this economic system, but that it cannot successfully furnish a bed upon which society can go to sleep. We must recognize that we gain together and we lose together.

We must continuously work to readjust and correct injustices and inequalities that are present and that will arise. Then we can have faith that this system will rise again and make ever greater progress in the interests of all of our people.

For the advance on this domestic front, can we entrust the leadership to those who have been in charge for the last 7 years? No. For 7 years jobs for the unemployed and parity for agriculture have been on order. And tonight, after billions of our substance have been scattered to the winds, jobs and parity are still not on hand but on order.

Here again is a challenge to the Republican Party to furnish the leadership and the program for a sound, sincere, step-by-step advance in keeping with the great basic principles of American economy.

RE-FORMING OF GOVERNMENT

What of our fourth front? Events at home and abroad bring forcefully to our attention the challenge to democracy to make itself more efficient and effective without surrendering its own basic principles.

The delays and confusion of yards and yards and yards of red tape, the waste and inefficiency of overlapping stumbling boards, bureaus, departments, divisions, and agencies, the lack of effective lines of Executive authority, the intermingling of powers that are legislative, executive, and judicial and the proper performance of none, the incessant conflict between governments on different levels, Federal, State, and local, these are the things by which lilliputians are restraining the slumbering giant of democracy and free enterprise and making him ineffective.

The inefficiency of our Government is a travesty in a land that has developed such magnificent efficiency in private endeavor.

There is a need of a sweeping, decisive reorganization of our Government. A real reorganization that streamlines our Government, simplifies our procedures, consolidates and eliminates useless and overlapping boards, bureaus, and agencies, establishes simple and effective lines of executive responsibility and separates the powers that are legislative, executive, and judicial. We need in public office servants of the people selected for their merit instead of corporals of a political army enlisted at a patronage pie counter.

Actual administrative details should be kept on as low a local level of government as possible. Relief, welfare, and farm programs should be administered locally in the counties, towns, cities, and villages. The State and Federal Governments should exercise only general powers of supervision and audit of their expenditures. Needless governmental functions must be cast off.

We must trim our sails for Government action in keeping with the tempo of the times. This will not only save millions of dollars of needless expenditures, but it will build up the respect and confidence of the people for their Government and will give us a fair chance to keep our liberty and still compete in a world of totalitarian states.

To whom shall we entrust the leadership on this front? Shall it be to those who have added almost 400,000 men and women to the public pay rolls of their political army, but have added only a few thousand to the pay rolls of our Regular Army? Or to those who tried to pack the Supreme Court of these United States? No. The Republican Party must furnish the leadership and the program to give to this great democracy of ours clear, decisive government.

As we advance upon these fronts many overshadowing problems of foreign policies will require decision. Let us frankly state to the people that we can neither fully anticipate these problems nor can we tie our hands before meeting them. As they are reached they must be faced and the people of this Nation must be made aware of what they mean so that informed public opinion may find expression in the policies of the Government.

PROTECTION FOR HEMISPHERE

It is clear that the first responsibility must be the future welfare of the people of this Nation and their way of life, but it is also clear that that future welfare cannot best be served by simply burying our heads in the sand. The world is constantly changing.

Modern inventions, developments of communication and travel, the flow of trade in a highly industrialized world, all these increase the impact of what happens in one part of the world upon the rest of the world. Let us determine and define where our interests lie.

Clearly in the first instance they lie in this hemisphere. We cannot permit an armed force, aggressive in nature, with a philosophy foreign to ours to establish itself upon this hemisphere. Neither can we allow subversive elements linked to alien aggressors to undermine government anywhere on this hemisphere. It is essential that we plan in advance and take decisive steps to establish hemisphere defense.

It is a sad commentary that in the past 7 years, which led right up to the outbreak of war, we have given the aid of our inventive genius, of our raw materials, and of our productive ability to those with philosophies foreign to ours as well as to those with philosophies similar to ours.

We have thus aided the manufacture of the implements of destruction that Russia used upon Finland, that Germany uses against the Allies, that Japan uses against China, that Italy uses against France. How belated is our now exclusive assistance to the Allies.

It is the responsibility of government in its foreign policy to endeavor in every honorable way to create and nurture a world environment in which its people can proceed along life's path in peace, expanding their material well-being and developing their way of life.

It is thus also clear that our interests lie with the encouragement of freedom and progress for all mankind and the development of order between nations based upon eternal moral and spiritual laws, rather than upon lawless force of economic strangulation.

Failing in the creation of that environment, it is the clear duty of government to make its people strong in their own defense, to so prepare them, that other portions of the world may not stamp out their way of life, and may not encroach upon their well-being.

KEEPING NATION OUT OF WAR

Measured by these guides, what can our verdict be of the foreign policies of this administration? We do not judge harshly, and yet our judgment must be that it has failed. What has this administration done to bring about a better world environment?

Was it in its recognition of Russia? Was it in its torpedoing of the London Economic Conference? Was it in its failure to advise the people of this Nation of the facts that it knew from the capitals of Europe? Was it in its announced attitude that this Nation was no longer dynamic, and was not pressing forward upon new frontiers? Was it in its continued sales of the means of warfare to those very nations who threatened to be aggressors?

No; nor was it in its appointment of wealthy playboys as foreign ministers and ambassadors.

Clearly failing in its first responsibility, neither did it meet its second duty of national preparedness. This Nation has had the shifting foreign policy of the politicians, unwilling to present hard facts to the people of the Nation.

The great need for our future foreign policy is a leadership that is frank and fair with the people. The people must have confidence that their leaders place the Nation's welfare above their own political future. The people must know that their leaders, while resolute in support of these basic policies, nevertheless have the earnest hope to keep this Nation out of war.

THIRD TERM TRADITION

Have we been too harsh in our judgment? No; in fact, we have not even referred to the strong self-indictment of the obvious effort to break down one of our bulwarks of freedom by violating the third-term tradition. The saddest chapter of the last 4 years has been that the national administration, instead of keeping its eyes, statesmanlike, upon the welfare of the people of this Nation, has turned its political gaze upon a third term. This un-American desire for a third term completely undermines their forthrightness in meeting all of our issues. It has destroyed statesmanship. Cleverly and surreptitiously they have strengthened the iron-handed control of the President over the Democratic Party. Building upon the corrupt political machines of Kelly, and Nash, and Hague, and their kind, they have erected as a superstructure, a political machine such as this country has never before seen. Democracy within the Democratic Party has been destroyed.

With this background they move on toward their convention, tossing aside the traditions of Washington and Jefferson.

"FREE CHOICE OF LEADERSHIP"

Let us fully recognize that this very situation is an added challenge to our party. With the Democratic Party's right of free choice of leadership denied to them, we must furnish the leadership for the men and women of all parties. To do so we must make our party truly representative of the people, independent of domination by any group, and fair to all.

Fellow-delegates, if we could reverse the magic of radio tonight, if we could turn the millions of radio receiving sets throughout this land into microphones and if we could turn our microphone here in this great convention hall into a receiving set we would hear an overwhelming message sweeping in upon us.

It would be a cry for a statesmanlike leadership to make America strong and our way of life secure. Shall we rise to meet this challenge? Let us proceed with our deliberations here in this historic city of Philadelphia.

Let us present to the people of this Nation a program worthy of their support. Let us nominate a man to carry out that program, a man the people will elect the next President of these United States.

Let us remember the words George Washington spoke in this very city: "If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN, THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN

You have bestowed upon me a great honor. I deeply appreciate it. I shall try earnestly to perform the duties of the convention chairmanship in a way to justify your confidence.

We are assembled in one of the oldest cities of our Nation. It is a city rich in precious memories and American traditions. Here, almost within the range of our voices, the American Republic was born. Here was heralded to the world a new ideal of government; a government dedicated to the proposition that the rich and the poor alike stand upon a common ground; that each shall have equal rights as well as equal opportunities; that each is entitled to the full protection of his government in the preservation of priceless rights and privileges of citizenship.

This convention will nominate a President to lead America out of the wilderness of economic confusion and spiritual chaos.

We are here to rally all patriots in a crusade for Americanism.

Our party is commanded by epochal events in the history of mankind to give vitality and power once more to the fundamental inspirations and traditions of our national life. Ours is the task to rescue our beloved America from the bog of failure and futility. We are challenged to defend and preserve the basic values of life, liberty, and human freedom in a world paralyzed and broken by the ravages of dictatorship, hatred, and war.

We echo in this great assemblage the glorious inspiration of our beginnings as a nation—"Easier were it to hurl the rooted mountain

from its base than to force the yoke of slavery upon men determined to be free."

SEES PARALLEL IN MEETINGS

The founding fathers gathered in this city in a period of national crisis. So do we today assemble in Philadelphia in a period of grave national trial—indeed, a period of world crisis. The early patriots came here to form a Nation. We come here today to protect and preserve that Nation.

We have been witnessing from this side of the seas a convulsion of history. It will have an inconceivable influence upon the destiny of mankind. We have watched with anxious eyes the liberties and rights of ancient peoples vanish almost overnight.

We have seen with heavy hearts our own Nation, for 7 years, drifting toward one-man government and national bankruptcy. These twin evils were greatly feared by the founding fathers. They sought in every possible way, in their deliberations in this very city, to guard against them.

All that is precious to us, all that makes life attractive or promising—personal liberty, equal rights, equal justice, constitutional government—these are in danger of being extinguished. There is a steady drift toward governmental absolutism, both at home and abroad. This drift must be checked. It must be checked this year. Generations of free men endured hardships and shed their blood so that our lives might be freer, fuller, richer, and more devoted to the cause of liberty and enlightenment. Our generation must not fail.

The spirit, the character, the courage, the faith which in that day threw off the galling yoke of tyranny and carved this great, rich, enlightened Nation out of the primeval wilderness still live in the men and women of today. That spirit, character, courage, and faith alone can preserve this Nation and the world from a return to the chaos, cruelty, ignorance, superstition, and brutality of the Dark Ages.

FINDS "PRICELESS PRIVILEGE"

It is at once the real responsibility and the priceless privilege of the Republican Party to lead the way; to reawaken, revitalize, and rally that spirit, that character, that courage, and that faith which are America's defense against danger of assault from without or within.

In this great convention the Republican Party will rise above partisanship and narrow political expediency. It will respond to that responsibility. It will avail itself of that privilege. We will not fail our country in her hour of need.

The eyes of the Nation are upon us. The hopes of the Nation are in us. This convention must point the way toward security for our beloved country; toward the preservation of our essential liberties while preparing our defense; toward maintaining our constitutional Republic.

My countrymen, we can, if we will, achieve concerted, effective effort just as efficiently as any subject peoples can. We can do it without surrendering the Bill of Rights.

Eyes that are clear, hearts that are fearless, minds that are free must maintain our ideals of liberty in the midst of world chaos and confusion.

We must see to it that our national reason is not warped and befuddled by political propaganda, pleas for power, bureaucratic blundering, or selfishness of section or class. This is no time to be stampeded into hasty decisions.

"FIFTH COLUMNS" HIT

We must preserve our country from the schemes and treachery of those unsympathetic to our constitutional Republic and who would destroy it. Destruction of our Constitution, our Government, and our freedom can be brought about, unless we are vigilant, by economic betrayal just as readily as by military betrayal. All "fifth columnists" must be rooted out and thrown out. "Trojan horses" must be barred from our Government. We must not permit political liberty to be used as a mask for plotters against the American system. The Constitution must not be misused to destroy the Constitution.

Our people may well thank God there is in this Nation one party which refuses to coddle or foster the enemies of free government.

The Republican Party stands today, as it has throughout its long and splendid history, a stalwart champion of national defense. We stand four-square in our determination to have an army, a navy, an air force amply able to protect our shores, to defend our people and our ideals from any foe who might challenge our determination to work out our destiny peacefully in the American way.

We want an America at peace with the world; an America untainted by hatreds and fears.

Following the paths of party tradition, the Republicans in Congress have consistently supported proposals to make the military and economic defenses of the Nation adequate.

As long ago as April 1939 we appointed a special committee of House Republicans to study our national defense. The proposals of that committee were ignored by the administration.

CALLS HEAVY TAX UNNECESSARY

To provide an adequate defense at this time enormous sums of money must be spent. It will mean taxes which will reach painfully into every household in this land. Many of those taxes should not be necessary now. They would not be if the administration had not in the last few years failed in its responsibility to protect the savings and the substance of the American people.

We have refused, and will continue to refuse, to permit either the military or economic defense of our country to be made a partisan issue.

The necessity for quickly building an adequate national defense must not be made the excuse to abandon economy and efficiency. After our national defense is achieved the Nation must continue to live. Our defense must not be defeated by an intolerable debt which will bring ruin through repudiation, inflation, or national bankruptcy. Rigid economy must be practiced in government if we are to obtain the money necessary for defense without reducing the people to poverty through unbearable tax burdens. In this hour of national peril many desirable comforts must be deferred so the Nation may live. There will be need for all to make personal sacrifices. Nevertheless, it is not a time for pessimism. We can achieve an adequate national defense; we can repair our internal economic structure; we can solve our foreign and domestic problems without either a ruinous war or a ruinous debt. If there is a will, there will be a way.

We have had 7 years of blundering and cotradictory policies. We have had a nightmare of experimentation and spending. We have had national planning without a plan. We have had managed economy with neither management nor economy. Vast sums of money—sums too vast to be comprehended by the human mind—have been scattered about with reckless abandon. Under the cloak of emergency and distress the American people have been ruinously exploited. Today the administration is bewildered by the effects of its own irresponsible conduct.

PAST PROMISES CITED

The Roosevelt administration has spent all the savings a thrifty people could hope to accumulate for many generations to come. It has enjoyed unlimited power. It has had every possible opportunity to make good its pledges. The American people were promised that the money changers would be driven out of the temple; the costs of government would be reduced 25 percent; bureaucracy would be checked; a more abundant life would come to all our people; there would be jobs for the unemployed; prosperity for the farmer. "Happy days were here again," so we were told.

The American people believed in their President.

Now what do we find after 7 years of spending and promising? The depression continues. The demands for relief are greater than ever. Millions are still without jobs. If it were not for the war, business would be in the midst of a panic more severe than anything we ever had before. The Public Treasury is empty. The debt limit of forty-five billions will soon be passed. Enormous taxes are in the offing.

The record is a somber story of failure and futility and broken promises. And there is much reason to believe we may yet wake up to find we have been pushed into war. That is the record of the New Deal. That record will never be approved by the American people. They will repudiate it next November. America wants to get back to sanity, progress, and peace—peace at home; peace abroad.

We agree that much money had to be appropriated for necessary relief and other worthy objectives. With those expenditures the citizens have no quarrel. The American people have never hesitated to pay for any worthy humanitarian cause. They do not hesitate now. But they do object—and they should object—to being victimized by false appeals and dishonest motives.

For 7 anxious years we have seen this march toward one-man government.

We have seen national, sectional, and class hatreds encouraged and fanned into the flames now consuming the lives, the liberties, the happiness, the security, and the material possessions of men.

We have seen the renunciation of all the ancient truths and traditions of Americanism; of individual worth and freedom; of personal liberties; of peace on earth toward men; of good will; of faith, courage, thrift, and self-reliance.

Every ideal of Americanism has been imperiled by those who would make our Government and our Nation tools to be manipulated by one man at the head of a great and unelected political bureaucracy. The time has come to end all this if we are to continue to live as a free people.

In the confusion caused by these efforts to change the character and traditions of the American people, in the midst of these great world upheavals, the Republican Party will courageously meet the issues.

This is not the time for discouragement. It is not the hour for either complacency or despondency. Our Nation is in danger. Clear and loud above the roar of war abroad, and chaos and confusion at home, comes the call to patriotic Americans. It is an appeal and a challenge to all who love America; to all, regardless of past party affiliations, who are true to the faith of the founders of this Republic.

CRUSADE CALLED FOR

This great patriotic call is worthy of a crusade. With the courage and fortitude born of a just cause we will press forward. With a high faith in the goodness and wisdom of the God of our fathers, we will carry on.

In this hour of national need, this hour of crisis and decision, the devotion of the consecrated spiritual forces of America alone can answer the compelling challenge which confronts us. We must preserve free America for the generations yet to come, cost us what it may.

Today I bring you the challenge of a new and deeper devotion—a challenge which came to me from the fields of Valley Forge—a challenge from that most sacred shrine of liberty and freedom.

In this hour of decision, I bring you the message of consecration before which I bowed but a day ago at that scene of supreme devotion:

"And here in this place of sacrifice, in this vale of humiliation, in this valley of the shadow of that death out of which the life of

America rose regenerate and free, let us believe with an abiding faith that to them union will seem as dear, and liberty as sweet, and progress as glorious as they were to our fathers, and are to you and me, and that the institutions which have made us happy, preserved by the virtue of our children, shall bless the remotest generation of the time to come."

(The inscription quoted by Mr. Martin is on the Memorial Arch in Valley Forge Park, erected by the Federal Government to the memory of officers and privates in the Continental Army. It was taken from a speech by Henry Armitt Brown at dedication ceremonies in 1914.)

Against Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

TELEGRAM FROM HON. EDWARD R. BURKE OF NEBRASKA TO WENDELL L. WILLKIE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram sent by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] to Wendell L. Willkie, on July 18, 1940.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 18, 1940.

Hon. WENDELL L. WILLKIE,
Colorado Springs, Colo.:

As one who feels deeply that in the light of present world conditions it is essential for our country to maintain the two-term limitation on the tenure of office of President, I shall work for your victory at the polls in November. Thus only may we make certain that never again will any party or any individual be tempted to try to overturn the wise precedent established by Washington, strengthened by Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, and cherished by all Americans who prize their freedom.

I am certain that a host of citizens nurtured in the Democratic faith, as you and I have been, will rally to the defense of the vital principle that under our form of government a limitation on the tenure of office of an all-powerful Executive is essential. We share the firm conviction of the patron saint of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, that should a President ever consent to be a candidate for a third term he will be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views. We believe with another Democratic President, Buchanan, that the principle that no President should be more than once reelected is as sacred as if it were written in the Constitution.

Andrew Jackson, honored by all real Democrats, steadfastly maintained that our liberties would possess an added safeguard if our Presidents were limited to a single term, and his view became party doctrine by action of the Democratic National Convention in 1912. Grover Cleveland saw the most serious danger to America resulting from the zeal born of benefits received and the hope of favors yet to come with which a horde of officeholders would seek to retain a President in office.

I disclaim the leadership of those of my party who but a few years ago put themselves on record that any departure from the two-term tradition would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions and who today take the very action they then denounced. A fitting rebuke to their apostasy will be administered by an aroused people. In that program of education I volunteer my services for the duration of the campaign.

Senator EDWARD R. BURKE.

Tribute to the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to the Negro by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. This tribute is part of an address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri at Sedalia, Mo., on June 15, 1940.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR TRUMAN'S TRIBUTE TO THE NEGRO

History is but one long record of the gigantic struggle labor has waged for its true vindication and right reward. But a new wave of feeling, saturated with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, which looks upon the poor with sympathetic eyes, is passing over our country. A hightened conception of the worth and dignity of human life is taking irresistible hold upon all sections of society. Man is no longer a breathing robot, but a living spirit endowed with the highest and holiest of powers, capable of touching the heavens in inspiration and desire.

And when we speak of man and his labor, at least in this country and, more particularly, in this locality, we must consider the problem of our Negro population and bend our every effort that, at least under law, they may claim their heritage of our Bill of Rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Their social life, will, naturally, remain their own, but as freemen they must have their equality before law.

The relation of colored and white people in this community and this State is one that should be given our interest and attention. We all desire to see proper and helpful relations exist between all classes of people. Certainly there should be no injustice, no contemptuous or unfair treatment allotted by any class to any other class. Most of all, the stronger group should not impose upon the weaker obnoxious conditions or situations. In all matters of progress and welfare, of economic opportunity and equal rights before law, Negroes deserve every aid and protection.

I believe in the brotherhood of man; not merely the brotherhood of white men, but the brotherhood of all men before law. I believe in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. In giving to the Negroes the rights that are theirs, we are only acting in accord with our ideals of a true democracy. If any class or race can be permanently set apart from, or pushed down below, the rest in political and civil rights, so may any other class or race when it shall incur the displeasure of its more powerful associates, and we may say farewell to the principles on which we count our safety.

During the World War the need of men for an Army and for war industries brought more and more of the Negroes from rural areas to the cities. In the years past, lynching and mob violence, lack of schools, and countless other equally unfair conditions, hastened the progress of the Negro from the country to the city. In these centers the Negroes have never had much choice in regard to work or anything else. By and large, they work mainly as unskilled laborers and domestic servants. They have been forced to live in segregated slums, neglected by the authorities. Negroes have been preyed upon by all types of exploiters, from the installment salesman of clothing, pianos, and furniture to the vendors of vice. The majority of our Negro people find but cold comfort in shanties and tenements. Surely, as freemen, they are entitled to something better than this.

Fortunately, with somewhat better chances for education, the Negro is gradually progressing. It is our duty to see that the Negroes in our locality have increased opportunity to exercise their privilege as freemen. When the details for working out this problem arise for decision, they become rather complex; but we can and must meet the situation. Above all else, education for the Negro is of vital importance.

It is safe to say that just to the degree that the Negro attains a proper educational level will he be able to compete on more nearly equal terms with the educated whites among whom he dwells. But he must have the opportunity to be educated. Since education is fundamental to a democratic form of government, our Government will be broad, free, and secure just in proportion as the education of the people composing it is universal and thorough. This means the Negro as much as anyone else. The condition of our Negro must be bettered.

I will quote you a few lines from a speech which I recently had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Even these brief lines show beyond all doubt just what is being done for the Negro by the Roosevelt administration.

"It has given us $2,000,000 for improvements at Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital; $262,000 to Virginia State College; $87,000 for Lincoln University in Missouri; $500,000 for the Wendell Phillips High School at Chicago; $40,000 for West Virginia State College; paid $100 per month to 114 colored school teachers in Chicago engaged in reducing adult illiteracy, and has extended this benevolent aid in other directions.

"According to the 1930 census Negro youth represented 11 percent of the total youth population between the ages of 16 to 24. It is estimated that in January 1940 approximately 82,800 Negro youths were employed on N. Y. A. programs. This was 11.1 percent of the total employment on these programs, or almost exactly the same proportion which Negro youth of the age bears to the total youth population.

"It (that is, the Roosevelt administration) has done more than any other administration to eliminate the slum districts of our great cities through its public-works programs, and that work has but begun."

Ladies and gentlemen, this record excels that of any previous administration, Democratic or Republican. The work of this administration must not be stopped.

May Alaskans Work in Alaska Fisheries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1940

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the subject which I am about to discuss today is of wide concern to the people of Alaska, and it may well be of definite interest to many Members of this body, because it involves questions of decentralization of population, of the employment of local residents in the industries of local communities, and of national defense.

If there is anything in what I shall presently say that may be deemed critical, I hope it will be understood that it is constructive criticism and not censure; the criticism of one who is seeking to promote the welfare not only of his own constituents but of the people of the United States as a whole. The purpose of making this statement is to give information to Congress and to the people of Alaska, to present the facts as known to me, and then, to the best of my ability, to draw reasonable deductions from those facts.

It is now recognized that one of the most regrettable tendencies of our modern social and economic development has been the concentration of people in the great centers of population, where in times of industrial depression or distress they are all but entirely helpless, so that, unless relief comes to them in liberal measure, they are literally faced with starvation. Economists have recognized the high advisability of reversing this process and of having the population of the country more equitably distributed over its surface, thus avoiding great concentrations of people in large communities. The welfare of the Nation is unquestionably promoted by having the people actually living on the land rather than by having them collected in the larger and more thickly settled communities without any attachment to the soil.

Mr. Speaker, as most of the Members of this House know, Alaska is a country vast in area and relatively sparsely populated. The preliminary returns of the 1940 census indicate that there are approximately 72,000 people in the Territory, of whom about 31,000 are descendants of the aboriginal Eskimo, Aleut, and Indian races of the whole or part blood, and the remainder are nearly all of the Caucasian race, with a few Filipinos, Japanese, and others. Since the area of Alaska is nearly 590,000 square miles, it would appear that at the present time there is one inhabitant in the Territory to each 8 square miles of area.

For a number of years past, and especially within the last 12 months, it has become increasingly evident that a much larger population in Alaska would be of definite benefit to the Nation as a whole, particularly with respect to problems of national defense.

As I have said to this House on several occasions, and as many of the Members are aware from their own individual study of the subject, Alaska lies on the short line and on the direct line, both by air and by sea, between the United States on the one side of the Pacific Ocean and the Empire of Japan and Soviet Russia on the other side. Alaska fronts for more than 2,500 miles on the north Pacific Ocean and has an abundance of land-locked harbors free of ice the year round. At its western extremity Alaska reaches to within 260 miles of the nearest Soviet territory at Bering Island, where a large military and naval air base has lately been constructed with the advice and aid of a considerable number of German technicians, and within approximately 700 miles of the northerly islands of Japan, on one of which is located a great naval base of that nation. At the other and eastern extremity, Alaska extends to within 700 miles of the main body of the United States, a really insignificant distance for modern aircraft. Obviously it would be in the interest of the Nation as a whole to have a substantial population in Alaska and to have Alaska developed to the point where it would be largely self-sustaining at least for ordinary articles of food and many of the necessary articles of winter clothing.

HOW THE DISCRIMINATION AROSE

The settlement and development of Alaska have been delayed not only by absentee ownership, or nonresident ownership, of its principal industries and industrial plants, but also even to a larger extent by the practice which has existed from the early days of bringing workmen into Alaska from the States for such seasonal operations as fishing, and placer mining, and road building, and construction work of all kinds, and then returning them to the States at the end of their respective working season, leaving Alaska and the residents of the Territory with little benefit from such operations. In cases without number, and continuously over a period of years until the present time, residents of the Territory have been denied employment in the industries of the Territory because of this influx of workers from the States, who in one fashion or another, in conjunction with the employers, would control the employment, and see that most, if not all, of the jobs were given to nonresidents rather than to residents of Alaska. In the early days of the American history of Alaska, of course, it was necessary to bring workmen into the Territory from the States to perform all types of labor in Alaska because few of the native inhabitants were accustomed to industrial work, and most of them did not care to undertake it, having a native economy of their own which at that time was sufficient for them.

As the years passed, however, and additional people settled in Alaska, the problem of being able to live in the Territory became more acute to the settlers unless they could find some remunerative employment in Alaska. And then as the Territory was more largely explored and overrun by men from the States, the resources of fish, fur, and game, providing food and clothing, which the natives had enjoyed from time immemorial, came more and more under the domination of the new settlers, or visitors, to the exclusion of the natives. Moreover, under the civilizing influences of the missions and the schools, the natives themselves changed their modes of life, and they, too, came to need opportunities to earn money by employment in the industries of the Territory if they were to survive and maintain any semblance of civilized existence.

Despite this increase in the number of permanent residents of Alaska who were not only willing but anxious to secure industrial employment, many of the industries continued to import workmen from the States to perform most of the available jobs, thus excluding residents of Alaska, both natives and whites, therefrom.

The condition became a serious one, particularly in the fisheries of Alaska. Each year has seen, and now sees, thousands of workers imported from the United States into Alaska who remain in Alaska only for the fishing season, and then return to the States with little, if any, benefit to the Territory or its permanent residents. Each attempt on the part of a resident of Alaska to secure a job in the fisheries has been met, first, with refusal, then, with difficulty, and, lastly, on many occasions, with a sort of second-rate opportunity to secure employment in the fishing industry. Residence in Alaska has long been, and is now in places, considered a positive disqualification for a man who sought employment in the work or industries of the Territory, and, particularly, in that of fishing.

Unfortunately that discrimination has not been confined to the fishing industry. For many years contractors building roads in the national forest areas of Alaska declined to employ any substantial number of residents of the Territory, and brought nearly all of their workmen from the States. This unhappy condition has now been remedied by a requirement of the Bureau of Public Roads that Alaskans be given priority in employment in road contracts where residents of the Territory are available for the work.

Still more recently—in fact, last year—the contractors now engaged in building naval air bases at Sitka and at Kodiak,

Alaska, under authorizations and appropriations made by Congress drew their contract with labor unions in Seattle for the employment of skilled workmen in such form that, while pretending to give preference to residents of Alaska, those residents were really discriminated against. In this particular case no blame can be attached to the Seattle labor unions, because they at all times expressed willingness that residents of the Territory should be given priority and that the machinery of employment should be so set up that such priority could be enjoyed by Alaska residents. The Navy Department was likewise quite willing that reasonable facilities should be established for the employment of residents of Alaska in this work, and yet it was only after much argument and strong representations that Alaskans were accorded a fair chance to get the available jobs.

With respect to the fishing industry, the discrimination against employment of the residents of Alaska has existed since the industry was set up. It is the fact that when salmon packing was first undertaken in Alaska there were few residents in the Territory available to work in the industry, and as a consequence the operators brought practically all, and in some cases all, of their employees from the States. Those who resided in Alaska and who wished employment in the industry were ordinarily refused because the operators had already brought from the States full crews for every operation, and so it was well-nigh impossible for an Alaskan to get a job either in fishing or in cannery work.

With the passing of the years and with the increase in population in Alaska conditions have become somewhat better, particularly as to fishing, and there are some areas in Alaska where few other than residents of Alaska are employed in fishing. I have in mind particularly some areas in southeastern Alaska and in Prince William Sound where local resident fishermen are in the vast majority, and, in some cases, no nonresidents are employed.

BRISTOL BAY

In the Bristol Bay area, however, the situation has never been satisfactory and is gravely objectionable at the present time. A statement of the conditions there existing was made to the subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the hearings held by that subcommittee in Alaska during the summer of 1939 by Hon. Edward D. Coffey, a member of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, who has fished in the Bristol Bay waters for a number of years. Mr. Coffey's statement appears in part I of the hearings, commencing on page 24, and is deserving of careful consideration, for he has first-hand knowledge of the subject, and the accuracy of his statement cannot be questioned by anyone. From the very beginning of the operations in Bristol Bay the operators and the nonresident fishermen were equally averse to having any residents of Alaska employed in that particular fishery, and hence the difficulties encountered by residents of Alaska in securing the right to fish in Bristol Bay go back for many years. And for a number of years past Alaskans have struggled desperately to secure a share of that employment, for without it many of them could not obtain remunerative employment in Alaska at all.

Their struggles came to a head in 1936 when the Alaska fishermen formed a union, called United Fishermen of Alaska, taking in practically all of the residents of Alaska engaged in fishing who resided in Seward, Cook Inlet, and Kodiak, and another union called Snag Point Fishermen's Union, embracing the fishermen residing in the Bristol Bay area. During that year a number of residents of Alaska fished in Bristol Bay, but the Alaska Fishermen's Union, composed almost exclusively of nonresidents, with headquarters in San Francisco, Calif., devised an ingenious scheme to make it unprofitable, and perhaps impossible, for Alaskans to be employed in fishing in that region. That scheme was to require the operators to pay to the members of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, as a kind of a gratuity or bonus, a sum equal to one-third of all money paid to residents of Alaska for the fish which those residents caught in Bristol Bay waters.

Let me explain a bit further. The price paid for fish that year by the operators to the Bristol Bay fishermen was 12½ cents per fish. This price was paid to all, residents and nonresidents, for the fish they caught. But the contract signed by the operators and the Alaska Fishermen's Union further provided that not only should the price per fish be 12½ cents but that at the end of the season the operators must pay to the nonresident fishermen, that is to say, the members of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, a sum equal to one-third of the total paid to the residents of Alaska for the fish taken by them. So, as a matter of fact, the operators paid 12½ cents for the fish caught by nonresidents of Alaska, but they were obliged to pay 16⅔ cents for the fish caught by residents of Alaska, 12½ cents to Alaska residents, and an additional 4⅙ cents to the nonresidents and thus the packers were penalized 4⅙ cents per fish for permitting any resident to catch any salmon at all. Now, it will be claimed, Mr. Speaker, that the nonresidents were entitled to that 4⅙ cents, because the residents of Alaska did not perform certain other work at and around the cannery in connection with the loading of the fish, but that claim is fiction. If the Alaskans did not do this extra work, it was because they did not have a chance to do it and because the nonresidents insisted upon having a monopoly of such work.

The device of the nonresident fishermen, the Alaska Fishermen's Union, which they put in the contract with the packers for 1936 and which, for all I know, was in the contract for other years, was intended to prevent the employment of any substantial number of residents of Alaska in the Bristol Bay fishery and the continuous monopolization of the same by nonresidents of the Territory. During the winter of 1936–37 the members of the United Fishermen of Alaska and of the Snag Point Fishermen's Union were compelled to join, and did join under such compulsion, and because they were threatened with complete exclusion from the Bristol Bay fishery otherwise, the Alaska Fishermen's Union, and branches of that union were established in Bristol Bay and in Anchorage. The Alaska resident fishermen at that time were in a desperate position and they were compelled by major force to comply with the demands, no matter how unreasonable, of the nonresident fishermen.

By the year 1939 approximately 50 percent of the fishermen in Bristol Bay were residents of Alaska and the other 50 percent were nonresidents. Hon. Edward D. Coffey, in his statement to the subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which I adverted a moment ago, claimed that despite this equality in numbers, the nonresident fishermen still demanded and claimed and enjoyed the advantage, because a part of their "gentlemen's agreement" with the operators was that the nonresidents should man the first six boats for every line of packing machinery operated in Bristol Bay, and thus by reserving to themselves the first six boats they were assured of employment, while the residents were just permitted to fill in, to catch any salmon that might be required to carry on the packing operations over and above that which might be supplied by the nonresidents' six boats.

In spite of denials, Mr. Coffey insists that this provision whereby the nonresident fishermen have given themselves a monopolistic first call on all salmon caught in Bristol Bay up to the capacities of the first six boats to the line of machinery operated is still in force and effect. Perhaps that is the condition that is referred to in the letter dated January 9, 1940, from Mr. George Lane, a representative of the International Fishermen and Allied Workers' of America, made a part of the record in the hearings held before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in which Mr. Lane says:

> I recognize that when the hearings are reopened the packers will have their innings on southeastern and southwestern Alaska, but I would also like to point out that if the Alaska Fishermen's Union is expected to permit Alaska residents to usurp the just proportion of jobs from the men from the States, we will refuse to permit any fishing in the area.

The "just proportion" of the jobs to which Mr. Lane refers is undoubtedly the privilege of manning the first six boats employed per line in the Bristol Bay fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, naturally the Legislature of Alaska has been much concerned to prevent the outright and, as it may be justly designated, the outrageous discrimination against resi-

dents of Alaska with respect to employment in the fisheries of Alaska. And so, at the last session of the Legislature of Alaska held between January and March 1939, a bill, Senate bill No. 67, was introduced by Senator Henry Roden and considered at length and thoroughly by the legislature. It passed the Senate by unanimous vote and was defeated in the House by a majority of one vote only. Section 2 of the bill provides as follows:

SEC. 2. In the employment of mechanics or laborers in the canning, salting, or other processing of salmon, herring, or other aquatic products, preference shall be given to residents of Alaska, as hereinafter defined and not less than 50 percent of all persons so employed shall be bona fide residents of this Territory and shall have been such for not less than 1 year immediately prior to entering such employment.

I shall not read the entire bill because the rest of it is all written around section 2, which I have just read.

While the bill did not pass both houses, it is significant that it passed the Senate unanimously and was defeated in the House by a majority of one. That action by the several members of the legislature shows a strong interest of the people of Alaska in any proposal which seeks to prevent discrimination against residents of Alaska for employment in the fisheries.

At the close of the year 1939, it was announced by the Bureau of Fisheries that curtailment of fishing in Bristol Bay in 1940 would be necessary to permit an adequate number of salmon to escape to the spawning grounds, as seed, to maintain the run on that particular 5-year cycle. It should be explained here for the benefit of the Members not conversant with the life habits of the salmon, that the salmon are always spawned and hatched in the inland rivers or lakes, go down to the sea at an early age and remain in the sea for several years, inevitably returning to the particular rivers or lakes in which they were spawned and hatched. That fact is so well established by observation that there is no disputing it. The salmon that run in the Bristol Bay area are, as to most of them, salmon that return to the spawning grounds 5 years after they were hatched. The Bureau of Fisheries knew from past records that the runs of salmon in Bristol Bay in 1935, and in 1930, and in 1925 were comparatively light; and so it was evident that a larger escapement than usual should be permitted for 1940; and so the requirements of conservation demanded that there be real curtailment of fishing in Bristol Bay in 1940.

Having in view such curtailment, and knowing the monopolistic device set up and enforced by the nonresident fishermen, it became evident that unless some change were made in that system, few resident Alaska fishermen would be employed in Bristol Bay in 1940. The Alaska fishermen who customarily fish in the Bristol Bay area have no other means of earning a living, whereas the fishermen who reside in the States do have, many of them, opportunities for other employment. As a consequence, the Bristol Bay fishermen sought some way to protect themselves with respect to fishing in Bristol Bay in 1940, and two of their number, Mr Vernon Hilliker and Mr. Ed Dodd, of Anchorage, Alaska, were selected to come to the States to try to secure an agreement with the nonresident fishermen or, that failing, to proceed to Washington in order to obtain aid, if possible, from the Government of the United States in protecting them and their means of livelihood.

The nonresidents having refused to make the desired concessions, Mr. Hilliker and Mr. Dodd came to Washington and asked for the assistance of Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior. They talked with Secretary Ickes and, as Messrs. Hilliker and Dodd later stated to me, the Secretary proffered aid.

In order to avoid any mistake which might arise from failure of my own recollection of what they told me on the subject, I have had Mr. Hilliker relate to me, by telegram dated May 15, the substance of their interview with Secretary Ickes. That telegram is as follows:

Reurtel, cannot quote exact words of Secretary Ickes; but when, during our meeting with him, it was pointed out that there was at present no legal authority to enforce priority for Alaskans. He advised Dodd and myself to go to you and Representative BLAND and try and get your cooperation to cite to you the need of the Alaskans for priority rights in the fisheries of Alaska, so that you might draw up and introduce in this session of Congress measures which give the Alaskans such priority. Advised that his office would support such legislation. Also remarked that legislation would be of great benefit in increasing the permanent resident population of the Territory. Acting Commissioner Jackson and Under Secretary Burlew were also present at this meeting and were apparently in hearty accord with the opinion of Secretary Ickes that the Alaskans merit priority of consideration and that some legal means should be provided which would grant priority this year and in all future years to come. Secretary Ickes asked Commissioner Jackson if the Alaskans could go to the State of Washington or to the State of California and fish, and Jackson advised that the Alaskans could not fish in Washington, as there was a State law which would prevent anyone but residents of the State to fish there. Alaskans could possibly go to California and fish, but it would be very doubtful if they would be granted the opportunity. Ickes then said that he could see no reason why fishermen from the States should be permitted to fish in Alaska, thereby taking the jobs that rightfully belong to residents of the Territory. He said that he believed in organized labor, but he did not believe that any organization in the States which would oppose priority for Alaskans was following the true policy of organized labor.

In accord with his statements to Messrs. Hilliker and Dodd, when the fisheries regulations for 1940 were signed by the Secretary of the Interior and promulgated, the Secretary at the same time under date of January 6, 1940, gave a press release as to the regulations containing the following significant language:

Of outstanding importance is the restriction of commercial salmon fishing in the Bristol Bay area to approximately 50 percent of normal operations. This curtailment for the season of 1940 is necessary in order to rebuild the weak run of the 5-year cycle of red salmon which occurs in the years divisible by 5 in this area. The proposed regulations contemplate that 780 fishing boats will be used in the Bristol Bay area, employing 1,560 fishermen. The Bureau's records show that in years of normal operations approximately 1,200 residents of the Territory have engaged in fishing in Bristol Bay.

It is the belief of the Department that these residents merit priority of consideration in connection with fishing operations.

It is admitted that under present law the Secretary of the Interior has no authority to compel priority for employment of anyone, either resident or nonresident, in any of the fisheries of Alaska, and, therefore, the only thing the Secretary could do, and the only thing that he attempted to do, was to request all concerned in the fishing industry in the Bristol Bay area to give priority of employment to residents of Alaska in that area. This was followed by a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Alvin J. Wirtz, dated January 24, 1940, addressed to each individual cannery concern operating in Bristol Bay containing the following paragraph:

Records show that year by year there has been an increase in the number of Alaska residents fishing in Bristol Bay, the aggregate now being about 1,200 persons. Secretary Ickes has declared that these residents merit priority of consideration in connection with fishing operations. The primary purpose of this letter is to acquaint the industry with the Department's attitude concerning the employment of Alaska residents in the fisheries of that Territory. It is earnestly hoped that the industry will bear this in mind in planning operations this year.

The support given to the cause of Alaskans by the Secretary of the Interior, as first stated to Mr. Hilliker and Mr. Dodd, and which found later expression in the paragraph of the 1940 regulations and in the letter written by Under Secretary Wirtz, which I have quoted, was received in Alaska with satisfaction and sincerely grateful appreciation. It was felt that, at last, Alaska residents had a powerful champion who would do everything possible within the law to help them.

It should be noted here that the 1940 fisheries regulations as approved and promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior were, in the judgment of Alaskans, the best and most favorable fisheries regulations that had been prescribed for Alaska for many, many years. For example, the 1940 regulations forbade the taking of herring in southeastern Alaska waters for reduction into oil, meal, or fertilizer. Those regulations also required the closing of 20 salmon traps, many of which had been particularly harmful to Alaska fishermen.

Since, under the present law, the Secretary of the Interior really has no authority to compel compliance with any request which would prevent discrimination against residents of Alaska for employment in the fisheries, or give them priority

as to such employment, I introduced in the House of Representatives three bills which I shall briefly describe:

H. R. 7987, introduced on January 17, 1940, seeks to provide desired priority to residents of Alaska for employment in the fisheries of the Territory by authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior, as a part of the annual fisheries regulations, to make suitable provisions for such priority to residents of Alaska.

H. R. 7988, introduced on the same date, is an attempt to provide for such priority to Alaska residents by requiring that over a period of 5 years the number of Alaskans employed in the fisheries shall be gradually increased so that in the year 1946, and each successive year thereafter, all persons employed in the Alaska fisheries must be residents of the Territory.

H. R. 8115, introduced on January 24, 1940, which has reference to only one year, 1940, and to one fishing district of Alaska, namely, Bristol Bay, and would require that all persons engaged in fishing in the Bristol Bay area in 1940 be residents of the Territory. This bill is, of course, in absolute harmony with the statement of the Secretary of the Interior made simultaneously with the signing and promulgation of the current fishing regulations for the year 1940, requesting that residents of Alaska be given priority in fishing in Bristol Bay during the present year.

While H. R. 7987 and H. R. 7988 covered the same field, my purpose in introducing both of them was to meet any possible objection that might be made as to the methods by which discrimination against residents of Alaska could be prevented, and priority given to those residents, in the fishing industry of the Territory.

At my request, hearings were had on the three bills, jointly, before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on March 12 and 14, 1940. I made a statement before the committee urging their enactment and advancing the supporting reasons substantially as stated here. The proposed legislation, in principle at least, also had the approval of Hon. Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, and of Mr. Don Carlos Brownell, then mayor of Seward, Alaska, each of whom appeared before the committee and testified personally. I offered to the committee, and received permission to incorporate in the record of the hearings, a number of letters and telegrams from residents of Alaska, Alaska labor union representatives, officials of American Legion posts in Alaska, and private citizens, urging passage of the legislation.

Just before the hearings closed I received from Mr. Hilbert Andersen, agent of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, Bristol Bay branch, who was then in San Francisco, Calif., a letter opposing the legislation, but it appeared from the accompanying copy of telegram that his opposition was, at least in part, based upon the meeting of 23 members of that organization, held in Bristol Bay. Since the organization represented by Mr. Andersen has more than 1,000 members, a majority vote of 17 to 6, at a meeting attended by only 23 members of the Union, did not seem to me to be particularly convincing.

Mr. J. F. Jurich, secretary-treasurer of the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America, Seattle, Wash., with which the Alaska Fishermen's Union is affiliated, appeared at the hearings, read a brief and testified in opposition to this and other proposed Alaska fisheries legislation.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, from what I have heretofore said that in presenting this legislation to Congress, that I expected and had reason to expect, powerful support of the Department of the Interior for legislation of the type thus proposed; and it must be further evident that in drafting the several bills mentioned, I endeavored to so phrase them as to meet any possible objection that might be offered to a particular form of draft. H. R. 8115 is almost literally in the language of the Secretary's press release with respect to the Bristol Bay fisheries, and H. R. 7987 is in complete harmony with his statement to Mr. Hilliker and Mr. Dodd when they talked with him on the subject and he suggested legislation by Congress.

At the time of the hearings on the bills, no department reports thereon had been received from the Secretary of the Interior. Later, and on or about May 3, 1940, such reports in the form of letters addressed to the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. S. O. BLAND, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and signed by Hon. Elbert K. Burlew, Acting Secretary of the Interior, were received by the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman BLAND, who promptly furnished copies thereof to me. Each and all of the reports are adverse, and recommend that the several bills be not enacted. Not only that, but no suggestion is made of any amendment or any substitute legislation for correction of the evils aimed at in the proposed legislation. The three letters are similar, but I quote here the one relating particularly to Bristol Bay, since that is the area in which Messrs. Hilliker and Dodd were principally interested. It is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 2, 1940.

HON. S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLAND: Reference is made to your request for a report on H. R. 8115, introduced by Delegate DIMOND on January 24, 1940, entitled "A bill making provision for employment of residents of Alaska only in the salmon fishery of the Bristol Bay area, Alaska, during the year 1940."

I recommend that the bill be not enacted.

Section 1 of the bill is in the nature of a preamble, stating "that it is in the national interest to increase the permanent resident population of the Territory of Alaska, and to that end it is necessary that residents of the Territory be aided in securing priority of employment in the industries thereof."

Section 2 provides specifically that "during the year 1940, no fishermen shall be employed, either directly or indirectly, in the commercial fishing for or taking of salmon in the Bristol Bay fishing area of Alaska unless such person is a bona fide resident of Alaska and has been such resident continuously for the period of 1 year prior to June 1, 1940."

The Department's regulations for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska in 1940 contemplate that commercial salmon fishing in Bristol Bay will be curtailed to 50 percent of a normal operation. There has been a progressive decline in the abundance of salmon in the Bristol Bay runs in every fifth year since 1915. This decline in the years in question is most striking, because it is unparalleled in the Bristol Bay runs for any other cyclical period. The regulations now in effect will provide for a breeding reserve of sufficient size to partially correct this situation, and it is expected that in the succeeding cycles in 1945 and 1950 this weak run will be fully restored.

The current regulations applicable in Bristol Bay contemplate the operation of 780 fishing boats, or one-fourth less than the number of boats operated in a normal year. As there are 2 fishermen to each boat, it is expected that 1,560 fishermen will be required in the Bristol Bay salmon fishery in the 1940 season. In 1939 about 1,200 of the Bristol Bay fishermen were residents of the Territory; the balance were from the Pacific Coast States. While in a year of limited operations such as 1940 the Territory of Alaska could probably provide all the fishermen required in the Bristol Bay area, the Department is of the opinion that to restrict the fishing for or taking of salmon in the Bristol Bay fishing area to bona fide residents of Alaska, as contemplated by section 2 of the bill, would establish an unwise precedent.

The Department is entirely in agreement with the assumption of the proposed bill that it is in the national interest to increase the permanent resident population of the Territory of Alaska. However, the proposed bill would defeat rather than aid this purpose since it would discourage immigration to Alaska by depriving new settlers of equal opportunities to secure employment. The Department, of course, has the responsibility of administering the fisheries of Alaska, and providing for their conservation. The restrictions contemplated by the bill, however, are not necessary to enable this Department to discharge its responsibilities.

I am informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. BURLEW,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

In the Acting Secretary's letter reporting upon H. R. 7987, which is similar to the letter relating to H. R. 7988, the following additional reasons are given for opposing the proposed legislation:

The Department is very anxious to develop a stable and permanent population for Alaska. The administrative difficulties, however, in meeting the objectives sought by the bill would be very great and would require, in effect, that an annual census be made of all bona fide residents of Alaska.

Even if actual bona fide residents of Alaska were given priority of employment only with respect to fishing, a considerable number of persons from the States would have to be employed. For example, the records show that in 1938, the latest year for which complete statistics are available, 11,007 fishermen were employed

in Alaska. This is apart from 17,077 other persons engaged in connection with the fishery operations in Alaska in that year. In certain important sections of Alaska the population is so sparse that it would be impossible to carry on commercial fishery operations on the present established scale with residents of the Territory only.

The salmon and other fisheries of Alaska are seasonal in character, and during the winter months there is almost complete cessation of fishery activities. In 1938, of the 3,051 fishermen credited to western Alaska, approximately 1,200, or considerably less than one-half, were residents of the Territory, and many of these were from other sections who migrated temporarily to Bristol Bay to engage in the fishery for red salmon.

* * * * * * *

Not only would the proposed legislation militate against the increase of the permanent population of the Territory, but it would establish a precedent which, if applied by the various States of the Union against Alaskans who may seek temporary employment in the States, would do a good deal of harm to the present population of Alaska.

Apart from the foregoing considerations of policy it should be added that the constitutionality of the proposed discrimination, particularly insofar as it affects employees in processing industries, is questionable.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

It may be said, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed legislation is unique although it is not really so because there is precedent for it in the legislation of several States, notably the States of Virginia and Washington. But whatever may be said of the legislation, conditions in Alaska are unique. I have mentioned the vast area of land and its sparse population. It is obviously in the public interest and in the interest of the Nation as a whole that Alaska should have a much larger resident population. After all, if the Territory is to be of the greatest possible value to the United States and not merely remain a vacant land of forests and meadows and lakes and rivers and reindeer pasture and the abode of wild animals, reasonable encouragement must be given to people who take up their residence in Alaska so that they can really make their homes in the Territory. From comparison of climate and resources and other physical conditions made with respect to Alaska on the one hand, and the Scandinavian countries, including Finland on the other, we have the reasonable assurance that Alaska can easily support a population of several millions.

It is not necessary to say to you, Mr. Speaker, nor to the members of the subcommittee who visited Alaska last summer, that the fishing industry, and particularly the salmon-packing industry, is of outstanding importance to the Territory. It supplies nearly 50 percent of the Territorial revenues. It furnishes a large part of the gainful employment to be had in Alaska. If Alaskans are measurably shut off from that employment, they cannot continue to reside in the Territory unless they may receive, and are willing to accept, some form of relief from the Federal Government. The Territory alone is not able to take care of them if they are unemployed.

Therefore, every consideration of sound national policy demands that we do what we can within reason and under the law to aid in giving employment to the residents of the Territory in the industries of the Territory, including the highly important industry of fishing and fish packing and processing. The opposite policy which contemplates the moving of thousands of workmen from California, or Washington, or Oregon, or some other place in the several States, to Alaska each summer and removing them from Alaska in the fall of each year leaving the Territory vacant and leaving little in the way of permanent structure and no continuous human life therein surely cannot be in harmony with the aims and objectives of the National Government.

What is attempted by the proposed legislation is supported by tradition coming down through the centuries for at least a thousand years of which history has a record. From the earliest times it has been considered that the inhabitants of the upland have the first claim to the fisheries in the marginal sea as against those who come from a distance. Frequently that has been a matter of necessity because if the residents of the shore were prevented from taking the fish of the adjoining sea, they often would have been unable to gain subsistence at all and thereby would have been forced to migrate to another region or else endure the slow ravages of malnutrition or outright starvation.

Historically, of course, the conflict between the inhabitants of the shore, and those who come from a distance, for the fisheries of the seas adjoining the shore has been frequently a conflict between different nationalities. But the principle is the same even if they all belong to the same race and give allegiance to the same flag. The principle, and I think it can be justly called a principle, is that those who reside on the shores of any sea have the first call, or the first claim, or a prior right, whatever it may be denominated, to the fisheries of the adjoining sea as against those who reside in the more remote places.

In Norway, the principle to which I have just adverted has been stated forcefully, and the Norwegians have constantly contended that the inhabitants of the coast who pursued the hard and laborious calling of fishermen should be protected from the intrusion of foreign vessels which may be better equipped and with more capital at their disposal; that a large proportion of the coastal population derive their livelihood from the sea, and that it would be an offense against justice and good morals to have that source of livelihood taken away from them. The subject has found treatment in the works of the law writers who have dealt with the question of jurisdiction in the marginal sea, but I shall now refer to one only, the truly learned and eminent Thomas W. Fulton and to his work, The Sovereignty of the Sea, published in 1911, in which he refers in turn to the writings of Wellwood, Selden, and others.

It is true that the main point discussed by all of these writers is the conflict between different nationals as to jurisdiction over the seas immediately adjoining the shores, but the principle itself is of universal application, and fully sustains and supports such legislation as is here proposed.

There is, then, nothing against natural justice in the suggested legislation, and it has the support of sound concepts of public welfare and highest national interests.

LABOR UNIONS—RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT

It is claimed that compensation, wages, and conditions of work of fishermen and cannery workers in Alaska have been greatly improved through the operation of the nonresident fishermen's and cannery workers' unions, and to that claim there is much merit. The nonresident workers claim all the credit for improvement of conditions in Alaska in connection with fishing and cannery work, but such an extensive claim is not supported by the known facts. Other unions, comprised mostly of residents of Alaska, have contributed equally to the improvement of conditions, and the present relatively good conditions will be readily maintained and improvements therein made if the nonresident unions should not send a single worker to Alaska.

It is true that the price paid to fishermen in Bristol Bay has increased over the years from 6 cents to 14 cents per salmon, or more, but the price paid to fishermen for the same type of red salmon in southeastern Alaska, a place where the Alaska Fishermen's Union has little if any connection, has increased much more, so that during the past season the fishermen in southeastern Alaska, and in Prince William Sound, received from 20 cents to 30 cents for each red salmon. I cite that fact to show that the residents of Alaska are amply able to take care of themselves through their own unions, and, in fact, they are just as devoted to labor-union principles as are the nonresidents, and perhaps more so.

It is not only in Bristol Bay, Mr. Speaker, that we have discrimination against residents of Alaska in employment in the fisheries. The record of the recent hearings held in Alaska will show other testimony indicating that the residents must maintain a continuous fight to secure employment, and frequently are not employed at all, through the demands of the nonresident workers, or are employed on much less favorable terms than nonresident workers.

Many of the operators now claim that they would prefer to employ residents of Alaska in fishing and in cannery work, but are prevented by the threat of strike, or the declaration of "hot cargo," by the nonresident unions. I am not able to say how much of such declaration is truth and how much is mere pretense. My doubt is based upon the fact that from

the earliest days the operators, at practically all times and under practically all circumstances, declined to hire a resident of Alaska in any capacity in the fisheries if a nonresident worker were available. Ordinarily they hired residents only when they could not get nonresidents to do the work, and so now when they say they would like to hire residents if they were permitted to do so, I am still skeptical.

It will be claimed, indeed, it has been claimed, that this is an attempt on the part of Alaskans to break down labor unions and labor unionism, and that the cannery operators are really responsible for the proposed legislation. Any such claim, Mr. Speaker, is completely untrue. There is no vestige of fact or of truth in it.

The discrimination against residents of the Territory, which has continued to be practiced over a period of years and which is now being practiced, is alien to true labor-union principles, just as it is alien to the public welfare. If the leaders of nonresident unions were loyal to the essential principles of unionism, it would not require any legislation or any recommendation even to persuade them to lay down as a policy that the residents of Alaska, who are immediately dependent upon the fishery of the adjoining waters for support, should be given a preference in that fishery; and it does not matter whether that number of residents of the upland should continue to increase over the years as the land is populated. As good citizens and good union men they should welcome the development of the Territory and they, too, should join with the rest of us in an attempt to make it possible for people to live in Alaska by making available to them such employment as there is in Alaskan industry. If the opposite course, and the course now urged by the opponents of giving jobs in Alaska to Alaskans, is carried to its logical conclusion, Alaska will be left a wilderness and few people will ever live there, and we shall have the sad spectacle of thousands of men being transported each year from some place in the States to employment in the Territory and then after a brief period of such employment, returned to their homes in the States leaving nothing behind them for the benefit of the land whose natural wealth they are utilizing, and a further concentration of population in the large cities.

Mr. Speaker, I am such an ardent believer in labor unions that I have often said, and I earnestly believe, that if labor unions did not exist, we would be compelled to invent them as a necessary part of our highly industrialized social organization, to prevent the degradation of human beings by savage commercial competition, to promote the welfare of society, and to insure the perpetuation of free government. I actively supported the collective-bargaining provision of section 7 of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, the first great modern charter guaranteeing the rights of labor unions, and upheld with like conviction the National Labor Relations Act, approved July 5, 1935, with all of its manifold safeguards for labor unions and labor-union principles. My advocacy of these measures was not merely passive, for as early as the fall of 1933, in a statement broadcast in Alaska, I advised the Alaska fishermen and cannery workers to form a Territory-wide union for the maintenance of their just and lawful rights.

These things were all done long before the people who are now denouncing my efforts for endeavoring to secure jobs for Alaskans had ever established a labor union in Alaska, or for Alaska, which was worth its salt. Therefore, it comes with singularly ill grace from them, whose only interest is to get as much out of Alaska as they can and leave nothing in the Territory for those of us who actually live there, to presume to tell us Alaskans that they are the only ones entitled to speak for labor unions or for labor unionism in Alaska, and boast that they have force enough to compel us to comply with their wishes and that if we do not so comply we will be ruined.

Our people in Alaska must have these jobs if they are to live in Alaska. That is not to the same extent true of those who come into Alaska from the States. In fact, I am reliably informed that many members of the Alaska Fishermen's Union in San Francisco who fish in Alaska have other regular jobs in San Francisco which they quit in order to come to Alaska to fish because the fishing is more profitable than the other jobs. Alaskans are denied this opportunity; generally they have no other jobs and so they must fish or work in the fisheries if they are to live in the Territory.

INVESTMENT OF CAPITAL AND RESIDENCE

It has been urged that if legislation is considered which would give priority to residents of Alaska in the fishing industry of the Territory or would limit work in that industry to residents of Alaska only, a similar restriction should be made as to the investment of money in the Territory by nonresidents of the Territory and as to the operation of industries or plants which are built through such investment. Such a proposal ignores the basic purpose which underlies the legislation now presented, designed to give priority to residents of Alaska in the Alaskan fishing industry. That basic purpose is to promote the settlement and development of the Territory and to aid in maintaining a permanent population in the Territory attached to the land by having gainful employment in Alaska, and that purpose is promoted by the investment in Alaska of capital that is earned elsewhere. Such investments also tend to the development of the Territory and tend, when residents of Alaska are employed, to build up and maintain the population of the Territory. The two go hand in hand. Money brought from the United States and invested in Alaska is ordinarily used, at least in part, in clearing and grading land or in purchase of land, or both, and in the construction of buildings which become a part and parcel of the land itself subject to taxation in the Territory. And thus such investment not only gives employment to the people resident in the Territory, unless they are forbidden such employment at the dictates of those who do not reside in the Territory, but also furnishes a possible source of income to the Territory itself, which works to the benefit and advantage of all of the economic, social, and cultural elements of the people of the Territory.

It must be obvious to anyone that in the beginning of an unpeopled country, particularly a country like Alaska in climate, soil, and topography, the investments of large amounts of capital are necessary in order to have any substantial number of people live or be employed in the Territory. To say that a man shall not invest a dollar in the fisheries, in the mines, or in the other industries of Alaska unless he lives there permanently himself would, of course, make the peopling of Alaska a matter of thousands of years instead of the few years or few tens of years as it should be.

Therefore the proposal that if nonresidents are given second place in the employment in the fishing industry of Alaska in favor of residents, the people of the United States should also be forbidden to invest their money in Alaska unless they live in Alaska themselves, is little better than silly.

THE SETTLEMENT OF ALASKA AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, I have already adverted to the position of Alaska with respect to national defense. Its importance is so well recognized that our Government now has under construction two naval air bases, one located at Sitka and the other located near Kodiak, Alaska, and an Army Air Corps experimental station near Fairbanks, Alaska. An Army air base of substantial size and a military post have been authorized for Anchorage, Alaska, and another naval air base for Unalaska; and the money for the constructon of those bases has been appropriated at the present session of Congress. Surely national defense will be promoted by having Alaska populated, by having a native citizenry in Alaska who can participate in that defense. It is hardly necessary to argue that point. A million people in the Territory, or even a few hundred thousand, would immensely promote the safety of the people of the United States. Therefore it is all the more vital that every reasonable effort should be made to increase the population of Alaska and, in any event, to see that the Territory is not depopulated by the enforcement of the mandates of nonresidents of the Territory who insist that they shall have all of the best jobs in Alaska connected with its most-important industry—the fisheries—and that none, or at most few, of those jobs can be enjoyed by resi-

dents of the Territory. In advocating what I am urging here I am not only endeavoring to promote the welfare of the people of Alaska but am also trying to advance the welfare and the safety of the people of the United States.

THE LAW

At the outset of our consideration of the proposed legislation, we are confronted with the question as to whether the legislation here before us is in harmony with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

So far as I am aware, no person can answer that question with complete assurance. It appears that the State of Washington some years ago enacted a law limiting fishing to residents of the State. Others have told me that the law is not now enforced. So far as I know, that law has never been challenged in court.

Without entering into an extended discussion of the constitutional features of the proposed legislation, it may be in order to make a brief statement with respect thereto.

Article IV, section 2, of the Constitution provides:

> The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities as citizens in the several States.

And in the fourteenth amendment we find the following:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Obviously the provisions of the fourteenth amendment have no application to the present case, except by remote inference. For the fourteenth amendment is a limitation upon the powers of the States and not a limitation upon the powers of the National Government.

The inquiry may now be made whether any citizen, by the legislation suggested, is being deprived of any right or privilege or immunity under that part of article IV, section 2 of the Constitution above quoted. It is evident that this provision, too, was intended to prevent adverse legislation by a State as to the privileges or immunities of a citizen of another State, rather than by similar adverse legislation by the Congress of the United States. There is no authoritative decision that I know of on the exact point involved.

There are, however, several decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which throw some light on the subject and which, to my mind, tend to indicate that the legislation now being sought does not run counter to any provision of the Constitution.

In the *Slaughter House cases* (18 Wall. 75, 83 U. S. 36), the Court passed upon the validity of an act of the Legislature of Louisiana whereby there was granted to a Louisiana corporation the exclusive right for 25 years to have and maintain slaughterhouses, landings for cattle, and yards for enclosing cattle intended for sale or slaughter within the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard in that State. The enactment was challenged upon the ground that it was in violation of article IV, section 2, and of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution. But the Court upheld the law.

In the case of *McReady* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391), the Supreme Court of the United States sustained an act of the Legislature of the State of Virginia reading as follows:

> If any person other than a citizen of this State shall take or catch oysters or any shellfish in any manner, or plant oysters in the waters thereof or in the Rivers Potomac or Pocomoke, he shall forfeit $500 and the vessel, tackle, and appurtenances.

The argument was made that the statute of Virginia in question was destructive of the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution to the citizens of the several States, that is to say, the citizens of other States. However, in an opinion by Chief Justice Waite, the Court sustained the act, holding that, subject to the paramount right of navigation, each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction and may appropriate them to be used by its citizens as a common for the taking and cultivating of fish; that the citizens of the State thus acquire a property right in the tidelands and to any crops which may be grown therein or thereon; and that the citizens of other States could not justly claim injury by being excluded from fishing in such tidelands.

The authority of McReady against Virginia would appear to be conclusive were Alaska a State instead of a Territory and if the State legislature should enact such legislation as I have proposed. Can it be reasonably argued that with respect to Territories, where Congress may lawfully exercise all the governmental power that exists under the Constitution, Congress is still denied the authority to enact legislation that may be validly enacted by a State? To ask that question would seem to answer it.

If the State of Virginia, under its police power, or any other power which it may exercise within the confines of the Constitution, may limit fishing or employment in the fisheries of the State to residents of the State, then I suggest that Congress, under the exercise of Government authority, which must of fundamental necessity be as broad and as comprehensive as the legislative authority of a State, and particularly exerting its power as a local legislature, fortified and enlarged by its general power over the public domain, may validly pass legislation that will similarly restrict fishing or employment in the fisheries of Alaska to residents of Alaska or will give those residents priority in such work.

The power of the State was again sustained in the case of *LaTourette* v. *McMaster* (reported in 248 U. S. 465). In this case a statute of the State of South Carolina was involved, providing that only such persons should be licensed to act as brokers to represent citizens for the placing of insurance with insurers in that State or elsewhere as were residents of the State and had been licensed agents of the State for at least 2 years. This is clearly a case where in the exercise of police power the State has restricted to its residents the performance of certain functions of private business. The act was sustained by the Supreme Court in an opinion rendered by Justice McKenna, holding the legislation to be a valid exercise of the police power of the State. The following is quoted from the opinion:

> "But we need not cast about for reasons for the legislative judgment. We are not required to be sure for the precise reasons for its exercise or be convinced of the wisdom of its exercise." It is enough if the legislation be passed in the exercise of a power of government and has relation to that power. *Bast* v. *Van Deman & Lewis Co.* (240 U. S. 342, 365, 366), and cases cited; also *Bunting* v. Oregon (243 U. S. 426, 437). * * *
>
> The court (referring to the opinion given in the case by the State supreme court) thus distinguishes between citizens and residents and decides that it is the purpose of the statute to do so, and by doing so it avoids discrimination. In other words, it is the effect of the statute that its requirement applies as well to citizens of the State of South Carolina as to citizens of other States, residence and citizenship being different things.

I invite the attention of the Members to the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Haavik* v. *The Alaska Packers Association* (263 U. S. 510). The case concerns an act of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska imposing an annual license tax of $5 upon every nonresident fisherman. The validity of the legislation was contested as being in contravention of the privileges and immunities clause of article IV, section 2, of the Constitution. The Court, in an opinion given by Mr. Justice McReynolds, sustained the law, and in so doing made, with respect to the privileges and immunities clause of section 2, the following observation:

> We are not here concerned with taxation by a State. The license tax cannot be said to conflict with section 2, article IV, of the Constitution—"the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." It applies only to nonresident fishermen; citizens of every State are treated alike. Only residents of the Territory are preferred. This is not wholly arbitrary or unreasonable, and we find nothing in the Constitution which prohibits Congress from favoring those who have acquired a local residence and upon whose efforts the future development of the Territory must largely depend. See *Alaska Pacific Fisheries* v. *United States, supra,* and *Alaska Fish Co.* v. *Smith* (255 U. S. 44, 47, 48).

In legislating for Alaska in a matter of this kind, I suppose it is reasonably plain that Congress not only acts in its national capacity but also as a local legislature. Congress, in legislating for the Territory, has all of the legislative power of the National Government and all of the legislative power which might be exercised by a local legislature. Congress

has general authority and sovereignty and jurisdiction over Alaska, subject, of course, to the provisions of the Constitution. And Congress has the right to exercise as to Alaska the full scope of the police power of the United States without any limitation which might possibly be imposed upon that power in the several States under our dual system of government, wherein we have a "sovereign Nation of sovereign States." In Alaska we are not dealing with a sovereign State, and there we have only the sovereign Nation; and, therefore, in legislating for Alaska, the police power of Congress, subject to the Constitution, is unbounded.

Having in mind the considerations of national welfare and of national defense, which make it advisable that the settlement of Alaska be encouraged, and having in mind the inescapable conclusion that Alaska never will be settled and, in fact, may lose a substantial part of its present sparse population unless Alaskans have a fair opportunity to find employment in the industries of the Territory—the industries of the Territory which are actually carried on in the Territory—I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that under the police power and for the promotion of the general welfare, Congress has a right to take this step to aid in the maintenance of the present population and an increase in the number of the people of Alaska.

Without being frivolous, or being disrespectful toward a coordinate branch of our National Government, it may be well for us to remember that in truth "the Constitution is what the judges say it is." If more than 50 lawyers, among them some of the more eminent members of the bar, could be mistaken before the event as to the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States on the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act—and, I may parenthetically say, a mistake which was joined in by thousands of other lawyers in the country in reliance upon prior decisions of that high tribunal—then, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we are well justified in not refusing to consider legislation on constitutional grounds, because it may run counter to what some people think is the true import of the United States Constitution, in view of the construction heretofore placed thereon by one or more of the courts. The Supreme Court, by a 6 to 3 majority, in the case of *United States of America* v. *William M. Butler, et al* (297 U. S. 1), held the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 to be in contravention of certain provisions of the Constitution of the United States. But I suppose there is not a single person in our country, lawyer or layman, who believes, or even suspects, that the same act, if now coming before that Court for the first time would be so held invalid. Lately the Supreme Court has sustained local sales taxes and use taxes, which 30 years ago almost every lawyer in the land would have said were clearly unconstitutional. One thing is certain, and that is that the Constitution is a living instrument and that no one should be frightened or deterred from attempting to do a good and useful thing by reason of some past construction placed upon that instrument by even so great a body as the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the hearings had on the bills extensive argument based principally upon law was offered on behalf of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, the nonresident Alaska organization, members of which fish in Bristol Bay, and other affiliated societies. That testimony was presented by Mr. J. F. Jurich, secretary-treasurer of the International Fishermen and Allied Workers' of America, an organization which embraces the Alaska Fishermen's Union.

The law argument presented was in some respects singular indeed. To my surprise, Mr. Jurich, who is a nonresident labor-union representative, cited to the committee as sound law the case of Truax against Corrigan reported in Two Hundred and Fifty-seventh United States, page 312. This case seems to be one of the bulwarks of their argument that the bills in question run counter to the Constitution and particularly are opposed to the privileges and immunities clause of article IV, section 2 thereof, and to the due-process clause of the fourteenth amendment.

The case of Truax against Corrigan is probably the one which most strongly holds in favor of the contention of those who oppose the proposed legislation, and we may assume that it is the one most confidently relied upon to support their position. Yet an examination of the opinion of the Court and of the dissenting opinion, and a consideration of present circumstances and conditions and of the later opinions of the same Court, will convince anyone, I think, that Truax against Corrigan is no longer authority and no longer deserving of serious consideration by lawyers or laymen.

At the outset it should be noted that the opinion was given by a Court divided 5 to 4, and that Justices Holmes, Pitney, Clarke, and Brandeis dissented.

The suit arose over the construction of certain provisions of an act of the Legislature of the State of Arizona forbidding the courts to grant injunctions in disputes arising between employers and employees concerning conditions of employment unless injunction was deemed necessary to protect property from injury through violence. It is indisputable, I think, that the main purpose of the law was to prohibit the Court from enjoining peaceful picketing and the boycott, and the precise question for decision was whether the statute transgressed the limitations imposed upon the powers of States by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Without repeating the argument, it is sufficient to say that the majority of the Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, held it beyond the power of the Arizona Legislature to enact any such law and held that the legislature had no right, under the due process and equal protection of the law clauses of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, to forbid the courts to enjoin peaceful picketing. The four justices of the minority held that the legislature possessed the power which had been expressed in the statute.

Anyone who is familiar with the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, and particularly the decisions rendered on April 22, 1940, in the cases of Thornhill against State of Alabama, No. 514, and Carlson against People of the State of California, No. 667, must be convinced that the views expressed by the minority and circumstantially presented in the dissenting opinion of Justice Brandeis, in the case of Truax against Corrigan are now the views of the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States as at present constituted, and so the law of the land.

It is singular indeed that representatives of labor unions would run for support to the majority decision in the case of Truax against Corrigan, a decision against the right of peaceful picketing and boycott in labor disputes. Is one to conclude that the gentlemen who rely so confidently on that doctrine must desire to have it extended to all labor disputes at the present time, where it is to their advantage?

PRIORITY FOR NONRESIDENTS DESIGNED TO BE PERPETUAL

That it is the intention of the nonresident fishermen of Alaska to make their iron grip on the Bristol Bay fisheries perpetual is indicated in the testimony somewhat reluctantly extracted from Mr. Jurich. The Alaska Fishermen's Union has said times without number that their books for admission to the Union were closed and that no one else could be admitted. Of course, this closing of the books even if true might be only a temporary expedient and certainly there is nothing in their constitution or by-laws which would forbid them from opening the books whenever a majority of the members, or perhaps whenever a majority of the responsible officers, saw fit to do so. In view of this oft-repeated statement we naturally thought we could rely upon it and that for the present at least the books were really closed to the admission of more members from the States. Such a program if established and adhered to, with the passage of years, would solve our problem of securing employment for the residents of Alaska even though the nonresidents might have the controlling influence for some time to come.

Well, it now appears from the testimony given by Mr. Jurich at the hearings that this claim of having the books of the Alaska Fishermen's Union in San Francisco closed is subject to exceptions. In order to show how far from fact it is, I here quote testimony given by Mr. Jurich before the

House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the course of hearings on the bills mentioned:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your purpose to keep your books closed, so far as the States are concerned?

Mr. JURICH. That is our policy; that is what has been done in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand they have been closed now for a number of years.

Mr. JURICH. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any threatened change of policy in that respect?

Mr. JURICH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Those people on your books now in the States are people who have formerly fished in Alaska?

Mr. JURICH. Yes; people who have fished in Alaska or members of some affiliate of the International who are experienced fishermen.

The CHAIRMAN. All of them have formerly fished in Alaska?

Mr. JURICH. Not all of them. I want to point out this, Mr. Chairman, that the last year or two when the nets came into existence in Bristol Bay they applied to one of the districts that had experienced gill-net fishermen. The Columbia River area is an example. I do not remember the number exactly, but probably 60 or 70 were transferred from that union into the Alaska Fishermen's Union to fish in that district.

The CHAIRMAN. You are, then, taking on new men from the States to fish in Alaskan waters, are you?

Mr. JURICH. No, sir; we do not tell the employers who they should employ.

The CHAIRMAN. But I mean your books are open to them.

Mr. JURICH. No; not to new people. No new people can go into the union primarily for the purpose of just fishing in Alaska. We have sent, in emergencies, substitute fishermen from other districts to fill in.

That is what Mr. Jurich says. Now it is perfectly plain from that this claim of having the books closed in the States to new members is just plain bunkum. The books of the Alaska Fishermen's Union are really open to all the affiliates. Members of the affiliates can be transferred, and have been transferred, from other unions to the Alaska Fishermen's Union, and then they are sent to fish in Alaska.

In his testimony given in opposition to the bill—pages 47 to 49 of the hearings—Mr. Jurich has given us a list of the affiliates from whom, as from an almost exhaustless reservoir, nonresident fishermen can be drawn for fishing in Alaska, to the exclusion of those who reside in the Territory. The affiliates include:

Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, with at least 17 locals.

The Pacific Coast Fishermen's Union, with at least the same number of locals.

United Fishermen's Union of Pacific, with offices and agents in San Pedro, Monterey, Newport, and San Francisco, Calif.; and in Seattle, Poulsbo, Tacoma, Everett, Anacortes, Bellingham, and Gig Harbor, Wash.

The United Fishermen's Union Cannery and Reduction Workers' locals at Everett, Wash.; Monterey, Calif.; Friday Harbor, Wash.; Pittsburg and San Francisco, Calif.

Northern California Fishermen's Union, with offices at Eureka, Fort Bragg, and Crescent City, Calif., as well as a number of directly affiliated cannery and reduction workers' locals.

With this incomplete list, Alaskans may know with what they are faced as to numbers in the affiliates who are eligible, under the present rules and regulations of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, to join that union and thus be given priority for fishing in Alaska.

Now, we would not object to that so much if they took their chances with residents of Alaska, but that they refuse. They insist upon having the first jobs in Alaska. Some of them are men who never fished in Alaska before. They have been or may be transferred from an affiliated union. That shows how much regard some of these men in the States have for their own union members in Alaska. They are willing to displace Alaskans in order to take care of some affiliates who live in the States.

In other words, when they haven't enough men to fill these jobs for which they claim preference in Alaska, they will take in emergency men from other districts to fish in Alaska and thus deprive Alaskans of any chance to get the jobs, because they say, as I quoted from Mr. Lane's letter, that if they can't get the jobs they demand there won't be any fishing in Alaska. There it is. I suggest to you that legislation by Congress or the Alaska Territorial Legislature for the protection of residents of Alaska is amply justified, and that some provision should be made to prevent this outright discrimination against residents of Alaska, just because they reside in the Territory.

A JUST CAUSE

In view of the opposition of the Secretary of the Interior to the enactment of any legislation on the subject, such as suggested by the three bills mentioned, the prospects of enactment of the measures at the current session are much dimmed. Bristol Bay, at least, ought to be protected by permanent legislation, rather than by such requests as may be made by the Secretary of the Interior, requests that he lacks legal power to enforce. The requests are likely to be largely ineffective unless authority is lodged by law in the Secretary of the Interior to make his requests mean something.

However, Mr. Speaker, in spite of this temporary setback, the cause of protecting residents of Alaska against discrimination in employment in the Territories' industries is so eminently just and fair, and that cause is so strongly supported by considerations of national interest and national safety, that, in my judgment, the end that we seek will be obtained if we in Alaska only continue unitedly in support of it. It is a tragedy that anyone residing in Alaska can be opposed to such a cause because the other alternative which involves the bringing into Alaska of thousands and thousands of workmen for some of its best opportunities for industrial employment, carries comparatively little of good to those who are brought in, and, if followed to its ultimate consequence, would result in the extraction of whatever wealth Alaska possesses and then leaving it a barren wilderness.

The other alternative, the one which is advocated by Alaskans, if followed, will inevitably result in bringing about a continuous and increasing settlement of the Territory by citizens of the United States who are willing to live their lives and make their homes there, and thus the welfare of the Territory and of the Nation will be promoted.

Logic and common sense and fair play and sound principles of union organization and administration are on our side, and, therefore, I am confident of the final outcome.

Dr. Judd Assails Our Help to Japan—Japanese Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. SUTPHIN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

EDITORIALS FROM ASBURY PARK SUNDAY PRESS

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Asbury Park Sunday Press of July 7, 1940:

[From the Asbury Park (N. J.) Sunday Press of July 7, 1940]

DR. JUDD ASSAILS OUR HELP TO JAPAN

Before expressing too much consternation over the blindness with which France and Great Britain played into Hitler's hands before hostilities began in Europe we should read the speech delivered before the Asbury Park Rotary Club, Wednesday, by Dr. Walter H. Judd. Printed in full in these pages, the address reveals how we are, through economic cooperation, strengthening Japan in Asia and building her up as a direct threat against the United States. Just as the Allies helped Hitler construct his tremendous war machine, so are we supplying Japan with the materials for her conquest of China and a possible assault on American interests. Even should such an assault never materialize, the concern that we feel in contemplating it and our consequent need for a two-ocean Navy

may be attributed to our inconsistent economic cooperation with a land in whose peaceful intentions we have no confidence.

Dr. Judd points out that this country supplied Japan with more than one-half of its war materials during the 3 years that it has spent in destroying China and that during the 10 months since hostilities began in Europe we have been furnishing 80 percent of Japan's military needs. Thus we are in the ironical position of sympathizing with China as she vainly tries to stave off Japanese domination while we serve as the arsenal supplying Japan's advancing armies.

There are two factors in this situation that must be removed if we are not to find ourselves in the position of the Allies being devoured by a Frankenstein of our own creation. American shippers must be impressed with the need for sacrificing the war market in Japan and American consumers must be convinced of the need for foregoing cheap Japanese products through the sale of which Japan establishes the credits to purchase war supplies from this country.

Dr. Judd's address should awaken this country from the slumber that permitted certain elements in France and Britain to assist Hitler in building up the war machine that he subsequently directed at them. So long as we recognize Japan as a menace to peace in the Far East and as a potential threat to this country simple patriotism demands that we cease supplying her with war materials that might be turned upon us and against which we are already spending millions in defense.

JAPANESE INVASION

Japan's invasion of Indochina is the result of no new plan. For 45 years the Japanese have been making successive moves toward domination of eastern Asia.

Until recent years they have been driven back by the strength of the western powers. But for the present, at least, western opposition has faded in effectiveness.

After the war between China and Japan 45 years ago the western powers forced Japan to renounce most of her gains. Again, after the World War, Japanese ambitions in Asia were curbed. But in 1931 Japanese troops marched into Manchuria and 3 years later the Peiping incident started the war with China which has not yet ended.

Many believe Japan could have been stopped in 1931 had England been willing to cooperate with the United States. But England refused to act with this country and appeasement began.

Now the war in Europe, Allied disasters, and the divided problems of the United States have made Japan more bold than ever.

Many things are at stage in Japan's newest move. The war with China for one. Chiang-Kai-Shek has been obtaining supplies from French Indochina and British Burma. Japan hopes to cut off both routes.

At stake also are the European concessions in Chinese cities and the colonies of the western nations. Indochina, a French protectorate, is larger than France itself and is rich in zinc, tin, and coal. Hong Kong, British-owned island south of Canton, is a center of British trade in South China. The Netherland Indies produces oil, tin, rubber, rice, tea, coffee, and sugar and are among the richest prizes of the east.

Relief for Flooded Areas in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and telegrams:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1940.

Hon. NEWT V. MILLS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: In reply to your telephone conversations regarding possible assistance of Federal agencies to farmers in northern Louisiana who have suffered serious losses because of excessive rains, I am glad to submit the following information:

We have discussed with officials of the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Work Projects Administration, the assistance they can and will be able to render to meet the present emergency.

Reports that have been received by these agencies indicate that while the present situation is serious, it is expected that the real needs will be more acute during the fall and winter months. The Farm Security Administration has notified their regional office to make loans for seed, for livestock feed crops, seed potatoes, seed for gardens, and for any purpose that will enable farmers to plant crops which will mature before the winter months. Families who are unable to obtain assistance for immediate needs will be given emergency grants provided they meet the usual requirements for rehabilitation aid.

The Work Projects Administration will increase the Louisiana quota, if and when it is determined that the Farm Security Administration cannot adequately cope with the situation. Officials of that agency believe, however, it will not be necessary to substantially increase their present operation at this time.

The Farm Credit Administration will not be able to be of any material assistance, as they make loans only for production and harvesting of crops. As it will be too late to plant a cash crop this year, the agency will not be in a position to assist until next spring. Officials of this agency in Louisiana have been instructed to adopt a very liberal collection policy. In other words, they are not to press for collection, any outstanding loans to the Farm Credit Administration where the borrower has suffered from the excessive rains during the past few weeks.

As soon as the agricultural report for July is available for study, other conferences will be held between the interested agencies, and further plans will then be made depending upon the results of the study.

We have had our State director for Arkansas make a number of reports on the situation. The information furnished by him has been turned over to other agencies to assist them in developing their program for farmers in Louisiana.

If there is any further assistance this office can render, please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

ADDISON G. FOSTER,
Executive Officer.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 22, 1940.*

Mr. JAMES H. CRUTCHER,
Work Projects Administration, New Orleans, La.:

Hundreds of people northeast Louisiana have petitioned my office for relief due to rains. Personally studied the farming condition of my section last week and found numbers of people unemployed as a result of this condition. Please grant W. P. A. employment to all people that are in need. Thanks for an immediate reply.

NEWT V. MILLS, M. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1940.*

Mr. C. ELLIS HENICAN,
State Department of Public Welfare, Baton Rouge, La.:

Hundreds of people northeast Louisiana have petitioned my office for relief due to rains. Personally studied the farming condition of my section last week and found the condition destitute. Please contact Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Washington, D. C., in an effort to help work out a method of distributing surplus commodities. Thanks for immediate attention.

NEWT V. MILLS, M. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1940.*

Mr. JAMES H. CRUTCHER,
Work Projects Administration, New Orleans, La.:

In further reference to my telegram addressed you yesterday, I would appreciate immediate survey being made to determine the needs of the people in north Louisiana due to the recent rains, as the Work Projects Administration is willing to increase the Louisiana quota.

NEWT V. MILLS, M. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1940.*

Richland Beacon, Rayville, La.,
Delhi Dispatch, Delhi, La.,
Jackson Flash, Jonesboro, La.,
Jackson Democrat, Jonesboro, La.,
Concordia Sentinel, Ferriday, La.
Caldwell Watchman, Columbia, La.,
The Gazette, Farmerville, La.,
The Bernice News, Bernice, La.,
Ruston Leader, Ruston, La.,
Morehouse Interprise, Bastrop, La.,
Wisner Herald, Wisner, La.,
Franklin Sun, Winnsboro, La.,
Louisiana Crusader, Winnsboro, La.,
Ouachita Citizen, West Monroe, La.,
Catahoula News, Harrisonburg, La.,
Madison Journal, Tallulah, La.,
Banner Democrat, Lake Providence, La.,
Tensas Parish Gazette, St. Joseph, La.,
West Carroll Gazette, Oak Grove, La.,
Mr. Sam H. Jones, Governor, Baton Rouge, La.,
New Orleans Item, New Orleans, La.,
Shreveport Journal, Shreveport, La.,
Times Picayune, New Orleans, La.,
Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La.:

Aid that will be granted by Federal agencies due to excessive rains. Farm Security Administration will give emergency grants to needy families who are unable to obtain assistance if they meet the usual requirements for rehabilitation, also will make loans for any purpose that will enable farmers to plant crops which will mature before the winter months. Farm Credit Administration has agreed not to press for collections any outstanding loans where the borrowers have suffered from excessive rains. Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation advises they will furnish commodities to

needy families, however it will be necessary to contact the welfare offices. The Work Projects Administration will increase the Louisiana quota if and when it is determined that the Farm Security Administration cannot adequately cope with the situation

NEWT V. MILLS, M. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1940.*

Mr. E. C. MCINNIS,
State Director, Farm Security Administration,
New Orleans, La.:

Hundreds of people northeast Louisiana have petitioned my office for relief due to rains. Personally studied the farming condition of my section last week and found the condition destitute. Please have study made of people's needs. Thanks.

NEWT V. MILLS, M. C.

Mr. Speaker, throughout northeast Louisiana we have received more rain recently than in any other similar period of time since 1900 or probably 1905.

The condition among the people is of such nature that thousands of farmers have been practically forced to abandon their crops due to rain. Naturally my people are very much grieved over the fact that we have been forced to call upon the Federal Government for aid, but the circumstances being unavoidable, we have appealed to several Federal agencies for assistance, and our petition has been met with favor for which we are very thankful.

I submit as part of these remarks a letter I received from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Government Reports, as to the type of aid that will be given my people; however, in addition I was advised that the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation will furnish to needy families commodities, but it will be necessary for such persons in need to make known their interest to the various public welfare offices.

Further, as part of these remarks I submit copies of telegrams I have forwarded to the various Federal and State agencies of Louisiana asking that immediate study be made as to the needs of the people, and also copy of telegram I wired various papers of Louisiana and Gov. Sam H. Jones.

William Jennings Bryan Memorial Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, AMBASSADOR TO MEXICO

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Wednesday morning, July 17, in the city of Chicago, during the Democratic National Convention, to attend a memorial breakfast for William Jennings Bryan, at which approximately 250 persons were present. In the honor guest list were Gov. Roy Cochran, of Nebraska, and former Gov. John Moorhead of the same State; Congressman Robert Doughton, of North Carolina; James A. Marsh, Democratic National Committeeman from Colorado, and Mrs. Mary Bryan Allen, sister of William Jennings Bryan.

The memory of that occasion will continue with me through the years, not alone for the spirit in which the friends of the former Great Commoner met, but also because of the unusually effective address delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, Ambassador from this country to Mexico.

Among the speakers were Senators Johnson of Colorado and Lee of Oklahoma; Hon. Edward Keating, former Member of the House of Representatives and manager and editor of Labor; William Allen White, noted journalist, of Emporia, Kans.; Congressman A. J. Sabath, of Illinois; William Hutchison; H. H. Hanks, and others. All of these gentlemen paid eloquent tribute to the memory of one of the truly great and good men of America.

During my brief remarks, I suggested that the principal address by Ambassador Daniels was of such real quality and fine content that it should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I insert it at this point, believing that those who read will gain both inspiration and knowledge from its contents:

"I think if you will be quiet I can make myself heard" was the first sentence audible to the packed galleries in the Democratic convention in Chicago 44 years ago when the young Lochinvar out of the West won the leadership of the Democratic Party. "I was leaving the hall, tired because none of the speakers could make themselves heard above the confusion, when that sentence with flute-like resonance fell upon my ears," Dr. Franklin Martin told me years after. It was the first time Bryan's voice had been raised in a national convention. The ablest statesmen in the party, Hill and Russell and Daniels, in the packed, superheated hall had vainly tried to speak above the din. But "the heaven-sent Bryan," as Vachel Lindsey called the Nebraskan, without any apparent effort, reached the ear and thrilled every listener in the remotest gallery. You could feel that they literally hung upon his words, charmed by the music of the timbre of his voice as well as by the logic of his argument. He closed with the famous sentence that electrified his listeners. As the climax of the most remarkable speech in the annals of American political oratory, Bryan declared with the seriousness of a prophet of old and with the beauty of the purest rhetoric "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold." That gem of eloquence comes back today to all of us privileged to have been present with all its cadence as it lifted hypnotized men to a new and holy consecration, and as it moved hardened convention-goers into an enthusiastic demonstration without precedent.

BRYAN LIVES IN MEMORY

Two score and 4 years have passed since Bryan captivated that great gathering. In the same environment as in 1896, I seem to hear again that voice of mingled sweetness and challenge and feel again the thrill that comes but once in a lifetime. Many thought and said an unknown man had captured the convention by one speech. Not so; Bryan did not suddenly reach that pinnacle. Behind that memorable hour was a brilliant record of achievement in the Halls of Congress and on the hustings. He had won two elections to the National House in rock-ribbed Republican districts in Nebraska. He had charmed "listening Senates" in a noble argument for tariff reform. In the battle between giants in the epoch of silver discussions the pebble in the sling of the young David from Nebraska had compassed the political death of more than one political Goliath.

Bryan's voice—the voice of a John the Baptist crying "make straight the path"—was raised in every part of the Republic in the succeeding days. The people crowded to hear the advocate who felt the ills under which they suffered. From East to West the forgotten and burdened welcomed him as their spokesman as he plead their cause which had lacked a leader. Those living on incomes derived from monopoly and enjoying the fat of the land raged in jittery fear lest he would win. Political and clerical Brahmins exhausted their vocabulary of hard names. Never in history has a sincere man spoken bravely in behalf of the oppressed without inciting the hate and opprobriums of those enjoying unearned possessions. The greater his sincerity the more their vindictiveness. Jefferson was a Jacobin, Jackson a demagogue. It is the price a great soul must pay to ring true against caste, privilege, and exploitation.

Bryan scared half of the plutocrats out of their wits, so that they opened their purses to buy the election in an orgy of corruption and coercion which had never before disgraced the Republic. Bryan's blaze-of-glory campaign not only enthused his followers, it also attracted many who came to scoff and remained to pray. It extorted a remarkably appreciative pen picture of the campaign from the wife of the most scholarly leader of reaction. In a letter written after the election to Cecil Spring-Rice, long-time British Ambassador to the United States, Mrs. Henry Cabot Lodge gave her British friend this illuminating comment upon a campaign waged against all for which her husband stood:

"The great fight is won. It was a fight conducted by trained and experienced and organized forces, with both hands full of money, with the full powers of the press—and of prestige—on the one side; on the other, a disorganized mob at first, out of which burst into sight, hearing, and force—one man, but such a man! Alone, penniless, without backing, without money, with scarce a paper, without speakers, that man fought such a fight that even those in the East can call him a crusader, an inspired fanatic—a prophet! It has been marvelous. * * * His speeches spoke to the intelligence and hearts of the people with a capital P. He almost won."

Mrs. Lodge might truly have added "Bryan did win, but he shares with Tilden the distinction of being denied the fruits of victory." However, that would have been an indictment of her husband's party not to be expected.

BRYAN KEPT FIGHTING

Sixteen years after he had captured the convention in Chicago I sat again in the Baltimore convention under the spell of Bryan's power to move men. In Chicago, he won for himself the nomination for the Presidency. In 1912, gone was the lute tone that at Chicago had been as pleasing as the strains of a Mendelssohn

composition by the master of a great instrument. Gone was the suppleness and the grace that made him an Apollo. But in its place had come out of long contests against privilege, the strength and courage of a noble crusader. He had buried ambition for political honors. Only devotion to a cause dominated his actions. He had come to believe, rather slowly, that Wilson incarnated the liberalism to which he had consecrated his life. Just as at Chicago Bryan's mastery of a convention won him the victory, so at Baltimore, in a historic conflict, Bryan made possible the selection of Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States. If there had been no fighting Bryan at Baltimore, it is my deliberate judgment, based upon my participation in the organization to nominate Wilson, America and the world would have been denied the statesmanship of Wilson in the high office in the great days when in peace and in war Wilson was recognized as the foremost chieftain of the world. If his own countrymen and others had followed Wilson in 1919, the present holocaust would have been averted.

Among permanent achievements of Bryan's public career, to name only a few, are the writing and compelling the insertion in the Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act of the graduated income and inheritance taxes. When by a mysterious change of one vote, the Supreme Court declared the levy of an income tax unconstitutional, it was Bryan who began and led the long campaign which resulted in the submission and ratification of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. If the name of the man chiefly responsible for a constitutional amendment was attached to it that amendment would bear the inscription "Made by William Jennings Bryan." The same inscription would go on the sixteenth amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the people; and the amendments for woman suffrage and national prohibition. No man since the reconstruction days has left his impress upon the Constitution to such an extent as Bryan. Likewise much reform legislation owed its inception to his advocacy, including the law forbidding contributions by corporations to campaign funds and requiring the publication of all contributions to political campaigns. It was Bryan's championship of the Federal Reserve System in a crucial time that contributed to ending an antiquated system.

A MAN OF PEACE

The perspective of time alone can properly appraise the place of Bryan among the distinguished men who have served as Secretary of State. In Bryan's incumbency of that office he was Secretary of Peace. His policies, exemplified in his 30 peace treaties foreshadowed the spirit of the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand treaties for the outlawry of war, and all the attempts to substitute arbitration for force. When asked by the Japanese Ambassador in an acute situation, "Is this the last word?" Bryan gave the answer, "There is no last word between friends." That inspirational sentiment ought to be engraved in letters of gold over the door of every chancelry in the world.

Bryan's principle of consistent opposition to dollar diplomacy and the use of the "big stick" in dealing with small nations has grown into the doctrine of "the good neighbor" and the hope of Western Hemisphere solidarity against penetration.

Controversy continues over the wisdom of Bryan's resignation from the Wilson Cabinet because he felt the policy adopted would carry our country into war, as it did. I have always believed he should have remained with the ship. Whatever may be the final verdict of Bryan's course in those troubled days, his Government has now approved his insistence that it was wiser for Americans not to assert the right of traveling on ships voyaging through the zone of war. Bryan is vindicated, whereas in 1916–18 he was derided.

When passion has subsided, the historian will write Bryan's name high among the great men who followed Jefferson in the high office of Secretary of State and as an illustrious patriot who never sold the truth to serve the hour. In confidence in that verdict we gather to do honor today to William Jennings Bryan and pray that others called to leadership will be as steadfast in devotion to the common weal as the sincere and eloquent Commoner.

Another Demonstration of Overwhelming Public Sentiment for the Ludlow War Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, every time there is a test of public opinion on my proposal to amend the Constitution so as to give the people a right to vote on proposals to participate in overseas warfare public sentiment rallies amazingly and overwhelmingly to its support.

Time after time tests have been made and the result is always and invariably the same. Five Gallup polls showed by large and decisive majorities that the people want this amendment written into the Constitution. The latest test was under a system of balloting conducted by the American Forum. In an announcement giving the results of the balloting the American Forum says:

A further indication of the pick-up in peace sentiment in this country since the surrender of France is the readers' vote on the latest issue submitted by Theodore Granik's American Forum.

On July 6 the American Forum presented a debate in the News on the question, "Should war be declared only by popular vote?" between Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, sponsor of the war-referendum bill, and Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson. Representative LUDLOW received 67.8 percent of all ballots and letters sent in by readers and Mr. Johnson 32.2 percent.

This closely parallels the vote of the previous week on compulsory military training. Additional returns from Massachusetts on this debate give Senator NYE, who opposed the idea, a national total of 65.4 percent against James H. R. Cromwell.

In the Ludlow-Johnson debate, Representative LUDLOW carried all States represented except Texas and Kentucky, where a close vote slightly favored Mr. Johnson, and New York, which split 50-50. The Ludlow margins varied from a bare majority in Massachusetts to a 4-to-1 vote in Pennsylvania.

Regional differences did not figure. States from which ballots and letters were received included Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the District, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, and Texas.

NOBODY FOR IT BUT THE PEOPLE

It has been truthfully said that nobody is for my proposition but the people of America. Just the people—that is all. The plain, common people, who when war comes have to suffer and if need be to die, and to bear the unspeakable burdens and costs and griefs of war. The people are weary over war hysteria, and they long to see peace stabilized in America.

I do not claim to be a prophet, but I predict that the time will come when the people, growing sick of being made the victims in the grim and tragic game of war, and losing faith in the weasel words of politicians, will arise in their might and will see to it that this great democratic principle, a referendum on overseas wars, is added to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States.

American People Are Face to Face With Grave Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American people are face to face with a grave decision. They must make a choice next November between fundamental Americanism—the Bill of Rights—constitutional government—and a government by men instead of by laws.

The convention at Chicago, controlled and bossed completely by President Roosevelt and his New Deal henchmen, including the unsavory Boss Hague, of New Jersey, Mayor Ed Kelly, of Chicago, Jake Arvey, and other fellow travelers of the underworld gangsters, made this choice inescapable.

The effort now on the part of the new dealers will be to argue that after all an American tradition is not sacred and that in these strange times tradition cannot be allowed to stand in the way of efficiently meeting threats and menaces from abroad.

The great and dangerous flaw which the American people must reject is that no threat or menace from the outside is as grave or as dangerous as this open, bold, and insolent threat to free government and the Bill of Rights emanating from the White House in the Nation's Capital.

The American tradition against a third term was born out of the certain knowledge of the American people that any argument or excuse for a third term is an equally valid argument or excuse for a fourth and a fifth and

a sixth term, and for a life tenure. If Franklin D. Roosevelt by reason of his ability and experience is the only man in America capable of being an efficient President now, he will be all the more indispensable after serving a third and a fourth term. There is not one single reason, there is not one single argument, for a third term which cannot be used for a life tenure of office for Franklin D. Roosevelt. The American people are convinced, and have been convinced all these years, that successive terms or life tenure in the office of the Presidency would inevitably lead to a political, or if not, a family dynasty, and would result in such a President being succeeded if not by an heir apparent, certainly by someone whom he would choose.

Of course, it is to be expected that an administration that has had 65 "crises" and "emergencies" in 7 years, and that has made and broken 57 major promises in 7 years, would not hesitate, and will not hesitate, to have another "emergency" and to make more promises in order to lure the people into acceptance of a violation of the third-term rule.

The manner in which the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt for a third term was brought about in Chicago, and the exhibition of cold ruthlessness in Mr. Roosevelt's method of shoving Henry A. Wallace down the convention's throat as the Vice Presidential nominee, are the most accurate, striking, and outstanding evidences of Mr. Roosevelt's desire to dictate, of his intention to dictate, and the way in which he will dictate to a political party or a nation over which he has gained control.

With the sordid picture of the Chicago convention in mind, the people should recall another picture—that of Mr. Roosevelt down in Georgia in the dead of night with his nightshirt flapping about his limbs, calling the press representatives from their slumbers to declare to the country that he had no desire to be a dictator. No one can take those two pictures and put them together without realizing how far the New Deal administration has driven this Nation down the road to one-man government.

It is perhaps a good thing that the issue is clearly drawn, because we might just as well find out in 1940 whether a majority of the American people believe in the continuance of fundamental Americanism—and there is not the slightest doubt that they do.

The American people ought not to forget, and they will not forget, the insult offered their intelligence when Mr. Roosevelt sat in the White House and seriously—or apparently seriously—stated to the Nation that all of his friends who knew him well had known for a long time he did not desire a third term and was yearning to retire to private life. If any of Mr. Roosevelt's friends knew any such thing, they have certainly set a world's record for keeping a secret. Of course, nobody believes any such thing—least of all probably Mr. Roosevelt himself.

Anyway, inasmuch as the whole emphasis now will be laid by the new dealers on the great sacrifice that Mr. Roosevelt will undergo to serve his Nation a third term, the gratitude of the Nation, it is to be hoped, will be such, and its desire to spare him further trials and tribulations will be such, that in spite of his willingness to submit himself to the rigors of further public service, the people will retire him to that peace and privacy for which he says he so yearns.

Fort Howard, Baltimore County, Md., Site for New Veterans' Administration Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Fort Howard, which is located in my home county of Baltimore, is to be abandoned as an Army post. The history of this beautifully located garrison is of such interest that any attempted abandonment of it would be protested but for the fact it is to be used for other highly desirable governmental purposes. It is a great relief to me, interested as I have been for a number of years in trying to bring about the location of a veterans' facility in Baltimore and vicinity, to find that this wonderful site at Fort Howard, abandoned by the War Department, is to be transferred to the Veterans' Administration for use in accordance with such plans as the Bureau will develop in the future.

For the information of the many residents of Maryland interested in both the future of Fort Howard and the establishment of a veterans' facility in the State, I publish herewith a portion of a letter which I just received from the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 23, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COLE: The President has recently approved a plan for an increase in the number of troops stationed in the vicinity of the National Capital, and in accordance therewith I desire to inform you in advance of publicity that the War Department has decided to discontinue the use of Fort Howard, Md., as an active post, and transfer the present garrison to the Arlington Farm site, Fort Myer, Va.

The above action will not only unite all components of the Twelfth Infantry in one location but will permit the larger units to operate as a team. The War Department considers it essential that, wherever practicable, the larger tactical units of the various arms must act as a team in combat should be so associated and trained in peace. The separation of tactical groupings in small isolated posts, such as Fort Howard, tends to adversely affect their readiness for instant service.

Fort Howard has been made available for transfer to the Veterans' Bureau, which is now making plans for its development.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Commenting on the abandonment of Fort Howard, the Baltimore morning Sun, edition of Wednesday, July 24, had a most interesting statement of its history. The news article to which I refer is, in part, as follows:

The fort, established in 1896 as a coast-artillery defense station for Baltimore, will be transferred from the United States Army to the Veterans' Administration.

MOVE STARTED BY LEGION

The fort is at North Point, which juts out between the Patapsco River and the Chesapeake Bay approximately 14 miles southeast of Baltimore, and the Point's history goes back to 1662.

"North Point was first taken up," says the fort record, "by Messrs. William Batten and Thomas Thomas in 1662. In 1664 Mr. Thomas Todd, son of Capt. Thomas Todd, came from Virginia and bought the land."

NAMED AFTER GENERAL HOWARD

In 1896 the Government purchased 145 acres on the point from the Elizabeth Gunther estate. The first mortar battery was placed and a 900-foot wharf was constructed the following year. Battery E, Fourth Artillery, arrived to garrison the fort on June 27, 1899.

By various condemnation proceedings, begun in 1896, the fort was enlarged to 245 acres. The post was named Howard after Gen. John Eager Howard, one of Maryland's officers in the Revolutionary Army.

The fort also is the site of the famous stand made by the Stricker Battery at the Battle of North Point in 1814.

BRITISH REPULSED

After the British had marched on Washington, Wellington's Invincibles and Nelson's marines landed at North Point under the command of General Ross as part of their general campaign to capture Baltimore, and were repulsed by the Americans, most of whom were Baltimoreans.

The Twelfth United States Infantry, which celebrated its one hundred and forty-second anniversary on July 3, was organized July 1, 1798. It was reorganized in 1812 to participate in the defense of Fort McHenry, the Battle of Lundy's Lane, and operations of the Niagara frontier.

SERVED IN CIVIL WAR

It was one of the first contingents which entered Mexico City in 1848 and had a part in the Battles of Gettysburg, Manassas, Antietam, Petersburg, and Chancellorsville in the Civil War.

The regiment also participated in suppressing two Philippine insurrections.

Several times the regiment has been disbanded and reorganized. It has been in constant service since 1861. During the World War it was stationed at Norfolk.

At present there are approximately 300 men at the fort. The normal complement of 600 will be reached in 9 days when 300 return from special duty at other posts.

ONCE SOUGHT AS A PARK

The selection of the Fort Howard site was made by the Federal Hospitalization Board. Since the ground is Government-owned, the $100,000 included in President Roosevelt's deficiency bill for the purchase of a site will be saved.

Fort Howard is located in Baltimore County, which is my home county. Naturally I am more than delighted with a decision of all those in authority and especially the Veterans' Administration and the President of the United States, who agreed with the petition of the veterans and their friends in Maryland, and finally brought into accomplishment that which all of us have looked forward to for so many years.

It is easy for me to prophesy that shortly after the transfer of Fort Howard to the Veterans' Facility by rehabilitating some of the old buildings and in erecting new and modern structures for hospital use, that the entire completed project will present one of the most attractive and best located Veterans' Facilities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the members of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Spanish War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Veterans Association of All Wars and their various auxiliaries, upon the determination, persistent, and convincing fight they have made for this improvement and for the tremendous help they have been to the Maryland delegation in the Senate and House in Washington whose duty it was to sponsor the necessary legislation which we did successfully, and which could only have been done with such support as referred to being back of it. I am sure all the veterans, their dependents, and friends join with me in thanking the Veterans' Administration and especially our fellow Marylander, Col. George Ijams, for the wisdom they have displayed in advancing Maryland's claim and in supporting the very fine solution to our problem which has just been announced. Many thought last year, when the actual appropriation for the hospital was put aside at the request of the President because of national-defense needs, that our fight was lost, but it now appears that in our decision the President was most wise and has resulted to much better advantage and far more acreage and greater advantages for the hospital than would have possibly been obtained under the appropriation which was at the time anticipated.

Mercy Ships for Refugee Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 22, I offered an amendment to the Neutrality Act, in order to permit American ships to transport English and other refugee children from the war zone. These ships will fly the American flag in a prominent position and shall be plainly marked as to their mission, to enable them to make these errands of rescue of humanity. Nazi bombers from above, or submarines, would not dare bomb ships of this character, when so plainly identified as American ships carrying refugee children.

Such vessels unmistakably marked as Red Cross ships are now marked, would lead to no danger or casualties. They could plainly be painted with the American flag and high letters could identify them as rescue ships. Electric lights at night could be used to mark them as mercy ships. The Nazis would not dare fire upon them. There is no danger, therefore, of war involvement. There is no British war propaganda connected with my bill. The saving from slaughter is not limited to British children. Infants of all nationals—Belgian, French, Dutch, German—may be saved from the coming holocaust on the fortress island of Great Britain. Prime Minister Churchill in his recent statement does not bar the rescue of children. He does not prohibit children from leaving. He simply called attention to difference of opinion in England as to the advisability of sending children to America because of dangers of transportation. He specifically said that the evacuation program was postponed, not abandoned.

Thousands of homes in America are now available for these unfortunate children. Scores of committees and organizations will supply all necessary funds. Let us start the ships on "errands of mercy" at once. There will be no distinction as to wealth, creed, color, or nationality.

There are a number of ships of the United States Lines, now idle, which could readily be used, including the *Washington* and the *Manhattan*. Both these ships contemplate tours along our coastal regions. They could easily be diverted in this humanitarian cause. I have just received an invitation to voyage from Virginia to New York on the new United States liner *America*. This is one of our best, fastest, and most luxurious liners built in the United States. This ship likewise, could enter such rescue service.

The ruthless slaughter of English children must be averted. The State Department has removed the last vestige of formality in order to have English, as well as any Belgian, Dutch, or other child refugees now in England, brought to this country, in order to save them from the widely advertised Nazi reign of terror. These children may not enter as immigrants or as visitors.

Furthermore, the administration, with a deep sense of the humanities involved, has made it unnecessary to require, in each individual instance, an affidavit of support from a relative or a friend of each child. The corporate form of affidavit has now been approved, so that a responsible charitable organization, such as the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, may now guarantee the support of as many children as their funds permit. Therefore, children without friends or relatives in this country shall be assured of support while they remain here.

The Nazi Stukas will not discriminate, and children will be struck down by the thousands. Such a holocaust is unthinkable. We have a paramount duty to evacuate these English children, as well as any Belgian, Dutch, or other child refugees now in England. This should be done as quickly as possible. Thousands of Americans have offered their homes, and over 500 institutions have signified their willingness to care for these unfortunates.

However, England cannot supply ships to transport these children. She needs all her ships and convoys for home defense. We can readily supply these "mercy" ships. The Neutrality Act stands in the way, however. Sending our ships into belligerent waters would be a violation of the act, despite the fact that such voyages were to rescue children. This act must be amended to permit American ships on such an errand to enter the war zone just as American Red Cross ships, carrying food and medical supplies, are exempt from the act.

My bill specifically provides that the ships must have "safe conduct." That means, under the terms of the Neutrality Act, safe conduct must be guaranteed by the nation blockaded or subject to attack, as well as the nation attempting the blockade or attacking the first nation. This means that we would have to first get the consent of England and France in order to send these ships to North Ireland where the children could embark. Should these ships proceed to England or Ireland without such "safe conduct," there would be danger of a German bomber sinking the ships. This would create such hysteria and excitement in this country as to probably result in war involvement, as was the case with the sinking of the *Lusitania* during the World War.

Furthermore, only organizations certified by the State Department could charter such rescue ships. Otherwise, any organization could send out a ship. This would create chaos. The State Department would only recognize such organizations as were controlled by able persons and who were well financed.

Only children under 12 years of age would be eligible for rescue. They would not come in as immigrants; they would come in as visitors. If children over 12 were admissible, they might be induced to take jobs. This would impinge upon the rights of American labor.

I set forth herewith a copy of the bill under discussion.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4, as amended, of the Neutrality Act of 1939 is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 4," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) the provisions of section 2 (a) and the provisions of section 3 shall not prohibit the transportation by vessels of United States registry in ballast, unarmed, and not under convoy, of refugee children, not over the age of 12 years, fleeing from war zones, together with such officials and adult personnel in charge as are members or employees of suitable and well-recognized organizations approved and certified by the Secretary of State, if such vessel is proceeding under safe conduct granted by all of the states named in the proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a), and if such vessel has painted prominently, distinctly, and unmistakably on each side thereof an American flag and a statement that such vessel is a refugee child rescue ship of the United States or under United States registry, so that night or day there can be no mistake as to the identity of such vessels."

United States Junior Chamber of Commerce Annual Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS OF PHILIP D. REED

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Philip D. Reed before the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce:

I am told that the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce comprises approximately 100,000 young business and professional men between the ages of 21 and 35 and that you come from every State in the Union, as well as Hawaii and Alaska. May I say that the very existence of the junior chamber as an active, vital agency for the exchange of views and the development of leadership is a most heartening and reassuring thing in these dark days.

I venture to say that every one of you in this room feels deeply and personally the responsibility shared today with older men, but which in the course of a few short years will be transferred almost wholly to your generation—the responsibility of guiding, directing, and administering the destiny of the United States of America. What that task will comprise, what new conditions will then exist, no one can accurately foretell. But it requires no clairvoyance to see that the next 5 years will in all likelihood be the most vitally important ones in the history of our Nation. The things to be done during that period, the legislation to be adopted, the leadership to be developed, the reaction and response of the American people to the events which lie ahead in the struggle between dictatorship and democracy will, in my judgment, irrevocably fashion the pattern of life to which we younger men, our children, and our children's children will of necessity conform.

The interests, therefore, of the generation you represent are greater in terms of the years ahead than those of any other part of our adult population. It follows that your generation must not only make its influence felt during these formative years, but that it must base its judgments and its action upon a real understanding of the issues, the trends, and the problems with which we as a nation are confronted.

Today we are in the first throes of organizing an enormous program of national defense. No one, I think, will doubt this country's need of greatly enlarged military, naval, and air defenses. To accomplish this herculean task quickly, efficiently, and well there must be the closest kind of cooperation and teamwork between government, industrial management, and labor. It is inconceivable that there should be a lack of it from any quarter, for the ultimate purpose and objective of this program is the preservation of our homes, our institutions, and our way of life. Patience and understanding will be needed. Delays and disappointments will occur. Sacrifices and concessions will be required. But as Americans all—and always—with the vitality and resourcefulness and organizational ability that have enabled us to create the greatest and most efficient production machine in history, we will do this job, and we will do it well.

One month from now our two great political parties will have selected their candidates for high office and the campaigns will be getting under way. The responsibility that falls upon the delegates charged with the duty of selecting the presidential and vice-presidential candidates in this period of world crisis is exceeded only by that which must rest upon the shoulders of the men selected.

The great issues today are not those we are accustomed to associate with party politics. They are cosmic questions, affecting on the one hand our relationships and ability to live with the other peoples of the world, and on the other hand the review and redetermination of our own doctrines of self-government. As normal human beings we all want to find the right answer to these vitally important questions. There can be no doubt of the sincerity and loyalty of our political, industrial, and labor leaders. But they and all of us must recognize before it is too late that the problems before us are far larger than the individual interests of any party, section, or group.

Large portions of the world's population have in recent years surrendered democratic freedom for dictatorship. The state has replaced the individual. These changes abroad have evidenced themselves in this country in many small ways. Each step is comparatively insignificant when taken by itself, but in the aggregate they constitute a definite and unmistakable trend toward centralization and enlargement of government powers and toward government by men rather than by laws.

We have been through 10 years of serious economic disorder. During that period we have made progress in certain directions, but none at all in others. For example, no one can question the fact that very real social progress has been made. The value and desirability of these accomplishments from the social standpoint are self-evident. Nor would any of us wish to see them lost, if we as a Nation can support and justify their continuation. The difficulty is that social legislation almost invariably costs money, large sums of money, and can be supported only if the economic condition of the country is healthy and prosperous. We all agree, I am sure, that American citizens should not be permitted to starve, that "made" work is better than the dole; that old-age and unemployment insurance and guaranteed bank deposits are fine and worthy things; that maximum hours and minimum wages are all to the good in sweatshop industries; that reclamation and rehabilitation of the soil is essential for the future of America; that slum clearance and low-cost housing are much to be desired. But I repeat that these enactments cost money, billions in the aggregate, and they can be supported through the years only if our economic system is sound and successful.

The fact is, however, that the economic record of the past decade is just as disappointing as the social record is gratifying. In a recent editorial Fortune magazine points out that our national income is back to 1919, our unemployment problem completely unsolved, our national debt up nineteen billions (now amounting to $1,250 per family), and that, comparing the period 1933–39 with 1923–29, the only significant increases among 22 basic economic measurements were in population, strikes, strikers, Federal taxes, Federal expenditures, and national debt. All the other items show a decline varying from 9 to 84 percent, and include manufacturing employment, industrial production, wholesale prices, factory pay rolls, national income, new construction, and corporate financing.

We must, I submit, place more emphasis on economic recovery, lest, failing to achieve it, we are forced to abandon—as we surely would be—the social advances of the last decade. For government cannot create wealth. All it can do is redistribute existing wealth. A great deal of new wealth must be created to support our social program, and this can be done only by increasing output, the production of useful goods. To reach this goal, we must move forward on the economic front.

Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "The longing for certainty and repose is in every human mind. But certainty is generally an illusion and repose is not the destiny of man." I do not know the circumstances which prompted Holmes to make that statement, but if it was true then, how deeply, how desperately true it is today. Certainty—that is to say assured security—is generally illusion, and repose—that is to say escape from hard work—is not the destiny of man. That quotation, gentlemen, is heavy with truth. May we all heed and profit by it.

The question of what is wrong with America's economic system, what has caused the long-continued apathy in our industrial and financial mechanisms, has produced a long list of conflicting explanations and as many suggestions, equally conflicting, for the correction of the difficulty. Stemming from totally different concepts of the cause of our lagging activity, the proposed corrective measures are not only diverse and inconsistent, but certain of them would alter fundamentally our traditional view of government and its functions and the jealously guarded freedom of action which American citizens have so long enjoyed.

This brings us face to face with a serious problem—a problem that is real, because it goes to the roots of our system of constitutional democracy, a problem that cannot be ignored. Let us examine ourselves as adult Americans. Are we good judges, competent critics, and intelligent readers of our country's history? Are we well enough grounded in political economy to judge what

is good for our future, and what is bad? Do we understand the fundamentals of the American system under which we have grown up? Lacking that knowledge of fundamentals, how can we distinguish between proposals which are consistent with the pattern of that system, and those which would impair and destroy it? Can we fashion for ourselves some kind of simple projector by which the trends and tendencies of the day can be clearly viewed and contrasted with the doctrines upon which this Nation was founded? These questions, gentlemen, are far easier to ask than to answer.

We are told that the average American has received no more than a seventh-grade schooling. It is clear, therefore, that the ordinary citizen cannot be expected to understand and pass intelligent judgment upon the complex questions which are ever before us in business, banking, agriculture, government, and many other fields. But it is he, nevertheless, who will determine whether and to what extent America will continue to live by the principles so firmly established by our forefathers. What can we do to keep these simple and fundamental doctrines ever before us?

No one knows better than I the difficulty of keeping even reasonably well informed on the major problems of the day, and the hours of reading and study it takes to satisfy not a New England, but merely a Midwestern conscience that one's views and pronouncements on current questions are not simply parroted from his favorite columnist but are bottomed by thoughtful analysis and honest conviction. And because our Government is and must be active in so many fields, and because the legislative and administrative questions before it are so diverse and numerous, it is most difficult to preserve perspective, to see the forest despite the trees, and to maintain an objective and consistent viewpoint. The task of thinking simply, unemotionally, and directly has perhaps never been more difficult and surely never more urgently needed than in this forty-first year of the twentieth century.

Formulae for thinking, like rules for making friends and influencing people, must be open to the charge of over-simplification and must prove to some extent ineffectual. Nevertheless, in this disturbed and complex day in which we live, when in foreign lands outlaws and iconoclasts seem successfully to be defying the validity of the virtues we have always embraced, when character and integrity appeal almost to inhibit rather than to help one's cause, it may not be unprofitable for each of us to sit down quietly and by way of reminder restate to ourselves as simply and briefly as we can, the fundamental principles which made, and if we hold firmly to them, which will preserve our American way of life.

Were we each to do this, the enumerations would doubtless differ, both in number of items and in the order of importance of the common ones. The central core, however, would surely be the same. If from that core we could formulate a simple one-page statement, a primer if you like, of the doctrines of American self-government, and if we could spread that statement far and wide across the land for every American to read and live by, the present trends toward government by men rather than by laws, toward enlargement and centralization of government functions and toward government by small but articulate pressure groups, would be arrested in their tracks.

And were I asked to set down in brief and simple fashion the items I would include in a primer of American self government, they would be these seven:

Our American Constitution is of inestimable value. In clear language it safeguards the fundamental rights of the individual. It limits the powers of government to those expressly and by clear implication granted to it. Because amendment is difficult and time-consuming, it stands as a bulwark against hurried, ill-considered, or emotional change. The first item of my primer of American self government is therefore:

1. UNDERSTAND, HONOR, AND PRESERVE THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

American government, whether National, State, or local, comprises three branches, which in order to prevent concentration of power must always be kept separate and distinct. They are the legislative branch, whose duty it is to enact all laws subject only to the principles and limitations laid down by the Constitution; the executive branch, whose duty it is to administer, but never to make, the laws of the land and to operate all government services; and the judicial branch, whose duty it is to interpret the laws made by the legislature, to decide whether they conform to the Constitution, and whether acts or omissions of the people or the other departments of government are in accordance with the law. The second item of my primer is, therefore:

2. KEEP FOREVER SEPARATE AND DISTINCT THE LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Government is created by and belongs to the people. It has no rights or powers except as the people grant them. The cost of government must be paid for by the people through taxation, and the tendency is for government to grow and become increasingly costly. Because government is not like private business, in which competition and the profit motive provide a tremendous incentive to careful planning and efficient operation, government is inherently less efficient than private business. Therefore it should be permitted to do only those things which government alone can properly do and which are necessary for the welfare of the people. Thus the third item of my primer becomes:

3. REMEMBER THAT GOVERNMENT BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE, IS INHERENTLY INEFFICIENT, AND THAT ITS ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THOSE WHICH GOVERNMENT ALONE CAN PERFORM

Of the many rights and guaranties which Americans enjoy under the Federal and State Constitutions, perhaps the most important are freedom of speech, freedom of worship according to one's own conscience, and freedom of decision and action in such matters as where to live, what kind of work to engage in, whom to work for, and at what pay. This freedom of action, coupled with the right of the American citizen to have and to hold the fruits of his labor and to save or dispose of them as he wishes, is called the enterprise system, and it provides opportunity and incentive to improve one's position in life. Our fourth item, accordingly, is:

4. BE VIGILANT FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH, FREEDOM OF WORSHIP, AND FREEDOM OF ACTION

The enterprise system under which thousands of private businesses and millions of men and women are constantly searching for new, better, and more useful products and services, and for ways to improve and lower the cost of existing ones, has produced a standard of living in this country higher than any which the world has ever known. The enterprise system cannot function successfully without incentive to improve, expand, and to create new enterprises.

Accordingly if the profits of business are taxed inordinately, or if restraints and limitations are imposed which deprive the managers of reasonable freedom of action, or if Government competes or threatens to compete with private business, the enterprise system will languish. These things should therefore be avoided, and if they are, the inherent incentives of the system will cause business to expand, to create new enterprises and profitably to produce ever better, ever cheaper goods for more people to buy. Along this road lies progress and the only permanent solution of our unemployment problem. The fifth item is therefore:

5. CHERISH THE SYSTEM OF FREE ENTERPRISE WHICH MADE AMERICA GREAT

Thrift and economy are still the great virtues they were in our grandmothers' time. Debt burdens the future and too much of it impairs one's credit. Borrowing, therefore, should be resorted to only in periods of real emergency. These principles apply equally to government and to private citizens. The difficulty is that government can borrow more readily than the citizen, and having borrowed for the benefit of one group, it is very difficult not to do so for other organized groups. Our national debt has risen enormously in the past 10 years despite substantial increases in taxation. All this money must some day be repaid out of future taxes. Our immediate problem is to stop piling up more debt. This is not easy, indeed for the moment it is impossible. The safeguard we must seek is widespread understanding of the problem plus realistic and courageous leadership. Briefly stated, our sixth item becomes:

6. RESPECT THRIFT AND ECONOMY, AND BEWARE OF DEBT

Integrity of contract and respect for the rights of others are foundation stones of civilization. They have been all but destroyed in many quarters of the world, and until they are restored barbarism will stalk the earth. Let us keep the candle of integrity burning brightly in America. If we do so, we shall one day use it to rekindle the flame of mutual trust, fair dealing, and respect for others in a suffering and chastened world. The seventh and last item of our primer is, therefore:

7. AEOVE ALL, LET US BE SCRUPULOUS IN KEEPING OUR WORD AND IN RESPECTING THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS

This, then, is one primer of American self-government. If each of you would write your own, I am sure I would be satisfied to accept them. For it seems to me that the principles are so simple, so clear, that having thought them through we may say of them in the language of our forefathers, "These truths we hold to be self-evident."

But thinking on these subjects, and particularly thinking through on them, is not sufficiently widespread. Is it not our task as Americans to encourage and stimulate such thinking in every way at our command? For if our educators, our business and professional men, our churchmen, and our farmers, our trade and civic organizations would write their primers of American self-government and tell the story on a national scale through the press, the radio, the pulpit, the classroom, and the public forum, how could we fail to reinculcate in the minds of our 130,000,000 home-loving citizens, the rules for living the American way?

And now in closing let me say that I have deliberately avoided anything but passing reference to the wars abroad. Tragic and disastrous as they are for those involved and for ourselves, and essential as it is for us to view them realistically and to prepare for bitter times ahead, let us emphatically remember that these wars may obscure but they cannot and will not cure our domestic ills. Indeed, if on a peacetime basis we view dangerous tendencies toward the extension and concentration of government, toward the creation of too powerful bureaucracies and toward unparalleled enlargement of our national debt, is it not clear that the preparation for or actual engagement in war must speed and aggravate these tendencies? Let us, therefore, keep our vision unclouded by emotionalism, and let us recognize that conditions beyond our borders make ever more compelling the need for understanding, for teaching, and for living our primer of American self-government.

Meeting of Representatives of American Republics at Habana, Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. CORDELL HULL, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State and delegate of the United States to the second meeting of the foreign ministers, or their representatives, of the American Republics, at Habana, Cuba, Monday, July 22, 1940:

Mr. Chairman, fellow representatives of the American republics, permit me, first of all, to express my deep personal pleasure in setting foot once more on the soil of the great nation whose guests we are at this time. Forty years have passed since my first visit to these shores, when I had the honor to serve with my regiment in the cause of Cuba's liberation. I doubly welcome the present opportunity to revisit this country—both because of the personal gratification which it affords me and because of the vital importance of the purpose which has brought us together in this beautiful city of Habana.

We are here as representatives of the 21 free and independent American Republics. We meet when world conditions are perhaps graver than they have ever been before. Our purpose is to devise concrete measures by which a number of pressing problems may be met. Our objective is to safeguard the independence, the peace, and the well-being of the American republics.

For nearly a year now a new major war has raged with increasing fury over important areas of the earth. It came as a culmination of a process of deterioration of international conduct and international morality, extending over a period of years, during which forces of ruthless conquest were gathering strength in several parts of the world.

These forces now at work in the world shrink from no means of attaining their ends. In their contempt for all moral and ethical values they are bent on uprooting the very foundation of orderly relations among nations and on subverting, undermining, and destroying existing social and political institutions within nations. They have already left in their wake formerly sovereign nations with their independence trampled into dust and millions of proud men and women with their liberties destroyed.

Our American republics had no part in kindling the tragic conflagration which has thus been sweeping across the world. On the contrary, severally and jointly, we did everything in our power to stay its outburst. Once the conflict had begun we did everything we could to limit its spreading. But it has been increasingly clear that in the vast tragedy which has befallen large portions of the earth there are dangers to the American nations, as well, which it would be suicidal not to recognize in time and not to prepare to meet fully and decisively.

It has been increasingly clear that our nations must not blind themselves into fatal complacency as so many nations have done to their mortal sorrow—regarding the possibility of attack against them from without or of externally directed attempts from within to undermine their national strength and to subvert their cherished social and political institutions, or both. Too many nations have only recently paid a tragic price for confidently placing reliance for their safety and security solely upon clearly expressed desire to remain at peace, upon unequivocally proclaimed neutrality, upon scrupulous avoidance of provocation. Conquerors, invaders, and destroyers ignore or brush aside reasons such as these.

Looming ominously on our horizon is the danger that attempts may be made to employ against our nations, too, the same means of subordinating their destinies to control and dictation from abroad that have already been notoriously employed elsewhere against numerous other countries. We must recognize the serious possibility that no effort or method may be spared to achieve, with respect to some of us, economic domination and political penetration, and to sow, among our nations, the seeds of suspicion, dissention, and discord—the frequent prelude to even more menacing action.

Lest our nations, too, suffer the fate that has already befallen so many other peace-loving and peace-seeking nations, wisdom and prudence require that we have in our hands adequate means of defense. To that end, in the face of common danger, our nations are already working together, in accordance with their firmly established practice of free consultation among equals and of voluntary cooperation with regard to problems which are of common concern to all of us. It is to examine such of these problems as are immediately pressing and to seek for them most effective solutions that the representatives of the 21 American republics have come together at this time.

I

I should like to consider first the situation which confronts us in the economic sphere.

The war now in progress has brought with it a disruption in the channels of international commerce and a curtailment of foreign markets for the products of the Western Hemisphere. This has meant to many American nations a diminution of foreign-exchange resources and a loss of purchasing power sufficiently serious to place severe strains on their national economies. In some cases, stagnant surpluses of commodities, the exportation of which is essential to the economic life of the countries concerned, have accumulated and continue to accumulate. Their existence is a matter of present and future concern to farmers, workers, businessmen, and governments throughout the continental area.

We must assume that these difficulties will continue certainly as long as the war exists. We must anticipate that these problems, and possibly others, will continue for some time after the war ends.

If the standards of living of the American peoples are to be maintained at levels already achieved, and particularly if they are to be raised in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of these peoples, production and distribution must expand, not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world. This same condition is essential to the well-being of all other areas. For no nation or group of nations can hope to become or to remain prosperous when growing poverty stalks the rest of the earth.

Under existing conditions, the problem is singularly pressing. Though war now is in progress, we must contemplate its eventual end. At that time, perhaps 80,000,000 people in Europe, and many millions in other parts of the world, who have been entirely engaged in war work, must find a new place for themselves in the economics of peace. At the same time, it is to be assumed that, once the pressures of war are ended, there will be a general demand that reasonable conditions of life may be restored. To effect this transition, and to supply the world with what it then needs, will necessitate a great increase in production, distribution, and exchange of goods. Failure to achieve this can only mean that the tragedy of war would be followed by the still greater horror of disintegration in great areas.

It is plain that international commerce is indispensable if economic rehabilitation is to be achieved. It is also plain that the only available means of doing this is to resume, as soon as circumstances permit, the normal currents of world trade. I have no doubt that the American republics are ready and indeed anxious to do their part in bringing this about; though the extent to which we can thus play our part must depend materially on the economic methods and policies pursued by other countries.

We are confronted with two opposite trading methods. Open trade, freed as rapidly as may be practicable from the obstruction and regimentation of excessive restrictions, can accomplish the necessary task. Prosperity for the American republics or for any part of the world cannot be achieved—even the necessities of the war-torn areas of the earth cannot be met—by regimented or restricted trade, especially directed under a policy of national or regional autarchy. We recognize the need for a transition period, but we are convinced that there can be only one satisfactory permanent policy.

We have long known from experience that international trade inevitably declines in volume and usefulness when it is conducted on a basis of exclusive bilateralism, or is pressed to unfair advantage, or is used to attempt economic domination. Eventually such methods destroy the trade and the trader alike. In the present situation they are totally unable to provide that volume and distribution of goods which alone can save great areas from intense distress. Only where equal treatment, fair practices, nondiscrimination, and peaceful motives lie beneath trade can it develop to the degree needed to rehabilitate a shattered world and to provide a foundation for further economic progress.

Today, in spite of what has occurred in other parts of the world, the American nations continue to adhere to liberal trade principles and are applying them in their relations with each other as fully as the present state of affairs permits. They should be prepared to resume the conduct of trade with the entire world on this basis as rapidly as other nations are willing to do likewise.

In the meantime the American nations must and should do everything in their power to strengthen their own economic position, to improve further the trade and other economic relations between and among themselves, and to devise and apply appropriate means of effective action to cope with the difficulties, disadvantages, and dangers of the present disturbed and dislocated world conditions. To accomplish these purposes the nations of the Western Hemisphere should undertake the fullest measure of economic cooperation, so designed and so conducted as to serve the best interests of each nation and to bring injury to none.

Progress has already been made toward the forging of new tools to carry out certain phases of economic cooperation on an inter-American basis. The Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, which was established last November pursuant to a resolution of the Panama meeting, has proven itself to be an efficient body for considering and working out such mechanisms. It has recently created the Inter-American Development Commission to carry out the work of planning and promoting the development of new productive facilities in the American republics. In

addition, it prepared the framework for the establishment of an Inter-American bank to foster cooperation in the spheres of long-term development and of money and foreign exchange. The Government of the United States is taking steps to implement the Inter-American Bank Convention and urges that the governments of the other American republics give their cooperation so that this important institution may be placed into operation as rapidly as possible.

Useful as these organizations can be in the long run, there remains the immediately pressing situation confronting the American republics as a result of the curtailment and changed character of important foreign markets. Fully realizing that under present disturbed conditions no nation can expect to maintain a normal economic situation, and in order to meet the emergencies which confront their nations, the governments of the American republics, it is believed, should give consideration to the following program of immediate cooperative action:

1. Strengthening and expansion of the activities of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee as an instrument for continuing consultation with respect to trade matters, including especially the situation immediately confronting the American republics as a result of the curtailment and changed character of important foreign markets.

2. Creation of facilities for the temporary handling and orderly marketing of accumulated surpluses of those commodities which are of primary importance to the maintenance of the economic life of the American republics, whenever such action becomes necessary.

3. Development of commodity agreements with a view to assuring equitable terms of trade for both producers and consumers of the commodities concerned.

4. Consideration of methods for improving the standard of living of the peoples of the Americas, including public-health measures, nutrition studies, and suitable organizations for the relief distribution of some part of any surplus commodities.

The Government of the United States of America has already utilized its existing agencies to enter into mutually advantageous cooperative arrangements with a number of American republics in connection with programs for the development of their national economies and by way of assistance to their central banks in monetary and foreign-exchange matters.

It is now taking steps which will make possible the extension of both the volume and character of the operations of such agencies. When these steps have been completed, the Government of the United States of America will be in a position to expand its cooperative efforts with other American nations in the fields of long-term development and of monetary and exchange matters.

It will also be able to participate in immediate joint action with other nations of this hemisphere to meet pressing trade situations which may arise before the program outlined has come into operation.

Finally, it will be enabled to enter effectively into the cooperative program as it proceeds, assisting in the temporary handling and orderly marketing of the important commodities of the hemisphere; implementing, on its part, the commodity agreements which are developed; and carrying out other operations involving such export products.

While the proposed measures are being developed, consideration should be given to the desirability of a broader system of inter-American cooperative organizations in trade matters to complement inter-American cooperative organizations in the field of long-term economic development and of money and foreign exchange.

By helping each other, by carrying out with vigor, determination, and loyalty whatever decisions are reached, the American nations can build a system of economic defense that will enable each of them to safeguard itself from the dangers of economic subordination from abroad and of economic distress at home. It is no part of our thought to obstruct in any way logical and natural trade with Europe or with any other portion of the world, but rather to promote such trade with nations willing to meet us, in good faith, in a spirit of friendly and peaceful purpose, and on a plane of frank and fair dealing. Against any other kind of dealing, we naturally will protect ourselves.

II

The solution of our economic problems alone is not enough to preserve the peace and security of this hemisphere. There exist also other problems, which are of an altogether different character but the solution of which is of no less importance to our freedom and independence.

I refer to the threat to our security arising from activities directed from without the hemisphere but which operate within our respective borders. A new and evil technique has been invented which seeks by devious methods to corrupt the body politic in order to subject it to alien purposes. With cynical effrontery, sanctuary within the generous citadels of free speech and freedom of assembly is demanded by agents whose masters would obliterate those institutions and foment instead dissension, prejudice, fear, and hatred.

Make no mistake concerning the purposes of this sinister campaign. It is an attempt to acquire domination of the American Republics by foreign governments in their own interest. Already we have seen the tragic results abroad when governmental structures have been undermined and the fabric of established institutions riddled by the termites of alien propaganda.

We long ago recognized the source and extent of this infection and have already taken some steps to eradicate it. At Lima we declared that it was incompatible with the sovereignty of any American Republic that persons or groups within our countries should be controlled by any outside government for its own purposes. It is now urgently incumbent upon us to take decisive remedial action to the end that the independence and political integrity of each of the American Republics may be fully safeguarded.

To this no friendly government can legitimately object. The inter-American system carries no implication of aggression and no threat to any nation. It is based solely on a policy of self-defense, designed to preserve the independence and the integrity of each of the American nations. It implies no hegemony on the part of any member of the inter-American group; but it equally rejects the thesis of hegemony by anyone else. It resembles in no way regional policies recently pursued in other parts of the world, which pretend to invoke our inter-American system as precedent. The difference is that our sole purpose is self-defense, while these other policies seem instead to be pretexts for conquest by the sword, for military occupation, and for complete economic and political domination of other free and independent peoples.

III

There are other pressing political problems arising out of the vast changes which have taken place on the continent of Europe. The principles on which we act with respect to these problems have been forged by the American republics through years of discussion and practice. They are applied entirely without discrimination, solely for the purpose of assuring that the security of the American Hemisphere shall not be impaired by the repercussions of warfare elsewhere.

Specifically, there is before us the problem of the status of European possessions in this hemisphere. These geographic regions have not heretofore constituted a menace to the peace of the Americas; their administrations were established, for the most part, many generations ago and, in our time, have acted as congenial neighbors. We have no desire to absorb these possessions or to extend our sovereignty over them, or to include them in any form of sphere of influence.

We could not, however, permit these regions to become a subject of barter in the settlement of European differences or a battleground for the adjustment of such differences. Either situation could only be regarded as a threat to the peace and safety of this hemisphere, as would any indication that they might be used to promote systems alien to the inter-American system. Any effort, therefore, to modify the existing status of these areas—whether by cession, by transfer, or by any impairment whatsoever in the control heretofore exercised—would be of profound and immediate concern to all the American republics.

It is accordingly essential that we consider a joint approach to this common problem. We must be in a position to move rapidly and without hesitation.

It has been suggested that our action take the form of the establishment of a collective trusteeship, to be exercised in the name of all of the American republics. The Government of the United States endorses this suggestion and is prepared to cooperate, should occasion arise, in its execution.

The establishment of a collective trusteeship for any region must not carry with it any thought of the creation of a special interest by any American republic. The purpose of a collective trusteeship must be to further the interests and security of all of the American nations, as well as the interest of the region in question. Moreover, as soon as conditions permit, the region should be restored to its original sovereign or be declared independent when able to establish and maintain stable self-government.

IV

Seldom has a meeting of friendly nations opened in an atmosphere of more widespread misconception and more flagrant misrepresentation as to its aims and purposes than have emanated in recent weeks, from responsible and irresponsible quarters, in connection with this meeting.

We have met to consult together regarding our own pressing problems. We covet nothing anywhere in the world. We are free from the spirit of enmity toward any nation. But we cannot fail to be acutely conscious of the dangers which confront us as a result of present world conditions and against which we are taking and intend to take fully adequate measures of defense. National life itself today imposes as an absolute obligation the will to national defense, should national institutions or integrity ever be threatened. Achievement of this requires that we call out anew the endless energy, the complete spirit of sacrifice, the iron will, which characterized the pioneers, the liberators, and the defenders, to whom we owe our present freedom. Let no man say that in the world of today any nation not willing to defend itself is safe. The fortitude and resolution of our forefathers won for us our free institutions. We proudly have inherited them, and proudly are prepared to maintain them.

At the same time, while meeting the imperative needs of emergency conditions we must—and, I am certain, we will—continue our abiding faith that what is happening today is but a temporary interruption in the progress of civilization. Mankind can advance only when human freedom is secure; when the right of self-government is safeguarded; when all nations recognize each other's right to conduct its internal affairs free from outside interference; when there exist among nations respect for the pledged word, determination to abstain from the use of armed force in pursuit of policy, and willingness to settle controversies by none but peaceful means; when international economic relations are based upon mutual benefit, equality of treatment, and fair dealing.

In 1937, in an attempt to prevent the impending catastrophe of a new war, the Government of the United States addressed a com-

munication to all nations, reciting these basic principles of orderly international relations under the rule of law as the foundation of its foreign policy and inviting comment thereon. More than 50 nations expressed on that occasion their belief in the validity of these principles. At Montevideo, at Buenos Aires, at Lima, at Panama the 21 American republics proclaimed their acceptance.

I am confident that sooner or later the entire world must return to a system of international relations based on those principles. They are the only possible foundation stones of an organized society assured of enduring peace and of sustained prosperity. The price of their abandonment is the chaos of international anarchy and the inexorable impoverishment of nations and individuals, such as we witness today in Europe and in Asia.

In a system of cooperative peace such as we envisage there is no exclusion. Its underlying principles are universal in their applicability; they can be accepted by all nations to the benefit of each and all; they must be accepted by all if the light of modern civilization is not to be extinguished. Any nation which in good faith accepts and practices them automatically shares in the vast benefits they confer.

At this time, when these principles and these ideals are being widely challenged, when institutions based on them are being crushed by force over large areas of the world, it is doubly essential that our nations keep them alive and rededicate themselves to the cause of their preservation.

It is in this spirit, and in this spirit alone, that the Government which I have the honor to represent approaches the tasks that are before our present meeting—in complete confidence that in this vital respect all of the American nations stand today as united as ever.

Dangerous Suspicions and Unfair Aspersions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during times such as these when the world becomes weary and heartsick with the results of war, we are apt to become confused and often suspicious of the motives and actions of our own people. Loyalty in America is not confined to any one nationalistic group any more than it is more abundant in one religious faith than in another. Loyalty and devotion to American ideals and to our system of government is just as strong in the heart of the Negro as it is in the heart of his Caucasian brother.

Those of us who have gone through the war period between 1914 and 1918 remember only too well the whispering and the suspicion which was directed against some of our loyal Americans of German antecedents and the actions of some of those who would cast aspersions upon this loyal American element were shameful and sinful in the extreme. Eavesdroppers strained their ears to obtain information against their German-American neighbors. Peeping toms observed every action of these people. Innocent remarks were often twisted and magnified to give unpatriotic meanings and doubtlessly many an innocent person was made to suffer heartache and public scorn because of the ultra-chauvinistic and superpatriotic antics of some of our misguided people.

Undoubtedly there were many innocent American citizens of German origin who were shadowed, trailed, and persecuted without any cause or reason whatsoever. Many were doubtlessly made to suffer along with dangerous aliens who were properly confined to stockades or were imprisoned, and it is against a resurgence and revival of any such possibility, Mr. Speaker, that I want to raise my voice at this time. There are countless thousands, there are millions of loyal Americans of German antecedents who hate and despise nazi-ism and who hope and pray for Germany's early return to right, reason, and decency. I have discussed this matter with many of my German-American friends and I am convinced that if it were within their ability to solve the problem that nazi-ism would be crushed and would become a thing of the past, relegated as it were to oblivion.

There is no tie that binds Nazi Germany to any element of our loyal people. The severest criticism and condemnation of Hitler and his Godless philosophy is frequently directed by German-American newspapers and societies. On more than one occasion Hitler himself has referred slurringly to German-Americans. He berated them as being below the average of German intellectualism. He placed them among those who might be rated as subhuman. Only recently a Berlin dispatch under date of July 19, emanating through the Associated Press, refers to the Germans in America in the following and uncomplimentary manner:

> The greatest traitors were those Germans and Italians who went to America and were incited against authoritarian states.

The Nazis of Germany recognize their inability to sway American sentiment, and on more than one occasion I have read of the chagrin and disappointment of the Nazi high command because the Americans of German extraction cannot be made to be tractable and will not follow Hitler's commands.

In our zeal to suppress nazi-ism, "fifth column," and other dangerous anti-American activities, let us be certain before we charge our friends and neighbors with acts of treason. Hysteria is a symptom of subsequent jitters which dulls the intellect and may be the cause of grave injustice, disorganization, and national panic, precisely what the "fifth columnists" and Nazis seek to attain as their objective. While ever on the alert, let us remain cool, calm, and in full possession of our faculties if we want to be helpful and effective.

American citizens of German extraction have proved their unfaltering patriotism to such an extent that their patriotism should never have to be questioned, and they can be relied upon to stand by the flag in any emergency. They will stand shoulder to shoulder with the great mass of our American people in defense of our American institutions, our ideals, and the preservation of the Nation.

Merchandising and Chain Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am offering for the RECORD excerpts from the testimony on April 26, 1940, of Malcolm P. McNair, professor of marketing at the Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, before a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 1, which would impose a destructive tax on the chain stores of this country.

CHAIN STORES ARE NOT MONOPOLIES

Now, the general point that I should like to make is in regard to this fear of monopoly, which is very frequently put forward as a reason for curbing the growth of chain stores. It is my opinion that that fear is quite unjustified.

In the first place, it is very easy, indeed, as everyone is aware, for an individual with relatively small means to enter many kinds of retail business, and those individuals are doing it practically every day.

Not only are these small retail stores in a very great numerical majority, but the most recent census figures which are available indicate that the sales of independents, during the period 1935 to 1937, were growing more rapidly than the sales of chains.

A comparison in the 1937 study on the basis of identical stores shows that 80,664 independent stores increased their sales 22.8 percent between 1935 and 1937, whereas 22,189 chain stores increased their sales only 17.1 percent between 1935 and 1937. And, incidentally, it may be remarked that these same 22,189 chain stores increased their pay roll 22 percent over this period.

CHAIN DISTRIBUTION STABILIZING

Now, the reasons why that change took place in the rate of growth, in my opinion, are two. First, I think that there is evidence that the chain system of distribution is becoming stabilized; chains are becoming stabilized as a factor in distribution; are not now growing as rapidly as they did during the initial period. Second, I should say that the development of new methods of

distribution is a factor, and I have in mind particularly the supermarket, during recent years, which has tended to slow up the rate of chain development.

Now, according to the best estimates which I can assemble, if we take all types of what might be called large-scale distributors—now, by large-scale distributors I mean chains; I mean mail-order houses; I mean department stores; even, I think, if we were to include voluntary chains in this group, because they are, after all, a type of mass distributor—if we were to take all that group together, I think, according to the best estimates I can get, it is very doubtful whether their total volume of sales is as much as 40 percent. I would guess that it was nearer 35 percent. If you take the voluntary chains out of that, I would guess that it drops down perhaps to the vicinity of 30 percent of the total retail distribution.

Frankly, I do not see much to get excited about in that situation. I think it is pretty clear that, considering the ease of access to retail business and the personal nature of the retail function, and the value placed by many consumers on personal contacts and services, that large-scale retail distribution is not going to wipe out independent merchants in any period that can now be foreseen.

As a matter of fact, I would say that a very considerable number of years would elapse before all of these large-scale methods of distribution, taken together, would amount to as much as 50 percent of the entire field of distribution.

Consequently, I think the fears of monopoly are very greatly exaggerated, in fact unwarranted.

Also, it is my own observation that the fiercest competition in the retail field is commonly found between the chains themselves; between each other, rather than between the chains and the independents. I think that is true rather generally of most types of large-scale distribution.

The large-scale distributor of the department store or chain store or supermarket type, my observation is, is primarily a price competitor. He goes out and fights on a price basis. That is not perhaps always true of the large-scale manufacturer.

I do think that in our apprehension about large business in this country we ought to make a distinction between the large businesses which tend to behave on a price-fixing or monopolistic basis, and those large businesses which go out and compete vigorously on a price basis. It is my observation, in the field of distribution, that the large-scale distributor of the chain type, the department store type, the supermarket type, the mail-order type, generally goes out and competes pretty vigorously on a price basis.

For those reasons I feel very strongly convinced myself that the fears of monopoly in connection with chain-store growth are wholly unwarranted.

LESS WASTE MOTION

Formerly we had the situation where a manufacturer here, for example, sold to an independent wholesaler over here, and the independent wholesaler, in turn sold to a small retailer over here.

That is the system in which, as a matter of fact, there is a good deal of waste motion; there is a salesman going out from the manufacturer to make the contacts with the wholesaler; the wholesaler's salesman traveling on to the retailer to make contacts with him. Nobody knows exactly what the requirements of the customers are. The wholesaler does not know exactly what he can sell to the various retailers. There is a lot of waste motion in that situation.

Therefore, we have seen at various times in the past a tendency for the manufacturer to absorb this wholesale jobber. He took them over and made wholesale branches of them, and sold direct to the retailer, so he could be in closer contact with the retailer.

What we have also seen, though it is not so well recognized, is that the retailer, when he distributes on a large scale, such as a chain, he takes over that wholesale job, incorporates the wholesaling business essentially under one overhead with his retail business.

That pulls together, in the first place, large buying power; in the second place, it pulls together a very exact knowledge of the requirements of the market and it makes it possible for this combination wholesaler-retailer, when he is operating a large number of stores, or supermarkets, or when he happens to be a large distributor himself, to go to the manufacturer, essentially to take the place of the manufacturer's sales organization, to sit down with the president of a manufacturing concern, explain to him his requirements, or give him an order that will keep that manufacturer busy perhaps over a period of 6 months or so, instead of having to manufacture in dribbles or smaller orders.

Now, then, my opinion, and I state this deliberately, is that the organization advantages, the advantages of the systemization that is possible, if you bring together or integrate or amalgamate these distribution functions, instead of scattering it between separate manufacturers, between separate wholesalers, and separate retailers, is a considerably more important reason for the advantages of the chain in dealing with a manufacturer, than is the buying power alone.

It is my opinion that buying power by and of itself has been exaggerated as one of the advantages of a chain or other large-scale retailer in dealing with the manufacturer. I think its principal advantages come from this combination and coordination of functions, this saving of lost time between the manufacturer and the consumer.

UNWILLINGNESS TO PROGRESS

I think our economic system is more likely to collapse from the throwing of monkey wrenches than it is from refinement and improvement. I think we have too many obstacles—I might put it this way: I think too many people have been unwilling to advance, unwilling to go along with new developments. I think there has been too much desire, perhaps, to hold prices too high. I am in hearty sympathy with those economists who maintain that prices on the whole perhaps have been held too high. We ought to get prices down so that we could have more progress. Of course, the T. N. E. C. has been working on this conundrum for a long time now, but I would suggest that perhaps some of the high prices that ought to be looked at are the high cost of distribution and not merely the high price of manufacturing.

I think it is quite possible, in my opinion, that one of the obstacles to greater investment today, is exactly this high cost of distribution. We haven't yet made enough of a dent in the high cost of distribution. We have made a little dent in it by means of some of these combined functions, particularly in the chains and the supermarkets, or combination distributors. I don't think we have made anywhere near enough dent in that.

LOGICAL COUNTER TO MASS PRODUCTION

I think this system of mass distribution really is a thoroughly logical counter to mass production. I don't think we can have any advance in our standards of living if we do not have capital flowing into the job of distribution and flowing in largely to the large-scale distributors, the chains and other large-scale enterprises. We have had a flow of capital into that. We are not distributing our merchandise in the fashion of the old "horse and buggy" days, or the small craftsmanship days. We have had a flow of capital into that, and I think that flow of capital into the field of distribution has tended to reduce distribution cost somewhat, but I don't think it has gone far enough. I think we need a freeing up of the flow of capital into the field of distribution. I think that instead of trying to freeze this situation, we have to thaw it, so that we can get as great ingenuity as possible working on this problem of reduction of distribution cost, because I think we have now reached the point where to get more opportunities for investment we have to squeeze down distribution cost as well as the manufacturing cost.

DANGER OF PATMAN BILL

I think there is a grave danger that if this Patman bill should become law it might cause a new business slump by upsetting the balance of production and distribution. Our economy, as we are now well aware, is in many respects a very delicate one, easily subject to shock. When any part of the economy sustains a shock the effects of that shock are very rapidly transmitted to other parts of the economy. The enactment of this measure would cause a decline in local real-estate values, would cause a loss of income to agricultural producers, would cause a drop in employment, not merely in the chains but also in many manufacturing enterprises which have been developed primarily to serve the chain-store market. The strong probability that those results would ensue has been brought out in previous testimony before this committee. I merely want to suggest to you that, even though men thus thrown out of work might eventually find employment in other types of distributive enterprise, even though the opening of new independent stores might eventually tend to check the decline in real-estate values, nevertheless the shock to the economic system of forcing such a drastic reorganization in the distribution machinery would be very likely to precipitate the country into a new economic tailspin.

I should like to remind you also that an incidental consequence, if this bill were enacted into law, would be a substantial decline in the tax revenues of the United States Treasury. Figures are not available for the total volume of income taxes paid by all chains; but I have been able to make a compilation of income taxes paid in 1938 by 35 large chains with a volume of sales of $2,451,222,000. This figure was $14,985,000. Estimates are based on data published in Survey of American Listed Corporations, industry reports of the survey of the American Listed Corporations, a Work Projects Administration study sponsored by the Securities and Exchange Commission, volume II, New York, March 1940. Even assuming that the ratio of taxes to sales volume is lower for the entire group of chains which would be affected by this legislation than it is for the selected ones whose tax figures are available, still the probable sum involved is in the neighborhood of $40,000,000 or $42,000,000. This figure, it should be noted, does not take into account social-security taxes. But whatever is the total sum of taxes now accruing to the Treasury from chains, there are several good reasons for supposing that this amount of Government income would be drastically reduced if the Patman bill were enacted into law. In the first place, because of lower efficiency, independent enterprise, even if they transacted the same volume of business as the chains which they replaced, almost certainly would not make so large a profit. In the second place, a very large number of these small enterprises would escape the social security taxes because of the small number of employees involved. And in the third place, the profits of individual stores would be the income of the proprietors and as such would be subject to personal and family exemptions. The net result, I am confident, would be to cut the Treasury's income from these sectors of retail business at least in half.

Keep These United States Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF SEATTLE PEACE COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of policy of the Seattle Peace Coordinating Committee. This organization in Seattle is a federation of peace groups representing citizens of all political persuasions, varying religious affiliations, and of many different racial origins. The statement indicates that this organization feels strongly about the matter of the maintenance of peace for America. They vehemently demand that emphasis be placed upon the continuation of progressive legislation for domestic rehabilitation and the taking of every precaution to insure that America will not be embroiled in the bloody holocaust of Europe; that we bolster our internal morale by providing opportunity for the unemployed and the neglected one-third of our citizenry and our youth to secure a place in the sun.

The resolution is as follows:

SEATTLE PEACE COORDINATING COMMITTEE—STATEMENT OF POLICY

The American people demand peace and preservation of civil rights.

They remember 1917. They are determined that America shall never again be sacrificed to Wall Street profits.

Yet today the national administration is whipping up hysteria to conceal maneuvers that are leading us into war. It is turning our resources over to the Allies, and demanding compulsory military training for all Americans. Such actions endanger our own defenses and threaten democracy itself.

The Seattle Peace Coordinating Committee declares that this Nation can and must remain at peace. To guarantee this, the committee pledges itself to the following program:

1. Strict neutrality in word and action.

2. No repeal of the Johnson Act to permit credits to warring nations which have defaulted on previous loans.

3. A true national-defense program based on a decent standard of living in every American home. This requires: (a) Defense of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively; (b) Jobs for the unemployed, and economic security, by passage of the American Standards Work and Assistance Act and the American Youth Act; (c) Adequate pensions for the aged, and cost of production for the farmer; (d) National housing and health programs. This program, implemented by adequate defensive armaments, will make this Nation invincible.

4. Opposition to conscription and compulsory military training; and

5. Preservation of the Bill of Rights, the very keystone of American liberty.

There shall be no M day in America.

A Fourth of July Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BOEHNE, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS OF REV. O. A. GEISEMAN, S. T. D.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Rev. O. A. Geiseman, S. T. D., Grace Lutheran Church, River Forest, Ill.:

A FOURTH OF JULY PRAYER

God willing, we, the people of these United States, shall in a few days again celebrate the day on which we commemorate the declaration of our national independence. One hundred and sixty-four years ago our American forbears created on this continent a free Nation. They shed their blood and they gave their lives in defense of the principle that the Creator has endowed all men with the inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They established a government by the people, of the people, and for the people. Many things have come to pass since that happened. The past one and a half centuries have perhaps been as eventful from the viewpoint of secular history as any other comparable period of time throughout all history. This has been the time in which especially the western world has witnessed a great industrial revolution; it has been the time in which our country has experienced a civil war, the passing of the great American frontier, the World War, a universal depression, and on top of all that, a second world war. Yet, despite all of these great historic events, despite the countless changes which have taken place otherwise, we still are a free people. And so, I invite you to join with me this morning in following the spirit of the psalmist who said, Psalm 95: verse 6, "Oh come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker."

Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker and with humble hearts and a sense of profoundest gratitude give thanks to our Heavenly Father. Let us give thanks to Him because He has preserved our freedom unto us. When our forbears sounded the battle cry of freedom in this land of ours, it echoed 'round the world. The flag of our Nation came to be unto men everywhere a symbol of liberty, of justice, and of hope. In certain parts of the world the lamps of liberty were lighted though they may never have burned there quite as brightly as they did in our country, yet they burned. But in recent years the light of freedom has been extinguished, first in one land and then in another, so that this morning we, the people of the United States, are practically the only great Nation which can still be spoken of as a free Nation. We still enjoy the freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of speech, and above all things, that freedom which, forget it not, is fundamental to all other freedom, the freedom of worship. Though these be troublous times yet the lowliest American citizen, no matter how ill-informed, no matter how prejudiced in his feelings and views, has the privilege of saying what he thinks so long as it does not subvert law and order and so long as he remains within the limits of our American Constitution and our laws. It makes our hearts heavy just to think that millions upon millions of men, women, and children who once knew what it meant to be free, this morning are no longer so.

When you and I then, approaching the day of our national independence, remember that we are free, we cannot but bow down before our God, kneel before our Maker, and thank Him with all our hearts for this blessed privilege.

But when we think as citizens of America, we have reason to be grateful not only for the freedom which is ours, but also for the abundance of material blessings which God has showered upon us. It has come to be quite popular for Americans to complain ever since the depression began. We can hang our heads and make long faces, and talk as though we were the most oppressed people in the world because of the taxes we have to pay and because of the bad times which we have experienced.

My friends, we ought to blush with shame just to think that way, to say nothing about talking that way. God has poured His gifts upon us with such abundance, He has blessed our land with so vast a store of natural resources that we are a rich people. Just think of the masses of immigrants who were born in other lands and who came to these shores poor as church mice, but who by reason of God's bountiful goodness, their own industry and frugality, and opportunities for free enterprise, the unbelievable development in industry on American soil, and the richness and fertility of our American farm lands, how many, many of these people have not only secured that which was necessary to their barest existence, but actually have become rich in a true sense of that word. Just think of the members of our own congregation. We live in decent homes, we wear adequate clothing, we eat wholesome food, our children get a good education—all because God has blessed us as American citizens.

I do not mean in any way to minimize the heartaches people have endured as a result of droughts, dust storms, mortgage foreclosures, unemployment, and business losses, but I do mean to say that the poorest person on the relief rolls of America has been more bountifully provided for than millions and millions of people in other lands ever dare hope to be in their fondest dreams. God has been good to us. We have reason as we approach a great day of national celebration to think of that goodness, to kneel down before the Lord, our Maker, and to express to Him our humblest thanks.

We have further reason to thank Almighty God because He has preserved peace unto us. Which other great nation in the world can you mention this morning that has not as yet become embroiled in the now raging and spreading wars? We are practically the only one. Our sons are still going to school, and they are still engaged in the productive enterprises of peace. Our wives, sweethearts, mothers, and daughters need not look through tear-dimmed eyes upon a world of sorrow and gloom from which their loved ones have been

erased by the murderous ruthlessness of war. We are not being driven mad by the hellish sound of fearful bombs dropping from Stuka dive bombers upon our homes, our churches, and our land. We can quietly pursue our daily tasks, enjoy our pastimes and pleasures, gather in the family circle, assemble in God's house to worship our Lord and our Redeemer. "Come, let us bow down, let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker," and give thanks unto Him.

But as we approach the day of our national observance we do not only want to thak God as we kneel before Him, but we also want to implore. We want to come to Him with our supplication that He may forgive—forgive all our sins, and only God knows how numerous and great they are, but forgive in particular our spirit of ingratitude, our failure to appreciate, our refusal to acknowledge the goodness of God, and the blessings which are ours as citizens of these United States. Where is our appreciation? What are you and I doing as individual Christian American citizens to show God that we are thankful, and to preserve for ourselves, our children, and our children's children the blessings we now have. We have reason with penitent and contrite hearts to come before God this morning and say, "Lord, have mercy! We have been unworthy of any grace. We have failed to appreciate. We deserve no more. Please forgive us."

And while we pray, let us beg of Him also that He may fill us with a holy zeal so that we may preach with greater enthusiasm the truths of His holy word, and, above all, His message of salvation. I am afraid that only a very few people understand the intimate relationship between civic liberty and the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Lose the one, and you are almost inevitably foredoomed to lose the other. It is only there where an appreciable number of people believe that God is the Creator, the Father of all; it is only there where an appreciable number of people believe that Jesus died for all, and that every single human being represents an immortal and blood-bought soul that you can hope to preserve an appreciation of the dignity of the individual man. It is at the foot of the cross on Calvary where all inequalities among men are wiped out.

I read only the other day that on the same Sunday in the same Christian church the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Charles Evans Hughes, and an unnamed Chinese laundryman were received at the same time. At the foot of the Cross the ground is level. Here there is no Jew nor Greek, here there is neither male nor female, neither bond nor free, but here all are one in Christ Jesus. It is only then when a sufficiently large number of people have that understanding and such a view of life and man that you can hope to preserve the spirit of democracy, the sense of freedom and equality which we enjoy as citizens in this country. Let us pray God then that we come to conceive of our task with greater clarity, that we recognize its tremendous significance more fully and that we further share this message of love and salvation with our fellowmen more eagerly, more generously, and enthusiastically. It is only by the saving message of God's Holy Word that the individual sinner can find peace with God and forgiveness for his sins; and it is only by the glorious message of divine love and salvation that we can hope to retain a solid foundation for the democracy which is now ours.

Having prayed for that, let us pray further that Almighty God may pour out His Holy Spirit upon us in such abundance that we can show forth the faith that is within us by shining deeds of love. Our message of love and salvation will be of little account if we do not exemplify it and support it by lives of love. Otherwise we will move men to blaspheme God rather than to honor and glorify Him. It is only then when we let our light so shine before men that they can see our good works that they will join us in glorifying our Father which is in Heaven. The Spirit of God works faith in the hearts of men by the message of salvation and by the blessed means of grace. Men should be attracted to this message by the beauty of our lives. The language of loving deeds performed by the Christian man and woman is a language which can be universally understood, and it is by this language we must meet the arguments of totalitarianism. It is by the force and the power of this argument we must overcome the forces of a godless anti-Christian communism, just as in the days of the early centuries the Christians overcame a heartless paganism by their deeds of love. Let us then pray the Heavenly Father that He may make us capable not only of confessing our faith in words, but of exemplifying it in deeds.

Further, let us pray for the President of the United States and all others in authority. The past decade has been one of chaos and confusion. The passions of partisan politics have often run very high and the people who have occupied positions of authority have become the victims of these passions. From 1929–31 it was Herbert Hoover over whom the storm broke, since 1932 it has been the present President of these United States. We are a free people. The humblest citizen may differ in his political views and ideas from the highest official in the land. But, my friends, nowhere has God allowed His children the privilege of cursing those who are in authority or even of holding them in contempt. Our Lord says, "I exhort, therefore, that first of all supplications and prayers be made for all men especially for those who are in authority." Let us turn then day after day to the throne of grace and beg our Heavenly Father that He may endow those who occupy the positions of authority—the President, the Congress, the Cabinet Officers, the foreign ambassadors, whoever they may be—with such wisdom, such discernment that they may say and do whatever may most fully reflect glory upon his Holy Name, whatever will contribute most fully to the preservation of peace for our own people, and whatever will serve best the well-being and happiness of men everywhere.

Finally, while we are on our knees and thinking of the 4th day of July in the year of our Lord 1940, let us also pray for the preservation of peace. We still have peace. We know not for how long. We do know that God has ordained the Government for the purpose of protecting the life and the property of its citizens. We do know that the Government possesses the power of the sword. We do know that if attacks should be made upon our own country you and I should want to be found among those who with unswerving loyalty and with true Christian and patriotic devotion would want to do all we could even to the sacrifice of our own lives for the preservation of Old Glory. But while all that is true, we also know that war can make no constructive contribution to the welfare of men. God may in His own way eventually work to bring out of such destruction something good for subsequent generations. That may all be true, but it can only come by the overruling power of God. It does not come as a result of war. War is a curse and not a blessing. Human lives and hearts are not conquered by cannon and by force. Men's hearts and souls are conquered only by love and persuasion and so we hope and pray that God may preserve peace unto us. We do not want our Nation to become embroiled in foreign wars and assist in creating blood-drenched shambles in wider areas of the world. We want our Nation to preserve the idea of peace and good will toward men everywhere, so that when others have spilled their blood, spent their energies, destroyed their countries, we may come with the hand of mercy and build a new day and a new civilization upon the ruins. It is our hope and prayer that this glorious flag of ours may more fully than ever before become the symbol of love, of kindness, of justice, and of hope for the nations of the world. May God hear us as we express our word of thanks and respond in infinite mercy to our humble pleas, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

Antitrust Laws and Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a great part of the world today finds itself locked in physical conflict. This battle among great nations and empires has drawn the close attention and observation of those other nations which are fortunate enough not to be engaged in this titanic struggle. The outcome of this war, undoubtedly, will have a tremendous effect even on the lives of those not engaged therein. It is only natural then, that we watch the tide of battle with deep interest and not a little apprehension.

But at this time, with so much of our thought and action concentrated on world-wide affairs, we must not forget certain ever-present and ever-pressing domestic problems that we have before us. There is a struggle going on in these United States which did not begin a few short months ago, nor a few years ago. It has been going on for more than half a century, and at times it has been a very bitter struggle. I am speaking of the fight which the laboring man of this country has carried on for the right to earn a living wage and work reasonable hours under decent conditions, as we Americans understand these things. It took a great deal of courage for a workingman to band with his fellow craftsman 50 years ago and announce the principles for which they stood and for which they were prepared to fight—courage and the determination born of the conviction that they were right. When one considers the power of their opponents—employers and big business corporations—it appears virtually incredible that they should succeed in any measure at all. Certain it is that the odds were no less than the allied nations faced at the outset of the war against the totalitarian states.

Labor unions formed by small groups of valiant workingmen had just discarded the swaddling clothes of its infancy in the

early 1900's and had begun to test its ability to walk. It had hardly taken the first step when it was struck a blow, from which it still feels the effect. This blow was the application by the Federal courts of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act to labor unions. At a time when it needed a helping hand it received instead a crippling kick. Later, attempts were made to free labor unions from the yoke of the antitrust laws by the passage of the Clayton Act, which in very high-sounding phrases proclaimed that the labor of a human being was not a commodity or article in commerce and that labor unions were free to strike and carry on all lawful activities of a labor union without such activities being a violation of the laws of the United States. The helping hand thus extended was withdrawn by judicial interpretation of the act and another blow thus was dealt to labor. With undaunted courage they carried on, never ceasing to have faith and to hope that some day the true plight of the workingman would be brought to light and effective measures carried out not only by the legislative branch of our Government but by the judicial and executive branches as well. Injunctive process halted labor in its attempts to better its conditions and preserve for itself whatever ground it had gained.

An enlightened legislature, fully realizing for the first time what government by injunction meant to organized labor, passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932, prohibiting the granting of injunctions by the Federal courts where a labor dispute existed. At least, recognition was given to the rights of labor to organize freely, to picket and strike if necessary, to do virtually everything that had been hitherto denied to them, short or fraud and violence, to bring about the objectives for which they had organized.

The declaration of the public policy as contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act shows that Congress recognized the necessity of giving the workers freedom to exercise actual liberty of contract and freedom to organize with groups of their own choosing for the avowed purpose of negotiating terms and conditions of employment. Nor did the declaration stop there. It went on to say that the worker shall not only be free to organize but he shall be free to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

No one can deny that this act has been a great boon to labor, nor that the declaration of public policy did not truly reflect the feelings of the great majority of the people. In limiting the power of the Federal courts in granting injunctions, a real obstacle was removed from labor's path. But that path has not remained free from hurdles, and now labor faces what is, undoubtedly, its most serious problem—namely, criminal indictments under the Sherman antitrust law. It is difficult, if not impossible, to comprehend how and why labor should be tempted on the one hand to act in accordance with the public policy as declared in the Norris-LaGuardia Act and on the other hand face the peril of criminal indictment by the Government if it should so act.

This is a problem that must be faced squarely if any stability and harmony is to be offered to the laboring man. It is sufficiently difficult in these trying times of lack of employment to keep up the spirit and morale of the working people. If labor unions are forced to relinquish the ground they have gained in the last half century through these indictments, then surely that last back-breaking straw has been placed upon the backbone of our country—the laboring man.

The rights which the Norris-LaGuardia Act has proclaimed to belong to labor should be guaranteed to it, and whatever steps are necessary should be taken without hesitation to declare the activities of labor unions, short of racketeering, to be exempt from criminal prosecution by the Government.

The aforesaid views are those of Irving Dobbins, member and officer of Local No. 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which views I espouse.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

RESOLUTION FROM THE DANVILLE (VA.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND AN EDITORIAL FROM THE DANVILLE (VA.) BEE

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Danville Chamber of Commerce and an editorial from the Danville Bee:

Be it resolved, That the Danville Junior Chamber of Commerce, composed of 100 business and professional men between the ages of 21 and 36, at a special meeting called for the purpose of considering the problem of an adequate national defense, do hereby approve and accept the resolutions passed by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled on the 21st of June, 1940.

It is our sincere belief that the resolutions so passed represent the views of millions of American young men on the subject of national defense and particularly on the question of compulsory military training.

We realize fully that compulsory military training affects our individual life, our families, our positions, and our future, but we feel that the integrity and institutions of our country are gravely threatened, and that to insure our independence and freedom it is imperative that we make the sacrifices necessary to assure adequate military training.

We believe compulsory military training as voted for by American citizens and controlled by the people of the country, is democratic in every sense of the word and that it is in our power, under our Constitution, to tax ourselves with this burden if we so desire to aid in the preservation of that Constitution.

We do not believe that military conscription as outlined in the bills before Congress will give any militaristic group the opportunity to sway this country against its democratic ideals or breed in us a militaristic attitude toward the world at large.

We thoroughly respect the opinion of those Americans and those organizations made up of Americans who feel that compulsory military training is not necessary to our program of national defense, but we challenge the rights of any organization to speak for young men of America which continues to include in its membership those, be they few or many, who openly favor any form of government contrary to the democratic form of government of the United States of America.

We challenge and condemn the resolutions as passed at the last convention of the American Youth Congress as failing to represent the views of American young men on the subject of compulsory military training.

Notice of this action taken by the Danville Junior Chamber of Commerce shall be forwarded to Congressman THOMAS G. BURCH, of the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia, to United States Senators HON. CARTER GLASS and HON. HARRY F. BYRD. We respectively commend this action to the attention of other junior chamber of commerce organizations in the State of Virginia, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and urge similar resolutions be forwarded to their respective Representatives in Washington.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee of July 19, 1940]

SMARTIES IN DISGUISE?

The resolutions adopted by the Danville Junior Chamber of Commerce are interesting because they openly challenge, for the first time, so far as we are aware, the cynical attitude of the American Youth Congress which recently expressed its opposition to compulsory selective service for national defense—an extremely unhealthy sign—but one which is not symptomatic of the Nation's youth, taking it as a whole. The Youth Congress has the same sort of leaning as has the Youth Committee Against War which has been doing some spectacular picketing and getting its name in the papers. The positions taken by the two groups of youth cited have a false value, inasmuch as they receive the national publicity when for every single youth who professes opposition to organized national defense there are a hundred conservative-minded and nonvocal youths who are not opposed to it.

The recorded position which seems to portray a lack of patriotic interest has caused many searching questions. Is this attitude the result of the so-called college instruction in liberalism which veers over toward the communistic side? Is it the result of an exaggerated sophistication which leads to the recording of this and similar actions simply for the sake of being smart or of creating an illusion of a new form of youthful intelligentsia?

The natural tendency of every normal young American is to defend his country and to place himself subserviently at the disposition of those in whom defense is entrusted. Groups which embark on policies which place the freedom of the individual above the freedom of the State are either being studiously misled or else are infected by a dangerous virus.

Examination of their point of view shows extraordinary shortsightedness. They take the position that having made sacrifices to pursue higher education they are entitled to something more than the armed camp and the drill ground, that the affairs of their country should be so ordered that they should escape the perils of conscription. They fail entirely to realize that national defense is for the sole purpose of perpetuating American freedom of action which protects the privilege of the pursuit of culture. They might be told in the plainest of English that by showing reluctance to serve their country they are inviting intellectual enslavement and the putting of the ax to the root of the tree of freedom which gives to the United States, these days, magnificent stature.

Expenditures for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has in recent weeks been much controversy and discussion on the floor of this House concerning expenditures for national defense. At times an effort has been made to make it appear that the Republican Party has in years past neglected national defense and failed to make adequate appropriations for this purpose. I am, therefore, inserting at this point a very carefully prepared table showing the expenditures of government, national-defense expenditures, and the ratio of national defense to the total of expenditures for the years from 1923 to 1940 inclusive. The table speaks for itself and should set at rest the misstatements and misrepresentations that have at one time and another been made on this very important subject.

Total ordinary expenditures (exclusive of debt retirement and refunds), total expenditures for national defense, and ratio of defense expenditures to total ordinary expenditures, 1923–41

Year	Total ordinary expenditure	Total national-defense expenditures	Ratio, national defense to total ordinary expenditures
			Percent
1923	$3,137,000,000	$607,000,000	19.3
1924	2,889,000,000	575,000,000	19.9
1925	2,881,000,000	578,000,000	20.0
1926	2,909,000,000	580,000,000	19.9
1927	2,865,000,000	586,000,000	20.4
1928	2,938,000,000	625,000,000	21.2
1929	3,087,000,000	677,000,000	21.9
1930	3,283,000,000	702,000,000	21.3
1931	3,580,000,000	667,000,000	18.2
1932	4,434,000,000	664,000,000	14.9
1933	3,794,000,000	633,000,000	16.6
1934	5,947,000,000	494,000,000	8.3
1935	6,933,000,000	663,000,000	9.5
1936	8,612,000,000	880,000,000	10.2
1937	8,386,000,000	895,000,000	10.6
1938	7,586,000,000	980,000,000	12.9
1939	9,142,000,000	1,056,000,000	11.5
1940	9,446,000,000	1,163,000,000	12.3

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

RESOLUTION OF RESERVE OFFICERS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting a resolution unanimously adopted by the Statewide rally of Reserve officers of South Carolina, held at Columbia, S. C., on June 29, 1940.

You will note that these Reserve officers of my State have endorsed the President's policies of handling the international situation, and that they pledge to him their loyalty and unlimited support.

This resolution is very timely and appropriate and clearly indicates the patriotic attitude of these Reserve officers:

I

That we endorse the President's policies in the handling of the international situation; that we express to him our confidence in his integrity of purpose and in the soundness of his judgment; that we pledge to him our loyalty and unlimited support.

II

That we endorse the appointment of Colonel Stimson to be Secretary of War, and of Colonel Knox to be Secretary of the Navy; that we believe both of these men highly qualified for their respective positions.

III

That we strongly deprecate and disapprove the injection of partisan politics into the handling of the questions of national defense and of international policies; that we strongly disapprove of the tactics of any public citizens and newspaper editors who at this time for partisan purposes continue to attack the President's motives and policies in the handling of the international situation; that we believe it is the duty of all good citizens to support and uphold the President in his international policies and in his efforts toward national defense, and we believe those who are doing otherwise are doing a disservice to this country.

IV

That we believe this country should make immediate preparation for war just as though we were about to enter the war, and that we favor bending every possible effort toward the organization and creation of an Army adequate to meet any emergency, with a corresponding increase in the air force and the Navy.

V

That we believe it essential to the immediate welfare and safety of the United States of America that we coordinate all national efforts in the realization that we are all but at war; and, therefore, it behooves all good citizens to conduct their affairs on the assumption that war may be imminent; full support of all measures being given to the President of the United States.

VI

That we believe compulsory military training should be at once instituted; that we are thoroughly convinced compulsory military training will enhance our prospects of remaining at peace and be of untold benefit to the youth of the country.

VII

That we believe the Amerfican ideals of liberty and equality of opportunity are worth fighting for; that we believe the American way of life and ideals are threatened in the war now going on in Europe. Hence we are in full sympathy with the policy adopted by the National Government of giving aid to Great Britain and those fighting with her in her fight for freedom.

VIII

We believe that full use should now be made of Reserve officers on basis of capacity to relieve Regular officers in discharge of many routine duties.

Mobility—and the Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY COL. STUART GODFREY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and pleasure of acquaintance with a number of the principal officers in the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, among them being Col. Stuart C. Godfrey, Chief, Operations and Training Section, Office of the Chief of Engineers. Colonel Godfrey, in the course of his duties, made a careful study of the function of engineer troops in the present European conflict and has prepared a nontechnical article entitled "Mobility—and the Engineer," which I am privileged to present to the House of Representatives and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article has been cleared for publication in the RECORD by the Public Relations Branch of the Intelligence Section of the Army.

As I was privileged to serve my country in the Corps of Engineers during the World War, and served 12 of my 29 months in France, and in that part of France which received the brunt of the Nazi attack, recent operations there have held for me an intense interest as I am well acquainted with the terrain. Hence, it is a pleasure to present Colonel Godfrey's discussion concerning the relation of engineer troops to mobility.

The article by Col. Stuart C. Godfrey, Corps of Engineers, follows:

MOBILITY AND THE ENGINEER

The military engineer is much concerned with movement. Therein he may be likened to a traffic cop, who gives the "go" signal for the movement of friendly transport, while posting a "stop" sign to hostile vehicles. The ability of transport to move, and move rapidly, depends in great degree upon his engineering means—to help or to hinder.

Thus in examining for its military lessons the astounding demonstration of mobility that has recently been given in Europe, involving the skillfully coordinated use of a balanced force, he is not surprised to note that the engineers played a very important part in the rapid advance.

The success of the recent "blitzkrieg" may indeed be viewed as one essentially due to an increased degree of mobility. Not so much the method, as the tempo at which it was executed, was novel. The foot soldier marches at some 3 miles an hour. Motors increase this rate more than tenfold, while planes multiply it a hundredfold. The problem, then, is to take full advantage of this increased mobility.

The planes, with the open sky as highway, become long-range artillery. They also transport parachutists and infantry behind the enemy lines.

But the tanks, earth-bound as they are, must also be hurled forward. Everything must be geared up to this accelerated pace.

Does an unfordable river block the advance? Perhaps a critical bridge may be seized by the dash of a few motorcyclists while the defenders are still hesitating to destroy it. But suppose the bridge is out, the opposite bank still held by the enemy. Time was when the army waited till night, crossed in the dark by raft or skiff, gained a foothold on the opposite bank, enlarged its toehold, later built a bridge. Now it appears that success may sometimes be achieved more speedily, a crossing accomplished audaciously in fast motorboats, or a bridge built under fire. Heavy losses for the engineers, yes; but a small price to pay for a formidable obstacle overcome.

Or suppose a fortified line blocks the way, with tank traps, mine fields, concrete pillboxes. Most careful preparations are now in order. The weakest spot or spots are selected, and a replica laid out in some rear area where the whole operation is minutely rehearsed. An initial bombing or shelling aims to stun the defenders. Then comes a hand-to-hand grappling with each obstacle in turn. In the van of the troops assigned to knock out a pillbox are engineers with explosives, hand grenades, flame throwers of intense heat, scaling ladders. Supporting them perhaps is the fire of antitank guns and antiaircraft guns directed against the portholes. Out of the sky are dropped other troops to operate against pillboxes farther to the rear. Meanwhile other engineers are opening up a path for the tanks, detecting and removing mines, cutting away steel barriers with acetylene torches, hastily bridging other obstacles such as ditches.

Such concentrated assault tactics may well result in an early breach in the fortified line. Instantly the breach is exploited, and through it pour streams of scout cars, tanks, supporting infantry, engineers with bridging equipment, ready for the next obstacle. Movement, full speed ahead, is resumed.

With such speed is coupled audacity—the calculated defiance of ordinary restraints. An unexpected seizure may yield an important bridge, an enemy airfield, even the capital of an unsuspecting nation. A column of tanks may succeed in traversing seemingly impassable mountain roads, or may thrust deep into enemy territory. Great the risk, but it is a calculated risk that plays for big stakes, and is willing to pay in losses.

This concept of mobility in the attack seeks at the same time to deny mobility to the defender. It attempts to bomb his airfields with their planes on the ground, it interrupts his routes of communication, blocks his tanks, breaks up his columns forming for counterattack.

A defense against such an offensive needs to be equally mobile. A purely passive defense will fail. Such attacks can be stopped, but only by the exercise of an equal degree of vigor, audacity, and speed on the part of a defensive force, equally well trained and equipped with modern weapons, and defending a position in great depth.

In the defense, as in the attack, time is of the essence. How often has a retiring force, fearing to destroy an important bridge too soon, failed to destroy it altogether, until too late.

For such an attack, or defense, the demands on engineers will be enormous. Engineers, combat engineers, will be needed in plentiful numbers out in front, in addition to the units at work on roads and general construction and special tasks in rear. These combat engineers, an essential part of the combat team, must be specially trained in rapidly removing obstacles, in building bridges, in grappling with fortifications. They will be imbued with initiative, foresight, and the ability to work at top speed.

On the defense, engineers will be able, rapidly and effectively, to organize ground for maximum resistance, to prepare tank obstacles that cannot readily be overcome, to gain time and thereby thwart a hostile rapid advance.

The equipment of these combat engineers must be designed to accomplish results in minimum time. Power tools replace hand methods when practicable—which is by no means the general rule at the front.

As to ferrying and bridging equipment, the crux of the need is to have available for each successive obstacle the suitable bridging means, in type and quantity (giving the impression that the bridge is actually cut to length for a given width of stream).

It must be recognized that heavy bridge loads are not compatible with a high degree of mobility. There is no reliable evidence to indicate that rapid bridging methods have been developed for tanks of 30 tons and upwards. Such tanks, brought to a locality by railroad, may well be effective in a local operation against a heavily fortified line, but the rapidly moving tank columns which have been used so effectively in Europe were composed of tanks of 20 tons and less.

As to our own Army and its engineers, their mission—to assist the movement of our own troops and impede enemy movement—remains unchanged. With the increase of motorization and mechanization, with the destructiveness of aerial bombing, with the increased tempo of operations, that task has become even more important—and also infinitely more difficult of execution, demanding greater numbers and more equipment.

In the first World War the engineers earned their place as a combat arm, and that role has been recognized anew in the composition of the combat teams of the triangular divisions. Still more significant, perhaps, with respect to mobility, is the task for the engineers with our armored divisions, and for the newly constituted aviation engineers who will serve the G. H. Q. Air Force.

Still to be achieved for us is the completion of the organization and equipment for an adequate balanced force, and its perfected training as a coordinated team. In the task of preparation, aiming to create a highly mobile force, great emphasis will be placed on every time-saving, every speed-increasing factor. In this quest for mobility the engineers will be prepared to make their distinctive contribution.

Can We Fight Hitler With Equipment "On Order"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address recently delivered by me before several State conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, as follows:

Comrade Commander and comrades, it is a real pleasure to get away from Washington and to enjoy the privilege again of not only addressing you but likewise mingling with a group that in the past have signally honored me.

To my mind, you represent a group that I affectionately term my own gang, and a gathering that appreciates a straight-from-the-shoulder discussion of the perplexing questions incident to the war situation.

Every war is accompanied by a wave of propaganda. You and I know the World War was no exception, and today from experience I hope that you comrades have not been misled by the abundance of foreign propaganda that has been unloaded on the American people during the past few years.

I hold in my hand a portion of what the average Member of Congress receives daily as propaganda from abroad. Here is a piece from Germany, a pamphlet from England, a circular from France, as well as Japan, Belgium, China, and other countries. Each of these pamphlets blames the other fellow in an effort to have the American people take sides in their century-old world wars.

To us who have served before, this propaganda is old stuff. We rubbed elbows with the Frenchman, the Britisher, the Jap, and others involved in this effort to sell their own bill of goods to America. Our services in the A. E. F. qualify us to take this propaganda with a grain of salt.

However, this cannot be said about the nonveteran. It appears that the American people are falling for this propaganda hook, line, and sinker. Therefore, we veterans must assume the responsibility of acquainting the American people with the true facts and, in so doing, make a worthwhile contribution to the welfare and preservation of our form of Government.

Unfortunately, all propaganda has not been confined to foreign sources, because I hold in my hand pieces of printed propaganda new being circulated throughout the United States by William Allen White, Kansas publisher, and his committee to defend America by aiding the Allies. For months and months the White committee has been leading the American people down a blind alley by advocating that we strip our own meager defenses to aid the Allies. There is no question the Allies have your sympathy and mine in the valiant struggle they put up against a superior military foe. But when it comes to exposing our own country to danger by disrupting our national defense, common sense tells us that we are forfeiting our own national safety.

At this point I want to impress upon you veterans, one thing, and that is, the White committee almost overnight developed to be self-appointed saviors of this Nation. Do you believe for a minute William Allen White is paying the bill for all this propaganda being fed the American people? Do you realize the members of the White committee are beyond military age? Can you forget that a few years ago this same gang of super-patriots labeled you and I treasury raiders when the adjusted compensation, commonly miscalled "bonus" was being considered in Congress? When we were pleading for adequate care and compensation for the disabled, and the dependents of deceased World War veterans, where was this same gang? Their patriotism was forgotten as they raised their voices in loud protest over payment of benefits to those whose service to country rendered them in need.

Let's forget William Allen White and his gang and talk about cold facts. For more than 150 years the American people have enjoyed the freedom of a democracy and a form of government universally recognized as a masterpiece of statesmanship. In 150 years we have accomplished more than the nations of the old world achieved in 10 centuries.

We value blessings that the Old World has never enjoyed. Therefore, comrades, if we are to continue to enjoy these benefits, we must safeguard our form of government by an adequate national defense, with a determined effort to stay out of this war.

Before talking about our national defense, let us give some thought to the type of defense needed should we be called to repel invasion from the Old World. The Hitler military machine, which is recognized as a mechanical military monster the like of which the world has never known, has required 7 years to develop at a cost of $40,000,000,000. It has consumed the energies of Europe's greatest industrial country, mobilizing every energy, talent, and resource of the industrious and talented German people. This military monster, a product of Hitler's mind, has revolutionized every phase of warfare to the extent that today it knows no equal. The striking power of Hitler's war machine is terrific.

In the short space of 21 days Hitler conquered Poland, destroyed a half million soldiers, and took 700,000 prisoners.

In spite of the British blockade, Hitler invaded and mastered Norway in 8 days. In similar fashion he crushed Holland in 4 days and vanquished Belgium in 17 days. In like manner he required but 21 days to destroy or capture the British expeditionary force in France, together with three entire French Armies.

Following the surrender of Belgium, it required Hitler but 17 days to conquer Paris, capture the Maginot line, drive the French Army more than 100 miles south of Paris, and reduce the French people to servitude.

In 2 months of active military operations Hitler has conquered a territory as great as New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. He has conquered more than a hundred million people, possibly destroyed 2,000,000 soldiers, and taken as prisoners 3,000,000 more.

With the exception of Norway and Denmark, each of the nations subdued was of the opinion that they had set up a real defense against German aggression.

Let us examine this German war machine. From information available, it has at least a dozen mechanized divisions, commonly referred to as Panzer divisions. Each division consists of 1,274 motor vehicles, that consume 10,568 gallons of gasoline and 1,023 gallons of oil every 24 hours. These divisions move at the unbelievable rate of 40 miles a day. To you veterans, surely you recognize the great problem of keeping this giant military monster in operation, whose make-up is as follows:

A Panzer Division—Its Fuel Consumption

	Number	Daily use in gallons	
		Gas	Oil
TANK BRIGADE			
Light tanks	288	8,740	576
Medium tanks	72	3,600	216
Armored cars	50	625	43
Attached tanks:			
6-ton "Assault"	45	1,350	90
20-ton "Break Thru"	36	4,320	360
80-ton "Break Thru"	12	6,000	360
Total	503	24,635	1,645
INFANTRY BRIGADE			
Two motorized battalions: Trucks	100	850	100
Infantry transport: Trucks	550	4,450	475
Motorized artillery:			
Carriers (7½–10-ton)	45	1,350	70
Truck train (80 2½-ton; 20 5½–7-ton)	100	1,034	134
Motorcycle battalion:			
Cycles	64	112	8
Trucks	42	115	13
Antitank battalion:			
Gun trailers	36	360	54
Cargo trucks	72	504	36
Reconnaissance bat talion:			
Scout cars	24	360	24
Trucks	79	475	37
Motorcycles	32	56	4
Trucks	8	80	11
Engineers' battalion:			
Light motorcars	12	72	4
Trucks	50	435	30
Service signal battalion:			
Light motorcars	24	70	5
Trucks	36	245	18
Total	1,274	10,568	1,023

Table above gives break-down estimates on a German Panzer division and shows tremendous daily consumption of gas and oil in gallons. Supply factors should double the figure shown for tank brigade gas and oil requirements, making totals 49,270 and 3,290. An air cooperation squadron is attached to each division but number of planes varies greatly. Figures for supply vehicles attached to a division are not available.

Recently I had an opportunity with other Members of Congress to view the official German war films in an "off the record" private showing in which was revealed the bloodiest warfare the world has ever known. We saw German parachutists land and immediately assemble machine guns; we saw giant German bombers unloading their cargo of death and destruction on the peace-loving countries of Norway, Holland, and Belgium; we saw the flame thrower taking its toll of human life and property; we saw the 6-ton, 20-ton, and the 80-ton tank in action; we saw the armored cars and motorcycles—in short, we saw Panzer Divisions, with not one soldier on foot, destroy modern armies that yesterday were heralded as among the world's greatest military forces.

My comrades, it is too bad William Allen White and his committee who advocate stripping our own national defense to aid the Allies could not witness the harrowing spectacle revealed by these films. In one Panzer Division they employ 288 light tanks, 72 medium tanks, 45 six-ton tanks, 36 twenty-ton and 12 eighty-ton tanks, or a total of 453 tanks. Remember, comrades, this is only one Panzer Division, and Hitler boasts of many such units.

On May 1, 1940, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and Gen. R. C. Moore, Assistant Chief of Staff for Supply, appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and disclosed the exact status of critical items of equipment for the preparedness military program of this Nation. They submitted the following table giving an inventory of what we actually have on hand and what we have "on order." The table is as follows:

Actually on hand May 1, 1940

Ordnance:	
Small arms and miscellaneous:	
Semiautomatic rifle, cal. .30	38,000
37-mm. antitank gun	228
60-mm. mortar	3
81-mm. mortar	183
Machine gun, .50 cal	319
Machine gun, .30 cal. (light)	86
Automatic rifle, cal. .30	0
Artillery:	
75-mm. gun (modern)	141
75-mm. howitzer (field)	60
105-mm. howitzer	0
155-mm howitzer (hi-speed)	436
155-mm. gun (modern)	4
155-mm. gun (hi-speed)	88
8-inch howitzer	0
Combat vehicles:	
Scout car	485
Combat car	114
Light tank	10
Medium tank	18
Antiaircraft equipment:	
3-inch gun, AA	448
90-mm. gun, AA	0
Director	168
Height finder	142
Sound locator	194
37 mm. gun, AA	15
Cal. .50 machine gun, AA	1,014
Detector, AA	0
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile, AA	285

On order, May 1, 1940

Item	Number	Date of delivery
Ordnance:		
Small arms and miscellaneous:		
Semiautomatic rifle, caliber .30	131,789	June 1942.
37-mm. antitank gun	744	Do.
60-mm. mortar	1,840	April 1941.
81-mm. mortar	479	November 1940.
Machine gun, .50 caliber	367	April 1941.
Machine gun, .30 caliber (light)	960	July 1941.
Automatic rifle, caliber .30	6,558	December 1940.
Artillery:		
75-mm. gun (modern)	459	June 1941.
75-mm. howitzer (field)	96	May 1941.
105-mm. howitzer	60	October 1941.
155-mm. howitzer (high-speed)	295	March 1941.
155-mm. gun (modern)	36	April 1942.
155-mm. gun (high-speed)	56	August 1940.
8-inch howitzer	0	
Combat vehicles:		
Scout car	0	
Combat car	34	December 1940.
Light tank	392	June 1941.
Medium tank	126	August 1941.
Antiaircraft equipment:		
3-inch gun, antiaircraft	52	September 1940.
90-mm. gun, antiaircraft	114	September 1941.
Director	39	September 1940.
Height finder	58	January 1942.
Sound locator	321	August 1941.
37-mm. gun, antiaircraft	584	Do.
Caliber .50 machine gun, antiaircraft	126	August 1940.
Detector, antiaircraft	18	August 1941
Searchlight, 60-inch mobile, antiaircraft	294	January 1941.

You will note from the above table that in the entire United States Army on May 1, 1940, we had 10 light tanks and 18 medium tanks, or a grand total of 28 modern tanks comparable to a modern German tank. Yes, it must be admitted we have 392 light tanks on order, but you will note they will not be delivered until June 1, 1941. You will also note we have 126 medium tanks on order and their delivery is not until August 1941.

When you return home and receive a copy of the convention proceedings, study this inventory and determine for yourself what we have and what we do not have and when delivery may be expected of items on order.

Let us not forget the Air Corps of the Army and Navy and their important place in present-day methods of warfare. Rear Admiral John H. Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, recently told the Senate Naval Affairs Committee that the Navy had on hand 1,755 planes and on order, 1,137. He continued by asserting the Navy would have only 1,902 combat planes by July 1, 1941.

Major General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, testified that of the 2,752 planes in the Army Air Corps, only 52 planes are fit for modern warfare, and of the remaining 2,700, perhaps a half dozen could be rendered fit for combat. In other words, 58 fighting planes in the United States Army and Germany has 18,000.

William Allen White and his committee, eager to furnish aid to the Allies, especially planes, should thoroughly analyze the fact that as to the planes on order, the whole delivery schedule of Army and Navy planes has been delayed by a recent order giving the Allies priority on all American military production desired by them. Thus the 3,837 plans on order are not in fact in production for our own use should the Allies elect to call for them.

Comrades, you recall from the start of this discussion we decided to look at the facts. One fact you cannot overlook is that soldiers, sailors, and marines cannot fight wars with equipment on order, and William Allen White and his committee should recognize this fact.

Another fact is that the General Staff of the United States Army knows more about war than the President or anyone else, and I am convinced when Hon. Harry H. Woodring resigned as Secretary of War he was forced to do so because he elected to follow the advice of military experts rather than to accept the viewpoint of a group of international meddlers whose military knowledge is zero plus and whose only concern is to utter high-sounding phrases tending to send the youth of America to the battlefields of Europe. Hon. Harry H. Woodring is entitled to the esteem and love of the great American public for his courage and manhood in refusing to become a tool of the international bankers. One has only to read the following statement from Harry Woodring's own lips to arrive at a suitable conclusion as to why he was forced to resign as Secretary of War. Upon returning to his native State of Kansas on June 1, 1940, to receive honors from Washburn College, Secretary Woodring said:

"I'm an advocate of adequate defense but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles. There is a comparatively small clique of international financiers who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower.

"I'm not going to stand for it and I'm not going to resign until forced to do so.

"They don't like me because I'm against stripping our own defenses for the sake of trying to stop Hitler 3,000 miles away. Eventually they will force me to resign, and I'll be darned glad to come back to Kansas where the people have their feet on the ground and are not easily swayed by demagogues and subtle propaganda."

Comrades, Harry Woodring saw the handwriting on the wall and as a true American he put the welfare of his country first. In other words, he has the veterans' viewpoint—build an adequate national defense by arming to the teeth.

But the White committee of superpatriots would have us police the entire globe and neglect our own back yard.

We must recognize the fact that in addition to building up our own military defenses we have the problem of assisting in militarizing the Western Hemisphere which means adequate defense for every country south of the Rio Grande.

Many of you comrades have served in the Latin-American countries and you realize the shortcomings of our neighbors in these countries in developing into military men. They lack both the temperament and the physique to make real soldiers. In order to protect our own interests and to offset the alien influences now running hog wild in these countries, we now have a huge task in being forced to send men, money, planes, tanks, and other implements of war to properly militarize this Western Hemisphere.

In the face of building our own inadequate defenses and shoulder the burdens of our Latin American neighbors, William Allen White and his commmittee have the gall of an army mule in advocating that we strip our armed forces of greatly needed military equipment in their frenzied efforts to meddle into European affairs.

I take the position we must arm to the teeth and when that task is completed militarize South America before turning our attention to the plight of European nations.

America has a huge task in carrying out our national-defense program because it is easily seen that needed equipment cannot be delivered for a period of from 18 months to 2 years. At the completion of that period we hope to have an Army and equipment comparable to Hitler at a cost of approximately $50,000,000,000. We cannot possibly achieve this goal if we are to listen to William Allen White and his cohorts or the propaganda from Europe that would have us strip our armed forces of an adequate national defense.

Our national-defense program will be of no avail unless we as a Nation unite in our efforts to properly defend this country and the Western Hemisphere. There was never a time in the history of this great Nation when national unity was at a greater premium.

If this objective is to be attained our national unity must be above suspicion. America will not countenance the presence of those who harbor a desire for other forms of government. Such deluded individuals with their warped minds and false political philosophies are the scum of creation and unfit to associate with liberty-loving Americans. These breeders of international hatred and disrupters of the American way of life are the tools of Stalin and Hitler and form the backbone of the "fifth column" in America.

Despite the love of Americans for national unity, it is a known fact that the "fifth column" is running hog-wild throughout the country. Yes, the "fifth column" is on the march.

No city in this great land is immune to the workings of these disciples of Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler. They preach and practice their un-American doctrines with a sneer on their faces and a song of hate in their black hearts.

With reckless abandon and unmitigated gall they have invaded Government departments in the Nation's Capital, enlisting Federal employees in their determined drive to undermine this Government.

Make no mistake about it—the "fifth column" is on the march.

Daily the corridors of many Government buildings in Washington resound to the footsteps of hundreds of Federal employees known to harbor un-American doctrines.

I hold in my hand a printed membership list of the Washington, D. C., branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy containing the names of 563 Government employees known to be members of this organization branded by the Dies committee as a Communist-front organization. The salaries of this group range from $1,080 to $10,000 annually, which are paid from the pockets of the taxpayers of America. Since this list was published in the official hearings of the Dies committee on October 5, 1939, only 20 persons named therein have notified the Dies Committee that they have renounced their membership. During the month of June the House of Representatives was informed that this group of employees was still on the Federal pay roll. One week later specific attention was directed to a fellow traveler in the Department of Labor who, while occupying a $7,000-a-year position, finds time to carry on at the expense of the American taxpayer the program of another Communist-front organization.

A week later I had called to my attention that the acting chairman of the Federal Advisory Council for Employment Security, when asked to consider a motion granting preference to American citizens, publicly confessed the fact that he was an alien.

The climax in this parade of "fifth columnists" was reached several days ago when there arrived in Washington a man who from his own lips asserted that he was a delegate to the Twentieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution in Moscow. This individual is daily awaiting an appointment to a key position in our national-defense program concerning the training of the youth of America.

Yes; the "fifth column" is truly on the march in this great Nation.

Congress has enacted the necessary laws to suppress the "fifth column" if only those high in authority would recognize this menace and move promptly to exterminate it.

America cannot afford to allow this parade of "fifth columnists" to go on unmolested. With the entire country working at a feverish pace to attain the objectives of our national-defense program, it is not difficult to realize how the "fifth columnists," or, as they are more appropriately termed, "filth columnists," can disrupt our well-organized plans.

Every loyal American will find no difficulty in recognizing the real threat of the "fifth column" to our national unity and likewise to our priceless heritage—a free democracy.

It is unthinkable that the taxpayers of America should be called upon to pay the salaries of Federal employees who have "fifth column" tendencies. Nor should the mothers and fathers of America be asked to entrust the training of their sons to Moscow-minded individuals. We have only to recall the sad fate of France and other countries of Europe betrayed by the "fifth columnists" who were permitted to thrive unmolested at the expense of the people.

Let the message of the American people to these alien agitators be phrased in plain language—if you don't like the American form of government, get out and stay out.

We have heard a lot recently of purging political office-holders for differences in opinion. If we are to attain the required solidarity of this Nation, let us witness those in high authority conducting a worthwhile purge in ousting from Government circles known enemies to the American way of life.

America has a gigantic task in building a national defense to preserve our priceless heritage of liberty and freedom. But we can never accomplish our task while there lurks in the shadows of the Nation's Capitol a group of alien-minded ingrates who, like vultures, are bent on destroying this Nation.

America is at the crossroads. If we are to proceed in the right direction, let us with a firm hand and a stout heart inform the "fifth columnists" that their hey-day is over and that they will be no longer coddled, nursed, or tolerated.

In short, there is no choice. You are either an American or not an American.

Let our actions and our words convey to these "fifth columnists" in blunt language the command of all liberty-loving Americans—if you don't like America, get out and stay out.

In closing, let me for a moment pay tribute to the great veteran organizations of this country who from year to year have advocated an adequate national defense and the suppression of un-American activities.

For 3 years I served you as your commander in chief and from coast to coast conveyed your wishes to the American people for an adequate national defense, urging them to realize the menace that springs from un-American groups who were bent on gaining a foothold in this country. Many laughed at us, called us superpatriots, and sneeringly remarked that we could see a "red" behind every bush.

Today as we assemble in this convention hall the people of America are aroused to the menace that is threatening our national life. Had the people of America taken the advice of the veteran organizations, today we would have a national defense second to none and we would have no ism in this country but true Americanism.

Comrades, in bidding you adieu I beseech you to return to your homes, happy in the thought that we are free Americans and that the false propaganda flooding our country in the language of an old sailor, is plain "baloney," and in stowing it away, "use plenty of salt."

Thanks a million, gang, and I hope to see everyone of you at our national convention in Los Angeles.

Nazi-Communist Strangulation of Small Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the war-ravaged world, calloused and inured to shock following repeated German excesses and the murder, plunder, and enslavement of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Denmark, and Norway, shuddered when the murderous German legions again invaded the peaceful countries of Luxemburg, Belgium, and Holland. The bloody imprint of the iron heel of the Hun blotted out the freedom, the culture, and the happiness of these unfortunate peoples. Like the locust hordes, the legions of Hitler destroyed everything in their path. Nothing was inviolate and nothing was spared. Some of the most beautiful and picturesque cities in all Europe have been ruthlessly destroyed. The civilization of a thousand years has been steeped in blood by the plundering hordes of nazi-ism and it will take another thousand years to eradiate the traces of this systematized, coldly premeditated German destruction.

Like the periodic plague of destructive locusts, the German armies break loose upon their unsuspecting and trusting neighbors at least once in every generation. The locusts, after devastating everything in their paths, reappear in 17 years. The German armies have in the past 75 years plundered and destroyed their neighbors on the average of once every 15 years. In 1864, Germany without excuse or reason attacked, plundered, and then deprived Denmark of the provinces of Schleswig and Holstein. In 1866, she traitorously turned upon Austria, her erstwhile ally and partner in crime. In 1870, France was brutally attacked and was treated in typical Germanic fashion. In 1914, Belgium and again France were made to feel the brunt of German madness which, of course, drenched nearly all of Europe in the blood of the innocents.

In 1939, or exactly 75 years since the previous attack upon Denmark, nazified Germany tore into shreds the 10-year nonaggression pact with Poland and invaded the realm of her peace-loving neighbor. How long the world will permit this organized frothing fiendishness to continue, no one knows. Unless it is destroyed or burns itself out, civilization and democracy among men and among nations is in danger of being extinguished. The atrocious attitude of this bandit among nations is responsible for all of the misery, destruction, and killing. Mussolini and Stalin are but accomplices and petty gangsters following the example and carrying out the orders of Hitler, the master mind and chief. This combination will never be broken up and peace will not come to the world unless and until Germany is defeated and Hitler, his hide tanned and stuffed, is put on display in a London museum as a warning to all future madmen who might be tempted to leave their lowly though honorable paperhanging trade for a career of murder and plunder.

Today Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia are no more. These three struggling little nations have been absorbed by the Russian bear. If press dispatches can be believed, the people of these little nations celebrated with dancing and music their absorption and inclusion in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. What brazen effrontery, what sinful misrepresentation disseminated in the United States for the purpose of misleading the American public—the proud and in-

tellectual Lithuanians, figuratively throwing their arms about the necks of their Bolshevik oppressors as they give up their own thousand-year-old nationalism, tradition, and culture for filthy and godless communism. Picture, if you can, these three gallant and inoffensive little nations along the shores of the Baltic dancing upon their own graves.

Lithuania will never give up her freedom. She will never forsake or renounce her independence and will, for a certainty, rise again when the world returns to rationalism and fairness. The absorption of the three little Baltic countries is the direct result of Germany's war phobia, for which no other nation in the world, not even the instrumental Russia, is to be blamed. Germany and Germany alone is responsible for everything that has happened recently in Europe and which has caused untold suffering, hardship, and the loss of independence by the invaded nations.

The "blitzkrieg" continues as nation after nation is wiped out. Hitler continues the visitation of destruction by fire and sword as he imposes his will and his desperate philosophies upon weak and God-fearing nations.

Let America take heed of what has happened, and let us not be misled by German propaganda and lies as to what Hitler's attitude might be toward expansion in the Western Hemisphere and his professed lack of interest in the United States. Let us arm this Nation so that all the power of Hitler and of hell combined will not prevail against us. That is the only kind of reasoning that Germany understands today. That is the only kind of action that she will recognize. It is the one certain way for America to preserve her democratic institutions, traditions, and system of government; that is the sole and the only way to preserve peace.

We are not going to attack Germany, but Germany will attack the United States only if we are unprepared. Rearmament, with a two-ocean navy, means peace and preservation for America.

Health and Medical Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS BY SURGEON GENERAL PARRAN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able statement recently made by Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, on the subject Health and Medical Preparedness, before the New York State Conference of Health Officers and Public Health Nurses, Saratoga Springs, June 25, 1940.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problem which concerns each of us today is what we can do to contribute to the safety of our country. Traditionally, as doctors and nurses, we have been servants of peace. When war did come, it was our job to patch up the wounds, ease the suffering of the wounded, and repair as best we could the damage done by shot and shell.

We are not at war. If we have time enough—if we are swift and wise enough in the time that we have—war in this hemisphere may be prevented. But the old rules of war, and the preparation for it, have been demolished. The whole task of national defense is different than it was 25 years ago. Just as the perversion of the physical and chemical sciences has brought more brutal, more rapid, more devastating destruction both to unprepared armies and unarmed civilians, the developments of the medical sciences have expanded the scope of what doctors and public-health workers can do for preparedness. The concept of a total war necessitates the concept of a total defense—a total national effort, not only toward resistance but toward unassailable strength.

Psychologically, this country as yet seems unprepared for the total effort toward strength which recent world events make imperative. On the one hand we hear imprecations because we are not now better prepared in guns and ships and planes and organized manpower. On the other hand, we hear criticism at steps taken now to prepare promptly against aggression toward ourselves or our immediate neighbors. One of the risks I see to national unity of action lies in the idea that defensiveness alone is all we need to preserve our democracy. Yet as Governor Lehman has said again and again, democracy is a thing we must constantly fight for. All recorded history shows, I think you will agree, that no nation has arisen to strength, as we have; or remained strong, as we hope to; no human rights have been established or liberties maintained without dynamic, aggressive action. St. Paul and the Apostles were not defensive when they established the Christian faith. Our Revolutionary ancestors were not defensive when they fought to establish human liberties and found a nation. The Boston Tea Party, for example, was one of the most provocative acts on record. Buchanan was merely defensive when he permitted the Nation to fall into the turbulence and dissension which preceded the Civil War. Lincoln took the dynamic aggressive to preserve the Union, without which we now should be as helpless as little Denmark.

Today I would discuss with you the aggressive action which you and I, by virtue of our calling—because we are the servants of peace—must take to build up national strength. The needs to be met are enormous in scope, yet simple in analysis. National strength can be built up only by the adequate application of all the sciences to the provision of armament, munitions, and supplies, food, and manpower. Our job is manpower.

Seven competent, trustworthy persons recently were called to assist the Government in national defense. Industry is represented both in raw materials and processing. Labor, agriculture, transportation, and the consumer are represented. There is a shrewd eye on the stabilization of prices. Research problems in the physical and chemical sciences are being attacked with vigor by an able committee, which will apply all the knowledge we have or can discover to the perfection of armaments. Yet, so far as I know, there has been no more thought than in 1917 of the application of medical and public-health science to the physical problems of a nation arming.

Yet for what cause is this Nation arming, if not on behalf of the men, women, and children who compose it? Their physical fitness, their freedom from preventable disease, their morale, or mental stamina will determine almost entirely the effectiveness of all other defense efforts. Important in the easy days of peace without a cloud on the horizon, it is urgent now that the people of this Nation be physically tough, mentally sound, and morally strong. If we are not, to quote Mr. MacLeish, "we can leave our planes unbuilt and our battleships on paper. We shall not need them."

In time of stress, the health problems of the military and civilian population are inseparable. At present they are the responsibility of many unrelated Federal agencies having the happiest personal good will toward one another, but with no more official authority or compulsion toward coordinated action than did an airplane factory and an automobile plant 2 months ago. Each of these agencies legally can perform only certain functions set up by law. None of them has a close, working integration with the organized medical and public-health professions. The State health departments are as diverse as the 48 States. None of the official agencies have the benefits of a full working relationship with the great voluntary associations for health and welfare, in which doctors, dentists, nurses, engineers, in their technical capacity, work side by side with citizens to caulk up the leaks in the hull of our national manpower. None of the official agencies has the full aid and service which the public-spirited foundations set up to promote health and welfare are able to give.

Our defense plans, for the immediate emergency, are still young. There is much in the way of organization and coordination yet to come. But as a first step in meeting the vital needs of manpower preparedness, I propose that a coordinator of medical and health preparedness for national defense be appointed under the National Defense Council. There is much for him to do. He would work with and through the Surgeons General of the United States Army, the United States Navy, and the United States Public Health Service, other Federal agencies, and the national voluntary organizations concerned with the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease.

A first task is the need for listing and classifying professional and technical personnel in the country; for planning and aiding, if and when necessary, the recruitment and mobilization of medical and health personnel.

Another urgent task involves the protection and promotion of the health of industrial workers. With the vast expansion of the war industries, many new industrial hazards appear and familiar ones are intensified. When new factories are designed, expert industrial-hygiene advice is required for proper installation of power exhausts of chemical gases. Records of present performance show the need of extended industrial-hygiene measures to control and prevent special health hazards. In the recruitment and training of workers, thorough physical examinations are necessary upon employment and periodically thereafter. It is wasteful for industry to train a highly skilled employee over long months, only to have him break down suddenly with tuberculosis, mental disease, or some other crippling condition. The expansion of war industries will bring acute problems of housing, medical care, and health protection for workers and their families. Our industrial machines are the most efficient in the world. The men

and women who man the machines must have a comparable efficiency.

Certain diseases have particular military importance. The venereal diseases are at the top of the list. They caused more disability in the last war than anything except wounds and influenza. Fortunately we have been forehanded in building some machinery in every State to deal with this problem. We need to intensify these efforts, especially in those areas of military and industrial mobilization.

The importance of tuberculosis is accentuated by the current situation. Here, too, we have made some progress since the last war in terms of a lower active infection rate and a lower death rate, but we do not have in any State the machinery to detect all active cases of the disease. In very few States do we have the sanatoria to care for such cases. It should be possible promptly to find and to isolate all sources of infection. Recent developments in the small and microfilm techniques mean that we can easily afford it.

Not one of the seven fine persons on the National Advisory Commission of the Defense Council, however, is aware of what this country can do to eliminate tuberculosis as a major obstacle to national security. We know that Hitler has put all of his active tuberculous together in factories to give, between dying coughs, a few months of service in munition making. This was segregation and service to the state but without regard for the welfare of the individual. If we plan well now, we shall not need such suicide squads for bomb manufacture. Segregate, yes; but let us restore also.

Of the many military medical and health problems in the tropical Americas, the most important is malaria. There is no disease of comparable importance (except the mental diseases) against which we have made less scientific progress, during my generation. Quinine is still the major remedy. Like rubber, originally secured from South America, now our major source of supply is from across the Pacific Ocean, the Dutch East Indies. Holland is no longer able to import, process, and distribute this remedy. Its cartel prevented us from storing a sufficient war chest of our most needed medical strategic material. All of Central and South America now look to us to supply their needs. For 2 years I have been concerned with this problem. It is not yet solved. No major military operations in the Tropics of this hemisphere are possible without quinine or the equally potent German synthetic, atabrine. Here is another job for a national coordinator on the medical front.

Another strategic medical material for which we are dependent upon foreign sources is opium. For 4 years I have prescribe the total annual amounts which could be imported into the United States. Before and after Munich, I aided our commercial importers to build up a war chest of opium and morphine. In the vaults at Washington, formerly used to store gold, we have stored enough morphine for at least 3 years. Our regular source has been from the eastern Mediterranean, now closed. Before this supply is exhausted we can, if necessary, grow in certain areas of the United States the pain-relieving poppy plant. But it must be planned now.

Other diseases require our attention. Next to the venereal diseases, mumps is the most disabling of the acute infections among recruits. Meningitis was a great hazard during the last war. Influenza still is a major threat. During the intervening 22 years many facts about it are becoming clear, but with present knowledge effective prevention and control is not possible. Research must be speeded up and coordinated. It may be that the nation which first learns how to control influenza will by this knowledge tip the scales toward victory in the wars ahead. No one now is coordinating our search for the practical prevention of this major hazard to successful defense. Until recent months we could expect aid from medical discoveries in our sister democracies. Now, in this country, alone, we must carry the burden. As yet we have not gone forward with it.

When armies are mobilized certain proven immunizations are used. Typhoid fever, yes. Smallpox, yes—since Jenner's discovery of more than 100 years ago. A recently developed toxoid against tetanus is of proven value and will be used routinely. Effective immunization against gas gangrene would be another great aid. By a few months of coordinated effort on the part of commercial, university, and governmental groups, a practical protection against this major war hazard should be perfected. Here is another job for the coordinator.

Our first concern may be in tropical America. I have discussed malaria. What about yellow fever? Prevalent throughout large areas of South America, a constant threat to the southern half of the United States, we do not have in this country enough of the effective vaccine against it to immunize one regiment. In spite of the requests from year to year, I have not been able to secure funds with which to produce a reserve supply.

These examples, among many I could cite, illustrate my major thesis. There are many diseases, of great military importance, which we could control if we were given the will, the authority, and the money to do it.

If or when war comes, every 1,000,000 men mobilized need 7,500 doctors drawn from civil practice. Dentists, nurses, sanitary engineers are needed too. In the mobilization of 4,000,000 during the last war, more than a fourth of the effective medical men of the country were called to the colors. Whole counties were depleted of doctors. Many medical schools were almost put out of business, because the best men left for military duty. We should not repeat these mistakes. Today we should investigate who should go, who should stay to practice, to teach, to operate an essential civilian service. We have no machinery now to do this. A coordinator of medical and health preparedness should create the machinery, working with the public health agencies, the schools, and the medical profession itself.

We have a shortage of laboratory technicians. Intensive courses would provide more. Universal training would deplete the ranks of medical students; yet we need doctors each year to replace obsolescence. Some medical and other scientists are vastly more valuable to the country working on their present jobs than they possibly could be in the Army or Navy. Here are other tasks for medical planning through a coordinator.

Further, let us consider the whole problem of national fitness. The President has recommended that all youth give 1 year to public service—be trained during this time in some skill. How fit are they from a physical and mental viewpoint? Enrollment should include a careful examination. All correctable defects should receive prompt attention. As yet, there is no organization, no planning of an organization to do it. This is a task projected.

Let us consider two tasks immediately before us. The National Youth Administration employs 300,000 young people. Here is a measurable group, beneficiaries of the Government. After 5 years no plan has been worked out to appraise their physical status. Shouldn't we take this group of underprivileged youth and apply our proven medical science to relieve their correctable defects?

Employed by the Work Projects Administration are nearly 2,000,000 people. The Nation wants to use their services; they, themselves, want to serve in the ways they can best contribute to national safety. What is their physical status? No one knows. I propose that each of them be examined; that we use methods comparable to those of the draft boards of 22 years ago, and classify the Work Projects Administration employees physically into three or four classes. Those qualified to become good workmen should be first on the list for training in the industries now short-handed. Those who have remediable defects merit rehabilitation. Up to now no agency has had the authority or the money to do these two specific jobs which seem important in national preparedness.

If our workers are malnourished, they cannot be efficient in producing what we need for defense. Yet every survey of nutrition, by whatever method conducted, shows that malnutrition in this country is widespread and serious. For example, studies by the Department of Agriculture show that 40 percent of the people are not getting a diet adequate to maintain good health and vigor. Eight out of every ten in this category do not have an income sufficient to purchase, at market prices, a diet adequate in amount and kind; this in spite of the fact that the foods of which the Nation has an apparent surplus are those in which the dietary of so many is deficient—milk and milk products, citrus fruits, green vegetables, and meat.

Not through any pity for their working people, but because their scientists proved to them that it was an essential to national power, the Germans began several years ago to provide for the working masses a diet better than ours have now. We have made a beginning in this direction through the food-stamp plan. What we need is an intensive national drive, with rigid scientific controls, to use the food we have to improve the fitness of our manpower.

Though I would not presume to draw up a blueprint for the whole effort of health preparedness, each of the problems mentioned needs prompt attention. With authority from the National Defense Council, several committees of experts, both official and professional, should undertake special responsibilities. What seems now a huge, illimitable job is, in reality, a composite of measurable tasks. There is a competent person to do each, if it is assigned to him. There is the will among our professions and among our citizens which will see that each is done. But I repeat, the first step is a strong leader in the National Defense Council to see that the country's needs are met for physical and mental preparedness, for health, and medical mobilization, for peace or war. At the same time he would serve to unite the efforts of official, professional, commercial, and voluntary groups in our unified drive for aggressive strength.

In the past there has been division of opinion and occasional dissension among our professions concerning methods proposed to bring better health and a higher standard of medical care to our people. In the face of danger it is the democratic way—even the herd instinct—to unite for the agreed objectives of safety. We cannot now afford controversies. The preparedness of our manpower for national safety is not controversial. Given a hand in the planning, all of us together, official and professional, can work out methods in which we all believe.

There is no time for dogged adherence to outworn patterns, nor for a major change in proved forms of medical practice. Medical science grows, expands, opens up new possibilities for saving life and building strength. In the application of its basic sciences, medical practice must expand also to meet the new demands of the Nation for self-preservation.

In the dictatorships, the state is served by sacrifice of the individual and enslavement of the men of science. If our democracy is to stand, we—as doctors, as health officers, as health workers, as citizens—of our own free will because we know it is necessary, must put medical science to work now, fully, to make our men as good as our machines.

Sad Commentary on Democratic Jobholders' Convention—"They Didn't Cheer in the Galleries"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY ELSIE ROBINSON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps P. T. Barnum was right when he said, "The people like to be fooled," but the reaction to the recent Democratic Convention in Chicago, of which a substantial proportion of the delegates were jobholders enjoying the largesse of the New Deal, seems to cast some doubt on Barnum's famous dictum. At least when a typical American gets fooled he does not want the party which perpetrated the hoax to think that he "got away with it"—perhaps this accounts for the great surge of sentiment throughout the land by which Americans are letting the President know that they were not misled by the "I don't want a third term" histrionics which preceded the steam-roller carnival in Chicago.

Elsie Robinson was an experienced and impartial observer of the Chicago convention. Her reactions are illuminating. She watched the job-holding delegates cheer as they applauded the "draft us and save our jobs" drama, but she wondered about the eloquent silence of the galleries. She investigated this curious paradox. With true reportorial skill she reveals her findings in the following article, which was syndicated in papers throughout the country.

The taxpayers and the job hunters in the galleries "sat on their hands," while the tax eaters and the jobholders went through their practiced parades and marched gleefully while the superintendent of city sewers of Chicago chanted his weird crys and called the tunes from a hide-out beneath the speakers' platform. Ed Kelley, of Chicago, and Frank Hague, of New Jersey, had their machines on the floor, and their "Pied Pipers" sent out the cry "Draft Roosevelt" which these two new patron saints of the Democratic Party had ordered them to proclaim. But they had forgotten the galleries—and they did not cheer in the galleries.

It is a most unusual story. But read it from the pen of an eyewitness. Elsie Robinson was there. She saw the parade on the floor and observed the awful silence in the galleries. Let her describe it to you in person:

GALLERY SILENT AS DELEGATES CHEER F. D. R.

(By Elsie Robinson, famous magazine writer and author)

They didn't cheer in the gallery.

Yes; you'll read differently. They'll tell you of the "spontaneous roars of enthusiasm" and the "uncontrolled delight" which met the announcement of F. D. R.'s name on the Tuesday evening meeting of the Democratic Convention. But it just wasn't so.

I was there—and I know. And there's no use trying to pull punches at a time like this—even though it might suit your preferences or mine to do so. The simple truth is all that can serve or save us in this era of fear and dismay.

So here's the pay-off on what really happened on Tuesday night at that "demonstration of Democratic loyalty." Whatever your position in our United States scheme of things, you had better get the facts straight. For, regardless of party or politics, those facts are going to make American history * * * and decide your destiny and mine. And the whole thing is condensed in the first line of this article:

They didn't cheer in the gallery.

SOMETHING WRONG

I was sitting in the press box when the rumpus started. Wondering. There's been something wrong with this picture since it started—but I couldn't figure it out. Individual pique? Political peeve? Quien sabe?

But something wasn't clicking—anyone could tell that. One look at the grim or bored faces of the delegates told that * * * particularly if you remembered those hot, hilarious riots of 1932. Riots no political boss needed to plan. And now—

The place was jammed, of course. The word had gone out that Senator BARKLEY was "going to spill the dope; be the President's mouthpiece; tell 'em where the big boy stood." So in they came. All those who had tickets. And presently, surprisingly, those who hadn't.

The common people, the obscure and forgotten, who've never seen a convention ticket, who've never heard the ballyhoo which decided their fate—in they came.

Men in overalls; women in shabby "basement bargains," with babies at their breasts or tugging at their knees; unemployed youngsters with hunger in their eyes, longing to find their place in the scheme of things.

Shuffling through the suddenly opened doors, past the strangely welcoming smiles of Chicago's slickest cops—America en masse—wondering what was what, shuffling down the long lobbies, climbing the long stairs, settling down at last in the gloom and glare of the galleries.

JUST BLURS IN GLOOM

Far up there in the stadium's smoky vault they sat. Thousands of pale, inarticulate blurs against the darkness. Blurs immeasurably removed from the colorful crowd of delegates on the floor, from the big shots on the platform, from the chattering "socialites" in the boxes, gay as birds of paradise. America's forgotten millions, sitting up there in the gloom, peering down through the mist, watching, waiting, waiting, waiting for the real stuff to happen.

And it didn't happen.

Yes; there was a show. You know the program. The speeches, the songs, the whoopee—all plotted far in advance, cleverly planned, carefully drilled, expensively arranged. The very best "enthusiastic response" which Messrs. Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, and Boss Hague, of New Jersey, could possibly contrive. Both of 'em past masters in fixing fireworks. But for once the fireworks didn't fix and the fuzes fizzled—fizzled because they had forgotten the one important thing—

Those faces in the gallery which didn't cheer!

So the show started off with many a misgiving. (It always had been so easy before—why should they doubt their stuff now?) At this moment Senator BARKLEY's voice would waver—drop—give the ultimate announcement.

"The President has never had, and has not today, any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President, to be a candidate for that office, or to be nominated by the convention for that office."

OVATION DOESN'T COME

The quaver, the hush, the announcement. So carefully planned and rehearsed. The waiting delegates, so thoroughly informed. And then?

Something went wrong. The delegates started to march. The big shots started to cheer. The visiting firemen were all set to cut loose. But something happened which upset the expectations and scuttled the beautiful dreams—

They didn't cheer in the galleries.

A mechanical dribble of mass marching. Most of the delegates sitting apathetically while their leaders stumbled forward, feebly, with half-furled flags. A trained voice shrieking "Alabama wants Roosevelt! Arkansas wants Roosevelt! Arizona wants Roosevelt!" But never an answering cheer to prove that all America wanted Roosevelt!

Never a cheer from those waiting, watching galleries!

FINDS ANSWER IN GALLERIES

No cheers? No mobs? Only this obvious, synthetic response? So what?

I decided to discover—left my seat—mounted by myriad steps to those glum and glowering galleries. Surely here, if anywhere, there should be spontaneous sizz-boom-bah. Here, in the ranks of the W. P. A., the ramparts of relief.

But there wasn't!

Silent they sat, those nameless millions—watching and waiting for the real works. Slant-eyed and cynical, they regarded the mechanical monkeyshines of the marionettes on the floor, so far below. With infinite boredom they listened to their dictated ballyhoo.

There weren't any cheers in the gallery.

Mayor Kelly might and did enthuse. The bands might thunder and the organ might peal, but the regiments of the ragged and hopeless weren't giving any smiles or sweet kisses. They had come looking for action. They were sick of projects * * * sick of relief * * * sick of charity or paternalism under any name. They had come seeking the old, self-respecting way of living and giving. The old American way of life.

And they hadn't found it. They'd seen a mechanized merry-go-round instead. And, as far as they were concerned, it was a flop.

That's the truth of what happened on Tuesday evening, July 16, in the Democratic Convention at Chicago.

CROWD DISILLUSIONED

I don't like to record that truth. I'm not a political writer. I'm just one of those wishful thinkers who saw, in Franklin Roosevelt, the hope and solution of our American system—our American problem. But there was no answer.

There came, Tuesday night, the cruelest disillusionment that has ever been handed to the voters of America. * * *

And I saw their roused, resentful answer to that disillusionment.

The galleries did not cheer.

Farley might smile, Kelly might thunder, Barkley might plead. But those silent galleries knew their own hearts' need—and hunger. They remembered what the man who did not come once had meant to them. They remembered their timid dreams * * *

their reluctant hopes * * * their final, reckless trust. They remembered—

And their trust turned to ashes within them.

He had not come—the man they had trusted. He had not spoken "Yes" or "No." He had postponed and denied * * * had sent, at last, a message which any man might mold to his own desire.

They had come seeking an answer. But there was no answer. The floor might turn on a spotlight and put on a show * * * but the gallery did not cheer.

Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ADDRESS OF HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to privilege granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the very able address delivered by former President, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, before the Republican National Convention recently held in Philadelphia. The address is as follows:

We are here faced with the task of saving America for free men. The whole world is in confusion. Two-thirds of the world is at war. Twenty nations have become the stamping ground of militant despotism. Almost everywhere in the Old World the light of liberty for which men have struggled and died has gone into a long night. Men and nations have lost their moral and spiritual moorings. Even in America our system of liberty has been weakened. We are divided in mind and fearful. And confusion in liberal nations is made worse by the spread of incompetence in government.

The world has survived confusion before. And men have grown in soul and safety. But how? Because some organizations of men have stood solid. They stood not because they knew the solutions to all these confusions, not even because they have the power to find solution. They stood firm and they held the light of civilization—until the furies passed, because they held to certain positive principles of life, of morals, of spiritual values.

SAVED THE NATION

In a time of confusion the action of a Republican convention 80 years ago saved this Nation for free men. And free men of two generations built it into unparalleled greatness.

Upon this party again rests the responsibility for the freedom and prosperity of men for the next two generations. The Republican Party again accepts that responsibility here and now.

Our party is not concerned here with petty or factional issues or minor criticisms.

This crisis in America is no sudden blow. We have witnessed a steady sapping of our system of liberty and the mismanagement of government for the last 8 years. During all this time we have had 10,000,000 chronically unemployed, 18,000,000 of our fellow Americans have been continuously on relief. Agriculture has been held afloat by Government subsidies. Unending deficits and huge increases in debt threaten the financial stability of the Government. Our industry and business are hesitant and are afraid. In this decade, we have actually decreased in national income and national wealth for the first time in 150 years. America has gone backward. The human consequence is that one-third of our people are frozen to poverty.

RESULT OF INCOMPETENCE

This condition is not an inheritance from the inevitable world depression which followed the last World War. It is the result of incompetence in government. We were on the way to recovery in 1932. Every other democracy had recovered from that depression long before the outbreak of this war.

Now, economically weakened for the past 8 years, we are faced with mismanaged national defense.

And this new world war is no sudden blow. It comes from the destruction of systems of liberty in the Old World. Since the last World War over a billion human beings in Europe and Asia have been shaken by revolutions. The insidious poisons of men's minds from this cauldron sweep over us.

And now with this war one liberty-loving country after another has been submerged. Our indignation, our sympathies, and our fears are desperately involved in their heroic struggles for freedom.

And now France, who tended the cradle of our liberties, has fallen. But the spirit of a great race does not die. France will rise again.

Whatever the outcome of this world cataclysm, whatever the solution of our domestic crisis, the pattern of this world will not again be the same. Dictatorships, totalitarian economics, and militarism will long continue over a large part of the earth. New economic and political forces will be loosened upon the world.

To be prepared, we must at once undertake seven stern tasks.

First. We must restore and revitalize liberty in America.

Second. We must restore and rebuild morals in government.

Third. We must restore decent life and living to one-third of our farmers and workers, who have been chronically submerged by the New Deal.

Fourth. We must restore competence to government.

Fifth. We must prepare this Nation to defend the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. We must develop and maintain foreign policies that keep us out of these wars unless we are attacked. We should facilitate all nations fighting for their freedom in procuring materials and munitions, but subject to definite limitations which keep us out of war.

Seventh. We must recall our people from the flabbiness of the New Deal. We must reestablish stamina, character, and ideals. We must regenerate hope and confidence in America.

WEAKENING STRUCTURE OF LIBERTY

Let us first examine the weakening of the structure of liberty in our Nation.

There is a far larger war in the world today than a war of tanks and airplanes. It is even more dangerous to America. That is a war of hostile ideas, philosophies, and systems of government. There are no neutrals in that war. That is where we have to fight.

From this vast seething laboratory of the Old World in revolution we can find warnings of the fate of democracy.

For more than a century and a half before the war of 1914 the whole continent of Europe up to the Russian border had been struggling upward toward liberty. These people in 20 races had attained a large degree of free government—free speech, free worship, orderly justice, and free enterprise. After that war, liberty and peace seemed assured to the world.

And then in less than 20 years hundreds of millions of these people surrendered freedom for bondage under totalitarian government. This abandonment of liberty has been the most gigantic revolution in history.

Two years ago I was the invited guest of some 12 European countries. That gave me a unique opportunity to inquire into some things that might help the American people.

LIBERTY WEAKENED

I wanted to know more of what ideas and pressures had plunged these nations into dictatorships.

There will flash into your minds that it was communism, fascism, or nazi-ism. That is not what I refer to. They were the effect. I was seeking the cause. Liberty had been weakened long before the dictators rose under those banners. There was a long poignant drama before the last act in this gigantic tragedy of civilization.

There were many disintegrating forces. But also, in every single case before the rise of totalitarian governments, there had been a period dominated by economic planners. Each of these nations had an era under starry-eyed men who believed that they could plan and force the economic life of the people. They believed that was the way to correct abuse or to meet emergencies in systems of free enterprise. They exalted the state as the solvent of all economic problems.

BUREAUCRATIC GOVERNMENT

These men thought they were liberals. But they also thought they could have economic dictatorship by bureaucracy, and at the same time preserve free speech, orderly justice, and free government. They can be called the totalitarian liberals. They were the spiritual fathers of the New Deal.

These men were not Communists or Fascists. But they mixed these ideas into free systems. It is true that Communists and Fascists were round about. They formed popular fronts and gave applause.

These so-called liberals shifted the relation of government to free enterprise from that of umpire to controller. Directly or indirectly they politically controlled credit, prices, and production of industry, farmer, and labor. They devalued, pump-primed, and inflated. They controlled private business by Government competition, by regulation, and by taxes. They met every failure with demands for more and more power of control. And they employed that handmaiden of power, named "Gimme a Billion, Quick."

These leaders ignored the fact that the driving power of free economic life is the initiative and enterprise of men.

When it was too late they discovered that every time they stretched the arm of government into private enterprise, except to correct abuse, then somehow, somewhere men's minds and judgments became confused. At once men became fearful and hesitant. Initiative slackened, industry slowed down in production.

GOVERNMENT DEBT MOUNTED

Then came chronic unemployment and frantic Government spending in effort to support the unemployed. Government debts mounted. And finally Government credit was undermined. Out of the miseries of their people there grew pressure groups—business, labor, farmers, demanding relief or special privilege. Class hate poisoned cooperation.

Does this sound unfamiliar to you?

It was all these confusions which rang down the curtain upon liberty. Frustrated and despairing, these hundreds of millions of

people voluntarily voted the powers of government to the man on horseback as the only way out. They did it in the hope of preserving themselves from want and poverty. They did it in hope of preserving their national independence.

And that blight of totalitarian liberalism even spread to Great Britain in 1929. But that liberty-loving people overthrew it in 1931. The British fully recovered prosperity in 1934. The blight swept over France in 1936 under Premier Blum and the French attempted to escape collapse by voting his government out in 1938. But their productive life was so injured that they are paying in blood, in tears, and defeat.

Need I carry this analogy further?

This is a battle which Americans had better not lose.

OUR TOTALITARIAN LIBERALS

We have now had 8 years of experience with our own totalitarian liberals. Battling against all the natural forces of recovery, they succeeded in stabilizing depression.

What is more, in forcing their economic measures upon us they have given even deeper wounds to liberty. Their headlines in history would be: Vast powers to President; Vast extension of bureaucracy; Supreme Court decides against New Deal; Attack on Supreme Court; Court loaded with totalitarian liberals; Congress surrenders power of purse by blank checks to President; Will of legislators weakened by patronage and political pie; Attacks on business; Stirring class hate; Pressure groups stimulated; Men's rights disregarded by boards and investigations; Resentment at free opposition; Attempt to discredit free press.

Certainly the New Deal has not been allergic to power. And now fed fat on power they demand a third term for Mr. Roosevelt. That is not a mere violation of tradition. It is a violation of a fundamental restraint on power in this Republic.

But we Republicans would welcome Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate. For this battle must be fought out under the guns of debate.

RESTORATION OF AMERICAN LIVING

One of our Republican tasks is to restore security of living and hope to those 40,000,000 Americans—farmers and workers—who are today plunged into insecurity or destitution. Restoration of jobs to 10,000,000 unemployed is the first step to lift this mass of poverty. It is the first step to relief of farmers. It is the first step to balancing our Budget.

Unemployment is not a chronic disease of a free system. It is a disease of governmental interference with that system. These jobs can be restored alone by the restoration of the vitality of free enterprise.

Let me say at once I am not interested in free enterprise because it is a property system. I am interested in it because intellectual and spiritual liberty can be sustained only by economic liberty. They are indissolubly bound in a common fate. I am interested in free enterprise because it is the one dynamic force by which we can restore jobs to our people.

INDIVIDUAL ENTERPRISE

It was dynamic individual enterprise which raised the country from insignificance to greatness. It was not government that put these prairies under the plow. It was not government that flung these railways across a continent. It was not government that built these great factories or cities. It was not government that built these millions of churches or added this wealth of music, art, and literature.

Is this Nation to be a great national workshop or a vast eleemosynary institution? We cannot exist two-thirds workers and one-third dependents.

It is easy to prove that the people are fearful of the New Deal. The evidence of their fears and loss of confidence is when they postpone the building of homes. It shows when they fail to improve and construct factories to produce the new goods to which science and invention beckon our energies. Let me give you just one figure.

POINTS WITH PRIDE

The New Deal points with pride to its housing schemes. In the 7 years before the New Deal, and with no subsidies, a free America built 3,437,000 new family units of housing. During the whole New Deal with all its subsidies, America has built 1,737,000 new units. They no doubt have some more "on order."

There can be a free economy in America which releases the productive energies of men. Or there can be a dictated economy. These cannot be mixed. A free economy means sweat, turmoil, competition—hard at times if you choose. It means ever-new wrongs that must be righted, but it means also resistless growth and progress.

The restoration of confidence does not require exploitation or monopoly. A free people can no more tolerate private economic power without checks and balances than we can tolerate political power without balances and checks. But in effecting great reforms there is a dividing line. Upon the right of this line is cure of abuse and solution of marginal problems. On the left of it is dictation and tyranny and discouragement of production. We must now reform the reforms.

LOSSES CAN BE REPAIRED

A confident, alert, alive, and free people can quickly repair losses, repay debts, and bury mistakes.

In the meantime while we are getting our economic machine back to work we must care for those who suffer. It was a Republican administration in 1930 that first announced we cannot allow Americans to go hungry and cold from no fault of their own. We organized and prevented it. It was a Republican administration which first started relief for farmers.

But wholesale relief cannot go on forever. No government can carry this deficit indefinitely. We must restore these people to self-support before the money fails. These people want work. The Nation needs their work. They want their self-respect restored through productive jobs.

That can come only through a change of administration.

That brings me to restoration of morals in government.

Does anyone in the United States doubt that the New Deal has built up the most gigantic political machine to control the vote ever known in this country?

What of the abundantly proved misuse of relief for politics?

What of this shady substitution of political patronage for the merit system?

What of this vicious building of city machines through handing them gigantic Federal funds to expend?

What of the use of taxpayers' money for partisan propaganda?

The whole business stank to an extent that the Jeffersonian Democrats joined with Republicans in Congress in passing new laws trying to stop this political corruption.

PHONE USE INCREASED

The effect of the new law on the New Deal has probably been to increase the use of the telephone instead of the typewriter.

Today there are three or four hundred thousand New Deal political officeholders who are the officers over an army of 10,000,000 voters who receive Government benefits. A modern explanation of the New Deal method would be that elections have been taken into protective custody.

There is no time tonight to go into the whole field of intellectual and financial morals of the New Deal. They will be amplified in this campaign.

At the end of this debate we ought to have an election—not an auction.

Is all this liberalism? Liberals fought these things for centuries.

Does not the citizen lose faith in the moral standards when he sees such Government dealings?

There can be no double standard of morals in a republic. For ideals must be served with clean hands.

COMPETENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Let us for a moment explore the question of competence in government, as distinguished from philosophy and morals.

There can be monstrosities in broad policies of government beyond those that merely cost money. They can jeopardize the Republic. I may mention a few samples. You will have others.

My first comment is that competence in government is not alone laws and policies. It is the capable administration of them. That means the quality and experience of the men and women doing the job. Many good objectives have gone wrong up that alley.

For 50 years the American people have fought to dig out the spoils system. Our people built a great dyke of competence through nonpolitical selection by merit. At one time 80 percent of Federal servants were employed that way. Today one-half of its officials have never passed a merit examination. That is, however, a minor part of the subject. I cannot discuss its major aspects because I do not wish to deal in personalities.

My second example of the consequences of incompetence in government relates to continued deficits and mounting national debt in peacetime. It is a dull subject. And like any chronic disease we "sort of get used to it." Deficits, debts, inflations, and their spawn on managed currency have been the curse of the earth ever since the last war. They are inscribed on the tombstones of every fallen democracy.

We are still alive and therefore I make two mild suggestions. These deficits are partly the natural results of pressures that arise from stabilized depression.

Therefore I suggest that we release national energies that make productive jobs.

Thereby we would restore the national income from the present seventy billions to the one hundred billions it ought to be today. Thereby the revenues of the Government would increase automatically. Thereby the billions of dollars for relief would decrease automatically.

These deficits are partly due to men who, no matter what they say, show no comprehension that the money which they spend comes from the sweat of people who toil and produce. Now the ordinary peacetime expenses of the Government have increased from about four billion under Republicans to nine billion under the "abundant life."

My other suggestion is that somehow, somewhere we might pare a little off the abundance without hurting anybody but officeholders. But these men cannot stop spending. It is in their blood. And it is part of the new economics.

Our national debt is now long past the danger sign and its speed is increasing. It already weakens our national defense.

One source of the intellectual depression today is Mr. Roosevelt's gay dismissal of his fantastic national debt by the idea that Americans do not owe it, because we owe it to Americans.

MUST BE PAID

You and your grocer are both Americans. You might ask your grocer if he would not concede the same idea. The fact is this debt represents the self-denial of those who have toiled and saved. They have a large part of their savings in that debt.

Their one hundred and twenty-five million insurance policies, and their thirty million savings and bank accounts are in it. Our children will have to pay it.

And in another direction these deficits and debts are becoming the explosives which will destroy the whole of our social reforms. During these 8 years the New Deal has given hourly advertising to their advances in the social field. There have been advances.

We sorely need them. We always will need them. Republicans builded them over years. We have no quarrel with the principle of protection for labor, the farmers, the old, and the destitute. Our quarrel is with method and incompetence in administration. But the torpedo prepared for these services is that the Nation is not allowed to produce enough goods and wealth to foot the bill for them.

They cannot be long paid by the magic of borrowed money.

CURRENCY

My third sample of the higher incompetence is the purchase of three-quarters of the whole world's gold supply. We bought it by giving foreigners our commodities and our investments. We have buried nineteen billions mostly in a hole at Fort Knox.

The foreigners got our property at depression prices. We paid a high price for this metal.

You have often been reminded of the legend of King Midas. Today that legend bears more careful examination. Midas also had the starry-eyed notion that he could benefit the kingdom if he had the power to turn his commodities into gold.

The gods gave him the power. And when he finished he had a great pile of gold but no commodities. Then he assembled another commission for advice. The god Bacchus advised him to jump in a certain river. He came out with donkey's ears.

FACE LOSS OF $19,000,000,000

Even Midas did not undertake to operate on silver. He left that to the New Deal.

Unless we quickly restore the vitality of this pile of dead gold, this Nation will face a loss of the whole nineteen billions of it. We should start by putting it in circulation at home. We should start putting it in circulation abroad by swapping it for useful metals which we do not ourselves produce.

We would far better have many years' stock of manganese, nickel, tungsten, and tin than the so-called precious metals. These we may need for national defense.

PREPAREDNESS

There are other major incompetences in government which I could well discuss. There are agriculture and relief. But tonight my last example is national defense.

Mr. Roosevelt recently broadcast an alibi that preparedness had been neglected by Republican administrations.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS

In the 6 years of peaceful world outlook before the New Deal we had spent about six hundred eighty million a year on our preparedness. As a matter of fact, Mr. Roosevelt considered we were spending too much on it.

He supported the Democratic platform in 1932 which implied that. And in 1934 he drastically reduced our defense to five hundred fifty million, lopping off twenty millions from the Air Corps alone. And that year he reduced the number of commissioned naval graduates by one-half.

The interlude would seem to weaken the alibi.

Nazi-ism in Germany and our New Deal both rose to power in 1933. During these dangerous years our Republicans in Congress supported repeated increases in defense appropriations until they reached one thousand four hundred million a year. In these 6 years the New Deal has spent six and two-tenths billions.

What have we got for that enormous sum?

UNPREPARED FOR DEFENSE

After all that expenditure we are told we are wholly unprepared to defend ourselves.

Our military leaders say to the Congress we are not organized for modern war; we do not have more than 75,000 fully equipped men.

Despite the growing menace in the air, and the expenditure of three hundred and fifty millions of dollars on the air force in the last 6 years, General Arnold says not half a dozen of our Army planes are modern.

If we spend another six and two-tenths billions and get no more actual defense than from the last six and two-tenths billions, nobody will be afraid of us.

Yet the lives of our children, the fate of our Nation, the future of our civilization are at stake. We cannot risk failure. This is another battle which America better not lose.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The first line of our national defense is clear, realistic, and sober foreign policies, directed to secure respect, good will, and peace.

To realize that ideal, during the whole 12 years of Republican administrations after the last Armistice we strove to keep the face of civilization turned toward good will and peace. Americans saved Europe and Russia from collapse in famine. Americans led the advance on methods of international controversy by peaceful means. We led the world to reduce naval arms and lifted billions from the backs of all who toiled. We led in constructive proposals for land disarmament. We set a moral standard in the world by refusal to recognize the murderous regime in Russia. We refused to issue a Communist licence to undermine our institutions. We had organized a world conference to stabilize currencies and by removing trade barriers to give the world a chance. That conference was scuttled by Mr. Roosevelt. That killed the last hope of world cooperation.

The immense task now is to shape our foreign policies to protect us from the conflagrations in Europe and Asia.

There is no such thing as our isolation from wars which envelop two-thirds of all the people in the world. The Monroe Doctrine alone is the negation of that. There is no such thing as economic isolation. Those shocks jam through the doors of our farmers and our workers every hour.

There is no such thing as moral isolation. These violations of treaties and agreements raise dangers to the reign of law everywhere. There is no such thing as intellectual and spiritual isolation. Emotions come through the air in every telegraphed and printed word.

NATIONAL UNITY

From all this there are shifting dangers in which the Nation should have common counsel that we may have national unity. In a few days this convention will have chosen our national leader. The President will be able to secure from him the views of our party upon those transcendent questions.

Today a thousand tragedies to mankind crash one after another. Our emotions are inflamed. We are hostile to totalitarian ideas. We resent aggression. We are indignant at brutality. Our national sympathies are with democracies fighting for their freedom.

But here and now America must summon reason to control emotion. The greatest quality of men in danger, second only to courage, is cool, deliberate action. That is equally the necessity in a nation. An idealism as never before must keep its feet on the grounds of realism.

TIME FOR PREPARATION

The first policy of calm realism is not to exaggerate our immediate dangers. Every whale that spouts is not a submarine. The 3,000 miles of ocean is still a protection. The air forces, tanks, and armies of Europe are useless to attack us unless they establish bases in the Western Hemisphere. To do that they must first press our Navy. It can stop anything in sight now.

The second policy in realism is competent preparedness. We must be armed so that no foreign nation will entertain the dangerous thought of starting over these 3,000 miles of ocean. We must be so prepared that we can rely solely upon our own right arm.

We need a Navy powerful as never before. Rather than a vast accumulation of arms, we must have an industry tuned up to turn out war machines faster and better than any nation on earth. We need a trained personnel of keymen in reserve. We have the resources, the genius, the industry to make us impregnable.

But preparedness is not only making armies and navies. It must be supported by a sound national finance, national economy, and a restored productivity of our people.

And before we can have preparedness we must have competent organization in Washington.

New Deal politics will never "make tyranny tremble." I suppose we might frighten tyrants by appointing another board to advise the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense.

The third of realistic policies bears upon supplies of materials and munitions to those nations who are fighting for their freedom. My belief is that we should facilitate them in every way subject to two limitations. First, that it involves no action which takes us to war, and, second, that as liberty lives by law we must act within the law.

PEACE OR WAR

Today many of our citizens, consciously or unconsciously, are considering peace or war with the totalitarian governments.

The most vital realism in all our relations requires that we keep out of these wars unless the Western Hemisphere is attacked.

It is a solemn determination. Our price of war is the lives of our sons and the poverty of our grandchildren. But we are here also considering the fate of our Nation and the fate of liberty in the world.

It is nonsense that we cannot defend freedom here even if the Old World fails. Our ancestors, with sparse population and resources for the first 50 years of this Republic, sustained liberty here when most of the world was ruled by despots. We can do it again if we have to.

And the spirits of American boys buried in Flanders 22 years ago rise before us today to warn us that we can make war but we cannot assure liberty in the Old World.

The hope of mankind and the hope of civilization is that democracy survive on this continent. Those who advocate war should never forget one thing. The first necessity of any great war is to set up dictatorship. France and England were compelled to do so. But with our already weakened structure of liberty and the fabulous national debt we shall have, and the mania for power of the New Deal, we would be generations in restoring free men in America. We should be sacrificing the last sanctuary of liberty in the world in the belief that we are defending liberty.

MORE HARM THAN GOOD

Those who feel we should intervene in this war should take note of other realistic reasons why we should keep out. If we join, we shall in our own unpreparedness require 2 or 3 years to make ourselves effective. That will be too late. In the meantime we should require the whole energies of American industry to arm ourselves. For us to declare war would do the Allies more harm than good.

The final realism is that if we are to keep cool and not stimulate war there must be an end to provocative speech by our officials.

Expressions of indignation or regret do not require insults. The first responsibility of the President of the United States is to abate war, not to stimulate it. It is not the province of the President of the United States to create hate. Irresponsible talk in explosive times may bring danger. And we need remember that the day will come when we might be of service to humanity in dealing with these same men for peace.

And there is an infinite service that America can bring to the world. After this struggle we shall see hate sitting at the peace table. We might with our moral force and counsel abate its dread consequences. I know the famine, disease, and suffering that is yet to come with this war. With our economic strength and our compassion we can save millions of lives, give aid to reconstruction and inspire tolerance and hope again to the world.

In foreign trade after this war we shall meet an impoverished Europe reduced in its standards of living and above all armed with totalitarian directed exports and imports. All that points in three directions. American workers and farmers will require more protection than ever from imports. We shall need mobilized counteraction on exports. We shall need to develop self-sufficiency in our own industrial production. Under these impacts the Hull treaties will go to the heaven of forgotten issues.

REGENERATION OF AMERICA

Finally, the greatest task of all deals with the intangibles of national life. It is to stiffen the stamina and the morals of our people. It is to unify their ideals and lift their spirits.

I have said whatever the outcome of this war, whatever the solution of our domestic crisis, the form of this world will not be the same. We must meet great change.

In time these world storms will blow themselves out. Perhaps it will be a long time. But the spirit of Luther, Goethe, Schiller, of Mazzini and Garibaldi still live. And here upon our soil the temple of liberty must stand.

But truly we have been following the suicide road for liberty that led to disaster in Europe. But let me give you a word of encouragement. Those countries were economically lean from the last war. We still have economic fat on our national bones.

QUALITY OF OUR PEOPLE

Our ability to meet these storms and these changes will abide in the qualities of our people.

There is in every nation some quality distilled from its racial life. Those are the mores of the race. Ours is a belief in God, a belief in the dignity of the common man. Ours is a spirit of independence, a vigorous assertion of self-reliance, of devotion to duty. Ours is a high sense of cooperation in time of stress.

We have always fought tyranny in any form. We have not in the past been deterred by difficulty or defeated by disaster. We have sought new frontiers, new obstacles to surmount. We have been resilient, courageous, fearless, and unconquerable. The New Deal has contributed to sapping of our stamina and making us soft.

In quest of security we have retreated from liberty. In quest of reform we have abandoned justice and stirred class hate. In quest of relief we have injured self-reliance. In quest of an easy way out we have lessened the vision of America.

REGENERATION HARD

The road to regeneration is burdensome and hard. It is straight and simple. It is a road paved with work and with sacrifice and consecration to the indefinable spirit that is America.

Centuries ago, alone under the stars, contrasting his own insignificance with the immensity of God's universe, there sprang to the lips of the Psalmist the question "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visiteth him?"

Was man created a little lower than the angels, a being for whom the abundance of life consists of justice, liberty, and opportunity?

Does he possess the right from the Creator to plan his own life, to dare his own adventure, to earn his own reward, so long as he does no harm to his fellows? Or must he submerge his life, his liberties, and his independent personality in an omnipotent government?

If man is merely one of the herd, running with the pack, Stalin is right, Hitler is right, and, God help us for our follies and our greeds, the New Deal is right.

AMERICANS DARE NOT LOSE

But if man is an inviolable human soul, possessed of dignity, endowed with inalienable rights, America is right. And this is a war that Americans dare not lose.

Republicans! You go into battle for the greatest cause entrusted to the government of mankind.

With steadfastness to these ideals, you can put this house in order. You can defend this Nation. You can demonstrate that self-governing, free people can solve the problems imposed by the industrial revolution. You can restore employment and agriculture and end their sufferings.

You can wipe out coercion and corruption. You can make this a classless country, devoted to equal opportunity for all. You can build up humane measures of security, of increasing standards of living for all of the people. You can remove their fears. You can inspire their devotion to American ideals. You can, and you will, hold alight to a confused world the lamp of liberty.

Are you prepared to fight?

War Propaganda, 1917 and 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, under permission granted, I present for publication in the RECORD another article referrrd to by me at that time as being part of a series entitled "Twenty-five Years Ago."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR TRADE AND NEUTRALITY

In discussing the forces that bring nations into war, one must not forget the powerful effect of war business.

It has a great appeal to public sentiment, particularly in a country that is suffering from unemployment. If citizens can be entangled in the economic battle of the war they can more easily be drawn into the military part.

The country buying the goods never fails to let it be known they are buying from us. It is part of their propaganda. It is the propaganda of economics.

Stephen and Joan Raushenbush, in their interesting and informative book, War Madness, say:

"The way to get into war is to get a war and a panic tied up together so we have to take one or the other. If we take the war, which is the likely course, we'll get the panic, too. But nobody thinks of that, because it will only come later."

Another interesting comment from their book:

"We had become a virtual arsenal of supplies for the Allied countries. It was hard to be neutral, then."

Today England speaks of the United States as being her arsenal.

Continuing the quotation from War Madness:

"In each of these decisions, the necessity to do nothing that would hurt our war trade and threaten panic was fundamental.

"Because almost all our trade was with the Allies, all the things we did, or failed to do, in order to keep the war boom going and avoid the panic which everybody seemed to expect if the war orders suddenly stopped, happened to work out in favor of our customers—the Allies. At the same time they all worked against Germany. Ours was a neutrality moulded and shaped by a great war trade of which we had become the victims.

"Once a war boom gets started, it is impossible to stop it. No administration would dare to throw the country into a depression by trying suddenly to stop a war boom. If we want to stay out of wars into which we are taken via a war boom, we must prevent that war boom from getting started. The American people can take their choice between peace or profits. They will not be able to have both. When the war starts in Europe, unless we protect ourselves adequately beforehand, we shall learn again that we cannot have a large war trade with whichever side has control of the air and the seas, and remain neutral."

ARE THEY INTERESTED IN PROFITS?

Certain bankers and industrialists who have large holdings in business very much affected by war trade, are calling for the continuation of the war. Could it be that every day the war continues brings to them and their corporations extra dividends?

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I named individuals who financed large newspaper advertisements calling for our more active intervention in the war. In the list you will find officials and directors of corporations that manufacture or sell iron and steel products, chemicals, mechanical equipment, oil, metals, celluloid, electrical equipment, aircraft, munitions, steel castings, barbed wire, shell casings, and many more products that are vital to the conduct of war.

They have interlocking business connections with others in this country and exert quite an influence to get America involved in the conflict.

It will be after the war when we find out the real story of the profit angle involved in the activities of many who now proclaim their interest in the war to be for lofty motives and high ideals. There are many who do believe this war is for these motives and ideals but there are others who claim so to cover up their profit motives.

Don't underestimate the propaganda of economics. It is a powerful force.

PRESIDENT EXPRESSES DANGER OF WAR TRADE

President Franklin Roosevelt expressed the danger of war trade in his Chautauqua speech when he said:

"It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a

whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

"It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

"Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

"They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

"It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that come from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace."

This is a quite different position than the one he took when asking for the repeal of the embargo and amending of the Neutrality Act, and in later statements.

The headline of the New York Times on November 3: "House dooms arms embargo, 243–181; $1,000,000,000 in war orders expected; Allies to buy 7,800 planes here; Rush of orders is foreseen within a few weeks—Trucks, clothing, foodstuffs are among many needed products."

Other headlines of the Times: "Says repeal opens arsenal to Allies; War orders flood aviation industry; Purchases of war materials to reach $1,000,000,000 in 6 months; Allies may double plane orders here."

Hundreds of such headlines are seen in the papers. The belligerents want to be sure that the feeling that business will get out to the smaller communities. They want to get them interested in the economic factors of the war. For instance, the headline in the Times says: "Small plants due to get war orders; British not to confine buying to large producers, head of commission says."

Newsweek, in relating the story of Allied buying, says:

"Actually, a new export boom (reflecting earlier buying, of course) was already under way. During the 48 hours ended last Monday, 250 bombers left New York harbor in Allied and Greek freighters, and the Association of American Railroads revealed that cars unloaded at the harbor soared to a new high early in June."

A recent story on the steel industry says that "the bare possibility of early peace in Europe, a factor not lost sight of by the steel industry, as 10 percent or more of current output is for the British," affects the future outlook.

We are advised that war exports boom our export trade and that "Exports in June * * * were more than 40 percent greater than the average for the corresponding month in the 3 preceding years."

Later in the article, I shall cite the involvement of war trade in 1914–17.

JEROME FRANK STATES THE CASE

This war business does affect our neutrality.

Jerome Frank, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, correctly states the case in his book, "Save America First":

"Every student of our conduct prior to our entry into the last war agrees that nonparticipation was made all but impossible because of our precious huge shipments to the belligerents. Lloyd George and Tardieu were both sure that our war trade would make it impossible for us to preserve our neutrality, and that it was only a question of time before we would join England and France. And there is only an artificial distinction between huge sales to belligerents after they declare war and when they are approaching war. The same forces are now at work that were operative in 1914–17."

I have heard Senators arise and with indignation say that the profit motive had nothing to do with our leaving the position of neutrality in the last World War.

But, let us look at the story of 1914–17 as recorded by historians.

WAR TRADE DESTROYS NEUTRALITY

Ray Stannard Baker, in his Life of Woodrow Wilson, said:

"Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our case was lost."

Writing about May 1916, Ray Stannard Baker used this language:

"Trade between the United States and the Allies had become the great artery which, flowing westward, fed American war prosperity and, flowing eastward, sustained the life of the Allied armies and populations. Diplomats and statesmen alike dreaded any policy that threatened to contract that life-giving stream. Even the boldest pronouncements and demands of the President fell short of being vital. Nevertheless, there was always the danger, which the diplomats of the belligerent nations had to watch narrowly, that some outrage would prove a breaking point, or that this strange President, with his ideals and his moral convictions, might—there was horror in the thought—bring his vast Nation into the war on the wrong side."

WARTIME TRADE ENTANGLES US

And, again, we find these words from Baker:

"And yet, however the President may have striven to subordinate or moralize the economic factors of the conflict, they were there, as always, enormously potent influences behind the scenes. At the beginning of the European war he had tried to curb their influence by a 'moral' loan policy, but had found it, by September 1915, impossible to maintain. The effect of our rapidly expanding wartime trade—trade that was then perfectly legal—was to entangle us vitally with the welfare of the Allies. The President saw clearly and feared this tendency; he considered that there was 'a moral obligation laid upon us to keep free the courses of our commerce and of our finance' from entanglements with either group of belligerents that we might use our increasing economic power for the benefit of the world."

Another statement by Ray Stannard Baker:

"Whether these vast economic forces were to be used selfishly or altruistically, there they were—realities, facts—and the President himself saw that 'we have interests which we see being drawn slowly into the maelstrom of this tremendous upheaval.' The war, indeed, had reached the point where everything that happened in Europe immediately affected America."

CREDIT FOLLOWS SALES

And, in the words of Baker, "if shipments (of war trade) were cut off, what would happen to American business?" The statement follows:

"It was inevitable that with the shipment of such enormous quantities of war materials to the Allies, the problem of paying for them would again arise. For a considerable time the British could finance their purchases through their large credit balance, but if the war continued even a quarter billion dollars would not last long. And when all was said, if the shipment of war materials was unobjectionable, why not loans of money? And if credits were not given, how could the munitions traffic continue? And if shipments were cut off, what would happen to American business?"

Secretary Lansing, whose memoirs show that he was not neutral from the first of the World War, said about war trade affecting neutrality:

"Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the true spirit of neutrality, made in the first days of the war, stand in the way of our national interests, which seem to be seriously threatened?"

Yet, if we look at the profits made by the sale of war material and then compare that with the cost of the war, we will see that war profits are an illusion.

M'ADOO COMMENTS

Secretary McAdoo said in 1915:

"The high prices for food products have brought great prosperity to our farmers, while the purchases of war munitions have stimulated industry and have set factories going to full capacity throughout the great manufacturing districts, while the reduction of imports and their actual cessation in some cases have caused new industries to spring up, and others to be enlarged. Great prosperity is coming. It will be tremendously increased if we can extend reasonable credits to our customers. * * * Our prosperity is dependent on our continued and enlarged foreign trade."

It is quite interesting that the Secretary of the Treasury 25 years later takes a similar position. Secretary Morgenthau is one of the first to break the news to the people of the value of foreign orders.

Sir Gilbert Parker, who directed the propaganda for Great Britain in the United States preceding the 1914–18 World War, knew the value of the propaganda of economics. He advised his country of the United States' interest in the sale of these war materials. One of his correspondents wrote:

"Within earshot of my own house 16,000 workmen are busy day and night * * * making munitions for England. Other factories of munitions and other war supplies are being enlarged or built new in this one city of New Haven."

Professor Peterson commented on this, as follows:

"Could it be other than that these thousands of workmen and people dependent upon them should be friendly to the British and anxious to have them win—even if it finally took American assistance?"

Jobs. It may mean jobs in the factories for a month or so, but it may be followed with jobs in the trenches for a lengthy period. It may mean gold, but it is fool's gold. When the books are finally balanced, it will not be worth the cost.

The safest course is to have a strong domestic economy rather than trying to bring prosperity from the tragedy of war.

And again I refer to the words of Chairman Frank, of the Securities Commission: "Every student of our conduct prior to our entry into the last war agrees that nonparticipation was made all but impossible because of our precious huge shipments to the belligerents. * * * The same forces are now at work that were operative in 1914–17."

My Own Record As Compared With My Predecessor's—A Reply to Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, prominent candidates in the recent campaign, which was held in Louisiana, accused the Louisiana delegation of neglecting their congressional duties while campaigning in Louisiana, and of "selling the sugar interests down the river."

What does the record show?

Follow me and I will prove these statements to be untrue by the record. I will give an account of my own stewardship for the 4 years that I have been in Congress and will confine myself strictly to the record. I will include in this record the very brief time that I spent in Louisiana during the recent campaign. For comparison, I will also give the official record of my immediate predecessor, who was here in Congress in 1935 and 1936, and who missed answering the roll call 66 times out of a total of 204, or nearly one-third of the time during the year 1935. In 1936 he did lots worse than he did in 1935; he only answered the roll call 13 times during the entire year and failed to answer it 123 times. He was present only one-thirteenth of the time. This entire year of 1936 he only voted 5 times when there was a total of 81 roll calls for votes.

In the 4 years that I have been here I have answered 603 roll calls and have missed answering 24 roll calls and most of the 24 that I missed were while I was on official business, as the attached record will prove. My 4-year record shows that I was present and answered roll call 96.2 percent of the time and was absent 3.8 percent of the time. My predecessor was present in his first year 67.64 percent of the time and in his second year only 9.6 percent of the time, being absent 90.4 percent of the time.

During the recent campaign, the Louisiana politicians used as a caption in reference to the absence of members of the congressional delegation from Washington: "When the roll was called up yonder where were they?"

Ask the politicians where my predecessor was when they voted on the discharge of the Ways and Means Committee on the Patman adjusted-compensation bill—soldiers' bonus. Why did my predecessor fail to answer the roll and vote?

Ask my predecessor where he was and why he failed to vote on February 21, 1936, on S. 3780, the bill which provided temporary Federal aid to farmers and a permanent policy of Federal aid to States for such purposes. Where was he on February 22, 1936, when H. R. 11418, the agricultural appropriation bill, was up for consideration and he did not vote?

Where was he on March 18, 1936, when he failed to vote on the conference report covering appropriations for more farm benefits?

Where was he on April 29, 1936 when they voted on the revenue bill of 1936, which bill was to supply funds with which to run the Federal Government?

Where was he when they voted to discharge the Rules Committee on H. R. 2066—a bill to liquidate and refinance farm indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest, which legislation was so important to the farmers? He did not vote. He failed to vote on this same bill on May 13, 1936, when it was up for final passage.

Why did he fail to vote on H. R. 11687, which authorized funds to be expended on highways and roads in the States?

Where was he and why did he not vote in 1936 on the conference report on H. R. 8455, which authorized public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, which legislation was so important to Louisiana?

Where was he when they voted on H. R. 11663, on June 17, 1936, which was the antilobbying bill to regulate those engaged in trying to influence legislation?

Suppose you go back to July 30, 1935, roll call No. 147, and ask my predecessor where he was when they voted on H. R. 7349, which was an act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River, and was probably the most important flood control legislation ever to come before Congress, and certainly of vital interest to all parts of Louisiana that are subject to overflows from the Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1935, shows that my predecessor failed to vote on this bill, which was probably the most important legislation enacted while he was in Congress. He was absent when they voted on the rivers and harbors bill for flood control in 1936, also.

Remember that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that my predecessor answered only 13 roll calls out of a total of 136 roll calls during the entire second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, which was from January 3 to June 20, 1936, inclusive. Do you think it would be safe to have a man in Congress during these precarious times, who was present for only 13 roll calls and 5 vote calls during the entire year of 1936?

I now ask these same politicians, who criticized me and my record, where my predecessor was when the roll was called up yonder? You might apply to him the words of that popular song of a few months ago, the title of which was, "The Little Man Who Wasn't There."

Read this entire record which is attached and find out for yourself how false was the statement about "selling the sugar industry down the river"; read what the sugar people had to say and note the size of some of the benefit payments which they received.

MY OWN RECORD

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session

I was sworn in on January 5, 1937. The session ended August 21, 1937. During this session there was a total of 152 roll calls. I was present for 146 roll calls and absent only 6. I missed 5 of these roll calls while in Louisiana for 8 days. At that time, I had official permission from the House of Representatives to go to Louisiana for 10 days to attend to business that concerned my congressional district. During that visit, I accompanied the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General to Donaldsonville, La., to lay the cornerstone of the post-office building there.

Seventy-fifth Congress, second session (called)

This session convened on November 15, 1937, and adjourned December 21, 1937. During this special session there was a total of 22 roll calls. I was present for 21 roll calls and was only absent once. I was present and did not vote 1 roll call (paired).

Seventy-fifth Congress, third session

This session convened on January 3, 1938, and adjourned June 14, 1938. During this session there was a total of 123 roll calls. I was present for 119 roll calls. I was absent and missed 4 roll calls, but was in Washington attending important committee meetings.

Recapitulation for the Seventy-fifth Congress

Total number of roll calls during the 2 years of the 75th Cong., which includes 2 regular and 1 special session	297
Number of roll calls present for the 3 sessions of the 75th Cong	286
Number of roll calls absent in the 2 years of the 75th Cong	11
Percent of times present and answering roll calls	96.29
Percent of times absent and failing to answer roll calls	3.71

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session

This Congress convened on January 3, 1939, and adjourned on August 5, 1939. During this session there was a total of 157 roll calls. I was present for 152 roll calls. I was absent only 5 roll calls. The 5 roll calls, from which I was marked absent, all came in the same week, during which time I was absent in compliance with a resolution of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and with instructions from the chairman of the committee and the Navy Department. I was honored by being named as a member of a subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee, to go to Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina to inspect proposed sites for a naval air base, over which a controversy had arisen between the Hepburn Board on the one side and the head of

naval aeronautics and a subcommittee on the other side, and to make a report of our findings. In reality, I was on duty in an official capacity at the time that I failed to answer the only 5 roll calls that I missed during the entire session.

The Naval Affairs, Military Affairs, and Appropriations Committees have been the busiest of all committees for 2 years; for weeks our committee—Naval Affairs—has been holding hearings from early morning until late evening, nearly every day, preparing legislation for the enlargement of our Navy and air force, and to facilitate this additional construction program. I have not missed a single meeting.

Seventy-sixth Congress, second session (special)

This session convened on September 21, 1939, and adjourned on November 3, 1939. During this session there was a total of seven roll calls. I did not miss any roll calls.

Seventy-sixth Congress, third session

This session convened on January 3, 1940. In January there was a total of 14 roll calls. I was present in January for 9 roll calls. I was absent in January from only 5 roll calls. I was present and did not vote—was paired—on January 29, 1940. In February 1940 there was a total of 18 roll calls. I was present for 17 of these 18 roll calls. I was absent from 1 roll call on February 8 but was in Washington on that date and was making a departmental call. I have a record to verify this statement. January and February 1940 were the 2 months that I was accused by the office seekers of spending all of my time in Louisiana, campaigning and "selling the sugar farmers down the river." But the record will prove that from January 3 to January 16, which were the dates that I was in Louisiana for the first primary, I was absent from only 5 roll calls. I did not miss any roll calls in February before the second primary, due to my presence in Louisiana.

There have been 165 roll calls so far this session and I have missed answering the roll call only eight times. In other words, I have been present for 95.2 percent of roll calls so far this session. I have been absent from roll calls only 4.8 percent of the time.

Now, let us look at the record of my immediate predecessor for the Seventy-fourth Congress, which includes the years 1935 and 1936.

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session

This session convened on January 3, 1935, and adjourned August 26, 1935. During the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, there was a total of 204 roll calls. My predecessor answered the roll call only 138 times. He failed to answer roll calls 66 times. In other words, he was absent from roll call nearly one-third of the time during the year 1935.

Please read carefully what is to follow.

Scan the record closely for the year 1936, which was my predecessor's last year in Congress.

Seventy-fourth Congress, Second Session (January 3 to June 20, 1936)

There were 136 roll calls during the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

My predecessor was absent from 123 roll calls.

He answered to his name only 13 times.

He was absent 90.37 percent of the time.

During this session, there were 81 calls for vote.

My predecessor failed to vote 76 times.

My predecessor voted only 5 times.

My predecessor was present and voted 6.18 percent of the time.

My predecessor was absent and failed to vote 93.82 percent of the time during the year 1936.

In both sessions of the Seventy-fourth Congress, including the years 1935 and 1936, there were 339 roll calls. My predecessor answered only 151 of these roll calls and failed to answer 188 roll calls.

He was absent much more than one-half of the time for the entire session of 2 years.

During my entire 4 years in Congress I missed a total of only 24 roll calls out of a possible total of 627. My predecessor, in only 2 years—1935–36—missed 188 roll calls out of a possible total of 339 roll calls.

I was present 96 percent of the time.

My predecessor was present only 41.6 percent of the time.

The above records are taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I will be glad to furnish the page, number of roll call, and date of each vote and quorum call for verification. I have a complete table and index, which will permit me to furnish this information within a few minutes.

In reply to the charge made by the politicians that the "Louisiana congressional delegation sold the Louisiana sugar interests down the river," I will again quote the RECORD and confine myself strictly to verifiable facts.

Prior to my election to Congress, and during the term which was served by my immediate predecessor, the Louisiana and Florida quota was 260,000 tons of sugar, raw value. Early in my first term of service in the Seventy-fifth Congress, in 1937, through diligent work and the complete cooperation of the Louisiana delegation—for the first time in history—we were able to have Louisiana's and Florida's quota raised from 260,000 tons, raw value—which they were receiving when my predecessor was in Congress—to 420,000 tons, raw value. We received the commendations of the sugar interests for our cooperation and united effort. I will quote below excerpts from letters and telegrams to substantiate the above statements. I have in my possession the originals and will be glad to show them:

[American Sugar Cane League, the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association, the American Cane Growers' Association, Producers and Manufacturers' Protective Association]

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *November 7, 1938.*

Hon. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Slidell, La.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the executive committee of the American Sugar Cane League held November 5, 1938, I was instructed to write you and express the appreciation of the league for the very fine spirit of helpfulness and cooperation that you have shown toward the Louisiana sugar industry in the fight it is engaged in to bring about conditions, legislative and economic, that will enable it to live and prosper.

REGINALD DYKERS,
Vice President and General Manager.

LOCAL UNIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE A. F. OF L.

SUGAR WORKERS CONFERENCE,
September 24, 1937.

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our organization is deeply grateful for your fine support for the sugar bill during this recent session of Congress.

By the successful enactment of this legislation thousands of American workingmen and their families are guaranteed economic security because they can continue on their jobs. Your willingness to assist American workers in the sugar industry will not be forgotten.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD J. BURKE,
Secretary-Treasurer, United Weighers.

THE AMERICAN SUGAR REFINING CO.,
New Orleans, La., September 16, 1937.

HON. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Member of Congress, Slidell, La.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: I desire to thank you very sincerely for your splendid support of the sugar-refining industry in the continental United States by your vote for the passage of the sugar bill in the recent session of Congress.

As you well know, many people in our State are working in the sugar refineries and are dependent upon them for their livelihood.

I can speak for the men and women employees of our Chalmette refinery and tell you that they are deeply appreciative of the determined fight you made for them as American workmen in protecting their jobs from a kind of competition which, considering wages and other factors, would be distinctly unfair.

With my very kind personal regards, and again my thanks, I remain,

Yours very truly,

WARREN J. CRANE,
Superintendent.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE, PASSED SEPTEMBER 3, 1937

Whereas the Louisiana sugar industry, as a whole, in all its branches, as represented by the 8,757 members of the American

Sugar Cane League, is deeply grateful to the members of the congressional delegation of Louisiana for their indefatigable and successful efforts to bring about the enactment of the Jones-Brown sugar bill in a form acceptable to our industry; therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the American Sugar Cane League, That the appreciation of the Louisiana sugar industry be formally expressed and put on record, and this we now do; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolutions be sent to each of the Members of Congress from Louisiana.

REGINALD DYKERS,
Vice President and General Manager.

THE AMERICAN SUGAR REFINING CO.,
New York, September 2, 1937.

Hon. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Member of Congress, Slidell, La.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: You may be sure that our employees as well as our company itself are most appreciative of your active cooperation in seeing to it that this legislation, as passed, protected the volume of business of continental refineries, and the jobs of their workmen, against subsidized tropical competition.

With personal regards and best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

H. BEACH CARPENTER,
General Counsel.

[Telegram]

AUGUST 11, 1937.

Hon. RENÉ L. DEROUEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Before leaving today on my vacation I wish to thank you and through you thank the entire Louisiana delegation for the earnest and effective work done by all of you in connection with sugar legislation. The sugar producers of south Louisiana are indeed fortunate to have such able representation in Congress.

C. K. KEMPER,
Chairman, Legislative Committee of the American Sugar Cane League.

AMERICAN SUGAR CANE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A.,
July 19, 1937.

Hon. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: With best wishes and assuring you that we appreciate the splendid work that you are doing for the Louisiana sugar industry, I am

Very truly yours,

C. J. BOURG, *Vice President.*

[Telegram]

JULY 5, 1937.

The American Sugar Cane League representing the Louisiana sugar industry realizes the strenuous fight which the Louisiana delegation has made to secure an adequate quota for Louisiana, and we appreciate your efforts and the fair attitude of Chairman JONES in working out a compromise necessary to get action in the House. * * * The Louisiana sugar industry is very grateful for the work that you have done and for your continuing interest in the maintenance and development of our industry which is so important and so necessary to the welfare of the State of Louisiana and its citizens.

C. D. KEMPER,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

ROTARY CLUB OF BATON ROUGE, LA.,
May 13, 1937.

Hon. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GRIFFITH: * * * By unanimous vote, the undersigned committee was appointed and directed to communicate to you an expression of appreciation for the good work that has been done in behalf of Louisiana's claim for this allotment. We hope that you will continue to do everything possible to have our quota raised. The fine spirit of united effort that is being exerted in the interests of the Louisiana cane-sugar industry is highly commendable, and we wish you to know that it is appreciated.

Very respectfully,

ROTARY CLUB OF BATON ROUGE,
By W. R. DODSON.
O. M. THOMPSON.
CHAS. P. MANSHIP, Jr.
W. MORTON EVANS.

[Telegram]

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 28, 1937.*

Hon. JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Washington, D. C.:

At the regular monthly meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Sugar Cane League held today I was instructed to wire you in behalf of the Louisiana Sugar Industry and say that those engaged in it thank you from the bottom of their hearts for the sponsorship of the cause of Louisiana sugar in which the Senators and Congressmen from this State have so splendidly united. We feel full confidence that the able work being done will result in a proper legislative recognition of the right to a quota of 500,000 tons for Louisiana.

REGINALD DYKERS,
Vice President and General Manager.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 8, 1937.*

Representative JOHN K. GRIFFITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept our sincere thanks for your very courteous letter of April 2, which we assure you is fully appreciated.

This bill will accomplish the purpose desired by so many of us. Your support of that bill, as well as an increased quota for Louisiana, will cover the situation beautifully.

Please be assured that your efforts in this direction are very much appreciated.

Yours truly,

BACKER & GREEN,
ALBERT F. BACKER.

[Excerpt from an editorial appearing in the Sugar Journal of November 1939]

In the past it has been difficult to get the entire Louisiana delegation, which at all times should be wholeheartedly for sugar, to come to its support. As a matter of fact, it has only been recently that all Members of the congressional delegation from Louisiana have voted together on sugar. They realized that a greater sugar industry in Louisiana means a greater prosperity for the State as a whole and that each section of the State would prosper in some degree because of a greater sugar industry. Our present delegation, then, has worked as a unit and voted as one for the benefit of an industry which means so much to the State.

The Louisiana sugar industry is fortunate at this time in having a congressional delegation that has stood with a united front in its effort for the industry. The Senators and Congressmen from this State realize the importance of the sugar industry to the State, and they have worked harmoniously and unitedly for its interest.

It is to be hoped that the congressional delegation from every sugar State in the Union will be as unified and that they will stand shoulder to shoulder with the united Louisiana delegation in the fight for a proper expansion of the American sugar industry.

Mr. Speaker, would the above communications indicate that I had "sold the sugar interests down the river"?

In addition to the above, I wish to add that Senator BYRD, of Virginia, had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1940, page 3155, the names of those who received as much as $10,000 or more from the Federal Government in benefit sugar payments, according to the 1937 sugar program. I find that there are 31 concerns in the State of Louisiana who received $10,000 or more in benefit sugar payments. One Louisiana concern received $195,698.76 and one company in my own district received $74,714. The above number naturally does not include the many hundreds of small sugar farmers who receive annually a lesser amount.

Does this look as if I have sold sugar down the river?

Northern Lakes States Regional Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, domestic problems are with us, and, as I have pointed out on other occasions, World War conditions should not be permitted to overshadow our economic conditions.

In 1934 the President appointed the National Resources Board, which had for its purpose a survey of the United States to find out what was wrong in the country and to report. The Board was succeeded by the National Resources Committee which is still active. In 1938 the National Resources Committee appointed the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee to investigate conditions in the Great Lakes States area. The report of the committee was made a year ago

and admits serious unemployment problems due to the passing away of the lumber industry. As the President says in his release a year ago, there are more people than jobs in this area and lack of work is the one thing that needs a solution. A program to give people employment must be adopted by the Government. The administration should take cognizance of its own report and the department that is responsible for carrying out the program should submit the necessary recommendations to Congress.

This morning I had a conference with a representative of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics regarding the report of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee concerning the rehabilitation of cut-over areas in northern Minnesota, northern Michigan, and northern Wisconsin. This report recommended to the President, and he in turn transmitted the same to Congress, certain definite objectives in efforts to assist these areas.

Recommendations from the committee indicate that legislation will be asked increasing the program of the United States National Forest Service. Additional funds will be requested, and a new policy of employing people who reside in the vicinity of the national forests will be carried out.

Recommendations of the Resources Committee would increase appropriations so that loans could be made to farmers living on small tracts of land, for the purpose of clearing land and increasing the size of their farms. Further, appropriations would be made available to help refinance farms already owned, and also to shift farmers from one particular location unsuited for agriculture to another location where they could farm with profit.

This program is an important one to northern Minnesota, as well as to the other States. There should, of course, be cooperation on the part of the State with the Federal Government. For example, those shaping the policy of State forests should cooperate with the United States Forest Service in an effort to provide employment for the localities. I have just been advised by William L. Strunk, Commissioner of Conservation, that the State of Minnesota does propose to enter actively into the work of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee. The Department of Conservation of Minnesota recognizes that there is a real problem in the matter of land use and unemployment, which has resulted from large cut-over areas. Various agencies which have to do with this problem, from the standpoint of the Federal Government, are located in the Department of Agriculture, and it is to be hoped that within the near future legislation will be recommended which will make possible an effort to carry out the recommendations of the Regional Committee.

R. O. T. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

LETTER FROM PEACOCK MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Peacock Military Academy, of San Antonio, Tex., to Maj. Gen. Claude J. Birkhead, commanding general, Thirty-sixth Division, Texas National Guard:

HEADQUARTERS, PEACOCK MILITARY ACADEMY,
SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 25, 1940.*

Subject: Existing regulations re junior R. O. T. C. units, and comments on same.

To: Maj. Gen. Claude V. Birkhead.

1. The Peacock Military Academy is in hearty accord with your proposal to the Texas delegation to Congress, dated June 21, 1940, especially in regard to paragraph 4, in which you state: "Make junior and senior R. O. T. C. effective in every junior and senior high school (both public and private), and in every college and university in the land." In connection therewith, I respectfully submit the following information, comments, and recommendations in the interest of national defense.

(1) Army Regulations 145–10 now provide for two types of junior R. O. T. C. units: "Class MS for essentially military schools" like T. M. I. and Peacock, and "Class CS for public schools," like the San Antonio public school system. These same regulations also prescribe that a Regular Army officer must be detailed to each junior R. O. T. C. unit as P. M. S. & T., and that each unit must maintain a minimum of 100 boys not less than 14 years of age. Also, both types of unit receive free uniforms for their students from the Government.

(2) Under the above provisions T. M. I. is furnished a Regular Army major as P. M. S. & T. exclusively for their one small unit, while the five San Antonio public high schools are all incorporated in one CS unit with only one Regular Army major as P. M. S. & T. for all five schools. In the latter case each of the five public high schools must furnish at its own expense a National Guard or Reserve officer as commandant to administer its military training under the supervision of the one Army major.

(3) At this point I call your attention to the fact that private military schools (class MS) could easily furnish their own commandant—a National Guard or Reserve officer—just as the public schools do, in which case the one Regular Army major already supervising the five public schools could also supervise the training in the private military schools in this city. This same condition would apply to other cities as well. Students attending private military schools can afford to buy their own uniforms. The Government should furnish uniforms only to public-school units.

(4) However, in time of war it would be necessary for the Government to detail a Regular Army officer to each school, for in this case all National Guard and Reserve officers would be called to active duty. Perhaps the National Guard or Reserve officer already employed by each school could be continued on active duty in the same capacity. This would be better than putting in new men unfamiliar with the school, as well as with R. O. T. C. training.

(5) Even if additional junior R. O. T. C. units were available at the present time, many deserving and old-established schools like Peacock (established 1894) would not qualify for a unit due to the requirement of a minimum of 100 boys not less than 14 years of age. In our case, and in the case of many other schools (including junior high schools), the school does have enough boys 12 years of age and over who are old enough for the entire course of R. O. T. C. training. I therefore urge that in providing for more junior R. O. T. C. units for preparatory schools the minimum age limit be reduced to 12 years of age.

(6) Junior R. O. T. C. units should be established in all junior and senior high schols, both public and private, in order that there shall be a uniform system of military training and in order that when a student transfers from one school to another he may receive credit for the military training completed in the first school. Under present regulations there are three school classifications, (a) junior R. O. T. C. units, (b) 55c units, and schools like Peacock who receive their Government recognition under (c) act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 370). By combining all of these various types of units into one junior R. O. T. C. unit the same course of military training will be given to all students and all students can transfer when necessary from one school to another without loss of time or credit. Furthermore, this would enable all students to have equal opportunity to secure credit toward a Reserve commission upon becoming 21 years of age.

(7) Another defect in the law which should be corrected is that cavalry equipment (saddles, etc.) is now available only to senior R. O. T. C. cavalry units, which are also furnished horses and caretakers by the Government. Many schools (like Peacock) have already added, or would like to add, cavalry training to their military department. They can afford to purchase and feed their own horses but they cannot buy or borrow saddles and other equipment from the Government necessary for cavalry training. In our case (Peacock) we receive rifles, bayonets, and ammunition from the Government (act of Apr. 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 370)), but there is no provision whereby we may obtain the use of saddles, rifle scabbards, and other necessary cavalry equipment (except by buying them at a high price through Army salvage stores).

(8) I, therefore, respectfully suggest the following:

(a) That junior R. O. T. C. units be made available to all junior and senior high schools (both public and private) who desire same, and that all red tape be dispensed with in order that these schools may obtain their units in time for the opening of the new school year in September 1940.

(b) That (if necessary as an economy measure) these schools be required to furnish (at their own expense) a National Guard or Reserve officer as commandant to give the military drill and instruction, under the supervision of a Regular Army officer. (One Regular Army officer could supervise several different schools in the same locality.)

(c) That private military school students be required to furnish their own uniforms (they can well afford this and most private schools alrleady have a distinctive uniform different in color from the Army uniform). This would save the Government this great expense.

(d) That all junior R. O. T. C. units be furnished with a Springfield rifle for each student and enough additional modern equipment to acquaint the student with the automatic rifle, ma-

chine guns, etc. (a few to each school). Also, that those schools desiring to give cavalry training and who maintain their own horses (without expense to the Government) be furnished with saddles, bridles, and other equipment necessary for cavalry drill.

D. W. PEACOCK,
Captain, Cavalry Reserve, Commandant.

A Railroad Brotherhood Makes Pertinent Observations Anent Military Preparations and the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

STATEMENT BY A. F. WHITNEY, PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a powerful statement issued by A. F. Whitney, eminent and brilliant president of the great Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of the United States. In this statement this order sets forth the views entertained by it with respect to national defense and the international situation. I commend its careful study to all.

President Roosevelt wisely counseled the American people when he declared that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. A people who have an abiding sense of security—security of their freedom, their civil liberties, their economic existence, their homes—is a fearless people. With one-third of our citizens ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-housed we cannot possess that national sense of security and contentment so vital to the defense of our country. Good homes, wholesome environment, short working hours with cultural wages, afford the people a sense of security that contributes most effectively to the national defense. Many years ago the principle of law was laid down that a man's home is his castle. Hovels do not make secure castles.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen wholeheartedly supports the program of complete national defense against any enemies who may attempt to enter our gates. We believe our homes should be fully protected against any possibility of invasion. We are opposed to sending our sons across the seas to fight on foreign land. Our influence for the attainment of a lasting and constructive peace will be more effective if we do not become involved in the abdication of human reason that has so completely destroyed human security on the European Continent. If we, the richest nation in the world, dedicate our resources, mental and material, to the uplift of human life, who can deny that the example we shall establish shall be an inspiration that will cause European nations eventually to dethrone their war lords? If we shall more completely dedicate the discoveries and advancements in science and technology to the attainment of improved living conditions, who can deny that we are not thereby serving God's purpose and dealing a heavy blow to the godless forces that divert these great human achievements to the processes of human destruction?

Like Hitler, whose "blitzkrieg" first struck the German trade unions, destroying the workers' organizations and looting their insurance reserves and union treasuries, some American industrialists have declared a lightning war against organized labor in the United States. These industrialists are apparently attempting to twist the virtues of national defense into a plan for destroying the gains which labor and progressive-minded citizens have achieved through many years of struggle; they would destroy the wages and hour law, emasculate the National Labor Relations Act, intensify their industrial spying activity, shackle labor's right to organize, and throttle the people's civil liberties.

A smoke screen of sweet reassurances is intended to disguise the attack on labor. As one chamber of commerce executive recently put it, "Labor no doubt will join in making whatever sacrifice is necessary for the protection and preservation of the Nation." This particular business spokesman is hopeful that the Government will ease up on the enforcement of wage-hour legislation.

A large public utilities corporation has urged the Securities and Exchange Commission—in the name of national defense—to hold in abeyance the death-sentence provision of the Securities and Exchange Act. Also in the name of national defense, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has sent its dive bombers into action against the National Labor Relations Act.

Why all this activity on the part of the industrial tycoons? Are they interested in real national defense? If they are, they would not be conspiring to weaken the defenses of American labor while fortifying their own strongholds. It does not require profound research to discover that the robber barons are bent on destroying organized labor in order to garner the maximum amount of profits during the present war period. Eighteen thousand new millionaires were harvested by the United States as a result of the first World War. All signs—particularly the absence of a general excess war-profits law—point to an even larger crop of profiteers at this time. Profits of many corporations have soared in 1940, as compared with 1939. While profiteers amass wealth, unemployment in the United States continues to be the lot of 10 or 11 million citizens, and there is nothing on the horizon—not even the huge public expenditures for national defense—to guarantee that this problem will be solved.

Those who lose no time to cast aspersions in the direction of organized labor not only for the purpose of discrediting and weakening the labor movement, but also to direct public attention away from their own "fifth column" activities, should be a sharp reminder of the fact that Hitler's rise to power in Germany was accomplished only because of the connivance of certain wealthy industrialists. The New York Times of November 21, 1939, quotes a United Press dispatch from Zurich, Switzerland, in part, as follows:

"Herr (Fritz) Thyssen and a small group of the Rhineland industrialists and bankers supported the Nazi cause in the years when it seemed hopeless. It was at the Cologne home of one of this group, Kurt von Schroeder, the banker, that Herr Hitler and Franz von Papen, former chancelor, reached the agreement that resulted in Herr Hitler's being called to the chancellery.

"After Herr Hitler came into power Herr Thyssen became 'leader of heavy industry' under the economic reorganization program and was appointed to the Prussian state council."

Today international affairs unfortunately are too largely governed by the rule of "tooth and claw." Nation after nation has felt the iron heel of the ruthless fuehrer. It is therefore quite understandable that the American people—and labor first of all—should be anxious to build up the strongest possible system of national defense. In bulwarking our Republic, however, we must not give way to the false plea that, in order to compete with the dictatorships, we must scuttle labor's rights and social legislation, and "temporarily" abandon the democratic way of life.

To deprive the people of achievements that have been made over years of great effort is to disarm them. It would arrest progress generally and seriously hamper our national-defense program. To refuse to solve the pressing domestic problems—unemployment, housing, social security—is to undermine the morale of the population. To whip up war hysteria and, in the fever of the moment, to restrict freedom of speech and of the press, is to bring this Nation that much nearer to fascism.

American labor must and will maintain the utmost vigilance, to see to it that democracy at home is not torpedoed from within or from without.

Colleges and the Selective Service Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter written to the editor of the New York Times, dated July 13, 1940, by Dr. Arnaud C. Marts, president of Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., showing the effect upon our colleges of the pending selective service bill as now drawn.

JULY 13, 1940.

THE EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES, NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR SIR: There is one aspect of the operation of the pending Burke-Wadsworth selective service bill which has not been discussed publicly and which is of sufficient national importance to merit discussion. I refer to the effect this bill would have upon the operations of our 600 private colleges.

First, let me say that I approve the principle of compulsory military service for all males between the ages of 21 and 45, as suggested in this bill, and believe our Nation must immediately take some such aggressive step in the preparation of our defense against what seems to be the plans of certain military nations for world conquest.

I also believe that this military training should be universal. I am sure college men, as I know them, would not want or expect any special treatment in this regard.

In the operation of the plan, however, we must guard against any unnecessary weakening of our essential agencies and services. President Conant of Harvard has already pointed out, in his statement to the congressional committee, several services, such as the medical and engineering professions and certain semiprofessional

activities, which should be protected against a too rigid operation of a conscription plan. I believe that some thought, also, should be given to the effect that a hastily conceived plan might have on the operation of our private colleges.

These colleges, with the exception of a score or so very highly endowed institutions, depend for most of their annual operating expenses upon their annual tuition income. If all male students at these colleges of the age of 21 and over were to be suddenly withdrawn from college during the next few months for their compulsory military service, many of these colleges would be forced into a serious financial crisis. They would lose immediately about 30 percent of their income and, with the exception of the few heavily endowed institutions referred to above, would be thrown into the operating red.

There is but one way for such a college to reduce its operating cost quickly to meet such an emergency—that is to reduce faculty salaries.

The average independent college, faced with an unexpected reduction of its tuition income, would have to make a horizontal slash of all faculty salaries of, approximately, 20 percent if it were to continue to operate soundly without a deficit.

There are about 50,000 faculty members in these independent colleges, and the average salary, outside of a few institutions noted above, is something less than $3,000. An unexpected cut on these salaries would throw these faculty families into the operating red.

I therefore bespeak a word of interest in their problem. These teachers in our traditional private American colleges are men and women of the highest patriotism, in spite of the contrary impression that a very small radical minority of them have created in the public mind through loose thinking and looser talking. It would be a great pity if these typically American families of modest income were made to suffer unnecessarily in time of peace, if careful thought in the preparation of the bill could protect them from this domestic disaster without weakening the bill.

I bespeak a word also for the problem of the colleges themselves. There are over 500,000 American boys and girls in these private institutions. Our Republic owes an inestimable debt to these colleges. They are among the most prized of our typically American institutions. They were our first colleges and have always been an important bulwark of the strength of our American democracy. A vast number of the present leaders of American life are graduates of these modest colleges, situated in every State in the Union. Some of these colleges have such financial worries brought on by the last 10 years of perplexities that they probably could not survive an additional acute problem of this nature. Most of them would survive, however, but at the cost of a measure of the vitality of their educational service to youth and to our Nation.

I do not have any particular suggestions to make in reference to the solution of this problem, but I do feel that the problem should be stated in order that the public should be aware of it, and in order that our Senators and Congressmen might take it into consideration in the final formulation of the bill.

Yours sincerely,

ARNAUD C. MARTS, *President.*

Who Is Out of Step on Trade Agreements?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK H. BUCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, following up the policy which was then approved by Republican leadership with reference to the reciprocal trade-agreements program of this administration, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], on June 4, extended his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an effort to convince American producers that they had been injured by imports which were alleged to have been the result of the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

I am glad to give credit where credit is due, consequently I am happy to note that in the RECORD for June 19, there was a rather frank admission by the gentleman that the June 4 contention might have been wrong.

In the June 19 statement he admits:

> The reductions already made have not resulted in widespread disaster to American economic conditions.

Then further on he confesses:

> Merely because the American market is not being flooded with the products of foreign countries does not mean that concessions made in rates of duty have not been unwise.

He expresses fear, however, that there may be injury sometime in the future.

Now, the whole implication of the gentleman's statement of June 4 was that the American market had been flooded with products of foreign countries. But in the statement of June 19 the gentleman was apparently afraid that some candidate who was not sympathetic with his point of view on trade agreements would be nominated on the Republican ticket, and that is just what happened. The gentleman turned out to be an excellent prophet. Without commenting on the contradictory foreign trade and tariff plank of the Republican platform at this time, I want to call attention to Mr. Willkie's repudiation of the position of every one of my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means on trade agreements. In spite of a side-stepping platform, what Mr. Willkie has done, or may do, many Americans have judged, and will continue to judge, Mr. Willkie on the following forthright statement from Fortune Magazine for April 1940:

> Now, obviously, it will not do for one great nation to become a free-trade country by itself. For the United States to erase its tariffs all at once would be ruinous to our people and many of our industries. The present Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, who is wise and temperate, realizes this. And so he adopted the reciprocal trade agreements as a step toward increasing our foreign business gradually. Under this policy the United States takes up the problem of tariffs with each country separately; lists the products that it would like to export; studies a similar list submitted by the other country; and then a deal is arranged, each country making such concessions as it can, with the least possible harm and most possible benefit to its own people. This agreement is then extended to apply to other countries too. What could be simpler or more in accord with common sense? What could be better qualified to benefit us, the people, as a whole? Of course, we have to make sacrifices. But the point is that, owing to the way the agreements are negotiated, the sacrifices are always, and should always be, less than the benefits gained. That is, we, the people, profit.
>
> We do not put much faith in the figures cited by the Republicans to show how damaging these Hull agreements have been or in the figures cited by the Democrats to show how profitable they have been. It may be years before conclusive results can be shown. But it is inconceivable to us that prosperity can be reestablished without any foreign trade. And it seems clear that if we are to have foreign trade it must be done on a reciprocal basis. We, the most successful people in the world at business and industry, know that there are two parties to every trade and that one cannot always profit at the expense of the other. It is of vital importance to us that the other party profit too.

I believe another of my Republican colleagues will be a prophet "in his own party." According to the newspapers, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] stated at Philadelphia that if Mr. Willkie should be nominated a number of Republican Congressmen would be defeated.

Since I have a real interest in the welfare of agriculture, I want to go into the gentleman's insertion in the RECORD of June 4 in more detail.

The gentleman starts out with the flat misstatement that—

> Eight years later, in 1940, we find that our foreign trade, instead of progressively improving, has steadily deteriorated under New Deal policies.

Now the truth is that in 1932 total United States foreign trade amounted to $2,934,000,000 of which $1,611,000,000 or 55 percent was exports. In 1939 United States foreign trade amounted to $5,496,000,000, a gain of 87 percent. Of the 1939 foreign trade $3,177,000,000 or 58 percent was in exports. Exports from the United States in 1939 were more than 97 percent higher than they were in 1932. That is how "our foreign trade has deteriorated under New Deal policies."

When the real facts are brought to light they explode—as they have exploded before—his assertions about the welfare of American farmers. In the attacks which he makes on the reciprocal trade agreements program, he has not had the courage to talk about the incomes that American farmers have received under that program. To dispel the smoke screen of deception which he is again trying to throw out, it really needs only two figures—the income of American farmers in 1932 in the last year of his administration, and the income in any year he chooses to select under the present administration since the trade-agreements program was inaugurated. In 1932 that income was $4,682,000,000, in 1939

it was $7,711,000,000, a gain of 65 percent. In the face of that gain, his handpicked statistics on a few imports cease to have any meaning. And those income figures can hardly be unknown to him because they have been called to his attention many times. If his concern for American farmers had any basis other than a partisan interest he would not continue to ignore facts and try to mislead his farmer constituents. Much of his outburst of June 4 is on the same level as the Republican talk, in 1936, about babassu nuts which Mr. Franklyn Waltman, Republican publicity director, so expertly ridiculed.

The gentleman from New York uses a tabulation of agricultural exports from this country, "competitive" agricultural imports, and the percentage which the latter are of the former, from 1932 through 1939. He professes to be horrified by the picture which he paints but he need not be horrified if he will only view the picture from the proper perspective. In 6 of the 7 years following 1932, despite the devastating droughts of 1934 and 1936, the agricultural exports of this country were greater than they were in the last year of his party's administration—1932.

The gentleman, in the process of being horrified about the effects of the trade-agreements program, lists 14 agricultural commodities or groups of commodities of which imports increased from 1932 to 1939. Unfortunately, for his inference that trade agreements caused increased imports, the tariff on 6 of these groups of commodities have never been touched—the tariffs on them remain at the levels that were fixed in the 1930 Tariff Act; so imports could not have been affected by the trade-agreements program, except insofar as the program has enhanced the ability of American farm and city consumers to buy these products. The 6 which he enumerates and on which no tariffs have been reduced under trade agreements are vegetable oils, flaxseed, clothing wool, unmanufactured cotton, canned beef, and hides and skins.

The other groups which represented something more than trade-agreement items were cheese, of which less than half comes in under duties reduced under trade agreements; imports of molasses which are controlled entirely by an import quota, and most of it is used by American farmers as an important feed for livestock, possibly even by the gentleman's dairy farmers; less than half of the imports of live cattle in 1939 came in under tariffs reduced under trade agreements. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] does not know this his informers have not performed their duty to him. Furthermore, the farm price of beef cattle in the United States and the farm cash income from beef cattle were higher in 1939 than they have been since 1929. Is this not an important fact omitted by the gentleman? Imports of sugar are controlled by quotas and enter under separate legislation. In addition to tariffs, benefit payments from the United States Government are paid to sugar producers. Why was this fact omitted? Is he in favor of paying the sugar producers less while increasing tariffs for other groups? Imports of nuts represent a negligible proportion of domestic consumption and are of kinds, grades, and varieties which do not directly compete with domestic production; imports of fodders and feeds and corn are made primarily for the benefit of farmers, such as the gentleman from New York has in his district; the only concession on corn was a nominal one granted exclusively to Cuba.

The gentleman seems to find in the fact that foreign countries have bought mostly the industrial goods which they need for their defense, an indictment of the trade-agreements program. He seems to expect that in the reciprocal trade-agreements program there was some aggressive and powerful force by which we should make foreign countries purchase the things we want them to purchase rather than the things they need to save their lives. Of course they have bought machinery, iron, and steel products, the paraphernalia of war, rather than agricultural products. It has been and is the philosophy of the trade-agreements program to facilitate the interchange between this country and other countries, of the things that both countries needed. There is no place in this program for forcing trade at the point of a bayonet. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] must know this, but he carefully avoids admitting it in his partisan attacks upon the trade-agreements program.

I want to revert to his confession of the "error of his ways," which appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 4018. After expressing great fear as to the possible "great flood" of imports which promises to be disastrous in the future, we find a ray of hope after November in the following words:

> Beyond that, they—
>
> Presumably Republicans—
>
> can proceed to correct such errors as do exist in the tariff structure by a proper revision to fit American conditions and world conditions which we know will exist at the conclusion of the disastrous wars now raging.

Is that the Republican promise and prophecy of another Hawley-Smoot Act which was such an important factor in causing the world depression, which in turn made conditions fertile for warring dictators?

The administration's proposal for greater commercial cooperation in the Western Hemisphere indicates that it is approaching world problems in a sane and constructive way. It is not so bankrupt of ideas that it can propose nothing but another war-provoking tariff orgy as the proper solution for the ills of the United States and the world.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask my colleagues to read the two articles which I have inserted in the RECORD today: One by Maj. Al Williams, entitled "Defense Program Not for Defense, Aviator Claims"; and the other a report on our military aid to Great Britain by the Commerce Department, entitled, "British Got Record Total of United States Arms in June." Both of these articles appeared in the Washington News, July 24, 1940.

The question arises in my mind as to the right of the administration to deplete our national defenses in order to help a foreign government. Surely such action is not only unneutral, but is in reality a direct effort by the administration to involve the United States in the present war on the side of the disintegrating British Empire.

No one should fail to realize that our present attitude toward Japan is an administration attempt to force the United States into war against Japan—which, of course, will aline us on the side of Great Britain. There is hardly any doubt of Japan joining the German-Italian alliance, and there is less doubt of the ultimate outcome of this conflict. The British Empire will lose, no matter what we do, and we should, therefore, look after our own defenses instead of jeopardizing our security by rendering aid to the international Jewish bankers, who have been using and abusing not only the British people but their nation as well as every nation in the world. We can only build a strong and sound America on the principles handed down to us by the founders of our Nation; and those principles are set forth in the Constitution of the United States. It is, therefore, time, as I have said before, that Congress awakens to the danger which now confronts our Nation and take such steps that will insure the welfare of our people and the security of our country. The first step is to impeach the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, for depleting and destroying our national defenses.

Congress has appropriated $15,000,000,000 to build defenses of the United States, and not those of foreign nations.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 24, 1940]

DEFENSE PROGRAM NOT FOR DEFENSE, AVIATOR CLAIMS

(By Al Williams)

Those who scream about the necessity for booming the defenses of the United States and at the same time ship airplanes, aerial machine guns, and mosquito warships to Europe are not going to get by this column.

The things now happening in this country are counterparts of things that have been put across on the peoples of Europe, in one form or another.

Each time I check the progress of our national rearmament program, I am informed by manufacturers of planes, engines, and munitions that they wonder whether we will be rearmed in time. "In time for what?" I ask. "Oh, for South America and the Japanese," they say.

URGES COMPLETE JOB

Well, my answer is that if we are rearming to defend the United States against invasion or aggression (which we are not, in my opinion) then there is time to do a complete job—with the aid of a definite plan. As proof that our "defense plan" is not for defense, I offer this evidence:

First, the administration smashed the 1939 Army Air Corps expansion program, whereby the Army was to have received about 3,000 planes by June 1941. Washington arbitrarily decided to shunt the production from that manufacturing program to the Allies. Those planes were flown from American soil, by hired civilian pilots (Americans), and were fully equipped with machine guns.

The Navy's standard dive bombers, the *SBC–4's*, were taken from the Navy and flown to Canada.

VERY VALUABLE

These Army and Navy planes are worth their weight in gold to the air-defense preparations of this country. But they were traded, sold, or pawned to foreign nations that had been doing the same thing with their own air-force planes from 1935 to 1939.

Every second line plane (and some of ours were not seconds) would have served for intermediate training of our young fighting pilots. We are woefully short of all types of miltary and naval planes, but the Army and Navy were stripped. Can you make that jibe with the hysteria about defense of America?

Will we be able to get ready militarily? For defense—yes. We have the time, and we may be able to develop enough potential sock in our forces. But we can't build military, naval, and air forces sufficient to keep pace with those who seem determined to get us into a foreign war.

That would mean developing forces and arming them well enough to fight the Japanese in Asia, someone else in South America, and still continuing to ship munitions to Europe. To manufacture weapons in those quantities we should have to discontinue all commercial business, scrap the career of every American man, woman, and child and turn the United States into a vast arsenal.

The second article to which I have referred; the report of the Commerce Department on our military aid to Great Britain, proves the statements of Major Williams. This gentleman has given timely advice before, similar to that given by Colonel Lindbergh and others. Why does not Congress heed the warnings of these men, who have the country's welfare at heart?

[From the Washington Daily News of July 24, 1940]

BRITISH GOT RECORD TOTAL OF UNITED STATES ARMS IN JUNE

The United Kingdom, bracing itself for "blitzkrieg," imported explosives, firearms, and ammunition valued at $23,000,000 from the United States in June, the Commerce Department revealed today.

These shipments compared with imports of only $300,000 in May and were believed to be the heaviest of their kind for any month since outbreak of war.

TOTAL OF SEVENTY-SEVEN MILLIONS

Arms exports represented nearly 30 percent of the value of all shipments to the United Kingdom in June. Preliminary figures show exports to the British aggregated $77,000,000, compared with $49,000,000 in May, and a monthly average of $51,000,000 during the first 9 months of the war.

Preliminary figures showed this country's world-wide exports in June totaled $344,000,000, a gain of approximately 8 percent over May. While the June shipments were 4 percent below the war peak of $360,000,000 reached last January, they were more than 40 percent larger than the average for the same month of the 3 immediately preceding years.

Exports for Canada and Latin America in June were the highest for any month of the war period and more than offset severely curtailed shipments to the Mediterranean area. Shipments to Canada were valued at $64,000,000, an increase of 8 percent over May. Those to Latin America totaled $71,000,000, an advance of 6 percent. The biggest gain—$4,000,000—was recorded in exports to Argentina.

Although trade with France fell off in the latter part of June, exports totaling $45,000,000—$8,000,000 more than in May—left the United States for France during the month.

What proportion entered French ports prior to the conclusion of the Franco-German armistice is not known.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say that Congress should investigate as to whether or not the 23 naval ships were released to Great Britain. It is my opinion that they were, as I view the picture on the front page of the Times-Herald of July 25, 1940. If this is true, and I have no reason to doubt the statement—let me now suggest that Congress take charge of this Government and eliminate those from public office who are responsible for the fiasco in which we find ourselves today.

The question may be asked, Has Congress capitulated to the Treasury Department, and is the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, now director and dictator of the United States? Has he superseded the President, or has he been appointed by the President to dispose of our armaments to foreign nations, so that we will be unprotected and open to invasion?

Let us look into the possibilities: Suppose that England, in an hour of stress, negotiated an agreement with Germany that a British empire should be established on the North American Continent, in what position would we be to defend ourselves against such aggression? Let us not forget that this was the dream of Carnegie and Cecil Rhodes that the United States should again become a part of the British Empire, and that is also a desire with which the international bankers are in accord. European trade and intrigue may place us just exactly in that position, and it is with that thought in view I maintain we should build our own defenses and let European nations shift for themselves. Our home is America, and it is our duty to consolidate the American Continent, in order to provide for our own security. We should, as I have said, take over Canada and all British and French islands, with the ultimate object of building an impregnable nation on the North American Continent.

Pertinent Questions of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to certain pertinent questions of today.

Was President Roosevelt drafted at the Chicago convention, or did he knowingly and willingly contrive to bring about his third-term nomination? Had the President's 3,500-word radio acceptance speech been prepared in advance, and if so, how long in advance of its delivery? Was the Chicago convention a boss-ridden convention, or was it "a free and open convention?" Is the President's claim that he is the only "experienced man" capable of steering the Nation through the present national crisis based upon facts?

These and many other similar questions are bothering great masses of sincere patriotic citizens today, both Republicans and Democrats. What does the record show?

The record shows a national debt bordering on bankruptcy; unemployment, after 7½ years of New Deal experiments, still around the ten million mark; the farm problem of parity prices still unsolved; our military unpreparedness so serious that it constitutes the major element of our present emergency crisis; a country divided into class-conscious groups, a national disunity brought about largely by name-callings indulged in by the President and his New Deal henchmen, Ickes, Jackson, Hopkins, and others; taxes the highest in the Nation's history; American business and industry shackled and handicapped by bureaucratic maladministration of the

N. L. R. A. and punitive taxation. Then, in addition to this list of New Deal failures, we must, in order to get the answer to our questions, consider the President's unsuccessful attempt to pack the Supreme Court, his unsuccessful attempt to reorganize the Federal Government on a basis that would have given the President the power of life and death over all Government agencies; and his unsuccessful attempt to purge life-long Democrats that opposed his Court-packing program.

Judging solely from the record, is the President the only man who can save the country in the present national emergency?

These are pertinent questions that must be answered. We should consult the record in order to arrive at correct answers. A decision must be made at the polls next November. I have faith to believe that the American people will render a proper decision.

A Footnote to the Democratic Convention's Lexicon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the attached article from the New York Times of July 24, 1940, by Arthur Krock is such an excellent footnote to the Democratic convention as to be eminently deserving of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times of July 24, 1940]

IN THE NATION—A FOOTNOTE TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION'S LEXICON

(By Arthur Krock)

A comparison between the contents of the parliamentary manual for the Democratic National Convention of 1940 with the text for 1936 suggests very strongly, if it does not completely prove, that the strategists in charge of the President's renomination drive made every provision to take out of quotation marks not only the "draft" but choice by "acclamation." That they failed is no fault of theirs, or of the President, who gave them the essential assistance of silent approval. The "draft" remained a build-up, and the "acclamation" was another pretense.

The comparison between the two convention manuals, both prepared by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, discloses that the following passage was added to the 1940 book:

"Acclamation is a unanimous viva voce vote and any objector may raise a point of order, but by long custom the chairman puts the question 'to suspend the rules and declare * * * nominated for President of the United States by acclamation.' The motion to nominate by acclamation is sometimes made before roll call starts (1888; 1916) and sometimes after roll call, in which a candidate has secured a nominating majority (1892; 1920)."

This, for the purposes of the record, turned out to be a very useful addition to the convention manual. In the official account it will accordingly appear that Mr. Roosevelt, who was actually nominated by acclamation in 1936, was similarly chosen in 1940, though the procedure in 1940 was the reverse of that in 1936. The official account, thanks to the added paragraph, will recite the record at the expense of both dictionary and facts.

From Philadelphia in 1936 a dispatch to this newspaper, dated June 27, described the actual process of acclamation as follows: "On motion of Governor Berry, of South Dakota, the rules were suspended and the roll call was dispensed with." Senator Robinson, the chairman, said that Philadelphia had "beaten Cleveland," where Mr. Landon, after a roll call and the registry of opposition, had been given a unanimous vote, which was accurately certified as such in the record and in the public accounts.

Aware of the difference, Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, in seconding Mr. Farley's motion to make the President's third nomination unanimous, used that word and not the other. When a similar motion was made to give a unit ballot to Secretary Wallace, after a roll call in which opposition had been recorded to his selection for second place on the ticket, the word "unanimous" and not the word "acclamation" again was used. But as the President, for the purposes of the strategists had to be "drafted," so the remainder of the game had to be played out if possible. And Mr. Farley assisted this in the following manner:

He had planned, according to the general custom, and in common parlance, to move to suspend the rules before the roll call was tallied and make renomination of Mr. Roosevelt unanimous. But Senator BYRNES, who was the President's floor leader in the "draft," informed him that the word "acclamation" was wanted and had the sanction of the manual. This Representative CANNON confirmed, showing Mr. Farley the most conveniently added passage. So, though Mr. Farley knew that acclamation after a roll call in which votes had been cast for others was not the accurate term as he understood it, or the process of Philadelphia, he obeyed the book.

When informed by this correspondent that the 1936 manual did not include the passage which had been shown to him, Mr. Farley was surprised.

This newspaper then sought to interview Representative CANNON in an effort to discover why the addition had been made. He said the manual is his own work "and not part of the Democratic rules." He said he compiled the book in order to cite precedents and to guide the convention in the interpretation and enforcement of the rules. He had this particular citation in mind this year because there were precedents on which it is based.

There is no such thing, continued Mr. Cannon, as nomination by acclamation under the rules, but in this instance it had been done by the Farley motion to suspend the rules. But why, he was asked again, did not this citation appear in the 1936 book, since the precedents mentioned existed when that book was prepared? Mr. Cannon declined to discuss the matter further.

The incident fits perfectly into the whole artificial structure at Chicago last week, whether or not Mr. Cannon made the addition with this in mind. For reasons which became more and more obvious and inescapable, Mr. Roosevelt was, of course, the overwhelming choice of the delegates and those leaders who had them selected. When they got to Chicago there was literally nothing else they could do unless the President issued a firm refusal to run again. But a "draft" means a spontaneous and unanimous call on a contrary-minded citizen, and none of these three adjectives describes what happened at Chicago. Likewise, "acclamation" means, as at Philadelphia, dispensing with a roll-call, suspending the rules, and giving a unanimous vote for someone.

The strategists proposed this course, and it failed. But by virtue of the convenient addendum to the manual they got the form of what they wanted.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from today's issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of July 25, 1940]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE PAPER SCHEMES

(By Walter Lippmann)

The paramount question is how soon, if ever, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie, or both, will begin to tell the people the truth about the national defense. The people are not being told the truth. They are being dazzled and diverted by grandiose authorizations, appropriations, contracts, plans, promises, and commitments. These are the easy things to which politicians invariably resort when they lack the resolution to do the hard and necessary things. Placed as we are in this country today, the supreme problem in foreign policy is to clarify and define the relationship of the United States to the British Commonwealth and to British sea power; the subject is treated by the politicians of both parties as unmentionable. Internally, the supreme problem of national defense is to increase rapidly the rate of industrial production in the munitions industries; since this cannot be done without inconvenience to everyone and without interfering with the vested interests of businessmen, trades-unions, and consumers, the subject is regarded by the politicians as untouchable.

Because we are drifting aimlessly and failing to define our foreign policy or seriously to organize the national defense, we are deceiving ourselves most dangerously by a series of paper schemes in which the second scheme covers up the defect of the first and the third scheme covers up the defect of the second.

The underlying paper scheme, our first and fundamental departure from the reality of America's vital interests, was the neutrality law. Even as amended last autumn, the law prevented the United States from acting to preserve in friendly hands the

naval control of our two-ocean frontiers; the neutrality law committed us to the immense gamble and the immeasurable risk of allowing British and French sea power to be destroyed, and of having, therefore, to let ourselves be isolated and compelled to defend ourselves in two oceans with one navy.

The conquest of France and the threat of the conquest of Britain tore a hole in the paper scheme of the neutrality law. The country reacted immediately. Thereupon, Congress and the administration pasted another piece of paper over the hole. They authorized another navy. But the hole of the paper navy was that it could not be constructed in less than 4 or 5 years, and that was an optimistic estimate. So over this hole in the scheme for a paper navy, another piece of paper has had to be pasted. A great army is to be authorized in order that we may be able to defend by land and air forces those vital positions in this hemisphere which the Navy alone, should Britain fall, is now unable to defend. But the great hole in this scheme for a paper army is that while a million men can be conscripted and given rudimentary drill, they cannot be equipped with modern weapons much before 1942–43.

For American industry and American labor are not now geared to produce these weapons rapidly, nor are serious and effective measures being discussed publicly, much less put into effect, to begin producing these weapons rapidly. Paper contracts are being signed. But the real task of putting the production of munitions ahead of everything else, ahead of private profit, private preferences, ahead of all peacetime reforms and all peacetime restrictions, has not begun. And neither political party and neither candidate has as yet dared to go to the people and tell them truthfully what sacrifices they must make if they are to translate any of these paper schemes into a dependable armed force.

The grim truth about the national defense is that by failing to use our whole diplomatic and economic power to insure ourselves against the conquest and collapse of the British Empire, we are compelled to authorize another navy which cannot be built before it may be needed, to authorize a great army which cannot be equipped before it may be needed, and to make pledges and commitments to our neighbors in this hemisphere which may not be valid if we lack the navy and the army to execute the pledges. And then, because the politicians are afraid to tell the people the truth, they are organizing the productive capacity of the country as if they had years of leisure ahead of them and as if no stringent measures were really necessary.

We are still going down the same road which all the other democracies have taken. We have not learned the plain lesson of their disasters. Our political leaders will not speak the truth for fear of shocking the voters. They will not speak the truth for fear that their opponents will make a demagogic attack upon them. They will not call capital to the colors; they are afraid to disturb the unawakened businessmen. They will not enlist labor for the national defense; they are afraid to ask the necessary sacrifices of hours, wages, and peactime restriction. They will not give the national defense priority over private consumption; they are afraid of the voting consumers.

They do not read the signs of the time; they read the Gallup polls. And they choose invariably those policies which promise much eventually and cost little immediately—as, for example, the promise of a two-ocean Navy and the promise of hemisphere defense. But they avoid the hard measures, such as coming to terms with the British nations because that would run into political prejudices, such as mobilizing capital and labor because that would call for real sacrifice to make real the big schemes.

It is difficult to imagine why any man should now wish to be elected President unless he had behind him an informed and awakened people. Does not experience show, the experience of Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier, that to assume responsibility without preparing the Nation for its task is to invite a national catastrophe and personal ruin? Elementary prudence, if nothing else, should make every candidate running for national office this year insist upon making the people realize what they must do to make themselves secure. For to be elected, and not to have told the people what will be necessary, is to accept an awful responsibility without making ready to meet it.

And so, though the immediate political risk of speaking the truth during the campaign is great, the political risk of not having spoken the truth will in the end be ever so much greater.

The Making of a Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR B. JENKS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, for the information and consideration of the voters of the First Congressional District of New Hampshire, I desire to include an address on The Making of a Representative, which was delivered on March 16, 1916, by the Honorable Champ Clark, then Speaker of the House of Representatives, before the Washington Press Club.

THE MAKING OF A REPRESENTATIVE—REMARKS OF CHAMP CLARK AT THE WASHINGTON PRESS CLUB THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1916

[Printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 17, 1916.]

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur, non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph of Roanoke in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate and General Jackson sent him to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the "top-notchers."

Let us take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served. I cannot name all, but will cite a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for length of service in the House in our entire history. In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker 8 years, only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr. Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, his sixteenth; Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr. Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr. Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr. Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth; Mr. Stephens, chairman of Indian Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Slayden, chairman of the Library, his twentieth; Mr. Henry, chairman of Rules, his twentieth; Mr. Lever, chairman of Agriculture, his sixteenth; Mr. Padgett, chairman of the Navy, his sixteenth; Mr. Lloyd, chairman of Accounts, his twentieth; and Mr. Sparkman, chairman of Rivers and Harbors, his twenty-second. There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that as a rule the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are old timers. The same thing holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillett and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth year, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairmen thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probability, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

New England and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have understood the value of long service all along, and, having elected a fairly good man to Congress, they keep him in the harness.

The Member of longest consecutive service is called the father of the House. Five Philadelphians in immediate succession bore that honorable title—Randall, Kelley, O'Neill, Harmer, and Bingham. Then it went to Mr. Dalzell, of Pittsburgh. When General Bingham announced the death of General Harmer, his immediate predecessor as "father of the House," he stated that the five Philadelphia "fathers of the House" had served a total of 147 years, and he served 8 or 10 years after the making that interesting statement.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the Speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth. These four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country.

The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them!

What has been true since the meeting of the First Congress under the Constitution of the United States in 1789 down to the days of Champ Clark is just as true today, as attested by an address entitled "There Is No Substitute for Experience," delivered on May 13, 1940, by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MARVIN JONES, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who stated, in part, as follows:

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly at this time in the interest of continuity of service in the Congress. As I am retiring from Congress at the end of the present term, I can speak without any thought of personal gain in the matter.

If a man is honest, if he has average or above-average ability and is industrious, then in fairness to him, in the best interest of his district and State as well as the Federal Government, his party at least should serve itself and honor him with renomination.

It has often been said that there is no substitute for experience. Under any system, ability plus experience is better than ability without experience. In no other field of service is this more clearly true than in the Congress of the United States. In addition, length of service gives one the advantage of seniority. Under the rules of the Congress, the majority-party Member who has served longest on any committee becomes the chairman of that committee.

Let me use my own State of Texas as an example of what continuous service of Members in Congress can mean. One of the finest and most beneficial traditions in Texas is that of returning her Representatives to the Congress. Much has been said in recent years of the power and prestige of the Texas delegation in the Congress. While I would not for 1 minute disparage the ability of my distinguished colleagues from Texas, I know from long years of experience and observation that such power and prestige as our delegation may possess comes more from years of service by the individual Members than from any other cause or causes. Other delegations get their effectiveness from the same source—long years of service and experience by its Members in the Congress.

In the House of Representatives we have 47 standing committees. Texas, with 21 Members in the lower House, holds 5 of these chairmanships. She is exceeded only by the Empire State of New York, which has 45 Members in the lower House and holds 6 chairmanships. Texans acquired these positions largely through years of service. SAM RAYBURN, majority leader from Texas, has served in the Congress for 27 years. HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has served in the Congress for 27 years. It has been my privilege to be chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I have served in the Congress for 23 years. JOSEPH MANSFIELD, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, has served in the Congress for 23 years. FRITZ LANHAM, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has served in the Congress for 21 years. ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 3, is an exception to the rule, having served in the Congress only 4 years. Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, has served in the Congress for 23 years. Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, has served in the Congress for 37 years. Both Senators have outstanding records and are chairmen of important Senate committees. Then, our distinguished Vice President, JOHN GARNER, of Texas, has served in the Congress for 38 years. Two Texans hold positions next to the chairmanship—LUTHER JOHNSON on Foreign Affairs and EWING THOMASON on Military Affairs. Other Texans hold high positions on major committees. These positions are held by Texans because Texas has kept these men in Congress.

The same story is true of the Nation generally.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, dean of the House and chairman of the Committee on Rules, has served 33 years. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has served 31 years. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has served 29 years; CARL VINSON, chairman of Naval Affairs, 27 years; HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, 25 years; CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 23 years; MILTON A. ROMJUE, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, 21 years; JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, 19 years; SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, 17 years. This is true of all the important chairmanships in the House.

These men are all highly respected and greatly beloved. Their experience in the Congress makes their services invaluable.

Before leaving the subject of seniority as a prerequisite to the important positions of committee chairman, let us note the average period of service in the Congress of the committee chairmen from other States. The six chairmen from the State of New York have served an average of 12 years; the four committee chairmen from Missouri an average of 13 years; the four committee chairmen from Illinois an average of 16 years; the three committee chairmen from North Carolina an average of 21 years; and the three committee chairmen from California have served an average period of 12 years.

I think it might be well, also, to examine some individual committees over a period of years to see how important continuous service in the Congress has been. Let us examine 4 of the most important committees of the House for a period covering the last 40 years. During the last 40 years 8 men have served the Ways and Means Committee as chairman. These 8 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of more than 22 years each. Their average period of service before becoming chairman of the committee was 17 years. During the last 40 years 8 men have served the Judiciary Committee as chairman. These 8 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of more than 18 years each. Their average period of service before becoming committee chairman was 12 years. During the last 40 years 10 men have served the Rules Committee as chairman. These 10 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of 25 years each. Their average period of service before becoming chairman of the committee was 18 years. During the last 40 years 12 men have served the Appropriations Committee as chairman. These 12 men have averaged serving in the Congress for a period of 22 years each. Their average period of service before becoming chairman of the committee was more than 16 years. * * *

The most able American writers on government have expressed themselves in similar vein. In James Albert Woodrum's book The American Republic and Its Government, published in 1916, we find this statement:

"The most distinguished congressional leaders are those who have sat for long terms by successive reelections."

Frederic A. Ogg and Ray P. Orman, in their able text, Introduction to American Government, in speaking of Members of the House, state:

"Nowadays it is widely conceded that the term is not too long, but too short. The average person elected to the House for the first time has no acquaintance with the assembly's methods of doing business, has had no legislative experience—except possibly in a State legislature or a city council—and has only a superficial knowledge of the public affairs with which Congress is called upon to deal. Elected for only 2 years he cannot progress far toward becoming a useful Member, much less a leader, before his term expires."

Munro, in his book, The Government of the United States, published in 1923, says:

"Seniority in service determines the chairmanship of important committees. * * * There are few walks of life in which experience counts for more than in politics. No one comes to Congress with an intuitive knowledge of what to do. The new Member is handicapped by the complexity of the rules and by a natural disinclination to push himself too far forward until he has acquired a sure footing."

While these things were true yesterday they are even more true today. While continuous service and experience were valuable in the legislative service of yesterday it is more valuable in the legislative service of today. Legislative experience becomes important in exact proportion to the expansion of business and the consequent activity of government to fit our expanded commerce. At the turn of the century most of the business and commerce of the country were within the limits of the respective States. Now much of it crosses State lines and has become a subject with which the National Government must deal.

Perhaps this increased responsibility, this growing complexity, is responsible for much of the complaint that one hears throughout the country in recent years that Congress has delegated to executive agencies too much of its power, too many of its prerogatives. Fear has been expressed that a proper balance as between the three branches of our Government no longer exists, that the system of checks and balances so wisely designed by our founding fathers is being destroyed, that the legislative branch of our Government is being dominated and controlled by the executive branch. The only way in which Congress can retain all of its powers, the only way in which it can escape domination by the executive branch of the Government, the only way in which it may serve successfully as a proper check upon the other branches of the Government is to retain at all times a large membership of experienced legislators.

A great American laid down a proper test for officeholders in a democracy as follows: Is he capable, is he honest, is he faithful to the Constitution? If a Member qualifies by this yardstick, then for all the reasons above discussed, and for many more, he should be reelected and reelected to that greatest legislative body in the world—the American Congress. [Applause.]

Under the rules governing the House of Representatives, seniority—length of continuous service—is an important factor in the opportunity for usefulness of any Member of Congress to his district, State, and the Nation.

With the exception of the last 6 days, I served as the Representative of the First Congressional District of New Hampshire throughout the three sessions of the Seventy-fifth Congress (January 5, 1937–June 9, 1938) and I am now completing my second term (January 3, 1939–January 3, 1941) as the Representative of that district.

During my tenure as a Member of Congress, I have served on the Committees on Labor, Naval Affairs, the Post Office and Post Roads, and War Claims.

The importance and prestige of the State of New Hampshire, like that of any other State, can grow and expand in the National Legislature only through the continuous and uninterrupted service of its Representatives in Congress.

The 1940 Drought Conditions in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have noticed the reports in the Washington papers of the intense heat in Nebraska. I think that the Congress should know that in addition to this intense heat many communities in Nebraska are suffering from a severe drought. This is not a drought of 1 year's duration. In some instances it is the seventh consecutive crop failure due to drought conditions.

I have taken this matter up with the Administrators of the Federal Works Agency, the Surplus Marketing Administration, the Farm Security Administration, and the National Youth Administration. I have also submitted to them a memorandum briefly setting forth certain facts pertaining to the situation in Nebraska. I feel that Congress should have those facts also. I therefore wish to include in my remarks that memorandum.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the conversation had with you recently I would like to submit these facts concerning the drought situation in Nebraska. I trust that it may have sympathetic consideration and that whatever is done may be done without too much delay.

The drought conditions in Nebraska are no less than terrible. It is true that there are spots that have had a fair crop this year, but many, many of the communities were faced with a complete and total crop failure. No one really knows how much actual poverty and want and distress prevails throughout the State. Three or four years ago the situation was bad, but these crop failures have been consistent. Some of these communities are now facing their seventh failure. The drought, dust storms, grasshoppers, intense heat, and in some portions floods have created hardship among the people that can no longer be borne.

Last year a number of the Nebraska counties were designated as drought-stricken counties. This year the same situation prevails and in some counties it is more pronounced.

Billions of dollars are being spent on national defense. We have no quarrel with this, but I wish to call your attention to the fact that out in the plains country of the Middle West there will be little expenditures of any great extent for national defense that will furnish employment and relieve the distress. The result is that this territory needs more assistance while some territories benefited by the defense program will need less.

The point I wish to make is that there are hundreds, yes, thousands, of families who have never been on relief that are actually hungry and in need of many things. Many of these people are too proud to let their condition be known. The most of them were during the predepression days what was known as the middle class. They have always been self-sustaining, but they are now completely without resources. Upon this so-called middle class has fallen the heaviest burden of the prolonged drought, crop failures, and depression. I appeal to you to direct some new and different attention to this group.

I believe that representatives of the various agencies should call upon the local officials in each county of the drought territory and ask their cooperation to resurvey the problem. I am satisfied that you could get fine, honest, sincere, and conscientious people who would be willing to serve on these lay committees without pay. These local committees, accompanied by representatives of your agencies, should investigate every township.

If upon investigation there are families who have never received any help whatever and need help it should be given to them. If there are wasteful people receiving help and spending money for nonessentials that situation should be corrected. I am convinced, however, that you will find the vast majority of Nebraskans honest people.

There has been criticism of relief and the administration of that relief. But all America wants the worthy destitute and poor adequately taken care of. I believe the situation in many parts of Nebraska is tragic and I feel that an effort should be made to ascertain what the need is and supply that need. I do hope that you will see fit to make use of local communities and that this problem will have your immediate attention.

Very respectfully yours,

CARL T. CURTIS, M. C.

Hon. Marvin Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in a little while we in this Congress and the American farmers are to lose one of the greatest exponents and defenders of the causes that activate American agriculture that has ever come before the American people.

At the same time the Committee on Agriculture is to lose the greatest chairman it ever had. An estimable, courteous, honorable scholar and statesman is to answer the roll in the House of Representatives for the last time.

The judiciary is about to wrap about the shoulders of our beloved friend, the gentleman from Texas, MARVIN JONES, the robe of a judge of the United States Court of Claims. Every man in this House rejoices in the honor that has come to him.

Mr. Speaker, while the legislative branch of our Government thus loses one of its most useful, trusted, and brilliant leaders, I cannot help but feel that the judicial branch is to receive one of the most beloved, impartial, dispassionate, honorable, equitable, and upstanding men who has ever been appointed to the bench of our country. I know that some day he will grace the bench of the Supreme Court itself.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter I have written to our beloved colleague from Texas, the Honorable MARVIN JONES, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of this House, expressing my own and I believe the sentiments of every Member of this body at the termination of his work among us.

God bless and keep MARVIN JONES.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 24, 1940.

The Honorable MARVIN JONES, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MARVIN: Believe me when I say that your every friend in both Houses of Congress was made happy when, sometime ago, the President summoned you to serve as judge of the Court of Claims of these United States.

Your colleagues in this House were not surprised, however, when shortly after your appointment to that high office the President saw fit to ask that you temporarily retain your seat in Congress, both to aid and direct the then-pending agricultural legislation before the House. One and all felt, as did the President, that great as are the virtues that characterized you for high office in the judiciary, still more pressing were the problems having to do with the well-being of our farmers which confronted the Congress.

It is universally conceded that nowhere in all the land was there a legislator so thoroughly grounded in the problems of the American farmers' legislation as your own good self. Much as I respect the abilities of my good friend who will succeed you as the chairman of the powerful Committee on Agriculture, I repeat with the sage of old:

"Let others hail the rising sun!
I bow to him whose work is done."

We are now fast approaching the end of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. We who sit in this body realize that we are about to lose to our Committee on Agriculture and to the

entire Congress the greatest chairman who ever presided over the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

I want you to believe that I do not speak these words out of any sense of loyalty to you, long my personal friend. Rather I would have you know that I speak them solely in truth and in candor. Moreover, I would have you know that in doing so I bespeak the sentiments and feelings of every Member of this House, sitting in all parties and on both sides of the aisle.

The manner in which you have conducted your committee, as well as your leadership on the floor, prove well that MARVIN JONES has never been a blind partisan nor blindly sectional on any question of American agriculture. Howsoever long it may be my privilege to represent my district in this body, I know I shall always treasure the friendships I made in this House. In you I found the friendship of a gallant, courteous American, a true Southern gentleman, one who will here be remembered as one of the finest, squarest, and most honorable men whose name has ever illumined the pages of the history of our country.

Even though your appointment was long since confirmed by the Senate of the United States, you have continued to serve in this House at the request of the President, and at a personal sacrifice to yourself. Happy am I to have seen you realize the goal which you set out to achieve in behalf of our farmers. We all hate to see you leave this Chamber, much as you merit the surcease from the arduous labor, as well as the high honors and higher duties to which you have been called.

Need I point the economic repercussions upon our farmers which must inevitably flow out of the bloody strife now carried on beyond the oceans which wash our every coast line? I cannot help but feel that with the exports of our surplus agricultural products further threatened by the economic, as well as political, penetration, which will surely follow the drone of bombers as they roar out of their hangars, that we will need the wisdom of your counsel more today in this Congress than ever before.

This Nation, like every other nation, is crying out for more men like MARVIN JONES. They need them to serve their people in every capacity of life. Today, as never before, we in America especially need:

"Tall men, sun crowned, who lived above the fog,
In public duty and in private thinking!
Men whom the lust of office does not kill.
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy.
Men who possess opinions and a will.
Men who have honor! Men who will not lie."

Such a man you have proven yourself on every occasion. In all the years you have walked among us, you have taught us, not by words alone, but by deeds and in action, that we were but the servants of our people, their representatives here in Congress to do their every bidding, and solely for the common good.

The world knows full well, that the door of your office has been, ever and always, open to men of every political faith, creed, or opinion. Patient, tolerant, and always helpful, it has made little difference to you whether the one who came to seek your help was a black, who farmed a few acres of cotton in the forks of our Alabama creeks, or the accredited representative of a militant organized American agriculture.

Your colleagues in this House have long known that to you, farming is but a principle of living—a mode of life. We further know that your duty in this Congress, as you saw it, has always been to the dirt-root farmers of America. Your accomplishments, in behalf of American agriculture, will forever stand as living symbols of your devotion to their cause.

Through all the years that will come, you will be remembered in every little cabin in the cotton of our great Southland. In the great cornfields of the Mississippi Valley they know you for your indefatigable labors. The fruits of those labors will long be reflected in the happiness and the greater abundance that will come to those who harvest the grain on the far-flung prairies of our great western country.

Your name, standing there as a pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, will be spoken every hour of each succeeding day by every man who gains his livelihood from the soil.

As a result of your agricultural leadership, our farmers have won a long list of notable victories. Among these were the fight for the conservation of our soils, the achievement of a parity of price to our farmers, and the reduction in the rates of interest on farm loans. Your never-ending battle for reduced freight rates on agricultural commodities, your struggle to liberate, if not eradicate, the blight of the currently obnoxious system of tenancy and sharecropping, your struggle for the establishment of the regional laboratories to find new uses for our surplus agricultural products, these and a score of other beneficencies achieved in behalf of American agriculture have pointed the way to a new life to the people of our farm sides.

Though you step out of the legislative to assume your new duties in the judicial branch of our Government, you will long be remembered in this Chamber for your gracious manner, your kindly counsel, your wisdom, justice, equity, square dealing, and innate sense of decency. These have endeared you to your every colleague.

Be assured, friend MARVIN, that we are going to miss you mightily. The little office, where you long burned the midnight oil, is going to miss you. Your committee and your every colleague is going to miss your leadership.

When the sun goes down on that last day you sit with us in regular session, and when, with your accustomed books and papers under your arm, we see you walk down the little path leading from the Nation's Capitol to the House Office Building, every Member of this Congress, Republican and Democrat alike, will say in truth:

"Before God, there walks a man."

I am hoping, however, MARVIN, that you will come back often, not only to give us your advice, but to have you near will be an inspiration to work harder and do more, not only for the farmers, but for all of the people of this Nation.

That God may bless and keep you, now and always, is the sincere wish of

Your friend and admirer.

Chattanooga Honors Mayor Ed Bass Upon His Completion of 25 Years of Service to His City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, during these turbulent and changing times, it is so infrequent that an official of a sizable and expanding city renders 25 years of continuous service and after that time is honored by his fellow citizens, that I feel an occasion of this kind is worthy of recognition in the official record of Congress. This is the case of Hon. Ed Bass, the mayor of Chattanooga.

During this 25 years Chattanooga has grown from a city of 65,000 to one of more than twice that population. There have been many bitter issues and sharp disputes during these 25 years. At times substantial groups of citizens have complained that Mayor Bass was not progressive enough. At other times citizens have complained that he was too progressive. The fact that Mayor Bass has survived politically, and has stayed in the public eye, and has now been paid a spontaneous tribute by the citizens of his city, speaks highly of his efficiency, honesty, and diligence as a public servant. During all these controversial years no one has questioned the integrity and ability of Chattanooga's mayor.

In an address of response to the hundreds of Chattanoogans who met to honor him on the start of the twenty-sixth consecutive year in the city's service, Mayor Bass said, "It is a proud moment to receive an honored trust, but it is a prouder moment to have those who trust you tell you that you have kept the faith." This is indeed an attitude and position that men in public life should attempt to deserve, and it would be a happy moment in the life of any public official to be able to make this statement after 25 consecutive years of public service. The Chattanooga papers all carried tributes to the mayor on their editorial page. I ask unanimous consent to include herein a short statement appearing in the Hamilton County Herald, published by Hon. Will Shepherd, which succinctly describes Chattanooga's tribute to its honored and distinguished mayor.

BEAUTIFUL TRIBUTE TO MAYOR ED BASS

(By Will Shepherd)

It's mighty nice when a man serves in public office over a course of 25 years and upon such an anniversary to witness an extemporaneous outpouring of his people eager to do him honor. That was exactly Mayor Bass' experience Wednesday noon at the Patten Hotel when well over 300 of his friends, all of a single mind and accord, assembled themselves together for the purpose of paying him honor. It was indeed an extemporaneous and voluntary outburst of admiration and respect that the citizenship of this city paid to its faithful servant, after a service of a quarter of a century. The affair was unique in its character. The announcement was merely made that the chamber of commerce proposed to sponsor a luncheon in honor of Mayor Bass upon the completion of his twenty-fifth year as a city official. That, and nothing more; no effort was made to ballyhoo a great crowd. Luncheon tickets were placed on sale at the Patten and at the chamber of commerce, which is the usual and regular routine for such affairs. The people responded far beyond the expectations of the chamber of commerce. All seats in the ballroom of the hotel were quickly taken. The luncheon crowd overflowed to the red room and filled that space, and even many people who desired to have a part in the commemoration were turned away and failed to even get into the room.

Will History Repeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

ARTICLE BY R. E. PRESCOTT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in one of the small towns of my district there lives a man named R. E. Prescott. He owns, publishes, and edits the Alcona County Herald. This publication serves the need of the lively little town of Lincoln, Mich., and the people of the surrounding countryside. Its editorial column is quoted freely by great metropolitan newspapers.

Mr. Prescott, who writes under the pseudonym "Peck," is not only an editor. He is also poet, philosopher, and historian. He is a disciple of Isaac Walton. He loves the lakes and the streams of the country in which he lives. He deliberately buried a highly successful newspaper and literary career because he loved the great out-of-doors and the denizens thereof. He is a keen student and analyst of world affairs, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including herewith an editorial by this distinguished gentleman.

AS WE SEE IT UP IN THE STICKS—WILL HISTORY REPEAT?

(By "Peck")

Again the war lords come to grips and grim destruction rages to write a tragic paragraph in history of the ages. Steel monsters belch forth flame and shell, death's wings the air lanes scour, and thousands die to gratify inhuman lust for power.

And fleeing helplessly before the dread invaders' might go women, children, aged folks. Unbroken day and night an endless stream flows ceaselessly, bowed down in fear and sorrow. Death's hordes pursuing them today, hope vanished for the morrow.

Shell pits, bestrewed with war's debris, in valley and on hill. Stark, mangled corpses dot the land, the grist of war god's mill. Red smoking ruins mark the sites of city and of town. The light of reason flickers out and darkness settles down. Unbridled passion reigns unchecked, by dogs of war released, the only law the ethics of the vicious jungle beast, and groans of dying mingle with exultant victors' cheers, as Mars sets back the hand of time at least a thousand years.

Do times like these which try men's souls, and all but hope is gone, portend the end or are they but the dark before the dawn? Will gains humanity has made be held as heritages, providing peace and happiness for those of future ages? Must human freedom's cause succumb to reign of blood and steel and peoples writhe in slavery beneath dictator's heel?

On Flanders' field white crosses stand and crimson poppies grow where brave men fought and died in vain two short decades ago. Again upon old battlefields the tramp of marching feet awakens echoes of the past. Will history repeat, and light of liberty emerge from darkness of the night and through deep carnage and travail defeat brute force and might?—R. E. Prescott in Detroit Free Press.

Never in the history of the United States has the Fourth of July held more significance than in the year of our Lord 1940.

A quarter of a century ago, after an election in which the slogan "He kept us out of war" was a deciding factor, we allowed ourselves to be shanghaied into a European conflict to "make the world safe for democracy."

Slogans may win elections. They don't win wars.

For our altruism then we were repaid with thousands of white crosses on foreign battlefields, thousands of blinded, maimed, and crippled veterans, a pension roll of millions of dollars yearly, the repudiation of billions of dollars in foreign loans, and the bitter enmity of all—foes and allies alike.

Will history repeat?

During the past few months we have seen governmental policy shift from determined neutrality to active participation in everything but the actual hostilities on European battlefields; we have heard an ambassador openly advocate war and as Chief Executive assume the prerogatives of Congress and promise, at present, everything but soldiers to the Allies.

Meanwhile propaganda machines and high Government officials have worked overtime to create a war hysteria. So far has this gone that Senator WHEELER, stalwart Democrat though he is, threatens withdrawal from his party.

And those who counsel calmness and caution are branded as "fifth columnists" and Nazi sympathizers.

A vast majority of the people of the United States are in sympathy with the Allied cause and approve of giving them every material aid; a vast majority favor, at whatever sacrifice it may entail, the expenditure of any amount of money necessary to make this country so strong on land, sea, and in the air that no nation or combination of nations will dare to invade it. This is shown by national surveys of public opinion.

But, whatever their sympathies, a vast majority of the people are opposed to the militarizing of American manpower and resources except in the defense of American homes on American soil, and are unalterably opposed to sending our youth abroad as sacrifices to the imbecility of a European diplomacy which permitted, unopposed, the building of the Frankenstein monster which now threatens their destruction.

With the so-called democratic nations of Europe crumbling one by one under the merciless wheels of the totalitarian Juggernaut; with hotbeds of nazi-ism, fascism, communism, and other foreign "isms" openly flourishing in other nations of this hemisphere, and only thinly veiled in this country, thanks to tacit if not open encouragement by the Government; with the national debt already exceeding constitutional limitations, and much of this huge debt contracted in profligate spending upon nebulous social experiments and the building of a political empire, and deficit financing, even for peacetime needs, the accepted method of operation; with war more than a possibility and the country's defenses—neglected while we chased social rainbows in a madly rearming world—tragically inadequate—not what we have "on order," but what we have—this country needs practical, cool heads and steady hands at the helm of the ship of state if we are to remain solvent and stay out of war.

And, facing bitter facts, we haven't got them—now.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

LETTER FROM NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter signed jointly by the President of the National Guard Association of the United States and the President of the Adjutant Generals' Association of the United States, and sent to the Honorable Henry L. Stimson under date of July 9, 1940. The National Guard is an important component of the Army of the United States. The members of the National Guard deserve great credit for preparing themselves for filling the important place as a part of our first line of defense. It is to be regretted that any reports in any way reflecting upon the Guard should have been circulated. The letter gives the lie to such reports, and reassures us as to the condition of readiness and willingness of the National Guard to do whatever may be imposed upon it in our national-defense program. The letter follows:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1940.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to the attention of the executive council and legislative committee of the National Guard Association of the United States and the executive committee of the Adjutants General Association of the United States, assembled in executive session this date in Washington, that many unfounded, false, and malicious reports have been circulated concerning the state of mind and readiness of the National Guard to take its proper place in accordance with its purpose, its oath, and its desire.

Deliberate misrepresentations, savoring of "fifth column" activities, as to the attitude of the officers and men of the National Guard toward emergency plans for the defense of this country have been made.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding on your part or in the minds of the people of the United States, or the National Congress, or in any other agencies concerned, as to the attitude of the National Guard, the aforementioned organizations representing the National Guard of the United States do here state in the most emphatic manner possible that the National Guard stands ready

and willing to enter into the service of the United States, as provided in the National Defense Act, today, tomorrow, or at any time the President of the United States sees fit to use the National Guard in the defense of this country.

The National Guard does here and now reaffirm its traditional position on matters pertaining to national defense and desires to pledge to you and the War Department its fullest and most complete cooperation for the development and training of the land forces of the United States, of which it is a component, to meet the emergency that now confronts our country and our people.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER A. DELAMATER,
Brigadier General, New York, President, National Guard Association of the United States.

CHAS. H. GRAHL,
Brigadier General, Iowa, President, Adjutants General Association of the United States.

Alaska Legislation in Seventy-sixth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, it now appears plain that Congress will remain in session for a considerable length of time. Matters now before this body vitally affecting the national defense require thorough consideration and will probably result in legislation.

Accordingly, although this session of Congress is evidently not nearing its end, it seems desirable to make a statement of the legislation enacted or considered by the Seventy-sixth Congress having particular reference to the Territory of Alaska.

Since March 4, 1933, I have enjoyed the high honor of representing the people of the Territory of Alaska in the House of Representatives. Recently I made an examination of the records of the several Congresses in which I have served as to legislation for Alaska. I find that since March 4, 1933, Congress has enacted 106 special laws concerning Alaska, covering a wide range of subjects. This list does not, of course, include general laws of Congress concerning the States as well as the Territory of Alaska, from which Alaska has largely benefited, such as the several rivers and harbors and flood-control acts which resulted in so much good to the Territory, and the general appropriation acts, both regular and emergency, in which Alaska has shared with the rest of the Nation.

During the present Seventy-sixth Congress there have been enacted 16 individual bills for Alaska, a list of which follows:

INVESTIGATION OF ALASKA FISHERIES

House Resolution 162 provides for an investigation of the fisheries of Alaska. That investigation, which was a thorough one, considering limitations of time, has already resulted in distinct benefit to the fishermen and the fishing industry of Alaska, and there is promise for additional benefits in the future.

RIVER-BOAT EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

H. R. 2178 amends the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act by providing retirement compensation for those employees of the Alaska Railroad who are employed on the river boats, owned and operated by the Alaska Railroad, thus granting retirement rights to a number of deserving employees of the railroad. Public Law No. 320.

KETCHIKAN WATER SUPPLY

H. R. 2413 places in reserve the water-supply basin or area of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, thus protecting it from contamination. Public Law No. 240.

ALASKA RAILROAD RETIREMENT

H. R. 2642 amends the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act by providing for designation of beneficiaries. Public Law No. 323.

POWERBOAT SERVICE ALONG ALASKA PENINSULA

H. R. 2748 (S. 882) makes special provision for powerboat service along the Alaska Peninsula between Seward and Unalaska and thence to Bristol Bay and Good News Bay by enabling the Postmaster General to require that the boat carrying mail be also of sufficient capacity to transport a reasonable number of passengers and a reasonable amount of freight. The purpose of the bill was to take care of a very serious condition arising from the award of a mail contract to a small boat which was not large enough to take care of passenger and freight traffic. After the enactment of the bill Congress appropriated $125,000 for the purpose and it is anticipated that the improved service will be put into operation at an early date, thus furnishing facilities for needed transportation to the residents of the Alaska Peninsula, Aleutian Islands, Bristol Bay, and Good News Bay area. Public Law No. 363.

SALE OF TIMBER ON SCHOOL LANDS

H. R. 3025 provides authority for the sale of the timber and mineral products on school lands in Alaska. Public Law No. 314.

RIGHT-OF-WAY THROUGH CHILKOOT BARRACKS

H. R. 3795 grants a right-of-way for a pipe line through Chilkoot Barracks for distributing oil needed for the town of Haines, Alaska. Public Law No. 348.

ALASKA TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE

H. R. 4776 does three things: (1) Changes the date of meeting of the Alaska Territorial Legislature from the second to the fourth Monday in January of each odd-numbered year; (2) authorizes special sessions of the legislature to continue in session 30 days instead of 15 days as heretofore; and (3) authorizes the Governor to call such special sessions of the legislature upon 15 days' notice instead of 30 days' as formerly, and also authorizes that notice of such special session shall be given by telegram or radiogram, as well as by letter or other writing. Public Law No. 457.

REFUND OF BONDED MUNICIPAL INDEBTEDNESS

H. R. 5919 authorizes the cities of Alaska to refund their bonded indebtedness and thus secure the benefit of lower rates of interest. The city of Juneau has already taken advantage of this act and refunded certain of its bonded indebtedness on such advantageous terms that the interest savings alone will over the course of years equal the total amount of the indebtedness thus refunded. Public Law No. 403.

POSTMASTERS TO ADMINISTER OATHS

H. R. 6114 authorizes postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths in certain cases. This legislation is of great advantage in the more thinly settled parts of Alaska where notaries public or other officers authorized to administer oaths are not available. Public Law No. 294.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO TOWN OF WRANGELL

H. R. 7612 authorizes the transfer from fund "C" of the District Court of the First Judicial Division of the Territory of Alaska of the sum of $6,092.76 to the town of Wrangell. Under the Federal tax laws applying in Alaska certain taxes collected within any incorporated town or city are paid into the treasury of such town or city and is therefor available for use by the town or city for municipal purposes. However, in the event the taxpayer fails to pay the tax due there is no provision in the law for the collection of the tax, but the law provides instead that the taxpayer may be indicted and tried in a criminal action for nonpayment of the tax and, if convicted, the fine imposed shall be equal to the amount of the tax. However, the fine so imposed does not go to the town treasury where it would go if paid as a tax, but is instead paid into fund "C" of the district court. A certain fish-packing company situated in the town of Wrangell failed to pay its license tax in the amount mentioned and was thereupon convicted in the district court for nonpayment of the tax and a fine in that amount was imposed upon the company, which it thereafter paid to the district court. Justice and equity required that the money be transferred to the town of

Wrangell in lieu of the unpaid tax. Hence, the legislation. Public Law No. 458.

PAYMENT OF FUNDS COLLECTED BY DISTRICT COURTS FOR NONPAYMENT OF LICENSE TAXES

H. R. 7634 (S. 3491) is a general law to cover such conditions as are described above with respect to H. R. 7612 and authorizes in every such case that the funds paid into the district courts as fines in criminal cases for nonpayment of license taxes shall be paid to the several towns or cities of Alaska, to which such taxes are due. Public Law No. 618.

CLERICAL EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

H. R. 8046. When the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act was passed the clerical employees were exempt from the retirement benefits thereof and were given instead the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act. That led to confusion and by the bill, H. R. 8046, all of the Alaska Railroad employees, including the clerical employees, are now enjoying the superior advantages of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act. Public Law No. 680.

EXEMPTION OF TROLLERS FROM WEEKLY CLOSED SEASON

H. R. 8172. This act exempts trollers of Alaska from the provisions of the weekly closed season. Trollers by reason of the very nature of their work are obliged to be absent from the fishing grounds for at least 36 hours a week in any event, a period equal to the weekly closed season. Moreover, they are frequently off the fishing grounds for days at a time on account of weather conditions. The application of the weekly closed season compelled all trollers to be in port between 6 o'clock Saturday night and 6 o'clock Monday morning. This led to congestion and much inconvenience and served no useful purpose. By the provisions of H. R. 8172, they are now exempt from the weekly closed season provisions of the law, but the Secretary of the Interior still has the authority by regulation to declare and enforce any closed seasons which may be necessary for conservation of salmon. Public Law No. 709.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGES

H. R. 9021 (S. 3650). This bill extends to Alaska the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act requiring that the prevailing rate of wages be paid on all public works in the territories of Alaska and Hawaii. Public Law No. 633.

R. O. T. C. AT UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

H. R. 9391 authorizes the formation and training of a Reserve Officers' Training Corps infantry unit at the University of Alaska with a minimum of 50 members instead of a minimum of 100 members as required by general law. The bill supports the program for national defense by permitting the University of Alaska to participate in the training of Reserve officers. Public Law No. 714.

EXEMPTION OF SMALL BOATS FROM CREW-REQUIREMENTS TREATY

H. R. 2641. This bill was not enacted but an almost identical bill introduced by the gentleman from Maryland, Representative AMBROSE J. KENNEDY, was passed instead. Under a treaty known as Draft Convention No. 53, all vessels, unless exempted by local law, were required to carry licensed captains, mates, engineers, and assistant engineers. The treaty, however, further provided that any country might by law exempt from the provisions of the treaty vessels under 200 tons. It would be obviously impossible to require every small fishing vessel to carry a licensed captain, mate, engineer, and assistant engineer and, therefore, the passage of the legislation mentioned was necessary. I am listing this among the Alaska bills passed because it is so vital to the welfare of the fishermen of Alaska and because of the fact that I introduced and urged for passage one of the several similar bills covering the same subject. It is not included, however, in the total number of bills enacted during the Seventy-sixth Congress for Alaska only.

OTHER LEGISLATION PENDING

A number of other bills especially affecting Alaska are now pending before Congress and it is hoped to secure passage of many, if not all, of them before Congress adjourns. A list of such bills follows:

VALIDATION OF MATANUSKA HOMESTEADS

H. R. 3695 is a bill to validate certain sections in the Matanuska Valley reserved by law for school purposes and the reservation instead of other unsettled sections. In 1934 when the Matanuska Valley farm settlement was established, several school sections were settled upon by oversight. The land has now been cleared and houses built and it would be obviously a hardship to require the settlers to move to new land. There is ample land in the Matanuska Valley which can be reserved for school purposes in place of the tracts upon which settlement has so been made. This bill passed the House on July 31, 1939.

ADDITIONAL LAND FOR MATANUSKA VALLEY SETTLERS

H. R. 6658 is a bill authorizing the assignment to settlers in Matanuska Valley of additional tracts of land. In the beginning these settlers were limited to 40 acres each. This has been found to be insufficient and it is now desired to grant them additional land. This bill passed the House on February 7, 1940.

RESERVES FOR CEMETERIES

H. R. 7252 is a bill to authorize reservation of small tracts of land for cemeteries in Alaska. This bill also passed the House on February 7, 1940.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA GAME LAW

H. R. 8474 seeks an amendment to the Alaska game law in one particular only. At the present time the Alaska game law under certain conditions permits the taking of game animals and birds out of season by Indians, Eskimos, prospectors, or travelers when in absolute need of food and other food is not available. Complaint has been made that natives, under the law as written, cannot take a game animal or bird out of season for food if they have any food whatever on hand, no matter how small the quantity may be. While such a construction of the law is not reasonable, one remedy is to amend the law by striking out the word "absolute" so that the law will permit the taking of game animals or birds out of season by Indians, Eskimos, prospectors, or travelers when they are in need of food and no other sufficient food is available, and that is being attempted by the bill. The bill has been favorably reported in the House by the House Committee on Territories.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND LOW-COST HOUSING

H. R. 8884 (S. 3686). This is a bill to permit the Territory of Alaska to create an authority for slum clearance and low-cost housing. It would permit Alaska to participate in the United States housing program. The United States Housing Act includes the Territories as well as the States but, under our Organic Act, the Territorial Legislature has no power to create an authority to engage in slum clearance and low-cost housing and, therefore, Alaska cannot at present obtain the benefits of the United States Housing Act. The bill has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House, having been favorably reported to the House by the House Committee on the Territories.

PETERSBURG WATER SUPPLY

H. R. 9173. The purpose of this bill is to reserve from settlement the water-supply basin which furnishes water to the town of Petersburg and thus prevent possible contamination of the water-supply source of that town. It is identical in purpose and similar in context to the bill which was passed for the protection of the water supply of the city of Ketchikan.

SITKA PUBLIC UTILITIES

H. R. 9571 (S. 3940) seeks to authorize the town of Sitka to purchase, improve, and extend certain public utilities, namely, the electric-current plant and water-supply system, and for that purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $200,000 in addition to its present indebtedness. Identical bills have been favorably reported by House and Senate committees and are now pending on the House and Senate calendars. Barring unforeseen difficulties the bill should be passed at an early date.

OTHER PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The bills above listed do not, of course, include all of the bills which I have introduced and the passage of which I have urged for the benefit of Alaska. Some of them and particularly those seeking larger powers of self-government for Alaska with respect to the fisheries and to the fur and game, the bill H. R. 3368, which looks to the abolition of all fish traps in Alaska, the several bills, H. R. 7987, H. R. 7988, and H. R. 8115, which seek to prevent discrimination against the employment of Alaskans in the fisheries of the Territory, and the bill, H. R. 7542, the object of which is to prohibit the seizure of boats and gear of fishermen for alleged violation of law unless and until the owners or operators of the boats and gear are convicted in court for the criminal offense involved, are among the most important of the measures proposed for Alaska. Only one of these several bills has been favorably reported by a committee of Congress and, the outlook for passage of any of them at this session of Congress is not favorable. One bill, namely, H. R. 7542, concerning forfeiture of boats and gear, passed the House by unanimous consent but was to all intents and purposes killed in the Senate upon the adverse report of the Secretary of the Interior, who asked that consideration of the subject matter of the bill be delayed for this year so that the Department of the Interior, which had recently been assigned supervision of the fisheries of Alaska under one of the reorganization orders, might gain further experience in the administration of the Alaska fisheries before any such legislation should be attempted. The subject of another bill, H. R. 3024, to prohibit in southeastern Alaska the conversion of herring into oil, meal, or fertilizer has been taken care of by regulation.

The work of the Delegate from Alaska not only embraces the enactment of desirable legislation but also the defeat of measures proposed by others which are inimical to the welfare of Alaska. A part of my time in the past 2 years has been devoted to the latter type of activity. Well-intentioned people who do not understand the Territory frequently desire to have legislation enacted which may be superficially attractive but in the long run would do Alaska infinite harm. At the moment I can recall three such legislative measures, which, if enacted, would have been harmful to the Territory, the passage of which I have been able to prevent.

One is the bill for the protection of the bald eagle, doubtless a highly desirable piece of legislation for the States but not desirable for Alaska where, unless the number of eagles is kept down, they will destroy many young foxes and thus add to the burdens and difficulties of the Alaska fox ranchers. But by suitable opposition to having Alaska included in this legislation the Territory was exempted and the law as passed does not apply to Alaska.

The second measure to which I refer is that wherein it was sought to withdraw from entry, with certain exceptions, all lands lying within 80 rods of navigable or other waters of Alaska and to empower the Secretary of the Interior to lease such lands on such terms as he might deem appropriate for periods not to exceed 20 years. The passage of this bill would, in my judgment, have done much to slow up the settlement and development of Alaska, for no sensible man would care to make any considerable investment of funds on lands held only by such a lease as the bill sought to authorize. By opposing this bill vigorously it was possible to prevent even its consideration by the House Committee on Public Lands, to which it was referred.

The third legislative proposal that I have in mind in this connection is the very attractive one which was designed for the development of Alaska by the settlement therein of European refugees who were to be admitted to the United States for that purpose over and above the present quota restrictions. It was called a bill for the development of Alaska, although it might more accurately have been called a bill for the relief of some of the persecuted peoples of Europe. Acting, I believe, in harmony with the overwhelming sentiment of the people of Alaska, I felt obliged to oppose the bill because it would have established in Alaska a unique class of alien residents who would have been authorized and encouraged to settle and live in Alaska but who would have been barred from entry into the States unless they should become citizens of the United States at some indefinite future time. Under this plan Alaska would have taken on some of the aspects of a concentration camp. While there was a chance that the Territory would gain substantially under the bill proposed, there was an absolute certainty that thereby Alaska would have been set off from the United States and a barrier erected between the Territory and the States. Hearings were had on one of the measures introduced before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, but up to this time no report has been made by that subcommittee to the full committee and so I think it probable that no further action will be taken on the measure at this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the question has several times been asked as to the expenditures of the Federal Government in Alaska and particularly the extent of the national defense program in the Territory. From several appropriation bills and from other sources of information I have compiled a list of the principal appropriations and allocations for Alaska made during the Seventy-sixth Congress. That list is as follows:

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN ALASKA

The following is a list of the principal appropriations and allocations for Alaska made by the United States Government for the 2 fiscal years commencing July 1, 1939, and to end July 1, 1941, and embracing appropriations made by the Seventy-sixth Congress. In some instances, such as with respect to emergency funds, where no exact or separate appropriations are made for use in Alaska during any fiscal year, or where complete data are not available at this time, the figures cover expenditures for 1939 and 1940. Many of the smaller items, which would probably aggregate several hundred thousand dollars, have not been included. Nor have there been included the anticipated appropriations of $109,000 for a small boat harbor at Sitka and $70,000 for harbor improvements at Kodiak.

Rivers and harbors and flood control:	
Juneau small-boat harbor	$232,000
Valdez small-boat harbor	68,000
Skagway harbor and flood improvement	105,000
Nome safety-harbor improvement	185,624
Lowell Creek (Seward) flood control	197,000
Tanana River-Chena Slough flood control	565,000
Fire prevention on public lands	64,500
Bureau of Fisheries	649,860
Game conservation and administration	285,793
Natives of Alaska, schools, hospitals, etc	3,176,420
Purchase of reindeer, etc	795,000
U. S. Geological Survey	120,000
Roads outside of national forests	1,130,000
Roads in national forests	968,000
Care of insane	411,880
Post Office Department—Excess of expenditures above receipts (estimated)	1,600,000
Civilian Conservation Corps	1,595,283
Works Progress Administration	476,170
Department of Justice, courts, etc	1,133,187
Public Works Administration—Grants (loans $748,864)	903,189
Agricultural experiment station work	48,750
Agricultural Extension Service	45,336
Legislative expenses	50,000
Alaska railroad-retirement and disability fund	175,000
Forest Service	261,780
Coast and Geodetic Survey vessel for Alaska	1,425,000
Treasury Department (approximate)	1,827,393
National defense:	
Sitka Navy air base	2,900,000
Kodiak Navy air base	8,750,000
Kodiak Navy air base	2,012,000
Unalaska Navy air base	2,963,000
Fairbanks Army air station	4,000,000
Anchorage Army air base	12,104,060
Anchorage military post	6,379,225
Alaska gas and bomb storage construction	630,000
Land purchase, Anchorage	85,000
Total	58,318,455

At least a fair beginning has been made upon the construction of national-defense works and facilities in Alaska. No one who really grasps the importance of Alaska in the national-defense program will say that nothing more will be required. In fact, much more will be required and among that "much more" is the construction of a number of air fields and the long-proposed highway to Alaska. Before the present national emergency arose, the construction of the

highway to Alaska was most desirable for economic reasons intimately relating to the development of the Territory. The present recognized need of adequate defense for Alaska makes the building of the international highway of the greatest consequence as a part of the national-defense program. In the event that our fleet is obliged to go to the Atlantic and we thus lose control of the Pacific to some hostile force, with a highway from the States to the Territory we would still have available an overland route to supply our defense forces in Alaska, as well as the civilian population.

Aside from considerations of national defense, as well as a part of the national-defense set-up, roads and air fields are needed for Alaska. An internal system of roads and a comprehensive system of air fields would do much for the development of the Territory and much to increase its population. The complete program for Alaska that I continue to advocate is the construction of such a system of roads and air fields within the Territory and the immediate building of the highway to connect the United States with Alaska. If that plan is carried out there will never be any occasion to invite, or urge, or stimulate the settlement of Alaska for, with travel facilities available, plenty and plenty of our citizens will come to the Territory to reside permanently.

Selective Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

LETTER AND STATEMENT BY ALBERT W. JOHNSON

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, because of illness and death in my immediate family I have been unable to give my personal attention to an important letter and statement which have been received in my office. If it had been possible I should have asked that they be entered in the hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs on universal compulsory military training. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Judge Albert W. Johnson, together with a statement he has prepared on the necessity for universal compulsory military training in the United States. This statement represents Mr. Johnson's views on this subject, and I present the statement at this time merely because I was not able to present it during the hearings.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURTS,
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Lewisburg, Pa., July 17, 1940.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS:
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: I enclose herewith copy of my article on universal compulsory military training. This, as you will notice, is somewhat comprehensive in covering all or most of the reasons in favor of such training. These reasons have been stated from time to time separately or partially but I have never seen a statement or argument containing all the reasons combined. Many of the very best reasons for such training are frequently or generally overlooked, and I felt it my duty to write them out in a somewhat logical and connected order.

I should like to have this article read into the record of the Committee on Military Affairs having now for consideration the Burke-Wadsworth bill now pending before Congress. Will you please see that this is read before the committee and placed upon the record. I was in the committee room when I was in Washington a few days ago and I noticed different witnesses, men and women, reading their testimony or statements before the committee and having them placed on the record.

If you think I should come down and read this personally and give any ideas in connection therewith, I shall be pleased to do it. This is a time when we must express ourselves and let whatever light we have shine and not keep it under a bushel.

I am not sending a copy of this article at the present time to the committee but I will let you handle it and will follow your suggestion. If you think I should send a copy directly to the committee with an offer to testify, I will do it. I might state to you that in mingling with the people, I find they are almost, if not entirely, unanimous for universal compulsory military training.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

THE NECESSITY FOR UNIVERSAL COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Albert W. Johnson, United States district judge, Lewisburg, Pa.)

Our Nation should at once pass a law providing for universal compulsory military training for all our young men who will be ready to be called out at once when necessary to protect our country, that in the future we may be prepared to defend ourselves and not be required to depend upon the armies and fleets of other nations for our protection. During the short life of our great Nation we have been engaged in six great wars—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the World War—18 years in all, one-ninth of our national life, not to count all minor wars, all of which have been unnecessarily costly in blood and treasure on account of the lack of preparation.

We must establish at once an efficient, well-equipped, and powerful army and air force superior to any nation or combination of nations that might attack us and a navy in the Atlantic and also a navy in the Pacific, each superior to any combination against it in either ocean. This is necessary not only in time of peace but also in time of war.

We are now experiencing a world revolution with conflicting ideas of government and civilization. Dictatorial and tyrannical governments are attacking and overcoming free democratic governments. This conflict will continue beyond actual hostilities. All of the autocratic governments are hostile to our democratic government.

The British Empire, now fighting for its existence, is now the only great surviving democracy outside of the United States. If this democracy is destroyed, the United States will stand alone in the midst of a world in arms.

Our democratic form of government is the best in the world, the dream of the ages, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. One of the chief purposes of our Constitution in establishing the Federal Government was to provide for the common defense. If this Republic is to continue, it must function with the highest efficiency and be able to defend itself against all the world.

I speak from personal knowledge and experience. I have associated from childhood with soldiers from the Civil War on both sides. I followed closely the Boer War in South Africa, the Spanish-American War, the Russian-Japanese War, and the great World War. My father was a member of the Union Army at the age of 17. Two of my sons were in the World War in France, one at the age of 16, and one, a second lieutenant in the Battle of the Argonne; my son-in-law, Carl A. Schug, one of the finest young men I have ever known, was a first lieutenant in the Seventy-seventh American Division, one of the first on the battlefields of France, twice seriously wounded in action, who, after a short but brilliant career as district attorney and lawyer, died as a result of his wounds. Of my 11 children, 8 are boys, all fit mentally, morally, and physically for military service, and 6 are now of sufficient age. The other two, 12 and 14, will soon be old enough for service.

Universal compulsory military training is necessary for the welfare and safety of our Nation. It is necessary for the citizen personally, necessary for the general welfare, and necessary for our national defense.

Such a system and training will create strong and healthy citizens, one of the primary objects of good government. Strong, healthy citizens make a strong, healthy government. This training will teach the citizen to care for his body. If he has any physical defects, they will be discovered and corrected. Good health will not only be preserved during the period of his life as a soldier, but throughout his life as a citizen. In this correction and maintenance of health, the benefit of military training to the Government will be worth more than all the cost.

Military training teaches the citizen efficiency. In the Army everything must be done in order and by plan that there may be the highest accomplishment. The efficiency which the citizen thus acquires will benefit him all through life.

Such training teaches discipline, necessary for success in life. No individual can be strong mentally, morally, or physically without discipline. There can be no successful leadership without it. The discipline that will be acquired through military training will be worth more to our people and the country than all its cost.

This military training will come to many young men at a period in life when they are completing their education. It will supplement their education and occupy millions of young men at a period when many of them may be idle and out of work.

This training will be of tremendous good for our whole country. It will lead to the unity of our people. Where disloyalty arises through ignorance, the citizens will be instructed; where it arises from loyalty to other countries, such disposition will be discovered and corrected.

This military training will increase patriotism. Service of our country inspires patriotism. All will learn more about our country as they are preparing to defend it and thus when they know our country better they will love it more.

Such training is democratic; it will apply to all alike. If our Nation is to live, all must defend it. The fact that we have not

always had such service is no argument against our having it now when we need it.

Such universal compulsory military training is necessary now and will likely continue to be necessary in the future for national defense. We cannot depend any longer on the volunteer system. The experience of the last few months proves the inadequacy of that system alone. We must have a large and powerful Army, Navy, and air force. It will require many soldiers adequately trained to equip these three departments and we cannot secure numbers sufficiently large by the volunteer system to meet the demands. This has been seen throughout the history of our Nation.

This universal military training will tend to prevent war. The Nations of Europe and the east are not convinced by argument and right but only by power and force. With our citizens trained and prepared, there will be little danger of war. The present war in Europe resulted because Germany knew that England and France were unprepared. But if war comes our Nation will be invincible. With such training there is not a nation in the world or any combination of nations that can defeat us or destroy our democracy and our liberty. Well-trained American soldiers are equal or superior to the best in the world, but they must be well trained and well equipped. The bravest soldiers in the world untrained and unequipped cannot stand against inferior soldiers well trained, disciplined, and in possession of the best equipment.

Universal military training will save blood and treasure if war comes. Military experts testify to this fact, and all the history of our Nation establishes it.

We are not only beneficiaries of this great democracy, having inherited it from our ancestors who established it at a great cost, but we are trustees to hand it on to our descendants and to all the world. We have no right to take a chance with our country. It is our duty to labor and sacrifice to secure it beyond all doubt.

In conclusion, preparation by universal military training will develop the highest character of citizen, promote the best interests of our common country, and secure its sure defense. In this way we will be more sure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish from this earth.

Selective Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address broadcast by me on July 28 on the subject, First Peacetime Conscription Bill in American History.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill, which is soon to be taken up in the Senate, and which I have discussed in this address, sets up the first peacetime-conscription program in the history of our country. I think we should, by all means, give the voluntary system of securing enlistments a fair trial for 1 year before we adopt a compulsory military training program.

The proposed conscription bill seems to have the enthusiastic approval of the Army high command, but I find strong opposition among people of all classes in the State from which I come. They believe, and I believe, that this conscription program will lead us closer all the time to the European war.

I am for an adequate Army and Navy to fight off any aggressive nation, but I do not believe we want the Hitler system of organizing for war.

The people want this country to remain a democracy. I find a growing feeling that compulsory regimentation has no place and can never form a part of a true democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION LAW IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Friends in the radio audience, one of the most fundamental and far-reaching changes in the American way of life is coming up for consideration in the Senate within a few days.

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs is reporting favorably a bill, known as the Burke-Wadsworth bill, providing conscription of men for military service in time of peace.

Under the proposal at least a million of our young men each year will be drafted into military service for a year.

Back of this bill, which is written to meet what is declared to be a present emergency, there is a drive to make universal military training for all our youth permanently a part of our governmental system.

My friends, I would be willing to vote for conscription of manpower for national defense if and when this Nation goes to war to defend our own national interests, but conscription in peacetime is another thing. I will admit that when the large number of men required to wage a modern war are needed, the only fair and equitable way to raise the large army is by the selective draft.

But when that is done I insist that wealth also must be drafted. I am opposed, even in wartime, to drafting men without also drafting money.

By the way, it is interesting to know what great men in the past have thought about some of the things that are perplexing us in these days. One of the great American statesmen of all time was Daniel Webster. Upon one occasion he was discussing conscription generally. And Webster declared that government had a much greater right to conscript profits than to conscript lives.

Naturally those who have money and property as a rule are more anxious to conscript the lives of boys than to conscript profits. I am inclined to go along with Daniel Webster on this question.

Incidentally the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, will meet tomorrow to consider a measure providing for levying additional excess-profits taxes to meet the expenditure of some eighteen or twenty billion dollars for the national-defense program, and I think we will do the job this time. I hope we do. I think the collection of an excess-profits tax is the fairest way to help pay the cost of national defense. I am opposed to creating several thousand "war millionaires" out of the national-defense program, whether we go to war or just prepare ourselves against going to war.

But that is aside from the main question now presented to Congress and to the country.

Shall the United States abandon its traditional policy of 150 years; shall we take away the personal freedom of our young men and adopt the policy of militaristic continental Europe and adopt military conscription?

Very frankly, I do not like the idea. It is repugnant to me. It smacks too much of the Hitler doctrine that men are mere vassals of the state—which means, under such a system, mere vassals of the dictator who runs the state. It is a step backward toward barbarism, as I see it.

I, for one, do not propose to vote for conscription for military service unless it is proved to me beyond all reasonable doubt that there is no other way of building up an adequate national defense, and I am not yet convinced that such is the case.

Suppose we try to meet this situation as calmly as the present disturbed state of the world will permit. Setting aside for the moment the consideration of personal liberty involved and our feelings against compulsory military service, and even passing over for the moment the disturbance a year or 2 years of military service would create in the lives of young men in school, young men holding their first jobs, young men who may be trying to get a start in business for themselves.

Laying aside all these considerations, let us consider the necessity in peacetime for military conscription in the United States, because, if it is absolutely necessary for preservation of our Government, then, of course, the other arguments fade into insignificance. In an emergency things that are necessary to be done must be done, no matter what the cost.

Today a number of proposals are being made about increasing the size of our Army. Congress has provided for an Army of 375,000 men. Army heads have told a House committee that they consider an Army of 1,200,000 men an immediate necessity.

The first plan calls merely for a numerical increase in the size of the Regular Army, an increase which The Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. Emory S. Adams—a Kansas man, by the way—has written Senator VANDENBERG, can be obtained by the recruiting service as at present organized.

The other might call for a basic change in structure of our defense forces—in fact, a fundamental change in our democracy. It is in line with this that the drive for conscription is being pressed at the present time.

In support of conscription there are cries that our system of voluntary enlistments has broken down. But there are no proofs in fact that the system of voluntary enlistments has failed. General Adams says that the Regular Army can be increased to 375,000 men by voluntary enlistments in 5 months' time.

It does seem to me also that if the period of enlistment were dropped from 3 years to 1 year, or even cut to 2 years, that it would be easier than ever before to get voluntary enlistments. Many a young man would enlist for a year who would hesitate to sign away 3 years of his life. I say we ought to try to fill our requirements, whatever they may be, by voluntary enlistments.

Now I will not deny that if the traditional and personal freedom method of filling the ranks of the Army by voluntary enlistment fails, and we have to raise the larger army, then we will be forced to go to compulsory military service.

But I do not see where voluntary enlistments have failed. Nor am I entirely satisfied that every effort has been made to speed enlistments. Most of the Army heads believe in compulsory service and might not be averse to having the voluntary system proved a failure.

It might be not amiss to remember that some 22 years ago 1,300,000 voluntary enlistments in the United States Army were made up until voluntary enlistments were stopped in August 1918.

I repeat, let's have it proved that we cannot enlist an army by the voluntary method in peacetime before we rush into compulsory conscription.

I have received a number of letters opposing military conscription. Supt. J. W. Murphy, of the Augusta City Schools of our State, says:

"It seems to me we can find a better way to get ready for any invasion that might occur without taking young men who have jobs and are just beginning their careers. Universal compulsory military training has been the curse of the Old World nations which have adopted it and will be the curse of the United States if we follow the example of these dictator-ruled nations of Europe."

"Compulsory military training is the extreme of tyranny and the destruction of individual liberty," says Superintendent Murphy. I think he is about right.

And I get this expression from the Reverend Walter Lee Taylor, of the Presbytery of Neosho, Fredonia, Kans.:

"The forcible seizure and militarizing of men in peacetime is simply not the democratic way of building up the true strength of democracy. It will make those who love democracy distrust the Government; it will make those who cherish the right to life and liberty fear the Government; it will make those who fearlessly adhere to the principle of freedom of conscience hate the Government as they would an alien enemy."

"Moreover, the passage of this bill," he says, "is unnecessary as it calls for a peacetime army of 2,000,000 men, which is three times the number Army officials have declared would be needed for the defense of the country. There is no justification for the passage of this bill unless our Government is secretly planning to invade a foreign country."

And I also want to quote this very sensible statement in a letter I received today from a sound businessman and patriotic citizen, R. W. McLeod, vice president and cashier of the First National Bank, of Smith Center, Kans.:

"If you have read Hitler's Mein Kampf you will notice in the Nazi platform set forth in this book 25 articles, 11 of which already are employed in the United States, and if compulsory military conscription is permitted to pass that will be the twelfth.

"This brings us to military conscription. I do not believe there is a loyal American," says Mr. McLeod, "who would hesitate to sanction conscription in time of need. While there is considerable hysteria at the present time, I do not believe that the House and Senate of the United States should lose their heads and vote conscription in time of peace. Above all, if the Army needs enlarging, they could at least raise the pay of a soldier to equal that of the W. P. A. laborer, and no doubt the Army would have more men in 2 months than they could have any need of."

And I get this statement of the case from Arthur W. Calhoun, of Sterling, Kans.:

"It is time for a stand on behalf of some elementary human rights. If liberty and democracy can be saved only by killing them in advance, then the dictators are the people that have the answer and there is nothing to be done about it."

And this comes to me from the Reverend Robert W. Scott, of the First Presbyterian Church, Coffeyville, Kans.:

"Such a bill makes a totalitarian state of our country, giving dictatorial powers to the Government. This is un-American.

"Above all times should we now think clearly and cautiously lest in the very emotion of thinking we are saving liberty and freedom we use conscription and make this a Fascist nation, giving the Government an iron hand, and put on our children a burden they never will be free from."

Now, the quotations I have just read, my friends, are typical of hundreds of letters I am getting, protesting against passage of the conscription bill.

And now I would call your attention to the following petition presented this week to the Senate from the Committee of One Million—it has 1,000,000 signers so far—and I quote:

"We, the undersigned, join with the mothers of America in petitioning the Congress of the United States to exert every effort possible, and within reason, necessary to keep America out of all foreign wars.

"We favor a national defense second to none; we are willing to make any sacrifice necessary in money and men to defend America, but we, the undersigned, are opposed to giving our money and our men to settle the political quarrels of foreign nations."

I say tonight to my Kansas friends that petition has my 100-percent approval. I will not vote to send American boys to fight in foreign wars.

And, in closing, I quote the statement of principles of this Committee of One Million:

"1. To rebuild the spirit of America.

"2. To wipe out to the last vestige communism and fascism in all its forms.

"3. To redefine the American national character.

"4. To instill a new spirit in American youth, dedicated intellectually and physically to the maintenance of American institutions.

"5. To issue a call to farmers and laborers to resist what is now known to be an international plot to make them part of a world revolution.

"6. To rededicate the citizenry of America to the family altar and to the spirit of the church.

"7. To secure the maintenance of a well-defined standard of American living."

And now, in closing, my friends, tell me what you think Congress should do on this military conscription bill.

Tributes to Senator McNary by Richard L. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, the people of my section of the country are unusually fortunate in having on the Republican ticket, as candidate for Vice President, a westerner who knows the West and who has represented the best interests of the West during many years here in the United States Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two unusually fine articles from the Portland Oregonian by Richard L. Neuberger on Senator CHARLES MCNARY.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.]

MCNARY IS STRONG IN THE NORTHWEST—WILLKIE'S RUNNING MATE HAS MANAGED TO REMAIN SENATOR IN DEMOCRATIC TERRITORY—CHAMPION OF THE FARMER

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

SALEM, OREG., July 6.—The nomination of sandy-haired CHARLES LINZA MCNARY, 66-year-old senior Senator from Oregon, for Vice President of the United States has animated Republicans in this part of the country. They believe a strong Democratic trend is about to be reversed. Not since 1928 has a Republican national ticket won a single electoral vote in the 11 States which comprise the area from the Rocky Mountain States westward.

Senator MCNARY'S presence on the 1940 ticket is relied upon to end this Democratic sovereignty. The Vice-Presidential nominee has long been known in the West as a champion of increased farm relief, Government power and irrigation projects, peace, and high tariffs. He has occupied his seat in the Senate for 23 years, the longest tenure of any present Member of Congress from the Pacific Northwest. When Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, endorsed Wendell L. Willkie at the start of the Republican National Convention, he stipulated that Mr. Willkie's running mate should by all means be a "progressive." This was interpreted to refer to Senator MCNARY, who has supported many of the New Deal's social and economic reforms.

Public ownership of electric power plants is a critical issue in this region, and new dealers were prepared to unlimber a heavy attack on the record of Mr. Willkie as a utility executive. The addition of Senator MCNARY to the ticket has complicated this strategy because he has been active in promoting the Columbia River power development program, having been the principal sponsor of the $75,000,000 Bonneville Dam.

WILLKIE CHOSE HIM

Democrats now are contending that Senator MCNARY was put on the slate to "camouflage" Mr. Willkie. Republicans, on the other hand, maintain that the inclusion of Senator MCNARY demonstrated that Mr. Willkie is not as "prejudiced" on the power question as his adversaries would make out. Friends of Senator MCNARY in Oregon say he was Mr. Willkie's personal choice for second place on the ticket.

The selection of Senator MCNARY has certain obvious advantages in the West. This section of America, at least until lately, has inclined toward isolation with respect to foreign affairs. It has approved such vast Federal hydroelectric projects as Boulder, Bonneville, Fort Peck, and Grand Coulee. And lumber companies and lumber workers have heatedly denounced Secretary Hull's trade treaties.

On all these points, Senator MCNARY is believed to agree with western sentiment more than does Mr. Willkie. The Presidential nominee has been sympathetic with many phases of the trade program, although Senator MCNARY has insisted it is damaging both agriculture and the lumber industry. Senator MCNARY opposed repeal of the arms embargo, whereas Mr. Willkie has favored aid short of war for the enemies of Hitler.

Senator MCNARY'S greatest following is among farmers. He is a farmer himself and lives on the Willamette Valley ranch where he was born in 1874. He is one of the country's most successful raisers of filberts.

LOYAL TO SENATOR

Independent voters have usually decided elections in the West, and many of these people are adherents of Senator MCNARY. Whether the Republican Party has been in sickness or in health, he

has survived personally. He has had absolute loyalty from the rural areas ever since he sponsored the McNary-Haugen farm debenture bill 15 years ago. Plans at present are that Senator McNARY shall be notified formally of his nomination at his farm, 6 miles north of Salem.

Some observers in the Pacific Northwest contend that Senator McNARY's acceptance of the Vice-Presidential nomination is an indication that President Roosevelt has decided not to run. They base their argument on several facts, chief among which is the friendship between the Republicans' Senate leader and the President. They insist that Senator McNARY would not have consented to run had he thought the fortunes of war would pit him against a ticket headed by Mr. Roosevelt.

[From the Oregonian (Portland, Oreg.) of July 14, 1940]

MCNARY FOLLOWS WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON IN HOME CHOICE WITH "FIR CONE," NEAR SALEM, TYPICAL COUNTRY BEAUTY SPOT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

SALEM, July 13.—Homes in the green countryside are in the American tradition for distinguished men in public life. Washington had Mount Vernon; Thomas Jefferson conceived the idea for the Declaration of Independence at Monticello; and Andrew Jackson owed fealty to the Hermitage.

This custom has endured. In contemporary times, President Roosevelt returns often to Hyde Park; Justice Owen Roberts, of the Supreme Court, has a farm in Pennsylvania; Senator BURTON K. WHEELER owns a retreat in Glacier National Park; and CHARLES LINZA MCNARY, senior Senator from Oregon and Republican nominee for Vice President of the United States, is almost boyishly proud of his 300-acre farm, Fir Cone.

TEN CHILDREN IN FAMILY

A few miles from Salem, on the Mission Bottom Road, is a mail box with the legend "CHARLES L. MCNARY, route 2, box 90." This marks the entrance to Fir Cone, the place the Senator's pioneering grandfather, James McNary, homesteaded 95 years ago. It was a dense wilderness when the frontiersman staked it out. With him was his 9-year-old son, Hugh Linza McNary, who later married Margaret Claggett, the daughter of Charles Claggett, who drove an ox team across the plains in 1850.

Hugh McNary and Margaret Claggett had 10 children, and one of them was CHARLES LINZA MCNARY, today the master of Fir Cone, where he was born 66 years ago. When Congress adjourns in the summer Fir Cone draws the Senator like a magnet. The bustle and rush of the National Capital have little appeal for him and he is impatient to get home. He told Wendell Willkie this week that Fir Cone is "the finest farm in the United States of America."

The principal crops at Fir Cone are filberts, walnuts, and prunes. MCNARY was one of the first men in the country to raise filberts on any scale. The bulk of the crop is sold to wholesale groceries in Portland. The farm has always been modestly successful financially. Neighboring farmers come to Fir Cone to get pointers. The Senator developed the Imperial prune, which is now the largest prune on the market.

FIR CONE ESTATE

Senator MCNARY takes an active interest in the operating of the ranch, talking over things frequently with his foreman, Ben Peterson. Ben, a Norwegian, has been working for MCNARY for 13 years. He lives in a farmhouse just across the road from Fir Cone, and shares with the Senator the hope that the visitors at the nomination notification ceremony "will not trample down the trees and bushes."

Fir Cone is an estate as well as a farm. Approximately 200 acres are in orchards. The rest is made up complexly. There is an arboretum, in which MCNARY has collected tree specimens from all over the Nation. Some day he may deed this to the State of Oregon. In a dense grove is a tennis court, and not far from the court is a rolling green where the Senator practices his putting and niblick shots.

M'NARY BEAN COOKER

Claggett Creek, named for Senator MCNARY's maternal grandfather, gurgles through the farm. Rainbow trout lie in its reaches. A lonely stump near the creek is cherished in the memory of the Senator, for from it his best friend, the late Senator Jim Couzens, multimillionaire New Deal Republican from Michigan, caught his first fish. Jim Couzens, on his visits to the West, used to say there was no place as picturesque or restful as Fir Cone.

The white-shingled bungalow at Fir Cone, built in 1926 at a cost of around $6,000, is low and rambling in typical frontier style. The big living room, 18 by 24 feet, is dominated by a huge fireplace. In it usually hangs a big iron kettle, in which Senator MCNARY likes to cook beans. He mixes the beans himself, putting in pork and molasses, and then ladles out the dish to his visitors.

Bookcases around the room hold innumerable volumes, many of them about Oregon history. On the table are some of the books Senator MCNARY has been reading recently—Hamilton and Jefferson, by Claude G. Bowers; Since Yesterday, by Frederick L. Allen; Our Times, by Mark Sullivan; and (aloud to Charlotte), The Sunbonnet Babies.

Miss Charlotte McNary, the adopted daughter of Senator and Mrs. McNary, is 5 years old. She and the Senator's wife escaped from the heat and commotion of Washington several weeks ago and came home ahead of the Senator. When her father asked her on the long-distance telephone what she thought of his nomination she replied, with political judiciousness, "I love you no matter what you are, daddy, and I love my pony, too."

The pony's name is "Dandy," and Charlotte rides him all over Fir Cone. He is tethered near her playhouse, which is in back of the bungalow. The playhouse was designed for her by David Lynn, Official Architect of the American Capitol Building. She and her small friends romp in the sand pile near-by, where they bury filbert nuts and then have a magnificent time digging for them.

Mrs. McNary, the former Cornelia Morton, of Chicago, is a descendant of Horace Greeley. She believes her ancestor had the right idea about going west, and she thinks Oregon in general and Fir Cone in particular are unparalleled. Mrs. McNary's father, Maj. Bruce Morton, served on the staff of Gen. Nelson Appleton Miles, the great Indian fighter. A picture of the general is on the living-room table at Fir Cone.

Fir Cone has developed into something of a show place since its squire became a candidate for the Vice Presidency, but it is essentially what James McNary long ago planned it to be—a home. He is fond of the clubby atmosphere of the United States Senate, despite his dislike of Washington, but among places Fir Cone is his first love. He has even registered the name Fir Cone with the copyright office.

Valedictory to James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS ITEM-TRIBUNE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item-Tribune entitled "Valedictory to James A. Farley."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans Item-Tribune]

VALEDICTORY TO JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley will step down as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and resign as Postmaster General, on August 17. His retirement will be followed by emotions on the part of his fellow countrymen very different from those which greeted his entrance 8 years ago.

He was known then only as a New York politician with some ability for organization. He is recognized now as the possessor of talent for organization that amounts to genius not surpassed in American politics. And he is known as a grand guy, a first-rate fighting man, and a supremely good sport.

In the past 8 years the Postmaster General has weathered many a storm. Known contemptuously as the Jobmaster, he made himself a whipping boy to take the beatings for the Roosevelt administration, while the PHD's brain trust looked down their noses at him.

Big Jim bore it all with smiling equanimity. And he learned from experience. He got to know all parts of the United States and their ways of feeling and thinking as few New Yorkers have ever known them. The country came to know him as an upstanding, straight-shooting man, upon whose word men could confidently rely. All Democrats, and hosts of others, came not only to trust this big, bald, New Yorker, but to have real affection for him.

You could have no greater proof that the boy from Grassy Point had made good than a party given for him when the Chicago convention was over. Cynicism is part of the armor of most newspaper folks. Nowhere in the fraternity is it burnished more brightly than among those correspondents who "cover" Washington. Yet these cynics were hosts at a farewell testimonial to Farley where feeling was so genuine and unrestrained that, in the words of the New York World-Telegram, it "brought mist to eyes long dry."

As Mr. Farley quits the political arena many will probably remember Tenniel's great cartoon, Dropping the Pilot. It depicted the young Kaiser Wilhelm II, watching over the rail of the ship, *Germania*, while the great Bismarck went down the ladder to a small boat waiting to carry him away.

Much has been said already, and more will be, about "the doctrine of indispensability." Some persons may wonder, before the present political drama reaches its climax, if the new dealers managing Mr. Roosevelt's campaign won't discover that Mr. Farley was "the indispensable man," too.

Still others, contemplating the greatly heightened stature of this simple, honest man, will reflect that character is the one thing without which other gifts of the gods are valueless. We salute the passing pilot in words borrowed from James Whitcomb Riley:

"Well, good-bye, Jim; take keer of yourse'f."

Great Smoky Mountains National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

BILLS AND ACTS RESULTING IN CREATION OF PARK

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, recently some question has arisen about the authorship of the measures establishing the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee and North Carolina. In order that there may be no further question about it, I have gathered together the several bills and acts of Congress which resulted in the creation of the park. I desire to have this material placed in the RECORD in the order marked. Also a copy of a letter I have written the Honorable Frank Maloney, Knoxville, Tenn., is attached.

I ask permission to have all this material printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In the Senate of the United States, January 2 (calendar day, January 3), 1925, Mr. Swanson introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys]

A bill (S. 3835, 68th Cong., 2d sess.) relative to the acquirement of a national park, to be known as Shenandoah National Park

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to determine the boundaries and area of such portion of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia lying east of the South Fork of the Shenandoah River and between Front Royal on the north and Waynesboro on the south as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as the Shenandoah National Park, and to receive definite offers of donations of lands and moneys, and to secure such options as in his judgment may be considered reasonable and just for the purchase of lands within said boundaries, and to report to Congress thereon: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act appoint a commission of five members, composed of a representative of the Interior Department and four national-park experts, said four members to serve without compensation.

SEC. 2. A sum sufficient to secure options and to pay the necessary expenses of the commission in carrying out the provisions of this act, including the salary of one clerk to the commission at a rate not to exceed $2,000 per annum, necessary traveling expenses of the members of the commission and $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, in all not to exceed $10,000, is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

[In the Senate of the United States January 26, 1925, Mr. McKELLAR introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys]

A bill (S. 4081, 68th Cong., 2d sess.) relative to the acquirement of a national park, to be known as Smoky Mountain National Park

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to determine the boundaries and area of such lands in the Smoky Mountains situated (1) in Johnson, Carter, Unicoi, Washington, Greene, Cocke, Sevier, Blount, Monroe, and Polk Counties, in the State of Tennessee; and (2) in Cherokee, Graham, Swain, Haywood, Madison, Yancy, Mitchell, Watauga, and Ashe Counties, in the State of North Carolina, as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park to be known as Smoky Mountain National Park, and to receive definite offers of donations of land and money and to secure such options as may, in his judgment, be considered reasonable and just for the purchase of lands within said boundaries to be established by him and to report to Congress thereon: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, appoint a commission of five members, composed of a representative of the Interior Department and four national park experts, said four members to serve without compensation.

SEC. 2. A sum sufficient to secure options and to pay the necessary expenses of the commission in carrying out the provisions of this act, including the salary of one clerk to the commission at a rate not to exceed $2,000 per annum, necessary traveling expenses of the members of the commission, and $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, in all not to exceed $10,000, is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

[In the Senate of the United States, January 26 (calendar day, January 27), 1925, Mr. Swanson and Mr. McKELLAR introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. February 3, (calendar day, February 5), 1925, reported by Mr. Ladd, without amendment]

A bill (S. 4109, 68th Cong., 2d sess.) relative to the acquirement of national parks, to be known as Shenandoah National Park and Smoky Mountain National Park

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to determine the boundaries and area of such portion of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia lying east of the South Fork of the Shenandoah River and between Front Royal on the north and Waynesboro on the south as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as the Shenandoah National Park, and to receive definite offers of donations of land and moneys, and to secure such options as in his judgment may be considered reasonable and just for the purchase of lands within said boundaries, and to report to Congress thereon.

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby further authorized and directed to determine the boundaries and area of such lands in the Smoky Mountains situated (1) in Johnson, Carter, Unicoi, Washington, Greene, Cocke, Sevier, Blount, Monroe, and Polk Counties, in the State of Tennessee; and (2) in Cherokee, Graham, Swain, Haywood, Madison, Yancey, Mitchell, Watauga, and Ashe Counties, in the State of North Carolina, as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as Smoky Mountain National Park, and to receive definite offers of donations of land and money and to secure such options as may, in his judgment, be considered reasonable and just for the purchase of lands within said boundaries to be established by him, and to report to Congress thereon. The Secretary of the Interior may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, appoint a commission of five members, composed of a representative of the Interior Department and four national-park experts, said four members to serve without compensation.

SEC. 2. A sum sufficient to secure options and to pay the necessary expenses of the commission in carrying out the provisions of this act, including the salary of one clerk to the commission at a rate not to exceed $2,000 per annum, necessary traveling expenses of the members of the commission, and $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, in all not to exceed $15,000, is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

[In the Senate of the United States, February 3 (calendar day, February 5), 1925, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed]

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Simmons to the bill (S. 4109) relative to the acquirement of national parks, to be known as Shenandoah National Park and Smoky Mountain National Park, viz: On page 2, line 12, following the word "Watauga", insert the following: "Avery, Caldwell, Burke."

[Public—No. 437—68th Cong.—S. 4109]

An act to provide for the securing of lands in the southern Appalachian Mountains and in the Mammoth Cave regions of Kentucky for perpetual preservation as national parks

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to determine the boundaries and area of such portion of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia lying east of the South Fork of the Shenandoah River and between Front Royal on the north and Waynesboro on the south as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as the Shenandoah National Park, and such portion of the Smoky Mountains lying in Tennessee and North Carolina as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as the Smoky Mountains National Park, and in the Mammoth Cave regions of Kentucky and also such other lands in the southern Appalachian Mountains as in his judgment should be acquired and administered as national parks, and to receive definite offers of donations of lands and moneys, and to secure such options as in his judgment may be considered reasonable and just for the purchase of lands within said boundaries, and to report to Congress thereon: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, appoint a commission of five members, composed of a representative of the Interior Department, and four national park experts, said four members to serve without compensation.

SEC. 2. A sum sufficient to secure options and to pay the necessary expenses of the commission in carrying out the provisions of this act, including the salary of one clerk to the commission at a rate not to exceed $2,000 per annum, necessary traveling expenses of the members of the commission, and $10 per diem in lieu of actual cost of subsistence, in all, not to exceed $20,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Approved, February 21, 1925.

[In the Senate of the United States, April 19 (calendar day, April 23), 1926, Mr. Swanson (for himself and Mr. Glass, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Overman, Mr. McKellar, and Mr. Tyson) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys]

A bill (S. 4073, 69th Cong., 1st sess.) to provide for the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia and the Great Smoky Mountain National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That when title to lands within the areas hereinafter referred to shall have been vested in the United States in fee simple there shall be, and are hereby, established, dedicated, and set apart as public parks for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, the tract of land in the Blue Ridge, in the State of Virginia, being approximately 521,000 acres recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, which area, or any part or parts thereof as may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions hereof, shall be known as the Shenandoah National Park; and the tract of land in the Great Smoky Mountains in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee being approximately 704,000 acres, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, which area, or any part or parts thereof as may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions hereof, shall be known as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; *Provided,* That the United States shall not purchase by appropriation of public moneys any land within the aforesaid areas, but that such lands shall be secured by the United States only by public or private donation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept as hereinafter provided on behalf of the United States title to the lands referred to in the previous section hereof and to be purchased with the $1,200,000 which has been subscribed by the State of Virginia and the Shenandoah National Park Association of Virginia and with other contributions for the purchase of lands in the Shenandoah National Park area, and with the $1,066,693 which has been subscribed by the State of Tennessee and the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association and by the Great Smoky Mountains (Incorporated) (North Carolina) and with other contributions for the purchase of lands in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park area.

SEC. 3. That the administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid parks shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended: *Provided,* That the provisions of the Act approved June 10, 1920, known as the Federal Water Power Act, shall not apply to these parks: *And provided further,* That the minimum area to be administered and protected by the National Park Service shall be for the Shenandoah National Park area 250,000 acres and for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park area 300,000 acres: *Provided further,* That no general development of either of these areas shall be undertaken until a major portion of the remainder in such area shall have been accepted by said Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act employ the commission authorized by the act approved February 21, 1925.

[Public—No. 268—69th Cong.—S. 4073]

An act to provide for the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia and the Great Smoky Mountain National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That when title to lands within the areas hereinafter referred to shall have been vested in the United States in fee simple there shall be, and are hereby, established, dedicated, and set apart as public parks for the benefit and enjoyment of the people the tract of land in the Blue Ridge, in the State of Virginia, being approximately 521,000 acres, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, which area, or any part or parts thereof as may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions hereof, shall be known as the Shenandoah National Park; and the tract of land in the Great Smoky Mountains in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, being approximately 704,000 acres, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, which area, or any part or parts thereof as may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions hereof, shall be known as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park: *Provided,* That the United States shall not purchase by appropriation of public moneys any land within the aforesaid areas, but that such lands shall be secured by the United States only by public or private donation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept as hereinafter provided on behalf of the United States title to the lands referred to in the previous section hereof and to be purchased with the $1,200,000 which has been subscribed by the State of Virginia and the Shenandoah National Park Association of Virginia and with other contributions for the purchase of lands in the Shenandoah National Park area, and with the $1,066,693 which has been subscribed by the State of Tennessee and the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association and by the Great Smoky Mountains, Inc., N. C., and with other contributions for the purchase of lands in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park area.

SEC. 3. That the administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid parks shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended: *Provided,* That the provisions of the act approved June 10, 1920, known as the Federal Water Power Act, shall not apply to these parks: *And provided further,* That the minimum area to be administered and protected by the National Park Service shall be for the Shenandoah National Park area, 250,000 acres, and for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park area, 150,000 acres: *Provided further,* That no general development of either of these areas shall be undertaken until a major portion of the remainder in such area shall have been accepted by said Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act employ the Commission authorized by the act approved February 21, 1925.

Approved May 22, 1926.

JULY 23, 1940.

HON. FRANK MALONEY,
516 State Street, Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR GENERAL MALONEY: Upon my return from Chicago I find your letter of July 11.

In order that there may not be any further controversy about the matter, I have examined the records and am enclosing herewith copies of same. I am enclosing photostatic copies of the records, listing them in their order:

1. Senator Swanson's bill, introduced January 3, 1925, to establish the Shenandoah Park in Virginia.

2. Senator MCKELLAR'S bill, introduced January 26, 1925, to establish the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee and North Carolina.

3. The bill of Senators Swanson and McKellar, introduced January 27, 1925, to establish both parks at the same time and to establish a park at Mammoth Cave, Ky.

4. Copy of the bill itself as it passed the Senate and the House and as it was approved by the President, dated February 21, 1925.

5. A bill introduced by Senator Swanson on behalf of himself, Senator Glass, Senator Simmons, Senator Overman, Senator McKellar, and Senator Tyson, dated April 23, 1926, for the further establishment of the park, approved May 22, 1926, nearly a year after the joint McKellar and Swanson bill had been approved.

6. The act approved May 22, 1926, based on such bill.

It is thus seen by indisputable proof from the records that I alone introduced the first bill for the creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and that a little later Senator Swanson and I joined in a bill to establish both parks in one bill; and that bill, with some amendments, became the law on February 25, 1925. I challenge anyone to find a bill introduced or passed prior to that time.

There was a reason why I introduced the bill individually at the time. That reason was the refusal of Senators Shields, Simmons, and Overman to join me in introducing the bill, although I asked them to do so, on the ground that they believed the bill was unconstitutional. A year later, after much work had been done to carry out the provisions of the original bill, Senators Simmons and Overman changed their minds. Senator Tyson had become a Senator, and a joint bill including the Senators from Virginia, the Senators from Tennessee, and the Senators from North Carolina was introduced and became the law, as shown by the bill approved May 22, 1926.

The Great Smoky Mountains National Park could not have been established, except by Federal enactment, and, as you see, this was done under a bill originally proposed by me.

The reason Senator Swanson and I introduced a joint bill after previously having introduced individual bills was this: We found, after careful investigation, that if these bills were taken up separately we could not get them passed in the Senate, but at the same time we found that if we consolidated the measures and put them all in one bill we would not have great trouble in passing the combined bill in the Senate. Senator Swanson and I being practical and experienced legislators, we joined our forces and established all three parks.

Since that time every measure concerning the park, insofar as I can recall, and I know every appropriation for the park, has been passed at my instance. Why the people of east Tennessee should question these facts I do not know, and especially why you, by reference to a portion of the record, should undertake to deprive me of the authorship, I am certainly unable to understand. In the last few years a number of gentlemen have claimed credit for the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, as you know. The foregoing constitute the facts.

I never did a more unselfish piece of work in my life than I did in establishing this park. There were these beautiful mountains which I thought could be turned into one of the most wonderful parks in the world. If anyone ever wrote me about it or suggested it to me I do not now recall it. I thought I could do my State, and especially east Tennessee, a great public service by taking the course I have uniformly taken concerning the park. For nearly 15 years I have seen constant publications in the two Knoxville papers

in which authorship of the park was claimed for other people. I did not believe that people generally believed any such statements, I supposed it was political opposition which caused these statements to be made, and insofar as I now know this is the first published claim I have ever made concerning the authorship of the bills which established these parks.

But when you, Chairman of the Great Smoky Mountains Regional Planning Commission, write me as you have definitely asserting that my authorship of the establishment of the park is not only questioned but you undertake to disprove it, I am forced to publish the facts. I sought only to do my State a service. Knoxville is the greatest beneficiary of the park, but all parts of the State, especially east Tennessee, are beneficiaries of these acts. Insofar as I can recall, I have never received a work of thanks from anyone concerning the park. On the contrary, I have seen published time and time again the fiercest criticism of me in connection with the park and statements of claims made by others as to their authorship of this great public undertaking.

It will be remembered that the legislature of Tennessee, on April 10, 1925, some 2 or 3 months after the passage of the McKellar bill in Congress creating the Great Smoky Mountains National Park passed a bill providing for the incorporation of corporations for park purposes and authorizing the acquisition of lands for public-park purposes. This bill was approved by Governor Peay on April 10, 1925. On the same date, April 10, 1925, the legislature passed a bill authorizing the Tennessee State Park and Forestry Commission to buy from the Little River Lumber Co. 76,507 acres of the lands now within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. This act also authorized the lands thus purchased to be turned over to the United States of America for national-park purposes. This bill was approved by Governor Peay on the same day, April 10, 1925. The purpose of these two acts was to take advantage of the act of Congress, introduced and passed by me, providing for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Frankly, General Maloney, I thought every informed man in the State knew how the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was established.

As to the bill you mention in your letter of July 11, H. R. 9464, concerning which I was never consulted, I shall be glad to look into the matter and see what can be done. If there is any reasonable expectation that you and your friends will be able to buy the right-of-way of which you speak, I shall be very happy to help you in the enterprise if we can find the money here for the construction of the road.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours.

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Connecticut Slovak Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ADDRESS BY EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK AND RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY SLOVAK ALLIANCE OF BRIDGEPORT AND VICINITY, INC.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a patriotic address delivered by Hon. Edward J. Behuncik on the occasion of Connecticut Slovak Day held at Bridgeport, Conn., on July 7, and that following the address of Mr. Behuncik there be published resolutions adopted on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your excellency, Bishop O'Brien, Reverend Fathers Hon. Senator Maloney, Hon. Mayor McLevy, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans of Slovak birth and descent, today we meet as we have in the last 4 years, to celebrate Slovak Day. Our program follows the general pattern of past years.

But because of world conditions and because we wish our position made known to all the purpose of today's festival differs from that of previous celebrations.

We had used this happy and joyful day of recreation to show our fellow Americans that we still respected and held dear the memory and traditions of our native and ancestral land even while we were good American citizens.

Today we likewise plan to have a good time, but we use this occasion to show our fellow Americans that we hold dearer our own United States, that we are true and loyal American citizens who stand firmly united beneath the one flag that symbolizes our common democracy, a nation of free men and women determined to maintain for ourselves and our posterity the principles of liberty and justice upon which our Government was founded, upon which it stands today, and upon which it will continue to stand so long as we all do our part.

This is no time for words unless they can be translated into action. Therefore this year we, first of all, discontinued our parade with its floats and flags of our ancestral land. Instead we took the initiative to become the first foreign racial group to place a float, which you all saw as you entered the park here today, in the "I am an American" parade on the Fourth of July and we won second prize with our entry. And lest any might think otherwise, we salute but one flag, the only flag you see on this platform—our own Stars and Stripes.

In thus making this a patriotic demonstration to exemplify our true Americanism we opened our program with religious services, because we appreciate and cherish freedom of worship given us by this Government of ours; we opened this portion of the speaking program with a patriotic hymn, because we appreciate and cherish freedom of speech given us by this Government of ours; we have representatives of our city, State, and National Governments discussing common problems in a friendly manner, even though they are all of three different political faiths—because we, with them, appreciate and cherish the right of free assemblage given us by our Government. We listen to the speeches without fear of air raids or uniformed armies because we still enjoy liberty and freedom in this last bulwark of democracy.

It is in this patriotic spirit that I greet and welcome you here as Americans rather than as fellow Slovaks. I trust you will enjoy yourselves with your families, your friends, and your acquaintances with whom you not only have ties of race and blood, but, what is of greater importance, ties of common citizenry in the greatest country of the world.

That you may take an active part in this manifestation of loyalty to our God and our country and of fealty to His and its elected authorities, the resolutions committee has prepared several resolutions to be submitted for your approval which then shall be forwarded to the proper persons and authorities.

Last year you were urged by one of our guest speakers to become citizens and to assist your friends and relatives in becoming citizens. That many of you have done so I know not only from personal experience and knowledge but from other sources as well. To you I extend our sincerest congratulations.

To those of you who are still but prospective citizens, I repeat that advice—show your appreciation for what this country has given you, what it means to you—become fellow citizens by your own free choice. Thus you, too, will be taking an active part in our program.

The committees who served with me have all given greatly of their time and energy to insure the success of this fifth Slovak Day. I wish to publicly thank each one of them for their unselfish sacrifices of time and effort and would have them feel that their work was but a patriotic service in making this the day of reaffirmed allegiance and loyalty to America by the Slovak-Americans of Bridgeport and vicinity. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen of all the committees.

To our distinguished speakers I extend a cordial welcome and express our sincere thanks for giving us of their valuable time and knowledge. I assure them that not only are we willing to state by word of mouth the allegiance we express today but, as always in the past, our groups here and elsewhere in America will ever remain loyal, firm, and true to the best interests of this our native or adopted country. Slovak history in America is one of which all Americans are proud, and here in Bridgeport our record is exceptional. So it shall continue.

On this day, while we still enjoy liberty and freedom, when we in America are not in any crisis of war, we renew our pledge of duty to our country; we humbly and reverently pray that peace to men of good will shall soon return to the world; we beg that Almighty God in His infinite goodness and mercy will assist with holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the decisions of the President of the United States and the deliberations of our Congress, so that peace here can be preserved, national safety and happiness promoted, and the blessing of equal liberty perpetuated. We respectfully and confidently submit to the leadership and wisdom of our great humanitarian President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our Congress, our State officials, and our municipal authorities.

To our guests I say, come what may when called by city, State, or National authorities to do our part in preparing the national defense, in preserving democracy on earth, and in promoting the return of peace the Slovak-Americans of Bridgeport and vicinity shall not fail, whatever the sacrifice required. I am certain I speak the sentiments of all when I say that our actions here today are but additional proof, if any be necessary, of the statement that "Ellis Island is beginning to share honors with Plymouth Rock" in American history.

[Resolution]

Whereas the trying days through which the entire world is passing are causing sadness and anxiety to all peace-loving Christians; and

Whereas ruthless invasions are being made upon the lives, property, and liberty of innocent and peace-loving populations in Europe, from which we Slovaks, together with other American citizens, have descended; and

Whereas the United States is presently infested with subversive and destructive elements, consisting of nationals of totalitarian countries, which make up the so-called "fifth column"; and

Whereas the sole purpose of these un-American groups is to disturb, undermine, and upset our democratic institutions; and

Whereas the Slovak Alliance of Bridgeport and Vicinity, Inc., is composed of Americans of Slovak birth or descent: Be it

Resolved, That we, members of the Slovak Alliance of Bridgeport and Vicinity, Inc., here assembled to celebrate our fifth annual Slovak Day, go on record denouncing such ruthless invasion of life, liberty, and property of innocent and peace-loving populations; and be it further

Resolved, That we wholeheartedly endorse the splendid stand taken by the President of the United States in his efforts for national defense and the preservation of peace in America; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm our allegiance of loyalty to the United States of America and its duly elected authorities; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the Slovak Alliance of Bridgeport and Vicinity, Inc., offer our cooperation and assistance to the President of the United States and to the other departments of our National, State, and municipal governments with the view of aiding our country in whatever capacity we can toward our national defense, and more particularly in combatting "fifth column" activities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions of loyalty and fealty be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Governor of our State, and to the mayor and the Common Council of the city of Bridgeport.

Dated at Bridgeport, this 7th day of July, A. D. 1940.

SLOVAK ALLIANCE OF BRIDGEPORT AND VICINITY, INC.,
By Rev. STEPHEN J. PANIK,
Rev. MICHAEL J. CARNICKE,
EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK,
Resolutions Committee.

Separate Command for Air Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there has been considerable talk in reference to our creating a third division of the national defense. Some high military authorities are of the opinion that we should have the air forces of this country under one specific head, working in coordination with the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the armed land forces. This afternoon I read an extremely interesting article in the columns of the Washington Daily News entitled "A Separate Command Is Nazi Air Secret." I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 29, 1940]

A SEPARATE COMMAND IS NAZI AIR SECRET

(By Richard C. Hottelet)

BERLIN, July 29.—The German Air Force, which started from scratch 6 years ago, has become indisputably the world's greatest.

Witness Poland, Norway, the low countries, France.

The one factor which, more than any other, made the Reich's "Luftwaffe" what it is today was unified organization—organization so perfect in detail that the German Air Force can function in one capacity or a dozen, in whole or in part, in offense or defense without a hitch and at a moment's notice.

STREAMLINED

The "Luftwaffe" is modern and streamlined in all its parts.

As one of Germany's three armed services, with which it is coequal, the air force has its own commander in chief. With the army and navy, it is subject to orders from Hitler's high command, the supreme unifying and coordinating power.

Non-German experts acquainted with the air force's organization have reported that it functions with an efficiency rare in such large and ramified bodies.

The methods of organization and the routines followed not only are brand new, these experts have discovered, but are also completely flexible so that they may be changed to meet new situations and to allow the greatest possible discretion to the numerous responsible officials.

DEFENSIVE ALSO

The air force is not, as recent history may have seemed to indicate, a purely offensive service. It includes every branch of Germany's defense against air attack, including all antiaircraft artillery. It also has its own signal and medical corps as well as other specialized groups which enable it to operate as a self-contained unit.

The air force may operate independently or in conjunction with the army and navy. Air force units may be detached for service under army or navy command. Discretion for such employment of the air force lies exclusively with the high command.

Although Reich Field Marshal Hermann Wilhelm Goering outranks Admiral Erich Raeder, navy commander in chief, and Gen. Field Marshal Walther von Brauchitsch, army commander in chief, the air force itself enjoys no precedence over the other two branches.

POLISH CAMPAIGN

The past 11 months have illustrated how the air force works. In an operation like the Polish campaign, the army would request a certain number of planes and antiaircraft batteries for local reconnaissance, artillery observation, and protection.

These units would be temporarily detached by the high command and placed under direct command of the army. Meanwhile, the main body of the air force would be operating in its own sphere, bombing enemy lines of communications and air bases and fighting enemy airplanes.

In an operation over difficult terrain and across a body of water, as in the Norwegian campaign, the air force would be closely coordinated with the navy as well as the army.

VERSUS FRANCE AND BRITAIN

In a mixed campaign, involving land as well as water operations, as in the offensive against France and Britain, air power would be used constantly, both independently and in coordination with land and sea forces.

At the outset of the drive, acting in its own realm, the air force would strike en masse against enemy air bases with a view to seizing air superiority at once. If success met this attempt, large units might then be detached for army service to aid ground forces to smash their way deeper into enemy territory.

Always, however, whatever its function of the moment, the air force is cooperating with its brother services in driving toward some specific strategic objective.

FLEXIBILITY FIRST

The air force's antiaircraft batteries were employed against enemy tanks and even warships, as well as against enemy planes. In all instances the greatest flexibility of operation was maintained and there was no adherence to set schemes of action merely for the scheme's sake.

In overseas operations the air force would act independently, raiding enemy industries, harbors, and other military objectives, and in close cooperation with the Navy, bombing enemy shipping or hunting submarines.

An illustration of the air arm's flexibility was the organization of Germany's crack parachute troops. The original idea was Gen. Ernst Udet's, whose job at the time ostensibly was in connection with the technical development of plane engines.

But there was no jealousy or quibbling and, according to one non-German aviation expert, "No one complained that he was overstepping the functions of his office—they all helped."

The Reich is divided into four air fleets (luftfoltten), each of which includes several air districts (luftgaue). In addition, there are special districts covering small areas of greater military vulnerability, such as Berlin, Leipzig, and the Ruhr industrial valley.

The air fleet command is in charge of all operations and all plane bases, communications, and whatever equipment it may need.

SELF-CONTAINED

If the air fleet gets an offensive assignment, it may leave its home base or even depart from Germany lock, stock, and barrel. It then becomes a completely self-contained fighting unit fully supplied with its own fighting, bombing, reconnaissance, staff and hospital planes, and its own antiaircraft batteries, signal corps, quartermasters detachments, and medical units.

In short, it is given the task of bringing operations to a successful conclusion and is supplied with all means of doing so.

One expert summed it up by saying:

"If circumstance demands, the air fleet can have infantrymen, sailors, artillerymen, and engineers assigned to it. Nobody worries about the seeming heterogeneity of organization—the only consideration is that the air fleet is to do a job and do it efficiently."

Hon. Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY GEN. HUGH S. JOHNSON

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Gen. Hugh S.

Johnson relative to Louis Johnson, formerly Assistant Secretary of War.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Hugh S. Johnson)

It should be a relief after covering two conventions to get the odor of intense politics out of your nostrils. It is bad enough in any convention—bad enough at Philadelphia, superlatively bad at Chicago.

The thing that caused both my hackles and my gorge to rise there was the wholesale crucifixion of loyalty. It is the highest human attribute, but it can be terribly misused. Tales of the berserk fanaticism of the Nazi troops in the Battle of France are eclipsed by the crusader's stories of the old man of the mountain. Hassan, Shiek Al Jabal, and his cult of assassins who would throw themselves over a precipice at their chieftain's nod to demonstrate their loyalty. I am sure it was no myth, because I saw such things at Chicago and know of similar things in our time done by the Moslem Juramentados of Mindanao.

Like sacrifices were demanded and made at Chicago. Men, some the best friends, who have fought unfailingly for the President, sometimes against their dearest convictions, were coldly liquidated by their own commanded action. There are, in Congress, no finer gentleman (in the homely American sense), sweeter characters, or truer men (in any sense) than Senators BYRNES and BARKLEY and Speaker BANKHEAD. They have loyally fought every fight for the President. They were highly entitled to his utmost loyalty in return.

Any of them could have been nominated for the Presidency or Vice Presidency. Any was entitled to it. For the first place, none ever had a chance. For the Vice Presidency all had to take their death sentences in favor of a New Deal Republican at the hand of a New Deal Socialist—neither of whom had ever been elected to anything.

They took their deprivation of the essential right of every American bravely, faithfully, and with a smile—and so did Jim Farley, to whom Mr. Roosevelt owes more than to any human being except his mother and his wife. The bosh about this being a choice in a crisis of the best potential President, I just can't swallow. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Wallace, but that he is better Presidential timber than any of these honorable, experienced, and faithful statesmen is pure hogwash.

Sickened, I returned to Washington for surcease, only to find a new rumor coming from so many informed sources as to give it credence. It was that the new Tory Republic Secretary of War had asked his vigorous assistant, Louis Johnson, to "get the hell out of there."

I have not always seen eye to eye with Mr. Johnson. At first I thought he was politicalizing and new dealizing the Army. My criticism was well-informed but it proved premature.

That job differs from any other sub-Cabinet position. It is charged by statute with industrial mobilization of the whole Nation in an emergency. My observation was that Mr. Johnson did not fully appreciate this vast problem in the beginning. He certainly does now. His work here is not paralleled elsewhere in Government.

It is no task for an amateur. Mr. Johnson has been educated. It would take a new man a year even to get the feel of it. We have no years to spare—not even days.

In 1937, the President recognized this. He persuaded Louis Johnson to remain by a forthright promise to make him Secretary of War.

At Chicago, American Legion leaders started to stage a cyclonic drive to make Johnson Vice President. He was hastily recalled to Washington. Immediately afterward, Secretary Stimson, with his new chair hardly warm, got out the ax. He would not have moved so boldly with no suggestion from the President.

Politics marches on—ruthlessly, respecting nothing, sparing nothing. I would like to go to Tahiti or San Juan de Boc Boc. I have been at the latter place. It has a romantic name but it stinks of sour copra, muddy hogs, and wet carabao. It is a vale of cashmere compared with this atmosphere.

Business Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY HARVEY E. RUNNER

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, the American people are very properly interested in knowing about the present economic situation in our country. It is important that they know the facts. In arriving at the facts it is always well to look to a source which is not prejudiced.

The New York Herald Tribune is outspoken in its opposition to the present administration. Therefore, when it features an article predicting industrial gains which may equal any in the Nation's history, such article is worthy of study by everyone interested.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Herald Tribune of yesterday, written by Harvey E. Runner, of the staff of that newspaper, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL NEWS OF THE DAY—MIDYEAR REPORTS OF EARNINGS SPREAD OPTIMISM FOR UPTURN—GOOD GAINS SHOWN WITHOUT BENEFITS OF DEFENSE PROGRAM, AND WHEN THAT GETS GOING, IMPROVEMENT MAY EQUAL ANY IN NATION'S HISTORY

(By Harvey E. Runner)

General business perked up from its becalmed state last week as a flood of good news unfolded in the semiannual financial reports of corporation earnings and sales covering operations in the first half of 1940. As compared with the same 1939 period, these reports showed a substantial improvement, which becomes more impressive when it is realized that the gains, in most instances, were made without the benefits bound to come from this Nation's multi-billion-dollar defense program.

But where the influences of the defense forces were at work, mostly in the aviation, automobile, and steel industries, the increases were truly phenomenal, resulting in some companies, like Chrysler Corporation and Glenn L. Martin Co., recording all-time highs in both sales and profits.

The favorable showing generally in the midyear financial statements, whether or not companies have been working on defense orders, was the week's most encouraging development to businessmen. The belief was that if corporations, both large and small, could have made the progress they did in the first half of the year, the possibilities were good that even greater sales and profits could be made in the second 6 months, provided, of course, no deterrents were inflicted on business in the meantime.

FAVORABLE SIGNS ON HORIZON

Meanwhile there were increasing signs that fall business would be good, always remembering, though, that an unfavorable turn for the English in the pending battle of Britain might change the picture. The New York Herald Tribune index of general business continued its upturn, advancing fractionally from 87 to 87.6. A year ago at the same time the index stood at 72.9.

Steel mill operations stepped into a new 1940 high. Iron Age placed the production rate at 89 percent of capacity, a 1.5-point rise from the previous week. British buying continued to be an important factor. Purchasing for new railroad locomotives, freight cars, and other needs also was substantial. Automobile companies, too, began to place orders for new steel. Buying for defense needs has increased, and while now being felt by the industry has not as yet reached the impressive proportions steel men believe will come as the armament program broadens.

Banks report business loans on the rise. Many inquiries are being received, too, which are traceable directly to the defense program. A vast amount of plant expansion remains to be done. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, sought to speed up the work by naming a five-man advisory committee to cooperate with his department on its forthcoming $500,000,000 defense construction program.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, also eased the way by issuing a ruling permitting amortization of new plant facilities over the period of the leasehold pending more definite legislative action. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been helping companies working on defense orders with loans. At the week end it announced a $92,000,000 loan to Wright Aeronautical to enable the company to build a new plant.

INDUSTRY BACKLOGS SUBSTANTIAL

Backlogs, especially in the aviation field, are the largest in history, calling for sizable plant expansion. In steel, too, the backlogs are large. Bethlehem Steel Corporation announced that new orders were pouring in at a rate about 40 percent in excess of the company's current operating lever of 99 percent of capacity. On June 30 the company had orders on hand valued at $288,521,487, a new peace-time record, comparing with orders of $184,921,081 as of June 30, 1939.

Significant is the announcement by Eugene G. Grace, president of Bethlehem, that the current backlog does not reflect the national-defense program to any important degree. This is even more true in the case of most companies, especially those operating in fields other than steel and aviation and in some branches of the textile industry.

When the full impact of the billions to be spent for defense is felt by industry, a period of business improvement equal to any in the Nation's history may prevail. According to the latest figures issued by William S. Knudsen, coordinator of industrial production for the National Advisory Defense Commission, Army and Navy contracts were placed at the rate of $41,147,500 each business day from June 6 through July 25.

AUTOMOBILE PICTURE BRIGHT

Continued good demand exists for automobiles, both new and used models. Like the first 10 days in July, reports covering the second 10 days of the month showed sharp increases in sales over the same 1939 period, July gains ranged up to 73 percent above a year ago. Predictions are that final figures for the month will show an average increase of 20 percent for the industry.

Automobile car loadings in the Great Lakes region in July, August, and September will show a gain of 35 percent over the like 1939 period, according to estimates furnished by shippers. At the same time, the report of the Great Lakes Regional Advisory Board forecasts total loading of all classifications of 480,281 cars, a gain of 13.2 percent over the third quarter of last year.

The board's report further stated that the forecast did not include any appreciable amount of activity arising out of the defense program, so that there is thus every possibility that the projected increase will be augmented considerably.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Mr. Knudsen reported at the week end that present schedules call for the delivery of 25,000 trucks to the Nation's armed services by December 31 of this year. He did not reveal whether this figure included truck deliveries already made. It is known that Chrysler has shipped more than 10,000 trucks so far this year to the Government and has on its books orders for 4,500 more.

Tire sales have reflected the improvement made in the automobile industry. June sales rose 17.5 percent over those of May, becoming the largest for any month since June 1932. Heavy buying in advance of the new Federal tax which became effective July 1 was a factor in the increase. Tire shipments for 1940 are expected to be the largest since 1929, with the possible exception of those of 1939.

Selective Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

LETTER FROM RABBI HARRY S. JACOBS AND REPLY BY HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR, OF NEW JERSEY, AND ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter under date of July 10 which I received from Rabbi Harry S. Jacobs, of Newark, in connection with the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill, a copy of my reply to Rabbi Jacobs under date of July 15, and an article from the New York Times of July 9 referred to in the rabbi's letter.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWARK, N. J., *July 10 1940.*

Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR,
Senator from New Jersey.

DEAR SENATOR BARBOUR: I have just received your letter thanking me for my suggestions to you anent keeping our beloved land out of the European conflict. I am indeed deeply appreciative of the courteous consideration you have given to my communication.

These are days of quick-moving events, and thus I hasten to urge another matter to your attention, namely, the soon-to-be-proposed Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill. Although whole-heartedly committed to the fullest national defense, in which you concur, I am opposed to totalitarian methods of conscription to raise an enormous fighting force by un-American and undemocratic methods, which a peacetime draft would signify. I am enclosing herewith a clipping from the New York Times of July 9, 1940, setting forth the views of 240 educators, authors, and clergymen on this matter. The declaration analyzes brilliantly, I believe, the totalitarian trend of the proposed measure. I would urge upon you very strongly to join your strength in opposing this measure and to aid in the public understanding of the danger of this measure to American free institutions, to have it published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under your privilege of extended remarks.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. HARRY S. JACOBS.

P. S.: I was glad to receive your statement concerning Mr. Cromwell's attack on the American Constitution. It was really a shock to read it. You can be assured of my unswerving devotion to your reelection.

H. S. J.

JULY 15, 1940.

Rabbi HARRY S. JACOBS,
178 Mapes Avenue, Newark, N. J.

DEAR RABBI JACOBS: Thank you once more for a most illuminating letter. Certainly I agree with you that there is no justification for introducing totalitarian methods in the United States. On the other hand, the volume of recruiting for the Army has proceeded so slowly that it is already quite evident that we shall have to find some other method of bringing the Army up to its newly authorized strength. It is not proposed to "raise an enormous fighting force by un-American and undemocratic methods," but we simply must build and maintain an Army of reasonable size and see that it is supplied with the best equipment procurable. To do less is to invite invasion of the Western Hemisphere, and I know that you and your associates would not want to see Hitlerism transplanted to America.

Your letter reaches me during a recess of Congress. When the Senate reconvenes I shall ask to have our two letters and the accompanying clipping introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you very much indeed, also, for your generous personal reference. I more than appreciate it.

With kind regard, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

[From the New York Times of July 9, 1940]

EDUCATORS ASSAIL PEACETIME DRAFT—GROUP OF 240, INCLUDING ALSO WRITERS, CLERGY, AND BUSINESS LEADERS, JOIN IN PROTEST—DICTATOR TREND IS SEEN—IDEA THAT THE INDIVIDUAL IS SUBSERVIENT TO STATE SAID TO UNDERLIE SUCH A PLAN

A "declaration against conscription" which said that peacetime drafting of manpower for military duties "smacks of totalitarianism" and would be highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy was issued yesterday by a group of 240 educators, writers, religious leaders, and professional and business men and women.

It was issued through the Committee on Militarism in Education, of which Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, professor emeritus of education at Teachers College, is chairman. Edwin C. Johnson is secretary.

TEXT OF DECLARATION

The declaration, in full, was as follows:

"The American people are today being deluged by propaganda for military conscription in peacetime. Sincere and distinguished as many of the proponents of conscription may be, and plausible as many of their contentions may seem, we, the undersigned, urge the American people and their representatives in Congress to deliberate with sober caution before permitting such an unprecedented innovation to become a part of our national life.

"In our judgment, military conscription in peacetime smacks of totalitarianism, and we are convinced that its adoption would be highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy. The reasons upon which we support this conviction are as follows:

"First, the essential idea underlying military conscription is the major premise of every dictatorship and all totalitarianism. It is the assumption that the individual citizen is but a pawn in the hands of unlimited state power. Conscription has always been abhorrent to free men because it is, in effect, a seizure of a man's body, time, and service by force and under threat of heavy penalty.

"For generations millions of Europeans have fled their native countries and become loyal and devoted American citizens in order to enjoy, among other things, our freedom from conscription. Universal military service has been and is today the chief weapon by which dictators suppress free conscience among their people, inculcate them with the false ideals of chauvinistic nationalism, and indoctrinate them with belief in the superiority of brute force over morals and ideas.

"The adoption of conscription among Americans will be the opening wedge for the totalitarian dogma that individual citizens are pawns of the state from birth until death, without any rights which those in positions of power are bound to respect. Americans must not delude themselves with the belief that their democracy will remain unscathed if we adopt the essentially antidemocratic processes which have worked such havoc abroad.

"SELECTIVE SERVICE HELD SOPHISTRY

"Second, we consider that peacetime conscription is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy. We reject as transparent sophistry the contention that conscription under the name of 'selective service' is democratic and that voluntary military service is undemocratic. The 'equality' that conscription makes for is akin to the 'equality' which prevails among regimented galley slaves. It is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude.

"Our American conception of democracy signifies vastly more than mere equality, for it also includes the great concepts of liberty and freedom for the individual. Furthermore, we deny that conscription can be justified by the assertion that it prevails in such democracies as England, Sweden, and Switzerland. The conditions we face in United States are in many respects widely different from and not comparable to those prevailing in European nations.

"For this reason valid conceptions of American democracy and military service must be derived from American history and tradition, not from contemporary European practices. In our view,

peacetime conscription and American democracy are quite incompatible.

"Third, the adoption of military conscription in peacetime would be a radical departure from historic American tradition. Never before in American history has it been thought necessary to resort to peacetime conscription for purposes of defense. This fact has been one of the truly glorious traditions of our American democracy; in common with most Americans we take profound pride in it, and we deny that the time has now come to abandon this feature of our national life because of the events in Europe, the gravity of which we well recognize.

"We are confident that the defense purposes enumerated in the Constitution—'to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasion'—can still be met and effectively discharged without resort to peacetime conscription.

"As ardently concerned for the safety of our beloved Republic as any advocate of universal service can possibly be, we reject the suggestion that to preserve American democracy we must embrace the worst feature of the totalitarian regimes. We deny that free Americans must now, in the name of freedom, submit to peacetime conscription and thereby become regimented vassals of the national state.

SEE DISRUPTION IN LIFE

"Finally, we oppose conscription because of the disruption it will cause in our American way of life, and also because we question its necessity and wisdom as a defense measure. The military regimentation of the entire manpower of our Nation will inevitably result in widespread dislocation in business, industry, agriculture, and higher education; and it may prove unnecessary and ineffectual from a military standpoint. Conscription would have been unnecessary in 1917 if we had been raising a force for the defense of our territory rather than an Army of 5,000,000 men for service in Europe.

"Today the asserted need is for substantial expansion in our Army, Navy, and Air Corps. If the personnel need is for higher-trained permanent forces sufficient in number to man expertly the new weapons as they are produced, we contend this need can best be met by voluntary enlistments under pay schedules sufficiently attractive to induce the required numbers to enroll. By such a procedure it may well be that the required enlistments could be obtained before the new weapons themselves are ready.

"This solution for the asserted need would seem to us to be vastly preferable to the alternative of organizing huge forces of partially trained civilians. It would be free of totalitarian semblance, as it would be in keeping with our democratic traditions and conceptions. Moreover, it would be based on a recognition of the military lesson being taught on European battlefields—that comparatively small forces of highly trained soldier-mechanics, properly equipped, can defeat many times their number of partially trained civilian conscripts, regardless of how courageous the latter may be.

"For these reasons, and for others, we appeal to all our fellow Americans who have a zealous regard for the preservation of their democratic institutions to identify themselves with the cause represented in this declaration."

SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION

The signers were: Rev. Ralph C. Abele, St. Louis, Mo.; Prof. Freeman H. Allen, Colgate University; Rev. Paul J. Allured, Kinde, Mich.; Rev. R. M. Atkins, Flint, Mich.; Prof. Zonia Baber, Chicago; Prof. Charles S. Bacon, Chicago; Cyrus LeRoy Baldridge, New York; Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, Cooperstown, N. Y.; Prof. Albert Barrett, Scarritt College, Nashville; Rev. Norman B. Barr, Chicago; Dr. John Barrow, Berea (Ky.) College; Prof. Howard K. Beale, University of North Carolina; Rev. Canon Bernard Iddings Bell, Providence, R. I.; Alice Stone Blackwell, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Ralph E. Blount, Oak Park, Ill.; Rev. Edward H. Bonsall, Jr., Philadelphia; Prof. Edwin Borchard, Yale University; Rev. Dr. Charles F. Boss, Jr., Chicago; Prof. W. Russell Bowie, Union Theological Seminary; Prof. Edward S. Boyer, James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.; Fred G. L. Boyer, Hamilton, Ohio; Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, New York; Rev. Dr. Edwin A. Brown, Cincinnati; Hugh Elmer Brown, Evanston, Ill.; Zaidee Brown, Upper Montclair, N. J.; F. W. Burnham, Richmond, Va; Harold S. Buttenheim, Madison, N. J.; Benjamin Cadbury, Moorestown, N. J.; Mrs. A. Morris Carey, Baltimore; Mr. and Mrs. Charles L. Carhart, Chevy Chase, Md.; Rev. J. Henry Carpenter, Brooklyn; Rev. Harold F. Carr, Flint, Mich.; Richard B. Carter, West Newton, Mass.; Prof. Adelaide Case, Columbia University; Prof. J. McKeen Cattell, Garrison, N. Y.; Dean W. G. Chambers, State College, Pa.; Rev. A. Burns Chalmers, Northampton, Mass.; Harold A. Chance, Philadelphia; Sarah Cleghorn, Manchester, Vt.; Prof. Frank W. Clelland, Atlanta; David L. Clendenin, New York; Prof. J. Herschel Coffin, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.; Mrs. E. A. Codman, Boston; Rev. Dr. Albert Buckner Coe, Oak Park, Ill.; Prof. Morris R. Cohen, New York; Prof. Norman F. Coleman, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. George L. Collins, Madison, Wis.; Dean E. N. Comfort, University of Oklahoma; Rev. Elbert M. Conover, New York; Paul M. Cope, Atlantic City, N. J.; Mrs. J. Sergeant Cram, New York; Rev. Dr. Henry H. Crane, Detroit; Dr. Abraham Cronbach, Cincinnati; Prof. Edward E. Curtis, Wellesley, Mass.; Dorothy Day, editor, the Catholic Worker, New York; Rev. Dr. Albert Edward Day, Pasadena, Calif.; Prof. John W. Darr, Scripps College, Claremont, Calif.; Rev. E. LeRoy Dakin, Milwaukee; Dorothy Detzer, Washington, D. C.; Babette Deutsch, New York; Prof. John Dewey, New York; Prof. Dorr Diefendorf, Madison, N. J.; Harriet A. Dillingham, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Alice L. Dodge, New York; Frances Doherty, Madison, N. J.; Prof. Horace A. Eaton, Syracuse University; Mrs. Emily L. Eaton, Syracuse, N. Y.; Christopher R. Eliot, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Ellen Coit Elliott, Sanford University; Rev. Dr. Phillips P. Elliott, Brooklyn; Prof. Charles A. Ellwood, Duke University; Jane Evans, Cincinnati; Allan Farquhar, Sandy Spring, Md.; Mary Farquharson, Seattle, Wash.; Rev. Victor G. Flinn, Brooklyn; William Floyd, New York; Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, Milton, Mass.; Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York; Margaret Gage, New York; Mrs. Ruth Gage-Colby, St. Paul, Minn.; President Buell G. Gallagher, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Mrs. Mary T. L. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. Merritt F. Garland, Haverhill, Mass.; Rev. Harding W. Gaylord, Farmington, Maine; Rev. Robert Cowan Grady, Cleveland; C. Hartley Grattan, New York; Rev. Dr. W. E. J. Gratz, Chicago; Prof. G. H. Graves, Purdue University; Harold S. Gray, Saline, Mich.; Richard B. Gregg, South Natick, Mass.; Prof. C. H. Hamlin, Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.; J. J. Handsaker, Portland, Oreg.; Prof. George W. Hartmann, Columbia University; Prof. Georgia Harkness, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Stanley G. Harris, Jr., Seattle, Wash.; Rev. Charles Hart, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Prof. Hugh Hartshorne, Yale University, J. S. C. Harvey, Radnor, Pa.; William B. Harvey, Westtown, Pa.; Harold A. Hatch, Sharon, Conn.; I. A. Hirschmann, New York; Rev. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York; Quincy Howe, New York; Clarence V. Howell, New York; Paul H. Hudson, Upper Montclair, N. J.; B. W. Huebsch, New York; Dr. Jessie Wallace Hughan, New York; Rev. Harold Stone Hull, Pasadena, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Allan A. Hunter, Hollywood, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Stanley Armstrong Hunter, Berkeley, Calif.; Paul Hutchinson, Chicago; Rev. Dr. Finis S. Idleman, New York; Mr. and Mrs. Philip E. Jacob, Princeton, N. J.; William C. James, Berkeley, Calif.; Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius Jansen, Pasadena, Calif.; Rev. Dr. Ray Freeman Jenney, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Harold V. Jensen, Seattle, Wash.; Bede A. Johnson, Los Angeles, Calif.; Edwin C. Johnson, New York; Bishop Paul Jones, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Prof. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford College; Rev. Allen Keedy, Shenandoah, Iowa; Rev. Harold R. Keen, Hebron, Conn.; Dean Frederick D. Kershner, Butler College, Indianapolis; Dr. William P. King, Nashville, Tenn.; President Willis J. King, Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Dow Kirkpatrick, Atlanta; Rev. Dr. Albert J. Kissling, Jacksonville, Fla.; Rev. H. P. Krehbiel, Newton, Kans.; Rev. Dr. William E. Lampe, Philadelphia; Rev. Leon Rosser Land, New York; Carl J. Landes, Chicago; Rev. Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Brooklyn; Bishop W. Appleton Lawrence, Springfield, Mass.; Henry W. Leeds, Atlantic City, N. J.; Caesar S. Ledbetter, Charleston, S. C.; Frederick J. Libby, Washington, D. C.; Rev. John Leslie Lobingier, Boston; Rev. Dr. Sidney Lovett, Yale University; Prof. Halford E. Luccock, Yale University; Prof. Eugene W. Lyman, Union Theological Seminary; Prof. Helen Merrell Lynd, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville; Prof. Robert S. Lynd, Columbia University; Robert W. MacGregor, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.; the Reverend Oscar Maddaus, Manhasset, Long Island, N. Y.; the Reverend Dr. Charles A. Maddry, Richmond, Va.; Horace Mann, Richmond, Mass.; Benjamin C. Marsh, Washington, D. C.; Milton S. Mayer, University of Chicago, Chicago; Mary S. McDowell, Brooklyn; the Reverend William McFadden, West La Fayette, Ind.; the Reverend Dr. D. P. McGeachy, Decatur, Ga.; the Reverend Dr. Elmore M. McKee, New York; Prof. Charles McKinley, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.; William Ayer McKinney, Chicago; the Reverend Dr. N. C. McPherson, Jr., Atlanta; President O. Myking Mehus, Winona State Teachers College, Winona, Minn.; President W. O. Mendenhall, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.; Orie O. Miller, Akron, Pa.; Bert G. Mitchell, Seattle, Wash.; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Phoenix, Ariz.; the Reverend Dr. A. J. Muste, New York; the Reverend Arthur Newell Moore, Houlton, Maine; Mrs. Ethel P. Moors, Brookline, Mass.; Rachel Conrad Nason, West Hartford, Conn.; the Reverend Dr. J. Pierce Newell, Superior, Wis.; the Reverend Charles C. Noble, Glens Falls, N. Y.; Dean S. A. Nock, Kansas State College; Waldemar Noll, Berea, Ky.; Mrs. Victor P. Noyes, Gittings, Md.; Helena M. Nye, Stanford University; Frank Olmstead, Leonia, N. J.; Mrs. Mildred Scott Olmsted, Philadelphia; the Reverend Howard B. Osborne, Bridgeport, Nebr.; the Reverend George L. Paine, Boston; Carl Patterson, Chester Hill, Ohio; Mrs. Marie Pautz, Los Angeles; Rabbi David Philipson, Cincinnati; Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce, New York; Dean Charles W. Pipkin, Louisiana State University; Kenneth W. Porter, Vassar College; the Reverend Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Cleveland; Richard W. Pousetti-Dart, Valhalla, N. Y.; President Roscoe Pulliam, Southern Illinois State Normal University, Carbondale, Ill.; Prof. Harris F. Rall, Evanston, Ill.; A. R. Rathert, Brainerd, Minn.; Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia University; J. W. Reed, Portland, Oreg.; Bishop William P. Remington, Pendleton, Oreg.; the Reverend E. K. Resler, Strong, Kans.; Ray C. Roberts, Seattle, Wash.; Prof. George L. Robinson, Chicago; Prof. Fred Rodell, Yale Law School; Prof. Herbert W. Rogers, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; George Knox Roth, Los Angeles; Constance Rumbough, Nashville, Tenn.; Dean Elbert Russell, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Porter Sargent, Boston; Mrs. J. Paul Satterthwaite, Westfield, N. J.; the Reverend John Nevin Sayre, Orangeburg, N. Y.; J. Henry Scattergood, Philadelphia; the Reverend Dr. Paul E. Scherer, New York; the Reverend Alfred Schmalz, Darien, Conn.; the Reverend Dr. Frank J. Scribner, New York; Gale Seaman, Los Angeles; Elizabeth Sessions, Hampden, Mass.; the Reverend Dr. Charles M. Sheldon, Topeka, Kans.; Mrs. Robert E. Simon, New York; E. W. Smiley, Warren, Pa.; Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, Evanston, Ill.; J. J. Smith, New Concord, Ohio; Don E. Smucker, Chicago; Prof. Theodore G. Soares, Altadena, Calif.; Guy W. Solt, Philadelphia; Rev. Dr. Frederick K. Stamm, Brooklyn; Dr. Joseph Stokes, Moorestown, N. J.; Rev. Dr. Alfred W. Swan, Madison, Wis.; Prof. Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Union

Theological Seminary; Rev. John M. Swomley, Jr., Harrisburg, Pa.; Alva W. Taylor, Nashville, Tenn.; Katharine Terrill, New York; Leon Thomson, Lincoln, Nebr.; the Reverend Dr. Ernest Fremont Tittle, Evanston, Ill.; Prof. Arthur J. Todd, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Frank M. Toothaker, Compton, Calif.; Prof. Edward L. Tullis, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Prof. Harold S. Tuttle, College of the City of New York; Rev. Dr. Robert Leonard Tucker, Columbus, Ohio; William A. Tyler, Ogden, Utah; Oswald Garrison Villard, New York; Dr. Carleton Washburne, Winnetka, Ill.; Mrs. Margaret P. Welch, Boston; Rev. Eliot White, Roselle, N. J.; Prof. Henry N. Wieman, University of Chicago; Rev. George L. Willets, Caldwell, N. J.; Theresa L. Wilson, St. Johns School, Mountain Lakes, N. J.; Rev. and Mrs. Elwin L. Wilson, Biddeford, Me.; Prof. Thomas Woody, University of Pennsylvania; Rev. Harold Worden Wylie, Clinton, N. Y.; President William L. Young, Park College, Parkville, Mo.

History of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE FROM ASHEVILLE (N. C.) ADVOCATE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article from the Asheville Advocate, of my home town, Asheville, N. C., which deals with the history of that section, and makes mention of the trek made there several hundred years ago by the explorer and discoverer, De Soto, when he was on his way westward.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMER SEASON IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA BRINGS TO MIND MANY INTERESTING NORTH CAROLINA FACTS—AUTOGRAPHED PHOTOS OF MANY MEN IN PUBLIC LIFE ON WALLS OF HOTEL LANGREN SENATORIAL SUITE

Annually there are held throughout the State of North Carolina many festivals, all of which have their queens to be crowned, and all queens of which are selected as a result of their poise, beauty, and popularity. There are tobacco festivals, cotton festivals, watermelon festivals, and festivals of all sorts, including last but by far not least, the rhododendron festival which is held in Asheville during the summer season.

The Asheville festival is no doubt one of the most unique of any and annually it is visited by thousands from all parts of the South, with many from the North and other sections of the country.

Rhododendron, providing a beautiful flower from most pretentious branches, is the theme of this occasion, and so widespread has been the publicity in reference to western North Carolina's colorful rhododendron that it is marketed by the mountaineers in many sections of the country through relatives or representatives.

A visit to Asheville, N. C., to this festival accords those who accept of the hospitality of this occasion an opportunity to visit the largest national park east of the Rocky Mountains, known as the Smoky Mountains National Park, one entrance of which is only a couple of hours' drive from the city of Asheville itself. This park as yet has not been accepted by the Federal Government, but arrangements are being made for that formal acceptance when the President of the United States may find it possible to honor the people of North Carolina and Tennessee with his presence at a dedicatory exercise, since part of the park is in Tennessee and part in North Carolina.

Last year more than 600,000 people visited the park, and during the ensuing year more than 900,000 are expected to vision the scenic, beautiful, and heavenly ranges and valleys that wind gracefully through its vast area.

North Carolinians are proud of its history and their heritage. In western North Carolina is to be found Mount Mitchell, said to be the highest peak east of the Rockies. Through these lofty hills and over these towering ranges, then a vast wilderness, the aborigines hunted and fished. In this section years before the white man came there was fought a great battle between two Indian tribes, probably the Cherokees on the one hand and the Shawnees or the Catawbas on the other. It is also a tradition that these lands for a long while were neutral hunting grounds for these tribes, and this is evidenced to a very large degree by the vast findings of flint rocks, arrow points, and in this connection it is said that two of the largest private collections of flints in existence are located in Asheville.

This section of western North Carolina has a historical background dated back to Hernando De Soto, who about 400 years ago is said to have passed through that section by way of Hickory Nut Gap, some 15 miles from Asheville, en route westward, where he died near the banks of the Mississippi River. De Soto, one of the conquerors of Peru, undertook to explore the eastern part of the present United States in search of another Peru and started at Tampa Bay, in Florida. He is said to have marched northward through Georgia, South Carolina, and into North Carolina, and then turned westward into the mountains, where we are told he passed along an Indian trail leading almost squarely through the present city of Asheville.

On the plateau upon which Asheville is constructed and at a site now occupied by the Langren Hotel, stood an inn always welcomed by travelers in the old days, known as the Old Buck Hotel, which was constructed by James M. Smith, one of the pioneers in developing that section of the State. During the War between the States the Confederate post office was located at the Old Buck Hotel, and it was there for many, many years that travelers came. The Old Buck Hotel, around 1910, was razed and on that spot there was erected the present Langren Hotel, in which are located the broadcasting quarters of Radio Station WISE. The Langren is unique in that its genial manager, Col. Jack Enwright, a World War veteran, has set aside a suite of rooms known as the senatorial suite. Upon the walls of these spacious quarters are to be found autographs of more than 75 of the 96 United States Senators.

A large engraved photograph of President Roosevelt occupies a commanding position between two of the windows of the living room overlooking Pack Square, where is the Vance Monument erected in honor of Zebulon B. Vance, North Carolina's War Governor and later United States Senator. Also in these rooms is a facsimile copy of the Declaration of Independence and a facsimile copy of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. North Carolinians, of course, are justly proud of these great documents and they delight in reminding their friends of other States of the Union that the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence was pronounced on May 20, 1775, months prior to the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia of July 4, 1776. Colonel Enwright, in an interview several months ago, stated that he had set aside these spacious quarters for exclusive use by all United States Senators because from its lofty location a most excellent view of surrounding mountains can be had, and that in their minds the pioneer days which provided thrills in this mountain country even for hardy and courageous adventurers.

The Old Buck Hotel was one of several hotels designed for the traveler who used the stagecoach. Another one of these old structures is said to have stood near King's Mountain, where one of the decisive battles of the Revolutionary War took place, which was participated in by patriots of North Carolina, South Carolina, and the frontiersmen of that territory now designated as Tennessee, and today the old residents who visit the Langren Hotel envision more readily from this historical site the histories told them by their forefathers.

Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, there has come to my attention the report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to insured banks as of June 30, 1940, made public today by Chairman Leo T. Crowley. This document, summarizing activities of the Corporation since January 1, 1934, is a stirring commentary upon the thorough rehabilitation of our banking system that has occurred during those years.

The rehabilitation began, of course, in 1933 with the subscription to preferred capital of banks by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This program has resulted in gross R. F. C. subscriptions of more than $1,160,000,000 to the capital of upward of 6,100 banks.

Since inception of Federal deposit insurance on January 1, 1934, the entire country has benefited from an era unique in our banking history. We have seen the number of bank failures kept to an absolute minimum, we have seen what hazardous banks there were closed or rehabilitated without material loss to their depositors, we have seen the quality of assets in our banks steadily improve.

These long-sought evidences of financial strength and security resulted from a combination of influences: The confidence inspired in our people by the existence of Federal deposit insurance, the ability of F. D. I. C. to discharge promptly its responsibility to depositors of banks that had difficulties, the elimination of unsound bank assets made possible by R. F. C. capital participation and by F. D. I. C. loans to facilitate mergers, and finally the constant and cooperative efforts of State and Federal bank supervisory

officials to correct weaknesses and to encourage sound bank operation.

What these developments mean in terms of dollars and cents and peace of mind to American bank depositors is strikingly shown by Mr. Crowley's report, which, in summary, shows that—

First. With the outlay of about $80,000,000 during the first 6 months of 1940—largest disbursements for any 6-month period since the beginning of deposit insurance—the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation brought near completion its program for the rehabilitation of banks in the system that have constituted a substantial hazard.

Second. From the beginning of deposit insurance on January 1, 1934, through June 30, 1940, the Corporation cleaned up 342 banks having deposits of more than $431,000,000 and 1,111,535 depositors. The Corporation's gross outlay for protection of depositors in these cases amounted to about $220,000,000. Of this amount about $46,000,000, or about 21 percent, is estimated as the eventual loss.

Third. Despite unprecedented expenditures during the first 6 months of 1940, the surplus of the Corporation increased by about $15,676,000, amounting to $180,265,000 as of June 30, 1940.

Fourth. Protection of all but 1,651 of the 1,111,535 depositors was extended in the 342 insured banks closed or merged with the aid of F. D. I. C. loans through June 30, 1940. Total deposits of these banks were $431,000,000, of which 97.8 percent was made promptly available.

Fifth. There occurred during the first 6 months of 1940 a net reduction of 55 in the number of insured banks, 82 banks having been eliminated, while only 27 banks were admitted to insurance.

Sixth. It now appears that the capital and surplus of the Corporation will have increased to about $500,000,000 by the end of 1940. It might soon, therefore, be appropriate to give consideration to a reasonable reduction in the rate of assessment paid by banks.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO BANKS INSURED BY THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation submits herewith a report relating to the activities of the Corporation for the 6 months ended June 30, 1940, with additional information pertaining to the operations during the 12 months ended on that date and during the entire period of operation of the Corporation. The report also includes a statement of assets and liabilities of the Corporation as of June 30, 1940, and an analysis of surplus for the 6 months ended on that date.

OPERATIONS

The income of the Corporation amounted to $27,382,078 for the 6 months ended June 30, 1940, of which $22,415,429.30 represented assessments paid by insured banks and $4,966,648.70 represented interest earned, after deducting provision for amortization of premiums, and profits on securities sold. Expenses and losses during this period amounted to $11,706,212.72, including deposit-insurance losses and expenses of $9,973,971.08 and administrative expenses and other charges of $1,732,241.64.

Income for the year ended June 30, 1940, amounted to $52,821,658.74, including assessments paid by insured banks of $43,271,826.35 and $9,549,832.39 representing interest earned, less provision for amortization of premiums and profits on securities sold. Total losses and expenses for the year amounted to $14,343,570.47 represented by deposit-insurance losses and expenses of $10,863,369.56 and administrative expenses and other charges of $3,480,200.91.

The surplus of the Corporation as of June 30, 1940, was $180,264,574.29, resulting from an excess of income over expenses and losses during the entire period of operations. From the beginning of deposit insurance, total income has amounted to $245,985,465.67, including assessments of $187,313,359.81 paid by insured banks and $58,672,105.86 derived from interest earned and profits from sales of securities, after making provision for amortization of premiums. Charges to surplus have amounted to $65,720,891.38. Net deposit insurance losses and expenses amounted to $45,525,603.64, resulting from the difference between total disbursements of $219,930,790.51 actually made or pending to depositors of closed insured banks in settlement of their claims and to merging banks or receivers of closed banks for loans and purchases of assets, including expenses incident thereto, and estimated recoveries of $174,405,186.87. Administrative expenses and other charges have amounted to $20,195,287.74.

CLOSED INSURED BANKS

During the 6 months ended June 30, 1940, 30 insured banks closed or received aid from the Corporation.[1] The 234,400 depositors in these banks, having total deposits of $136,391,000, were protected by insurance or otherwise to the extent of $136,224,000, or about 99.9 percent of their claims. Only 55 depositors in the suspended banks were not fully protected.

During the year ended June 30, 1940, 42 insured banks closed or received aid from the Corporation.[1] The 268,351 depositors in these banks had total deposits of $148,179,000 and were protected against loss to the extent of $147,907,000, or about 99.8 percent of their claims. There were only 82 depositors who were not fully protected.

During the existence of deposit insurance, 345 insured banks have been closed because of financial difficulties.[1] Of these, 3 subsequently were reopened or taken over by other insured banks, and 342, having 1,111,535 depositors, were liquidated or were merged with the aid of loans from the Corporation. These banks had total deposits of $431,098,000, of which $421,592,000, or 97.8 percent, were made available promptly without loss to depositors. Only 1,651 of the 1,111,535 depositors, or less than one-quarter of 1 percent, were not fully protected by insurance offset, preferment, pledge of security, or terms of the merger agreements.

MEMBERSHIP

As of June 30, 1940, there were 13,534 operating banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The decrease of 55 banks in the number of insured banks during the 6 months ended June 30, 1940, resulted principally from continued elimination of banks in unsound condition and from the chartering of few new banks.

During the 6 months 82 banks were eliminated: 12 by suspension; 14 by merger with the aid of loans or purchase of assets by the Corporation; and 56 by merger, consolidation, or voluntary liquidation. There were 27 banks admitted to insurance, of which 9 were in operation or were successors to noninsured banks in operation at the beginning of the year and 18 first opened for business during the year.

There continues to be a close cooperation on the part of all bank chartering and supervisory authorities in eliminating unsound banks from the banking system and in permitting the chartering of only those newly organized banks sufficiently strong to be admitted to deposit insurance. During the period there was only one bank first organized and opened for business which at June 30 was not insured.

COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM FOR THE ELIMINATION OF CONCENTRATED HAZARDS TO THE BANKING SYSTEM

With the disbursement of more than $65,000,000 to facilitate the merger of 20 banks during the past 6 months, the corporation has about completed its program for the rehabilitation of the banks in the system constituting a substantial hazard. During the existence of deposit insurance, and particularly since 1935, when the Congress granted to the corporation power to make loans to or purchase assets from banks to facilitate mergers where such action would reduce or avert a threatened loss, the corporation has consistently pursued a program of singling out weak or unsound banks and of cooperating in the consummation of the necessary corrective action. All of the larger cases, and many of the smaller, were banks in an impaired condition following the banking holiday that were admitted to insurance in order to avoid further banking difficulty. Unfortunately the assets of these banks were of such nature that their recovery in value did not keep pace with the general recovery and it would have been poor policy to permit them to continue to operate with an increasing accumulation of loss. However, these problem cases, together with all other cases, involving deposits of more than $431,000,000 and 1,111,535 depositors, have been cleaned up with an anticipated loss to the corporation of about $46,000,000.

We can now say with a reasonable degree of assurance that the accumulated losses in the banking system have been eliminated, with the possible exception of a few small scattered cases. However, it is inevitable that there will be bank failures from losses currently arising, just as there are failures in any other business. Henceforth bank owners should assume a greater share of the risk of their business by investing more private capital, particularly in the case of weak or inadequately capitalized banks. An increased financial interest on the part of stockholders will contribute to the development of more effective management and will prevent an accumulation of losses, decreasing the need for governmental subsidy of inefficiently operated banks.

It now appears that the capital of the Corporation will have increased to about $500,000,000 by the end of 1940. This amount will have accumulated sooner than was expected since income has been in excess of that contemplated at the time of the passage of the Banking Act of 1935. We believe, therefore, that it would be appropriate to give consideration to a reasonable reduction in the rate of assessment paid by banks. The continued success of the Corporation is more dependent upon its possession of adequate supervisory powers than it is on annual revenue. Inadequate supervision of banks would require a charge considerably greater than the present assessment. We believe, however, that the banking system will become increasingly stronger with the existence of Federal deposit insurance to stabilize the demands on banks and to serve as an

[1] Includes 1 bank with 43,850 depositors holding deposits amounting to $35,239,000 which had not been closed by June 30, 1940. (See footnote, Statement of Assets and Liabilities.)

instrumentality for the development and maintenance of an adequate and uniform bank supervision, provided there continues to be reasonable cooperation on the part of other supervisory agencies and bank management.

By order of the Board of Directors.

LEO T. CROWLEY, *Chairman.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 29, 1940.*

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation statement of assets and liabilities, June 30, 1940

ASSETS

Cash on hand, in transit, and on deposit	$19,368,725.53	
U. S. Government securities (cost less reserve for amortization of premiums) and accrued interest receivable	348,489,672.87	
		$367,858,398.40
Assets acquired through bank suspensions and mergers (less collections):		
Subrogated claims of depositors against closed insured banks	38,650,536.93	
Net balances of depositors in closed insured banks, pending settlement or not claimed, to be subrogated when paid—contra	805,955.39	
Loans to merging insured banks to avert deposit insurance losses and recoverable liquidation expenses	63,843,041.79	
Assets purchased from merging insured banks, to avert deposit insurance losses, under an agreement to return any excess recovery to selling banks	25,759,605.82	
Assets purchased from merging insured banks and receivers of closed insured banks to avert deposit insurance losses	1,097,370.73	
	130,156,510.66	
Less: Reserve for losses	39,209,069.65	
		90,947,441.01
Funds deposited for consummation of commitment to purchase assets from an insured bank upon its fulfillment of certain conditions (see footnote)		16,690,481.49
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment		1.00
Deferred charges and miscellaneous receivables		69,596.68
Total assets		475,565,918.58

LIABILITIES

Current liabilities:		
Accounts and assessment rebates payable	$268,971.20	
Earnest money deposits and unapplied collections applicable to loans to merging insured banks and assets purchased	505,025.43	
Net balances of depositors in closed insured banks, pending settlement or not claimed—contra	805,955.39	
		1,579,952.02
Unused credits for assessments paid to temporary Federal deposit insurance funds and prepaid assessments		6,302.30
Deferred credits		265.07
Reserve for administrative and deposit insurance expenses		140,267.91
Reserve for loss on assets to be acquired under terms of commitment to purchase assets from an insured bank upon its fulfillment of certain conditions (see footnote)		4,275,000.00
Total liabilities		6,001,787.30

CAPITAL

Capital stock		289,299,556.99
Surplus:		
Balance Dec. 31, 1939	$163,411,165.03	
Add adjustments applicable to periods prior to Jan. 1, 1940	1,177,543.98	
Balance as adjusted Dec. 31, 1939	164,588,709.01	
Surplus for the 6 months ending June 30, 1940:		
Additions:		
Deposit insurance assessments	$22,415,529.30	
Interest earned and profit on sales of securities (less provision for amortization of premiums)	4,927,278.02	
Interest received on loans and subrogated claims of depositors	39,370.68	
	27,382,078.00	
Deductions:		
Deposit insurance losses and expenses	9,973,971.08	
Administrative expenses	1,672,937.08	
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment purchased and charged off	59,304.56	
	11,706,212.72	
	15,675,865.28	
		180,264,574.29
Total capital		469,564,131.28
Total liabilities and capital		475,565,918.58

NOTE.—As of June 30, 1940, the Corporation had deposited $16,690,481.49 in a special account for the purchase of assets from an insured bank, if and when an existing purchase commitment is consummated. A reserve has been provided for the estimated loss of $4,275,000 in the liquidation of these assets and the surplus of the Corporation has been reduced by this amount by the inclusion of a provision for this loss with other deposit insurance losses and expenses.

TABLE I.—*Analysis of changes in the number of operating insured banks, Jan. 1, 1940, to June 30, 1940, United States and possessions*

	All banks	Commercial banks				Mutual savings banks
		Total	Members, Federal Reserve System		Not members, Federal Reserve System	
			National	State		
Number of banks, June 29, 1940	13,534	13,483	5,164	1,234	7,085	51
Number of banks, Dec. 30, 1939	13,589	13,538	5,187	1,175	7,176	51
Net change	−55	−55	−23	+59	−91	
Additions—total	27	27	2	2	23	
Previously operating banks becoming insured [1]	9	9		1	8	
Banks commencing operations during year insured at close of period [2]	18	18	2	1	15	
Reductions—total	82	82	25	8	49	
Suspended	12	12			12	
Absorbed by other banks with financial aid of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—net decrease [3]	14	14	5	2	7	
Other mergers, consolidations, absorptions, and voluntary liquidations—net decrease	56	56	20	6	30	
Successions and changes in classification—net change				+65	−65	

[1] Includes 1 bank which had suspended and was admitted to insurance at time of reopening.

[2] Includes 1 "industrial bank" not previously authorized to accept deposits which qualified under State law as a bank of deposit and was subsequently admitted to insurance, and 1 bank which had suspended during 1939 and was reopened and admitted to insurance.

[3] The Corporation also extended financial aid to 1 national bank and 2 State banks members of the Federal Reserve System which did not affect the number of banks operating on June 29, 1940.

Thoughts After the Fall of Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very challenging article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 17, 1940.

I do not always agree with Miss Thompson, but in this case I believe the widest possible reading of her article would be beneficial to the thinking of America.

And I wish emphatically to call attention to a very significant part of her article; it is that which pertains to the German method of financing the war, in contrast to that of the Allies. May we learn, and speedily, to make our money system the handmaid of industry and national needs instead of a great barrier to full employment and full production.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 17, 1940]

ON THE RECORD—THOUGHTS AFTER THE FALL OF PARIS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

For many generations the governments of free peoples, the democracies, have enjoyed the dominance of western civilization and have had the power to determine the destiny of the world. Now they have suffered the worst disaster in their history. Their very survival is threatened.

Their disaster involves us. It involves us for reasons which Mr. Lippmann set forth with admirable lucidity on Saturday morning. We should face that fact with complete clarity in order that out of today's defeat we may draw tomorrow's strength and wisdom.

There are simple, realistic reasons why Hitler has so far won this war. We must understand those reasons and look at ourselves in the light of those reasons.

First. His observations regarding the internal weakness of democratic societies—observations which formed the basis for his conquest of Germany itself by the Nazi revolution.

The democratic ideal, which started as a noble and heroic conception, as an attempt to liberate human beings and offer them the opportunity to develop and perfect themselves and thus grow from individuals into persons, has degenerated away from the idea of self-perfection through effort, away from the idea of equal and cooperative endeavor, into the idea of self-interest. The pursuit of happiness, which is vain except as it represents an accrual of joy through creative action, has become the pursuit of pleasure.

The concept that the laborer is worthy of his hire has been supplanted by the idea that work is a commodity, to be bargained for and sold at the highest price that can be extorted, regardless of the product. And the same is true of capital, whose creative function has become secondary to its safety. Capital—the accumulated savings upon which new creative activity can be based—has also come to be treated like a commodity, whose worth and use depends upon the market.

Higher education has been divorced from the idea of training the whole man, into the production of experts, who, possessed of immense amounts of specialized knowledge, are without the sense with which they were born. Secondary education has devoted itself to training youth by words rather than by action. It is literary and divorced from life, which is reality. Every June our high schools and colleges turn out youngsters who are completely unfitted for the realities of the world into which they emerge. An age that needs mechanics, technicians, skilled workers, men whose hands and brains have been coordinated to a unified efficiency, is flooded with young people who cannot read a slide rule or handle a screwdriver, let alone an exquisite machine.

A social snobbery which belies every democratic principle perpetuates the idea that a man who wears a white collar and adds up columns in a book, or a girl who types "Yours of the 10th received" is somehow of superior status to the driver of a steam locomotive or a first-rate cook.

We educate our children to come up in the world, instead of to live in it.

We belie our own democracy at every step. We classify people according to success—according to income—rather than achievement; or according to race, instead of according to quality.

Nothing is dearer to us than ourselves, and the ideal of ourselves is comfort.

Hitler is destroying democracy by the sword, and by revolution, because democracy has already gone far on the road to self-destruction.

Second. Hitler is winning the war because he has been fighting it with an industrial and engineering economy, while the democracies have been fighting it with a money, or financial economy, and fighting it stingily. We are now following Britain and France in our defense program.

The Germans did not vote themselves 4,000,000,000 money units for defense. They voted—had voted for them—30,000 airplanes, so-and-so many guns, so-and-so many thousand tons of reserves of oil and raw materials. The German economy is an economy of things and men; the Allied economy is an economy of symbols; money. The German economy recognizes that all wealth is in goods, particularly in capital goods, and that these are not created by money, which is only a medium of exchange, but by the application of labor to materials.

The Allies had money but failed to produce goods. The Germans had no money, but did produce them.

To recognize this is not to accept the mystic race-domination, fanatical, Hitler-worshiping secular religion of nazi-ism. This economy was not designed by Hitler. Thorstein Veblen, an American, knew all about it; Henry George, an American, knew a great deal about it. As far as Germany is concerned, the man who first saw and practiced the facts about an industrial and engineering economy was Walter Rathenau, the coordinator of the German economy during the last war, and he was a Jew whom the Nazis murdered. The Germans were forced into it, because they had a will to conquest and no money. But the lack of money proved to be a godsend to them.

Third. The Germans are winning the war because, in spite of a complete political dictatorship, they have devoluted power to the places where power exists. Power is knowledge.

To take an illustration: Hitler wanted planes. The place to get planes is in the highly organized industries. In those industries were the scientific, technical, and engineering brains, and the skilled labor to produce those planes. The Government demanded the planes and demanded of the industries that they produce them—produce the blueprints, the models, and the goods. The designs were not made by bureaucrats, or tin hats, but by pilots and industrialists. If Hitler had had Mr. Ford, he would have told Mr. Ford to turn out the model he claims he can produce in clouds and masses; he would release to the fullest the energies in Mr. Ford's remarkable organization, and he would give Mr. Ford full freedom to see whether he could deliver the goods, without interference from bureaucrats or politicians.

The speed with which Germany rearmed lay in the use, coordination, and expansion of the existing plant, and the placing of responsibility where it belongs, namely, where the power is. It does not require dictatorship and a Gestapo to do this.

Fourth. The Germans are winning the war because they have a vision. That vision is appalling to us. They envisage Germans as the master race, setting a design for living for all the peoples of the earth. The vision is at the moment the basis of their communal morale, but before this world revolution is finished it will be the basis of the Nazi defeat. For it is not in harmony with truth and reality. They are not the superior race. They are not superior to the French, or the British. They are merely more numerous, more united, and have hold of a few truths which are universal and available to all people.

But one cannot oppose an ignoble and untrue vision with no vision at all. The Germans are strong because they can imagine this world as a small planet. They can imagine conquering it. And it can be conquered. The Germans today live in a totally different sphere of possibilities from the one in which the democracies have lived. (The democracies were not always so. Certainly this country was not always so. Once we believed with all the passion of our hearts that the ideals on which this Nation was founded were valid for all the earth. But that was long ago.)

We shall not survive this epoch unless we can conceive a vision as large as theirs, but truer and more real.

The concept of the supernation, being untrue, must die. But the concept of the union of all peoples in a world-wide scheme of things, in a planetary cooperative commonwealth, in which those things are denationalized which are not national and those things that are the special cultural values of individual races are given the freest expression, was a concept born in the democratic mind; it has failed only because of the failure of our will, because we have become complacent, provincial, and comfort loving.

Today the news is heartbreaking. But let us not think of today. Let us think and plan for tomorrow. Let us find each other—those of us who are not discouraged, and do not intend to be discouraged, either for this country or for the world.

The Chinese write with symbols, with what they call "ideagrams." And the Chinese word for "crisis" is "danger plus opportunity."

We live in the greatest epoch of human history. It holds the greatest possibilities for evil and the greatest possibilities for good. It can plunge mankind into chaos or liberate him into light. And everything in this world and this epoch is either given to us in and by Nature, or has been created by the mind and imagination, intellect, and soul of human beings.

And what is sown in tears can yet be reaped in joy.

Aid to Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this morning I observed in the columns of the Washington Post an article entitled "Miss Perkins' Aid to Aliens is Censured—Small-Business Men Charge She Saved 700 'Deportables.'"

This is a dispatch by the United Press from Chicago, the first paragraph of which reads:

> The National Small-Business Men's Association charged tonight that more than 700 aliens guilty of deportable offenses have been granted exemptions from deportation by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins.

In this connection I desire to call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that about 3 weeks ago I brought this subject to the attention of the Members of this body, at which time I specifically referred to a list of 700 names of alien criminals whom the Secretary of Labor had permitted to leave the country and to reenter legally in order that they might remain here permanently, taking advantage of what I claim to be a misinterpretation of the seventh proviso of the general Immigration Act of 1917. I therefore ask that this article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISS PERKINS' AID TO ALIENS IS CENSURED—SMALL-BUSINESS MEN CHARGE SHE SAVED 700 "DEPORTABLES"

CHICAGO, July 28.—The National Small-Business Men's Association charged tonight that more than 700 aliens guilty of deportable

offenses have been granted exemptions from deportation by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins.

Donald Despain, vice president of the association, said in a prepared statement that "practically all" of the aliens committed a felony by entering the United States illegally. His statement was accompanied by an official State Department list of the aliens and the charges against them.

"Instead of deporting these aliens, Secretary Perkins devised elaborate methods to keep them permanently in the United States. They were advised to move temporarily to Mexico or Canada, there to request new incoming visas, which then were approved by the Labor Department under special discretionary provisions of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917," Despain said.

"Section 3 of the act provided that an alien who had lived 7 consecutive years in the United States, and had maintained his American residence during temporary absence in a foreign land, might be readmitted to this country, in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, without regard to certain exclusion laws. By the gross abuse of this old and forgotten discretionary authority, the Department of Labor has contrived to prevent the deportation of criminal aliens, as specifically required by other sections of the immigration statutes."

Despain said that some of the aliens who were readmitted to the United States "by this illegal device" had been deported previously as Communist agitators.

"Having later reentered the country illegally," he said, "these Communists now have the formal official protection of the Labor Department, by virtue of the abuse of Secretary Perkins' discretionary authority.

"Instead of using the immigration laws to protect the United States, the Department, in at least 700 cases, has distorted them to shelter deportable criminal aliens. Undoubtedly there are many more cases of this sort throughout the country which have not yet come to the notice of the country."

The Defense Program and Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when the Nation was in the throes of the World War I, it was found that we were as woefully unprepared for furnishing food supplies to sustain our armed forces as we were to furnish arms and ammunition. It was a bitter experience indeed for a country with the greatest agricultural resources in the world, in order to have food for the millions of men under arms, to be obliged to place restrictive measures on use of food by our civilian population and materially increase our imports of foods from foreign sources.

TIME REQUIRED TO PREPARE

Regardless of our experience 23 years ago, it seems that we must learn all over again that it takes time to build factories for manufacture of airplanes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and war equipment. It takes time to recover and process raw materials that will be needed by the factories called upon to produce the equipment we need. Let us not forget that it also takes time to prepare the land, plant, grow, and process the food for our armed forces and our civilian population during a war period.

Suddenly everybody is demanding that we arm in a way that we will be fully able to defend our 130,000,000 people against attack from any combination that may be organized against us. Congress is appropriating billions for the purpose of doubling our Navy, for an army of a million men, for construction of 50,000 airplanes, with millions of rifles, big guns, and manufactured articles needed to equip our defense forces, but not one single word has been said about food for the men engaged in this vast program of preparedness.

ARMY MUST HAVE PROPER FOOD

Less than a quarter century ago we were thrust into a war situation and found that notwithstanding a so-called food surplus that was supposed to exist just prior to that time, the country was as ill-prepared for furnishing the classes of foods necessary to maintain an army as we were to provide arms and military equipment. The huge quantities of meats, flour, sugar, dairy products, and condensed foods were not available in the United States to maintain our Army without considering our civilian population, factory workers on war orders and their families.

FOREIGN PRODUCTS PURCHASED

Regardless of our need for ships to transport our Army and equipment abroad, we were obliged to go into foreign markets for food and transport it ourselves to the United States. As an example, you will recall that it was necessary to purchase the entire Cuban sugar crop because the country had not in peacetime been foresighted enough to encourage the production of sugar beets on a scale that would more than fill a small part of domestic sugar requirements. That same condition exists today as our mainland growers of beets and cane are producing less than 30 percent of our consumption requirements.

What happened to sugar prices as an aftermath of the World War is also well known to the housewives of the country, for they paid highly exorbitant prices for sugar in 1920. As a matter of fact, the only thing that stands in the way of sugar prices going skyward under prevailing war conditions is the small production of sugar beets on the irrigated farms of the West and the demand for allotment of additional acreage which would most certainly follow any attempt to boost the price of imported sugar.

IRRIGATED AREAS NEEDED TO STABILIZE NATION'S FOOD SUPPLY

This brings me to one of the main points I wish to make, which is that the irrigated areas of the West offer the major opportunity to stabilize the Nation's food supply, come what may. Droughts inflict themselves with periodic regularity on other agricultural sections. Should a drought come with World War conditions as they are now, the United States would be faced with a crisis more critical than it faces in unpreparedness in airplanes, tanks, ships, and other implements of war.

WHAT IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE FOOD FOR DEFENSE

How can we meet this situation with respect to our food supplies and insure stabilized production? By continuing and expanding our reclamation policy. Reclamation projects under construction and recently approved, when completed, will go a long, long way toward insuring a stabilized food supply for the Nation, without having to resort to import during times of drought or war. Water storage reservoirs are needed to supply fully the need in many old settled areas of the West. People, generally, are under the impression that reclamation means only bringing new land under cultivation. As a matter of fact, a major objective of Federal reclamation today is to complete the supply of water for established irrigated areas, thus bringing land up to full crop production and insuring the preservation of established communities that are now threatened with destruction and desolation on account of shortage of water supply. Many of the larger projects now receiving the attention of the Bureau of Reclamation do not bring a single acre of new land into cultivation. I refer as examples to the following:

The Central Valley project of California.

The Big Thompson project in Colorado.

The Anderson Reservoir, Boise project, Idaho.

There are hundreds of farms in the West with highly productive land capable of producing feed for livestock, beef, hogs, and sheep, thus assuring fats and foods that are so vitally needed, that must have a supplemental supply of irrigation water. Water is available and can be impounded and conserved against the time of need at small cost, stabilizing production of vital commodities needed under the defense program, and will at the same time maintain the purchasing power of the West.

IRRIGATED AREAS IMPORTANT TO INDUSTRIAL SECTIONS

The reclamation program has been hampered by lack of funds. Opposition to increased appropriation is not so much the cost to the Government, as funds for reclamation projects are fully repayable to the Treasury by water users, but because of fear of adding to surplus of certain products, such as

wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco. This is another mistaken idea, which can be proven to the satisfaction of anyone willing to investigate. Irrigated areas add practically nothing to farm surplus of crops mentioned. I am including a table of imports into two Idaho counties having 340,000 acres of irrigated land. Records show that 9,740 carloads of goods were shipped into this section during the year 1939 and included 1,249 cars of food supplies, while the outgoing shipments during the same period included 32 carloads of corn, 1 carload of wheat, and no cotton or tobacco.

1939 carload shipments into Ada and Canyon Counties, classified by regions

Commodities	Northeast		South Atlantic		North Central		South Central		Rocky Mountain		Pacific Coast		Idaho		Total less Idaho		Total cars	Total value
	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value	Carloads	Total estimated value		
Automobiles and trucks					316	$1,200,800					240	$912,000			556	$2,112,800	556	$2,112,800
Gasoline									41	$65,600	572	915,200	1	$1,600	613	980,800	614	982,400
Lubricating oil and grease	8	$12,000			25	37,500	37	$55,500	17	25,500	114	171,000			201	301,500	201	301,500
Tires					1	12,000									1	12,000	1	12,000
Tractors					58	464,000			4	32,000			5	40,000	62	496,000	67	536,000
Total	8	12,000			400	1,714,300	37	55,500	62	123,100	926	1,998,200	6	41,600	1,433	3,903,100	1,439	3,944,700
Farm equipment and supplies:																		
Agricultural implements					37	203,500			2	11,000					39	214,500	39	214,500
Emigrant movables					7	21,000			3	9,000			3	9,000	10	30,000	13	39,000
Fertilizer									1	1,100	4	4,400			5	5,500	5	5,500
Fencing and wire					11	33,000			5	15,000	8	24,000			24	72,000	24	72,000
Sprays and weed-killing compounds											9	15,300			9	15,300	9	15,300
Miscellaneous farm supplies					2	6,000	2	6,000	1	3,000	1	3,000	2	6,000	6	18,000	8	24,000
Total					57	263,500	2	6,000	12	39,100	22	46,700	5	15,000	93	355,300	98	370,300
Food supplies:																		
Citrus fruits			5	$9,250			3	5,550	6	11,100	70	129,500			84	155,400	84	155,400
Canned goods	10	25,000	5	12,500	68	170,000	12	30,000	51	127,500	115	287,500	10	25,000	261	652,500	271	677,500
Cereals					50	80,000			2	3,200	12	19,200			64	102,400	64	102,400
Corn products	1	2,500			27	67,500	1	2,500							29	72,500	29	72,500
Coffee											35	192,500			35	192,500	35	192,500
Dry groceries	1	4,500			12	54,000	3	13,500	24	108,000	5	22,500			45	202,500	45	202,500
Fresh fruits	3	3,000					4	4,000	2	2,000	82	82,000	19	19,000	91	91,000	110	110,000
Fresh meat					6	7,200	1	1,200	3	3,600					10	12,000	10	12,000
Fresh vegetables							1	500	3	1,500	59	29,500			63	31,500	63	31,500
Miscellaneous food supplies	31	46,500	5	7,500	87	130,500	12	18,000	152	228,000	279	418,500	106	159,000	566	849,000	672	1,008,000
Total	46	81,500	15	29,250	250	509,200	37	75,250	243	484,900	657	1,181,200	135	203,000	1,248	2,361,300	1,383	2,564,300
Household equipment:																		
Furniture	1	2,500	5	12,500	33	82,500	1	2,500			8	20,000			48	120,000	48	120,000
Radios	6	19,200													6	19,200	6	19,200
Ranges and stoves, coal					14	42,000	2	6,000							16	48,000	16	48,000
Ranges and stoves, electric	1	7,000			31	217,000									32	224,000	32	224,000
Refrigerators	12	72,000	2	12,000	54	324,000									68	408,000	68	408,000
Washing machines	16	64,000			22	88,000									38	152,000	38	152,000
Miscellaneous household equipment	5	10,000			31	62,000			9	18,000	7	14,000	2	4,000	52	104,000	54	108,000
Total	41	174,700	7	24,500	185	815,500	3	8,500	9	18,000	15	34,000	2	4,000	260	1,075,200	262	1,079,200
Building materials:																		
Copper wire and cable	2	16,000			2	16,000			1	8,000	1	8,000			6	48,000	6	48,000
Fiberboard and wallboard	5	7,000	4	5,600	22	30,800	14	19,600	7	9,800	30	42,000			82	114,800	82	114,800
Hardware	2	6,000			18	54,000			8	24,000	14	42,000			42	126,000	42	126,000
Lumber and lumber products	3	3,000	1	1,000	14	14,000	27	27,000			421	421,000	134	134,000	466	466,000	600	600,000
Plumbing fixtures	3	7,500			2	5,000	8	20,000			5	12,500			18	45,000	18	45,000
Pipe, wrought iron	2	7,000	1	3,500	29	101,500			25	87,500	7	24,500	1	3,500	64	224,000	65	227,500
Steel and steel products	13	46,800	1	3,600	40	144,000	1	3,600	23	82,800	117	421,200			195	702,000	195	702,000
Miscellaneous building material	5	12,500			51	127,500			58	145,000	248	620,000	98	245,000	362	905,000	460	1,150,000
Total	35	105,800	7	13,700	178	492,800	50	70,200	122	357,100	843	1,591,200	233	382,500	1,235	2,630,800	1,468	3,013,300
Miscellaneous:																		
Coal	1	150			5	750			3,331	499,650					3,337	500,550	3,337	500,550
Paper and paper products	15	30,000	1	2,000	38	76,000	1	2,000	2	4,000	58	116,000			[1] 132	[1] 264,000	132	[1] 264,000
Miscellaneous	27	67,500	7	17,500	513	1,282,500	168	420,000	394	985,000	653	1,632,500	1,297	3,242,500	[1] 1,768	[1] 4,420,000	[1] 3,065	[1] 7,662,500
Beverages	3	7,200			98	235,200			9	21,600	124	297,600			234	561,600	234	561,600
Total	46	104,850	8	19,500	654	1,594,450	169	422,000	3,736	1,510,250	835	2,046,100	1,297	3,242,500	5,471	5,746,150	6,768	8,988,650
Grand total	176	478,850	37	86,950	1,724	5,389,750	298	637,450	4,184	2,532,450	3,298	6,897,400	1,678	3,888,600	9,740	16,071,850	11,418	19,960,450

[1] These totals include the following items from Canada: Paper and paper products, 17 carloads, $34,000 total estimated value; miscellaneous, 6 carloads, $15,000 total estimated value.

Regions.—Northeast: Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania. South Atlantic: Florida, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland. North Central: South Dakota, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Nebraska, Kansas, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri. South Central: Tennessee, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma. Rocky Mountain: Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico. Pacific coast: Washington, Oregon, California.

The outgoing shipments from the two counties mentioned for the year 1939 included the following:

	Carloads
Agricultural products:	
Onions	1,632
Sugar beets	2,037
Potatoes	1,511
Peas	416
Lettuce	720
Fruit	662
Seed	170
Miscellaneous	204
Total	7,352
Livestock:	
Cattle	623
Hogs	416
Sheep	553
Miscellaneous	113
Total	1,705
Dairy and poultry products:	
Butter	168
Powdered milk	184
Poultry and eggs	40
Total	392

RECLAMATION PROJECTS SHOULD BE SPEEDILY COMPLETED

The Nation will need the food supplies from reclamation areas in event of an emergency caused by drought or war, otherwise we will again be unable to provide proper food for our civilian population and be forced to look to foreign lands for food for our armed forces. The Nation needs the great markets of the West in peacetime to assist in maintaining our domestic economy and in paying the tremendous costs of our defense program. The Nation must not neglect as a preparedness measure to assure itself of an adequate food supply, otherwise our great armament secured at such heavy cost will be useless.

In this crisis we cannot afford to neglect a great natural resource. I, therefore, ask that the program of the Bureau of Reclamation for conservation of water and power be continued to the full extent of use of every dollar directly appropriated by Congress, and that additional funds be allotted from defense appropriations in such amounts as will enable the Bureau to speedily build the projects needed to complete the water supply for lands already under cultivation in the West and Great Plains areas.

Roosevelt's Third-Term Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (OREG.) JOURNAL

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by including therein an editorial appearing in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of July 18, 1940. The editorial is as follows:

ROOSEVELT'S THIRD TERM NOMINATION MUCH LIKE AN APPLE WITH A WORM IN IT; ALL NOT AS ROSY AS APPEARS ON SURFACE

The nomination of President Roosevelt for a third term is an accomplished fact. His running mate will be selected today and the campaign will be on.

On the surface the apparent unanimity of Roosevelt's selection augurs well, but does it?

The people will not be gullible enough to swallow the draft. Long before the convention assembled it was known that more than 800 delegates were pledged to vote for President Roosevelt. For months delegates were in the course of selection, State by State, by convention and by primary election. In the great majority of these States the rank and file of Democracy wanted Roosevelt renominated. As the preprimary campaign ran on, President Roosevelt did nothing to indicate, as Senator BARKLEY was permitted to declare Tuesday night, that he, the President, "has never had and has not today any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President, to be a candidate for the office or to be nominated by the convention for that office." However, by his silence Roosevelt gave consent to the movement in his behalf. Thus more than four-fifths of the delegates went to Chicago instructed for Roosevelt. His eleventh-hour declaration, which Senator BARKLEY also was permitted to disclose, that "all of the delegates to this convention are free to vote for any candidate" was, indeed, an empty phrase.

Stripped of all window dressing, President Roosevelt, by indirection, sought and secured for the third time the Democratic nomination which 4 years ago and 8 years ago he won by direct methods.

During his two terms Roosevelt has bowled over precedent at will with the notable exception of the bold attempt to bring the Supreme Court within the spell of the New Deal by congressional action. He now challenges the 150-year-old tradition against the third term, an unwritten law of the Democratic Party since the days of Thomas Jefferson. Time will determine the importance which the people will attach to the third-term issue.

Determined opposition to the third term compelled Vice President Garner to enter the race months ago. He knew it was a futile quest, but so strongly does he disagree with certain trends of the New Deal that as he nears the close of two score years of public service he felt it his duty to so go on record.

Determined opposition to the third term likewise drove Postmaster General Farley off the Roosevelt reservation. The White House juggernaut, which owes much to Jim Farley, ruthlessly ran him down. However, Farley comes out of the convention stronger than he went into it. He kept the faith. Loyalties are not something to be bandied about even by the President of the United States.

Senator WHEELER'S withdrawal from the Presidential nomination Wednesday afternoon, after taking a fling at the Roosevelt-controlled convention, by no means sounds a note of harmony. It may indicate a third-term defection.

Roosevelt's apparently overwhelming convention victory is like an apple with a worm in it; all is not as rosy as appears on the surface. The entire procedure smacks too much of regimentation and overweening personal ambition.

Why Willkie Got It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE COLUMBIA (S. C.) STATE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a very interesting and timely editorial carried in the Columbia (S. C.) State paper of July 25, 1940, entitled "Why Willkie Got It."

This item is particularly appropriate in that it is almost impossible to pick up any paper from day to day without reading headlines, "Wendell Willkie," referring to everything on the face of the earth except the actual man as he is.

Of course, this is done for no other purpose than to cover up the main issue—that is, he is at the head of one of the biggest Power Trusts of the country—with the hope that the people may be induced to vote for Willkie as he was when he was washing dishes and driving cattle through the pasture, and before he became connected with the Power Trusts and Wall Street.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of July 25, 1940]

WHY WILLKIE GOT IT

After reading many accounts of the Philadelphia convention, the State concludes the nomination of Mr. Willkie was due to these causes:

First. The absence of any other strong Republican candidate.

Second. The appeal of Mr. Willkie to a large number of people.

Third. The smartest publicity drive ever put on by and for any candidate. A score or more of the top advertising and public-relations men were employed by or affiliated with the Willkie preconvention campaign. They set the stage perfectly. They played down the big-business connections of their man and played up his personality, including unpressed pants and uncombed hair. When a Morgan partner appeared too active in behalf of Mr. Willkie, these

publicity and advertising men hung a screen between him and the public. A wonderful job of pressure selling.

These pressure sellers, being a little alarmed when people began to talk about the resemblance of the telegraph campaign to former lobbying efforts by big utilities, began to deny they planned it that way. Those tens of thousands of obscure grass rooters just happened to send those tens of thousands of telegrams to the non-Willkie delegates, even before it was generally known which were the Willkie and which the non-Willkie men.

And—this is interesting—the grass rooters knew the precise names, the hotel addresses, and even the room numbers of the non-Willkie delegates.

The pressure sellers haven't explained yet how small-town merchants and little farmers in Kansas happened to know the room numbers of delegates from New Jersey, but they still say the telegraph campaign was spontaneous.

Youghiogheny Watershed Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CONNELLSVILLE (PA.) DIGEST

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including an editorial from the Connellsville Digest by the editor, Michael Pryce, I wish to say that the United States Army engineers are now well on their way in the construction of this $9,000,000 multi-purpose dam, which is being constructed between Confluence, Pa., and Somerfield, Pa., on the "Yough" River.

The first contract for the tunnel was let and the work is well under way. The second contract is about to be let. The purchasing of the land that will be covered by the dam is progressing rapidly.

Mr. Pryce, in his editorial, calls attention to the fact that the assessed value of the property that the dam will cover is $417,000, which will be just about as much as 1 year's value to the counties and people living within the "Yough" watershed after the dam is completed. In other words, the Army engineers estimate that the values in dollars and cents to the people in the watershed and those receiving benefits from the watershed will average $500,000 each year after the dam is completed.

After the dam is completed a year or two it will be with this dam just as it was with the Pennsylvania Turnpike. A group of men in Somerset County who style themselves as leaders and opponents of the Roosevelt administration were bitter in their protests against building the turnpike. For 10 years before the turnpike was finally started they were protesting against it. During the campaign for governor in 1938 they campaigned on the plank that if Governor James was elected they would stop the foolish thing of building the turnpike. But what happened? After James was inaugurated he thought he would not let them complete the turnpike, although it was not costing the State of Pennsylvania a single penny because the Federal P. W. A. and the Federal R. F. C. furnished all the money to build the turnpike—but the State of Pennsylvania had to give certain grants and titles, and so forth. Suffice to say that after different agencies pointed out to Governor James the wisdom of building this turnpike he gave in and in a short time was converted to the advantages of same and is now himself, we understand, advocating running the turnpike on to Philadelphia.

As for the group in Somerset County who 3 years ago—yes 2 years ago—opposed the building of the turnpike, they are the ones now who, if you were to shut down the turnpike, would be out in protest against shutting it. Many of the same protestors when work started went after jobs and positions in construction work that would enable them to make some money out of the building of the highway, and they succeeded in so doing. The same will be true of the Youghiogheny Watershed. When this $9,000,000 multipurpose dam is built, these protestors will be the ones who will be looking for the avenues that the dam creates wherein they can make some money.

The United States Army engineers know what they are doing at all times when it comes to building dams and conserving water, and so forth. This, the Yough Dam, is the place they list as being the outstanding dam of all the flood control and other dams being built on the upper Ohio. Drive down to Taggert Dam in West Virginia some Sunday and see what is taking place there. That will give you a little idea of what will take place on the banks of the Youghiogheny multipurpose dam 4, 5, or 6 years from now.

The editorial referred to above is as follows:

[From the Connellsville (Pa.) Digest]

"FROSTY SONS OF THUNDER" ARE ALL WET ON PROTEST AGAINST YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER DAM

A group of "Frosty Sons of Thunder" over in Somerset County have protested the flood-control dam on the Youghiogheny River below Somerfield as an unnecessary waste of millions of dollars.

They short-sightedly object to acquisition of land by the State and Federal Government which has an assessed valuation, they claim of $417,000. They fear that the acquisition of this land will prove a loss to Somerset County and eventually cause an increase in taxes.

The Somerset County farmers fail to see that $417,000 will be dumped into the laps of owners of land, not now of very great value from an agricultural standpoint. They fail to see that adjacent lands will be benefited materially by the large body of water that will be created. They fail to take into consideration that the owners of the land and houses to be taken over by the State and Government, will buy other lands and erect modern homes and farm buildings of much greater value than now exists. The Somerset County protesters are nearsighted. They fail to see that by the creation of the Youghiogheny lake that thousands of summer tourists are going to be attracted that way and that hundreds of cottages will dot the banks of the new inland ocean and that the valuation of these alone will increase Somerset's tax revenue several times as much as they fear will be lost in the acquisition of lands for the dam.

The Youghiogheny River Dam will make Somerset County. Improvement of the watershed, the reclamation of cut-over woodlands, and reforestation alone will eventually increase the land valuation in a great area of the county and thereby pay a good portion of the taxes.

The Somerset County Pomona Grange, apparently has not checked the loss against the gain. It sees but one thing, the loss of property valuations, estimated at $417,000, and steps there. Neither has the organization taken into consideration that hundreds of thousands of dollars will be paid to Somerset County workmen employed on the dam project. Those fellows are seeing red when the color actually is green. The grangers, because of their blindness to the march of time, appear selfish in their attitude to the communities that suffer big losses every time there is an abnormal flood.

Industrial life in the "Yough" Valley will be stimulated by the conservation of water for both industrial and domestic purposes, without which there would be little hope of attracting industry that requires a large and constant supply of good water. The Youghiogheny project means more to Connellsville and communities farther down the river than prevention against flood damage. It will be industry's guaranty of a constant and adequate supply of pure water, something that is absolutely necessary in many lines of manufacture.

The whole Youghiogheny watershed should and probably will be harnessed when the entire river program is completed. Then Connellsville and the "Yough" Valley will be sitting on top of the world. Somerset County will reap big benefits from those who will want to spend their vacations on its inland lakes.

Thank God for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Charles M. Fillmore, of Indianapolis, Ind., is the author of a very inspiring new song entitled "Thank God for America." The first edition of this song was issued on June 6, 1940, accompanied by a notice

stating that it was not published for profit. Since then there have been two more editions. The publisher's notice says:

The United States of America is one of the foremost nations of the world, a truth attested by abundant, positive evidence. We have better reasons than the citizens of any other nation for real, patriotic pride. We should cherish it jealously and cultivate it zealously.

One of the best mediums through which to develop this real kind of patriotism is song. Here is a new patriotic song, Thank God for America, that undoubtedly will come to rank with My Country 'Tis of Thee, with America the Beautiful, and with the recent God Bless America. It supplements others by emphasizing the gratitude which we owe to God for His many blessings to us. It will meet a sincere response from the soul of every true lover of our Nation, and find a hearty expression upon their lips.

The author of the new song has had a long and useful life of service, having passed his eightieth milestone.

In these times of grave national concern over the safety of our revered institutions founded on freedom and the rights of man, when in so many countries of the world liberty is being crushed beneath the heels of despotism and the lights of Christianity are going out, it behooves all of us to Thank God for America, and by unanimous consent of the House I present for publication in the RECORD the words of Mr. Fillmore's new song, as follows:

I

Thank God for America!
The good, old U. S. A.
Thank God for America!
And thank Him every day.

Refrain

God has blessed America
With all things fair and good;
We will show our gratitude
By living as we should.

II

Thank God for America!
The best place on the earth;
Thank God for America!
The land of highest worth.

III

Thank God for America!
"Sweet land of liberty";
Thank God for America!
Whose citizens are free.

Refrain (to be sung after last stanza)

God will bless America,
And bless the whole world, too,
As with Him America
Unites His will to do.

Encores

Thank God for America!
Our flag—red, white, and blue.
Thank God for America!
The strong, the brave, the true.

Thank God for America!
Both human and divine.
Thank God for America!
God's land and also mine.

It Pays To Stay Put

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SHREVEPORT (LA.) JOURNAL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the Shreveport Journal of July 20, 1940:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of July 20, 1940]

IT PAYS TO STAY PUT

The comparatively new State of Oklahoma has nine Members of the Lower House of Congress, including one elected from the State at large, and any one of them has been renominated in spite of the fact that they did not make any sort of personal campaign. On the other hand, the nine Congressmen from Oklahoma, sensing their duty to be paramount, stayed on the job at Washington throughout the campaign; whatever electioneering was done in their behalf, then, was done by their friends. There was plenty of opposition in every district, and no less a figure than "Alfalfa Bill" Murray undertook to grab the State-at-large job of Representative WILL ROGERS, but the voters took care of the men who elected to "stay put." The Oklahoma congressional delegation and the Democratic voters of that Commonwealth are entitled to commendation and to congratulations.

Financing Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY W. A. OVERHOLSER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I have said so many times before this, the basic foundation for true national defense is full employment of our people, our resources, and our industrial plant, and the key to such full employment lies in a system of national finance which will permit expansion of our money and credit, without increasing debt, as production expands.

The following article by Mr. Willis Overholser, appearing in the Waukegan News-Sun, will carry the same message, and I am pleased to include it with my remarks:

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun of July 19, 1940]

FINANCING DEFENSE—MEETING CHANGES IN A CHANGING WORLD

(By Willis A. Overholser)

Several weeks ago I spoke before a bankers' association on the need for certain changes in our money and banking systems. At the time the public press was full of reports from the battlefields of Europe revealing victory after victory in favor of the Germans. After the meeting one of the bankers told of a discussion among a group of people prior to the outbreak of the war.

He related that the possibility of Germany going to war was brought up during the discussion. Some elderly banker, who was present, spoke up saying: "Germany can't go to war. She is bankrupt." Afterward, and out of the presence of the gentleman who had made this remark, some woman in the group remarked in substance as follows: "I have traveled quite extensively throughout Germany and the other countries in Europe during recent years and it didn't look to me, from what I saw, as though Germany was bankrupt. As a matter of fact, Germany appeared to be further from bankruptcy than the other countries of Europe. Of course, Mr. ——— is a banker and knows more about financial matters than I do, so I may be wrong, but we shall wait and see what happens." The banker who related this remarked that in view of the German victories, and the equipment and supplies which she had, that it certainly appeared as though the lady was right and the old banker was wrong in the respective conclusions which they had drawn.

THE GOLD STANDARD

Measuring things by the old standards, the old banker undoubtedly was correct. Germany was virtually without any gold, and that means bankruptcy according to the orthodox views of international financing. But we are beginning to learn that the antiquated and deflationary gold standard by producing a curtailment of production, an increase in unemployment, and a stopping of the wheels of progress, is not the answer to our modern financial needs. There are good reasons for believing that the gold standard was one of the chief causes of the long list of bankruptcies of the past 15-year period. Nevertheless, there is a growing cry for a return to the gold standard. An example of this may be found in the articles by Harry Scherman appearing in the July 6 and 13, 1940, issues of the Saturday Evening Post. Both every advocate and every opponent of the gold standard will find it to their advantage to read these articles, although I wish to warn the reader that many able students of the subject strongly deny many of Mr. Scherman's conclusions, particularly those contained in the second article.

In the United States today we are endeavoring to embark upon a vast program for defense. The question arises as to how we are going to finance an adequate defense program. In that connection the question also arises as to how Germany, a supposedly bankrupt nation, financed the development of a more powerful war machine than those of the other nations of Europe, which were regarded as being in better financial circumstances.

OUTMODED FINANCIAL PRACTICES

The answer lies in the fact that the other nations of Europe, like us, kept on trying to adjust their production, distribution, and consumption to their outmoded financial systems, instead of adjusting their financial systems to their productive and consumptive capacities and to their distribution needs. Hitler, it appears, made these adjustments, although it does not necessarily follow that it must be done just exactly in the way that he did it for it to be done successfully. Certainly a dictatorship is no essential part of the making of the needed adjustments, unless through our apathy we fail to work them out until a dictatorship is upon us.

Dr. H. R. Fack, of San Antonio, Tex., who traveled in Germany prior to the war and has made a special study of this question, in a recent article, in which he pointed out that Germany had financed the elimination of unemployment and the development of its war machine through the actual exercise of powers conferred upon our American Congress under article I, section 8, clause 5, of our Constitution, stated among other things:

"As a progressive nation, we usually do not hesitate to adopt technical development, scientific discoveries, military strategems, or other 'darn tricks,' such as Mr. Churchill referred to recently, when they come from Germany or any other nation, just as the Germans are not fools enough to refuse to accept progress where they find it. We have even permitted ourselves to move strongly, under the Roosevelt regime, in the direction of regimentation, State interference with private economic life, emergency powers, etc., similar to Nazi Germany. Strangely, however, we have moved heaven and hell in order not to adopt Hitler's financial technique, which actually is the source of Germany's amazing economic rise and increasing power."

FINANCING COMPARED

Similarly, the monthly newspaper, Money, has stated the following, among other things, in its July editorial:

"Adolf Hitler learned early the power and possibilities of free money to release an abundance of war material and equipment. His teachers were Feder, in his own movement, the British expert, Arthur Kitson, and the German economist, Silvio Gesell. When he rose to power, Hitler was as keen on application as he was quick to learn. He soon saved all the waste of unemployment to use in production of planes, tanks, munitions, for the world war to come. These cost the Germans nothing since the labor went to waste, anyway.

"In contrast, take the case of Paul Renaud, last civil Premier of France, former Finance Minister, who always kept on his desk German marks of the inflationary period. When monetary reformers came to plead with the Finance Minister for free money to create arms to meet Germany, they were shown the worthless German money, warned that Hitler's money system would never work. Renaud was confident to the last that only 'sound' money could save France. * * *

"With her dying gasp, France begged for 1,000 planes, at once. The request was thought preposterous. Yet Henry Ford can make 1,000 planes a day. One day's work at one American factory could have kept life in France. But planes cost a lot, so we have not made them. The money system makes us stingy.

"France is gone. * * * History will say: They refused to monetize their vast resources, put their unemployed to work, and so create the spirit and the means of resistance; these great empires fell because they could not learn the power of debt-free money nor use it for their own defense and security. * * *

"Hitler geared money issuance to unemployment, stopped issuance when all were employed. Good enough, though, there may be better standards of issuance."

Dynamic America, speaking in a similar vein in its July issue, has also stated, among other things:

"The common people of France can thank their banker-politicians for their present plight. And the same is true of England. England did not prepare herself adequately for the present war because she measured preparedness in terms of pounds and shillings instead of airplanes, tanks, ships, and munitions.

"Reactionaries everywhere, trying to conceal their own responsibility for the break-down of peace and the destruction of democratic institutions, are attempting to shift the blame. * * * It was the totally irresponsible position of the French financiers who under the leadership of Bonnet held France fast to a gold standard for years after other nations had abandoned it, and thereby bringing on deflation and depression in France. If one wants to find the real 'fifth column' of France, one can readily find it in the counting-houses in the financial districts of France.

"The democratic peoples of France and England are deserving of a better fate than to be crushed under the heels of a brutal megalomaniac. But, unfortunately for these millions of victims of Nazi aggression, neither the French nor English people were able to throw off the yoke of a financial system which hastened the process of their destruction. We in America must not repeat the mistakes of the English and French."

Whether you agree with all of the implications contained in the foregoing statements is not important. It is important to realize that we cannot continue indefinitely to resist needed changes and adjustments. If we attempt such resistance then sometime something or somebody will sweep aside our most treasured possessions. It is the law of a changing universe.

God bless America! May she be saved from the stupidity of reactionary resistance to the fulfillment of modern needs.

Roosevelt Moves Toward Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. SCHAFER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our ex-international banker Fuehrer Roosevelt's third-term "blitzkrieg" is a major move to establish a dictatorship in the United States.

Laboring under delusions and hallucinations, Stalin believes that he is the only person in the world capable of ruling Soviet Russia. Hitler has delusions and hallucinations that he is the only person in the world capable of ruling Germany. Mussolini has delusions and hallucinations that he is the only person in the world capable of ruling Italy. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the ex-international banker New Deal fuehrer, has delusions and hallucinations that he is the only person in the world capable of ruling the United States. Should Fuehrer Roosevelt's third-term "blitzkrieg" be successful, the world will then have another added to the long list of dictators on horseback.

Under permission granted by the House I incorporate the following exceptionally fine editorial appearing in Father Coughlin's July 29, 1940, issue of Social Justice.

RESULTS OF THE THIRD TERM

Most beneficial for America will the third-term nomination of Mr. Roosevelt prove to be.

The veil of secrecy and of hypocrisy has now been removed.

The lust for power and self-perpetuation has been exhibited.

In nominating Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, the National Democratic Convention—composed of jobholders predominantly—has gone on record for several things:

First, it has voted democracy out of existence, as far as it was able.

Second, it has voted for a dictatorship dominated by public servants and pork-barrel munchers.

Third, it has destroyed the old-time Jeffersonian Democratic Party.

And all this at the expense of honesty, forthrightness and decency.

Honesty was ash-canned when Mr. Roosevelt accepted the nomination after having protested that he had nothing to do with it.

Forthrightness was discredited through the activities of Hopkins, Ickes, Kelly, Hague, and the steam-roller politicians who attempted to practice deceit upon the listening public, as they rigged every movement of the convention.

Decency was decapitated in the manifestation of rowdyism, vulgarity, sovietism, and intemperance which characterized the convention.

If the American people want the perpetuation of a gang of job holders under the regency of a power-mad politician, that is the business of the American people.

And is all this democracy?

Is all this identified with the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the liberties which they safeguarded?

Social Justice does not think so. We believe that the decent element amongst the millions of Democrats of America will resent being hoodwinked, lied to, yelled at by sewer superintendents, and steam rollered by party politicians.

This decent element, with CARTER GLASS, MILLARD TYDINGS, Vice President GARNER, and a host of others will put patriotism above decadent partyism, preferring to risk the destiny of America to the guidance of Wendell Willkie.

Nothing more disgraceful ever occurred at any national convention than the imposition of Henry A. Wallace upon the electorate of America.

If Henry Wallace were only a dreamer, an idealist, and a political stooge, one could afford to be silent.

More than all that, he has proven to be a destructionist of the worst possible type.

It was under his jurisdiction that thousands of pigs were scuttled.

It was under his jurisdiction that thousands of fruit-bearing acres were plowed under.

And all this at a time when a great portion of our population was on the verge of starvation; all this at a time when President Roosevelt was more concerned with raising prices than with alleviating the hunger of our fellow citizens.

Yes; all this at a time when Henry Wallace was busy importing foodstuffs from abroad to the disparagement of the markets at home.

The nominations of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Henry A. Wallace will prove most beneficial to this Nation. It gives a clear-cut opportunity to the American people to decide between dictatorship and democracy, inefficiency and efficiency, partyism and patriotism, war and peace, depression and prosperity.

It was ironical to hear the job holders in the Chicago Stadium sing God Bless America after having poniarded the real blessings which are identified with America.

It were more appropriate had they substituted for those words, "God help America."

As for the platform written by the job holders and their delegates, pay no heed to it.

Platforms are written—as is history oftentimes—to be a conspiracy against the truth.

Woodrow Wilson was elected on the implied promise of keeping us out of war.

Franklin Roosevelt desires to be reelected for the moral certainty of getting us into war.

His deeds for the past 7 years speak more eloquently than all the unctuous words which are crammed into his platform.

I also incorporate the following article, entitled "Daily Worker," appearing in the same issue of Social Justice which refers to the activities of Stalin's Communist agents now operating in the United States:

"DAILY WORKER"

The Daily Worker, Jewish-Communist sheet, prints the following in its edition of July 15:

"A powerful drive to force the Department of Justice to investigate Father Coughlin and the Christian Front as the real 'fifth column' in America will be launched with a monster mass meeting on Wednesday, July 31, at Manhattan Center, Thirty-fourth Street and Eighth Avenue. Outstanding leaders from all walks of American life will address the meeting which is being called under the auspices of the Jewish People's Committee.

"Rabbi Moses Miller, national president of the Jewish People's Committee, today issued the following statement on the meeting:

" 'The acquittal verdict in the trial of the 14 Christian Fronters, followed by Father Coughlin's anti-Semitic incitement, has been greeted as a green-light signal by the anti-Semitic forces which are daily growing bolder. Events of the past few weeks have made it crystal clear that only a powerful and determined demand can force the Department of Justice to act. The people must raise their voices now. From one end of America to the other the cry must ring out: Investigate Coughlin now! Smash the anti-Semites, the real "fifth column" in America!'

"Support of the meeting has already been pledged by large numbers of trade unions and other progressive organizations which have set about rallying their membership to attend the mass meeting in the largest numbers.

"Tickets for the meeting will be sold at 25 cents each in order to insure the largest possible attendance. Tickets will be put on sale on Tuesday and can be purchased directly from the Jewish People's Committee at 1133 Broadway, room 1427."

The date of July 31 is very important to all persons living in New York, Brooklyn, etc.

The meeting is being held under the auspices of the Jewish People's Committee, a radical organization notorious for its "red" leadership.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that Fuehrer Roosevelt on November 16, 1933, extended recognition to Fuehrer Stalin's bloody red butcher government in Moscow, and on many occasions sent congratulatory communications on its birthday anniversaries.

The New Deal administration in Washington was so impressed with communism as preached and practiced in Moscow that shortly thereafter it commenced to advocate, effectuate, and emulate the planned economy of the Soviet conception of regimented bureaucratic autocracy. Shortly thereafter, in early 1934, according to the sworn testimony of the aviation expert, Mr. Anthony H. S. Fokker, before the Special Senate Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt made a deal with Fokker to sell the Communist Russian Government 50 Douglas military airplanes of Lockheed make. Mr. Fokker's testimony revealed that the agreement which he signed with Mr. Elliott Roosevelt was a special agreement for the sale of these planes to Russia, and when questioned concerning why he had signed an agreement for such a large commission of $500,000 to Mr. Elliott Roosevelt and $500,000 to himself, Mr. Fokker explained that he had not felt that the prices which it was proposed to charge the Russians for these 50 military planes were at all reasonable and, in fact, he had thought them notably excessive, but that he had been persuaded by Mr. Elliott Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt's associate, Mr. Stratton, that Mr. Elliott Roosevelt had enough influence with the Export-Import Bank and the Russian Purchasing Commission, then in this country, to swing the deal at that excessive price.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, the son of our New Deal President, is truly a great liberal—liberal when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money in order to make money for himself. Mr. Elliott Roosevelt proposed, through the Federal Export-Import Bank, to raid our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury of millions of dollars to hand to Soviet Russia for the purchase of 50 Douglas military airplanes from himself and his associate, Mr. Fokker, each of whom was to receive $500,000 commission on the deal.

In the interest of the taxpayers of the United States and our country's national defense it is essential that we have a thorough congressional investigation of all foreign and domestic military airplane purchases in the United States since the New Deal disciples of Karl Marx have had control of our Federal Government.

Democratic Central Committee Proposes Suffrage Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MALCOLM S. McCONIHE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion of suffrage for the District of Columbia I am pleased to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the resolution on this subject which was adopted by the Democratic central committee of the District of Columbia at a meeting in Washington on May 13, 1940.

The Honorable Malcolm S. McConihe, national Democratic committeeman for the District, offered the resolution which was passed unanimously. From this action came the introduction of the resolution by Melvin D. Hildreth, vice chairman of the Democratic central committee, when he appeared at Chicago and did excellent work as a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention.

I have received from Walter F. Bramhall, secretary treasurer of the Democratic central committee, the resolution, which is as follows:

RESOLUTION PROPOSING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PLANK

Whereas the political status of the over half a million residents of the District is so completely at variance with the accepted principles of a democratic government, in that they are taxed by the Nation but denied any participation in the Nation's councils, a condition as unfair and obnoxious today as in the days of the forefathers; and

Whereas the District of Columbia with a population exceeding each of eight of the States, and a population of voting age in excess of each of 10 States, bears all the burdens of national citizenship including the payment of national taxes and the bearing of arms in the country's defense; and

Whereas during the fiscal year 1938 District citizens paid into the United States Treasury $27,660,524 in Federal internal revenue taxes toward the support of the National Government, which was greater than the payment by each of 24 States and more than the combined payments of 9 States, which 9 States were represented in the Congress by 18 Senators and 18 Representatives, and will have 36 Presidential electors; and

Whereas such un-American conditions prevailing at the Nation's Capital are violative of the cardinal principles of the Democratic Party and in conflict with our best American traditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense and desire of the Democratic central committee of the District of Columbia that the delegates elected to represent the people of the District of Columbia at the Democratic National Convention, to be convened in Chicago on July 15,

1940, shall use their utmost efforts to prevail upon the committee on resolutions and the convention itself to insert the following plank in the forthcoming National Democratic platform:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"We favor granting to the people of the District of Columbia voting representation in the Senate, House of Representatives, and electoral college."

What's Ahead for the Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS, SECRETARIES, AND DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, serious as are the international problems which confront this Congress, we must not permit concern with foreign affairs to blot out our responsibility to improve conditions in the many domestic problems which continue to plague and perplex America. Of vital importance among these unsolved domestic problems is the development of a long-range farm program to provide something more than bare sustenance incomes for our American farmers and to open the doors of opportunity to farm families once again so they can receive a fair price for a full crop. Our farmers are entitled to a program enabling them to look forward to earning enough profits on the farm during the active periods of their life so that when old age comes they will have put aside enough to move to town and retire, as used to be the accepted American custom for the typical American farmer.

Because the farm problem is of such basic importance to our whole recovery program, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a set of resolutions adopted by the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture at their convention held in Deadwood, S. Dak., July 19, 1940. These men represent a variety of parties and a highly significant block of farm States, and so it occurs to me that their unanimous observations will be of interest to the Members of this body who are working to secure equity, parity, and justice for the American farmer. These officials are in close touch with the farmers of their respective States and their findings reflect a wide cross section of farm sentiment regardless of political affiliation or place of residence. The American farmer is entitled to a fair chance and a square deal and this Congress should not adjourn before perfecting a permanent program by which farming can again become profitable in this country.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES SET FORTH BY THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF THE COMMISSIONERS, SECRETARIES, AND DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURE JULY 19, 1940, AT DEADWOOD, S. DAK.

We reaffirm our faith in the American system of government as the surest foundation of true progress, sound social security, and permanent general welfare. We must have tolerance and understanding among all groups of people. We are opposed to totalitarian forms of government. We believe in constitutional democracy. We believe that the unsolved problems here are even more threatening to democracy and the public than any European dictator. We believe a well-balanced domestic economy is our strongest first line of defense. We believe our Nation must stand ready to protect all of our citizens who are engaged in useful pursuits and investments so long as these investments are confined within the boundaries of these United States of America, and we also urge that the United States Fleet and the United States flag will never follow American investors into foreign countries. We believe that by taking the profits out of war we will do much to lessen the possibility of our engaging in it.

Effective organization of our military and economic defenses are the outstanding problems of our Nation in these trying times that lie ahead. Partisanship must not be allowed to interfere in these vital questions. In a world of armed totalitarian states our people will and must be called upon to make rapid and radical revaluations, a readaption of their mental habits. Democracy must now meet the acid test. It is for us the people who are privileged to be citizens of this great Republic to prove to the world that a government for and by the people cannot only maintain and continue to give us liberty and freedom but be efficient in times of great crisis.

Our first line of defense must be to put our own house in order. In this connection we wish to emphasize the fact that on the subject of preparedness the production of food and fabrics is of equal if not greater importance than the manufacture of arms and ammunition and that those who produce this food and fabric are entitled to equal consideration as to the compensation for these patriotic services. We demand that the American farmer be given the first opportunity to supply the American market to the extent of his ability to supply that market. The farm problem is an economic, a political, and a social problem of the first magnitude. The farm problem is everyone's problem. The farmer does not seek privileges but he does want an equal opportunity in our economic system. We believe that the problem of the ten or twelve millions of people that are now unemployed has its roots in the low income of agriculture; that our greatest problem is to make agriculture prosperous; that only as the farmer prospers can industry and labor prosper.

We pledge our support to a program which will produce cost of production net to the farmer on that portion of agricultural products consumed in the United States. Planned scarcity means national bankruptcy. We further believe that farm cooperatives are a powerful weapon in the fight against monopolies and we pledge to them our loyal support.

We favor the continued research and experimentation in the development of other than food uses for our surplus farm products and the manufacture of such surplus farm products into such other manufactured products as rapidly as they prove to be practical and economical.

We believe that the regulatory functions of government as they pertain to agriculture should be placed under the State departments of agriculture.

We commend the Federal Division of Plant Quarantine and Insect Control, under Dr. Lee Strong, of the United States Department, in their effort to save the farmers' crops from the destruction by grasshoppers and other insect pests.

IMPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS

Whereas, under existing trade agreements, large importations of foreign agricultural products, such as are produced in abundance on our own farms, annually enter the United States; and

Whereas such trade agreements are entered into by the Department of State, without hearings or study by Congress or either House thereof; and

Whereas such agreements, having the force and effect of treaties, should be studied and considered by the United States Senate, which is much more responsive to the will of the people than any department or bureau: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Central Association of Secretaries, Commissioners, and Directors of Agriculture, in convention assembled on this 19 day of July A. D. 1940, at Deadwood, S. Dak., That we request and petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring that all trade agreements be first submitted to the Senate for study and approval or rejection after the manner in which treaties are now considered and ratified or rejected by that branch of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the press of the Nation.

MATH DAHL,
President, Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor of North Dakota.

E. H. EVERSON,
Secretary, State Secretary of Agriculture of South Dakota.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

RESOLUTION PASSED BY QUEENSBORO CIVIC CLUB, OF SHREVEPORT, LA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by Queensboro Civic Club, of Shreveport, La., on July 25, 1940:

Whereas the United States of America is now recognized as the last bulwark of democracy in the civilized world; and

Whereas on this 25th day of July 1940, Queensboro Civic Club, an organization of American citizens, desiring to promote the welfare of the community of Queensboro, a section of the city of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, as well as our entire State and country, have unanimously approved your proposed adequate national-defense bill: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our Federal Government should take all possible precautionary measures for the protection of our religious liberty, civic welfare, and for the promotion of democracy and the ideals for which it stands in the United States of America, and in the entire Western Hemisphere.

Thus done and signed at its regular meeting.

QUEENSBORO CIVIC CLUB,
By LEONARD A. SPEAKS,
President.

The Mythical "Jewish Vote"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES SECCOMBE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. BRUCE BARTON OF NEW YORK

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. BRUCE BARTON, published recently in the Jewish Veteran.

THE MYTHICAL "JEWISH VOTE"

(By Hon. BRUCE BARTON)

There has been a great deal of talk about "unfriendly" cities and "unfriendly" people, but there's no doubt that any man who likes people can have as many friends as he wants. And he doesn't have to be aggressive or a "go-getter" either. He merely has to be a decent fellow and treat others as he'd like to be treated himself. The average American is probably the friendliest fellow on the face of the earth. Being an average American, with the traditional good-will and friendliness of the American people, his friends will be Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, Democrats and Republicans, Irish, English, Italian, or German, as the case may be.

Certainly the average American can never be accused of harboring ill will toward any person or group of people merely because of religious belief or national origin. But with his trusting good nature, the average American citizen is often an easier mark for rumor mongers than the average citizen of other lands. When the rumors are designed to set one group in the American scene apart from their fellow citizens, and especially when such rumors have not a grain of truth in them, they should be spiked as soon as possible.

A man in public life has an advantage over the average citizen in one respect. While he has the same sort of friends as the average man, from whom he can get a cross section of public opinion, his public office and his experiences while campaigning for office give him a considerably wider perspective. As a private citizen, I encountered one untrue rumor which I should like to refute on the basis of my experience as a public officer. The rumor I'd like to spike right now is the sort that everyone is supposed to whisper about, but the sort that no politician is supposed to discuss publicly. I refer to the so-called Jewish vote in New York.

Ever since I entered politics I've been hearing about the Jewish vote, the Italian vote, the Catholic vote, and all sorts of racial and religious votes. And my opinion is that it just ain't so.

There is no Jewish vote.

A majority of Congressmen in Washington are probably not qualified to speak on this subject, except in vague generalized terms, because there are very few Jewish citizens in their congressional districts. Since I represent the Seventeenth New York Congressional District in the Congress of the United States, I feel in a position of authority to discuss the roots and ramifications of the idea of a "Jewish vote." The Seventeenth Congressional District is at least 50-percent Jewish in population. I have run twice for office in that district, and each time my opponent for office was Jewish.

We've all heard talk about some sort of tremendously mysterious conspiracy or something, in which the Jewish citizens of the United States are falsely charged with getting together on every important and insignificant issue of politics and business and always sticking together. Naturally, they're supposed to vote together. That's what people mean by the "Jewish vote." If you want to know exactly what the "Jewish vote" means, you will probably have to trace the rumors back to their source. My guess is that all too often they will be found to have come in one way or another from the "fifth columnists" that are running around our land today.

As I say, I have run twice for public office. Each time, my opponent was a Jew, yet the religious question never once entered into either campaign. I ran for office as an ordinary American and laid no claim to any religious or nationality vote. My opponent ran for office as an ordinary American, and I'm sure it would never have occurred to him to call upon the Jewish voters in our district to vote for him because he was a coreligionist. No more did it occur to the Jewish voters of the district to vote for my opponent because he was a Jew. If there had been the slightest sign of Jewish solidarity in voting, if there had been any such thing as a "Jewish vote," I would be a private citizen and not a Congressman today.

I was elected by a substantial majority, in which there were thousands of votes cast by Jewish citizens. Without those thousands of votes cast by Jewish voters against my Jewish opponent, I could never have been elected. And yet I was not elected by Jewish votes.

I was elected by American votes, cast by Yankees, Italians, Finns, Germans, and Jews, all Americans.

We Americans are today proud of the national unity we have preserved so solidly in spite of "fifth column" attempts to destroy it by raising smoke-screen anti-Semitic issues. But our unity is a unity of free men in defense of democracy and the basic principles on which democracy rests. It is not a slavish subservience to a unity of thoughts and beliefs imposed by a totalitarian dictator. On all other issues, except the issue of the defense of American democracy, the American people will be found on both sides. So will the Jews.

Jews are Americans and divide on every political and social question like their fellow American citizens. I've heard some conscious or unconscious "fifth columnists" rant on about how Jews all support the New Deal. I ran for office in a Jewish neighborhood as a liberal Republican, not as a New Deal Democrat. If all Jews supported the New Deal, I would never have been elected to office. The fact that I am holding office now is incontrovertible proof that while some Jews may vote for the New Deal—which is their privilege as Americans—many thousands of others vote against it. Which is also their privilege, as Americans.

Jews usually divide in exactly the same proportions as the rest of the American population. That division applies both to prominent Jewish citizens and political leaders and to ordinary Jewish citizens, who react to every political measure in exactly the same way as their Catholic or Protestant neighbors.

The plain fact is that when Jews walk into the voting booths, they walk in not as members of a religious faith but as Americans.

I contend further that in the broad sense there is no Jewish problem. There is an American problem. The problem of preserving the foundations of this democracy—free speech, free worship, free assembly. If this is a good country for my children, it will be a good country for the children of every other American citizen, regardless of his or her faith. If it is a country torn by class hatred and sectional and religious dissensions, then it will be as bad for my children as for the children of my Jewish friends.

Untruths about the Jewish citizens of America, whether uttered with the best or worst of intentions, merely increase the possibilities of class, sectional, and religious dissensions in our country.

A strife-torn nation will be equally bad for the children of Jews, Protestants, and Catholics, and it is in the interest of every loyal American citizen to spike any rumors that might contribute to malice or misunderstanding among the various great religions of our country. If every misinformed but well-intentioned Catholic or Protestant refused to heed or repeat any malicious rumors about his Jewish fellow citizens, the rumors would immediately be traced to their sources. And those sources will inevitably be self-seeking demagogues who grind the ax of religious discrimination to further their own selfish aims of aggrandizement.

We need a different emphasis on the word "tolerance." We speak of tolerance in the negative sense. We say: "I don't like that man, but I tolerate him," or, "I dislike such and such a situation, but I tolerate it." If the man is evil, or the situation is unbearable, it should not be tolerated at all. Evil must never be tolerated. It must be eradicated, with every physical and spiritual means at our disposal. The religion of another man, unless it is a religion of evil, should not be tolerated, but should be respected and furthered. The Jewish faith is a noble and ancient one. It is entitled to respect, not tolerance.

The word "tolerate" is derived from the Latin tolero, tolerare, to lift, to bear up, to carry forward. It connotes a willingness to do something, not merely to accept something. I am tolerant because I want this country to be a united America, in which I, whose ancestors came from England a century and a half ago, can stand shoulder to shoulder with the man whose parents came here from Ireland or Germany, from Austria or Russia, a generaton or less ago; or with the man whose forebears were brought here as slaves from Africa. This is the glory of America, that we are all free and all endowed with "certain unalienable rights." Not merely a few of us, not merely those whose forebears happened to come earlier, not only those who happen to live on the right side of the tracks. But all of us, every man of whatever race, creed, color, or economic status. Let us not be satisfied with tolerance in the negative sense of merely refraining from hate. Let us have the tolerance which is a creative force for a finer and nobler civilization than the world has ever yet produced.

It is because I want this country to be free to work out its unique destiny that I am determined, as one Member of Congress, to vote to keep it out of any foreign war. And it is for this reason also that I hope we shall hear less and less, as our country matures in good will and understanding, about the so-called Jewish vote, which does not exist. I hope we shall hear less and less about the so-called Jewish problem, which is actually the problem of Jews, Catholics, Protestants, and all other Americans alike.

His Majesty Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE COSHOCTON (OHIO) TRIBUNE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Coshocton Tribune of July 17, 1940:

[From the Coshocton (Ohio) Tribune of July 17, 1940]

HIS MAJESTY SPEAKS

His Majesty, Franklin the First, last night sent a high-ranking vassal, Senator BARKLEY, with a message for a thousand or more of his subjects gathered in Chicago.

This was indeed gracious of His Majesty. Up to this time he had not deigned to take the people into his confidence on the great secret. It isn't wise, of course, to let the people in on affairs of state. Tax 'em, rule 'em, regulate 'em, and tell 'em nothing—that's the system of Franklin the First.

Last night's message, like many another royal decree from Washington, is quite clever and needs a bit of interpreting. We therefore make bold to read between the lines.

The statements below are ostensibly what Franklin had to say in his message. After each statement, in parentheses, is the statement that we believe he really means.

Frankly, boys, I don't want a third term. (Frankly, boys, I do want a third term.)

No one has ever heard me say that I want the nomination, have they? (No one has ever heard me say, either, that I would refuse it, have they?)

All of you delegates are free to vote for anyone you like. (All of you delegates had better vote for me—and I mean all!)

I've never even announced that I'm a candidate. (Now, when the time comes I want you dopes to whoop it up plenty and make this "draft" business look like the real McCoy, not like a phony that was all rigged up ahead of time. Whoop it up and make me run for a third term. That's all you're here for. Don't kid yourselves that you have any choice in the matter.)

I release my delegates. Go ahead and pick somebody else if you want to. (Yeh, just try it. By patronage politics and other devices I've already killed off every guy that had a chance, so what the hell!)

I'm tired of being President and I'd like to retire. (But a great man like me has to sacrifice his own desires. You certainly aren't silly enough to suppose the American people are capable of governing themselves, are you? It's bad enough in normal times, but in a time of crisis such as this—why, gee whiz, mah frans, the country just can't get along without me!)

Army Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS A. COLLINS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered last Sunday night by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune:

From the earliest of times we read of armies in the terms of infantry and cavalry; men marching on foot; men mounted on horses; and the ancient equivalents of artillery—instruments drawn by horses.

These are called the three principal arms and are considered as unchangeable as the principles of war are said to be. All military thought from the beginning of time has revolved around the speed at which these components could be moved. So it was that Napoleon could say:

"Read and reread the campaigns of Alexander, Caesar, and Frederick; model yourself upon them; this is the only way to become a great captain and to discover the secrets of the art of war."

WAR INSTRUMENTS CHANGE

But Napoleon was about the last man who could say so accurately. After his day the inventor and the manufacturer began to so change the instruments of war that the old lessons no longer held.

The industrial revolution which drove admirals crazy, first with steam, then with armor, then with torpedoes, dealt gently with the generals. Nothing new came into the army for a hundred years. Infantry goose-stepped up Unter den Linden; artillery fired in the Place de la Bastille; cavalry drilled in the horse guards.

RAILROADS USED IN CIVIL WAR

In the American Civil War, however, great strategic movements were made by railroad. The genius of Grant used speedy river boats and the railroad for the tactical movement of troops on the battlefield, but no one paid any attention to this example.

Said Von Moltke of the Civil War:

"This colossal conflict was but a matter of two armed mobs chasing each other around the country, from which nothing could be learned."

Generals blundered through the wars of 1864, 1866, and 1870 without perceiving the results of the slight changes in material that they had allowed to be adopted. The lessons of the war in South Africa from smokeless powder and high-powered rifles were but dimly perceived by the brass hats, who only saw in automobiles more comfortable conveyances for themselves.

AUTOMATIC WEAPONS UTILIZED

Came automatic weapons: The Gatling gun, the Maxim, and the Colt. Rapid fire and long range multiplied the battlefield in width and depth.

By 1914 the equipment adopted by European armies had passed far beyond the comprehension of the generals. Their maneuvers at a foot pace were nowhere able to pass through the fire of the weapons.

Inventors having outsmarted the soldiers, other inventors were called upon to break the deadlock. The classic conception of the infantry, that it must consist of men walking with individual weapons in their hands, could not be thrust aside, so mortars, machine guns, infantry cannon, flame throwers, and heavy artillery were added to the infantry equipment, while busses were taken from the streets, first to bring men leisurely up to trenches, then frantically to re-form broken lines, finally to set up a surprise attack. Tractors were introduced to draw heavy guns and to become tanks.

CAVALRY GETS INTO TANKS

Men fighting on horseback were shown to be utterly futile in that war. In consequence, except for a few animals retained to carry scouts and weapons in certain terrains, the cavalry arm agreed to get into tanks.

But 3 miles an hour remained the common denominator of the war colleges, except in Germany, where Von Brauchitsch, using flying boats and gasoline trains, as Grant had used river boats and railroad trains, scored another Vicksburg and another Appomattox.

Now we have infantry in tanks and cavalry in tanks.

Shall the infantry have the slow tanks and the cavalry the fast tanks? How slow and how fast? The infantry the big tanks and the cavalry the little tanks? How big and how little? Isn't this nonsense?

The terms "infantry" and "cavalry" have become anachronisms. When a tank carries a gun is it artillery? No? Is the demarcation, then, between a gun mounted on a tractor and one fastened behind it? And are we to have artillery guns, infantry guns, cavalry guns, tank guns, antitank guns, aviation guns, and antiaviation guns? Confusion worse confounded. Furthermore, aerial bombardment does not use cannon at all. The artillery arm has ceased to exist. It has burst into fragments.

INFANTRY, CAVALRY, ARTILLERY

Infantry, cavalry, artillery! Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon! All equally dead. We cannot cramp the creations of inventive genius into the coffins of the past.

I subscribe to General Miles' statement, that:

"Fundamentally our concepts of basic military facts are proved to be largely in error."

We no longer have an army composed of three arms: Men walking, men riding on horses, and guns drawn by horses. Our organization of infantry, cavalry, and artillery is as obsolete as the organization of the fleet of sailing ships and fire boats in Decatur's day. We have an infinite complexity of machines bearing men, and still more intricate machines.

HOW SHALL ARMY BE DIVIDED?

As I showed last week, an air force that holds aloof from the other defenses is of little use. An air arm is as wrong a conception as the older arms. There are many forms of aviation tactics, and most of them are in direct connection with some element of the ground forces.

How, then, shall this new army be divided? Patently, all mechanics belong in one class, whether it be aviation, tractor, or truck. Aviators cannot deny that pilots and chauffeurs are one and the same, since the greatest of them was once a racing driver before he was a flyer.

Shooting is shooting, whether from an airplane, a tank, or a shell hole; whether the shooter is transported in a tank, a truck, an airplane, a parachute, or moves for short distances on foot.

THREE PRINCIPAL BRANCHES

The new three principal branches of the army should be, therefore: mechanics, pilots, and gunners.

Of our old services, only the engineers remain, or appear to remain.

The field fortifications of yesterday varied as little from Julius Caesar's as did yesterday's tactics. Now they belong in the museum.

To resist the charge of giant tanks and of heavy bombers, fortifications must be on a scale as undreamed of as warfare at 40 miles an hour was 30 years ago. These can only be erected by machines that can dig veritable canals and pile up great embankments in short order.

And so, while engineer officers must be versatile architects, the engineer soldiers again will be mechanics.

Until these changes from the dead past are made, Congress is wasting all its billions of money and its millions of men.

Nominating Franklin D. Roosevelt for President at Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks which I made at the recent Democratic National Convention at Chicago when placing in nomination Franklin D. Roosevelt for President of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet not merely to answer to our party's call but to answer the call of America in her hour of need. The Alabama delegation places its duty to the United States above and beyond all selfish aims. Our desire to put in nomination the name of Alabama's illustrious son, the temporary chairman of this convention, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the strong arm of the present Democratic administration in the House of Representatives, the Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, is overwhelmed by our desire, shared by the Speaker himself, that we put service to our country first. America needs loyal hearts today more than she has ever needed them in all her history. This is no time for untried hands to pilot the ship of state. This convention must name a leader whose record of achievements will inspire our Nation with supreme confidence.

Fortunately for us and for our country we have in our party a man whose courage is beyond all question, who came back from a living death to serve his country, whose proven will to live and to achieve matches the great will of the American people. The greatness of his vision is demonstrated by the roll of his achievements.

When the great banks and bankers of America were falling before a force beyond all their power and beyond all their imaginings, this man saved them. When millions of Americans faint with hunger cried out in their anguish, he gave them food. When strong hearts grew faint he gave them courage. Under his leadership a Nation milling in gloom became a resolute people marching toward the light of a better day and a better world. His heart made him a friend of the lowly; his deeds show him to be the friend of all, both great and small.

With such a man in our party there is no choice left to us. He alone is strong enough to match the strength of America against the avalanche of fate. If peace is possible—and I pray to Almighty God that it is—he can preserve it for us. If war is inevitable, he can win it for us.

If America is to survive we must all give the best that is in us and must demand the best of every American. We must be valiant, and we must demand valor. This man whose name I am proud to offer saw the approach of the whirlwind of disaster while it was far off. He has labored to make us strong, to keep us at peace, and to keep us free. He stands the symbol of the hopes of all the stricken and suffering peoples of this earth. In the name of the State and people of Alabama, in behalf of the people of the whole United States, and in furtherance of the cause of freedom and law and justice in a world at grips with chaos, I place in nomination that valiant American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Democratic National Convention, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. PAUL V. McNUTT

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt at the Democratic National Convention on July 18, 1940.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to express my eternal gratitude for the thousands of true and loyal friends who have accorded me such generous and loyal support. I would be both ungracious and ungrateful were I to fail to make some public recognition of their efforts on my behalf.

The State of Indiana, from whence I am proud to come, believes that our party is destined to be the vehicle by which the processes of liberal government are to be preserved, and in facing that responsibility it is above everything else necessary that we be and remain a united party.

Our party stands on the record of the last 7 years. It goes to the people under the leadership of the greatest peacetime President in the history of the Nation.

America needs strong, logical, liberal, and able leadership in the kind of a world in which we live today. We cannot take chances now. A nation only gets one chance these days. If it makes a mistake, it is lost. We must have leaders who have demonstrated what they can do, what they will do—men whom we know will keep this country safe and free, men who have been through the fires and have come out proven liberals and proven leaders.

We have such a leader in Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He is my commander in chief, I follow his wishes, and I am here to support his choice for Vice President of the United States. I therefore ask in all sincerity that my name be withdrawn from nomination by this convention. I pledge my wholehearted and enthusiastic support to the Democratic Party and to the nominees which it is selecting on this historic occasion.

Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

ADDRESS BY FREDERICK G. HUGHES TO EMPLOYEES OF GENERAL MOTORS MANUFACTURING CO.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely address delivered by Mr. Frederick G. Hughes at a dinner given in honor of many old employees of the New Departure plant of the General Motors Manufacturing Co., at Bristol, Conn., on June 24, 1940.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On each of the past 5 years since it has been possible for the New Departure old guard to gather together to celebrate our successful adventure in industrial good-fellowship it has been a great pleasure to welcome larger and larger numbers of 20-year men and women to this group of industrial heroes.

This year the new recruits number 121 and while 5 years ago we had 250 Old Timers, this year there are over 600—602 to be exact. We welcome you, old friends. None has gathered here who has not earned his or her place through friendship, loyalty, and good faith, these many years.

As we greet you who are newly added to our ranks we cannot forget that there are some who last year broke bread with us and having passed to the Great Beyond, now dining at the Father's table, are with us in spirit to inspire and guide us through the days to come.

During the year we have lost Gustaf Adolph Ahl, Frederick A. Bunnell, John C. Carter, Mrs. Ida H. Cook, James J. Corrigan, Gales P. Moore, Robert H. Muzzy, DeWitt Page, George J. Pearl, John Stotz.

Of these, two were among our oldest members, DeWitt Page and Robert Muzzy, each of whom had been with New Departure over 40 years. Each as a young man had thrown in his lot with this young company whose principal asset was a restless spirit of adventure.

Each grew and prospered as he contributed to the growth and good fortune of the company. I know that tonight as we honor these men who have gone on before, we feel as though we had lost elder brothers in whose advice and counsel we had trusted completely.

Especially is this true of the loss of Mr. Page who for 48 of our 51 years had exercised so tremendous an influence upon the life and success of all of us.

Coming to the New Departure Bell Co. a young man, poor in money but rich in courage, physically handicapped by impaired eyesight, yet equipped with the vision of a bright future to be wrought through his complete faith and trust in his fellow men, DeWitt Page brought with him boundless energy, coupled with a magnetic personality that converted him first into one of America's greatest salesmen and then in the hour of need into the leader who brought New Departure through difficulties to the forefront of industry.

DeWitt Page, himself a new departure in men, has left his imprint upon the life and character of every New Departure man and woman here tonight. To him no tribute we can pay will cancel the debt we owe to his leadership.

It is fitting that we should express our sympathy to Mrs. Page who a year ago with Mr. Page attended this gathering. I propose that we send her this resolution:

"Six hundred and two New Departure men and women who for most of their 20 or more years of association worked with Mr. Page in the upbuilding of this industry, remembering with affection his loyalty to them and their indebtedness to his foresight and leadership, express to Mrs. Page their deepest sympathy in her loss, in which they too have so great a share."

From the beginning these Old Timers' Dinners have had the nature of a memorial service for those of our old time associates who have passed to the Great Beyond, as well as a celebration for the service of those who for 20 years or more, by loyal cooperation and friendly association, have achieved maturity here with New Departure.

When last year we celebrated our fiftieth anniversary in this same hall, we looked forward to the years to come and said that with the same courage, the same loyalty, inventiveness, and resource we would press on to the unknown future, determined to master difficulties, to invent new things, to expand and grow, to do our share of whatever might come; that we as a group of men and women, engaged in earning a living and achieving happiness, might expect to continue to win through to success and brighter days.

We who for over 20 years have worked side by side together have learned that while not every day is bright and sunshiny, that every problem is not easily solved, that hills go up as well as down; we have learned that loyalty and friendly cooperation with each other ease the road that leads on to fortune.

We have known that for the last 10 years the way has been harder and the path to success in America much more difficult than in the years before, yet with courage we have fought through, perhaps not to the heights we once attained, but to a substantial measure of success and prosperity. All through those years we have sensed a change in outlook, not only in America but in the world at large.

In many foreign countries movements which claim to be the will of the common people, the spontaneous achievement of a common desire, and the effective expression of a democratic ideal through compulsory unanimity of popular vote, have nevertheless set up rulers as absolute as any monarch, Caesar, or czar that history records. These rulers at their personal whim are able to command the lifeblood of the people, first in regulative control and compulsory industry and then to make war upon those more defenseless than themselves in order that they might satisfy their lust for power.

All over the world we have seen the progressive deterioration of the idea of the individual as a person of importance; as an entity with the right to expect freedom, justice, mercy, kindness, friendship, and the right to live in peace with his fellows as a human being. While these ideas, so destructive of the individuality of the person and of his dreams of individual liberty and freedom, were being fostered under the dominance of the superauthority, there grew up in these countries a deep sense of national unity and purpose, a stiffening of morale, and, strange to say, a ready and universal desire to work hard and long for the accomplishment of the national ideal.

From such a Spartan regimen of discipline there grew up a sense of power; power not based on right but power based on might, power asserting itself as supreme over the rights of men, over the rights of weaker nations, a power strong and determined, a power realistic in its knowledge that the fit must naturally survive, determined that their nation should be the strongest and most determined to survive, even at the expense of the lives and property of their neighboring states.

While the ideology of the dictators was becoming supreme in central and eastern Europe, and even in parts of Asia, there was among the democratic nations, late allies and supposedly the victors in the war of 1914, a lowering of morale, a lessening of the desire to work, and the growth of the idea that pay comes before production. Among these sponsors of democracy, the people deemed themselves so secure in their freedom and their democratic privileges that they need no longer strive to preserve them, forgetting that freedom was only possible as it was earned. They began to believe that security, their prosperity, and a high standard of living, and even wealth and happiness, were gifts of the gods and not to be earned by work.

Thus, while dictatorships were becoming strong and powerful, the democracies weakened themselves all over the world, including America, by pursuing false gods and dallying with the idea of a self-perpetuating, unearned salvation.

It is not surprising that eventually the depredations of a strong and virile people upon the weak should soon become intolerable, and that war should break out between those devoted to the totalitarian ideal and those representing the democracies. The world for nearly a year has been in that war; nation after nation has fallen before the power of the dictators, and the democracies are sorely pressed.

On many occasions before I have said that America has been at war for the past 10 years, perhaps longer. America has been at war with herself. America has been at war with her own ideals; America has been at war—civil war, if you please—with the ideals of the founding fathers. The democracy that we claim to be has already been at war with democracy; the responsibilities of the individual for its preservation have been ignored in our desire to have comfort; America has been at war with common sense; America has been at war with the lessons of history.

I do not need to remind you of the battles that we have fought, so many of which remain to be won—battle of the depression, the battle of surpluses, the battle with debt, and the battle of unemployment. We are beginning to be convinced that the battle for security, whether it be internal or external, is not to be won by thumb-twiddling exercises.

In this war which we have been fighting too many Americans have been unwilling to fight the stern and hard way; they did not have sufficient moral courage to stand the gaff and fight through in the cause of honesty and straight thinking. They sought to find the easy way out—to find Paradise on a bed of roses with a cushion of false promises.

Now we see abroad the trial of a real war in which the weapons produce sudden death through bomb and shrapnel, not through the slow decay of moral fiber. We, who have set such store upon our comforts—are we prepared for the hardships of the preparedness sacrifices? Are we who lend and borrow with such liberality prepared to realize that preparedness cannot be bought with dollars alone, but is to be secured with the items of production, with things; with guns, with battleships, with planes, with motors—all the product of work, of labor not given to the pursuit of peace?

Are we sure we know the ends for which we would fight; and are we prepared to donate labor, materials, and endure the hard times, the sacrifices, which must be ours if we would make ourselves secure; or do we propose to run away from these new sacrifices as we attempted to avoid the depression?

We ask the question in the supposition that we have a choice.

Certain it is that industry does not want war; certain it is that people of intelligence do not want war; certain it is that the poor do not want war; certain it is that the rich do not want war—for the result of war is death, either complete or partial, not only for men and women, whether they be rich or poor, but for industries, for nations, and for all people.

America wants peace, America needs peace, not only abroad but at home, and America should be prepared to fight for peace—peace abroad and peace at home.

The fight for peace may be as hard and call for even greater sacrifice than to fight in a war. Either choice requires more courage, greater sacrifice, than Americans have been accustomed to make in the battle of the depression. We who have been accustomed to cozen ourselves with the sophistries of an easy life, and of riches gained through idleness, and coddled with the security of the promise that the wealth of the thrifty should provide for the old age of the lazy—we Americans, if we are to escape slavery, slavery either physical or slavery to falsehood and false ideals, we must wake up, prepare to go to work early in the morning and to work until late at night.

Salvation of any kind presupposes willingness to work to attain it. Without labor it is lost. To a people long grown accustomed to lollypops and ice cream a diet of fried potatoes and onions may be a real hardship. Are we prepared to endure it; are we members of the New Departure family prepared to do our part, essential as it is sure to be, for the salvation of this country of ours, the preservation of our ideals, our pleasant home, our freedom, and our liberties?

You who are here tonight have demonstrated your loyalty to the better things, loyalty to friends, loyalty to work, loyalty to honesty, truth, fair dealing—of you, one need have no question. We have learned in 20 years to be tolerant and long suffering, to be truthful and cooperative, to be inventive, resourceful, to be restless and pioneering.

Whatever the future may bring, those same qualities which have brought us this far on the road will carry us through, if there be anything left of truth, of faith, of all of the things that we have held worth while.

Sure as we are that the realities of peace in some measure must be foregone and that we must prepare the weapons of war, it is necessary that we trust in the honor, in the loyalty of each member

of the family, to God and to his country as we prepare things even more important, even more essential, than bullets or guns for the winning of the battle. Whether it be bearings for machine tools or tanks, for airplanes or guns, for trucks or for tractors, we know that your appreciation of honest workmanship will show in the bearings which make it possible for the Nation to effectively defend itself.

While the products of our hands, the products of New Departure, may be in the first line of defense of the ideals, the hopes which have made America the refuge of the oppressed of all the world, back of these is our real first line of defense, that which we have grown to know through all the years as the New Departure spirit—the spirit of fair play, the spirit of cooperation, friendship, truthfulness. This has made it possible for us all, working together these many, many years, to have built on a solid foundation an industry worthy of the honor of defending our homes, our loved ones, and our country.

May God grant us courage to face the future, whatever it may be, as New Departure men and women, grown accustomed to struggle, work to victory. If God grants our prayers for peace, may we with that same courage carry on to new and broadening fields the banner of the New Departure pioneers.

'While for us in Flanders Fields
May no poppies grow in row on row,
Yet as one by one beneath the sod of these New England hills we go,
Heaven grant that they who live may know that here a hero lies,
Defender of the faith, his friends, his country, and, O God, of You."

Mr. Willkie's Candidacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of this morning, which is a reprint of an editorial published in the New York News of this morning, dealing with the candidacy of Wendell L. Willkie.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 30, 1940]

We publish editorials from the New York Daily News because, as we have said, we find them interesting, well written, and because we agree with the thoughts they express.

Today's editorial from the News is interesting and well written. With the thought we agree only in part.

WE AGREE IN PART

We are not sure at this writing which candidate for President we would like to see win. We think the question of which would make a better President cannot be answered until the wars abroad have reached another stage, as they are almost certain to before election time.

In one set of circumstances the United States may have to make such a drastic change in foreign policy that Mr. Roosevelt, with his record, would be an impossible leader to take us around the turn. Mr. Willkie, then, regardless of his sentiments or private view, would be the only one free to deal with the situation.

In another set of circumstances we may be so deeply involved in daily difficulties that a change in Presidents would be most dangerous to the successful prosecution of whatever policy may have been forced upon us.

To sum it up—we are going to wait and see. Meanwhile, we will print the News' well-written, interesting editorials, and add our own differences of opinion when we feel like it. Herewith today's:

THINKING OUT LOUD

Yesterday we read a piece somewhere, in which it was stated that 91 percent of United States newspapers are for Willkie this year, whereas 86 percent of them were for Alf Landon in 1936.

We don't know who made the count, but it may well be that 91 percent of the Nation's newspapers want to see Mr. Willkie defeat Mr. Roosevelt and are working as hard as they can to bring that about.

In 1936 the New York Daily News was among the alleged 14 percent of American newspapers which were for Roosevelt and against Landon. The question now before us is whether the News in 1940 is to be among the alleged 9 percent of newspapers favoring Roosevelt over Willkie.

We'll say at the start that the third-term issue cuts no ice in our thinking about this campaign. When this country in times as dangerous as these has a good President, it ought to keep him as long as it can or until it can get a better one, and too bad about traditions. The very fact that 91 percent of our newspapers are at liberty to curse the Roosevelt administration and demand a change shows the dictatorship talk to be absurd.

As long as the European war goes on, it will overshadow every public happening in the United States.

CHOICE BETWEEN INTERVENTIONISTS

We've sometimes felt that Mr. Roosevelt was too much of an interventionist; too much inclined to give other nations advice and scold all four of the gangster nations (Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia) at once.

It was Thomas E. Dewey's isolationism that moved us to say some kind words for him when he was trying to sew up the Republican nomination.

But when Dewey began to make a pronounced hit with the western and midwestern farmers with his stay-out-of-it speeches, lo and behold, a lot of important eastern money shied away from Dewey and moved toward Willkie. And the fact now is, since Willkie's nomination, that Willkie's supporters include some of our wealthiest interventionists and some of our most powerful interventionist newspapers.

It looks as if Willkie is as much of an interventionist as the President. The President necessarily knows much more about national defense, and particularly about the Navy, than Willkie. Willkie, highly intelligent though he evidently is, can't have learned much about our Army, Navy, and air arms by being a corporation lawyer connected with big utility holding companies.

If we've got to choose between a couple of interventionists for President, the better choice would seem to be the better informed and more experienced of the two—meaning Roosevelt.

As regards domestic problems, we prefer Roosevelt far and away.

NEW DEALER; OLD DEALER

Roosevelt has made mistakes. Some of his appointments were not so good. The purge turned out badly for him. His handling of the Supreme Court issue was not adept. But Roosevelt has urged this country's thinking and acting in the direction we have to take, we believe, if democracy is to survive in this country. That direction is toward a wider distribution of wealth and away from the state of affairs where 10 men have $100,000,000 apiece and 10,000,000 have nothing apiece.

Willkie's crowd are against a wider distribution of wealth. That is why they hate Roosevelt so hard—because he's for it. Willkie's crowd feel that everything that happened before 1929 was ideal and that the depression was just a regrettable accident—that if we'd only stood by Herbert Hoover a little longer we'd be O. K. now.

We can't feel in our bones that this theory is correct. We think the New Deal has been and is on the right track.

Therefore, if the election were held tomorrow, this writer would vote for Roosevelt.

The picture of things may change between now and November, as often happens. Presidential elections in this country are usually settled sometime in September or October. But at this time we're for Roosevelt.

The Third-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK SUN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Sun of Monday, July 29, 1940, entitled "The Acute Angle of the Third-Term Issue."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of July 29, 1940]

THE ACUTE ANGLE OF THE THIRD-TERM ISSUE

Most literate Americans are familiar with the historic high lights of the third-term issue. Washington, who could have had a third term, refused it. Jefferson followed suit in 1808. By the end of the administrations of Madison and Monroe the tradition against a third term for Presidents had been fairly well established. The fathers feared the return of a king as we fear the arrival of a dictator. There was an attempt to give a third nomination to Jackson in 1836, but he would not countenance it. Indeed, he favored a constitutional amendment which would restrict the Presidency to a single term. When Theodore Roosevelt was nominated in 1904 he announced that he regarded his service in the Presidency, to which he was elevated by the death of President McKinley in 1901, as his first term, adding that he would not take a renomination in 1908; nor did he. President Coolidge, who reached the Presidency similarly, and who could have been nominated in 1928 as

easily as he had been in 1924, put an end to possible third-term talk by saying, in the summer of 1927, that he did not choose to run.

To find a partial parallel for the case of Franklin D. Roosevelt we must turn to the history of Ulysses S. Grant. It is a parallel to the extent that Grant undoubtedly wished a third term. The reasons were obvious. He desired to atone for some of the evils of his first and second terms; unlike Mr. Roosevelt, he was a poor man and he enjoyed the Presidential salary; his personal and political friends, like some of President Roosevelt's, wanted him to stay in the White House. But there were also friends, loyal supporters of Grant, who had eyes on the Presidency. Grant, a grateful man, undoubtedly had a thought for the ambitions of Republicans like Conkling, Oliver P. Morton, and Hamilton Fish. So on May 29, 1875, Grant wrote a letter in response to the demand that he declare himself. He said that he did not want a third term any more than he did the first. He wound up by saying:

"I am not, nor have I ever been, a candidate for a renomination. I would not accept a renomination if it were tendered unless it should come under such circumstances as to make it an imperative duty—circumstances not likely to arise."

In the timing of this declaration we see the radical difference between two Presidents who wished to cling to the Presidency longer than 8 years. General Grant, no matter what his personal desires, set other Republicans free more than a year before the convention. Mr. Roosevelt waited until the Democratic National Convention was in session and the nomination was in the bag for him before he authorized Senator BARKLEY to say that he "has never had, and has not today, any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President." As he did not refuse a third nomination this message was, in the circumstances, a bid for it. The Hull, Garner, Farley, McNutt, and other candidacies had already been nullified, a sharp contrast with the Republican convention of 1876, in which Grant's name was not presented, and in which, after a struggle among seven candidates, Hayes emerged the winner.

The third term will be a leading issue in this year's campaign, but the acute angle of that issue is the method used by President Roosevelt in his attempt to violate the tradition. He declared in his speech of acceptance that his friends knew that he was not a candidate and that he intended last September to announce this at an early date. But where is there a scrap of evidence? If it had been known that Mr. Roosevelt would not accept, his lieutenants could not have sewed up the State delegations one by one until he had a majority of them. The third-term workers went about their job as quietly as possible. When Henry A. Wallace let the cat partly out of the bag last October by saying that the third term had become a necessity he was gently chided by the White House for having made Mr. Roosevelt the victim of a prediction. It is evident that there was no victimizing except to the extent that a premature announcement by one of the President's intimates might clog the wheels of a personal political machine moving quietly toward its goal.

If Mr. Roosevelt had come out a year ago, with the frankness of Grant or Coolidge, and declared himself on the subject of the third term—even if he had said that the tradition was not to be respected by him—the country would think better of him than it does. But in his view the people had no right to know. If it be suggested that Mr. Roosevelt could not think so poorly of his fellow countrymen—"my friends," as he calls them—we have only to turn to the record. Mr. Farley called on him not long before the convention to learn the truth about the third term, and, presumably, Farley got it, but his lips were sealed. The public was not to be let in on the ambitions and movements of the President. But the palace guard knew and worked its head off to put over the third-term idea. Otherwise why was Farley replaced by Harry Hopkins at Chicago long before BARKLEY made the announcement that the delegates were free to vote for whom they pleased—a declaration which was swallowed only by the simple-minded?

It is all too evident that the third-term bee began buzzing in Mr. Roosevelt's bonnet long ago—perhaps years ago. He had only to keep silent and let his cohorts put the pressure of the Federal power where it would result in the election of delegates committed to him. The attempt to violate the tradition is painful to many, regardless of party. But the strategy of silence, the keeping of his own party members in the dark, must be particularly irksome to men and women who still may rightfully call themselves Democrats.

Glass Against Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS ITEM

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans Item entitled "Glass Against Kelly," having to do with the booing of the name of Thomas Jefferson at the recent Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLASS AGAINST KELLY

When the veteran CARTER GLASS spoke at Chicago it was for two purposes: One, to nominate James A. Farley was a gallant gesture but futile. The second was to remind Democrats of the ancient opposition of their party to a third term for a President.

No utterance of Senator GLASS could be colored by personal ambition, not alone because of his age but because, should he live to 182 years Virginia would keep him in the Senate. As he stood in the withering glare of the klieg lights, holding the rostrum for support, his cracked old voice gained force as he appealed to his fellow Democrats not to forsake the teaching of Thomas Jefferson.

Thereupon burst forth a bedlam of boos and hisses. That marked the first time that any gathering of Americans has hissed and booed the name of the author of the Declaration of Independence. Many in the vast and sweltering assemblage looked on this scene in frozen silence. Chairman BARKLEY tried to put down the pandemonium, while the brave old Senator stood his ground as if he had been 7 feet tall and 21 years old.

Order was finally restored by the rising of a colored balloon from the hand of Boss Kelly of Chicago. Many of Boss Kelly's minions don't speak or understand English. They had never heard of Thomas Jefferson. They were there to boo, clap, whistle, or stamp their feet, on the Boss' order. But he had to give his orders in sign language.

After a tumultous few minutes, it must have filtered through even Boss Kelly's thinking apparatus that his hoodlums were doing a bad night's work. The balloon was released, order was restored, and Mr. GLASS went on to conclude his remarks.

The newest of naturalized citizens of the United States is entitled to the same rights as the descendants of those who came over in the *Mayflower*. And these poor misguided rowdies were not responsible for this shocking exhibition of disrespect to one of the Nation's founders. The men responsible were Ed Kelly and those new dealers who welcome this notorious boss into their inner councils.

Many a delegate who intended to vote for Mr. Roosevelt's renomination left the convention that night heartsick over the sorry pass to which the party of Jefferson had come.

The Virginia delegation sat like so many graven images throughout the strange proceedings. But when Mr. GLASS called on Democrats to stand by Jeffersonian principle the Virginians rose as one man and gave a mighty cheer for Thomas Jefferson and CARTER GLASS. And the Virginia standards waved on high for the only time during the convention.

Senator GLASS' words didn't make a dent in the well-armored political tank but they will be remembered by many who heard them. Some Democrats, on observing the delegates from the Old Dominion, may have paraphrased the words of the first psalm: "I will lift up mine eyes unto Virginia from whence cometh the light."

Suspension of Publication of Chattanooga News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Philadelphia Record of July 29, 1940, entitled "Who Killed the Paper That Fought Willkie?" It is an open letter addressed to Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, and when Mr. Willkie replies I shall be very glad to place his reply in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of July 29, 1940]

WHO KILLED THE PAPER THAT FOUGHT WILLKIE?—AN OPEN LETTER

Hon. WENDELL L. WILLKIE,
1010 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WILLKIE: Who killed the Chattanooga News?

Published by George Fort Milton, the Chattanooga News was one of the foremost liberal newspapers in the country, and one of a very few papers in the South which opposed you and your Commonwealth & Southern Corporation in your fight against the T. V. A.

Mr. Willkie, we ask you, "Who killed the Chattanooga News?" for two reasons:

First, because at Cheyenne, Wyo., on July 23, you declared that "a free and untrammelled press is one of the guaranties of democracy."

Second, because the Tennessee Utilities Commission found your power company, Tennessee Electric, guilty on 917 counts of "using unlawful devices" to destroy the Chattanooga News by illegally helping its competitor, which was "friendly" to your interests. Tennessee Electric was a subsidiary of your Commonwealth & Southern.

What is the truth, Mr. Willkie?

Do you believe in freedom of the press for all of the press?

Or only for those newspapers which do not stand in your way or in the way of your corporations?

The public is entitled to a clear answer.

You naturally know all the facts in this case—because the killing of the Chattanooga News took place while you were president of Commonwealth & Southern.

Milton's paper first supported T. V. A., then favored a publicly owned power plant for Chattanooga. What followed? We refer you to the records of the Tennessee Utilities Commission, which show—

(a) That your company withdrew its advertising from the Chattanooga News after a competitor, the Free Press, had been set up in business by a group of men whose chief stockholder was Silas Williams, an attorney for your Tennessee Electric Power Co.

(b) That your company was found guilty of turning over to this Silas Williams the sum of $10,000 "under the guise of counsel fees * * * all of which the said Williams shortly turned over to the Free Press in ostensible consideration for the issue to him of certain shares of stock."

(c) That your power company bought $19,303 worth of advertising in the paper set up to fight the Chattanooga News, and paid an advertising rate "far in excess of the regular rates"—about 25 percent higher—the only conclusion being that your company paid more than it had to as a subsidy.

(d) That your company granted a 5-percent discount on the power bills of the Free Press, even after they had become delinquent, and when, according to your company's advertisements, they were not subject to discount.

(e) That your company further gave indirect financial help to the publisher who was fighting the Chattanooga News by giving him 5-percent discount on the bills of some forty-odd grocery stores in which he was interested.

(f) That when the congressional committee investigating T. V. A. came across this whole episode its counsel, Francis Biddle, declared: "Tennessee Electric has been subsidizing the Chattanooga Free Press."

There were 909 other counts on which your company was found guilty of trying to destroy a newspaper whose policies it didn't like.

As directing head of the corporation in control of this situation, we'd like to hear your explanation, Mr. Willkie.

What finally happened to the Chattanooga News?

Surely you recall, Mr. Willkie, that it was sold by the sheriff to the Free Press, the same paper the Tennessee Utilities Commission said had been subsidized by your power companies.

The News was sold even though, in its last days, it was breaking about even while the company which bought it was then supposed to be losing money.

The News was sold even though its own employees raised $15,000 at the last minute by mortgaging their homes and cashing their savings in an effort to preserve their jobs.

The News was sold—and a lot of people are still wondering where its competitor got the money to buy it.

Sold, Mr. Willkie—and then killed. That was the fate of the Chattanooga News, the newspaper which stood in your way in Tennessee.

What could other American newspapers expect, Mr. Willkie, if you were to become President—and they were to oppose your policies?

Would they share the same fate?

You've been reading the papers of Mr. Justice Holmes lately. Maybe you observed his famous phrase, "Freedom of speech means freedom for the thought we hate as well as for the thought we love."

Freedom of the press, Mr. Willkie, means freedom to applaud you or to criticize you; freedom to support you or to oppose you.

From the time your company first turned on the heat of its financial power down to the very last kilowatt-hour, the Chattanooga News was no longer free.

It was electrocuted.

Maybe you'd like to tell us why.

THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD.

Kentucky's Self-Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1940

EDITORIAL FROM GRAND RAPIDS (MICH.) PRESS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I respectfully ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial from the pages of the Grand Rapids Press of recent date entitled "Kentucky's Self-Appraisal." This editorial compliments a report of the management of the government of Kentucky by our most popular colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] during the time he was serving as Governor of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENTUCKY'S SELF-APPRAISAL

Since the government of a State is responsible to the voters, the work of that government should be brought before the voters in a form which can be understood by the majority. But State governments never have accomplished much in this respect. The Michigan Manual, published every 2 years, is mainly statistical and far too weighty for popular consumption.

Kentucky last year offered what may be considered a practical solution to the problem, in a paper-bound booklet designed with an eye to popular appeal. Inside the attractive cover are photographs, charts, and diagrams instead of columnar statistics. There is no monotony in the presentation of the material, and the pictographic make-up attracts many persons who otherwise would show little interest in their State government. There is evidence of a studied effort to avoid partisanship. Comparisons of administrations are omitted and the Governor's name appears only once, in the letter of introduction.

The report is organized on the basis of reporting each type of governmental activity separately, whether the job is to be performed by one or by several State departments. There are sections on reorganization, finance, highways, education, health and welfare, industrial relations, business regulation, conservation and agriculture, and Federal-State-local relations. The final section is entitled "Looking Forward," in which the unfinished tasks of the administration are enumerated, with an evaluation of proposals made both through the legislature and in organs of public opinion.

The publication is certainly inexpensive, and its value can hardly be overestimated, especially since it presents such an impartial picture of the situation to the people who have the chief right to know about it. The voters of Michigan might eagerly welcome such an opportunity to learn about their government in everyday language.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. DUNCAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE ST. JOSEPH (MO.) NEWS-PRESS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the St. Joseph News-Press, of St. Joseph, Mo.:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Wendell L. Willkie and Franklin D. Roosevelt should get together without loss of time and let all America know, as well as all the world, including the international brigand, Adolf Hitler, that America is back of Great Britain to the last ounce. All this "hooey" about neutrality is so much "guff." America has not been neutral from the very beginning and if anybody is loony enough to think Hitler believes us neutral he should be examined.

The United States should take immediate steps to protect its own interests. These interests include preservation of the British Empire. This is not pro-English propaganda. It is cold fact. If the British Empire goes to pieces, and well it may, the outlook for the United States is black. That is not meant to be too pessimistic, but it is exactly the situation as we view it.

We say again as we have said before no nation should adopt a foreign policy except inasmuch as it will serve her own selfish interests. All right. America's selfish interest is for the utter and complete defeat of Germany and the restoration of the nations Hitler has overrun in the last year or two. You pro-Germans will howl at that. You are afraid to come out and say you want to see Hitler win. You have not the courage to say that you are Nazi at heart. You hide behind the plea that we must not concern ourselves with Europe's age-old quarrels, that we are safe from all harm, and all that twaddle.

Adolf Hitler is another Attila, the Scourge of God, one of those inflictions of human fiends that Divine Providence permits on various occasions in the history of the world for His own mysterious purpose. Hitler was at first just a nuisance. Now he is a menace. And he is a menace to the United States of America. We are in the same position England was before Munich. We've got a great Nation which would like to see the world go on its smooth even way.

Surely, we all want that, but let's face facts as they are, not face fancies as we would like to have them.

The United States already has taken sides in this European quarrel. Hitler and all Germany know that the United States is unfriendly to the Nazi regime. Hitler and all Germany know we think the overrunning of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and France colossally criminal, a satanic lust for power. Let's not fool ourselves. What makes us think Hitler will go so far and no farther? His word! He says he has no intention of meddling in the United States. That's a laugh. His word is worth exactly nothing.

We are in for all the hell Hitler can give us if and when he subdues Great Britain. That is as certain as that Hitler beat France. Therefore it seems to us that we are a great big lumbering fat sleepy boy, waiting, waiting, leaning against a tree while the bully whips the other boys on the street one by one. What makes us think he'll pass us by? He'll take us on next. This is not red-eyed war mongering. This is a calm analysis of the way of dictators. They get drunk with victory. There is no turning back.

Don't fool yourselves that the German people would not follow Hitler in a war against the United States. He would get greater support than against any other foe, excepting perhaps Britain alone. Therefore let us quit this quibbling about whether or not we should jump in. Let's jump in and give Great Britain every ounce of support. We have—in the eyes of every German on the European continent—the name of being an ally of Britain. Let's have the game.

And let us go into this thing so earnestly and so strongly believing in the God of might that we annihilate Hitler and all for which he stands. This is unneutral. It is meant to be. We believe intensely that whether we like it or not America and Britain are allies and have been allies for many, many years. Our interests are closely intertwined. It is to our own selfish interest to see the daylight whaled out of Adolf Hitler, and we might as well get ready for the task.

Let's not blind ourselves. If Great Britain and France had been prepared and had jumped in when Hitler first ran amuck, he could have been brought to his knees. They were not prepared. France is reduced to the status of a third-rate power. The fate of Great Britain hangs in the balance. In the name of all that is good and holy, in the name of decency and justice, in the name of God and His cause, let America tip the scales. Let America tip the scales so that Britain's fate shall be decided in Britain's favor and in our favor.

Let America tip the scales that Hitlerism shall be destroyed as ruthlessly as he himself, this antichrist, has destroyed all that was good and fine and clean on the European Continent. Let us not deceive ourselves. Hitler hates America. Let Hitler destroy Britain and we shall have not a problem in economics, not a peaceful penetration through marts below the Rio Grande. We shall have war, plain war, hellish war, as only Hitler knows how to wage it. And he'll come down through beaten and crushed Canada or through treacherous, villainous South American routes. Let's not kid ourselves that those pseudosouthern republics love us. Rot. Let's face the cold fact that about the only friend we've got is Great Britain. Let's join hands with her and mop up on Hitler running loose like a madman escaped from a lunatic asylum.

Treasury Department Law-Enforcement Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

REPORT OF ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting report has just been made to the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the activities of enforcement agencies of the Treasury Department. A record that any enforcement agency can be proud of is that of the United States Secret Service, 97 percent of the cases tried in Federal courts resulting in conviction. As for income-tax evasions, 147 who were tried were convicted, 13 being acquitted. As part of my remarks, I include a statement concerning the report referred to. It follows:

Losses to the public through acceptance of counterfeit notes were reduced by 50.5 percent in the 1940 fiscal year ended June 30, as compared with the preceding 12 months, Elmer L. Irey, Coordinator of the Treasury law-enforcement agencies, reported today to Secretary Morgenthau.

This accomplishment by the United States Secret Service reduced losses to $145,644, as against losses of $294,057 in fiscal year 1939. It featured a performance report which revealed that marked successes against all crimes directed at the Treasury attended the coordinated efforts of the six agencies comprising the law-enforcement unit.

These agencies—the Secret Service, Coast Guard, Intelligence Unit and Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Bureau of Narcotics, and the Bureau of Customs—which originally functioned as separate bodies, were grouped 5 years ago into a closely knit and cooperative organization.

Suppression of counterfeiting resulted from an intensive campaign instituted by the Secret Service and made fruitful by the voluntary enrollment of millions of citizens, Mr. Irey said.

Education was the keynote of the new attack, Mr. Irey observed. Acting on the premise that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," the campaign, he said, effectively demonstrated the truth of this adage, and proved that the major crime of counterfeiting can be curbed more successfully by the modern system of education than by investigation and prosecution after the crime.

The campaign, having for its slogan, "Know your money," demonstrated to storekeepers, cashiers, and the public the difference between good money and bad, and illustrated what should be done when confronted with spurious currency or its purveyors. The public, Mr. Irey explained, was eager for this education and grasped quickly the important points the Secret Service strove to make.

As a result, millions of citizens received their first instructions through the "Know your money" campaign, which made use of sound motion pictures, circulars, public meetings, radio broadcasts, the daily papers, magazines, and trade journals. Active cooperation was extended by the broadcasting companies, and hundreds of broadcasts were made by Secret Service personnel and chiefs of police, in which simple rules were given to aid in spotting bad money and professional passers.

Exhibits of counterfeit money were placed in banks where tellers were detailed by bank officials to explain its defects.

This widespread educational program was carried out under the personal direction of Chief Frank J. Wilson, and came, incidentally, during the seventy-fifth anniversary of the agency.

Secret Service arrests totaled 3,281 persons during the year. Of this number 2,222 were in connection with forgeries, 778 related to counterfeiting, and 281 covered a wide miscellany of crimes against the Treasury. In the previous year there were 3,985 persons arrested—2,598 for forgeries, 1,045 against counterfeiting, and 342 for miscellaneous crimes.

Of the cases that went to trial during the year, convictions were obtained in 2,897 instances, or 97 percent, while 893 cases were awaiting trial at the close of the year.

The loss to the public through acceptance of counterfeit coins during the year was $51,737.42 as compared with $50,325.42 the year before, while seizures of spurious currency not yet in circulation amounted to $94,589.

COAST GUARD

The United States Coast Guard, national maritime law enforcement agency, reported the absence of organized liquor smuggling during the fiscal year.

It found little or no bulk liquor smuggling by sea, the few isolated cases encountered being insignificant.

"This is evidence of the high state of cooperation between the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, and the Alcohol Tax Unit, and is a result of the accumulated deterrent effect of years of vigilant patrolling," Admiral R. R. Waesche, Commandant, declared.

A summary of the principal enforcement activities of the Coast Guard for the year follows:

Miles cruised by Coast Guard vessels	2,182,706
Miles flown by Coast Guard aircraft	1,219,082
Vessels trailed, prevention narcotics smuggling	4,510
Regattas patrolled	462
Vessels boarded	37,617
Vessels reported for violations	1,208
Fines for which liable	$217,619
Vessels seized for violations	18
Value of vessels and cargoes	$80,750
Radios sealed on merchant vessels	4,397
Armaments on merchant vessels inspected	603
Identifications of vessels in connection with neutrality	163,119
Illicit distilleries located	718
Still seizures with Coast Guard cooperation	75
Gallons contraband liquor seized with Coast Guard cooperation	1,358

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Special agents of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue obtained the indictment of 360 individuals, including prominent and professional men as well as racketeers, for evasion of income and other taxes during the year. One hundred and sixty individuals were tried during that period. Of these, 147 were convicted and then, in addition to prison sentences, were fined $266,640. Additional taxes and penalties totaling $33,319,063 were recommended for assessment in cases investigated during the year.

Of the individual indictments, 52 resulted from attempts to evade the social-security tax. In addition, special agents were active in connection with violations of the National Firearms Act, and convictions of 37 individuals were obtained in the 12 months for this offense.

The outstanding achievement of the unit during the year was the conviction of Moses L. Annenberg, of Chicago, who entered a plea of guilty in April to charges of income-tax evasion. In addition, he agreed to pay $8,000,000 in settlement of his income-tax liability. In addition, Annenberg must pay 6 percent interest on unpaid balances. He is now serving a 3-year prison sentence.

An interesting case was culminated in January when Ralph Waldo Wagner, of Los Angeles, was convicted of evasion of income tax and sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment, plus a fine of $2,500. This taxpayer described himself as a "natural clairvoyant with remarkable talents for the benefit of humanity."

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

Experience of the Bureau of Narcotics disclosed a sharp reduction in the illegal field of traffic in narcotics during the year.

Arrests for violations of Federal marihuana laws during the year totaled 2,796 as compared with 3,196 persons in the previous fiscal period. In addition, 788 persons were arrested for violations of the Marihuana Tax Act as compared with 971 arrests in the previous period.

A marked decline in the amount of illicit narcotics seized in the internal traffic as well as a substantial decline in the amount of narcotic drugs seized at customs ports and borders was noted in the Bureau report. A marihuana eradication program in cooperation with other Federal agencies and with State and local authorities was continued, resulting in 7,805 acres of volunteer marihuana being destroyed in contrast to 10,391 acres in 1939.

Scarcity of narcotic drugs in the illicit traffic was further accentuated during the year, the Bureau reported. Such narcotics as are available are generally highly adulterated, it was found, and there has been a substantial increase in what were already exorbitant prices. The Bureau declared that at no time since the beginning of the enforcement of the Harrison Narcotic Act has there been such a sustained scarcity of illicit narcotic drugs as appears at present.

Functions of this Bureau resulted in a further disintegration of various rings engaged in the illegal traffic of narcotics.

Outstanding among these was the notorious Louis (Lepke) Buchalter who, in December 1939, was tried in the southern district of New York and convicted for conspiracy to violate the Federal narcotic laws. He pleaded guilty to nine additional indictments charging substantive violations of the Federal narcotic laws and received a sentence of 12 years' imprisonment. Buchalter had been indicted in November 1937, with some 30 others, as a result of an exhaustive investigation by customs and narcotics officers.

Another case involved Dr. D. M. Nigro and others in Kansas City, Mo. Dr. Nigro, along with several other members of the medical profession, was indicted in April 1940 for selling illicit narcotics without prescriptions. The Bureau found that the physicians were alleged to have been selling large quantities of illicit drugs to narcotic addicts simply for the gratification of addiction. Dr. Nigro, a city official, was tried alone in this case, found guilty, and sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment and fined $12,000.

In still another case indictments for conspiracy to violate narcotic laws and evasion of income taxes were returned in New York City against Charles, Harry, and George Neiditch, better known in the underworld as the Newman brothers. They pleaded guilty in April 1940 and were sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment each, and in addition incurred substantial fines. These brothers were considered by the Bureau to be ringleaders in the world-wide illicit narcotics traffic.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Law-enforcement activities of the Bureau of Customs were again directed in large measure against the smuggling of narcotics into the United States during the year. Operating independently, and in some cases in cooperation with the Bureau of Narcotics and the United States Coast Guard, it seized a number of important narcotic shipments and apprehended many notorious smugglers.

Seizures of all kinds of smuggled commodities totaled 6,600, a decline from the previous year. There were 3,000 seizures of smuggled liquor, also a decrease. Narcotic seizures aggregated 600 instances, a drop of 302 under the fiscal year 1939.

Customs seizures in the Southwest indicated there was a trickle of Mexican raw opium and marihuana into the United States from Mexico. Seizures generally were of minor caliber.

Agents of this Bureau, culminating an extended investigation made on behalf of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Department of Commerce, obtained and showed evidence of fraudulent registry of approximately 200 American vessels of various sizes during the year. These vessels, documented under the American flag as being owned by United States citizens, were found to be owned by aliens, principally Japanese. Many of the vessels have been seized and proceedings are pending against the others.

A summary showing the number of Federal prisoners committed to penitentiaries during the fiscal years 1939 and 1940 through the activities of customs officials follows:

Number:	
1939	231
1940 (11 months)	203
Sentences to be served:	
1939	324 years, 6 months, 11 days.
1940 (11 months)	168 years, 3 months, 3 days.

ALCOHOL TAX UNIT

A total of 27,099 prosecutions was recommended to United States attorneys in alcohol-tax cases during the fiscal year 1940. Of these 22,037 defendants were indicted, and 18,056 were convicted. Approximately 14,000 defendants were awaiting grand jury or trial action in Federal liquor cases at the year's end. Of the defendants indicted, 3,552 were involved in conspiracy cases, that is, cases involving major frauds on the revenue.

Comparative statistics for the Alcohol Tax Unit covering seizures and arrests for the last 2 fiscal years are as follows:

Seizures and arrests	Fiscal year ended June 30—	
	1939	1940 [1]
Stills seized	12,059	10,661
Distilled spirits (gallons)	336,268	264,590
Mash (gallons)	8,076,461	6,480,150
Automobiles	4,109	4,066
Trucks	447	458
Value of property	$2,223,899	$2,042,883
Number of persons arrested	28,844	25,621

[1] Preliminary.

The report of seizures and arrests during the year reflected a general decrease in illicit operations. Compared with the previous 12 months, there was a 12-percent decrease in the number of stills seized, a 20-percent decrease in the gallons of mash seized, and an 11-percent decrease in the number of persons arrested.

An analysis of the data indicated substantial progress in the drive against moonshine violators in the Southern States. In the metropolitan areas of the North and East an increase in the activity of groups operating alcohol distilleries was noted. Despite this increase in activity the unit, through effective enforcement, further reduced the fraud on the revenue in this area.

After Mobilization—What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

LETTER FROM LT. COL. A. H. STACKPOLE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Lt. Col. A. H. Stackpole, of the One Hundred and Fourth Cavalry, Pennsylvania National Guard. In this letter Colonel Stackpole sets forth and explains a plan to utilize the State National Guards in connection with the proposed compulsory training program. Colonel Stackpole has had a long and distinguished career in the Army and in the National Guard, and the suggestions which are embodied in his letter are the result not only of extensive study on his part but also of collaboration with other members of the Pennsylvania National Guard who are interested in making more efficient the defense program of the United States in this present emergency. A careful study of the plan will repay every Member, I feel sure. Colonel Stackpole's letter follows:

AFTER MOBILIZATION—WHAT?

Indications point to an imminent mobilization of the National Guard of the United States, with active training continuing for a period of a year or more.

But when the National Guard marches away from its armories, what then? In many States, of course, there are plans for a supplemental force within the States, such as the Pennsylvania Reserve Militia and the Home Guard of New York. That system was operative in 1917–18, and it is felt in many States that it should be equally successful now.

However, it occurs to this writer that another plan might prove even more effective, embodying both the retention of a continuing State force and replacements for those in the field.

Briefly, the scheme is this:

Let us assume that on October 1, 1940, the Federal Government will have 235,000 National Guard men called into the field for protracted active training. This leaves the communities from which they are drawn without guard protection.

To immediately replace these 235,000 guardsmen, let a similar number be drafted and placed in the armories in the same numbers and organizations in which they have been withdrawn for field training.

Give these 235,000 new guardsmen 6 months of training in the same manner as the National Guard has been receiving for many years. Let them continue to live at home, thus in no wise disrupting their civil occupations or their schooling, and at the end of 6 months send that force into the field to supplement those already there.

As they leave, call up the third 235,000 and put them into training, and so on, each 6 months. Thus you have a constant reservoir

of men trained only in the basic school of the soldier, with intensive specialized training to come upon their arrival in the camps.

If the international situation indicates that a continuing greater force of men under arms is not required, then the first contingents could be relieved after a year as the new men come in, and return to a civilian status, although still held on the reserve roles.

The chief objection to the scheme, that under the Constitution men cannot be called into compulsory military service by the Federal Government and then used as State troops, could be met through orders to State military headquarters to retain these troops within the confines of the States until further orders.

Briefly summed up, let us look at the plan thus:

1. The National Guard, 235,000 strong, is called into active service, by order of the President of the United States, on October 1, 1940.

2. Selective service replaces these men at once, in the communities where the present guard troops are established.

3. Six months later, or April 1, 1941, this "secondary National Guard" moves out to camp, and is immediately replaced by a third group for its 6 months of preliminary basic training at home station.

4. At the end of the year, or in October 1941, relieve the initial force, if the international situation warrants it, as the third 235,000 move into camp.

As to weapons, etc., it is understood that there would be an insufficient number of rifles, machine guns, field pieces, and the like, but this situation would improve as the months go by and Government orders are filled.

And all the time this plan is operative, States will have their so-called home-defense forces, and many hundreds of thousands of men will be getting the training so essential at the beginning of every soldier's career.

A. H. STACKPOLE,
Lieutenant Colonel, One Hundred and Fourth Cavalry.

The New Deal Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the program of the New Deal can well be summarized in the caption of the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

DRAFT ROOSEVELT AND HE WILL DRAFT YOU

The administration's bill to register for military conscription all male Americans between the ages of 18 and 64 provides another evidence that Mr. Roosevelt intends to get this country into the war as quickly as possible.

Though the bill is still in committee, the War Department has already completed its preparations for the draft. The blanks have already been prepared and skeleton organizations to direct the registration are ready in each State.

If Mr. Roosevelt knows, or has any reason to believe, that an attack upon America is imminent, he ought not to keep the facts upon which his judgment is based a secret. If there were substantial reason to believe that within a few weeks or months a German force would be on its way across the Atlantic, there might be some excuse for drafting an army this summer, even though no arms were available for the conscripts to use.

But no such evidence of imminent danger has been provided, and common sense suggests that an invasion, however likely it may become in the indefinite future, is not now imminent. Herr Hitler seems to have the habit of calling his shots, and at the moment he is talking about London, and nothing else. It took him 5 years to prepare for his present wars. Not one of his airplanes would prove of value in a trans-Atlantic campaign, because none of them can fly the ocean with a load of bombs. He has not yet captured the British Navy, and at the moment is trying to sink it rather than seize it. If he gets it, many months and probably several years would be required in which to organize an expedition which would have any hope of a successful landing on our shores, even in our present state of unpreparedness.

As the new arms and an understanding of their use become available to the Army, and that means a year from now at the earliest, conscription of the young men of the country may be required. There is surely much to be said for it in principle; but the draft at this time can only interfere with the Nation's preparation for defense. It will divert the attention of the Army from the more pressing business of obtaining armaments and at the same time disorganize the productive capacity of the country.

Immediate conscription makes sense only if it is assumed that Mr. Roosevelt means to organize an expeditionary force within the next few months. Mr. Roosevelt's conscripts would not be ready for war against a first-class enemy, but they could take their place in the line in an emergency and, perhaps, before they were all killed off they could be replaced with men better armed and better trained.

Meanwhile conscription can serve Mr. Roosevelt in other ways. The departure of National Guard men as well as the draftees for camp will whip up the war hysteria upon which he is counting to win him his third term. The mounting excitement will make it easier to bring the country into war, and the knowledge that a million men are in training will give many people a wholly false sense of the Nation's military strength, encouraging them to undertake adventures for which we shall be insufficiently prepared.

At the same time Mr. Roosevelt will have been given a powerful engine with which to quiet opposition. Every man in the United States between the ages of 18 and 64 will find himself subject to orders from the White House. Citizens who may wish to argue that there is no occasion for war and less for the third term may find it expedient to keep their thoughts to themselves. The penalty might be an assignment to work in a factory halfway across the country.

It is difficult to believe that the President's conscription bill is going to meet with popular favor. It is difficult to believe that the people of the United States are not suspicious of the motives behind the scheme, and especially so in the absence of any clear showing of a need for the measure at this time.

The President assumes that Congress, like the Democratic convention at Chicago, will do his bidding; and already, before the legislation has been enacted, he evidently is making plans to send not only a half billion dollars into South America to buy surplus commodities but to send as well American citizens.

Mr. Roosevelt must always have his spending program, whether it be disguised as a relief measure, as a program to assist the underprivileged or the forgotten man, or whether it be a so-called preparedness or conscription plan.

On one excuse or another, he must spend and spend, for only by spending can he perpetuate himself and his new dealers in office.

Long ago as good a Democrat as Senator GLASS charged that the 1936 election was bought with the aid of public funds. Now, in addition to gambling with public funds, President Roosevelt desires to gamble with the lives of American citizens.

By his war-provoking utterances, by his warlike acts, he each day is making it more difficult for other nations to avoid retaliation, for us to avoid becoming involved in war.

Long ago it was written, "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

Well might we now ask, What will it profit America, if, by engaging in war in an effort to save the so-called "democracies" of the world, we here in the last great democracy lose our liberty?

If we wish to avoid a dictatorship, we will work unceasingly for the defeat of the would-be dictator, Roosevelt, who, in time of peace, would draft us for an unnecessary and avoidable war, but which his every act brings nearer.

Secretary Perkins Accused of Harboring 700 Alien Lawbreakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM LOS ANGELES EXAMINER

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Examiner:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of July 29, 1940]

PERKINS ACCUSED OF HARBORING 700 ALIEN LAWBREAKERS—DESPAIN TELLS LIST OF ALIENS AND OFFENSES—ILLEGAL ENTRY AND FELONIOUS CRIMES LAID TO MOST OF THOSE DECLARED PROTECTED

WASHINGTON, July 28.—Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins was accused today of exempting from deportation more than 700 unnaturalized aliens guilty of deportable offenses against the laws of the United States. The charge was made by Donald Despain, of Chicago, vice president, National Small-Business Men's Association. Accompanying his statement was a copy of the State Department's list of exempted aliens and their deportable offenses, which, he said, had been made a part of the public records of Congress.

CALLS IT AMAZING

"It is amazing and shocking for American citizens to learn, while official Washington is calling upon the Nation to prepare for defense against foreign enemies * * * that over the last 5 years an executive department of the Government has been exerting unusual efforts to protect and keep within our borders hundreds of foreigners branded as criminals," Despain said.

He said Secretary Perkins, instead of deporting these aliens, "devised elaborate methods to keep them permanently in the United States."

"They were advised to move temporarily to Mexico or Canada, there to request incoming visas, which then were approved by the Labor Department under special discretion provisions of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917," Despain continued.

ALLOWS REENTRY

This provision, he said, allows the reentry of an alien who had lived 7 years in the country and had maintained his American home during a temporary absence, at the Department's discretion. Despain argued the purpose of the provision was to avoid hardships to law-abiding aliens who had lived orderly and constructive lives in this country for 7 years, but were temporarily out of the country in 1917 when the law was passed.

"By the gross abuse of this old, forgotten discretionary authority," Despain continued, "the Department of Labor has contrived to prevent the deportation of criminal aliens, as specifically required by other sections of the immigration statutes.

DEPORTED PREVIOUSLY

"Some of the aliens listed, who were readmitted to the United States by this illegal device, had been deported previously as Communist agitators."

He accused the Secretary of abusing her discretionary authority.

"In the first place, practically all of these aliens committed a felony by entering the United States illegally," Despain stated. "That fact alone made them deportable. In the second place, they have committed crimes of every nature while remaining in the United States illegally as unnaturalized aliens."

He said these crimes included perjury, forgery, smuggling, marriage-license fraud, registration fraud, theft, burglary, criminal assault, rape, bigamy, larceny, receiving stolen goods, procurer, conspiracy and extortion, fraudulent enlistment in the military service, shoplifting, manslaughter, embezzlement, and illegal entry.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1940

RADIO ADDRESSES BY HON. J. THORKELSON, OF MONTANA

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include three radio addresses given over the western Montana network on July 8, 11, and 15, 1940:

[JULY 8, 1940]

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, government must, to remain sound, be played according to rule. We have strict rules for baseball, football, golf, and various other sports. We take pride in adhering to the rules and playing the game fair and straight. Is it not much more important to take the same interest in your own Government and see that Congress plays square and sticks to the rules?

You and I get fighting mad when the rules are violated in a game. Why do we tolerate violation of rules by the Government? The rule you and I have given to our Government is embodied in the Constitution of the United States. We are safe as long as the Government adheres to the rule, but we become slaves to despots when the rule is violated. It is that condition that is developing today.

I shall take the liberty to quote the preamble, because it expresses the purpose of the document itself:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

These are the fundamental principles of our Government. Have they been observed? The answer is "No." The Union is no longer perfect, for that was destroyed in 1913. It is difficult to establish justice and we have no domestic tranquillity. We are not united in common defense or for the general welfare. We are instead ruled and regulated by minority groups. Liberty is destroyed day by day by the Government itself. This should be clearly evident as we consider Federal meddling, snooping, and persecution of private citizens.

We have a government with no head or tail—clearly incompetent and irresponsible. This deplorable situation is caused by failure to adhere to the rule—the Constitution of the United States.

This is the first of a series of talks on national defense, and tonight I shall begin by discussing industrial preparedness. The first requisite for national defense is self-sufficiency. We must produce our own food supplies and raw material, if possible. No army or people can defend themselves when they are starving; neither can we protect ourselves without arms and ammunition.

Instead of being self-sustaining, we are very much dependent upon foreign nations for food, as well as raw materials. In 1939 we imported 754,000 head of live cattle, 86,000,000 pounds of canned beef, and 105,000 pounds of fresh mutton. What would happen were we compelled to rely upon our own resources? Isn't it possible that many of us would be short of food?

In 1939 we imported 323,000,000 pounds of hides and skins, 134,000,000 pounds of cattle hides, and 64,000,000 pounds of sheep and lamb skins. What would happen if these supplies were cut off? Wouldn't it be much more sensible to allow our own farmers to raise this stock and produce the raw material?

In 1939 we imported 776,000 bushels of barley, 4,000,000 bushels of oats, 11,000,000 bushels of wheat, 70,000,000 pounds of wheat flour. This in spite of the fact that we can raise the best wheat in the world right here in this country. Suppose our supply were cut off in the fall of the year. Would we be able to sustain ourselves from the surplus now available in the United States? Or would we be compelled to reduce our rations?

In 1939 we imported 94,000,000 pounds of Irish or white potatoes and 11,000,000 pounds of potato starch, all of which can be raised on our own farms or produced in the United States. Do you believe your Government is playing the rules straight when they import this from foreign nations? Or is the Government playing into the hands of the international financiers who have interests in foreign countries?

In 1939 we imported 246,000,000 pounds of raw wool. Let us assume this import is cut off. Have we sufficient surplus to take care of us and provide clothing for our civilian and armed forces? I doubt it very much.

In 1939 we imported 5,500,000,000 pounds of sugar. Yet our own farmers are operating on restricted acreage and restriction in processing quotas. Sitting in the committee on the sugar hearing, I put this question to some of the sugar producers: "Is it possible for us to raise all the sugar we need?" Answer, "No." "How long would it take for us to develop sugar production to a point of self-sufficiency?" "More than 5 years," was the answer. In other words, with unlimited production, no restriction, it would take more than 5 years for us to develop sufficient sugar to take care of our own demand. In spite of this no effort is made to develop our own production; but we buy, instead, from Cuba and other foreign nations, no doubt because our international bankers have an interest in those countries.

In other words, the Secretary of State, to maintain a good-neighbor policy, sacrifices our own farmers for foreign agriculture and leaves us dependent upon foreign imports when we could be self-sustaining.

In 1939 we imported 16,000,000 pounds of flaxseed, 12,000,000 pounds of maple sugar and sirup, 59,000,000 pounds of cheese, 22,000 gallons of raw milk, 2,500,000 pounds of dried and malted milk, 16,000,000 pounds of casein, 329,000 dozen eggs in the shell—and we even imported over 48,000 tons of hay.

Now, then, this is a small part of our imports. And all are farm commodities that could be raised in the United States and should be raised in the United States in order to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of our people. Food is the most important item in our national defense, and should for that reason be produced in the United States.

I have discussed this purely from a national-defense angle, which of course is very important. However, do you believe it is good business to leave our own farms and our own farmers in poverty? Do you believe it is good business to develop foreign farming at the expense of our own agricultural structure? Do you believe it is good business to loan nearly one and a half billion dollars to South America for development of farm and other production in that country at the expense of our own farmers and production at home? The South American republics are in default on these loans to the extent of one and a quarter billion dollars. Do you believe it is good business to borrow this money from the international bankers, charge the loans, including the interest, to the farmers of the United States, and then loan the money to South American republics, when it is generally conceded that these loans will never be repaid to us, either in principal or interest? Wouldn't it have been more sensible to give one and a half billion dollars in gold to our own farmers?

It makes me smile to read about the efforts now made to prepare our Army and our Navy for national defense. Our statesmen seem to forget that the Army and Navy have to eat if they are going to fight. Our statesmen seem to forget that our enemy may prevent imports by blockade.

It is also possible that Argentina may need its own beef supply or it may even be bought by our enemy at a higher price. In either case, our supply is cut off, a situation to which we could not object. This holds good for all imports, for there is no assurance in case of war that such material is going to reach our own ports. It follows, therefore, that the most important part in national defense is in the developing of a self-sufficient and abundant food supply for our own people, and by our own farmers.

We must also develop strategic war materials, for such imports may also be stopped by the exporting nations. As a case in point, last year there was much discussion in Congress about developing strategic war materials in this country. Manganese was one of these materials. After much discussion Congress appropriated $10,000,000 to develop manganese. Did we get any part of that in Montana? No, indeed. A few hundred thousand dollars was spent in Virginia and the rest of it was spent in Cuba because the mines in Cuba are owned by the international financiers, who have no interest in developing the resources of the United States.

It should be clear from this that this administration is not interested in national defense except as a political gesture.

The best way to keep out of war is to be well prepared not only in a military sense but economic as well. We should therefore develop all minerals within the continental United States and in our Territories. Rubber, tea, and coffee may be grown in the Philippine Islands. We should import no competitive farm products. On the contrary, all farm products should be raised by our own farmers to meet all requirements in peace as well as war. This will not only leave us well prepared in a military sense but will also bring back prosperity, which we have lost by squandering our resources in foreign nations.

[JULY 11, 1940]

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, in my discussion last Monday I called your attention to an alarming increase in the imports of food and raw material that should be raised or produced in the United States. It should be evident that the first step in national defense lies in self-sufficiency. We must produce all food and raw material for our civilian and military populations. That can only be accomplished by removing all restrictions on farm and raw material production.

We must then, in order to protect our own industries, place a protective tariff on all competitive imports. We will be ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed until the unemployed go to work in private industry, and there will be no work in private industry until the farmer supplies our people with food and the manufacturer supplies us with merchandise.

Radicals should be eliminated from the councils of business and labor, for they are enemy agents or provocateurs. Dissension destroys the effectiveness of the industrial structure. There must be agreement between the real leaders of business and labor, for one group cannot operate successfully without the aid of the other.

No effort has been made in the last 8 years to bring harmony and cooperation in industry, and no sound or permanent aid has been given to the farmer. In 1936, under the pretense of increasing prices for farm commodities, the Government advised killing of livestock. Did the price increase? No. The prices and profits have instead declined not only on livestock but on all farm production. The Government then placed a premium on idleness; bonuses were paid for not raising stock and other farm commodities—a procedure which was bound to end in fraud and corruption.

Today, instead of being self-sufficient and self-sustaining as we were before the New Deal began to plan poverty, we are now largely dependent upon foreign countries for our food supply and raw materials. In order to make this clear, allow me to draw a brief comparison between the imports in 1938 and 1939.

We imported 424,022 head of live cattle in 1938, and 753,570 in 1939. We imported 3,829,000 bushels of wheat in 1938, and 10,774,000 bushels in 1939. We imported 45,859,000 pounds of white potatoes in 1938 and 93,859,000 pounds in 1939. We imported 274,250,000 pounds of hides and skins, cattle hides, sheep and lamb skins in 1938, and 521,329,000 pounds in 1939.

This increase in imports took place in 1 year and will, if continued, end in complete destruction of our agricultural industry. It will also, if continued, leave us totally unable to sustain ourselves should these imports be cut off. This may happen in time of peace, but it will surely happen in time of war, when all imports are cut off by blockade or by diversion to other nations.

Realizing the danger of such imports should a real emergency arise, I have opposed trade pacts and trade treaties. And so would all of you, did you understand their real background.

The first and most important step in national defense is an independent source of food and raw material, and the best place to develop these is right here in the United States.

One of the major causes for the present European war is density of population and lack of adequate food and raw material. This scarcity of food and raw material is felt most keenly in the central European states, and it is these states which suffer when the supplies are cut off by a blockading power.

We may well take a lesson from the present European war, for the central European powers are fighting to obtain territory which will furnish raw material and food for their people. What are we doing? We have already given up Cuba. We set Panama free and have promised independence to the Philippine Islands in 1946. We are importing ever-increasing quantities of food and raw material that can and should be raised and produced in the United States. We are, in fact, engaged upon a course of self-destruction which can only end in internal strife and revolution.

I have tried to warn Congress of this stupid policy without success. I now call your attention to it, in the hope you will interest yourself in your own Government and in the failure of Congress to protect your rights.

Realizing before 1939 that war would break out in Europe, and the necessity for national defense, I suggested on February 22, 1939, that we fortify the Philippines and the island of Guam. Such fortification would furnish a most efficient protection for the west coast of the United States and the Panama Canal. Neither side of the House supported this plan, and even defeated a $5,000,000 appropriation to provide a safe harbor in the island of Guam. It should be clear from this that I am not only in favor of national defense, but I proposed preparedness long before the President or the Congress gave it the slightest thought or consideration.

During the debate, one of my colleagues, Mr. COLE of New York, said: "But the gentleman said he favored fortifying the island, which is much greater than a submarine base."

And to this I replied: "I understand that, too. It is also the duty of Congress to provide for such protection, and justification for such expenditure may be found in the Constitution. Congress, of course, has the power to declare war, but Congress cannot always control and maintain peace, so it becomes the duty of Congress to maintain sufficient military and naval forces to assure peace. Realizing the danger of unpreparedness, the Constitution in these words makes it obligatory upon Congress:

" 'To raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.' "

In continuing this debate I said: "These powers are very important for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 2499 and 2795, February 22, and 27, 1939.)

We have squandered over $30,000,000,000 on useless and unnecessary projects. Suppose that labor had been employed at regular wage scales in the construction of national defenses, as I suggested over a year and a half ago. Suppose the President had started this construction when he took office in 1933. Suppose a part of the $65,000,000,000 which the administration has spent in the past 7½ years had been used to build our national defenses. How free and secure we could feel now. We could have had a first-class army and navy, prosperous industries, full employment. What have we today? We have a stupendous political machine, dormant industries, and bankrupt business. We have nearly 20,000,000 people unemployed or on part-time employment. We have a debased currency. We are not only unprepared for war but we are totally unprepared to maintain ourselves while at peace.

What has become of the $7,000,000,000 which Congress has appropriated for national defense? We have 1 modern and 312 obsolete antiaircraft guns. We have 1 or 2 new cruisers and a few destroyers, the latter too top-heavy for practical use. We have built no fortifications or airfields along our coastal borders. We have less than 1,000 modern airplanes fit for combat use. The best airplanes we had have already been turned over to Great Britain.

If we include recent appropriations for national defense, it reaches the staggering total of $13,000,000,000—a sum which, in my opinion, should be sufficient to build up the best navy and army in the world. I am not opposed to this, providing the money is used for national defense, but I am opposed to squandering and wasting of public funds as has been customary in the past by this administration.

I thank you.

[JULY 15, 1940]

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, realizing that Europe could not avoid war, and our own unpreparedness, I recommended a year and a half ago that we fortify the Philippines and the island of Guam. Our Pacific possessions are not only valuable for military and commercial bases, but the islands will, when fortified, furnish a most effective protection for the west coast of the United States and the Panama Canal. It should be clear that no oriental power would dare to leave these islands astern for an attack on the west coast of the United States.

I have called particular attention to this because it should be considered in our plan of national defense. A first-class navy, of course, is important, but well-equipped naval and merchant-marine bases in our Pacific possessions are equally important because they would increase the fleet's radius of operation and striking power. Such naval bases would also be economical, because we could operate with a smaller fleet.

The Philippines and other Pacific islands are also valuable as commercial outposts and distributing centers of farm production and other merchandise to the Orient, India, and Australia. Storage space and warehouse facilities at conveniently located market points throughout the world are as necessary and important to our foreign trade as conveniently located and well-appointed stores are to us at home. To facilitate delivery it is important that our merchandise be carried in our own ships instead of foreign vessels. Just imagine the many delays and inconveniences we will experience when we depend upon foreign transportation for delivery of our merchandise. It is only natural for competitive nations to delay delivery in order to help their own export trade. As a matter of fact, this is exactly what has happened, for we have lost many foreign accounts as a result of overdue delivery.

Realizing that it is impractical to ship our merchandise in foreign vessels, and that deliveries will be purposely delayed in order to destroy our foreign markets, I have opposed the transfer and sale of our merchant marine to foreign nations. I have also opposed the sale and transfer of our fastest combat airplanes to foreign nations, for the simple reason that we need them for our own defenses.

When the Secretary of the Treasury and the President proposed the transfer of 23 of our naval ships to the British Government I made this statement on the floor of the House: "Congress should now take charge of the Government as it is supposed to do, and

impeach the President for turning our warships over to a foreign power and weakening our national defense."

We should, in order to be in a position to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, own all British and French islands in the Caribbean, including Bermuda and the Bahamas group: Should we attempt to enforce the Monroe Doctrine in British possessions or Mexico, it would be no different from enforcing the Monroe Doctrine in South America, for it would, if not agreeable to the government in question, be tantamount to a declaration of war. As a matter of fact, England informed us last year that our regulation and control ended at the 3-mile limit. In making this statement, England was correct, for it is generally accepted that everything outside of the 3-mile zone is open water.

Realizing this, I have already suggested that we take over the English and French islands for the war debt, and invite Canada to come in for mutual protection and for consolidation and strengthening of North America. This would leave us protected from foreign invasion by water and from the north by land. We should also take over British Honduras and Central America.

We should also suggest that Mexico release Lower California as part payment on her indebtedness to us. Such transfer would provide additional protection for the west coast of the United States. The strategic value of Lower California should not be overlooked, for, fortified, it would make a Mexican invasion of the United States inconvenient.

I, of course, realize that my suggestion may prove objectionable to the internationalist, the Anglophile, and those hyphenates who still believe that the United States should again become a British colony, as advocated by Andrew Carnegie and Cecil Rhodes. However, I and others believe that Europe should pay her debt to us, and that can best be done by transfer of these colonies. The same thing may be said of Mexico, for it is high time that we discard our unsound "good-neighbor" attitude, in which we sacrifice our own welfare and the security of this Nation in order to have some foreign beneficiary say, "Uncle Sam is a swell guy. He is a real Santa Claus."

We have been dominated by the British Government too long, and what we now need is a patriotic American Government that will devote all its attention to the common defense and the general welfare of the United States. Our first line of defense is not in Europe nor in Asia. It is instead in our colonies in the Pacific, proximal islands in the Atlantic, and small states in North and Central America. It is only a question of time until we will be compelled to consolidate North America as a step toward our own security, so why not think about it now?

It is also high time that we set ourselves free from the Bank of England and its internationalistic lords, dukes, and noble exploiters. These international Shylocks are making their last stand in the United States, in defense of their empire of gold, a metal which we have foolishly allowed them to control and use to enslave us and enrich themselves. Our Federal Reserve banks and Treasury Department are today so interwoven with international finance and with the Bank of England that they are in reality operating to benefit this alien interest instead of our own people.

The victims of the British propaganda machine who still believe that we should extend further aid to England should remember that we have already given England the shirt off our back. British interests are holding over $13,000,000,000 gold credit in the United States. This will, when paid, reduce the gold in the Treasury to nearly $6,000,000,000. Against this small balance the Treasury Department has issued $17,000,000,000 in gold certificates to interests outside of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve banks, a privately owned institution. We are therefore a debtor nation to the international bankers, to the tune of $10,000,000,000 in gold. In other words, we are flat broke today.

And don't forget that our national debt is over $50,000,000,000 today, and will be over $70,000,000,000 by June 30, 1941, and that we are using commodity money or inflated money instead of secured currency.

The international bankers have taken $14.33 profit on every ounce of gold which has come into the United States since 1934, and this profit amounts to approximately $6,000,000,000 in gold. To those who still believe that we have not given enough, let me say that we are now financing England's war with credit, material, and merchandise. If this is not enough, let me also remind these generous givers that we are destroying our own farm and manufacturing industries by imports from foreign nations. This unsound procedure is regulated by the international bankers in order to establish such balance in the international credit structure as will favor their continuous control of gold and international gold credit.

All this is engineered by the international bankers, the real war mongers, in order to shift the cost of the war upon the taxpayers. This was done during the World War, and it is the same today. It is this small group that is the real rulers of the British Empire, the United States, and all nations in which they control gold money and credit. They operate through the United States Treasury, the Federal Reserve Banks, the Export and Import Bank, the Bank of England, the Bank of International Settlements, and all other associate banks, including international brokers such as J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. It is this monetary hierarchy that manipulates international gold credit in such manner that it always controls the gold. It operates in such manner that losses are charged to the taxpayers of all nations, instead of to themselves, in spite of the fact that they make the loans and are the real beneficiaries of all international transactions. In other words, the common people of all nations sustain and pay the losses, while the international bankers take all the profits.

I have exposed this control of gold money and credit because I maintain that gold is a property that belongs to the people of this Nation and not to a special private group. Surely no one will disagree with me when I say that we, the people, should be secured by the gold that is now owned and controlled by this small group of money changers.

Let us always remember that when we work for the bare necessities to sustain life we are no better than slaves, because we exchange today's work for today's living. When we work for gold, the permanent standard medium of value, we are free men, because we pay as we go and save for the future. We can do this only when our compensation is money of standard international recognized value—gold.

It is this freedom and security I want to restore to the people, and it can only be accomplished by setting the Treasury gold up as security for money in circulation. When that is done, we will again enjoy the use of sound money, the use of a dollar worth 100 cents in gold and 100 cents in purchasing value—the same dollar that we had in 1926, when taxes were lowered and our national debt was reduced from twenty-seven to sixteen billion dollars.

In conclusion let me say that I have always been opposed to war. I am not only bitterly opposed to it, but I have, as a Member of Congress, employed every means to get the people to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the articles inserted therein by my colleagues who are also opposed to war.

I am not only opposed to war, but it may interest you to know that I am willing to impeach the No. 1 warmonger in the administration, should he, accidentally or intentionally, hang on to the British lion's tail in order to provide an incident to drag us into the present British war.

Financial Responsibility of Certain American Republics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the good-neighbor policy indicate that the Congress will shortly be called upon to authorize and approve a new international banking structure with a capitalization of $500,000,000 to be provided by the people of the United States. The alleged purpose of this new institution, we are told, is to give further financial aid to our South and Central American neighbors.

This suggestion has attracted the attention of many thoughtful citizens of America. Mr. T. R. Frentz, Sr., one of the outstanding bankers of the State of Wisconsin and a lifelong advocate of the true principles of the Democratic Party, has written me an interesting letter on this subject. I am pleased to give to the Members of Congress and to the country at large the information contained therein. The letter follows:

Before you vote for the administration's modest $500,000,000 allotment to our "dear neighbors" of South America, this little spotlight on their financial responsibilities may interest you quite a bit.

PARAGUAY

In 1874 defaulted two loans.
In 1885 debt was refunded at 50 cents.
In 1892 again defaulted.
In 1921 again defaulted.
No quotations on their bonds.

PERU

In 1849 defaulted.
In 1875 again defaulted.
In 1890 entire foreign debt canceled.
In 1907 failed to make payments.
In 1915 internal debt also suspended.
In 1931 all debts were suspended.
In 1932 all foreign debts were again suspended.
No quotations on their bonds.

BOLIVIA

In 1874 defaulted two-thirds of their loans.
In 1877 again defaulted.
In 1931 again in default.
Quotations on their bonds, from 2½ to 6.

BRAZIL

In 1901 all interest suspended for 13 years.
In 1914 all interest again suspended for 13 years.
In 1931 all interest again suspended for 3 years.
In 1937 all interest again suspended for 3 years.
Quotations on their bonds, from 10 to 28.

ARGENTINE

Some defaults, some reductions in interest, but general record "fair."

Quotations on their bonds from 59 to 76.

CHILE

In 1928, defaulted.

In 1931, partial defaults.

Quotations on their bonds from 11 to 17.

COLOMBIA

Prior to 1905, all external debts were marked by adjustments and readjustments.

In 1932, 1933, 1934, interest payments were adjusted at 80 cents on the dollar.

Quotations on their bonds from 15¾ to 80.

COSTA RICA

In 1874, loans defaulted and reduced 50 percent.

In 1895, interest defaulted.

In 1901, again defaulted.

In 1912, payments defaulted until 1932.

In 1936, payments on external debts suspended.

Quotations on their bonds from 10 to 21.

GUATEMALA

Between 1828–55, debt was in default.

Finally compromised at between 75–80 cents on the dollar.

From 1927 to 1933, all manner of suspensions and compromises.

Quotations on their bonds from 35 to 42.

Nice record is it not? Ought to be easily entitled to a $500,000,000 "loan" don't you think so?

Hemispheres and Quarterspheres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

EDITORIAL BY MEADOR WRIGHT

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the pen of Meador Wright, distinguished publisher, author, and political analyst, of New Jersey.

In this editorial, Hemispheres and Quarterspheres, Mr. Wright has set forth some very illuminating observations concerning our position in world affairs.

HEMISPHERES AND QUARTERSPHERES

America's frontier on the Rhine—if we assume that we ever had one—has now been resolved by the rush of the German tanks. For better or for worse that phase in our foreign relations is over. The only part of Europe we could fight in today are the British Isles, and no strategist of repute would advocate an expeditionary force there.

But American public opinion is being prepared for another possible foreign venture that promises to be as fruitless as our last march into Europe. Like that one it carries a dual label: for security and democrary. Not mentioned in the schoolbooks but lurking beside the other two is a third factor—the ever fair siren of imperialism. The empire with which she teases us is South America. A fourth factor in the equation is the shibboleth that we have rights there as well as duties.

Even a casual examination of the facts will demolish all four of these factors. None can stand the light of honest rationalization. Collectively they fall down as completely as they do singly. There are no better reasons why American boys should die on the banks of the Platte than on the banks of the Rhine or the Marne. There are not reasons as good. Had the United States Army taken up a position in France last fall as many honest minded persons believe it should have done, we at least would have been fighting for ideals with which we are familiar and for peoples—Danes, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians, French, and British—whom we admire. By reason of immigration and ancestral and cultural background we have a dozen reasons to be concerned over the fate of western Europe where we have one in South America. Fighting for their defense in a very real sense would have been a fight to strengthen and preserve democracy. One could haul away in a wheelbarrow all the democracy that ever was south of the Rio Grande, or probably ever will be in our time.

The so-called republics in Latin America have drifted from dictatorship to dictatorship during the century and a quarter that they have been free of European control. Some of these dictatorships, notably the Gomez regime in Venezuela, have been tyrannies unmatched since the days of Nero. Hundreds of broken and tortured wretches languished in the medieval prisons of Venezuela at the very time we undertook our last crusade to make the world safe for democracy. The Machado regime in Cuba was little better. The average government in Latin America is more enlightened than these, but democratic and representative government as it is known here and in western Europe is the meager exception rather than the general rule. Even if we attempted to arm South America for its own defense, there is a strong likelihood that many of these arms would be used either to make tyranny more complete or revolution more bloody.

As for cultural and racial ties, we have fewer than with any other section of the world, except Asia and Africa. The argument that by giving military assistance to South America we would be strengthening democratic government and ideals or assisting a neighboring or kindred people just simply does not stand up. The South Americans are neither democrats, relatives, nor neighbors.

Let us examine in the following order the other three factors mentioned above: (1) security; (2) imperialistic profits; (3) rights. The security of the United States rests on a continental defense, not a hemisphere defense. A proper continental defense includes the Caribbean Sea and the lands upon which it borders. The Caribbean ends roughly at the eastern boundary of Venezuela which is some 1,500 miles from the Panama Canal. On the Pacific the southern boundary of Colombia is 500 miles from the Canal. Obviously we have defense interests in these two countries which no outside nation would question. A declaration of policy guaranteeing their independence and even demanding naval or military bases there would be accepted everywhere as logical and proper. Ecuador and the Guianas might be included. But the remainder of South America just as decidedly is not within our defense sphere as the countries bordering on the Caribbean are. By making an imaginary claim to all of South America we are weakening the moral claim we have to that part which concerns us. Our area of defense should extend from Ecuador and the Galapagos to Hawaii and the Aleutian Islands on the west. On the east it should begin at the Guianas and include the West Indies, Bermuda, Newfoundland and Greenland. Within this area including the entire North American Continent we should demand the right to acquire military and naval bases necessary for an impregnable defense.

Likewise we should demand that the foreign and military policies of the nations within this area should conform to these defense needs. To facilitate this we should take steps to acquire any and all rights European nations have here. The nations involved are Great Britain, France, Holland, and Denmark. Three of these nations are now completely under the control of Germany with the possibility that the fourth may be soon. This gives Germany a claim—an immoral claim it may be noted, but a claim nevertheless. It must be remembered that England's claim to Canada derives not from discovery and settlement but by conquest from the French.

The most satisfactory way to acquire the rights of other nations in territory desired is by purchase. If we could exchange a billion dollars of our dangerously useless gold—or even five billions—for a clear title to all European claims in North America and the Caribbean it would be a good investment. If some of this gold went directly or indirectly to Germany so much the better. If Germany would not acquiesce in our title it would not be worth very much. No matter how much we dislike it or for how good reasons, Germany is the master of Europe and promises to remain so for many years. We must trade with her or fight her, either with weapons or blockade. Even if war is inevitable, which decidedly the writer does not believe, we owe it to history no less than to the boys who must die in that war and to their mothers to take every means within our power consistent with national honor to avoid it. It is not inconsistent with national honor to offer peace generously or even with some humility either to Germany or Japan, even though the hands of both may be wet with the blood of unjust wars. More blood is a poor solvent with which to wash away that which has already been shed. At any rate, as Gen. Hugh Johnson has observed, let us stay out of war until we are ready to get in.

As to the profits, those that would derive from an imperialistic policy in South America—and the Monroe Doctrine beyond the limits of defense needs is imperialism pure and simple—are likely to be largely illusory. Within the defense area outlined is territory approximately twice as large as the United States. In Venezuela and Colombia there is more oil than in any other section of the world. Mexico has mineral resources that are fabulous. Canada is a great unexploited frontier. Greenland and Alaska are potential storehouses of wealth. Like those of the United States, these resources are within our natural orbit. Whether through actual possession as would probably be the case eventually north of the Rio Grande, or as a sphere of influence as would be the case south of that river, these resources would make us richer than any other people. The area embraces just a quarter of the globe, contains 175,000,000 people, and has food and other natural resources ample for a population at least thrice as large.

Yet this area is not so large or so populous as to make it impossible for us to monopolize trade if such monopoly should be necessary to prevent foreign penetration. President Roosevelt's proposed cartel system of purchase could be made applicable north of the Caribbean. If extended to embrace all of South America it would serve no purpose other than to bankrupt us and disappoint South America. We simply cannot absorb a major portion of what South America has to sell. She wants markets for grain, cotton, meat, hides, wool, and minerals. Most of these commodities we have in abundance, we do not need them, while Europe does.

Europe is South America's natural market and must remain so for the next half century. While Europe was at war between 1914

and 1918, we captured much of South America's trade. But we lost it as soon as conditions in Europe were normal, and a great deal of our investments along with it. Businessmen who have had dealings in South America are aware of the difficulties of trying to sell when we are not willing to buy. The general public is not aware of these difficulties and hence is gullible to the argument that with European markets closed to us because of totalitarian control—an assumption by no means necessarily true—we must cultivate trade with South America to avoid the poverty of complete commercial isolation.

Lastly, what about our rights in South America above those of European nations? Claim to special rights are based upon two factors, one historic and one geographic. The historic factor is the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine, as every well-informed schoolboy knows, was proposed originally by Great Britain and has remained without serious challenge for a century, only because British naval supremacy has not been challenged during that period. Withdraw the British Navy and the Monroe Doctrine is as strong as the force with which we will back it up and no stronger. Attempting to defend South America below the Caribbean will require a naval and air force larger than the combined forces that might be brought against us both from the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Natal, the easternmost point of Brazil is only 1,400 miles from the African coast, already two-thirds of the way under German control. But Natal is 3,000 miles even from the Panama Canal, and twice that distance from New York. The only geographic claim we have to South America is that North and South America are in the same hemisphere. This claim is so flimsy as to be ludicrous. If we should follow this argument to its natural conclusion, we would claim that portion of Antarctica lying within the so-called Western Hemisphere and instruct Admiral Byrd to build a Maginot line of fortifications square through the center to protect that claim.

If the United States has no legitimate claim to hegemony in South America, what about other nations? Only four nations have sent immigrants to South America in any considerable numbers—Spain, Portugal, Germany, and Italy. According to a recent map published by the Newark Evening News there are 2,306,000 Germans and 6,271,500 Italians in South American countries other than Colombia and Venezuela. While these are only 11 percent of the total population they are roughly a third of the white population. These immigrants form a bond between Germany and Italy and South America that is far stronger than any possible claim we can make. There is room in Argentina, Uruguay, and southern Brazil for millions more of Europe's excess population. From our standpoint it would be better if Europeans fill up South America rather than Asiatics. Furthermore, if we attempt to deny Germany and Italy access to Latin America south of the Caribbean, we can hardly expect those nations to recognize our claim to the area bordering it. Europe needs South America, both its products and as an outlet for surplus population. To try to prevent this natural relation will mean war.

MEADOR WRIGHT.

Dempsey Scores Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the outstanding victory recently attained by my friend and colleague the gentleman from New Mexico, the Honorable JACK DEMPSEY.

In fighting one of the hardest battles in recent years to get the Dempsey-Hatch clean politics bill No. 2 up to a vote, the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman DEMPSEY, scored against all odds by a final victory in the House 242 to 122.

The passage of this bill again demonstrated the ability and tenacity, as well as the leadership and popularity, of the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman DEMPSEY. His services for his State of New Mexico and for the Nation are so well known that they need no elaboration to us who have followed his valuable services in this body. His legislative career is filled with dozens of such successes as that recently achieved.

In addition to his activity in sponsoring and carrying through to final passage an even 100 important legislative bills, the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman DEMPSEY, has given his attention and services on the two most important committees of the House—the Dies committee investigating un-American activities and the all-important Rules Committee of the House. His record of thoroughness and fairness in all his dealings on both of these committees have brought him praise from the Nation's press.

New Mexico is fortunate indeed to be represented by our colleague [JACK DEMPSEY]. He has brought much favorable publicity to his State for his able and active contributions to the Nation's welfare in this critical time.

Recently the news magazine Time devoted much space to his outstanding record in the National Congress. I take pleasure in incorporating this in my remarks as only one piece of the evidence of the outstanding services in Washington of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

[From Time of July 22, 1940]

THE CONGRESS

One of the most popular men in Washington is red-faced, white-haired JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico's lone Representative in the House. One-time water boy on a railroad, hard-working JACK DEMPSEY fought his way to success, then, with the profits of some Oklahoma oil, went to New Mexico to retire. Instead he got into politics up to his neck. He first entered Congress in 1935. In 6 years he saw 99 of his bills become law—a legislative record.

Last winter the Senate passed Hatch bill II, prohibiting political activity by State employees who are paid in whole or in part from Federal funds. Many a Senator voted for it for the simple political reason that he was confident it would never pass the House. Experts gave the bill no better than to 10-to-1 chance. At this point scrappy JACK DEMPSEY stepped in, told his friends, "I'm going to pass that bill."

The Hatch bill never had the support of the administration. It was strenuously opposed by the Democratic leaders in the House. Its most formidable opponent was Texas' old, respected HATTON SUMNERS, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, where the bill reposed. The committee, horrified by the bill's proposed reforms, held a secret ballot, announced a vote of 14 to 10 to table the measure. Congressman DEMPSEY thereupon raised Congress' roof by announcing that 13 Members told him afterward they had voted for the bill. He started a petition to extricate the bill from the committee. Embarrassed Congressmen stayed away from Mr. DEMPSEY'S petition in droves. Back he went to the committee members, wheedled, cajoled, and bullied them for almost a month. Finally, by an open vote, the Hatch bill passed the Judiciary Committee, 16 to 8.

The fight was not yet won. Dempsey had to get the measure through the Rules Committee before it could reach the floor of the House. To Rules Committee members he said: "I'm a member of this committee and I want you men to give me this rule just because its me." They gave him enough votes, and at last the bill was sent to the House. There HATTON SUMNERS made a final, vitriolic attack on it. With unfading zeal Mr. DEMPSEY stuck to his guns. The bill passed, 243 to 122. At week's end the Senate concurred, without debate. The final bill, as approved by both Houses, limited expenditure by a political party to $3,000,000 in a single year, limited single campaign contributions to $5,000, prohibited fund-raising devices such as the Democratic yearbook. As soon as the President signs it, the bill will become a law.

Having jacked his legislative score to an even 100 bills, JACK DEMPSEY, hale and hearty at 61, indicated that he would leave the House, run for the Senate in the fall. His opponent, New Mexico's Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, whose relatives were once involved in a W. P. A. scandal (they were later tried and acquitted), thoroughly disapproved of the Hatch bill from the start.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GRAND RAPIDS (MICH.) HERALD

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of July 24, 1940:

BACK TO PRIVATE LIFE

James A. Farley, for 8 years chairman of the Democratic National Committee and for nearly that time Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt, before the week end will step down from all his political offices and become just Jim Farley, one of the owners and managers of the New York Yankee baseball team.

With his passing from public life will go one of the most beloved figures ever to hold the political spotlight in this or any other

nation. Not alone among the members of his own party but among those of opposite political faith Jim Farley is respected and loved.

No man ever held public office who so universally held the respect and affection of the hard-boiled newspaper crowd as did Jim. Two events which gained no publicity in the recent Chicago convention showed more than anything else the respect they hold for him. On the day of his last press conference when Jim entered the room the entire body of newspaper correspondents rose and cheered him. And on Friday afternoon the press gallery gave a reception for Jim in the grand ballroom of the Stevens Hotel. Two such circumstances never before occurred for any man in the position of Mr. Farley and that demonstration of their affection for him was spontaneous. It needed neither the machinations of Mayor Kelly nor of any other cheer leader to bring about those events.

Jim Farley easily was the most popular man before the Chicago convention. The cheers for him always were genuine and from the hearts of the galleries and of the delegates. Abused, slighted, insulted as he had been by the man he had "made," Jim went smilingly about the business of handling the convention, pledged his support to the ticket even though he is unalterably opposed to a third term for anybody. He was loyal to the last moment of his public career. Disloyalty was all on the other side.

He had been hurt to the heart. The greatest hurt of all was when the President said Farley would be unavailable for the Presidency because of his religion. Jim is a devout Catholic who is sincere in his devotion and who is a credit to the church to which, as in everything else, he is always loyal.

Jim Farley started life as humbly as a man might. As a boy he was a bartender, yet he has yet to know the taste either of liquor or tobacco. His mother is a saint to him and she warned him early against the use of either.

A wonderful memory has Farley. It is said he can call 50,000 persons over the Nation by their first names. And whatever may be their positions in life, whatever their politics, their religious beliefs, their color, or their race, Jim Farley always is their loyal friend.

The Democratic Party has lost its greatest asset in Mr. Farley's refusal to conduct another campaign for the man whom he twice so triumphantly elected. But Farley will not bolt. His loyal disposition does not permit of that. And whatever the party may have lost, public service has lost infinitely more. They don't make a Farley every day. All over this Nation are those of all political faiths who will be wishing Jim Farley the best of success in his new place in private life and who will feel that public life has lost one of its highest type of men, the kind so much needed in the political life of this Nation.

Alien Registration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. VITO MARCANTONIO, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me in behalf of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign-Born over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Sunday, July 28, 1940:

On June 28, 1940, the President of the United States approved an act which provides that within 60 days thereafter, every noncitizen who is 14 years of age or older, and who has not been registered and fingerprinted prior to his entry into the United States, shall report to the nearest post office or at such places as may be designated by the Commissioner of Immigration, to be fingerprinted and registered. The parents of noncitizen children under the age of 14 shall apply for the registration and fingerprinting of said children. The law further provides that the forms for the fingerprinting and registering of the noncitizen shall contain inquiries with respect to the time and place of entry of the noncitizen into the United States; the activities in which he has been and intends to be engaged; the length of time he intends to stay in the United States; the criminal records, if any, of such noncitizen; and such additional matters as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration with the approval of the Attorney General. The act also provides that the fingerprinting and registration records shall be made available to such persons or agencies which may be designated by the Commissioner of Immigration with the approval of the Attorney General. This undoubtedly means these records will be placed at the disposal of the F. B. I. Failure on the part of noncitizens to comply with the act will subject them to a fine not to exceed $1,000 or to imprisonment not to exceed 6 months, or both.

It is estimated that 3,500,000 noncitizens will have to submit to fingerprinting and registration within 4 months after September 1. Over 3,000,000 of these have lived in the United States 10 years or more.

Thus in free America we will witness the Hitler-imitating spectacle of 3,500,000 men, women, and children composed of loyal, hard-working people in all walks of life—priests, nuns, rabbis, ministers, bricklayers, carpenters, and clerks—all of whom have been making a contribution toward the greatness of America, being subjected to the criminal-like treatment of registration and fingerprinting.

Further, after this humiliation, a resident noncitizen so registered and fingerprinted shall notify the Commissioner of Immigration in writing of each change of residence and new address within 5 days of the time of such change.

By the registration and fingerprinting of the noncitizen, by the continuous check-up of the noncitizen, and by the continuous hounding of the noncitizen as provided in this law, we have virtually segregated from the rest of our people a class of 3,500,000 innocent people. We have completely reversed our traditional policy of asylum, equality, and freedom to one of discrimination and segregation. We have substituted bigotry for tolerance. We have crowned with vengeful victory the know-nothingism of the 1850's, the Ku Klux Klanism of the 1920's, and the Gestapoism of today. It is not remote from reality that those responsible for this atrocious rape of American institutions will next advance into legislation the doctrine of Aryan superiority, the Nuremberg laws, and the concentration camps.

On June 22 the House adopted this measure by a vote of 382 to 4. I was one of the four who voted against it and the only one who spoke against it. You may wonder why it was passed by such an overwhelming majority. It was "blitzkrieged" through Congress as a part of the so-called national-defense program. It was another legitimate offspring of the present-day war hysteria. I am confident that when the American people insist that their legislators return to democracy that many will disclaim parentage of this truly alien, un-American, and violently subversive legislation.

I sat throughout the debate of this bill and carried the fight against it. I distinctly recall the arguments advanced for its enactment. The sole explanation advanced was that this method was necessary to fight Trojan horses, "fifth columnists," spies, and saboteurs.

It is my considered judgment that this argument was not advanced in good faith. I strongly believe that spies and saboteurs and all others engaged in illegal activities should be immediately apprehended and punished, but you do not accomplish this end by this law. Spies and saboteurs and other law violators will not report to a post office and submit themselves to fingerprinting. The citizen spy and saboteur does not have to register and be fingerprinted. The noncitizen law violators will not by their own act expose themselves simply because Congress asks them to do so. It is either naive or dishonest to contend that a spy or a saboteur or a real Trojan horse or a real "fifth columnist" who is engaged, particularly at this time, in destroying American peace and American liberty will, on or after September 1, report to a post office and disclose the nature of his activities. Only by honest, intelligent police work will the law violators be apprehended and not by the destruction of our free institutions such as this law tends to do.

The only true reason for this type of legislation is that those who seek to destroy American democracy and plunge this country into war have chosen the noncitizens as the object of their terror, so as to intimidate them and persecute them and thus eliminate them from the great army of the American people who are determined to preserve American peace and freedom.

The noncitizen resident is an integral part of America. The noncitizen in the United States in the overwhelming majority is a noncitizen through no fault of his own. When he attempts to become an American citizen he has to hurdle many barriers. He is often asked questions that even United States Supreme Court judges cannot answer. Frequently he is strangled by red tape, by unnecessary delays, and the fees that are required of him. He is a good American despite the fact that he lacks the technical status of naturalization. He is determined to keep America out of war. He believes in the Bill of Rights and is ready to defend our Nation against invasion, but simply because the war makers and bigots know that this honest type in our midst is unalterably opposed to our participation in an imperialist war, they now, in the name of national defense, subject him to all forms of discriminatory practices.

There was a time, however, in the history of our country when we wanted the immigrant to come to our shores. Labor exploiters sent agents to Europe and these agents pictured prosperity here and said, "Come on over, good wages, good living, and hospitality."

The immigrants believed them. They sold their few belongings and were herded into steerage. They greeted the Statue of Liberty with tears in their eyes, and their hearts swelled with the desire to become Americans, raise their families as Americans, and to become merged into a great democratic nation. No sooner had they turned their heads they found themselves in Ellis Island. They were tagged and shipped to work in the mines, on the roads, in the mills and sweatshops, and on the railroads. They gave America their greatest contributions, that of honest toil and the blood of their sons in 1917. Since their arrival they were forced to travel along the Via Crucis of discrimination and exploitation. Now that these foreign-born workers have joined their native fellow workers in the struggle for a decent American standard of living and seek to prevent a repetition of 1917, they are being forced to the crucifixion by those who seek to destroy the labor movement, by those

who seek to destroy the civil rights of the American people, by those who seek to drive us into an imperialist war. The real motive, therefore, for this legislation is that it is part of a scheme to drive us into war. The real motive, therefore, is not to protect American democracy but to destroy it.

The war program is to smash civil rights first in order to stifle the voices of Americans opposed to war and start this overthrow of democracy with the persecution of the noncitizen. The noncitizen is among the first victims of this "blitzkrieg" against the peace and liberties of the people.

It has also been said that this amputation of our freedom was necessary in order to protect our American democracy. I believe this is the most incongruous proposition I have ever heard. On the one hand it is said that they want to preserve American liberties, and then they set out to destroy it. They strangle American freedom under the demagogic excuse of seeking to protect it. My friends, if we carry out this course we will end with no freedom and no democracy. Such has been the history of nations which have done just as we are doing by this legislation.

In a period as trying as this the test of a democracy lies in the ability of that democracy to maintain its liberties and to have more freedom rather than less freedom. The test of a democracy lies in its ability to preserve its institutions of equality. Remember, when the founding fathers said in that everlasting document, the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, they did not say that all men are created equal except Italians, they did not say that all men are created equal except Jews, they did not say that all men are created equal except Negroes, nor did they say that all men are created equal except noncitizens. They said that all men are created equal. By this they meant no discrimination, no segregation, and no persecution of the foreign-born.

I submit that the best way to preserve the American way of life is preserve our liberties. American democracy can live only by letting it live. Limiting it will not permit it to live. It will choke it and kill it. Only by strict adherence to the Declaration of Independence, only by strict adherence to the Bill of Rights, only by the militant and vigilant realization that there are no "ifs," and that there are no "buts" to these great principles of our country can we successfully defend our American way of life.

Midwest Demands Share in National-Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a timely editorial from the Kansas City Times for Saturday, July 27, together with a copy of the resolution adopted at a meeting of the middle western business leaders from nine States, which was held in Kansas City, Mo., on Friday, July 26. This meeting was called because up to the present time the national-defense program has not been extended to the Middle West.

It is recognized that in the beginning, because of the need for haste, existing industrial plants located very largely in the East should be fully utilized and in some cases expanded. Those of us from the Middle West, however, feel very deeply that a great mistake will be made if the vast natural resources and ample supply of capable, well-trained, and efficient labor to be found in the Middle West are not fully utilized.

For the purpose of bringing about a thorough discussion of this question and of submitting to those in authority a program showing the advantages which the Middle West has to offer, a meeting has been called to be held in Kansas City, Mo., on August 30. To this meeting will be invited Members of Congress from the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. There will be present also representative businessmen from these States.

The resolution above referred to is as follows:

Representatives of nine States, representing the principal cities of the Midwest, assembled in Kansas City, July 26, 1940, make the following declarations:

"Our territory fully supports the objectives of our Government in making these United States impregnable to attack. We recognize these fundamental facts:

"The money for defense must be spent efficiently.

"Speed is essential. Existing plants must be used to their fullest capacity."

On the long-range program, however, which entails the location and building of additional plants to produce strategic war materials, the nine Midwestern States have many advantages which should be brought to the attention of the proper officials of our Government. These major facilities are:

Invulnerability against any conceivable foreign attack.
An adequate supply of raw materials.
Sufficient native-born trained labor.
Speedy transportation to the three coasts and the Great Lakes.
The cheap food needed to support any increased population.
Adequate low-cost housing already existing for industrial workers.
An abundance of fuel and power at low cost.

POPULATION DROP NOTED

These nine Midwestern States have suffered severely in the past, as the 1940 census population figures reveal, because of the fact that they have been depending too much on agriculture alone. The opening of the Panama Canal tended to drain industries from the center of the country to the rim. This was particularly accentuated by the industrial expansion during and following the last World War. A strong national economy depends upon a proper balance between industry and agriculture.

The nine States participating in this conference fear that if this new expansion of defense industry is largely concentrated in the already congested industrial areas, then there will be another further severe dislocation of population.

The present trend is:

To take our able-bodied young men into the materially enlarged Army and Navy.

To drain our highly trained skilled workers and surplus farm labor from this area to the coastal regions.

To draw our raw materials away from the point of production to the already congested manufacturing areas, thus adding undue costs by the transportation of those materials.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of these facts, we strongly recommend:

That all plants now existing in the Middle West which now manufacture or can be adapted to the manufacture of war materials be utilized by the War and Navy Departments.

We emphasize the recommendations of President Roosevelt that when additional plants are to be built, they be located between the Alleghenies and the Rocky Mountains. We urge that a rightful share be located in this nine-State area where the agricultural problem is now acute because of the loss of our export markets.

We believe that in the interest of economy the existing army posts and training schools be utilized to capacity before any additional camps or posts are constructed.

Resolved, That it is the unanimous opinion of this conference that our views thus expressed be conveyed in the most forceful manner to the President of the United States, members of the National Defense Council, and to the Senators and Representatives from our area.

To effectuate this, we recommend that not less than 100 representatives from this area assemble in Kansas City at an early date (August 30) for a conference with our Senators and Representatives in order that our views may be presented most advantageously.

We further recommend that a temporary organization be formed composed of not less than one representative from each of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas to carry out this program; and be it

Resolved, That the National Defense Commission be requested to appoint an outstanding businessman in each of the nine Midwestern States represented here to serve with Federal authority at $1 a year, to assist in placing defense production throughout each of these States.

Following is the editorial from the Kansas City Times:

THE NINE-STATE CONFERENCE

The Midwest conference in Kansas City yesterday should help impress on Washington the need of taking the midwestern area into account in the preparedness program. There was no disposition to interfere with the speed and efficiency of the preparedness measures. But the conference emphasized the disorganizing effect on the economic structure of the Middle West—and so of the Nation—from draining off hundreds of thousands of workers into the congested industrial areas.

For the welfare of the Nation, as well as of the Valley States, the balance of industry and agriculture should be maintained. Unless this fact is kept in mind by the men in charge at Washington, the balance will be still further disturbed by the draining off of population into the great new war industries in the coastal regions.

Such an outcome is not necessarily involved in an intelligent and far-sighted handling of the program. There are many war supplies that can be quickly and economically manufactured in the Midwest area. The danger is that the Defense Committee in Washington, made up almost exclusively of eastern men, will forget that the Middle West exists.

The conference yesterday showed that the nine States represented are determined not to allow things to go by default. They are determined to have their case impressively and intelligently presented to the committee. They should be able to give effective backing to the movement already under way to establish the importance of the Middle West in the expansion program now under way.

A House Page Turns Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a former page of the House, Albert C. Losche, of Indianapolis, better known as Bud Losche, well known to many Members on this floor, has written a very interesting book which bears the title "Washington Memoirs." This book presents to the reading public in a candid and refreshing way the impressions of a very brilliant, though youthful, mind in regard to the National Capital, the United States Government, and public men, and measures in general. It teems with the vibrant recollections of a very observant page, written in an easy, entertaining style. My heart thumped when I read the dedication, which is as follows:

To Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW, who gave me the opportunity to gather the material to write this book, to his high ideals and future hopes this book is respectfully dedicated.

Although Bud's sojourn on earth has been brief, he has already created a big stir. He developed an oratorical faculty before he could enunciate plainly and by the time he reached his teens he had become famous as a public speaker, stumping the State of Indiana for the Democratic Party and receiving numerous calls to charge the enemy from the rostrum in neighboring States. His skill and resourcefulness in painting the virtues of Democracy and the sins of omission and commission of the opposition brought him wide renown.

Bud served with credit and distinction as page in the Seventy-fifth Congress, and as his sponsor I was proud of the record he made. Having reached the advanced age of 15 he has retired, written his memoirs, and is preparing for a career in law and public affairs. He has a natural flair for politics and the public service and there is every indication that he will write his name high on the wall of success. I am not the seventh son of a seventh son; I have no familiarity whatever with crystal bowls and I claim no gift of vaticination, but I can easily imagine that a third, or half a century hence the Hon. Bud Losche will be saying "Mr. Speaker" in this Chamber or "Mr. President" in the other Chamber, or, who knows, he may be down at the far end of the Avenue, serving his third term.

College Students and Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a comprehensive letter from a very able college senior, a constituent of mine:

TOPEKA, KANS., *July 26, 1940.*

Mr. W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Representative, First District, Kansas,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: The Capital this morning reports "vigorous opposition broke out in the Senate" yesterday to the compulsory military training bill. I hope to hear in the near future that you are an opponent of the bill in the House.

To explain why I think I can give you the reactons of a large number of young voters, I remind you that I am a student at Dartmouth College, a senior next year, barely turned 21, and consequently in the age group most likely to be affected. As managing editor of The Dartmouth, college daily, I have had considerable contact with student opinion, and while this bill has come up since school was out, and apparently will be rushed to a vote before school reconvenes, I am confident that undergraduate opinion is against such a bill. I know that youths my own age in Topeka are opposed to it.

College students of this group are just as patriotic and loyal, just as willing to fight for the country, if necessary, as any other group. I doubt if the ideals of democracy are anywhere held in higher repute than among college youth. Our opposition is not based on merely selfish motives.

It is not serving the country we object to, nor military training. It is the idea of having our futures disrupted by something the necessity of which is not clearly established, something which may reflect only a passing hysteria and be repealed when the country returns to a calmer mind. A permanent, well-planned military training that a person could expect and prepare for, and perhaps take in conjunction with college work or during summer vacations, would be less disastrous.

Already there are many who feel that education, especially for men entering the professions, has stretched out until it covers too many years of a man's life. While college men have no dependents, and are not engaged in jobs essential to industry, what they are doing is potentially more for the good of the country than if they were skilled airplane-instrument makers. A draft extending the time a man must pass in preliminaries before beginning an actually productive career is apt to mean that fewer men will care to tackle the long grind of professional training—especially men who have had no warning, no chance to shape their plans with the thought of a year or two in armed service. That is certainly not for the good of the country.

As illustrations, let me give myself and my roommate at Dartmouth. Both of us are planning to finish college work next spring and proceed to prepare for a profession. Bill for medicine, I for law. Such study requires careful advance planning for time and finances. If our plans are rudely shattered by the requirement of a year in military camp first we (and we are typical of many other youths) will probably have to abandon plans for professional study.

As I said before, while I have had no direct contact with fellow Dartmouth students since June, I know that youths my own age in Topeka are opposed to the bill.

Sincerely yours,

CLIF STRATTON, Jr.

Defense Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Star of Washington for July 28, 1940:

DEFENSE HOUSING

By linking the United States Housing Authority program with national defense, both Congress and the Democratic Convention gave timely cognizance of an acute shortage of decent, inexpensive dwellings in key cities that threatens now, as it succeeded in doing in 1917, to embarrass and retard the best-laid plans for military and industrial expansion.

Before the Chicago convention adopted a forthright plank pledging the New Deal to accelerate plans to make low-rent housing "a powerful arm of national defense by supplying housing for the families of enlisted personnel, and for workers in areas where industry is expanding to meet defense needs," the National Executive Committee of Housing Authorities had sounded an alarm. In a comprehensive review of existing housing conditions made available to the President's National Defense Advisory Commission these representatives of some 500 public housing agencies warned:

"In many cities migration has already set in on a large scale, and workers brought in for jobs in defense industries are being forced to leave because they cannot find places to live in. Some families are paying as much as 50 percent of their income for rent. Workers are occupying beds in two and three shifts. Buildings unfit for use are being opened to the rush of thousands of families being employed in defense industries. Arsenal employees already are refusing to come to work in cities where they cannot find homes. Yet the national-defense program has only just begun.

"In 1940 * * * we are already in a situation as desperate as we were during the World War, when disastrous delays occurred because war industries couldn't get and hold workers for whom no housing was available."

That this is no exaggeration of conditions is evidenced from the fact that in the 3 weeks since Congress empowered the United

States Housing Authority to act in this new emergency more than 150 communities from coast to coast have laid their cases before the Federal agency or applied for defense housing loans. Very properly, no project can be undertaken without the approval of the President, who must first determine if an acute housing shortage in the community impedes the defense program. The President should hew close to the line if the funds are to be spent where they will do most good. The United States Housing Authority is making much to-do about accelerating the defense program and getting it before the public. Public housing, by necessity, moves slowly. Yet the Federal agency is slashing red tape and has set up a defense schedule designed to reduce the construction period of projects by about two-thirds. Under that schedule ordinary projects should be built in 4 to 6 months.

Present Administration Fails To Define Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1940

MEMORANDUM BY GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum by George N. Peek:

In times of world crisis and national confusion such as these we must look straight to fundamentals. We must, moreover, be able to relate our policies and programs in specific fields to a central core of fundamental national policy. Much of the confusion and danger in which we find ourselves involved springs from the failure of the present administration to define clearly for itself and for the country a central core of unified national policy in which each field of endeavor would have its component part. Instead, the administration has pursued domestic policies irredeemably in conflict with each other and foreign policies which have conflicted with the domestic policies they should have supplemented.

A principal reason for this has been the failure of the administration to make and correlate essential studies of the cold facts of our national situation, internal and external. In spite of the mass of statistics collected in dozens of Government agencies in Washington, we do not know just what our national income is, how it is earned, whence it is derived, how and where it is spent. We do not know how many people there are unemployed, where they are, or what they could do. We lack essential studies as to the interrelation of wage levels and price levels. Yet current knowledge and current use of such facts as these are first essentials to the intelligent conduct of national affairs, and an essential foundation to the intelligent formulation of national policies, domestic and foreign.

The war, terrible as it is, has done one thing for this Nation. It has awakened it with a bang. After 7 years we see what the dreamers, schemers, and bunglers have done for us. In spite of the huge expenditures of the past 7 years we see unemployment and lack of social and economic balance; we see also that we are unarmed and unprepared. We have this opportunity at a critical moment to dispense with the bunglers and to follow our natural bent for organization, protection, and defense.

It is the inescapable duty of the Republican Party to identify and define a basic national policy and then to coordinate to it the various domestic policies on which our functioning as a nation depends, and to supplement it by a foreign policy and activity which such a unified national domestic policy demands. Our national interest must be the yardstick; to it all other policies must conform.

Every thinking man and woman must view with the gravest misgivings the recklessness and emotionalism which characterize the foreign policy of the present administration. It has already affected the abandonment of the safeguard of our neutrality. It is stripping us of military aircraft and supplies, without the prospect of their early replacement, at a most critical juncture in world affairs. It threatens, if not checked, to embroil us in a European war, with unforeseeable losses of blood, treasure, and strength; to involve us for generations to come in the politics and intrigues of Europe and Asia; and to facilitate the establishment here of a New Deal dictatorship. This is gambling with our national security and imperiling the very foundations upon which our democracy is laid. The only way we can assist democracy abroad is by preserving and strengthening it here. Whatever our personal sympathies for the people of the British and French Empires may be, we should conserve our men, money, material, and energies for the sole purpose of insuring and making effective our national security.

We must start with the proposition that the national interest of the American people must be the primary concern of those whom we entrust with direction of our Government. We must build for ourselves forthwith a position of military and economic defense, within the field of our potential control, so imposing and so impregnable that no aggressor will dare assail it, either directly or indirectly—a defense which will function effectively to protect us, our economy, and our institutions, regardless of the changes which may come about in other continents as a result of the tragic events now transpiring in Europe and Asia. The present war may be short or it may be long drawn out, but we can be certain that its post-war effects will not pass within our time. Our national policy must be such that it can cope with the vicissitudes of war and peace alike, and must be fashioned with that in view. All that conduces to that end must be retained and strengthened; all that does not accord with that purpose must be thrust away, no matter what its individual appeal or desirability may seem.

If we are substantially in accord on this concept of national interest as the supreme need of national policy, many of the problems with which we deal fall naturally into place and dictate their own solutions.

I. MILITARY DEFENSE

Complete self-dependence for national defense in the air, on the land and sea. A two-ocean navy or its equivalent to make us independent of the navy of any foreign country in our relations with the rest of the world.

Immediate negotiations looking toward our political and military control of all European-owned islands in our American waters in both the Atlantic and Pacific essential to our defense and defense of the Monroe Doctrine, accompanied by appropriate military arrangements with other American republics for the defense of the Monroe Doctrine.

II. ECONOMIC DEFENSE

The immediate gearing of our industry, agriculture, transportation, and labor to wartime requirements, under a Department of Economic Defense clothed with adequate powers and unhampered by political tampering or by bureaucratic or legalistic red tape.

Development of new resources or substitutes for needed essential supplies (rubber, tin, manganese, etc.) in the United States and the nations reasonably adjacent to us.

III. DIPLOMATIC DEFENSE

Reorientation of our foreign policies to conform to the paramount objective of national security, military and economic. Reaffirmation of our historic policy of no entangling alliances and that of the Monroe Doctrine. Conservation of our human and material resources to that end.

IV. INTERNAL STABILITY

Reorganization of the long-established protective system as the basis of American prosperity and social stability, and in particular its extension to insure fully the maintenance of a prosperous and self-dependent agriculture as the foundation of our economic system and of our social and political institutions.

V. FARM POLICY

The present agricultural program, as administered by Washington, is a demonstrated failure. We should, by amendment and improvement of existing legislation, make mandatory certain provisions and vigorously prosecute them administratively, so that the following shall be sustained:

The restoration of farm income and purchasing power and the maintenance of a free and self-dependent agriculture, which form the essential basis for industrial and national prosperity, employment, and security. Against the present program of restricted production and increased imports of competitive farm products, we should seek to increase farm income to its proper size through the medium of improved prices and increased sales for American farm products.

(1) The protection and full price benefit of the American market for the American farmer by the limitation to actual requirements (by tariffs, quotas, embargoes, or otherwise) of competitive farm imports or substitutes therefor. A method by which this may be accomplished is suggested by H. R. 7590 (introduced October 19, 1939, by the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan), placing an embargo on farm imports whenever domestic prices are below parity.

(2) The development of new uses for American agricultural products in industry and commerce and the development in the United States of the growth of farm commodities or their substitutes previously imported.

(3) An American price for American consumption, independent of export or world prices. To accomplish this in the case of surplus crops on which the tariff is ineffective until such time as (1) and (2) above become fully effective, the payment of benefits upon the domestically consumed portion of such crops to compensate for lack of tariff protection and to insure a fair exchange value with the products farmers buy. When this parity price has been attained we should provide the machinery whereby the farmers may establish a self-sustaining program, without substantial cost to the Government, through the medium of an equalization fee, substantially as provided in the McNary-Haugen bill of 1928.

(4) Government assistance in disposing of surpluses in foreign trade for the best prices obtainable, bargaining for foreign markets selectively by countries and otherwise, both as to exports and imports.

(5) The adoption of a long-range program for conservation of the soil for its own sake, as distinguished from schemes for production control, such program to be administered by the land-grant colleges or other responsible State agencies with Federal financial and technical assistance.

(6) The encouragement of farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative organizations to decrease the price spread between producer and consumer, the extension of commodity loans to farmers on a sound basis to assist in carrying seasonal surpluses, and the encouragement of crop insurance under proper auspices.

(7) The encouragement of the better financing of farm mortgages on a sound basis through recognized public and private agencies at low rates of interest on an amortization plan, to the end that farm ownership may be more widely distributed in the hands of those who actually work the land.

VI. FOREIGN TRADE AND FINANCIAL POLICIES

These must be shaped to protect and supplement our basic national security, the military and economic policies which that entails, and the internal stability on which national security must rest. We should concentrate control of our foreign trade and financial activities in a foreign-trade board.

Foreign trade and financial policy should be based upon and conform to the requirements of our domestic economic objectives. These objectives are the protection of the American market for American agriculture, industry, and labor, and the protection of American employment and standards of living. These should not be needlessly exposed to the impact of events abroad over which we have no control, nor should American recovery be sacrificed upon the altar of academic whims or internationalist diplomacy, particularly in the difficult post-war conditions with which we shall surely be confronted when the millions now engaged in warfare and in war production return to peacetime production and trade competition. Specifically there should be:

(1) A reorganization of the Tariff Commission into a Foreign Trade Board as the responsible executive authority for the determination of foreign trade and financial policy in the light of American domestic interests and for the coordination of the foreign commercial and financial activities of the Federal Government.

(2) The establishment of a comprehensive system of national bookkeeping, expressed in simple arithmetic, covering all our commercial and financial transactions with other nations, as an essential basis for determining questions of foreign trade and financial policy.

(3) The adoption of a realistic policy of trading in the national interest under a system of quotas, and of selective imports and exports, granting tariff or other trade concessions only on a quid pro quo basis, thus returning to the traditional American policy of offering to all nations reciprocal treatment on the basis of the condition most-favored-nation principle.

(4) Congressional approval of all general trade agreements which have been or may be negotiated, as an essential to the maintenance of constitutional and responsible government.

A method by which this program may be effected is suggested by a bill (S. 3238), introduced in the United States Senate on February 1, 1940, by the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan.

To summarize, we must make national security the sole criterion of our national policies. We should seek it by direct military, economic, and diplomatic measures such as are outlined above. We must establish it upon a firm basis of internal stability, to attain which a sound solution of the farm problem is indispensable. We must supplement that internal stability by foreign trade and financial policies which will strengthen and insulate that stability against the shocks and strains of wartime and post-war conditions.

We are a warm-hearted and courageous people. We must be cool-headed as well if we are not to dissipate the heritage of our fathers by following the false gods of foreign intervention and war. Our experience in Europe in 1917–19 was a costly and terrible lesson in the futility and folly of intervening in European affairs. Americans should not have to learn that lesson nor pay that price a second time, for the price is the blood and shattered lives of our young men and it it may be the permanent loss of our liberties to a New Deal dictatorship.

GEORGE N. PEEK.

JUNE 15, 1940.

Leaders of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1940

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY FREDERICK E. HASLER AT Y. M. C. A. DAY AT NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the unanimous consent of the House of Representatives to insert the following address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address delivered Tuesday, July 9, 1940, in the Temple of Religion of the World's Fair by Mr. Frederick E. Hasler, president of the Pan American Society, was nationally broadcast and sent by short wave to South American countries.

Mr. Hasler is chairman of the executive committee of the Continental Bank & Trust Co. of New York, and chairman of the executive committee of the New York State Chamber of Commerce. Words of direction and advice from a man of such wide experience may well be taken as a guide for the youth of America.

On behalf of the Congress, I wish to congratulate Mr. Hasler for his scholarly and timely speech in which he gave expression to thoughts we all have had in our minds and hearts. The Young Men's Christian Association's celebration was the most appropriate forum for this inspiring appeal to our youth.

In times of crisis, such as the world faces today, the relative importance of many things changes. With the Western Hemisphere facing economic and military threat from the totalitarian nations of Europe, the Pan American Union has taken on a new and vital importance. The ideals of the union have, by recent events, been brought out in bold relief. Organized primarily for peace, commerce, and culture, the events of the last few months in Europe have given a new, temporary character to it—that of a great defensive alliance for the preservation of democracy and freedom on the continents of the Americas and their adjacent islands.

These same world events have also given added importance and offer new and greater opportunities to the Young Men's Christian Association in the influential part it plays in the national life of our countries. The building of strong, healthy bodies by physical training, the inspiring of a love of good sportsmanship, fair play, clean living, kindly regard for one's fellow men, loyalty to country, and belief in the Creator are of especial practical importance in times of crisis; more so than even in times of world tranquillity. All these things are important to the American way of life—and by the use of the word American I do not mean just the United States, but all the Americas. When the American way of life is threatened, as it is today, the things which the Young Men's Christian Association is doing become vital to national welfare. Upon the youth of today depends the hope of civilization and democracy, and the preservation of both the spiritual and temporal ideals for which our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

I have confidence in the young manhood of the United States and other pan-American nations. Our youth have not become soft, as events in Europe indicated the youth of some nations there became. Neither is our young manhood brutal, cruel, nor selfish as the youth of some dictator countries has proved to be.

The young men of the Americas face the world unafraid, but theirs is not a regimented courage or a bravery drilled into them by iron-handed discipline. Life is dear to them, freedom more so, and they are not prepared blindly to give up either at the bidding of a fanatical, war-crazed tyrant. But they are ready to make any sacrifice to preserve our democratic form of government, and even eager, if necessary, to meet any challenge the dictators may make in the Western Hemisphere.

I have sufficient faith, too, in American enterprise to believe that it will be able, through 100 percent preparedness, to meet successfully any economic or military attack which the wreckers of European civilization may devise. Once this menace, so far as it affects the Western Hemisphere, is destroyed and some measure of normalcy is restored in Europe, I believe that a new day will dawn in the affairs and fortunes of all countries of the Americas.

Many of you may not know that the Young Men's Christian Association is firmly established and for many years has been doing splendid work in all the large cities of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Uruguay, and Mexico. The branch in Rio de Janeiro was founded at the beginning of this century. The leaders of public life in these countries recognize, as they do here, that the Young Men's Christian Association is one of the great bulwarks of Christianity and a protection against the march of paganism and destruction, and is their strongest weapon against the insidious doctrines that seek to undermine the spiritual and moral fibre of the youth of the world. Because it is such a powerful force for building up good will and brotherly love, it can be of tremendous help in further solidifying pan-America in the crisis which now faces the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Frequently, I am asked what pan-Americanism stands for. It is this: The determination of all the peoples of the Americas to stand together, to work together for the good of all, and to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Pan-Americanism means more today than ever before. Each of the 21 nations has a big stake in its success. Upon its solidarity and single purposedness the future of each nation, in large measure, depends. The United States must cooperate in every way to help the other nations, for we are all members of one family—the family of democracy and freedom, bound together by geography and kinship in the campaign against hate, intolerance, and tyranny.

If I have said too much about pan-Americanism and too little about the Young Men's Christian Association tonight, let me assure you that it was not because I was unappreciative of the fine program which has been staged here. The national recognition awards made this evening for the five best "Y" projects carried on by "young people for young people" are a splendid illustration of the high type of work the world-wide service of the organization inspires.

In closing, I want to wish the Young Men's Christian Association greater success and ever widening influence, not only in New York, but throughout the Americas. To you, young men, and to all who hear my voice on this Nation-wide radio broadcast, you who are destined to be the leaders of tomorrow, I earnestly appeal to have courage, to merit the training and advantages that have been yours, and never let defeatism have any part in your thoughts. The ideals you stand for are the lifeblood of civilization. Democracy is not a forgotten dream—democracy is not on the run. It has been asleep. The decent people of the world, in failing to recognize that the devil and his works were not dead, placed their trust in the good faith of supposedly civilized governments whose spoken and written words have proved to be worthless. It may be a matter of months or years, but no matter how long it takes, victory is ours because the young men of the democracies are real men, not quitters.

The Americas are safe so long as young men are alert—you are.

Prevent Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA COUNCIL OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted by the Iowa Council of Republican Women.

Whereas conditions in many foreign countries have revealed an alarming spread of ideas that are antidemocratic, resulting in disloyalty of the peoples of those countries; and

Whereas the Iowa Council of Republican Women strongly feel that in the United States a powerful defense against the spread of antidemocratic ideas and activities is needed at this time as a protection to our form of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we earnestly urge the President of the United States and the Congress to direct the properly legalized departments of the United States to set up an increased and widespread program to prevent and to deal with, by legal methods, any activity on the part of persons whose ideas are opposed to the form of government of this country; and, further, that the citizens of these, our United States, be given assurance that a definite program of protection is being carried on for their safety; be it

Resolved by the Iowa Council of Republican Women, That the President of the United States and the Congress be urged to utilize every available resource to immediately expand and complete an adequate defense system, both economic and military, to properly protect the safety of the United States and to insure adequate training and equipment for each and every person called to the service of the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to remain constantly in session during this period of emergency in order to properly protect the interests of the United States of America and to safeguard the liberties and welfare of the people of this great democracy.

Mrs. ETHEL PETERSON,
Corresponding Secretary, Iowa Council of Republican Women.

Threaten Defeat of Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

LETTER FROM GERMAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a letter in which a threat is made against various Members of Congress who voted contrary to the wishes of the German-American National Alliance on the legislation Congress enacted at the special session to modify the Neutrality Act. I am advised other Members of Congress received an identical or similar letter. I do not know what steps are being taken to carry out the threat made in this letter, but I am sure that such an attitude by this or any other organization is resented by all fair-minded people.

The letter mentioned is as follows:

GERMAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., September 1939.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
United States Representative of Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We attach hereto a list, recording the voting of the Members of the House of Representatives in matters of the Bloom fake neutrality bill. We have tried to correctly set forth therein the vote of each Member and would appreciate to have you check the list concerning your vote. If an error or omission has taken place, kindly so advise us, so that we may change the list accordingly before we give it national publicity through the various channels open to us.

In the event of a special session of Congress and further voting on the matter of neutrality by the House of Representatives, we shall revise the list according to the vote then given, before giving it wide circulation.

Permit us to state that we are aiming to pledge all of our members and members of all organizations which are or may become affiliated with us to assist in preventing by lawful means any person from ever again holding a public office, who votes for the enactment of legislation or termination of existing laws, as a result whereof the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war would be permitted in the matter of the present European conflict.

We are convinced that such action on part of Congress would lead us into the present European war, which is of no concern to our country.

Very truly yours,

GERMAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
By PAUL A. F. WARNHOLTZ,
Chairman of Committee on Public Affairs.

War if Roosevelt Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

DISPATCH FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following dispatch published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 19, 1940:

WAR IF ROOSEVELT WINS IS FORECAST IN CANADA

OTTAWA, July 18.—If President Roosevelt is reelected for a third term, "the United States will be in the war before Christmas," it was forecast here today by G. Howard Ferguson, former Premier of Ontario and former Canadian High Commissioner at London.

He described Mr. Roosevelt's nomination as "a good thing for us," and added that pro-British sentiment in the United States was "very strong." All that was required to lead the United States into the war was "a little leadership in the right direction by some outstanding man like Roosevelt," he said.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM C. MASSINGALE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG, OF TEXAS

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Texas, Hon. RICHARD M. KLEBERG:

PREPAREDNESS—THE INNER DEFENSES, THE MATERIAL DEFENSES, AND THE GEOGRAPHIC DEFENSES OF THE UNITED STATES

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, my fellow citizens, at the outset permit me to express my appreciation for the courtesies extended by KRIS on this occasion.

For the past several weeks the Congress of the United States has been in session considering problems connected with the preparation of our country to meet a situation filled with ominous portent. The war clouds hanging low over Europe, which have blasted with their lightning of destruction nation after nation, have caused you to recommend to the Congress that it remain in session during this period of emergency. As your Representative in the Congress of the United States, it has therefore been impossible for me to come home save in this period of recess.

Ever since last year, before the session was called to consider neutrality legislation, it has been my responsibility, along with other Members of the Congress, to consider, with an ever-growing sense of responsibility, the picture which even then had begun to rapidly unfold itself. The picture which has developed as of today is one which, I am candid to admit, depicts the most tragic hour in world history. We are witnessing the perversion of the products and fruits of scientific civilization into paths which bend the minds and efforts of men to the study of the intricate science of individual and mass human destruction; paths which in Europe are leading men away from the teaching of the Prince of Peace and our common God; paths which lead us as your Representatives to believe that we, the United States of America and the peaceful peoples of the Western Hemisphere, may be encompassed by their ominous advance and trends. So I find myself tonight addressing you on a subject of gravest importance.

In this hour I voice the hope, coupled with prayer, that I may have your undivided attention and your serious consideration.

I have divided my discussion into three divisions, which, insofar as our national defense is concerned, present this matter as I see it in its more practical aspects. First, the inner defenses; second, the material defenses; and third, the geographic defenses of our country.

The inner defenses of the United States are to be found in the hearts of every true and devoted American citizen. They are formed of the combination of an imperishable faith in our common God and an utter, unwavering devotion to our freemen's government of reason and laws, which is founded upon that faith. In this period of congressional recess, on my visit here at home, as a Member of Congress and as your Representative, I am devoting my every effort and such limited mental capacity as I possess to the problem of seeking ways and means of calling to the attention of my fellow citizens of this district and elsewhere the importance of this particular portion of our preparedness program.

Past and recent history are filled with uncontrovertible evidence to the effect that, after all is said and done, and regardless of the guns, battleships, tanks, airplanes, and other equipment and material of war, the final success of military effort, defensive or offensive, depends upon the man behind the gun and the man who mans the guns, the battleships, the tanks, and the airplanes.

The United States is a peace-loving country. Its people are probably the most devoted to peace in the world today. But once their martial spirit is aroused, they have proven themselves on the fields of honor to be made of the sternest fiber of all. Our success in preparing ourselves—and God forbid the test should come—will depend in the main upon the rehabilitation of these inner defenses and upon the question as to whether or not, after years of division of our people into classes and political divisions, we can reweld ourselves into the united people of the United States with the united and common purpose of giving our all, if need be, for our God and our country.

Recent history lays before us in vivid array the wreck and conquest of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. These countries had each of them modeled their governments after the Bill of Rights and Constitution of the United States. To these countries, however, and to their peoples, their governments were merely document. To us, our Government is the crystallization of a God-given genius, the fundamentals of which had come down through the centuries from the hearts and minds of people elsewhere. May we always remember and never forget this truth in this tragic hour. Our Government's background and historic tradition—yes, and the Almighty Providence to which we pledged our faith and which, in the days of George Washington, gave to us the Government of the United States and with it those inner defenses which left an army-wide trail of bloody footprints on the rocky ice and snow at Valley Forge—these are the kind of qualities of inner defenses we need today.

Unless every man and women in this land of ours has a deep and abiding conviction in their heart-of-hearts that we have something worth fighting for—yes, and worth dying for if need be—we have but to remember the fate of the other democracies I have just mentioned, which, because of internal strife and dissension, or may I say democratic indifference, offered fertile fields for the diabolic work and success of the "fifth column" which paved the way for the collapse and destruction of each and every one of them.

The work and research of the intelligence services of our War and Navy Departments, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and of the Dies committee on un-American activities, indicates the widespread and divergent field of subversive activities going on today within our country, gnawing at its vitals and eroding its foundations. God grant that we can awaken in time and call upon our inner selves for a resurgence of the vital and intelligent patriotism which gave us the land of the free and the home of the brave, and upon which its continuity depends today.

It seems as though tonight, if Americans could hear a voice which over a century and a half ago read to the soldiers before the march at Valley Forge, at the request of George Washington, that inimitable document which began with these words: "These are the times that try men's souls," and, thus hearing that voice, give in response what those men gave there, and what Texans gave at the Alamo, at Goliad, and at San Jacinto—that which can only be given by those of imperishable American faith in God and country, and could I be sure that somehow, some way, irrefutable evidence of the concerted power—that imperishable devotion of Americans for God and country—which has come to us in times of stress before, could be given to the world at large, and particularly to the advancing armies bent on conquest and destruction, that I would feel an unshakable faith, not only in the permanency of our institutions, but in the permanency of peace here in our homeland. But it is because of conditions here that are doubtless known abroad that in this recess period I address to all within the sound of my voice a most urgent call to all Americans to man and rehabilitate those inner defenses which are the only ones upon which we can definitely depend for our national continuity and safety.

The material defenses of this Nation, and the preparation for their completion are going forward apace. You have all read in the newspapers the gigantic appropriations which have been made for naval, land, and air armaments and equipment. You are informed of the legislative authorization bills calling for the building of tanks, guns, airplanes, battleships, air and naval bases, Army training camps, and so forth. You know that when Congress again takes up its duties it immediately begins consideration of appropriations approximating five billions more for the Army and Navy, legislation looking toward compulsory military training, mobilization of the National Guard, and preparing the way for selective draft in emergency. All of these constitute the material defenses and, inasmuch as you are familiar with them, I shall not take time to discuss them further than to say that on Sunday night I leave for Washington to be present at the consideration of these various problems by committees, and in conference next week. The Congress itself will possibly not consider these legislative problems until after July 29.

Now as to geographic defenses, which have to do with the location of our Nation in the central part of North America, between Canada and Mexico, comprising as it does the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the Western Hemisphere. We have recognized since the days of James Monroe that immortal document known as the Monroe Doctrine, looking toward the continued maintenance of the peace and establishment of those countries already extant in North and South America, and the maintenance of their sovereignty and immunity from invasion. But my countrymen, it takes more than the Monroe Doctrine to complete the geographic defenses of the United States.

First of all, we must consider and remember that we live not only in North America as a nation, not only in the Western Hemisphere as a nation, but that we live in the world as a nation. We must first of all remember and never forget that in this inimitable crisis, upon the behavior and actions of the United States of America finally depends, in more than mere probability, the fate of both Christianity and civilization as united forces for the good of mankind. We likewise must not forget the major lessons of history, which indicate without possible challenge the truth that a man with friends is stronger than he who would stand alone, the truth that in nature's greatest of all schoolhouses the gregarious forms of life are stronger than those which seek survival alone and unsupported. And so it is among nations that a nation with friends, earned and real (not bought or coerced by fear), is far stronger than a nation which declares that it can and will stand alone and that it desires so to do.

What I am getting at and trying to convey to you is that it is my definite opinion that much more can and should be done on the part of the United States, its administration, its representative branch, and its diplomatic corps, to earn the friendship, to a greater degree than we now have it, not only of Canada and Mexico, but of Central and South America. This earned and increased friendship can be acquired only by a desire on our part to understand their problems and at the same time to lay our own cards on the table for their review. There is an indivisibility and community of interest between the nations of the Western Hemisphere and the insular populations and nations which surround it, which becomes increasingly vital as the years go forward and the picture which the future is unfolding becomes more apparent and visible. These geographic defenses constitute a vital part of the inner defenses of this Nation. The inspiration of a true confidence existing between our neighbors and ourselves is a vital factor tending to reinforce our and their strength.

In the Western Hemisphere we have a major advantage over Europe and Asia in that in both North and South America two languages are common to all of their peoples—English and Spanish. Could we but see the importance here, as I am sure we can if we would think, of immediately undertaking for the future, both immediate and remote, the study of Spanish as a requirement in our schools, and would they in Latin America, as I am sure they will, undertake the requirement of English in their schools, the major barrier to a growing and permanent friendship between our country and Latin America would be removed.

We have but to recognize that in our country, formed as it is of racial strains including every civilized nationality, we are not confronted, as is the case in Europe, with a condition like unto that which confronted the builders of the Tower of Babel. We have welded a united citizenship speaking the English language, which is taught in all our schools. As a token of the success of that venture we have but to witness the history of age-old Europe in its recurrent wars and revolutions, occasioned in the main by their inability to understand one another and to recognize those essential communities of interest between all humanity the world over; we have but to recall the inhibitions in our organic law

which frees our country of religious and racial prejudices which are rampant in Europe, and the development of the American spirit which is based upon a tolerance between our citizens which is not to be found elsewhere—a tolerance which, if strengthened to a still greater degree, is of essential and vital importance in this day when suspicions are aroused, for instance, concerning "fifth column" activities—a tolerance which by steadfast national self-control should warn and inhibit against the pointing of the finger of suspicion at our neighbor because of his racial descendence—a tolerance which will cause us to be sure before we indulge in any of those overt acts which tend to destroy the unity of our people—a tolerance which will lead us into united effort to uproot and cast aside all of the class hatreds which are born of both carelessness as to the true principles of political expediency of the hour and of intolerance, which is one of humanity's greatest curses.

In conclusion, these statements which I have made are in the form of suggestions for mental exercise and practice, and the development of constructive thought which is essential to the prompt and permanent rebuilding of our inner defenses, as I see it.

And so, my fellow citizens, may I again, with all of the earnestness and emphasis at my command, commend you to marshal that great heritage incident only to citizens of a country governed by its people, under a government which derives all of its just powers from you, the people; a government under which the Federal branch functions under a constitution limiting its powers, and which Constitution and Bill of Rights reserve all powers not delegated to the Federal Government to the States and to you, the people, so that not only it may not vanish from the earth but, God willing, it may continue in its imperishable service to mankind here and everywhere. By dedicating ourselves to the rehabilitation of our inner defenses, in a tragic hour when Almighty God has imposed upon us an uncomparable trust, may we exhibit and show a worthiness of that trust by the manner in which we bend our efforts in service to our common God and country. May we never relinquish our priceless liberties which come to us through God at one and the same time with the life He gives us. May we remember that here in the United States of America we hold in trust to countless generations which are to follow, the last gigantic crucible where Christian men and women, free in mind and thought and speech, may work undisturbed for the benefit of our families, our friends, our country and the rest of the world. Let us be true to that trust, and let us exhibit in this realm of free men's government an ability and capacity for self-government that will hurl back the challenge from abroad.

The National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the President's plan proposed to the Habana conference by Secretary Hull that the United States purchase all surplus commodities in South America has evidently collapsed. It is a good thing for the farmers of the United States, as well as the taxpayers that the program collapsed so early. The President's proposal that $500,000,000 be used to purchase these commodities was just a small beginning of another impossible New Deal program that would have cost the Nation billions of dollars. The farmers of America have a perfect right to ask how the President thinks we can control the surpluses of South America when we cannot control our own.

The Government now owns vast quantities of corn, wheat, and cotton, and under this program they would have had to purchase probably a million and a half bales of cotton from Brazil, together with probably 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, 10,000,000 bags of coffee, 725,000 tons of meat, 214,000 tons of wool, 300,000 tons of copper, and about 20,000,000 tons of oil. And this is not nearly all of the commodities we would have had to purchase. To the American farmer and taxpayer this sounds just as foolhardy as the purchase of 80 percent of the world's gold to bury it in a hole in the ground.

We farmers all over the country are threshing our wheat right now and selling it for just about one-half of the cost of production. Every American farmer wants to know what the administration has done to get him a better price. Dollar wheat would be worth much more to the farmers of this country than a cheap loan from the Government to help him hang on until he is entirely swamped. The taxpayers, too, have a right to know why these billions of dollars are being appropriated in the name of national defense without any plans submitted by the President as to how the money should be spent. There is a righteous wave of indignation sweeping the country as they learn that these billions appropriated for national defense are blank checks in the President's hands. It is altogether evident now that much of this money will be used for purposes other than national defense. It is also becoming known that many of the taxes soon to go into effect would not have needed to be levied for some time to come, since much of this money cannot be legitimately expended for national defense for several years. The fact that we find it impossible to secure mechanics now at the time when they are greatly needed is simply because they refused to let young men and women learn trades for the last 4 or 5 years. Hundreds of thousands of young men wanting to learn trades have been forced to the highways and to the ranks of common laborers. These were unable to find jobs, and now we find their personal initiative gone and the country short of tradesmen in this critical hour.

Now it becomes necessary for us to spend millions of dollars of the national-defense appropriation to create mechanics that we would have had had not they interfered in the lives and programs of our men during the last 7 years, and, what is more important, we would have them right now, when we need them. They would be full-fledged, experienced men who could operate the mechanized equipment of a modern army instead of having to wait in many cases 2 years for a mechanic who then has no practical experience. I believe we should in all possible haste make it possible for the industry of the country to take on apprentices. This would be a much more sensible way of getting practical men than to spend the taxpayers' money to teach them trades in schools, which is apparently going to be the program. We must train mechanics regardless, but I do not believe that we need to resort to compulsory military training on the scale recommended by the President simply because war hysteria has been created by certain men in executive positions. And I do not intend to support a bill for compulsory military training until I am convinced that we cannot raise an army otherwise. Compulsory military training is a far departure from the American practice and point of view, and I find in the country an overwhelming sentiment against it.

Will Harry Hopkins Have His "Brain Trust" Anyhow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS H. CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce, I made a point of order against an item which would have provided funds for an additional quota of specialists, experts, and so forth, in the office of the Secretary, for whom there was no authority in law. The point of order was sustained, and the item went out.

When the bill went to the other body an attempt was made to insert the item by amendment. There, in a brilliant exposé of the number of secretaries and assistant secretaries and assistants to the secretaries, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator LODGE, defeated the proposal. Thus funds were denied by Congress for this unauthorized increase of personnel, and under every customary interpretation of congressional intent the whole proposal went out the window.

Lately I have been advised that this plain denial of funds and the absence of legislative authority is being flouted by the Secretary of Commerce, who seems determined to have his special "brain trust" whether Congress wills or not. The

procedure adopted is to eliminate career men in the Department by forcing their retirement under one pretext or another in order to have funds to pay the desired new employees. A large number of men at modest salaries will be forced out to make way for the Secretary's pets. Mr. Speaker, such a move is a challenge to Congress which must not be ignored. I propose to present further details on the matter shortly.

Appropriation National Defense—T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for projects, the completion of which will increase the generating capacity of the T. V. A. 298,000 kilowatts. It provides an initial appropriation of $25,000,000 for a program of expansion, the total cost of which will be $65,800,000. It is brought before the Congress as an emergency matter and its proponents are the members of the National Defense Council. This bill would not have been favorably reported by the Appropriations Committee, it would not have received a favorable report from the Rules Committee, and it would not be before the House today were it not a part of the program of national defense, which a vast majority of the American people are now demanding. I feel sure that if this additional power demanded for our national defense were not to be provided in connection with the existing T. V. A., there would be very little, if any, opposition in the House. Be it remembered that the Senate this very afternoon passed this same bill unanimously. Not a single Senator from a single State in the Union raised his voice or cast his vote in opposition to this request on the part of the National Defense Council.

Now, I take it that we are all for adequate national defense. There can be no question about that. The debate this afternoon, however, has developed that certain Members of the House are satisfied that this additional kilowatt power is not needed. Then, there are those among us who insist that even though this additional kilowatt power is needed for our national defense, nevertheless, this is the wrong place and the wrong method to be used in procuring the power. Now, there are 435 Members of Congress and, as one of those Members charged with responsibility in this matter, I am free to admit that I am not an expert on the production of kilowatt power; neither am I an expert qualified to speak as to the necessities of the National Defense Council in providing kilowatt power for our national defense. In this particular I think I am in the same position as all Members of the Congress. Assuming that we all want to furnish this national defense and that we are not experts ourselves, then it necessarily follows that we must rely upon expert advice in shaping our course here today. In these circumstances, let us call the witnesses who are presumed to know.

Parenthetically, permit me to say that I have always opposed this T. V. A. socialistic experiment which has sounded, and is sounding, the death knell of much of private initiative and industry by its unfair competition. I am opposed to subsidizing with the taxpayers' money any venture on the part of Government in business, the effect, if not the purpose, of which is to drive out of business the small businessman as well as legitimate industry. I have consistently opposed, on the floor of this House, extending the tentacles of this gigantic New Deal endeavor. I have been in Congress since the inception of the T. V. A. I am not only prejudiced against socialization of this kind, but my opposition is based on sound reason. In these circumstances, the position I take today is certainly not based on any desire to extend or amplify the T. V. A.

The National Defense Council is a nationally known group of business leaders and experts called together to assist the Government in its hour of peril and to provide as rapidly as possible an adequate national defense. Among those on this Council are William S. Knudsen, of General Motors, Mr. Stettinius, former president of the United States Steel Corporation. Mr. Knudsen is an expert in mass production and his job is to see that the industry of America is coordinated and voluntarily mobilized to meet the requirements of our national-defense program. Mr. Stettinius' specific job on the Council is to furnish the raw material to be used in Mr. Knudsen's endeavors. Mr. Knudsen advised Mr. Stettinius as to the requirements of kilowatt power for the purpose of making aluminum to be used in the manufacture of our airplanes. Aluminum is a vital part of every airplane, the average airplane requiring 5 tons of aluminum.

The testimony before the committee shows that Mr. Stettinius sought the advice of Mr. Gano Dunn, who is admitted by all to be one of the outstanding authorities in this country on the production of electric power. Having before him Mr. Knudsen's requirements as to power, a survey was made of power-producing facilities throughout the country. After this survey, it was agreed by Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Knudsen, relying much upon the advice of Mr. Dunn, that the legislation we are now considering is essential to our national defense. Mr. Stettinius, appearing before the Appropriations Committee, said:

> I have been over this matter for approaching 3 weeks now with Mr. Dunn and the members of our staff, and I am perfectly confident, gentlemen, that from the standpoint of our aluminum production to meet the aviation program which Mr. Knudsen is responsible for, and a great many other developments in the southeastern section, we must have this added power.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia asked:

> And you cannot get it from private industry?

Mr. Stettinius responded:

> We cannot, sir; and it cannot be delayed for reasons which Mr. Dunn will bring out in his testimony. Not weeks, but days, count now from the standpoint of speeding this work up so that we can get the full effect of the spring floods 2 years hence.

I am not going to quote what Mr. Dunn, the engineer, said because that has already been quoted several times here today and in the remarks made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS], as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be found Mr. Dunn's full statement. Suffice it to say that it seems difficult to read Mr. Dunn's conclusions and not be convinced that this legislation is not only advisable but necessary and urgent in the interest of our national defense.

Now, if Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Knudsen, and Mr. Dunn were advocates of, believers in, or sympathetic with the T. V. A. project, then we might be justified in charging prejudice on their part in favor of the development of the T. V. A. It so happens, however, that Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Knudsen, and Mr. Dunn are all opposed to the philosophy of the T. V. A. They have been its opponents and not its advocates. They believe in individual initiative and the development of our vast national resources by private industry under Government regulation. Then why are they advocating this extension of T. V. A.? To me the answer is simple. Our national defense requires this additional power and it is most available in this particular place. If this were a new proposition, that is, a question of developing kilowatt power by steam, or water, that would be another question. Mr. Dunn, the engineer, made it clear before the committee that with few exceptions kilowatt power can be developed in this country at this time cheaper by steam than water power. He cited as the best evidence of this fact the policy of all private utilities to provide additional kilowatt power by steam rather than further development of potential water power. He attributed this change to modern efficiency of the steam plant.

I call as my next witness a man whom we all agree probably knows as much about T. V. A. and electric power as any man in the country. Former president of the Commonwealth & Southern Power Co., he has opposed the T. V. A. most

strenuously from its inception. I refer to none other than Wendell L. Willkie, who because of his opposition to the T. V. A. has been the constant object of attack down through the years by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and other New Deal T. V. A. exponents. When appearing at the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Dunn, who had been Mr. Willkie's consulting engineer in his opposition to the T. V. A., made this statement:

I would like to read a statement by Mr. Willkie into the record. Here is what Mr. Willkie said on that subject on June 15, when this proposal was presented in a memorandum to the President. On June 12 it was presented, and it became public, without our knowledge. The reporters went ahead and saw Wendell Willkie, expecting to get a grand slam from him against doing this thing. I will quote from this newspaper interview of June 14, in a Scripps-Howard paper. This is what Mr. Willkie said:

"Nothing is more important than defense, and that is nothing which might and will mask more political logrolling than the flag-waving variety of national defense. But if some impartial group, the United States Army or its engineers, for instance, do say that the completion of these dams is a link in our national defense, the dams should be completed and as rapidly as those charged with our defense think necessary."

The National Defense Council is an "impartial group" as described by Mr. Willkie, and this impartial group says—

That the completion of these dams is a link in our national defense; the dams should be completed and as rapidly as those charged with our defense think necessary.

Mr. Willkie is big enough and patriotic enough not to permit his dislike for T. V. A. and his prejudice against this New Deal socialistic experiment to prevent him from recommending a step which the engineers and the experts tell him is an essential part of our national defense. I agree with Mr. Willkie.

Now, who is opposed to this legislation and what are their reasons? So far as the committee hearings are concerned, and so far as the records show, the only opposition is that opposition expressed here today in the debate. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the others who have spoken in opposition to this bill are all capable, conscientious, and outstanding legislators. They are experts in legislation, tried, experienced, and great weight should be given to their views in the consideration of proposed legislation coming from their committees. They are not experts, however, in the production of kilowatt power, and they do not claim to be. It is the duty of the Congress to determine the policy, but we must rely upon those especially qualified in various lines of endeavor—the experts—for the facts which determine our course as to policy.

In the final analysis, it seems to me that two questions are involved in this debate: First. Is it necessary for the Government to provide additional kilowatt power as requested in this bill? Second. Under existing conditions, should this power be provided in connection with the T. V. A.?

Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Stettinius, and Mr. Dunn answer these questions in the affirmative, and give their reasons. Those in opposition doubt the necessity for this legislation at this time. However, they are satisfied that even if legislation providing for additional power is necessary it should not be produced in connection with T. V. A.

I must make a decision as to which group in this controversy is more likely to be correct. The Senate has already made this decision by a unanimous vote and because in the opinion of the Senate this legislation is so vital, that body is at this minute in recess awaiting the action of the House. Just as soon as this bill passes the House, it will be approved by the Senate and go to the President for signature on this very day.

In spite of the fact that I always have, and still do, oppose the general principle of the T. V. A., yet for the reasons herein given, I am constrained to believe that my duty lies in but one direction. If there is doubt in my mind, that doubt must be resolved in favor of national defense. My conscience tells me that duty requires that I vote for this bill.

The Supply of Tin in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON AND ROBERT S. ALLEN

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, from today's Washington Merry-Go-Round:

WASHINGTON DAILY MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen)

After 7 years of stalling over one of the most important raw materials to American industry, the State Department actually is doing something about the United States tin supply.

In cooperation with the National Defense Commission, State Department officials are doing three things:

1. Talking with Jesse Jones about an R. F. C. loan to establish a tin smelter in the United States. The United States firms in on this are Phelps-Dodge, National Lead, American Metals, and the American Smelting & Refining Co.

2. Facilitating the visit of the world's biggest tin king, Simon Patino, to the United States; also holding conversations with Mauricio Hochschild, big German-Jewish producer of Bolivian tin.

3. The National Defense Commission has ordered 75,000 tons of metallic tin from the Malay Peninsula and the Dutch East Indies.

This is almost enough to last the United States for half a year—if it ever gets here. But the catch is that the tin is still down in the mines of Malay and must not only be mined and smelted, but also shipped half way around the world. Meanwhile, the Japanese may move into this area of the South Pacific, or the Germans may crush the British combine which controls Malay tin, or the British may decide that they need the tin for their own military purposes.

ONLY 3 WEEKS' SUPPLY

All of which reveals one of the most inexcusable chapters of national-defense neglect in recent history.

Almost nobody knew that on January 1 of this year, United States stocks of tin were so low that we had only 3 weeks' supply. And few people know what the exhaustion of our supply would mean to American life and industry. Not only would it put an end to our packing of food in tin cans, which is a major industry, but it would eventually mean a black-out for every American home not lighted by gas or kerosene lamps. For the contact point of every electric light bulb is made of tin.

Furthermore, the United States Fleet would be laid up in a few months for lack of tin for bearing replacements. The same would apply to automobiles, and to many other products intimately woven into American life.

BOLIVIAN OVERTURES

Despite this, the State Department literally ignored representations by the Bolivian Government to work out a trade agreement whereby the United States would secure tin not from the South Pacific, but from inside the Western Hemisphere, thus avoiding dangerous shipping hauls, and the danger of foreign controls.

First Bolivian overture to the State Department was made by Chargé d'Affaires Enrique Lozada in June 1933, at the suggestion of the Washington Merry-Go-Round. At that time, Acting Secretary of State William Phillips, now Ambassador to Rome, turned a deaf ear. He said the United States was not interested.

Then the late Representative Sam McReynolds, of Tennessee, introduced legislation placing an excise tax on the importation of crude tin, in order to encourage its smelting in the United States. Whereupon the State Department actually intervened to kill the bill, causing its author to protest to his old friend, Cordell Hull.

"This memorandum," said McReynolds, referring to the State Department's memo opposing the tax on crude tin, "could have been no more favorable to British interests if it had been written in the British Foreign Office.

OPPONENTS OF PLAN

By that time it had become apparent that the chief opponents of having Bolivian tin smelted in the United States were (1) the British tin monopoly; (2) the Patino tin interests, which were shipping ore all the way from Bolivia to Liverpool, thence back to the United States, in order to enjoy British monopoly price-fixing; and (3) the National Lead Co., and perhaps also other heavy

United States users of tin, which seemed to be linked with the British-Patino interests.

For instance, the late Edward J. Cornish, chairman of National Lead, also was chairman of Patino Mines and Enterprises, while the present chairman of the Patino company, Fletcher W. Rockwell, is also president of National Lead.

Thus, big American business appeared to be cooperating with the British-Patino monopoly, despite national-defense interests, while the State Department appeared to condone that cooperation.

But now, suddenly awakening to the grave danger of the situation, the State Department is trying desperately to make up for past negligence. Several days ago it sought to arrange for space on a clipper plane for Patino to come to the United States. But, since his family almost fills one clipper, he is en route by boat.

NAZIS IN BOLIVIA

Meanwhile, Jesse Jones, in cooperation with the State Department, is discussing an R. F. C. loan to set up a tin smelter in the United States, with a possible subsidy of 1 or 2 cents a pound on smelted tin. The first company to show an interest was Phelps-Dodge, but more recently American Metals, American Smelting and Refining, and National Lead have shown interest.

Meanwhile Hochschild, who has been mining tin in Bolivia for 10 years, informed the National Defense Commission that he was ready to do immediate business. But the Defense Commission, like the State Department, bowed to the tin king and said they would wait for Patino's arrival.

Most ominus development has been the recent and sudden activity of Nazi interests in Bolivia to try to block these deals. The Bolivian Army, long trained by German officers, and leaning heavily toward the Nazis, is doing everything possible to sabotage the negotiations now being conducted by Bolivian Minister Guachalla in Washington.

NOTE.—Dr. W. Y. Elliott, Harvard expert, comments on the present tin situation: "Today the prospect of Japanese domination of Asia and of German domination of Europe and the whole of its colonies presents this country with an entirely changed strategic situation, desperate in its implications. The securing and processing of these vital strategic materials is no longer an arguable point. It may be a matter of survival itself of the American people."

Why America Should Keep Out of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

WINNING ESSAY, BY REV. JOHN WARREN DAY

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the very short but wonderful essay by Rev. John Warren Day, of Topeka, Kans. It was the prize winner among 400 submitted to the National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars.

America should keep out of foreign wars—

(1) Because up until 1917 our traditional foreign policy of keeping out of entangling alliances with foreign nations, combined with the Monroe Doctrine, made it possible for this Nation to develop her own material, moral, and social resources to a high level of achievement. Our first flight into foreign meddling on a large military scale seems to have resulted in throwing us into reverse.

(2) Because war destroys a large part of a nation's most virile manhood. It upsets international trade, the national economy, the ordinary peacetime standards of decency and morality, thereby retarding the processes of democracy which are so dependent upon the motives set forth by the Christian religion.

(3) Because to fight another foreign war to preserve democracy will undoubtedly insure its destruction in America for many years, because it would necessitate a military dictatorship to carry it to a successful military conclusion. Foreign wars are based upon imperialistic aims. Imperialisms always move in the direction of dictatorships, and warfare is their modus operandi. Democracy constantly moves in the opposite direction. It makes progress not by cracking heads but by counting them.

The Very Reverend JOHN WARREN DAY,
Dean of Grace Cathedral, Topeka, Kans.

Operations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

STATEMENT BY LEO T. CROWLEY

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Leo T. Crowley, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune on July 29:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 29, 1940]

F. D. I. C. SHOWS GAIN IN CAPITAL; MAY CUT FEES—FUNDS NEAR $500,000,000, AND CROWLEY CONSIDERS DIP IN ASSESSMENT RATE

WASHINGTON, July 28.—In reporting to insured banks today on the condition of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as of June 30, Leo T. Crowley, Chairman, says that, as it now appears that the capital of the Corporation will have increased to about $500,000,000 by the end of 1940, it would be appropriate to give consideration to a reasonable reduction in the rate of assessments paid by banks.

Mr. Crowley did not give any inkling in his report as to his ideas of a reasonable reduction in the Corporation's assessment rate. There have been reports here, however, that the Corporation would not look with disfavor on legislation which would pare the assessment rate to one-fourteenth of 1 percent of insured deposits from the present figure of one-twelfth of 1 percent.

Assessment income realized by the Corporation in the first 6 months of this year amounted to $22,415,429, or at an annual rate of approximately $45,000,000. On this basis, a reduction in the assessment rate to one-fourteenth of 1 percent would mean to insured banks a saving of about $6,500,000 on an annual basis. It was regarded as significant that Mr. Crowley spoke of a cut in the assessment rate rather than elimination of the assessment on interbank deposits, as would be achieved by a bill pending in the Senate since the regular session of Congress last year.

LOSSES TO BE FEWER

Following an outlay of about $80,000,000 in the first half of this year, the largest disbursements by the Corporation in any 6 months' period, Mr. Crowley says: "We can now say with a reasonable degree of assurance that the accumulated losses in the banking system have been eliminated with the possible exception of a few small scattered cases." However, it is inevitable that there will be bank failures from losses currently arising just as there are failures in any other business. Henceforth bank owners should assume a greater share of the risk of their business by investing more private capital, particularly in the case of weak or inadequately capitalized banks.

Mr. Crowley informs the insured banks that the corporation in the first 6 months disbursed more than $65,000,000 to facilitate the merger of 20 banks. Included in this outlay were the following sums: $16,000,000 for Integrity Trust Co., Philadelphia; $23,000,000 for First Trust & Deposit Co., Syracuse; and $16,700,000 for First Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Utica.

Income of the Corporation for the first 6 months amounted to $27,382,078, of which $22,415,429 represented assessments paid by insured banks and $4,966,649 represented interest earned, after deducting provision for amortization of premiums, and profits on securities sold. Expenses and losses amounted to $11,706,213, including deposit insurance losses and expenses of $9,973,971 and administrative expenses and other charges of $1,732,242.

SURPLUS GAINED

For the year ended June 30, income of the Corporation amounted to $52,821,659, including assessments paid by insured banks of $43,271,826 and $9,549,832 of interest earned, less provision for amortization of premiums, and profits on securities sold. Total losses and expenses for the year amounted to $14,343,570, represented by deposit insurance losses and expenses of $10,863,370 and administrative expenses and other charges of $3,480,201.

Surplus of the Corporation as of June 30 was $180,264,574, representing the excess of income over expenses and losses during the entire period of operation. Since the beginning of deposit insurance total income has amounted to $245,985,466, including assessments of $187,313,360 paid by insured banks and $58,672,106 derived from interest earned and profits from sales of securities, after provision for amortization of premiums. Charges to surplus

have amounted to $65,720,891. Net deposit insurance losses and expenses amounted to $45,525,604, resulting from the difference between total disbursements of $219,930,791 actually made or pending to depositors of closed insured banks and estimated recoveries of $174,405,187.

Statement of assets and liabilities, June 30, 1940

ASSETS

Cash on hand, in transit, and on deposit		$19,368,725
U. S. Government securities (cost less reserve for amortization of premiums) and accrued interest receivable		348,489,672
		367,858,398
Assets acquired through suspensions and mergers (less collections):		
Subrogated claims against closed insured banks	$38,650,536	
Net balances in closed banks	805,955	
Loans to merging insured banks	63,843,041	
Assets from merging insured banks to avert deposit-insurance losses	25,759,605	
Assets from merging insured banks and receivers of closed insured banks	1,097,370	
Total	130,156,510	
Less: Reserve for losses	39,209,069	
		90,947,441
Funds of commitment to purchase assets from an insured bank		[1] 16,690,481
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment		1
Deferred charges and miscellaneous		69,596
Total assets		475,565,918

LIABILITIES

Current liabilities:		
Accounts and assessment rebates		268,971
Earnest-money deposits and unapplied collections applicable to loans to merging insured banks and assets purchased		505,025
Net balances in closed insured banks		805,955
Total		1,579,952
Unused credits for assessments to temporary Federal Deposit Insurance fund and prepaid assessments		6,302
Deferred credits		265
Reserve for expenses		140,267
Reserve for loss on assets to be acquired		[1] 4,275,000
Total liabilities		6,001,787

CAPITAL

Capital stock		289,299,556
Surplus:		
Balance Dec. 31, 1939	$163,411,165	
Adjustments prior to Jan. 1, 1940	1,177,543	
Balance as adjusted Dec. 31, 1939		164,588,709
Surplus for the 6 months ending June 30, 1940:		
Additions:		
Deposit insurance assessments	$22,415,429	
Interest and profit on sales of securities (less amortization)	4,927,278	
Interest on loans and subrogated claims	39,370	
		27,382,078
Deductions:		
Losses and expenses	9,973,971	
Administrative expenses	1,672,937	
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment	59,304	
		11,706,212
		15,675,865
		180,264,574
Total capital		469,564,131
Total liabilities and capital		475,565,918

[1] As of June 3, 1940, the Corporation had deposited $16,690,481 in a special account for the purchase of assets from an insured bank, if and when an existing purchase commitment is consummated. A reserve has been provided for the estimated loss of $4,275,000 in the liquidation of these assets, and the surplus of the corporation has been reduced by this amount by the inclusion of a provision for this loss with other deposit-insurance losses and expenses.

In the first half year 30 insured banks closed or received aid from the Corporation. The 234,400 depositors in these banks, having total deposits of $136,391,000, were protected by insurance or otherwise to the extent of $136,224,000.

Marvelous Rescue of the Mosquito Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appears in the August 3 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

MARVELOUS RESCUE OF THE MOSQUITO FLEET

Here is a story that was blurred in the news. It is the story of how an original fleet of fast torpedo boats building for the United States Navy was lost by intent, recaptured by accident, and then restored to the national defense, where it will stay.

Early in June there were rumors, seemingly from London, that the British Admiralty was negotiating with the American Government for some "old" destroyers. And it was supposed that the American Government, if it were so resolved, could actually effect a transfer of United States Navy vessels to a foreign belligerent, as it had already been doing with airplanes and guns, by the simple device of declaring them to be "surplus" and selling them, not directly to the Allies, but first to the manufacturer, on condition that he resell and deliver them immediately to the Allies—the American Government to take credit for replacements to be made out of future production.

The rumors were not confirmed. The Navy Department was silent.

One afternoon the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, having an officer of the Navy before it to testify on other matters, suddenly asked him what he knew about it. He replied "that nothing had been done about releasing destroyers." Whereupon, in the presence of the naval officer, the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs agreed to address a letter to the President asking him what property of the United States Navy, surplus or other, had been disposed of.

The next morning, before there had been time to send such a letter, the Acting Secretary of the Navy got the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs on the telephone and told him that 11 motor torpedo boats and 12 motor submarine chasers, a total of 23 vessels, called the mosquito fleet, had been disposed of. This was the very first the Congress knew of it.

What had happened, according to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, reporting it afterward to the Senate, was that when the naval officer got back to the Department, he told his superiors what the committee was going to do and suggested tactfully that somebody had better tell it about the disposal that had been made of the mosquito fleet.

The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs immediately summoned the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Lewis Compton. He was asked by what authority of law the Navy had released the mosquito fleet it was building. Certainly a fleet in building could not be called surplus or obsolete, could it? The Acting Secretary of the Navy admitted that it couldn't; but he called the committee's attention to a law that permitted the Navy to change its designs and modify its contracts. Well, then, all it had done had been to decide that it could build better vessels by an improved design, which made it possible so to modify its contract with the boat builders that they could sell to the British Admiralty the fleet they were building for the United States Navy.

At this, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs exclaimed: "Now, Senators, see how careful we shall have to be in our legislation. They have a right to modify or change their contracts. So all these transactions have been based, not on any legal authority—for they have none—to dispose of any property except surplus, but upon the fact that they have authority to modify or change contracts. Who in God's name, in Congress or in the country, thought, when such a power was given, that these contracts for our own protection would be modified or changed in order to assist one side or the other of belligerents at war?"

But beyond the question of legal authority was the question of responsibility. The Acting Secretary of the Navy was asked on whose responsibility this thing had been done. He said it had been done entirely upon his own responsibility.

He was asked, "And you say on your own responsibility that this was done without consulting the Commander in Chief?"

His answer was, "Yes."

It was very handsome of the Acting Secretary of the Navy to take upon himself the entire responsibility—possibly more handsome

than he knew—for, as it turned out, the transaction was in violation of a statute in the Federal Criminal Code.

However, the President could not accept it. He caused his private secretary to issue a White House statement saying that he, the President, had been himself fully and directly responsible. Thus clarified, Mr. Compton was heard no more on that matter.

It had been, as Chairman WALSH said, "by the merest accident" that the loss of the mosquito fleet was discovered in the first place; and it looked then as if it were already too late.

What saved it was unexpected. A Member of Congress from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] suddenly stood in the well of the House of Representatives reading chapter 30, title V, 3, 40 Statutes 222—in effect since 1917—which says it shall be unlawful "during a war in which the United States is a neutral nation to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war * * * with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation," under pain of fine or imprisonment, or both.

And that was what saved the mosquito fleet—the only defense of that kind we had in preparation.

After a silent week end at Hyde Park, the President returned to Washington, and abruptly canceled the Navy Department's release of its mosquito fleet to the British Admiralty. This he did, according to the White House statement, on "an informal opinion prepared by the Attorney General." Which leaves one to ask whether the transaction had been begun with no legal opinion at all, or whether the Attorney General was indebted to Mr. CASE of South Dakota, for his knowledge of the law that made it criminal.

The rest of the White House statement was defensive argument. Firstly, those fast motor torpedo boats were experimental. Secondly, if it took 6 months to replace the fleet that was going to be released to the British, still no time would be really lost, because the quantity would accelerate production, there would be all the more time to train the personnel, and we should be learning something. Waive all that. It may or may not be technical. The triumph of the defense was to say that the new fleet to be built in place of the one released to the British would be designed for the 21-inch torpedo, which is standard in the United States Navy; whereas the fleet that was going to be sold to the British Government was designed for the 18-inch torpedo, which is obsolete in the United States Navy.

What would this mean? It would mean that the United States Navy had been building a mosquito fleet for an obsolete torpedo. As we believe in the United States Navy, we do not believe this.

Not the least distorted feature of the whole matter was the disposition of the Navy to belittle its own work. Senator WALSH said: "The Navy Department called the vessels 'boats' first of all. They did not give the emphasis to value which I myself had and which other members of the committee had. * * * I wish to say that I have given the Navy credit for having more sense and more patriotism than to spend $6,000,000 for ships which are not of value and importance to the Navy." And he added that the loss of these vessels, which were for the defense of eastern seaboard harbors, would have been a serious injury to our own national defense.

Well, there is the story. The only sequel, so far, is a paragraph written into the naval appropriations bill saying, "No vessel, ship, or boat now in the United States Navy or being built therefor shall be disposed of by sale or otherwise or be chartered or scrapped without the consent of the Congress."

Those are strange words to appear in an American law. The necessity that gave rise to them was strange above all.

Extension of Credit to Latin American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday by unanimous consent, I incorporated in the RECORD information with reference to the defaults of South American nations compiled by one of my constituents.

Further light is thrown upon this proposal to extend further Government credits to Latin American countries in the Western Hemisphere by an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune under date of July 29, 1940, and for the information of Members of Congress and the country at large I am incorporating this statement and these remarks in the RECORD, so as to make the record complete.

MOST OF LATIN AMERICAN LOANS ARE IN DEFAULT—UNITED STATES INVESTORS HOLD ONE AND SEVEN-TENTHS BILLIONS

Latin American governments and corporations have defaulted on more than 75 percent of their obligations held by investors in the United States, a survey indicated yesterday. United States investors' holdings of Latin American obligations total about one and seven-tenths billion dollars.

Interest payments on many of the Latin-American dollar bonds were suspended early in the depression.

ADJUSTMENT EFFORTS FAIL

Adjustments, part payments, and drawn-out negotiations between representatives of American bondholders and the Latin American countries have brought little improvement in the debt service.

"Latin American countries, taken as a world group, have made relatively the poorest showing in the adjustment of their defaulted bonds," said the Foreign Bondholders' Protective Council, Inc., in its most recent report. The council is a private nonprofit organization formed to protect American holders of foreign securities.

DATA ON BOND DEFAULTS

Figures showing the status of some of the bonds of Latin American countries held in the United States and the percentage of the face value of the bonds in default at the end of 1939, as reported recently in an analysis by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, follow:

	Par value	Percent in default
Argentina	$197,900,000	5.1
Bolivia	53,600,000	100.0
Brazil	273,200,000	92.2
Chile	191,590,000	74.8
Cuba	66,400,000	17.0
Costa Rica	8,000,000	100.0
Colombia	128,000,000	89.6
Guatemala	8,000,000	100.0
Panama	11,300,000	69.3
Peru	54,100,000	100.0
Salvador	4,100,000	100.0
Uruguay	35,700,000	10.4

In addition to the loss of interest, American investors have taken heavy losses in the market value of the Latin American bonds.

The Real "Fifth Columnists"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE E. GEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

ARTICLE FROM FORTUNE MAGAZINE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, since there are so many who seem to desire to conscript our manpower, without doing the same for the wealth of the country, it might be well to get a clear view of the entire picture. Not the least of the "subversive" influences in the country are the armament maker and others who hope to profit by a blood bath. Let us see what Fortune magazine has to say.

[From Fortune magazine of March 1934]

ARMS AND THE MEN—LOVE THINE ENEMY

The armorers, after all, are the true internationalists. Regardless of their nationalities, they work in concert at the two axioms of their trade—prolong wars, disturb peace. Between 1914 and 1918 they practiced constantly a neat practical way of prolonging war.

It was this: If your enemy is in danger of running short of a basic raw material that he needs in the business of destroying your troops, sell him some out of your own surplus stocks.

Such interchanges went on constantly during the war—always, of course, through a neutral intermediary. (The amenities of warfare must be observed, even at some inconvenience.) Throughout the war English and French industries maintained to Germany a steady stream of glycerin (for explosives), nickel, copper, oil, and rubber. Germany even returned the compliment: She sent France iron and steel and magnetos for gasoline engines. This constant traffic went on during the war via Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Spain, or Holland by the simple process of transshipment—enemy to neutral to enemy.

It is no bristling Communist who supplies corroboration, but as conservative and well-considered a gentleman as Rear Admiral Montagu William Warcop Peter Consett, who was British naval

attaché in Denmark between 1912 and 1917 and in Norway and Sweden between 1912 and 1919. He stated in so many words that if the "blockade" of Germany had been really effective during 1915 and 1916 Germany would have been forced to her knees long before the collapse of Russia permitted her to prolong the struggle by throwing more troops into the trenches of the western front. And it is he who is responsible for the following statement:

"In 1915 England exported twice as much nickel to Sweden as in the 2 previous years put together. Of the total imports of 504 tons, 70 were reshipped to Germany. But it can be said that the total importation served the needs of Germany, for the remaining 434 tons were used in Sweden for the manufacture of munitions."

And so it went. Germany throughout the war had urgent need of nickel, aluminum, and chemicals like glycerin for explosives. France, because the rich Briey basin and other sources were out of her control, had to scratch hard for iron and steel. Continuously, therefore, what one nation lacked the armament manufacturers of an enemy nation did their urgent best to provide. Month after month during the war German heavy industries exported an average of 150,000 tons of scrap iron, steel, or barbed wire to Switzerland, where, having been smelted to a more convenient form, it was then transshipped to France. France, in her turn, shipped chemicals to the Lonza Co. (a Swiss industrial concern, German controlled, but with directors who were French, Italian, and Austrian as well), from which they reached munitions works in Germany. It was all very profitable—and the splendid war went on and on.

THIS FRENCH GUN BELONGS TO THE FRENCH NAVY

But that does not mean that cannon merchants equip only their own armies with the tools of war. In 1899 British soldiers were shot down by British guns that British armament firms had sold to the Boers. When in 1914 the Kaiser's armies marched westward into Belgium and eastward toward Russia German soldiers were killed by German guns manned by the armies of King Albert and Czar Nicholas II. Great Britain had built and equipped the Turkish Navy before the war; in the Dardanelles British ships were blown up by British mines, shattered by British cannon. Bulgarian troops turned French 75s (the famous "Soixante-Quinze" of the Schneider-Creusot factories) on French poilus. In every naval engagement of the World War the German fleet encountered vessels protected by armor plate made by Germans or with German patents. On a village green in rural England stands a war memorial, a cannon captured by the local regiment from the Germans. On one side of the cannon are engraved the names of the English soldiers who were killed in that advance. On the other side is the manufacturer's name, the English Vickers, Ltd. The Riffs found French guns useful in mowing down French regular troops. China has been pleased to use excellent Japanese guns for the purpose of killing excellent Japanese soldiers. This friendly exchange is still in vogue. Perhaps it is only sentimental to mention it. If a man must be shot to death, what difference does it make whether his enemy or his brother forges the gun that kills him?

ARMS AND THE MEN

A primer on Europe's armament makers, their mines, their smelters, their banks, their holding companies, their ability to supply everything you need for a war from cannons to the casus belli; their axioms, which are (a) prolong war, (b) disturb peace.

According to the best accounting figures, it cost about $25,000 to kill a soldier during the World War. There is one class of big-business men in Europe that never rose up to denounce the extravagance of its governments in this regard—to point out that when death is left unhampered as an enterprise for the individual initiative of gangsters the cost of a single killing seldom exceeds $100. The reason for the silence of these big-business men is quite simple: The killing is their business * * * every time a burst shell fragment finds its way into the brain, the heart, or the intestines of a man in the front line, a great part of the $25,000, much of it profit, finds its way into the pocket of the armament maker.

French interests not only sold arms to Hungary in flat violation of the Treaty of Trianon, but when Hungary defaulted on the bill the armorers got the French Government to lend Hungary the money to pay the French armorers. Thus, too, the great Czechoslovakian armament company, controlled by Frenchmen, promoted the rise of Hitler in Germany and contributed millions of marks to Hitler's campaign. These same Frenchmen own newspapers that did more than any others to enrage France against Hitler. It is time we had a dramatis personae of arms and the men.

"NO SOLDIER WOULD START A NEW WAR!"—GEN. MAXIME WEYGAND, OF FRANCE

Germany, forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles to import armaments, receives generous supplies from Sweden (where Krupp controls the armament firm of Bofors) and Holland. Forbidden to export armaments, she ships to South Africa, the Far East, or to any European nation that will violate its own treaty by ordering from her. Yet for all the might of the Krupp works, we must look elsewhere today to find the real heart of the armament business.

BETHLEHEM STEEL ET AL.

To the United States, perhaps? After all, we have our Du Ponts, who at least own the State of Delaware. We have an Army and Navy whose officers, according to the statement of a former Cabinet officer, are far and away more active than the officers of any other armed forces in the world against any sort of international understanding. We have an armament bill of over $200,000,000 a year. We once had our (when we say armaments we mean here, and hereafter, only the actual implements and materials of war—cannon, guns, ammunition, tanks, military aircraft, and naval vessels) "big bass drum," Mr. William B. Shearer, whose boast was that he wrecked the Naval Conference at Geneva in 1927. We have our Midvale Co. (controlled by the Baldwin Locomotive Works), which prospered mightily during the war and has continued the manufacture of guns and gun forgings, armor plate, and projectiles; our Colt's Patent Firearms Manufacturing Co., which supplies machine guns as well as squirrel rifles, which declared an extra dividend in 1933; our Remington Arms Co. (controlled by Du Pont), whose output of firearms and ammunition together is one-third of United States production. And we have our Bethlehem Steel Co.

Bethlehem's Mr. Charles M. Schwab dismayed the cadets of West Point in 1927 by saying: "Today the Bethlehem Steel Co. has definitely abandoned any thought of ever again engaging in the manufacture of ordnance except in times of great national emergency." Such times are apparently with us now—have, in fact, been continually with us since Mr. Schwab unloosed this shaft of oratory. In the official listing of Bethlehem's products (you need only turn to standard statistics or Bethlehem's own most recent annual report) you will find armor plate, projectiles, gun and shell forgings, battleships, battle cruisers, scout cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and airplane carriers all listed as products of Bethlehem's plants. The site at Bethlehem where cannon and armor plate are made is separate from the rest of the plant. No outsiders are allowed. * * *

Our own country is not, then, quite so virginally innocent in this business as we might like to suppose. But despite the size of our armament bill, our armament and munitions exports to South and Central America, and the Far East, we are essentially small fry in this game.

ENGLAND'S VICKERS-ARMSTRONG

Much larger fry is England, where the firm of Vickers-Armstrong is the brightest star in the armament firmament. The annual bills of Vickers-Armstrong to nations for armaments purchased quite possibly amount to $100,000,000.

The sun never sets upon Vickers. It has its factories in Rumania where, for greater convenience, Sir Herbert Lawrence is a director of the Bank of Rumania (and Vickers to some degree allies itself with the Czechoslovakian armament firm of Skoda). In Italy it latinizes its name to Societa Vickers-Terni; in Japan it has as a subsidiary the Japan Steel Works, and thus allies itself with the Japanese armament and industrial firm of Mitsui. There are Vickers factories or subsidiary companies in Spain, Canada, Ireland, Holland (The Hague affords an appropriate site for some of the Vickers operations), and New Zealand.

Vickers directors are men of wide affairs. Sir Herbert Lawrence, besides being a director of the Bank of Rumania, is also a director of the Sun Insurance Office, Ltd., with which Vickers-Armstrong has a curious agreement that "if the profits (of Vickers) in any year during the 5 years ending December 31, 1932, do not amount to £900,000, then a contribution not exceeding £200,000 will be made in each year." Sir Otto Niemeyer, the infant phenomenon of British finance, who first entered His Majesty's Treasury at the age of 23, is another Vickers director; he is, in addition, an officer of the Bank of England, a director of the Anglo-International Bank and the Bank of International Settlements.

Among the more prominent shareholders of Vickers or allied concerns in 1932 were: Rt. Hon. Neville Chamberlain, Chancelor of the Exchequer; Sir Austen Chamberlain, Member of Parliament, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1925. * * * In 1914 the list was even more imposing. It included that lofty philosopher, Lord Balfour; that glittering snob, Lord Curzon; and also Lord Kinnaird (president of the Y. M. C. A.), three bishops, and Dean Inge of St. Paul's. It was in that same year that Socialist Philip Snowden spoke in Parliament: "It would be impossible to throw a stone on the benches opposite without hitting a member who is a shareholder in one or other of these firms."

The American that gladdened his heart was Hiram Maxim, whose new machine gun was incomparably the best killing machine Zaharoff had ever seen. * * * The Boer War added to his laurels; Boers shot Englishmen with Vickers guns and ammunition. The Russo-Japan War provided him with an even wider field for his gifts; Vickers sold as much war material (and possibly more) to Russia as it did to Japan, England's supposed ally.

SCHNEIDER-CREUSOT

France stands at the very top. She stands at the top in the amount her Government spends on armaments; at the top in the amount of arms she exports to other nations; at the top also by virtue of the billion francs she has spent to build a military Chinese wall of forts, many of them underground, along her eastern boundaries. But these mere quantitative details do not reveal the true significance of her position.

She stands today as a queer paradox: France, the democracy, a quiet pasture land for the world's famous peasantry, coexisting with France, the greatest military power of modern times, with an army which all but equals in number, and far surpasses in equipment, Germany's vast militaristic machine of 1914.

The French threat to the peace of the world lies elsewhere—in France. For in France, and only in France, a new situation exists; the armament makers are no longer, like Alfred Krupp or Sir Basil Zaharoff in his younger days, humble petitioners of government, hat-in-hand solicitors of orders—their influence is so infiltrated into the industrial, social, and political affairs of the nation that they have power in some ways beyond the state; a power so mighty that they are all but able, for their own individualistic reasons, to sweep the state along in a course of action against its own will. They are all but anonymous, these men. They are displeased by publicity and are well able to enforce their displeasure.

But we must now displease one of them and present the figure of M. Charles Prosper Eugene Schneider.

Charles Prosper Eugene Schneider is a man of many offices—the executive head of hundreds of armament firms throughout Europe. He is the president of the Schneider-Creusot Co., armament manufacturers with mines, smelters, and foundries scattered throughout France. He is director of the Banque de l'Union Parisienne, one of whose most profitable sources of business is the financing of loans for armaments.

François de Wendel comes legitimately by his present power and position; his family have been Europe's armorers since before the French Revolution, although the De Wendels have not always been French, not even always the De Wendels. There was once a Johann Georg von Wendel, who, in the seventeenth century, was a colonel in the armies of Ferdinand III, of Germany.

The tragedy of Waterloo was no tragedy to the De Wendels; a cartoon of them going home after the battle to count their profit from it would not have been far-fetched.

They are conspirators because they have no loyalties, because theirs is the sword that knows no brother.

In Germany the greatest steel company is the Vereinigte Stahlwerke A. G., and for its head it has Fritz Thyssen. * * * It was Thyssen who was Hitler's angel.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

One of the first public men to comment on Arms and the Men in Fortune's March issue was Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University and president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Here is an excerpt from an interview with him as published in the New York Herald Tribune for March 4, 1934:

"But the thing which will make the greatest sensation since the World War is the exposure in the March issue of Fortune of the interlocking of the armament industries, in which the German manufacturers sold to the Frenchmen guns and ammunition to kill the German and the French munition men sold to the Germans munitions to kill Frenchmen. I doubt that this material will be published abroad. The reason is that the munition men control the European press. If that article were published in either France or Germany it would cause a tremendous reaction, but I expect that it will not be printed. Great Britain did not sell guns and ammunition to the enemies of England."

Unfortunately, if Dr. Butler is quoted correctly he has, in his last statement, come into collision with facts. For 18 years has stood unchallenged the charge of British Rear Admiral Montagu W. W. P. Consett that British manufacturers during the war conducted a profitable trade with Germany in nickel and other war materials through the intermediary of one or another convenient neutral.

LONDON, March 26.—The direct question whether munitions turned out by Vickers, Ltd., great British armaments firm, were secretly being used for the rearmament of Germany and Austria was put at the annual meeting of Vickers shareholders here today.

Gen. Sir Herbert A. Lawrence, chairman of the firm, replied that he could not give any assurance in definite terms, but pointed out that exports of armaments from Great Britain were strictly limited to shipments approved by the Government, and said nothing was done without the complete sanction and approval of the Government.

Miss Eleanor Rathbone, independent member for the English universities of the House of Commons, questioned the chairman as to advertisements of tanks and other armaments circulated by the firm in German newspapers.

The explanation, as already given, said the chairman, was that the English press was not well represented in South American countries where Vickers had many old clients for shipbuilding and armaments, but that many German newspapers circulated there; consequently, they felt the best way to get in touch with many interests in South America was through advertisements in German papers which circulated there.

One other criticism made perhaps by a dozen readers is epitomized by George Seldes:

I notice you speak only of the "sinister business going on in Europe." I have been gathering material for 10 years on this subject and will publish it shortly. You may be surprised how much of this sinister business has always been and still is (I say regretfully) American.

Our Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1940

TEXT OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the President's message to the National Foreign Trade Convention at San Francisco, as quoted by the New York Times, July 31, 1940:

[From the New York Times of July 31, 1940]

It is a great pleasure to offer my warm greetings to the delegates assembled for the Twenty-seventh National Foreign Trade Convention at San Francisco. I am confident that your deliberations, which are characteristic of our democracy at work, will contribute substantially to the successful solution of your common problems—problems which are today of grave concern to the entire Nation.

Producers and workers in our export industries, both agricultural and industrial; consumers of imported products; foreign traders; banks, insurance and shipping companies; all of the millions of our people who have a vital stake in the Nation's foreign trade, realize the seriousness and the difficulty of the problems confronting us in this field today. You are all aware of the dislocations suffered by our foreign trade as a result of armed conflict in other parts of the world. Established trade channels have been disrupted, our exports of many important products, particularly agricultural, have been severely curtailed, our trade with virtually the entire European continent has dwindled to a small fraction of its former volume, and the weakening of the international economic structure has necessitated the imposition by many countries of even more drastic trade-control measures than existed before the war.

Nevertheless, the substantial progress made during the past 6 years in our efforts to maintain trade between free nations, on the basis of the liberal and democratic principles which underlie our trade-agreement program, has not by any means been lost. In order to safeguard the progress made thus far, and to meet any external threat to our economic security, we must redouble our efforts to bring about, by every practicable means, the closest possible economic cooperation with other countries, particularly with those in the Western Hemisphere. It is my profound conviction that such a vigorous program of economic defense is an essential part of our national-defense program.

It has been suggested or implied by a few faint-hearted defeatists in recent weeks that we should abandon our efforts to conduct our foreign trade on the basis of liberal and democratic principles. The logic of such implications, if they be true, would lead us to embark upon a course of action which would subject our producers, consumers, and foreign traders, and ultimately the entire Nation, to the regimentation of a totalitarian system. For it is naive to imagine that we could adopt a totalitarian control of our foreign trade and at the same time escape totalitarian regimentation of our internal economy. I, therefore, reject any implication that we have been defeated in our efforts to maintain liberal trade principles and, to the end that our continued efforts to maintain those principles may be crowned with lasting success, I pledge you the whole-hearted cooperation of your Government.

An American Principle Wrecked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WILLIAMSPORT (PA.) SUN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the Williamsport Sun, Williamsport, Pa., showing how President Roosevelt has wrecked an American principle of vital importance to the preservation of the Republic and the only way the American people can recover and reestablish that principle is by the smashing defeat of Mr. Roosevelt:

AN AMERICAN PRINCIPLE WRECKED

We are writing this editorial long hours before Mr. Roosevelt is scheduled to complete the "draft" farce with an address to the Democratic Convention.

For all that matters, with the exception of bringing one or two items up to the minute, it could have been prepared months ago. The facts in it have long been obvious, but we American people are a funny lot.

Even in the face of contrary circumstances we still hope on and on. We have so great confidence in and respect for those who occupy our highest offices it is difficult for us to accept the final truth that they are capable of any other than the most sincere acts with complete conformance to the justice and propriety of the occasion.

Hence, we continued to cling to the hope that respect for American tradition and justice to those who have been loyal to man and party at the cost of much personal sacrifice would bring an honorable ending to the Chicago convention.

Like many, many other persons we have been reading columnists and listening to commentators. Those who have been critical, we

thought might be suffering from partisan or personal prejudice and that in the long run the outcome would upset their dope and prove they had misread happenings and developments.

'Tis true that we could not close our ears securely to the echo of rumblings of the unsuccessful efforts at purging that have marked previous campaigns in which the present administration figured.

We could not escape the reverberations of the blasting of other Presidential candidates during the past months. Nor could we banish entirely the sight of the smearing of other aspirants, nor get altogether away from the sickening sound of the blows the group of ambition killers rained upon the heads of these aspirants whenever they stuck them above the crowd.

All this flowed and ebbed in memory, but still we hoped that tradition and fairness would win out.

Of course, there was always the ominous silence. No break occurred in it, even when sincere, honorably ambitious men went up the steps of the White House with requests for information and guidance. Their hands cupped behind their ears intercepted no sound waves.

Then, a palace guardsman, one who had been making his home at the White House, left for Chicago. Could he have the answer to the riddle? Would some act or word of his set straight the unique situation?

Would he utter the message the Nation wanted to hear—that precious American tradition, tradition established and continued at the patriotic sacrifice of great Americans' hopes and ambitions, would be adhered to?

Would he convince us that, after all, we were unfair and needlessly perturbed over the hovering apprehension that unholy things were going on behind the back of the public?

But no, his first acts were to set up a telephone line in direct communication with the White House and to hang out a shingle indicating that he was in Chicago to make good all the plans and plots of the third termers.

Still, we hoped.

Then came the momentous statement of Tuesday night. Hope gasped and passed out before the Kentucky Senator was half through his announcement.

The American people do not mind being fooled occasionally, and they like to be kidded, but they resent insult, and especially insult to their intelligence. That's what, we find, has happened to us. We're expected to believe that all this "draft" movement has been the natural, spontaneous demand of the people, when, now through it all, we can see and recognize the hands that engineered the manipulation.

Today we are disillusioned; we are hurt; our hearts ache with sadness. The wool is removed from our eyes and they betray tears over discovery of political trickery in high places.

We have a bit of the reaction of concern, even fear. If good and understanding people such as those who make up the State and county leadership of the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, and who thereby furnish delegates to national conventions, have been misled by their chieftains, what of the future of the Republic?

On some sides you can hear expressions of jubilation that Mr. Roosevelt has broken a tradition. He hasn't broken a tradition, he's wrecked an American principle of vital importance to the preservation of the Republic, and the only way the American people can recover and reestablish that principle is by the smashing defeat of Mr. Roosevelt.

The Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. L. MARSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Cleveland Plain Dealer expressing the attitude of Rabbi A. H. Silver on the third-term question.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 1, 1940]

"NO THIRD TERM" URGED BY SILVER—TRADITION OF ROTATION IS SOUND RABBI SAYS

President Roosevelt ought not to stand for election for a third term, in the opinion of Rabbi A. H. Silver, expressed in an address before a capacity audience at the temple yesterday morning.

"The tradition of rotation and restricted tenure of office is a sound one," Rabbi Silver asserted. "With this salutary tradition we have come a century and a half through many crises, some of which, in my opinion, were graver than that of today. The whole genius of American political life is against the one-man savior. The philosophy of dictatorship is the very antithesis of the philosophy of democracy. The strength of democracy is not its faith in the man, but in the people.

"It is not a law but a tradition there should be rotation in the office of Chief Executive every 4 or 8 years. In this case the tradition or custom is more powerful than a law.

SHOULD DEMONSTRATE FAITH

"The real question over the third term for President Roosevelt is whether the times are so desperate as to warrant a break from tradition, and I, for one, say 'No.'

"At this time I think it is particularly desirable that a President should demonstrate his faith in democracy by voluntarily relinquishing office. To insist on the reelection of a President on the ground that he is the sole leader who can save the people is to acknowledge publicly the bankruptcy of democracy. It is preferable in this case to elect an apparently less qualified candidate with the hope that the office will develop his powers, just as the responsibilities of office developed President Roosevelt.

"Renomination of President Roosevelt will obscure the issue in the forthcoming election, relieving the Republican Party of the responsibility in showing what it proposes to do about the real problems of the country. The issue would be fought over the cry of 'Roosevelt the would-be dictator,' and otherwise nothing would be decided by the election.

PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE

"No matter what party is elected, we must remember that substantial progress was registered under President Roosevelt and that that progress must be continued if chaos is to be averted. Whoever succeeds President Roosevelt will have to follow him in solving our problems from the bottom up, not the top down, in terms of the masses and not of the classes, and with primary concern for the laborer, the farmer, and the boy seeking a job, rather than for the corporations.

"No mere negation of the New Deal is adequate to meet the present situation. If there is to be a new party it must show how it will deal with the problems of unemployment, the Dust Bowl, the regions where the Grapes of Wrath are stored, wages and hours, labor relations, social and old-age security and Federal relief. It is well to talk about balancing the Budget, and how is it to be balanced? It is desirable that taxes should be reduced, but at whose expense? To specific problems, specific concrete answers must be given."

"Fifth Column" Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWT V. MILLS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, of course I shall support every national-defense bill. We have been a long time realizing that this Nation is not adequately prepared, and we cannot hope to, within a few short days after this realization has dawned on us, complete legislation which will completely meet the demands of national defense as we see it today.

We have only touched the surface when we pass a bill authorizing an expansion of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. If we do that, then smugly tell our folks that we have done a great job, we will have missed the point a long way. There is much to be done, and I believe this Congress should stay in session until an adequate national-defense program has been completed.

Hitler has bragged publicly that he was able to do the speedy and devastating job he has done in Europe largely by reason of the operation of what he chooses to call the "fifth column" in the countries of Europe. Anyone who thinks that there are no subversive activities going on in the United States today is one who refuses to face the facts. At the moment the Federal Bureau of Investigation has only a force of approximately 1,000 men to stamp out Communist, Fascist, Nazi, and other subversive activities in the United States among 130,000,000 people.

I propose to introduce legislation to correct this, as I hold the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be authorized to employ a sufficient number of men to protect the people of the United States against "fifth column" and all subversive activities.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be derelict in our duty if we do not, before this Congress adjourns, provide an authorization and funds to be placed in the hands of one of the

greatest men in his specialized line that this Nation has ever seen—J. Edgar Hoover—to combat the "fifth column" movement in the United States.

I want to tell you that the time is here when we of this body had better begin to give a little concern to the cankerous infection within the vitals of this Government, which is being nurtured and fed by those of foreign birth who advocate European "isms" as a substitute for our form of government.

We have gone far enough in our smug complacency in furnishing police protection to Communists, Fascists, and members of the German Bund, as they in the public square and in public places openly advocate the overthrow of this, the greatest Government in the world.

Now is the time when we should begin to think seriously about this thing which has grown up in our Government and which is among us and which, day after day, proposes the overthrow of this Government.

I am advised that we have many people on the Federal pay roll in the Nation's Capital here in Washington who glibly admit that they are connected with either the Communist, Fascist, or German Bund parties. If this be the case, surely the executive heads of our various governmental agencies will have the intestinal fortitude, if in the past they have been so lacking in American patriotism that they have failed to do so heretofore, to discharge these traitors from the Federal pay roll.

Compulsory Military Training Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

RESOLUTION BY RALPH D. COLE POST, NO. 3, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Ralph D. Cole Post, No. 3, of the American Legion at Findlay, Ohio, opposing the Burke-Wadsworth compulsory military training bill. This resolution was adopted at their last meeting held July 29, 1940, and forwarded to me by the adjutant of that post, Mr. W. Earl Ulrich.

Whereas the Burke-Wadsworth bill (compulsory conscription) is now pending before the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the members of the American Legion have always been willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States in cases of emergency and still are willing to serve; and

Whereas the members of the American Legion believe in compulsory conscription when an emergency and the interest of our defense require it to assure the best possible defense for the welfare of our people; and

Whereas the members of the Ralph D. Cole Post, No. 3, of the American Legion of Findlay, Ohio, deem the aforesaid Burke-Wadsworth bill to be premature and not now necessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the said Ralph D. Cole Post, No. 3, of the American Legion oppose the said Burke-Wadsworth bill for the following reasons:

1. It provides for the drafting of 400,000 men by October 1, 1940, despite the fact that it has been thoroughly established by competent testimony of Army and Navy officials that these men so drafted will not have adequate camp and uniform facilities, and there is not and cannot be available at that date or soon thereafter the necessary modern equipment to train them.

2. It provides for the drafting of 1,500,000 men within a span of 18 months from October of 1940, without reasonable assurance of the necessary equipment to train them or adequate camp facilities to house them.

3. The passage of this act would create war hysteria and would divert attention from the all-important task of producing the necessary mechanized equipment of modern warfare, and interrupt the smooth and efficient functioning of our production of war materials and supplies.

4. Compulsory conscription should be resorted to only after voluntary enlistment has been demonstrated to be inadequate, and when all of the equipment and facilities necessary for the proper training of those conscripted are available for their immediate use.

5. The bill vests too much authority in the appointees of the President of the United States in its administration, regardless of the political party in power. Compulsory conscription, if adopted, should be removed from politics and should be administered by an independent, nonpartisan board and responsible only to Congress—the elected representatives of the people; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be given to the press and that true copies thereof be sent by the adjutant of this post to Senators VIC DONAHEY, ROBERT A. TAFT, and Congressman FREDERICK C. SMITH of Ohio.

Barriers to Plane Production Must Be Understood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to reprint herewith an editorial which appeared in this morning's Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and which is most timely.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 31, 1940]

BARRIERS TO PLANE PRODUCTION MUST BE UNDERSTOOD

Once again the little word of caution lest exuberance outrun capacity, for which we are indebted to Mr. Knudsen of the National Advisory Defense Commission. In the month of August the schedule of airplane production calls for 895 completed combat and large transport planes, of which 396 will go to the Army and Navy, 236 to the British Government, 84 to other governments, and 174 transports will go into commercial use.

Last week Lord Beaverbrook, British minister for aviation production, broadcast to the English people that the United States would approve a production plan to supply 3,000 planes a month for British war use. Secretary Morgenthau confirmed this, adding that the United States had pledged "every facility" to enable British purchase of 3,000 planes monthly.

There can be no question as to American willingness to supply this number, or any number of planes desired by England. Unfortunately, willingness is not enough. Plants and equipment and skilled mechanics also are needed to build 36,000 more planes annually for export to Britain. Mr. Knudsen, assembling these facts, asserts that England could not expect deliveries under this schedule of new production until late in 1941, or even in 1942.

It is wisest now that we neither fool ourselves nor mislead our friends. There is a great deal of difference between approving a production plan and putting it in operation. Because of misunderstanding as to what this country could supply immediately in the shape of war materials, we have incurred a degree of ill will on the part of many French people who expected more than they received. They had been led to such expectation by unwarranted belief that United States production could be geared swiftly to their needs. That ill will must not be duplicated in Britain because of confusion between "on order" and "on hand." With all the goodwill in the world, the United States cannot send 3,000 planes to England monthly when total production for August is scheduled at 895.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a brief trip through the district which I represent in northern Michigan. I found in parts of that district many people who, because of their friendship for and dealings with Canadians, naturally have a great deal of interest in this important question of supplying aid to Great Britain and its colonies. Throughout the entire district I found my constituents genuinely concerned about our own pitiful state of unpreparedness and particularly our lack of aircraft. These people have been led to believe by false propaganda that it is a simple matter to tool the vast manufacturing resources of this country for the immediate expansion of our armament program and particularly the production of aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know that it cannot be done without upsetting our normal economy, and more particularly it cannot be done until we cut the red tape. Let us stop kidding the people and let us stop kidding Canada and Great Britain.

Yesterday your New Deal leadership forced us to vote $25,000,000 as the initial expenditure of a $65,000,000 program

to furnish power in the Tennessee Valley for the manufacture of this aluminum that has to go in these planes. Doubtless some of the people think it was a patriotic act. But what you do not make public is the engineers' testimony to the effect that a steam generating plant of comparable capacity could have been built for $18,000,000 within a year, whereas your hydro plant cannot be completed before the summer of 1942 and then can go into production only when, as, and if there is a spring flood in 1943.

Mr. Speaker, again I ask this question: What crimes will be committed with the taxpayer's pocketbook under the guise of national defense?

Undesirable or Dangerous Aliens—How Shall Congress Deal With Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there are between three and four million aliens now in the United States. Assuming that a large majority of our aliens are peaceful, law-abiding persons who appreciate America and contribute to its upbuilding, yet there are many who are not desirable, either as residents or as citizens, and some who are actually a menace and should be properly dealt with for our national security. The Congress has, within certain constitutional limitations, full and adequate power to deal properly with this class of persons. No constitutional amendment is required to enable Congress to meet the present situation. I maintain that the Government of the United States has plenary power to deal with undesirable aliens, and I demand that they be properly dealt with as a matter of national security. I have worked toward this end in 10 or a dozen instances, but I have not asked for an unnecessary or undesirable constitutional amendment for the purpose. What should be done?

Two courses of legislative action have been begun toward undesirable aliens. One of these is a right method and the other a wrong method. One method is wise, constitutional, and very likely to be effective. The other is exceedingly unwise, unconstitutional, and very probably will be ineffective. The right method was begun several months ago, before this World War started, and has proceeded slowly—too slowly perhaps—because of red tape and the natural cumbersomeness of governmental action. The wrong method grew out of a mixture of motives, encouraged by hysteria and perhaps an honest rebellion against red tape; but it is a rash attempt to short circuit the process and attain a certain objective no matter what it costs America later. This method is like "cutting off the nose to spite the face," or "burning the home to kill a cockroach."

The right method defines undesirable aliens so all may know, and provides for their trial and deportation. It violates no treaty provisions with other governments regarding nationals residing here; it does no violence to constitutional principles which our fathers set up to safeguard personal rights—that is, the personal rights of Americans—and it depends only upon enforcement to be effective. On June 28 the President signed a bill—not the Bridges bill, for it hasn't passed the Senate—but the Smith bill which embodies a right way of dealing with undesirable aliens. Recently the President and Congress transferred jurisdiction over aliens from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice. Our laws have been too lax, and possibly too laxly enforced, but now with the F. B. I. and Department of Justice on the job, and with the proper legislation, we may expect certain undesirable aliens deported. This new method, part of which is already law, and for all of which I voted, will probably deport Harry Bridges and do it in a constitutional manner.

The wrong method was begun on Harry Bridges by rushing through the House on June 13 a bill of attainder which ordered the Attorney General to disregard all other provisions of law and to take Bridges into custody and deport him forthwith. That bill charged no crime, furnished no hearing, permitted no trial, and is the first of its kind ever passed by either House of the American Congress. It is very probable that this individual deportation bill for Bridges will never be effective, for it is not likely ever to become a law, or to be upheld as a law if passed as is by both Houses. It ought not become law, for it is very, very unwise, as well as unconstitutional, because it sets up a dangerous precedent, which, if allowed to stand, would soon be applied to other persons, citizens as well as aliens, and more extreme treatment than deportation. To start something in America like the Allen-Van Zandt bill, which passed the House June 13, to get rid of Harry Bridges would jeopardize us and our children for untold generations and is too great a price for us to pay to get rid of Harry Bridges, irrespective of how undesirable he may be, or any person.

Let us do a thing the right way and not a wrong way which might at first seem all right to some. On June 13 I voted to consider the Allen bill to deport Bridges, hoping to amend it and make it general in its terms and thus constitutional. Let the country be safeguarded from Harry Bridges and Heaven knows how many others in the right way, by well-considered legislation. Thank Heaven, such legislation has been pending for more than a year and a part of it is now law. I think it will be effective.

IF FOLKS ONLY KNEW THAT "THINGS ARE NOT ALWAYS WHAT THEY SEEM"

Would you approve of a nurse putting a nipple on a well-filled bottle and placing it in the crib in the nursery? Well, yes; that seems all right—but certainly not if that bottle is filled with nitroglycerin!

The Third Term—Unwarranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a government is no stronger than its leadership. Ever since the days af Aristotle men have been debating the relative merits of the many governmental systems which he so thoroughly analyzed. They have discussed the values of aristocracies, democracies, oligarchies, and tyrannies. Some have accepted the conclusion to which Aristotle was driven, that each form of government contains within itself forces which will ultimately destroy it. Others have insisted that the philosopher was unjustified, and arguing that for forms of government only fools contest. "That form of government is best which governs best."

Whatever may be the merits of this abstract theorizing we in America know that our system of government has functioned effectively because men have learned to respect and to follow the Nation's leadership. The Presidency of the United States has become a position warranting the Nation's utmost confidence because the men who have occupied the office have placed the Nation above themselves. They have looked upon the White House as a solemn trust to be tended carefully and to be turned over to their successors unimpaired. Even in the midst of the cares of their own office they have found time to discuss its implications and to offer rules of conduct to guide those who follow them.

There has never been a time in the history of our country when any man felt that he was greater than the Presidential chair he occupied. From Washington through Herbert Hoover every President of the United States has yielded to the tradition established in the beginning of our Republic, preventing every effort to win three consecutive terms in the

White House. This precedent is defied today. Franklin D. Roosevelt believes that 8 years are not sufficient to carry out his plan "to make America over." He believes that an emergency of such pressing proportions faces this Nation that it demands his personal presence as supervisor of arrangements.

There is no reason in the nature of things to make us believe that Mr. Roosevelt's ambitious plans for this Nation can be achieved in 12 years any more than they were achieved in the last 8. We have reason to believe that Mr. Roosevelt looks upon America as a never-ending problem. Each new partial solution suggests a dozen necessary additional steps. One program leads invariably to another, so that we shall never know when the task set by Mr. Roosevelt has been accomplished. It may take 12 years; it may take 16 years; it may take 20 years. And if we are to continue Mr. Roosevelt in office for a third term, there is no logical reason in the nature of things why he should not remain in office indefinitely in the future.

There is no man alive who believes that all of America's problems can be solved through the simple device of continuing Mr. Roosevelt in office. Our problems are too complex for any one man. If we fall into the fatal error of believing that our President is the only man who can begin to meet these problems, we shall be denying the lesson of all our history. Since the days of the colonists, one new difficulty after another has been confronted and solved by our people. They will continue to be solved without Mr. Roosevelt's presence.

But argument against a third term presents other considerations. Mr. Roosevelt should not be regarded as indispensable. He is not the only leader in our country capable of charting a path through the wilderness. In both great political parties there are many men capable of demonstrating the genius of America.

We should bear in mind the circumstances in which we find ourselves in 1940. Throughout the world, democracy, the right of the people to choose their own leadership, is being relentlessly assailed. We in America have always been proud of the principle of rotation in office. We point to those nations which salute their leaders for 15 or 20 years as illustrations of the surrender of human liberties. Shall we confess in this hour when democracy is on trial, that we too are relying upon one man?

Thomas Jefferson expressed the view that our Constitution itself should limit the term of office for which a President should be eligible. He believed that perpetual reeligibility might one day result in life tenure, and at the end of his second term as President of the United States he declared:

> I should unwillingly be the first person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office.

To the people of this country Jefferson declared 20 years later:

> Should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views.

Andrew Jackson might well have been able to break the third-term tradition. He refused. When Gen. Ulysses S. Grant sought a third term, the Republican Party refused to grant him nomination in 1880. When Theodore Roosevelt sought to serve beyond the 8-year limit, the people of the United States rejected him.

We have seen the results of third-term discussion. We know full well that in dictatorship-led countries, the reelection of our President for three terms will give added point to their argument that democratic government is collapsing. It is a sad condition when a nation which subscribes to universal education declares that only one man is able to do its hardest job over a period of 12 years.

Let us tell the world these things:

First. The third-term tradition has served to check any tendency toward a dictatorship in our country. It will continue to do so.

Second. It has discouraged the use of politics and patronage as a means of indefinite continuation in office.

Third. It has given every American the feeling that some day he or his children may prove worthy of the Presidency, since no man may monopolize it.

Fourth. It has prevented Presidents from paying so much attention to the quest for popularity in the hope of constant reelection that they endanger the course of national policy.

In this Nation, let the people speak. Let them decide for themselves who the President of the United States shall be. Let there never come a day when the President becomes so sacrosanct he perpetuates himself in office beyond 8 years of steady usefulness.

We need no third term in 1940.

So long as America lives, we shall never need it.

Propaganda of the Committee to Defend America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, this country is today being flooded with a mass of propaganda in the papers, over the radio, and in special printed pamphlets which has for its purpose the involvement of the United States in war, either with Germany or Japan.

Members of Congress are the recipients of the bulk of this propaganda, and within the past few days I have received some pamphlets issued by a committee which calls itself the Committee to Defend America, a deceptive title, for it is quite evident that the purpose of this committee is to involve the United States in war on the side of Great Britain. These pamphlets are printed in glaring red and black scareheads, so that they will not fail to attract attention. I do not know whether the red is supposed to represent blood or communism, perhaps both, because bloodshed goes hand in hand with communism.

It is my candid opinion that should Congress investigate this committee it will be found that the Committee to Defend America is not what the name implies, but is, instead, a rabid prointernational and pro-English organization, the purpose of which is to stampede this Nation into war. This committee is not concerned with the safety of America. It is not concerned with the welfare of our people, for if the members of the committee had such interest at heart they would not try to promote a war that could only end in disaster to us, as well as to the nations now engaged in combat.

The contents of these pamphlets are an insult to Congress and one of the best reasons for defeating conscription and the attempt to call the National Guard into active service. There is no need for conscription nor for calling out the National Guard, and there is no need to augment the already immense appropriations, for the money cannot be expended in a useful and sensible manner. Members of Congress should get their feet on the ground and prepare to take charge of the Government instead of leaving its administration in the hands of alien-minded crackpots. Members of Congress must realize that we are heading into a revolution at home, under the excuse of which the Executive will attempt to establish himself in power, as have the dictators of South American republics, namely, by military force. War would give him the power to establish a dictatorship, but our people are not disposed to engage in war for Roosevelt or anyone else.

The next step is internal strife, promoted as it was in Russia by Lenin and Trotsky. Should such revolution take place under the leadership of the Communists who are now well placed in all Federal departments, the President will use it for an excuse to call upon Congress to declare a greater

emergency. That would be to establish a one-man control, for who else will be the dictator except the Chief of the Army and Navy? This, however, will not solve the problem, because it is my firm conviction that the Army and Navy will not go along with such plan. As a matter of fact, the Army and Navy should not go along with such plan, because the officers in both services have obligated themselves to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and not the delusionary ideas held by the Chief Executive and his internationalistic advisers.

The two pamphlets which I have obtained permission to insert in the RECORD are vivid examples of false, subsidized propaganda, to confuse the people and lead our Nation into war. This propaganda is issued by people who are alien-minded and dupes of foreign governments; and I am even willing to believe that it is written by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, of New York, a league which has preached hatred, enmity and boycott since 1933, when it was organized by the late Samuel Untermyer.

PRIMER OF AMERICAN DEFENSE

COMMITTEE TO DEFEND AMERICA,
45 Devonshire St., Boston, Mass.:

Keep this copy moving. Pass it along. Don't destroy it. Additional copies $2.50 per hundred obtainable at committee headquarters. Contributions—any amount will help to carry on this work. Make checks payable to Allan Forbes, treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, if this is a primer of American defense, we are already considered a British colony by the Committee to Defend America, and the dream of Andrew Carnegie and Cecil Rhodes has already come to pass. I am, however, of the opinion that Americans with our country's interest at heart will think otherwise.

The first thing an invader must have is bases from which to operate. Are there any such bases available to the Nazis on this side of the Atlantic?

There are no bases available for any foreign power on this side of the Atlantic, if such bases have been relinquished by their present owners. It is our duty, in the interest of our own defense to occupy the present French and Dutch possessions in the Caribbean and north from the Guianas.

Yes. Now that Germany controls the French Government, she also may control the French islands of St. Martin, Martinique, and Guadaloupe, * * * within 5 hours' flight of the Panama Canal, * * * and the island of St. Pierre, * * * an ideal submarine base, * * * but—

This question has already been answered, yet to emphasize my statement, let me say that we should occupy these islands, including French Guiana and Devils Island, in order to consolidate North America and provide for its security—

is Germany in a position to make use of these bases so close to us? No; because * * *.

The answer given by the committee to this question is partly correct, for Germany is in no position to take possession or occupy any islands in the Caribbean or the Guianas. It is also the very best reason why we should establish bases in the Philippines and in the island of Guam, so that we will not find ourselves in the same position in which Germany is today, namely, without bases for naval and commercial operations.

Germany does not control the sea. * * * She has no lines of communication to these western bases. Why doesn't Germany control the sea? Because of * * *.

Neither Germany, Great Britain, nor any other power has inherent right to control the ocean trade routes. Such routes should, instead, be open to all nations, and will, if left open, provide a more friendly feeling and equitable justice to all. The German Navy has been insignificant, because her interests have been directed in establishing commercial relationship with foreign nations, instead of naval domination and commercial dictatorship, as is the policy of Great Britain.

The British Fleet. As long as the British Fleet defends the Atlantic * * * we are in no immediate danger. Why doesn't our fleet control the Atlantic? Because * * *.

The conclusions drawn in this statement are erroneous, because Russia and Germany have never been able to maintain a fleet, as they lack port facilities for naval operations. Both countries have been successfully blockaded by the British Navy which in itself is unjust and responsible for European ill feeling toward England. Great Britain has never been of any aid to the United States.

The British Navy burned our undefended shore towns in 1776–83, 1812–14, tacitly assisted the rebellion against the United States, 1860–64 gave Napoleon III the green light to transport a large French army and his puppet Maximilian across the Atlantic to Mexico. Britain took advantage of the situation to turn the self-governing community of British Honduras into an empire colony, threatened Venezuela in 1887 and again in 1895–99. Can we be any more sure about England than England was about France. Politicians and admirals are being arrested in England, too. Upton Close in Common Sense for Americans, Living Age, August 1940. (Sargent bulletin, July 29, 1940.)

Our fleet is not large enough to defend us in both the Pacific and the Atlantic. What can we do about this? We must—

This statement is correct for our fleet is not large enough to defend us in the Atlantic and Pacific because we have only one fleet built and maintained. We are now consigned to build two fleets, a policy which I venture to predict will be sabotaged by our politicians. The answer, however, is not what this committee would have us believe, but is to provide for our own defenses so we will not have to depend on England or any other foreign power—

help the Allied fleets so that they will continue to defend the Atlantic, at least until we are ready to defend ourselves. If the British Fleet goes under, Germany will also get the British naval bases, which are still nearer our shores. Then we would be even more dangerously threatened. What can we do?

To help the British—not the Allies—so that they can "continue to defend the Atlantic" simply means to make a vassal state of us and place our Navy in a subservient position to the British Fleet. In other words, we leave ourselves hanging on the coattails of John Bull.

Why not build a navy of our own, a navy sufficiently powerful to protect our colonies and our Atlantic and Pacific coast lines? If the British Navy goes under, our Navy will then be large enough to occupy and take possession of all British-owned islands in the Caribbean and off the Atlantic coast. This cannot be done if we maintain, as the committee does, that the British Navy is our first line of defense.

Help England to defend us. Help with the guns, planes, shells, and the things that she must have to continue the fight. That we will do this is Hitler's one great fear. And what can you do?

This question, "What can you do? Help England to defend us!" is just about the most hopeless statement I have ever seen. It is defeatism in its most tragic aspect. Here is what we can do. We can fortify our possessions in the Pacific, including the Philippine Islands and the Midway group. We can build another canal to Nicaragua, to be used for military purposes alone in wartime. We can build another navy over a period of a few years, instead of rushing into construction pell-mell, as we are doing now. After this Navy is launched, it should be maintained by adding new ships yearly, so that its efficiency is always A–1. Our great trouble in the past has been that we have played politics instead of looking after our national defenses and the general welfare of our people. What we need are more pro-Americans and less pro-English and pro-internationalists. What we need more than anything else is a party composed of sound and sensible Americans, who have the country's interest at heart, instead of political parties and political patronage.

I am not worried about Hitler, whether he loves us or whether he fears us. Hitler is only one man, and as one man he can live no longer than the rest of us. Time will, therefore, take care of him, as it will others here who are less patriotic to the United States than he is to his own country.

Suggested message to your Congressman: "It is vital that we realize that the Allies are our first line of defense. I, therefore, urge that you do everything you can to speed up production and delivery of all needed supplies to the Allies." Do it now!

This effrontery; this message which the Committee to Defend America suggests sending to Members of Congress, is in itself the very best reason why we should vote against conscription and the drafting of the National Guard.

Any group, no matter what they may call themselves, which takes the responsibility that this committee has taken in

advising people to send this message to Congress, is not only un-American but it does not have the country's interest at heart—and let us make no mistake about that. This committee is interested in one thing alone, and that is to involve the United States in war. My suggestion is that the committee enlist its members, so that they may be sent across to England and fight for the nation they prefer to that of our Republic.

Write or wire your Congressman * * * right now that we must speed up our production of planes and munitions, and must send help immediately to our first line of defense.

It was too late for Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Belgium, Holland, and France. Are we going to be too tragically late?

I have always maintained that we can serve Central Europe best by leaving them alone. The Treaty of Versailles is the best evidence that this statement is correct. European nations have always settled their boundaries and will in the future without our help. The deplorable part of the invasions referred to is that had we come out in 1933 or in 1939 and said that we would be strictly neutral; that we would give no aid to any belligerent, no doubt peace would have prevailed in Europe today. It is our meddling and fooling with a situation that we know little about, that is in a sense responsible for the present war in Europe. So I say again, let us set our own house in order and allow foreign nations to do the same.

Call the roll. Austria, gone. Czechoslovakia, gone. Danzig, gone. Poland, gone. Norway, gone. Denmark, gone. Holland, gone. Belgium, gone. Luxemburg, gone. France, gone.

Who is left to face a Germany which rides roughshod over Europe? Britain!

Can Britain carry on? Yes! She can if we do our part.

This we must do. Britain is fighting our battle. The British Navy is protecting us. For more than a century, it has been our first line of defense. We and other American countries are safe from attack as long as the British Fleet stands between us and Hitler * * * and no longer.

Tanks, planes, artillery, machine guns, rifles, ammunition, food * * * these Britains must have. We must supply them. Must! In enormous quantities. Without delay. If we fail, another name will be added to the list of countries which were once free but are so no longer. It will read:

The United States, gone.

Let it be understood that Great Britain is not fighting our battles, but instead is fighting her own—which is only just and proper, as it is the first time she has had no help to defend the British Empire. Let it be furthermore understood that our first line of defense is not the British Navy, but it is instead the United States Navy, which is equal to or better than the British Fleet. At any rate, if it is not, it will be when we get through with it. There will be no "Britannia rules the waves" any more, because we are going to rule a few of these waves from now on. Some day the American people will discover the real truth and we will then return again and unite upon those sound principles set forth in the Constitution as it was in its original form when given to us by the founders of this country. When we discover ourselves, we will then develop a part of that spirit of '76, that started the boys marching for freedom.

We have sent ships, planes, and all war equipment that we manufacture to England, even to the point where we have little left for our own protection. We can send nothing more except men, and that we shall not do, as we realize it would be in a hopeless and lost cause. If England is not safe for her noble lords and dukes; if she is not safe for the titled and the wealthy; if she is not safe for the internationalists and for those who control the British Government, she is not safe for anyone of us. If this crowd of refugees who have come here for protection, are unwilling to defend their own empire, it certainly would be a stupid blunder for us to send our men to drown in the Atlantic or to be killed on the battlefields of England.

England could have settled this war by disgorging some of the colonies that she has unjustly held since the World War, and it occurs to me that she should have restored such colonies in the interest of her own people and the security of the British Empire.

I have incorporated copies of this propaganda for war in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I want the people to know the pressure which is used to involve this Nation in war. I want them to know that they should pay no attention to any propaganda issued, no matter what the statements may be; for they are issued by a people who have no interest in the United States except for favors they can receive. It is therefore better to allow England to fight this war alone; for in this experience she will think twice before she declares war again.

Provocation—Then War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS D. THILL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ARTICLE BY JOHN T. FLYNN

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by John T. Flynn, which appeared in the Washington Daily News, July 30, 1940. It depicts the provocative war course this Nation is following. Will the American people wake up some day and find Roosevelt's course of action has led to war?

PLAIN ECONOMICS

(By John T. Flynn)

NEW YORK, July 30.—It is not possible to read the daily papers this last week without feeling alarmed at the swiftness with which we are being hustled into war. For instance, military men tell Congress that we must have 400,000 men in the Army by October 1, and add omniously that "maybe" we cannot wait that long.

Another commentator tells us that maybe "days will count soon." What do they mean? The first of October is only 2 months off. What is brewing that may cause us to need that new army before that date?

Then we read that England has blockaded the Spanish coast, and a statement from the British Government that "the United States is expected to promptly end shipments to Spain." The same paper, in a Washington dispatch, tells us that the President has embargoed shipments of oil, etc., to Spain and cut off American shipping thither.

Are the British and American Governments in consultation in the shaping of war moves against Germany? How far does that put us away from war?

And then the American nations are actually considering an arrangement to seize Latin American territories that belong to England or France to prevent them falling into German hands. This is well enough, but we are informed that the American Government considers that Martinique, which belongs to France, has actually changed hands because Germany dominates France, and that therefore we should seize Martinique now.

If we do, France will protest. She will certainly say it is an act of war by the United States and other American governments. If this is carried out, we will have actually committed an act of open war, and we may find ourselves at war. And that any day.

Certainly our Government is leaving no stone unturned to translate events as they arise from day to day into excuses for provocative action against Germany.

Of course, we are told that we must not refrain from doing these things because of fear of Germany's disapproval. This is a very ingenious way of stating the case. The more truthful way is to recognize that we cannot go on committing hostile acts against any power and expect that that power will not recognize them as such and act accordingly.

It is not a question of whether we are afraid of Germany's displeasure. It is a question of whether we want to go to war with Germany—to get into this war. The American people certainly do not want to get in. But assuredly some fatal power, some force which we do not see in daily action and cannot trace, is leading us in that direction.

This will go on—one provocation after another—until one day we will wake up with a difficult incident on our hands. Then all the engines of propaganda will go into action to inflame the American people more than they are already inflamed. We are treading on thin ice.

Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1940

POEM BY PLINY A. WILEY, OF WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a timely and beautiful poem composed by Mr. Pliny A. Wiley, of Wichita, Kans., who feels that in these dark days it may be an inspiration to those who have grave doubts and fears about the future. The poem follows:

OPPORTUNITY

They wrongly speak who say I am no more
And that the future's gates are locked and sealed.
Tomorrow's sun will rise bright shining as before.
My pathway then will clearly be revealed.

There will be work for willing hands to do;
Good seed to sow and golden grain to reap.
I shall rejoice the world's advance to view.
All mankind's gains I shall most surely keep.

Roses will bloom with fragrance rich and rare.
Orchard and field and countryside
In various language will declare
That industry and bounty here abide.

There will be sick and sorrowing ones, I know.
But love will haste with healing to their side.
Within Earth's Eden thistles rank will grow.
Battle and conflict will this world betide.

But God is ruler of the nations yet,
His purpose in the ages to fulfill.
The Star of Bethlehem and Olivet
Will guide men on to greater glories still.

We welcome you, brave comrades in your youth.
The sword of justice and of human right
Will nobly serve you in your quest of truth.
You shall possess eternal hills of light.

—*Pliny A. Wiley.*

Patriotism and 8 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1940

FABLE BY O. HORACE FEATHERS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks, I include a fable written by one of my constituents. While we are trying to fasten the methods of Hitler by way of regimentation of our male population between the ages of 18 and 64 on our Nation we should pause to reflect. The fable follows:

PATRIOTISM AND 8 PERCENT—A PHABLE INPHECTED WITH PHACT

(By O. Horace Feathers)

Once upon a time, there was a great nation, which was called Democracy, and in which everybody and his uncle had an equal voice, although some grew voice and voice.

In democracy there were two kinds of citizens, the gazabos, who owned all the private property, and the galoots, who did all the work. This arrangement was called private capitalism, in which everybody invested his all. The gazabos invested their money, and the galoots invested their skill. The gazabos drew a dividend of $8 for each dollar invested, and the galoots drew $8 for each week they worked. This racket was known as 8 percent.

And it came to pass, that a warlike neighbor threatened to invade democracy, and a great army was needed pronto, if not sooner. So, the gazabos arranged all the great factories to make war canoes and spears instead of fire chariots and private yachts. This action was prompted by a great surge of patriotism.

Then spake the head man of democracy, saying: "Mah frands, we are sore beset by a nasty outfit. Everybody must help to save his country. All the galoots will be conscripted into the army and to man the war canoes, while all the gazabos will please fix it up so the galoots will have plenty to fight with, while the gazabos will have plenty to fight for, which will make it a fifty-fifty proposition."

Then it come to pass that the gazabos went out on a sit-down strike, saying, "We are not interested. Eight percent is not enough to hire our patriotism, and the limit must be taken off our profits. Otherwise, roll your own war canoes and spears."

But one of the galoots had, through some strange miscarriage of justice, been equipped with a brain when he was built, and he sat down and thought it over. Then he called a war council of all the galoots in Democracy, and said unto them: "See, birds have nests, and foxes have holes, but we have not where to lay our heads. Since these slick foxes and birds of prey own this country, why not let them fight to protect it?"

And, being democracy, it was easy to get justice, and a law was passed requiring one day's service in the war canoes for each $100 of the country that each gazabo and galoot owned. But, since none of the gazabos could expect to live long enough to serve their time, they agreed to be conscripted along with their private property, and fight on equal terms with the galoots. And it came to pass that the nasty outfit was dam well licked.—The end.

Hours-of-Labor Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER AND DISCUSSION BY COL. PHILIP B. FLEMING, ADMINISTRATOR OF WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on July 11, 1940, Col. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, wrote a letter to the President of the United States in relation to the question whether in the light of a national-defense emergency, it will be necessary to raise the ceiling for hours of labor and on July 12, 1940, Colonel Fleming and his associate, Mr. Osgood Nichols of the Information Branch of the Wage and Hour Division, engaged in a discussion on a Nation-wide hook-up over the National Broadcasting Company on this subject. Because of the universal interest and because of the information contained in the letter to the President and in the broadcast, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and discussion inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and discussion were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COLONEL FLEMING'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT ON THE CEILING FOR HOURS AND THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

The following letter was read by the President this morning (Friday, July 12, 1940) at his press conference:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION,
Washington, July 11, 1940.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The question whether in the light of the national-defense emergency it will be necessary to raise the ceiling for hours, above which time and one-half must be paid, has given me much concern.

As a soldier, the Nation's defense is my primary interest. My assignment to the administration of a labor law has in no way lessened that interest.

Were there any defense need in certain industries for abrogation of the time and one-half rule, nothing could keep me from so reporting. In my contacts with industry no such need has yet been demonstrated to me.

Two documents from the last war should be called to public attention:

One is the wartime report of the British Munitions Commission. The report stated that from experiments spread over thirteen and

a half months, a reduction of working hours of munitions workers was associated with an increase of production. For example, in one factory hours of work were changed, first from a 66-hour week to a 55-hour week, and then to a 45½-hour week. Considering the weekly output of the 66-hour week as 100, it was found that the 55-hour week yielded a relative output of 111. The 45½-hour week yielded a relative output of 109. Thus the 45½-hour week yielded more in products than the 66-hour week and practically as much as the 55-hour week. The same results were obtained during the 13-month period in various other munitions factories.

The other document is General Order No. 13, issued by the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, on November 15, 1917—7 months after the declaration of war—when the United States was at the height of its procurement effort. The order stated:

"In view of the urgent necessity for a prompt increase in the volume of production of practically every article required for the conduct of the war, vigilance is demanded of all those in any way associated with industry lest the safeguards with which the people of this country have sought to protect labor should be unwisely and unnecessarily broken down. It is a fair assumption that for the most part these safeguards are the mechanisms of efficiency. Industrial history proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production. During the war every attempt should be made to conserve in every way possible all of our achievements in the way of social betterment. But the pressing argument for maintaining industrial safeguards in the present emergency is that they actually contribute to efficiency. To waive them would be a shortsighted policy, leading gradually but inevitably toward lowered production."

These documents were drafted almost a generation ago. The production-line techniques of industry have been greatly developed since then. Today maximum production calls for maximum efficiency of the machine. Maximum efficiency of the machine is usually obtained by using relays of workers in shifts short enough to make constantly intense effort possible.

I think it also should be called to the public's attention that the French 40-hour week in effect from 1936 to 1938 had little resemblance to our "ceiling for hours." The French 40-hour week generally was a rigid limitation.

Germany was on an 8-hour-day, 48-hour-week basis from July 26, 1934, to January 1, 1939. A survey entitled "Labor Policy in Germany" appearing in the June 1940 issue of the Monthly Labor Review reports that a 10-hour day, 60-hour week began in nondefense industries after January 1, 1939, due to a labor shortage. In the more vital industries, hours up to 16 per day might be permitted by the factory inspector. But this lengthening of working hours was not successful. The article states: "Production began to fall off rapidly, accompanied by such an alarming increase of industrial accidents and stoppages as to attract the serious attention of the Government authorities. * * * The Government applied the strictest measures against suspected saboteurs but also began to lighten somewhat the hard labor conditions."

Any complaints from the key defense industries that the payment of time and a half for overtime is making difficult their operation will be promptly brought to your attention. To date the Wage and Hour Division has received but three such complaints, all from small establishments.

Respectfully,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator.

RADIO BROADCAST DELIVERED BY COL. PHILIP B. FLEMING, ADMINISTRATOR, WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, OVER THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO., FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1940

ANNOUNCER. At this time all the energies of the United States Government, and of many private individuals and industries, are being bent toward national defense. Here in Washington at the moment little else is being talked about. Congress has appropriated unprecedented funds for the Army and Navy. Tonight we have invited Col. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, to discuss the bearing of the wage and hour law on this matter of national defense. The talk will be handled in the form of an interview. Mr. Osgood Nichols, of the information branch of the Wage and Hour Division, will ask the colonel to answer the questions concerning this important matter which he believes are uppermost in the minds of the American people today. Mr. Nichols.

Mr. NICHOLS. First of all, I should like to ask you, Colonel Fleming, whether you think the wage and hour law can be retained, in view of the need for increased production.

Colonel FLEMING. It is not only possible to keep the wage and hour law, but imperative that we keep it.

Mr. NICHOLS. I don't quite follow you there, Colonel. Doesn't the wage and hour law limit the workweek to 42 hours, and, after October 24, to 40 hours? If we don't permit people to work more than 40 hours a week, how are we going to produce tanks, guns, airplanes, and warships quickly enough?

Colonel FLEMING. Surely you haven't forgotten that there are still between eight and ten million people out of work in the United States. Don't you think it will be time enough to talk about longer hours after industry has absorbed these people?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; but there was unemployment in France, too. Yet France enacted a 40-hour week law. The result was that the country's industries could not produce the war equipment needed and France was left unprepared.

Colonel FLEMING. I am not quite so sure as you seem to be that France was unprepared from the material standpoint. There doubtless was a deficiency of such things as tanks and airplanes, but that rather indicates a mistake in judgment rather than any shortage of productive capacity. France had prepared to fight a defensive war behind the Maginot line, not a "blitzkrieg" in the open. And we now know that the difficulty may have been political, patriotic, and psychological unpreparedness and not economic unpreparedness.

Mr. NICHOLS. Still, some newspaper columnists and political writers have been saying that the 40-hour workweek was disastrous for France.

Colonel FLEMING. I also have read those columnists and political writers. And it strikes me as rather significant that most of the hue and cry about the need for lengthening the workweek comes from these armchair generals and not from actual employers in the primary defense industries.

Mr. NICHOLS. In other words, you think the armchair generals don't know what they are talking about?

Colonel FLEMING. I'd prefer to say that most of them have drawn conclusions that are much too general from too little evidence. How many of them have pointed out the differences between the French 40-hour law and our wage and hour law? It would seem that if they were aware of the difference they would be honest enough to state it.

Mr. NICHOLS. There is a difference, then, Colonel?

Colonel FLEMING. A vast difference. Take the wage and hour law first. What does it do? It says that all employers subject to the law shall pay their workers at least a minimum wage, which for most industry is now 30 cents an hour. The law also sets a maximum workweek of 42 hours. But the workweek isn't limited to 42 hours. Employees can work any number of hours, provided they are paid time and a half for overtime. If an employer is producing goods directly for the Government's account—and this includes, among other things, guns, airplanes, and battleships—he comes under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. NICHOLS. Doesn't the Walsh-Healey Act call for an 8-hour day?

Colonel FLEMING. Yes; it sets up an 8-hour day and a 40-hour week. But here, again, just as in the wage and hour law, there is plenty of flexibility.

Mr. NICHOLS. You mean that the Walsh-Healey Act permits overtime to be worked?

Mr. FLEMING. Exactly. Any amount of overtime can be worked as long as the employer pays time and a half. Under either the wage and hour law or the Walsh-Healey Act there is nothing to prevent a 60- or 70-hour week, as long as the employer pays extra for overtime.

Mr. NICHOLS. You said a moment ago that our laws differed from the French. What is the difference?

Colonel FLEMING. The main difference between the two laws is that the French law did not provide much flexibility. When the Blum Popular Front Government came into power in France in 1936, it reduced the workweek from around 48 hours to 40. This was a hard and fast limitation for most industry. Overtime could be worked only under exceptional circumstances. As I have pointed out, the wage and hour law contains no such strict limitations.

Mr. NICHOLS. What about the wage provisions of the French law?

Colonel FLEMING. This is where most of the trouble arose. The law required that the same wages be paid for 40 hours as had previously been paid for 48. This was a real shock to French industry. It meant an increase of 20 percent all at once in their wage rates.

Mr. NICHOLS. I can see how such a law would tend to curtail production. Was that law in effect when war was declared?

Colonel FLEMING. No. There again, the armchair generals have ignored the actual situation. When Germany marched into Austria in the Spring of 1938, the Popular Front Government was no longer in power in France. Under the increasing pressure of the international situation, the 40-hour week was gradually abandoned. Not long after the agreement was signed at Munich, the workweek in those industries working directly or indirectly in the interest of national defense had been lengthened to 60 hours.

Mr. NICHOLS. I have read that all the time France was operating under the 40-hour law, or various modifications of it, German workers were toiling 84 hours a week without overtime pay, and had been for 5 years before the war broke out. That certainly must have had a good deal to do with the Germans' amazing "blitzkrieg" successes.

Colonel FLEMING. Eighty-four hours a week! How in the world did you find that out?

Mr. NICHOLS. I read it in a newspaper article by one of the Washington columnists.

Colonel FLEMING. I am afraid the credulity of the writer had been gravely imposed upon. I suppose it is natural, because of their amazing successes, to attribute to the Dictator and his Nazis feats of superhuman strength and cunning. But I suspect that Nazis are made of flesh and blood, like the rest of us, and suffer from the same limitations upon human endurance. At any rate, it simply isn't true to say that German workers have been toiling 84 hours a week. From July 26, 1934, to January 1, 1939, German industry was on an 8-hour day, 48-hour week.

Mr. NICHOLS. Then you mean that 9 months before the war broke out the French law allowed industry to work longer hours than the German?

Colonel FLEMING. Precisely. The Nazis did not introduce the 10-hour day, 60-hour week until January 1939. After this time in

more vital munitions industries hours up to 16 a day could be permitted by the labor inspector.

Mr. NICHOLS. How did such long hours work out?

Colonel FLEMING. They didn't work out. Let me quote from the Monthly Labor Review: "Production began to fall off rapidly, accompanied by such an alarming increase of industrial accidents and stoppages as to attract the serious attention of the governmental authorities. * * * The Government applied the sternest measures against the suspected saboteurs, but also began to lighten somewhat the hard labor conditions."

Mr. NICHOLS. You mean even Nazis have a limit?

Colonel FLEMING. Yes. The Nazis could shoot the lagging worker but they couldn't stand outraged Mother Nature up against the wall. Fatigue is still fatigue in any language. This accords with common sense and the experience of every other industrial nation. The fact is that no important nation in the world today, whether Democratic, Fascist, or Communist, believes that it is possible for a modern industrial system to operate in peace or war without social and labor regulation. Take our own country, for instance. During the last war the United States Army was in the forefront in demanding that we safeguard our American labor standards.

Mr. NICHOLS. The United States Army? Why?

Colonel FLEMING. Let me tell you in the Army's own words. This is what the Chief of Ordnance and the Quartermaster General said in a general order issued 7 months after we had entered the war:

"Industrial history," they said, "proves that reasonable hours, fair working conditions, and a proper wage scale are essential to high production. The pressing argument for maintaining industrial safeguards in the present emergency is that they actually contribute to efficiency. To waive them would be a short-sighted policy, leading gradually but inevitably toward lowered production. It might be expected that an individual working 10 hours a day, instead of 8, would turn out more goods. He can, for the first few days. But experience shows us that in a few weeks, or a few months, the output will be the same, or even less, than it was during the shorter day."

Mr. NICHOLS. The Army's point, then, was that shorter hours bring higher production.

Colonel FLEMING. Exactly. The Army, which was as desperately in need of supplies then as it is today, realized that American labor standards were not standards of peace and leisure. They were the standards of efficiency. This was borne out in the last war, not only in this country but also in Great Britain. Exhaustive studies were made by the British after the war concerning the relative efficiency of long and short workweeks.

Mr. NICHOLS. What did these studies show, Colonel?

Colonel FLEMING. During the World War, in an effort to increase output, hours of work in the British munitions plants were greatly increased. An investigation by an official commission showed that the long hours imposed too severe a strain on the workers; that the rate of production decreased; that the extra hours produced proportionately little or no additional output; and that the quality of the output suffered.

Mr. NICHOLS. Did British employers try experiments with workweeks of different lengths to see whether they really could produce more goods in a shorter workweek?

Colonel FLEMING. Yes. In one ordnance factory they tried first a 66-hour week, then a 55-hour week, and finally a 45½-hour week. The workers produced 10 percent more in 55 hours than in 66, and only 1 percent less in 45½ hours than they had in 55 hours.

Mr. NICHOLS. That should dispel the popular notion that production can be increased by the unlimited lengthening of hours. These facts show that just the opposite seems to happen—at least beyond a certain point.

Colonel FLEMING. That has been the experience of American industry. That is what our industrialists have found after reducing their hours of work from 12 hours a day to as low, in some cases, as 6.

Mr. NICHOLS. While it is true, as you say, that there are many millions of unemployed workers in the United States, it is my understanding that there still is a shortage of skilled workers.

Colonel FLEMING. But is there a shortage of skilled labor; and if so, does it warrant discarding all regulation of wages and hours? I have seen a preliminary summary on this subject made by the Social Security Board.

Mr. NICHOLS. What does this survey show?

Colonel FLEMING. A tabulation of some 5,100,000 registered jobseekers made at the beginning of April shows that in 33 States there were 23,000 technicians, 657,000 skilled craftsmen and 858,000 semiskilled production workers unemployed and looking for jobs. And these figures do not include New York and some other important industrial States. Of these, approximately 1,500 aircraft workers in the 20 most important occupations were found to be unemployed.

Mr. NICHOLS. But if we are going to expand aircraft production fourfold, we shall need many more than 1,500 additional workers.

Colonel FLEMING. Yes; and it is also true that some of the skilled men now idle are skilled in building construction or other occupations not directly related to defense production. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the national-defense program, it is important to place the emphasis upon the training of new workers rather than the extension of hours for present workers. Let us not burn our candle at both ends. If for no other reason, time and a half for overtime is a worth-while prod to induce employers to expand their personnel now. The wage and hour law makes ample provision for the training of skilled workers by permitting their employment, under proper safeguards, at less than the minimum wage rate.

Mr. NICHOLS. Don't most of the skilled workers depend upon collective-bargaining contracts for overtime pay rather than on the wage and hour law?

Colonel FLEMING. Yes. The result of relaxing the wage and hour law would simply be to permit the working of unorganized, unskilled workers—of which there is an abundant oversupply—long hours without paying for the overtime, while the skilled workers would continue to collect for overtime as before.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do you know whether industry has been training skilled workers on a large scale before now?

Colonel FLEMING. Far-sighted employers have been making provision for the training of skilled workers for sometime. The crucial machine-tool industry, according to the president of its trade association, is well prepared for the national-defense program, because for many months it has been training new workers and installing new machinery.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is very encouraging. It would seem that some of the stories being printed today are based more on fear than on fact.

Colonel FLEMING. In conclusion let me say again that, in my opinion, no relaxation of the wage and hour law is necessary at this time, nor is it desirable. Only today the President affirmed his support of this view. Legitimate businessmen themselves are not asking for it, because they know perfectly well that it does not handicap them. The law is fair, because if upon labor is laid the burden of long hours, a corresponding burden is laid upon the employer who must pay for that overtime. The wage and hour law represents a part of that fair, equitable, democratic order of which we are so proud and which we are resolved to defend at any cost. Certainly no sane man defends his most priceless possessions by throwing them away as he gets ready to fight for them.

Tribute to the Late Senator Logan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ADDRESS BY GEORGE McCOMBS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent tribute to the late Senator M. M. Logan by George McCombs, delivered on Memorial Day, May 30, at the Brownsville Lodge, No. 164, Independent Order of Odd Fellows. These words will bring back to the Members of the Senate, and all who read them, the splendid abilities and deep-hearted spirit of Senator Logan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For many years past this day of each year has been designated, set aside, and observed as the day to pay tribute to our dead. It has been a day of sad memories and of tears. At this time the hearts of our people are unusually burdened and saddened on account of the wretched and terrible conditions prevailing in a large portion of the world—greed, avarice, heartless cruelty. War and destruction are loosened and running rampant.

These vicious and destructive forces have gathered great momentum and are sweeping away the most cherished hopes and virtues of mankind, namely, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, leaving in its wake death, suffering, misery, and despair. These things dearest to the hearts of our people are being crushed and destroyed in other parts of the world. And while we rejoice that these destructive forces of war, misery, and despair have not invaded our country nor directly visited its wrath upon us, and while we hope and pray that it may not, yet we realize that these terrible war clouds of the east which have produced this disastrous conflagration have cast shadows across the pathways of our people and shut out the sunshine of life. The thunderous roar of its devices and instruments of cruel destruction strikes terror to the hearts of the people, and today American people stand with bowed heads at the graves of its dead.

Our beloved deceased brother to whose memory we now pay tribute was at the time of his death known to the country at large as the Honorable M. M. Logan, United States Senator from Kentucky. To us he was, he is, and always will be simply "Mills" Logan, our friend and brother of Edmonson County. He was a product of Edmonson County pure and simple. He was the product of the forces of Nature working together in unison and harmony with the hills, the streams, and the people of Edmonson County over a period of 150 years. That made him what he was. Before leaving Edmonson County he possessed and had demonstrated every qualification and attribute of mind and of heart that later characterized

his distinguished and honored life of public service to the people. His life was a pride, a blessing, and an honor to the county that gave him birth, and provided and instilled within him those characteristic virtues that made him useful and great. In return he did more than any other person, living or dead, to bring respect to Edmonson County.

Despite the weakness and poverty of Edmonson County compared with others as to territory, population, and wealth, it was never his embarrassment or apology but his pride and inspiration in meeting and discharging public duty and trust in the higher positions of public service. He was not from Edmonson County but was and is and always will be of Edmonson County. Hence, it is entirely fitting and proper and in keeping with his expressed wishes that his last resting place be at the scenes of his childhood and that his remains be returned to the spot that gave him birth.

Thirty-six years ago he was a leader in a movement to establish the Odd Fellows lodge that we represent today. He was one of the 13 charter members of this organization created for the purpose of the diffusion of the principles of benevolence and charity and the teachings of friendship, love, and truth. Before entering this fraternal order he possessed in an unusual degree every characteristic and virtue required to make a good and useful member. He rapidly rose to distinction and leadership in his home lodge and brought State-wide, Nation-wide, and world-wide distinction and honor to himself and our Odd Fellows lodge. He occupied and graced every position of trust and honor in this great order and, becoming sovereign grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the World, he carried the message of the achievements of Brownsville Lodge No. 164 across the seas.

It required on Mills Logan's part no effort or sacrifice to live Odd Fellowship. His every heart throb beat in unison and sympathy with the teachings of the order. Living, spreading, and teaching the principles of benevolence and charity were the natural and spontaneous outflow of his great soul. He was the good samaritan to the wounded, the neglected, and the distressed. He found great pleasure in relieving misery, in caring for the sick in mind or body, and to assist in educating the orphan was part of his religion. Of all his great virtues, charity was his outstanding characteristic. His love for and desire to help his fellowman knew no bounds. His sympathies were always with the poor, the weak, the wronged, and the underprivileged. He was as meek as the lowly Nazarene, and the humblest and least deserving could always approach him with assurance of a kindly, sympathetic hearing, and were never repulsed or turned away empty handed. To those who may have reviled or despitefully used him, he held no malice or animus. His life was a life of unremitting toil and sacrifice to and for people, and were everyone to whom he did a favor or loving sacrifice to bring today a flower to lay upon his grave he would sleep tonight under a heavy blanket of blossoms that would bank high up this beautiful and enduring granite monument that marks his last resting place.

He was loyal, faithful, and true to his people, to his lodge, to his church and to his Creator. He never forsook or neglected a friend. He never betrayed or abused any trust confided to him by the people.

The life and achievements of Senator LOGAN is a challenge and an inspiration to the youth of the land and especially to the youth of Edmonson. He has blazed the way from the old log cabin that stands in sight of this monument, to the United States Senate. He has shown that it can be done despite poverty and obscurity or lack of educational advantages.

He has proven that:

"Honor and fame from no condition rise" and has taught the valuable lesson to "act well your part; there all the honor lies."

As he consistently climbed to higher positions of useful services and honor his burdens became heavier and finally his burdens became so great that his physical being was so tired and exhausted that he has lain down by the wayside to rest, using his burdens for a pillow, and has fallen into that dreamless sleep.

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, sayeth the Spirit, that they may rest from their labor; and their works do follow them."

Universal Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on the subject Should the United States Require Universal Conscription? which was published in the Sunday Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., on Sunday, July 28, 1940.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of July 28, 1940]

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES REQUIRE UNIVERSAL CONSCRIPTION?

(By Senator CLAUDE PEPPER)

In this crucial period, the whole of this great Nation is concerned about the safety of our country and the preservation of our institutions. We have been thrown, by conditions over which we have no control, into a maelstrom of war and all of its consequential chaos the world over. International law, the restraints of morality and religion have been repudiated and disdained. Force alone has come to be the arbitrator of the destiny of nations, of liberty, and of Christianity.

The mightiest conflict which ever raged is sweeping across the earth. Mussolini restated it when he entered the war: "This revolution * * * asserts itself against those who control the riches of the earth. * * * It is a struggle of one century against another. * * * This asserts itself against the strangers, the richer nations. It is a struggle between young and progressive people as against decadent people."

The dictatorships have gone into a war for loot, for territory, for gold, for trade, for power. They have mobilized every unit of their people and resources to wage war for gain and for conquest.

Those who stand in their way are the democracies of the world. The democratic nations have the territory, the resources, the gold, the power to produce in factories and on farms the good things of the world which the dictators want. Furthermore, the totalitarian states have evolved a system of government, a way of life which is the antithesis of the democratic way, and they have a fanatic's zeal to bring the world under the sway of that system by whatever means necessary.

Unless the dictators repudiate their designs and alter their philosophies, or the democracies relinquish what they have and change their faith, there can be no end to this conflict short of defeat for one side.

This condition of the world leaves the United States with no alternative but to prepare itself to the utmost, to marshal its whole strength for a clash which is not in the future but already in deadly progress—the shadow of which falls more heavily across our continent and our country with the passing of each sad day.

Our efforts therefore must be nothing less than total efforts.

Every able-bodied man who is needed to bear arms must be trained for armed service until 1,000,000, 2,000,000, 3,000,000—all we can ever need—are prepared for service if our country's defense demands that they be called into active duty. The number who are thus trained among the citizens will diminish the number required in a standing professional army—an army of paid soldiers.

Thus I favor universal service for our defense. It is the democratic way for filling the ranks of a democratic army, and it is necessary to assure the integrity of our land and of what we love.

But it is not enough that those called under universal service be soldiers only. We must have mechanics and technicians of every class. Democratic universal service requires that all who are needed in a great defense effort be called to their country's service and perform such duties as they are best fitted to perform. We will never again see the day when our Nation, fighting for its life, will have the spectacle of men in the Army at $30 a month, men in the shipyards at $18 a day, and men in management enjoying salaries of $50,000 a year.

The training our young men will get in military service will be of inestimable value to them in the discipline they learn, in the physical strength they will develop, in the skills they acquire. Many of those called will learn trades and arts, gain experience, acquire skill which will serve them in civil pursuits as well as in their country's defense.

The whole Nation, under a well-proportioned program of this character, will gain a new solidarity, feel a fresh unity, sense a degree of patriotism which will make our democracy, not a decadent and antiquated system but a vital and living force, capable of its defense, proud of its own righteous power, determined to preserve for itself and for the world its own honorable way of life. Hence, by mobilizing all our great strength we will not only save America but we will build America into yet a greater nation than she has ever been before in all her long history.

Bryan Memorial Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM RITCHIE, OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Wil-

liam Ritchie, of Omaha, Nebr., at the William Jennings Bryan memorial breakfast held in connection with the 1940 Democratic National Convention, in the Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., on June 17, 1940. I may state that Mr. Ritchie was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention from Nebraska and voted consistently against a third Presidential term.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Democrats, Nebraska glories in the fact that from her broad plains and fertile fields, from the travail and hardships of her pioneers, the gay spirit of a young man, just come from Illinois, soared to the heavens with the song of a lark. Nebraska is proud of the fact that she gave William Jennings Bryan to the Nation, to humanity, to the ages.

In the hindsight of a half century of history, it is now clear as crystal that William Jennings Bryan was the John the Baptist of the outstanding political and social advances made in America by the present generation. Followers of few world statesmen can boast so proud a record.

My poor endowments will not enable me to picture to you Bryan's glorious qualities and career; your thoughts and memories will bring these to you better than I can, so I shall content myself with telling you a personal experience which may not be generally known, and which I hope will help to bring the Great Commoner back to us for a few moments this morning.

Many of us here today remember the Thomas Fortune Ryan resolution which Mr. Bryan introduced at the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore in 1912, and which resulted in the nomination of Woodrow Wilson for the Presidency. Many of you will also remember that at that time it was charged that Mr. Bryan was thus seeking to nominate himself. I know that this was not so. I was an alternate delegate to that convention from Mr. Bryan's congressional district. After the nomination, returning to the Belvidere Hotel, I found myself in an elevator alone with Mr. and Mrs. Bryan. I said to Mr. Bryan: "Well, sir, how do you feel now?" Mrs. Bryan, beaming, spontaneously replied, "This is the happiest moment in our lives." Mr. Bryan joyously acquiesced. No one who saw and heard Mr. and Mrs. Bryan then could doubt that they spoke from the bottom of their hearts.

Looking back on that convention, I remember the bushel baskets full of telegrams that poured in upon the delegates after the Thomas Fortune Ryan speech was made. And I marvel now when I realize that Bryan's great voice and magnetic personality were confined to the walls of that auditorium; yet his spiritual appeal was so great, cold print could arouse the country to a magnificent response.

How history would now be changed if radio had been discovered and developed in his day.

Fellow Democrats, I love to think of Bryan's great spirit, wiser now that it is freed from the burdens of the flesh, hovering over us today. I gain inspiration from his memory to take heart and courage to do my duty here as it hath vouchsafed God to show me the way and the light; so that I may here in this grave hour of our country's history stand firm for liberty, justice, and democracy, and for the safety, security, and perpetuation of our great republic.

Agreement at Habana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, July 31, 1940, entitled "Agreement at Habana."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 31, 1940]

AGREEMENT AT HABANA

Of the three agreements concluded at the Habana conference, by far the most important is that which provides for a collective American trusteeship over European possessions in this hemisphere in the event that their status as dependencies of democratic nations is affected by the outcome of the present war.

This agreement is important—and far-reaching in its implications—for three separate reasons. The first of these is the manner in which it enlarges and modifies the scope of the Monroe Doctrine.

That cornerstone of American foreign policy has heretofore been essentially unilateral. That is to say, it was promulgated and has been made effective by the United States alone, without regard to the policies of the various Latin American republics.

Broadly speaking, we have heretofore maintained that we would regard any further attempt by European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." We have always hoped that other American republics would take the same attitude. But whether they approved or not in no way affected the position of the United States. The Monroe Doctrine was a policy of self-defense, its operation not contingent upon the cooperation of our neighbors.

The development of pan-American unity has for some years tended to broaden this original conception of the Monroe Doctrine, and to make it a joint rather than an individual undertaking. But until the present Habana conference it could not be said that the unilateral doctrine had become multilateral. It does so with the signing of the convention which develops into a matter of continental concern those contingencies which President Monroe had defined as dangerous to our peace and safety.

This aspect of the major convention approved at Habana would of itself make this draft treaty a matter of great historic importance. But beyond that the new convention provides for the creation of permanent machinery to uphold and support the enlargement given to the Monroe Doctrine.

This is done on the principle, firmly and forcefully asserted, that the American republics are an international community which acts integrally and forcefully. This community, it is further argued, has the international juridical capacity to act in matters affecting continental unity and security.

As has already been observed in these columns, the enunciation of this principle of international unity, together with measures to make that unity effective, is equivalent to the establishment of an American League of Nations. It is immaterial that the administration is not asserting that this development is its purpose. Deeds are more important than words.

And the deeds at Habana clearly point to the quiet establishment of a league which will be less ambitious, but may also have more of the characteristics of a superstate, than the ill-fated Geneva organization.

The third significant aspect of the collective trusteeship convention is found in the accord which it has brought between the viewpoints of the United States and of the Argentine. To have reconciled these different viewpoints, representing fundamental divergencies of national interest, is a great tribute to the diplomatic skill of Secretary Hull. The magnitude of his accomplishment is only emphasized by the importance of the issue on which Argentine agreement was finally secured.

It is true that the Argentine delegation has taken occasion to state that signature of the convention at Habana will not necessarily commit the Government in Buenos Aires. But, as a matter of fact, that is only stating the obvious. The same condition applies for the United States. None knows better than Secretary Hull that his signature on this treaty will not bind this country until Senate ratification has given it validity as a governmental action.

The Argentine delegation, it seems, was not so much loath to sign the collective trusteeship convention as it was eager to emphasize the democratic character of its Government. Some of the envoys at Habana were able to commit their semitotalitarian countries by their own personal actions. That does not apply for the Argentine and, by the same token, it does not apply for the United States.

This will be realized more fully when the Senate opens debate on whether or not the treaties we have sponsored at Habana should be ratified. Immediate action is not to be expected, and in some important respects administration policy can follow the lines laid down without Senate approval.

But the latter is nonetheless essential and the treaties should, from this moment, be securing the close senatorial examination to which their vast potential importance entitles them.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, which appears in this morning's Washington Post under the headline " 'Total defense' stalled."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 1, 1940]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—"TOTAL DEFENSE" STALLED

Last Friday the Washington correspondent of the New York Sun, Mr. Phelps Adams, stated that "that great armada of fighting planes which President Roosevelt promised Congress and the American people more than 2 months ago is not even on order today. The money has been appropriated, the flying services know what they want, the manufacturers are ready to expand, but a confusion of rules has brought about such a snarl that no contracts are expected to be signed for some months."

Mr. Adams went on to say that of the vast sums appropriated for the fiscal year 1941 the War Department has contracted to spend exactly $900,378 on a handful of two-engined advanced training planes, but that no new contracts have been signed for bombers, pursuit, or combat planes of any kind. No one has, or, I think, will, question the accuracy of Mr. Adams' statements; in fact, he could have gone further. For what he reported about aviation contracts is no less true in the absolutely vital matter of expanding the production of armor plate for the Navy and tanks. There, too, the contracts are ready. But they are not signed, and operations, which at best will require years to produce results, have not yet been begun. They have not been begun because the administration and Congress have not cleared the way for them.

It is important to the country that the situation should be understood. For even if this particular obstacle can be removed by a sufficiently loud protest from the country, the state of mind which has produced it will raise up new obstacles. The fact of the matter is that the politicians and the bureaucrats in Washington, while professing to put "total defense" above all other considerations, have not yet seriously begun to put the national defense above all other considerations.

At the moment the great contracts to expand the facilities for producing armaments are stalled over the question of tax amortization. But I am credibly informed that while the Advisory Commission has been struggling with the White House, the Treasury, and Congress to remove the tax obstacle, the Department of Justice has been on the point of launching one of the greatest antitrust suits of all time against the oil industry; it has been getting ready to proceed with a lawsuit which would take years to try and would occupy the attention of the leaders of the industry at the very moment when the executives of that industry are being called upon to use their brains and their energy in organizing to produce synthetic rubber and aviation gasoline and a number of other critical commodities. So whatever the administration's publicity agents may say about it, the fact is that the national defense is not being organiezd with the full, sincere, and single-minded cooperation of the whole Government.

This is a serious charge. But in the light of the known and indisputable facts about the tax-amortization question, which has stalled the airplane and armor-plate contracts, the charge is, I submit, incontrovertible. And though the tax question is a technical one, no expert knowledge of taxation is needed to see what is the trouble in Washington today.

This in simple terms is the problem: In order to make the new warships, the airplanes, and the mechanical equipment for the army, it is necessary to build and equip large additional plants and factories. This requires the investment of new capital, supplied in part by the Government through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and in part by existing aviation, steel, and other companies. As regards the new capital to be supplied by the Government, the problems have, it appears, been solved satisfactorily. But as regards the new capital privately supplied, two questions naturally arise: First the repayment, or debt amortization as it is called, of the borrowed money—a problem which is solved in the prices agreed upon in the contract; and second, the question of how in calculating taxes the depreciation, or tax amortization, shall be calculated. This is the obstacle. For without new legislation the tax requirements are such that the companies will not sign the contracts and go to work.

Now it is not necessary to discuss the rights and wrongs of just how tax amortization ought to be arranged. There is general agreement. What is holding up everything is the fact that the President and the Treasury are insisting upon tying up this particular tax amendment with the larger general question of the taxation of war profits. And since it might take Congress many weeks to write a general tax bill, the simple and indispensable amendment of the existing laws must wait too, and its enactment must depend on a rough-and-tumble political debate about war profits. So the airplanes have to wait, the armor plate has to wait, the Navy has to wait, the Army has to wait for an amendment which everybody agrees is necessary even to begin to arm this Nation.

If some great, disputed principle were involved in the tax-amortization amendment, it would still be wrong to tie it up with and confuse it with all the other questions of war finance. But there is no dispute about the amendment. It has been tied to the disputed question of war finance for no good reason at all unless it be the disgraceful political reason that the tax laws cannot be relaxed at all in favor of business corporations without at the same political moment imposing new taxes on business corporations. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that a technical change in the tax laws is being held up even though the whole armament program is stalled in the process. Whatever the reason, it is not a reason arising out of a wholehearted purpose to arm this Nation rapidly.

Perhaps the administration can be induced to reverse itself on the matter, and let the contracts be signed. But that will not be enough. For new obstacles will arise as long as the President and the administration and Congress, including leaders of both parties, and the country do not acquire the conviction that the task of arming is urgent and serious and that it cannot be done slowly, half-heartedly, and by men who are not really interested in it to the exclusion of every political consideration.

Such a state of mind does not as yet exist in Washington, and unless the country wakes up and then wakes up its politicians, it is headed for the rudest shocks and most unpleasant experiences in its history. For the fact of the matter is that the Nation is passive unnecessarily and inexcusably, while its vital security is at stake in the great battles for the control of the seas. The fact of the matter is that the country is assuming obligations and responsibilities which are inescapable but are tremendous. The fact is that the country is not seriously preparing itself. The administration, which is supposed to realize how critical and urgent is the problem of our defense, is, as we have seen, trifling with the armament program. And the Republican opposition in Congress, if one is to judge by its articulate spokesmen, is fast asleep and sunk in dreams of a world that no longer exists.

Thus far the record is not one which the politicians concerned will be able to stand upon when, as is certain, the country eventually calls them to account.

Training of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM LIBERTY MAGAZINE

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Bernarr Macfadden editorial which is to appear in Liberty on August 17 be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Bernarr Macfadden is known to all as perhaps the most outstanding exponent in America of physical culture and health, and his editorial on this vital subject is very timely. The author was kind enough to send it to me in advance of its appearance in his famous magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[To be inserted in Liberty of August 17, 1940]

HOW LONG, O LORD, HOW LONG?

How long will we have to wait for Congress to take some action in building the one asset needed for the preservation of this Nation?

I again refer to manpower, and it cannot be reiterated too often. In the last 50 years I have repeatedly warned my own countrymen and the English-speaking world generally of the dangers we are facing in neglecting this momentous requirement.

Germany has smashed France with her "blitzkrieg"—due largely to manpower. Yes, there were mechanized units, but the courage and the stamina, the ruggedness that comes from physical upbuilding, were the real source of these victories.

Just read this quotation from a letter I received from a young German:

"Before the last war the sports in Germany were not so important, but when the last war was lost for Germany, the sports—all kinds of them—became very important, even in every small village. They built football arenas and swimming pools, very often against the wishes of the old-timers, who could not understand the new times."

To wage a successful war there must be fighting spirit, keen, even frantic enthusiasm, grim, relentless determination, the will to struggle at times with ruthless violence, regardless of the difficulties.

Such extraordinary powers come largely from superabundant physical force, superior muscular and vital energy, a heart trained to stand the strain, with great bodily vigor throbbing with vibrant life.

Now Congress has voted billions for the Army, for ships and planes, but the millions of men required to man these mechanized units, and the added millions that are required behind the lines—what is being done to train them?

Every man and every woman must do his or her part, and these millions must begin immediately to make the sacrifices necessary to prepare for the battles that we will undoubtedly have to fight.

As a beginning, we should at this time, without delay, register every male citizen in this country from 16 to 40 years of age. This should be done now—not a month or 3 months hence. Such

a registration could be accomplished in a few days. The radio chains and the newspapers of this country should receive a governmental mandate which would compel them to publicize a simple questionnaire that every man should fill out and mail to Washington. When these answers are received there should be experts trained to answer them intelligently by return mail, giving definite instructions to each individual, which should include a chart of simple exercises, adapted to individual needs, regulated by the vital conditions as indicated by the answers to the questionnaire.

Strict adherence to such training would harden and strengthen the body throughout every part. These exercises could be taken at home, although ultimately there should be classes arranged for this purpose everywhere.

Such a plan would raise the physical status of the manhood of this country to an extraordinary degree within a few months.

We have been taking everything for granted. We have been accepting the freedom, the extraordinary privileges secured in this country without an atom of appreciation; but to retain them, definite sacrifices will be necessary, and when every citizen is made to realize his duty in helping to meet this emergency, it will add quite materially to his understanding and appreciation of what this country has done for him.

Shortly following this training procedure of those from 16 to 40 years of age, there should be a registration of those from 40 to 50 years of age, and 50 to 60 years of age. They, too, should be willing to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve the freedom that Americanism has brought us.

Many of our young men will be suffering from diseases of various kinds, but the revolutionary changes in the healing art have brought simple measures for effecting cures in but a short time. Physicians familiar with such methods could effectively manage these difficulties.

If our citizens could begin this hardening process in 6 months, literally millions would be ready to take the military training required.

Congress can pass a bill that will put this plan to work immediately. Why wait a week, or even a day? Do it now. There never has been and never will be anything before Congress that is more important than the building up of American manhood to meet the present tragic emergency.

BERNARR MACFADDEN.

Sound Principles of International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT W. VANDERPOEL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Robert V. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American, entitled "Americans Must Learn Quickly Sound Principles of International Trade."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Chicago Herald-American of July 29, 1940]

AMERICANS MUST LEARN QUICKLY SOUND PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

There has never been a time in the history of this country when it has been so important that the people have a clear realization of sound principles of foreign trade and exchange as at this moment.

Unfortunately, such an understanding is woefully lacking.

It is true that we have made some progress in this direction in recent years, but it has been slow, painfully slow, and today events are moving fast, breathtakingly fast.

German Economic Minister Walther Funk may have made one of those psychological mistakes for which the Germans are famous when he attempted to break up the Habana conference with the threat that Nazi-dominated Europe, with unity of economic control, would deal only with individual, free, and sovereign states of South America.

NAZIS NEED AMERICAS

Great efforts have been made to convince the people of this hermisphere that they need Germany. It is true that cooperative effort is always the most beneficial for all. But it is Germany, Europe, that needs this hemisphere, first and foremost.

It has been predicted that millions in Europe will starve this winter. They will starve for the foodstuffs of the Americas.

NO STARVATION HERE

The economics of the American nations may be upset as a result of the war's disturbance to international trade, but people will not starve on this side of the ocean.

Who needs who?

Europe needs America. The Germans know this, but they know, too, that if they can prevent, through threats and blustering, unified action in this hemisphere they can outbargain each individual or each nation through their concentration of control.

Thus it is that they are using every effort to prevent an economic arrangement here by voluntary action comparable to the one that Hitler is determined to force upon Europe through threats and conquest.

HIT UNITED STATES WEAK SPOT

While Funk's position was inconsistent, arrogant, and offensive, he did hit upon the weak spot in the American picture and the thing that even today is making the task of the representatives of this country at Habana difficult. Funk declared:

"If the United States wishes to contribute again to the shaping of a world economy it must abandon its false methods of wishing to be the greatest creditor country and at the same time the greatest exporting nation. These are things that cannot be reconciled."

Every economist the world over knows that this is true. Some of our statesmen, notably Secretaries Hull and Wallace, know that it is true.

But too many American people, lacking in economic knowledge, confused by false advisers, listening to selfish pressure groups, have not understood, and as a result too many of our politicians have followed mistaken paths, paths that have created world trouble and unless deserted quickly now threaten world cataclysm.

Aid for Defense of British Isles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLES BY HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., OF WISCONSIN, AND COL. HENRY BRECKINRIDGE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles written for the American Forum by Col. Henry Breckinridge and myself on the topic Should We Fight the Nazis to Defend the British Isles?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FORUM: SHOULD WE FIGHT THE NAZIS TO DEFEND THE BRITISH ISLES?

THE QUESTION

(By Theodore Granik, Director, the American Forum)

As this is written, the eyes of the world anxiously watch news reports of an imminent Nazi invasion—another "blitzkrieg" by military might determined to make a shambles of the British homeland.

Heartsick peoples everywhere read the headline "Politicians vote end of French Republic." France has caved in—"Liberty, equality, fraternity" are no more. The nation which to our generation has been so much a symbol of democracy, has joined the dictatorships.

What will happen to Great Britain? How will the outcome affect America and American democracy? What should—and can—we do?

Some have urged that every nation in the Western Hemisphere should immediately declare war on Hitler. They maintain that those now fighting him are fighting our battle. Others contend, however, that our entrance into the war would be a tragic mistake for us. It would mean an end to our democracy and do little to save it abroad.

The question of war or peace is no longer mere theory; the actual decision may have to be made by the American people, and made soon. Herewith are the views of two prominent Americans, written exclusively for the American Forum.

YES, SAYS BRECKINRIDGE

(By Col. Henry Breckinridge, former Assistant Secretary of War)

The United States should prevent the conquest of the British Isles by the Nazi.

For a quarter century American policy has been built on the holding of the Pacific by the American Fleet and the holding of the Atlantic by the British Fleet.

Britain is the last bastion between us and the conquering dictators. If she goes down, we face them alone. If we permit it, we shall deserve and suffer every baleful consequence of the disaster.

Hitler's jackal, Mussolini, gave the warning in his formal declaration of war. This gigantic battle, he said, is only a phase in the destruction of the "plutocratic democracies" of the west, who hoard the natural resources of the earth and sit on a pile of all its gold. Well, we are the particular "plutocratic democracy" of the west that sits on the pile of gold, twenty billions of it, 80 percent of the world's supply.

The well-known final goal of nazi-ism and fascism operating in Spain is the reconstitution of the Spanish Empire. Spain is to be the front. Nazi military might and organizing ability will be the real drive behind the conquest and the subsequent exploitation of the illimitable natural resources of South America. The millions of "fifth columnists" will do their stint in South America as they have done elsewhere.

The Nazi agent, the "fifth column" man, the sincere pacifist, the shallow military follower of the cult of Nazi invincibility, the defeatist—each is playing his role here and now. They did it successfully in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and even in France and England. The Munich umbrella will may be the immutable symbol of the dying democracies of the world. America has its Quislings.

"DO NOTHING" POLICIES

The isolationists tell us at each stage of the discussion that we must do nothing, or can do nothing, at the moment. A year and a half ago it was that we must build no planes until there be research. Ten months ago we must build none until there be a meticulous definition of our foreign policy in all its details. One month ago we must do nothing until the elaboration of a great plan.

They tell us that America has nothing to do with Europe's wars; that there is nothing to choose between the Nazi and democracy; that the broad Atlantic and Pacific are our impassable barriers against the wars of Europe and Asia.

Seven years ago Italo Balbo, now dead, a better man than Hitler's jackal, made the first air reconnaissance in flying from Rome to Chicago. He made it easily and successfully with 24 planes. He used the well-known stepping stones—Iceland and Greenland—easy hops for every type of modern military plane.

Now the Nazi has conquered Denmark, who owns Iceland and Greenland. Now the Nazi has conquered Holland and France, who own islands off our northern coast—islands girdling the Carribean—and large areas on the very mainland of America. As for Asia, it is 55 miles from America across the Bering Strait, not 6,000 miles across the Pacific.

War is a terrible thing. The resources of the earth could yield a bountiful living for all if peace and the Golden Rule prevailed. But the die has been cast otherwise.

A modern Genghis Khan marches to universal conquest, universal destruction, and universal slavery. The old Genghis Khan placed a pyramid of human skulls every few miles on his post roads as a warning to those who would resist his will. The modern Genghis Khan looses from the air the thunderbolts of obliteration on whole populations. Having disarmed the conquered, he holds them in complete subjugation by airplane, tank, and Gestapo. If he is not defeated before the conquest becomes universal, his victims will be slaves, not for a while but forever. Disarmed men cannot revolt successfully against tanks and bombers.

Our Quislings and their assorted allies say, "We cannot fight; we could not do anything effective if we would—even if we had the vision, the courage to see the fatal import of the present hour and act." But the very ceaseless activities of these Quislings indicate they still have a slight lingering fear that we may act in the end like our ancestors at Gettysburg and Valley Forge, like Charles Martel at Tours in 732, like the Greeks at Thermopylae and Marathon.

WHAT WE CAN DO

Is there nothing we could do?

1. We could mobilize our merchant ships, convoy them with warships, and bring the children of Britain to the refuge of our shores. Not to suffer the little children to come to us now would be to deny our every heritage of humanity.

2. We could send 1,000 volunteer pursuit pilots to the air fields of Britain.

Let us not be deluded about our air forces. We have 4,000 of the finest military and naval pilots in the world. They would knock the Nazi bombers out of the air like vultures struck by lightning. In equal combat the British have universally bested the Nazi airmen in the present war. One thousand American pilots in Britain would turn the tide of war.

3. Stir the power of this Nation to action! Mobilize its productive activity! Outmatch every diabolical machine Hitler can contrive! Take the Nazi out of his cross-country locomotive and he is no better than any other man, and not so good as some. Match him in the air with equal numbers of planes flown by free men and he will soon be back on the ground. If he asks for it, put him at the other end of the bead drawn from an American bomb sight, and see if he can stand the punishment which he mercilessly metes out to others.

The cult of the invinciblity of the Nazi is a myth. America has the material resources and organizing genius to be invincible and irresistible, but prompt and courageous action is the cost even of survival. The British Isles are our last outpost against the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. If we permit Britain to go down without a struggle, history will record in yellow letters of shame the failure of American intelligence and courage in the most fatal crisis of modern history. Would the America of Lincoln let "government of the people, by the people, for the people" perish from the earth?

NO! SAYS LA FOLLETTE

(By ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., United States Senator from Wisconsin)

It would be a tragic mistake to go to war to defend the British Isles. That would take us into the total European conflict on all fronts. Once before we went to Europe to save democracy; Italy, Japan, and Russia were our allies then. With rapidly shifting alliances we might soon be fighting Frenchmen or be allied again with Russia. We would be going into war blind as to the future.

The way to save democracy now is to save it here. The first casualty after we declared war would be our own democracy. Modern war cannot be fought successfully under democratic control. France and England have learned this sad lesson, written in the blood of brave patriots.

America in war would create a dictatorship for its duration. Our Government would be drastically altered for an indefinite time to come. We would betray our heritage of democracy by entrance into the war—unprepared as we are—and do nothing effective to save democracy abroad.

We must recognize that democracy will not and cannot take a nation through complete chaos. With manpower decimated, capital and producing units in ruins, hunger and pestilence rampant, Europe will be in chaos after this war. Let no man, therefore, believe we can preserve democracy at home or abroad merely by going to war to defend the British Isles.

PRICE OF WAR

However our hearts may ache, it is time to use our heads. However idealistic our motive, it is the plain, ordinary people who will pay the cost of war. They paid last time in blood, treasure, and bitter disillusionment. They will pay again.

Through 1938 the cash costs of our participation in World War No. 1 was $47,247,000,000. This does not include the Allied war debt, which will never be repaid. With interest, this is over $12,211,000,000—or a grand total of $59,458,000,000—which our last effort "to make the world safe for democracy" cost the people of this country.

Yet those enormous figures do not tell half the story. We must add to them most of our staggering governmental bills since 1929. The after effects of World War No. 1 finally took their toll on the Nation's whole economic life, through loss of markets abroad, the dislocation and wartime expansion of our major industries, cotton textiles, lumber, coal, and agriculture. Deflation of these industries finally caused the collapse of the Nation's purchasing power.

What we have suffered in the loss of human values and material wealth as a result of our last misadventure in Europe will be as nothing compared to the economic consequences all our people will suffer if we go to war to defend the British Isles.

BRITAIN'S MISTAKES

We cannot remedy the mistakes made by Great Britain during the last 22 years in both foreign and domestic policy. What is happening now was decided long before September 3, 1939. It is tragic to see France defeated and brave Englishmen fighting against odds. But, powerful as we are, we have not the strength to reverse the running of the European sands of time; and it takes time to train men, to put people to work producing wealth, and to turn out mechanized implements of war.

Another lesson we must learn from the tragic events in Europe is that arms and implements of war are not enough to make a nation strong. The cruel fact has been driven home to a shocked world that a nation with a dynamic, expanding economy can smash a nation or a combination of nations in which manpower, capital, human and natural resources are not at work producing real wealth. It would be fatal to let our abhorrence of the brutalitarian revolution in Germany blind us to this vital fact.

We cannot preserve democracy at home or abroad by going to war to try to defend the British Isles. The only realistic way we can now serve the ultimate cause of democracy in the world is to turn our energies to the creation of a dynamic expanding economy under our own democratic form of government. We have a responsibility to our nation and this hemisphere which will require our full and undivided energies and resources.

PROGRAM FOR "DYNAMIC AMERICA"

I propose the following foreign and domestic policies based on our vital national interest:

1. Stay out of foreign overseas wars, including one to defend the British Isles.

2. A sound national defense which will protect this Nation and defend this hemisphere from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn against all comers. A tax plan which will prevent fat profits being made from such a program.

3. Build an economy not only on this continent but in this hemisphere, which will give us the necessary stimulus for prosperity and utilize the full energies and resources of our people.

4. Utilize our idle manpower, productive capacity, and idle capital not required for national defense to restore our national resource base, to rehabilitate and conserve our human resources.

Here is a program which will give us a dynamic America and restore that equality of economic opportunity which characterized the development of our own physical frontier. It will give the farmer a decent living and restore farming as a way of life.

It will provide the opportunity to those who work in shop, store, office, and factory to earn a decent and secure living, by assuring to every able-bodied American useful and productive employment at a living wage.

This program will assure a national plan to provide generous, adequate, and self-respecting security for those who, because of age or other disability, are unable to provide for themselves.

It will end the unpardonable crime of denying opportunity to the Nation's most precious asset—its youth.

Here is a program which will give this generation "a rendezvous with destiny" in this hemisphere instead of with death in some other. It will make and keep democracy safe for America.

American Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA, AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on July 30, 1940, under the auspices of American defense group of Harvard University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends and fellow Americans, as I stand here in Cambridge, I find my mind turning to ancient history, to the graphic picture of an ancient world, which lingers tenaciously in my memory—a quiet, peaceful, little agitated world. The antique world upon which my reflection centers is the world of the year 1924 when I graduated from the Harvard Law School.

In this great university at that time there were many men, masters of much knowledge; men of unique vision, with almost the gift of prophecy. Yet I wonder who of that world would venture to say that he was able to see 16 years ahead to this sad world of 1940.

Who could have believed what you and I have seen happen in 5 years, in 2 years, in 9 months, in 10 weeks? Who would have dared to claim it possible to alter the character of the world, the destiny perhaps of mankind, the security of this great Nation in 3 months?

Here where genius has given birth to so many miracles; where have been carved so many magic wands which gave an easy mastery over the potent forces of nature, who would have thought that venerated science could gain such a pyrrhic victory.

Yet the dullest mind knows that his world has been caught in the crush of dynamic forces and shattered into many incongruous fragments. One wonders almost if he is sane when such ugly images form on the retina of his mind if he dare lift his eye to the horizon. One thinks he even sees scorpions of doubt crawling over dogmas, faiths, and philosophies, even upon the pages of Holy Writ which tell of the sovereignty of God and the dignity of man. Into one's mind creep insuppressible misgivings about the integrity of human character and the quality of human worth.

Things refuse to be rational, to take on any natural shape to which we are accustomed. Life has lost pattern, and men stumble along an uncertain way; the balance of their mind disturbed; the delicate mechanism of their governance unsettled. One feels that he is lost on a slippery surface, moved along by sinister forces which he can neither guide nor restrain.

Paradox rears its peculiar head everywhere. The greatest cruelty is found in an age which has achieved the greatest charity man has ever known. The most widespread slavery history recalls sobs in a world which knows the most complete freedom of all time. The strongest will abides in a world rent with the breaking of the weakest wills. Courage shares our time with outrageous cowardice. Men who hold their course like the compass needle must share the reins which guide a nation's course with flabby appeasers.

Yet chaos, unruly forces, incongruous fragments, facts which refuse to be rational have been the fallow ground from which men of skill, vision, patience, and courage have always brought forth the great things of the world. Men have always had to contend with destructive forces, to harness them, to curb their damage, and eventually to exterminate them. Men have always rallied against danger, pooling their forces, coordinating their efforts, marshalling their wills to win. The terrible anger of outraged right has always been a devastating force.

What concerns you and me now is whether our generation of men and women, of boys and girls, is to be an exception or whether we are worthy of that noble past which has many times moved through the dark valleys but always marched on to the light, which has met many evil forces but always mastered them.

Let me congratulate the American defense group of Harvard University. You are a spearhead of your generation's effort. You are one of those forging the weapons which shall break the shackles upon our security, our standard of living, the worship of God, and the rights of man. All over America, all over this hemisphere, all over the world, though in many places stealthily, other men and women of all ages are propagating the same sentiments which you are generating here.

Your objectives are comprehensive. You are advancing upon a broad front. You are singularly fitted to give especial leadership to the great effort which the occasion demands, for you know that the first duty that leadership has is to see clearly what is to be done. What is our problem? Tell us what is right and then we will know what is our duty. Tell us whether there is merit in these strange claims that are made; whether there is justice in these novel demands; whether there is justification for this so-called world revolution. If not, tell us how fiendish it is. And if that be the truth, tell us that it is the ugly head of age-old tyranny rising up again through the earth blood soaked endless times with its destruction.

Tell us, you who teach, what of all that we have gained in the ages' struggle is worth keeping, even at the price of our lives. Where shall we make our stand to fight and where shall we yield up the corrupt?

Tell us, you who lead, who is with us, whose interests lie with ours and with whom do our interests lie. Who are the beneficiaries of this vast inheritance which the past has bequeathed? Who has enough stake in it to defend it? Is it for all that we have preserved these good things, or is it for only a few?

How much shall we pay to keep what we have, to gain the hope of better? Is lip service enough? Is time enough? Is money enough? Is labor enough? Is life too much?

You who think, tell us also, what is the alternative to the dictator's world; what kind of a world do you want; what kind of a world ought we to have? Is the present the best you can offer in place of the world the dictators want? What has your world to offer to the individual in health and strength, in family happiness, in security—security against harm, security against poverty, security against fear?

What has your world to offer against war and the causes of war; against international anarchy and brigandage; against the constant class of over-zealous nationalisms; against the stresses and the strains of peoples historically crowded into abnormal barriers; against the pull of forces across artificial boundaries?

Is your concept of democracy so vital that its very exuberance throws the lie into the despots' charge of decadence? Can you tell us, you who study, how men and women, boys and girls, may regain their enthusiasm for the democratic life so that they shall speak of it with that pride and satisfaction which comes from a knowledge that they share a great trust?

Can you tell us where we may draw the line in a democratic state between liberty and restraint? How much can we settle a share of the whole responsibility upon each without losing the character of a free people? How much can we coordinate our efforts, pool our strength, marshal our wills and still be a liberty-loving people?

In this chaotic day the demand is primarily for those who can think through to some rational conclusion; who can properly appraise the issues and the causes at stake; who can keep a clear view of what we are aiming at and not lose sight of the purpose of the struggle in the means by which it is carried on.

And if you can, tell us what is this strange paralysis which has gripped the wills of our generation and made it resist not even when its vitals are attacked? Is this the dreaded new weapon fashioned in some fiendish mind? Is the right to worship God according to one's conscience no longer worth preserving? Is man no longer a rational being worth saving? Is human dignity a false claim not worth defending? Are these things which we call the mind and the spirit, the gentler subtle forces of the world, frills and furbelows, the appendixes of civilization? How could a substantial number of people, how could any leader trusted with authority and duty, question these fundamentals of the life we know?

Yet, you and I know that those who do not see, and worse the appeaser who thinks so little of his brother's blood that he would grip the hand that took it; who so ignores his ancestor's sacrifices that he would embrace the principle that slew him, those who cry "Peace" when there is no peace with evil; those who cry "Stay" when we are already too late, are in every city, town, and hamlet, in both Houses of Congress, writing books and publishing newspapers, and some while their breasts are still warm from a tyrant's embrace daring to counsel a brave people over the radio.

Amid the fearful uncertainties of this dangerous hour, dare you and I not speak candidly and fearlessly to each other and to our countrymen? The American people are a brave people, able to stand steadfast against the shock of truth, to meet courageously the challenge of trial.

Let us, therefore, unceasingly tell the American people some ugly facts.

1. The United States of America is in greater physical danger than it has been since it gained its independence. It is possible

for a combination of existing world forces who have reason to desire our downfall seriously to threaten our security. Other nations of the world inimical to our interests have military and mechanical forces which if they were landed in this country we are unable to meet. If the British Navy were destroyed or should fall into the hands of an enemy, such an enemy could marshal naval forces which would prove vastly superior to our naval forces and could attack either Continental United States or its Territories at places which could not be adequately defended.

2. The Western Hemisphere is in greater physical danger than it has been at any other time since the establishment of the Monroe Doctrine. The Hydrographic Service of the United States Government reports that the total coast line from the northern part of Iceland around the eastern boundary of North, Central, and South America, past the Horn, and up the western boundary of this hemisphere to the Arctic Circle is 43,000 miles. I believe it to be true that with the British Navy out of consideration that hemisphere cannot be defended successfully against possible and potential enemies of the United States by the existing naval forces of the United States or forces which can be brought into being and effectiveness inside a period of 10 years.

3. The internal stability, the economic strength of the Western Hemisphere is more uncertain today than it has been in the history of this country. The Western Hemisphere cannot maintain its present economic organization and preserve its present standard of living with Europe economically cut off from it. A high authority in the United States Government has made to me the statement that "The wolf is really at the door of America." Farm prices are now being held by the United States Government approximately 20 percent above the world market. We are not the natural market for the principal commodities of South America. They have been accustomed to take only about one-third of our exports and to give us about one-third of theirs. To reestablish commerce with a Europe dominated by Hitler means to abandon gold as the medium and measure of world trade, to enter into a barter system agreeable to Hitler's demands, and to meet any conditions dictatorship may choose to impose. It means joining hands with our mortal enemy and helping to keep alive the forces which have destroyed these things which have made the world worth living in to us and shattered the foundations of our own prosperity, security, and happiness.

4. Democracy cannot survive as we now know it in this hemisphere—in this Nation—if the world continues as the dictators have now made it and if dictatorship as it now exists still lives. A free economy, free lives will have to be sacrificed to totalitarianism in order to meet totalitarianism, or we shall perish before totalitarianism. All the incidents of dictatorship abroad will be here in the United States—inflation, forced loans from the public, Government price fixing, Government freezing of wages and people in their jobs, shifting of population to Government-designated areas, forced residence on farms, strict Government-controlled agriculture, the suppression of personal liberties—if practically all of the rest of the world lies prostrate under the cruel feet of modern dictatorship. A world can no more exist half slave and half free than can a nation. Free private enterprise, free exchange of goods and services, free lives cannot exist in such an order.

5. Intellectual life as we know it today cannot live in a world dominated by modern dictatorship. Research, creative writing, constructive thinking, seeking after new worlds of the mind are stifled in the brutality of the totalitarian state. The intellectual inheritance of the ages would first be prostituted and then repudiated.

6. The spiritual values, those potent unreal but moving forces which have wrought civilization out of the base past would be strangled like an unwanted baby aborning. Man would lose his grasp upon the divine hand which has guided him through the dark eras and fall into an endless night. The soul shorn of its wings, would spend eternity like a base serpent condemned to crawl upon the earth.

Can there be any division in counsel as to whether your country and mine will suffer any force upon earth even to threaten us with that kind of a life?

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet" as to be purchasable in modern America "at the price of chains and slavery"?

Are we unwilling to risk some danger to avoid a surer death and a more certain destruction? Should we cringe behind some fancied screen either too blind to see devastation all around us, or too selfish to aid the common friend against the common foe?

Shall we let the inheritance of freedom be stricken from the hope of our children by a few arrogant men who have sworn our destruction without even a show of courage as a testament to them? Shall we speak only in soothing and honeyed words to a people whose whole character has been rooted in the foundation of forthrightness, courage, and determination?

I know that the people know what is going on in their world and what is being done to their world and who is doing it and why they are doing it, and who proposes to defend their world and those who are unworthy of trust in it.

I propose, therefore, that this sturdy defense group of Harvard University, in the age-old tradition of this institution, blaze a fresh trail in the thought of America. Let it be clear. Let it be straight. Let it go unerringly to its goal. Let this group propose to the American people this declaration of faith and purpose:

1. We believe in God and we will defend the right to worship Him according to the dictates of one's conscience.

2. We proudly redeclare that man is a rational and dignified being and that he who enslaves him profanes God's highest handiwork.

3. We will defend with all we have our country, our continent, our way of life, our standard of living, and the right to approach all men everywhere for a free exchange of sentiments, goods, and services.

4. As a part of the moral right of self-defense we inform all men that we will resist the conquest of Great Britain as inimical to our own security.

5. To our prayers for peace we will add our good offices to all men toward bringing about a just peace upon democratic principles in Europe or Asia.

6. That we honor the memory of all Americans who have contributed to the creation of a system which would help to bring about a law-abiding world, and we will assume an honorable part in an effort to bring about a world condition where wrong may be redressed and redressable and justice under law may become an international practice.

In an earlier day our forefathers combed all the past for the framework of what they built here. They did not fear to seek new material and to build a new structure without any counterpart in all the world. How well their courage and confidence have been vindicated is attested by a nation which has not been approximated in history. Now is a time for new pioneering. As the wild forces of nature were once harnessed upon this continent, so must the tumultuous and violent forces of a mad world be brought to a new obedience to those higher precepts which man has dreamed.

This Nation was consciously built. So must a new world be. The pattern of this Government never came into being by negation or equivocation or emasculating timidity. It grew out of a bold dream under the persistent urge of indomitable wills that dared to do what God and judgment told them was right. It is time for America to stir itself out of its apathy, to break the shackles which have strangled its moral sense to be done with weaklings and twisted-minded patriots or sinister opportunists. It is time, high time, for America to be her old self again and Americans to be worthy of their name.

Within almost a stone's throw from where we stand the blood of patriots was spilled in the holy cause of liberty and freedom for a God-loving people. Those heroes had no assurances that an army would form at their side, and that a scattered people would so unite in strength that their's might assume the dignity of a great cause. Yet so did the zeal of their spirit arouse the whole country that soon a citizen of far-off Virginia assumed command of the Continental Army within sight of where these men of Massachusetts died.

The spirit of those men who, too, loved life and freedom—loved them so much that they were willing to die for them—still pulses through the hearts of Americans. Nor have Americans lost that moral sense that men of Massachusetts peculiarly possessed and builded into the institutions of this Nation. No brazen tyrant can suppress the determination of the people of America to denounce murder, bloody conquest, heinous wrong, wherever it be, nor restrain this moral sense of America from demanding right and justice and throwing its weight and heart-uttered benediction with those who defend them.

All America needs is bold, fearless, unyielding leadership which knows it is on God's side and cares about nothing else.

Of you men and women of Harvard the times demand such new leadership; for where better than from these monuments that honor patriots' graves, than from these books which tell the epic of patriots' sacrifices, than from these halls where human rationality and dignity have been taught, than from the shades of these trees from which Washington went forth to wage war against the tyranny of his day, could come a clear call to the people of America to awake and be about the stern business of defending the ramparts they love.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM MRS. LILLIAN L. VAN BURGH

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, last February a gentle old lady, of Casper, Wyo., whom I have known for several years, wrote me, in response to a holiday letter, a very elo-

quent and moving letter on old-age pensions from the point of view of a mother. Several of my friends saw copies of the communication, and all were impressed by it, as was I. I have now been requested to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is worthy of such recognition.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mrs. Lillian L. Van Burgh, of Casper, Wyo., to me may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASPER, WYO., *February 1940.*

Senator J. C. O'MAHONEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I was much pleased to receive your Christmas greetings letter. Knowing what a busy man you are, it was all the more pleasing to know you had not forgotten the short talk we had last summer regarding my young grandson, who now informs me he still wants to go to Annapolis if possible. He is a sophomore at State University, Berkeley, Calif. I am anxious to help the lad all I can, and will be more grateful than I can say for anything you may be able to do regarding an appointment. Some time I may be able to return the favor. (Strange things are happening in this old topsy-turvy world of ours.)

Now, Senator, I am going to ask you to, please, talk with Dr. Townsend. You will like him, I know, and I am also sure he will show you, in his simple, clear way, that the plan is sound, and will bring our country back on its old solid foundation once more; for you must realize, as we all are now doing, that our beloved Nation is tottering too close to an unthinkable abyss. To you men in Washington, our Senators and Congressmen, we have given the power to show the way to prevent such disaster to our country.

I was a voting delegate to the three last national conventions, and I know what the Townsend plan is and what it will do for me.

Senator, could you visualize your own dear mother—if she is still with you—an object of charity, or in the home of one of her children? No matter how kind they may be, it is not her own home. She is not queen of that hive. No hive ever has two queens.

God intended it to be so. After long years of independence, laboring happily for her loved ones, striving to form in each child principles and characters that will make them a credit to her and their country—for that is what we mothers are for, to give our country good, honorable, law-abiding citizens. I have given three, and so far not one has caused me to regret their birth. When her task is finished, and they no longer really need her, and perhaps under present conditions the children can scarcely provide for their own, too often she finds herself alone, homeless, with no means now to purchase the things she had longed for during the years when the children needed so much. How she had longed to travel, to see the wonderful places of which she had read! If she could only run away where no one she knew could ever see her again, or—"Dear Father, if I could just die!" No, Senator; that could not be your mother, thank God; but it could be and is thousands of mothers today in this glorious(?) land of ours.

Every mother, so long as she can walk, wants her own home and independence. No matter how fine or good her children may be, no mother wants to be compelled to become a member of their home. Mother is living in a different generation. Their lives, their ways, are not hers.

Can you not see, dear Senator, what the Townsend plan would mean to us, your senior citizens of this Nation, the sound foundation of which we laid for you of the present generation to build upon?

Please study the plan, and I know you will vote right. If you return to Wyoming soon, I hope I may have the pleasure of meeting you again. I seem to have as many political friends among the Democrats as among my own Republicans.

Please pardon this too-long letter. I guess I thought you were "one of my boys" to whom I was talking. Often they come to "Mother Van" with their problems.

Most sincerely,

MRS. LILLIAN L. VAN BURGH.

Appropriations for Army and Air Corps and Navy and Bureau of Aeronautics, 1920–41

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting table showing the appropriations for the Army and the Air Corps from 1920 to 1941, and also the appropriations for the Navy and the Bureau of Aeronautics for the same period. The table is very interesting and I think it will prove enlightening to the Senate and the country.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations for the Army and the Air Corps, 1920–41

Fiscal year	Citation to appropriation act	Tital of act	Army	Air (Service) Corps	Total
1920	41 Stat. 104–131	Army	[1] $747,324,877.50	[1] $25,000,000.00	$774,602,809.70
	40 Stat. 1336–1348	Military Academy	[1] 2,277,932.20		
1921	41 Stat. 948–977	Army	[2] 359,123,365.00	[2] 33,435,000.00	394,700,577.70
	41 Stat. 538–548	Military Academy	[2] 2,142,212.70		
1922	42 Stat. 68–103	Army (including Military Academy)	[3] 308,913,529.80	[3] 19,200,000.00	[3] 328,113,529.80
1923	42 Stat. 716–756	War Department, military activities	[4] 257,668,263.87	[4] 12,895,000.00	[4] 270,563,263.87
1924	42 Stat. 1377–1416	do	[5] 244,838,768.00	[5] 12,436,000.00	[5] 257,274,768.00
1925	43 Stat. 477–510	do	[6] 243,716,703.13	[6] 12,798,576.00	[6] 256,515,279.13
1926	43 Stat. 892–925	do	[7] 245,846,059.00	[7] 14,911,191.00	[7] 260,757,250.00
1927	44 Stat. 254–287	do	[8] 254,082,552.16	[8] 15,256,694.00	[8] 269,339,246.16
1928	44 Stat. 1106–1137	do	[9] 261,516,291.00	[9] 20,602,594.00	[9] 282,118,885.00
1929	45 Stat. 326–353	do	[10] 286,537,200.50	[10] 24,630,268.00	[10] 311,167,468.50
1930	45 Stat. 1349–1374	do	[11] 297,713,557.00	[11] 34,690,785.00	[11] 332,404,342.00
1931	46 Stat. 432–457	do	[12] 299,781,496.00	[12] 35,823,473.00	[12] 335,604,969.00
1932	46 Stat. 1277–1301	do	[13] 298,841,333.00	[13] 31,479,635.00	[13] 330,320,968.00
1933	47 Stat. 664–689	do	[14] 274,554,789.00	[14] 25,439,131.00	[14] 299,993,920.00
1934	47 Stat. 1571–1595	do	[15] 248,625,068.00	[15] 23,324,185.00	[15] 271,949,253.00
1935	48 Stat. 614–638	do	[16] 236,072,808.00	[16] 27,646,328.00	[16] 263,719,136.00
1936	49 Stat. 120–148	do	[17] 300,477,622.00	[17] 45,383,400.00	[17] 345,861,022.00
1937	49 Stat. 1278–1309	do	[18] 323,389,553.00	[18] 59,397,714.00	[18] 382,787,267.00
1938	50 Stat. 442–468	Military Appropriation Act	[19] 347,780,548.00	[19] 58,618,406.00	[19] 406,398,954.00
1939	52 Stat. 642–667	do	[20] 379,374,402.00	[20] 70,556,972.00	[20] 449,931,374.00
1940	53 Stat. 592–618	do	[21] 475,702,942.00	[21] 184,464,936.00	[21] 660,167,878.00
1941	Pub., No. 611, 76th Cong	do	[22] 1,233,436,904.00	[22] 265,886,418.00	[22] 1,499,323,322.00
Grand total			7,929,738,776.86	1,053,876,706.00	8,983,615,482.86

[1] S. Doc. 456, 65th Cong., pp. 43, 215, 227.
[2] S. Doc. 204, 66th Cong., pp. 48, 71, 226.
[3] The Budget, 1923, pp. 316, 348.
[4] The Budget, 1924, pp. 753, 882.
[5] The Budget, 1925, pp. 756, 877.
[6] The Budget, 1926, pp. 845, 950.
[7] The Budget, 1927, pp. 1007, 1186.
[8] The Budget, 1928, pp. 1008, 1193.
[9] The Budget, 1929, pp. 1072, 1273.
[10] The Budget, 1930, pp. 1118, 1307.
[11] The Budget, 1931, pp. 1151, 1353.
[12] The Budget, 1932, pp. XLVII.
[13] The Budget, 1933, p. L.
[14] The Budget, 1934, pp. LI, LII.
[15] The Budget, 1935, p. XLII.
[16] The Budget, 1936, p. 587.
[17] The Budget, 1937, p. 575.
[18] The Budget, 1938, p. 631.
[19] The Budget, 1939, p. 645.
[20] The Budget, 1940, p. 697.
[21] The Budget, 1941, p. 751.
[22] House Appropriations Committee.

Appropriations for the Navy and the Bureau of Aeronautics, 1920–41

Fiscal year	Citation to appropriation act	Title of act	Navy	Bureau of Aeronautics [1]	Total
1920	41 Stat. 131–157	Naval service	[2] $616,096,838.88		$616,096,838.88
1921	41 Stat. 812–837	do	[3] 433,279,574.00		433,279,574.00
1922	42 Stat. 122–141	do	[4] 397,259,858.23	[4] $13,413,431.00	[4] 410,673,289.23
1923	42 Stat. 786–812	Navy Department	[5] 283,520,705.25	[5] 14,803,560.00	[5] 298,324,265.25
1924	42 Stat. 1132–1154	do	[6] 282,303,690.00	[6] 14,793,560.00	[6] 297,097,250.00
1925	43 Stat. 182–205	Navy Department and naval service	[7] 261,879,827.00	[7] 15,328,500.00	[7] 277,208,327.00
1926	43 Stat. 861–881	do	[8] 287,881,378.00	[8] 14,981,000.00	[8] 302,862,378.00
1927	44 Stat. 591–614	do	[9] 302,805,687.00	[9] 19,256,288.00	[9] 322,061,975.00
1928	44 Stat. 1275–1296	do	[10] 297,831,957.00	[10] 20,300,000.00	[10] 318,131,957.00
1929	45 Stat. 624–644	do	[11] 332,277,362.00	[11] 31,956,000.00	[11] 364,233,362.00
1930	45 Stat. 1452–1472	do	[12] 330,631,247.00	[12] 31,430,000.00	[12] 362,061,247.00
1931	46 Stat. 556–579	do	[13] 350,471,982.00	[13] 32,033,211.00	[13] 382,505,193.00
1932	46 Stat. 1431–1453	do	[14] 328,956,593.00	[14] 31,145,000.00	[14] 360,101,593.00
1933	47 Stat. 421–445	do	[15] 303,660,721.00	[15] 25,245,420.00	[15] 328,906,141.00
1934	47 Stat. 1521–1543	do	[16] 287,515,201.00	[16] 21,957,459.00	[16] 309,472,660.00
1935	48 Stat. 403–425	do	[17] 283,666,419.00	[17] 19,156,929.00	[17] 302,823,348.00
1936	49 Stat. 398–421	do	[18] 440,999,069.00	[18] 40,732,310.00	[18] 481,731,379.00
1937	49 Stat. 1398–1420	do	[19] 489,514,262.00	[19] 38,588,270.00	[19] 528,102,532.00
1938	50 Stat. 96–118	do	[20] 470,225,179.00	[20] 49,500,000.00	[20] 519,725,179.00
1939	52 Stat. 223–246	do	[21] 511,100,744.00	[21] 48,075,000.00	[21] 559,175,744.00
1940	53 Stat. 757–782	do	[22] 637,991,461.00	[22] 82,798,000.00	[22] 720,789,461.00
1941	Pub., No. 588, 76th Cong	do	[23] 1,213,968,238.00	[23] 94,202,900.00	[23] 1,308,171,138.00
Grand total			9,143,837,993.36	659,696,838.00	9,803,534,831.36

[1] Bureau of Aeronautics was created by sec. 8 of act of July 12, 1921.
[2] S. Doc. 456, 65th Cong., p. 254.
[3] S. Doc. 204, 66th Cong., p. 251.
[4] The Budget, 1923, pp. 368, 376.
[5] The Budget, 1924, pp. 590, 600.
[6] The Budget, 1925, pp. 596, 604.
[7] The Budget, 1926, pp. 650, 664.
[8] The Budget, 1927, pp. 771, 781.
[9] The Budget, 1928, pp. 777, 786.
[10] The Budget, 1929, pp. 822, 831.
[11] The Budget, 1930, pp. 853, 879.
[12] The Budget, 1931, pp. 892, 918.
[13] The Budget, 1932, p. XL.
[14] The Budget, 1933, p. XLII.
[15] The Budget, 1934, p. XLIII.
[16] The Budget, 1935, p. XXXIV (i. e., grand total minus trust funds).
[17] The Budget, 1936, p. 471.
[18] The Budget, 1937, p. 457.
[19] The Budget, 1938, p. 511.
[20] The Budget, 1939, p. 527.
[21] The Budget, 1940, p. 569.
[22] The Budget, 1941, p. 647.
[23] House Appropriations Committee.

Production Statistics on Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

TABLE SHOWING PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS OF AMERICAN COTTON, 1840 TO DATE

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table:

Cotton, American: Production and exports, 1840 to date
[In thousand running bales]

Year [1]	Production	Exports	Exports as percentage of production
1840–41	1,635	1,060	64.9
1841–42	1,684	1,169	69.5
1842–43	2,379	1,585	66.6
1843–44	2,030	1,327	65.4
1944–45	2,395	1,746	72.9
1845–46	2,101	1,095	52.1
1846–47	1,779	1,054	59.3
1847–48	2,440	1,629	66.7
1948–49	2,867	2,053	71.6
1849–50	2,469	1,271	51.5
1850–51	2,454	1,854	75.6
1851–52	3,126	2,186	69.9
1852–53	3,416	2,223	65.1
1853–54	3,075	1,976	64.2
1854–55	2,983	2,017	67.6
1855–56	3,666	2,703	73.7
1856–57	3,094	2,097	67.8
1857–58	3,257	2,237	68.7
1858–59	4,019	2,773	69.0
1859–60	5,387	3,535	65.6
1860–61	3,849	615	16.0
1861–62	4,500	10	.2
1862–63	1,600	23	1.4
1863–64	450	24	5.3
1864–65	300	18	5.9
1865–66	2,269	1,301	57.3
1866–67	2,097	1,402	66.8
1867–68	2,520	1,503	59.6
1868–69	2,366	1,300	55.0
1869–70	3,012	1,988	66.0
1870–71	4,352	2,923	67.2
1871–72	2,974	1,825	61.4
1872–73	3,931	2,471	62.9
1873–74	4,170	2,683	64.3
1874–75	3,833	2,504	65.3
1875–76	4,632	3,038	65.6
1876–77	4,474	2,839	63.5
1877–78	4,774	3,197	67.0
1878–79	5,074	3,290	64.8
1879–80	5,755	3,743	65.0
1880–81	6,606	4,453	67.4
1881–82	5,456	3,377	61.9
1882–83	6,950	4,591	66.1
1883–84	5,713	3,733	65.3
1884–85	5,682	3,783	66.6
1885–86	6,576	4,201	63.9
1886–87	6,505	4,302	66.1
1887–88	7,047	4,519	64.1
1888–89	6,938	4,730	68.2
1889–90	7,473	4,929	66.0
1890–91	8,653	5,850	67.6
1891–92	9,035	5,897	65.3
1892–93	6,700	4,485	66.9
1893–94	7,493	5,307	70.8
1894–95	9,901	6,961	70.3
1895–96	7,161	4,762	66.5
1896–97	8,533	6,124	71.8
1897–98	10,898	7,811	71.7
1898–99	11,189	7,627	68.2
1899–1900	9,393	6,168	65.7
1900–01	10,102	6,807	67.4
1901–02	9,583	6,870	71.7
1902–03	10,588	6,914	65.3
1903–04	9,820	6,234	63.5
1904–05	13,451	9,057	67.3
1905–06	10,495	6,975	66.5
1906–07	12,983	8,825	68.0
1907–08	11,058	7,780	70.4
1908–09	13,086	8,890	67.9
1909–10	10,073	6,492	64.4
1910–11	11,568	8,026	69.4
1911–12	15,553	11,081	71.2
1912–13	13,489	9,199	68.2
1913–14	13,983	9,256	66.2
1914–15	15,906	8,323	52.3
1915–16	11,068	5,896	53.3
1916–17	11,364	5,300	46.6
1917–18	11,248	4,288	38.1
1918–19	11,906	5,592	47.0
1919–20	11,326	6,545	57.8
1920–21	13,271	5,745	43.3

[1] Production statistics relate to year of growth. For the years 1840 to 1842, inclusive, the statistics of exports relate to the 12 months beginning Oct. 1; for 1843 to 1866, inclusive, to the 12 months beginning with July 1; for 1867 to 1913, inclusive, to the 12 months beginning with Sept. 1; and for 1914 to date to the 12 months beginning with Aug. 1.

Cotton, American: Production and exports, 1840 to date—Continued
[In thousand running bales]

Year	Production	Exports	Exports as percentage of production

Cotton, American: Production and exports, 1840 to date—Continued

[In thousand running bales]

Year	Production	Exports	Exports as percentage of production
1921–22	7,978	6,184	77.5
1922–23	9,729	4,823	49.6
1923–24	10,171	5,656	55.6
1924–25	13,639	8,005	58.7
1925–26	16,123	8,051	49.9
1926–27	17,755	10,927	61.5
1927–28	12,783	7,540	59.0
1928–29	14,297	8,044	56.3
1929–30	14,548	6,690	46.0
1930–31	13,756	6,760	49.1
1931–32	16,629	8,708	52.4
1932–33	12,710	8,419	66.2
1933–34	12,664	7,534	59.5
1934–35	9,472	4,799	50.7
1935–36	10,420	5,973	57.3
1936–37	12,141	5,440	44.8
1937–38	18,252	5,598	30.7
1938–39	11,623	3,327	28.6
1939–40			

Source: Cotton Production and Distribution, Bulletins 169 and 176, Bureau of the Census. Southern Division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Apr. 3, 1940.

Decline and Rise of United States Naval Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Decline and Rise of United States Naval Power, 1921–40," with the accompanying tables.

There being no objection, the article and accompanying tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECLINE AND RISE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL POWER, 1921–40

In 1921 the United States had, in ships built and building, the most powerful navy in the world. There were 536 ships in the combatant categories, the tonnage of which was 2,134,497 tons. Manning this number one fleet of the world were 134,237 trained officers and men. Available to repair and replace units of this fleet as they became over age was a shipbuilding industry such as the Nation had not had before. It had established a world record never since equaled of constructing a destroyer in 45½ working days. The quality of its product is attested by the hundred-odd over-age destroyers still doing valuable service.

But it was not for long that we held our place as first among the navies of the world. Late in 1921, under the leadership of our Government, a disarmament conference met in Washington. After the disarmament conference, work stopped on most of our naval vessels under construction. Shipbuilding plants closed down one by one. Their skilled artisans scattered to the four corners of the land. The building ways rotted and rusted.

We disposed of or demilitarized 31 capital ships including 7 new battleships and 4 new battle cruisers which averaged 28 percent completed. One of the battleships, the *Washington*, was 75.9 percent, or nearer completion than the *Washington* which was launched in Philadelphia June 1 of this year. Approximately $277,000,000 were sacrificed in the scrapping of ships under this treaty. With those ships we would today have a more powerful battle line than we can hope to have in the next 6 years.

Of the 20 older capital ships disposed of, only 2 were then over age by our present standards and some were little past the halfway mark toward obsolescence.

Our total tonnage disposed of or demilitarized under the Washington Treaty was 767,880 tons, compared to Great Britain's 447,750 and Japan's 355,730. We were no longer the world's largest naval power.

But in 1930 we agreed to dispose of 3 more capital ships plus 203 cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, or a total of 206 ships of 331,109 tons. This brought the total naval combatant ships disposed of or demilitarized to 237 of a total tonnage of 1,098,989 tons. Thus we reduced the Nation's naval defense by a fleet almost as large as our entire fleet today.

By 1933 we had dropped below Great Britain, below Japan, and even below France in the number of under-age combatant ships. The numbers were Great Britain 138, Japan 184, France 124, and United States 101. Even on a tonnage basis we were in a relatively weak position in under-age combatant vessels. Great Britain had 980,169 tons, Japan 726,138 tons, and we had 728,000 tons. The average age of our under-age ships being older than Japan's, we were actually in third place in over-all fighting power.

It was not only the sacrifice of ships under the treaty agreements which brought us to the unfavorable relative strength which we had in 1933, when we began to rebuild our Navy. The treaties allowed us to build ships as replacements, but we didn't build them. Of some 150 combatant ships which we were allowed to lay down between 1922 and 1933, we actually did lay down only 25 and completed 14.

Since 1933 we have laid down and/or contracted for 242 and commissioned 124 combatant vessels. We have under construction now 138 combatant ships and 18 auxiliaries plus 34 motor torpedo boats and submarine chasers, or a total of 190 craft.

In the meantime we have rehabilitated our shipbuilding industry, both private and Government. In 1933 there were 4,969 men employed in shipbuilding in navy yards, and now we have 28,800.

The trained naval personnel in 1933 was 90,334 naval officers and men and 15,927 marine officers and men. We now have 150,451 Navy, including aviation cadets, and 27,542 Marine Corps. The over-all increase in trained personnel has been 63 percent since 1933.

In 1933 we had only 1,066 naval planes. Today we have on hand about 2,100 plus over 2,000 on order, and the efficiency of our naval air arm is unequaled.

SUMMARY—DECLINE

From 1921 until 1933 the naval power of the United States was on the decline. The extent of this weakening of our naval defense is indicated by the following facts:

1. About half of our fighting naval tonnage was disposed of or demilitarized (in accordance with the terms of limitation of armament treaties of 1921–22 and 1930).

2. The United States failed to build the necessary replacement naval vessels allowed under the treaty, having laid down only approximately 17 percent of some 150 combatant vessels needed and allowed.

3. The failure to build these naval vessels contributed to the atrophied condition to which our shipbuilding industry had declined by 1933.

4. Trained naval and Marine Corps personnel was reduced by approximately one-third, necessitating the decommissioning of useful naval vessels and the operation of others with reduced complements.

5. The condition of the auxiliary vessels of the fleet reduced its over-all efficiency and imposed upon it a greatly reduced speed. Not a single auxiliary naval vessel was laid down from 1922 to 1933.

RISE

Early in 1933 the decline in United States naval power reached its turning point and has been on the rise ever since. The extent of improvement of naval strength since 1933 is evidenced by:

1. We have built and commissioned since 1933 more fighting ships than our number of underage ships at the beginning of 1933. In these 7 years we have, in fact, commissioned eight times as many combatant ships as in the 7 years preceding 1933, this despite the unhappy condition of our shipbuilding industry in 1933.

2. Naval shipbuilding has been greatly speeded up. There are now 190 naval craft building. The number of men employed in naval shipbuilding has increased from less than 9,000 to over 75,000.

3. The naval air arm has been doubled and raised to an enviable state of efficiency. A well-thought-out program of naval air bases strategically located in both oceans is well under way.

4. Trained personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps has been increased by over 60 percent.

5. Naval research has been intensified and has already produced far reaching results.

A comparison of the present average age of United States combatant vessels with treaty-age definitions

Type	Present average age	Useful life	
		Washington Treaty, 1922	London Treaty, 1936
	Years	*Years*	*Years*
Battleship	22.3	20	26
Aircraft carrier	6.2	20	20
Heavy cruiser	7.3	[1] 20	[1] 20
Light cruiser	9.6	[1] 20	[1] 20
Destroyer	15.0+	[2] 12	16
Submarine	13.2	13	13

[1] If laid down before Jan. 1, 1920, 16 years.

[2] If laid down after Dec. 31, 1920, 16 years.

Average age of all United States combatant vessels, 14.1 years.

Personnel strength of the U. S. Navy

Period	U. S. Navy				U. S. Naval Reserve				U. S. Marine Corps							
	Officers Regular U. S. Navy	Enlisted men, Regular U. S. Navy	Total	Officers, U. S. Navy retired	Officers, U. S. Naval Reserve	Aviation Cadets	Enlisted men, U. S. Naval Reserve	Total, U. S. Naval Reserve	Officers, Regular U. S. Marine Corps	Enlisted men, Regular U. S. Marine Corps	Total	Men and officers, U. S. Marine Corps retired	Officers, U. S. Marine Corps Reserve	Aviation cadets	Men, U. S. Marine Corps Reserve	Total
1921	8,658	125,579	134,237	1,026	26,376	----------	230,078	256,454	1,021	21,539	22,560	352	571	----------	4,632	5,203
1925	8,015	86,811	94,826	1,401	3,818	----------	23,259	27,077	1,164	19,036	20,200	498	141	----------	471	612
929	8,704	84,986	93,690	1,647	6,078	----------	28,338	34,416	1,178	18,612	19,790	558	435	----------	8,849	9,284
1933	9,327	81,007	90,334	2,068	7,549	----------	33,735	41,284	1,175	14,752	15,927	788	602	----------	8,487	9,089
1940 (June)	10,817	139,060	149,877	3,384	14,642	574	40,204	55,420	1,433	26,067	27,500	1,358	1,145	42	14,956	16,143

TOTALS—ALL CLASSES

Period	Active	Retired	Total	Period	Active	Retired	Total
1921	418,454	1,378	419,832	1933	156,634	2,856	159,490
1925	142,715	1,899	144,614	1940 (June)	248,940	4,742	253,682
1929	157,180	2,205	159,385				

Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTERS AND TABLES SHOWING CONDITION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and tables showing the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 27, 1940.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107) an act to maintain unimpaired the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation at $100,000,000, and for other purposes, an appraisal has been made of all the assets and liabilities of said corporation as of March 31, 1940. As a result of such appraisal and on the basis of market prices as of March 31, 1940, it has been determined that the assets of the corporation exceed the liabilities, including capital stock at $100,000,000, by an amount of $43,756,731.01. A report of the committee appointed by me to appraise, on my behalf, the assets and liabilities of the corporation is attached for your information.

In the Budget for the fiscal year 1941, transmitted to the Congress on January 3, 1940, it was estimated that $60,000,000 would be repaid to the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of the appraisal of its assets as of March 31, 1940. This estimate was made in the fall of 1939 and obviously was subject to a number of factors not under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation, such as the course of commodity prices between then and March 31, 1940. In February 1940, a further estimate was made of the amount repayable to the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation during the current fiscal year. At that time, on the basis of commodity prices then existing, it was estimated that $75,000,000 would be repaid to the Treasury. Subsequent to such estimate and before March 31, 1940, there was a substantial recession in the prices of commodities on which the corporation had made loans, and additional loans were made by lending agencies under the corporation's commitments to take over such loans. As a result of this situation the amount to be repaid to the Treasury as determined by the appraisal of the corporation's assets as of March 31, 1940, is $43,756,731.01.

The above cited act provides that in the event the net worth of the corporation, as shown by the appraisal by the Secretary of the Treasury, is in excess of $100,000,000, such excess shall, as soon as practicable after such appraisal be deposited in the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation and shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts. In view of the foregoing, it is recommended that the Commodity Credit Corporation be furnished a copy of the appraisal report enclosed herewith and be directed to deposit in the Treasury the amount of $43,756,731.01, as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938.

Faithfully,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.
[Enclosure.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 27, 1940.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In compliance with your instructions in letter of March 22, 1940, the undersigned committee, on your behalf, has made an appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of determining its net worth as of March 31, 1940, as required by the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107).

There is attached hereto a balance sheet (exhibit A) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of March 31, 1940, showing its assets and liabilities on the basis of its book values, together with adjustments to reflect the value of assets, insofar as possible, on the basis of market values as of that date.

As a result of the appraisal of the Corporation's assets, it has been determined that the total assets exceed the total liabilities, including capital stock, to the extent of $43,756,731.01.

ACCOUNTING VERIFICATION

At the request of the committee, the Corporation made arrangements with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assign its auditors to make a special examination of the books and related records of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1940. A report of this examination has been furnished the committee and indicates that the books, records, and procedures of the Corporation correctly reflect its financial condition.

VALUATION OF COMMODITIES—GENERAL

There is attached hereto a statement of commodity loans as of March 31, 1940 (exhibit B) showing the amounts due the Corporation separated as to principal, accrued interest, estimated accrued warehouse and storage charges, the amounts of the commodities held as security for such loans, the value of such commodities on the basis of market prices as of March 31, 1940, and the estimated loss as of that date on the basis of such values.

An independent verification of all market prices was made by representatives of the Treasury, and the data in the attached statements were checked by the Treasury representatives to the books and records of the Corporation.

In the case of certain commodities no market quotations were available for the particular classes or grades of commodities held by the Corporation. In such instances certification of prices applicable to the commodities involved were obtained from specialists of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture familiar with the marketing of these commodities. The bases used in these certifications were carefully analyzed and the prices certified were used for the valuation of the respective commodities.

COTTON

Cotton valuations were based on the weighted average prices, according to grades and staples of cotton, of the 10 designated spot markets as published in the official quotation schedule issued by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture for March 30, 1940, reduced where necessary to reflect an average location differential.

The amount of cotton held, the average market prices, and the total market value by crop years are as follows:

Crop year	Bales	Pounds	Average price (per pound)	Total market value
			Cents	
1934–35, pool-owned [1]	1,551,854	777,834,159	9.42+	$73,317,796.19
1937–38, pool-owned [1]	5,068,056	2,643,370,680	9.11+	241,022,015.63
1938–39, loans	743,490	381,229,751		[2] 38,622,066.10
1939–40, loans	2,502	1,279,811		[3] 117,112.61
Total	7,365,902	3,803,714,401		353,078,990.53

[1] The cotton "pool-owned" represents cotton taken over from producers through Mar. 31, 1940, under the terms of the loan program, title to which has been acquired by the Corporation.

[2] The market value of this cotton as of Mar. 31, 1940 (381,229,751 pounds at 10.86 cents=$41,401,550.96) is in excess of the amount due the Corporation as of Mar. 31, 1940. Consequently, for the purpose of this report the cotton has been allowed on the basis of the loans thereon by the Corporation which were outstanding as of Mar. 31, 1940.

[3] The market value of this cotton as of Mar. 31, 1940 (1,279,811 pounds at 9.95 cents=$127,341.19) is in excess of the amount due the Corporation as of Mar. 31, 1940. Consequently, for the purpose of this report, the cotton has been allowed on the basis of the loans thereon by the Corporation which were outstanding as of Mar. 31, 1940.

CORN

The value of corn, excepting the pooled corn, was based on the weighted average local market prices (farm prices) in the commercial corn areas, as such corn is stored under seal on the farms of the borrowers.

The pooled corn represents corn taken over from producers through March 31, 1940, title to which has been acquired by the Corporation under the terms of the loan program. This corn has been priced at the market prices per bushel for the respective quantities stored in terminal elevators, subterminal elevators, country elevators, and steel bins of various county agricultural conservation associations.

The amount of corn held, the average market price, and the total value, by crop years, are as follows:

Crop year	Corn held	Average price per bushel	Total market value
	Bushels	*Cents*	
1937–38, loans	509,939	47.9	$244,260.78
1937–38, pool-owned	237,294	[1] 19.79	46,960.48
1938–39, loans	160,825,833	47.9	77,035,574.00
1938–39, pool-owned	90,997,881	48.2+	43,901,506.00
1939–40, loans	8,226,573	47.9	3,940,528.47
Total	260,797,520		125,168,829.73

[1] Valued at the known liquidation price at the time of appraisal. This corn was of substandard grades.

WHEAT

The basis for the valuation of wheat was determined by a comparison of the basic-loan rates on representative grades of wheat under loan with the terminal market prices as of March 31, 1940. This comparison showed that in all cases the terminal market prices were in excess of the basic-loan rates in amounts ample to assure the Corporation against any loss as of March 31, 1940. Consequently, for the purpose of this report, the wheat loans have been allowed on the basis of the amounts due the Corporation on such loans as of March 31, 1940.

The amount of such outstanding loans, plus accrued interest, etc., and quantities held as collateral thereto, by crop years, are as follows:

Crop year	Quantities held	Outstanding loans, plus interest, etc.
	Bushels	
1938, wheat	1,282,394	$907,225.08
1939, wheat	7,233,417	5,737,504.98
Total	8,515,811	6,644,730.06

RYE

The value of rye was based on the weighted average market price per bushel at Minneapolis, as furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, with allowance for location differential.

As the market value of the rye (1,181,190 pounds at 51.8 cents equals $611,856.42) is in excess of the amount due the Corporation as of March 31, 1940, the rye loans have been allowed on the basis of the amounts due the Corporation on such loans as of that date.

The amount of outstanding loans plus accrued interest, etc., and quantities held as collateral thereto, by crop years, are as follows:

Crop year	Quantities held	Outstanding loans, plus interest, etc.
	Bushels	
1939, rye	1,181,190	$532,834.60

TOBACCO

The value of tobacco was based on information furnished by the Director, General Crops Division of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and were arrived at after giving careful consideration to the inventories, age, current market conditions, and trade trends.

The amount of tobacco held, the average prices as recommended by the Director, and the total market value are as follows:

Crop year	Quantities held	Average price	Total market value
	Pounds	*Cents*	
1933–37, loans	15,234,986	5.2+	$803,677.10
1938, Wisconsin	278,846	3.5	9,759.61
1939, purchased	177,082,035		[1] 36,827,720.99
Total	192,595,867		37,641,157.70

[1] This tobacco is owned by the Corporation and was purchased for its account by certain exporting firms from funds advanced by the Corporation. The exporting firms have options to purchase the tobacco from the Corporation at cost including charges. The Director also estimated that the tobacco could fairly be valued at the amount paid thereon by the Corporation as of Mar. 31, 1940, as it is estimated that such amount was less than market prices for the respective grades held as of that date.

TURPENTINE AND ROSIN

The value of turpentine and gum rosin was based on the Savannah naval stores' quotations for March 30, 1940.

The amount of turpentine and gum rosin, the price of turpentine in bulk and rosin in barrels, and the total market values are as follows:

Production year	Turpentine and rosin held	Market price	Total market price
1938, turpentine	None		
	106 empty barrels	$2.00	$212.00
1938, rosin	538,424 barrels [1]	$10.12+	5,348,177.78
1939, turpentine	4,482,419 gallons	25.75 cents	1,154,222.89
1939, rosin	601,638 barrels [1]	$9.94+	5,982,119.73
Total			12,484,732.40

[1] On basis of 500 pounds per barrel.

PEANUTS, FIGS, AND PECANS

The value of peanuts, figs, and pecans was based on the amounts loaned on these commodities, plus accrued interest and expenses, if any, as such loans were made in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture in order to remove these commodities from the edible trade for the purpose of stabilizing trade prices. These commodities are disposed of from time to time, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, by being diverted, as much as possible, to other than the edible trade. Under agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the borrowers, the Corporation is secured against any loss in these transactions. Therefore, for the purpose of this report, these commodity loans have been allowed on the basis of the amounts due the Corporation on such loans as of March 31, 1940.

The amount of such outstanding loans, plus accrued interest, etc., and quantities held as collateral thereto, are as follows:

Commodity	Quantities held	Outstanding loans, plus interest, etc.
	Pounds	
1939–40, peanuts	14,440,015	$448,894.45
1939–40, figs	3,100,850	44,055.93
1938–39, pecans	2,005,174	305,514.59
Total	19,546,039	798,464.97

HOPS

These loans were made under marketing agreements with the borrowers. The market value of hops was based on information furnished by the Director, General Crops Division of the Commodity Credit Corporation and was arrived at after giving careful consideration to the inventories, domestic and foreign markets,

the age of the hops, and lack of demand for hops of the particular class held by the Corporation.

The amount of hops held by crop years, the average price as recommended by the Director, and the total market price are as follows:

Crop year	Quantities held	Average price	Total market value
	Pounds	*Cents*	
1938-39, hops	4,975,753	10	$497,575.30

RAISINS, WOOL, AND BUTTER

Loans on the above commodities were made under marketing agreements with the borrowers. The market values on such commodities as of March 31, 1940, are, in each instance, in excess of the amount due the Corporation as of that date. Therefore, for the purpose of this report, these commodity loans have been allowed on the basis of the amounts due the Corporation on such loans as of March 31, 1940.

The amount of such outstanding loans, plus accrued interest, etc., quantities held as collateral thereto, by commodities, are as follows:

Commodity	Quantities held	Outstanding loans, plus interest, etc.
1938-39, raisins	51,352.8 tons	$1,196,011.45
1939, wool	86,729 pounds	15,225.95
1939, butter	716,974 pounds	194,589.09
Total		1,405,826.49

LOANS HELD BY LENDING AGENCIES

As of March 31, 1940, various lending agencies had made loans on commodities under the terms of Commodity Credit Corporation contracts to purchase such loans from the lending agencies under certain specified conditions. The amount of outstanding loans, the accrued interest and estimated warehouse and storage charges on the underlying collateral held by lending agencies as reported to the Corporation as of March 31, 1940, and which it is committed to purchase under its contracts, are as follows:

Commodity	Face amount of loans, interest, and warehouse charges	Market value of security [1]	Estimated loss
1938-39, cotton	$98,128,879.22	$98,128,879.22	None
1939-40, cotton	907,189.72	907,189.72	None
1939-40, corn	146,466,926.38	122,789,722.03	$23,677,204.35
1939, wheat	78,661,904.98	78,661,904.98	None
1939, wool	184,942.67	184,942.67	None
Total	324,349,842.97	300,672,638.62	23,677,204.35

[1] In valuing the above cotton, corn, wheat, and wool, the same prices were applied as those used in valuing these same commodities by crop years as appear in the forepart of this report.

Based on the market values of the commodities, listed in the foregoing table, on which loans had been made by lending agencies and reported to the Commodity Credit Corporation as at March 31, 1940, an estimated loss of $23,677,204.35 will be sustained in view of the Corporation's commitments to purchase such loans from the lending agencies under certain specified conditions. The details of this estimated loss are set forth in exhibit C.

COMMITMENTS TO MAKE LOANS

As of March 31, 1940, various tobacco associations had made loans to producers on the 1939 crop tobacco under the terms of Commodity Credit Corporation commitments wherein the Corporation agreed to take over such loans from the associations. Through March 31, 1940, the associations had availed themselves of commitments with the Corporation, the particulars of which are as follows:

Commitments	Amount of loans by associations	Market value of security	Estimated loss to Commodity Credit Corporation
No. 1—1939, tobacco	$37,077.00	$17,867.23	$19,209.77
No. 2—1939, tobacco	60,450.00	28,190.26	32,259.74
No. 3—1939, tobacco	381,610.00	307,750.00	73,860.00
No. 4—1939, tobacco	176,131.80	176,131.80	None
No. 5—1939, tobacco	88,400.00	88,400.00	None
Total	743,668.80	618,339.29	125,329.51

Based on the market value of the tobacco held by the associations under these commitments, an estimated loss of $125,329.51 will be sustained. The details of such estimated loss are set forth in Exhibit C.

BASIS OF APPRAISAL

The Corporation's assets secured by the various commodities were valued strictly on the basis of the market prices which were available on such commodities as of March 31, 1940, adjusted, where necessary, to give effect to grade differences and freight differentials between the actual location of the commodities and the terminal markets. The Corporation's liabilities were adjusted where necesary to reflect the true liability for the purpose of appraisal.

The committee is of the opinion that the prices used in the valuation of the various commodities accurately reflect the market prices of such commodities as of March 31, 1940, as contemplated under the act of March 8, 1938, and that the necessary consideration has been given to all related factors, such as accrued interest and other charges, in arriving at the stated excess of $43,756,731.01 of assets over liabilities as at March 31, 1940.

EXCESS OF NET WORTH FOR DEPOSIT IN THE TREASURY AS MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS

On the basis of this appraisal it has been determined that the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation is $43,756,731.01 in excess of $100,000,000. A reconciliation of net worth is as follows:

NET WORTH

Capital stock		$100,000,000.00
Add paid-in surplus: Contributions by the Secretary of the Treasury to restore impairment of capital stock:		
Appraisal as of Mar. 31, 1938	$94,285,404.73	
Appraisal as of Mar. 31, 1939	119,599,918.05	
	213,885,322.78	
Less accumulated deficit as result of appraisal Mar. 31, 1940	170,128,591.77	
		43,756,731.01
Total net worth Mar. 31, 1940		143,756,731.01

Respectfully submitted.

D. W. BELL,
Treasury Department.
R. J. LINDQUIST,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
W. R. FUCHS,
Department of Agriculture.

EXHIBIT A

Balance sheet of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of Mar. 31, 1940

	Book values (adjusted)	Estimated loss on basis of market prices as of Mar. 31, 1940	Appraised value of assets as of Mar. 31, 1940
ASSETS			
Cash:			
On deposit with the Treasurer of the United States	$1,745,451.15		
Petty cash	25.00		
Total	1,745,476.15	None	$1,745,476.15
Funds on deposit with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:			
Principal	27,474,250.59		
Accrued interest	291,176.76		
Total	27,765,427.35	None	27,765,427.35
Commodity loans (purchased), exhibit B:			
Principal	631,791,520.79		
Accrued interest receivable	3,944,746.18		
Estimated accrued warehouse and storage charges:			
Corn inste el granaries (bins)	2,100,000.00		
All others (contra)	15,029,427.99		
Total	652,865,694.96	$114,612,553.18	$538,253,141.78
Commodity loans (agreements to purchase), exhibit C:			
Principal (contra)	309,701,554.57		
Accrued interest receivable (contra)	3,551,318.62		
Estimated accrued warehouse and storage charges (contra)	11,096,969.78		
Total	324,349,842.97	23,677,204.35	300,672,638.62
Commitments, tobacco 1939 crop (contra), exhibit D	743,668.80	125,329.51	618,339.29

EXHIBIT A—Continued

	Book values (adjusted)	Estimated loss on basis of market price as of Mar. 31, 1940	Appraised value of liabilities as of Mar. 31, 1940
ASSETS—continued			
Commodity acquired under exchange agreements:			
Rubber received, inspected, and accepted.	$755,493.33		
Claim for rubber to be delivered by the United Kingdom for which cotton has been delivered.	9,973,683.22		
Unexpended advances held by the War Department to be used for receiving and storing rubber.	162,432.68		
Total	10,891,609.23	None	$10,891,609.23
Accounts receivable:			
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.	6,426,564.42		
County agricultural conservation associations (for granaries).	5,996,848.19		
Fire, flood, and other losses in process of settlement.	174,533.13		
Miscellaneous claims in process of settlement.	511,453.38		
Travel advances due from officers and employees.	150.00		
Total	13,109,549.12	None	13,109,549.12
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment.	46,515.84	None	46,515.84
Prepaid expenses	13,407.50	None	13,407.50
Total assets	1,031,531,191.92	$138,415,087.04	893,116,104.88
LIABILITIES			
Notes payable:			
Principal	406,794,000.00		
Accrued interest	1,046,055.81		
Total	407,840,055.81	None	407,840,055.81
Estimated accrued warehouse and storage charges (contra):			
On commodity loans purchased.	15,029,427.99		
On commodity loans not purchased.	11,096,969.78		
Total	26,126,397.77	None	26,126,397.77
Commitments to banks and lending agencies (contra):			
Principal on loans not purchased.	309,701,554.57		

EXHIBIT A—Continued

	Book values (adjusted)	Estimated loss on basis of market price as of Mar. 31, 1940	Appraised value of liabilities as of Mar. 31, 1940
LIABILITIES—continued			
Commitments to banks—Con.			
Interest on loans not purchased.	$3,551,318.62		
Total	313,252,873.19	None	$313,252,873.19
Commitments to tobacco associations (contra).	743,668.80	None	743,668.80
uspended credits:			
Proceeds of sales of cotton not allocated.	635,696.87		
Proceeds of sales of raisins held pending settlement of litigation.	229,546.88		
Total	865,243.75	None	865,243.75
Accounts payable:			
Agricultural Adjustment Administration.	500,865.19		
Insurance premiums on corn	23,182.22		
Miscellaneous	7,087.14		
Total	531,134.55	None	531,134.55
Total liabilities	749,359,373.87	None	749,359,373.87
Capital	100,000,000.00	None	100,000,000.00
Reserve:			
Representing payments received from the Secretary of the Treasury covering restoration of capital impairment as of:			
Mar. 31, 1938	94,285,404.73		
Mar. 31, 1939	119,599,918.05		
Total	213,885,322.78	[1] $213,885,322.78	
Less: Accumulated book deficit, as of Mar. 31, 1940.	31,713,504.73		
	182,171,818.05	[2] 170,128,591.77	
Excess of Treasury contributions for restoration of capital impairment over the actual impairment as shown by the appraisal Mar. 31, 1940.			43,756,731.01
Total liabilities and capital	1,031,531,191.92		893,116,104.88

[1] Amount of capital impairment restored by the Secretary of the Treasury as of Mar. 31. 1939.
[2] Less: Accumulated deficit to Mar. 31, 1940, including loss due to appraisal of $138,415,087.04.

EXHIBIT B

Commodity Credit Corporation—Statement of commodity loans as of Mar. 31, 1940

Commodity	Book values (adjusted)			Total	Appraisal of collateral			Loss on basis of market prices as of Mar. 31, 1940
	Principal	Accrued interest	Estimated accrued warehouse and storage charges		Amounts of commodities held as security for loans		Value on basis of market prices as of Mar. 31, 1940 [1]	
					Bales	Pounds		
COMMODITY LOANS								
Cotton:								
1938-39 crop	$36,774,888.45	$1,190,545.54	$656,632.11	$38,622,066.10	743,490	381,229,751	$38,622,066.10	
1939-40 crop	115,107.92	440.94	1,563.75	117,112.61	2,502	1,279,811	117,112.61	
	36,889,996.37	1,190,986.48	658,195.86	38,739,178.71	745,992	382,509,562	38,739,178.71	
Corn:								
1937-38 crop (refinanced as 1938)	293,889.75	227,749.29		521,639.04		[2] 509,939	244,260.78	$277,378.26
1938-39 crop	101,445,203.31	2,283,783.04	4,159,037.42	107,888,023.77		[2] 160,825,853	77,035,574.00	30,852,449.77
1939-40 crop	4,663,335.00	19,372.18		4,682,707.18		[2] 8,226,573	3,940,528.47	742,178.71
	106,402,428.06	2,530,904.51	4,159,037.42	113,092,369.99		[2] 169,562,345	81,220,363.25	31,872,006.74
Wheat:								
1938 crop	778,985.68		128,239.40	907,225.08		[2] 1,282,394	907,225.08	
1939 crop	4,989,546.20	70,898.82	677,059.96	5,737,504.98		[2] 7,233,417	5,737,504.98	
	5,768,531.88	70,898.82	805,299.36	6,644,730.06		[2] 8,515,811	6,644,730.06	
Rye: 1939 crop	444,672.88	5,478.42	82,683.30	532,834.60		[2] 1,181,190	532,834.60	

EXHIBIT B—Continued

Commodity	Book values (adjusted)			Total	Appraisal of collateral			Loss on basis of market prices as of Mar. 31, 1940
	Principal	Accrued interest	Estimated accrued warehouse and storage charges		Amounts of commodities held as security for loans		Value on basis of market prices as of Mar. 31, 1940 [1]	
					Bales	Pounds		
Tobacco:								
1933–36 crops	$2,752,121.19		$3,296.88	$2,755,418.07		[3] 14,398,495	$720,864.50	$2,034,553.57
1937–38 crop		$26,005.95	173.52	26,179.47		[3] 836,491	82,812.60	[4] 56,633.13
1938–39 crop (Wisconsin)	13,926.87	390.55		14,317.42		[3] 278,846	9,759.61	4,557.81
	2,766,048.06	26,396.50	3,470.40	2,795,914.96		[3] 15,513,832	813,436.71	1,982,478.25
Turpentine and rosin:								
1938	7,149,393.19	43,002.61	32,305.44	7,224,701.24		[4] 106 [5] 538,424	5,348,389.78	1,876,311.46
1939	7,902,879.37	55,566.93	49,545.54	8,007,991.84		[6] 601,638 [7] 4,482,419	7,136,342.62	871,649.22
	15,052,272.56	98,569.54	81,850.98	15,232,693.08			12,484,732.40	2,747,960.68
Peanuts: 1939–40 crop	445,002.91	3,891.54		448,894.45		[3] 14,440,015	448,894.45	
Figs: 1939–40 crop	43,943.54	112.39		44,055.93		[3] 3,100,850	44,055.93	
Raisins: 1938–39 crop	1,183,377.07	10,967.28	1,667.10	1,196,011.45		[8] 51,352.82	1,196,011.45	
Hops: 1938–39 crop	1,046,758.31	2,693.94	8,379.50	1,057,831.75		[3] 4,975,753	497,575.30	560,256.45
Pecans: 1938–39 crop	302,298.79	3,215.80		305,514.59		[3] 2,005,174	305,514.59	
Wool and mohair: 1939 crop	14,372.91	202.58	650.46	15,225.95		[3] 86,729	15,225.95	
Butter: 1939 crop	194,160.71	428.38		194,589.09		[3] 716,974	194,589.09	
Total commodity loans	170,553,864.05	3,944,746.18	5,801,234.38	180,299,844.61			143,137,142.49	37,162,702.12
COMMODITY POOLS								
Corn:								
1937–38	3,307,390.06			3,307,390.06		[2] 237,294	46,960.48	3,260,429.58
1938–39	53,356,514.17		4,441,759.48	57,798,273.65		[2] 90,997,881	43,901,506.00	13,896,767.65
	56,663,904.23		4,441,759.48	61,105,663.71		[2] 91,235,175	43,948,466.48	17,157,197.23
Cotton:								
1934–35	117,423,410.25		1,657,314.18	119,080,724.43	1,551,854	777,834,159	73,317,796.19	45,762,928.24
1937–38	250,322,621.27		5,229,119.95	255,551,741.22	5,068,056	2,643,370,680	241,022,015.63	14,529,725.59
	367,746,031.52		6,886,434.13	374,632,465.65	6,619,910	3,421,204,839	314,339,811.82	60,292,653.83
Total, commodity pools	424,409,935.75		11,328,193.61	435,738,129.36			358,288,278.30	77,449,851.06
COMMODITIES PURCHASED								
Tobacco:								
1939 crop, Flue-cured	36,326,317.59			36,326,317.59		[3] 173,778,829	36,326,317.59	
1939 crop, Dark-fired	501,403.40			501,403.40		[3] 3,303,206	501,403.40	
Total	36,827,720.99			36,827,720.99		[3] 177,082,035	36,827,720.99	
Grand total	631,791,520.79	3,944,746.18	17,129,427.99	652,865,694.96			538,253,141.78	114,612,553.18

[1] Where market values exceeded loan values, the collateral was appraised at loan value on all commodities other than those owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.
[2] Bushels.
[3] Pounds.
[4] Profit due to appraisal. The collateral for 1937–38 crops is pledged to secure 1933–36 crops also in event of liquidating loss on the latter.
[5] Empty barrels.
[6] Barrels, rosin.
[7] Gallons, turpentine.
[8] Tons.

EXHIBIT C

Statement of loans held by lending agencies and value of pledged collateral, with loss due to appraisal as of Mar. 31, 1940

Commodity	Principal	Estimated accrued interest to Mar. 31, 1940	Estimated accrued warehouse and handling charges to Mar. 31, 1940	Total amount of obligation	Quantity	Appraised value of collateral	Lossdue to appraisal, Mar. 31, 1940
1938–39, cotton	[1] $93,799,676.19	$2,278,267.50	$2,050,935.53	$98,128,879.22	1,907,847 bales 978,763,668 pounds	$98,128,879.22	None
1939–40, cotton	891,024.70	3,759.39	12,405.63	907,189.72	19,849 bales 10,153,160 pounds	907,189.72	None
1939–40, corn	145,921,220.99	545,705.39		146,466,926.38	256,345,975 bushels	122,789,722.03	$23,677,204.35
1939, crops wheat	68,915,755.31	720,311.25	9,025,838.42	78,661,904.98	97,569,248 bushels	78,661,904.98	None
1939, wool	173,877.38	3,275.09	7,790.20	184,942.67	1,038,693 pounds	184,942.67	None
Total	309,701,554.57	3,551,318.62	11,096,969.78	324,349,842.97		300,672,638.62	23,677,204.35

[1] Includes accrued warehouse charges through July 31, 1939, in the amount of $4,862,449.47 and paid by banks and lending agencies.

These loans are held by banks and lending agencies under contracts to purchase whereby the Commodity Credit Corporation is obligated to purchase the notes when presented prior to maturity dates shown and at the following interest rates:

Commodity	Maturity date	Interest rate	Estimated dates, computation of interest
1938–39, cotton	July 31, 1939	2½ percent	Nov. 1, 1938, through July 30, 1939.
	July 31, 1940, extension and rate change	1 percent	July 31, 1939, through Mar. 31, 1940.
	July 31, 1941, extension	do	
1939–40, cotton	July 31, 1940	2 percent	Jan. 15, 1940, through Mar. 31, 1940.
1939–40, corn	Aug. 1, 1940	1½ percent	Jan. 1, 1940, through Mar. 31, 1940.
1939, crop wheat	Apr. 30, 1940	2½ percent	Oct. 1, 1939, through Oct. 31, 1949.
		2 percent rate charge only	Nov. 1, 1939, through Mar. 31, 1940.
1939, wool	May 31, 1940	2½ percent	July 1, 1939, through Mar. 31, 1940.

EXHIBIT D

Statement of commitments on 1939 tobacco, with loss thereon due to appraisal as of Mar. 31, 1940

Commitments	Takings by association under commitments	Average advance rate	Amount	Appraised value of collateral	Commitment loss due to appraisal, Mar. 31, 1940
	Pounds	*Cents*			
Commitment No. 1	255,000	14.54	$37,077.00	$17,867.23	$19,209.77
Commitment No. 2	403,000	15.00	60,450.00	28,190.26	32,259.74
Commitment No. 3	6,155,000	6.20	381,610.00	307,750.00	73,860.00
Commitment No. 4	1,521,000	11.58	176,131.80	176,131.80	None
Commitment No. 5	1,300,000	6.80	88,400.00	88,400.00	None
Total	9,634,000		743,668.80	618,339.29	125,329.51

Represents takings of the 1939 crop tobacco by various tobacco associations from producers under commitments with the Commodity Credit Corporation to pledge such tobacco for loans. As of Mar. 31, 1940, none of the tobacco so committed had been pledged with the corporation. No further takings will be made by the associations, as the marketing season under the program had closed on Mar. 15, 1940.

Pick-up Routes in 7 States Will Bring Air Mail Service to 139 Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is worthy of comment, at this time, that we are to see the greatest expansion in the domestic air-transportation system which has taken place thus far in the history of the United States. I refer to the service which will soon be started through the use of the pick-up and delivery device on five routes which have been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board by the issuing of a certificate of convenience and necessity to All American Aviation, Inc.

SEVEN STATES ARE SERVED

These routes include 7 States. There are 78 new points that they will cover which is exclusive of 8 cities that now have air service. There are 53 additional nearby communities which will be served from these stations, making a total of 139 that will receive the advantages of direct service through the unique service by which air mail and air express are collected by airplanes in flight.

Counting terminal points this total includes 83 cities and towns in Pennsylvania, 54 of which will be station points; 37 in West Virginia, 25 of which will be station points; 15 in Ohio, 8 of which will be station points; 4 in Delaware with 1 station point; 2 in Kentucky, both station points; 2 in New York with 1 station point; and 1 substation point in New Jersey. Many of the terminal points population of the communities ranges from 799 to 115,000. Glenville, W. Va., is the smallest and Wilmington, Del., is the largest.

After 22 years of development present air transportation includes 189 cities, most of which have a population well over 100,000. The pick-up system brings advantages of air mail to smaller cities, which are nevertheless important trading centers.

EFFICIENT SERVICE GIVEN

I believe this new development marks the first practical effort by the Civil Aeronautics Board to extend benefits of air transportation directly to small communities through the establishment of feeder lines, although both the Government and the aviation industry have been studying this problem for some time. The successful experimental service of this type was proof of the real need. This service has a primary purpose of the air pick-up system by which it is possible to render fast and efficient service to any town regardless of size, location, or landing facilities. Thirty-nine towns on the five routes awarded have no airports. The Board's decision indicated that if the system attracts a substantial patronage "further extension on an increasing scale may be expected to be justified."

In opposing the application of All American, Eastern Air Lines and T. W. A. had felt that existing air lines were entitled to preference in the development of feeder routes. The Board rejected this argument as untenable. In its decision we find the following:

It is the insistence of T. W. A. and Eastern that the existing air transportation system should be given the opportunity to participate in the development of feeder routes, and should not be preceded into this field by new companies. Such an asserting of a preemptive right ignores the fact that applicant is a pioneer in a type of service which the established carriers have made no attempt to develop and which is necessarily distinct from through service. Airplanes engaged in long distance through operations cannot, without destroying the value of that operation, make frequent landings, nor even such frequent descents to low altitudes without landing as a pick-up operation requires.

Moreover, the application of the principle suggested by the interveners would be clearly inconsistent with the mandate contained in section 2 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act which directs the Board to consider as being in the public interest and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity "competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense." Any such theory as advocated by the interveners, which would result in reserving solely for existing air lines the privilege of providing all additions to the present air-transportation system of the United States, is untenable. Our adoption of such a policy would certainly not be consistent with a sound development of air transportation, and would not be conducive to the best interests of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense.

Transportation of mail and express only is authorized in the certificate recently issued. The company had applied for a route between Pittsburgh and Cleveland on which passenger carrying was proposed. The plan was to extend similar service to the other routes if it proved successful. This section of the application was denied by the Board because the projected service was largely experimental. It was stated, however, that its finding is without prejudice, and that it would entertain a renewal of the application at such a time as the company is prepared to present a more completely developed proposal. I feel in time a combination service will be recognized as practical.

The air pick-up system which will be used on the new routes is practical, as demonstrated in a year's operation conducted by All American, under the supervision of the Post Office Department, on two experimental routes which was concluded on May 15. These 2 routes covered 62 communities, 58 of which have been included on the new lines.

FINE PERFORMANCE RECORD

During this experiment of 1 year, planes operated 438,145 scheduled miles and made over 23,000 pick-ups without a casualty, for a performance record of 91.6 percent. Reporting to Congress on the results, the Postmaster General said that the safety record was "perhaps without precedent" for a pioneer service, and that the performance record had exceeded all expectations. The system, he stated, had proved both feasible and practical. He recommended the permanent establishment of air pick-up routes under the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was my pleasure to have called attention on the floor of the House of Representatives, many times, to

the success of the operations. I shall always be happy that I labored, in the face of discouragements, to bring about passage of legislation which made possible this service.

Richard C. du Pont, president of All American, has declared the company is prepared to start service over the new routes just as soon as arrangements can be cleared with the Post Office Department. The company, he states, has held its organization practically intact since suspension of service on the experimental routes in May. It is believed ready to begin operations again on a very short notice.

Rejection by the Civil Aeronautics Board of the application to carry passengers, Du Pont stated, will not affect the company's developmental work in this direction. He repeated that he was convinced that passenger service can be conducted efficiently in connection with pick-up operations, and that the company intended to acquire a twin-engined passenger plane in the near future with which experiments along this line will be conducted. He said:

> The decision of the C. A. B. did not close the door on this idea. It simply asked us to come back when we are prepared to present a more completely developed proposal. I think that we will be able to do that as the result of the experiments we are now planning. Developmental work is an important part of our activities. We have been working to improve the pick-up system almost since the day the company was organized, and we have developed an improved and simplified system capable of handling much heavier loads. This system has performed according to expectations in numerous tests and we hope to announce soon that it is ready to be placed in regular operation.

It is my strong feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the further use of the pick-up system will continue to give the United States the leadership in this field. We shall, I feel certain, continue to give support and encouragement to the program so successfully begun.

Jews Drill Here for an Alaskan Defense Colony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, July 21, 1940. This article is in relation to a subject on which I have already spoken, that of a Jewish army organized to fight somewhere in the United States.

I want those who read this to bear in mind that Mr. Hefter is not a veteran of the Imperial German Army, the Imperial Russian Army, the Imperial Austrian and Hungarian Armies. He fought instead under the red revolutionary banner of Lenin, Trotsky, and Bela Kuhn, the revolutionaries who were financed by the international financiers in Wall Street, to bring about the overthrow of the Imperial Russian Government, that finally terminated in the murder of the royal Russian family, including the intelligentsia and the industrialists of the same country. As a matter of fact, this communistic revolution is an example of what the Communist will do in those countries in which they obtain control, and should be a warning to us. These revolutionary armies murdered in cold blood over 30,000 Christians in Hungary, and did not spare unprotected and unarmed men, women, and children. They did not spare churches and other sacred institutions, but destroyed them as they have done in Russia. These same revolutionaries killed over 70,000 white Christian Russians on the Crimean Peninsula, and are largely responsible for the death of over 10,000,000 innocent people since the communistic regime began in Russia over 20 years ago. It is this disciple of revolution who is now training the so-called Jewish army, advertised and pictured in a Washington paper and in the Herald Tribune on July 21, 1940.

The point for us to bear in mind is that this Russian revolutionary, Mr. Hefter, intends to operate his army in Alaska, and let us not forget that our Alaska island of Little Diomede, is only 1 mile apart from the Russian Island of the same name. Let us also bear in mind that the Russian Government is a Jewish revolutionary government, as it was when organized by Lenin and Trotsky.

If this movement is allowed to go on, can we be assured that this army of 100,000, fully equipped for field service, will not join with the Russian revolutionaries to bring about an invasion of the United States by the way of Alaska? Isn't it possible that if this army is allowed to operate free from Government control, it will become extremely dangerous to the safety and security of the United States. Why should we tolerate such organization when the nonsectarian anti-Nazi league raised such a rumpus over 21 members of the Christian Front who had in their possession 17 or 18 obsolete .22 caliber rifles, which were used for target practice? Surely, we have many rifle teams throughout the United States with much more modern equipment, the members of which derive much pleasure in target practice and competition with other similar organizations. Here, however, in Mr. Hefter's army, we are confronted with a military organization under the leadership of a revolutionary, operating free from military supervision or Federal control. This army—if the paper is correct—is intended to operate in Alaska, a country through which the Communists of Russia may invade Canada and the United States, across a little body of water that separates Alaska from the Russian continent.

It occurs to me that these people, if they want to fight, should join the American Army or take themselves across to Russia to fight for a principle in which they seem to believe, but which is foreign to the United States. However, the fact still remains that no private organization or private group has any constitutional right to organize themselves into an army in this country, to operate for any purpose except that prescribed by our own military laws. It is now up to Congress to investigate and institute proceedings to stop this organization.

Let it be understood that when I speak of the international revolutionary Jew, or anyone else engaged in the same subversive activities, I do not include those Jewish citizens who believe in the fundamental principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, for they are, of course, loyal Americans, like everyone else who believes in these principles, and are so considered by me in all my discussions.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 21, 1940]

JEWS DRILL HERE FOR AN ALASKAN DEFENSE COLONY—VETERAN OF FOUR ARMIES WILL PUT "ARMY" IN FIELD TO PROTECT UNITED STATES TERRITORY

Defense and colonization of the sparsely settled parts of Alaska by a group of young American Jews may soon become a reality, it was disclosed yesterday by Otmar Hefter, writer, retired clothing designer, and veteran of four armies. Mr. Hefter, member of the board of the Great West Colonization, which is seeking to settle Jews in Alaska, is now enlisting "tough young Jews" for an American-Jewish border regiment. He reports that nearly 800 recruits are already receiving training in group settlement and guerrilla warfare.

The Alaskan program is an outgrowth of the Nai Juda movement, which sought to erect an independent Jewish state in South America, and has the approval of the War Department and of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Hefter said. With several of his associates, he appeared in Washington recently before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and he asserted that Senator WILLIAM D. KING, Democrat, of Utah, who presided at the hearing, commended the plan.

When the present world situation forced the abandonment of the project for colonizing Jews on a tract of land in South America, its sponsors turned to Alaska. At first it was believed that civilian training would be sufficient for the colonists, but as the defense problem became more acute, it was decided to create an "emergency auxiliary fighting force" which either could be fused with the colonists or could operate as a separate body, Mr. Hefter said.

"We have proved to the Government that we not only can aid in exploiting the rich resources of Alaska, but that we can contribute to its defense," he said. "We have virtually the only organization in America that is fully prepared for large-scale colonization. After discussing the plan with Government officials, we undertook to train small contingents for the work. Now the groundwork has been laid

to enable us to take care of large groups, and it will be possible to send them to Alaska in a few months."

It is planned to settle the new frontiersmen on the Kenai Peninsula, near Seward, and the chamber of commerce of that town has placed itself on record as backing such an undertaking four-square. Mr. Hefter said that the legal and economic problems connected with the undertaking had been ironed out after lengthy negotiations with the Department of the Interior. It has been suggested, he added, that the settlers might tackle the construction of a road extension north or west of Seward as part of their development program.

The men of the border regiment will become the plainsmen of the twentieth century, according to Mr. Hefter, and each settlement will be quasi military, so that the defense corps can be mobilized at bases whenever necessary. The colonists themselves will be trained in the use of arms so that in the event of an armed invasion they would augment the forces of the border regiment.

Mr. Hefter has designed a uniform of camouflage cloth for the regiment, fully adaptable to rigorous outdoor life. It was decided to instruct the men in the practices of guerrilla warfare, since that method of fighting should give the defenders a decided advantage over an enemy in Alaska. The tactics of the Chinese armies in harassing Japanese troop movements and cutting communications have been carefully studied and are being taught to the volunteers.

Squads of 25 men each have been drilling regularly in the rather cramped quarters of Mr. Hefter's headquarters at 112 West Forty-sixth Street. As soon as the men have mastered the rudiments of handling arms they will be taken to two training bases at Oxford, Conn., and Livingston Manor, N. Y., where Mr. Hefter said he would give them 6 weeks of training. In that time, he promised, "I'll break their backs or make men of them."

The men forming the border regiment will receive maintenance, but no salary, Mr. Hefter said, and they will be kept outdoors all the time, with one blanket apiece. The volunteers are between the ages of 18 and 25. All must be robust, and according to the recruit's enlistment form each pledges "as an American, a Jew, and a man to guard the borders of our country, to fight to the finish for its freedom, and not to lay down my arms as long as liberty and the rights of man are threatened."

Should there be national conscription of men from 21 to 25, Mr. Hefter said he would turn over to the Government at least partially trained troops, and the younger men of the border regiment would continue their work until such time as they were called up.

Young women may join the colonization group and the wives of some of the recruits have already done so. They are subjected to the same strenuous training which the prospective colonists undergo. Mr. Hefter said that women were encouraged to join so that communal life might be established in the new settlements.

Mr. Hefter served in the Austrian Army from 1914 to 1918 and won four medals for gallantry in action. He joined the Hungarian National Army in 1918 and served with the Czechoslovakian Army in 1920, after which he joined the French Foreign Legion. He came to the United States in 1925 and became a citizen 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is very generous of Mr. Hefter to turn over partially trained men to the United States Army, but is it not strange that a private citizen should be allowed to train troops for the United States.

I wonder why this army puts particular stress on young women, who are invited to join, and in the same breath states that they are subject to the same strenuous training as prescribed for those who are to colonize Alaska. There is, however, one sentence in this paragraph to which I wish to call particular attention, which reads: "Mr. Hefter said that women were encouraged to join so that communal life may be established." I want you to note the word "communal," because the women of Russia were communized or regimented into national service. We hold our women in the highest esteem and we do not want any American young women organized into communal service for a revolutionary army; for that is the Russian not the American way of treating women.

Dr. Francis Townsend's Great Service to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay some deserved tribute to a former South Dakotan who, for the past several years has probably been more in the public eye than any other citizen of this country, with the possible exception of the President himself. I refer to Dr. Francis E. Townsend, president and organizer of the Townsend National Recovery Plan.

A few moments of serious reflection must convince any sincere citizen that Dr. Townsend's service to America has had a remarkable impact upon our national life, and the thousands of local clubs and State organizations which have joined with him continue their activities with a persistence which can only be the result of a sincere devotion to the ideals which they expound. It is not necessary that a citizen belong to one of these clubs or even that he support the program of universal pensions which they espouse in order to recognize the great public service which Dr. Townsend has rendered to America, and which he continues to provide on a variety of fronts as the years come and go. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that somebody in this House should stand up and give due credit to Dr. Townsend, the man, for his determined courage and unyielding patriotism in fighting for a better and safer America, on a variety of fronts.

Undaunted by ridicule or persecution, Dr. Townsend has fought consistently and persistently for a program of pay-as-you-go pensions which avoid the necessity of taking a pauper's oath as a prerequisite to eligibility, and as his organization has increased in size and maturity he has lent its influence in support of other worth-while objectives looking to the building of a better and safer America.

ONE NEW DEAL PURGE THAT FAILED

At the outset of this campaign to make Americans pension conscious, Dr. Townsend was subjected to the sharpest ridicule of the most poignant pens but he and his followers refused to be "laughed out of court." When a congressional committee packed with antagonistic new dealers turned an orderly investigation into a cruel inquisition, Dr. Townsend was cited for a highly justified contempt which he registered for the committee and was sentenced to a Federal court. He asked no quarter from his persecutors and refused to fight this infamous miscarriage of justice. When he came to Washington to serve his sentence, pressure on President Roosevelt became so great that he could no longer ignore it so the President finally yielded and partially undid the injustice of his political and party associates by pardoning Dr. Townsend in spite of his willingness to accept the star-chamber action of his attackers. Even the most ardent foes of Dr. Townsend's program resented the treatment accorded him by these high-handed disciples of the New Deal who tried to railroad him out of public esteem by consigning him to a jail cell. Like most attempts to use force unjustly and with arrogance, the attempt failed and Dr. Townsend emerged from his rift with the New Deal palace brigade stronger than before his persecution.

DR. TOWNSEND HAS MADE AMERICA PENSION MINDED

When the final book of history is written, honest recorders will have to give much of the credit to Dr. Townsend for the mighty strides which America has taken toward a program of honest and universal pensions. No other man and no other agency have done as much to quicken the consciousness of this country to the needs of its elderly citizens as Dr. Townsend and the national-recovery plan with which he has pioneered.

Many observers believe that the inauguration of our present Social Security Act, inadequate and inequitable as it is, came as an effort to sidetrack Dr. Townsend; and practically all observers agree that we would now have no such law on our statue books were it not for the spadework done by the Townsend people of America. If the Social Security Act does nothing else—and it does very little else for the farmers, small-business men, and individual workers of America—it is a recognition of the fact that this country does have an obligation to the aged, the unemployed, and the unfortunate in its midst; and for drilling that fact into the consciousness of America, much of the credit must go to Dr. Townsend.

Definite planks in the platforms of both of our major national parties pay further tribute to Dr. Townsend by recognizing the fundamental truth of his philosophy through the

inclusion of planks calling for pay-as-you-go pensions for America's elder citizens on an increasingly generous and inclusive basis. It cannot be denied that had not Dr. Townsend years ago begun his efforts to make America pension-minded, meaningless white spaces would undoubtedly represent the places in these party platforms which are now filled by pledges to go further and further toward the goal defined by Dr. Townsend and his associates.

DR. TOWNSEND'S PUBLIC SERVICE NOT LIMITED TO PENSIONS

Of late years, it is gratifying to notice the increasing scope of Dr. Townsend's sphere of influence and service in this country. He and his organization were among the first to become articulate in the demand that America avoid involvement in war overseas. They were insistent in their demands that we perfect and modernize our national-defense establishment, but they were equally insistent that American boys must not again be sent overseas to die in wars on foreign battlefields. The influence of an organization as large and as representative as Dr. Townsend's cannot be minimized whenever it throws its support behind a national issue of great public concern. Even his erstwhile persecutors and those who would have thrown him in jail cannot accuse him of selfish or ulterior motives or insinuate that he seeks personal profit by taking a public stand on the vital issues of peace and preparedness.

Within the month, Dr. Townsend has again demonstrated in a two-fold manner that his influence for the betterment of human society in this country is not limited to his efforts to attain the fundamental pension goal established by his organization. On July 16, Dr. Townsend sent telegrams to the Governors of each of the respective States of the Union urging them to enact anti "fifth column" legislation, and pledging the full support of his organization and all its individual chapters to combating subversive un-American activities in this country. By this move he has again evidenced his capacity for public service to America. America must rid itself of the hazards resulting from Nazi bunds, Communist camps, and Fascist fronts if we are to remain safe and strong, and Dr. Townsend's support of this pro-American campaign is both timely and effective. He is entitled to the congratulations of all patriotic Americans for his activity in this connection.

DR. TOWNSEND OPPOSES ATTEMPT TO VIOLATE THIRD-TERM TRADITION

Finally, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Dr. Townsend—whose political affiliation is unknown to me as it is to most of you, since he has consistently refused to make his organization political, except as it is necessary to do so to support its friends, to resist its oppressors, and to defeat policies and programs it considers harmful to America—has made a statement showing the dangers of a third term which should be read by every American. Not only did the fifth annual national Townsend convention adopt a strong resolution condemning a third term for any President, at its convention in St. Louis, but Dr. Townsend has displayed traditional courage and forthrightness by making a recent statement amplifying the reasons why he and his organization fear the un-American and nation-wrecking consequences of a third term.

Because of its candor and logic and because it so closely parallels the position of other outstanding Americans who are voicing their opinion of the third term at this critical stage in our national history, I am concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by inserting in the RECORD a substantial portion of Dr. Townsend's criticism of President Roosevelt's unprecedented attempt to secure for himself a third consecutive term as President of the United States. This statement was taken from the Townsend National Weekly for Saturday, July 27, 1940.

"NO THIRD TERM," SAYS DR. TOWNSEND

(By Dr. F. E. Townsend)

I have been asked to state my views to the press on the matter of a third term for President Roosevelt.

If I had had any views to the contrary, the practically unanimous vote against a third term for any president, given by the 10,000 delegates to the Townsend Convention in St. Louis 2 weeks ago would have compelled me to change my mind.

I am against the third term in principle. The proposal to elect a man for a third term is an intimation that we are running short of men with capabilities for filling the position of President. This I shall never admit. I believe there are better men now living who are qualified as Presidential timber and more of them than ever before existed. I admit that it is hard to secure their services for this important job but when the need is greatest the man always appears.

INVITES CORRUPTION

I am against the third term because it invites political corruption and makes it possible for political gangs to perpetuate themselves in office and to spread their corruption in ever widening circles of the population. A recent statement appearing in the press and attributed to Bert Stand of Tammany is as follows: "The third term is taken care of. Roosevelt's got to run. We're for him all the way and we're for him for a fourth term, too."

I am against Mr. Roosevelt's nomination for a third term by the Democratic Party because during his administration the low income groups of the Nation have been imposed upon and compelled to contribute of their meager incomes to support a "social-security" program that is a fraudulent and tragic failure. It purports to tax them for their own protection but the protection actually afforded them will not keep starvation from their doors.

CITES PERSECUTION

Certainly a President should know at all times what his Congress is doing. During Mr. Roosevelt's administration a "congressional investigation" of the Townsend old-age revolving pensions plan was inaugurated that for political viciousness and scandalous disregard of congressional honor and decency has never before been equaled.

I am against a continuation of the New Deal under Mr. Roosevelt because during his term of office the taxpayers' money has been used to influence elections through W. P. A. and other job-dispensing agencies.

I am against a continuation of Mr. Roosevelt's regime because it has brought upon the country a ruinous burden of debt and has made of the Congress of the United States a subservient "must Congress" to its lasting shame and disgrace.

POINTS TO ACTS

I am against him as President any longer because of his willingness to break with precedent and proceed toward his own desired ends, through such acts as his attempt to pack the Supreme Court and to "purge" his political enemies.

The Democratic Convention made a tragic mistake, in my opinion, when it nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a third term.

Hon. Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a humble and great character came into the Union Station this morning after one of the most eventful episodes in the diplomatic history of our Nation. That man was the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull. What he did at Habana, in the way that has characterized his greatness since his public career began, need not be heralded now by my mere words. History will speak in a permanent way, but what he said as he responded to the felicitous greetings of the gentleman from Alabama, Speaker WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, must be of interest.

"I accept your greetings with all the sincerity my nature allows," he answered, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative CHARLES EATON promptly added, "That is some sincerity." That sincerity, that honesty, that character, all have been of the greatest influence in our good-neighbor policy. If we are winning back our friends south of the Rio Grande, the accomplishment is in no small way due to the man who directs our diplomatic department. He certainly fulfills the Biblical statement, "Seekest thou a man diligent in his business, he shall stand before kings. He shall not stand before mean men."

A Phony Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL BY C. FRANK RIDENOUR

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I insert this editorial written by C. Frank Ridenour, owner and editor of the Piqua Daily Call, Piqua, Ohio:

A PHONY DRAFT

The third-term unwritten law, which has not been violated during the entire life of this Republic, was broken early this morning, for the first time, when the Democratic Convention, acting under the spur and whip of President Roosevelt and his clique of White House draft schemers, renominated the President for a third term. The action of this convention, responding to sealed orders, represents a new low in political conventions and reveals President Roosevelt in his true colors. In a large measure this ridiculous and hypocritical convention, as manipulated by the President, justifies the widespread claim of political adversaries that the President seeks power for power's sake. Millions of people, who honestly admired President Roosevelt and honestly believed that he was destined to go down in history as one of the country's greatest leaders, will be saddened by this revelation. Because they admired and believed in him, in spite of the growing distrust of some of his policies, they are sorry to discover another idol with feet of clay.

The renomination of President Roosevelt was not in fact a draft by the people, as the leaders of the draft movement so desperately tried to make it appear, but was purely "phony" in character, as is now revealed for all to see.

By his silence, right down to the eve of his nomination, President Roosevelt made it impossible for other candidates for the nomination to attract the attention of the party. It is now apparent he "planned it that way." The fact that he had Harry Hopkins, his personal representative, in Chicago and had a direct wire from the White House to the Hopkins headquarters is proof that he was running the convention by remote control. And then for the President to send a message to the convention, and indirectly to the public, disclaiming his desire or purpose of being a candidate, was little short of an insult to the intelligence of the delegates and the public.

It was not a sincere statement. The facts did not bear it out. It was made in an effort to make the "draft" look plausible to the Nation. In that it surely failed. It only served to show the Chief Executive in the worst position he has occupied during his long public career.

It is little short of a tragedy that a man, who was destined for a high place in history, should by his own action cheat himself out of that place in the recorded history of our time.

In spite of their forced demonstrations of joy it seems apparent that the delegates to the convention were not happy. It is also apparent that millions of Democrats are not happy over the outcome of their convention, and it is probable they will join the Republicans in November to elect Wendell L. Willkie and thereby give notice that the people do not think any man is indispensable to the country.

"Render to Caesar the Things That Are Caesar's and to God the Things That Are God's"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. SHANLEY
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

STATEMENT BY RT. REV. MSGR. MICHAEL J. READY

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, no better and more cogent expression of the religious attitude on peacetime conscription has been given than that expressed by the Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference before the Military Committee yesterday. He bespoke a studied and calm reexamination of the whole question. This Congress will guarantee that study, I am confident. I insert his statement here:

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

I appear before this committee by direction of the archbishops and bishops of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The administrative board, consisting of 16 archbishops and bishops is elected annually by the general meeting of the bishops of the United States, to serve the national interests of the church, and in this particular and present action, it is obeying a resolution of the general meeting adopted November 16, 1939, in its session at the Catholic University, Washington.

I have the honor to present to this Military Affairs Committee of the House a statement of general attitude toward the bill under consideration, written by the board of bishops at a meeting in Chicago, July 4, 1940:

"The Catholic Church is committed by its very nature to the promulgation of the gospel of peace and to the elimination from human society of the causes of war. The ideal of the church is the 'peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ.' Again and again in these latter days the present Supreme Pontiff has reminded the world of this ideal and, even as his predecessors before him, has striven with all the means at his disposal to preserve the world from the horrors of armed conflict. For this he has won the admiration of religious men and women of all creeds. Inspired by his leadership, Catholics in our own country have endeavored to promote international peace and have worked and prayed, and continue to work and pray, that God may avert from this favored land the disasters of war.

"It seems that tragic circumstances of the present hour are demanding that we invoke the law of self-protection for our national security. Regretfully, Christians are obliged to realize that adequate national defense demands the training of large numbers of our citizens in the arts of warfare. It is imperative that the extent of the emergency and the consequent need for action should be generally realized. On the other hand, in the interests of sound procedure, it should not be overstated. Because of the character of the times, any program promoted by any group, be it militarist, isolationist, or interventionist, should be subjected to critical appraisal and cool, sound judgment.

"The American way of life has developed certain definite democratic ideals. No emergency should be allowed to destroy the values that are of the very essence of liberty as we know it in America. Consequently, no plan for the national defense should do unnecessary violence to the religious and educational traditions upon which our democracy is founded and apart from which it will not continue to flourish."

Because of the serious damage this bill would cause to the religious, educational, and charitable institutions of the church, and consequently to our whole civil society, the bishops are opposed to provisions in this bill which include for compulsory military service students for the priesthood and brothers under vow to serve the works of religion.

H. R. 10132 is a bill which proposes "to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service."

The bill declares that "the integrity and institutions of the United States are gravely threatened and that to insure the independence and freedom of the people of the United States it is imperative that immediate measures be taken to mobilize the Nation's strength."

Specifically, the bill proposes to mobilize the Nation's manpower so that "every able-bodied man shall fit into his proper place under a fair system of selective compulsory military training and service."

The bill does not define or state what are the dangers which gravely threaten the integrity and institutions of our country in a manner that calls for the mobilization of all the men of the Nation.

That the integrity and the institutions of the United States face possible dangers today because of a war ravaging most of Europe is apparent. That these dangers justify national preparedness for defense on the scale contemplated in the bill under consideration is not supported by any evidence.

The bill seems to propose compulsory military service as a permanent national policy "whether a state of war exists or not" (sec. 4).

The bill does not contemplate an emergency which might justify total mobilization. It would provide a long-range defense program as a national policy.

Dangers to national integrity and institutions are not all external; many are internal, relating to national unity, to respect for national institutions, to morale, to those virtues civic and moral which are fountains of strength and courage enabling men to sacrifice when sacrifice is required. No national-defense policy would be adequate that neglected the agencies by which these virtues are fostered and promoted.

Chief among these agencies are the churches with their charitable and educational as well as their distinctly religious activities.

We believe that the interests of our country would have been served better if this proposed legislation had originated in Congress.

Certainly, Congress would have supported, not to say protected, the basic interests of religion.

There is at present a high-pressure propaganda for this bill emanating from the military professionals. This propaganda is designed to convince the American people that war is inevitable and that the time to prepare for that war is very short. If the measure of defense contemplated in this conscription bill is forecast accurately, then those who will be called to give their lives for the defense of our country should know the facts.

Military conscription is a matter of supreme importance to our present citizens and to future generations. This legislation is too important to be rushed through Congress until all other possible programs have been examined. The military professionals would convince us that necessary forces of men cannot be obtained by voluntary service. The newspapers tell us that a thousand men a day are enlisting in various branches of the service. It is certain that a proper, reasonable, Nation-wide appeal to the men of our country would be answered by volunteers in numbers greater than present resources to care for them. If the study and propaganda expended on this conscription bill had been applied to methods for getting voluntary enlistments, the Nation would have been better served. The possibility of a 1 year voluntary enlistment program should be exhausted before resorting to a compulsory one. We are, after all, living at peace with the world and our determination should lead us to the preservation of such peace.

Every loyal American is in favor of a defense program which will make us so strong that no other nation or coalition of nations dare to attack us. In preparing such a defense, we should rely on the fine traditions which have made and kept this Nation great.

We believe that Congress understands better than military professionals the services to our American society which religion has established, supported, and administered. These services are given to the Nation not only in specific churches and houses of worship but also in universities, colleges, secondary schools, hospitals, houses of protection and correction for youth, and in a wide variety of special agencies for mercy and charity. These institutions are staffed and directed by a personnel consecrated to the ministry of religion. Young men willingly enter our seminaries and novitiates in answer to a call of conscience. They volunteer to dedicate their lives to the service of Christ and the service of their neighbor for the love of and in imitation of Christ.

They may expect no earthly remuneration in this ministry, except a frugal, humble subsistence. We do not believe that the Congress of the United States will knowingly destroy or interfere with such heroic religious practice. We hold that much of the world's present distress is due to the spirit of stark materialism which has seized the minds and wills of men and nations. This Republic has been enriched by the Christian social services fostered by the Church and administered from the motive of Christian charity and benevolence. We believe that the Congress will insure continued protection to that consecrated service for God and humanity.

The present bill departs from that national tradition of respect for and protection of religious institutions. The military mind which drafted the bill now under consideration had an intense fear of the word exemption. No service to the Nation, even in peacetime, according to this bill, is comparable to the lowest form of military training. All modes of life, even in peacetime, must give way to a plan which the military professionals deem necessary.

The bill, however, grants automatic deferment to the Vice President and governmental officers of all categories. In this instance, what is the meaning of deferment against the traditional exemption for such officers?

In section 7 (c) the bill gives some recognition to the importance of religion, providing that "The President shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe" defer training and service in the Army and Navy of men whose service is more important in industry and the professions. Among those whose service is thus to be deferred are "regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, in the regular discharge of their ministerial duties."

However, there is no provision in this bill for the exemption of those training for the ministry nor for those carrying on an actual ministry in religious education and charity.

Candidates for the priesthood are selected with great care, they are given a long preparatory training leading up to the study of theology. The seminary is not merely an educational institution, it is above all a place of formation for those priestly virtues and that mode of life which will enable the priest to serve Christ by example as well as by teaching and preaching and the administration of institutions of social charity. Any interruption in this strict discipline will work to the disadvantage of the individual candidates and to the great detriment of the church in the maintenance of her institutions.

In other selective compulsory draft acts, specifically the acts of 1917 and 1918, the Congress, acting even under stress of war, recognized the distinctive character of the minister and by statute exempted him and students of theology from the draft.

We believe that in any national-defense policy, such as the enactment of this bill would provide, this section 7 (c) should be amended and that after section 7 (b) a provision should be added exempting from the selective compulsory draft herein provided all priests in holy orders, ministers of religion, students who are preparing for the priesthood or ministry, and regular members of religious communities.

Just what does deferment mean in this bill? Does it mean deferred to a class to be called later than class I? Does it connote obligation on the part of the President? What area of choice is left to the President in the clause "under such regulations as he may prescribe"? What discretion in "deferment" will be left to the various 6,000 conscription officials throughout the country who will pass on registrants?

The citizen would be protected if Congress wrote definite exemptions and defined exactly what "deferment" meant. The bill eschews deferment by class and leaves the status of the individual applicant to the judgment of a local conscription-board functionary.

The elasticity of "deferment," as conceived in the military mind, is known from the language used in the proposed regulations to accompany the draft bill as designed by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee. In section 100B of the regulations we read:

"Ordinarily registrants placed in class I will be inducted into the public armed forces before registrants placed in any of the other classes, but nothing herein contained shall prevent the induction of any registrant, whatever his classification or order number, when the President deems it necessary in the national interest."

That is, the priest or minister of religion or other person who is deferred by Executive order may when the President deems it necessary be subjected to the selective draft.

In another place these regulations use much language to define the term "regular or duly ordained minister." The language is totally inadequate and would exclude from "deferment" bishops, college and university presidents, hospital administrators, and other classes of ordained and regular ministers who are in administrative, missionary, and general offices of the church.

I cite these regulations to inquire who will be charged with writing such regulations for the proposed legislation, if enacted. What norms will guard the 6,000 local conscription functionaries in interpreting the regulations?

This legislation is entirely too important to be left to haphazard conjecture. The acts of Congress even in wartime were more definitely and more justly written, and, besides, they accepted and followed the traditions of our country.

In view of the utter disregard in this bill for the normal recruiting of a clergy to carry on the religious, educational, and charitable works of the church, we ask respectfully that this committee and the Members of Congress generally give attention to the result which must inevitably follow. Just at a time when greater demands will be put on the church for supplying chaplains in the armed forces, in the extended Civilian Conservation Corps, and for social welfare work in cantonments, the church faces the loss of many candidates for the ministry because of the refusal to grant even a deferred status to seminarians. Nowhere in the present bill is any consideration given to this need. How can the church meet the new demands for chaplains and other personnel related to the defense program if students for the ministry are thought to be more necessary in military units? We are informed that the extended Army and Navy program already authorized calls for 500 priests. It is impossible to get candidates for the ministry as one would employees in industry.

We reject the thought that this present proposed legislation is any indication of a change in the possible attitude of Congress toward religion. That attitude has been and continues to be respectful of the liberty of the church in selecting and directing her ministers.

Experience in wartime is evidence that any loss of fighting personnel arising out of the exemption from the selective draft of ministers of religion and students for the ministry is not only meager, but generously compensated for by the advantage of morale, unity, and loyalty promoted and maintained among noncombatants by the clergy and among combatants by the officers of the Chaplain Corps.

It is our firm belief that there will be available a sufficient number of volunteers for service in the Chaplain Corps if ministers of religion and students for the ministry continue to be exempt from the draft.

We speak only for the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. To enforce provisions of law such as those now considered would dangerously interfere with the progress, even with the preservation of religion, and would result in grievous suffering and hardship to millions of families by depriving them of sacramental ministrations and would curtail an influence that contributes inestimably to the preservation of morale and the strengthening of national unity.

Experience shows that the normal increase of the Catholic population in the United States requires an increase of about 750 priests each year. In the school year 1935–36, for which complete statistics are available, 1,400 students were graduated from 93 theological seminaries in the United States. That number was barely sufficient to replace the deceased and superannuated and provide the increase called for by an increase in the Catholic population. It would be extremely difficult for the existing theological seminaries to provide additional priests for service in the Chaplain Corps. Adequate provision could not be made for the necessary normal demand for additional priests and at the same time for service with the increased military and naval forces.

Taking into consideration these facts, the Parliament of Great Britain, by the Armed Forces Act of 1939, exempted from military service all men in holy orders and regular ministers of religious denominations, and recent regulations added "church students and religious" to the schedule of reserved occupations—that is, gave them a specific vocation exemption from the draft. The rule applies to all "clergymen and church students of all denominations."

The British regulations define "theological student" as "a man established in his course as a student at an institution recognized

by any religious denomination as a training institution for holy orders or for regular ministers of that denomination, while he continues as such a student and intends to qualify for holy orders or for appointment as a regular minister." This exemption is of particular reference, since all of us know what Great Britain has faced since September 1939.

Therefore we respectfully recommend that ministers of religion and students for the ministry of religion be specifically exempt from the selective compulsory military service proposals now under consideration.

Immunity from military service is inseparable from the right of a people to religious liberty. It is not a privilege conceded unfairly to the ministers of religion as a class. In respecting the immunity of the clergy from military service the state recognizes the right of the people at all times to practice their religion and to have available for that purpose the ministrations of their priests.

It is argued that to recognize the immunity of theological students would open the way for abuses. Too many would seek to enter theological seminaries to escape the draft.

There will be no rush of students to Catholic theological seminaries by men seeking to evade conscription. No student is admitted at any time to the seminary without evidence of fitness and without having completed at least 2 years of study in a liberal arts college. Ecclesiastical superiors would be bound to exercise even greater caution in times of crisis and would be even more severe and exacting in ascertaining whether or not an applicant truly has a vocation for the ministry. The church would not object to reasonable efforts by the state to prevent abuses. The state certainly might designate for exemption only the seminarians or divinity students enrolled in institutions which have been functioning for a specified number of years. Indeed such efforts would protect the church as well as the state, for to receive students or confer holy orders on candidates who had no vocation would harm the church and religion even more than it would the state.

Believing the proposed provisions of the bill as now drawn are contrary to our national traditions and national ideals, as well as hostile to the explicit declarations and laws of the church, we are confident that you Members of this Congress will wish to reexamine the whole question in relation to the points which we submit most respectfully.

Will We Do It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial, I present the following from the Saturday Evening Post of July 6, 1940. I commend this editorial to the careful consideration of the Members of the House and all those who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 6, 1940]

WILL WE DO IT?

We do not believe the great ways of thinking and feeling that have made this country what it is can be overthrown. They may be betrayed. Therefore we say—saying it bluntly as a challenge—that for a time already too long the American people have been out of character in their emotional premises, in their reactions to evil, and in their choice of mentors and leadership. And if the principle of free government were really in danger in the world, it would be owing less to the rise of the totalitarian powers than to the softness of a people upon whom freedom has conferred incomparable gifts.

Not the first bad sign, perhaps, but certainly a very wrong turn, was when the country followed the magicians who said there was an easy way out of depression. Repudiation of debts and contracts, debasement of money, inflation, confiscation, redistribution of the national income by law; then recovery, the more abundant life, less work for more pay, and security forever—all of that was wishful thinking.

Such was the beginning of a headlong flight from individual responsibility. It was the beginning of a dangerous habit of soft living unearned. We presented the spectacle of a people trying to consume more than they produced and able for a while to do it because they had been so rich. We had the finest industrial machine in the world, and for 7 years we have been consuming it. Do you know what that means? Take a single fact as it was stated by Mr. Hoover, that according to a recent census of machine tools in the United States, 70 percent of them now are more than 10 years old, whereas in 1932 only 52 percent of them were more than 10 years old. And no move had been made to enforce an embargo up to June 4.

All this time certain hungry nations commonly called the have-nots, and first among these the German people, were working twice as hard as we were, consuming not more but much less than they produced, in order by heroic self-denial to create a surplus. We were purposely destroying our surplus, saying it was ruinous. They were putting theirs into war machines, with intent, when they were ready, to turn them on the soft democracies and take from them what they wanted.

We knew it; we watched them doing it. Behaving as if our power were still intact, we warned them not to do what they were intending to do. Yet they went on as if we had said nothing. They knew what we had done to our strength, that we had let our armaments rust.

From here on it is painful. When the war the Germans had been preparing was imminent, what did this country, the richest, most powerful republic that ever lived on earth—what did it do? It adopted the thesis that its own first line of defense was in France. It would not itself go to the battlefield. Never. Yet the aggressor had to be stopped; the free governments of the world must stand together. Therefore, it would sell food, supplies, planes, and war munitions to France and England, provided they came in their own ships to get them and paid cash; it changed its neutrality laws accordingly, and argued as it did so that it was helping to save democracy, keeping itself out of war, and doing business, all at the same time. And such was the leadership the people followed, apparently unaware that if the thesis were true, their country's behavior was pusillanimous.

The thesis was false. Our first line of defense was not in Europe. It was here. American civilization, that is our own possession. It could not be saved in Europe or defended there. We are its sole defenders and it can be saved only here.

Well, then, the war came, and suddenly it appeared that the strength of the aggressor had been fatally underestimated. Thereupon a great voice was heard in many places at once, as if it were the American voice, saying we must rush to the side of the Allies with material aid—with credit, munitions, anything but men—because it would be cheaper and more intelligent to do that than to let the war come to us, and because (we quote it exactly): "The success of the Allies is vital to us."

We do not believe that was the American voice. It was the voice of fear, to say no worse of it. "Vital" is not a word to be misunderstood. It means something essential to life. Was it the American voice saying the life of this American Republic was at stake on the outcome of a war in Europe, even such a thing as the fall of the British Empire? Never had the American spirit a voice like that.

May came. The historian who examines the American newspapers for the month of May 1940 may wonder how much of ourselves we saw in that mirror.

What had happened? The power of the German war machine had been revealed, its triumph was a definite possibility, the fall of the British Empire was imaginable; and the American mind passed through the strangest experience of its life. The emotion was that of dread, acted upon by hysterical mentorship. If we may speak of the national mind, certainly never had its behavior been so unimportant, so weak against the impact of deformed ideas crashed forth before they were born, such as the idea that we should forsake our political traditions and name Mr. Roosevelt on both party tickets, because that would be a demonstration of unity, meaning mass-mindedness, and it would be dangerous in this emergency to change leadership.

The President's own first contribution was a defense message, hastily prepared, in which he suggested how easy it would be for an aggressor to get here with bombs unless we were prepared to stop him en route, which we were not. He imagined that adequate American preparedness would require 50,000 airplanes and then asked the Congress to increase the regular Army and Navy appropriations by a sum not much more than the amount it was voting for the W. P. A. program. Less than 2 weeks later he was saying to the reporters at a White House press conference, as reported in the New York Times, "that there was no reason for the country to become 'discomboomerated.' The women of the country would not have to give up their cosmetics, lipsticks, and chocolate sodas in consequence of the preparedness program. * * * The whole idea was that the present state of international affairs called for an outlay of about a billion and a quarter dollars over and above the two billions that were being spent on the Military and Naval Establishments." Three days later he was saying, in another message to Congress, that "the almost incredible events of the last 2 weeks" made it necessary to appropriate another billion for defense.

While the Germans were doing without butter and buying one cigarette at a time in order to have guns, we were changing our automobiles once a year. "We have not manufactured a big gun for many years," says General Marshall, our Chief of Staff, "but it would take about two and a half years to make a 16-inch gun and carriage," for the coast defense.

We are not prepared to fight the aggressor. Yet we defy him. He shall not make us give up any of our social gains, says the President. He shall not upset the normal American way of life. American women shall have their cosmetics still, in spite of him. Preparedness the easiest way.

If the Government knows what the problem is, comprehends it even dimly, it is treating the American people as if they were children unable to bear reality. If it does not know, its incompetence, hitherto an economic disaster only, may come to be remembered as a calamity.

The problem is not that we stand alone in this hemisphere, with not one powerful friend in the world to help us defend it. When was it that we stood not alone here? Where was that powerful friend in the world ever willing to help us defend American civilization? We are sick of hearing that the British Navy all this time has been defending our Monroe Doctrine. More than once we had been willing to fight the British Navy for it. Our part is to stand alone for so long as we have the hardihood, the spirit and the fortitude to do it, and when we haven't, we may as well stop talking about American destiny.

No; the problem is that a balanced distribution of power in the world has been upset. A new and frightful power has appeared, an offensive power, moved by an unappeasable earth hunger, conscious of no right but the right of might. It does not threaten this country with invasion, at least, not yet. It does threaten the Western Hemisphere by economic and political designs in the Latin American countries, and this, for us, is an ominous fact. But the larger aspect of what has happened is that the world is in a state of unbalance. Until an equal defensive power has been created in the hands of people who prefer peace to war, there will be no safe living in it, no security for free government.

Who shall create that equal defensive power and restore the balance? You have only to ask the question to get the answer. There is one country in the whole world that can do it. In that simple sense it is the United States against Germany, now or later. And that is not to speak of war. It is the minimum price of peace.

The cost of doing it, in terms of self-discipline, harder living, more work, may be terrific. This is the truth that we have so far declined to face. It might well cost us, not some billions more or less to be voted by Congress, not a 10-percent increase of the income tax, but possibly a quarter of our total national exertions for several years. There is no easier way. A thousand airplanes a day, if necessary. That is the American voice. It is possible. But how many of us realize what we should have to do without for a thousand airplanes a day? What we will, that we can do.

Proposed Investigation of Pulp and Paper Industry Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM R. A. HAYWARD, PRESIDENT OF KALAMAZOO VEGETABLE PARCHMENT CO.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an investigation of the pulp and paper industry of America has been proposed in a resolution recently introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. This investigation, I am convinced, would result in an unnecessary expenditure of Government funds and would seriously affect the paper industry at this time.

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. R. A. Hayward, president of the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., which I believe should be read by every Member of Congress who is of the opinion that the proposed investigation should be made. In this letter Mr. Hayward, who is one of the best-informed paper manufacturers of the Nation, ably gives his reasons why the resolution by the gentleman from South Carolina should not be favorably considered.

Mr. Hayward's letter follows:

KALAMAZOO VEGETABLE PARCHMENT CO.,
Kalamazoo, Mich., July 25, 1940.

The Hon. PAUL SHAFER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: I have had called to my attention the House Resolution No. 576, calling for a complete investigation of the Pulp and Paper Industry by the Department of Agriculture.

Knowing intimately, as I do, the entire operation of the industry, I know that such an investigation would be a complete waste of our taxpayers' money and would be a burden on the executives of the pulp and paper industry who are now struggling night and day to make ends meet.

We are now having investigations by every other department in Washington, and if there is any question of monopolistic practice in the industry, can it not be referred to the Department of Justice so that they can carry along the investigation with the same men who are now working in the industry?

This resolution points out that the price of paper has increased from $65 to $85 per ton. This is not a statement of fact, showing that the gentleman who introduced this resolution did not know the truth or he would be more accurate in his statements.

The price of bleached sulphite pulp has increased from $55 per ton up to $75 per ton which is a $20 increase in the cost of pulp.

I know that every domestic manufacturer selling pulp at this price could sell the same pulp for export at $10 to $20 more than this price. I think they should be given credit for stabilizing the domestic market and not taking advantage of a temporary opportunity to export the pulp.

The price of paper has increased about $10 per ton—so that the paper manufacturer is having now to absorb at least $10 per ton because of the difference in the increase in their costs of raw materials and the increase in their selling prices.

The profits for our company for the first 6 months of this year were 20 percent less than the first 6 months of last year.

I think these few simple facts will illustrate why we think any investigation of this kind is absolutely useless and worthless at this time.

I hope you will agree with our viewpoint and oppose this resolution and see if you can direct the rest of the Congress to do something that will help stimulate business instead of further hampering it.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) R. A. HAYWARD.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL BY THE ALTUS (OKLA.) TIMES-DEMOCRAT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to incorporate an excellent editorial printed by the Altus Times-Democrat of Altus, Okla., on the compulsory military training bill. The editorial was written by Harrington Wimberly, editor of the paper and a member of the University of Oklahoma board of regents.

A dozen raw recruits for Uncle Sam's Army got on a bus we rode out of Oklahoma City last night. They were genuine Okies gathered by the Tulsa recruiting office from the hills of eastern Oklahoma. Not one appeared to be over 20 years old and one lad in the crowd could have passed for 16. Quite obviously they were from relief families and they were joining the Army for a meal ticket. The boys stated that they had passed physical examinations, although one youngster looked anemic and another had a bad cough.

We applaud the patriotism of those boys and we hope Uncle Sam takes good care of them. But one thing is sure: The Army is hard up for new recruits, or better selections would be made. Not over two or three in that gang are physically fit at this time for hard labor and some of them never will be. The undernourished lad might make a hand at peeling potatoes, but we doubt if he could handle a big gun within the next 2 years.

The men for this great army of defense that America is trying to organize must not come alone from families on relief. This war business is not a W. P. A. project. It is unfair as well as dangerous to fill the Army and Navy with jobless boys who have nothing else to do. If an emergency exists—and all agree that such is the case—then recruiting must be done on an emergency basis.

The boys from the country clubs are not enlisting in the Army and they are not going to. The exclusive fraternity houses at the universities and colleges throughout the country will be filled as usual this fall. Young men with good-paying jobs or parents who can support them in ease are not going to work up a patriotic fever to the point of signing up with Uncle Sam for 3 years. They might be interested in an officer's commission, but the Army needs buck privates who can do hard labor and who will submit to discipline and intensive training. The care-free youth with a check book and a roadster will have to give up his luxuries and freedom if he joins the Army, and he is not going to do it until he has to. There won't be any dancing until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning and sleeping until noon in a training camp.

America's army of defense must come from homes of all classes and all economic circumstances, and the only fair way to mobilize it is by a selective and compulsory training system. God grant that the boys will never come within the range of an enemy's fire; but, if so, every home in America must be prepared to make its sacrifice.

The problem is to defend our democracy and our freedom and the job is not the exclusive responsibility of boys who can't find anything else to do. Rich and poor alike must render service, and a compulsory selection is the only method that will fill the ranks with all classes. The boys from the slums and the squatter cabins in the hills are not going to be happy if they discover they are fighting the battles for the young men who stay home because it's so much nicer—and safer.

It is taken for granted that the United States needs an army. Voluntary enlistments are coming in slowly and generally from the down-and-out class. There are exceptions but they are hard to find. Compulsory training will give the Army the strength it needs in both numbers and morale. This is not a poor man's fight and it must not be a rich man's victory. When it comes to defending America and a democracy that permits us to live as free men and women, a bank account cannot be an exemption or the tragic fall of France will be duplicated in the Western Hemisphere.

Challenge to St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS CALL

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the patriotism of the American Negro has never been questioned. As a group, there is none in our country more solidly and devotedly anxious to bear its part in the present national-defense program. Under leave granted, it gives me pleasure to include the following editorial from the St. Louis Call, a newspaper of distinction and standing, enjoying a wide circulation among our Negro citizens. Its brilliant editor, Chester E. Stovall, has cogently expressed some of the thoughts of our colored citizens today. They want to share, and share proportionately and substantially in this national enterprise now engaging our best thought and energies. Let us see to it that they have the opportunity.

The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Call of July 12, 1940]

CHALLENGE TO ST. LOUIS

To: Our fellow white citizens of St. Louis and Missouri.
From: A group of Negro citizens.
Subject: Suggestions on Strengthening Our National-Defense Program.

The people of the United States, of whom the Negro citizens are an important one-tenth, are being called upon to fulfill their patriotic duty toward our national-defense program. As in the past, we Negro citizens are prepared to prove our unwavering loyalty and allegiance to our country.

We witness and live in a time when the darkest pages of human history are being written. We witness with horror the destruction of life and of great social values. We see the havoc caused by the action of dangerous "fifth columnists." We see the demoralization caused by lack of national unity in nations, and we know that prejudice and political interests have been the cause of these tragedies.

We ask therefore, in the name of national security, whether our leaders believe that death and destruction will discriminate between whites and Negroes. The graveyards of Europe prove the contrary to us. We ask these leaders whether they believe that airplanes reaping their harvest from the skies will stop at the color line or at the Mason and Dixon's line? We ask these leaders whether they believe that national unity can come out of Jim Crowism, segregation, and prejudice?

We believe that if America is to reach its maximum in productive power, in military strength and morale, the Negro people must be fully integrated into the Nation's industrial and commercial life, into its political and community life, and into its armed forces. At this point we emphasize the fact which is unknown to the general public, that, contrary to the democratic principle, Negro men are denied enrollment in the present aviation training courses in St. Louis because to qualify they must be enrolled in Washington or St. Louis Universities or Jefferson College, none of which—their names to the contrary—will admit Negro students. Negro soldiers are effectively barred from the mechanized units of the Army; restricted to mess attendants in the Navy; and barred absolutely from the Marine Corps. They are excluded from Missouri's units of the National Guard.

Our white American leaders must learn, and they must learn quickly, that national unity and that democracy are indivisible. They can know no color line.

Accordingly, we submit to our fellow white Americans the following proposals, and we plead with all, both individually and in organizations, to set in motion ways and means of achieving these objectives as evidence of their interest in our Nation's defense, and as evidence of their devotion to American democracy.

We propose:

1. That the chamber of commerce urge all of its members and affiliated groups to drop the color line in the employment, assignment, and payment of workers.
2. That those trade-unions that now by constitution, ritual, or tradition bar Negro workers discontinue this practice.
3. That Missouri's Congressmen, with the aid of the Governor and the mayor of St. Louis, go about opening the doors of all units of our armed forces, including the National Guard, to qualified Negro men.
4. That on all committees and in all major services having to do with the national defense competent Negro citizens be democratically included.
5. That in the proposed program for the training of skilled workers to meet our defense needs Negro young people be given the same opportunity accorded to all other young people.
6. That relief standards be raised in keeping with sound national defense.

Missouri is in the heart of our great Nation. Let it therefore take the lead in the execution of this program, which would undoubtedly strengthen our defenses and vitalize our democracy.

For greater national defense, and for a more vigorous democracy, we are,

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Milton Thompson, minister, Berea Presbyterian Church; Frank C. Cox, 1157 Aubert; Chas. A. Pitman, 4248 West Belle; T. A. Curtis, 4459 Enright; Noah W. Williams, bishop, 4423 Enright; Wm. E. Allen, Jr., M. D., 4204a Easton; Rev. R. C. Clopton, 2951 Dayton; Russell S. Brown, pastor, St. Paul A. M. E. Church; O. O. Morris, executive secretary, Pine St. Y. M. C. A.; Hayes Pillars, member Musicians Union No. 2; Elmer Mosee, commander, Tom Powell Post, American Legion; C. H. Wilson, M. D.; Chester E. Stovall, editor, St. Louis Call; Orlan A. Staten, chairman, Colored Clerks Circle; Daniel W. Bowles, manager, State Industrial Home, Tipton, Mo.; Jos. L. McLemore, attorney, board of directors, National Democratic Organization; R. L. Witherspoon, attorney, president, St. Louis Negro Federation; W. P. Curtis, treasurer, Urban League; Silas E. Garner, attorney; Harvey V. Tucker, attorney, president, Mound City Bar Association; A. N. Vaughn, M. D., president, National Medical Association; Emanuel Williams, attorney; Jesse J. Johnson, DeLuxe Enterprises; Geo. L. Vaughn, chairman, executive board of the Midwestern Negro Democratic Association; J. W. Howard, pastor, Fairfax Baptist Church; Frank M. Jones, president, Colored Clerks Circle; E. J. Bradley, vice president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Robert N. Owens, attorney; Frank Hargraves, president, Local 1400, International Longshoremen's Association; Walter Lowe, American Legion; David L. Knox, Pullman Car Employees Association; G. A. Gaikins, M. D.; A. Courtney Davis, 1 North Broadway, attorney; Jack Ward Gray, M. D.; Lawrence L. Pierre, minister, Open Door Congregational Church; W. H. Sinkler, M. D.; Guy D. Ruffin, teacher; S. R. Redmond, president, National Bar Association; John A. Davis, attorney, chairman, Civil Liberties Committee, N. A. A. C. P.; John T. Clark, executive secretary, St. Louis Urban League; Sidney R. Williams, industrial secretary, Urban League; Leyton Weston, president, Dining Car Employees Union; Frank S. Bledsoe, judge, formerly private first class, 317 Sanitary Train, Ninety-second Division; Dr. L. B. Howell, Elks; Harold E. Young, 11 North Jefferson, photographer.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MON C. WALLGREN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. PATRICK J. BOLAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. PATRICK J. BOLAND, over Station WGBI, Scranton, Pa., Sunday, July 28, 1940.

The future of this country is the most important question which presents itself to the American people at this time.

No one can dispute the positive fact that we will be in a far more vulnerable position for attack from foreign sources after the war is over than we are at the present time, and no one can prophesy what conditions will confront us 30 days from now or 1 year from today.

We will hear many diversified opinions and perhaps much criticism of the President and his policies; yes, no doubt, there will be much oratory against his nomination for a third term.

It is my opinion that this will be a minor issue in the coming campaign and will fade into insignificance because of the great necessity of our people to become united upon the great objective to preserve our democratic institutions and this great democracy.

I can recall quite vividly a year ago when Congress was considering the much-talked-of neutrality bill, many Members of Congress, newspaper editors, and commentators stated that if we should repeal the Arms Embargo Act, it would be the first step toward our becoming involved in the European war.

All through the debate of this legislation that school of thought was presented to the American people with such force that letter after letter and petitions came to my office from mothers and sons who believed that if we repealed the arms embargo, immediately the youth of America would be marching the streets going off to war.

These statements were not based upon facts because we are not engaged in war, and the President's recent statement to Congress convinces all of us, who will allow ourselves to be convinced, that we will not send our boys to Europe.

I quote the President's words here:

"That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression. We will not send our men to take part in European wars."

That statement alone should satisfy the people, regardless of what his most-hated enemies might say to the contrary.

We heard it said many times that:

"The President is trying to get us into war."

"Whatever he does means war."

"This fellow Roosevelt in the White House is not a peaceful man, he is a warrior."

Very well; let us see what he said in answering these unjust statements. Again I quote:

"Let no man or group in any walk of life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America, because I conceive that, regardless of party or section, the mantle of peace and patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the peace bloc. We all belong to it."

Several times during the past 7 years the President advised the people and their Representatives in Congress of grave dangers threatening the United States and its people and the institutions of democracy everywhere.

Time after time he availed himself of opportunities to reassert and to implement the right of all nations of the American Hemisphere to freedom from attack or control by any non-American power.

In September of last year the horror of war again broke out, and the President called Congress into special session, and on the 21st of that month in his message he said:

"This Government must lose no time or effort to keep this Nation from being drawn into the war."

In January 1940 he recommended to the present Congress the expansion of the personnel of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, and submitted estimates for national defense amounting to approximately $2,000,000,000.

Again on May 16 of this year he pointed out that the swift and shocking developments forced every neutral nation to look to its defenses in the light of new factors loosed by the brutal force of modern offensive war.

He also called attention to the "fifth column," by which persons supposed to be peaceful visitors were actually a part of an enemy unit of occupation.

He at that time asked for an additional sum of $1,182,000,000 for defense purposes.

Again on May 31, 1940, he sent a message to Congress stating that almost incredible events have happened within the past 2 weeks that necessitated the enlargement of our military program and asked for an appropriation of $1,277,741,170.

And in less than 2 months' time he came to Congress in person and delivered a most far-reaching message not only to the people of the United States but to the whole world. He said on that day that:

"We, the free men and women of the United States with memories of our fathers to inspire us and the hopes of our children to sustain us are determined to be strong as well as free. We fully understand the threat of the new enslavement in which men may not speak, may not listen, may not think. As these threats become more numerous and their dire meaning more clear, it deepens the determination of the American people to meet them with wholly adequate defense."

He asked that day for an additional authorization of $4,881,171,957 for national defense or a total for this year of $9,340,913,127, and Congress has appropriated this vast sum to make our country secure.

History will record the unerring judgment of President Roosevelt, who as no other individual in this country, saw the approach almost 3 years ago of the present world calamity.

In the city of Chicago in October 1937 he courageously pointed to the approaching danger to civilization. He was attempting by that speech to fire the imagination of the American people to such a point that he might recommend at that time the type and kind of preparation for defense on which we are so feverishly and furiously working at this very moment.

But the American people were in no mood for such advice. They felt secure. Why, even 6 months ago had the Congress of the United States attempted to put through a $5,000,000,000 program for national defense, you would not have a dozen Members of Congress voting for it.

At that time we were all of the opinion that the war between Germany and France was a phony or cream-puff war.

We know now how wrong we have been in not realizing the danger we were in, and now we are confronted with the great necessity of a united cooperation of all our people.

Nations in almost every continent who have believed in our way of life have become victims of ruthless aggression because they were not prepared to resist those who would destroy them.

Cities, homes, industries, nations, and civilizations are today threatened as they have not been threatened in all the recorded history of man.

The inventive genius of man which has brought to mankind the means of a better life now threatens to destroy that life and all the things which make it worth living.

We in America rest under a tremendous obligation.

More than a century ago James Monroe inaugurated the doctrine that bears his name, that the Americas were to be the proving grounds of a new democracy, which should be set up in the Western Hemisphere for the service and enjoyment of the peoples of this hemisphere, and also as an example for the rest of the world.

We have thus far defended, preserved, and extended it, but we cannot assume that wishing alone will continue to make it so. We cannot assume that those who have no respect for democratic governments elsewhere will respect ours in America. They respect only those whom they fear or whom they know to be able to withstand their assaults.

We want peace in America. We have drawn more closely together throughout North, South, and Central America, not because we have any designs upon our neighbors; not because we want anything they have save their friendship and their cooperation, but because we know that in unity there is strength and that the problem of protecting democracy and liberty in any part of America is the problem of protecting it in all America.

We want peace throughout the world. There is no nation on earth against which we desire to become an aggressor. We pray that civilization and applied Christianity may yet triumph and lift their bruised heads above the scream of shells and the roar of devastating planes and tanks and all the agencies of death and incredible horror.

But as we have toiled in this land to develop our free institutions, and we have fought to create a nation devoted to freedom and equality; as we have sacrificed treasure to improve the standards of life for men and women here, so shall we struggle to the limit of our capacity to preserve these things from corrosive or destructive influences within our borders no less than from any ruthless juggernaut that may assail us from without.

Therefore we shall be ready. We shall prepare. We shall arm that we may not be caught unawares like so many others have been caught in the holocaust which now sweeps over so much of the world.

In this great task there is no room for partisan rancor or selfish aggrandizement. It serves no purpose now to blame one or another man or group for not knowing years in advance what the world was coming to. From 1921 to 1932 we deluded ourselves with the belief that wars of aggression were at an end; that each nation might pursue in peace its own purposes so long as those purposes did not infringe on the rights of others. We signed treaties of disarmament. We signed treaties of arbitration. We renounced, with all the world, war as an instrument of national policy. Navies were reduced. The world rejoiced that at last an era of peace had come upon it.

The world has learned its bitter lesson. Treaties supposed to have been sacred have been thrown into wastebaskets. Territory that was supposed to be inviolate has been ravaged. Men, women, and children whose only offense was that they were human beings have been murdered and driven from their homes. Throughout the world mankind is now inquiring whether Christianity is a mockery and whether civilization can survive.

In the midst of all this we find the oceans narrowing and the world contracting. We are again realizing that we are a part of the world and that there is no assurance that the lust for power and wealth may not seek to engulf our Nation and our people in the catastrophe which has overtaken others.

In the midst of these threats we call upon our people for unity. We know that call will find a response in the hearts of all our people, regardless of race, color, nationality, or condition. We know that Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, white and colored, rich and poor, native-born and foreign-born, will rise to the task which faces us. The hosts of free America will protect the freedom of America under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, not because he was elected as a Democrat but because he is the President of the United States and the spokesman of our people. We trust him because he has guided the Nation out of the depths of a cruel despondency in our domestic affairs. We trust him to guide us in the solution of our international affairs.

As a humble participant in the events of recent years in Washington, I am proud to proclaim the accomplishments of the Roose-

velt regime. I am proud to have had a part in these events. You likewise are proud of these unprecedented advances.

We all know that this is a solemn hour for the entire democratic world, and we also realize that we, in the United States, are now facing one of the most critical periods of our entire history. With the greatest possible speed we must prepare to the limit on every front.

Only through the utmost of preparedness, quickly and efficiently brought to pass, can we be sure of peace on this continent. In this tremendous effort all of us will be needed.

Each one of us must contribute his or her part. The time is here for every free citizen of our country to show his patriotic love for this glorious land.

But let us remember that we are defending a way of life and not merely a national sovereignty. We cannot defend that way of life successfully by arms unless we are constantly defending it by living it. United, trusting in Almighty God, and in each other we shall protect this great democracy and its people.

March of Aggressors Threatens Democracies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

RESOLUTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the national committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America:

We believe that the march of aggressors throughout the world threatens democracies everywhere. Our sympathies naturally flow toward those democratic countries which have fallen before this march, which are resisting this aggression or may be called upon to fight in the future for their freedom. We support wholeheartedly this administration's policy of translating these sympathies into an active program of giving all material aid to these countries.

The youth of America stands firmly behind President Roosevelt's declaration that "We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars."

The defense of this Nation is bound irrevocably to the protection of the Western Hemisphere. We therefore solidly support this administration's interpretation of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and all efforts to protect them along cultural and economic lines.

Members of the Young Democratic Clubs of America are willing and anxious to make any sacrifice for the defense of our country. The young men realize that the cause of preparedness and their own self-interest demand that they be trained now for any eventuality. Therefore, they endorse a program of service to the Government—a program that calls into service all young men, either for training in the armed forces or in civilian and vocational fields. Compulsory military service alone does not meet all the needs for this Nation's defense Simultaneous training in civilian and industrial lines not only buttresses the effectiveness of our land and sea forces, but also equips the young men of this country for jobs and a more successful career in our democracy.

We believe the social gains of the past 7 years have preserved and strengthened our democracy at a time when democracies everywhere have been in danger. Because of this conviction we do not subscribe to any hysterical demands for scrapping of this social program. It should be noted that much of the clamor for repeal of various phases of the social program comes from persons and organizations which opposed enactment of the vital measures into law.

We know that the young men and young women of this country are determined to protect the social program that, since 1933, has reopened the door to education, jobs, and other opportunity for them. We believe that this administration's concern with the preservation of civil liberties during these strenuous times deserves every commendation and support. The traditional American freedoms must be preserved, and our democracy must remain a form of government actively working for the well-being of all the people, if we are to present the strongest front against the totalitarian threat.

We, the young men and young women of American democracy, want no part of totalitarian government. We regret that some small segment of the American people toy vicariously with notions of corporate states and other "streamlined forms of government" that have swallowed peoples who once were free.

We, the young men and young women of American democracy, are militantly opposed to all dictatorships. When we say dictatorships, we mean those countries whose philosophies are destructive to everything Americans hold dear. We mean those totalitarian governments of Germany, Italy, and Japan. And we mean Russia, too.

Manufactured War Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the manufactured war hysteria—war fear unquestionably manufactured for political purposes by the New Deal administration—the Congress was well on the way to reassuming its "rubber stamp" character of the New Deal panic days until an organized and vocal minority began to call a halt and demand that some of these mobilization schemes and conscription plans be looked into with more care and consideration.

The result of that minority opposition has been not in the least to impair any rational or reasonable plan for national defense, but to prevent the administration from carrying the Congress and the country along on a wave of war hysteria that was threatening to disrupt the whole economic system of the United States if not called to a halt.

It is little short of absurd to talk about drafting men from the ages of 18 to 64. The fact is, and every reputable naval and military officer will so testify before the committees of the Congress, that we could not properly train and equip an army of 2,000,000 men in the next 2 years, no matter how hard we might try nor no matter how much money Congress would appropriate.

It must always be kept in mind that appropriations alone do not constitute a national defense in any sense of the word. The spending of vast sums of money does not constitute a national defense. Military and naval authorities have already warned the country time and again that men without machines, airplanes, tanks, guns, ships, submarines, ammunition, uniforms, and all of the other paraphernalia a soldier must have, would not constitute a national defense. On the other hand, all the machines, airships, guns, seaships, submarines, land tanks, and bombs that could be manufactured would be practically useless without men trained in their operation. The training of men involves a time element and the manufacture of all these mechanical weapons involves a time element.

If the conscription act were amended to include only those from the ages of 20 to 30, at least 10,000,000 men would be made available for service. Counting out the unfit, those with dependents, those more valuable in industry, and for every other cause, and bringing the percentage of those chosen down to one-fifth, we would still have 2,000,000 men for training and equipment. Every responsible naval and military man knows, and many have testified, that an army of 2,000,000 men could not be equipped and properly trained in the next 2 years regardless of the amounts of money appropriated.

This is to say nothing of the testimony given by a high ranking officer of the General Staff before the House Military Affairs Committee in January of this year in which he said that with 480,000 men properly equipped, all the nations of Europe combined with full control of the high seas could not land one corps of troops on American shores.

Therefore, in the light of these facts, this ill-conceived proposition—hysterical chatter is an excellent term for it—of mobilizing and registering all male citizens from 18 to 64 is grotesque. The people will not forget, incidentally, that

only a few weeks ago the President was talking about registering women as well as men. He was going to conscript the girls between the ages of 18 and 20.

This whole proposition shows its hysterical character all the more plainly when we stop to realize that in the last few months the congressional appropriations and contractual authority grants, which are substantially equal to cash, aggregate more than $10,000,000,000 and the President is asking for something like five billions additional.

It is perfectly evident that the administration has gone hog wild on this whole question and is trying to drive the country hog wild along with it.

A very substantial opposition is rapidly arising in Congress irrespective of party lines against this sort of ill-considered procedure, and it behooves the taxpayers of this country to advise their Congressmen by wire or letter to scan these proposals more carefully before giving the administration the green light for going as far as it apparently desires in calling out the National Guard for service anywhere in the Western Hemisphere, and for conscripting millions of citizens who could be neither trained nor equipped in the next 2 or 3 years.

There is no question about the desire of the Republican minority in the Congress to give every assistance in creating a national defense, but the Republicans want a national defense created on a scientific, common-sense, economical, and practical basis.

Of course, everybody in the Government, in Congress, and in the Military Establishment knows they cannot possibly spend, sensibly and economically, in the next 2 years, the money already placed at their disposal.

Information Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I insert the following clipping from a western newspaper:

INFORMATION PLEASE

Who nominated Hitler?
Hitler.
Who nominated Mussolini?
Mussolini.
Who nominated Stalin?
Stalin.
Who nominated Roosevelt?
Roosevelt.
Who are we to be bragging about "democracy"?
Who, indeed.

War Hysteria—Is it Based Upon a Real Danger or Is It the Result of Political Manipulation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before this last great democracy surrenders the liberties of its citizens on the excuse that it is necessary to save the democracies of Europe; before we rush headlong into conscription in peacetime, it is well that we do a little sober thinking.

Three outstanding authorities have expressed opinions as to the imminence and the reality of the suggested danger to our country. An editorial of the Detroit Free Press gives their opinions and it is here inserted:

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 31, 1940]

DEMOCRACY, CONSCRIPTION'S VICTIM?

The congressional hearings on the proposed conscription bill should be deliberate enough to determine three things:

How much is the demand for a total military and civilian dictatorship over the manpower of the Nation due to a realistic attitude?

How much is it due to plain hysteria?

How much of it is due to politics?

These questions should be fully answered now so that the people may have complete understanding.

A peacetime totalitarianism is a far graver violation of tradition than any proposal for a third term.

The latter is a simple issue. The people understand it and have a right to accept or reject it as they please.

But compulsory service for all men between the ages of 18 to 64, with broad authority for the President to call on anybody as he chooses for any kind of duty, military or otherwise, is another matter. It is not easily understood.

The American people are being asked to give away their liberties with no assurance that they will ever get them back.

They are being led to believe that war is imminent. It is characteristic of Americans to respond instinctively to any call to patriotic duty.

It is not at all surprising that one poll shows 67 percent of the people are in favor of some form of conscription. They responded in the same manner when President Wilson issued his draft call.

But are they not now voting in the same spirit in the belief that we either are already at war or are about to be plunged into one?

Is it not possible that they have been whipped into such a fever of emotionalism that they believe this is the one way to save America?

If that is the case, they have been misled.

The best of our military experts do not believe that any such massing of manpower—42,000,000 men and boys—is necessary.

At the outside figure they are interested only in an army of 750,000 soldiers. More, they would not know what to do with the 2,000,000 men Mr. Roosevelt talks about.

What of the other 40,000,000? Out of the clouds of oratory and tub thumping, the idea seems to loom that they would be regimented into various industries and civic duties—regimented as was the total manpower of Germany.

As to this phase of the problem the career men in the Army have nothing to say. That is all outside their tasks. They might get 2,000,000 men but any politically minded administration would have complete control over the other 40,000,000.

"But," the war-minded at Washington, in both parties, argue, "this is necessary if we are to meet the Hitler invasion when it comes."

"When it comes." That is the spur. Yet military experts have no idea that it is coming next week or next year or the year after, if ever. The career men cannot talk. However, the Free Press here offers quotations from three world famous writers on military matters who are not given to hysterics; who are not running for office, and who strive hard to see things as they are.

First, there is Col. Frederick Palmer, recognized as one of the greatest living authorities on war. He was the official press representative for the A. E. F. in France and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his work. For years, though an American, he was the military expert for the London Times.

Is he excited? Not a bit. He says:

"Whence and in what strength will any attack upon us come? * * * Will our impatience for speed in our vast preparations defeat the very object for which we are striving?"

Japan? He points out that Japan has its hands full right now with China and will have for some years to come without taking us on. "This," he says, "dismisses any immediate danger on the Pacific coast."

But there is the Atlantic—and Hitler. Palmer calls attention to the simple fact that neutral military observers now agree that Germany had no "wonder army that wrought a military miracle." Germany really had no opposition, with France collapsing before a real fight started.

"Consequently there is no reason why we should be scared or overimpressed by German might as touched by some kind of hellish totalitarian magic."

Palmer even questions that Hitler can possibly defeat England across those 22 miles of turbulent waters. But, supposing he does? What then?

"Hitherto, Hitler's sea tactics have been negative and destructive. Now he must have surface sea command himself. His position is reversed. He must protect his convoys across the Atlantic."

Palmer first predicts the failure of the British campaign and then shows how utterly impossible it would be for Hitler to bring his army across to our shores. The danger is not immediate. "Our danger is," he concludes, "that we shall get an extravagant, unbalanced preparedness whose continuance we shall neglect when we are lulled into security, with the result that one day an enemy, or group of enemies, will get the jump on us."

This is taking the long view, a consideration of the years and not the days.

The whole program for conscription could go over until after the fevers of the coming election without in any way endangering America as long as industry maintains equipment production. Then we might think more sanely.

The President has asked that the National Guard be mobilized to meet some immediate danger, the nature of which he does not state. If the guard is called out it will take 6 months at least to furnish it sufficient equipment to put it on a battle-worthy basis.

The Presidential campaign will be over in 3 months. So what could be done with 2,000,000 raw civilians in that time?

This rush program does not make sense.

Second, there is Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert for the New York Times. How could Germany land a sufficient number of troops on this continent to require such a vast standing army to overcome them? He says:

"The maximum initial force that could be transported, even if control of the sea were wrested from us, would not be much larger than 50,000 men. The transportation of such a force would require 375,000 tons of shipping, perhaps 40 ships, about the largest force that could conveniently be convoyed in a single operation.

"To supply such a force might require from 650,000 tons of shipping to 2,000,000 tons monthly; in other words, perhaps half of the tonnage of the German merchant marine would have to be devoted solely to the job of supplying 50,000 soldiers. If this force were to be doubled, the shipping tonnage necessary would be doubled; to supply an army of 1,000,000 men in this hemisphere would require at the very least 13,000,000 tons of shipping.

"Economically and commercially the problem seems impossible; not even Britain or a combination of Britain and Germany has sufficient shipping to divert such an enormous amount of it from their ordinary and vital trade routes to military purposes."

The third of this triumvirate of famed military authorities is Maj. George Fielding Eliot, war expert for the New York Herald Trbune and Life magazine, and author of the widely read book on American preparedness, The Ramparts We Watch.

"Nothing could be worse," he writes, "than to give our own people and the peoples of the rest of the world the idea that we are going to have, or are even on the point of creating, a vast citizen army of millions. We cannot do this for a long time.

"We ought not to try to build up such an army on any half-baked basis. If we have learned anything from the present war, it is the need of ample training. Let us all know exactly what we are doing; let us all know, not just the White House coterie and the general staff.

"Let us not forget we are primarily a sea power. * * * There may be other ways of improving the national morale besides spending more than is necessary on any army which, if it passes the size needful for hemisphere missions, may well become an instrument useful only for overseas adventures—perhaps for a ghastly holocaust in Europe.

"We should be quite clear on one point: That we do not propose to furnish the manpower for any invasion of the European continent. It will be much better not to create any instrument of war which can be useful for that purpose.

"It all gets back to the lack of any coordinated, well-weighed plan for our defense. * * * We should do our thinking now while we have the time. And we should appoint able and experienced experts to do the job of translating thought into concrete and complete plans upon which to base our expenditures and our labors."

By common public acceptance these three men know what they are talking about. They are nonemotional and nonpolitical students of military preparedness and the arts of warfare.

The Free Press does not question the sincerity of President Roosevelt in his drive for preparedness, but it is forced at times to question his judgment because, in the very ardor of his cause, he lets his enthusiasm and his emotions run away with him—as is well evidenced by that "Stab in the back" speech at Charlottesville and his proposal to "quarantine aggressor nations" in his Chicago address in 1937.

The issue involves too vital a change in our whole concept of American life not to speak out bluntly about it.

The American people should not be lulled to sleep by grandiose talk. Our dangers from abroad are not one-half so real as the danger within our own borders. It may well be that the very life of democracy itself is at stake here.

Why, then, all the mad, precipitate rush?

If the Members of the United States Congress do not weigh carefully all the factors involved, if they do not permit the people full and open hearings so that they will have complete understanding, then they will be derelict in their duty and recreant to a sacred trust.

Let the people know that once they have bent their necks to the yoke of regimentation there is no turning back. The bands will play martial music, the flags will fly—and we, a once free people, may march to the goose step under a totalitarian government.

We may well pause and note the following from a western newspaper:

Who nominated Hitler? Hitler.
Who nominated Mussolini? Mussolini.
Who nominated Stalin? Stalin.
Who nominated Roosevelt? Roosevelt.
Who are we to be bragging about "democracy"?
Who, indeed.

Roosevelt having nominated himself; having called for peacetime conscription; there having surreptitiously been put through Congress a bill giving him power to take over and operate all industrial plants, if the American people grant him a third term, they will find that he has firmly established himself as a dictator and will either continue in office indefinitely or name his successor.

The November election is coming on apace. If we would save our country, no time or effort is to be lost. Arouse your neighbors to the danger.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

STATEMENT BY EMIL E. HOLMES AND BILL INTRODUCED BY HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Emil E. Holmes, national deputy chief of staff, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and also a bill introduced by me. Mr. Holmes' statement follows:

Few if any of those who argue against the so-called draft bill deny that it is a fair system, that it is in reality a selective service; also, it is a rare thing to find anyone who will today deny the need for national defense.

The only reason worthy of consideration is against the establishing of a professional military system. This, however, can very easily be avoided through the adoption of such legislation as H. R. 10113, a copy of which follows:

"A bill (H. R. 10113) to establish as a part of the military reserves of the United States a Home Defense Organized Reserve for local home defense against present-day foreign military methods and "fifth column" infiltration and sabotage

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 1 of the National Defense Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SECTION 1. That the Army of the United States shall consist of the Regular Army, the National Guard while in the service of the United States, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Organized Reserves, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and the Home Defense Organized Reserve.'

"SEC. 2. Section 55 of the National Defense Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 55d. Home Defense Organized Reserve—Veterans shall be given preference; (1) The President is authorized and directed to establish a Home Defense Organized Reserve, which shall consist of such number of officers and men (not exceeding 1,000,000) over the age of 36 years voluntarily enlisting therein as its duties may require. The President may also assign officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army for duty with or for training of the Home Defense Organized Reserve.

" '(2) In order to increase efficiency and to conserve time and save expense for the training of individuals, officials charged with the duty of determining who shall be selected to serve in the home-reserve units, in case there are more volunteers than there are positions to be filled in any area, shall give preference to veterans with previous military service.

" '(3) All policies affecting the organization, distribution, appointment, and promotion in, training of, assignment to, and discharge from the Home Defense Organized Reserve shall be prepared by committees of appropriate branches or divisions of the War Department General Staff, to which shall be added the necessary number of officers from the Home Defense Organized Reserve.

" 'SEC. 55e. Organization of Home Defense Organized Reserve: (1) The Home Defense Organized Reserve shall have corps areas coextensive with the corps areas of the Regular Army. The War Department General Staff shall assign officers from the personnel of the Home Defense Organized Reserve to assist in such command and to establish and maintain liaison within the corps area.

" '(2) In each home-defense department there shall be such local home-defense districts as the War Department General Staff deems the duties of the Home Defense Organized Reserve in such department require. In each such district there shall be a home-defense unit composed of such number of officers and men voluntarily enlisting therein, organized in such manner, as the War Department General Staff deems necessary.

" 'SEC. 55f. Duties of Home Defense Organized Reserve: The Home Defense Organized Reserve shall, under the direction of the War Department through the organization herein provided for—

"'(1) Become fully informed of all strategic points within their respective home-defense districts, such as oil and gas supplies, waterworks, manfacturing establishments, bridges, docks, airports, tunnels, and be prepared to protect and defend such points from sabotage and enemy infiltration in time of national emergency;

"'(2) Become fully informed of all roads, trails, railroads, and other lines of communication within their respective home-defense districts;

"'(3) Become fully informed of the topography of their respective home-defense districts together with tne significance thereof in relation to military tactics;

"'(4) Provide for and assist in the hospitalization and evacuation of civilian population in their respective home-defense districts in time of national emergency;

"'(5) Cooperate with the Intelligence Section of the Regular Army.

"'(6) Train and arm a sufficient force to act in emergency to defend their respective home-defense districts against any preliminary enemy activity; and

"'(7) Perform such other duties in connection with home defense and to cooperate with the Regular Army with such information with respect to their respective home-defense districts as the War Department may prescribe.

"'SEC. 55g. Active service of Home Defense Organized Reserve: Members of the Home Defense Organized Reserve may be called to active service only in time of national emergency declared by Congress. While on active service, the House Defense Organized Reserve shall receive the same pay and allowances as personnel of equal rank in the Regular Army.

"'SEC. 55h. Surplus Army equipment: The Secretary of War is authorized to furnish the local Home Defense Organized Reserve units with such surplus rifles (together with ammunition therefor), equipment, matériel, etc., as may be required for the training, drilling, and use of such units, and as may be required by their duties.

"'SEC. 55i. Pensions, bounties, bonuses, etc.: No member of the Home Defense Organized Reserve shall by reason of service therein be denied or deprived of any pension, bounty, bonus, gratuity, or hospitalization to which he is now or may hereafter be entitled under present laws by reason of service under this act.'"

This bill would give us a large and highly trained army without delay, and that would within a less period and with less expense train the younger needed millions for future defense armies. Col. William Donovan, World War commander of the fighting Sixty-ninth, offers some expert opinion on this and his views are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of April 22, 1940, inserted there by Congressman JOHN G. ALEXANDER.

May I urge those who are opposed to the building of a permanent military system to cooperate in putting this idea before the citizens of this Nation? May I urge every Member of Congress to read it and, if opposed, to debate it before the people of their district?

It is my contention that we who fought the past battles of this Nation are entitled to a hearing on this, and that our testimony supported by facts is preferable to schoolboy opinions.

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Boston Post:

DRAFT DEBATE

Some formidable opposition is developing to the proposed Compulsory Service Act in Congress.

This, however, is not expected to block the passage of the bill. A substantial majority in both the Senate and the House has been unofficially polled and is in favor of the bill in its present form.

Because of its novelty in our American system of life and because it has no precedent in times of peace, a debate of far-reaching proportions is in the offing.

Many people throughout the country have been jarred because the bill seems to interfere with our way of life.

Many organizations, favoring the liberal mode of living and opposing any interference by the Government in any of the normal activities of our citizens, are getting very busy in opposing the draft bill.

But the public seems to understand better than many of its representatives and better than many peace and liberal organizations that the broad implication of the Burke-Wadsworth bill is to insure continuation of our way of life in the midst of what is really a world revolution.

Any complacency which we might have that the evils besetting men in other lands will never reach us here is chimerical.

Complacency is, in these hours, a moral dry rot.

A writer who recently returned from Europe after a tour of France, England, and the Low Countries before and after the German continental successes, wrote that she was much impressed with the fact that the only people in high positions that realized what was going on appeared to be the American military attachés.

The complacency of the French and British was overwhelming.

At the very hour when Chamberlain exulted that "Hitler missed the bus" and Churchill declared that the Norwegian invasion was a mistake comparable to that of Napoleon in Spain, these officers, to their credit, declared that they could see no reason for optimism.

Something of their cynicism regarding the ability of the English and the French to withstand the Germans is present in the average American mind.

While great writers and public persons here have continually sneered at Hitler and his army, the public generally has not underestimated the destructive power of the man and his followers.

To combat this power, it is the work of wisdom to prepare for any eventuality in a military way.

It has been clearly shown that we cannot get voluntary enlistments fast enough to fill our Army even to maximum peace strength.

But we cannot let our country and its institutions go to pieces because of this factor.

Thus, the draft debate this week should not be extended for personal or political reasons.

Reply to Judge Greenspan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the July 7 issue of the New York Enquirer appeared an article by Judge Benjamin E. Greenspan, in which he deplores the fact that I informed one of our Intelligence Departments that the communistic Jew Hefter was organizing an army of 100,000 men to fight somewhere in the United States. That report the jurist should know was in the line of duty and in conformity with my oath of office as an officer and as a Member of Congress.

In the article the distinguished jurist says, "The Jews cannot organize anything." To this statement I can only reply that the judge is wrong, for the Jews have organized themselves out of nearly every country in which they have found a home and will, if they persist in their present tactics of boycott and election meddling, organize themselves out of the United States.

Is it just for the Jews to use their own press, the nationally controlled press, and their own hired defamers to vilify and slander every American citizen who believes in and upholds constitutional government because such person cannot see eye to eye with the Jews? Is it just for the Jewish defamer, Mr. Winchell, who walks through the gutters before he broadcasts his vile accusations, in order to advertise articles manufactured by his employers? Is it fair to those who are attacked by him not to have an opportunity of replying to this defamer of the air channels, who, like the rest, engages in boycott and then brags about it when he complimented people in various States last Sunday for having defeated those in election that he thought should not be elected? I wonder if the real American people appreciate this compliment by this character assassin who, like a hyena, shelters himself under the protection of his employer to attack in the dark those who cannot reply to him, because of boycott by the press and broadcasting stations which do not allow those attacked by him to reply.

The boycott is an oriental and Jewish weapon which should now be employed against its proponents, so that they may stew in their own juice. The first place to begin that boycott is in denial of entrance into the United States.

Judge Greenspan is wrong when he says that the Jews cannot organize, for they have over 200 national organizations, of which over 190 are located in New York City. They have over 300 State organizations and many subdivisions within the States. The national organization issues 154 publications, which with 180 Jewish publications appearing in the United States makes a total of 334. The Jews have 557 newspapers published in foreign languages, and the publication society, according to the Jewish Year Book, numbers over 9,300 people. These are just a few organizations, for there are many more. In addition to these, the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League numbered over 700 organizations in 1939, and these organizations are Jewish except for the framing. Their stock in trade is to promote boycott and hatreds toward any and all who do not join them in their league of hate. This league, according to its own statement, is served by an organized detective service that was instrumental in building the case against the Christian Front. It has a bureau of statistics and a bureau of propaganda analysis. It has a defamation service that is well versed in character destruction, in the best and well-organized Jewish manner. This same league pictures in its own magazines various Christians as "Apes of Wrath."

The Jews are well represented in the three branches of the Federal Government, and particularly in the Justice and Intelligence Departments. There is not one Federal Department in which the Jews are not well organized and hold key positions. I, therefore, wonder why this most distinguished jurist comes out in the press to attack me and, in addition to that, announced to the public that the Jews cannot organize anything. The Jews are so well organized that they do not appear in the list as operating farms or engaged in farm labor. They do not appear in the ranks of hard labor. As a matter of fact, I have not seen any but Negroes and Gentiles on Government projects here in Washington. They do not appear among those who are engaged in the various crafts and in dangerous occupations, and their names do not appear in the list of those who are working in coal mines, copper mines, or similar hazardous occupations and trades. They are so well organized that I have not seen any one of them in the ranks of the unemployed, which speaks well for their organizing ability. There are very few Jews in the enlisted personnel of the Army or Navy, and I have never seen any one as a sailor in the merchant marine. They are, however, as we well know, conspicuous as organizers in radical and communistic labor movements, movements in which they have been engaged in the United States for over 20 years.

I, therefore, repeat and ask the distinguished jurist what he means when he says that the Jews cannot organize? The Jews organized the revolution in Russia, which was financed by money that came from Wall Street; and they have organized the gosplan of Soviet Russia, the political economic plan or PEP in Great Britain, the economie dirigee in France, and the New Deal in the United States. It is under their supervision that we have our trade pacts and trade treaties and the asinine and stupid policies of Secretary Wallace. No one realizes this better than the Members of Congress, as they observe one Jew after another appearing to testify before the various congressional committees on Government organization.

When the judge insinuates that I am anti-Semitic, he knows that that statement is false, and he knows that he could not substantiate his statement in any gentile court, or even in the Beth Din, even if the rabbis were just. The judge then makes this most astounding statement:

> If such [a Jewish army] is being formed, I'd say the movement is admirable, if it is for the purpose of defense of the United States, and I think that Congressman THORKELSON is trying to misinterpret the movement.

To this I can only say that I am not misrepresenting the movement, for such army exists in fact, if one is to believe pictures or newspapers.

Mr. Hefter claims to be a veteran of four wars. In what armies did he serve? Not in the Imperial Russian Army; not in the Imperial German, Austrian, or Hungarian armies, but he served instead in the revolutionary army under Lenin, Trotsky, and Bela Kun. He is now engaged in organizing and training another army—for what? Another revolutionary army, no doubt, to participate in an attempt toward the same overthrow of government that was so successfully accomplished by those under whom he served. However, he should not be allowed to organize a Jewish or any other army, for that right is even denied to patriotic law-abiding American citizens.

The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League even howled because the Christian Front had 17 obsolete .22-caliber rifles; but this Jewish army, according to the pictures, is well equipped with modern weapons for field service. What is it all about? The Judge ridiculed the idea of conspiracy in this organization, but he knows as well as I that this army is not organized for the welfare of the United States, and that should be clearly evident to anyone with just 1 ounce of gray matter.

The judge then makes this most extraordinary statement:

> I imagine that if Ireland were attacked, the Irish would conspire to defend it.

What interpretation is to be taken from this statement? Naturally the Irish would defend Ireland, but does Judge Greenspan infer that the United States is in the future to be protected by the Jews instead of the United States Army and Navy? And are we now supposed to be a Jewish state? If one is to believe his remarks and their inferences, we cannot fail to interpret them with a certain amount of apprehension, for it certainly appears that the distinguished jurist believes that the Jews are now actually in control of the United States.

The judge deplores my statement, and I can well understand his anxiety, for I have stood in support of the Constitution as it was given to us by the founders of this great and glorious country. In addition to that, I have opposed those who are engaged in misinterpretation or sabotage of the document, and in the conversion of our Government into what Judge Greenspan now seems to believe it is, a Jewish state. I deplore that the judge said I was anti-Semitic, when the fact is that I am not even anti-Jewish. I am not concerned about Semitics, but I do feel sorry for those Jews who are first Americans and who may become innocent sufferers for the act of "a few Godless Jews." It certainly should make our own people think, could they only realize that the word "anti" is not employed by anyone except the Jew. What a strange country we would have, and in what a mess we would be, if we were composed of a nation of anti-Danish, anti-Dutch, anti-Swedish, anti-English, anti-Irish, and so on, ad infinitum. What would it be if all of us indulged in designating those who disagree with us as "anti" to our own ancestral race, and in such designation expect all others to join in their suppression? It is this that the Jews expect every American to do when he designates those who disagree with him as anti-Semitics. The term is not even correct, because he should call them "anti-Jews" if they are actually opposed to the Jew, but certainly not if they speak in defense of the Constitution and our own country.

I furthermore deplore that the Jewish communistic press and the Jewish-controlled national press have done their best to villify and libel me since May 1, 1930. I deplore the fact that the Jews have hired unprincipled gentiles to disseminate false information and to engage in a whispering campaign of slander against me in my own State. I deplore the fact that the Daily Worker, the New Leader, the Jewish Examiner, the Jewish Transcript, Equality, the New Republic, and Time have villified and slandered me because I have spoken the truth. I also regret that the Montana Cut Bank Pioneer Press, and another defamatory sheet, the Great Falls Tribune, have seen fit to engage in the same libellous accusations which they could not substantiate, should I insist that they do so. I deplore the fact that the Jewish press has attacked me and other Christians, and I now deplore the fact that Judge Greenspan has stultified himself and his office in joining my defamers in libellous accusation, that neither he nor anyone else can substantiate in any American court.

It must, however, be understood that when I discuss the international Jew, I do not include those who believe in the fundamental principles of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, for they are loyal American citizens and considered as such by myself and all other Americans.

Activities of "Front" Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LELAND M. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY ASSEMBLYMAN JACK B. TENNEY, OF INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Assemblyman Jack B. Tenney, published in the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News of July 8, 1940:

[From the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News of July 8, 1940]

TENNEY EXPOSES "FRONT" ORGANIZATIONS IN FIGHT TO RID STATE OF "ISMS"

Assemblyman Jack B. Henney, of Inglewood, arch foe of the "isms" which threaten America, and who has been doing outstanding work as a member of the Yorty committee investigating radicalism in this State, delivered the following radio address over KMTR last Friday evening, under the auspices of the American Federation of Labor:

"I wish to speak to you tonight concerning one of communism's great 'front' organizations in the field of American labor—the so-called Labor's Non-Partisan League. I want to emphasize by way of preface that the many fine American men and women of organized labor have been deceived into supporting this front organization, and I want to say that my remarks are not in any way a reflection upon the rank and file of patriotic citizens who have unwittingly and innocently given strength and prestige to this Stalin-dominated Trojan horse. The truth is now known, however, and there will be little excuse for any patriotic member of American labor to continue to support this un-American organization in the future.

LABOR OPPOSES DICTATORS

"Totalitarianism cannot flourish if democratic labor organizations are permitted to exist. Totalitarian Russia was and is no exception. One of the first official acts of the Soviet gangsters under the dictatorship of the proletariat was the abolition of Russia's trade-union movement. Collective bargaining, like free speech and the right of free assembly, become a capital offense. To strike and to picket become acts of treason and were designated counterrevolutionary. Firing squads took the place of labor injunctions, while brutal regimentation was substituted for collective bargaining. The despotic czars of the old Russia are remembered as industrial sentimentalists compared to the bloodstained masters now in the throne room of the Kremlin. When futile resistance was broken by the summary execution of several thousand disillusioned trade-unionists and their leaders, a new and terrifying state feudalism was born, and Russia's labor movement had perished.

"The Third International—known to the blood-stained monsters of the Kremlin as the Comintern—spawned the Red Trade Union International in 1919. This organization is known among these same 'comrades' as the Profintern, and it was organized and first headed by Comrade Losovsky. (Incidentally, textbooks by this same Comrade Losovsky on trade-unions and their use by Communists as a smoke screen to the revolution are used today in the Communist trade-union schools throughout the county of Los Angeles.) The expressed aim of the Red Trade Union International was to sabotage and destroy 'reformist unions' everywhere, and particularly the American Federation of Labor in the United States.

"Comrade W. Z. Foster organized the Trade Union Educational League in the United States in 1922, acting under orders handed down at the First World Congress of the Profintern, held that year in Moscow. Foster, by the way, testified before a congressional investigating committee that Soviet Russia was the fatherland of all Communists and workers and that the 'red' flag was the symbol to which all Communists owed allegiance. The purpose of the Trade Union Educational League was to attack the unions of the American Federation of Labor by 'boring from within'—to sabotage and wreck these great democratic associations of American labor. The patriotic rank-and-file members and the alert leadership of the American Federation of Labor was completely successful in blocking the infiltration attempts of these 'red' termites. But Communists do not despair. A new organization was set up by Foster which was named the Trade Union Unity League—deceiving and misleading—but strangely reminiscent of today's Labor's Non-Partisan League.

"FRONT" ORGANIZATIONS

"This new 'front' organization, the Trade Union Unity League, became the first dual union movement set up by the Communists to oppose the American Federation of Labor. Its un-American and revolutionary character was little disguised and undenied. It gave birth to certain incipient industrial unions, and its chief activity was the calling and waging of strikes for any reason or no reason at all.

MOSCOW GANGSTERS

"The Moscow gangsters, despairing of capturing the A. F. of L., turned its agents to the possibilities presented by the C. I. O., which came into being in 1935. Stalin's stooges made considerable headway in the inexperienced and loosely organized unions that began to mushroom into existence under the leadership and guidance of John L. Lewis.

"In 1935 'Comrade' Georgi Dimitrov distinguished the Seventh World Congress of the Hammer and Sickle by achieving a 'new high' in treachery and deceit—his diabolical and pernicious adaption of the Trojan horse and the 'united front' tactics. Foreign agents eagerly took up the new Soviet treachery in the United States and it was not long until patriotic American men and women, deceived and betrayed, were marching shoulder to shoulder with the sneering stooges of totalitarian Russia.

UNITED FRONT TACTIC

"Then came the classic example of the 'united front' tactic in the American labor movement—Labor's Non-Partisan League. Baited with high-sounding objectives and window-dressed with unsuspecting respectability, this new machine of Communist dishonesty rolled forward. It is significant to note that although John L. Lewis was the national chairman of this new 'front' organization, his name was omitted from most of the letterheads for the express purpose of ensnaring and capturing A. F. of L. support. Only the name of E. L. Oliver appeared with the title of executive vice president.

"The Communist Party began its new, and probably its most effective, drive for the capture of California labor in 1937. The general plan of the "red" high command was to fuse Railway Brotherhoods, the C. I. O., and the A. F. of L. into Labor's Non-Partisan League and thus to become the spokesman and leader of all labor groups. Secret control of the league was assured at the start. Other 'front' organizations were instructed to help build the league and to give it prestige and political power. The wresting of all leadership from the A. F. of L. were immediate objectives.

BROWDER SPOUTS

"Earl Browder emphasized the importance of the league in a party periodical called the Communist in December 1937. William Schneidermann, the California State secretary of the Communist Party, who has just had his citizenship papers canceled, wrote about the league in the December 22 issue of the Western Worker, the predecessor of the current Communist daily, the People's World. So that there will be no doubt of the Communist interest in Labor's Non-Partisan League, I quote from the California Party Guide for January 1938, published at 121 Haight Street in San Francisco, at page 7, under the title 'L. N. P. L.':

" 'It is essential that the utmost attention be given to help build Labor's Non-Partisan League in every important industrial center of California and to win the affiliation of unions, both C. I. O. and A. F. of L., and railway brotherhoods, with special concentration upon A. F. of L. unions, in every section of the State.'

"This quotation from the confidential guide of the Communist Party can leave no doubt of the interest in, and certain control of, Labor's Non-Partisan League. Although many patriotic, well-meaning union men and women have been deceived by this 'front' organization in the past, the revelations recently disclosed by the assembly investigating committee headed by Assemblyman Sam Yorty, of which I am a member, leaves little excuse for continued affiliation. It is well known now, that Don Healey, Los Angeles County Secretary of Labor's Non-Partisan League was formerly a registered Communist in this county and evidence before our committee shows his continuation as a Communist in the so-called Communist Enlarged Trade Union Commission. Information in the hands of the Yorty assembly investigating committee reveals the Communist Party secret affiliations of many other leaders in Labor's Non-Partisan League. One of the leading lights, active in labor and politics, is known to the comrades under the alias of Harold Stark, and this individual is honored by his Stalin superiors with the title of educational director of the Communist Party schools.

OLIVER WRITES

"If further evidence were needed, it came this week in the form of a communication addressed to me from E. L. Oliver, executive vice president of Labor's Non-Partisan League. Mr. Oliver enclosed a copy of a letter he wrote to John L. Lewis under date of June 21, 1940. He tells Mr. Lewis in part:

" 'Events of the past 10 days have made it clear to me that I cannot conscientiously continue in the position of executive vice president of Labor's Non-Partisan League. It is with sincere regret that I am therefore resigning that position, effective immediately.'

"Mr. Oliver says further to Mr. Lewis:

" 'The infinitesimal minority within the league opposing the re-election of President Roosevelt is, in my judgment, predominantly composed of individuals affiliated with or following the leadership of organizations controlled from outside of the United States, whose policies are fixed without reference to the needs of American labor.'

"No one can be left in doubt as to what Mr. Oliver means in his letter of resignation. Undoubtedly Mr. Oliver feels like Mr. David Lasser felt when the latter gentleman resigned as national president of the Communist-controlled Workers Alliance. Commenting on his resignation Mr. Lasser said:

" '* * * It was because I could no longer stomach the rule-or-ruin tactics by the Communist leadership that I was forced to resign and let you know the facts.'

"Real Americans who have heretofore been deceived by these un-American 'front' organizations controlled by forces from outside the United States are following the examples set by David Lasser, of the Workers Alliance, and Mr. Oliver, of Labor's Non-Partisan League.

"Patriotic citizens within the ranks of organized labor, as well as patriotic citizens everywhere, have a twofold duty before them. One is to purge all foreign-spawned termites from every American organization and the other is to end unemployment in the United States. I will conclude by quoting the last paragraph of the report of the assembly investigating committee, heretofore referred to:

" 'Most important of all, a sound, constructive program of reemployment must be determined upon and executed through the cooperation of government, business, and labor. This is a necessary defense measure. Subversive groups feed the fires of discontent created by economic break-down. Their lying propaganda and promises are doubled in effectiveness during periods of economic uncertainty. The combined intelligence and patriotism of all Americans must cause them to support whatever equitable economic adjustments are necessary to put an end to the scourge of unemployment. Doles are not the answer. Doles and demoralization go hand in hand. The great morale that has always characterized the American people must be safeguarded. The calamity howlers must be met by a deafening roar of American industrial activity.' "

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN BOLLES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of my constituents:

RACINE, WIS., *July 30, 1940.*

Congressman STEPHEN BOLLES,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is, or will be, up for consideration before your honorable body the so-called conscription bill as recommended by the President.

I, together with a great many other American citizens, am at a loss to understand the present war hysteria and the unseemly and unreasonable antics on the part of our lawmaking bodies.

We all believe in preparedness, but the idea of appropriating billions that cannot be spent in less than 5 years, when nobody knows what we are preparing against and what kind of weapons will be necessary to combat our so-called future enemies seems supremely ridiculous.

We are appropriating millions for battleships when there is great doubt as to their value in modern warfare. Why not clearly study the situation before going off half-cocked. There is no enemy at our doors, and won't be for several years to come at the earliest. When it does come let us be properly prepared with the right kind of weapons and not find that billions in money and effort have been wasted.

Now comes the conscription bill on top of all the rest of the half-baked provisions for war. What's the idea? Everybody knows that all past methods of military training are obsolete and that the future training will be to handle mechanized units and airplanes.

Where are the implements of war with which to train the boys when you have them in camp?

If it is going to be a matter of drill, you might just as well leave them home and let them drill in some alley with broomsticks in their spare time.

To take the boys away from their work or professions for a whole year and have them spend it uselessly in some camp without any definite program seems to me the height of foolishness.

I am a widow with one son 24 years of age. I take a back seat for no one when it is a matter of sacrificing for my country when in danger, but I take decided exception to having my boy's future success interfered with by spending a year in useless drill.

Respectfully,

JO WIECHERS.

The Third-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER BY SEDGWICK KISTLER TO LOCK HAVEN (PA.) EXPRESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Sedgwick Kistler for the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express of July 30, 1940:

[From the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express of July 30, 1940]

VIEWS THIRD TERM AS VITAL ISSUE IN PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

The EXPRESS.

SIR: You contend editorially, "now that Roosevelt is running, the third-term issue is out of date," and our acceptance of that contention is a test of our "national unity." Hitler has completely developed that sort of philosophy; Germans must vote for him only in order to show their national unity. If they don't—and are found out—they are sent to concentration camps.

The third term has been an issue in this Nation since Washington was the first President. Washington refused a third term, though it was offered him without a contest. Jefferson did likewise, and no two men in our Nation's history did more than those two great Presidents to create and establish our democratic form of government. They possessed vision and wisdom and realized the future dangers that would beset democratic government, believing the greatest danger would be any President's long-continued period in an office whose powers so readily lend themselves to the erection of a dictatorship and the consequent destruction of democracy. Such was the reason which prompted Washington and Jefferson to refuse a third term, and they in their times were as indispensable to the security and progress of the Nation and its form of government as any President ever will be.

Washington set a precedent about the third term; Roosevelt would break that precedent for the sake of his New Deal and New Dealers and in so doing would take our Government a long step in the direction of dictatorship, which historically and inevitably results from every long-continued period of great power in government by any individual.

It is a well-known condition here that a president has powerful means through his control of political office holders and beneficiaries of reelecting himself. (This condition prompts the popular belief in a single 6-year term for our Presidents.) To use that control for his one reelection has been excused by the people but to use that control again and again for reelection after reelection is not in accord with the principles of the democratic form of government nor with our traditions.

To put his plea for his reelection to 12 years in office, as Roosevelt does, on the demand he and he alone must carry on the program he began 8 years ago is to put him and his program in the same category with Stalin and his 5-year programs, Hitler and his 6 years, Mussolini with 10 years. Now Roosevelt wants 12 years—the first 12 years. Who of the four of them will say "I have finished"? Not one, for all are obsessed with the delusion they and they alone can save their countries, their satellites, themselves, and their works.

Through a combination of maneuvers, some ignoble, Roosevelt gained control of the National Democratic Party exactly as Hitler gained control of what once was the national democratic party in Germany. Today both of those democratic parties, as exemplified by Roosevelt here and Hitler over there, have no resemblance in principles or purpose to their original ones. The real Democrats at the recent Chicago convention were put in the "dog house," which is common knowledge; the real democrats in Germany have been put into concentration camps, also common knowledge. Dictatorship has its degrees but under it what begins with a dog house can easily grow into a concentration camp.

Too many of us close our eyes, stick our heads in the sand and believe "it cannot happen here," as if human nature is different on different sides of an ocean. Dictatorships have come to one nation after another under different names but all of them with much the same line of procedure and all to end with the same effect, for in every one of them the result has been the loss of the freedom of the individual. It seems human weakness to put

little value on what we have and great value on what we do not have; we risk our individual freedom for the promise of better material conditions. The end is the loss of both freedom and better conditions, as all existing dictatorships conclusively prove.

Why talk about dictatorship over here? One move after another, one urge after another, one purge after another here in recent years is of the exact nature if not the full degree of those in Europe. And now, in Roosevelt's third-term demand, we have here in degree as well as in nature the essence of complete dictatorship which is the continuance of an individual's political control of the people, the consequent death of self-government, and ending in the loss of the freedom of the people.

Roosevelt wants a third term. He schemed it that way, against all the fundamental principles and precedents of our democratic Government. He undermined and overpowered a great political party with a "fifth column" of new dealers. His control of his recent renomination was absolute and arbitrary and he is now free to do everything he wishes to the end of reelecting himself President, continuing his power, and dictating the governmental policy of the Nation.

If there is any issue in this country today between dictatorial control of our Government and democratic control of our Government then certainly the third term is an issue in the coming election.

SEDGWICK KISTLER.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EWING THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY L. STIMSON BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, before the House Committee on Military Affairs:

TEXT OF STIMSON'S STATEMENT ON DRAFT—SECRETARY OF WAR URGES CONSCRIPTION BEFORE HOUSE UNIT

You, gentlemen, are the trustees of the security of the United States. One of the main purposes of our Constitution is to provide for the common defense. Under that Constitution the power to raise and support armies was specifically given to the Congress. You, gentlemen, are the members of the committee which was created to guide the House of Representatives in the performance of its duties in that matter of raising and supporting armies. Thus in that matter you are in very special sense, the trustees for the people of the United States.

Now what are the rules which in ordinary life guide a trustee in the performance of his duties?

First and foremost it his duty to follow the lessons of experience. It is his duty to avoid methods which have been shown to be ineffective and futile; which have not only been futile but have been breeders of evils and dangers. It is his duty, in other words, to play safe with the great trust which has been confided to him.

NO DOUBT AS TO METHOD

When we apply these simple and well-known fiduciary rules to the problem of this bill which is before you now, it seems to me that there can be no doubt or question as to the method to follow. If there is any lesson that has been thoroughly proved by history throughout the life of our Nation, it is that the only safe and effective way to meet a great war emergency is by the timely creation of a selective compulsory system for raising our armies. The other system, the system of volunteering, has been tried again and again, and in every serious war, as well as in some wars which were not serious, it has proved a costly failure. Our Government tried it in the Revolution. Within 2 years the great States of Virginia and Massachusetts were forced to resort to the draft and even then the total number of men serving under arms in the American armies declined from some 79,000 men in 1776 to less than 30,000 men in 1781. In the Civil War both sides began with volunteers and both sides eventually were compelled to resort to the draft. We tried it in the Spanish War, and although the number of men required was extremely small in comparison to our population, even that small number was never fully enlisted.

CITES WORLD WAR SUCCESS

Finally, in the Great War, our Government began with a carefully devised selective and compulsory system, and the largest armies ever used in our history were raised with an enthusiasm which was magnificent, and with a minimum of disturbance to our national and industrial life.

The experience of Great Britain has been similar to ours. She had the same prejudice as we did against conscription and in favor of the voluntary system. In both the Great War and on the approach of the present war, she delayed in instituting a compulsory system, with the result, in both cases, that there was caused enormous loss and confusion, and now possibly eventual disaster. In all the other nations of Europe, from peace-loving Switzerland to the totalitarian states, the compulsory system is recognized as the only effective method by which a nation can organize its military strength.

Thus, from the standpoint of the lessons of human experience, there can be no question between the two methods; there can be no question that one has regularly proved a costly failure, while the other is now universally recognized as the only system which is effective.

ONLY EFFICIENT SYSTEM

In the next place, from the standpoint of principle, the selective compulsory system is the only one which is fair; the only system which distributes the primary duty of national defense upon every citizen and which distributes that duty so that each man may serve in the capacity where he will be most effective. It is also the only system which is appropriate to a democracy; which recognizes that, in a country where all citizens have the right to participate in choosing their own government, they are also obligated to serve and defend that government in case of the peril of war. It would be just as unfair to leave to the whim of the individual the question of whether or not he will render service to his government in time of war as it would be to leave to the whim of the individual the question of whether or not he would pay taxes for the support of that government.

Thirdly, the selective compulsory system is the only efficient system in the great task of avoiding, so far as possible, the disruption of the Nation's normal life. The voluntary system is not only inadequate to raise modern armies but it is disruptive of industry and of agriculture and of all the sciences and specialties upon which a nation must depend in time of war. All those activities, under a voluntary system, are liable to be disrupted by the rush of patriotic citizens to enlist and fight when they might be more useful elsewhere.

MINIMUM OF DISLOCATION

On the other hand, the compulsory system, when carefully administered, as it was during the Great War, by local boards which take into account not only the battle needs of the country but also its needs of supplies and armaments, will carry the country through the strain of war with the minimum of dislocation. It will not only do that but it will carry it through with the minimum of injustice to the individual, because those boards take into account the situation of each man in respect to his occupation, his family duties and his health.

In all these ways the selective compulsory system is the closest approximation to both efficiency and justice which the experience of this country has yet evolved.

But some of the opponents of compulsory service say that it is a war measure and therefore that we should not adopt it until war has actually arrived. That is exactly what people in Great Britain said to Winston Churchill for 4 years, when he was steadily preaching that war was coming and that Britain should immediately prepare herself for it. When we look at Great Britain today, are we inclined to take the risk of a similar delay? The successive experiences of Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, and Britain, teach the lesson of the danger of not preparing before war actually arrives.

FAR GREATER PERIL NOW

We don't have to look abroad for an answer to this question. We only have to contrast the position in which we ourselves stand today with the position in which we stood in 1917 when we adopted the Selective Act of 1917. I ask you in all fairness, are we not today confronting a far greater peril than we did in June 1917? In 1917 we were protected by the unbroken line of the Allies in France and by the unshaken control of the sea by those Allies. Today there is no line in France, and the control of the sea by the British Fleet is in jeopardy. Today we are face to face with a potential enemy which not only has been conscripting and training its own forces for the past 6 years but which today is putting conscription into effect upon its victims in Poland and France, and in Norway, Denmark, and Holland, in order that its own war supplies may be more ample.

We have been accustomed to think of our Navy and the seas which surround our country as constituting a line of defense so strong that a powerful Army was unnecessary. But today the great shipbuilding industries of Norway and Holland have passed into German hands. The fleet of Italy and her shipbuilding capacity are subject to German disposition. A prudent trustee must take into consideration the possibility that in another 30 days Great Britain herself may be conquered and her shipyards pass under German control. Many of the war vessels of France have already come under the control of Germany, and the same thing may occur in regard to the great fleet of Great Britain.

ARMS NO GOOD WITHOUT MEN

In the Pacific Ocean the powerful fleet of Japan is owned by a power acting in close sympathy with Germany and Italy. Under these circumstances it seems to me very clear that we must revise our former conception of the strength of our first line of defense.

If all of these contingencies which now confront us should be resolved in Germany's favor, she would at once control a naval power which would outrank us in all classes of fighting craft. What is worse, she would outrank us in shipbuilding capacity in a ratio of at least 6 to 1. In the prospect of such a possibility, I suggest to you in all earnestness that it is your duty as trustees to take at once those measures for the security of the United States which have behind them those reasons of experience, of efficiency, of justice, and of fairness which I have just recited.

The Congress has already wisely recognized what a long time it takes to secure a modern armament and has already made large appropriations for that purpose. It would be well to recognize also that it takes a long time to secure and train the men to use such arms, and that the arms are of little use without the men.

War Department Designates Strategic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

MEMORANDUM FROM COL. H. K. RUTHERFORD, ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues and in the interest of an adequate national defense, the following memorandum received this date from Col. H. K. Rutherford, Ordnance Department, Director of Planning Branch, United States Army, defines the areas regarded by the War Department as most suitable for the locating of new munitions plants:

It was recognized that one of the important factors to be considered in locating new munitions plants would be placing them in the interior of the country so as to minimize the hazard of attack from the air. For this reason the War Department decided that such plants should be placed within an area from 200 to 250 miles inside the geographic boundaries of the United States. In exceptional cases, however, where the necessities of the situation may make it imperative, exceptions could be made to this boundary line, but each exception would be carefully considered on its merits.

Within the general area so defined a tentative subdivision was made into five areas, numbered A, B, C, D, and E. These subdivisions were made roughly on the bases of the character of the industries and resources predominant in the various areas. The new plants to be established would be distributed as equitably as practicable over the five areas. This distribution would be accomplished in the several areas after due consideration to the munitions industries already in the area or in contiguous areas, the adaptability of the area to particular type of munitions manufacture, and the effectiveness with which the particular location would contribute to the execution of the defense program. Many detailed studies of the factors involved will, of course, have to be made before particular sites can be selected.

The areas tentatively selected are outlined roughly below. It is not intended that these areas as defined shall be rigidly adhered to, since the primary purpose of designating them is simply as a preliminary step in distributing the new munitions plants as equitably and safely as practicable. It is expected that the new plants to be erected would be distributed among the five areas, and probably, too, additional areas would be established later so that each unit would be reasonably well integrated within itself, and so that if any one area were damaged or lost remaining areas would continue to supply the essential requirements under the defense program.

Area "A" includes, roughly, northern Indiana, northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin and Minnesota, and Iowa, and thence westward.

Area "B" includes Ohio, southwestern Pennsylvania, West Virginia, the western portion of Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

Area "C" includes southern Indiana and Illinois, western Kentucky, Missouri, eastern Kansas, and thence westward.

Area "D" includes western North Carolina, northern Georgia and Alabama, and the eastern part of Tennessee.

Area "E" includes the western part of Tennessee, northern Mississippi, Arkansas, northern Louisiana and Texas, Oklahoma, and westward.

2. Trusting that this gives you the information desired, I remain,
Cordially yours,

H. K. RUTHERFORD,
Colonel, Ordnance Department, Director, Planning Branch.

Vocational Educational Training by the Federal Bureau of Education and the National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

STATEMENT PREPARED BY J. W. STUDEBAKER, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, AND AUBREY WILLIAMS, NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of some of my friends and colleagues, I asked the United States Commissioner of Education, Mr. J. W. Studebaker, and the Federal Administrator of National Youth Administration, Mr. Aubrey Williams, to give me a statement as to just how they were going to coordinate their work in carrying out a program that would be efficient and at the same time not overlap in personnel or expenditures. They have submitted to me such a statement, and I hereby include the same.

The sole purpose of the United States Office of Education is to promote the cause of education throughout the country and thus to aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems,[1] including cooperation with the States in the promotion of vocational education.[2] In securing the establishment of policies and in the operation of procedures to achieve this purpose, the Office necessarily works regularly and officially with and through State departments of education, institutions of higher learning, and local school systems. In general, its methods involve (1) cooperative relationships with State educational systems and agencies, especially through grants-in-aid of various forms of vocational education and for the operation of land-grant colleges and universities, (2) research and the dissemination of its findings, (3) leadership and clearing-house functions concerning education in general performed through National and State conferences, educational planning, publications, and public addresses, and (4) experimentation and demonstrations to discover more effective educational policies and practices.

Through the years, therefore, the United States Office of Education has naturally and necessarily established its contacts with the schools and colleges in the States. To avoid overlapping and confusion of functions and duplication of effort, and to secure economy and efficiency in the operation of policies requiring Federal-State relationships with the school systems in the States, it is essential that the responsibility for Federal policies designed to stimulate or to support expansions or modifications of educational services to the youth of the country be placed in the United States Office of Education.

The purpose of the National Youth Administration is to furnish employment to needy youth. Incidental to and as a part of such employment there is necessarily an element of training. But the operation of schools and training programs as such is not a function of the National Youth Administration. To several hundred thousand young people in high schools and colleges the employment provided by the National Youth Administration furnishes a means of enabling the students to remain in school or college. For out-of-school young people of the ages 17 to 25 employment will be provided on work projects to enable each person employed to earn a subsistence wage, or about $18 per month. In general, young people employed by the National Youth Administration are expected to work an average of 15 hours a week. The national program is administered by a staff in Washington which operates through State organizations established for the special purpose of administering the program of the National Youth Administration.

Since any sound program for the development of youth should be designed to eliminate idleness among young people, and to substitute therefor the productive use of their time either in full-time productive work or in full-time education, or in a combination of both, it is the general objective of the national program of work and education for youth sponsored by the National Youth Administration and the United States Office of Education, respectively, to engage the time of each young person employed by the National Youth Administration during at least 30 hours each week.

[1] Excerpt from act of 30th Cong., 2d sess., approved by President Andrew Johnson, March 2, 1867.

[2] Excerpt from Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act passed by Congress February 23, 1917.

Briefly, then, the function of the United States Office of Education is to secure the development and operation of educational or training programs for all youth, and the function of the National Youth Administration is to organize and administer programs of work for needy or selected youth.

In view of these clearly defined and mutually exclusive functions of the two agencies, it is agreed that—

1. It is the function of the United States Office of Education to exercise leadership in developing and in administering federally financed programs of education, including emergency-training programs to be conducted cooperatively by the Federal Government, the States, and the local communities, in schools and colleges. The Office, in accordance with its long-time policy, will develop and administer such programs through the established channels of educational administration.

2. It is the function of the National Youth Administration to provide and administer the funds with which to support programs of student work for young people who will be enrolled full time in schools or colleges, and also employment on work projects for other young people, all of whom will be provided with related or necessary instruction under the direction of Federal, State, and local educational authorities.

3. In establishing and carrying forward Federal-State relations while performing the functions as indicated under paragraph 1 above, the United States Office of Education is the Federal agency responsible for dealing directly with State educational systems and institutions.

4. In performing its functions as specified in paragraph 2 above, the Federal Office of the National Youth Administration will be responsible for dealing directly with its authorized agents in the State.

5. In working out policies for the development of their respective programs, neither the United States Office of Education nor the National Youth Administration will seek to secure appropriations with which to support activities in the States which are not strictly in accordance with the respective functions of these agencies as indicated above.

6. It is understood that insofar as the Federal Government participates in the support of educational services in the States for young people employed by the National Youth Administration and involving personnel, supplies, equipment, and other operating costs, such support will be limited to the funds made available to the United States Office of Education and allotted by it to the States.

7. The United States Commissioner of Education and the Federal Administrator of the National Youth Administration assume the responsibility for securing the acceptance of this definition of functions by the officials of State departments of education and the State administrators of the National Youth Administration respectively.

8. In planning projects the State Youth Administrator shall work out jointly with the State department of education the nature of and plan for the work, including the location of the project. The State department of education shall be responsible for developing a program of education suited to the needs of the youth employed on such projects. In any situation in which the State department of education decides that it is not feasible to furnish instruction in addition to that which is incidental to and a part of the work and is given during the work period, the specific situation in question shall be referred to a committee of three persons, selected jointly by the State director of vocational education and the State administrator of the National Youth Administration. This committee shall decide whether such additional instruction is to be provided and whether the State department of education or the National Youth Administration shall provide it.

Offers Home to English Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM ANNA FAY SNOW, OF VERNAL, UTAH

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I received a letter from a little 12-year-old constituent of mine, appended to which was an approval by her mother. In my opinion, it is the most eloquent exhibit of the charity, love, and Christian spirit, which is so much a part of the womanhood of America, that I have received during my tenure of office as a Member of this distinguished body. I would be derelict, as a Member of this House, if I did not put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be read, I hope, by all Members of Congress and by other American citizens throughout the country.

The little girl who wrote the letter is Anna Fay Snow, of Vernal, Utah. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Snow. They are typical, average American citizens, and she is a typical American schoolgirl. The letter is written in her own simple language and handwriting, and I am sure it contains a genuine expression coming directly from the heart of this fine American girl, so typical, in my opinion, of the average American girl.

VERNAL, UTAH, *July 10, 1940.*

Mr. ABE MURDOCK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURDOCK: I heard over the radio that the English people were asking the Americans to take their children into our homes until the war is over. I don't know who to write to unless you could get one for me to let stay with us.

I would like a little girl as near my own age as possible. I am 12 years old this month and have neither brothers nor sisters. My mother and father would like to have a little girl come and stay with us, too. We live on a small farm. We are poor but we have plenty to eat and a good warm house. My daddy and mother are good reliable citizens and say they would treat the little girl the same as they do me. She would not be expected to do any more work than I do, which isn't much. I spend most of my time with my music. I also have bicycles and plenty of room to play in.

So if you know of any little English girls wanting to visit America during the war I wish you would please recommend our family.

Yours truly,

ANNA FAY SNOW.

Father's name: Kenneth Snow.

We would like very much to have a little girl stay with us as a companion to our own.

MRS. KENNETH SNOW.

Selective Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. RIVERS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired:

NEW YORK, *July 29, 1940.*

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WADSWORTH: I have seen no mention of the failure of the volunteer system in our War with Spain in the discussions about the Burke-Wadsworth bill for conscripting men without dependents and who are between the ages of 21 and 35.

Our War with Spain was a generally popular war, but the quota of 275,000 volunteers called for by President McKinley in 1898 was not completely filled. The volunteers were needed to fill the ranks of the National Guard and the Regular Army. The maximum strength of the Regular Army was at that time fixed by law at 25,000. Energetic efforts were made to secure volunteers. Each regiment of the Army was authorized to send out recruiting parties in addition to the efforts of the regular recruiting service.

The declaration of war and the shipment of troops to Europe in 1917 were measures which were generally popular. Considerable numbers of volunteers did come forward. However, many of these men may have been spurred on by the knowledge that the conscription law was soon to be passed.

The public is much in favor of increasing our land and naval forces for defensive purposes at the present time. Yet the fear that we may send soldiers to fight in Europe still seems to be in the minds of many who might volunteer now. Sending our troops overseas would be an unpopular measure. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to fill the ranks of the guard and the Regular Army by the volunteer system at the present time.

I should like to commend the general provisions of the Burke-Wadsworth bill now under consideration. The effectiveness and fairness of the system of selecting men for the Army in the present emergency appear to be more generally recognized throughout the country. Only by selecting men for the Army ranks can we make sure that the men best qualified for manufacturing service are used where they are most needed.

The principal objection in the minds of most persons who are opposed to the present bill is that it provides for conscription in peacetime. It is wise to prepare in peace for war and for emergencies. We are obliged to take certain precautions at once unless we are willing to run the risk of grave national danger in a world already heavily armed. For our country it is peacetime. However, we must all admit that it is a peculiar and unstable sort of peacetime under which we now live.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM C. RIVERS,
Major General, United States Army, Retired.

Old-Line Democratic Paper Rejects Third Term and Comes Out for Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE HARRISBURG (PA.) PATRIOT

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1940, the Harrisburg Patriot, which for many years has been an outstanding Democratic daily in central Pennsylvania, rejected the third-term candidacy of President Roosevelt and announced its support of the Republican nominee, Mr. Wendell Willkie. The Patriot, together with the Evening News, have been under the active management of Vance C. McCormick, of Harrisburg, who was the campaign manager for Woodrow Wilson during the 1916 campaign. Mr. McCormick has held many positions of trust and confidence under the Democratic Party. In the editorial in which the Patriot announced its support of Mr. Willkie, the editor cited 26 New Deal policies which he considered highly objectionable; and then announced that it was fortunate that those Democrats who cherished and believed in the ideals of Thomas Jefferson had the opportunity to vote for a man who believed in those ideals, and whose utterances to date give evidence of sound thinking on economic and other public policies.

The editorial from the Patriot follows:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot of July 20, 1940]

ISSUES WHICH ARE FUNDAMENTAL

The Patriot is sorry it cannot support the Democratic candidate for President this year. Renomination of President Roosevelt breaks the third-term tradition as well as the hearts of millions of Democrats who had hoped the dangerous and uneconomic policies of the New Deal would be repudiated and the party rededicated to its fundamental principles.

This is the worst of all times in American history to shatter a tradition which not only is sound in itself but dear to millions of American citizens. The world is so full of dictatorships that even talk or suspicion of it here, in view of the unprecedented growth of bureaucracy, is not in the public interest.

But serious as is the disregard for the third-term tradition, it is but one of many reasons why this newspaper cannot approve or encourage a perpetuation of the New Deal and its further damage to the Nation's interest. If the New Deal has meant well, it has wrought disastrously. Instead of speeding recovery, recovery has been retarded. The New Deal has not kept its word to abandon social and economic experiments which failed. Instead it has indulged in even more wasteful and unsound programs.

The New Deal has adopted some measures which Jeffersonian Democrats could support, but in number and seriousness these are dwarfed by the undesirable and damaging effects of others. Its most illustrious example of futility is the deplorable fact that after 8 years the number of unemployed remains virtually where it started.

President Roosevelt did an excellent job in restoring order out of widespread panic when he took office in the midst of the depression. That credit is his, and deservedly so. As that first term proceeded many of the policies were fantastic and questionable, but they were accepted as part of the emergency.

On that ground the Nation, including this newspaper, supported him for a second term. There was reason to believe that as conditions improved the President would turn back to the platforms of 1932 and 1936 and administer public affairs in accord with Jeffersonian democracy. There were disappointment and criticism when he failed to do so and it became apparent that the New Deal economic fallacies were not to be discarded but to be perpetuated.

These fallacies this newspaper has cited and criticized frequently. Among them are these:

1. Attempt to pack the Supreme Court and questionable appointments.
2. The vindictive senatorial purge.
3. Endless lend and spend policies and the mistaken mischievous notion that a people can spend their way back to prosperity.
4. Readiness to borrow and boost the national debt to the stratosphere.
5. Indifference to the importance of thrift in and out of Government service.
6. Drift toward nationalization of industry and state socialism.
7. Direct and indirect denial of a man's constitutional right to work.
8. Permitting wretched discrimination by the National Labor Relations Board and refusal to strip the Wagner Act of its injustices to employers and employees alike.
9. Contempt for newspapers still free from such governmental control as is exercised over the radio.
10. Encouragement, if not stimulation, of class feeling.
11. Inexcusable indifference to the illegal sit-down strike and other forms of industrial violence.
12. Noninterference with prostitution of relief for political purposes, as in Pennsylvania and Kentucky.
13. Iniquitous undistributed-profits tax.
14. Alarming and extravagant growth in bureaucracy.
15. The yoke around the neck of free enterprise and business.
16. Fraternization with organizations under investigation for their pink-to-red complexions.
17. Preaching the heresy of scarcity as a cure for depression.
18. The dizzy notion that Government spending can create purchasing power.
19. Such wasteful projects costing millions as Quoddy, the Florida Ship Canal, the Santee-Cooper River power projects, as well as uneconomic homestead villages.
20. Concentration of authority in the Executive and the usurpation of lawmaking powers by bureaus and commissions with no recourse to the courts.
21. Disastrous and ineffective Guffey coal law.
22. Cultivating for business and others uncertainty as to the Government's next nostrum.
23. Sanctioning the evasion of the Corrupt Practices Act by using a campaign booklet as a screen to wheedle contributions out of corporations in the form of advertising.
24. Repudiation of 1932–36 campaign pledges.
25. Ruinous and unnecessary foreign silver-buying policy.
26. Collection of social-security payments and their use in the general fund.

That is a program and a prospect alike distasteful to those who believe in Democratic fundamentals. There are many like the Patriot who cherish the doctrines of Jeffersonian democracy. For them it is fortunate that in these times there is a candidate who also cherishes and believes in such Jeffersonian ideals. Mr. Willkie was a lifelong Democrat until 1936. He supported President Roosevelt in 1932. Even today he shares the President's views on foreign policies so that this cannot be a campaign issue.

In his utterances thus far Mr. Willkie reflects his Democratic background and gives evidence of sound thinking on economic and other public policies such as the Hull trade treaties. Like other Democrats, he saw his party principles distorted and displaced by New Deal fallacies. Thus far in the campaign, in the opinion of many persons, Mr. Willkie adheres more closely to the fundamental Democratic faith than do Mr. Roosevelt and his inner associates. As long as Mr. Willkie adheres to these doctrines, the course of the genuine believer in Jeffersonian democracy is clear and urgent. That course will be followed by the Patriot in its support of Mr. Willkie and the determination of issues which go to the very foundations of the American system of government.

The Honorable Foster Stearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the good people of my neighboring State of New Hampshire have long had the reputation and commendable foresight of sending as their Representatives to the Congress men of vision, wisdom, and ability in the science of government.

That they continue to do so is clearly indicated in their choice of the present incumbent from the Second District,

my esteemed colleague and friend the gentleman from New Hampshire, FOSTER STEARNS. His enviable record during this his first term has more than justified the faith his constituents placed in him when they named him as their Representative in Congress.

Recognition of his ability is not alone restricted to his district and State. The Boston Herald, one of the leading New England molders of public opinion, recently paid him an editorial tribute, which I wish to include in my remarks at this point:

CONGRESSMAN STEARNS

Had they known in advance that Congress was to face new and extremely difficult problems growing out of the war in Europe, the people of the Second New Hampshire District could not have chosen better than when they sent FOSTER STEARNS, of Hancock, to represent them in Washington. His first term amply justified the confidence of his district and gave him experience which will make him all the more valuable in the second term for which he now aspires.

Of peculiar advantage to Mr. STEARNS was his service in the diplomatic corps. The value of that experience was recognized by his appointment to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, an unusual distinction for a new Member. His grasp of the foreign situation was indicated by his vote—one of seven Republicans—for the repeal of the arms embargo last September, revealing an independence which his constituents have admired. His primary victory 2 years ago, his large plurality in the election, and his more recent election as delegate to the Republican National Convention

If Congress remains in session, Congressmen will have to choose all reveal his strength at the polls.
between staying on the job in Washington and promoting their own candidacies at home. The people of the Second New Hampshire District will, beyond doubt, approve the purpose of their Congressman to put his duties at Washington ahead of what he describes as "merely personal aspirations."

Labor Votes Henry Ford Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY L. MOSER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 22, 1940

FORTUNE SURVEY XXXI WITH TABLE OF COMPARATIVE PREFERENCES OF AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Fortune Survey XXXI, showing the great majority of American workers consider Henry Ford labor's best friend as contrasted with two other industrialists and eight avowed champions of the labor movement:

Which of these people do you feel have been on the whole helpful to labor and which harmful?

	Helpful	Harmful	Don't know
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Henry Ford	73.6	12.3	14.1
Senator Wagner	51.8	5.6	42.6
William Green	49.7	18.2	32.1
Secretary of Labor Perkins	43.4	19.4	37.2
Alfred P. Sloan, Jr.	25.5	7.7	66.8
Senator Robert La Follette, Jr.	22.0	5.5	72.5
Senator Burton K. Wheeler	19.1	3.2	77.7
John L. Lewis	32.6	44.6	22.8
Norman Thomas	14.1	20.5	65.4
Tom Girdler	4.4	9.7	85.9
Earl Browder	4.2	39.4	56.4

The great majority of American workers are thus shown by Fortune's impartial survey to recognize Henry Ford as a true friend of labor. They rate his helpfulness to labor high above that of any of the others on the selected list, which includes, in addition to two other industrialists, eight avowed champions of the labor movement.

More than 25 years ago Henry Ford revolutionized the industrial wage scale by doubling the going rate of factory pay at a single stroke. This one voluntary act was hailed by leaders in labor as having done "more for labor than 50 years of agitation." It was followed by scores of important, if less dramatic, advances for labor in the Ford industry.

In view of this record, there should be no surprise in finding that labor knows Henry Ford as a friend. Even the C. I. O., described by Fortune as "the most militant group in labor," gives Mr. Ford a "thumping vote of 51.5 percent," as being most helpful to labor.

Commenting on this part of the showing, the magazine says:

"It is a significant reflection of the fact that what United States labor wants most for its toil is a high wage rather than the recognition of economic and political principles."

Bolt to Willkie by Democrats Deeply Rooted—Dissatisfaction With New Deal Policies Covers Wide Range; Third Term Adds Fuel to Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, many distinguished members of the Democratic Party have announced their intention of supporting Willkie and MCNARY in the Presidential election. It is clearly evident that the motivating cause of this very wide movement, which extends throughout the United States, is not due to a local condition or to minor reasons. The causes are deep-seated and go to the very foundation of the structure of our Government. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article enumerating some of the principal reasons why this movement is so widespread. The article was written by Mr. J. Roscoe Drummond, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, and appeared in that publication July 31, 1940.

BOLT TO WILLKIE BY DEMOCRATS DEEPLY ROOTED—DISSATISFACTION WITH NEW DEAL POLICIES COVERS WIDE RANGE; THIRD TERM ADDS FUEL TO FIRE

(By J. Roscoe Drummond)

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., July 31.—Exactly why are so many distinguished Democrats who were early and earnest supporters of President Roosevelt quitting the New Deal and supporting the Presidential candidacy of Wendell L. Willkie?

The answer to this crucial question is becoming increasingly clear here from the varied statements by the leading Democratic recruits to the Willkie cause. With the accession today of Alfred E. Smith, 1928 Democratic Presidential candidate, and Judge Samuel Seabury to the side of the Republican nominee, it is apparent that the split in Democratic ranks is springing not from one issue but from the whole range of New Deal policies.

Analysis of the telegrams which Mr. Willkie has received lately from Democrats who voted for the President in 1932 and 1936, from Democrats who served the New Deal in the first term or the second, from Democrats who have voted their party ticket throughout their lifetime, shows them assigning seven major reasons for opposing the administration they once supported.

PRINCIPAL REASONS

They are:

1. The menace of third term to the free functioning of American democracy. This factor is advanced more frequently than others and is especially emphasized by Lewis W. Douglas and John W. Hanes, both of whom were officials of the New Deal and at one time highly praised by Mr. Roosevelt.

2. Continuous centralization of power in the hands of the Federal Government and continuous centralization of the Federal Government in the hands of the President himself, both impelling the Nation toward totalitarianism.

3. The close association of the most notorious city and State political machines with the New Deal and the dependence of the President upon their support for his third-term renomination. This view is particularly stressed again today by Judge Seabury, whom Mr. Willkie characterized as the father of the movement to clean out corrupt machine politics during the past 10 years.

4. Loose financial policies which have left the country with a dangerously unbalanced budget and uncontrolled spending which has not accomplished any of its objectives, since there remain 10,000,000 unemployed and a farm depression still unsolved.

5. The whole philosophy of scarcity economics which limit production and decrease the Nation's standard of living.

6. Inadequate defense and inadequate prospect that President Roosevelt will be able to mobilize the industrial production of the Nation to the requirements of rapid and thorough preparedness. This reason is underlined by Dr. Charles Seymour, president

of Yale University, who expressed the conviction that Mr. Willkie and his policies "will assure protection against foreign danger."

7. A class-conscious government by men instead of a government by law giving equal opportunity for all. This issue is put foremost by Joseph M. Proskauer, justice of the New York State Supreme Court for 7 years and at one time an intimate adviser of Mr. Roosevelt. Judge Proskauer urged an end to "government by men who array class against class, destroy the productivity of the Nation and with half-baked schemes for the aid of the worker, actually deprive him of his chance to work."

SEABURY ANALYSIS

Judge Seabury, who almost single handedly initiated the investigation of the affairs of New York City under Mayor James J. Walker, which ultimately led to the downfall of Tammany Hall and the election of Fiorello H. La Guardia as Fusion mayor, sent Mr. Willkie a telegram endorsing his policies and pledging active support. This message sums up more fully than the others the broad case of the dissatisfied Democrat against the New Deal. It reads:

"I rejoice in the manner in which your nomination was made. You were not the choice of machine politicians or a controlled convention but of the plain people of this country who felt that the Nation needed your services at this time.

"Your declarations against the effort of despotisms to crush democracy in the continent of Europe and in Great Britain I believe express the views of the American people.

"Your nomination justifies the hope that under your Presidency order and equality of opportunity may supplant the present bureaucratic chaos which has paralyzed and demoralized industry. New Deal experiments designed to limit production and to substitute governmental regimentation for industrial and group initiative have revealed a succession of failures which have lowered the standard of living, increased the power of the Federal Government, impelling it along the way which leads to totalitarianism, and left us with an unbalanced Budget without substantially reducing the number of the unemployed."

"SIGNIFICANT THING"

The Republican nominee said that he was "greatly gratified that a man of the great public standing of Judge Seabury, and the things for which he stands in the way of clean government in opposition to machine rule, should endorse me." "It is a significant thing," he added.

Further telegrams from Democrats released today by Mr. Willkie included as assurance of support from Frederic R. Coudert, one of the most widely known international lawyers of New York City, who said that, although having twice voted for Mr. Roosevelt, he was "unalterably opposed to a third term in the Presidency of the United States." He declared that defeat of a third term was essential to the preservation of "our representative constitutional democracy."

"I do not believe," Mr. Coudert said, "in the theory of the indispensable individual. That theory inevitably leads to dictatorship."

Mrs. Gilford Dudley, of Nashville, first Tennessee woman to serve as delegate at large to a Democratic Convention, offered her services to the Republican nominee and said she would be glad to aid in any way to what she considered Mr. Willkie's "inevitable victory."

RESEARCH DIRECTOR

Mr. Willkie announced that Raymond Leslie Buell, formerly president of the Foreign Policy Association and round-table editor of Fortune magazine, who arrived here yesterday, would direct his research staff in preparing background for his principal speeches. He said that he was working on six or eight major subjects with which he would deal during the course of the campaign, these including, among others, Government finance, agriculture, labor, Government relationship to business, foreign policy, and defense.

Mr. Willkie conferred this afternoon with Gov. Payne Ratner, of Kansas, Walter Fees, Kansas State Republican chairman, and Harry Darby, Republican National Committeeman from Kansas.

In commenting upon former Governor Smith's announcement from New York, Mr. Willkie made no obscure reference to a remark which President Roosevelt tossed off at a press conference last week. Reporters had asked the President about Mr. Douglas and Mr. Hanes coming out for the Republican candidate, and Mr. Roosevelt remarked that these men had always been more interested in dollars than humanity.

PRAISE FOR SMITH

"I hope," Mr. Willkie said, "that nobody suggests that the warmhearted Alfred E. Smith, most distinguished liberal Governor New York ever had, is one of those persons who is actuated by love of money rather than love of humanity. I think it is little known that during the last several years Governor Smith has devoted more of his time than any other prominent citizen I know in New York to charitable and philanthropic works. His liberal principles as Governor were those later adopted by his two successors, Franklin Roosevelt and Herbert Lehman."

Hardly a day passes in which Mr. Willkie fails to receive some word of support from the South. L. A. Casey, coordinator of all the Democratic, independent, and nonpartisan Willkie clubs of Texas wired Mr. Willkie that Joseph W. Bailey, Jr., Democratic member of Congress from Texas from 1933 to 1935, would serve as general chairman of the movement.

"Already thousands have pledged allegiance to you here," Mr. Casey said, "and enthusiasm for your candidacy increases daily in Texas."

Mr. Speaker, in my own district there are many Democrats who have been loyal party supporters through the years, but who are unable to support the present Democratic national ticket, and have announced their intention to support the Republican nominees for President and Vice President. Under permission heretofore granted, I include a letter received from a resident of my district, Mr. Dellmore Lessard, under date of July 25, 1940, in which he announces that notwithstanding he is a Democrat, and still believes in the fundamentals of the Democratic Party as founded and advocated by Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson, he will support the Willkie-McNary ticket in the fall election. The letter is as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 25, 1940.*

At the request of many loyal, old-time Democrats who still believe in the fundamentals of the Democratic Party as founded and advocated by Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson, I have called a meeting to be held in my office Monday, July 29, at 8 p. m. We propose at this meeting to form an organization of our party members who feel that Americanism and the traditions of the Democratic Party should be given first consideration in the forthcoming presidential campaign.

We believe the leadership of the present Democratic Party has, for the purpose of political preferment, willfully and deliberately abandoned those traditions which have made our party the champion in the preservation of American ideals:

In that it is now seeking a third term for President Roosevelt;

In that it has now become the part of the internationalists instead of a stronghold for the common people;

In that it has entirely ignored the platforms adopted at our national conventions;

In that it has consistently promised and has entirely failed to reduce the public debt or to balance the Budget;

In that it has consistently absorbed and encroached upon, and to a large degree, has abolished States' rights;

In that the leadership of the present Democratic Party has entirely deserted those loyal Democrats who made the victories of 1932 and 1936 possible and has consistently appointed to governmental positions those of other political faiths who have no conception of those immortal principles we deem necessary to the continuation of a free government.

We believe that real Democrats should be encouraged to stand steadfast and not change their registrations, but for the reason that the Willkie-McNary ticket at this time more nearly represents those American ideals and principles which we as good Democrats will always cherish; we should as good citizens support this ticket and assist in again establishing the ideals of our Republic. We are facing a national crisis in our party and in our country, and we must organize to meet it.

If you believe in the principles of the Democratic Party and the necessity for its perpetuation, then you are urged to be among those present in my office on Monday, July 29, at 8 p. m.

Very truly yours,

DELLMORE LESSARD.

T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the campaign that is approaching, and especially in view of the fact that Hon. Wendell Willkie, Republican nominee for President of the United States, has been so long tied up with, interested in, and managing public utilities, and in view of his great sympathetic interest in utility power companies, it is interesting to note the vote cast by Democratic Members of Congress and Republican Members of Congress in the House of Representatives on July 30, 1940, when the T. V. A. dam on Holston River to furnish power to manufacture aluminum for the purpose of building airplanes and other defense material, the roll call on the passage of the bill showed 265 Members of the House voting for and 93 Members of the House voting against this measure. The 93 voting "no" were each and every one Republicans, and there was not a single Democrat that voted against this bill.

Aluminum is one of the most important and necessary materials used in the construction of airplanes, and it is well

known that airplanes are of very great importance and are indispensable in our national defense. For years the Aluminum Trust was in the hands and control largely of the Mellon group.

It is commendable that every Democrat in the House voting on this measure voted for it as against the wishes of those sponsoring Willkie's candidacy and the program and policies for which he stands.

Any thoughtful person can quite readily see that this campaign is not unlike many that have been waged before. That is, the corporation and utility interests lined up back of Mr. Willkie, the great mass of working people and middle-class people in business and farmers largely will be lined up in opposition to the Willkie utility and corporate forces. From the foundation of this great Government down to the present time there has been no President that has been more sympathetic with the unfortunate and needy human individuals than has President Roosevelt. Those for the most part who assail and criticize President Roosevelt are those who want to run the Government for their own individual benefit, without taking into consideration the needs and the rights and welfare of the great mass of humanity. I would not claim by any means that President Roosevelt has been perfect, or that any other human individual is perfect. The perfect always die young. But instead of the corporations and trusts continuing to bleed the people, as they have done in many years past, President Roosevelt and those supporting him have reversed the policy so that the benefits of the Government have been flowing more directly back to the needy and deserving agricultural and working classes.

The Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST OF JULY 24, 1940

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Boston Post of July 24, 1940, entitled "The Children." I consider this one of the finest and most powerful editorials that I have ever read. It is an editorial worthy of profound consideration, and I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues and for the readers of the RECORD.

[From the Boston Post of July 24, 1940]

THE CHILDREN

It would be hard to find in all human annals a situation so touching as that of the children of the British Isles.

It is difficult to think of this problem, and that of the other children caught in the maelstrom of Europe, without a feeling of compassion, of deep sympathy and, in view of circumstances, despair.

For 5,000 years we have climbed the path of civilization, and now we find ourselves bound by rules and regulations, so that we cannot save children from war, from hunger, or from that awful fear which is imbedded in the minds of the very young when they watch the immolation of modern battle.

From a human standpoint, we cannot be proud of the efforts we have made in this country to solve this problem.

From the same standpoint, the British Government is just as much at fault as ours.

It is easy to blame Hitler, but that does not answer the final question.

What shall we do, in the name of humanity, to save the children?

Not long ago the British Ministry of Shipping decided that it would take steps to take children out of England on empty troop ships headed away from the British Isles.

This decision caused thousands of parents, at what mental anguish no one knows, to throngs to public places and register their children for this flight to safety.

In the meantime, the submarine and aerial war intensified. The plans were canceled. Voices were raised in Parliament protesting that the children of the rich, hundreds and hundreds of them, are safe in America or in other places, but the children of the poor must remain to await the onslaught.

In this country hundreds of thousands of people have been shocked by this cruel trick of fate.

Appeals have poured in from many to be allowed to take these children into their homes until the war is over. Americans love children, no matter where they are, and this was a manifestation of the great heart of America.

The British Government complains that it is short of warships to convoy these cargoes of mercy.

The American Government is bound by the neutrality law and cannot send after the children.

Thus we have the spectacle of two mighty nations, preening themselves in their democracy and respectability, standing idly by while the military minds of Germany coolly plot the destruction of England.

It is one of the blackest pages of human history.

American Youth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM CHAIRMAN OF AMERICAN YOUTH CONGRESS AND REPLY

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter received from Mr. Jack McMichael, chairman, American Youth Congress, inviting me to join a committee of emergency peace mobilization, which is to hold a meeting at Chicago on August 3 and 4 next. I include also my reply to the invitation.

The letters are as follows:

EMERGENCY PEACE MOBILIZATION,
June 21, 1940.

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,
The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HART: Each day the danger of America's involvement in the European war becomes more immediate. Yet we all know that the American people do not want war.

There is yet time to unite and organize this will for peace. America is a democracy. If the people speak, they shall be heard and their will shall prevail.

Young people, who will be the first to do the fighting and the dying, have suggested that all who oppose American participation in the war join in an emergency peace mobilization in Chicago, August 3 and 4, the twenty-sixth anniversary of the outbreak of the first World War. They ask leaders in all walks of American life—labor, farm, unemployed, church, Negro, women, scientists, journalists, etc.—to form a committee to defend America by keeping out of war, in order to sponsor this mobilization.

We ask you to join the committee, which will choose an executive board with full responsibility for the program and organization of the mobilization.

In the mobilization the American people will insist that the best defense of America is to keep our country at peace. They will express their determination to protect labor standards, the rights of religious and racial minorities, social welfare, and civil liberties. This is the test, whether our present defense policy is really one of defense or one of preparation for participation in the war.

As a prominent citizen, we urge you to join with thousands more to give the leadership which the American people are seeking and make possible the democratic expression of our united desire.

Sincerely yours,

JACK MCMICHAEL,
Chairman, American Youth Congress.

P. S.—Please rush your reply by return mail or collect wire to Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, One Hundred and Seventeenth Street and Broadway, New York City.

JUNE 22, 1940.

Mr. JACK MCMICHAEL,
Chairman, American Youth Congress, One Hundred and Seventeenth Street and Broadway, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have yours of June 21 advising me of the emergency peace mobilization in Chicago on August 3 and 4.

While I am glad to do everything I can for the continuance of peace, I would not join any organization for peace or anything else unless I had absolute, complete assurances that there were no

members of the Communist Party and no Communist sympathizers or other elements who place the interests of other countries above America in the group. Not having any such assurances concerning your organization, I must decline to join with it.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. HART.

Training of Physicians and Surgeons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE E. GEYER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

COMMUNICATION FROM THE UNITED MEDICAL SERVICE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, while we are talking of preparedness it might be well to think in terms of an adequate supply of physicians and surgeons.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I present a communication from the United Medical Service, along with their recommendations, as follows:

UNITED MEDICAL SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., July 26, 1940.

Subject: Adequate supply of physicians and surgeons for both the defensive forces and the civilian population of the United States.

To: Hon. Lee E. Geyer:

The enclosed statement sets forth the pressing need for immediate action to provide physicians and surgeons, both for the defensive forces about to be called into service as well as the civilian population of these United States.

J. A. RYAN,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Retired.
J. G. BERKOWITZ, M. D.

Present world conditions, and those in Europe particularly, have aroused our people to the necessity for an adequate preparedness program by our Government, and measures are being taken to increase the personnel of our Army, Navy, aviation, and all other services necessary, as well as increasing its equipment and supplying it with all modern implements necessary to place us in a complete state of defense and preparedness.

All previous wars have shown that unless medical care is adequate deaths due to disease far exceed those due to the casualties of war.

Thus far, to our knowledge, nothing has been said as to the necessity of increasing the number of physicians and surgeons in the United States in order to supply the number of doctors necessary to care for both the preparedness program and the public.

At present the number of physicians in the United States is not based upon the great need of the public for curative and preventive medical care but rather upon its ability to pay for the medical services rendered. We have today about 175,000 physicians to care for our more than 130,000,000 population, which means 1 physician for every 750 of our people.

The defense program as submitted by competent leaders indicates the need of 1 physician to every 175 to 200 enlisted personnel. This makes the proportion of doctors per 1,000 personnel needed for the different services almost four times the number at present available and used by our civilian population.

We speak of being adequately prepared for any emergency in possibly a period of a year or two, and of training aviators over a period of 6 months, but it takes many years to educate and train a doctor. After his premedical preparation of 4 years, he still has to go through 4 years of study at a medical college, and 2 years of hospital internship; in addition, he must study for several years in any specialty in which he may desire to become proficient.

While we have today in the United States about 175,000 doctors, in case of an emergency, there would be many rejections due to age, lack of knowledge, physical disability, marital status, and for various other reasons. This would serve to reduce tremendously the number of doctors, possibly to less than 120,000 from which to select the medical personnel for a possible enlisted force of 6,000,000. This would require 30,000 physicians on active duty, not including the number necessary for replacement and in training, and it would be difficult even to withdraw a much smaller number without leaving the general public seriously unprotected.

Investigation will disclose that over a number of years there has been a progressive reduction in the number of medical teaching institutions. Also, those medical schools, private or State controlled, still in existence have been progressively reducing the number of new admissions every year to study for the medical profession. This is a definite policy of the American Medical Association and State medical societies. It has been done to control and restrict the number of physicians and surgeons that are to be available to the public in the years to come. It is not based upon lack of men possessing proper qualifications to study for the medical profession, for many more than are accepted are admitted to premedical courses and qualified in this free democratic country of equal opportunities to all, and are then told there is no room for them, even in the State-tax-supported medical schools. If this situation is allowed to continue, it will prove disastrous for the preparedness program and the general public. To meet this great need of preparedness to be adequately prepared the following plan should be adopted without delay.

(1) All existing medical schools should be required to increase the number of admissions without delay up to the limit of their existing facilities and if necessary these facilities should be increased.

(2) Vacation periods should be abolished; a medical student could then concentrate the required number of hours study and preparation over a period of 3 years instead of 4 years.

(3) Plans should be developed whereby part of their hospital training and internship should be incorporated during this period of schooling.

(4) Just as the Government is paying for the training of men in all the branches of service such as aviation, Army, Navy, et cetera, it should appoint duly qualified men who have met the premedical requirements to study medicine and pay for their continued education and training. These medical students should be at once enrolled as members of a medical cadet reserve corps.

(5) The Government, in addition to the existing medical schools, should develop medical schools at all the base hospitals where their medical officer personnel and facilities are or could be made sufficiently adequate to teach general medicine and all its branches. (The Walter Reed Hospital would be particularly fitted for this purpose.)

(6) The course of study should be arranged so that while all members of the medical students reserve corps receive the same basic education in medicine, each medical cadet at the same time should specialize and receive special instruction in one of the branches of medicine so that on the completion of their full course each could be assigned at once to that particular branch in which he has received specialized training. In case of extreme emergency the Government could at once use these medical cadets to act as assistants to trained medical officers in their different specialties in field hospitals.

From present indications the next 10 years will be filled with strife or preparations for strife and if we hope to protect the freedom of our people and our form of government on the Western Continent from the rule of dictators, an adequate supply of trained medical men is as necessary for the success of our efforts as are the other commissioned officers and personnel that lead and fight in the various services.

We realize that our goal of a navy on each ocean will take some years—it takes 4 years to build a battleship so our plans are laid accordingly. We must remember that under present conditions it takes at least 10 years to make a doctor. We have not at present a sufficient force of medical men to adequately care for the population, if we are to make medical care, treatment, and prevention available to all, let alone provide for the different services that are necessary for our defense program and this necessity can be met only by timely measures taken at once, as outlined above, for the training of more men and women for the medical profession to meet this emergency and continued need for medical care by the public.

This plan may arouse the opposition of the American Medical Association and the branch State medical societies in view of their present policies, but, in spite of this, there will be many qualified physicians who would place the country's need before their association policies and provide the cooperation to meet this need.

J. A. RYAN,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Retired.
J. G. BERKOWITZ, M. D.

Warmongering Financiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK, N. Y., OF AUGUST 3, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Gaelic American,

New York, August 3, 1940, on the subject Warmongering Financiers, as follows:

[From the Gaelic American, New York, August 3, 1940.]

WARMONGERING FINANCIERS

The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, of which William Allen White, is national chairman has inserted on July 30, a five-column advertisement in papers all over the country. The first advertisement from the same source appeared on June 10. The cost of such advertisements reaches in the hundreds of thousands of dollars and those who pay the piper are personally interested in the welfare of the British Empire. Like all the internationalists the members of the committee are shouting that America has been protected from invasion, since its establishment as a nation, by the English fleet and that defeat of the English would expose us to invasion by a victorious Germany. On this point the committee's advertisement is not clear and the average American cannot see clearly how the English fleet is now or had been at any time the protector of their country. Who was the enemy from whom that fleet ever protected the United States? Who sacked Washington and burned the National Capitol in the War of 1812? The declarations of President Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie on World War No. 2 are quoted while the platforms of both parties and the planks which oppose the sending our military forces into the foreign conflict are entirely ignored.

The burden of the advertisement of July 30 is an appeal to the Washington administration to let England have 60 over-age American destroyers which the pro-English committee say that we could spare without weakening our own under-sized Military Establishment. In other words the Committee is more concerned about England's military requirements than for those of America. The men, who are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in newspaper publicity are more English than American and care more for the safety of a foreign country than that of their own. To help England they would drive a coach and four through American neutrality in their eagerness to give military aid to an imperialist power that has annexed one-fourth of the land surface of the globe by force, conquest and crooked diplomacy.

The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies—the title has not been altered to conform to changed conditions as so far England has no ally since the fall of France—this committee and its membership were exposed in the Senate on July 11 by Senator HOLT. Mr. HOLT referred in part as follows to those who paid for the newspaper advertisements of June 10:

"Now, let us see who paid for the advertisement. I have found out, and I think the Senate should have the facts. You find it is not the little fellows who paid for this advertisement "Stop Hitler Now!" Let us see who did. You find in that list the directors of international banks, and I will name them in a moment. You will find directors of corporations of Great Britain and the British Empire. No wonder they are interested. But they make it appear that they are doing so for America. We find bondholders of foreign countries that are so involved. We find international lawyers who have business in the countries now involved in war. We find directors of manganese corporations, we find directors of mechanical equipment corporations that make equipment for warring nations. We find directors of oil companies. Anyone knows what oil means in time of war. We find a director of a celluloid company, we find directors of metal companies, we find directors of electric companies, directors of steamship lines, and others interested in aircraft corporation.

* * * * * * *

"The partial list is as follows:

"Guaranty Trust Co., with branch offices in Antwerp, Brussels, Havre, Liverpool, Paris, and London, controls French-American Banking Corporation jointly with Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris and First National Bank of Boston. This corporation does an international banking business.

"Kuhn, Loeb & Co., international banking.

"Drexel & Co., interlocked with J. P. Morgan & Co.

"J. P. Morgan & Co., interlocked with banking operations in London and Paris and one of the best known international banking firms.

"Lehman Bros., international banking."

Mr. HOLT also named Mrs. Averell Harriman; Mrs. H. P. Davidson; Mrs. Daniel Gugghenheim; Mrs. John Schiff, wife of a partner of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Cornelius D. Whitney; Thomas W. Lamont, director of J. P. Morgan & Co.; John Thomas of Lehman Brothers; J. D. Levy, director of Columbia Broadcasting Co.; Jerome H. Louchheim, bank director and director of Columbia Broadcasting; Samuel Goldwyn; Maxwell Anderson; Fred Astaire; Irving Berlin; Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.; Lynn Fontaine; Myrna Loy; Alfred Lunt; Paul Muni; and Robert Sherwood.

The advertisement of June 10 had the approval of President Roosevelt, and it was paid for by banking firms and those who make profits from war. The banks and industrial organizations, should America enter the war, will be enriched by millions of dollars and they can be relied on to do their utmost to bring about involvement. The members of the committee are more interested in their investments abroad than in the welfare of America. Defeat of England would actually mean a collapse of their banking business abroad and their losses would go into the billions. The international financiers are nervous and uneasy and would not hesitate, in order to save their vast fortunes, to hurl the flower of American manhood into the European shambles.

The Committee to Aid America by Defending the Allies is more dangerous to the well-being of America than the "fifth column" or the Trojan horses. It is believed that Mr. William Allen White, who is a well-meaning man, is a dupe of the financiers, who are putting up the money for the advertisements. The names of the plotters are known as well as their connections, and the people should rise in righteous wrath against them. They lack loyalty to their own country and their wealth and assumed respectability should not be permitted to shield them from their baseness. Their allegiance follows their investments. They are internationalists, not Americans.

Campaign To Oust National Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN L. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK, N. Y., JULY 27, 1940

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Gaelic American, New York, July 27, 1940, entitled "Campaign To Oust National Anthem."

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Gaelic American, New York, N. Y., July 27, 1940]

CAMPAIGN TO OUST NATIONAL ANTHEM

Another campaign to oust The Star-Spangled Banner from its pride of place is in full swing and the leaders of it would scrap Francis Scott Key's immortal national anthem for Irving Berlin's God Bless America. By clever manipulation, the latter song has been featured at recent conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties held in Philadelphia and Chicago. The song is also exploited in the theaters and over the radio systems all over the country.

For nearly two generations British propagandists have been attacking The Star-Spangled Banner, mainly on the alleged ground that it keeps alive hatred against England. It has also been alleged that it is full of pride and boasting, and some critics have gone as far as to assert that the song is unsingable.

Those who pretend that the anthem promotes hate and war ignore that the last verse breathes deep religious and sublime sentiments. The verse is as follows:

"O, thus be it ever, when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation!
Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n-rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a Nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause is just,
And this be our motto, "In God is our trust;"
And The Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Most of the critics ignore the occasion which inspired Francis Scott Key's immortal song. The poet, who was aboard an enemy's ship, was uncertain whether Fort McHenry had fallen into the hands of the English invaders. When in the early morning's light he saw the flag of his country floating proudly over Fort McHenry, he knew that the enemy had failed in the attack on the fort and Baltimore city. Small wonder that he poured out his soul in words that will live as long as the United States. His description of the bombardment is only what may be expected in the composition of any American who could put his ideas and feelings into a hymn of thanksgiving.

The first public attack on The Star-Spangled Banner was made by Sir Howard Vincent, in the 1904 Christmas edition of the New York Herald. He pleaded that the third verse of the anthem should be cut out in the interest of harmony between the peoples of the two nations. This request was approved editorially by the New York Herald, which was then owned by the late James Gorden Bennett.

As a matter of fact, Sir Vincent's request to cut out the third verse of the song had already been carried out in several of the books in use in American schools.

This stealthy plot was unmasked, the people throughout the country were aroused by this glaring instance of foreign interference in American schools. Several States passed laws making illegal the circulation in the schools of books giving an emasculated version of Key's immortal song. The publishers who had deleted the third stanza had to call in their books and supply books giving the correct unabridged version of the national anthem.

The anti-Americans claim that the anthem is poor as a literary effort, that the theme is episodic, that the words breathe the spirit of war, and that the song is unsingable.

Is The Star-Spangled Banner an anthem unworthy of the United States? Anybody who will examine it with a mind free from bias or self-interest cannot come to any other conclusion than that it is one of the finest hymns possessed by any nation. Possibly the Marseillaise may be a shade superior to it as an anthem, but on this point there is great divergence of opinion. True, an episode in the War of 1812 inspired the song, yet it is an apostrophe to the flag, which will thrill for all time the heart of every patriotic American. The flag and the anthem have become associated forever, and the flag itself is called The Star-Spangled Banner.

Is the anthem unsingable? Everybody who has heard it frequently sung by big audiences and by large congregations will deny this allegation. Up to a very recent period it never occurred to any normal American that the anthem is unsingable.

The critics also complain that the hymn is set to the music of a drinking song. Surely this is not a draw-back. The music is more solemn than convivial. Anybody hearing it played on the organ would be inclined to place it in the category of sacred music.

The composer of the music is unknown. The air is the same as To Anacreon in Heaven, which was put to the music of an air much older than the song itself. As to whether the air is Irish, English, French, or German, the question has not yet been settled, and authorities are not in agreement.

Most critics of our national anthem are not Americans. The reference to England as the foe and despoiler is what has concentrated attacks on the national anthem. Had this reference been omitted, and had the foe been any other nation than England, there would have been no long-continued attacks on Key's immortal song. The reasons for the attacks are known. So also are the attackers. The flag and the anthem have become entwined. He who does not appreciate the anthem has no love for the flag.

The new move against The Star-Spangled Banner is more subtle than previous frontal attacks which ended in failure. God Bless America has some merit, but it can never take the place of Scott Key's inspired song. In the attempt to dislodge it the press agents and the theaters will have no more success than had the campaign conducted by foreign propagandists. They cannot immortalize commonplace compositions which will not be remembered for one generation. The Star-Spangled Banner has survived more than a century and a quarter, and it will live as long as the United States, which has, since Scott Key's time, become a giant among the nations.

Deportation of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1940

LETTER FROM MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are few men in America who command the honor, respect, and love of people more generally than does Msgr. John A. Ryan, the head of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

I am pleased, therefore, to include with my remarks a letter from Father Ryan on the subject of the bill for the forthright deportation of Harry Bridges, as follows:

JULY 6, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM H. KING,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KING: Some of us are so greatly disturbed over the action of the House of Representatives in passing the bill for the forthright deportation of Harry Bridges that we are requesting the opportunity for a hearing on the bill before the subcommittee of the Senate to which it has been referred. We regard this bill as a grave infringement of the spirit as well as the letter of the Bill of Rights. In all probability, it violates the due-process clause of the fifth amendment; for the Supreme Court has held in at least two cases that the word "person" in the fifth amendment includes aliens, even natives of China (*Wong Wing* v. *United States*, 163 U. S. 238, and *Li Sing* v. *United States*, 180 U. S. 495). In its present form the bill would deport Harry Bridges without a hearing or any kind of proceeding that could be regarded as due process.

Even if it be not unconstitutional, the bill is revolutionary, arbitrary, and extremely dangerous as a precedent. If Harry Bridges can be deported in this fashion, so can any other alien whom Congress does not like, when it succumbs to the factitious hysteria of the moment. Congress should hesitate long before it sanctions this unwarranted inovation and creates this horrendous precedent.

Harry Bridges is a pest and a nuisance. While he has stimulated the unionization of large groups of workers on the Pacific coast and obtained for them considerable economic benefits, he has done much more harm than good to the cause of organized labor as a whole. Nevertheless, he is as much entitled to the protection of the Constitution and of the regular forms of law and judicial procedure as any other alien. The fifth amendment does not say that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, "except aliens who have become undesirable." In fact, the Bill of Rights was designed in no small degree for the benefit of such unpopular persons as Harry Bridges. Respectable persons seldom, if ever, need the protection of the due-process clause. It is the unrespectable, the unpopular, the despised minorities, the politically weak, and the socially helpless who stand most in need of this protection. The Bill of Rights is based upon the fundamental, ethical principle that even members of the foregoing classes are human beings, endowed with a moral and indestructible dignity of personality, and requiring civil protection for the fundamental rights of personality. In this respect, the United States differs sharply and completely from totalitarian countries. In the present critical situation, we ought scrupulously to refrain from any act which would enable the totalitarian states to point at us the finger of scorn and to assert that we care no more than they for individual human rights.

So we hope and trust, dear Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittee of the Committee on Immigration will afford the opportunity of a hearing to those who hold the views set forth in the preceding paragraphs and likewise to those who approve the passing of the bill by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

My Report to the People of Mason County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Mason County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress; their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty and flood-control projects approved and carried out in Southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am, therefore, thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is

important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today, holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continue.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the merchants, laborers, farmers, and people generally in 1932, when I visited Shelton, Hoodsport, Lilliwaup, Harstine Island, Belfair, and all sections of Mason County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation; prices were down and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now, and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought, but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

SHELTON POST OFFICE

When I took my seat in Congress in 1933, the first person who spoke to me about endeavoring to secure a Federal Post Office Building for Shelton was the late Mark Reed. Mr. Reed called at my office in the Capital and discussed the matter with me. I was profoundly impressed with his civic pride and deep interest in Shelton and Mason County and all her people. I immediately introduced the bill in Congress and after four years of persistent effort we secured the allocation of funds in 1937, and on August 6, 1939, the beautiful new Shelton Post Office, costing $72,743, was formally dedicated with appropriate ceremonies. I stated in my dedicatory address that it was a source of extreme regret to all that Mr. Reed did not live to witness the fulfillment of a desire which was so close to his heart and uppermost in his endeavors. Apparently the large concourse of citizens who were present agreed with me when I said that the edifice would be a lasting monument to the memory of this great industrial leader and community builder.

SKOKOMISH INDIAN SCHOOL

On May 11, 1937, I introduced the bill authorizing $25,000 for construction of a new school building for Skokomish School District No. 2, Mason County, and after obtaining its enactment by Congress obtained the PWA allocation of funds. The school building was constructed in 1939. It was the only Indian school project authorized by Congress in the 75th Congress, all the other bills being objected to on the House Calendar and some of which are still pending. This school was badly needed and will serve the Indian and white children in the district.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Mason County the sum of $935,828, and loaned therein the additional sum of $139,113, a total of $1,074,941.

Flood control, school, road, street, sewer, park, sanitation, transmission-line projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have therefore supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, viz, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and Postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was "paid," we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Mason County thus received $219,287.88.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows and dependents, which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME OWNERS' LOAN—BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPOSITS

As one of the five members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Mason County 20 citizens have received loans aggregating $55,200 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people, and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the bank at Shelton have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. The 566 depositors in the Mason County Savings & Loan Association likewise have their deposits insured under the same legislation. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about these great reforms which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free text books for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the P. T. A. in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and National life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which, as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general-welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934 and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently for the first time authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect enough of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have since 1932 doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have therefore at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in Southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I am proud of my sponsorship of the Bonneville $70,000,000 project and rural-electrification projects and shall exert every effort to bring their benefits to all our citizens.

Through the Work Projects Administration an allotment of $46,316 has been provided to construct electric power transmission lines with transformers, anchors, and connections, to serve Mason County rural areas.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my whole-hearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1337 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time and for 5 years previously the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE, in the campaign in 1932, to say: "The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact."

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933, the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeeting of this association, held in Tacoma February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

SHINGLE WEAVERS COMMEND SMITH

A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle-weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased expresses our feeling very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill, and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been "on the job" for us, and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain,

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years, and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of fact, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the Revenue Act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked on to the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100 percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if any, would be interesting, probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulphite workers' unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers Association, O. M. Porter, has written me, as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries,

with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21 and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler-log matter.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State Administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Mason County a total of 18 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $270. Two Shelton schools are included in the school-work program, with a total of 43 student workers and a total yearly quota of $1,350.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138, as amended, was carefully considered and provides effective remedies against all foreign "isms" without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and the best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one "ism," and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

My Report to the People of Wahkiakum County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Wahkiakum County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress; their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty, and flood control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time, the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am, therefore, thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas, in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continue.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the merchants, laborers, fishermen, and farmers in 1932 when I visited Cathlamet, Puget Island, Skamokawa, Rosburg, Deep River, Grays River, and all the communities of Wahkiakum County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation—prices were down, and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought, but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

PUGET ISLAND BRIDGE

On March 27, 1934, I introduced the first Puget Island Bridge bill in Congress and continued the struggle until on

September 15, 1937, I secured the P. W. A. allotment of $225,000 from the Federal Government to supplement the contributions of the State of Washington and Wahkiakum County. Finally, on August 26, 1939, the magnificent new span across the Columbia River from Puget Island to Cathlamet was dedicated and the dream of the late Sivert Olson and countless other pioneers was realized. It was a long, hard fight which was won only through the untiring and unselfish efforts of hundreds of fine citizens, civic organizations, and public officials, among whom I am happy and proud to be included.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Wahkiakum County the sum of $833,003, and loaned therein the additional sum of $117,648, a total of $950,651.

Flood control, school, road, street, park, community building, courthouse improvement projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have, therefore, supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, namely, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was "paid," we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Wahkiakum County thus received $84,183.88.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935 paying their pensions in full and the Philippine travel pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows and dependents which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME OWNERS LOAN—BANK DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Wahkiakum County a $2,000 loan has been made.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act, and am glad that five citizens of Wahkiakum County have received loans aggregating $5,684.72. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people, and Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the Wahkiakum County bank have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress, which I heartily supported and voted for. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people, and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about this great reform which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the P. T. A. in making the public schools a more effective, far reaching and American force in local, State, and national life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934, and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently for the first time authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect enough of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have since 1932 doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicans running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem, but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Breckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have therefore at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I am proud of my sponsorship of the $70,000,000 Bonneville project and rural-electrification projects, and shall exert every effort to bring their benefits to all our citizens.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress, on every occasion without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industry and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my wholehearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers' Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time, and for 5 years previously, the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE in the campaign in 1932 to say:

The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact.

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933 the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote, when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red-cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

SHINGLE WEAVERS COMMEND SMITH

A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red-cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased, expresses our feeling very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been on the job for us and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain,

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years, and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of fact, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager

and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the Revenue Act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, wrote me, as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked on to the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party, under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100-percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if any, would be interesting, probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulphite workers unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21, and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler log matter.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Wahkiakum County a total of 7 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $105. There have been 10 Wahkiakum County young people in the school-work program at Cathlamet, with a total yearly quota of $432.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district, in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. Camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, fifth column, and un-American activities, and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138 as amended was carefully considered and provides effective remedies against all foreign isms without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one ism and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

The Draft Bill Should Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent now that the draft bill now before the Senate will not reach the House for several days—maybe weeks, and I take this occasion while the bill is not pending before us to extend my remarks on the subject under leave previously obtained.

This Nation should prepare to defend itself, but to put two million men in training to use a gun will do about as

much good as to attempt to grow feathers on a fish. Wars are not fought these days with men with guns to their hands. Wars are fought with war machines. To destroy the enemy electricity and scientific contrivances now take the place of men. A million men armed with the latest improved rifles are helpless before a fleet of modern tanks. In Europe today the old-time foot soldier is used almost entirely for police duty after the country is overrun with tanks and pounded flat with air bombs.

We need to draft our young men in the study of sciences. If our object is to fight a defensive war if necessary, then let us prepare to defend. If the French had invented some contrivance that would have stopped the German tanks, France would still be France. Her millions of men armed and trained in the use of small weapons proved to be no defense at all. The French spent their money building concrete lines of defense instead of building and equipping a movable defense on the ground and in the air.

We do not need any draft program to train our men for a complete defense. We need engines on the ground and in the air and on and under the sea, and experts to man them. Can we draft airplane operators? No country on earth has such a program. Germany does not draft men to operate planes. Every pilot is a volunteer, and he is selected only when his peculiar fitness for the job is apparent.

We do not need any draft to train skilled operators of war machines. There will be more volunteers than we can or will select.

We do not need a draft to train our men in the sciences of peace or war and after all it is science that makes a war machine powerful.

If we knew that war was certain to come to this country, the kind of defense we need is a scientific defense, and not a defense of a mass of men carrying small arms. The draft will not supply what we need.

Again, there is no immediate danger of any war in this country. Hysteria has been whipped up to a glaring flame in many parts of the country to such an extent that many private citizens are buying guns to either carry with them or have in a handy place. This is propaganda to bring on a war. None of the war machines of Europe has any chance, and probably have no idea, of attacking the Western Hemisphere. Countries like Italy and Germany will be so busy fighting famine during the next 3 years that they will not have the power to strike across 3,000 miles of water. It is becoming more apparent every hour that Germany will exhaust herself in trying to invade England, only 9 minutes away by air.

There is no immediate danger of our having to fight any defensive war in the Western Hemisphere—at least for 3 years. In the meantime let us prepare to do some defending. We can train men in the skilled performance of defensive weapons of the kind that will defend against any machine yet contrived, or which is apt to be contrived within the next 3 years. We must keep ahead in science and improvement and inventions. But far more important than all this is to prepare the mass of our people for safe defense. We must put the idle to work; we must stop the foreclosures and dispossessions of home owners; we must take special privilege away from those who have it and grant equality to all. This Government must take possession of its money and credit and use it for all the people, and immediately stop the use of our funds and credit by private individuals for their own profit.

Just remember that capitalism is on trial throughout the world. Capitalism has been blind—it is blind in this country today. It will not stop and observe the handwriting on the wall. Capitalism is being abolished in the world at a terrific rate. The complete abolishment of capitalism means the destruction of individual liberty of action. Our problem here, if we wish to preserve individual liberty, is to make capitalism work in the interest of the mass of the American people. If we cannot make it work, then we shall follow in the wake of the total destruction of capitalism.

In this country right now capitalism should of its own motion amend its practices and deal out more of the combined profits of capital and labor to labor. Heretofore capitalism has kept too much of the joint venture until there are a few too rich and too many too poor. Capitalism has gained this advantage through special privilege—I mean acts of State legislatures and Congress in granting them special advantages.

Right now at this very moment capitalism is determined to rule the people—a movement is now in motion to defeat every progressive-minded official in the United States and replace them with men and women who will bow subserviently to the wishes of large capital groups.

Our job is to oppose this blind program of capitalism and establish some semblance of equality in this country by law. The law permitted the growth of organized capital and the law can stop it. For example, we do not need to pay any interest on the public debt, and with the elimination of that interest the interest system operating on private individuals will be reduced. When we contemplate that it takes all of the entire income annually of the farms and of the laboring class to pay the annual interest on our debt—public and private—we can gain some picture of the devastation this interest-taking dragon has taken and is taking from the American people.

The result of this system is now seen in idle people, hungry people, ragged people, homeless people. Do you want that to continue? Can you defend this country with homeless soldiers? Can you defend this country against an enemy which promises to destroy this interest-taking system? The unbridled reign of capitalism can continue until there will be no one left to defend what remains of this Republic.

If this draft law is passed it will not in the slightest degree make us more able to defend ourselves against the engines of modern war. It will degrade our people and unjustly charge them with being unwilling to volunteer to fight for their country. Our first job is to make this country worth defending—make this country in fact what the Declaration of Independence declared—where every citizen shall have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If we will do that, millions will come forward to fight in the defense of that Government. To turn home owners out of their homes, to allow millions to walk the streets for a job and shelter, and before we correct the situation to reach out with the arm of the law and drag these citizens into training camps against their will, can have no other effect than to make a bad situation worse. We ought not to do it; we ought not to attempt it.

The directors of capitalism in America should get right down and think—if they can be assumed to have that power—and give up themselves, without any law, the selfishness that they have heretofore enjoyed. Capitalism should learn to serve the people, not exploit them. Then and only then will capitalism be preserved, and with it individual liberty. If capitalism remains blind to its own errors and refuses to recede from its unwarranted grasp upon the necessities of the American people, it will be destroyed, and, worst of all, individual liberty will be destroyed with it.

That situation is more to be feared than all the combined armies of Europe. Let this Government do the right thing by the mass of the people and the mass of the people will defend the Government against all enemies to their last breath.

Mr. Speaker, this draft law should be defeated.

My Report to the People of Skamania County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and

account of my official record to the citizens of Skamania County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress—their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am, therefore, thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

> A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continues.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the storekeepers, laborers, and farmers in 1932 when I visited Stevenson, what is now North Bonneville, Carson, Underwood, Cape Horn, and all the communities of Skamania County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation—prices were down and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I shall always be proud of my sponsorship of the original legislation creating the great Bonneville $70,000,000 project and my active participation during the years in every step to bring its benefits to the citizens and communities of Skamania County and our district. On March 4, 1938, the late John D. Ross, Administrator of the Bonneville project, wrote me:

> I wish to express my deep appreciation of your efforts in obtaining the Bonneville appropriation through the House. The cooperation which I received while in Washington and since I left has pleased me very much.

Bonneville will always remain a monument to the memory of this sturdy champion of public power for all the people.

On March 27, 1939, Charles E. Carey, Acting Administrator, wrote me:

> With friends like you in Congress, we feel that the future of Bonneville is in safe hands. We will do everything we can to see that your friends in southwestern Washington are fully advised of your service and active support of the Bonneville project.

In this session of Congress I appeared twice before the Appropriations Committee and testified at length in support of increased appropriations this year, which we succeeded in obtaining so the work can continue unabated.

Under date of June 20, 1940, Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, wrote me:

> I want to express my appreciation for the very able assistance which you gave this Administration in connection with our request for an appropriation sufficient to meet our construction needs to get the power from the Bonneville Dam to the market areas.

I have actively supported our rural electrification projects which are, of course, valuable adjuncts to Bonneville.

PROPOSED STEVENSON POST OFFICE

My bill for a post-office building for Stevenson is in a favorable position. Its actual construction will depend upon the progress of the new public building program. The latter is temporarily deferred owing to the emergency national defense program.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Skamania County the sum of $1,200,222, and loaned therein the additional sum of $114,191, a total of $1,314,413.

School, road, street, park, water-system, community-building, sanitation projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have, therefore, supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, viz, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was "paid," we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Skamania County thus received $63,018.02.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935 paying their pensions in full

and the Philippine travel pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows, and dependents which has come before Congress and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME OWNERS' LOAN—BANK DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Skamania County five citizens have received loans aggregating $9,200 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that three citizens of Skamania County have received loans aggregating $3,312.64. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

> Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people, and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people we save America.

Depositors in the Bank of Stevenson have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about this great reform, which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the P. T. A. in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and National life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general-welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934 and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement, until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently, for the first time, authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect a sufficient number of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have therefore at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have, since 1932, doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me, and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940, and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture, and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Breckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

LUMBER, SHINGLE, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my wholehearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish

to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time and for 5 years previously the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE in the campaign in 1932 to say: "The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact."

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933, the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote, when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma, February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

SHINGLE WEAVERS COMMEND SMITH

A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased expresses our feeling very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industry, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill, and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been on the job for us and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain,

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when the candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of facts, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legisiative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the revenue act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt, and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked onto the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party, under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100-percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if made, would be interesting; probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the Pulp and Sulphite Workers Unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible

toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill, H. R. 7312, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER-LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me—

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21, and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler-log matter.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, the Washington State administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Skamania County a total of 9 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $135. There have been 19 Skamania County young people in the school-work program at Stevenson, with a total yearly quota of $540.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. Civilian Conservation Corps camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138 as amended was carefully considered and provides effective remedies against all foreign isms without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one ism and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

Roads for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY ROBERT HARPER FROM SCRIBNER'S COMMENTATOR

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Robert E. Harper, the brilliant young director of public relations of the American Road Builders' Association, Washington, D. C., which appears in the August 1940 issue of the magazine, Scribner's Commentator:

ROADS FOR DEFENSE

(By Robert Harper)

Road Builder Hitler bound his highway engineers by no limitations. He alone, perhaps, knew that he was building roads for tomorrow's conquest. He was laying the essential foundations for "blitzkriegs" to come. Der Fuehrer was creating split-second mobility for his yet unheralded army on wheels. He was already scheming victories with streamlined tanks, rapid-transit troop trucks, and high-speed cannon on pneumatics. Hitler was calling the shots in advance. He was presupposing the urgency of modern highways for modern warfare. He demanded the best in roads and got better.

The National Socialist Party organized a central road authority immediately after coming into power. This Nazi governmental unit soon launched the construction of a brand-new 4,300-mile system of master motorways. Herr Hitler turned the first spade of dirt in September 1933. By September 1937, 950 miles had been opened to traffic, 1,120 were under construction, 1,150 were approved and ready for construction, and only 1,080 miles of the 4,300 were still awaiting survey. The original project was completed in 1938 and has since been extended to not less than 6,000 miles.

Hitler's highways are constructed for fast-moving, long-distance traffic. They are designed for speeds approximating 100 miles an hour and are completely isolated from all previously existing roads. Built into the German superroad are the safety features long recommended by American highway engineers. The over-all width of the four-lane motorway is 80 feet. It is divided in the center by a 16-foot grass strip that completely separates the opposing streams of traffic. The two-lane roadway on either side is 25 feet wide. There are no railroad grade crossings, no cross-road intersections. All feeder roads overpass the superhighway and connect it with nearby towns that are by-passed at distances of 2 to 4 miles. All curves are superelevated; all surfaces are nonskid. Traffic is controlled at junctions by clearly defined, systematic lay-outs. Vehicles are not allowed to stop, but parking places are provided alongside the motorway. Pedestrians, bicyclists, and animals are excluded.

It is impossible for me to believe that a certain British road historian did not have his fingers crossed in 1938 when he reported, "One is delighted to be able to applaud the peaceful aspects of this work. * * * To be sure, part of the motorways was crowded with motor-borne troops at the time of the Anschluss with Austria; and it has been calculated that in the new army transport lorries 70,000 men can be carried each way per hour." Hitler's highways are as he conceived them. They are military roads. But these are the routes of dictatorial offensive. There are also roads for democratic defense. France and England have their martial highways.

The thoroughfares of the French pointed away from their industrial nerve centers to the bomb-blasted, tank-tortured front. They were packed with democratic resistance that rolls to battle. They were flooded, too, with refugees from the shambles of steam-rollered towns who made pitiful the progress of reinforcements for the poilus in "blitzkrieg" land.

Across the channel, the vehicles of homeland defense race over the roads of the British Isles. England frantically builds the accessories of self-preservation to better brace itself for the impact of the first foreign invasion since the ancient days of William the Conqueror. John Bull's industrial pulse is at top beat. England's manufacturing heart hourly pumps new mechanical transfusions through the nation's motor arteries to the channel fortifications. Sheffield, Leeds, Newcastle, Glasgow, and all the rest rush the

accoutrements of modern war down the roads to the coast to roar "hands off" to Adolf the Audacious.

But what about roads for America's defense? In a recent radio broadcast, President Roosevelt said, "In this era of swift, mechanized warfare, we all have to remember that what is modern today and up to date, what is efficient and practical, becomes obsolete and outworn tomorrow." The Chief Executive's statement is no less true of our highway facilities than it is of our Army, Navy, and air essentials. Charles M. Upham, engineer-director of the American Road Builders' Association, Washington, D. C., world-recognized highway authority, gives us some startling figures. There are 100,000 miles of obsolete highway and 22,000 outworn bridges on the primary or main-road system. That's deterioration. Here's a more decadent display. There are 1,100,000 miles of the country road system that have never known improvement. The record is the same for 585,000 miles of the township system and 65,000 of the State network. This adds up to 1,750,000 miles of unimproved, inefficient, impractical American highway. Farm-to-market roads, America's lifelines, constitute 1,685,000 of this total. There are roughly 3,000,000 miles of roadway in the whole United States system.

Why are these cardinal facts? Why are highways vital to competent national defense? Let's listen to the military experts. General Pershing said, "The country road will be of tremendous value in time of war. The roads must be relied upon to obtain needed food supplies." In normal times big-city markets receive more than 50 percent of their fresh-fruit and vegetable supply via motor truck. The American metropolis receives 90 percent of its milk by way of the highway. Sixty percent of the Nation's livestock tonnage goes to market over the rubber-tired route. This peacetime demand will be trebled in wartime. Add to this highway use the movement of mechanized armies and America's insufficient roads will be hopelessly entangled within 24 hours.

Lieut. Col. Russell P. Hartle, War Plans Division of the War Department, told United States House Roads Committee members, "Movement is essential in war and, save for the deployed movements of a few arms in battle, must take place on roads or railroads. War can be conducted without railroads, but not without roads. Even the battle, if important enough to call for the use of combined arms, must take place where there are roads. Both strategical and tactical plans are limited by roads, because freedom of maneuver depends upon their number, quality, location, and direction. Two streams of traffic flow parallel, steadily and opposite in direction during war, one of filled vehicles and fresh men flowing toward the front, the other of empty vehicles and the wreckage of war flowing toward the rear."

Recent United States Army maneuvers in east Texas and Louisiana proved that only 25 percent of the roads used are comparable to the military-purpose highway standard set by the War Department. Roads of lower-type construction were totally unfit to carry even the lightest motorized Army equipment. Normal traffic was constantly disturbed and congested. A similar situation in wartime, with civilians in retreat as troops and supplies move over the roads to the front, will be disastrous.

To prepare the roads for Army maneuvers, the highway department resurfaced certain paved roads determined to possess sufficient base. During maneuvers, maintenance crews constantly repaired the roads in use. The surface of one 20-mile stretch near Nacogdoches, Tex., supply base for the "red army," was completely torn up. Its reconstruction will cost several hundred thousand dollars. This stretch is typical of a large mileage of Texas highway. Yet the War Department has designated 5,700 Texas-miles as military roads. The Louisiana story is practically identical.

Lieutenant-General Stanley H. Ford, commander, Sixth Corps Area, United States Army, believes, "Roads rank in importance with the soldier and his weapons as elements in the national defense." The network of roads recommended for efficient military operation approximates 80,000 miles. It generally coincides with the Federal-Aid Peacetime Highway System. Standard United States Public Roads Administration specifications for Federal-aid highways correspond to those called for by the War Department. Attack on the West Coast, for instance will demand the arrival of truck troops and fire power from eastern or southern posts to the emergency zone in 3 days. Enemy bombing attacks on planned inland plane and munition plants will exact immediate removal to safety. The wars of yesterday required days to position armed forces for major offensives. Today, minutes are priceless and decisive. America needs broad, straight, strong modern highways to link up its centers of population and industry, to connect its vast agricultural interior with the strategic districts that must be defended in the event of national emergency.

"The ability of our highway engineers to construct new modern motorways and to rebuild outworn existing roads is limited only by available funds," United States House Roads Committee Chairman WILBURN CARTWRIGHT, of Oklahoma, points out. "Recently Congress passed a new Federal Aid for Highways Act. It authorizes the annual appropriation of more than $160,000,000 for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943. These authorizations, of course, provide for only the normal expenditure for roads to serve our every-day commercial needs. No army and no navy can move without food and supplies. Roads are as necessary a part of national defense as guns and ammunition. We need roads to the farms where the food is produced. We need roads to the factories where munitions and supplies are made. We need roads so our defense forces can be transported wherever and whenever needed."

Here's an example of accepted efficient military use of highways. Fort Knox, Ky., motorized units moved 200 miles from the area of upper New York State maneuvers to the World's Fair. They arrived at specified stations within 30 seconds of scheduled time. Three thousand men and 157 pieces of equipment passed a given point in 1 hour and 20 minutes. Completely mechanized, the contingent maintained a 40-mile-per-hour speed and was complete within itself, with regimental command, supplies, hospital, kitchen, power plant, and repair section. But compare this with Hitler's highway "miracle" of 70,000 truck troops each way per hour!

Roads rule the world! Roads—good roads—can also competently defend this part of the world that refuses to be ruled. With the rest of the world at its own throat, roads are peacetime investments that will pay wartime dividends!

Sentiment in Arkansas for Material Aid to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE T. ELLIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT FULBRIGHT OF STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, usually the Midwest is the last to become aroused over situations abroad. However, today even in those remotest sections and in all parts of the earth where civilization has touched the heart of man, there is bitter resentment against the intolerable indecencies and indignities of those two inhuman nincompoops of Germany and Italy who are at this moment on the verge of destroying every cherished ideal which we in the Western World have held so dear. More and more the conviction is growing, and in fact we have it in his own words, that the plan of Hitler is that the fall of America shall follow the fall of Britain as certainly as the night follows day. More and more the conviction is growing among our people—whether it be for the ultimate good of the Nation or not, it is growing—that the United States should send to Britain all possible materials and aid, short of war itself. As an evidence of this trend, I insert in the RECORD a letter from President J. W. Fulbright, of the University of Arkansas, who, incidentally, is well versed in foreign affairs.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
Fayetteville, July 29, 1940.

Hon. CLYDE ELLIS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: I have recently returned from a tour of the State and I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the people of this State are strongly in favor of selling or giving 50 of the reconditioned destroyers to Great Britain immediately. In fact, they favor all possible mechanical assistance and at once.

Very truly yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, *President.*

The Aliens Amendment and Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ADDRESS BY MR. LOUW IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN ASSEMBLY, FEBRUARY 24, 1939

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Louw, of the South African Assembly:

[House of Assembly, February 24, 1939]

ALIENS AMENDMENT AND IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. Louw. I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 1937 session of this House the honorable the leader of the opposition submitted a motion

in which he called upon the Government to take certain steps in regard to immigration, in regard to the matter of aliens in South Africa and, more particularly, in regard to the matter of Jewish immigration. According to the Hansard report of the debate that followed, the honorable member for Cape Town [Castle] [Mr. Alexander], in speaking to this motion, made the following statement:

"The honorable gentleman published a bill on December 28 and he is running away from his bill now. He knows perfectly well that if his motion is carried nothing can happen, excepting one thing. A motion can achieve nothing, but a bill can achieve something. It is curious that in his bill he makes no reference to the Jew at all."

Reading through that statement I felt that the honorable member had given very useful advice, and I decided to act upon that advice. Hence this bill of which the second reading is on the order paper today. Since this bill was published it has been very severely criticized in the press. It has been described as contemptible, as intolerant, as uncouth, and what not. I myself have been labeled as a racialist, as un-Christian, as a political opportunist, and as a South African prototype of Herr Streicher. Coming from certain sections of the press, I do not think that the criticisms need be taken too seriously, either as reflecting the considered opinion of these particular newspapers, or as reflecting the opinion of the majority of their readers. What we have heard has been nothing but His Master's Voice, that voice which does not hesitate to command or to threaten when Jewish interests are involved. I think the honorable member for Cape Town [Castle] can speak with some experience of His Master's Voice. We have been witnessing the same sort of thing in international affairs during the past few years, and particularly during the month of September of last year in regard to the news reports which have been coming to South Africa from America and from Europe. Those news reports I am convinced were then, and today still are, to a large extent inspired by Jewish influence.

Those reports were and are intended to stir up public feeling in regard to Germany. The efforts of Mr. Chamberlain and of M. Daladier toward appeasement have been rendered infinitely more difficult by the overt and hidden campaign which has been carried on under the influence of Jewish pressure, by the news agencies, and by the press. In September of last year a very considerable section of world Jewry was literally praying for England to be involved in a war with Germany. They were bitterly disappointed when Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier were able to come to an agreement with Herr Hitler at Munich, and they have not yet forgiven Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier. I am convinced that if it were possible to remove Jewish influence and Jewish pressure from the press and from the news agencies the international outlook would be considerably brighter than it is today. In introducing this bill I am actuated neither by fascism nor racialism. I have acted solely as a South African, as a member, sir, of one of the two sections of our population in South Africa whose forefathers were the pioneers of this country, who built up South Africa and made it what it is today. I am a member of one of those two sections that are going to remain in South Africa. There is amongst either the English or the Dutch-speaking South Africans nothing which is comparable to the Zionist movement of the Jews. In introducing this bill I have acted as a South African who is genuinely worried about the creation of a new and additional race problem in South Africa. In the second place, I, and those who feel with me, are worried about the extent to which a race, alien to and unassimilable with the English- and Dutch-speaking population in South Africa, has during past years been securing control of business and industry, and also of the professions. I know that in this matter my feelings are shared by tens of thousands of South Africans, English- as well as Afrikaans-speaking. This bill is fully backed by the Nationalist Party. And I have received support from an unexpected quarter. Sir Abe Bailey, arriving at Cape Town on one of his periodical visits to South Africa on the 26th of November of last year, was interviewed by the press, and in the course of that interview he said:

"It is not in the interests of South Africa nor of the Jews themselves that further immigration of Jews should be continued."

It is not often that the National Party finds itself on common ground with Sir Abe Bailey. In spite of that declaration made by Sir Abe Bailey, he was not labeled by the press as a racialist or as being intolerant or un-Christian. I notice, sir, that the honorable member for Johannesburg (North), Mr. Hofmeyr, at a meeting at Pretoria stated that the United Party was going to vote as one man against this bill. It is perfectly clear that the honorable member for Johannesburg (North) intended to convey the impression that every member of the United Party is opposed to the principles of my bill.

The honorable member for Johannesburg (North) knows that in his own party there is a very considerable division of opinion on this matter.

The main principle of this bill is that it admits the existence in South Africa of a Jewish problem and that it faces up to that problem. I say it is in the interests of the Jew himself in South Africa that this problem should be squarely faced. I say that if it is not faced, and if it is not tackled, we will have in South Africa a repetition of the history that has taken place in the countries of Europe.

Before proceeding further, allow me to give a short résumé of the provisions of this bill. I take it that honorable members have read the bill. It was not sprung upon them as is the case with Government measures, but was published at the beginning of January. First, as regards the definitions in the bill, I shall deal with two of these. There is the definition of the word "assimilate." I have, therefore, provided a definition which reads—

" 'Assimilate,' in relation to any person, means being absorbed by, and identifying himself with, the inhabitants of the Union, with due consideration of the ethnological, racial, sociological, and cultural bases of such inhabitants."

Mr. MADELEY. In the committee stage, will you define the definition?

Mr. LOUW. I shall define it at any time.

Mr. MADELEY. Well, do it now.

Mr. LOUW. I will do it later. In the 1937 act there is a curious difference between the English text and the Afrikaans text. In the English text the word is "assimilate," and in the Afrikaans text it means "to identify himself with." The suggestion in the one case is passive, and in the other it is active. I thought it well to include both in my definition. There is another definition which has caused much discussion, namely Jewish parentage. This reads: " 'Jewish parentage' in relation to any person means that person whose father and mother are or were either wholly or partly Jews, whether or not they professed to Jewish religion."

Section 2 of the bill deals with the British-born Jew. The 1937 bill dealt only with the naturalized Jew. Section 3 deals with the matter of passports, and provides in (c)—

"(c) For the purpose of either permanent residence, or temporary sojourn if his passport provides that he shall lose his nationality within a specified period, or does not permit his reentry into the country in which such passport is issued, or if his passport is one commonly known as a 'Nansen passport' or a 'travel document.' "

In this respect the bill follows the practice observed in most other countries although it is not actually mentioned in the law of England. I am informed on the best of authority that this is the practice in regard to the East African territories. I come to section 4 where a proviso is added, namely—

"That no applicant who is of Jewish parentage shall be deemed to be readily assimilable."

This is the main feature of the bill which I shall deal with later on in my speech. Subsection 2 deals with communism. Here, also, a new principle is introduced. The third subsection deals with the matter of permits. At the present time it is possible for an immigrant with a temporary permit to make application for a permit for permanent residence while he is in the country. This bill provides—and I am here following the American practice—that he has to leave the country before he can apply for a permanent permit. Moreover, he must be out of the country for a period of 6 months, otherwise, it would be easy for a person holding a temporary permit to go to Lourenco Marques, and to make application for a permanent permit from there. I have followed the practice of most European countries, and also that which is to some extent followed in England, namely, that the holders of temporary permits must report periodically to the police, so that the police can know their whereabouts. Section 6 provides that an alien who is without visible means of existence can be deported. That also is the principle observed in most countries including England. Then logically, in view of the fact that under section 4 Communists are not regarded as desirable immigrants, the next section provides that an alien can be deported who is engaged in communistic propaganda, or in any other propaganda which is likely to disturb harmonious relations between the European and the non-European sections of the population of the Union. Section 7 provides that immigrants who have entered the Union since the commencement of 1937, and who have received permits from the selection board, have to turn in these permits, and renew their application under the provisions of this act. That is to say, persons who have not yet been naturalized as citizens of the Union of South Africa. The following section deals with unnaturalized aliens who entered during the period 1930 to 1937:

Section 9 deals with the registration of aliens. That, sir, is a principle which has been adopted by practically every European country and has also been adopted by the Aliens Order of Great Britain. Section 10, when read in conjunction with the principal act, means that an alien is not allowed to change his name. Section 11 excludes members of the Diplomatic Service and Consular officials. Section 12 gives the Governor-General the power, by proclamation, to designate any business which may not be carried on by an alien or to restrict the number of businesses in which aliens may be so employed. Section 13 deals with the restriction of the employment of aliens.

Here again the bill follows the general rule observed in all European countries and which in actual practice obtains also in Great Britain. I have seen a recent instruction issued by the British Government in regard to this matter. Section 14 deals with the registration of businesses. This is the principle adopted in England during the great war, and which has been adopted by other countries. Then there follows section 15, which lays down that in case of all businesses the names of the owners should be disclosed on signboards and on letterheads. This principle has also been adopted in several countries, including to some extent Great Britain. Section 17 follows logically on the amendment of section 4. It amends the provisions of the act of 1913 and stipulates that the Yiddish language shall not be regarded as a European language. Section 18, the final section, obliges the Minister before the last day of February each year to lay upon the table of the House a full statement giving full details in regard to the

working of his department and full figures in regard to the matter of immigration. At present such information has to be drawn from the Minister by way of questions, and we heard only yesterday what difficulty the opposition had in securing replies to their questions. I now proceed to discuss more particularly the principles of the bill.

I will deal first with the clause relating to communism. Section 4 provides that the Selection Board shall not admit an immigrant who is known to be, or has been a member, or a supporter of any Communist organization, or who has espoused, or professed the principles of communism. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps appropriate that this matter of communism should be dealt with in a bill which also deals with the Jewish question, because communism, since its earliest days has been linked with Jewry. This has been denied by the Jews but such denial is not in accordance with the facts. I do not suggest that all Jews are Communists. In fact the honorable member for Cape Town (Castle) (Mr. Alexander) had a Communist as his opponent at the last general election. But I do say that the Jews were the people who conceived the idea of communism, and it was by the Jews that communism was directed, and is still being directed today. That is perfectly comprehensible because communism is international, and a Jew is international in his outlook. Communism had its birth in the teachings of Karl Marx, who was a Jew. If we study the history of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia we find that the great majority of those who were the instigators of the revolution and who occupied the most prominent posts in the Bolshevik Government were Jews. I find that H. A. Gwynne in his book the Cause of the World Unrest, says that of the Bolshevist leaders 40 were Jews and 7 were Russians. I can also speak from my personal observations during the course of my diplomatic service, when I had the opportunity of seeing who were the representatives of this Soviet Government. I found that in most cases they were of the Jewish race. I remember the Soviet delegation to the League of Nations. In that delegation there were seven Jews and one Russian. We find that in most countries where communism has taken root, the leaders of communism are Jews. That is also the case in South Africa. The two leaders of communism in South Africa are Messrs. Solly Sachs and Weinberg. Communism, Mr. Speaker, is an international movement.

It is the very antithesis of nationalism in its widest sense. The declared object of communism, as stated by its leaders, is world revolution, dictatorship by the proletariat, or as they say in France, the ministry of the masses. Its doctrine is that the communistic state must arise from the destruction of the existing order. It is directed against the institutions of western civilization, against religion, the family, and private property. Then there is another very important feature of communism, which is particularly important for us in South Africa; That is, that the Communist makes no distinction whatever on political, economic, or social grounds between the black and white races. Communism is an international movement, with its headquarters in Russia, and the Communist Parties of the different countries are not merely affiliated with the communism in Moscow, but they are actually branches of the Communist Party there. We find, for instance, that the Communist paper in South Africa, the South African Worker, complete with hammer and sickle, states:

"The Communist Party of South Africa is a section of the Communist International."

The Communist Party in every country takes its instructions directly from Moscow. I had the opportunity of observing the growth and working of communism during the period of my 3 years' stay in Paris. When I arrived there there were only 10 Communist members of the Chamber of Deputies, and at the following election the number rose to between 80 and 90. With regard to the procedure which is followed by the Communists, it will be found that this is practically the same in every country in which they operate. One of the principal methods is to secure the key positions in the trade-unions. The Communist starts by causing trouble and by fomenting strikes amongst the working classes. Another favorite method of propaganda is to establish so-called liberal societies and associations. We have them in South Africa. There are the Universal Democratic League, the International Youth League, the League Against Fascism, and the Workers Defense League. There is also the Left Book Club, of which the Honorable Minister is such a great admirer, so much so that his commendation of the Left Book Club is now being used in their advertisements. There are also the Friends of the Soviet Union, and a few others.

These are the communistic societies—organizations which under the cloak of liberalism attempt to draw those with liberal tendencies into the communistic fold. Amongst the most important activities of the Communists in South Africa is propaganda amongst the natives of the country. If there is any doubt as to the intention of the Communist Party in South Africa, let honorable members turn to the case of Sachs versus the Minister of Justice (A. D. 1934); the then Minister of Justice is at present the Minister of Defense. They will find that the Minister of Justice in that case filed affidavits based upon confidential information received from police and other sources, in which it was clearly established that it was the intention of the Communist Party to establish in South Africa a black republic. But it is not necessary for the Minister to go to the case of Sachs versus the Minister of Justice. If they will only take a walk down to the parade and listen to the speeches which are delivered there to natives and colored by Communist agitators, then they will realize that there is serious communistic propaganda in our country. The Right Honorable the Minister of Justice—and I think also the Minister of the Interior—have in the past made light of these meetings on the parade and tried to dismiss them as being merely soap-box oratory, comparable with the oratory in Hyde Park, London. I have had the advantage of attending both, and I can assure members of this House that there is a very distinct difference between the two. The attitude of the Hyde Park audience is one of amused tolerance. They are out for an afternoon's pleasure and have fun in heckling the speakers. But go down to the parade and watch one of these men addressing a colored and native gathering, and you will see an entirely different attitude on the part of the audience. They are in dead earnest as they listen to the propaganda which is being poured into their ears. I say that there is serious danger from communistic propaganda in South Africa in view of the fact that we have a black population of about 6,000,000, and it is very necessary in the interests of peace that communistic propaganda should be curbed. Another method followed by the Communists is to establish what is called the popular front. In France they have the Front Populaire, in Spain there was the thing, and here in South Africa, too, an attempt is being made to establish a popular front. I have before me the minutes of the meeting which was held in camera in Johannesburg and attended by representatives of 26 trade-unions. I find running through the discussions the same refrain, namely, "Organize the black worker." We find, for instance, Comrade Basner stating that he was very much interested in the united front, which has been successful in several countries. "I tell you," he said, "we will not win strikes in South Africa without the assistance of the natives." Miss Cornelius, the young lady who has been taking trips to Moscow to attend communistic gatherings there, said, "We must help to organize the natives, even if not in one organization. The united front is wide enough to embrace all. We must get the natives, but as we must not antagonize the whites we must be careful not to bring the natives into the forefront." I could go on quoting from several of these speeches, all in the same line—"organize the native"—and eventually, as far as the Communist Party is concerned, the establishment of a black proletariat here in South Africa.

Now, I come to what is the main feature of the bill, namely, the new principle introduced of definitely naming the Jewish race as a race not suitable for immigration into South Africa. This is the feature of the bill that has been most discussed, most criticised, and I am glad to say, most commended. In this section 4 (b) which I have already quoted, we have an extension of the principle of previous legislation, the act of 1937, and also the 1930 quota act, where the Jew was aimed at, but not specifically named. In this act he is specifically named. Now, the objection which is made is that in this act I discriminate against the Jew as such. I frankly admit that there is discrimination against the Jew as an immigrant, and against the Jew who is still an alien in South Africa. And while on this question of discrimination, let me point out this to those newspapers, and to those who have been the most violent critics of my bill, that they themselves practice a form of discrimination against the Jew—not the man who is coming in, not the Jew who is an alien, but the old-established Jew. These very people are practicing a form of discrimination which, in my opinion, hurts the Jew in his self-respect and pride far more than anything in the bill. I refer to social discrimination. That is being practiced every day. The same man who writes the editorial criticizing my bill; the same man who gets on a platform and makes a speech in defense of the Jew. Those same men will not propose a Jew as a member of their exclusive clubs. It has happened right here near Cape Town. I am informed that not so long ago two very well known Jews, against whom nothing whatever could be said, men of culture, men of standing in the community, were proposed as members of a certain Cape Town club, and in both cases they were blackballed because they were Jews, and for no other reason. We find the same thing in everyday conversation. These same people who call me intolerant, and accuse me of discrimination, speak contemptuously of the Jews as "Yids" when they are in private conversation among themselves, or having a drink together. I have been accused of anti-Semitism, and what not, but let me say in all sincerity, that I have never yet in private conversation spoken of a Jew as a "Yid." These people who pose as friends of the Jews are the same people who are practicing social discrimination against the Jews in South Africa.

And it is not only in South Africa, it is the same in America. In New York and in Chicago the Jews were obliged to establish their own clubs, because they were not admitted to the clubs of the "gentile" Americans. I am informed that in Cape Town they have established their own clubs for the same reason. There is a man who has written a book on the Jews, and who is a friend of the Jews. This is what he says: "The Jews who mix with the wealthiest classes in London have no idea of their true position in the eyes of their hosts."

He goes on to say: "We play a deliberately false part in our relations with Jews."

I say that such an attitude on the part of those who are today accusing me of anti-Semitism, of racialism and intolerance, is nothing but rank hypocrisy. Furthermore, it is not fair to the Jews themselves. It places the Jew in a false position; it gives him a false sense of security, and afterward when he wakes up and finds that there is a certain amount of anti-Jewish feeling in the country, then he is surprised because to his face he has been told one thing, and behind his back another attitude is adopted. Such hypocrisy complicates an already serious problem. My bill certainly does not

suffer from hypocrisy. It is characterized by complete candor and frankness.

But unfortunately candor and frankness are very often mistaken for hostility.

Why is this principle of discrimination introduced into my bill? Because in the first place the Jew is not assimilable. I am going to deal with that aspect of the bill later. That the Jew is not assimilable has been shown from the records of history, and it is also admitted by the Jew himself. Secondly, this bill discriminates against the Jewish immigrant and Jewish alien, because owing to certain racial characteristics he creates a problem in any country as soon as the Jewish population exceeds a certain percentage of the total. Thirdly, because in South Africa the Jewish population has already reached that percentage, and consequently we have with us today a Jewish problem which must be squarely faced. I will deal first with assimilation, because that is the basic principle of my bill. That is no new principle. It has been already adopted by the South African Parliament.

It was adopted in the Quota Act, and confirmed in the act of 1937, so we have accepted that principle of assimilability. But in the act of 1937 it was left to the Selection Board to decide whether or not a particular race or person is assimilable. Parliament gave to the board a very wide discretion which necessarily must be influenced by the personal opinions of its members, and it may happen that there may be a difference of opinion as to whether a certain race is or is not assimilable. It may also happen that the personnel of the board may change, and there may be a change in policy.

In other words, we cannot be sure of having in South Africa uniformity of policy in regard to this very serious question. When, therefore, it is known from the record of history, and from the frank admission of its members, that a certain race is not readily assimilable; and when we know from our own observation that such a race has not been absorbed by either the English-speaking or by the Dutch-speaking section of the population, then the time has arrived that the board must receive instructions by legislation that such a race is not assimilable. That is the object of section 4 (b). My contention is that the Jewish race, taken as a whole, is not readily absorbed by either the Dutch- or English-speaking sections in South Africa. I know there are exceptions, there are exceptions to every rule, and so also there have been exceptions in the case of the Jewish race. But let us look at history. Since the great dispersion, for a period of over 2,000 years, the Jew has wandered over the face of the earth, and today he is found in all countries of the globe; but throughout the ages, scattered as he is today over the face of the earth, he has always remained a Jew. You don't speak of a Jew in England as an Englishman, or in Holland as a Dutchman, or in France as a Frenchman. No; you speak of him as an English Jew, a Dutch Jew, or a French Jew. He has maintained his racial identity and his Jewish customs, he has remained true to the faith of his forefathers, he has maintained the purity of his Jewish blood, and above all he has remained a separate nation. Now, sir; in spite of my being accused of being an anti-Semite, let me say in all sincerity that I think that it is very wonderful that the Jews over a period of 2,000 years, often living under unfavorable conditions, have retained the integrity of their race. But that very fact proves that they are, and will remain a separate nation; in other words, that they are, and will remain unassimilable. The reason is apparent. Read through the Old Testament, the Laws of Moses. I could quote dozens of texts to show that the Jew received strict injunctions that he should not mix with the nations amongst whom he lived. Look at the teachings of the Talmud. I have gone to the fountain head as far as it has been possible for me to do so. I have here a book, Miscellaneous Extracts From the Talmud—the more important extracts—and it is edited by a Jew. It is the teaching of the Talmud—which the Jew is taught in his schools—that he must keep his race pure, and remain a separate nation. I find in the Jewish Chronicle of 1935, that a Talmudical Society was established in South Africa, and on that occasion Rabbi Mervish stated that "the study of the Torah distinguished Jews from other nations, and kept them together as a people."

But for centuries at a time the Jews have also lived in circumstances favorable to absorption. There were times when they were persecuted in certain countries and also in Great Britain, but there have also been long periods when they have lived under favorable circumstances in Great Britain and elsewhere, and yet they were not absorbed. Even in America, the so-called melting pot of the world, they have remained a separate nation.

The Jew has a remarkable aptitude of being able to adapt himself to his environment, of being able to adopt the customs and the ways of living of the people amongst whom he lives, of being able to acquire the veneer of the people amongst whom he lives. That is where people make a mistake.

They think that is absorption. It is nothing of the kind. It is merely the facility of the Jew to adapt himself to his environment. What is Zionism but the refusal of the Jew to assimilate, and that was the idea of Theodore Herzl, the founder of the movement. Mr. Speaker, the Jew is a nomad by nature. I am not saying that in an unfavorable sense. I am not comparing the Jew with the gypsy; but the history of the Jew is a history of his wandering among the nations of the earth. The Jew is a cosmopolitan. The Jew looks forward to that time when there will be reestablished a Jewish state where he will await the coming of the Messiah. But let the Jew speak for himself. I don't want to weary the House with quotations, but I think it is necessary to hear what leading Jews say. These books from which I shall quote are to be found in the parliamentary library. Ludwig Lewissohn, a well-known Jewish writer, says: "Assimilation is impossible, because the Jew cannot change his national character."

He goes on further and says: "Assimilation is bankrupt. Germany was the great laboratory experiment, and I think that the experiment was necessary, but it failed."

Then there is another book, The Real Jew, written by H. Newman, with an introduction by Israel Zangwill. What does he say?

"In examining the causes which have served to keep the Jews a people apart we find that deeply engraved in the soul of the Jewish people there are certain fundamental ideals. * * * These created an impassable barrier between their own deeply rooted ideas of life and those of the surrounding peoples. Thus, whereas the Flemings, the Normans, and the Huguenots were able wholly to assimilate with the English race at various epochs in their history, the Jews have never been able to merge themselves in their new environment to the same extent.

Then, sir, I find in A Book of Jewish Thoughts by Dr. J. H. Hertz, I think he was chief rabbi at one time, a chapter headed "The tragedy of assimilation." He says: "What I understand by assimilation is loss of identity. It is the kind of assimilation that I dread most, even more than pogroms."

Then from Jewish Life in Modern Times, by Israel Cohen: "However acute the divisions may be on the merits of orthodoxy, or on the virtue of the Zionist ideal, they are leveled by the influence of the past, which generates a spirit of solidarity welding the disparate units into a harmonious whole. Opposed to the agencies consciously striving for the conservation of Jewry are forces working for its dissolution. * * * There is open advocacy of assimilation, viz, that Jews should regard as distinguished from their fellow citizens merely in respect of religion, but that otherwise they should merge themselves completely in the general life of a nation in whose midst they dwell. * * * Thus the soul of Israel amongst the nations is nowhere immune from insidious assault."

Then I find that a distinguished Jew, Mr. Basil M. Henriques, made a speech in London which was reported in the Zionist Record of South Africa of the 29th of January last, and he says: "There must be no assimilation. We are a peculiar people, and a peculiar people we must remain."

I find also in the Zionist Record an article by Mr. Ludwig Lewissohn. He says: "Men exist in groups that create their cultures in their own image, and as the expression of their permanent character. Men exist in no other way. Neither do Jews. We are a culture group; we are a people; we are a nationality. No; don't stick your head into the sand at this point. It's so silly, and so unrealistic, and so cowardly. We are a nationality."

And so, Mr. Speaker, when one examines the writings of Jewish writers, of those who have spoken on behalf of their race, one finds them fighting against this idea of assimilation. I repeat: The history of the Jews in those countries in which they have lived under favorable circumstances show that they may absorb others, but they themselves cannot be absorbed. It is also clear from their own admissions and statements that they do not wish to be absorbed.

In the second place, it is necessary to discriminate against the Jewish immigrants and the alien Jew in South Africa because, owing to certain racial characteristics and habits, the Jew creates a problem as soon as his numbers unduly increase. What happens is that you have an alien body in the general body of the state, and, as in the human organism, such an alien body causes irritation and friction and results in inflammation and disease. That is what has happened in many other countries, and that is what is happening in South Africa today. What are those racial characteristics?

In the first place, the Jew is international. He is international in his outlook; and, furthermore, he is part of a vast interlocked organization. His race is spread over the globe, a race that is bound by ties of culture, religion, and blood, to which add the bonds of finance and commerce and industry.

The Jew, in the first instance, is loyal to his own people, loyal to Israel, and what Israel stands for. In the second place he is concerned mainly with his own personal and material interests. May I refer to the position during the Great War in England? It explains this characteristic of the Jew. If one reads the post-war books, it is perfectly clear that there was something wrong, especially during the earlier years of the war. Honorable members may remember that meetings were held in England to protest against what was called the hidden hand. That hidden hand was the intrigue and disloyalty of the Jewish banking and financial firms. Jewry believed that the central powers were going to win the war, and therefore the majority of Jews were backing the central powers. It was perfectly clear that things were going wrong in England, for instance, with regard to supplies of foodstuffs, and that the blockade of Germany was ineffectual. It was later discovered that there was disloyalty on the part of some of the Jews in London and elsewhere. It will be recollected the Sir Edgar Speyer, a privy councilor, was later deprived of his naturalization certificate and of his honors, because it was proved that he was a member of the coterie of Jewish financiers who were working against the interests of England. Then the position became so acute that the British Government was obliged to do something in order to secure the support of the Jews. It was during the most critical period of the war. What did they do? It came in the form of the Balfour declaration on Palestine. That declaration was not merely a happy idea on the part of Mr.

Balfour. It was necessary for England to enlist Jewish help. The Jews were against England, but the Jew was prepared to give his help to the Allied cause for a price, and the price that the British Government paid was the Balfour declaration. I noticed in the discussion, which took place in 1937, that the honorable member for Troyeville, Mr. Kentridge, denied that there was such a thing as Jewish solidarity or organized Jewry. Allow me again to quote what the Jews themselves say about that matter of their solidarity. I have here Jewish Life, by Israel Cohen, and what he says throws some light on what is happening in South Africa. He states: "Amidst the welter of conflicting movements there is one unifying element, the sentiment of solidarity. The concrete form in which it is normally manifested, is the spontaneous organization of the communities in whatever part of the world the Jews settle. The simplest and commonest form of Jewish solidarity is the organized community which will be found in any town containing even a handful of Jews. * * * The town communities are linked together by associations with a central body in the metropolis either for religious or secular purposes. The religious body acts as the ecclesiastical authority; the secular as the guardian of civil and political interests. Cognate in origin, allied by the same traditions, these communities give to modern Jewry the semblance of a vast network of autonomous settlements."

He goes on to describe the whole machinery of organized Jewry and the solidarity of Jewry, and he explains how in political matters organized Jewry acts as one. Here in South Africa there is also this organized Jewry the existence of which has been denied by the Jews and their supporters. I found a very interesting book in the library, The South African Jewish Year Book. It was presented to the parliamentary library by Mr. Morris Alexander. The editor of the yearbook gives a historical review of Jewish organizations in South Africa and, more particularly, of the work of the Jewish Board of Deputies. He states that a board of deputies was first established in the Transvaal and Natal. The objects of the board were "to watch and take action with reference to all matters affecting the welfare of the Transvaal and Natal Jews as a community." It was further decided that "the board shall take observations of all proceedings relative to legislative municipal enactments, and shall use such means as they may deem requisite, in order that no infraction of the Jews' rights, and of the privileges of the Jewish community may ensue therefrom." We find that is a review of the work of the board of deputies; on March 6, 1907, it was reported inter alia that Mr. Jack Cohen had seen the editor of the Sunday Times regarding the use of the word "Peruvian." The board also put a stop to the practice of using the word "Jew" in charge sheets and in newspapers in their reports of criminal cases. In 1910 the number of immigrant cases began to grow and the board resolved to give the question of immigration the board's special attention. During the discussion on the 1937 bill, it was denied in this House that the Jewish Board of Deputies had taken an active part in the question of promoting Jewish immigration to South Africa. Let us hear what the report says about the work of the board in regard to the matter of immigration. In 1904 it says: "Lord Milner agreed that all Jews who had no permits to stay in South Africa could apply for them. The Jewish Board of Deputies appointed a special committee to deal with the matter. So strenuously did the board work that it is reported that 300 applicants had been recommended for permits."

This work being so successful, it was decided to extend their activities. We find a Jewish Board of Deputies in the Cape Colony in 1905. It took steps to have Jewish shopkeepers exempted from the operation of the Half Holiday Act, such facilities being granted to butchers who had had their shops closed on the Jewish Sabbath. One of the features of the Jewish problem is that the Jews, as a community, are always claiming for themselves special privileges. Here we have the same thing. They claim the privilege of not closing their shops on the usual half-holiday. It is reported that the board dealt with a number of immigration cases, with the result "that many deserving immigrants were allowed to land who otherwise would have been sent back to the countries whence they came." The immigration authorities had decided to send some of them back, but so effectively did the Jewish Board of Deputies work that these people were allowed to land. In view of the successful work of the board of deputies it was decided to hold a conference at Bloemfontein. The writer refers to South African Jewry "denoting as it does today a cohesive whole composed of the organized Jewish population of this subcontinent, its component and well-defined parts organized, correlated to each other even more efficiently than in the case of Jewries in some of the older countries."

So the good work goes on. A meeting of the board was held in 1913. It was reported that the first 2 years of the South African board's history were chiefly concerned with matters of immigration and with consolidating the board's position. They urged the appointment of a Jew on the appeal board. Then another congress was held. This congress was chiefly notable for the protest against legislation against aliens in the bill then before Parliament. Resolutions were adopted protesting against the introduction of the registration proposal, the same registration system which I have in my bill. They protested on the ground that it was a violation of the rights of a large number of Jews in South Africa. Again, the claim of special privileges for the Jew. As a result of these representations the objectionable sections were ultimately deleted from the bill. But we are told that there is no such thing as Jewish pressure on behalf of the organized Jewish community. The report goes on to say that the executive, as the result of the war and its aftereffects, was obliged to go beyond the strict letter of the board's objects as laid down in its constitution, and the board was empowered to deal with the welfare of Jews overseas, in addition to concerning itself with the well-being of those in southern Africa. "Thus," the report proceeds, "the board greatly widened the scope of its activities and developed an international phase of activity." It goes on to say that in 1920–21 Jewish immigration began to increase, and the board published information both here and overseas. They sent information overseas in order to encourage Jewish immigrants to come to South Africa, and including information regarding the procedure to be adopted regarding emigration to South Africa. Then, in 1921, the congress met again, and a protest was made against the raising of the naturalization fee. Deputations were sent to the government and it was decided to organize protest meetings of Jews all over the country in the event of General Smuts' reply being unsatisfactory. A deputation was received by the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior and, as a result, the fee was reduced to £5.

I will now deal with the matter of pressure which is being exerted by organized Jewry in South Africa. Strong pressure was brought to bear in connection with the report of the Carnegie Commission in South Africa, because the commission in its report mentioned the fact of Jewish competition and the difficulty of South Africans being able to find work. It is well known that the Jews have at different times tried to secure favorable reports in the press and brought pressure to bear on the editors of newspapers in South Africa. In regard to the treatment of Jews in Germany, public meetings were held in different parts of the country. These public meetings were advertised as being nonsectarian and nonracial, but it is known that in those cases the procedure was that certain gentlemen well known as Christian leaders were asked to organize the meetings in order to give the impression of these meetings being genuine gentile protests. Then we have the matter of the boycott against German goods. This matter was raised during the last session of this House. The honorable member for Cape Town (Castle) denied that the Jewish community had anything to do with the Jewish boycott in this country and said that the Jews themselves merely decided not to buy German goods. He received support from the honorable member for Benoni (Mr. Madeley), who said that his party had been responsible for the boycott. If the honorable member for Benoni, or if the South African Trades and Labor Council wish to suggest that this German boycott originated with them, then in the language of the classics I say: "Go and tell that to the marines." The idea originated with the Jews, and they used the South African Trades and Labor Council for the purpose of initiating this boycott. I have before me a circular which was sent to a gentile firm calling upon them to boycott German goods and also warning them not to advertise in a German paper published in Johannesburg. The circular ends by saying: "Do you know that the Jewish community will see to it that your firm is boycotted if you continue to advertise in the Deutsch-Afrikaner of Pretoria?"

I have also the envelope addressed to the firm in question. That was the way the boycott was carried on. It is still being carried on today. I have here a notice which is put on orders which are sent overseas by Jewish firms in the following form: "Acceptance of goods will be refused if the goods are shipped by a German vessel or through a German port or insured with a German company."

Now, sir, when the Jew buys goods for his own personal use he is perfectly entitled to do that if he wishes, but in this case he is not buying goods for his own consumption, but goods which are sold to the gentile population. I have the Boycott Bulletin which I read last year. The honorable member for Cape Town (Castle) said it was published in England. It was published in England, but it was distributed in South Africa. The boycott is a favorite weapon which is used by Jewry, and it is an efficient weapon from their point of view, because of the control they exercise on trade and industry.

Allow me to say—and I say it with a full sense of responsibility—to the Jewish population of South Africa that in making use of this boycott weapon in connection with trade or in connection with press advertisements they are playing with fire, they are using a double-edged weapon. I say that the time will come when the people of South Africa will turn and will not tolerate that sort of weapon being used in our country. I think that it is well that that word of warning should be sounded to the Jewish community in South Africa. Reverting to the matter of immigration, I have already referred to the reports of the meetings of the Jewish Board of Deputies. In the 1937 debate there was read a telegram or a letter which was sent to Bentwich, in which it was stated that the Jewish Board of Deputies had advised against any further Jewish immigration into South Africa. Of course, such a letter was sent; it was sent as a matter of tactics, because the immigrants were arriving here in boatloads. The *Stuttgart* had arrived, there were 360 on the *Carnarvon Castle*, and naturally the board in effect warned: "Don't send them in such big crowds; it is making trouble; let them dribble in." I happen to know something about Jewish emigration from my personal knowledge. There is in Paris a certain organization—I think it is called Ica—a Jewish colonization organization, with offices at 26 Rue Bassano in Paris. That organization instructed one of the banks in South Africa to pay out a sum of £5,000 to be used as deposits for immigrants arriving here from Europe. And yet we are told that the Jewish community in South Africa did not encourage immigration into our country. I will now leave the question of immigration. We know it has been encouraged by the Jews in South Africa, and the sooner they

realize that there is already a sufficiently large Jewish population in this country the better it will be for the older-established Jewish population itself.

Another factor which causes friction is Jewish control of finance and business, the formation of monopolies, and also the domination of the professions. This is particularly so with regard to high finance and international banking. It is unnecessary to enter into that. I am sure that the members of the Jewish race themselves will admit that they control high finance and international banking in Europe and in America. Remember that the international banker controls credit, and through his control of credit, he is also able to exercise control over industry and trade. International finance and industry and trade are thus closely related. In the United States the Jews have already managed to secure control of a number of the most important industries in the country, finance, the wholesale and retail trade, the garment trade, motion pictures, furniture and liquor trade, and so on. To a large extent the same thing has happened in England. But let us come to South Africa. One has only to go about the country to see to what extent the Jew is controlling retail and wholesale business in South Africa. He controls the liquor trade. There is a firm known as the South African Board of Distilleries, which is almost entirely controlled by Jews. To a large extent the Jew controls the meat trade, and he almost entirely controls the theater and cinema business. He exercises a large measure of control over the hotel trade and shirt manufacture—the honorable member for Maitland (Mr. Mushet) will be able to confirm to what extent today Jewish interests control the manufacture of shirts in South Africa. In the retail tobacco trade it is the same thing, and then one has only to look to the enormous economic control exercised by a prominent Jew, Mr. I. W. Schlesinger, to realize to what lengths this has gone. Not content with the control of finance and business, the Jew is now turning to the professions. I have gone through the telephone list very carefully in Johannesburg and Cape Town, and have taken only those names which I am quite sure are Jewish. What do I find?

That in Johannesburg 65 percent of the attorney firms are Jewish; of the advocates, 45 percent are Jewish; in Cape Town the attorneys are 41 percent and the advocates 28 percent. I have here the list of the law certificate examination results of January of this year. Forty-four percent of the successful candidates in the law-certificate examination were Jews.

Mr. KENTRIDGE. Did you look through the Taalbond results?

Mr. LOUW. I don't deny that the Jew is an expert linguist, and that he will also excel in the Taalbond examination, so that he can thereby compete more successfully in business and trade and in the professions. Nobody has ever denied the genius of the Jew, and he will succeed in the Taalbond examination because he fully appreciates its value, in view of the fact that South Africa is a bilingual country. As regards medical practitioners, in Johannesburg 48 percent are Jews, and that, I am informed, is a very conservative estimate, because I have not included the names of persons who have changed their names. In Cape Town at least 31 percent of the medical practitioners are Jews. In the Witwatersrand University final examination 68 percent of the successful medical students were Jews. In Cape Town the percentage was 32 percent. I am informed that in the first-, second-, and third-year classes the percentage is even higher. But, sir, it is not only in business and the professions where the Jew occupies a position out of all proportion to his percentage of the population. We find him also in positions of authority. That is particularly so in England and America.

That was particularly the case in England during the period of the Great War. In the Lloyd George cabinet there were several Jews. The Spectator, in an editorial in 1920, wrote—

"We are convinced that at the present moment persons of the Jewish faith are far too numerous in our Cabinet. We have got a great many more Jews than we deserve."

The Spectator probably also had in mind the Marconi scandal which had taken place not long before in which several prominent Jews were implicated. Following the same line as that taken by the honorable member for Troyeville when he referred to the question of the Taalbond examination, the Jews often ask, "Why is the gentile unable to compete with the Jew? Is it not the fault of the gentile himself?" That charge has often been leveled.

Let me frankly admit that the Jew is a very clever and adroit businessman, but there are other reasons why the gentile finds it difficult to compete with him. Firstly, as regards international trade and finance, there is the fact that the Jew is international, and has international affiliations. As regards inland trade, there is that racial cement, that bond of racial unity which enables the Jew to make arrangements which it is impossible for the gentile to make under similar circumstances. And finally, let me add this, namely, that in his business dealings with the gentile the Jew undoubtedly has a different outlook and a different business standard. I don't want to go too deeply into that aspect, as I do not wish to hurt the susceptibilities of members of this House who are Jews, but I would mention that the matter is dealt with in the Talmud, which is the collection of laws and precepts by which the everyday life of the Jew is guided. In the Talmud there are certain precepts which throw a very interesting light upon the attitude and on the standards of the Jew when he is dealing with the gentiles. I have here a collection of Talmudic precepts, and the editor of this book says in the introduction—

"Here is the law for the man of thought and the man of action; the law of the household and the law of the state; directions for the health of the body; the attainment of wise knowledge, the conquest of virtue, and the conduct of life. . . . It covers the whole field of life, and its principles affect or ought to affect, every thought and every action of every member in the Jewish state. Such, in the abstract, is the regard in which this book is held in Jewry."

No Jew, I think, would deny that in his daily life he is guided by the precepts which he finds in the Talmud. I suggest to anybody who wishes to go into the matter further to study the Talmud, and he will find some light thrown on the question as to why the Jew is able to compete so successfully with the gentile.

Another habit of the Jew which creates trouble and friction, especially when his numbers exceed a certain percentage, is the Jewish habit of secrecy. That aptitude of the Jew of being able to conceal what he wishes to keep secret, especially when it is in his own interests, was probably initiated during the period of the persecutions, but it has remained a habit of the Jew and has become almost a national instinct. This habit of secret action will be illustrated by reference to a case which was heard in the Supreme Court at Cape Town about a year ago, when a certain Mr. Goodman, representing the Jewish Board of Deputies, secured an interdict against Mr. von Moltke, calling upon him to refrain from publishing certain documents which he had in his possession.

Mr. BLACKWELL. Stolen papers.

Mr. LOUW. If they were or were not stolen, I don't know. The question is, Why was there that undue haste on the part of the Jewish board of deputies to prevent the publication of those documents? I think the inference to be drawn from their action is that there were in those documents certain matters which the Jewish Board of Deputies did not want published in South Africa.

An HONORABLE MEMBER. What did the court do?

Mr. LOUW. The court granted the injunction on the ground of authorship, that the persons who had written the letters had not given Von Moltke the right of authorship. This habit of concealment takes another form in the changing of names. Why does the Jew change his name? It is in order to give an outward appearance of having been assimilated. The honorable member for Troyeville (Mr. Kentridge) admitted during the 1937 debate why he changed his name. Some remark was made about his having changed his name, and he said that he did it to show that he had been assimilated. But the honorable member remains the same Jew that he was, whether he is called Kentridge or Kantorovitch. Another reason why the Jew changes his name is to secure certain advantages of a business or a social nature, and that is happening in South Africa. I put a question to the honorable the Minister the other day. I took at random two cases which I happened to find in the Government Gazette, where two Jews had changed their names. I asked what were "the good and sufficient reasons" postulated by the act for the change of the name, and the Minister replied that these particular persons had changed their names "for business, social, and personal reasons." I submit that it was not the intention of the act that a man should be permitted to change his name for such reasons. When a man changes his name for business reasons he is practicing deception upon his customers and upon the people in the town where he does business, and I say to the Minister that he was not acting according to the spirit and according to the letter of the act of 1937 when he allowed people to change their names for business, social, and personal reasons. That is not a good and sufficient reason under that act.

Mr. Speaker, I have shown that the Jew is unassimilable, and that he has certain racial characteristics which cause friction. I have shown that when the Jewish population figure reaches a certain percentage of the population of a state, it causes trouble. That is also the view of the Jews themselves. The great leader of Jewish Zionism, Dr. Herzl, is quoted in the South African Jewish Chronical of the 25th of May, 1934: "Herzl foresaw long ago that the percentage of Jews that a county can absorb before anti-Semitism sets in is very low, barely 5 percent. After that a saturation sets in, the weather breaks, and threatening storms appear on the horizon."

Here in South Africa the Jewish population exceeds that percentage of safety. The saturation point was reached some time ago, and the storm clouds are not merely on the horizon, they have already moved up. I am not going to enter into discussion on figures, I am not going to ask whether in this year more Jews were allowed in than in another year, because that is beside the point, in view of the terms of my bill, which provides that no further Jewish immigration should be allowed in South Africa. But what I do say is that, having regard to the state of the problem, and the serious proportions it has attained in South Africa, we have to ask three questions:

What is the Jewish population in South Africa; what percentage of the total white population does that constitute; and, finally, is it being fed by further immigration? It is difficult to arrive at a definite figure as to what the South African Jewish population is today. In the first place the census figures are based on religious confession and in 1939 the Jews themselves admitted that there were then about 400 Jews in South Africa who no longer attended the synagogue. The immigration figures are definitely not reliable, because in the first place those figures are dependent upon the Jew's own statement as to whether he is or is not of the Jewish race, and knowing that there is a certain amount of anti-Jewish feeling, he hesitates to state whether or not he is of the Jewish race. Then there is the fact that thousands of temporary visitors come to South Africa. In what way are they being controlled? We are told about the deposit, but a Jew is cheerfully going to forfeit this deposit, if by so doing he can be certain of remaining in the country. There are also the in-transit immigrants, figures running into several hundreds per month. What check has the minister that they do not remain in the country, or that having gone

into a neighboring country, that they do not return? Here again the minister's reply about the deposit does not hold water, because the Jew or any other immigrant will cheerfully forfeit that deposit if there is any prospect of his being able to remain in South Africa. As to visitors going into neighboring territories and again re-crossing the boundaries, the Minister's reply shows that there is nothing to prevent these people from reentering the Union. In November 1936 the Jewish Board estimated that the Jewish population was 95,000.

Add to those figures the immigration figures of the selection board, allow a percentage for those who do not attend the synagogue, and for visitors and in-transit immigrants; allow also for the natural increase, because the Jews live according to the Mosaic laws, which tell them to be fruitful and to multiply. I think it will be found that there is a much higher birth rate among the Jews than among the rest of the population. On this basis I think it can be safely said that on a conservative estimate the Jewish population must be today between 98,000 and 100,000, and that brings us to 5 percent of the white population of South Africa. I do not know whether honorable members realize there are only three other contries in Europe that have a higher percentage of Jewish population than South Africa. We are fourth on the list, and we are practically equal with the third, which is Hungary; the others being Poland and Lithuania.

Mr. BLACKWELL. The United States surely has 5 percent.

Mr. LOUW. Nothing like it. Then, sir, quite apart from the matter of percentage, South Africa has in actual numbers a larger Jewish population than 15 European countries. That is the present position. What about the future? Is the Jewish population being increased by immigration, apart from the natural increase? In answer to that question, I would point to the fact that since the act of 1937 was passed Jewish immigration has exceeded on the average 1,000 per annum. During the period 1928 to 1938, on a conservative estimate, allowing for British-born Jews, but not allowing for visitors who have remained, and in-transit immigrants, 16,880 Jewish immigrants entered South Africa, and during the period 1934 to 1938 there were 7,584. Is there any reason to expect a decrease of Jewish immigration in South Africa? I say definitely no, because a new situation has developed in Europe and every effort is being made to find homes for thousands of Jewish refugees. One has only to read the press to see to what extent that is being done. Propaganda is being carried on not only in Europe but here in South Africa. The Minister was visited by members of Rand constituencies who asked him to open the door wider to Jewish immigration. According to two newspaper reports, the Minister said he was prepared to give favorable consideration to their representations. He did not pledge himself to anything, and I do not suggest that he has acceded to the request made by those honorable members. But it shows that pressure is being brought to bear to secure the admission of Jewish refugees into this country. Poland and Rumania have indicated that they want to get rid of their Jewish population, and England also is doing its utmost to get rid of its refugees.

Propaganda is being made, and pressure is being exerted to induce the Government to open the door wider. We have the visit of Lord Marley. He has come here ostensibly to get funds for the Jewish refugees, but reading the speeches of Lord Marley, and reading between the lines, you will find that he is also creating a certain atmosphere, appealing to people's humanitarian feelings, and saying, in effect: "Here are these poor, homeless people; why don't you help them?" That sort of thing is going on and if ever there was a time when a bill of this kind was necessary, it is now when efforts are being made all over the world to find room for Jewish refugees. Our attitude, sir, the attitude of the Nationalist Party, is that the Jewish population of South Africa is already too large. It has exceeded the danger point percentage. It is no good telling me that during this or that year immigration was so much less, or was only so much. Even if the number of immigrants were 100 per annum, I say that they are 100 too many, in view of the fact that saturation point has been reached, in the words of Dr. Herzl, the leader of the Zionist movement. We say that Jewish immigration must be completely stopped. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that that is the view, not only of those of us who sit on this side of the House, but I am convinced that that is the view which is shared by the great majority of the English- and Dutch-speaking people in South Africa. I say that the time has arrived when we have to deal frankly with this problem. We owe it to our children, and it is only fair to the Jewish population themselves, to let them know where they stand, to deal openly and frankly and honestly with them. This bill of mine, contrary to the criticisms which have been made in the press, does not touch the old-established Jew in South Africa. It is aimed to prevent any further Jewish immigration. It is further aimed at the alien Jew at present in South Africa. May I commend, sir, to this House and also to honorable Members who are Jews, and to Jews outside of this House, the words of a man who is a friend of the Jews, the words of Hillaire Belloc. He says:

"There is a Jewish problem, and the Jews who resent the statement of the problem, and an attempt at solving it, are not doing their own people any good, and they are at the same time denying us the right to put our house in order, which denial is of course intolerable."

I commend to the Jews and to their liberal friends to ponder very carefully over those words of Mr. Belloc. To honorable members on the other side of the House and to the Government, I say we have here today in South Africa a very serious problem, a complicated problem, and a problem which is growing more serious with every immigrant who is coming into the country. I say, sir, to the Government and to honorable members on that side of the house that if their Jewish supporters decline to see reason, then you owe it to the country to eliminate this factor from political considerations. You owe it to the pioneers of the Great Trek, whose centenary we recently celebrated, and you owe it to the pioneers of the 1820 settlers, those English- and Dutch-speaking pioneers who left a heritage for their descendants in our country.

I say further, you owe it to the people of South Africa, and you owe it to future generations of South Africans to tackle this problem now, before it is too late. I say to the Jewish members of this House and to the Jewish community outside the House, "In your own interests, beware that you do not put anything in the way of the tackling of this problem. I say to you, read the history of your own race, and be satisfied with the numbers that you have in the country today."

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LELAND M. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

VIEWS OF THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE IN THE SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following views of the Republican Members of the House in the Seventy-sixth Congress:

OUR POLICY OF DEFENSE AND THE MISSION OF OUR MILITARY FORCES THEREUNDER

(Submitted to the House February 14, 1939)

In the foreign policy of the United States, which has been consistent and has developed naturally with the years, there has been for over a century but one principle which has remained definite and unchanged—the principle known as the Monroe Doctrine. The famous declaration of President Monroe informed the nations of Europe that the United States would regard any attempt to extend European domination in the countries of Central and South America as an unfriendly act. It is not a treaty, nor has any foreign power ever approved it. It is, in truth, a "no trespass" sign posted around the entire area south of the Rio Grande, and as the years have passed we have made it plain that the warning is addressed to all foreign powers, no matter where situated.

While the doctrine may be of advantage to the nations of Latin America, fundamentally it is our doctrine and ours alone. We adhere to it because we are convinced that our safety is dependent upon its enforcement. It is a policy of defense.

The United States may from time to time adopt new attitudes and pursue new policies relating to other matters in this ever-changing world, but there can be no lessening of its devotion to the Monroe Doctrine, because this, more than any other single aspect of policy, involves the safety of the Nation and its vital interests. Especially is this true now that by an act of Congress we are withdrawing from the Philippines and shall not be expected to defend those islands.

Obviously, our military establishment must be adequate to carry out the obligation so clearly implied in the Monroe Doctrine—the obligation to prevent the extension of foreign political domination through military action in the Western Hemisphere. This may well be considered as part of the supreme obligation to defend the continental United States. We thus envision our whole defense. Without the Panama Canal we should be sadly handicapped. It is our life-line and must be maintained.

For our defense in the Pacific we believe the mission of our Military Establishment is the maintenance, impregnably, of the line following roughly the 180th meridian, commencing at the Alaskan islands, passing somewhat westward of Hawaii, and thence generally southeastward to include and cover the Panama Canal. With comparatively slight additions our presently authorized military strength, both Army and Navy, is equal to that particular task.

We conceive the disposition of our military forces in the Atlantic and the Pacific as having a common objective—the enforcement of our defense policy. We should look upon Oahu as an outpost not only of our Pacific coast, but of the Canal. We should look upon Guantanamo and Puerto Rico, and our naval and aviation establishments along our Atlantic coast as likewise outposts of Panama. Everything should be done to extend and strengthen such outposts in the areas of defense, whether they be in the hands of the Army or the Navy.

As for Panama itself, there is great need of a substantial increase in the strength of the garrison, in order that the armament

now there, or shortly to be installed, may be manned with at least one shift; and we must add certain equipment vital to the conduct of its defense.

If we control the sea and the air over a wide radius from the Canal, it will not be easy for an enemy to reach it from the sea. Likewise, if, when the need arises, we take instant measures to prevent the establishment of hostile bases in Central or South America, we shall have gone a long way toward closing the door.

With our defense system made effective far out in the Pacific and far out in the Atlantic, with hostile military infiltration promptly prevented, and with the Canal itself fortified to the utmost degree of effectiveness, we shall be secure in the western world. Such should be our military policy—such must be our defense.

THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF A SOUND NATIONAL ECONOMY

(Submitted to the House March 12, 1940)

In the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress the Republican minority united in adopting and putting forward a statement defining and clarifying the policy of national defense which they believed should appeal to the Congress and to the people. That statement of policy was presented to the House of Representatives. Subsequent action of the Congress was such as to justify the belief that this statement of policy and of the mission of our military forces in defense of it met with general approval. Nothing has occurred since then to alter this belief. Further study prompts the minority to submit to the House some considerations which it deems to be of the utmost importance at this time.

Our concern is heightened and intensified by what we see going on all over the world today. Recent events strengthen our determination that we shall remain at peace, and secure in that peace. As we plan for security we mean security not only in the physical or material sense, but, taking the long view, the security of our free institutions.

Our thoughts now turn to the present condition of our military services. In order that they shall be able to perform the mission assigned to them, it is obvious that we need them in adequate strength. It is when we come to give consideration to the strength of the services—not only strength in numbers but especially strength in material and equipment of all kinds—that we find ourselves confronting a difficult and complicated circumstance. It is conceded, we believe, that both the Army and Navy should be stronger if our military defense is to be adequate. We believe, further, that there would be little hesitation on the part of the Congress in adding very substantially to the present-day strength, especially in equipment, were it not for that circumstance which confronts us and which we must not ignore.

To reach a better understanding of it we must reexamine the broad outline of our participation in the World War. Upon doing so we are reminded that when we entered that war, in April of 1917, the national debt stood at $1,100,000,000. In the 18 months of our participation we spent something in excess of $35,000,000,000. To meet that expenditure we raised about ten billions through taxes. We borrowed the remainder and came out of the World War with a national debt of twenty-six billions. That wartime financing was accomplished with comparative ease, for when we began it the Government owed very little.

Compare that to our present situation. For 8 or 9 years the Federal Treasury has been running in the red. Through all of these years we have been spending much more than we have collected from taxes. The more we have spent the more we have borrowed. As a result, we have piled up a huge national debt. Present law provides that the national debt shall not exceed forty-five billions. It is now conceded that by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1940, the direct bonded debt will have approached forty-four billions. If our spending in the near future goes on at anything like the recent rate, the forty-five billion limit will be reached, the Congress will have to raise the limit, and we shall continue plunging along the reckless road.

Let us remember, therefore, that should we be drawn into a war of first magnitude we should have to start with a debt of at least forty-four billions, probably more, and then finance the effort on top of that debt. It is a prospect which must concern every thoughtful person in the land.

The President himself gave evidence of his concern when, in his message to the Congress, he suggested the imposition of a special tax calculated to produce revenue sufficient to meet the additional burden of the national defense and at the same time avoid the necessity of increasing the debt limit. While we share the President's apparent concern, we are convinced that the imposition of an additional special national-defense tax would be inadequate as a remedy and essentially unsound. It would not reach the heart of the problem.

No one at this time can foresee accurately the measures we might have to employ were we drawn into war, but all of us can visualize the danger to our institutions were we forced to resort to inflation, to confiscation, and ultimate repudiation. Could our free institutions survive such a strain? Similar institutions have perished in other lands within our time. Driven to such expedients, it might well be that we shall have failed actually in our defense.

Such a possibility should convince us that the most serious weakness in the armor of our national defense today is the existence of a national debt of $44,000,000,000. There it stands, towering, ominous. Much as we should like to, we cannot consider our problem solely in terms of soldiers and sailors, of divisions and battleships.

To deny that a healthy economic condition is vital to our national defense would be absurd. Our ability to mobilize and maintain the resources of the country in a major effort depends fundamentally upon the strength of our national economy. True, we need soldiers and sailors, divisions and battleships, with adequate modern equipment, but to secure their effectiveness in a long, grueling struggle, and at the same time to preserve our institutions, we must mend our ways.

It will not be an easy task. We have acquired a habit difficult to cast off. Many of our people, thoughtless of the consequences, laugh at debt and demand that spending shall go on. But it must be curbed, for we cannot go on this way and be secure in this troubled world.

The maintenance of our defense is linked with the maintenance of all other necessary activities of our Government. At the present juncture we cannot separate one from the other. The cost of the whole of them combined must be our concern as we strive to put our house in order.

To put it simply, our plea is that the Congress, and others in high authority, reestablish thrift as a virtue in the conduct of government, as it is a virtue in the conduct of the individual.

Below is the text of the announcement by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican leader in the House, on January 23, 1939, when the Special Conference Committee on National Defense was appointed:

"In recognition of the enlarged emphasis upon armaments and defense in the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Republican conference of the House unanimously has directed establishment of a Special Conference Committee on National Defense, to examine with particular care the rearmament proposals of the administration.

"The committee will be composed of 13 Members, with Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York, designated as chairman.

"National defense is in no sense a partisan issue, but it is a large concern of national policy which touches directly the welfare, prosperity, and security of every home in the land. In this aspect of the discussion, the Republican Members of the House recognize a great responsibility to the American people, that they shall exert every proper influence on the side of orderly and deliberative legislative procedure.

"In an extended executive session on January 20 the conference surveyed the whole field of foreign relations and defense, and agreed upon three principal concerns of Republican legislative policy, as follows:

"(1) To insure a sound integration of the land, naval, air, and industrial segments of the defense program in the interest of maximum efficiency and economy.

"(2) To invite a clear definition of the fixed foreign policy of the United States, as a measuring rod for the whole scheme of defense; and

"(3) To make certain that the projected rearmament program shall be directed exclusively to the defense and security of the Nation, rather than toward dangerous intervention in the international frictions and discords of other peoples.

"The Republican Party is committed to the proposition that the American people are determined to direct their energies, not toward war, but toward peace.

"In addition to the chairman, I have appointed the following Members to the special Committee on National Defense:

"MELVIN J. MAAS, of Minnesota, and RALPH E. CHURCH, of Illinois, from the Committee on Naval Affairs;

"WALTER G. ANDREWS, of New York, and DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, from the Committee on Military Affairs;

"D. LANE POWERS, of New Jersey, and J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania, from the Army and Navy subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee;

"LELAND M. FORD, of California, representing the Pacific States;

"HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho, representing the Mountain States;

"EARL R. LEWIS, of Ohio, representing the Central West;

"RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, representing New England;

"JAMES W. MOTT, of Oregon, representing the Pacific Northwest; and

"THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, representing the agricultural States.

"THE CAPITOL,

"January 23, 1939."

War Propaganda, 1917 and 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 28), 1940

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, under permission granted, I present for publication in the RECORD another of the articles

referred to by me at that time as being part of a series entitled "Twenty-five Years Ago."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTION PICTURES AND PROPAGANDA

Today, motion pictures are a part of American life. They exert a large influence with our citizens.

Some motion-picture producers are misusing the screen for war propaganda. Part of this is being done to make money. Part of it is to carry out the wishes of those who produce the shows and who are hopeful that this country become a participant.

It is announced that James Roosevelt is to distribute a film recognized as one to generate hate and bitterness, which in turn promotes a spirit of war hysteria.

The use of motion pictures for war propaganda in 1914–17 was limited because the pictures were not such a powerful influence as they are today. But this part of approach to the people of the United States was not overlooked. Miss Winifred Johnston, in her Memo on the Movies, a discussion of war propaganda from 1914–39, gives some interesting facts about the subject.

WAR PROPAGANDA, 1914–39

"What is truth?" said jesting Pilate. Sometimes the question would seem to be the actuating principle of propagandists as a whole and those of the movies in particular.

As propaganda the motion picture shares the seeming virtue of all photography; its evidence appears on the face of it to be unassailable. This is because it rests upon an assumption of truth to facts. The photograph is, first of all, assumed to be true in itself; that is, not "faked" or "doctored" in the actual negative or print. Secondly, the undoctored film is in turn assumed to represent the veriest reality, the "real" person, or the "real" happening.

How often this is untrue is just beginning to be perceived. The distortions of the "candid" photograph (particularly when assisted by unnatural angles and viewpoints) are only an indication of how the "real person" may be weirdly or viciously misrepresented in size, feature, and demeanor. But was the person real to begin with? Or was this individual only an actor—accomplished or unconscious—assuming for the occasion of the picture, the name, garb, and identity desired by the photographer?

Events have proved that photographers as well as photographs can lie. With the movies this danger becomes still more acute as news reels and documentaries are cut and assembled rather than being presented in their original continuities. When events are actually re-created for the camera, as in the March of Time and many semiofficial war movies, the editorial interpretation is inevitable. The whole sequence, as well as each enacted episode, must necessarily be considered as questionable—opinion rather than fact.

"I saw it in a picture," the naive say, and are inclined to consider their evidence as not to be denied. So the assumption of truth to facts persists and works its will in picture magazines and newsreels. Far too few are the inquiries as to the identity or motives of the owners of the magazine and theater or of the creators and distributors of the pictures themselves.

So strong is this illusion of reality that it hangs over theatrical movies as well as news reels. The propagandistic value of theatrical movies is actually double. The assumption of truth to facts which belongs to this peculiar medium—as it does, through another sense, to radio also—is further enhanced by that illusion of reality which is the quality of art. Children especially are susceptible to convictions arising from story movies. So are unsophisticated people in general—whether primitive or civilized. Even the literate and knowing find it difficult to separate themselves from the strong emotional appeal begotten of the identification that takes place between audience and hero. For these in particular, the better the movie, the better the propaganda.

News reels are obviously weapons in this psychological attack. But theatrical pictures also have their usefulness in impressing old and young with the final and conclusive idea—that war is a glorious means to a good end.

Films creating such opinion can be divided roughly into three groups. These may be listed, according to their purposes, in the chronological order in which they usually appear:

I. War itself is depicted as decisive, heroic, romantic. The glory of war is presented by means of glittering generalities, honor, liberty, democracy, empire, and what is known as card stacking—omission of facts, underemphasis of some facts, overemphasis of others, general distortion.

II. One of the sides is depicted as good—brave—a force for righteousness and civilization. The heroes are indicated by the device of transfer—presenting the characters or nations on that side in terms that rouse favorable connotations in the audience. Thus the term "democratic nations" includes in various propagandas such diverse governments and practices as those represented by the countries of North and South America, Great Britain, France, Russia, Turkey; and the term "law abiding nations" is applied to those nations willing to abide by the laws they made to favor themselves. If the audience can be thus led to identify itself continuously and sympathetically with these idealized heroes, the desires and ends of these protagonists are gradually accepted as desires and ends that not only are admirable but that also belong to the audience.

3. The other side—when at last selected—is depicted as brutal, depraved, lacking in abilities, decencies, and charm, a force for evil and barbarism. The villains are made repulsive and frightful by such devices as card stacking, transfer, and name calling (Huns, aggressors, godless nations, killer of women and children).

Records show that the screens of the world are always full of movies depicting war as decisive, heroic, and romantic. The side that is presented as good, brave, and righteous largely depends upon whose money financed the picture. Whatever party, country, or institution is claimed by the financial powers back of the movies will naturally be peopled by heroes—men whose cause has been uniformly right in the eyes of God and man—as proved by the historical pictures financed by these owners. Enough of these historical epics will be on the screens at all times to keep their audiences convinced that the financial agent's side has been the right side in all the critical moments of the world. The band-wagon device will urge the audience's loyalties by depicting that side not only as right but also as uniformly victorious.

"When the last group of pictures begins to appear—movies depicting a villain for the people to hate—the nations are usually already on their road to war."

Think! As you see some of the films now being shown on the screen, have you not seen the villain to be one of the belligerents of the present war?

Miss Johnston also gives this interesting data:

"The need was to create and sustain a war temper," Harry Alan Potamkin has written, repeating almost exactly the words of some of these civic leaders, "to eliminate all doubts, and to extract devotion, moral and material. The impressionable directors set to. Thomas Ince, producer of Civilization, emitted Viva la France. Slogan films were plentiful: Over There, To Hell With the Kaiser, For France, Lest We Forget. Love for our brothers in arms was instilled by films, domestic and imported, such as The Belgian, Daughters of France, Sarah Bernhardt in Mothers of France. * * * The vestiges of admiration for Germany were eliminated by films like The Kaiser, Beast of Berlin, The Prussian Cur, The Hun Within. A miniature Joan, Baby Peggy, joined the abominable harangue that children spat on fathers of families: "Don't be a slacker." An insidious propaganda among children was instituted and developed. The nonmilitary Boy Scouts had films made especially for them: Pershing's Crusaders, The Star-Spangled Banner, The War Waif, Your Flag and My Flag, serials like The English Boy Scouts to the Rescue, and Ten Adventures of a Boy Scout. The objector was shamed by 'don't bite the hand that's feeding you' movies: My Own United States, A Call to Arms, The Son of Democracy, The Man Without a Country, Draft 258, The Unbeliever, The Great Love, One More American, The Man Who Was Afraid. German atrocities were insisted upon: The Woman the Germans Shot. All branches of the service were gilded, Submarine *D–2*. * * * Douglas Fairbanks jumped from a roof for $100 for the Red Cross and Chaplin sold autographed halves of his hat. * * * The movie actors joined the California Coast Artillery; others organized the Lasky Home Guards. * * * The popular star, Robert Warwick, now a captain, was quoted in the fan press upon war's ennobling qualities."

For a while at least the propaganda worked. Even Carl Laemmle, as war came nearer the United States, responded, as did the millions of his compatriots. By the end of 1917 he had arranged for an impressive sheet of messages to be circulated through the motion-picture houses. The Vice President, Thomas Marshall, headed the list. Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Northcliffe followed with General Pershing, Cardinal Gibbons, members of the Cabinet, Ambassadors, university presidents, State Governors, and United States Senators, all whipping up the people's war fever and declaring that their slogan should be "Peace never until forever."

One message arrived too late for inclusion in this theater harrangue. It was from William Jennings Bryan, who had resigned from his office as Secretary of State rather than sign the second *Lusitania* note to Germany in 1915.

Very simply it declared: "When, except in case of invasion, declarations of war are submitted to the people for ratification before hostilities begin—then ambitious rulers and greedy commercial interests will be unable to plunge nations into unnecessary conflicts."

SAMUEL GOLDWYN

I recently gave to the Senate data on those who paid for the advertisements to get us more involved in the present conflict. One of those individuals who helped to pay for the advertisements was Samuel Goldwyn. This is not his first interest in such matters. Miss Johnson gives some data on the producer in the following words:

"When Adolph Zukor combined his Famous Players with the Lasky-Goldfish-DeMille organization in 1916, the man who was born Samuel Goldfish withdrew, taking $1,000,000 for his interest. By Christmas of the same year, Goldfish had effected a combination with Edgar Selwyn in the Goldwyn Pictures Corporation (whose name Goldfish finally adopted by law as his own).

"The Goldwyn concern specialized in authors. In his biography Goldwyn claims that Zukor countered by importing from England such writers as Arnold Bennett, Eleanor Glynn, and Sir Gilbert Parker. Eleanor Glynn was a confessed propagandist for France, and Sir Gilbert Parker was head of the American section (or Ministry of Information) of the British War Propaganda Bureau. In his history of the movies Terry Ramsaye states that it was Goldwyn who signed their contracts. The significant point is that these recognized Allied propagandists should be offered the freedom of American screens as they had already achieved domination of American lecture platforms.

"Goldwyn's first film, as a matter of fact, was not released until about the time the United States made formal announcement of its entry in the war. Before the war ended Goldwyn had enlisted the financial support of Frank Joseph Godsol, an American-born citizen of France, who had made a fortune in buying and selling war supplies in France. Godsol in turn interested the Du Ponts and other capitalists to the sum of $7,000,000 in cash. 'With this capitalization,' Goldwyn has said, 'all my financial struggles ended.' "

THEATER PROPAGANDA, 1916–17

Walter Millis, editorial writer for the New York Herald Tribune, notes in his book, The Road to War, the feeling of the motion-picture audiences preceding the last war. Let us read some statements from his book:

"The public which devoured these exposures of the Teutonic system of corruption and distortion of American opinion was but dimly conscious of the many systems operating to the same end on behalf of the Entente. When, in September, a motion picture made up of war films collected from within the Central Powers was released in New York it offered the American public practically its first chance * * * to see anything on the screen that admitted there were two sides to the war. But it was also in September that another and far more moving product of the cinematographic art received its first showing. This memorable addition to the pictorial backgrounds of the war years sprang from the marriage of two great minds. Into the hands of Commodore J. Stuart Blackton, a leading motion-picture producer of the spectacular school, there had fallen a copy (it seems to have fallen into the hands of nearly every literate person in the United States) of Mr. Hudson Maxim's Defenseless America. The commodore read it in a night and sprang for the motion-picture rights; the result was The Battle Cry of Peace.

"Hundreds of thousands of Americans were to witness this gory piece of incomparable propaganda for preparedness. They were to be thrilled and horrified by its portrayal of an unprepared America overrun by the brutal and licentious soldiery of a foreign power which, though unnamed, uniformed its troops in a strangely close imitation of the Germans. Assisted by tons of smoke powder and regiments of supers, Miss Norma Talmadge and Mr. Charles Richman personified the Nation in the agonies of an invasion far more horrible—and more exciting—than anything depicted in the censored films of the real war in Europe. Commodore Blackton's masterpiece, according to an historian of the motion picture, won warm endorsement from the belligerently minded, most conspicuously from Col. Theodore Roosevelt—national exploitation of the picture began; and it was soon inculcating an enthusiasm for big armament appropriations and fears and hatred for the Germans in theaters throughout the length and breadth of the United States."

HOLLYWOOD, SEPTEMBER 1939

Now, let us move the calendar 25 years to the beginning of the present world war.

Variety, one of the most informative papers of the screen and entertainment field, shows the trends toward war propaganda.

The first follows the declaration of war in September, in which it is "doubtful" in Hollywood how the war propaganda will be taken by the audience. Note the change as time progresses. The article of September 13, 1939:

"ANTIWAR FEELING IN UNITED STATES COOLS FILM-REISSUING PLANS

"Although all film distribs are rummaging through vaults for war pix that might be appropriate for reissue, they're not at all certain how many and to what degree they will hit the screens. Lists of prospective reissues are being compiled, but distribution execs are just sitting and waiting while they try to figure out which way the wind of public temper is blowing as regards things martial.

"There's a fear by officials that instead of being draws, because of their timeliness, war films may be actually repulsive to many people.

"One reissue actually being booked so far is the March of Time's Inside the Maginot Line, first released last October. It's being well received, but as it is of an educational nature it is naturally far removed from treatment of war in fictional form in an ordinary feature.

"Likely for reissue is RKO's Woman I Love (Miriam Hopkins and Paul Muni), originally released in April 1937. Muni plays French World War ace. RKO also is considering Lost Squadron for reissue.

"U NOT SURE OF DUO

"Universal during the past week has screened All Quiet on the Western Front and its sequal Road Back. Because the German soldiers and average German citizen is treated sympathetically in the film, there is some question as to what the response would be, in view of current feeling against all things pertaining to the Reich.

"Columbia recently turned out Clouds Over Europe, which will definitely not be reissued, partially because it was released only a short time ago and partially because it did tepid business. Col will, however, on September 30 release a new war film which is believed to be particularly well-timed, U-Boat 29.

"United Artists has under consideration Things To Come, with Raymond Massey, which originally unreeled in April 1936. If the war fever is decided a good bet to capitalize on, this is expected to be a particularly strong release because of the added stature Massey has gained in the legit production of Abe Lincoln.

"Monogram has resurrected Navy Secrets, a spy story, but isn't giving it much consideration. Metro, Par, Fox, and Republic either have nothing suitable or won't reissue anything.

WAR IS FACTOR IN BROADWAY FOLDS OF "ME" AND "WAY"

Decision to withdraw The American Way, at the Center, New York, September 23, and the probable closing of Leave It To Me, Imperial, Saturday (16) were week-end developments. The war may be partly responsible in curtailing attendance at both shows, scripts in each case having political contexts, comic in "Me" and serious in "Way." Preservation of United States neutrality ideals is said to have been a factor in lifting "Way," particularly since the drama is pointedly anti-Nazi. However, both suspended engagements after the late spring slump that attended the opening of the New York World's Fair, indicating that resumptions are difficult operations, although there have been exceptions.

By October, one finds this situation in Hollywood about propaganda films:

ANTI-NAZI SCRIPTS SHELVED BUT WAR THEMES GO ON

Desire of American producers to sidestep anything that might cause a finger to be pointed at them as violators of this country's neutrality has resulted in the indefinite shelving of at least 10 stories which were already bought and in some cases ready for the cameras.

Warner Bros. is believed to have the largest number of this type of property, mostly anti-Nazi, on hand. Among four or five they are reported to be holding up is the biography of Niemoller, German pastor, who was a U-boat commander in the last war and is now in a concentration camp. Another is Underground, story of the alleged secret movement within Germany to overthrow Hitler.

Metro has three anti-Nazi pieces which it has decided to allow to gather dust. They are I Had a Comrade, by Viscount Castlerose; Flotsam, by Erich Remarque; and The Mortal Storm, by Phyliss Bottome. Twentieth-Fox is understood to have two or three stories similarly on the shelf, one of which is I Married a Nazi, formerly tagged Swastika, by Oscar Schisgall.

An unusual situation has arisen with Escape, a book which was published by Little, Brown about a month ago and is rapidly becoming a best seller. It ran in the Saturday Evening Post as a serial. Although it has what might be looked upon as an anti-Nazi angle, it is being eyed by story editors. Book is understood written by a well-known author under the pseudonym of Ethel Vance, because she has relatives in Germany.

Aside from the anti-Nazi pix, practically all producers are going ahead with war films.

ARMS REPEAL AND BOX OFFICE

The lifting of the arms embargo was watched in Hollywood with much interest. But the headline of the story says "Arms repeal to boom box office." The story follows:

"ARMS REPEAL TO BOOM BOX OFFICE—BIGGEST GROSS FORECAST FOR 1940—SECTORS SUPPLYING WAR NEEDS CAN'T HELP BENEFITING, ESPECIALLY EAST OF THE MISSISSIPPI—75 PERCENT OF REVENUE THERE

" 'If peace doesn't break out,' as one theater operating executive of a major producer-distributor puts it, the arms embargo repeal should react to the benefit of film box offices within 2 or 3 months, and, on a continuance of the war, send 1940 into new and highest ground since the 1929 sinking.

"The fact that the great majority of receipts comes from communities east of the Mississippi that are important in the field of manufacturing or produce (wheat, cotton, oil, etc.) makes it doubly conclusive that if the arms embargo repeal is to set off a boom, the result on industry books is going to be very positive.

"It is estimated that about 75 percent of the rental returns and the gross admissions are from east of the Mississippi, although throughout portions of the Midwest in the farming belt and in the Southwest in oil and cotton territory, the reaction at the box office on war prosperity could be very important beyond the river.

"The experience of the last war was that the theaters didn't begin to ride the boom that was developed until about 6 months of fighting had gone on. That experience may be duplicated this time, also, as manufacturing progress and growing gets deeper under way in the face of increased market demands.

"Grosses are now running ahead of the same time last year but reported in theater statistical quarters that the tendency during the past 3 weeks has been to show signs of weakening a little instead of strengthening in spite of the fact the pictures on release are of normal quality or better.

"While the failure of grosses to forge ahead at this time is causing some pessimism, in view of pictures available on the market, operators believe this is due at the moment to the uncertainties that exist, the weeks of consideration of the arms embargo repeal in Washington, and possibly, for a time yet, the doubt as to what the repeal will mean to business generally.

"It is confidently believed that if a boom is to come, neither Washington nor anything else can stop profiteering and the soaring of prices, all of which would redound to the benefit of the theaters and enable upping of prices here and there. What would greatly rose-color the situation when the country is taken as a whole on grosses, would be the sudden return to life of scores of cities and towns where manufacturing has been at a very low ebb for years. This would also be true of farming communities which have suffered."

THE LION HAS WINGS

By January the British-produced The Lion Has Wings appeared in this country. It will be recalled that members of the United States Senate Naval and Military Affairs Committees were

invited to be special guests at the Washington showing. I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material about this incident.

Variety has this to say in its January 24 issue:

"First of the official British propaganda pictures to reach the United States since the outbreak of hostilities, The Lion Has Wings, demonstrates how film propaganda, as well as the other instruments of warfare, have progressed since the last war. Which isn't to say that this picture is a masterpiece. Far from it. But at least it's much more skillful than anything of the kind heretofore shown. As has been observed before, the English are shrewd propagandists.

"Film is part dramatic and part documentary. First portion is aimed to justify Britain's war stand, while the second part dramatizes the development and activities of the Royal Air Force. Although it presents nothing that hasn't been repeated over and over before, the early part dealing with the alleged war guilt is rather impressive. Using shots of Hitler addressing the Reichstag and purporting to take the Fuehrer's own words, it shows time and again how he made solemn pledges to the German people and the other nations. Then in each case the picture shows scenes of Nazi troops marching into territory which Hitler had promised not to violate. Thus a map of Germany and its surrounding countries is used to illustrate how the Nazi swallowed smaller nation after nation into the present Reich. In that part of the picture Producer Korda has even gone back to 1914 to revive the incident of the German Ambassador railing at the British for going to war over a 'scrap of paper.'

"After that argumentative (and reasonably convincing) portion, the picture swings into the dramatic story of the air force. First is heard the voice of Chamberlain addressing Parliament and broadcasting the declaration of war against Germany; and, as the scene shifts to a private home in London, Merle Oberon is shown listening to the radio. In one of the two or three genuinely affecting moments of the picture she and another girl silently listen as the Prime Minister concludes and the strains of God Save the King are heard.

"That leads into the human story that runs faintly through the rest of the film. But most of the dramatic portion stresses more the manufacture of munitions and planes for the war in the air. While much of the munitions-making shots are routine stuff, a few bits are instructive. And the parts dealing with the plan of defending England against air raids is intensely interesting. Reenacted air battles with raiding squadrons and the restaged Royal Air Force raid on the Nazi pocket battleships in the Kiel Canal are too obviously one-sided to be convincing, however. As one Missourian in the audience remarked loudly, 'If it's as easy as that, the war'd already be over.'

"Even so, the picture has undeniably logical arguments in the earlier portions and abounds in graphically effective air shots and illuminating technical details in the latter portions. If the dramatic story is humdrum and the acting negligible, the picture is still far above par in entertainment—for propaganda. And because of its timely quality and the obvious United States sympathy for its viewpoint, the film should also coin a neat profit."

Note that it is "far above par in entertainment—for propaganda." Also that the film "should coin a neat profit." A combination of propaganda and profit—something that is not unusual in war propaganda.

But the resentment caused the picture to be picketed. The two incidents recorded follow:

[Variety, Wednesday, April 24, 1940]

"LION HAS WINGS PICKETED IN ST. LOUIS AS PROPAGANDA

"ST. LOUIS, April 23.—Five 'nabes'—the Esquire, Norside, Uptown, Ritz, and Varsity—were picketed several days last week for showing the British made The Lion Has Wings (UA-Korda), which was shown for the first time locally in these houses. Members of the St. Louis Chapter of the League of Draftable Men, organized ostensibly to maintain neutrality in the United States, constituted the pickets.

"One, decked out in a silk hat, frock coat, and totin' an umbrella to resemble Premier Chamberlain, paraded in front of the Ritz. At all houses dodgers were distributed inviting passers-by to see the feature. The dodgers were signed 'Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill.' The pickets asserted the flicker was British propaganda and should not be shown. L. A. Bornero, general manager of the Ansell Bros. circuit, which owns and operates the Ritz and Varsity, said the film was booked for entertainment and it was not considered British propaganda.

"The picture shows British war preparations and is similar to a newsreel with a story starring Merle Oberon. An attaché at one of the theaters said the picketing bolstered the box office.

"SAN DIEGO DISTURBANCE

"SAN DIEGO, April 23.—Disturbance broke out in California (F-WC) here during blind preview of The Lion Has Wings. Member of audience shouted 'We don't want propaganda.'

"Someone answered, 'If you don't like it, why don't you go home?'

"Original voice shrieked, 'I think I will.'

"Commotion brought A. Roberts, manager, to scene. He escorted agent to box office, refunded admission, and sent him on his way."

CHANGING SENTIMENT

You will recall how the theatrical producers had fear about using war films in September of 1939. This had changed by June of 1940 when one finds noted that Noel Coward's Cavalcade would be revised. The story of the reissue:

"Principal hitch to whether the play will be done on Broadway in the fall is the uncertainty of what the war and international developments may be in the meantime. It was at first feared that Cavalcade would arouse audience resentment because of its pro-British flavor, but it is now figured that public sentiment in the United States has changed so rapidly that phase would be acceptable. However it is a question whether Coward can minimize the drama's defeatist attitude toward war without weakening it theatrically."

Then, a most interesting part of the story is given to the readers:

"After a couple of months' visit in the United States, the playwright clippered back to Europe last Sunday to resume his official duties in Paris for the British Government."

Link the two paragraphs together and note the reasons.

LORD LOTHIAN TELLS ACTORS TO STAY HERE

Speaking of the value of actors in the American theater, Lord Lothian was quoted by the British consul in Los Angeles that the British actors "were doing a far better job for their country by continuing their professional work and representing British character on the screen than by going into combat units."

The British consul, Eric Martin Cleuth, declared that he had gone to Washington to talk to Lord Lothian about these actors and that the judgment was that they were "doing a far better job for their country" by remaining here in the United States.

The British actors resented a statement by Sir Seymour Hicks who had said that these actors were "gallantly facing the footlights" in the United States.

Laurence Olivier and Herbert Wilcox replied that they had been informed by British authorities that they would be doing the best possible service to their country by remaining in the United States and representing the British character.

They were enlisted in the war service of England, the service of propaganda in the United States.

In the new book War Propaganda and the United States the authors discuss the fact that Lord Lothian has not overlooked this motion-picture propaganda:

"Lord Lothian staged the first major Hollywood coup. He conferred with George J. Schaefer, president of R. K. O., and at the conference a picture was born. Schaefer agreed to advance capital to finance a production which would be created entirely by French and British performers in Hollywood, with the proceeds allocated to Anglo-French relief agencies. R. K. O. also consented to distribute the film at actual cost. Among those who immediately volunteered to act were Brian Aherne, Charles Boyer, Cary Grant, Vivien Leigh, Charles Laughton, Victor Saville, and Herbert Wilcox. A great theme was expected to be chosen."

A glance at some of the pictures is very interesting:

FILM REVIEWS

Notes from the film-review sections:

AN ENGLISHMAN'S HOME

"Starting slowly, the story gains in impetus as it goes along. Designed for propaganda, it will serve its purpose and should do business in this country." (Variety.)

TORPEDOED

"In many ways the picture is strong propagandic, but no complaint will be raised about that. The box-office potentialities are fairly promising." (Variety.)

MAD MEN OF EUROPE

"Film, which tends to showcase the 'invasion' of England by Nazi parachutists, is hysterically shrieking, inept propaganda. The market for this one in the United States should be decidedly limited despite the vast exploitation possibilities." (Variety.)

PASTOR HALL

"Purely and simply a denunciation against nazi-ism. As such it is tremendously effective and should be valuable propaganda for the Allies." (Variety.)

BEASTS OF BERLIN

"Its treatment is precisely the sort calculated to inflame mob passions during a period of growing hysteria. As propaganda it may have some effect, since it's all easily understood and likely to appeal to ready hatreds." (Variety.)

"CONFESSIONS OF A NAZI SPY—PACKS BIGGER PUNCH TODAY

"Confessions of a Nazi Spy, which returned in a reissue to the Metropolitan yesterday, is vastly more important in many ways now than it was the first time, primarily because you will see it in such an entirely different light.

"The picture first appeared more than a year ago as an exposé of a sensational spy trial then just completed in the United States District Court in New York, involving 18 persons convicted of stealing military secrets for a foreign power. We thought of it mostly as a scandal, and of the German-American Bund meetings it so vividly pictures as something slightly fantastic. Few, if any, of us took it seriously.

"Today we are faced with the actual possibility of invasion, and the Nation is in the midst of a tremendous effort to arm quickly, sufficiently, and without hysteria. Simply put, the Nation a year ago thought of all these things as remote. Today they are desperately close to home. That was evidenced by the alternate hissing, booing, and applause that yesterday afternoon's audience at the Metropolitan expressed continuously.

"Though the show has no outstanding stars, Edward G. Robinson as the Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is as close to the lead as anyone. Francis Lederer as the deluded would-be spy, George Sanders as the Nazi contact man, and Paul Lukas as the bund leader and American fuehrer are all excellent. Also

the steadying influence of the United States attorney by Henry O'Neill is gratifying.

"To take us another step along in the scene, the Metropolitan offers some excellent films of the Allied retreat from Dunkirk, now hailed as a military miracle." (Washington Daily News.)

MORTAL STORM

"It is not the first anti-Nazi picture to come from Hollywood. A remake of an earlier blast, openly titled 'Confessions of a Nazi Spy,' is plying a return engagement just down the street at the Met. Out at the Open Air this week is something called Hitler, the Beast of Berlin. Both hit at the same madness, the one exposing its inroads over here, the other purporting to show its ultimate horror over there. Both are shocking, sensational, frantic tirades." (Washington Daily News.)

WAR SPIRIT IN WASHINGTON

A glance at the newspapers in Washington will give an insight to the use of the screen to build up the war spirit. In the Daily News of May 18, 1940, one will find this comment:

"WAR ECHOES HIT NEW HIGH AT TRANS LUX

"The drums of war form the pit orchestra at the Trans Lux this week. After we see amazing pictures of total war in Europe in all its phases and its savage suddenness. Mr. Roosevelt talks to a stirred Congress and legislators and executives reecho his determination to make this country ready for any emergency. It's difficult to view all the scenes from abroad and our own official alarm without feeling a flicker of hysteria.

"Years of Hollywood spectacles have dulled us to wholesale fires and destruction, but the knowledge that all of this was grimly real and happening with lightning devastation kept the audience on the edges of its seats last night.

"Most graphic is the burning of Namsos in Norway, after being fired by the German bombers."

Then, note the words of Sidney Rogerson as to how the United States would be propagandized for our entrance into war. Here are Mr. Robertson's words:

"Similarly with news-reel men. They should be the first to be allowed to 'shoot' horror pictures of air raids in order that the proper volume of pictorial horror will be available in one of the few great countries where 'atrocity propaganda' will still be operative."

One week later, one finds this comment:

"In the Trans Lux bill of the news reel this week, the war is made so vivid you can picture yourself, almost too easily, in place of Europe's unfortunates. Pictures that would be called maudlin if they had been authored in Hollywood, like the shots of Poland's bombed hospitals and churches, are far too real to evoke anything but horror in their audiences. * * * Other news shows the Germans consolidating their positions in Norway and their air force raining bombs on Belgium and France."

In June 1, 1940 issue, the audience reaction is discussed in the following manner:

APPLAUSE AND HISSES GREET NEWS REELS AT TRANS LUX

Sustained applause for Senator CLAUDE PEPPER'S fiery interventionist speech and hisses for shots of Messrs. Count Ciano and Hitler by audiences at the Trans Lux's new show this week provide a dramatic cross section of current public opinion."

"Skillful news handling by the film editors—which put the sickening scenes of hospitals deliberately bombed by the Nazis just before shots of Senator PEPPER'S speech—might have been responsible, but the audience's reaction, themselves, are almost warlike."

This review, of course, must be short. Only a small number of references could be given but they indicate the use of the motion pictures for war propaganda. One of the first things in successful war propaganda is to generate hate. Part of the films being shown in the United States are in that category, to spread hate. To get people ready to enter war requires this development.

It is to be regretted that the motion pictures which should be for entertainment help build a psychology of bitterness, which in turn destroys entertainment and brings disaster and ruin.

What Are the Chances of the G. O. P. Ticket?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

RADIO PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings of the American Forum of the Air on Sunday, July 7, 1940:

Announcer STEPHEN MCCORMICK. Listeners from coast to coast are invited to hear the American Forum of the Air. We bring you another program presented by WOL in cooperation with WOR and emanating tonight from the Willard Room of the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

Information as to how you may receive a copy of tonight's proceedings will be given at the conclusion of the broadcast.

Tonight the American Forum of the Air will be presented in the form of short statements, followed by an informal panel discussion. Questions anent tonight's subject are invited from the audience here present.

This series of programs is arranged and presented by Theodore Granik, founder and director of the American Forum of the Air, as well as the American Forum, nationally syndicated newspaper feature. Mr. Granik will act as chairman and moderator.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. McCormick.

It will be some time before political big-wigs stop discussing the "blitzkrieg" in Philadelphia, where Republicans invaded the City of Brotherly Love to nominate their standard-bearers. It was an amazing convention—nothing exactly like it ever happened before in American politics. A new name emerged on the political scene—Wendell L. Willkie, who until a few days ago was president of the Commonwealth and Southern Corporation, and who stated to newspapermen that he had never considered himself a candidate until some 30 or 40 days before the convention.

As the delegates got under way, the town was a beehive of activity. All about there were rumors of deals. Everybody seemed to have inside information as to possible trades and vote switching. And there were dark horses and speeches aplenty.

But with the third day a new excitement started. Delegates were besieged by letter, telephone, and wire with a "We want Willkie" campaign and the galleries were shouting this slogan time after time, like a college yell. And while a rising suspense hung over Philadelphia, with delegates debating with each other, high pressured from all sources, managers of every candidate predicted a confident victory. Somewhat general on controversial domestic issues, the platform's foreign policy plank declared, "The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace." This brought a retort from the New York Times that the Republican Party is not entitled to call itself the exclusive "peace party" of the United States.

Following the ringing nominating speeches, a tense convention awaited the balloting.

Amid the cheers of hoarse gallery-ites, early leaders began to slip. Pledged delegates switched, and slowly it became apparent that the Willkie boom was on the way to victory. In the bedlam following Senator Reed's tossing of Pennsylvania's 72 votes to the nominee, Governor Bricker, of Ohio, moved that the choice be made unanimous. Worn-out delegates returned to their hotels, to come back the following day and nominate CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, popular minority leader of the United States Senate, as Mr. Willkie's Vice Presidential running mate.

With Democrats about to gather in Chicago on July 15 to nominate their standard bearers; with speculation running wild regarding the President's third-term intentions, and Candidate Willkie's remark that he would like to "meet the Champ," everyone wants to know, "What are the chances of the G. O. P. ticket?" As legislative leaders of both parties have begun to fire their big guns for and against the platform and the candidates, the American Forum of the Air has invited four prominent Members of our Congress, two Republicans and two Democrats, to present their views tonight. Next Sunday night we hope to present a group of outstanding newspaper writers in a preview of the Democratic Convention from Chicago.

Tonight you will first hear short prepared statements by Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois; Congressman T. V. SMITH, Democrat, also of Illinois; Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, Republican, of Michigan; and Congressman SAM HOBBS, Democrat, of Alabama.

Immediately following they will engage in an informal round-table extemporaneous panel discussion.

And now, our opening speaker, Congressman DIRKSEN.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

In 1932 the voters of this Nation elected Franklin D. Roosevelt by an overwhelming majority. It was not a case of placing a new party in power. It was not a case of adopting a platform. It was a case of electing a sparkling, dynamic personality. It was a case of making a change. It was a case of weariness resulting from the failure of the party in power to initiate needed reforms. It was a desire for a new emotional pattern. It was a desire for swift action. It was a case of a nation, suffering from the repeated shocks of the depression, groping for the spark that would set it right and restore recovery. It was a desire for virile and comforting leadership in an hour of acute distress. In 1940 these same factors are present to indicate that the Republican Party, under the leadership of Wendell Willkie, will prevail.

Change is eternal. Many years ago a professor at Johns Hopkins University announced a new scientific discovery. His associates promptly examined into his discovery and tore it to pieces. In desperation he asked, "Is there nothing eternal?" To this one of his associates replied: "Nothing save change." The American people have a rare gift of sportsmanship and patience. They elect a President and bear with him through trials and tribulations. They applaud his triumphs and temper the severity of their comment over his failures. Finally, the age-old instinct for change manifests itself. Call it a new trend if you will. Call it disillusionment. Call it weariness. Call it what you will. A casual examination of our history from the beginnings of the Republic indicate

how effectively this instinct has operated for 160 years. It is operative today. A new trend or change is at hand and Wendell Willkie is the spearhead of that new trend.

The American people patiently abide the failures of an administration. But at long last they demand results. They want a victory over the problems which this or any other administration promises to solve. We see it in the incident of the Sangamon County farmer who, while talking to Lincoln about his prospects of election to office after so many defeats at the polls, said: "Abe, I want to support you, but somehow you never win." The people want a victory over the problem of joblessness, but after more than 7 years unemployment is still our primary problem. The farmers want a victory over the problem of inadequate prices, but that problem is still with us. The people want a victory over the problems of expanding debt and increasing taxes, but those problems are more aggravated today than at any time in the history of the Nation. After making due allowance for the many good things which the administration has accomplished, the primary problems of unemployment, low farm prices, business stagnation, debt, and taxes are still here. People will be seeking a leader who in his own field of private endeavor has evidenced remarkable results in behalf of the thousands for whom he has served as a leader and a trustee.

There must be a resurgence of the will to recover prosperity, and Wendell Willkie has the capacity for supplying the spark. How many millions of people have at one time or another said, "We are the world's wealthiest Nation. We have everything. We have natural resources, manpower, money, fertile acres, ingenuity, resourcefulness. Why don't we go forward? Why can't we have prosperity and plenty instead of distress and want? Why don't somebody do something about it?" That is despair speaking. That is frustration speaking. That is the expression of a hope that someone will supply the mystic spark to the dormant will. Defeatism must be driven away. That is why Wendell Willkie has captivated the fancy of people in all walks of life. He is regarded as the embodiment of a new trend. People will listen to him. And listening people become supporters.

Wendell Willkie brings a new emotional pattern to America. It is the pattern of plain and rugged speech coupled with a rugged conscience. He is the best example of a sterling conscience which rebels at the foibles and unfairness of government. As a trustee for 20,000 people who had millions invested in the power properties of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation he watched public funds being used to build huge generating plants to compete with his people. He saw public funds used to buy and build transmission lines with which to liquidate the investments of the citizens for whom he was a trustee. He saw P. W. A. loans and grants go to southern cities to build duplicate transmission lines with which to take away his customers and put his people out of business. He saw all this and then was forced to capitulate to an all-powerful Government and take what it offered for his properties. Who can contemplate all this without realizing that in government as elsewhere there must be a conscience to dictate the government's relationship with its citizens? Sooner or later the citizenry become acutely aware of this condition and join the following of one who embodies this philosophy. And as they follow Wendell Willkie, his party will prevail.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman DIRKSEN.

And now we present Congressman T. V. SMITH, of Illinois.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN T. V. SMITH

I myself believe so deeply in politics and in politicians that to me the question of who can win any election boils down to the deeper question, Who is most worthy to win it? In a two-party system, either party is worthy to win. In considering which party is this time more worthy to win, we may safely disregard the Republican platform. But for a little change of emphasis here, a little pecadillo picking there, and a little sweet carping all over the lot, the declared Republican principles are but a rehash of what it has taken the Democrats 8 years to make into acceptable doctrine.

We might say the same thing for the Republican candidate—that the Democratic Party made him possible—but the saying would not be wholly true. What is true is this: It is Mr. Roosevelt's dash and daring that nerved, not to say nagged, the Republican Party into nominating a man like Mr. Wendell Willkie. Think of the party of Harding, convivial if not corrupt; think of the party of Coolidge comfortable if not complacent; think of the party of Hoover, inept if not choleric; think of that party following Willkie—Willkie, the corporate magician, if not, with Mr. DIRKSEN, the coming mystic spark of our national resurrection. Of that you can think at all only because Mr. Roosevelt has got you used to it while getting the Republicans nerved to it. Temperamentally, Mr. Willkie is a miniature Franklin Roosevelt.

I say a "miniature" rather than a second Roosevelt for one simple, though one compelling, reason—a reason which turns on the matter of experience, negatively and positively. The plain truth is that Mr. Wendell Willkie has nearly all the wrong sort of experience and next to none of the right sort for the Presidency. Not a week in either State legislature or National Congress, nor a single day as chief executive of any American Commonwealth. Presumably he is a very able man, as he is clearly a charmer of Republican conventions. Mr. Willkie, you see, elected to go the corporate way of experience and so has naturally developed what Mr. William Allen White, a Willkie promoter, has described as "a business rather than a political mind." Let us have no misunderstanding about this: the kind of experience which Mr. Willkie has is excellent, is indeed indispensable, for what it is excellent for. But this is not the experience which fits one for something entirely different like politics. Such experience largely unfits one for democratic politics, though, I doubt not, it would be excellent in Italy, where politics is fascism and where fascism is the politics of the corporate state.

There are two reason why I hold the Willkie experience against him, and these reasons are weighty to me, still a political apprentice after 6 years' earnest effort in State legislature and National Congress.

1. The first is that corporate experience makes one an interested party in the game which government must be disinterested about. Why, it was Mr. Willkie's one-sided interest in a certain power corporation and apparently that primarily drove him out of the Democratic Party in 1936 and made him available as Republican nominee in 1940.

2. The second one is that corporate experience gets one in a certain habit of high-handedness which is very bad for democratic cooperation. (A virtue there becomes a vice here, and in an emergency it might develop into a crime.) To hire and fire in business is one thing, but to cooperate with equals in politics is quite something else again. In our form of government, the mightiest President cannot fire, nor very often hire, a single Congressman, not even the humblest. I blanched for plain Republican shame and, I may add, with a little fear for democratic procedure, when over the radio I heard Mr. Wendell Willkie in his debut before the convention say "You Republicans." Try that a few times on Congress, not to say on farmers and laborers—and then talk of national unity? Shades of unity.

To summarize: Experience in big business is not political experience save under a foreign form of government. The experience required for successful democratic politics is experience in politics itself. Of this Mr. Willkie has none. Charm developed in big business is not the kind of charm that makes democratic politics charming.

And speaking now of another thing—i. e., of who is most worthy to win in 1940—I wonder whether the American people will turn over to an utter political novice the most important political job in the world at one of the most dangerous moments of our whole national life. I wonder and doubt.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman T. V. SMITH.

We now present as our third speaker Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRED L. CRAWFORD

What are the chances for the G. O. P. ticket? Fundamentally, they are the best we have faced during the present century. I am a conservative in thought and deed. I was taught to be so by a grand Scotch father. Six years' service in the House and in the atmosphere of and under New Deal pressure, has not changed me. I still speak and vote conservatively, and I now submit the reasons why the G. O. P.'s chances are good.

The American people have again discovered themselves. Although they were for a number of years lulled to sleep on the pillow of "the state" and were led to believe the Government was an everlasting milk cow, they have now come back to themselves.

The present generation has had its splurge of irresponsibility; it has found that parties alone cannot conduct free government. Permitted to do so, parties will demand more and more power—and still more dictatorial power in order to be able to administer the country. If an irresponsible electorate permits, the substance of the people, as the citizen delivers it to the tax box, will be consumed by the politician as a form of manna, to perpetuate himself in office. A sleeping electorate encourages the political procurer to act as a purveyor of public funds back to the local parish in the form of "gravy." This practice dulls the conscience of the voter; destroys the fiscal structure of government; decreases pride in national life; and it leads the people to think only in terms of local projects instead of along national lines. This practice creates a localized individual selfishness that positively will not support a free government.

Government derives its just powers from the consent of those governed. National defense is much more than social reforms. Permitted to do so, the politician will, under an appropriate catch phrase, make call after call upon the people to which they will respond for more and more tax dollars. In due course the taxpaying citizen naturally questions the use of the funds and, invariably, will find the substance has been applied to promote more so-called social reforms.

This has happened in most all of the countries of western Europe, particularly in France and England. We are, I trust, quite familiar with the fact of the parallel in our own policies, here in the United States, in recent years.

Free men and women have duties to perform as well as rights to enjoy. For too many years we have had preached to us the easy way of life. God Almighty has arranged the affairs of mankind so that the idea that "government won't let you down" can remain in control for just about so long a time. Then there comes an awakening. If it comes too late, the people—like the French—become the slaves of some stronger group.

Now our people are, before it is too late, we hope, participating in a rebirth. The American voter is now in a frame of mind which demands a degree of statesmanship from his legislators. The voter now insists upon the interests of the Nation being placed before those of the individual politician and his party. Those who falsely preach that the proper duty of government is to arrange an easy way of life can no longer lead the voter.

The voters of this Nation have again determined that, under God, citizens of both sexes are going to defend their country,

preserve its liberties, and bequeath to their children an opportunity to live under a free government.

For a decade the voters of this country have witnessed a debauch which, like rich food, palls their taste and becomes nauseating. They have had enough of this leveling of the Nation and the people always down to a lower level. Our people are now ready—yea! They are eager to correct and eliminate those fallacious policies which brought us near the brink of ruin. Our awakening is rude. We face a terrific task. Those who were thinking of retiring must now go back to work.

Our Nation is not yet lost; it is not yet beaten. We, the people, have made colossal errors, but we are now anxious to correct them.

The voters will now support the new leader, "Win" Willkie, and help him transform this country, and—

1. Take its natural resources and create jobs for 9,000,000 workers in private industry.
2. Break the spell gold has over us.
3. Remove the dangerous inflationary threat involved in its present status and stop the further purchases of foreign gold.
4. Put the $20,000,000,000 of gold bullion we now own directly to work for the taxpayers.
5. Prevent it from being dissipated through giving it away to the central banking systems of the world in a futile attempt to restore the so-called international gold standard.
6. Put the $1,000,000,000 worth of foodstuffs and fibers now held by a Government agency, the Commodity Credit Corporation, back into the channels of trade and then into consumption before it becomes another loss to chalk up against the taxpayer.
7. Bring life to a dying cotton South which has lost its historical cotton export market, and now definitely looms as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem.
8. Put order into Government fiscal affairs, raise the necessary funds to provide an adequate peacetime and defense Budget, and all without further destroying our private enterprise system with improperly applied taxes and more Government competition.
9. Proceed to collect a large portion of the $14,000,000,000 owed us by the European countries.
10. Prevent the dumping in our markets of loot taken from the conquered countries.

The voters will support "Win" Willkie in making our Nation strong enough to command fear, and the respect of every aggressor; stop our growing weakness, and provide a modern aircraft development to bolster our faltering military and naval program.

Understanding our American enterprise system, "Win" Willkie can weld a sound Pan American Union either on a triangular trade basis or, if forced by the totalitarian countries of Europe and Asia to do so, he can place our hemispherical defense in a position to deal blow for blow until the opposition grows weary and reasonable. entitled to public confidence and support, a party must keep itself operated by "reds." This program—this necessity—demands a leader who has no taint of the wastrel or of the fallacious philosophy of the past decade. "Win" Willkie is a graduate of the school of hard knocks.

Nominee Willkie is not a politician, therefore he will be engaged in rebuilding the physical and moral forces of this Nation instead of just playing politics. That is what the people expect and will get from him—and they will like it.

The G. O. P. is now the young people's party. The people will support the G. O. P. ticket because they know "it is back to work we go" if there are to be any more "happy days."

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman CRAWFORD. And now as our concluding speaker in the first half of tonight's forum we present Congressman SAM HOBBS, of Alabama.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN SAM HOBBS

The question assigned for discussion tonight, "What are the chances of the G. O. P. ticket?" is too vague to present an issue. This is deplorable.

The question, of course, is not "What chance has the G. O. P. ticket to win?" for there is no possible question as to that, and if that were the question, truthfulness would compel the only candid answer—"None."

But, phrased as it is, there are almost as many answers as there may be minds considering the question.

For instance, there is the chance for the G. O. P. immediately to contribute to the prosperity of many and the relief of unemployment by the simple expedient of hiring enough help to make this look like a real campaign. That chance is good, for their war chest, as usual, will be huge and full.

Another good chance the Republicans have is to carry a State or two other than Vermont and Maine. Some voters enjoy varying the monotony somewhat.

Still another good chance, which the G. O. P. improved greatly at Philadelphia and which is brightening every minute, is to die. Mr. Willkie himself says, "Party lines will fade in November." Should this be "the last round-up" for the elephant, I shall be among the mourners, for I like most Republicans—they're nice people; what they lack in religion they make up in education and etiquette.

This new, glamorous chauffeur of the Republican taxi may attract a few prospective fares to the old, old bus dolled up for the occasion, but there's no gasoline in its tank. It takes the gasoline of sound thinking to motivate a winning political party. To be entitled to public confidence and support, a party must keep itself abreast of the times, equipped to serve modern needs. The Democratic Party has what it takes. It is the party of progress as well as of principles; of performance rather than promises. The Republican Party, to the contrary, hasn't had a progressive thought since the Emancipation Proclamation. For 75 years the only words in the elephant's vocabulary have been "Me, too." Read the Philadelphia platform. Doesn't it O. K. everything the Democratic Party has done? Which of the great, progressive services inaugurated by the party of the people would the party of pillage repeal? Not one. Yet for 8 years the old elephant has trumpeted violent opposition to every one of these measures that he now endorses with a faint "Me, too."

But this is nothing new. Thus it hath ever been. What political blessing has ever come to America which was not achieved by the Democratic Party?

Some of the achievements of the Democratic Party:

Thomas Jefferson—Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of petition, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, the Louisiana Purchase.

Andrew Jackson—Yoke of the money power thrown off—abolition of the bank of the United States, acquisition of California, admission of Texas to the Union.

Grover Cleveland—Creation of the civil service.

John Tyler Morgan—The Isthmian Canal, promoting trade, and making one Navy do the duty of two for 30 years.

Woodrow Wilson—Federal Reserve System, Federal farm-loan banks, Underwood tariff law, Burnett restricted immigration law, Bankhead good-roads law, Muscle Shoals development, World War insurance, compensation and bonus, budget system, Oliver creation of Appropriations Committee, Parcel Post Service.

Franklin D. Roosevelt—Banks saved; Steagall insurance of bank deposits law; business saved (national income upped from thirty-eight to sixty billion dollars); unemployment reduced; bread and soup lines eliminated; wages increased, hours shortened, working and living conditions improved; sweatshops and child labor abolished; farm income doubled; system of farm credits established; principle of parity prices for farm products recognized; surplus commodities made a blessing instead of a curse; farm and home foreclosures stopped and millions of others averted; soil conservation made a national practice; direct relief; public-works program; C. C. C.; T. V. A.; R. E. A.; National Youth Administration; public schools saved; national defense strengthened immeasurably; 20 ships laid down in 12 years of Republican coupon clipping; 115 ships laid down in 7 years of Democratic administration before the present program; kidnaping stamped out; reciprocal-trade agreements, making righteous tariff reductions, promoting world trade, and peace; social security begun and then strengthened; beginning of freight-rate justice; righteous principles of international law proclaimed and pleas for peace repeatedly and forcefully made; "fifth column" activities checked and counteracting laws passed; the greatest program for peace by national defense in all history begun.

We must be fair, however. There have been some Republican blessings:

The high protective tariff, which has robbed every worker on farm and in mine, forest, or factory.

Unjust, discriminatory freight rates.

The great depression.

But they say their glamour-boy has political "it" and "oomph," and that, though he is one of the heads of the power trust, he reduced the price of electricity. Those who would seduce must be seductive. The burglar who surrenders his stolen swag after his arrest, when the spotlight of the cop is fully upon him, is entitled to the same amount of credit as is the Power Trust for reducing rates after its arrest and exposure.

The father of Republicanism, Alexander Hamilton, frankly taught that Government should make the rich so rich that the rest of us could eat of the crumbs falling from their groaning tables. His philosophy still dominates the G. O. P.

The Democrats, tutored by Thomas Jefferson, have always believed in prosperity for all.

In recent history, the post-World War No. 1 period, we grew hard with Harding, cool with Coolidge, hungry with Hoover, but everything has grown rosy with Roosevelt. That hue suffuses the sky of our national life. A new day—a new, better era—is here. The American people know it, too, is the gift of the Democrats, and that only by continuing in power the party of performance can the future be assured.

After the Democratic victory in November the camp of the Republicans will be as dark and cold as was Elwood, Ind., when the natural gas gave out.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman HOBBS. This concludes part 1 of our program. And now as part 2 of tonight's American Forum of the Air, we present an informal panel discussion. Congressman DIRKSEN will open the discussion.

Congressman DIRKSEN. Mr. Granik, I should like to make an observation and probably ask a question of my friend and colleague, Mr. SMITH. He spoke some about the lack of experience of Mr. Willkie in political office. Well, it is rather singular that our Democratic brethren have been mentioning Attorney General Jackson for the Presidency, who has never held so much as the position of alderman on a city council. They have even mentioned Mr. Wallace of the Department of Agriculture, who has never held a political office. They have mentioned Mr. Farley, who has held a lot of party offices, but who has never held public political office.

I make another answer to that, and that is that Mr. Willkie, who has been the trustee and the steward of a property where more than $1,000,000,000 was invested, numbering hundreds of thousands of consumers and thousands of investors, has had so much experience in contacting the public, in seeking to interpret public desire, that he has a broad, fundamental foundation for public office that is

unmatched anywhere, and finally let me say to my good friend, T. V. SMITH, with respect to his corporative experience, T. V., don't forget that in 1929 there was a shingle hanging out at 52 Wall Street, and the name on that shingle was Roosevelt and O'Connor, attorneys at law, and they were doing corporate business.

Congressman SMITH. It was such a little bit of a baby of a business that they were doing, though.

Congressman DIRKSEN. They were doing plenty of business up there, and, in addition, Franklin D. was the director of any number of corporations at the time.

Congressman SMITH. I thank you, DIRKSEN, for calling my attention to the lack of experience, as you say, in a good many Democratic aspirants, but I call attention in the first place to the fact that none of them have "blitzkrieged" the Democratic convention yet into nominating them for President. Second, every one you mention is a Cabinet officer, I believe, which constitutes a type of political experience that is a thousand miles nearer to the genius of our democratic form of government than any type of business experience can constitute. I don't deny that there is a good deal of virtue in the type of experience that Mr. Willkie has had and I have no doubt that he has turned it to the very best possible advantage for himself and for his stockholders, but the simple truth remains that anybody whose entire experience has been in one of the industrial aspects of American life, where there are plenty of other competitors, simply has not any type of political experience to justify a hope that he can be an effective President of the United States. Since man to man is so unjust, as the restaurant maxim goes, we never know just whom to trust. We have trusted many to our sorrow. Let them say today——

Congressman DIRKSEN. T. V., let me interrupt there a moment. Perhaps too much political experience is unwise, too. I am satisfied that Mr. Willkie, through his lack of experience, as you put it, certainly wouldn't undertake to pack the Supreme Court and send a "must" calendar up to Congress every time we have been in session the last 8 years.

Congressman SMITH. You wait until Mr. Willkie runs into some type of obstacle and you will see what he does. You are taking too much on trust about him.

Congressman DIRKSEN. You should see the warm smile that he has. His countenance is an open book.

Congressman SMITH. He has been used to having his way. You know this business yourself, DIRKSEN; you have spent years at this business, and you are extraordinarily effective at it. You know you weren't worth a continental the first day you were in Congress. I was not, and I am not worth much yet. You are extraordinarily able because you know this game, and nobody can learn it in a few days.

Congressman DIRKSEN. He has had contact with the public, and that has been his business for a great many years.

Congressman CRAWFORD. I should like to ask our friend and colleague, Mr. SMITH, to expound just a little bit on the two thoughts he gave us, the first with reference to the acceptable doctrines, which the administration has given us in the last few years. In the first place, as I recall, the voters at the last election in November 1938 sent about 75 or 80 new House Members down here on the Republican side, which would indicate to me that the doctrines which were being followed were not quite so acceptable.

Another point is with reference to Mr. Willkie's corporate experience. If I have not misled myself the last few weeks, it appears that this Nation is in the middle of a bad fix and needs some very serious fixing up from the standpoint of national defense, and I have also led myself to believe that the President is now calling upon the corporate enterprises of this country to build that national defense in the form of tanks, antiaircraft guns, ships, and so forth and so on. Where will we be if we politicians keep palavering around and wind up within 5 or 10 years from now with having just played politics for 8 or 10 more years and not any national defense?

Would you give us just a little more light about those two points, about acceptable doctrines and corporate experience?

Congressman SMITH. The trouble is, Mr. CRAWFORD, that all the crying around about politics that has been done has been done by the new Republicans, who don't know any better. They ball up the machinery of Congress. It is one thing, however, to have new Members of Congress where you always have enough old Members to season them and break them in, as we have broken these new Republicans in, until they are now becoming almost responsible devotees of our defense program, and it is another thing to put a man in the single office of the United States where there is no competitor, but where he must deal with equals, and where all of his experience has been the experience of being able to have his way, to order things done—that is a very serious matter, in my opinion.

Congressman CRAWFORD. Of course, this is the first time I have known the Democrats to admit that the new Republicans we have—with the Democrats having over two-thirds majority in both the House and Senate—have gummed up the works and blocked the program and prevented the Democrats from having their way. That certainly is news to me.

Congressman SMITH. I am talking about playing politics. We have been able to keep you in line and have been successful in getting the program along.

Mr. Wendell Willkie is a Roosevelt Democrat when it comes to that defense question.

Congressman DIRKSEN. I would like to point out, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, that I made an examination of that matter not so long ago. I found that within the 8 years we gave within $37,000,000 of what was asked for through the Budget Bureau. It was either the President or the Budget Bureau and not the Congress that fell down. With respect to the appropriations for defense, we gave them all except $37,000,000 out of $3,000,000,000, and if our national-defense program is still "on order," T. V., the blame rests in the White House—not on the Hill. That is all before the present defense program.

Congressman HOBBS. I can't refrain from asking Mr. DIRKSEN to read Senator BYRNES' speech on that subject of national defense, and I am sure that his remarks indicate that he has not.

The question that I would like to ask him is, If he thinks there is any causal connection between the charging by the Power Trust in some instances as high as 15 cents for electricity which cost only 2 mills?

Congressman DIRKSEN. Why, SAM, I would like say that the answer to that is right here before me. I brought along a copy of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the House with respect to that bill to give Commonwealth & Southern $76,000,000 for their properties, taking over those in Alabama and Tennessee, and here is the chief engineer of the T. V. A. testifying, mind you, that they gave Commonwealth & Southern an extra $9,000,000 to get them out of business. What a fine kettle of fish in the country when Uncle Sam steps in, opens up the Treasury, and says, "Here is an extra $9,000,000; we want you out of business because we don't want to compete with you. It will be too destructive, the rates will go down even more, consumption will go up, and Uncle Sam will be holding the bag." There is the whole record of the business before the House committee, which is the answer to the question as to how much has been charged.

As a matter of fact, power rates have gone down by half in your area and consumption has gone up by more than 100 percent. That is the answer. When toasters and curling irons are brought to obscure people, there is Willkie's answer, and he can stand on his own feet and announce it to all the world.

Congressman HOBBS. But that just shows how wrong you are when you quote from the record. I understood you to say that the T. V. A. has been cruel to Wendell Willkie and not——

Congressman DIRKSEN (interposing). It put him out of business in your State, as a matter of fact.

Congressman HOBBS. And yet we gave him $9,000,000 more than he was entitled to.

Congressman DIRKSEN. You know and any enterprise knows full well that you can't compete with this huge Juggernaut known as the United States Government, which has a bonded-debt limit up to $49,000,000,000 at the present time. No private enterprise in the country can stand up against that kind of unfairness.

Congressman HOBBS. And yet in Alabama there are instances where the rates charged by Mr. Willkie were as high as 15 cents for the unit that cost him 2 mills. Seventy-five times the cost of production is a pretty good profit, and that may be some answer to the query: Why did Government compete? The answer is: To serve the people and to reduce rates to where they were fair, so that the people could use electricity and to lighten the burdens of housewives.

Congressman SMITH. You don't deny, do you, that the T. V. A. has had a good deal of causal influence in the bringing down of electric rates?

Congressman DIRKSEN. I don't believe it has had one iota of influence out in our country. The T. V. A. power doesn't get up to Illinois.

Congressman SMITH. I am not talking about Illinois. I am talking about the T. V. A. region.

Congressman DIRKSEN. It has probably had some effect down there, no doubt. If it hasn't, then, of course, we have $500,000,000 invested in the Tennessee Valley for which the taxpayers of 48 States of the Union paid and the taxpayers of only 2 States really derived the benefit. Is that fair?

Congressman SMITH. Well, it is terribly important to keep that very clear here, because this principle of governmental intervention into what the businessmen call business is really the issue from which nearly all the Republicans who have nominated Willkie hope for relief.

Congressman HOBBS. I would just like to ask if there isn't such a thing as indirect action? In other words, if the T. V. A. yardstick, which may or may not be accurate and fair, hasn't saved the power consumers all over the Nation over $500,000,000 a year in power and light bills?

Congressman CRAWFORD. I should like to ask Mr. HOBBS, of Alabama, this question: He referred to the way the Republicans were now going to build a great army of employees in order to win this election. I wonder if my friend from Alabama overlooks the fact that this party of pillage, the Democratic Party, has added about 450,000 employees to the Government's pay rolls in the last few years at the cost of the taxpayers; while if Mr. Willkie builds up a group such as our friend from Alabama refers to, it will be paid for out of the private pockets of the people voluntarily. Now, wherein do you get mixed up as to the party of pillage? Will you explain to us why the Democrats have had to add these 450,000 people to the pay roll? Incidentally, that 1,000,000 now on the Federal pay roll does not include some 3,500,000 more which are on the pay roll in the form of relief, and I would like to see all of these people get back on private pay rolls. I am sick and tired of seeing them depend on public pay rolls all the time.

Congressman HOBBS. I will be more than happy to answer the gentleman's question. The reason that most people are on the public pay roll is to correct the abuses and mistakes made by your Republican administrations or, rather, misadministrations, in the 12 years of your coupon clipping. You led them into free soup

lines and bread lines and didn't give them anything to do. We have restored the morale of the masses by giving them work relief.

Congressman CRAWFORD. You have spent 8 years trying to build back what you claim was torn down in about 3 years. About how many years will your party want to really put this thing in good shape?

Congressman HOBBS. Just as long as a grateful people will recognize that their desires are being answered by the party of the people.

Congressman DIRKSEN. I was going to say to Sam, with respect to that observation and also with respect to his earlier observation about the progress that has been made in the last 8 years, that when it started out there were about 11,000,000 people out of work; they have run the national debt from $21,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000 and then asked Congress for an additional $4,000,000,000 to their $45,000,000,000, and the reduction in unemployment has been 1,000,000 at the very outside. So, while there is a staggering burden of debt in the country today, we still have at least 10,000,000 people out of work, and they take comfort in the fact that they have done some good. It is like the old wheeze I used to tell about pulling a man three-quarters of the way out of the well. When he says, "Pull me out of here," you say, "Aren't you better off than when you were at the bottom?" That is the kind of comfort they give you in the country today.

Congressman HOBBS. Yes; but there was just 1 man in the well, and there were 11,000,000 in this hole.

Congressman DIRKSEN. And they are still there.

Congressman HOBBS. Ask the 1,000,000 or the 3,000,000 that I say have been saved.

Congressman SMITH. After all, DIRKSEN, we have a very real problem here, as you know. We haven't been too successful in it. I don't want to put on any false front, but so far as the Republican platform is concerned—which you have ignored—and so far as Mr. Wendell Willkie's program—which you don't know—is concerned, not one single subsidy to anybody of the Federal Government in the Democratic Party is going to be stopped under the Republican administration if they win in 1940. You simply are talking thin air about the better correction of these difficulties and the more complete solution of these problems under Mr. Willkie, aren't you?

Congressman DIRKSEN. Let's see what the problem is. If you asked the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission here in Washington, he would tell you that the amount of money that is going into new corporate financings at the present time is a mere drop in the bucket compared to what it was in 1929, in spite of the fact that there is more money on deposit in the banks of the country today than at any other time in the history of the country. Until that money goes to work, until idle dollars join in holy wedlock with idle hands, we are not going to find the solution to that problem, and it becomes necessary to let the administration take its clammy hands off of investment in order to get this country started, and that is the spark that Wendell Willkie will supply.

Congressman SMITH. Do you know that Wendell Willkie is the Pied Piper that will do it, for I beg you to remember that during the so-called honeymoon Roosevelt was more trusted by American big business than any other President that we have had perhaps in 2 decades.

Congressman DIRKSEN. I admit that was despair speaking in 1933, and we have been very patient and very tolerant about it. I have gone along with more than one-half of the New Deal measures that have been brought to Congress in the last 8 years. Now we take a survey, and what is the result? Business is stagnant today; after 8 years the debt is 'way up; the unemployed are still there, and farm prices are so inadequate that the spectral hands of foreclosure are still reaching down and taking farms away from the farmers in this country.

Congressman CRAWFORD. Dirksen, don't you know that that is the live nation that can't be resurrected that our friend, T. V., was speaking about a while ago?

Congressman DIRKSEN. It can be resurrected.

Congressman SMITH. But don't you see that when he pays all the subsidies that we have been paying and everything else—and you don't know anything to the contrary—you are going to have clammier hands than ever, because they will be corporative, if not corpulent, hands.

Congressman DIRKSEN. That is no answer to the real problem, and I have pointed out the real problem, and that is to get idle dollars into enterprise.

Congressman HOBBS. I just want to say it amuses me to hear these Republicans talk. They are fine fellows personally, and, having been raised that way, they can't see that they are wrong.

Here is what the Republican platform says, that is, as nearly as you will find any clear statement in it: "We will do everything that you inaugurated and are now doing. We will do it better, and under us it wouldn't cost anything."

Congressman DIRKSEN. Sam, let me say that there is one thing, of course, we aren't going to follow you in. We aren't going to follow that course that is likely to put this country into a foreign war. We very specifically state that in the platform.

Congressman SMITH. The Democratic Party certainly is the peace party, so far as peace is possible through either preparedness in Europe or moral preparedness in South America. Wait until you see the Democratic Party's platform, if you are going to trust promises. We have kept the country out of war.

Congressman DIRKSEN. Don't you know you never used your 1932 or your 1936 platforms?

Congressman CRAWFORD. I would just like to point out that, in my opinion, our domestic situation is not in order. This is not a live Nation at the present time. In capital investment it is profoundly missing. This must be corrected if labor is to be increased, costs reduced, and goods improved, so that we may get these so-called South American markets we are talking about. A high standard of living is never created by legislation, but it comes from coordinated research, engineering, management, capital, and labor; and, in my opinion, "Wen" Willkie will put those important forces into operation.

Congressman HOBBS. I just want to say that, if my recollection serves me correctly, the majority of the seven wars that have been fought by this Nation have been under Republican administrations but I feel perfectly sure that both great parties are committed to peace, and that there will be no intervention in foreign wars.

Two representatives were passing the White House the other day as Mr. Roosevelt rolled down the drive. One of them threw a thumb toward the White House—this was before the Philadelphia convention—and said, "Dewey or Taft?" The other one, wiser and older and more experienced, said, "Big boy, you have got your wires crossed; that isn't the question. The question is, 'Do he or don't he?'"

That is still the question, only it is now transposed to "Will he or won't he?"

Dr. MAURICE PROTAS. I see by the papers that Senator WHEELER might head a third party. My question is, Mr. Granik, What effect would a coalition of Roosevelt and WHEELER have on the G. O. P.?

Mr. GRANIK. Congressman SMITH?

Congressman SMITH. That is so improbable. I especially dislike to prophesy on things that are improbable.

Congressman CRAWFORD. I don't mind making an observation on that. So far as I am personally concerned, I would be delighted to have President Roosevelt and Mr. WHEELER on the Democratic ticket.

Mr. GRANIK. Any further comment, Mr. HOBBS?

Congressman HOBBS. None at all, except to say that I think that is the business of the Democratic Convention and not of my very dear friend, FRED CRAWFORD; but we welcome his endorsement of any Democratic ticket.

Congressman DIRKSEN. I want to make one observation with respect to a question raised by Mr. HOBBS a while ago about the so-called T. V. A. yardstick. The public generally doesn't know that in administering the hundreds of millions that we invested in T. V. A. they developed a very synthetic, artificial, and almost fantastic formula. That is to say, they allocated about 30 percent of the money to power, the rest to flood control and navigation, and then they predicated rates on that 30 percent. You show me a utility in this country or any other country that can stay in business competition with the Federal Government where only 30 percent of its investment is made the basis for rate making. Then they talk about adopting this synthetic, chimerical, and silly yardstick. It just can't be adapted to American enterprise and industry today.

Congressman HOBBS. Show me a public utility that has ever benefited the public by flood control or improved navigation facilities. The answer to that, the reason we charged those amounts to those two great beneficent services, is that we delivered the goods. That is why.

Congressman DIRKSEN. I would like to see somebody show me the kind of navigation they are going to have on the Tennessee River.

Congressman HOBBS. You are going to have a 9-foot channel to Paducah, Ky.

Congressman DIRKSEN. Yes; and you are going to have a lake so wide that anything which is less than an ocean-going vessel will founder.

Congressman HOBBS. Anything might founder that is run by the Republicans. I wouldn't vouch for that.

Congressman SMITH. After all, we do have a magnificent plant down there, DIRKSEN, and, after all, the electric rates have been coming down more rapidly under this administration under private management than the country had any right to expect and certainly ever experienced before. That speaks very eloquently for it.

Congressman DIRKSEN. Oh, does it? What was the bill we had the other day to reimburse the people in Tennessee and Alabama for the taxes that were lost that were heretofore paid by private utilities? They came to Congress and said, "We have lost these taxes in our cities, counties, and school districts. Now let's dip into the Federal Treasury and let the people in the other States of the Union pay the tax bill for the displacement of taxes on public utilities."

Congressman HOBBS. Of course, the distinguished gentleman knows that that is in the 12 percent which was added to the rates charged by T. V. A. for that purpose, because they realize that it was just. They, being under a Democratic administration, think that it is wrong to steal.

Congressman DIRKSEN. The answer to that is that in 1933, when they passed the bill, I heard them stand in the Well of the House of Representatives and say 5 percent was enough, and we gave it to them.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to the American Forum of the Air presenting a discussion on What Are the Chances of the G. O. P. Ticket? And now for a final word from Mr. McCormick.

Announcer STEPHEN MCCORMICK. Thank you, Mr. Granik.

Thus we conclude another broadcast in this season's series of the American Forum of the Air, arranged and presented by Theodore Granik, founder and director of the American Forum of the Air,

as well as the American Forum, nationally syndicated newspaper feature.

In the interest of education, there are printed and distributed free of charge the entire proceedings of these broadcasts. When requesting copies by mail, please enclose 5 cents to defray postage and mailing. Address your requests to Station WOL, Washington, D. C.

The American Forum of the Air emanated tonight from the Willard Room of the Willard Hotel in Washington and was a presentation of WOL in cooperation with WOR. Next Sunday night the American Forum will come to you from Chicago, scene of the Democratic National Convention, and will return to Washington the following week, July 21.

This program has come to you through the facilities of WOL, Washington, D. C. Stephen McCormick speaking. This is the Mutual Broadcast System.

Presidential Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLES BY HON. EDWARD R. BURKE, OF NEBRASKA, AND HON KENNETH McKELLAR, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, several days ago there were published in the Chicago Herald-American articles by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] and myself concerning a political matter. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I'LL VOTE FOR WILLKIE

(By EDWARD R. BURKE, Democratic Senator from Nebraska—written expressly for the Chicago Herald-American)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—Without question, we are on the threshold of one of the most interesting, one of the most bitterly contested, one of the most significant Presidential campaigns in our entire history. There are to be presented conflicting views on domestic policy and on foreign relations.

To my mind, there is involved in this election a principle of such vital importance that the decision made next November will be the turning point which will settle once for all the kind of government which will prevail in the United States for generations to come.

The question to which I refer is not merely whether we shall permit a Chief Executive to continue himself in office for a third term.

Such a course itself has been declared by both Houses of Congress, and by the ablest and most far-seeing of our statesmen, to be "unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

But the question before the country now is not simply whether we shall permit a third term, contrary to the precedent established by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, and strongly upheld in principle by Cleveland, Bryan, Taft, and many of our greatest statesmen. The issue which will be settled this year is whether there shall be any limitation on the tenure of office of President.

If Roosevelt is reelected in November and the illusion of indispensability of one man is established—if the electorate decides that among the 130,000,000 of our citizens there is only one man to whom we can safely turn to guide the ship of state—then, indeed, we will have done much more than decide that in the present emergency we are willing to continue Roosevelt for 4 years more.

Is there anyone so simple-minded as to believe that in 1944 the world will not be faced with the same or another emergency that will require that this one indispensable man shall be continued on indefinitely?

Before you consent to tear down the tradition which has required our Chief Executive to face the necessity of surrendering his power at the end of a limited term, let there be present in your mind this thought, that the one who is now asking you to break this sacred tradition is the same man who 3 short years ago sought with all the power of his great office to apply force to the judiciary, to destroy the independence of our courts, to violate the spirit and in fact the constitutional requirement for the separation of the powers of the Government into three independent branches.

It may be that some Presidents we have had could have served for three terms or more without serious injury to our form of government. It may be that in other times, more normal, this tradition of limited tenure was not so vital.

But in view of world trends in 1940, and particularly in consideration of certain qualities of the present occupant of the office of Chief Executive, the continuance of this rule that requires the surrender of authority on a fixed day becomes of the utmost importance.

As the only practical means of accomplishing the defeat of the forces that would undermine this fundamental safeguard of American liberty, I shall work and vote for the election of Wendell Willkie as President.

WHY I'LL VOTE FOR ROOSEVELT

(By KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democratic Senator from Tennessee—written expressly for the Chicago Herald-American)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—I have been asked by your paper to give my reasons why I am supporting President Roosevelt for reelection in November. My reasons follow:

I believe that in this world war crisis, with war raging in Europe, Asia, Africa, and on the high seas, President Roosevelt, with his 8 years' experience, is the best equipped and most experienced man in our country to direct our Government in the best interests of our people.

I believe that because of President Roosevelt's forthright and vigorous way of dealing with our foreign situation our chances of peace will be better, and there will be less disposition in the mind of any foreign dictator to attack us, whatever may be the result of the war in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere.

I believe our first duty in this crisis is to prepare our country for any emergency. President Roosevelt has shown, by his messages to the Congress on the subject of preparedness, that he is fully and completely alive to the dangers which confront us, that he has already begun preparedness on a mammoth scale, and that he intends, with congressional approval, to continue to prepare this country so that no other nation will dare attack us.

I believe that few Presidents in our history, perhaps none, would have taken the prompt, vigorous, and almost unlimited steps which President Roosevelt has already taken to preserve peace and prevent attack.

It must be remembered that President Roosvelt more than a year ago warned us of impending danger from without and urged the Congress immediately to change our neutrality laws the better to preserve peace; and he has also warned us to increase our Army and Navy to prepare us for any eventuality.

It must also be remembered that President Roosevelt has uniformly been an advocate of peace. Many times he has urged foreign countries not to invade other countries, not to attempt to govern by force, not to go to war. He has used every effort to keep peace among our foreign neighbors and to keep peace at home.

Again, I am for President Roosevelt because I approve of his domestic policies. When he took office our country was in economic ruin. He has restored it to a remarkable degree. He has taken the lead in restoring the agricultural conditions of the country, and has improved the condition of the farmer as no other President ever did.

I am for him because he has done more to improve the condition of the men who labor with their hands than any other President who has ever sat in the White House. He has done more for the "forgotten man" than any other President ever did.

I am for him because he has done more to restore the Nation's business, especially a sound system of banking, than any other leader we ever had—a banking system in which every depositor in a bank is more secure, and can get his money whenever he checks against it.

President Roosevelt has done more for social security, more to alleviate the necessities of old age, of children, of the sick, and all others in distress, and has done more for human charity, than any other President we have had.

I am for President Roosevelt because during his administration, for the most part, we have been prosperous and happy, and have had perfect peace at home, and our government and people are respected, esteemed, and looked up to abroad.

President Roosevelt has aided in building up and restoring our entire country, its roads, its schoolhouses, its public buildings, its waterways, its airways, its transportation system, including better urban and rural electrification, and has aided wonderfully in making our country a better place in which to live.

I am supporting President Roosevelt because of his large humanitarianism, and his sustained interest in the great masses of the people.

I am supporting him because his opponent is an outstanding representative of class and special privilege, and a lifelong advocate of taxing by way of utility rates all the people for the special benefit of the few he represents.

I am supporting President Roosevelt because his opponent has never had any open experience with any legislative, executive, judicial, or other governmental activity, and without some such experience it would be a miracle if he made a good President of the United States.

Finally, we all know how private power companies have been established in this country. Men like Mr. Willkie have come to a [illegible] town and secured a contract from the local government to distribute light and power there for a long term of years. They then organized a corporation which promptly issued bonds, the

amount and proceeds of which would build the plant and pay all preliminary expenses. At the same time they would issue common stock, usually in double the amount of the bonds, giving the bond buyers a part of such watered stock for furnishing the money, and paying the remainder of the watered stock to themselves as a bonus, the company in all cases getting no money value for the common stock. By their contract they fixed such enormous rates to be charged the users of electricity as would pay all running expenses, interest, and sinking-fund charges, and still have ample and sufficient money to pay large dividends upon the watered stock. They would then form holding companies and again pyramid this watered stock, on which the people were required to pay unconscionable dividends. It is the most outstanding and unconscionable system of private exploitation of the people ever known in the world. Mr. Willkie for many years has been part and parcel of this exploiting scheme, and the president of one of its leading organizations. I concede that Mr. Willkie in this business has been a past grand master. His contract with the Tennessee Valley Authority, in which he sold his Tennessee companies to that Authority, shows that he is able, that he serves the watered-stock holders of his companies as perhaps no other man ever did. This has been his life work. I do not believe that this business has fitted him to be President of the United States. I do not believe the American people want a watered-stock salesman for their President.

The Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE RETAIL COALMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, another governmental bureau in this present administration, and I refer to the Bituminous Coal Commission, is causing a very serious protestation from not only the coal dealers and from coal operators but most consumers of coal throughout our Nation. Before imposing further restrictions on the coal industry we should most seriously consider the harm that is going to entail among the consumers of coal.

Mr. B. C. Forbes, under date of July 16, 1940, in the New York Journal-American in his article in regard to Britain's experience in girding for warfare, made the following statement:

> The coal business has been demoralized by state control. Coal was rationed, although there is plenty of it. Few today believe in the nationalization of the coal business.
>
> One fact that has been strongly impressed upon the minds of British businessmen is the need for strong, watchful trade associations, to protect trades and industries from harmful regulations.

Also, I submit a very interesting article in the June issue of the Retail Coalman, on the subject A Decision Which Is Wholly Unmoral.

The article follows:

[From the Retail Coalman of June 1940]

A DECISION WHICH IS WHOLLY UNMORAL—THE FINDING OF THE SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS THE GOVERNMENT AND IGNORES PUBLIC WELFARE

It is unfortunate that a man who occupies the exalted position of Mr. Justice Douglas should stoop to two methods which dictated the tenor of the decision of the United States Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the Coal Act of 1937. Specifically, he rested an important part of the ruling upon a statement which is not true. That statement was:

"For a generation there have been various manifestations of incessant demand for Federal intervention in the coal industry."

Bluntly stated, that is not true. It is true that the Congress has had that subject before it. But who were the proponents? It was suggested in 1917 by the Federal Trade Commission, which wanted, itself, to be the master of coal. At other intervals it was proposed by the bureaus in the Department of the Interior which wanted to be, and is now and finally, the regulatory body. It was proposed by Senators Frelinghuysen and Calder, who represented coal-consuming States, because they wanted to be reelected to office. It was, at times, concurred in by the miners' union, which hoped thereby to gain a final mastery of the southern field, which it has won since by means of this regulation.

There has never been a single resolution by any body of consumers saying that they were willing to pay the higher prices involved if coal were bailed by the Government out of an unprofitable routine. Until minimum prices were proposed, no single body of investors in coal ever signified any interest in the subject. So it is not true, as Mr. Justice Douglas said, that there has been other than a self-serving demand for Federal intervention in coal. It is unfortunate that he should have said otherwise.

Mr. Justice Douglas said, in substance, that the wisdom of the legislation was for the Congress to decide; not the courts. The Supreme Court never decided any case in that way until it began to save its hide by abdicating part of the judicial function which, theretofore, the same Court had exercised through a century. It was an act of softness—of cowardice, if you please—when the Court began to vote its political opinions rather than the principles of law and justice.

Coal is an industry which, while keeping the wheels of industry turning over, produces 200,000 tons per hour. It used to produce 250,000 per hour. Bituminous has suffered that loss of 50,000 tons per hour because it has priced itself out of its market. It was forced to do that—and to undertake mechanization—because its costs dictated its prices. Its costs, in turn, were dictated by the stranglehold of labor on the industry. Labor got that stranglehold—and has the highest wages in all industry—due to Federal intervention in behalf of the union.

There is not on record a single protest by the industry or by the consumer raising the slightest objection to the ending of turmoil and strife within the coal industry. There has been no protest against avoiding waste of this natural resource. There has been no protest against the ending of murderous cutthroat competition or the adoption of fair-trade practices. Coal has been abundantly on record in favor of all of them.

We come, then, to the real point at issue. The coal producer and retailer have wanted to reduce prices in keeping with improved methods. They advocated that policy out of consideration for the consumers. That is public welfare raised to the *n*th power.

What they have objected to—and still do—is to raising costs which will force higher prices—against good public policy. The iniquity of the present set-up is that it gives the Department of the Interior control over costs. This will be enhanced, manyfold, if the Congress shall enact the mine-inspection law. Costs—dictated costs—are then made the basis of minimum prices. The unmorality of the statute is this marriage of costs and prices which has ruined every industry regulated under the same theory. That question runs to the wisdom of the statute. That question is ignored by the Supreme Court—it refused to consider it. This means that the Supreme Court holds it is good law if an administration wants it and can force it through the Congress. That is politics, not justice.

Justified Suspicions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. This editorial has to do with disclosures made by me earlier in today's session.

[From New York Herald Tribune of August 5, 1940]

JUSTIFIED SUSPICIONS

One remembers that President Roosevelt asked, and on June 27 got, from Congress permission to spend the entire W. P. A. appropriation for the current fiscal year within 8 months from July 1 at his discretion. We mention this for whatever bearing it may have on the statement of Representative SHAFER of Michigan that there has been a "startling increase in the printing of blank relief checks and food stamps by the Bureau of Engraving," presumably for distribution in key States in the course of the President's campaign for a third term.

"I am fully aware," says Mr. SHAFER, "of the serious nature of the implications contained in my statement." He relies, however, on the past performance of the administration to justify them and cites the recurring phenomenon in election years of a rise in relief rolls between June and November against an upturn in business and increase in private employment. He points to the reverse phenomenon in nonelection years, namely, a reduction of these rolls despite a decline in business and in private employment.

We are not prepared to vouch for the complete accuracy of his percentages, but a glance at the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1939 supports his general thesis. Thus one finds that in 1936 persons employed on W. P. A. projects decreased in number

from 3,019,000 in February to 2,245,000 in July, when an upturn started, reaching its peak of 2,546,000 in October, and this notwithstanding an improvement of business that fall and a reduction of unemployment for the year which Mr. SHAFER estimates at 13 percent. After election the rolls fell off, reaching a low for the year of 2,243,000 in December.

In 1937, a nonelection year, on the other hand, the relief rolls continued to decline through September, showing a slight increase in October and November and a jump in December. Yet 1937 marked the collapse of the second Roosevelt recovery. "In 1937," according to Mr. SHAFER of Michigan, "the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 16.9 percent from June through October, although the index of production declined 10.5 percent in that period."

Most of us are familiar with the padding of the relief rolls in advance of the elections in 1938. They reached an all-time high of 3,239,000 in November of that year in face of a rise of private employment. Then again, as in 1936, they began dropping in December. Thanks in part to the disgust of Congress with the use of W. P. A. votes in the campaign of 1938, the drop continued in 1939. Mr. SHAFER of Michigan says it increased 25.5 percent for the months preceding the usual election date which held no interest for the Federal administration.

Against such a background Mr. SHAFER of Michigan need not apologize for his suspicions. There is the record; there are the blank checks; there is the President's authority, at his request, to spend the money allotted to the W. P. A. in the next 7 months, if he chooses, and, perhaps not an insignificant item, there is Harry Hopkins more or less in charge of the third-term effort. Meanwhile a war boom of unexampled proportions has set in. Soon, with $10,000,000,000 earmarked for national defense, it will be absorbing idle or relief workers by the tens of thousands daily. Is it possible that the President, under these circumstances, is really contemplating a repetition of his Santa Claus strategy of 1936 and 1938?

American Legion on a Program of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS H. CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, at its annual convention in Watertown, S. Dak., July 30, 1940:

Whereas it has been the policy of the American Legion from its first inception to stand behind a universal draft and conscription plan that would not only affect the manpower of our Nation but factories, shops, and every facility having a military bearing; and

Whereas after 20 years the Nation is coming into line with the American Legion's campaign for adequate national defense, and the Legion faces a new challenge—that of being a balance wheel to help guarantee that the new national enthusiasm does not carry the nation at a higher speed than conditions justify and wind up in inefficiency, hysteria, and waste. The task of calming hysteria rests particularly upon the shoulders of the Legion in the Middle West, free as it is of the war talk and bogey man heralded on both coasts and even in the National Capital: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, urges that the Legion continue spreading to all Americans the facts concerning the menace of "fifth columnists" and continue directing all reports of subversive activity through proper channels to the authorities equipped and authorized by law to handle such activities;

That there be kept in mind the long-time Legion program of calling equally upon capital, industry, and labor for their part in any building up of national defense, and that there be no rush to build up vast armies unequipped—armies which we are unprepared to train;

That any effort toward Nation-wide conscription or mass draft of manpower be approached most carefully and not undertaken until all other avenues have been exhausted, and until there has been an earnest and well-built-up call for volunteers. The response to the call for pilots to train under C. A. A. indicates that young men are willing to go, and their voluntary enlistment will of necessity mean less disruption in industry and less hysteria and war fear in the land than will conscription;

That the discipline of the Civilian Conservation Corps be tightened to a degree that any program set up by Government can be definitely carried out, and that C. C. C. enrollees be given training in truck transport and repair and in those other noncombatant services which are most important and slowest to develop in time of emergency;

That the American Legion in South Dakota continue its program of service to the community and that its membership make clear its readiness to serve in any formal or casual defense program that may be set up; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be promptly forwarded to our United States Senators and Representatives in Washington, D. C.

What Price Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

EXTRACT FROM THE VERMONT HOUSE JOURNAL, SPECIAL SESSION, JULY 24, 1940

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include an extract from the Vermont House Journal of the special session of the Vermont Legislature of date July 24, 1940:

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. PLUMLEY INTRODUCED

The Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Congressman at large from Vermont, appearing within the lobby of the house, was introduced by the speaker and thereupon delivered an address, which, upon motion of Mr. Bloomer, of West Rutland, was ordered printed in the journal and is as follows:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, they tell me that a city mail carrier's idea of a vacation is to take a 10-mile walk. Apparently some of you think that in this recess of the Congress I should take a similar type of vacation, and that is why you have invited me to address you.

I would like to take advantage of this occasion and to speak to you as one who for a good many years was one of the clerks and later the speaker of this body. I would like publicly to commend your clerk, Mr. Harold Arthur, for the very valuable and comprehensive work accomplished by him in his undertaking to codify the precedents of the Vermont House of Representatives and to index the same. It was a tremendous job, as no one knows better than I do. Some 30 years ago the Honorable Homer L. Skeels, then secretary of the senate, and I, undertook to do the very thing which your clerk, Arthur, has carried to such successful completion.

The Vermont Legislature is traditionally the finest parliamentary body in this country if not in the world, and that is by reason of the fact that you so strictly and so closely follow the rules which you have prescribed. Through the years certain precedents have been established in modification of general rules or in amplification of the same. Today, by virtue of the public interests and his desire to serve as manifested by this work, you have before you an outstanding codification which will stand for all time, not only as a monument to you but to the young man who gave his time and effort to spread the same on your records.

Confidentially, I am going to talk to you for a few minutes and I am not at a loss for what to say, because I am going to make you the speech which I had prepared to deliver at the Legion convention next Friday. I will have to go home after adjournment today and prepare another speech for the Legion convention.

So I say to you, as he looked out across the valleys toward the mountain tops and into the faces of the men and women of his native State, that most distinguished son of Vermont, the former President, Calvin Coolidge, at Bennington, took occasion to say:

"If the spirit of liberty should vanish in other parts of the Union and support of our institutions should languish, it could all be replenished from the generous store held by the people of this brave little State of Vermont."

No man ever made a statement more true or one more justly or more genuinely deserved, but let me tell you, fellow Vermonters, that liberty comes alone and lives alone when the hard-won rights of men are held inalienable, where governments themselves may not infringe, where governments are indeed but the mechanisms to protect and sustain these liberties from encroachment. It was this for which our fathers died; it was this heritage they gave to us. It was not the provision with regard to interstate commerce or the determination of weights and measures or coinage, for which the Constitution was derived—it was the guaranties that men possessed fundamental liberties apart from the state, that they were not the pawns but masters of the state. We know that we cannot extend the mastery of governments over the daily life of a people without somewhere making it master of peoples' souls. Government conduct of business might give us maximum efficiency, but it would be purchased at the cost of freedom.

The appetite for power grows with every opportunity to assume it, and power over the rights of men leads to arrogance, then despotism, then liberty dies. Everywhere democracy is on the

defensive. Everywhere free enterprise is in chains. The world no longer moves forward on the wings of freedom.

Men in high places challenge the validity of the principles upon which we have built our American civilization. Governmental policies are steadily undermining the foundations of our political and economic structures.

It is time for the American people to pause and take stock; to get back to fundamentals; to realize there is no magic cure for their troubles and that they have reached the point where they must decide whether to fight it out within the framework of the American constitutional system and in accordance with well-established American social and economic principles or to throw over 150 years of experience, scuttle our American institutions, and try their luck with some form of European collectivism.

The obligation of our generation is to protect and to preserve and to pass on to our children the heritage of liberty that was entrusted to us.

That is the hope which inspires us. It is the beginning of self-government. It is the throne of our highest ideals. It is the center of the energy that drives us on to accomplishment.

So today let us thank God that our lot is cast on this continent; here are our frontiers; here is found our opportunity to make the finest type of civilization the world has ever known, provided you and I and those who come after us only have the intelligence to conserve the opportunity that is ours and the necessary courage to defend and to preserve it. If we do not have both, we do not deserve the great good fortune that is ours to have and to hold.

Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OSCAR YOUNGDAHL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS TIMES-TRIBUNE

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Times-Tribune of July 30.

CONSCRIPTION

No one, with the possible exception of professional soldiers, is in favor of compulsory military training or conscription. In and of itself, nothing can be said for it that cannot with equal truth be said for many other forms of totalitarianism. It is a surrender of personal liberty on a rather large scale, and its social and economic effects will be disagreeable and costly. No one is in favor of the expenditure of billions of taxpayers' money, with the consequent lowering of our level of living, in order to build another navy; no one is in favor of spending more billions to underwrite the export surpluses of Mexico, Canada, Central America, and South America. Each and every one of these proposals, if put into effect, will take something desirable out of our lives. Democracy, as we know it and love it, will be diminished, with the dread possibility that eventually it may be extinguished.

The only debatable issue is, Are any or all of these proposals necessary?

If the required necessity exists, there is no question as to the abstract qualities, virtues, or faults of the proposals any more than there is to the abstract quality of relief expenditures. Anyone can make a point of the economic absurdity of paying farmers not to produce food, but no one can deny the existing sociological necessity for doing so. It may be pointed out that the morale and the initiative of many of the recipients of the various forms of relief are weakened, but no alternative to these payments is forthcoming. Necessity has made us depart from policies once considered immutable, and necessity may cause us to resort to compulsory military training.

In the matter of military defense we are, for the time being, confronted with possibilities rather than actualities, such as unemployment, food surpluses, etc. We are considering what may happen, rather than what has happened, and thus find ourselves in the field of speculation which has no other boundaries than human imagination. One may believe that as soon as Hitler has finished with England he will launch a devastating attack on our shores to continue his conquest around the globe, and yet another be convinced that an ocean 100 times the width of the English Channel makes the possibility of an attack negligible. Between these extremes there is ample room for differences of opinion as to the necessity for conscription.

It will be generally admitted that in the present state of the world, the United States must take some defensive precautions. If we are going to take upon ourselves the military and economic defense of this hemisphere from pole to pole, a great many unwilling men and a great many unwilling dollars will be required, and a very close approximation to totalitarianism will be necessary.

What we need today, more than anything else, is a calm, dispassionate appraisal of probabilities, not possibilities, to determine just what insurance we should take out. The present haste to impose conscription on the youth of the country suggests panic and hysteria. The unpredictable future may make conscription necessary, or even inevitable, but there is not discernible, in the present situation, any justification for overnight action.

To plan an adequate Navy that will come into existence years hence is one thing; to start immediately to conscript youth for a war that may never come to our shores, is another and much more serious matter.

Hands Off the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY JESSE S. COTTRELL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very splendid feature written by Jesse S. Cottrell. Mr. Cottrell was Minister to Bolivia from 1921 to 1927 and is therefore personally acquainted with the South American situation. He is now an able and popular Washington correspondent. His analysis of the work of the administration through the great Secretary of State is well worth reading.

The article is as follows:

HANDS OFF THE AMERICAS

(By Jesse S. Cottrell, United States Minister to Bolivia, 1921 to 1927, during the Harding and Coolidge administrations)

The eyes of the diverse and varied political interests of the Western Hemisphere are today centered on the Pan American Conference that begins in Habana July 20.

This is why the Washington Government approaches the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the 21 American republics, spokesmen for 250,000,000 people, with no misgivings as to its epochal importance.

It is realized by State Department officials that the good-neighbor policy of Mr. Roosevelt, as enunciated by Secretary Hull, and the oft-strained cordiale that was established by the first Pan American Conference, presided over by Secretary of State James G. Blaine, in October 1889, face a crucial test.

The importance of the conference and its potentialities is exemplified by the fact that the initial agenda of June 29 has been broadened in scope and concept by the governing board of the Pan American Union.

It now even portends possible establishment of military and economic barriers, from the Great Lakes to the Falklands, that would make the Americas impregnable to aggression of any character from within and without.

MEETING TO DISCUSS AMERICAS' PROBLEMS

The final draft of the agenda of July 5 throws the meeting open for discussion of every vexatious and thorny problem that the Americas may face attributable to the rapidly changing political and economic conditions due to Nazi aggression. It even contemplates new and unforeseen happenings as they may react upon the sensitized minds of delegates from Spanish America.

In this conference, it is estimated that the United States holds the biggest stake. It suddenly realizes that the United States is far more defenseless economically south of the Rio Grande and its own Panama Canal than at home as to men and armaments. As to safety from foreign encroachment and loss of trade, the situation is viewed as alarmingly distressing.

This is why Secretary of State Hull plans to attend the conference and direct the interests of the United States, lest some untoward happenings mar the program.

The newly called Pan-American Conference is a corollary to the defense program launched by President Roosevelt as the forces of the Fuehrer blitzkrieged their way to the English Channel, and suddenly shook this country from lethargical complacence as to national security.

By the time the $5,000,000,000 defense program was well before Congress, with a full appreciation of its import, the reports of possible "fifth column" activities in this country, and their acknowledged existence in South American countries like the Argentine, Uruguay, and Brazil, caused concern, chiefly as they related to national defense.

As one European country after another fell before the German invasion, realization of the effect of such upon trade relations with the 20 countries of Latin America, that constitute the greatest outlet for the commerce of this country, dawned upon the United States Government.

This caused the belated realization that economically Germany, Italy, and Japan already had their column of commerce on the grounds, due to many years of infiltration.

As the capitulation of Paris appeared imminent with a possibility that Chancelor Hitler might lay claim to French possessions in the Western Hemisphere, Mr. Roosevelt declared as applicable the doctrine of James Monroe, as laid down by the fifth President when he said on December 2, 1823, that no European power could seize territory or set up a government on the American continent.

With the fall of Paris came passage of the Pittman-Bloom joint resolution by Congress that no non-American government should acquire by purchase, conquest, or otherwise, territory in the Western Hemisphere held by a non-American government.

Under Secretary Sumner Welles at press conference, June 19, said that this resolution "reaffirmed by Congress the principles of our traditional doctrine, though it was in no sense an extension of the doctrine."

The spontaneity with which presidents of Latin American republics replied to the invitation has been heartening to the State Department. In fact, the trend of replies indicates that the conference may resolve itself into a "Stop-Hitler drive," backed by every country represented.

This was indicated July 4 by President Alfredo Baldomir, of Uruguay, when he delivered an address by radio to President Roosevelt and the people of the Americas for a strong and aggresive Pan-Americanism.

President Roosevelt and his representatives are scheduled to meet this with generosity and enthusiasm. It would be backed at home by the $5,000,000,000 proposed for a supplemental defense program that will bring authorization at this session of Congress of approximately $14,000,000,000 that would be spent for defense.

In turn, the conference, as suggested by the expanded agenda is expected to adopt a cartel, providing:

1. Reaffirmation of the good-neighbor policy as enunciated at Montevideo at the Seventh Pan American Conference of 1933, when reciprocal-trade agreements were endorsed, and when the idea of nonintervention was reinforced in contradistinction to the previous policy as to Nicaragua and Haiti; reaffirmation of accord at the Eighth Pan American Conference in Lima in 1938 for solidarity and unity with consultation upon threats of invasion, and condemnation of infiltration of subversive elements; and reaffirmation of the general declaration of neutrality of the American republics, and establishment of the demarcations of safety zones in American waters as agreed upon at the Panama Conference of October 1939.

MONROE DOCTRINE TO BE APPROVED

2. Approval of the Monroe Doctrine as outlined by Secretary Hull July 4, when he warned rulers of totalitarian states that they must keep hands off the Americas (including non-American-owned islands), and as reasserted by Mr. Roosevelt, and embodied in the Pittman-Bloom Act.

3. That American republics cooperate in taking over possessions of Holland, France, and Great Britain if threatened by Germany.

4. Organization of a general defense program for the 20 republics cooperating with the United States, on land, sea, and in the air, financed by loans by the United States, probably guaranteed by exchange of raw products such as tin, rubber, chromite, antimony, tungsten, nitrates, coffee, panama hats, copper and silver, molybdenum, borax, lignite, asbestos, and especially many of the 29 strategic minerals, desired by the Inter-Departmental Munitions Board.

5. Adoption of an economic cartel under which a $5,000,000,000 pool would be formed to purchase surpluses of field and factories from the 20 South American countries for disposal in the United States and to European countries to combat Nazi and Italian penetration, with part of the $18,000,000,000 worth of gold buried at Fort Knox, Ky., used for this purchase.

6. Exchange of Army and Naval officers to improve the armies.

7. Consideration of further restriction of Nazi, Russian, and Italian immigration.

ADDITIONAL LOANS FOR TRANSPORTATION

8. Further loans by the Import-Export Bank for construction of railroads and highways, similar to recent loans to Ecuador and the Argentine.

The biggest stake for the United States is trade. Latin America now looms as the greatest possible outlet for products of the farms and factories of the United States, always attended by heavy surpluses. This has just been brought home to this country as a poignant reminder.

For example, exports of the United States to South America in May jumped to $40,332,000 from $22,668,000 in May 1939, with exports to Belgium dropping from $6,734,000 to $1,932,000. Similar decreases to England, France, Norway, and the Netherlands, with German trade almost nil, were reported. The United States now controls South American markets and plans to hold them when the European holocaust ends.

Regardless of this, the past attitude of Latin American countries, one of general suspicion, may still lurk in the background. This is attributable to the policy of the United States in dealing with Latin American countries. Such is chargeable to no one administration or political party, but more to a lack of understanding of Latin American people, who have in turn not always understood "Yankee enterprise."

During the decade preceding 1930 nearly $2,000,000,000 was loaned to the 12 countries south of the Canal by New York bankers. Their representatives swarmed over Latin America like locusts seeking borrowers. Much of this remains unpaid, and the aftermath has been unpleasant.

The presence of foreign elements in Latin America is not discounted. In fact, Uncle Sam, when he reaches the hinterland of South America, will find upward of 800,000 Germans in Brazil, more than 450,000 in the Argentine, 1,000 in Bolivia, 500 in Paraguay, and with the entire southern part of Chile in the hands of German farmers, who are as successful as any in the world.

HOW THE GERMANS GET A FOOTHOLD

They will be found on working and trading terms with Italians, who are in some places as numerous as Germans. For example, Brazil boasts of an Italian population of 8,000,000 to 10,000,000, who harvest the coffee crops of Sao Paulo, while in the Argentine are more than half this number.

Annually thousands of Italians swarm to Brazil for the coffee harvesting season and make enough money to live at home for 2 years without work. The wealthiest coffee growers and shippers in Brazil are Italians and Germans and the most powerful figures.

The German Government has already made encroachments upon Latin American trade. The system is simple and practical. A young German appears upon the scene and finds employment in an English, French, or United States business or export house. He is at his post at 6 in the morning, long before opening hours, and in the afternoon, when natives are at their siesta, he toils on.

He returns to his place of employment at night and toils far into the morning hours. He makes himself indispensable. Meanwhile young men from the United States, likewise employed, are on the golf course, in the pool or ball rooms, or night clubs, and soon fade from the picture.

Soon the young German enters business backed by the El Banco Aleman, the Bank of Germany.

Mr. Hoover's Mistakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM A WESTERN NEWSPAPER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an editorial from the August 3, 1940, issue of the South Haven Daily Tribune of South Haven, Mich., as reprinted from the Wallace (Idaho) Miner:

[From the Wallace (Idaho) Miner]

MR. HOOVER'S MISTAKES

An inspired piece from one of the New Deal propagandists says that "Hoover was a complete failure." So he was. He failed in a lot of things. He failed to draw out his salary of $75,000 a year while he was President, turning it all back into the Treasury. He failed to have his sons organize insurance-company firms to write insurance on Government enterprises. He built a Rapidan resort for fishing and recreation at his own expense and gave it to the Government. None of his sons went racing through the divorce courts to the disillusionment of the public. He never bundled up a lot of Government documents to sell as a book to the faithful at a huge profit to himself and he never sold himself into political slavery to a labor organization for a $500,000 campaign fund. He gathered a marvelous collection of war stuff and built a museum for it, but failed to ask Congress to pay the bill—he paid it himself.

He did not preach class hatred; nor try to pack the Supreme Court. He did not plow up every third row of cotton and he did not promise the American people one thing while at the same moment doing everything to accomplish the directly opposite result.

He did not ask Congress to assess the taxpayers a billion dollars every time someone shot off a firecracker in Europe, and he did not go on fishing trips on Government warships, accompanied by a fleet of destroyers; neither did he kill off all the farmers' little pigs nor encourage the importation of Argentine beef. In fact, there were a lot of foolish things that Hoover didn't do that some other people have done. There are a lot of constructive things he could have done if he had not had the opposition of a Democratic Congress, but, anyway, he did not leave the American people $45,000,000,000 in debt.

Mr. Speaker, each of the acts Mr. Hoover failed to do—and as listed above—is to his credit.

The Dire Need of the People of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the Congress to the drought situation in the State of Nebraska. Since that time I have received many, many communications from Nebraska which indicate that the situation is much worse than previously indicated.

Nebraska people must have feed for their livestock immediately. Unless feed is furnished without delay, hundreds of farms will be entirely without horses, milk cows, and chickens. This will mean that great masses of people not only will be on relief but they will be without the means to make a livelihood when the drought period is over.

For some time I have been appealing to the Surplus Commodities Corporation to send into the drought-stricken territory of Nebraska surplus grains and feeds now held by the Government. If this cannot be a direct gift or grant, this feed should be sold at greatly reduced prices on the same basis that this material is dumped on foreign markets.

Are not these American citizens living in the drought-stricken territory of Nebraska entitled to as much consideration as the people of foreign lands? A most serious situation exists right in the heart of continental United States, yet the great Government of the United States at Washington is so engrossed in foreign affairs that this problem goes unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks two letters that I have recently received. These letters are not from cranks. I know the source from which they come and they accurately picture conditions as they are:

ADAMS-WEBSTER NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Hastings, Nebr., August 2, 1940.

Mr. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: As you are in Washington, I want to tell you of the conditions out here.

In the Adams-Webster National Farm Loan Association, which I have charge of, we have leases on 97 farms and the total income from wheat was $402. This is less than $5 per farm. Corn is all burned up. There will be some sorghums, if we would have a good general rain. The local showers don't do much good.

Farmers are rushing their livestock to market. Cows are selling at $21 per head and work horses at $40 per head. They are asking $12 to $14 per ton for hay trucked in and 70 cents per bushel for corn.

Seventy-five percent of the farmers will need subsistence grants and many will be too proud to ask for aid.

With all our surplus wheat and corn in storage, why can't seed wheat and corn for feed be released to farmers in this drought-stricken territory and let them pay it back bushel for bushel as soon as they raise a crop?

If this plan meets your approval your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

H. R. FAUSCH,
Secretary-Treasurer, Adams-Webster National Farm Loan Association.

Among the many other letters that I have received from my district is the following. The name of the sender is being withheld for obvious reasons:

JULY 29, 1940.

Representative CARL T. CURTIS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a farmer's wife and writing not only in behalf of my own family but of hundreds and hundreds of farmers' families in south central and southwestern Nebraska.

If you have been living in Nebraska this summer, you know of the severe drought conditions; and if you could drive over Highway No. 3, you would see what the farmers are up against.

When the drought of 1934 came we made up our minds to stick it through, and after 7 years under the most disheartening conditions we are still trying to survive. In 1934 it was bad, but we had a lot behind us, and now, after 7 years, everything is gone and unless we get aid somehow the people here will surely perish.

We live only by means of our cream and egg checks. Our cows have gone dry because of no pastures, and our flocks of hens have been thrown into an early moult through the high temperatures of the past few weeks. Our means of support is being surely cut off until we cannot even buy the bare necessities for existence.

We have passed up the luxuries of life long ago. We are too poor to have a radio, a daily paper. We have not seen a picture show for years. Dentist bills are entirely out of the picture. Our finances do not permit us to attend church and Sunday school any more, and even fruits and vegetables have become such a luxury they no longer grace our tables.

We do not have clothing for winter and there is no way to buy it. In 5 more weeks the school bells will be ringing and our children will not be clothed to go—no shoes, overalls, shirts, dresses, no overshoes, coats, caps, mittens, no food for the dinner pails, and only a few eggs to sell at 9 cents per dozen.

Never have we asked for relief, only a loan through the F. S. A. to help us on our feet, that we might be able to hold up our heads and still be self-supporting citizens. This last spring we had to borrow $100 for seed and tractor fuel to put in a crop. For this we had to turn our conservation check back to the Government, and now we have nothing. With our conservation money we always paid our taxes, bought the car license, had our little girl's eyes cared for (progressive myopia is the trouble), and met the unseen expenses that always arise in every household.

There must be some misunderstanding about these drought years; surely Uncle Sam isn't so poor that he needs to take the very bread out of our little children's mouths to carry on his national affairs. I know people who left this country and went to California and have been on relief for years. No one has kept track of what they owe the Government, and they are not being reminded that they must pay it back in 5 years. It seems to have become a popular notion that this drought belongs to these disheartened, poorly fed, poorly clothed, bankrupt, poverty-stricken farmers and their families, and those in authority are adding up the interest each year even on the old unpaid feed loans of 1934.

In the June 26, 1940, issue of the United States News (and this is sent to us by a relative in Colorado, for we are too poor to pay the $2 per year subscription price) there is an article entitled "Famine in a World Glutted With Foods." How welcome some of this huge surplus in foods and cottons would be in our homes where the supply of towels, sheets, blankets, comforters, etc., has long been exhausted and cannot be replaced.

The tires are worn off our cars; the batteries run down; we are nearing the end of the trail.

This is a busy time at Washington, and your time is valuable, so I want to thank you for taking the time to read this letter. You may use it in any way you wish if it will be the means of helping bring relief to these stricken people.

I thank you and remain,

Yours respectfully,

(Signed by a lady residing in the Fourth Congressional District in Nebraska.)

Americans Detest One-Man Dominance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OLYMPIAN, OLYMPIA, WASH.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Olympian, of Olympia, Wash., of July 21, 1940:

AMERICANS DETEST ONE-MAN DOMINANCE

For many years George Washington and a Continental Army fought to establish a new kind of government in America. This government was to permit, among other things, freedom of action and thought and expression. They fought against tyranny and oppression, against the long-established custom of handing down power from father to son in an unbroken line. They won their battle; a new kind of government came into being.

But before it was formed, some of Washington's army officers started a movement to make him king of America. His reply was peremptory, even angry. In plain terms he stated his abhorrence of the proposal. He was against kings and all things autocratic.

Washington twice was elected President of the United States by the unanimous vote of electors, and could have served a third time. But he refused, resting on the desire to prevent the possibility of a despotism.

The United States Constitution provides that the President shall be re-eligible to office. No limitation against a third term is expressed or implied.

But Washington realized how great and varied are the powers of the President. He desired to protect the Nation against the temptation of unsurpation, and so he surrendered his authority at the end of two terms.

That is how America's most famous precedent was established, 144 years ago.

During the intervening years thousands of laws have been passed by Congress and written into the statute books. All of them have been broken from time to time by someone.

But the unwritten law, the tradition against a third term, has not been violated, was held in the highest respect—until the night of July 18, 1940.

Adherence to this tradition has been an important factor in the economic development of this country, in the preservation of liberty, in the promotion of happiness, just as Washington thought it would.

And now a man who discourses eloquently on the evils of dictatorships, who has led his country to the brink of war, who attempted to stuff the Supreme Court with his obedient stooges, who strived to influence the election of Congressmen, who has emptied the Treasury and created an unexampled debt, who has attempted to usurp the power delegated to the legislative branch of the Government, who "blitzkrieged" the friends who helped him ascend to political eminence, who implies his services are indispensable in this time of stress, who brought to the White House the greatest egomania possessed by any tenant of that dwelling—this man pleads with the Nation to join with him in the utter demolition of a tradition as old as the Republic.

This man cries out his hatred of dictators, but he proved in recent days that he is as much a dictator to a thousand men and women, representing millions more, as are any of the blood-spilling tyrants on the other sides of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Where would this superegotist set the limit of his authority, were he returned to office?

Fortunately for the future of the Nation, his nomination does not mean election.

By November a vast majority of the voters probably will realize fully the extent of dangers that will come of one-man dominance, which Americans have detested since the day the Republic was founded.

The precedent established by Washington, whose stature as a leader increases with the passing of the years, must be preserved.

Purchasing Another Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, not content with endangering the very existence of our form of government by its drive to establish Roosevelt as a dictator, under the smoke screen of war hysteria which it has created, the New Deal is again on its corrupt way toward the purchase of another election.

Democratic Senator CARTER GLASS it was, who, on June 24, 1937, and you will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date on page 6284, said:

> The last election was carried by people who were getting favors from the Government, people who were subsidized by the Government, people who were on relief rolls.

It is matter of common knowledge that, seeking votes, the President has sought and obtained extraordinary power and blank checks for unbelievable sums, some of the money appropriated specifically for relief.

A Democratic committee of the Senate established the fact indisputably that relief funds had been used to purchase political support.

Now, fearful that the war hysteria will not be sufficient to elect Roosevelt for a third term, the new dealers, whose continuance on the public pay roll is dependent upon his election, are again seeking to purchase the coming November election.

The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman PAUL SHAFER, of the Third District, in a statement issued yesterday, reveals this glaring and corrupt proposed use of relief money for political purposes. His statement shows that he has information disclosing a startling increase in the printing of blank relief checks and food stamps by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing during the past week.

The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman SHAFER, wrote:

> My information is that orders for 10,000,000 blank relief checks were received by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in the past week—more blank checks than have been printed in the last 9 months. Three million of these checks are printed for use in Minnesota, whose Governor is Harold E. Stassen. Other blank checks are for use in Illinois, New York, Michigan, and other political key States.
>
> I have also ascertained that more food stamps were shipped in 3 days during the past week by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing than have been shipped out in the entire history of the food-stamp plan. The present supply is going to Brooklyn, Minneapolis, Cleveland, and other politically strategic centers.
>
> I am fully aware of the serious nature of the implications contained in my statement regarding these developments, and if the past performance of the administration had not been what it has been, I would hesitate to make public these facts and bring them to the floor of the House of Representatives. We must remember, however, that despite the fact tnat Harry Hopkins, then the Administrator of the W. P. A., in an address delivered on May 8, 1938, said:
>
> "Anyone who uses his position with the W. P. A. in any way to influence the votes of others by threat or intimidation would be dismissed."
>
> Nevertheless the President's chief relief officials have made many political statements designed to influence relief votes.
>
> Aubrey Williams, then Deputy Administrator of W. P. A., now head of the National Youth Administration, in a speech to the Workers' Alliance, Washington, D. C., June 27, 1938, said:
>
> "You know your friends very well. Just judge the folks who come and ask for your support by the crowd they run with. * * * The people who stand for Government support of work-relief measures are those who are going to win the election."
>
> Incidentally, I find that in addition to the 10,000,000 relief checks, 700,000 of new checks have been ordered by N. Y. A. to be administered by Mr. Williams.
>
> Harry Hopkins, then Administrator of the W. P. A., now Secretary of Commerce and one of the directing heads of the New Deal campaign, said in a press conference on July 21, 1938:
>
> "We got about 3,000,000 people working for us, and they are Americans like ourselves, and no one can tell them how to vote. * * * They have their own political views, and incidentally I think I know what their views are. * * * At least 90 percent of them are for Roosevelt."
>
> Keeping in mind this sudden and significant, not to say startling, increase in the orders for blank checks, it becomes a remarkable coincidence that the number of persons on the Federal relief rolls have in the past increased greatly from June through October in each election year. Thus in 1933, a nonelection year, the number of persons on Federal relief declined 15.4 percent during these months, although the index of industrial production, reflecting employment, declined 16.5 percent in that period. Yet in the election year of 1934 the number of persons on Federal relief increased 11.6 percent from June through October.
>
> In 1935, a nonelection year, the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 9.6 percent from June through October; but in 1936, an election year, the Federal relief rolls increased 14.4 percent, although unemployment had been reduced 13 percent. In 1937, when there was no election, the Federal relief rolls showed a decline of 16.9 percent from June through October, although the index of production declined 10.5 percent in that period. But in 1938, an election year, the Federal relief rolls showed an increase of 19.2 percent, although unemployment declined 9 percent from June through October. In 1939, when there was no election, the number on relief declined 25.5 percent for the months preceding the usual election date.
>
> The Senate Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures and the Use of Government Funds in the Campaign of 1938 composed of one Republican and four Democratic Senators, under the chairmanship of Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, reported that all over the country pressure was brought to bear on relief workers, relief funds were wrongfully used for political purposes, and the committee found that especially deplorable conditions existed in Kentucky.
>
> Under the circumstances, and in view of this record in the past, this startling and sudden increase in the number of relief checks has a significance which cannot be ignored. Ten million blank relief checks will, whether or not it is so intended, reach and perhaps influence a lot of voters. The free gift of food by the use of food stamps, the distribution of which is under the authority of Henry A. Wallace, the New Deal Vice-Presidential candidate, will reach a lot of voters who naturally would be expected to feel friendly to the administration which gave them this food.
>
> This certainly is a situation in which the old adage has a direct application: "Where there is so much smoke, there's bound to be some fire."

Mr. Speaker, so consumed by his ambition for personal power is the President, that, as stated by Raymond Clapper, his personal friend and who heretofore has been very sympathetic with the New Deal, he was "betrayed into the monumental and historic deception which he now places on the record"—with reference to his desire for a third term.

It is remembered that Roosevelt himself, at New York on November 3, 1932, quoting President Wilson, said: "There is no indispensable man."

Roosevelt also made the statement that there were no "master minds," no "supermen" in Washington.

But now, overwhelmed by his urge to grasp for himself the powers of a dictator, to change our form of government, to use those powers which he said had been returned to Washington and which he said were sufficient to "provide shackles for the liberties of the people," the President is not only attempting, by creating a fear of foreign invasion in the minds of our people, to grasp the reins of government but seeks to use money appropriated for our own unfortunate to purchase political support to maintain himself in office.

Should not our people, who have always heretofore been insistent that public officials be truthful and honest and show a high degree of political morality, overwhelmingly defeat the man they trusted, the man who has betrayed them, and who would destroy our form of government?

My Report to the People of Lewis County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Lewis County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress—their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty, and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's ccunty of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am therefore thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today, holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York, with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continues.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the merchants, laborers, farmers, and citizens generally in 1932 when I visited Centralia, Chehalis, Winlock, Vader, Onalaska, Dryad, Alpha, Mossyrock, Toledo, Pe Ell, Morton, Glenoma, Little Rock, Mineral, Randle, Napavine, Doty, Packwood, and all the other communities of Lewis County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation; prices were down, and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now, and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought, but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

CENTRALIA POST OFFICE

The citizens of Centralia had sought a new Federal post-office building for more than 20 years. In 1933, upon taking my seat in Congress, I introduced my first bill to provide such a structure for this progressive community. Our efforts to obtain authorization and allocation of funds culminated in success in 1935, but due to delays caused by disagreements in regard to site, actual construction was not commenced until 1937. On October 15, 1937, a new, modern, and commodious structure was dedicated by Postmaster General James A. Farley, which was the first post-office building in the history of western Washington to be dedicated personally by a Postmaster General of the United States. The site, building, furnishings, and fixtures cost $76,377.

In his dedicatory address Postmaster General Farley, in referring to my work and record in Congress, said:

I am especially delighted today to be in Centralia with my good friend, your Congressman, MARTIN F. SMITH. This district may well be proud of Congressman SMITH'S able representation in the House of Representatives. He has at all times supported the Administration and President Roosevelt in his efforts to be of assistance to the people. I congratulate this district upon its good judgment in selecting as its Representative Congressman SMITH, and I hope that you will keep him in Washington as long as he cares to remain.

Bills for post-office buildings at Winlock, Pe Ell, and other growing communities in Lewis County have been advanced to favorable position and they will be constructed whenever a new public-building program is undertaken, depending upon the duration of the national-defense emergency.

CHEHALIS PROJECTS

There are few communities in the State and Nation, based upon population, which have had as many improvements made by the Federal Government as Chehalis. Altogether some 25 Federal projects, aggregating over $300,000, have been constructed, consisting of fairground buildings, parks, streets, sidewalks, water mains, a dozen different school projects, playgrounds, tennis courts, and various other community projects of permanent value. Centralia, including

Borst Park, has received a great diversity of municipal and school projects, too numerous to mention.

WHITE PASS HIGHWAY

During the period of my service in Congress I have cooperated actively with the citizens and communities of southwest Washington in furthering the completion of the White Pass Highway. I succeeded several years ago in obtaining allocation of funds through the United States Bureau of Public Roads and more recently Federal forestry funds. The Federal Government has made substantial contributions toward the construction of this important link in our highway system, so vitally important to Lewis County and all of southwest Washington. I am now stressing its importance as a link in our national defense, as no funds have been allotted this year on account of the emergency national-defense program.

COOPERATION REGARDING LEWIS COUNTY PRODUCTS

It has been my privilege to cooperate vigorously with the Chehalis Brick & Tile Co., George H. Burrows, president and manager, Centralia coal dealers, miners, and other business firms in behalf of the use of local products and the employing of local labor on Government contracts.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Lewis County the sum of $5,260,224, and loaned therein the additional sum of $2,456,109, a total of $7,716,333.

County roads, school, power-transmission lines, fish ladders, flood control, armory, parks, playgrounds, sanitation, streets, sidewalks, sewers, county mapping, water mains, city-buildings projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have therefore supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, viz, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was paid, we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Lewis County thus received $872,661.14.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran—the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel-pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows, and dependents which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME-OWNERS' LOANS—BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPOSITS

As one of the 5 Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Lewis County 132 citizens have received loans aggregating $258,250 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the buildings trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that 338 citizens in Lewis County have received loans aggregating $471,131.72. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people; and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the 7 banks in Lewis County have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. The 4,392 depositors in 3 savings and loan associations likewise have their deposits insured under the same legislation. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about these great reforms which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public-works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the parent-teachers' associations in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and national life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general-welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934 and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States

Senate recently for the first time authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect enough of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have since 1932 doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me, and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have, therefore, at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fishponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I am proud of my sponsorship of the $70,000,000 Bonneville project and rural-electrification projects and shall exert every effort to bring their benefits to all our citizens.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my wholehearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time and for 5 years previously, the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE in the campaign in 1932 to say:

The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact. .

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933, the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red-cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red-cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

Shingle weavers commend SMITH. A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red-cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased expresses our feeling very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill, and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been "on the job" for us, and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain,

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when the candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years, and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of facts, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago, and again this year, the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1928, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith Amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the Revenue Act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked on to the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100 percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if made, would be interesting, probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulfite workers' unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER-LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21, and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler-log matter.

APPOINTMENTS TO WEST POINT AND ANNAPOLIS

Reginald J. Clizbe, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ira J. Clizbe, 501 South Washington Avenue, Centralia, who was appointed to the United States Military Academy at West Point on my recommendation, graduated with honors this year.

Richard L. Evans, of Chehalis, was appointed to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis on my recommendation and is due to graduate in 1942.

William F. Jennings, of Centralia, was appointed to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis on my recommendation, graduated with honors in 1938, and is now an ensign on the destroyer *MacDonough.*

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington, and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Lewis County a total of 113 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $1,695. Under the college-work program there are 13 students attending Centralia Junior College, with a total yearly quota of $1,350. Twelve schools of Lewis County are included in the school-work program, with a total of 145 student workers and a total yearly quota of $4,644.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district, in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138 as amended was carefully considered and provides effective remedies against all foreign "isms" without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one "ism," and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe, and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

Revival of Pan American Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 23, 1940:

[From the Times-Herald of June 23, 1940]

STRAIGHT FROM THE SHOULDER—AN OPEN LETTER TO F. D. R.

(By Vincent X. Flaherty)

Dear Mr. President, we are no expert on national and international topics. Neither do we profess any great knowledge of diplomacy as defined by the State Department. We are not well enough versed upon current topics to consider ourself either an interventionist or an isolationist. Possibly, because we aren't quick to soak up the things we read and hear and store them away in our mental locker room as concrete facts.

If we belong to any school of thought, we're probably qualified to hold a back-row seat in what George Marshall calls the "common sensenist" party, whose headquarters are located in most American homes. But we do know a little about sport, its attractiveness to the peoples of the world, and this thing they call crowd psychology. Well, at least we think we do.

So now, at this time when there is much talk about the spreading of good will among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, the "common-sensenist" crops out in us enough to make us believe the United States is missing the greatest bet of all in weaving the Pan-American countries together in a closely knitted oneness. And we allude to sports.

Sports, more than all the diplomatic back patting and hand clasping, can accomplish more in 1 day than any other medium might accomplish in months or years. It is the language of the world and not understood in only one county, State, province, or country. And the athletic field is the universal meeting ground of common understanding.

WHY NOT REVIVE PAN-AMERICAN GAMES?

So why not now revive the pan-American games which George Marshall promoted in connection with the Texas Centennial in 1937 at Dallas? For the most part, it would be a self-supporting proposition and would not require any great outlaying of cash.

The first pan-American games were witnessed by more than 100,000 persons, although the attendances were largely made up of native Texans. Moreover, the Little Olympics of Dallas were staged on a minor scale, compared to the great dimensions a revival of the games might reach. And what more appropriate site could one desire than the Nation's Capital for a renewal of this great track and field classic?

Among the pan-American countries represented at Dallas were Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Canada, and the United States. The greatest of Latin-American athletes went to complete the pounding panorama, and more than 25,000 news stories flooded the Americas as newspapermen from all sections of the Western Hemisphere filed accounts to their homelands. Likewise, radio broadcasts covered all of South America, and news reels carried pictorial accounts of the games into Montreal, New York, and Rio de Janeiro.

Every spectator who saw the games came away with a newer and deeper confidence in Latin American nations because of the skill, courage, and sportsmanship displayed by their athletes. On the other hand, Latin American participants left for their homes with a more wholesome respect for the United States because of its great athletes, the fairness of its sports fans, and the warm hospitality they received. Sports, like no other medium, can accomplish that.

MUST FIRST HAVE STADIUM HERE

Of course, Washington, D. C., must first have a suitable stadium to house such a great spectacle. And though voteless Washingtonians have fought for years for a stadium, our thought of bringing back the pan-American games alive isn't particularly used as a means toward that end. Our primary interest is offering sports as a panacea for the pan-American problem. And a stadium for Washington is less than a secondary motive.

On May 16, 1940, Representative JACK NICHOLS introduced a bill before the House of Representatives identified as H. R. 9797. And that bill could provide a stadium which would pay for itself in time. It would more than fit the needs of the pan-American games.

We do not expect to enlighten you, Mr. President, upon the values of athletics. We are quite familiar with your football and baseball background at Groton. How you won the running high kick and created a Groton record, which still stands, during your prep-school years. We are acquainted, too, with the facts concerning your prowess on the Nashua River as an oarsman, and how you ultimately made the Newell crew at Harvard.

So we need not tell you how the heat of competitive sport breeds good fellowship in the after hours. Nor need we illustrate the night after an Army-Navy game as an example of the good will which results when Navy's midshipmen and the cadets of West Point band together in convivial groups, win, lose, or tie.

So why not start this international league of friendliness in the Nation's Capital and then let the Latin-American nations alternate in playing host to us in ensuing years until it is our turn to bring our South American friends back again? For sport is the greatest ambassador of good will the world has ever known, and it nullifies the hypocrisy of platinumed oratory and shows of tinseled culture. It is that real!

The Ramparts We Watch—America, What of the Morrow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. HOMER D. ANGELL, OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address which I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Wednesday, July 31, 1940, from the studios of WJSV, Columbia's station for the Nation's Capital. The address is as follows:

THE RAMPARTS WE WATCH—AMERICA WHAT OF THE MORROW?

Summer heat has descended upon Washington in all its intensity. Many of the Federal departments have been compelled, by reason of the excessive heat and humidity, to dismiss their staffs early in the afternoons. Congress, however, is in session. On June 11 the President stated that there seemed to be no reason why Congress could not clean up its work in a couple of weeks and adjourn. However, the President in his third-term acceptance speech said:

"Events move so fast in other parts of the world that it has become my duty to remain either in the White House or at some nearby point where I can reach Washington, and even Europe and Asia, by direct telephone; where, if need be, I can be back at my desk in the space of a very few hours."

Those of us who from the outset have opposed adjournment and who have had to do with the extensive program of legislation for national defense still uncompleted, and with the necessary changes in the program almost from day to day, realize more fully now than ever that the most serious mistake Congress could make would be to adjourn during these critical times. If it is necessary that the President remain at or near his desk, it is equally important that the Congress, which alone can pass the needed legislation and provide for the national defense, should remain at work. The welfare of the Nation must come first. The political fortunes or personal welfare of Members of the Congress are unimportant when the welfare of the Nation is involved.

There are two major issues confronting the Congress today. The first is our national defense. In the last 7 years we have expended billions of dollars in a vain attempt to restore prosperity to America. While we engaged in practically every sort of project

to provide employment for the millions of idle American workers, we completely neglected our national defense, with 10,000,000 workers unemployed and available for the task. At the time the present administration assumed office the totalitarian powers of Europe began their programs, building war machines with which to subjugate the world. Unquestionably our accredited representatives at these foreign capitals were fully aware of this feverish activity in building these superwar facilities. Otherwise they were derelict in their duties. Nevertheless, the administration permitted our own defenses to lag until now we find ourselves miserably equipped and wholly unprepared for any major conflict.

The Congress is now endeavoring to remedy the error by passing the needed legislation for preparedness against any attack. The Congress has already voted at this session more than $15,500,000,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations. Requests still before the Congress will bring the total to more than $20,000,000,000. Senator WALSH has estimated that the two-ocean navy bill just signed by the President will cost the taxpayers $10,000,000,000. However, the mere authorization and appropriation of the funds for military, naval, and air equipment and personnel will not insure adequate defense. These appropriations must be transformed into guns, munitions, ships, bombing planes, mechanized equipment, and other modern implements of warfare. To do so requires complete mobilization of our industrial enterprises and our manpower. It cannot be done overnight. It will require years. The expenditures we have already authorized will be only a first payment on an armament-cost bill that will exceed many times these original outlays and will involve a continuing yearly expense for maintenance running into billions. The problem confronting the Congress today is to insure that these vast armaments shall be dedicated to defense and not offense—that we shall make clear to all that we are providing the means to defend ourselves against attack but not to engage in intervention or foreign expeditions. The Congress should remain at its post of duty until this objective is accomplished and until this emergency is over. Such a course will be our best assurance against being drawn into the European war. It is not enough that we refrain from sending our soldiers overseas. We must see to it that America is kept out of the war—by intervention or otherwise.

This whole preparedness program is preliminary to the other major problem confronting the Congress today, namely, the protection and preservation of our American democracy for ourselves and future generations. It is useless to provide these immense armaments unless we make sure that the thing we hold most dear—the American way of life—will be preserved by their use.

On July 4, 1776, our forebears established here on American soil a new concept of government. It has come to be known as American democracy, although strictly speaking it is a Republican form of government. It is a government of free men. Abraham Lincoln described it as a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. As we look overseas today we find the Old World has almost completely repudiated this concept of government which we hold dear. For over 140 years our American democratic way has been a model for other countries in their endeavor to throw off the yoke of slavery and assume the status of free men. But for almost a quarter of a century now we have seen spreading throughout Europe and Asia an ideology of government based upon a concept diametrically opposed to the American plan. Instead of protecting the freedom of the individual by government, it seeks to submerge the individual in the state and to make him a slave of the state, and to establish a totalitarian rule, a government ruled by one man or by a small class, self-appointed and self-perpetuated. Our problem today in America is to protect and preserve our American way against these insidious attacks and undermining by this European concept. An attack upon us may indeed never come by force of arms, but we are already experiencing an assault upon our American ideals, morale, and institutions from within. Our greatest task as Americans is to meet this attack and effectively stamp out this infiltration of totalitarian ideologies seeking to pollute and destroy our American way of life.

We in America today are in the midst of a great "war of the nerves." Rumor, gossip, opinions, propaganda, and every factor that sways human emotions are tearing into the structure of the individual and creating suspicion and hatred among a normally happy and contented people. This onslaught is designed to undermine and tear down the foundations of the American structure of free government operated by free men which we have been building in America for more than 150 years.

We may be far removed from the spitting of machine guns, the roar of the tank, and the clashing of arms—but we are close, very, very close to the influences of distorted opinion wearing away at the structure of American tolerance and democracy. We find too few people who have taken sufficient time to comprehend clearly that after all, this is America and our job in this crisis is to save America, preserve our American ideals and keep America clear of involvement in the feuds and wars of the Old World. This is the challenge confronting the Congress. With your help, God willing, we must and will prevail.

We can preserve and maintain our own ideals of government and escape the fate the Old World is experiencing today for a thousand years to come if we will complete our military defenses as planned and chart our course to avoid our entanglement in the feuds, power politics, and wars of Europe and Asia, and bar from our shores their emissaries preaching the gospel of intolerance, unrest, and disloyalty. The Monroe Doctrine decrees that the Old World keep hands off of the Western Hemisphere. Likewise it bars American interference in the internal affairs of Europe and Asia.

Totalitarian governments centralize all power in one head. In our own America there has been a marked trend along this road in the centralization of power in the Nation's Capital, which has been proceeding for several years. It is evidenced by the gradual absorption by the executive department of the Federal Government of governmental activities which formerly were performed by local communities or the individual States of the Union. The huge bureaucracies under the control of the Executive and centered in Washington have reached out into every activity of our Government. It is also evidenced by the Executive control over the legislative branch of the Government, relegating the Congress to a mere rubber stamp giving mere formal approval to the plans formulated by the Executive. This trend was further shown by the attempt to bring the judiciary under the control and domination of the Executive. If these plans are allowed to mature, we will be a long way down the road leading to a totalitarian government. This totalitarian concept of one-man rule has been pressed to the front by the renomination in Chicago of a President for a third term. One of the foundation stones of the American Republic was the repudiation of the idea of the divine right of the King to rule; the hereditary right of the ruler to perpetuate himself in power. The framers of the Constitution sought to draft a constitution which would banish one-man rule and curb the power of the representatives of the people to jeopardize the fundamental liberties retained by the people themselves. They therefore established checks and balances against the several departments of government, lodging different and specific powers in each, freed from the control of the others, and limiting the functions of the Executive to certain delegated powers.

One problem facing the framers of the Constitution was the limitation to be placed on the tenure of the office of the Chief Executive. After a provision limiting the tenure to one term of 7 years was adopted and later reconsidered, the term of office of the Executive was fixed at 4 years, with no designated prohibition against reelection. Jefferson confessed to Washington that the "perpetual reeligibility of the President" might make for life or even for hereditary tenure and deplored the failure to place a limitation upon the term of the office. However, this defect in the Constitution was overcome by Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe refusing to accept a third term and establishing an unwritten law that there should be no third term. This precedent, established by the Father of our Country, the founder of the Democratic Party, and the author of the Monroe Doctrine, has never been broken for a hundred and fifty years. No political party since that time has felt justified in overriding this precedent, which now amounts to law, until our present Chief Executive forced his renomination at the recent Democratic convention. Jefferson, on being urged to run for a third term, said:

"But that I should lay down my charge at a proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully.

"If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for years, will in fact become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance.

"Believing that a representative government responsible at short periods of election is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle; and I should unwillingly be the person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office."

Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, further said:

"Should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

The underlying reason against a third term is that a President having served for 8 years and having under his control the vast power now resident in the Chief Executive of the Nation, is in a position, should he desire to use his power, to compel his renomination. As Jefferson said, this may make the office nominally for years, one for life and, as history shows, might degenerate into an inheritance. This procedure is un-American and clearly opposed to the American concept of a democratic government. It is an attribute of a totalitarian rule or dictatorship. This very thing did happen in Chicago, when the Chief Executive, through his domination and control of the convention by the exercise of the great powers of his office, not only forced his own renomination for a third term but also named the Vice Presidential nominee.

The Democratic Party, in its 1896 national platform, declared:

"We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the examples of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our Government, that no man shall be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office."

The Senate of the United States, on February 10, 1928, adopted the following resolution:

"That it is the sense of the Senate that the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from the Presidential office after their second term has become by universal concurrence a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

The resolution was passed by a vote of 56 to 26. Among others voting for it were Senators CAPPER, HARRISON, NORRIS, ASHURST, BARKLEY, BLACK, GLASS, KING, PITTMAN, THOMAS, TYDINGS, WHEELER, and WAGNER.

CONCLUSION

The Government belongs to the people. It is slipping from their grasp. Our task—yours and mine—is to help the people of America recapture their government. Our democracy is on trial. Our American way of life is confronted with a real challenge. It is nonpartisan. We must be imbued with the spirit of sacrifice if we are to meet it. We must not forget that our founding fathers in penning the Declaration of Independence, which chartered our liberties, cried out against the iniquities of one-man rule with the indictment: He has obstructed the administration of justice; he has made judges dependent upon his will for the tenure of their office; he has erected a multitude of new offices and sent swarms of officers to harass our people and to eat out their substance; he has kept among us in times of peace standing armies. As a result they declared their independence, severing the political bonds which bound them to the mother country. They were not unmindful, however, of the price they must pay for their liberties, and they declared as the concluding article in the Declaration of Independence:

"And for the support of this declaration, with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

We of today who have come into this precious heritage, the liberties of free men, can do no less than did these immortal founders of our Nation—pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to preserve our America for ourselves and those who will follow us in the years that lie ahead.

My Report to the People of Thurston County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Thurston County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress. Their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty, and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate, they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district, and am, therefore, thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House, today holds five chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continue.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the merchants, laborers and farmers in 1932 when I visited Olympia, Tumwater, Tenino, Rochester, Bucoda, Grand Mound, Little Rock, Gate, and all the other communities in Thurston County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation—prices were down and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

OLYMPIA HARBOR

During my service in Congress and as a member of the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, we have had more dredging and improvements accomplished in Olympia Harbor than during the entire previous history of the port, which fact will be verified by the efficient port manager, Mr. E. C. Gribble, and the port commissioners. I have had no less than four separate projects approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for deepening of the channel, providing turning basins, and so forth. We have now pending and awaiting authorization and allocation of funds a new project to cost $80,000. As a direct consequence of this cooperation and our successful efforts, the port of Olympia has become one of the outstanding commercial ports in the Pacific Northwest, and the facilities provided have caused a steady growth and increase in employment, trade, and cargo tonnage. These harbor improvements are a substantial and direct benefit to the industries and workers of Olympia.

In 1939 the port of Olympia enjoyed the most prosperous year in its history, the total revenue surpassing any previous year by 41 percent. Lumber loadings were the largest in 10 years. General cargoes were 50 percent greater than those of the previous record year of 1938. There were 293 ships berthed at the port.

COOPERATION REGARDING THURSTON COUNTY PRODUCTS

It has been my privilege to cooperate vigorously in behalf of the use of rock and stone from the Skookumchuck Quarry on the Grays Harbor Jetties, which has provided much employment for local citizens. Also, I have cooperated constantly with Mr. Andrew Wilson in behalf of Tenino sandstone on contracts on Federal buildings.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Thurston County the sum of $6,563,028, and loaned therein the additional sum of $1,332,934, a total of $7,895,962.

Flood control, school, airport, dock, armory, irrigation, drainage, road, street, sidewalk, water system, recreation field, park, sanitation projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have therefore supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, namely, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was "paid," we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Thurston County thus received $683,389.10.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel-pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows and dependents, which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME OWNERS' LOANS—BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Thurston County 313 citizens have received loans aggregating $1,006,500 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including painters, electricians, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that 368 citizens in Thurston County have received loans aggregating $602,378.45. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people, and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the two banks in Thurston County have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. The 11,919 depositors in three savings and loan associations likewise have their deposits insured under the same legislation. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about these great reforms which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active Member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the parent-teacher associations in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and National life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which, as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934, and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently, for the first time, authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress, we confidently expect to reelect enough of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration, and have since 1932 doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me, and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem, but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the

worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940, and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan, to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture, and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I am proud of my sponsorship of the $70,000,000 Bonneville Project and rural electrification projects, and shall exert every effort to bring their benefits to all our citizens.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have, therefore, at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fishponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my whole-hearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1337 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time, and for 5 years previously, the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE, in the campaign in 1932, to say, "The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact."

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933 the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

> I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

> This news is about the most important that has come to red cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

> At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

SHINGLE WEAVERS COMMEND SMITH

> A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weavers unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

> The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased expresses our feeling very mildly.
>
> Having full knowledge of the difficulties of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.
>
> All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill, and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been "on the job" for us and we are very appreciative.
>
> With best wishes for your continued success we remain.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
> By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
> *Secretary-Manager.*

I would suggest that when the candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of facts, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager

and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the Revenue Act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked onto the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100 percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if made, would be interesting, probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulphite workers unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21, and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler log matter.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington, and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State Administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures for the college work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college work funds. In Thurston County a total of 102 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $1,530. Under the college work program there are 10 students attending St. Martin's College, with a total yearly quota of $1,350. Five schools of Thurston County are included in the school work program, with a total of 134 student workers, and a total yearly quota of $4,860.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district, in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods, and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation, and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities, and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138, as amended, was carefully considered, and provides effective remedies against all foreign isms without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and the best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one ism, and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe, and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me over the National Broadcasting System on the night of July 30 in opposition to military conscription in peacetime.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that before the United States adopts compulsory military service in peacetime we should first give the traditional voluntary-enlistment plan a fair trial.

Those urging compulsory military training for the young men of the Nation assert that the voluntary-enlistment plan has failed, but they produce no evidence to show that voluntary enlistment has failed. The Adjutant General of the Army and General Marshall, Chief of Staff, tell us that the recruiting service of the Army has filled every quota set by the Army and that in June and July the quotas were obtained before the end of the month.

I am convinced that if the term of enlistment is reduced from 3 years to 1 year and if the base pay is increased from $21 to $30 a month all the men needed will enlist. I say we should give this democratic plan a fair trial before adopting the Hitler system of military conscription in the United States.

I send to the desk a copy of my radio broadcast to be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR 1-YEAR VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT IN PEACETIME

Friends in the radio audience, I am opposed emphatically to the conscription of our young men into military service in peacetime.

Therefore I shall oppose to the limit of my strength and ability the Burke-Wadsworth bill, which would set up the first peacetime conscription program in the history of the United States. I am for 1-year voluntary enlistment in peacetime.

I shall oppose conscription without rancor, without hysteria, and without casting any doubts upon the purposes of those sponsoring this legislation. I know that those supporting, as well as those opposing, conscription in peacetime are sincerely and patriotically interested in national defense, as I am.

No doubt those favoring this legislation believe honestly that such a program is essential to safeguard our country against the fate which has befallen France and other European nations in the past few months. I might note in passing, however, that France had conscription of manpower, so it was not failure or neglect to conscript its youth into the army that caused France's downfall.

I sincerely believe, and many others have the same belief, that America can be adequately defended and our interests safeguarded, without resorting to conscription of manpower, without compulsory military training.

The proposed conscription bill seems to have the approval of the Army high command, and that is not to be wondered at. It will enable the Army to reach into every county in the United States and get the pick of the young men and boys to work with.

But the people of my State, including all classes, are opposed to conscription in peacetime as a matter of principle and as leading directly to the destruction of their personal liberties. They believe and I believe that conscription will prove to be still another step in the program to lead us into the European war. I am against that.

Now, I am for an adequate national defense. I want an Army, Navy, and air force large enough, well enough equipped, well enough trained to fight off any aggression that might be attempted against us. But I do not believe we want the Hitler system of organizing this Nation for war. And certainly there is no reason why the pending bill should be rushed through Congress without fair and full consideration.

The people of this country want the United States to remain a democracy. I want the United States to remain a democracy. I do not believe that conscription of the youth of the Nation in peacetime can be labeled a democratic process by any stretch of the imagination.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill provides for the registration of all males between the ages of 18 and 64. It empowers the President, in peacetime, at his own discretion, subject only to necessary appropriations by Congress, to draft into the military service such men as are considered needed between the ages of 21 and 45; to draft those between 18 and 21, and between 45 and 64, for home-defense purposes.

Army spokesmen appearing before Senate and House committees inform us that it is only intended to draft for military training a million men a year from those without dependents, and not needed in industry for national-defense purposes, between the ages of 21 to 31. However, the bill provides specifically for drafting also a percentage from the 31–45 group. The Army informs us also that the drafting machinery already has been set up in all the 48 States, ready to start grinding as soon as Congress enacts the legislation.

Under this proposal at least a million of our young men will be drafted into the military service every year for a year's training.

Back of this bill, which has a life of 5 years, but is pushed as designed only to meet an existing emergency, there is a drive to make universal military training for all our youth permanently a part of our governmental system. I am against that program. It is un-American and unnecessary. I am for the American way of organizing our defense forces, not the Hitler way.

My friends, I would be willing to vote for conscription of manpower for national defense if and when this Nation goes to war to defend our own national interests.

But conscription in peacetime is another thing. I will admit that when the United States finds it necessary to engage in modern war, the only fair and equitable and efficient way to raise the Army is through the selective service.

And right at this point I wish to interject another thought. If ever we go to war, and it becomes necessary to draft men, I say we also should draft wealth. I am opposed, even in wartime, to drafting men without also drafting war profits. I am opposed to any program which creates several thousand war millionaires.

It is generally recognized that under present conditions, with a good part of the world war mad and the dictators of Europe on the march of pillage and destruction, the United States is not adequately prepared to defend itself against all the forces that might conceivably be thrown against us.

A gigantic rearmament program is under way. Billions of dollars are being expended for warships, airplanes, tanks, other equipment, and munitions and war supplies.

I think all of us realize that the mere appropriation and expenditure of $15,000,000,000 or more is not all that is necessary to build an adequate national defense. Trained men and tried leadership must be provided.

But the fact that men are needed for our armed forces does not of itself prove that conscription is necessary.

If we can obtain the necessary men in the traditional and democratic way of voluntary enlistments—and I believe we can—I say that would be highly preferable to conscription.

There is no showing as yet that the Army cannot be recruited to necessary strength, even to a million or more men, through voluntary enlistments, for 1 year. That is the plan I am supporting and I hope Congress will approve it. General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, told the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that so far enlistments have run ahead of the quotas set by the Army itself. The June quota was 15,000—that quota was reached 10 days before the end of the month.

"In other words," said General Marshall, "recruiting went ahead in good shape."

And at that, it is worth noting that those who enlist now in the Army must enlist for a full 3-year period, at a base pay of $21 a month. Young men can enlist in the Civilian Conservation Corps for 1 year and draw $30 a month.

It seems to me that it might be well worth while to allow Army enlistment for 1 year or one 18-month period, pay $30 a month, and see if the response will not be more than enough to get a million men for the first year's training.

Instead of taking it for granted, without any attempt at proof, that an army for training purposes cannot be raised by voluntary enlistment, why not make a real effort to recruit the Army through voluntary enlistments for 1 year before taking the Hitler way of conscripting our boys and young men for military service? That seems to me to be good common sense.

There is another danger in this hurried attempt to force through conscription and build up a huge army—perhaps larger than is needed for even Western Hemisphere defense.

That danger was pointed out by Maj. George Fielding Eliot in the Herald Tribune last Sunday. Writing of this mass mobilization of man power proposed, Major Eliot said:

"There may be other ways of improving the national morale besides spending more than is necessary on an army which, if it passes the size needed for hemisphere missions, may well become an instrument useful only for overseas adventures—perhaps for a ghastly holocaust in Europe in case the British-German duel fights itself down to a standstill.

"Remember there is no certainty," Major Eliot continued, "either that Britain can stand off Germany or that Germany can successfully invade Britain. But if Britain makes a successful defense of her islands—as we all hope—she can hardly take the offensive against Germany thereafter, for lack of manpower. We should be quite clear on one point—that we do not propose to provide the manpower for any invasion of the European continent. It will be much better not to create any instrument of war which can be useful for that purpose alone." I say we must keep out of Europe's war.

I tell you, my friends, this Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill should be given careful attention by the Congress, and by the country, before it reaches the stage of a final vote.

Is the purpose back of this measure merely to provide an army for adequate defense—which all of us want, and for which any needed sacrifice will be made cheerfully and willingly—or is it for the purpose of training a larger army that will be available for service overseas? Is Congress being asked to pass a draft law to provide the men for another American expeditionary force to fight in Europe's wars? I certainly am against that.

These are legitimate questions. Those sponsoring this measure should be required to show (1) that the number of men intended to be trained is necessary for national defense; (2) that the required number cannot be recruited by voluntary enlistments.

And I believe they should make it plain that all they want is an Army, Navy, and air force designed for national defense—not an

oversized Army for overseas service. It would be criminal to take us into a foreign war at this time.

I say we should consider this whole proposition as calmly as the present disturbed state of the world will permit.

It seems to me the fundamental questions involved are these:

Has it become necessary for the United States to abandon its traditional American policy of 150 years and raise a conscript Army in peacetime?

Has it become necessary for the United States to declare that the individual is only a pawn in the hands of the State, without personal choice?

Has it become necessary to abandon—aye, to destroy—personal freedom of our young men and adopt the Hitler policies of militaristic continental Europe and use autocratic military conscription?

I say it is up to the proponents of this conscription bill to show that the answers to these questions are all "Yes." As for me, I do not believe it.

I, for one, will not vote for conscription for military service unless and until it is proved to me beyond all reasonable doubt that there is no other way of building up an adequate national defense.

And I am convinced that this cannot be proved.

Furthermore, as I have stated many times on the floor of the Senate, I will never vote to send American boys across the seas to fight in other people's wars.

I shall continue to do everything in my power to keep this country out of foreign wars. It would be criminal to take the United States into Europe's war at this time.

Revision of National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN MINTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], published in the Washington Daily News of August 3, 1940, under the auspices of the American Forum, on the question: Should the Wagner Labor Act be drastically revised?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN FORUM—SHOULD THE WAGNER LABOR ACT BE DRASTICALLY REVISED?—THE QUESTION

(By Theodore Granik, director, the American Forum)

One vital difference between the Republican and Democratic platforms adopted for the 1940 campaign is the stand of the opposing parties on the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act.

The Republican position is that the act should "be amended in fairness to employers and all groups of employees so as to provide true freedom for, and orderliness in, self-organization and collective bargaining." The Democratic pledge "to maintain the principles" of the act, and "to strengthen the orderly processes of collective bargaining and peaceful settlement of labor disputes."

The point of cleavage is the issue of amending the law, which has been the subject of bitter controversy. Hailed by labor as a new Magna Carta, the Wagner Act has been denounced by various organizations as one-sided and discriminatory.

Last year both the House and Senate Labor Committees held extensive hearings, and this year a special committee headed by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Virginia Democrat, made an inquiry into the operations of the act and the personnel of the Labor Board. The Republican labor plank is written on the basis of the disclosures of the Smith committee.

To present both sides of this important campaign issue, the American Forum has secured authoritative articles from congressional leaders of the opposing viewpoints. They are written exclusively for this page.

"NO," SAYS SENATOR THOMAS

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor)

No one would be opposed to any constructive amendment to any act, for all persons realize that no act is perfect. Therefore, when I answer "No" to the question submitted, I mean that I am opposed to any amendment which would destroy the effectiveness, or the purpose, or the basically democratic principles behind the National Labor Relations Act in its attempt to make collective bargaining function properly.

Those of us who took part in the framing of the National Labor Relations Act realized that we were bringing into existence a great habit-forming institution. We assumed that the principle of collective bargaining was a correct principle. We assumed that all steps toward bringing about the selection of the collective bargainers must be steps consistent with the basic principles of free action, of free elections uncoerced and uninfluenced.

Especially should those steps be free in the sense that no person either representing or secretly acting for the employer could be able to use persuasion, economic pressure, or threat of losing a job upon anyone who should appear at the polls or who should take part in any of the preliminaries expected to result in an election. In other words, the framers of the act, in order to assure honest bargaining, took a firm stand against the company-dominated union.

EXPERIMENT NOT YET TESTED

Therefore the first reason why I would stand against any amendment which was not a corrective or constructive amendment would be that the time element, which is necessary to insure a real test of any habit-forming legislation such as the National Labor Relations Act, has not been sufficient to give that test.

The next reason I would oppose amendments at this time is that through the enforcement of the act the regulations have been changed from time to time; court reviews, in fact, have made some of these changes necessary, so that the act as yet has not reached the position in time or in practice which could be called stable.

The National Labor Relations Act was a great experiment in an attempt to do a democratic thing in a democratic way and to give to the workers of this Nation a right to speak honestly for themselves when their welfare demanded that they should. The experiment has gone far enough for us to know that it has justified itself.

It has not gone far enough for us to call the experiment perfect. But there are hundreds of thousands of workers in America who realize that they have attained a new freedom, a freedom that gives them a sense of security, a freedom that causes them to know that in America there is an economic democracy as well as a political democracy. This new great freedom will add to the stability of our industrial organizations manyfold.

GROWTH OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

It will be discovered as time goes on that the interests of the workers will increase, that their appreciation of their employer's position and needs will grow. The people of our country, watching this growth, will note that just as political democracy tends toward stability, just so will economic democracy tend toward stability.

It is interesting to point out that those who fear a growth of industrial democracy are like those among our founding fathers who feared the growth of political democracy. The more the people have to do with things the more stable in all things will our land become. Let wealth and power be gathered in one place and the people are divided; let wealth and power be scattered and the people will become united.

It was a glorious sight to watch 135,000 employees of one of our great corporations go to the ballot booths and vote for bargainers, in much the same way as they vote as citizens of the United States in selecting their Representatives in Congress or their Governors or their President.

Think of it. One corporation alone on the same day having 135,000 of its employees freely expressing themselves about who should represent them. More ballots cast in one industry than are cast in some of the States of the Union at a general election.

This is a magnificent spectacle when viewed from the standpoint of the growth and development of democracy. I know that some of those who are demanding amendments will say that they do not want to interfere with this splendid spectacle, but that they just want to make it better. How can we make an institution better by amending the process before time has proved the worthwhileness of its great fundamentals?

LABOR SELF-DISCIPLINING

The dream that every thoughtful person has for industrial America is that labor shall take on the privileges of citizenship in industrial America; that labor shall become self-disciplining; that labor shall reprimand its own leadership when its leadership is at fault or corrupt; that labor shall be free to select its own leaders. Therein is the key of good leadership.

Throughout history those in society who have had the privileged positions have always been suspicious of extending the privileges of those positions to others. Whenever a freedom has been obtained, those of the privileged group have always been afraid that such freedom would be abused.

Let us give labor a chance to use its freedom, assert its freedom, and let us have faith that labor itself will correct its own abuses. The American laboring man is considered competent to vote for his Governor, to vote for his President. If he can be trusted to vote right politically, where the stake is great, we may rest assured that he can be trusted to vote right economically, where the stake is the lesser.

Just as laboring men strike down dishonest and corrupt leaders politically, so they will, if given a chance and if their elections are kept free, strike down a corrupt labor leader. Let us let democracy function.

My Report to the People of Pacific County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN F. SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Pacific County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress—their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years, and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am, therefore, thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems, and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House, today holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York, with 6 out of its 45 members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

> A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continue.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the merchants, laborers, farmers, and citizens generally in 1932 when I visited Raymond, South Bend, Naselle, Ilwaco, Long Beach, Seaview, Chinook, Ocean Park, and all the communities of Pacific County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation—prices were down, and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now, and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AID AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought, but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

RAYMOND POST OFFICE

For many years the progressive citizens of Raymond have sought a new post-office building. On April 18, 1935, I introduced the first bill in Congress and finally in 1939 secured the first allocation of $80,000 and later an additional $20,000, making approximately $100,000 for the building and site. The building is now in course of construction and, when completed, the citizens and patrons of the Raymond post office will have one of the finest and most commodious buildings in any community of like population in the State of Washington. I am pressing vigorously my bill for a new post-office building for South Bend and feel sure that my efforts will be successful as they were in the case of Raymond.

WILLAPA HARBOR—NARROWS PROJECT

During the period of my service in Congress and as a member of the powerful Committee on Rivers and Harbors, we have had more dredging and new improvements on Willapa Harbor than during the entire previous history of the port, which can be verified by the efficient port manager and engineer, Maj. L. D. Williams, Jr., and the port commissioners. As a direct consequence of this cooperation and our successful efforts, the facilities provided have caused a steady growth and increase in employment, trade, and cargo tonnage. These harbor improvements are a substantial and direct benefit to the industries and workers of Willapa Harbor.

For 10 years prior to my election to Congress, the industries and citizens desired improvement and straightening of the Narrows. We have succeeded in having this project approved and the actual work done by the Federal Government at a cost of $200,000. I recently had approved the new Bay Center Channel dredging project at a cost of $30,000, and the funds will be provided and actual work done in due course.

BAKER BAY, CHINOOK BREAKWATER, WEST CHANNEL

We have had the Baker Bay project, so important to Ilwaco, Long Beach, and Seaview, at a cost of $56,000, carried out; also the Chinook Breakwater, costing $25,000.

After 3 years of steady, up-hill effort, we have finally obtained adoption, after several rebuffs, of the West Channel project, estimated cost $170,000, which will be carried out as soon as the necessary authorization is made and the funds are available. The North Jetty on the Columbia River, costing $1,170,000, was completed in August 1937. On account of its importance to Pacific County, this project received my active and vigorous support before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and in Congress from the time it was first proposed until it was completed.

NEW ILWACO HOSPITAL

I consider the new Ilwaco Hospital, to which the P. W. A. allotted $7,650, one of the most useful and necessary projects in Pacific County. I cooperated actively with the board of county commissioners, local citizens, and all interested parties in securing Federal aid and making possible this worthy enterprise. Under the efficient supervision of Dr. D. M. Strang and his staff of nurses, and with the most modern

equipment, this hospital will benefit the health and prolong the lives of many citizens.

AIRPLANE AND SEAPLANE BASE

I have introduced a bill to authorize an appropriation of $1,000,000 for an airplane and seaplane base on Willapa Harbor as a companion measure to a similar bill for Grays Harbor, aeronautical experts to decide which site is preferable. The proposal will be studied and considered as a part of the national-defense program.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Pacific County the sum of $2,079,902, and loaned therein the additional sum of $656,262, a total of $2,736,164.

Flood control, drainage, school, road, street, water system, hospital, sanitation, recreation projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress, I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have, therefore, supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers; that is, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members, which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was paid, we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Pacific thus received $326,316.06.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows and dependents which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget, but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME OWNERS' LOAN—BANK DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Pacific County 35 citizens have received loans aggregating $88,200 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that 83 citizens of Pacific County have received loans aggregating $111,475.88. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people; and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the three banks of Pacific County have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about this great reform which should have been introduced many years ago.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public works and relief appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our parent-teacher associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government, through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the P.-T. A. in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and National life.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest which as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general welfare legislation before Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934 and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of our steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently for the first time authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect enough of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have therefore at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575. to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66,

a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have since 1932 doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem, but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of American agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan to insure the farmer parity prices with industry offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture, and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, master of Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

BONNEVILLE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

I am proud of my sponsorship of the Bonneville $70,000,000 project and rural-electrification projects and shall exert every effort to bring their benefits to all our citizens.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress, on every occasion without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my wholehearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers' Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time and for 5 years previously the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota, the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years, without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE, in the campaign in 1932, to say:

> The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact.

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933 the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built, until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed as in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

> I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

> This news is about the most important that has come to red-cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

> At the annual membership meeting of this association, held in Tacoma, February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red-cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

> Shingle weavers commend SMITH: A resolution endorsing MARTIN F. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red-cedar shingles imported from Canada, the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

> The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased expresses our feeling very mildly.
>
> Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.
>
> All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill, and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been "on the job" for us and we are very appreciative.
>
> With best wishes for your continued success, we remain,
>
> Yours truly,
>
> UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
> By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
> *Secretary-Manager.*

I would suggest that when candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be after reading the foregoing recital of fact, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the revenue act in 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt, and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938. Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, wrote me as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber import excise tax, which was tacked onto the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party, under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100-percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if any, would be interesting; probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulphite workers' unions and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers' Association, O. M. Porter, has written me as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER-LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21, and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler-log matter.

APPOINTMENTS TO WEST POINT AND ANNAPOLIS

Jerry G. Clancy, of Ocean Park, was appointed in June 1937, to the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, on my recommendation and is due to graduate in 1941. Lowell Doupe, of Ilwaco, has been recommended by me for appointment to the United States Military Academy, West Point, on July 1, 1940.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION, CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington, and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State Administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures on the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Pacific County a total of 37 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $555. Seven schools of Pacific County are included in the school-work program, with a total of 41 student workers and a total yearly quota of $1,674.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district, in addition to building trails, roads, and bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington

AMERICA FOREVER; COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities, and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138, as amended, was carefully considered, and provides effective remedies against all foreign "isms" without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one "ism," and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe, and we are going to keep Europe out of America.

The Virginia Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY JOHN W. CARTER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at the State convention of the Democratic Party in Virginia, held in Roanoke, Va., on June 14, State Senator John W. Carter, as keynoter for the Democratic Party of Virginia, delivered a most eloquent and brilliant address, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in part in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Virginia State Democratic Convention, I feel a deep sense of appreciation for the high privilege which is mine in serving as temporary chairman of this convention. I also feel quite keenly the burden of responsibility that rests upon me, in that, by custom, it becomes my duty to sound a battle cry for the militant Virginia democracy in the campaign of 1940.

THE WORLD AFLAME

I think we all must agree that it is peculiarly fitting that this convention assembles here in this magnificent city of Roanoke on the 14th day of June. That day is the birthday of the American flag. Never before within my observation or reading have so many Americans, thinking Americans, felt that that flag, the country of which it is a symbol, the system of government for which it stands, are all in dire peril of complete annihilation at the behest of a foreign despot; never before have any of us even suspected that this fair land of ours, consecrated to liberty and devoted to the arts of peace, was a likely victim to the hungry and blood-besmeared jaws of a cruel and monstrous tyrant devoid of any sense of mercy, any knowledge of justice, or any disposition to live, except by the law of force.

I think it was in the issue of the Philistine, which left the press just a day or two before its publisher, Elbert Hubbard, set sail from New York on the last voyage of the ill-fated *Lusitania*, that there appeared an article from Hubbard's pen under the caption "Who took the lid off of hell?" That question does not now seem apropos. None of us care very much to know who took the lid off. Most of us think we do know who performed that despicable act. What counts is that all of us know that the lid is, in fact, off, and a startled world, with the horror that is within their hearts reflected on their faces, stands by and gazes into an infernal cauldron of death and destruction so terrible and so devastating as to almost make us doubt the correctness of our perceptions. We want to disbelieve what our eyes see and what our ears hear. We would like to treat as chimerical what our reason tells us must be true. But, unfortunately, we cannot, like Alice, avail ourselves of the privilege of going through the looking glass into wonderland. We are a part of this war-wracked world, and a part of it we must remain.

True it is, as was said by President Roosevelt in his Chicago speech of October 5, 1937: "America hates war and hopes for peace; therefore America actively engages in the search for peace." But America is not stupid enough to hope to secure peace by talk, and America is unwilling to accept peace at the price of submission to the will of a little madman with a Charley Chaplin mustache, who, like a big tick, has fattened himself on blood and who has the insane delusion that he has been appointed of God (of course, a German god) to rule all men according to his own peculiar views. The Nazi philosophy of government is the antithesis of ours. Thank God America is free, and America intends to remain free.

What is liberty? What is freedom? It is so commonplace to us that I fear many would have difficulty in analyzing and defining it. I mention a few, and I emphasize that they are only a few, of the attributes of liberty as we know it:

1. Freedom of worship, which means that every man has the inalienable right to approach his God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

2. Freedom of speech, which means the right of every man to say what he thinks on any subject he chooses.

3. Freedcm of the press, which means the right of anyone to disseminate his views with respect to those who are in power without opposition and punishment from official source.

4. The right of trial by a jury of one's peers, which protects one from the arbitrary act of a governing class.

5. Protection of the writ of habeas corpus, which is insurance against arbitrary imprisonment for long years without a formal charge being made and without a speedy trial on such charge.

6. The right and security of property and due process of law, which means our Government is not powerful enough to take away from one of us, even the yearling calf that is ours, or the lawn mower that we have acquired. They are ours against the world, and we are deprived of them only by the law of the land, applying alike to all others.

7. Protection from ex post facto laws. That is to say, laws which make something we have done unlawful which was not unlawful when we did it. In short, protection against arbitrary power.

8. Right of equality of opportunity. In other words, we are guaranteed a free field and no favors.

There is not a man who lives under a Nazi-controlled government, a Fascist-controlled government, or a communistic-controlled government who enjoys a single one of these rights which we insist are God-given and exercised just as naturally as we breathe pure air or drink pure water. We think nothing of them, and yet life would be unbearable without them. They may be likened to the air we breathe, for so long as we breathe it it never occurs to us to be grateful for such a privilege. But cut the air off and we soon strangle and suffocate for the lack of it.

Understand me; I do not think that America has become panic-stricken. I do not think that it has lost its courage. I believe that it will fight for its land, its liberty, and its institutions with the ferocity born of its indignation that any crackpot dictator could conceive of the subjugation of our free people. If I felt otherwise I should feel constrained to go just 50 miles north of where I speak, where rest the ashes of Lee and Jackson, and there apologize to the disembodied spirits of those heroes for the existence of a race of pusillanimous Virginians. No; America is not afraid and America is not stupid. It realizes that in modern warfare bravery alone cannot overcome mechanized armies with terrible destructive powers. It realizes that to pit mere manpower against thousands of armored tanks and fast-moving armored airplanes means simply a futile slaughter of brave men without effective resistance to such invading forces.

America is not afraid, neither is it foolish. If it were reasonably sure of a flood it would not yield to terror, but it would make preparations for defense against the flood. It now believes that it is faced with the threat of attack from a powerfully armed and ruthless foe. It is not afraid of that attack, but it intends to prepare for it, and prepare for it to the teeth.

Congress has and will respond to the President's request for billions to be employed to build up the national defense. Industry will respond to the administration's request to coordinate, speed up our productive system, take care of the back-breaking load that is necessary to arm ourselves in time to make resistance effective. Labor is prepared to do its full part in this great defense program, and the manpower of the Nation will quickly show that it is ready for the training that will make our new warships, our new tanks, and our new airplanes effective, and that promptly, to defend Old Glory and those things for which it stands.

The foremost issue in this campaign and the first question which the voters will determine is this: What is the best qualified agency to which we may entrust the big job of building an impregnable national defense in this serious national crisis? In my judgment the answer will necessarily be: The Democratic Party.

As briefly as I may, please permit me to give you the reasons which I think will prompt this answer. Let me first of all assure you that man for man I am quite sure that there is as much patriotism in the Republican ranks as there is in ours. That has been demonstrated ere this; it will probably be demonstrated in the future. If the time shall come when we shall have to contend with a "fifth column" you will find few of such recruited from the ranks of republicanism and the ranks of democracy. With both of those parties partisanry has always ceased at the frontier in time of war.

However, it is my belief that partisanry is now more active in the ranks of the Republicans than among the Democrats and that so long as there is no certainty of attack from abroad there may be a tendency to seek to embarrass the Democratic administration by thrusts at its program. For example, I am quite sure that all America, Republicans and Democrats alike, shared with me a feeling of distinct disappointment when Governor Landon, after a visit to the White House, to which he had been invited for the purpose of securing the benefit of his views on urgent questions affecting the defense of his country and ours, took occasion to give out an interview the sole purpose of which seemed to be to secure a political advantage for his party as the price for the cooperation of himself and his fellow Republicans in preparing America against attack from abroad. To my mind, it was the cheapest sort of effort at a cheap political trade under circumstances that should have made it impossible for a man of Governor Landon's status to even consider such a thing. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of the Republican Party no more approved of his course than I did. I had hoped that Mr. Landon stood alone, but my hopes were shattered on May 23—one week after the President's appeal for increased armaments—when I read in the column of Mr. Walter Lippmann the following extract:

"The Republican leaders could not talk as they have talked the past few days if they realized the extreme and immediate peril in which America has been placed. Apparently they are still under the impression that the question is whether we shall let our sympathy for the Allies lead us into the European war; apparently they still think that the question is whether Mr. Roosevelt is to get some

kind of political advantage at home out of the catastrophe overseas. They are tragically mistaken. These are no longer the questions before the public."

Certainly Mr. Lippmann has not been unfriendly to the Republican Party; certainly he voted for Mr. Landon in 1936; and, therefore, when I read this item I was forced to the conclusion that important Republicans, including their congressional leaders, had taken their cue from the titular leader and were seeking to make political capital out of the dangerous situation in which our country finds itself.

I do not believe that the rank and file of the people of this country, either Republicans or Democrats, will be willing to accept such leadership in the big job of preparing America to defend itself and its very existence.

Again, I think the people of America, those of both the major parties, are people of common sense and that in their own important affairs they would hesitate to employ amateurs to serve them in matters of great consequence. Remember that the task of preparation will in all probability extend beyond the end of the present administration. For 7½ years the Republicans have been entirely without experience in administering the affairs of the National Government. They have been wholly unrepresented in the executive department of the Government. For 6 of those 7½ years their representation in the House of Representatives has been negligible and always in the minority. For all of that time their representation in the Senate has been pitifully small. For 6 of those years one could count their Governors on one's fingers. Not a single one of their prospective candidates for the Presidency has had any experience whatsoever as a Federal or State executive. In good times or bad, as far as domestic affairs are concerned, the country might be willing to take a chance on committing our interests to an amateur but not in the face of a crisis when the failure to properly meet that crisis spells complete disaster to our Nation and its institutions. It would be just as sensible to discharge all of the members of an experienced fire department as they are on their way to combat a conflagration that threatened the existence of a city and replace them with men who had never seen a fire. It would be just as sensible to get rid of an experienced Coast Guard personnel when a terrific storm was approaching our shores and substitute the Old Man of the Mountain. No; America will not select amateurs to perfect its national defense at this stage of its existence.

Further, I believe that the American people are capable of looking to the record and determining for themselves which of the two parties has historically demonstrated the greater efficiency in preparing for war.

A cursory examination of the record will develop the fact that a Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, foresaw the necessity for a real American Navy, and formulated a great plan to carry his idea into effect. The plan was adopted by a Democratic Congress and later scrapped by Republican administration. If it had not been so scrapped, we would today be able to successfully contend with the combined navies of the entire world. On February 3, 1916, in a speech at St. Louis, Wilson insisted that America should at once begin to build and sustain "incomparably the most adequate Navy in the world." What he meant, as subsequent developments show, was a Navy that could protect America from the combined navies of the world. Shortly afterward, his plan was submitted to Congress. Obviously this result could not be achieved overnight. The proposed legislation provided for a longe-range building program whereby America would be the strongest naval power in the world within 20 years, notwithstanding the efforts of any other nations to compete with it. America had the money to build such a Navy. The other nations were not so fortunate. The plan became law in August 1916, and continued effective so long as the Democratic Party remained in power. The building was begun and continued at a rapid rate of speed. It was not a program on paper. At the close of the Wilson administration the ways of every shipyard in the country bore evidence of the fact that America intended to be able to command the seas if it chose so to do.

The plan is described by a great naval authority as "an unprecedented naval program." The same authority says that "Wilson went to Paris determined that America's position of eminence on the sea should be preserved for her own future welfare, as well as for that of the world. Plans went forward at home for continuing his great naval program of 1916."

But in 1921 the Republican Party came back into power, and before that year was ended President Harding called for an international conference to consider naval limitations. That conference met in Washington. I quote from page 426 of "A History of the United States Navy," written by Captain Dudley W. Knox, and published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, of New York:

"After an address by President Harding, Secretary of State Hughes opened the Washington Conference on November 12, 1921, by offering a plan of naval limitation which astonished the foreign delegates by its altruistic liberality. He proposed establishing an upper limit of tonnage for each category of ships, which would provide for parity between Great Britain and the United States and limit Japan's tonnages to three-fifths of those allocated to the other two. At that time the United States had a very large margin of ships built and building over and above the proposed basis. Compared with Britain our superiority amounted to 340,000 tons of capital ships (equivalent to about 10 battleships or battle cruisers), 112,000 tons of destroyers (equivalent to nearly 100 of these vessels) and 9,500 tons of submarines. In the aggregate our superiority over the Japanese quota was nearly the same. All three countries were to do some scrapping of capital ships in order to effect a general reduction, but the American program of destruction was marked by the generous selection of many of her own ships on the building ways, into whose plans had been incorporated the lessons of the late war, and besides this we offered to eliminate our surplus over the others in the aggregate of nearly 460,000 tons of ships. In return they were asked for similar concessions in the cruiser category, in which the British superiority over us was about 81,000 tons, and the corresponding Japanese advantage was 41,000."

All of America's suggested concessions were accepted. We agreed to the treaty and as a result we scuttled more warships than any nation had ever lost or given up as the result of conquest. We had in course of construction as the result of Wilson's policy the greatest Navy that ever sailed the seas, far greater than either England or Japan, and practically equal to both. We had actually spent $330,000,000 to that date in carrying out the Wilson plan, many of the capital ships being more than 50 percent complete.

We not only destroyed and sunk this armada, but we paid out of our pockets $25,000,000 as the cost of this silly operation. Mr. Hughes, then Secretary of State, said, "It was the most magnificent gesture in the interest of world peace that had ever been made by any civilized nation." And yet they say that the Democrats are the idealists and theorists, and the Republicans are the hard-headed practical men. I wouldn't call it a magnificent gesture. I would say that it was pluperfect asininity.

Irvin Cobb, the humorist, appreciated the situation as falling distinctly within his field. He said that "We took a worse licking in that conference than we would ever take or had taken on the field of battle."

But we had not yet satisfied Britain and Japan, so there came the London conference on limitation of naval armaments "called," says Captain Knox, "at the instance of President Hoover after his personal interview with Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister," and when we got through with that conference we had yielded a further loss to Britain of 396,871 tons; and to Japan 450,178 tons of naval shipping. If my memory serves me correctly, President Hoover was one of those practical hard-headed Republicans, not a sentimental, soft-headed Democrat.

No wonder that when Franklin Roosevelt assumed office March 4, 1933, the Navy was at a low ebb, and it took his vigorous efforts to build and commission close to 140 fighting ships within the last 7¼ years in order that the Navy might be brought to its present peak, so far as peacetime power is concerned. I have confidence in the common intelligence of the American people, and with this record before them, I have no doubt as to their decision as to which of the two parties may be best trusted to arm America for a supreme conflict.

Another reason which induces me to believe that the American people, without reference to partisan alinements, will insist upon a Democratic administration for the next 4 years, during which in all probability America's fate (to paraphrase Mr. Hitler) will be settled for the next 1,000 years, is perhaps of a political nature, but nevertheless highly important, and will weigh heavily when understood by the people. Teamwork at this time is essential. Conflict and controversy in Washington would be highly unfortunate. Of course, a minority may render great service by pointing out objections that may be sound and that will stay the hand of the majority and cause it to reach sounder conclusions. No political student would deny this theory. But this purpose is not accomplished by having divided responsibility. Legislation is enacted by the House, the Senate, and the President. If any one of the three balks, legislation fails. Here is not a case of effective influence exerted by a minority through its opportunity to criticize. Here is confusion worse confounded. Now, if this is true, the people of the United States are confronted with the cold fact that in the absence of a miracle, the Senate of the United States will remain Democratic for the first 2 years of the next administration, and probably for the entire 4 years of that administration. The bare facts show this to be true.

The present Senate is compcsed of 69 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 2 Farmer-Laborites, 1 Progressive, and 1 Independent; total, 96. At the November election 32 Senators are to be elected for 6-year terms and 4 are to be elected for shorter terms, they now filling vacancies created by deaths. This is a total of 36 Senators to be reelected; of the 36, 26 are Democrats, 8 are Republicans, 1 is a Progressive, and 1 is a Farmer-Laborite. A majority of the Senate is 49. The Democrats may lose 20 seats now held by them and still retain that majority. Assuming that they make no gains of seats now held by Republicans or members of other parties, they can lose 20 of the 26 seats that are theirs and up for reelection and still control the Senate.

In other words, if they elected only 6 of the 36 Senators who will be candidates in November, they will organize that body, appoint its committees, and have a veto upon the acts of the President and the House of Representatives, conceding that the Republicans elect the President and a majority of the House. Six of the Senators who are to be elected will be chosen from the southern States of Florida, Mississippi, Virginia, Texas, and Tennessee.

It would indeed be an optimistic Republican who could conceive of any one of those five Southern States electing a Republican Senator this fall. As a matter of fact, there is almost a certainty that the Democrats will elect at least 10 other Senators, and a probability that they will lose only 2 of the 26 seats. If this analysis is correct, control of the Senate by the Democrats for

the first 2 years of the next administration is assured. And the probabilities are that that control is assured during the entire 4 years of such administration.

In this view of the case I do not believe that the common sense of the American people will insist upon a change of party control in the Presidency and in the House of Representatives when they know such change cannot be made in the Senate. Never was there a time in the country's history when teamwork was more essential and the only way teamwork can be assured is to elect a Democratic President and a Democratic House.

For the foregoing reasons I am satisfied that this great issue, this paramount issue, this issue which is of more importance to America than any it has ever confronted during the course of its existence, will be decided by the American electorate in accordance with the Democratic viewpoint, and in support of that party.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

In an effort to discuss domestic issues, I think it may be well to go back a bit and trace the historical attitude of the two great parties. The Democratic Party owes its existence to Thomas Jefferson. The Republican Party acknowledges the paternity of Alexander Hamilton. The opposing political views of these two statesmen give a certain clue to the respective political views of the two parties. Hamilton was an outspoken monarchist and believed the British form of government the most desirable. He realized that monarchy would not be accepted by Americans who had revolted from it, but in the Constitutional Convention he advocated the nearest thing to it that he thought had a chance of getting by. He favored a President elected for life, with powers to name the Governors of the States for life. These Governors to have an absolute veto power over legislation enacted by the peoples' chosen representatives. He also advocated a United States Senate elected for life. Madison's reports of the Convention give the substance of a 5-hour address by Mr. Hamilton on the advantages of a House of Lords. After its ratification he spoke of the Constitution as a "shilly-shally thing." And late in life he said, "Day by day I am more and more convinced that I was not made for this American world." His bosom friend, Gouverneur Morris, delivered his funeral oration. In Morris' diary the night before the oration, he spoke of Hamilton as follows:

"He was in principle opposed to republican, and attached to monarchial government."

These same facts are reflected in the writings and letters of Gouverneur Morris, Rufus King, Thomas Pickering, George Cabot, and Fisher Ames, all friends of Hamilton and members of his party.

On the other hand, Jefferson was a great Democrat, with confidence in the ability of the people to govern themselves. He at first opposed the Constitution because it contained no Bill of Rights that guaranteed the people from governmental action that might limit freedom of speech, freedom of the press, religious liberty, and the right of peaceable assembly.

He suggested the first 10 amendments, the Federal Bill of Rights, and after their adoption he became an advocate and supporter of the Constitution.

Throughout their careers Hamilton favored special interests and privilege, and Jefferson proceeded upon his announced tenet, "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

After the deaths of these two leaders the parties divided on similar lines. It was the Republican Party that supported the special privileges of Nick Biddle's National Bank. It was the Democrat, Andrew Jackson, who destroyed that bank and all that it stood for. The tariff was seized by the Republicans as an agency to direct unearned profits into the pockets of the powerful. The Democrats contended that tariffs should only be applied for the good of the whole people. This battle first developed in full force during Cleveland's administration. Then came the Wilson administration, which continued over Republican protest to fight for the common people. Then was established the Federal Reserve System for the purpose of preventing the hoarding of the money of the country in the vaults of Wall Street banks for the use of gamblers and speculators, and sending it instead circulating throughout the Nation for the benefit of every section, sect, and class.

The Federal Trade Commission was created. The Rural Credit System was provided for the farmer. An income-tax law was passed, and the popular election of Senators made a reality. There was not a single piece of reactionary legislation enacted during the Wilson era. All that was proposed was bitterly fought by the Republicans, but when they afterward came into power and remained in power for 12 years, they dared not repeal a line of it.

During the Wilson administration the national wealth increased from $187,000,000,000 to $330,000,000,000. And there was a widespread diversion of this wealth among the public generally rather than its concentration in a few hands.

A distinguished author, Mr. W. W. Durbin, of Ohio, has made a list of the outstanding Democratic achievements from its beginning through the Wilson administration, and it is as follows:

"The Democratic Party wrecked the Hamiltonian plan of making a partnership between government and a money power.

"It forced into the Constitution the Bill of Rights.

"It killed the un-American alien and sedition laws.

"It extended the domain of the Nation through the acquisition of the Territories of Louisiana and Florida, and later added California.

"It gave the Nation the Monroe Doctrine.

"It destroyed Nick Biddle's bank, which was threatening to dominate the Nation in the interest of a few.

"It crushed the nullification movement under Jackson.

"It threw open the public lands to settlers.

"It stood foursquare for constitutional rights during the reign of terror of the period of reconstruction after the Civil War.

"It has fought special privilege from the days of Jefferson to those of Wilson.

"It pioneered the fight for an income tax.

"It stood for the popular election of Senators.

"It created the Federal Reserve System.

"It gave to the farmers the Rural Credits Act.

"It gave to labor the Magna Carta of its rights.

"It passed the first national act to end child slavery.

"A Democratic administration directed with brilliant success the greatest war in history.

"A Democratic President gave to mankind the plan of international cooperation for the ending of militarism and international slaughter to which more than 50 nations have subscribed.

"The history of the Democratic Party is the history of the development and extension of the democratic principle on the American Continent."

After Wilson came 12 years of Republican rule under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. We all know what happened. During the Harding administration the Government was actually turned over to a gang of thieves. That was the day of the Ohio gang. Gaston Means, Jess Smith, Charley Forbes, and Albert B. Fall had to be "seen," and I do mean "seen" in its worst sense, before anybody could get anything done. And, of course, we know that when "seen," they proceeded upon the theory that the laborer was worthy of his hire. Vast oil reserves of the Government were bartered away by a cabinet officer who afterward went to jail. And this with the approval of Secretary of the Navy Denby, and Assistant Secretary Theodore Roosevelt, Jr.

I, of course, hasten to add that no one thought that there was anything consciously wrongful in the conduct of Messrs. Denby and Roosevelt. They merely proved to be stupid. But you know the loss of your property, when arranged for by fools, hurts just as bad as when stolen by thieves. Then came silent Cal, and the Government ran itself while Cal wouldn't talk.

There followed the great engineer who promised to abolish poverty. More than 8,000 banks closed their doors up to February 1932, and by the end of the Republican regime all of them had closed. The railroads sickened and languished until they were on the verge of bankruptcy. The farmers, never so prosperous as during the Wilson administration, were faced with almost universal foreclosures, and prices for farm products were at the lowest scale in history. The small merchant and shopkeeper were staggering down the path of insolvency. Labor was unemployed and hopeless. To paraphrase Don Quixote: "In voting the Republican Party into power the American people went out for wool and came home shorn themselves."

Under the administration of the marvelous engineer then occupying the White House there was industrial chaos, commercial stagnation, transportation paralysis of the creeping kind, agricultural disaster, business calamity, and banking collapse, while a great nation stood with grief and hopelessness waiting what appeared to be the absolute wreckage of what it had thought was a matchless economic structure. Some wag has been unkind enough to say that Hoover was indeed a great engineer because inside of 4 years he damned and ditched a hundred and twenty million American citizens.

I do not believe my Republican friends will question the accuracy of the picture I have painted as it existed on March 3, 1933. The following day, March 4, 1933, saw the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I was in Washington on that occasion. I could sense the depth of the gloom that smothered the gayety and pageantry of the inaugural parade. No bank was open in the United States except in Virginia and Delaware. Factories were idle, mines shut down, farms not being operated because that meant loss instead of profit, merchants were marking up on their calendars the dates on which they expected to file their bankruptcy petitions, labor was idle. There was no sunshine anywhere, and no prospect of any. There was no confidence that conditions would or could improve. Twelve years of Republican misgovernment had caused the American people to lose faith in the effectiveness of their institutions. There was nothing but black despair in the hearts of our people. Many thinking and prudent men felt that a revolution was pending, and that America would shortly be governed by the mob. Of course, I know that Mr. Hoover explained the whole thing as resulting from the failure of some bank in Austria, but I have never found anyone who agreed with him.

I do know that within 30 days a miracle had been accomplished. Banks that had closed rather than be closed by their depositors were open again, doing a normal business and maintaining the confidence of the public; business had begun to march slowly but surely; people were going back to work bit by bit, but above all, despair had been replaced by hope and faith. The frowning brow was replaced by the smile of confidence. A song in the heart took the place of that piece of lead that had been there so long. The American people had taken on new life, had recovered their courage, and were determined to make things work.

I say that this was a miracle, and it came about because the Democratic Party had given to the country a leader who had

confidence in himself and his country, and the power to radiate that confidence into his fellow citizens, and save a collapsing American political and business economy. He had the power to give them confidence in banks that but a few days before they had hated and distrusted. He gave them confidence that industry would come back, that farming could recover, that trade and commerce could again be restored. Above all he gave them confidence in themselves. That day the Hoover depression was over and we started on the long, long trail back to "normalcy."

As to how far we have gotten opinions differ, but I shall contend that we have come a long ways. I shall not contend that mistakes have not been made. I do not approve of all that has been done myself, but on the whole I insist the job is a good one. and in attempting to prove this I shall use a method which I like to employ in my practice of law. Whenever I can select from my opponent's testimony facts asserted by his witnesses and be able to show that under the law such evidence entitles my clients to a verdict, I feel pretty sure of winning my case. Here and now I shall attempt to prove a case for democracy on the basis of the evidence that I draw from the statements made by our opponents.

I call as my first adverse witness: Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill of Indiana, a former Member of Congress, and without doubt the bitterest critic and most uncompromising opponent of the present Democratic administration that lives in America today. I quote from his most recent work, "Smoke Screen," which has come from the press during this good year of 1940. In his chapter "Balance Sheet" on pages 80 and 81, he sets up what he regards as the items to be placed on the asset side of the ledger in making an accounting of the administration activities. I list the items under assets, not as selected by me, but as chosen by this witness for the other side. They are:

"The divorcement of commercial and investment banking.
"The guaranty of bank deposits.
"The regulation of stock exchanges.
"The regulation of the interstate sale of securities.
"The growth of national income from 42 to 68 billions.
"Reciprocal-trade agreements, on net balance more gain than loss.
"Part of the public utility bill.
"The Lindbergh Act and the war on kidnaping.
"The C. C. C. Camps.
"Much of the P. W. A. program.
"Soil conservation.
"The handling of foreign affairs and national defense.
"The recognition of the right of collective bargaining.
"Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
"Federal Housing Administration.
"Relief—but badly managed.
"Civil Aeronautics Administration.
"Pure food and drug amendments.
"Truck and bus legislation."

It seems to me that if such an uncompromising opponent has to agree to this imposing list of accomplishments as assets, it must be conceded that whatever else the administration has done, it has concluded a tremendously helpful program in behalf of the American people and in the interest of industrial recovery.

However, that is not all that I develop from this hostile witness. On page 72 of the same book Mr. Pettengill asserts that if an American were to meet a foreigner and that each brought with him their respective shares of all of the gold in the world, the American would bring 97 percent and the foreigner 3 percent.

And then he lists a table of other commodities with like percentages listed for the American and the foreigner. I quote that table from page 72 of his book:

	American percent	Foreigner percent
Wheat	74	26
Butter	81	19
Milk	83	17
Coal	86	14
Cotton	93	7
Petroleum	96	4
Telephones	94	6
Aluminum	82	18
Cement	83	17
Silver	83	17
Tobacco	86	14
Rayon	87	13
Steel	90	10
Movie shows	91	9
Telephone calls	94	6
Automobiles	96	4
Railroad mileage	86	14
Improved highway mileage	88	12
Radios	94	6
Bathtubs	98	2
Civilian airplanes	97	3

How is it possible for anyone to contend that an administration of American affairs has failed in view of the showing that the overwhelming majority of both necessities and luxuries today are in the possession of Americans as against foreigners. The lowest percentage is wheat, of which America owns 74 percent of the entire world supply. The highest is bathtubs, of which it owns 98 percent. And civilian airplanes, automobiles, and petroleum, telephones, telephone calls, radios, movie shows and steel come closely behind, all with percentages over 90.

My second witness is Mr. Thomas E. Dewey, candidate for the Republican nomination, who tells us that if elected he will not abandon the social legislation of the last 7 years, but merely improve it.

My third witness is Senator VANDENBERG, another candidate, who is burning with a zeal to save the accomplishments of the present administration.

My fourth witness is Senator TAFT, who says that he, too, wants to continue the policies of the Democratic administration with respect to relief, but thinks that can be better done through State agencies.

My next witnesses are Dr. Glenn Frank and the several hundred distinguished Republicans who serve on the Republican program committee. They include a number of influential members of the party, of which it may be well to mention Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, and Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University. This committee was assigned by the Republican National Committee "to ascertain as fully as possible the various views held by the rank and file of the Republican Party, its national and local leaders, including auxiliaries of men, women and youth, upon such questions as may properly come before it for consideration." In his letter of transmittal to the national chairman, Dr. Frank says: "In the judgment of the chairman and executive committee, the report faithfully reflects that consensus of rank and file Republican opinion which the Republican National Committee directed the program committee to secure and record."

In the foreword of the report we find this statement: "In this document the program committee undertakes to reflect its analysis of the philosophy, policies, and actual results of the present administration and to throw into contrast thereto what, in its judgment, should be the guiding principles of national policy for dealing with the problem of getting our national economy into sustained high gear so that we can realize full employment of our men, our money, and our materials, a progressive rise in our living standards, and an increased security for our people."

Then the report discusses various public questions. It advocates staying out of war and is quite fearful of what might happen if we got in. I don't suppose that this is any different from the viewpoint of the Democratic Party. Certainly there is no charge to that effect. The report next expresses the opinion that America has suffered dreadfully during the past seven and a half years and gives some misleading figures and statistics to support the claim. It does not, however, suggest a return to the days and processes of the Hoover administration. It is next asserted that the Democratic administration misunderstands America; that it has attempted to copy big business; that it has applied the brakes to production; and that it has thought that America was running down. It is said that the administration turns its back on the expansion of enterprise; that it is defeatist and reactionary. Not a line or syllable of proof is attempted in behalf of these generalities. Then, under the title The Republican Position, it says that their party does not believe that the country has run down; nor does it believe in defeatism; that, on the contrary, "Our frontiers are better than ever; the Nation's plant is underbuilt; new enterprise is in sight; investment opportunities are ample and expansion is possible." It says, "Our private economy is not at a dead end." All of this information, of course, is of the most delightful character and, so far as I know, not disputed by anyone.

Foreign relations are met with indisputable courage. I quote: "The foreign policy of the United States must be determined by a realistic consideration of the political, economic, and military situation that now obtains throughout the world. We must not allow our emotions to unfit us for rational analysis of what will best safeguard our own national institutions, ideals, and interests and best enable us to play a constructive role in our relations with the rest of the world. There is no conflict between these two objectives. The first concern of our foreign policy must be to protect the security and welfare of the American people. This security and welfare, however, will be served by every advance that is made toward a more peaceful and more rationally ordered world. Our political and economic foreign policy, therefore, should be flexible enough that, in a rapidly changing international situation, we can adopt the measures that will, at any given time, most effectively serve both these purposes."

If you can find any one man in the United States who disagrees with that I want to meet him.

The report, given out on February 18 of this year, contains the startling news that there is war in Europe and Asia, and recognizes the fact that as individual Americans we shall react emotionally to these wars, but that we ought to be very careful and not do anything about it. It goes on to say that we ought to keep out of other people's wars, but ought to defend the Western Hemisphere. It insists that we should reaffirm our adherence to the principles of decent international behavior.

It next points to international trends toward prohibitive tariff quotas and Government trade control, and adds this highly controversial statement:

"As this movement toward self-sufficiency spreads in more and more nations, it tends more and more to isolate the United States from its traditional role in world trade. We cannot, of course, dictate the trade policies of other nations. If the present trend toward national self-sufficiency continues, we must frankly face the

problem of organizing our own economic life on the basis of a large measure of self-sufficiency. Happily, we are better situated than almost any other nation to live within our own resources. The few resources we lack could, no doubt, be secured through carefully negotiated reciprocity treaties even in a world largely given over to policies of self-containment.

"We should make clear in our foreign-policy pronouncements, however, that we stand ready to cooperate, if and when cooperation is possible, in clearing away the obstacles to such access to raw materials and such flow of international trade as will enable the vigorous forces of the modern productive system to make their full contribution to well-being the world around."

There follows a Republican idea of a realistic trades-relation program toward America, as follows:

"First, we must fully protect our own national living standards, the wages of our workers, and the income of our farmers. However fully we may recognize the long-run fallacy of the present world epidemic of trade restrictions, we must not indulge in any trade policies at this time that will make the United States the dumping ground for the subsidized and politically managed exports of other countries.

"Second, we must try to increase our foreign trade by every measure available consistent with the protection of our living standards, the wages of our workers, and the income of our farmers. This will require a constructive administration of our tariff relationships. The measures that may be taken will be varied. Some tariffs may have to be raised, some lowered, some left alone. And such progress toward an increased foreign trade as can be made under the present world situation can be made only by intelligent and realistic negotiation of trade agreements through which genuine reciprocity benefits are realized, with the agreements subject to the safeguard of approval by concurrent resolution of both Houses of the Congress.

"The function of our tariff policy, in view of the abnormal world situation, must be to protect our own best interests and to promote, as far as the restrictive policies of the rest of the world will permit, a revival of world trade.

"It is not the function of tariff policy to erect walls so high that behind them industries can maintain excessive prices or be so completely freed from external competition that they become inefficient. The people have the right to expect government to protect them against monopolistic advantage created by tariff favors. For tariff policy, like every other policy of government, is but a tool with which to advance the welfare of the people as a whole. Tariffs should be modified whenever necessary to realize this result. Their modification should be made not by logrolling but by expert study, research, and open democratic processes."

If there could be a more vague and indefinite foreign policy than that advocated by the committee, I cannot well conceive what it could be.

But when the committee reaches it chapter Toward Labor Program, it rings the changes. It states "four goals of American workers," as follows:

"Enlightened American workers have four main goals: (1) To secure for every employable industrial worker a job in productive enterprise at the best possible wage, under the best possible working conditions, and on a schedule of hours that makes satisfactory living possible for the worker and the worker's family; (2) to develop whatever form or forms of organization of American workers will best enable them to protect and to promote their every legitimate interest in the industrial process; (3) to stimulate a progressive increase of the contribution of labor toward an improved efficiency of American industry; and (4) to give informed voice to the judgment of American workers in the determination of those public policies which give over-all direction to our national economy."

It fails to suggest any means whatever whereby any one of the goals may be reached.

However, the first criticism it offers is in this part of the report. It says:

"There is, however, in the judgment of this committee, justified dissatisfaction with varied aspects of the National Labor Relations Act and with its administration by the National Labor Relations Board."

It then proceeds to tell how the National Labor Relations Act should be amended, as follows:

"The National Labor Relations Act requires responsible amendment alike in the interest of American workers and in the interest of a productive functioning of American enterprise. The objective of such amendment must be to maintain without wavering a firm guaranty of the right of free organization and collective bargaining while so revising the provisions and procedures and so altering the spirit of the administration of the act as to surround the whole employee-employer relationship with a sense of complete fairness to all parties and all interests concerned."

We confess that a little more detail might be helpful to the draftsman of the proposed amendment.

Its stand on wage and hour legislation is peculiarly emphatic. it does not think that we ought to have such legislation unless necessary. It presents a splendid formula for the proper wage level. It says that:

"Obviously the healthiest wage level, both for American workers and for American enterprise, is the level at which maximum employment can be maintained at the highest feasible yearly income for the largest possible number of employable workers."

If the committee had given us some inkling as to how this perfect ideal can be realized, every worker in America would be duly grateful to it. The entire chapter on labor is similarly vague and general in its language. No legislation is suggested and no criticism is made of any legislation enacted except the National Labor Relations Act, and that criticism has already been referred to. The report definitely does not advocate the repeal of that act.

The report manifests deep interest in the farmer. It says that the farm problem, when stripped to its essentials, is:

"(1) The problem of so handling, disposing of, or preventing farm surpluses that farm prices will not be wrecked by an unsalable oversupply; and (2) the problem of bringing the prices the farmer gets for what he sells into a sounder relation to the prices he pays for what he buys."

Again, unfortunately, no sort of practical suggestion is made as to how this may be accomplished. No new legislation is proposed and no old legislation is criticized. It says that the farmer's market ought to be expanded and that it would be a good thing to find further industrial use for the farmer's products. It approves of soil conservation, crop loans, and orderly marketing, and it gives the sage advice that in developing the program for the farmer the Government should "open-mindedly consider both the policies that are sound for the long haul and policies that are inescapable for the short haul, and undertake so to relate its permanent policies and its emergency policies that practical progress for the farmer will be realized and long-run dangers be reduced to the minimum." This, I concede, is a perfect gem of an idea.

With respect to business, Dr. Frank gives us this sage advice:

"It is clear to this committee that the best interests of the American people require that we preserve and modernize our traditional system of free enterprise with the minimum governmental regulation necessary to prevent abuse and promote justice in its operation. If the nature of the business system largely determines what government has to do about it, and if we are to proceed on the basis of an intelligently modernized system of free enterprise, then it becomes important to know what the basic characteristics of a free-enterprise system are and at what points, if any, it has been perverted or blocked in the United States. Otherwise we have no dependable basis of judgment on what government should do respecting either business regulation or business reform."

Further on he makes it plain that government intervention in business is here to stay, and that good intervention is good and bad intervention is bad. Something like Calvin Coolidge's daily column that usually informed us that work was desirable, thrift a virtue, and honesty a good thing. We are told that new enterprise must not be controlled; that regulation ought to stimulate rather than repress; that government ought not to compete with business except where it ought to compete. And, again, not a line of legislation is suggested in aid of business, nor is the repeal of any demanded.

In the chapter dealing with fiscal program it is said that the Budget should be balanced as soon as possible. The excess-profits tax is criticized. Social-security taxes are referred to as having imposed a fixed charge on enterprise, but no suggestion is made that they should be abandoned. It is recommended that consideration should be given to the segregation of the tax structure; that all tax exemptions should be eliminated from future issues of State, Federal, and municipal securities.

Of course, we know that that has been advocated by Senator BYRD ever since he has been in public life. It is further recommended that there be some reduction in the higher, individual surtax rates, repeal of the capital stock and excess-profits taxes, and the abolition of the normal tax on dividends, and it suggests that if new levies be desired it should be raised by increases on income in the middle brackets. It further recommends a substantial reduction of governmental expenditures; repeal of the emergency monetary powers of the President, and return to a fixed gold standard. In one breath it advocates the discontinuance of long-time loans of the Government and in the next breath approves of mortgage banks established on capital supplied by the Government to deal in farm and home mortgages. It says that public-works expenditures undertaken as an aid to recovery are proper and useful if they are made under such conditions as the program committee approves. It will be seen that in this section of the report some definite legislation is recommended, particularly changes in the tax structure, and with respect to the currency.

Under the caption "Towards a Social Program" it seems to me that the program definitely approves what the Democratic administration has done along this line, although expressing some criticism of the details. It agrees that social objectives are beyond partisanship; that relief is a responsibility of the Government; that there should be old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, a definite housing program, a public-health service. It states its general position as follows:

"This committee believes, without reservation, as it has said, that modern society must fully protect against privation any of its citizens unemployed through no fault of their own until recovery from abnormal depression conditions makes their reemployment possible. It regards relief, however, as a temporary protection against the destructive effects of unemployment, not as a permanent substitute for employment. It believes, therefore, that a realistic relief policy will be rooted in three considerations: (1) Relief to the suffering, the needy, and the unemployed as

long as necessary; (2) self-respecting jobs at fair wages as soon as possible; and (3) the active rehabilitation of the unemployed so they will be equipped to step promptly back into productive employment as soon as full recovery is realized."

It does not point out abuses under the relief program of the administration, but, nevertheless, it asserts that relief has cost too much.

This concludes the report, except its own "conclusion." That conclusion contains this explanatory paragraph:

"The four principles by which the conclusions of this report have been tested are: (1) a balanced representative government, (2) a protectively regulated system of free enterprise, (3) a workable economics of plenty, and (4) an inviolate code of civil liberties supported by political and economic circumstances which make the practice of these liberties possible."

I should certainly advise every Democrat to read the report in full, if possible. I think it would be splendid if the Democratic National Committee would circulate it throughout the United States. It would afford more amusement than Joe Miller's joke book. It contains 115 printed pages, exclusive of the letter of transmittal. Its criticism of Democratic policies are couched in the most general phrases. Its suggestions of its own attitude are platitudinous and solemn pronouncements, without meat or meaning. It almost completely avoids taking a definite position in any controversial matter and suggests no legislation, except the few proposals I have referred to. Remember, please, that it was designed to be the final word in the way of a complete indictment of more than 7 years of Democratic administration. It was supposed that it would get down to cases and point out where and wherein the administration has erred in its policies and wherein improvements could be made. One who reads it is bound to conclude that "The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse." I submit that those who signed this report are a substantial group of witnesses for the soundness and the beneficiality of the Democratic program. If a group of detectives, looking for trouble, can develop nothing more than Dr. Frank and his associates, I think we may well assume that "All is well in Israel."

The Glenn Frank committee and other critics of the administration remind me very much of the man referred to by Postmaster General Farley in one of his many speeches. He said a certain fellow sat by and watched the building of the first automobile, and while its construction was in progress, persistently shook his head and confidently said it could not be built. The automobile was finally finished, the motor in place, the chassis set up, the wheels attached, and the machinery apparently perfect in theory according to the blue prints, but the doubting Thomas still shook his head and said, "It will never run; you just can't get the engine to start; it just won't do," and then the gasoline was poured into the tank, the driver cranked the new contraption, as was required in those days, the spark struck, and the gasoline motor began to turn over and run. The doubter still shook his head and said, "Well, maybe you have got it started, but it won't pull. You can't get it to go around the block. It will stop before you get to the corner." The driver put in his clutch, meshed his gears, the automobile started off slowly at first and then at high speed and went, not only around the block, but many blocks. The doubting Thomas was not convinced. "It will give out in a day or two," he said, "the machinery cannot stand the pressure you put on it. It will be a pile of junk within a week." But the automobile continued to run, continued to serve its owner, continued to be a means of travel from point to point, until the doubting Thomas was finally convinced that it was practical. Did he show any spirit of humility at a demonstration of his erroneous judgment? Not at all. As soon as he was convinced that the automobile would go and go permanently, he walked up to the driver and said, "Get out and let somebody run the damn thing that knows how." That, in effect, is the attitude of the program committee and the Republican opposition to the administration program. They are afraid to oppose its theories and its practices, but they insist that they ought to run it.

I think I have a right to demand a verdict at your hands upon the testimony of these adverse witnesses.

Having submitted the evidence of my hostile witnesses, I would like to refer to one that I am not prepared to say is hostile, but I should hardly think is a Democratic partisan. In the April issue of the Magazine of Wall Street there was an article by a well-known authority, from which I quote:

"The significant fact is that we approximated our 1929 income in both 1936 and 1937, that we exceeded it in 1939, and that we have a good chance of exceeding it again this year. Of course, we are not talking of national income in terms of dollars. With the cost of living at one level, an income of $50 a week can have a purchasing power as great as an income of $75 would have at a higher level of living costs."

In other words, the American people have a real purchasing power equal to that which prevailed in the most wildly speculative year of the country's existence; that is to say, that the same degree of prosperity had been realized without the business inflation.

This same writer said that 100 corporations listed on the exchange earned greater profits in 1939 than they did in the so-called boom year of 1929. The Associated Press has recently reported that the first 250 corporations to report their income for the initial quarter of 1940 show earnings 50 percent above those for the same period for last year, and yet we are told that the Democratic administration has taken the profit motive out of industry.

I again insist that I am entitled to a verdict.

I shall not undertake to go into details with respect to all of the accomplishments of the Democratic administration. Two only, that I regard of vital interest, will receive some detailed attention.

RESULTS OF THE NEUTRALITY POLICY

The central objective of the foreign policy of the United States under the present administration has been the preservation of the peace and security of the Nation. In pursuance of this objective, the Government has sought in every appropriate way to exert moral influence in favor of establishment and strengthening of order under law in relations among nations as the most effective way of prevention of war. Fully conscious of the fact that these efforts might fail, the Government has sought to create defensive military forces adequate to safeguard the security of this country. It has also sought to devise neutrality legislation designed to reduce the risks of involvement in war if war should unhappily occur.

The first legislation of this kind was enacted in 1935. It was revised in 1936, in 1937, and again in 1939. Up to the time of the last revision, the neutrality legislation contained an inflexible embargo on the export of arms to belligerents.

When this arms embargo was first enacted, Secretary Hull warned against the dangers for our national security which were inherent in this type of policy. As time went on, it became increasingly clear that the arms embargo policy, without adding anything to the security of this country, was an encouragement to heavily arming nations intent on conquest and aggression. In view of existing circumstances, the arms embargo policy was, in reality, unneutral.

When, early in 1939, consideration was given to the revision of existing neutrality legislation, Secretary Hull emphasized that the involvement of the United States in controversies with belligerents was most likely to arise from the destruction of American lives—and not from the sale of arms—and that we could effectively diminish our risks only by keeping American nationals and vessels out of areas of special danger. He recommended, therefore, that the arms embargo be repealed and suggested enactment or reenactment of the following provisions which he believed would help to keep the United States out of war: (1) To prohibit American vessels from entering combat areas; (2) to restrict travel by American citizens in combat areas; (3) to provide that the export of goods destined for belligerents should be preceded by transfer of title to the foreign purchaser; (4) to continue the existing legislation respecting loans and credits to nations at war; and (5) to regulate the solicitation and collection of funds for belligerents.

Throughout the summer and autumn Secretary Hull steadfastly advocated these principles. After the outbreak of the European war in September 1939, the public rallied to the support of this neutrality program. The program was substantially enacted by the Congress in a resolution approved by the President on November 4, 1939. Upon the enactment of that resolution, the Secretary said that our first and most sacred task was to keep the United States secure and at peace, and that the new Neutrality Act would greatly assist in this undertaking.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 has now been in operation 7 months. It has fully justified the hopes of its proponents. Since its enactment we have been able to avoid dangerous controversies with belligerents. No American lives are known to have been lost on the high seas as a result of belligerent operations. Furthermore, no American vessel has been destroyed as a result of belligerent activity, although many vessels of other neutral countries have been sunk in the war areas. Thus, as a consequence of the Neutrality Act, we have avoided the destruction of American lives and American vessels, which in other times has resulted in serious controversies with belligerents.

Even though the movements of American merchant vessels have been circumscribed, our merchant marine has not, up to the present, suffered great hardship as a consequence of the Neutrality Act. American shipping companies were compelled to abandon temporarily some of their valuable trade routes, but subsequently advantageous use for their vessels was found elsewhere. Today most of the American merchant vessels are again busily employed in passenger and freight traffic.

Certainly this legislation urged on the Congress by the President has not endangered America's business. For that matter, it has definitely kept it out of Europe's wars. If war comes, it will be a war of self-defense and not brought about by entangling our affairs with those of Europe.

GAINS TO THE UNITED STATES FROM THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The reciprocal trade agreements program constitutes the first realistic, scientific, and effective approach to the tariff angle of the foreign-trade problem of the United States. Its purpose is to increase that trade and thereby enlarge and maintain both foreign and domestic markets for American products. It thus helps American farmers and creates jobs for American workers. In this manner it increases the entire Nation's buying power for the products of American farms and factories.

This program utilizes the experience of technically trained experts in the Government departments concerned with the commercial policy of the United States—the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, the Treasury, and the United States Tariff Commission. It constitutes the first tariff-making program in which these technical services have been used effectively. The

program replaces the old logrolling methods of tariff making which always resulted in piecemeal and unscientific establishment of higher and higher tariff rates through the activities of self-seeking pressure groups. These old methods came into full flower in connection with the embargo Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930.

Between 1929 and 1932, after the Hawley-Smoot tariff had been in operation for 2½ years, this country's national income fell by more than $42,000,000,000, or more than half; the value of United States foreign trade declined from $9,600,000,000 to $2,900,000,000; export of United States farm products dropped from a value of $1,700,000,000 in 1929 to $662,000,000 in 1932; United States farm cash income dropped from $11,200,000,000 in 1929 to $4,700,000,000 in 1932.

The Hawley-Smoot tariff was a principal cause of a rise of unprecedented trade restrictions everywhere. When these excessive barriers choked world trade channels, American workmen lost jobs, American farm surpluses became dammed up, and American farm and other prices were forced to disastrously low levels.

During the more than 5 years prior to the outbreak of the new war in Europe the reciprocal trade agreements program was effective in clearing away thousands of tariff and other obstructions from world trade channels. It contributed materially to the increase in volume of our foreign commerce, which, in turn, was an important factor in the improvement of the economic situation of American farmers and workers. Trade agreements have been negotiated with 21 countries, which accounted for nearly two-thirds of total United States foreign trade.

By 1939, after 5½ years of the operation of the trade-agreements program, the following increases, as compared with 1933, took place in some of the principal factors of our national prosperity:

	Increase	
	Amount	Percent
United States total foreign trade	$2,370,000,000	76
United States exports	1,502,000,000	90
United States imports	868,000,000	60
United States national income	25,996,000,000	61
United States farm cash income (excluding Government payments)	2,433,000,000	46
Wages and salaries in manufacturing industries	5,137,000,000	69

Effectiveness of the trade-agreements program as a major factor among those which brought about these increases is demonstrated by the fact that United States trade with the countries with which we have trade agreements has increased far more rapidly than has trade with nonagreement countries. Our exports to the countries covered by the 18 agreements in effect throughout the year 1939 averaged 50.5 percent greater in 1938–39 than in 1934–35, while our exports to all other countries increased by only 31.7 percent.

The trade-agreement method of operating to increase foreign trade is that of bargaining with individual foreign countries for reductions in their tariffs or other barriers against specific United States export products which we have in abundance, making, in return, reductions in excessive United States tariffs on products of foreign countries which American industries and American consumers need and want. The tariff concessions which the United States may grant in an agreement are strictly limited by the law itself and are safeguarded by provisions formulated by the Government experts with a view to preventing serious injury to established domestic producers.

Through the agreements the United States has obtained from foreign countries concessions on hundreds of American farm and factory goods produced for export. Concessions in effect on January 1, 1940, applied to products which in 1937 made up 30.3 percent of our total exports and included 47.3 percent of our 1937 farm exports and 24.9 percent of our nonagricultural exports in the same year.

War has not wiped out the gains made in the preceding 5 years through the reciprocal trade-agreements program. It is true that measures taken by certain foreign countries for the purpose of strengthening their war effort, or with a view to counteracting the effects of war on their trade, have resulted in the temporary suspension of certain detailed provisions of our trade agreements with belligerent countries and have restricted the immediate opportunities for negotiating new agreements. The nature of our wartime trade with foreign countries is different in many respects from what it was in time of peace, but notwithstanding the effects of war—

(1) The trade agreements now in effect provide a basis and a mechanism for maintaining the best commercial relations possible under existing circumstances;

(2) The authority under the Trade Agreements Act and the interdepartmental technical organization set up to administer the program are available for making quick and sound decisions and for taking effective action to meet the new and urgent problems of world trade in wartime; and

(3) The principles of equal treatment and of mutually beneficial trade relations among all nations embodied in the trade agreements program remain the soundest possible foundation for establishing a satisfactory postwar world economy. They are an indispensable foundation for stable and enduring peace among nations.

This last point is of special importance. Steadfast adherence to the principles of a liberal economic policy in international relations—even though, in the light of existing conditions, some temporary deviations might be necessary—is an essential part of the defense and promotion of our best national interest. Only if these principles come to prevail in the relations among nations will there be any hope for enduring peace and satisfactory prosperity for our Nation and for all nations.

May I add to this discussion of the reciprocal-trade agreements a brief word of defense to the charge that the Hull trade-treaty program (because this program has been the pet child of Secretary of State Cordell Hull) in some instances has caused an increase in imports, the inference being that American business has lost trade by reason of that fact. In discussing this matter, I quote from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which recommended the extension of authority to negotiate and conclude such agreements. The report touching this point said:

"This leads straight to the vital point which the opposing testimony continuously failed to recognize—namely, that the condition of the American markets rather than the small proportion supplied by imports is the important consideration. To put it in simple form, it is far better to have a somewhat smaller proportion of a good market than a larger proportion of a poor one. A former member of this committee stated the situation forcefully in the House debate on the trade-agreements resolution in 1937 when he asked which the critics of the trade agreements would rather have—95 percent of something or 100 percent of nothing. For example, the producers of Cheddar cheese, who complained about the tariff reduction on such cheese in the first Canadian agreement, had 99.84 percent of the domestic market in 1932, following passage of the Hawley-Smoot Act, but were getting only about 10 cents a pound for cheese and had a gross income of about $37,000,000 in that year. In 1936, the first year of the Canadian agreement, they had 2 percent less (97.78 percent) of the domestic market than in 1932, but they got an average of 15.3 cents a pound for their cheese and received a gross income of $75,000,000.

"To take an industrial illustration: In 1931, 7,700,000 pounds of window glass were imported; in 1937, imports had increased to 46,000,000 pounds, or sixfold. But what was the situation with respect to domestic production in these years? In 1931, 347,000,000 pounds, valued at $10,400,000 of window glass was produced in the United States; in 1937 the domestic production had increased to 851,000,000 pounds, valued at $31,400,000. In other words, the domestic producers in 1931 supplied 97.8 percent of a poor market and in 1937, a smaller percent (94.9) of a much better market."

CONCLUSION

And, now, having discussed the issues upon which we believe our party can appeal with confidence to the American people, and particularly the people of Virginia, my task is over.

I do not feel that it is a part of my function to attempt to choose between proposed or prospective candidates, or to prophesy or advise either this convention or the national convention at Chicago as to its choice of standard bearers. There is an abundance of material.

However, the point I wish to stress is that whatever may be the result of the convention at Chicago, many of us may be disappointed with that result. But earnestly I implore you that that should make no difference in our attitude toward the party nominee. I voted for Bryan in 1908, for Wilson in 1912 and in 1916, for Cox in 1920, for Davis in 1924, for Al Smith in 1928, and for Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936. I have never run my pencil through the name of a Democratic nominee, National, State, or local, and I don't propose to begin that practice in 1940. Whoever the nominees of the Chicago convention are I shall support them and so will the overwhelming majority of the Democrats of Virginia. When these nominations are made the orders will come: "Fall in" and the militant hosts of Virginia Democrats will take their position in solid columns without a straggler missing. "Right shoulder arms," and every musket will be in proper position. "Forward march," the Democratic army will start their advance that will not end until November 5, when every soldier shall cast a vote for the national ticket, for HARRY BYRD for United States Senator, and for at least one of the nine Democratic nominees for Congress in Virginia. In that march, I suggest that the general order will be, "Don't shoot, boys, until you see the whites of their eyes, but when you do, give them hell."

Recent Defense Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement

showing the recent progress of national defense in both the Army and the Navy from 1934 to 1940.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECENT DEFENSE PROGRESS

ARMY

Between 1934 and 1940, the Regular Army was raised from 134,000 officers and men to 242,648 officers and men. During the same period the National Guard was raised from a strength of 189,000 to 251,000.

NAVY

Since 1933 more ships have been built and commissioned than the number of under-age ships at the beginning of 1933. During 1933–40 eight times as many combatant ships were built as in the previous 7 years. Naval personnel was increased over 60 percent. Some illustrative figures follow:

United States Navy

	1934	1940
Ships under age	84 of 708,550 tons	134 of 929,070 tons.
Ships building	47 of 152,760 tons	77 of 488,860 tons.
Ships over age	288 of 330,110 tons	235 of 328,290 tons.

Under present authorizations, we shall have 617 ships of 2,611,670 tons—the world's greatest fleet.

Air forces

	1934	1940
Navy	933	1,765
Army	1,497	2,800

STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS

A $100,000,000 program of building up stocks of strategic raw materials was started over a year ago. Over $10,000,000 worth of these essentials for national defense have already been purchased.

DEFENSE CONSTRUCTION

Over 12,000 military and naval buildings and 500 landing fields were constructed or improved under W. P. A. projects 1935–40. The W. P. A. performed work on three-fourths of all Army posts. One hundred thousand men were employed on national defense W. P. A. projects in June 1940.

The P. W. A. in 5 years allotted $861,750,464 directly to the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard. The P. W. A. completed 383 airport construction projects.

DEFENSE LOANS

On June 25, the President signed a bill which empowered the R. F. C. to make loans for defense-plant construction and raw-material purchases. By July 31, 22 loans totaling $287,546,340 had been made.

LABOR IN DEFENSE

(a) On July 31, 4 weeks after the defense vocational training program was started, 70,000 people were taking training courses in defense skills in vocational high schools. This number was increasing at the rate of 10,000 a week.

(b) The United States Employment Service has made an inventory of 5,000,000 unemployed with a view to using their skills for defense purposes.

(c) Employment in aircraft, machine tool, aluminum, and explosive industries shows the following trends:

1937 average	195,500
April 1940	282,500
May 1940	294,900
June 1940	316,900

RECENT ARMY CONTRACTS

During the period between June 6 and July 17, the National Defense Advisory Commission cleared $1,650,000,000 worth of Army and Navy contracts.

A contract for the construction and operation of a Government powder plant has been signed, although it was not until 7 months after we were at war in 1917 that such a contract was signed.

The Defense Commission has announced that it will have an emergency plan for the production of synthetic rubber ready within a few weeks, that 500 Garand rifles will be delivered daily by October 1, that by December 31, 25,000 trucks will be delivered, and that 25,000 planes will be produced yearly by 1942. At the present time, 900 planes are being delivered monthly. There will be 1,500 monthly by the fall.

Many of the activities of the Commission have not yet been made public.

EXPORT CONTROL

Arms have been exported only under license for several years. Recently, measures have been taken to prevent export of materials necessary to national defense.

AIRPLANE PILOT TRAINING

About 14,000 young men are now being trained as pilots under the Civil Aeronautics Board. During the past school year some 10,000 were trained. There will be 15,000 new trainees in September, and another 15,000 in February.

American Defense Meeting of Harvard Summer School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY PROF. SIDNEY POST SIMPSON

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Prof. Sidney Post Simpson, of Harvard Law School, before the American defense meeting of the Harvard summer school on July 30 of this year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, men and women of the Harvard Summer School, not so long ago these things we are talking about tonight would have sounded to most of us like a fairy story. Perhaps it would have begun like this: Once upon a time, in the year 1940, there was a very rich country. It was relatively free. It was relatively prosperous. It was devoted to the arts of peace. It had most of the gold in the world. It had most of the coal and iron. It had most of the oil. It had grown rich and sure of its own external security. Many of its people were mainly absorbed with making money and with securing material comfort. But it had churches, schools, colleges, universities, and it cherished a tradition of the freedom and dignity of man and the maintenance of certain elemental human decencies.

Three thousand miles away, across a great ocean, were some countries something like it—less rich, mostly less free, some smaller countries perhaps more free. But there were other countries, too; countries which had ordered the lives of their people on quite a different plan. For relative freedom they substituted organized constraint. For the arts of peace they substituted the art of war. In their relations with other countries they employed a diplomacy based on propaganda and an equal readiness to make or to break promises in order to reach a desired end. For the human decencies habitually observed in other countries they substituted different ways of doing things.

One of them in particular was a very efficient country, and it devoted its efficiency to developing the art of war. It had an extremely ambitious leader. That leader, indeed, was so ambitious that most people in the other countries could not comprehend his ambition, even though he had put it all in a book. They thought that he was looking for more ultimate comfort for his people, for more territory, for a more adequate share of the world's raw materials, for revenge on enemies. He was looking for these things. But he was also looking for more, and so were his people—and the mass of his people were squarely behind him, partly by reason of a new system of education, and partly by reason of a drastic means of dealing with those who disagreed. He was even able to persuade the women of his people to accept a definitely inferior position in his country's scheme, and he was able to enlist the enthusiastic aid of many of his people in cruel racial and religious persecutions. He and his people were looking for power. His and their desires for power were not limited, any more than were those of Alexander, or of the Caesars, or of Napoleon. To be sure, most people in the other countries could not, or would not, understand this. But such was the fact. This country was seeking to dominate the world—not part of the world, but all of the world.

So this particular country set out on its career of world conquest. It was a comparatively small country, half the size of its great, rich neighbor 3,000 miles across the sea. It had been crushed in a war not many years before. The terms of the peace imposed upon it had been harsh, in some respects unjust, and in many respects unwise. After this peace this country had been bankrupt, and very unhappy. But when this leader came into power he was able in 6 years to undertake his career of conquest, and in 1 more year he and his people dominated, or were about to dominate, a continent. One by one, the less powerful first, the countries nearest were reduced to submission, sometimes by deception, sometimes by force, sometimes without resistance.

In the meantime, the great, rich country across the sea attended to the arts of peace and sought to help its people be happy; and, while it did not succeed perfectly, it had begun to succeed pretty well. But it did not realize that it was in any danger. It played games, especially a game called politics, and it got very soft and very defenseless. Then, one day after it saw one smaller country after another fall into the hands of a conqueror, it began to wake up. But then it was very nearly too late. The country was large, it was thought by its enemies—and not without reason—to be disunited, and it still wanted to play the game called politics. Its people used little words, like "Republican" and "Democrat" and "New Deal" and "third term" and "underprivilege" and "C. I. O." and "A. F. L.," and "American business." It had forgotten to think in terms of big words, like "our country" and "American ideals," and it did not like to think at all of two very big and terrible words, "war" and "invasion." And there seemed only one answer to what would happen.

Is there only one answer? That is the question that the United States must face, and face without any delay. I ask you to face it with me tonight, without fear, but without self-deception.

Let us first examine the basis of the policy of which we have heard so much—that the United States must keep out of war. It is based on the assumption of a fact. Unless that fact is true, that policy is mere words. The fact which that policy assumes is that there is no practical possibility of a successful attack on the continental United States.

There are three questions which we must ask. First, is an attack on the United States possible, as a technical military question? Second, if such an attack is possible, is it likely to be attempted? Third, do we want to prevent it? Let us consider each of these questions.

The answer to the first question is clear. It is "yes." A totalitarian attack on the United States is a military possibility. While the considerations that compel that answer are technical military consideration, they are intelligible enough. Let me direct your attention to four things and you can draw your own conclusions.

First, the German strategy beginning in Poland, then in Norway, then in Flanders, and most recently—so far—in France is a new kind of strategy. It is fundamentally based, not on defeating opposing armies directly, but on attack of rear areas and on attemps to break down the morale of the civil population. It is not like the older strategy which primarily contemplated the occupation and holding of territory. It operates rather in terms of paralyzing the adversary's circulatory and nervous systems.

Second, to carry out such a strategy, where the primary purpose is destruction rather than occupation, with occupation coming later when the opposing army is paralyzed or civil morale broken, does not require large bodies of troops. Irretrievable destruction can be accomplished by comparatively small numbers of determined men, and these people I am talking about are very determined men. The parachute corps of the German army has been recruited by volunteering. It is a suicide assignment and it is known to be such. And yet it has been impossible to accept anywhere near all the men who have volunteered for that service.

Third, in past wars the assumption has been that a military force must keep open a line of retreat. That assumption, with respect to the present German Army, can no longer be made. With their strategy, and with their troops, soldiers can be sent out to do their mission of destruction—and they need not return. Hitherto our consideration of the possible vulnerability of the United States to air attack, even taking into account the geographical location of our munition plants and our industries—all now above ground—and the ease with which the complicated organization of our great cities—as for example the water supply, power plants, and transportation centers serving Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—could be disorganized, has been proceeding on the theory that planes must get here and back. Leave out the "and back," and the picture is different. Fourth, the *Atlantic Clipper* is now flying, nonstop, from Horta, in the Azores, to New York; heavy bombers are being delivered in England by flying them from Newfoundland; the United States Navy has just ordered patrol bombers with a cruising range of 5,000 miles. While we do not know what large long-range airplanes the Germans have built, there are persistent rumors of some large enough to carry 15-ton tanks by air, which seem confirmed at least as to possibility by recent Russian air transport of tanks in Rumania. Of course, no one with military experience supposes that such tank-carrying planes would, in the event of a Nazi attack on the United States, be used to carry tanks. Their lifting capacity would be used rather for gasoline to get them across the Atlantic, and for suicide squads of soldiers with orders to destroy munitions plants, airplane factories, and vital establishments in our big cities on the Atlantic coast. And if anyone in the United States thinks that these things indicate merely a threat to our Eastern seaboard, let them remember the large extent of German interpenetration in Mexico and South America which has already been accomplished, and let them also consider the unenviable position of the Pacific coast if it becomes necessary to transfer the American Battle Fleet to the Atlantic.

Some of you may be wondering, perhaps, what the effect of this kind of an attack would be. It might have several effects. First, it might break civil morale in a large part of the country, very important strategically and industrially, to an extent where an olive branch would be held out to the Army. If you do not believe that this can happen where sufficient havoc is wrought on the civil population, especially women and children, consider Leopold's surrender of the Belgian Army. Second, such an attack would involve large loss of investments by a number of wealthy men, and some of them might try to hold out the olive branch. Third, and perhaps most important, an attack of this sort—eliminating essential munitions plants in New England, New York, and New Jersey—would delay this country's preparedness plans by many months. When you may have to face an opponent who runs "blitzkriegs," this is too long a delay to be risked.

If an attack on America is militarily practicable, as it is, may it be attempted? Here again let me call your attention to some concrete facts. One fact is the character of the ambition of Nazi Germany, and its systematic refusal to be hampered by considerations of humaneness or honor. Another is the real and inescapable conflict of interest, both material and ideological, between the United States and the Germany of Hitler. This, indeed may very well be a case where, not the country, but the world, cannot exist half slave and half free. Moreover, this country is a rich prize in its own right—a far richer prize than any of the other countries which thus far have been subjected to German military and economic domination. Even if the United States had undertaken to appease the dictators and had refused material aid to France and England, it would still have been in certain danger.

This brings up the third question: Do we want to prevent an attack on the United States? I heard a man say in New York City the other day that he would rather have Hitler than Roosevelt. I don't think that he really would, and I am sure that he did not have the slightest idea of what that would actually mean. This particular man was engaged in business—fairly big business. I suppose he had not heard of the fate of Fritz Thyssen, who was the Henry Ford of Germany not so many years ago. I suppose that he had not realized that the fate of businessmen in Germany, large and small, even before the outbreak of the present war, has been to carry out the orders of the National Socialist Party—without assurance of profit, at their own expense, under penalty of removal to concentration camps or being put to work as day laborers wherever labor might be needed if they did not comply to the party's satisfaction. Indeed, I wonder how many of us have considered realistically what this Nazi system means. I think American labor has. Labor knows that the domination of the Nazi system would mean the end of trade-unions, of collective bargaining, and of all the things that they have worked and hoped for. Some of the rest of us, however, have not been so wise. Many of us who, like myself, have come from the Farm Belt of the Middle West have not realized that the German farmer and the farmers in the countries conquered by Germany have been tied to the land, they and their children, like medieval serfs under penalty of confiscation and the concentration camp if they leave it. I do think that most of us in the educational field have realized the utter change in the educational system which has taken place in Germany and is now taking place in the conquered countries—the substitution of dictated dogma for search after truth; the substitution of indoctrination for free inquiry. Some of us may have realized what has happened to the young people in Germany and the conquered countries—the changing of young men into war machines and young women into birth machines.

Again, we in this country have been developing—imperfectly enough, but increasingly—the principle that men and women are equal partners in the things that this country needs to do. Contrast that with the situation in Germany and in the conquered countries, where woman's place in the social order is definitely an inferior one—her only significant functions being the wholesale production of children in or out of wedlock, and, to use Nietzsche's phrase, the "amusement of the warrior."

But surely further emphasis on what Nazi domination involves is unnecessary with this audience. To you and in this place, surely I need do no more than mention our country's historic struggles toward an expanding ideal of freedom, our American devotion to Christianity and the freedom of all religions, and our American reluctance to become a subject race. We do want to prevent any attack on the United States.

Thus, when we face the actual situation, the supposed fact that has been the basis for all this talk about America keeping out of the war dissolves. The question is not whether we can keep America out of war but whether we can keep war out of America. There was much talk in recent months about "not sending our boys to die in France." No one has ever wanted our boys to die in France or anywhere else—but certainly, if it should be necessary to defend the United States, it would have been better if we had been able to do so in France rather than in Massachusetts, or New York, or California, or Illinois. No one wants Boston or New York City or Chicago bombed as Rotterdam and Warsaw and Bordeaux were, and as England is now being bombed. Surely, too, we do not want to take any chances that our high command may have to consider whether to make a stand on the line of the Connecticut River or withdraw to the line of the Hudson—or farther west.

In any case, talk about America's now sending troops abroad is foolish. Our whole Regular Army ready for active service in the continental United States is about one-fourth the size of what was the Army of the Netherlands.

You will think I am painting a dark picture. I am. That is the picture. Some of you may think that I am an alarmist, but I ask you, if you think so, to search your consciences and ask yourselves if you are not thinking that way because that is the way you want to think. In military operations—and the present situation is in essence a military operation forced upon the United States by other powers—it is necessary to consider not only what potential enemies are most likely to do, but what is the most dangerous thing that they can do, and then it is necessary to take sufficient and prompt steps to meet that most dangerous possibility. If we disregard what can happen, and prepare only to meet what is most likely to happen, we will be in the same situation as the British and Norwegians who thought a few months ago, for very good reasons, that a difficult pass in Norway could not be crossed by a Nazi mechanized force.

The importance of this basic principle for American defense plans cannot be too much emphasized. This country must prepare for all possible eventualities, even—indeed, especially—for those which at the moment seem on the whole somewhat unlikely. The Nazi technique for the conduct of war is based largely on the factor of surprise, and one of the most effective means of producing military surprise is to do the thing that the opposing country or army thinks is unlikely. Some persons seem to take the view that this country may safely limit itself to preparing against the more probable courses of totalitarian attack—but that way lies disaster. To say, for example, that we need only concern ourselves with preventing the establishment of enemy land bases in this hemisphere because an air attack on the eastern seaboard would be unlikely to come until after such bases were established, to invite a different kind of attack. Moreover, it is essential to prepare first to meet the kind of attack which can come soonest, and also to remember that even if an attack of a particular kind might not ultimately result in permanent occupation of American territory, there is no reason for courting destruction of our cities and industries and death of our people, both in the armed forces and in civil life, merely because we hope an invader could later be expelled.

The most dangerous immediate military possibility, probably, is some such form of direct air attack on our cities and industrial plants as I have suggested. But there are other possibilities fully as dangerous, and perhaps more likely even if less immediate. A successful German invasion of Great Britain and Ireland might involve the loss or surrender of the British Navy. It might involve the removal of the British Government to Canada. It might involve German domination of the other British possessions near us in South America, Central America, and the West Indies. Indeed, we are now confronted with similar if less serious problems with respect to the French possessions in this hemisphere, and with respect to Iceland and Greenland.

Again, we are only now beginning to realize fully the extent of Nazi activities south of the Rio Grande. There is now evidence that there are more armed and equipped Germans in South America than there are soldiers in our entire Regular Army. There are large German airlines in the Argentine and further north, with many commercial planes which could be readily converted for military use. And we must not forget that effective development of German air bases in Colombia and especially in Mexico would mean that the Middle West and the Pacific Coast would be as open to air attacks as the eastern seaboard now is.

To consider another aspect of the whole picture, the Far Eastern situation is loaded with dynamite. Even from a purely economic standpoint, Japanese seizure of the Netherlands Indies would be a serious matter for us, and vulnerability of the Philippines as well as their usefulness to Japan are familiar enough facts? If Japan is allowed to dominate eastern Asia and the South Seas, and thus can exclude American trade except on her own terms, there will be real trouble for us economically, to say nothing of the possibility of a German-Italian-Japanese military alliance for an attack on America from several directions, nor of the uncertain attitude of Russia.

These are not all the possibilities, but they are some of the more serious. And let me emphasize again that none can be disregarded, and that the most immediately dangerous must be prepared against immediately. We as a nation and as individuals cannot take any chances on allowing any of these things to happen.

All of which is to say that we are in a very tough spot—a very tough spot, indeed. What can we do to get ourselves out of that spot?

1. We can support immediate and effective measures—military, naval, and industrial—for American defense. Things must be made to move and move fast. This will probably require that our war industries begin to run 24 hours a day. It certainly means that any attempt by any industrial group to make large profits out of preparedness must be dealt with at once and drastically. It means recognition of the principle of universal national service—which can be described as compulsory only for those few who are not willing to join in a united national effort because they hope someone else will do it for them.

There has been much talk about the present selective military service bill from various quarters, but I think the wisest comment I have heard came to me from a man of 20 who is working as a mechanic in a garage in Cambridge, with whom I talked the other night. I asked him what he thought about selective service. He said, "My friends and I are all for it. We don't want to enlist in the Regular Army, because that is no life for a man. We don't want to join the National Guard, because we have heard that it's an antilabor outfit. But we know there may be a fight, and we know that we can't fight the Germans with monkey wrenches. We would like to know how to fight if we have to."

But let me tell you another story which seems to me equally significant. I was talking a few weeks ago with an unemployed union carpenter in a South Boston bar. He said to me: "The reason why most of my friends believe in compulsory service is the same reason most of us believe in the closed shop. Most of us are willing to serve, just like most of us pay union dues—and we don't want to see a few bums who aren't willing get away with something." It seems to me that this story gives the answer to suggestions that our Army should be recruited solely by volunteering. Indeed, these two stories, I think, sum up the whole case for the present selective military service bill. No doubt we must go further than that bill. Perhaps very soon what we should aim for is a real system of universal registration and universal availability for national service without regard to age, class, or sex. I think we all want to make our services available where they can be most useful. Make no mistake, my friends, if we really want to avoid the danger of becoming subject to an alien power, we must prepare ourselves to make serious sacrifices of our time and our wealth, to make them cheerfully, and to be proud of them. Unless our people care enough about our country so that not having been selected for military service is a cause for regret rather than joy, we are very close to disaster.

2. So far as the safety of the United States is concerned, we can stop talking and thinking in political terms. A lot of us have been talking and thinking that way. A lot of us are thinking almost wholly in terms of such words as "Roosevelt" and "Willkie" and "Wallace" and "McNary." Politics may be important, but American defense must transcend politics. Regardless of whom any of us may decide to vote for next November, this is no time to snipe at the Commander in Chief. The same thing will be true after next January regardless of the result of the November election.

3. Let us not fool ourselves as to the issue before our country. That issue is not isolation or intervention. We could not intervene if we would. And we can remain isolated only if and so long as Herr Hitler permits it. The issue is peace—if we want it and will work for it—or a prelude to surrender. But we must work as we have never worked before, and we must all work, and work together. And we must get going now. Talk of preparedness in 1942 is folly; our deadline must be next April or sooner. We cannot afford to wait, as did France and as did England.

4. We can firmly resist movements for appeasement of any totalitarian power, east or west. There are still some people who seem to think as Chamberlain did and as many French politicians did that you can change a man-eating tiger into a house cat by patting it on the head. If and when trouble really starts we must have developed a national morale which will prevent an American Munich.

But you are saying to yourselves, "This is all very general talk. What can I personally do?" At least I hope you are saying that. It seems to me clear that you can do very important things, more important than any of us here at Harvard can do. In less than 2 weeks you will be going back to your schools and your communities—schools and communities which in any realistic assessment of our United States are much more important than Harvard or Cambridge. Some of you are going back to my part of the country, the Middle West. Some of you are going back to the Pacific coast, and some to the South. If we are going to preserve our common country as we have known it—and, with all its imperfections, loved it and hoped to make it better—we must make articulate to 130,000,000 people the things that Mr. Lerner has said so well tonight, the things that I have tried to say, the things Senator PEPPER is going to say, and the things that I know that you think. And we must spare no effort in doing so. This is no time to think about ourselves, our plans, or our personal comfort. This is no time to think about taking vacations or of the pleasanter things of life. The only way that we can get out of the very tough spot this country is now in is by vigorous, united, and immediate effort.

Some of you may be thinking: "He is asking us to spread a gospel." That is just what I am asking. It is the gospel of our country, and it needs to be spread. You, my friends, are in a wonderfully good position to spread it. This little thing of ours called American defense: Harvard Group is just an imperfect pattern. There should be, and I hope there will be, an American-defense group in every school and college and in every city and town in our country. And I know that each of you can, if you will, bring that about in your own community. But these things must be started without delay.

We must realize now that this is a really critical situation; that the next 6 months, or even less, may well be decisive; that a real and visible national unity is immediately essential. It will be a very tough job to win this fight. The way the game is being played now by some of our politicians, we have a beautiful chance of losing. But we can still win if we all act together at once—and we can give our country peace. It will be a hard job, and it may take a long time—but it can be done.

Treatment of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY CLARENCE DEAN

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Clarence Dean which appeared in the Hartford Times of Hartford, Conn., on August 2, 1940.

This article contains a bold accusation relating to the treatment of American Indians. I find it hard to believe that the charges contained in the article are accurate, but it has so startled me that I felt that the Members of Congress should be given a chance to read it. Some Senators will know whether or not it is wholly or in part true. If any of it is true, something should be done about it immediately. If we are neglecting the Indians to the extent pointed out in the newspaper story, we are not only guilty of gross injustice but deserving of condemnation.

Just as soon as circumstances permit I myself shall endeavor to make a personal investigation. In the meantime I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and particularly those who are representing parts of the country in which Indians reside, a horrifying statement made by a man who professes to have examined the situation, and who appears to be greatly concerned with the welfare of the American Indians. This gentleman is Mr. John E. Hamilton, of Hartford, Conn. I do not know Mr. Hamilton, but his article speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of August 2, 1940]

LEAGUE HEAD FINDS DISEASE RAMPANT ON RESERVATIONS

(By Clarence Dean)

"Indescribable misery" among the American Indians on Federal reservations was reported today by John E. Hamilton, of Hartford, president and executive director of the National American Indian Defense Association, Inc.

Mr. Hamilton recently returned from a personal investigation on two Montana reservations, during which he arranged for representatives of the association to carry the investigation into other reservations.

"No one acquainted with the conditions that I saw with my own eyes," Mr. Hamilton declared today, "can doubt that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is both incapable and neglectful.

"I say further that the Bureau has built up a system that lends itself to corruption of all kinds—a system that makes the welfare of the Indian a matter of the least importance. All of this must be charged to the indifference of Congress and the American people."

"I found on the Blackfeet Reservation in Browning, Mont., and the Rocky Boy Reservation in Box Elder," Mr. Hamilton reported, "widespread tuberculosis and trachoma, a disease of the eyes.

"The majority of the Indians are starving and in immediate need of food.

"The taste of fruits, vegetables, and milk are unknown to thousands of these Indians. Very little meat is given to them; salt pork is stale and of the cheapest quality.

"Some of them are fortunate enough to obtain small quantities of flour in doles from the Government agencies. It has been exposed to dust, dirt, mice, and vermin. Lard is rancid. For coffee, they are handed out the green beans.

"Many of them are obliged to walk miles for water, and the water they are able to carry back to their dwellings is of insufficient quantity. It is impossible for them to bathe except when it rains. In winter, they use snow for bathing and drinking.

"They are compelled to live in dilapidated and unsanitary dwellings which they make themselves whenever they can find cardboard; old slabs, clay, reeds, brush, and rocks.

"Because of the lack of nourishment, shelter, and medical attention, the Indians—from the babies to the aged—are subject to all kinds of diseases, particularly tuberculosis and trachoma."

Establishing headquarters on the Blackfeet Reservation, where approximately 4,000 Indians live, Mr. Hamilton reported members of the tribe walked for miles to tell him of their hardships.

"One old woman came to me crying," he said. "She had not eaten, she told me, for days. I was carrying in my pocket a box of graham crackers, and I gave her a handful. She shoved them into her mouth and ate them almost like an animal."

"On the Rocky Boy Reservation there are no floors in the shacks. The Indians sleep on the ground. In winter their only heat is obtained by turning over a tin tub on the ground and building a fire underneath. This fills the tent or shack with smoke and contributes to the prevalence of trachoma.

"The whole administration of Indian affairs is on a hit-or-miss basis. There is no regular allotment of food. A great many of the children receive absolutely no schooling.

"The Indians' plight is the more serious because they have no means, even if physically able, to leave the reservation and find employment. They can obtain no money and are not free to sell their own goods, even if they have any.

"One Indian wrote to me, 'I have about 95 acres in the oil fields and there are 2 producing wells on my place. My brother has 55 acres joining me. It was leased the other day for $200 an acre. They give me $14.34 a year for my share. My brother gets $8.25 a year for his, or 15 cents an acre. This land was allotted to us about in 1910.'

"All the finances of the reservation are in the hands of the superintendent. He receives all moneys and buys all goods and is accountable only to the Indian Commissioner, who is accountable only to the Secretary of the Interior.

"To maintain this guardianship of the American Indian, the Indian Bureau maintains an organization of 10,000 employees—about 1 employee for every 25 Indians.

"The Bureau is wastrel, profligate beyond description. It is a bureaucracy which has grown insidiously like a cancer through its own sinister lust for power and the neglect and indifference of Congress.

"It has multiplied employees and expenses to a staggering total. It has woven a web of laws and rules until every step and act of helpless human beings is subject to a bureau's whims and will. It has repressed protests with an iron hand, violated the inherent constitutional rights of men whose only crime was an honest desire to help a people in bondage.

"It has been imbecile and inefficient in actual performance, wasting with reckless hands the property of the Indians and funds of the American taxpayers.

"The expenses of the Bureau have been greatly augmented during the past few years, the number of employees has been multiplied, and more than one-half of the stupendous sum taken from the Indians and from the Treasury of the United States annually has been consumed by the employees of the Bureau.

"The Bureau has reached the point where the Indians are almost forgotten and the Bureau is its principal excuse for being.

"Because Congress has the exclusive power over tribal Indians, Congress, and the American people must bear the responsibility for permitting these disgraceful conditions to continue. I am sure that most of the indifference is due, especially in the East, to ignorance."

The association that Mr. Hamilton heads is preparing to intensify its efforts for reform through a membership campaign in October. By this time, Mr. Hamilton expects to have still more detailed information on reservation conditions. He invites all persons interested in doing volunteer work during the campaign to communicate with the association at 22 Arnold Street, telephone 6–1187.

Improvement in Business Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, from time to time during the past several months I have presented to the Senate statements concerning the business situation in the United States. Each time I have tried to present a statement by an authority and printed in a paper or magazine which could not be construed as being prejudiced in favor of this administration. There has been no paper in the country more critical of the administration's domestic policy than the New York Herald Tribune. One of the

outstanding financial writers in the country is Roger W. Babson. In view of these two facts it should be of particular interest to have available an article on our business prospects printed in the New York Herald Tribune, written by Mr. Babson. I ask consent that such an article appearing on July 9 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 4, 1940]

WIDE UPTURNS SEEN BY BABSON IN SECOND HALF—CLOSING MONTHS MAY BRING BEST BUSINESS IN HISTORY OF NATION, HE PREDICTS

(By Roger W. Babson)

Business in the second half of this year should be very active in most lines—maybe the best final half in history. More real jobs, fatter pay envelopes, modestly higher farm income, bigger dividends than in the first half of 1940 or in the final 6 months of 1939 are assured. There will be no noticeable gain in living costs, but taxes will be the heaviest in a quarter century. The next few months will be a period of intense industrial activity as our mammoth defense program gets under way.

This defense program will put the "oomph" in the industrial boom ahead. If peace comes in Europe before the program gets going full blast, there will be a temporary halt in the upswing. The longer peace is postponed, however, the greater the possibility that business activity will break all previous records sometime in 1940 or 1941. Specifically, I estimate that business in the second half will run about 6 percent above the same period of 1939, and also 6 percent higher than in the first 6 months of this year.

Readers will recall that in my outlook for the first half of 1940 I predicted a gain of 10 to 15 percent over the same months of 1939, but a downward trend from the high levels of January 1. This gain was 11.5 percent and business is 6 percent under the new-year level. I also said that we would have either a boom or a crash (no halfway course) in the second half of the year. I felt that it was impossible at that time to say which it would be. Now, however, I predict for the balance of this year a real boom in most industries.

Pace setter in this industrial expansion ahead will be the heavy industries. Steel operations are scheduled to reach a new peak for any 6-month period on record. They are entering the second half at close to 90 percent of capacity, the highest midsummer figure since 1929. Machine shops, metal foundries, airplane factories, shipyards, railway-equipment plants, have huge backlogs of orders. Only a shortage of skilled labor can prevent these industries from breaking all previous records.

The next few months may well see the railroads pull themselves out of the doldrums for the first time in 10 years. Rail traffic is almost sure to reach new highs since the "big depression" set in. Railroad earnings will be the best since 1930 and there will be openings for thousands of railroad workers. The railroad revival may be short lived, however. Electric power plants, textile mills, lumber camps, copper, lead, and iron mines, truck factories, should all get "their cut" of expanding activity.

Home builders should handle a fourth again as many "jobs" as in the late months of 1939. With factories frantically pushing expansion plans, many industrial contractors should see their business doubled. Building costs are expected to move upward, too, but less than 5 percent. Real-estate values and activity will improve noticeably, especially around shipyards and in other areas where the defense program is concentrated. Rents for factories, offices, and single houses may be a little firmer.

Naturally an industrial revival, such as is now in prospect, means more jobs and bigger pay rolls. I would not be surprised to see a million jobless people go back to work before snow flies. Wage rates will not be much higher—perhaps only 2 percent on the average. The increase, furthermore, will be due to the boosting of rates in selected jobs rather than a general mark-up in wages. I do not foresee any serious gain in strikes. The public will not tolerate interference from any source in the defense job.

While things will look brighter for city workers, I do not believe that rural areas will fare so well. Only a moderate gain in prices of certain farm products is in prospect, despite the fourth smallest acreage since 1915. There is a big demand for foodstuffs in Europe, but we can do nothing about it as long as Britain's blockade remains unbroken. Dairy products, eggs, canned goods, cattle, and hogs are among the farm products that ought to sell higher this fall. On the whole, prices may average around 3 percent above a year ago with total cash farm income (including Government checks) registering a little bigger increase.

With the demand for goods sharply increased, with a major war on abroad, with the prospect for higher taxes, many people are worried over a runaway rise in living costs. I think such fears are unfounded for the present even though the basic trend of living costs is upward. Household bills are expected to move ahead only moderately—not much more than 3 percent over the current level. The biggest mark-up will come in food. If taxes are figured into the living costs, the average will be somewhat higher because taxes are scheduled to hit the highest point in 25 years some time in the near future.

Heavier pay rolls, higher farm income, bigger dividends, plus fixed living costs, should mean brisker retail sales. But trade in the final half of 1939 was good, so that the gain over last year's level may average less than 5 percent for all lines—including groceries, novelties, furniture, automobiles, dry goods. Price tags will continue their modest mark-ups of early 1940, but need be only 3 percent above the corresponding months of 1939. Advertising volume should increase at least 5 percent over the like period of last year.

Not only should wage workers, businessmen, and farmers be better off, but investors should see increased income. In fact, the next few months will see the largest dividend payments since 1937, providing Congress is reasonable about taxes. Right now stocks are the cheapest in years, based on earnings. World-wide uncertainties, plus excess-profits tax threats, have unnecessarily frightened investors. Hence, prices of certain stocks should move ahead as business activity and profits continue to gain. Selection will be the keynote with steels, rails, munitions, machinery, and retail trade shares most favorably situated.

Interest rates will remain at very low levels; but high-grade long-term bonds should be weaker. Second-grade bonds—particularly rails—are temporarily in a strategic position because (1) the excess-profits tax does not hit them and (2) rail traffic promises to reach a new post-1929 peak this fall. Roads serving the industrial area are the best bet. The Treasury has a job on its hands to underwrite the mammoth defense program without putting the Government bond market "on the spot."

Foreign trade should hold at current levels, well above a year ago. Loss of our continental European markets should be offset by increased trade with South America and perhaps with the Far East. Great Britain will continue to be a big customer as long as the war lasts. No one knows what the outcome of the war in Europe will be. My belief is that it will either end very soon or will drag on for a long time. Whichever happens, I will not change my forecast on business for the next 6 months. This same statement applies regardless of who is elected President in November.

All in all, the remainder of 1940 promises to be the most active final half year in history. Our standard of living, however, will not increase because the defense program will not create more goods for us to divide. Only as more useful goods are produced are there more goods to divide—and only as there are more goods to divide does the standard of living increase. An entirely new tax program must be enacted. On this tax program largely rests the answer to the question, "Will the unproductive defense program give us some indirect benefit by eliminating certain unemployment and by cutting down relief, thus cushioning the fall in the standard of living?"

However, the next few months will seem to be good times, the closest we have come to prosperity since 1929. They will be crucial months—months in which the handling of our domestic political problems, of our foreign problems, of our South American relations, of our defense program will dictate the future destiny of the United States. If we rise to the challenge—if we show intelligence, courage, self-sacrifice, and industry—we need fear no axis, no country, no man. Otherwise much of the coming prosperity will rest on unsound foundations. Good times, built on borrowed money or unproductive labor, always come back to roost.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

RESOLUTION OF UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is an organization of young business and professional men between the ages of 21 and 35 from approximately 1,000 local organizations located in all 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii. At their twenty-first annual convention, June 19 to 22, 1940, in Washington, D. C., the 1,600 delegates present adopted a resolution as to their stand on national defense which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled on this the 21st day of June 1940, That our position with reference to the present significant problems of national defense be stated as follows:

1. We believe in the preservation of the democratic form of government which assures to our citizens the liberties and freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. We believe

that the latent dynamics of a democracy, once aroused, are more powerful than the driven dynamics of dictatorships. To obtain that end, we realize that the young men of America have a special responsibility. Hence, we pledge our efforts to allay hysteria and not to forget the need for the solution of important domestic problems which continue to be vital to our democratic form of life and to assist in welding together our people through mutual confidence and trust, recognizing that to achieve this end we must reduce unemployment, preserve industrial peace and the rights of labor, assure the fair treatment that encourages capital investment, assure fair treatment for agriculture, and discourage unfair advantage wherever shown.

2. We consider that the most important problem of the day is the immediate establishment of an adequate national defense.

3. We believe that the following are necessary elements of an adequate national defense:

A. A clear definition of the necessary geographical area of defense. As a minimum, such an area must include the United States and its possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

B. Immediate organization of all resources, including industry and manpower, which includes:

1. Compulsory military training.

2. Training of individuals in skills and techniques necessary to the rapid and efficient production of materials and equipment required for defense.

3. Administrative coordination of all agencies involved directly or indirectly in the defense program; appointment by the President of one person charged with this administrative responsibility; and elimination of delays and unnecessary procedural technicalities.

4. Elimination of excessive profits to industry, agriculture and labor by reason of production incident to the defense program.

5. Development of our own resources with a view to national self-sufficiency through an immediate program of extensive research as to latent resources, chemical substance, mechanical devices and synthetic products.

C. Recognition and willingness to bear the increased costs of such a defense program. Insofar as possible these costs must be paid currently out of tax revenues. As young men, we will assume our share of this burden.

D. Loyalty to the United States of America. We declare our belief in the loyalty of the great majority of our citizens. However, adequate steps must immediately be taken to eliminate all acts of disloyalty to our democratic form of government. This involves, among other steps, strict enforcement of the immigration laws and mandatory registration of all aliens.

E. Elimination of the use of the cloak of diplomatic privilege as a device to conceal unfriendly propaganda and subversive activity.

F. Public knowledge of all pertinent facts relative to problems of national defense and our relationship to foreign conflicts. We insist that our governmental leaders are under an obligation to keep us promptly and fully informed on these matters. We recognize the reciprocal obligation on the part of every citizen to keep himself fully informed.

G. Also, as an element of defense the step may be justified of making available for purchase supplies and equipment to those nations important to our plan of national defense, provided that the requirements of our own defenses shall in no event be prejudiced by such sale.

IV. We oppose sending an armed force outside the Western Hemisphere.

V. No armed force shall be sent beyond our geographical area of defense.

Having faith in our future and confidence in the willingness of our young men to make any sacrifices necessary, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce tenders to the Nation the services of its members and organizations—local, State, and National—in the establishment of adequate national defense and the maintenance of our democratic form of government.

Racketeering in Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER AND JOINT RESOLUTION BY HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article by the keen pen of that courageous columnist, Mr. Westbrook Pegler, whose articles are published daily in the Washington Daily Post, of Washington, D. C., as well as many other daily newspapers of the United States.

Mr. Pegler's articles are daily entitled "Fair Enough," and the particular article to which I refer deals with certain racketeers and criminals connected with some union organizations, mentioning particularly one George E. Browne, of Chicago, who, according to Mr. Pegler, "is an associate of criminals of the most dangerous and vicious type," and "Bioff, a common Chicago 'gorilla,' who served in the power ranks of the old Capone-Nitti hooch and prostitution enterprises, who is the real boss with power of death over Browne, and so forth."

In addition thereto I ask that a copy of my proposed legislation (S. J. Res. 275), introduced in the Senate by me on June 10, 1940, which among other things provides that labor organizations or unions may not employ as an agent, representative, or officer an American who has lost his rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony be included.

There being no objection, the article and joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK.—The International Union of Stagehands and Moving Picture Employees, which is a vicious racket preying on rank-and-file American workers, begins its convention in Louisville on Monday.

This union is controlled by elements of the new Capone mob or syndicate of Chicago criminals. It is a disgrace to the labor movement and a reproach to the American system of government which, by indirect but irresistible Government pressure, compels decent citizens to submit to its brutal and predatory rule.

The president of this racket is George E. Browne, of Chicago, whose voting power, derived from the large number of members, gives him important influence in the American Federation of Labor and a place on the executive council of that organization.

Browne gets $20,000 a year and allowances. He is an associate of criminals of the most dangerous and vicious type, and not only associates with such vermin but appoints them to positions of great power.

IN ONE CITY UNION FEE REACHED $3,000

Helpless under this power, the rank and file are compelled to pay high dues, amounting in some crafts to a 10-percent income tax on their gross earnings, heavy assessments, and fines. In one city the initiation fee reached the incredible and prohibitive amount of $3,000.

Officers of subunions or locals have established private rackets by which they have compelled owners of movie theaters to buy equipment and services from companies in which they were financially interested.

Officers of subunions also have established a licensing system whereby ostensibly free American workmen have been compelled to pay heavily for work permits, but have still been excluded from union membership, which would give them a theoretical and illusory right to vote.

Men in this subhuman, slave category have been compelled to work for nothing when their families needed wages and turn over their pay to the racketeers in command.

Decent American citizens with ever moral right to hold themselves above the most casual contact with a man of Browne's associations have been harried from job to job and from town to town and compelled to live furtively and work under false names.

First vice president under Browne is John P. Nick, a racketeer whose oppression and extortion provoked a rank-and-file rebellion in a St. Louis local and gave rise to the celebrated Post-Dispatch contempt case. Like Browne, he runs with thugs.

BIOFF ACTUALLY HAS CONTROL

Browne announced last Thursday that no action was contemplated by the union against Willie Bioff, his personal appointee to the post of international representative, a nonelective office of tremendous power, who is now in jail in Chicago belatedly serving an old sentence for sharing the earnings of a prostitute.

The actual reason why Browne contemplates no action against Bioff is that Bioff, a common Chicago gorilla, who served in the lower ranks of the old Capone-Nitti hooch and prostitution enterprises, is the real boss of the union, with power of death over Browne. If Browne were to attempt to throw out Bioff or Nick Circella, a stick-up man who is another of his appointees, he probably would be killed.

As to the question of how ably Bioff serves the union, the fact is that Bioff accepted $100,000 from Joseph Schenck, who represented the Hollywood employers in labor negotiations.

Schenck admits that he conveyed the money to Bioff, using an intermediary for purposes of concealment, but says the transaction was a forced loan and insists that Bioff returned the $100,000. The Government has indicted Bioff for failure to declare the $100,000 as income and pay the tax on it.

Schenck also admits that he "put Bioff in the market," and another incident which indicates how faithfully Browne's personal representative served the union was a de luxe cruise to South America on the French liner *Normandie* by Bioff and his wife, on tickets which cost $3,700 and were paid for by an employer with whom Bioff conducted union negotiations. Schenck takes the position that Bioff used his union power to extort his favors.

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 275) to provide for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents

Whereas it is common knowledge that "fifth column" activities in various European countries contributed largely to their defeat; and

Whereas such activities consisted in part of sabotage in key industries and propaganda disseminated among the workers of such industries; and

Whereas such activities are now being carried on in this country and will gather more momentum in the future, thus undermining our national defense; and

Whereas because of their key positions in our industrial mobilization plans, officers and agents of labor organizations should all be American citizens whose allegiance to their country is unquestioned and who can be depended upon to cooperate with the Government in stamping out such treacherous activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization which represents, or purports to represent, in any manner the interests of any persons employed by any business enterprise which is engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or in the production of goods for such commerce or for national-defense purposes, to have as an officer or agent any person who is not a citizen of the United States, who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi bund organization, who has been at any time within the past 2 years a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi bund organization, who is ineligible to hold public office, or who has lost his rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of each such labor union or other labor organization to use due diligence to determine whether any of its officers or agents is a person who is prohibited from being such an officer or agent under the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "labor union or other labor organization" shall include any group which is a part of or affiliated with any labor union or other labor organization which is national in scope or whose jurisdiction extends to more than one State.

SEC. 4. Any labor union or other labor organization willfully violating any of the provisions of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000; and each such violation shall be deemed to be a separate offense.

The New Order in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY NEWS AND WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial originally appearing in the New York Daily News, as reprinted in this morning's Washington Times-Herald, entitled "The New Order in Asia."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW ORDER IN ASIA

The new Japanese Cabinet, headed by Premier Fumimaro Konoye, plans to make Japan even more of a totalitarian state than it has been. More significant than that for the rest of the world, the Konoye government is mapping out some Japanese expansion which it hopes will cost Japan less and profit it more than the war in China has done up to now.

French Indochina is on the list of properties which Prince Konoye hopes to pick up for Japan. So are the Dutch East Indies. So, apparently, is British-owned Hong Kong; and it would surprise few people if the American-owned Philippine Islands should turn out to be on that same list.

There are rich pickings in the Orient for a strong, aggressive nation like Japan when the western world has a major war going on. Prince Konoye doesn't intend that the grass shall grow under Japan's feet while the white folks bleed themselves still whiter. The whole structure which he plans is to go by the resounding name of "The New Order for Greater East Asia."

A CHANGE OF BOSSES

What puzzles us is why so many Americans are so worried by the prospect of these changes.

We can't see any reason for moral indignation over Japan's expected seizure of the lands above named. The Dutch never exercised democracy in the Dutch East Indies. They exploited those rich islands and their easy-going natives methodically and thoroughly.

Certainly the French didn't bring the blessings of democracy to Indochina. They farmed and mined it just as the Dutch did the East Indies. Britishers in Hong Kong have never been famed for a chummy, democratic attitude toward the Chinese. When you come right down to it, our efforts to bring democracy to the Philippines have been pretty much blocked by the Filipinos' own dislike of us and all our ways.

If these territories should be taken over by the Japanese, it would only mean a change of bosses for their inhabitants, most of whom probably wouldn't care, and probably would be neither better nor worse off after the seizure.

POLITICS AND RUBBER

It is also argued that if Japan takes the Dutch East Indies we'll be out of luck for the 600,000 long tons of rubber which we consume annually. Japan is expected to cut us off from this vital supply, and also from the tin and quinine which we import from the East Indies.

That is nonsense. We are sometimes foolish enough to cut off good customers because we don't like their politics, but Japan isn't. If we play ball with Japan, Japan will play ball with us, commercially, at least. Japan always has. For decades, Japan has been a better customer of ours than China, has bought more from us and has sold us more.

If the East Indies rubber is cut off from us it will be because our Government refuses to recognize changes on the map; insists on hanging to the status quo though the heavens fall, or though Americans have to go to great expense to build up a synthetic-rubber industry.

We'd better get realistic about such things as Japan's rise to overlordship of the East.

If we don't, we'll commit ourselves to a policy of combating changes on the map wherever they occur—combating them by protest notes, trade embargoes, or actual warfare. That will mean that one of the world's greatest and richest nations will be working unceasingly to cripple the flow of trade around the world and dam back needed goods from the areas that need them.

Such a policy may be as righteous as the late Woodrow Wilson. But its practical effect will be to keep prices higher than they should be and world living standards lower than they need be.

Let's build up our Army to 1,000,000 mechanic-sergeants, 50,000 planes, and 100,000 pilots; let the Philippines go if Japan makes a pass at them; and mind our own business—meaning our own dollars-and-cents business as well as our own political business.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE SUMMER SESSION COLLEGIAN

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Summer Session Collegian of July 26, 1940, entitled "A Change of Policy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State College (Pa.) Summer Session Collegian of July 26, 1940]

A CHANGE OF POLICY

As traditional as the tower of Old Main, and almost as hallowed by the years, has been the antipathy of the Collegian toward compulsory military training at Penn State. Ever since this college was a two-by-four agricultural settlement, denouncing the R. O. T. C. has been a required course for every Collegian editor.

When all else failed—when the combined brain power of the editorial staff failed to produce a single literary spark—the flood of student apathy for the hated R. O. T. C. could always be tapped to fill the editorial column. "Down With Rotisse" has been a campus byword for years.

Typical idiotic college journalism? But the Collegian was only serving in its just capacity as a mirror of student opinion. Everybody hated military training. It was a bore, a useless, unnecessary evil. "Do away with it! Why do we need military training? It's propaganda for war!"

The Collegian was not the only college newspaper to denounce military training. Nor was Penn State the only campus on which it was hated. Many land-grant colleges successfully abolished it.

And all of this college antimilitary feeling was but the reflection of a vast national movement. Books, movies, newspapers everywhere recited the horrors of war. The mighty power of propaganda was used to drive deep into the fiber of America a hatred, a loathing for war and everything warlike. Never again would we waste our billions and our boys' lives! Isolationism became our paramount doctrine of foreign policy.

And the "voices in the wilderness" who urged preparedness were shouted down, were branded as warmongers, were crucified.

NOW AMERICA REAPS ITS REWARD

The most vital crisis of our history. Hitler, his appetite whetted on the blood of France, sharpening the knife of nazi-ism for Britain. Democracy at the crossroads. The future black for the hopes of free people.

And America—the greatest nation in the world—so handcuffed by her own nearsightedness that she has not so much as a single military unit capable of opposing the mighty German machine. America so unprepared that her entire Army could not hold the State of Pennsylvania for a week against a "blitzkrieg" assault.

These are the fruits of isolationism. This is the result of the idealistic spirit which prompted countless Collegian editors to write countess editorials against R. O. T. C.

Fortunately, the Atlantic Ocean and England may give the United States time to make amends. But much of the damage has already been done, with America powerless to interfere, the strong statements of her Chief Executive carrying no more weight than the impregnability of the Maginot line.

And, awakened like Congress from its long dream of "splendid isolation," the Collegian is now ready to admit its guilt. The Summer Collegian hereby repudiates once and for all its antimilitary policy and pledges itself to the support of compulsory military training for America's youth.

We hope that we—and America—have not "seen the light" too late.

Give the Volunteer System a Fair Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, OVER THE AMERICAN RADIO FORUM PROGRAM

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the American Radio Forum broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. network, Sunday evening, August 4, 1940:

As one who has voted for most of the administration's measures for national defense in the House, I insisted, before accepting the invitation to speak on this program, on being permitted a liberal construction of the subject under discussion.

The question of national defense is the biggest issue before Congress, and will continue to be the most important issue until we adjourn.

I believe in making America invincible on sea and air, and recruiting our Army and National Guard up to 800,000 as prescribed by Congress or even to 1,000,000 men.

I submit that the volunteer system, according to the Adjutant General, has not failed to provide all the recruits asked for by the Army. This is a matter of record, in spite of the inspired propaganda and extraordinary myth that has been let loose on the public in the eastern newspapers.

The time has come for clear and intelligent thinking and deliberate action, based on facts and not on propaganda. The Congress must proceed carefully before it attempts to regiment American youth and conscript them in time of peace.

We must not, under a barrage of war hysteria, import the European war system and foreign forms of militarism and autocracy into America, or bring over a counterpart of Hitler's dictatorship to the United States.

Our answer to the dictator nations is to make democracy work in America, and not subvert it with a military dictatorship or by the European conscription or war system.

I am convinced that if Congress will reduce the term of enlistment for the Army and National Guard from 3 years to 1 year and increase the pay from $21 to $30 a month we could get 400,000 volunteers by the first of October, or within 30 days of the time the change is made by law. In case of failure to obtain all the volunteers we want, I would vote for a temporary modified conscription bill providing for 400,000 to be drafted by October 1 and reducing the age limit from 64 to 25, because we need youth, not old men, to serve and fight in defense of our country.

If we need to increase the size of our Army next spring, then let the new Congress that convenes in January consider the situation at that time and act in accordance with our needs for national defense.

This proposal would not jeopardize our preparedness program, as we could not and had not intended to train more than 400,000 men by next spring.

We must try out our American volunteer system before resorting to any form of military conscription in time of peace, and before regimenting American youth into a huge military machine after the pattern of Hitler and other foreign dictators.

Conscription in peace is not the American way, but the road to militarism, dictatorship, and war.

The Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill, if voted upon next Monday, would not have the support of 10 percent of the Republicans in the House and probably not more than half of the Democrats.

I do not impugn the motives or sincerity of the New York Times or other proponents and originators of the draft bill. I do know, however, that it did not originate from the National Grange, American Farm Bureau, American Federation of Labor, nor does it represent the viewpoint of the farmers or the wage earners in America.

Whom do we fear? Do we fear Hitler, who seems afraid to attack England over 20 miles of sea, when he would have 3,000 miles to cross over here? That is preposterous, when we have the greatest Navy in the world, six or seven times larger than the German Navy, or that we should fear Hitler and Mussolini combined to make it necessary to rush in and conscript two or three million American youths.

We have an air force of 5,000 planes, and are expanding it at the potential rate of 800 airplanes a month. Yet no airplane has ever been invented, as Col. Charles Lindbergh rightly said, that could fly over here, bomb our cities, and get back to its European base.

Let us stop this fear hysteria and expose the war propaganda of the interventionists who are trying to force us into the European war against the will of 95 percent of the American people.

Let the American people ask the administration to take them into their confidence. What war do we face? How imminent is it? Is it the truth that "every day counts," as some administration leaders say behind closed doors?

With whom are we going to fight?
Where are we going to fight?
When are we going to fight?
Why are we going to fight?

I have yet to hear any Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives answer any one of these questions.

Why are all the cards kept under the table, concealed from the duly elected Representatives of the people, not to mention the people themselves?

It is my deliberate and sincere judgment that conscription in time of peace is un-American, undemocratic, and would create a huge military machine or Frankenstein that would devour our free institutions and destroy our constitutional and republican form of government.

All history and particularly contemporary history proves that placing the power of life and livelihood in the hands of any one man is the road to dictatorship and totalitarianism. I am bitterly opposed to both, and shall resist conscription until every effort has been made to exhaust the advantages of the American volunteer system under which our rights and liberties as a free people have been preserved.

Our Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WADE H. KITCHENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of most of the world being in the flames of war, our country is still trading

and doing business. I have some statistics and will incorporate them along in my remarks.

Summary of foreign trade of the United States during June and the first 6 months of 1940

	June 1940	June 1939	January–June	
			1940	1939
Exports including re-exports	$350,000,000	$236,000,000	$2,068,000,000	$1,416,000,000
General imports	211,000,000	179,000,000	1,294,000,000	1,094,000,000
Export balance	139,000,000	57,000,000	774,000,000	322,000,000

During June 1940 the normal seasonal recession in trade did not occur, and the exports, including reexports, were 8 percent above those for the 2 preceding months. Due principally to the continued heavy exportation of war material, exports during the first 6 months of 1940 were nearly 40 percent above those for the same period of 1939, whereas imports for the first 6 months of this year were about 14 percent greater than those for the comparable period of 1939.

The volume of both exports and imports increased less than the value because of the higher prices obtaining this year.

The export balance for the first half of 1940 was the highest for any similar period since 1921.

Exports and imports during the war period, September 1939 through June 1940

	1939–40	1938–39
Exports including reexports	$3,347,000,000	$2,461,000,000
General imports	2,192,000,000	1,787,000,000

For the 10-month war period, September 1939 through June 1940, exports were 36 percent greater than during the comparable months of 1938, while imports were about 23 percent greater. In addition to the heavy demand for war materials from the belligerent countries, countries of the Western Hemisphere increased their demand for iron and steel.

Exports of domestic merchandise

	January–June	
	1940	1939
Total	$2,022,000,000	$1,398,000,000
Agricultural	353,000,000	268,000,000
Nonagricultural	1,669,000,000	1,130,000,000

The heavy shipments of cotton, amounting to 8.5 percent of all exports, were almost entirely responsible for the increased value of agricultural exports during the first half of 1940, over the same period 1939. However, exports of corn, soybeans, fresh, dried and canned vegetables, and edible-vegetable oils and fats were greater this year than last.

Important commodities adversely affected by the war in the value of their exports during the first 6 months of 1940, compared with the corresponding months of 1939 were automobiles, gasoline, lumber, foodstuffs, and tobacco.

The import value of six leading strategic defense materials—crude rubber, tin, ferromanganese, nickel, silk, and wool—increased from $169,000,000 during the first half of 1939, to $308,000,000 during the first half of 1940, an increase of 82 percent.

In addition to increases in the national-defense materials imported during the first half of this year over the same period of last year, much higher values were shown for the 1940 imports of newsprint and paper base stocks, petroleum and its products, sawed boards, gas oil, coal-tar products, and burlaps.

Government Stand-by Plants—Best Answer to Problem of Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if we really mean what we say about not letting anything interfere with the progress of the national-defense effort, there are certain considerations regarding procurement of weapons and equipment which cannot possibly be overlooked. Machinery has become all important and I think almost anyone will agree, at least theoretically, that we should be in a position to obtain it promptly in times of necessity and at the least possible cost to the people of America. It is obvious that private enterprise cannot afford to maintain idle plant capacity in continual readiness for an emergency that may never arise. Therefore, if such additional capacity, created during an emergency, is in the hands of private enterprise, it either must be sacrificed or otherwise disposed of or else arms and implements of war must continue to be produced on a large scale and either sold at home at great expense or sold to foreign nations, there to become, in many cases, a threat to this country.

It seems to me, therefore, clear that the only sensible thing to do is for the Government to maintain such standby productive capacity as may be necessary much as it maintains its battleships and forts. Peacetime needs of the Army and Navy might be partly cared for in such plants by means of a skeleton staff. Continual experimentation could be carried on. Never again would we find ourselves in the situation we are now confronting where the Nation is compelled to meet the terms of private manufacturers, whatever they may be, and where a great deal of time is required to get actual manufacturing of defense materials under way.

It is unreasonable, furthermore, to expect private industry to supply the needs of the Nation in times of stress, for it is obviously necessary at such times that the most modern and up-to-date equipment be obtained, and in the very nature of the case private industry cannot very well be prepared to do this job since it is engaged in a task of continuous production of peacetime goods and cannot change its tools, dyes, and machinery overnight. If it tries to do this, serious economic dislocation is certain to result once the period of emergency has passed. These factors combined with the inevitable increase in unemployment and other deflationary influences which may be expected at the conclusion of any period of stress are certain to lead to a situation which I need not, I am sure, elaborate.

Even if the governmental defense program would fully amortize the cost of excess plant capacity in the hands of private manufacturers, the very existence of these empty plants in the hands of private industry is bound to increase the depth of depression, and this is entirely aside from a further question of why private industry rather than the people of the United States should have title to such plants when the Government has in fact paid for them. These considerations should lead us to careful thought on what ought to be done in the present situation.

Certain alternatives suggest themselves. The first is that plants to make possible additional necessary production for defense be constructed for a Government agency by a private manufacturer and be operated by that manufacturer under a management contract. Title to the plant would remain in the Government agency and units produced would be sold by the agency to the Government either at cost or at cost plus an amount which would amortize the investment over a reasonable period. The private manufacturer would, of course, be paid a reasonable compensation for management and supervision and this might either be a fixed sum, or, as an incentive to greater production, be increased on the basis of the number of defense units produced.

A second plan which I would suggest would be this: That a plant might be constructed for a Government agency by a private manufacturer and leased to him by the agency at a rental based upon a percentage of proceeds of each defense unit produced and sold. Such rental should include provision for amortization of the investment. The manufacturer should have the right to termination of the lease without any further liability to him whenever he is no longer receiving Government contracts. The Government agency on the other hand would have the right to terminate the lease if the manu-

facturer failed to fill orders or refuse to accept them on reasonable terms.

Third alternative is the construction and operation of such emergency plants by Government agency itself. The problem in this case would, of course, be the one in obtaining the right sort of personnel and I would be perfectly willing to pay well for such personnel under circumstances of this sort. Under circumstances of this kind, the cost of an armament program would be protected against all charges except those actually necessary. The possibility of profiteering would be eliminated.

It is widely reported that private manufacturers have declared that they are not especially anxious to do the things they will have to do in order to transform their plants or add to them with the purpose of the defense program. This is after all not the kind of production that can be fitted into the plans of an efficient private enterprise without serious disruption.

Under the plans I have suggested, everybody in the picture, the Government, the taxpayers, and the manufacturers would all know exactly where they stood. Production for defense needs could be started at any time and carried forward promptly and plants could be located at the most strategic points. I know that there is but small chance that what I have to say about these matters will be listened to today but I have been profoundly disheartened at some of the reports that have come to me about the excessive terms of some of the defense contracts. Some day the history of these times will be written and those who read that history will wonder why some such reasonable plan for defense production as I have outlined above, was not adopted.

There Is No Alternative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very strong article by Miss Freda Kirchwey, published in The Nation of August 3 last, under the caption "There Is No Alternative." There is no alternative for the selective-service bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Nation of August 3, 1940]

THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE

(By Freda Kirchwey)

Almost every sentence in Maxwell Stewart's attack on conscription in this issue of The Nation is, by itself, convincing. The trouble with his argument lies in its premises. He analyzes the proposal for universal military service today in terms of the draft army of 1917, and in those terms he opposes it—cogently. If our Army is to be only the A. E. F. over again, its value is certainly to be questioned. But the very circumstances in which it is being created insure important differences.

The conscript Army of 1917 was improvised after war had been declared. With surprising efficiency considering the pressure of events, but hastily none the less, 2,000,000 men were selected, trained, and put under arms. The raising of this Army was a temporary break in a normal national life in which military affairs were happily remote from the ordinary citizen. After the war armament expenditures were sharply reduced, the Army was demobilized, and the United States washed its hands of the affairs of Europe.

Contrast the situation today: France disastrously defeated in the field and Hitler lord over continental Europe; Britain, with no unconquered Allies except its colonies and the dominions, facing imminent assault. No one knows whether Britain will be able to resist or will be overwhelmed with the loss of empire and fleet. But, at best, we cannot realistically hope for an early defeat of Hitler. Churchill's warning after Dunkerque that a successful withdrawal must not be confused with a victory applies to England's present situation. A successful resistance will also not be a victory. The political and military dominance of Nazi Germany, together with the spreading power of Japan in Asia—these are the controlling characteristics of the world of 1940. The creation of a strong army is not a temporary emergency measure; it is part of a long-range program necessitated by a world situation which is likely to grow worse.

A period of peace preceded the war of 1914. It was a period pricked with warnings for those who chose to see them; but few did. The world awoke to war with a start. The present war is different. It began—where? In the Rhineland or in Ethiopia? Or before that in the bare hills of Manchuria? It is not an event that can be pinned down with a date, but this much is sure: Hitler did not defeat France in 40 days of invasion; he defeated France in the years that went before—years of deliberate, implacable preparation. Britain and France were at peace during those years, but Germany was at war. Britain and France approached the final showdown in much the same mood that characterized the years leading up to 1914—the same old diplomatic maneuvers, the conventional pre-World War military preparations. They believed that they were at peace until they found themselves fighting, but all the time they were in process of being conquered.

It is this error that the United States should avoid. As long as Nazi despotism rules Europe and threatens the world, so long must the word and hope of peace be banished from our minds. Even today the United States is no longer at peace. It is living in a state of war preparation which will last until fascism has been defeated. Hitler's successes and further ambitions have thrust upon us an unwelcome but inescapable job of total preparation. Out of nothing—speaking relatively—we must create a war machine, not as an emergency improvisation but as an integral part of our national life in the years to come.

Maxwell Stewart opposes conscription for two reasons. First, he contends, we need no large army; a two-ocean navy, an expanded air force, together with antiaircraft defenses, and a well-equipped army of about 300,000 men are all that is required. For such an army conscription is unnecessary. Second, American experience with conscription in 1917 was not the sort to recommend the system today.

Even in his own terms Mr. Stewart is not wholly consistent. At the start of his essay he says, "Conscription in wartime is regrettable but necessary." But why? If a small, well-equipped army were sufficient, conscription would never be necessary. On the other hand, if, as Mr. Stewart admits, a conscript army is required in case of war, it should most certainly be created before the actual fighting begins. That is the real lesson of 1917. For such an army must not be improvised. Its construction and equipping are a long job, especially today, when, as Mr. Stewart points out, the intricate machines of modern warfare demand a high proportion of technically trained soldiers.

It is quite true that the final size and disposition of the Army cannot be determined exactly until we know the issue of the struggle over England. As long as the British Fleet is intact, we have a two-ocean navy. If it is lost to Hitler, we have far less than a one-ocean navy. If it is lost, we must rush our preparations in order to be able to occupy by land and air forces any threatened area near our coasts or within striking distance of the Panama Canal. A two-ocean navy takes longer to build than even a modern army; during the next few years, years in which Hitler will be making his bid for world dominion, our newly authorized navy will still be under construction. Today we must act on the assumption that Britain may be defeated and that we may be faced with an early threat to the security of the hemisphere. It will be easier later on to limit our program, if fate permits, than to try, in the face of threat, to reach the level of totalitarian preparation in one desperate leap.

Mr. Stewart's second main argument against compulsory military service rests on two sets of facts—his experiences in the American Army during the World War, and the reactionary influence of the conscript armies of Europe. With many of his points I agree. At a time when a reasonable chance existed of maintaining our independence and our democratic way of life without a big army, his insistence on the social dangers of militarism and on the deadening effect of army discipline would have bespoken a radical and militant attitude. Today that chance is gone. We have no choice between civilian virtues and military vices, between good and evil, between an army and no army. The choice lies between an army based on universal service and a greatly expanded professional army. That is the issue under debate in Washington this week. Admittedly a conscript army holds many potential dangers of reaction; admittedly, even in democratic nations, the armies are more reactionary than the general political level of the countries; at the same time the dangers of reactionary control in a volunteer professional army are even greater.

By and large, in every nation, the progressive groups in the community have shunned the army. This is due partly to a sensible objection to military life and military ideals, partly to the lack of professional inducements to take up an army career. The result is

that a volunteer army is largely populated with able-bodied ne'er-do-wells and misfits, officered by reactionaries and bureaucrats. An army based on universal service will not be democratic per se, but it offers all the elements out of which a democratic institution can be built. To reject universal service out of fear of its potentially reactionary results would be to deliver the army to the reactionaries without a struggle. The very dangers to which Mr. Stewart points lead me to the opposite conclusion. An army is at best a favorable breeding ground for reaction. We must fight for its democratization; and success in that fight is only possible if we have an army in which all elements of the population are represented.

American liberals should recognize before it is too late what the British working class and its leaders realized only after the war had started—that the left must take a positive position on the question of national defense. It must make the struggle against Hitler an honest fight for the faith it lives by. And it can do this in only one way—by working not against the army but for army. It must help to create it and man it and then to control it—by democratic methods and for democratic ends.

County Report of Federal Expenditures, Butler County, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

EXPENDITURES MARCH 4, 1933, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Federal expenditures in Butler County, Kans., from March 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939:

County report of Federal expenditures, Butler County, Kans., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)	-------	$500,005
2. Disaster Loan Corporation	-------	----------
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	-------	(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed	-------	----------
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	254	[2] 528,700
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	114	[2] 11,335
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation	-------	143,476
8. Farm Security Administration, farm tenant purchase	-------	----------
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	1	66,000
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	96	17,198
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	263	459,039
Total, repayable	-------	1,725,753

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		6	$372,430
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		-------	----------
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects		-------	391,726
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings		-------	53,889
5. Work Projects Administration		-------	724,744
6. Other projects under works program		-------	----------
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old age assistance	$66,155	418	
Aid to dependent children	20,945	313	
Aid to the blind	1,686	11	
			88,786

[1] These projects received both loans and gnrats.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

County report of Federal expenditures, Butler County, Kans., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

EXPENDITURES—continued

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS—continued		
Department of Agriculture:		
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:		
1936 $90,644	-------	
1937 78,268	-------	
		$168,912
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation	-------	35,327
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration	-------	301,085
11. Civil Works Administration	-------	140,924
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments	-------	552,049
13. U. S. Housing Administration—Housing (former Public Works Administration Housing only)	-------	----------
Total, nonrepayable	-------	2,829,872
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable	-------	4,555,625
OTHER BENEFITS		
Federal Housing Administration:		
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans insured	155	68,611
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance	137	358,350
Total housing insurance	-------	426,961
Farm Security Administration: Farm debt reduction	33	88,318
Public Roads Administration: Active project allotments	-------	2,060

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	9,388
Dwellings, 1930	9,000
Individual income-tax returns, 1935	829
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	9,166
Families with radios, 1938	7,130
Residential telephones, 1935	3,386
Domestic electric meters, 1930	4,461
Farms, 1935	2,738
Retail employees, 1935	853
Wholesale employees, 1935	107
Manufacturing employees, 1935	884
Persons on farms, 1935	11,239

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

Our Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE BEAVER (PA.) DAILY TIMES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Times, of Beaver, Pa.:

[From the Beaver (Pa.) Daily Times of August 3, 1940]

OUR BANKS

Government credit—Government banking—whatever you wish to call it—means far more than the socialization of an industry. The average man may not stop to think that if the Government should suddenly take over the banks in his community, it would not be just stepping into the local bankers shoes to supervise a single enterprise. Banking does not halt at the marble facade fronting Main street. Any bank statement will revel the deep economic roots of banking. Listed among assets you will find heavy investments in practically every form of enterprise in every corner of the land, including mortgages on homes, farms, peanut stands, ad infinitum. You will also find thousands or even millions in loans, promissory notes, and other obligations of private citizens.

Banking is every man's business. Every man's business would become Government business if the Government controlled banking, directly or indirectly, through the influence of political power and favor.

Private management, under proper, safe, and reasonable public regulation, means the ultimate in precautionary measures to insure the safety and integrity of banking. Nothing would so strike at the foundation of free enterprise as political domination and control of banking and credit. Such a step would create a financial

monopoly that for sheer size and power would dwarf anything the world has ever seen before. It might easily lead to confiscation by Government force of all material resources of the people.

The American system of private banking is a highly competitive business. Banks are anxious to make loans and investments. That is their source of income and their chief reason for existence. Fifteen thousand banks in this country are constantly striving to encourage community growth and prosperity. Every banker knows that he will fail or succeed with the community in which he lives and to which his bank affords a banking service. These incentives to service and progress are lacking in any business dominated and controlled by remote political power.

We do not—we cannot—believe that Americans want or will tolerate a politically controlled banking system. Already we have seen enough to indicate clearly what political control of banking would mean to the people and to all forms of free and successful enterprise on which the growth and success of this great Nation squarely and securely rests.

We have seen governmental force beat down interest rates toward the zero mark. Perhaps this was done to avoid immediate national bankruptcy. With a national debt of approximately fifty billions, the national income would scarcely more than meet interest charges alone at 6 percent. While forcing down interest rates to its own temporary advantage, the administration has reduced by two-thirds the only income of numerous millions of investors and savings account owners.

Privately owned and managed banks are necessary to the continued progress and prosperity of our country and every community. We urge Times readers to write or wire Members of Congress—both in the House and the Senate—to oppose all legislation that tends to give politicians in or out of office any measure or degree of political control over our banking system. It is the writer's conviction, after many years' study of and experience in the banking business, that all the banks of the whole country would be in a better position if all belonged to the Federal Reserve System. It has demonstrated its value and usefulness to its entire membership. Its service, influence, and general usefulness would be much enlarged if all banks were members because the System is successfully managed by bankers, not by politicians.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

OPEN LETTER FROM EDITOR OF UTICA (OHIO) HERALD

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter addressed to me from the Utica (Ohio) Herald:

[From the Utica (Ohio) Herald]

EDITOR WRITES AN OPEN LETTER TO OUR CONGRESSMAN—OFFICERS TRAINING METHODS ALL WRONG, SAYS "YE ED," WHO KNOWS FROM EXPERIENCE

UTICA, OHIO, *July 29, 1940.*

Mr. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Congressman, Seventeenth Ohio,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: A recent article in Look magazine by Maj. Leonard Nason, entitled "Why Hitler Laughs at America," had some mighty good points in it and one of them was in regard to the training of civilians to be officers in the United States Army.

The idea of the old-line generals who have charge of this officer training would be laughable if they were not so tragic at this time. Imagine anyone being so dumb that they think the way to teach officers how to command hundreds or even thousands of men, or how to move these men from place to place or to supply them with food, ammunition, or transportation is to teach them to make a bed or wait on table.

These officers who come into the army from civilian life will in large numbers be used on staff jobs where their habits of business efficiency and dispatch can best help the cause and yet they are making them waste their time peeling potatoes or cleaning rifles.

The present Regular Army and National Guard is full of corporals and sergeants who could quite reasonably be promoted to lieutenants and captains and who could do a far better job of teaching privates how to use their weapons, how to make their beds, care for their equipment, etc.

Hitler and his Nazis have won thus far because of their perfect organization together with fine coordination of weapons and manpower. Did they get this organization and coordination by having staff officers make beds and peel potatoes? What is your guess?

Of course, I suppose if you have 4 years to make an officer you could make him learn all the details of soldiering but the American businessman has neither the time nor the patience for such foolishness.

Back in World War days we who were to be given commissions and who were called—pathetically true just often "90-day wonders"—spent weeks on drill and rifles and minor details and only a few hours on military problems of leading men and of meeting various situations and handicaps such as always present themselves in wartime.

It seems that the Army never changes. Just the other day President Roosevelt appointed a $12,000 a year judge to be the Assistant Secretary of War and do you know what this man was doing when news of the appointment reached him? He was in a businessmen's training camp at Plattsburg and he was working in the kitchen.

I submit to you that in all common sense we ought to junk all the generals who know so little as to expect to teach a staff officer how to solve big troop problems by having him sling hash.

Of course it is no disgrace to sling hash, peel potatoes, or work in a kitchen. Quite the contrary for Napoleon said truly "that an army travels on its stomach."

But when the Army and the country, too, is full of men who know how to prepare the best possible menus on the least money, it is just plain silly to have men who are worth $1,000 a month doing that when they might use those thousand-dollar brains on problems for which they are more fitted.

What can you do about it? Well, you can raise so much dash, dash, dash about these antiquated army training methods that when our boys do have to go into battle they will not be butchered by the Nazis because the officers who should have known how to get them supplies, ammunition, weapons, etc., are busy teaching buck privates how to make up an army cot in the style approved by the 1904 regulations, page 3, in the red book.

Yours for a common-sense army made up of Americans who, as Mark Twain is reported to have said "are as good as anybody and probably a damn sight better."

Stay in there, Harry, and keep fighting for the little man, for he needs friends as never before.

Most cordially yours,

R. R. BRINKERHOFF.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

RESOLUTIONS COMMENDING JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a resolution unanimously passed by the Democratic County Convention of Hill County, Tex., on August 3, 1940, commending the Honorable James A. Farley.

Hill County, Tex., is one of the counties which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and the sentiments expressed in the resolution reflect my own feelings and admiration for Jim Farley and I believe also that millions of other American citizens have the same affectionate regard and admiration for him.

Whereas the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York, has rendered distinguished and outstanding service to the Democratic Party for many years, it is most fitting that this convention express deep appreciation on behalf of the Democrats of Hill County to this great Democratic leader on the eve of his voluntary retirement as chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Jim Farley will be long remembered as one of the great Americans of this era. Future historians will probably brand him as the greatest and most popular leader within the ranks of the Democratic Party during his generation. He has been the most effective and most beloved national chairman ever to serve the party.

It has been truthfully said by a noble American statesman that absolute faith can always be placed in the pledged word of Jim Farley. This trait is becoming rare in the lives of men who occupy high place in the governments throughout the world. It is with natural pride that the Democrats of Hill County can join the Democrats of the United States in pointing to this top leader as a man who has that true quality of character.

Jim Farley is the very example of clean and honorable living, of integrity, and his name will forever be associated with that of fair and square dealing in American public life; therefore be it

Resolved by the Hill County Democratic Convention assembled in Hillsboro, Tex., on the 3d day of August, 1940, That we do hereby

express our complete confidence in retiring National Chairman Farley and send to him our best wishes for the future; be it further

Resolved, That we send to the new national chairman, Hon. Edward J. Flynn, of New York, the friend of Mr. Farley, our pledge of fullest cooperation in the carrying on of the affairs of the Democratic Party.

The above resolution was unanimously passed by the Democratic County Convention assembled in Hillsboro, Tex., on the 3d day of August 1940.

Attest:

GLENN F. MARSHALL, *Secretary.*
CLAY BEDELL, *Chairman.*

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLES FROM THE ROANOKE (VA.) TIMES

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Roanoke Times of August 4, 1940:

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of August 4, 1940]

WOODRUM "MAN OF WEEK" IN CONGRESSIONAL WORK—CONGRESSMAN STEERS T. V. A. AND DEFENSE MEASURES THROUGH HOUSE

WASHINGTON, August 3.—Virginia's Representative CLIFTON A. WOODRUM was again the "man of the week" in the congressional legislative program.

The Virginian acted as chief pilot in the House for the two principal bills passed during the week, the $25,000,000 appropriation for expanding facilities in the Tennessee Valley Authority for essential national-defense works, and the $5,000,000,000 supplemental national-defense appropriation bill.

As appropriations subcommittee chairman and frequently as acting chairman of the full committee, it has been WOODRUM'S responsibility to act as floor manager for House action on a majority of the supply measures passed.

PRESSES FOR ECONOMY

At the same time he has been recognized as a leader of the House group which has demanded the closest possible trimming of all outlays, and has led the fight to keep all outlays within Budget figures.

While there was little opposition to the bills voted this week, WOODRUM nevertheless seized the opportunity to reiterate his often-voiced views on the subject of Federal expenditures.

"I do not know of any controversy in the bill," he told the House in presenting the $5,000,000,000 defense measure. "That does not mean that we did not go into it carefully. We did, but I say this for the Appropriations Committee as a whole and for each subcommittee dealing with this defense program: The fact that we are in a great emergency calling for mobilization of our resources and of our manpower for defense needs in no way minimizes or lessens the importance of watching and seeing to those fundamental principles of accounting and Budget balancing, about which Congress has been and should be very much concerned.

FOLLOW-THROUGH PROMISES

"It is going to be the purpose of the Appropriations Committee and of each subcommittee to follow every one of these appropriations just as carefully as we can humanly do so and see to the application of the purchase money as we would say in the law, or see to it that these funds are expended in the manner in which Congress means them to be spent, and that the American taxpayer gets a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar we appropriate. We believe that can be done and that it will be done."

WOODRUM agreed that "it is necessary in this emergency to act quickly, to act expeditiously, and the fact that a bill of this size will pass in 1 day's consideration, by the Congress does not mean that we are any less interested in fiscal affairs, or are going to be any less zealous in days to come to see to it that useless expenditures are cut off and that there shall be an orderly accounting in all fiscal affairs."

In presenting the case for the $25,000,000 T. V. A. bill, Woodrum spoke in lavish praise of the men making up the Defense Advisory Commission, who urgently advocated the legislation.

"I doubt if any man in this Chamber," he told the House, "would challenge the fact that Mr. William S. Knudsen, head of the Commission, is probably as well, if not better, qualified than any man in the United States when it comes to the question of mass production, of actually producing expeditiously the necessary implements of national defense.

"AIDS ALSO PRAISED

"Mr. Knudsen surrounded himself with experts of equal prominence, one of the principal of whom is Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., former chairman of the board of United States Steel.

"These men proceeded to surround themselves with men expert in their own particular lines in order to build up this defense program and get it going. I for one wish to record the fact that I believe everything humanly possible is being done to carry out the wishes of Congress and the wishes of the American people that this defense program be expedited and that we not only appropriate money but get something for the money that we appropriate, and get it quickly."

WOODRUM SAYS PEOPLE BEHIND DEFENSE PLANS—CONGRESSMAN CALLS FOR SACRIFICES AT CLIFTON FORGE CELEBRATION

CLIFTON FORGE, August 3.—Representative CLIFTON A. WOODRUM said today "the people of this country are now resolved that the iron heel of the dictator or any combinations of dictators shall not press upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere."

Representative WOODRUM, speaking at a luncheon held as a part of the Lions' Club Founders Week celebration, declared defense is uppermost in the minds of the American people today and the Nation is now bent on the greatest industrial and military mobilization in the history of the world.

He recalled how the United States, in the interest of world peace, scrapped a large portion of its Navy in 1921, and traced the steps now being taken to rearm this country.

QUEEN IS CROWNED

Later in the afternoon, Frank B. Haynes, Lion's club president, crowned Miss Mary Wallace, of Covington, queen of the celebration, at exercises at the municipal playground. There the throng was also entertained by addresses and a band concert. A parade with gaily decorated floats, drum and bugle corps, military units, and fraternal and civic organizations taking part was held prior to the program at the playground.

Representative WOODRUM warned that regardless of the outcome of the European struggle, this country will have to adjust itself to a new world economy.

"We of America must prepare to meet a new economy which will call for sacrifice on the part of every man and woman in this country," he said.

"It is my opinion," he went on, "that the tide is turning in Europe—that the dictators have run against a snag and have found that armed force alone will not win the war.

"Here in America we pray that Great Britain may be given abundant power to save herself. America, we know, cannot be saved by the Democratic Party or the Republican Party, but by men and women who put love of country above everything else."

PROMINENT PERSONS ATTEND

Other prominent persons introduced at the luncheon by the toastmaster, C. H. Lawler, included:

Richard Brooke, assistant general manager of C. & O. Railway; A. T. Lowmaster, vice president; C. J. Geyer, maintenance-of-way engineer; Guy P. Gibbs, superintendent; L. A. Grubbs, general superintendent; Thomas W. Ozlin, chairman, State corporation commission; Thomas B. Morton, department of labor and industries; Dr. I. C. Riggin, State health commissioner; M. J. Connell, president, Virginia Public Service Corporation; W. W. Gibbs, president, Clifton Forge-Waynesboro Telephone Co.; Mayor A. H. Griffith, of Buena Vista; Earl J. Valentine, president, Shenandoah Valley, Inc.; Maj. Richard Beirne, editor, Covington Virginian; Mayor F. H. Wheeler, of this city; Mrs. W. Kent Ford, Mrs. L. A. Houff, Miss Clyde Cox, of this city; Jay Johns, director, board of Virginia Public Service Co.; Senator Charles Loving, of Warm Springs; Milton R. Morgan, Eagle Rock, commissioner of banking; Ben Moomaw, secretary, Covington Chamber of Commerce; M. B. Whiting, president of Kiwanis Club; Lester Carrier, of Covington, manager, Industrial Rayon Corporation; J. T. S. Helm, Clifton Forge Retail Merchants Association; C. M. Brown, president, Clifton Forge Chamber of Commerce.

Nominating Hon. John Nance Garner for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY WRIGHT MORROW

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

Wright Morrow nominating JOHN NANCE GARNER for President on the Democratic ticket, the National Democratic Convention, Chicago, July 1940:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats and delegates, ladies and gentlemen, 8 years ago, in this great American city, the Democratic Party assembled to write its platform and nominate standard bearers to carry the message of the party to a people then desperate and despairing of an economic situation unparalleled in our history. Here we met, confronted with the clearest of calls to arise and arouse ourselves to meet the needs and demands of our people. Here we met, and, after consideration of those proposed, we nominated our great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt for President, and his running mate, the great Texan, JOHN NANCE GARNER, for Vice President. The delegation from the Lone Star State of Texas, which I now have the honor to represent, had the privilege in that convention, when it appeared it would be deadlocked, to place their votes and influence in support of Mr. Roosevelt for President, and, for that reason, we proudly claim no small part of the credit for giving him to this Nation. That we chose wisely and well is proven by the record.

Upon the election of these two men in November of that year, there arose immediately and spontaneously a new hope in the hearts of the people of the United States—a hope that had been almost crushed under the conditions that existed in the previous Republican administration. With their hearts and minds filled with naught save patriotic purpose, the leaders of this great administration set about the rebuilding of the morale of this citizenship and by almost superhuman energy and enterprise, aided by Members of the Congress, brought our people through this crucible of adversity and restored to them the desire again to live, to work, and to hold their heads high as citizens of this Republic. The legislative accomplishments of that period immediately after the inauguration in 1933, looking to the welfare of this Nation and its people is unsurpassed in our history.

Then we came to 1936. We presented to the voters of the Nation the same ticket for the second term. We pointed to their record of achievement and asked approval. With unanimity unprecedented in political annals, the voters returned our great party and its great leadership to the control of our affairs.

In concluding a public address at that time, I made this statement, which I believed then, and I believe now. It is so easy for people to forget that I take the liberty of repeating it here:

"They, the Republicans, crave to get back in power and govern a prosperous and peaceful people. They ask not only approval and applause but a reward for their failure—but the people of the United States—the great mass of people—remember the things that have been done for them. They remember their anxiety and distress. They recall the great assistance that has been given them which has restored domestic tranquillity, promoted the general welfare, and established a more even justice—the prime purposes of our Government."

Now, in this year of our Lord 1940, we assemble here again, we assemble in typical American style, to find and express the will of the Democrats of this Nation, to again put forth a platform of principles, and to select candidates to present them for the cause of our country and our party.

What condition do we now find? Where in 1932 and even in 1936 we were troubled and depressed in large measure by domestic problems alone, we are now face to face with a condition which even the Dark Ages, with the pall of gloom and despair settled over the earth blotting out all but the seed of learning—which Providence saved for the revival of mankind—held nothing worse than this. It is with the march—the onward and oppressive march—of totalitarian philosophy that we are now so concerned. I used a while ago the whole expression "the year of our Lord" deliberately. While in all democratic countries, and anyway in our own country, we recognize the omnipotent power of a Supreme Being, the dictator conceives no higher power, no supreme authority, nothing greater than his own whim or decree. Ours is a Republic—no other kind of government—a constitutional democracy. Liberty has never been won except by the blood of men who hold it as something dearer than life itself and they who did not themselves achieve it but only enjoy it are seldom capable of appraising it at its true worth. Today we are encompassed about with practically the whole world at war, with overwhelming tragedy and calamity visited upon the peoples and nations in other lands. These things we cannot shut from our view because it is an intolerable situation for us, a free people, to witness, and a situation that we can never bear in our own land.

We have seen in the past 3 years the steady march of a philosophy of force. Force that says "might makes right" because with force you can destroy, and in the last 3 months we have seen this destruction in unlimited action. In the language of our great President, the machine has become the master. Nation after nation has been stricken by and has succumbed to this force. Sedition and treason thrive amid the decadence of the people. Liberty is no longer there.

In Germany a dictator, by artifice and accident in power, is as merciless as any tyrant in history. By vicious and insidious methods of influence and propaganda, he destroys the spirit of the people. With suppression of all individual freedom of thought and action, he subverts these governments. One by one in heart-breaking regularity and rapidity, these nations have fallen like straws in the wind. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Holland, Norway, Belgium, and France are prostrate, their governments disrupted, the morale of their people completely destroyed, ground under the heels of this philosophy of force in action. In Italy another dictator, drunk with power, springs on an already helpless people to divide the spoils of their devastation. Civilians, innocent people, women and children, ruthlessly killed and maimed. Today even the very existence of the British Empire is threatened—sadly threatened.

What does all this mean to us? We are, as a people, opposed to any war except one of defense of our own institutions in our own country, and the countries protected under the Monroe Doctrine. But this Republic is founded on the basis that men are free—free to speak and act and think and worship. This was never intended to be the land of a weak or a faint-hearted race but of one strong and virile, hardy, unafraid, clean-minded, and clear-minded, firmly grounded in the moralities and ideas which are the inheritance of its blood. Are we equal to this test? We are and must be equal to the test to which we are now put, but we must meet it with devotion to our duties to our country—our ideals—to sacrifice, to suffer, to fight, and even to die to save our own democracy, our own institutions in our own land. We must reinvigorate ourselves and guard the elements of Americans which have made them stalwart, worthy to hold and to keep these liberties—worthy to govern themselves and to preserve this Republic.

Our party has never espoused expediency to dodge principles or constructive ideals. We favor liberal and progressive measures for the benefit and the general welfare of our citizens but we cannot blind our eyes to the signs about us. We have become accustomed to ease—at least to ease compared with the people of the rest of the world. We have had difficulties and troubles in our own land but our standard of living is high above that of the people of other countries. We did not, ourselves, in this generation, achieve our liberty but we must rededicate ourselves to these principles so we may realize the perils, the suffering and the sacrifice which those who did gain our liberty for us, made in order to gain that freedom. I hold that the simple virtues of those pioneers—their strength of body and mind—their willingness—nay—their resolution to stand for their principles and rights and to sacrifice and suffer to uphold them—to exalt their duties as citizens—are the elements of man that made this country great, rich, and independent. The exaltation of the material over the real values of right and reason, conscience and tolerance, is not the American way. It is the degeneration of the spiritual and real qualities of mankind that brings them ruin and helpless dependence on the edict of a dictator. "Steep are the steps slow-hewn in flintiest rock on which nations climb to power, but slippery those with gold down which they stumble to eternal mock."

Let us remember then that it is not the enervation of intellect but the enervation of character that causes great peoples to disappear from the face of the earth. It is our task to strive for a rebirth in our own selves of the hardy, homely, simple virtues—virtues that throw a luster over adversity and by the innate power and strength of which America has been wrought and builded.

It is our time and our duty to reawaken the spirit in ourselves, to take lesson from the startling and pitiable disclosures coming to us in every news story from Europe. We must defend our country in our country, not only by building machines, gearing our industry to match the overpowering death-dealing implements of modern warfare, but set ourselves to the task of rebuilding our characters to meet this crucial condition.

The American people will preserve their democracy because they believe in their democracy. You and I would shrink from facing in another world—the world that is to come—a ragged Continental soldier, in the form the redeemed may wear, whose spirit had ascended from a battlefield of the Revolution, if we had not kept as a holy thing the doctrine of liberty for which the majority of the soldiers of Washington made their sacrifice.

There are two remarkable lines in a play by Maxwell Anderson which pictures Washington at Valley Forge in the darkest hour of that cruel winter with all the misery and suffering of his men before his eyes. In sadness, in gloom, but with his great heart still beating with courage and his unconquerable will still resolute, in the lines he says:

"This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies to get it."

I give you this sentiment because it professes the profound truth. There is a moral law which makes effort the price and touchstone of all substantial things.

It would put our minds in a purer air if we turned in these troublous times oftener to Washington. From the walls of homes and public places over the land, his strong, calm face looks down upon us and in it we may read, not warning or rebuke, but appeal that we keep the country safe, respectful of law, faithful in its justice, jealous in the protection of the rights of every citizen—even the humblest—and in season and out of season devoted to the conception of freedom and constitutional limitations of powers on which its government is founded.

We, the delegates from Texas, believe the Democratic Party is the only instrumentality that you and I can use to reconsecrate ourselves to meet the task before us. Today, next week, and next November, the people of our country will approve this statement: In offering our candidate for the nomination of this great party

for the highest office in the world, we do so in the real and sincere belief that we can give the party the kind of man, with the kind of character who can, during these next 4 strenuous years, render the greatest service to his party and his country and furnish the kind of leadership imperatively required to direct its affairs.

This is indeed a time ordinarily for young men, but in a crisis of this nature we believe there is no substitute for experience—the experience that makes rugged character. Here we have a man in whose veins courses the blood of the pioneer—the pioneer woman, whose spirit, courage, and ambition impelled her to bring her six fatherless children in a prairie schooner 600 miles over trackless and dangerous roads from the great State of Tennessee—the State that gave us Sam Houston as well—to seek a home for herself and her children in the prairies of northeast Texas.

Here in simple country fashion she desired to rear these children to become real American citizens. There, in a log cabin built by his pioneer grandmother from Tennessee, near Blossom Prairie in Red River County, Tex., our candidate was born. Exposed to the rigors and hard work then common to the country youth, he had the chance to equip his mind and heart with the plain virtues that go to make up the character of a boy raised on a farm in that day. When old enough, he began the study of law. He was admitted to the bar, then moved to southwest Texas, nearer the frontier of our country. He became the county judge in Uvalde County, then a member of the State legislature, and in 1902 the voters of his district elected him as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States. Elected and reelected 15 times, he served continuously for 30 years and with conspicuous success. He was a member of the most important committees, Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means and others. He became minority leader of his party and in 1931 he climaxed his congressional career by being elected Speaker of the House. He was the confidential friend and adviser during the last World War of our beloved President Woodrow Wilson. Finding him well versed in the business of the House and wise and patient in his decisions, the President made an engagement to meet him twice a week at the White House and this schedule was adhered to during the entire period of the war. He has the experience, the knowledge, and the capacity, as well as the character and the courage, to lead our people in these times. He possesses the rugged characteristics of other men born on earlier frontiers who have lived to be the President of their country—such as Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln. Honesty of thought and purpose, sincerity of action, and steadfastness and candor in every engagement of life, marks the record of our candidate.

He has now served nearly 8 years as the Vice President of the United States. During his incumbency as Vice President, this office has risen in importance to where it is, in reality, second only to that of the President. He has added his voice to the councils of the administration in Cabinet meetings and as President of the Senate, and not since the day of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our party, has there been a Vice President who has attained the position of importance, of influence, and of national significance as our candidate. He has manifested loyalty, sagacity, and steadfastness. No man is entitled to more credit for assisting in the passage of the legislative enactments of this administration for the general welfare of our people than our candidate. He has been publicly applauded many times for his active assistance by the leaders of our great party. He is a plain American, risen from modest and humble beginnings to become one of the most influential men of the day and he has achieved this place by the practice of his rugged American virtues. He is a patriot and a statesman of the highest order. As an example of his patriotism and his nature, during the dark days of the depression he made this significant statement:

"Politics will be a secondary consideration. Country should always come ahead of party, and now the country should be the sole thought of everyone."

He is a liberal Democrat—and has been a liberal Democrat for many years in Congress. He believes in equality of opportunity for every American citizen. He believes in necessary legislation and regulation for the protection of the weak against the strong—the poor against the rich—the owner of property against those who would destroy the ownership of property.

Our candidate has the personal friendship and confidence of as many Members of Congress in both Houses—and in both parties—as any other man who could be presented to this convention.

If we are to survive as a democracy—and we shall survive—it is because the citizens of the United States will never lose their liberty; when spurred to action they will guard and keep it as their pioneer fathers and forefathers gained these rights by sacrifice and suffering. We are the last hope of the democratic way of life, and we must, as American citizens, realize that upon us depends the hope of a free people throughout the world. We offer our candidate to you in the belief, in the absolutely confident belief, that he is a man who, under these conditions, is preeminently fitted and qualified for this office.

It is my privilege and honor, my fellow countrymen, delegates to this Democratic convention, on behalf of the State of Texas, to present to you her distinguished citizen, our neighbor and our friend, a man whom we deem well worthy, a man loved, admired, and respected throughout this land, a wise, practical, experienced, patriotic American citizen, the Honorable JOHN NANCE GARNER, of Texas.

County Report of Federal Expenditures, Sedgwick County, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

EXPENDITURES, MARCH 4, 1933, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1939

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Federal expenditures in Sedgwick County, Kans., from March 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939:

County report of Federal expenditures, Sedgwick County, Kans., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939

LOANS

	Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS		
Federal Loan Agency:		
1. Reconstruction Finance Corporation (from Feb. 2, 1932)	-------	$1,038,920
2. Disaster Loan Corporation	-------	----------
Federal Works Agency:		
3. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects	-------	(1)
4. U. S. Housing Authority, loan contracts signed	-------	----------
Department of Agriculture:		
5. Farm Credit Administration, Land Bank Commissioner	353	[2] 695,400
6. Farm Credit Administration, emergency crop and feed	125	[2] 14,360
7. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation	-------	86,163
8. Farm Security Administration, farm-tenant purchase	-------	----------
9. Rural Electrification Administration (total project cost divided by number of counties participating)	2	293,000
COMPLETED PROGRAMS		
10. Farm Credit Administration, 1934-35 drought relief	34	4,559
11. Home Owners' Loan Corporation, 1933-36	2,835	6,182,490
Total, repayable	-------	8,314,892

EXPENDITURES

		Number	Amount
CURRENT PROGRAMS			
Federal Works Agency:			
1. Public Works Administration, non-Federal projects		12	$1,547,198
2. Public Works Administration, Federal projects		5	398,933
3. Public Roads Administration, completed projects		-------	935,325
4. Public Buildings Administration, Federal buildings		-------	----------
5. Work Projects Administration		-------	5,696,155
6. Other projects under works program		-------	30,825
Federal Security Agency:			
7. Social Security Board:			
Old-age assistance	$287,665	1,748	
Aid to dependent children	69,421	976	
Aid to the blind	13,319	74	
			370,405
Department of Agriculture:			
8. Agricultural Adjustment Administration conservation programs:			
1936	$144,705	-------	
1937	65,256	-------	
			209,961
9. Farm Security Administration, rural rehabilitation		-------	42,954
COMPLETED PROGRAMS			
10. Federal Emergency Relief Administration		-------	3,042,530
11. Civil Works Administration		-------	1,042,107
12. Agricultural Adjustment Administration rental and benefit payments		-------	1,926,125
13. U. S. Housing Authority, housing (former Public Works Administration housing only)		-------	----------
Total, nonrepayable		-------	15,242,515
Grand total, repayable and nonrepayable		-------	23,557,407
OTHER BENEFITS			
Federal Housing Administration:			
Title I. Modernization and improvement loans, insured		1,513	480,185
Title II. Mortgages accepted for insurance		1,199	4,410,155
Total housing insurance		-------	4,890,340
Farm Security Administration: Farm-debt reduction		30	12,529
Public Roads Administration: Active project allotments		-------	177,183

[1] These projects received both loans and grants.
[2] As of Dec. 31, 1938.

County report of Federal expenditures, Sedgwick County, Kans., Mar. 4, 1933, through June 30, 1939—Continued

COUNTY STATISTICS [3]

Families in county, 1930	36,221
Dwellings, 1930	32,000
Individual income tax return, 1935	6,324
Passenger automobiles registered, 1936	35,555
Families with radios, 1938	32,850
Residential telephones, 1935	21,458
Domestic electric meters, 1930	28,051
Farms, 1935	3,865
Retail employees, 1935	6,975
Wholesale employees, 1935	2,711
Mining employees, 1935	30
Manufacturing employees, 1935	4,353
Persons on farms, 1935	16,095

[3] Source: Consumer Market Data Handbook.

The Vote on the Bridges Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including copies of editorials taken from the Okanogan Independent of Okanogan, Wash., together with a letter written by myself to that paper, a copy of the Bridges deportation bill, and the telegram which I sent to the Spokane American Legion post, all of which appeared in this same newspaper.

I might say that the editors and publishers of this paper, Mr. O. H. Woody and Mr. Harley Heath, are men of exceptionally high character and are fair-minded.

On July 22, 1940, soon after the Bridges bill was voted upon in this House, the following editorial appeared in the Okanogan Independent:

WHY THAT BRIDGES VOTE?

People of the Fifth District are distinctly not pleased with the vote of Congressman LEAVY against the measure to deport Harry Bridges. It is true that the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of booting the troublemaking Australian out of the country, and equally true that Judge LEAVY, with no C. I. O. strength in his district, could not have been influenced by fear of the C. I. O. in casting his vote, but the people of the district, whom he represents, are entitled to know the reason for the vote.

Bridges has undoubtedly caused the people of the Pacific coast more trouble, more financial loss, and has engendered more class hatred than any other individual. While he has been doing all these things, many times consorting with communistic elements in the process, he has failed to seek American citizenship.

Americans are an easy going and tolerant people—too much so for their own good, sometimes—but they are fed up with the antics of alien troublemakers.

As far as this district is concerned, it joins with most of the other congressional districts in the country in favoring the immediate deportation of Bridges and all his kind.

We note the statement of Attorney General Robert H. Jackson in opposition to the Bridges deportation. "It would be," he says, "the first time since the alien and sedition laws a century and a half ago that any law would provide for deportation without a hearing and without, indeed, the slightest pretense toward giving the accused what our Nation has long known as due process of law."

Mr. Jackson is undoubtedly sincere in his view of the rights of aliens, but his reasoning is faulty. The Constitution does not guarantee to aliens the same rights that are guaranteed to citizens and an alien visitor here should not expect with impunity to foment trouble.

On June 26 I addressed a letter to the editors of this paper and enclosed a copy of a telegram I had previously sent to the Spokane Legion Post and a copy of the Bridges bill, which read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 26, 1940.*

EDITOR, INDEPENDENT:

In your issue of the Independent on June 22 you have an editorial entitled "Why the Bridges Vote?" Your editorial is very fair and I certainly do not find fault with it. You state that the people are entitled to know the reason for my vote and they are. I am sending you herewith a copy of a telegram in response to one received from the Spokane Legion Post, which concisely sets forth my position, and I would be glad to have you give it publicity.

Incidentally, I might state that in the last paragraph of your editorial wherein you state that the Constitution does not guarantee to aliens the same rights that are guaranteed the citizens, you are in error. In reference to due process which is guaranteed to all persons by the provisions of the fifth and fourteenth amendments, and likewise the prohibition against a denial of the writ of habeas corpus, or the enactment of a bill of attainder, ex post facto law, apply alike to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. There is an unbroken line of court decisions beginning back in the earliest years of our national existence supporting the statements that I have just made. Upon second thought, your own experience will indicate that, because all civil and criminal proceedings in our courts are carried on in exactly the same manner whether the litigants be citizens or aliens.

I might add that we have in this session passed two measures, either of which would be broad enough to care for the Bridges problem.

Again let me express my appreciation of the fair manner in which you approach this whole problem.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. LEAVY, M. C.

P. S.—Am enclosing copy of bill. It requires no lawyer to see the dangerous implications to such laws:

"An act to direct the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges

"Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful.

"Passed the House of Representatives June 13, 1940.

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk.*"

TELEGRAM TO SPOKANE POST

Your telegram received regard Bridges vote. Evidently provisions of bill not understood at home. No veteran or citizen can be more opposed to communism or nazi-ism than I am. The House has passed a bill, for which I voted, whereby Bridges could be deported if charges against him are proven. The bill about which you wire is unique in that such a bill was never passed in the 152 years of our Government, where Congress voted a man guilty without charging an offense or giving him any right of a hearing. Our forefathers knew the danger of bills of attainder and denial of the writ of habeas corpus. They protected us against its dangers by the provisions of the Constitution. Bridges was not an issue in my vote, but the sacredness of the American Constitution which I have sworn to uphold, was. I have resisted any encroachment upon the rights of the legislative branch of our Government by the judiciary or the Executive. In this case I voted against destruction of judicial functions by the legislative branch. Periods of hate and national emergencies often threaten to overthrow fundamentals of our democratic principles.

Totalitarian and communistic governments issue decrees of guilt and punishment. America passes laws and the guilt and punishment are fixed by judicial decisions. The only way to preserve the long-established safeguards of liberty and government by law are to preserve the Constitution and not to destroy it.

CHARLES H. LEAVY, M. C.

Subsequent to the receipt of my letter the editors of the Okanogan Independent on July 13 wrote and published the editorial which follows:

THE VOTE EXPLAINED

In response to an editorial question about his vote on the bill to deport Harry Bridges, Congressman CHARLES H. LEAVY has written the Independent giving full facts in the matter and enclosing a copy of the bill which he voted against.

It's a brief bill and it directs the Attorney General to deport Bridges "notwithstanding any other provisions of law."

Obviously it is a bad bill, and Judge LEAVY was absolutely right in voting against it. Imagine an American Congress deliberately passing a law which instructs an agent of the American Government to disregard any other laws which might touch on the same subject. It took political courage to vote as LEAVY did on the matter in view of the fact he has no C. I. O. strength in his district to support such a vote.

We don't know who introduced the bill, but it is amazing to find that any man intelligent enough to be elected to Congress would write it, or that a large majority of the Members of Congress would favor it.

And this is no endorsement of Harry Bridges. He ought to be deported forthwith on the strength of legislation already on the statute books. Judge LEAVY said in his letter to this paper:

"I might add that we have in this session passed two measures, either of which would be broad enough to care for the Bridges problem."

These editorials show an exceptional degree of fairness and openmindedness on the part of the editors of this paper and a type of patriotism not actuated by hysteria that is commendable and which has in times past, and which will in years to come, carry this country through its critical periods.

Roosevelt and Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TIMES

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Times of July 19, 1940, which presents an unusually fine analysis of the situation as to the two major political parties.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Times of July 19, 1940]

ROOSEVELT AND WALLACE

On the noisy, hot, short-tempered crowd of delegates and spectators at the stadium a sudden hush fell when Senator BARKLEY announced the President of the United States. Into the quiet came the best-known voice in the Nation—"It is with a very full heart that I speak to you tonight * * *."

For nearly 40 minutes some 30,000 people sat in a historic silence listening to the grave words of the great leader who has guided the Nation through nearly 8 turbulent years. At times the stillness was like that of a great cathedral. For the first time in history, an American President was telling why he was willing to go to the voters for a third term. And when the voice died away, asking the Divine blessing upon the American people "as they face the future with courage and with faith," there was an exultant fervor in the mighty roar which arose.

The magic in Roosevelt's voice, the magnetism of his personality, still are potent. The pull may not be as great as it was in 1936. Only time can tell that. There were some disgruntled and angry delegates when the gavel fell. But outside the shattered ranks of the reactionaries, crushed by the final blow of Henry A. Wallace's nomination for the Vice Presidency, most of the anger and soreness, we believe, arose from a sense of frustration and will pass.

Politicians of the practical school are accustomed to fixing things up to suit themselves. By the very nature of their calling these practical men are arrogant and high-handed. They arrange and then induce the people to accept.

And the practical politicians didn't arrange things at this convention. The practical politicians got pushed around. For the moment they feel that they were pushed around by President Roosevelt and his close followers—just as the practical politicians left Philadelphia feeling that they were pushed around by Wendell Willkie.

In truth it was not Mr. Willkie or Mr. Roosevelt who did the pushing. It was a much mightier—and, to the politicians, a much more alarming force. It was public opinion, a terrible, unseen, uncontrollable force which took matters out of the hands of the politicians.

POLITICIANS DON'T UNDERSTAND WALLACE

The practical politicians among the delegates had already bowed to the people insofar as Mr. Roosevelt's renomination was concerned, long before they came to Chicago. But it was hard for them to swallow Henry Wallace. They do not understand Mr. Wallace, whom somebody once called a mystic mathematician. They cannot understand a hard-headed, successful farmer combined with a brilliantly intellectual liberal idealist—and the combined whole completely indifferent to practical politics.

But President Roosevelt wanted Wallace to round out the triumph of liberalism over reactionism. And the politicians sensed, somehow, the grim public demand to make the Democratic Party genuinely, not superficially, liberal. So resentfully and reluctantly they yielded.

The reason Mr. Roosevelt wanted Mr. Wallace as his running mate was plain throughout the President's address last night. He wanted him as a strong aid in the fight to preserve liberal and democratic institutions against attack from within and from without. He said:

"Whenever tyranny has replaced a more human form of government, it has been due more to internal causes than external. Democracy can thrive only when it enlists the devotion of those whom Lincoln called the common people. Democracy can hold that devotion only when it adequately respects their dignity by so ordering society as to assure to the masses of men and women reasonable security and hope for themselves and for their children."

That is the battle that lies ahead. There will be attempts to becloud the issues. The people will be told that the only important thing today is to put in office a businessman with whom industry will cooperate in rearming the Nation. They will be told that social progress must be abandoned in the name of national defense. They will be told that the third-term tradition is too sacred to violate.

But the President has drawn the battle line. No nation can survive unless its institutions, its ideals, its services to all its people make it worth defending to the last drop of every citizen's blood. That is what must be done before we can be strong and safe in national unity.

"The American people must decide whether these things are worth making sacrifices of money, of energy, or self. They will not decide by listening to mere words or reading mere pledges, interpretations, and claims. They will decide on the record—the record as it has been made—the record of things as they are."

That is where Franklin D. Roosevelt rests his case. We think that is where it should rest.

An Oregon Pioneer Answers Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. PIERCE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY W. L. GOSSLIN

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at Champoeg, before the Sons and Daughters of Oregon Pioneers, by W. L. Gosslin, Portland attorney, July 4, 1940:

A few days ago a little Austrian stood before the impressive tomb in Paris of a little Corsican adventurer who 125 years ago terrorized Europe. What must have been the thoughts of Adolf Hitler as he thus stood in triumph in the presence of the dead Emperor Napoleon? Within a brief period of 7 years Hitler has lifted Germany from a position of crushing military defeat, political impotence, and economic chaos to the hegemony of continental Europe. As he stood there under the vast dome of the Pantheon, did he recall that for 15 years Napoleon dominated Europe, holding in his grasp France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, the Low Countries, Switzerland, the Austrian Empire, Denmark, Poland, and large parts of Russia? Did he think of Napoleon's dreams of world empire that led him on past his victories at Marengo, Ulm, Austerlitz, Jena, Wagram, Borodino, to the retreat from Moscow, to Leipzig, and to Waterloo? Did Hitler think of the crushing of Napoleon's plan to conquer England by Admiral Nelson at Trafalgar? Did the black marble tomb remind Der Fuehrer of Elba and of St. Helena?

On May 10, 1940, in his order of the day to the German armies invading the Low Countries, Hitler declared: "The fight which begins today will decide the fate of the German Nation for the next thousand years." Does Hitler imagine himself in a Europe of A. D. 962 to 1250, when the Germans were the masters of western Christendom? He speaks frankly of the "consolidation of Europe"—obviously under Nazi domination. This means the formation of some half dozen large countries out of the some twenty large and small ones we have now—the consolidation of the Balkan States into one federation and of the Scandinavian countries into another. It means the disappearance in their present form of Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland. Hitler gave the clue when he told the nations of the world to withdraw their diplomatic representatives from Brussels, The Hague, Luxembourg, Copenhagen, and Oslo and stated that after July 15 representation at Berlin was all that was necessary. This is the Versailles Treaty in reverse. This is the rebirth of a holy Roman empire—at once more vast and infinitely more cruel.

We know the fate of the French, Belgians, Dutch, Danes, and Norwegians from what has already happened to the Czechs and the Poles. They are to be slaves of the German Reich. Refugees have told us of the removal from Poland to Germany of the art treasures, of family heirlooms—in fact, of every article of value. Nazi efficiency is so remarkable that scientific instruments purchased in Germany by Polish scientists have been checked through the original sales records and have been confiscated.

But by far the most ghastly aspect of Hitler's methods for the "consolidation of Europe," is the apparently studied effort to remove all possible sources of opposition in the conquered countries—the mass murders of the intelligentsia and of all individuals and groups from which leadership might be expected to come. A German army officer told an American friend that Poland was one huge graveyard and that he shuddered to think of the fate of the Poles left to the "tender" mercies of the Gestapo. For every German killed, 100 Poles, whether guilty or innocent, are to die. A rebel Czech or Pole, before his own execution, hears the shrieks of indescribable agony and despair of his own wife, mother, and children and sees the torture of their quivering flesh by methods that make the inhumanities of the Spanish Inquisition pale into insignificance. By such devices does Hitler seek to glorify the German Volk, and to provide for them "lebensraum" (living space).

Europe is to be a vast concentration camp, with the good German people cast by Hitler in the role of the hated Gestapo. Liberty and Democracy everywhere are to be trampled under the heels of the ceaselessly advancing Panzer and Schnell divisions, marching forward to "blitzkrieg" civilization. The peace of Hitler is the peace of death and the sword. Truth must abdicate in favor of propaganda; science must be the handmaid of war. The Reich is to be everything; the individual, nothing. Motherhood is to be merely a convenient device for the production of cannon fodder. Christianity and freedom of worship are to be relegated to the ashcan, already occupied by freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly. Treachery, bribery, falsehood, intimidation, torture, starvation, mass murder, and death are to be the instruments of "progress." And throughout the land, full play is to be given to the fury of 21 years of pent-up bitterness, hatred, and revenge, culminating in one mighty outburst of evil triumphant. Such is Adolf Hitler's plan for the world.

There are others who have had different plans and used different methods. We are gathered here today to pay the tribute of our admiration and love to our pioneer mothers and fathers who founded on the shores of the Pacific this great State. Think of the courage and patriotism of that handful of men and women 3,000 miles from the seat of their Government, separated by trackless forests and deserts, alone in a strange land, dominated by the mighty Hudson's Bay Co., the agency of a rival power. The first action of those pioneers on coming to Oregon, after the erection of their homes had been the building of schools and churches. They were a devout and Christian people, devoted to education and to democratic ideals. And so they formed a government that should be the servant, and not the master, of the people; a government that should cherish the rights of every individual, no matter how lowly; a government that should protect the weak and helpless from the depredations of the wicked, the cruel and the strong; a government that should guarantee to all, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, under the guiding star of justice and truth. That Government for this great Oregon country, which included what are now the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming, was established without shedding one drop of human blood. What a contrast with Hitler's conquests which have bathed a continent in blood and tears! To the maintenance of that Government of ours, we here pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor. The glorious flag of freedom, planted here by our fathers, must never cease to wave over this emerald land.

And what would be the answer of those Oregon pioneer mothers and fathers to Adolf Hitler? Atop our State Capitol stands a symbol of them, the Golden Pioneer. As he surveys the beautiful peaceful Oregon countryside let him speak for us all:

"Adolf Hitler—we know you of old. You breathe the spirit of Genghis Khan, of Tamerlane, of Attila the Hun, Caesar, Charlemagne, of Otto the Great, and Frederick Barbarossa, of Czar Peter of Russia, and of Frederick, the Prussian King. You drink the wine of violence. As you stand there at the Corsican's tomb you believe that you are a new Napoleon. But where are all those conquerors now? They are dust, as you will be one day; their empires disintegrated, their bloody victories, legends but faintly remembered. What rolling field is to be your Waterloo? What rock-bound isle is to be your St. Helena? In humanity's long march down the centuries it has seen the conquerors come, and it has seen them go. That mighty procession of historic humanity, which soon forgets the conqueror, will always cherish the memory of a Hugo Grotius, the father of international law, of a Goethe, of a Martin Luther, a Wagner, a Gutenberg, a Bach, Brahms, or Beethoven, of an Einstein, a Thomas Mann, a Roentgen, a Hans Holbein, or an Albrecht Durer. A humanity that has already forgotten Emperor William Hohenzollern, sawing wood at the castle of Doorn, will never forget Mme. Ernestine Schumann-Heink.

"And so today as I, the Golden Pioneer, stand on my pedestal atop the State Capitol, watching the beautiful Willamette flow eternally onward to the sea, admiring the mighty forests of Oregon which have seen a thousand conquerors pass from the face of the earth, I know that beneath me, in this white marble citadel of freedom, the democratic institutions of government and of law will still be serving humanity long after you, Adolf Hitler, are dust, and your proud achievements only a myth among men!"

Walkers and Bolters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

STATEMENT BY HON. CLYDE WILLIAMS, OF MISSOURI

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by my colleague, Hon. CLYDE WILLIAMS, Representative of the Eighth District of Missouri, and which was published in the Missouri Democrat under date of August 2, 1940, which is as follows:

Having nominated the head of a Power Trust holding company from Wall Street as its candidate for President, the Republican Party, through its big newspaper writers and radio commentators, is having a strenuous time these hot days trying to build him up. He is first hurried away to Colorado where he is pictured around chuck wagons and hot-dog stands, where he is placed on old stage coaches and paraded before rodeos in order that he may be his natural self and where he wisecracks and plays low politics. They want to get this glamour boy from Wall Street out into the great open spaces of the West and try to fool the people into thinking he is one of them.

Then these same papers that were chagrined, peeved, and in fact infuriated because they could not catapult Roosevelt out of the Democratic nomination like they "blitzkrieged" Willkie into the Republican nomination, now are bringing all their ingenuity and skill into the build-up picture for the Republican candidate.

They have started a walking marathon and a bolting battalion composed of supposed Democrats who are acclaimed as leaving the party. Who are they? They mention as a sample of those who are going to take a walk such ancient and venerable pedestrians as Al (good loser) Smith, John (doubtful) Raskob, Jouett (Liberty League) Shouse, and our Jim (ex-Senator) Reed. No one had ever discovered that these veteran political amblers had got back from the last walk they took. These men and their type are seasoned and experienced walkers. For years they have been on the march away from the ideals of democracy toward the citadel of special privilege and it is expected that a great utility magnate will receive them with open arms and bestow upon them his blessings at the end of the rough and footsore journey. It is hoped that he will keep them within his fold so that in the future there may be no more shoe leather wasted on these long, intermittent, and futile walks.

Then these same newspapers, backed up by the radio commentators, mention, as an example, those who are bolting the Democratic party, Senator BURKE of Nebraska, Senator HOLT of West Virginia, and "Alfalfa" Bill Murray of Oklahoma, all of whom recently were candidates in their own States and all of whom were overwhelmingly defeated by the Democrats at home who know them. The Democrats in their own community beat them to the bolt. This little group of bolters has openly gone over to the party which it for years has so faithfully served. These lame ducks with their soiled and tarnished plumage present a dull, a colorless, and a sorry scene as they waddle and toddle along the dusty path in their wild confusion and scramble to reach Mr. Willkie's "old swimmin' hole."

These writers and commentators who are trying to build up Willkie by this talk of walks and bolts from the Democratic Party seem to think that the people have no memory at all and are utter and total fools. The people are not deceived. They know that the Democratic Party has lost nothing by the action of these so-called walkers and bolters.

A Liberal Trade Policy and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN M. HOUSTON, OF KANSAS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech on A Liberal Trade Policy and National Defense:

A LIBERAL TRADE POLICY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The liberal trade program carried out by the United States has as its main purpose the facilitation and stimulation of peaceful commerce between nations. However, even before the present war flamed into destruction over half the earth's surface and disrupted peacetime commerce, trade agreements were both directly and indirectly forwarding the American program of national defense. Nations cannot be made strong by armaments alone. A well-rounded national economy must run parallel to military defense. In order to be prepared, nations must make use of their natural resources, produce and distribute goods efficiently. It has been demonstrated that no armies, navies, tariffs, or embargoes can defend us from invasions of depressions, which lead to lower standards of living. It is recognized that prosperity and peace go hand in hand; to promote one, promotes the other. Any program which creates greater prosperity, greater commercial freedom, and

higher standards of living is the best sort of defense against all kinds of invasions. Such economic security helps to eliminate the conditions which make greater military defense necessary and at the same time strengthens military defense.

More directly, the trade-agreements program has contributed to the solution of some of the problems of national defense and security by facilitating the acquisition from abroad of certain materials such as manganese, mica, and nickel, vital to our national defense, which are not and cannot adequately be produced in the United States itself.

Private business in the United States not only carries on the international commerce of this country in peacetime, but bears a heavy responsibility for the operation of the national-defense program when the country lies under the threat of hostilities.

The aim and effect of the trade-agreements program are and have been to facilitate commerce carried on by private business, to remove the obstructions and barriers which grew up and throttled that commerce in the twenties and early thirties, and to enable private business to fulfill its proper functions in the handling of foreign trade. Under a democracy private business is geared to conduct such commerce more efficiently and more expeditiously than Government agencies.

Under the excessive tariff policy that culminated in the passage of the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930, the United States took a leading roll in the world-wide rush to throw barriers and obstructions across the channels of normal world commerce. Under that policy "pressure groups," by log-rolling tactics, were able to obtain exorbitant rates of tariff on a great number of products—including some that are necessary to the military defense of this country. Such tariffs have been imposed on certain products such as nickel, mercury, and quinine that are not produced in the United States in quantities adequate to meet defense needs. The main results of such trade restrictions were to increase the costs to American industries and consumers, to retard national defense, and to throttle both our foreign trade and our domestic economy, because when the United States barred normal imports by excessive tariffs, such action likewise shut off the exports of the things which this country produces in surplus. It caused huge farm surpluses to pile up in this country and force down farm prices; it caused factories by the hundreds to close down and threw American industrial workers into the breadlines.

This so-called tariff protection was granted under the pretext that it would strengthen domestic industry for peacetime and national preparedness against emergency. Excessive tariffs have done neither. Rather they have restricted trade, increased poverty and engendered hostility between countries. The record of the twenties and early thirties gives ample evidence that tariff retaliations encouraged the present situation in Europe; it is not necessary to go into the details of that record. The so-called tariff protection is a misnomer of the worst sort; it protected no one from the poverty conditions such as existed in 1932.

Both our economy and our national defense were injured by the Hawley-Smoot policy. It is obvious that a country in which business is bad, where workers are unemployed, and farmers are going bankrupt is not a strong country if called upon to defend itself.

The Hawley-Smoot tariff policy did not make the United States self-sufficient and strong; it did not even bring about self-sufficiency in the essential materials for national defense, notwithstanding the fact that tariffs on some such materials were increased.

Those who were responsible for the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act do not like to have that act exposed as one of the causes of world-wide economic warfare that has led to the present military conflict. But the chronology of events and the established record tell the story all too plainly. It is a well-established fact that the Hawley-Smoot Act was followed by retaliatory measures by foreign countries all over the globe. The abrupt ending of our unsound foreign-loan policy at about the same time also had an unsettling effect. All nations concerned about their economic security were likewise concerned about their political security and took restrictive measures intended to protect their own depressed industries. Such steps included tariff isolation, exchange and quota regulations, and many other artificial and uneconomic restrictions. As their normal international commerce was lost, these countries were driven to barter and similar programs. American foreign trade suffered a decline even more drastic than that of the rest of the world. European and Asiatic countries were driven off the gold standard and began a race of depreciating their currencies, thus adding to the confusion in international trade.

Complete national self-sufficiency, as advocated by some persons, is too costly to be sought for unless under absolute military necessity. When military necessity—or government by a dictatorship—demands national self-sufficiency it means lower standards of living for all the people, complete regimentation, a loss of the rewards of individual enterprise in business and industry, strict mobilization of the productive power of the Nation along the lines ordered by the Government. Even the step toward isolation represented by excessive tariffs on imports of necessary commodities tends toward this effect.

Self-sufficiency means high costs of production and higher prices; these high costs tend to decrease consumption and thus lower living standards. When a country has to use a greater share of its productive energy in the production of war essentials it spends a greater portion of its national income for those essentials and naturally has a smaller share left for other goods.

The price of self-sufficiency is well illustrated by the high cost of the gasoline that Germany has been producing from coal. Germany's "ersatz" program indicates national inefficiency to the extent represented by the value of the goods she could produce efficiently and exchange with other countries for the goods she cannot produce efficiently. Such self-sufficiency is often a confession of national inefficiency, yet we have many in this country who advocate just this sort of national inefficiency. Every time a tariff revision is undertaken by the Congress, efforts are made to make productive inefficiency a virtue. This is attempted in the name of "military necessity," "protecting infant industries," or some other recognized vote-getting tariff slogan.

The reciprocal trade agreements program represents the antithesis of a self-sufficiency-at-all-costs economic philosophy. It represents a movement to free private business from the obstacles thrown in its way, and permits private business, within the framework of sound economic principles, to use its efficiency and its enterprise in the production and exchange of goods among nations, with the resultant increase in living standards for all countries.

So much for the more general considerations of the relationship of the trade-agreements program to national defense. The Army-Navy Munitions Board has classified certain materials as strategic and critical for defense purposes. According to the definition of the Board, strategic materials are those which are essential to national defense and which, in time of war, must be obtained in whole or in substantial part from sources outside the continental United States. Strict conservation and control of the distribution of such materials are necessary in time of war. Critical materials are those which are essential to the national defense, but which offer less difficult procurement problems than do the strategic materials, either because the critical materials are less necessary in the prosecution of a war, or because they can be obtained in more nearly adequate quantities from domestic sources. Some degree of conservation and control of distribution of these materials is necessary in wartime.

The list of strategic materials is as follows: Antimony, chromium, coconut shell char, manganese, ferrograde, manila, fiber, mercury, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, and tungsten.

The critical materials are: Aluminum, asbestos, cork, graphite, hides, iodine, kapok, opium, optical glass, phenol, platinum, tanning materials, toluol, vanadium, and wool.

The imports of these 29 products in 1939 were valued at about $300,000,000 or approximately 15 percent of the total imports into the United States for that year. These items represent an important phase of United States import trade. Even in peacetime they are possibly more essential to our economy than the proportion in percentages might indicate.

The Army-Navy Munitions Board lists and keeps under surveillance certain additional materials which might at any time become strategic or critical materials. Some materials shift back and forth among the three categories, depending upon their availability and on whether substitutes for them are developed.

The trade-agreements program is related to these materials in the national-defense program in two specific ways: (1) By expanding foreign markets for our own products, with which to pay other countries for the essential materials we may purchase from them; and (2) by making it easier for American businessmen, in performing their part in the national defense, to acquire for the United States, at lower costs, the necessary quantities of essential materials. When United States tariffs on essential defense materials are lowered through a trade agreement, the cost of those materials to this country is also lowered.

Reductions in United States tariffs, or other concessions on imports, have been provided on several of the 29 essential materials cataloged by the Army-Navy Munitions Board under the trade-agreements program. Duties have been reduced on manganese, mica, nickel, graphite, and aluminum. In order to stabilize trade, rubber, tin, asbestos, quinine, kapok, chromite, and chrome ore were bound against duty assessment during the life of the agreements.

When national defense really is at stake, no one objects to a reasonable tariff subsidy on the production of strategic or critical materials within the United States. It is recognized, however, that no program of self-sufficiency can make the United States independent of outside sources for some of these materials. Defense was taken into consideration before reductions were made in the duties on these items. Past history shows that tariff subsidies, demanded in the name of national defense, ought to be carefully examined in order to make sure that such subsidies really look toward national security and not toward the financial security of selfish producers posing as patriots. This national-defense argument has been overworked in obtaining "defenseless tariffs" in the past.

MANGANESE

Possibly one of the best illustrations of the failure of high-tariff protection to bring about self-sufficiency in a material necessary to the national defense is the case of manganese. Notwithstanding a tariff subsidy of as high as 100 percent ad valorem over a

period of many years, the United States has not produced more than 5 to 10 percent of the manganese needed for peacetime consumption in the steel industry of this country.

In considering the Tariff Act of 1922 the producers claimed that if manganese were given adequate tariff protection, they could produce in this country enough for our domestic requirements in peacetime. Notwithstanding another increase in the manganese tariff in response to this same claim in 1930 they never have produced in recent years more than 10 percent of the domestic requirements; the steel industry or, in final analysis, the consumers of steel products, paid an average of $6,650,000 a year tariff subsidy on the 90 or so percent of the domestic requirements being imported.

In the trade agreement with Brazil, the United States tariff on manganese was reduced by 50 percent. In spite of the fact that this product is vital to national defense, certain potential domestic producers continually protest against this reduction and go so far as to say that we could have had self-sufficiency in manganese if they had had "proper protection."

OPTICAL GLASS

The case of optical glass, a critical material, is interesting from the viewpoint of tariff protection and self-sufficiency. Domestic producers of such glass have enjoyed high tariff protection for many years but this infant industry has not grown to maturity under such shelter.

There is one domestic producer of optical glass in the United States, but this manufacturer has not developed the capacity to supply the present demands, so Congress recently appropriated $100,000 to enlarge a plant and to furnish new equipment for the National Bureau of Standards.

Apparently outright production by the Government would have been less expensive and more adequate for the purpose of national defense. As was brought out during the hearings on the Second Deficiency Appropriation bill (June 10, 1940), the National Bureau of Standards has been manufacturing some optical glass since the first World War and has supplied part of the Army and Navy requirements. Before the present war broke out, the United States obtained a part of its optical glass from Germany, France, and England.

As with manganese and other strategic and critical materials, no one quarrels with tariff subsidies on optical glass if real independence is gained. That, however, has not been the case. It merely constitutes another failure of so-called self-sufficiency under costly tariff subsidies. In addition, the Government, in time of emergency, finds it necessary to produce optical glass for its own needs.

It is elemental that tariff subsidies are invisible taxes paid by consumers in way of higher prices, not only on the portion which may be imported but upon the domestic supply as well. Tariff subsidies granted on the spurious plea of developing a domestic industry to the point of self-sufficiency, in many instances, instead of contributing to the national defense, have actually hampered it and have added to the cost of the very materials and supplies upon which defense must depend.

The trade-agreements program, on the other hand, has operated to facilitate the acquisition of essential materials at a lower cost and at the same time to promote the general business and industrial conditions within the United States which make for an economically as well as a militarily prepared Nation.

Administration of the Securities and Exchange Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO NEWS FINANCIAL

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the San Francisco News Financial dated July 8, 1940:

FINANCE AND INDUSTRY—S. E. C. BLACKENS REPUTATIONS AND FAILS TO CORRECT ACCUSATIONS AFTER JURY CLEARS DEFENDANTS

(By John S. Piper, the News Financial editor)

More than 2 weeks have elapsed since all defendants in the cases of the United States of America against Robert S. Odell and 11 others affiliated with the Pacific States Savings & Loan Co. were acquitted by a jury under orders from the judge in a Federal district court in Los Angeles. The Securities and Exchange Commission, which gave wide publicity to the indictments, has not as yet issued an announcement that the men whose names it blackened last December were found not guilty.

This is in line with the public-relations policy of the S. E. C. and is convincing proof of the biased attitude prevalent in a bureaucratic agency which thrives on the publicity it chooses to release.

The S. E. C. in Washington maintains a press bureau which broadcasts a release whenever it participates in the indictment of an individual. The news release recites all the counts in the indictment and goes into detail to justify his prosecution.

If the accused man is convicted, it means another release, again reciting all of the accusations against him. When the convicted man is sentenced it issues still another release, again reciting his crimes.

But if the man who was indicted at the instance of the S. E. C. is acquitted, the news bureau in Washington does not issue a release to inform the public that the individual whose reputation it besmirched was found not guilty of the charges against him.

This arbitrary method of controlling publicity to its own advantage is one phase of the administration of the Securities and Exchange Commission which should be delved into when the next Congress investigates the S. E. C.

SEVEN-PAGE STATEMENT

Last December 20 the San Francisco regional office of the S. E. C. issued a release on the indictment of Mr. Odell and other defendants which was seven typewritten pages in length. The release consisted of a two-page statement by Howard A. Judy, regional S. E. C. administrator, three pages of biographical sketches of those indicted, with their ages, and a two-page statement of Ben Harrison, United States attorney at Los Angeles.

The December 20 statement, released by the S. E. C. here, placed the position of the accused men in the most unfavorable light possible.

"Howard A. Judy, Securities and Exchange Commission regional administrator, announced today," it said, "that a Federal grand jury in Los Angeles had returned a 19-count indictment, charging mail fraud, violation of the fraud provisions of the Securities Act and conspiracy to violate the mail-fraud statute, against 14 defendants in connection with the operation and sales of securities of Pacific States Savings & Loan Co.

"Robert S. Odell, the president, and 10 other officers and directors of the company and affiliated corporations, and Thomas M. Gannon and Erle Leaf, deputy building and loan commissioners of the State of California, and T. W. Dahlquist, prominent San Francisco attorney, were named as the defendants.

"COMPANY INSOLVENT

"The indictment charged the defendants with devising and employing a scheme to defraud investors and prospective investors in the company. * * * It charges that false financial statements were prepared and circulated by the defendants, and that the defendants misrepresented to investors and prospective investors that the company was solvent when it was in fact insolvent.

"It charges, further, that the defendants diverted the funds of investors to their own use and violated California statutes regulating the business of building and loan associations, and that they corruptly influenced legislators and administrators to take action favorable to the company and its management and detrimental to the interest of investors. * * *

"The Securities and Exchange Commission was represented by Roger Kent, attorney, and Allen G. Mainland, accountant investigator attached to the San Francisco regional office of the S. E. C."

The above is only a part of Mr. Judy's statement and only a small part of the seven-page press release.

If the S. E. C. were to depart from its policy of leaving reputations blackened even after the men it has accused have been acquitted, it would issue a press release immediately after the acquittal.

HOW IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

The opinion of Judge Leon R. Yankwich in the Pacific States case, in which he ordered the jury to find the defendants not guilty, would have supplied material for a press release equally as long as the one the S. E. C. made public here last December.

Here is how the S. E. C. might have prepared such a release:

"'Howard A. Judy, Securities and Exchange Commission regional administrator announced today that a Federal jury in Los Angeles had acquitted all defendants who were indicted last December on charges of mail fraud, violation of the fraud provisions of the Securities Act, and conspiracy to violate the mail fraud statute in connection with the operation and sales of securities of Pacific States Savings & Loan Co.

"Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich directed the jury to return a verdict of not guilty.

"The judge and the jury held that the defendants did not devise and employ a scheme to defraud investors and prospective investors, as charged in the indictments. The judge and the jury also decided that the defendants did not divert funds of investors to their own use, etc. * * *

"Judge Yankwich, in his opinion on the case at the end of the trial, said: 'There is not in this record any substantial evidence from which a jury can infer by any stretch of the imagination that any of the defendants in this case have been guilty of any of the fraudulent acts with which the Government of the United States has charged them.' "

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1940

ARTICLE BY LEWIS P. MILLER

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the entire history of our Nation we have been able to raise an Army, a Navy, and the component parts thereof by voluntary enlistment. We have never been compelled to resort to any compulsory plan of conscription in order to raise our peacetime forces for national defense. We do not have to resort to any compulsory method, as proposed, to raise our peacetime Army for our national defense at this time. The men and boys of this Nation are ready and willing to answer the call of their country, under a voluntary-enlistment plan, for training purposes and for our national defense. Any plan of compulsory conscription at the outset, without giving the voluntary-enlistment plan a fair and equitable trial, is a challenge to the patriotism of our people.

While we need an army for our national defense in this Nation, we need an army of men and women, of every walk in life, who will march forward as Americans to aid in saving our Nation from every un-American influence from within.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial written by Mr. Lewis P. Miller, of Middletown, Ind., which appeared in the Middletown News, of Middletown, Ind., on a recent date, which is as follows:

WE DO NEED AN ARMY—A VOTING ARMY TO HELP PRESERVE FREE GOVERNMENT

(By Lewis P. Miller, R. F. D. 1, Mooreland)

Are we or are we not going to be transformed from a peaceful, individualistic nation of workers to a fighting, regimented army of soldiers to wage other people's wars? That is the question the United States Congress is now wrestling with and which it will probably settle one way or the other in a few days.

If a compulsory military training law is passed, it will be simply for one or two reasons. Either we are about to formally plunge into the European war with men as well as machines or President Roosevelt and his New Deal crew are making a last desperate effort to conceal their utter failure as navigators of the ship of state by stirring up a frenzy of militant patriotism just before election time.

No other possible explanation of this proposed legislation will hold water. This country is not threatened with invasion either now or as far as we can see into the future. Hitler has not whipped England yet. He has no navy with which to cross the ocean. He can't invade us with his present air force. Why then this un-American proposal to conscript soldiers when we are technically at peace with all the world?

If it is for the purpose of again participating in a European war, then why isn't President Roosevelt honest enough to say so? He is campaigning on a promise to refrain from such participation. But, judging from his past preelection pledges, if he were to start broadcasting every other day that he intended to send an army to Europe as soon as it could be embarked, we could feel much more confident that we were not heading for war.

Moreover, his statement to the Chicago convention disavowing any desire or purpose to run again is the most striking instance in American history of political duplicity on the part of an incumbent President. Everyone who heard it knew, the moment it was read, that it meant exactly the opposite of what it said. The fact seems to be that Mr. Roosevelt has developed such a habit of saying one thing and meaning another that the only way to correctly interpret his statements is to take them in reverse.

So when he insists that we need a conscript army to meet a foreign invader the only logical interpretation is that he means we need it to invade a foreign country. When he says everyone must be prepared to preserve the domestic peace, what he most probably means is that everybody should be ready to preserve the New Deal.

Such contortion of language is unworthy of the high office of the Presidency. When our Chief Executive has so perverted the truth that his most intimate henchmen take him to mean the opposite of what he says he no longer is a true representative of the American people—he can no longer be trusted to lead a great nation in the midst of a troubled world.

There are but few patriotic Americans who are not in favor of completely adequate defense for the United States. But there are a good many of us who do not believe that in order to have such a defense we must resort to totalitarian methods of acquiring it.

The New Deal is drunk with power. For 7 years it has squandered tens of billions of dollars of the people's money in an attempt to bribe them into docile submission to dictation from Washington. That attempt has not fully succeeded.

Thinking people in every part of the Nation are at last becoming aroused to the enormity of the danger of continuing the New Deal in power. They are revolting—here, there, and everywhere. And President Roosevelt is beginning to show signs of panic at what is happening. His supply of exhilaration—the power to govern largely by Executive order and spend billions upon billions of dollars in wild abandonment—is about to be taken from him. And, like a heavy toper about to be deprived of his bottle, Mr. Roosevelt is in a resentful and surly temper.

He has been making derogatory remarks about his former friends and supporters who can no longer stomach the New Deal and who have announced they will fight his efforts to continue in office indefinitely.

The greatest emergency facing the American people today is the situation created by a President who wants to be king. The people's interest in this emergency will not be served by conscripting a military army to fight in Europe but by enlisting a volunteer army to fight at the polls to preserve the American system of free, representative government.

President Roosevelt may have convinced himself that he is the only man in the United States capable of heading our Government. But he has the toughest job of his life ahead of him to so convince the American people.

Actors' Equity Association Asks for Dies Committee Investigation of Communists in the Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, since the second demise of the W. P. A. theater project I have had considerable correspondence with members of the Actors' Equity Association, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and with many others in the entertainment profession as to the encroachment of Communists into key positions in that profession. Some startling information has recently come to me and I am hopeful that there will be a thoroughgoing investigation of this matter by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the meantime I wish to call the attention of the House to certain phases of my own investigation and offer the following correspondence.

My attention was first attracted to this situation by an extensive coverage of the last annual meeting of the Actors' Equity Association appearing in the association magazine, Equity. At this meeting the annual election of new members to the council occurred, and in reporting the meeting this magazine referred to certain functioning of Equity's election machinery which disturbed Philip Loeb, one of the seven council members whom I have accused of being a Communist. Loeb was particularly disturbed over the campaign against Sam Jaffe, but the magazine gave no hint as to the nature of the alleged campaign. It referred to it as charges and countercharges, so I looked into it and found a real fight had occurred on the propriety of electing Jaffe, another communist. Jaffe was accused of being a Communist, and did not deny the charge. However, none of these details were brought out in the official report of the meeting published in Equity, the only medium the council has of keeping its far-flung membership of over 4,000, scattered throughout the United States, informed of happenings in the New York headquarters.

Jaffe succeeded in winning the election and is now a duly qualified member of the council, as brought out in my remarks of July 4 and July 11 before the House.

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
New York, July 10, 1940.

Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: The press throughout the United States has given considerable publicity to certain statements allegedly made by you, and which we understand, have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Newspaper clippings purporting to quote your remarks were brought to the attention of our council at its meeting yesterday, resulting in the adoption of the following resolution:

"Moved, seconded, and carried: That the council on behalf of itself and the membership denies emphatically that either the Equity council or the Equity membership is, or ever has been, dominated or controlled by Communists and requests that Congressman LAMBERTSON furnish satisfactory proof to the contrary or submit the source of his information."

We were instructed to convey this council action to you and to inform you that the Actors' Equity Association is not a political organization and that every actor and actress, eligible for membership, has never had any of their religious or political beliefs interferred with, and as the membership of Equity represents practically 100 percent of all actors and actresses in the American legitimate and musical-comedy theater, we feel, if you have been quoted correctly, that you have "smeared" not only the members of the council, whose names have been used, but the entire association.

The council and the membership feels that it has been unjustifiably attacked because our Americanism has never been challenged in this manner during the more than 30 years of our existence, and on behalf of the thousands of men and women that are Equity members, we call on you to comply with what is set forth in the resolution herein, or publicly retract this most unfair stigma, which it would appear from the newspaper reports, you are responsible for.

Permit us to point out that the character of this defamation is such that it may have serious consequences regarding not only the reputations of the people whose names it is alleged you have used, but their future career in the theater, with the resultant loss of employment. Indeed, we consider that all of us will be seriously damaged if this brand of "communism" which you have, according to the press, placed on us, is not removed.

Equity feels, very strongly, that men in high places, like yourself, who are supposed to represent fairly and without prejudice, the best interests of the citizenry of the United States, should be most careful, particularly at this time when there is so much hatred and conflict and misunderstanding going on in the world, to at least make some effort to establish and ferret out the true facts before they rise in the Congress of the United States to give voice to slanderous statements like those it is claimed you have made, and which have been echoed by the press and radio throughout the Nation.

Surely, as a fair-minded person and one of the lawmakers of our country, you will desire to right what this organization believes to be a grievous wrong, and we hereby give you the opportunity to do so; for after all, we only seek fairness and justice.

Very truly,

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary.

JULY 11, 1940.

PAUL DULLZELL,
Secretary, 45 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City:

Acknowledging your letter of yesterday kindly wire me names of members voting for and voting against resolution mentioned.

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

JULY 11, 1940.

PAUL DULLZELL,
Secretary, 45 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City.

DEAR MR. DULLZELL: I wired you today as follows: "Acknowledging your letter of yesterday kindly wire me names of members voting for and voting against resolution mentioned."

I noticed that this resolution quotes me as stating in my remarks of July 4, copy of which is enclosed, that the Equity Council is now "dominated or controlled by Communists."

Please advise me exactly how you read this from my statement of July 4.

Thanking you, I am
Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 11, 1940.*

Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives:

Cannot furnish information requested without authorization of council. All business transacted by council is considered confidential and no member of council has right to reveal what takes place when council is in session without council consent. We will of course submit your telegram at next council meeting which will be on July 23 and will be instructed what to do. However, this information should not have anything to do with your reply. The resolution was adopted by a majority of 19 to 5. We fail to see how the names of people present and voting has anything to do with council's request that you furnish satisfactory evidence or submit source of your information.

PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

Mr. Speaker, this refusal to furnish the names of the members was disappointing as the information would have helped me materially. When the council did meet, it also refused to permit me to have the names, as is brought out in succeeding correspondence. In order that the council could be more fully informed I wrote Mr. Dullzell under date of July 20, enclosing the following statement, which I requested him to read to the council. I had previously questioned the use of the words "dominate" and "control" in the resolution.

JULY 20, 1940.

TO THE COUNCIL MEMBERS OF ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION, *New York City.*

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It was with disappointment and considerable shock that I read the statements of your officials and the resolution of your council in response to my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 4. I cannot believe the careful reading of my statement could result in your answering resolution. I request therefore that my July 4 statement, my telegram and letter to Mr. Dullzell concerning your resolution, and my further remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11 be read to you.

In common with many of my fellow Members of Congress, I have a great respect and affection for members of your profession. Actors have given me much enjoyment. Their warm-hearted generosity to many worth-while causes is well known. For many years Actors' Equity Association has enjoyed an enviable reputation as a fair-minded, liberal labor organization. I believe anyone familiar with the hearings and debates on the Federal theater project in 1939, knows the high esteem in which actors and the Equity Association were held by Members of Congress.

I believe it is well known why the theater project was eliminated from the W. P. A., and I think friends of the theater were justified in anticipating a cleaning out of subversive elements in the entertainment organizations. It was therefore shocking to realize that the Actors' Equity Association in the last year of the Federal Theater used the language, methods, and ideas of the Workers' Alliance and the Communist Party in its conduct and negotiations with Federal theater officials. It has been disappointing to me to see Equity's fine reputation besmirched in the public prints in the controversy over benefits for Finland, their refusal to cooperate in the production of the patriotic spectacle The American Jubilee, and the storm over possible affiliation with the Theater Arts Committee.

It is rather significant that at the very time your representatives were presumably assuring Congress that no possible "red" influence could again obtain control of a Federal theater project, a man was elected to your governing board who as recently as last August signed his name to a complete endorsement of the Soviet system. I refer to Sam Jaffe.

It is my belief, and I think the belief of many citizens of the United States, that New York City has nourished a small minority of Communist Party members and subservient party-line rubber stamps in the theater, the newspapers, and the arts. Although a minority, they have been successful in obtaining key positions in their organizations, where they carry on a consistent campaign of obstruction, troublemaking, and propaganda against our democratic institutions and ideals. Very often they use a professed belief in these ideals to destroy them. Witness their shrieks about civil liberties, and at the same time their hearty praise for Russia, where no liberties exist.

I cannot believe that the members of Actors' Equity Association, and most particularly the council, are entirely unaware of this subversive infiltration. Indeed, from newspaper clippings and other accounts of your election in May, it is my impression that Miss Talullah Bankhead was nominated to combat this constantly growing influence. Yet Miss Bankhead was defeated. Nowhere in your official Equity magazine do I see presented the issue on which Miss Bankhead states she was a candidate.

These facts lead me to believe that the officers and members of the Actors' Equity Association are complacent about, ignorant of, or in alliance with the Marxists, Communists, fellow travelers (label them as you will) who appear to be powerful enough to keep the Equity Association constantly in the public eye on distinctly communistic controversies.

I made my statement of July 4 to combat that complacency, or ignorance. I believe the actors and actresses of America deserve to know why the Federal theater project was banned and continues to be banned by Congress. I hoped that by giving them this information they would purge their organizations of this element in office. I regret that many fine actors and actresses in need may not be helped by a Government theater project until the Equity Association is finally and completely cleared of this "red" influence. It was to assist in bringing about this "consummation devoutly to be wished" that I made the statement.

As to the sources of my information about which you inquire, they were the newspapers, your magazine Equity, the Dies committee reports, hearings before committees, and debates in Congress, and last, but by no means least, many appeals and statements from members of your organization.

Regarding your request for "satisfactory evidence," may I ask, satisfactory to whom? Obviously, the facts are sufficiently satisfactory to my colleagues in Congress and to myself to warrant continuing the ban against the Federal theater.

I do not have in my possession membership cards in the Communist Party of the seven people named. However, all of them have been or are now members of one or more "Communist Front" organizations. Some of them have been signatories to public statements lauding or defending the Soviet system, the U. S. S. R., or preaching "party line" propaganda. I enclose herewith a very few samples of evidence with which you no doubt are familiar, as I believe they were all issued from New York:

1. Louis Schaffer's "Stalin's 'Fifth Column' on Broadway."

2. A photostatic copy of page 2 of the Daily Worker of August 14, 1939, showing the names of some of the signatories to the now famous letter of August 10, 1939, dubbed by The Nation a "complete endorsement of the Soviet system."

3. A photostatic copy of the statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials, volume 1, page 375, of the Dies committee hearings, signed by Philip Loeb.

In conclusion I wish to advise you that a copy of this communication will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I shall be pleased to insert also your reply.

In order that the rank and file of your membership may be familiar with this situation, I request that this communication and my letter to Mr. Dullzell about your resolution, together with my statements on the subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of July 4 and July 11, be printed in your magazine Equity at an early date.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

JULY 22, 1940.

PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary, Actors' Equity Association, 45 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City:

Forwarded response to your letter together with letter to council. Please advise collect whether received.

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 23, 1940.*

Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON: We have received both your letters dated July 20 as well as excerpts from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, also photostats, all of which will be presented to the council at its meeting today.

PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
New York, July 25, 1940.

Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: Both your letters dated July 20, along with the portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 4 and and 11, as well as the photostatic copies, including Mr. Schaffer's booklet, were brought to the attention of the council at its meeting on Tuesday.

Before we go any further, we would like to quote from the second paragraph of your letter addressed to us as follows: "In order that the council may be more fully informed, I request that my letter of July 11, confirming my telegraphic request for names and questioning the use of the words 'dominated or controlled' in the resolution be read to the council." We have to inform you that we never received such a letter. The only communication that we had from you prior to those we have referred to above, was a telegram acknowledging our letter and requesting the names of the members of the council who voted for and those who voted against the resolution referred to. We therefore would appreciate your sending us a copy of your letter dated July 11.

The council also considered your telegraphic request for the names of the council members voting for and voting against the resolution and we were directed to inform you that inasmuch as the discussions before the council and the voting thereon has by long-established precedent been secret, and inasmuch further as these discussions made it evident that the vote was determined by matters not pertinent to the issue involved, and because further if the Dies committee will go into this whole matter quickly and thoroughly, all facts in which you are interested will be brought to light, the council feels that the names of the voters one way or the other should not be presently revealed.

However, in any investigation to be made by any governmental agency, we will be glad to open our records of those voting.

We think you should also know that as a result of this situation and its developments, that the council adopted a resolution, the sense of which is that Equity will request and demand an investigation of the whole matter by the Dies committee or any other governmental agency, and we ask for your cooperation to this end. We have already communicated with Mr. DIES.

Regarding compliance with the request made in the last paragraph of your letter, which we quote:

"In order that the rank and file of your membership may be familiar with this situation, I request that this communication and my letter to Mr. Dullzell about your resolution, together with my statements on the subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of July 4 and July 11, be printed in your magazine Equity at an early date."

The council has agreed that this request be complied with. As this activity requested by you and carried out by us is clearly outside legislative protection, publication in accordance with our established practice is contingent upon a favorable opinion from our legal department that neither you nor we are laying ourselves open to a claim of libel by any of the parties affected. Your early advices on this point will be appreciated.

This printed record will also contain the individual statements of members affected regarding their relation to communism or communistic activities.

Very truly yours,

ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary.

JULY 26, 1940.

Mr. PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary, Actors' Equity Association, 45 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City.

DEAR MR. DULLZELL: Your letter of July 25 has been received, and I am pleased to enclose a copy of my previous letter of the 11th, which evidently never reached your desk.

I am disappointed that you have not seen fit to furnish me with the names of the proponents and opponents of the council's strange resolution of July 9, as this might lead some people to believe that the voters were afraid of something. The reason I wanted the names was that it occurred to me some of these people having communistic leanings may have been the very people who voted for the resolution. I was anxious to know whether I had been of assistance to the council in bringing this situation out in the clear, but apparently the reaction was one of opposition to my efforts. Perhaps some of the very people I have accused were influential in getting this resolution passed. I know that you have nothing to hide, but others might not look at it this way. Another possible use of the names might be in aiding the Dies committee to come to a decision as to whether or not a prompt investigation of my charges should be made.

With respect to the propriety of reprinting in Equity my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there may be some question as to whether such quotations would be immune from possible libel proceedings, so I would agree that you put the matter up to your legal department. As promised in my letter of July 20, this and other correspondence will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I request that these data be included with the remarks of July 4 and 11 for printing in Equity. I shall forward a copy as soon as printed.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

AUGUST 1, 1940.

Mr. PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary, Actors' Equity Association,
New York City:

Has my letter of July 26 been received? If so when may answer be expected? Need for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

AUGUST 2, 1940.

Mr. PAUL DULLZELL,
Executive Secretary, Actors' Equity Association,
New York City.

DEAR MR. DULLZELL: I have been looking for a reply to my special-delivery letter of the 26th ultimo; and when none was received, wired you yesterday, as follows:

"Has my letter of July 26 been received? If so, when may answer be expected? Need for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

I was very much pleased with the democratic action of the council in voting to accede to my wish to print the material I requested in Equity magazine, and trust that your lawyers have by this time allayed any fears as to libel. If that is not the case, I would call attention to the privilege you have of having these various statements printed at cost by the Government Printing Office. Franked envelopes would be furnished, permitting the mailing to your membership at no cost for postage.

Miss Maida Reade has written me in connection with this matter, and since she is an official of your association, I would appreciate my letter to her of today being read at your next council meeting.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Mr. Speaker, I have no reply to my telegram of the 1st or my letter of the 2d.

As I go over this correspondence with Equity, I cannot escape the conclusion that its executive officers are in fact restrained from opening up and laying all the cards on the table. Over 2 months have passed since the W. P. A. theater project was killed the second time, and all I hear from several of the responsible officials of Equity are comments which can only be construed as hostile, both to Congress in

deciding not to permit Federal aid to a communistic-controlled profession and to my own feeble efforts to spread some light upon a sordid situation. However, I must exempt from this conclusion several of Equity's officials who have phoned and written me that I am absolutely right.

Actors and actresses in economic distress are as entitled to Federal relief and Federal encouragement as is any other group hit by the depression. The Government has been lavish in its efforts to keep the wolf away from the door of the humble home and the "white collar" apartment, and it has done a fairly good job. Then why should this ban be continued against one of the finest and most patriotic groups of American citizens? The only answer to this question is the fact that the entertainment profession, deeper in the throes of the depression than any other profession, has been seized upon by the "reds," and the decent members must suffer. Even when the W. P. A. theater project was first killed, only good American artists were fired by Hallie Flanagan. By some unseen, hidden power Mrs. Flanagan transferred all of her Communists over to the National Youth project. They did not lose a day. And are they laughing at Congress!

Honest and patriotic actors are caught in the trough and made to suffer. With only a half dozen plays now on Broadway, and a continued decline in opportunities even in the busy season, due to the encroachment of the movies and the radio, the plight of these professional people is indeed bad. And it is always when unemployment persists that the subversive elements get in their best licks. Despondent and without nearby hopes, decent members of organized groups become the prey of the Communists who have invariably wormed their way into the inner councils. Important policies are determined by small groups comprised of the very elements who are in actual minority, but who are able to put their ideas across due to the disheartened attitude of respectable and patriotic members. Any attempt to bring out the true facts results in cries of "red baiting."

An eloquent plea in behalf of unemployed actors and actresses was made before the Committee on Appropriations considering the new W. P. A. bill by Miss Maida Reade, chairman of Equity's Unemployment Committee, and I wish to call attention to the following correspondence with Miss Reade; also to a telegram signed by Miss Reade and others. She opens up a possibility which I feel should be prosecuted further:

NEW YORK, *July 12, 1940.*

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: As chairman of the various committees which shuttled to and from New York and Washington from early April to the middle of June seeking to get actors back into the relief bill, I am very anxious to know why you made your July 4 speech. You must have had some information or proof, and I assure you that as the present chairman of the unemployment committee in Equity I will, upon receipt of such information or proof, start an immediate movement to rid ourselves of such Communists on the grounds that they are undesirable members of Equity and have hindered the chances of their fellow members to get employment under the relief bill.

The impression I received from the member of my committee who called on you, Mr. Stephen Kent, was that you would favor the return of the theater to the relief bill if proper restrictions could be made to insure no repetition of the former abuses in the Federal Theater. Those restrictions were offered in our hearing before the Senate subcommittee and the Senate refused to put them in. We then urged the members of the House subcommittee to put in those restrictions or any others they wished.

It would seem, if you and the other members of the committee who said they would vote to put the theater back if properly restricted, had been sincere in their desire to help good American actors, you would have put in those restrictions and given us back the theater. My committee found Washington overrun with Workers Alliance members, the people whose tactics caused the discontinuance of the Federal theater before, and to the complete amazement of all of us, found them being received with the utmost cordiality by Congress. I can only say that the back slapping by Congress of people of the caliber of the Workers Alliance, while possibly expedient to vote getting, aroused a feeling of nausea in us at the spectacle. It seems to me it was a feeling of fear as to what the Workers Alliance might do to their Representatives at election time instead of the few potential "reds" there may be in Equity that caused us to be once more left out, and the exhibition is not inspiring.

Trusting that I may receive an early reply from you, I am,

Very sincerely,

MAIDA READE,
Chairman, Unemployment Committee, Actors' Equity Association.

AUGUST 2, 1940.

MISS MAIDA READE,
Chairman, Unemployment Committee, Actors' Equity Association, 45 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City.

DEAR MISS READE: This will refer to your letter of July 12 concerning the Communists on your council. I also note that you are one of the signers of a telegram of the same date protesting against our Government continuing its recognition of the Communist Party.

The enclosed copies of my remarks of July 4 and 11 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will largely answer the points raised in your letter. However, you state:

"My committee found Washington overrun with Workers Alliance members, the people whose tactics caused the discontinuance of the Federal theater before, and to the complete amazement of all of us found them being received with the utmost cordiality by Congress. * * * It seems to me it was a feeling of fear as to what the Workers Alliance might do to their representatives at election time instead of the few potential 'reds' there may be in Equity that caused us to be once more left out, and the exhibition is not inspiring."

If there is still any such idea remaining in your mind after reading the enclosed statements, I wish to call your attention to one more. The following is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, page 6754:

"The latter restriction would keep out mere amateurs and would also remove much cause of opposition on the score that a lot of young men and women, members of many radical organizations, had wormed their way into places of influence and power in the last theater project. * * * The reason why I included in my amendment the limitation that the actor or actress had to be a member of the theatrical profession prior to July 1, 1933, was to avoid bringing these so-called amateur thespians into the theater project and to prevent the so-called Workers Alliance from dominating the situation."

This statement was made by my colleague, Hon. Emanuel Celler, who offered an amendment, sponsored, I presume, by your committee. This amendment would have reinstated the theater project in the W. P. A. with certain restrictions.

However, Mr. Speaker, the amendment and the reinstatement of the Federal theater project were not acceptable to Congress since they could not believe your committee's assurance that the "red" influence would be eliminated. Congress had learned of the communistic infiltration into the Actors' Equity Association itself. If you will refer to page 18 of the report of the House Committee on Appropriations, Report No. 2186, on House Joint Resolution 544 you will find reference to the investigation made by a subcommittee of W. P. A. activities and the disclosure of such subversive activities. I cannot understand your statement that Congress feared the Workers Alliance since you must know, if you were in Washington while the above resolution was being considered, that Congress granted none of the Workers Alliance demands.

Now with respect to the Communist Party and the viewpoints brought out in your telegram—it is my firm conviction that any political organization which is subject to foreign influence such as the Nazi Bund or the Communist Party should be outlawed, and we made one halting step in that direction in House Joint Resolution 544 by depriving such travelers of W. P. A. benefits. I would further say that any citizen of the United States knowingly joining and insisting on membership in such organizations should be charged with treason. I am in complete agreement with your suggestion that Congress should outlaw the Communist Party and assure you I shall be glad to do all in my power to help accomplish this.

Some of the council members I have named may be innocents, but their tours up and down and always along the party line make it difficult to consider them as merely soft-minded liberals. The council should certainly know the extent to which they have been colonized by Communists, conscious fellow-travelers, and innocent Communist "stooges." The council knows (or is guilty of a most grevious neglect of duty not merely to its organization but to the Nation) the members who have Muscovite predilections, whose actions frequently parallel the party line. They deny it, of course, in the way familiar with their kind. However, that hardly relieves the council of its obvious duty.

I do not know the extent to which the cosigners of your telegram are familiar with my statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and my correspondence with Mr. Dullzell, but as I have been advised by Mr. Dullzell that the magazine Equity will reprint all of this material, I need not review it here.

I would appreciate it if you would show this letter to the others signing the telegram and also read it to the next council meeting, as I note from your letterhead that you are a member.

Thanking you for your cooperation, I am,

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 12, 1940.*

Congressman WILLIAM LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

If we have Communists in our membership, which you say we have, the undersigned Equity members suggest that you, as a Member of Congress, insist that Congress outlaw the Communist Party and facilitate the housecleaning you advise. We have no more use for Communists than you have, but how can any American organization expel them when the American Government recognizes them as a legal political party?

Winifred Lenihan, Alfred Kappeler, Lee Baker, Kathryn Givney, William David, Hugh Cameron, Beverly Bayne, Richard Whorf, Matt Briggs, and Maida Reade.

Numerous protests have been received in behalf of Alan Hewitt, another member of the council, named by me as one of the seven Communists on the council. I have no desire to harm any man and if Hewitt is in fact innocent I shall take the first opportunity to do my best to clear him. I have received letters and telegrams stating that he has never been a Communist from Stanley H. Silverman, New York City; William H. Scherman, Schwab and Beatty, New York City; Frederic March, West Los Angeles, Calif.; S. N. Behrman and Robert E. Sherwood, New York City.

I have also received a telegram along the same line from some 25 people, dated Princeton, N. J., July 9, which I ask to be inserted following these remarks, together with my reply, which, to date, has not been answered.

PRINCETON, N. J., *July 9, 1940.*

Representative LAMBERTSON,
House Office Building:

We, the undersigned members of the theatrical profession, protest the accusation you have made that Alan Hewitt, of the Equity Council, is a Communist. Knowing him to be a loyal American citizen, having no affiliation or even sympathy with the Communist Party, we deplore these completely unfounded charges.

Betty Garde, Theresa Helburn, Agnes Young, M. B. Loeb, Bill Rousseau, Frank Somers, Courtenay Savage, Harry Ellerbe, Frederic Tozere, Edith King, Bram Nossen, Ethel Wilson, Zachary Scott, Charles Newman, Jr., Bois Sokoloff, Charles Dingle, Mary Michael, Forrest Orr, Robert Griffith, Charles Holden, Virginia Holden, Perry Inins, Paul Ballantyne, Roger De Koven, Peter Beauvais, Kingsley Colton, Charles Stark.

JULY 17, 1940.

Miss THERESA HELBURN,
Care Theater Guild, 245 West Fifty-second Street,
New York City.

DEAR MISS HELBURN: I received a telegram signed by yourself and many others at Princeton, N. J., in behalf of Mr. Alan Hewitt. The information which you send has been noted.

However, Hewitt has affiliated himself with Communist projects and as far as I know is still affiliated. I am sure you must understand what I am talking about in view of your connection with the beginning of the League Against War and Fascism. I believe you are no longer a supporter of that movement, and I am wondering whether you may not be again mistaken in thus sponsoring Mr. Hewitt.

I would appreciate it very much if you would pass this letter along to the others who signed the above-mentioned telegram as I do not have their individual addresses.

I am enclosing my additional remarks on this subject as of July 11.

Sincerely,

W. P. LAMBERTSON.

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1940

RADIO ADDRESSES BY HON. FRANK KNOX, HON. ROBERT PORTER PATTERSON, AND GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a radio address delivered yesterday by the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox; also an address delivered yesterday over the radio by the Honorable Robert Porter Patterson, Assistant Secretary of War; and a radio address also delivered yesterday by Gen. John J. Pershing. These addresses pertain to the urgent necessity of our national defense. I feel that the most earnest judgment of all three of those very distinguished men are entitled to preservation in the RECORD for the careful consideration of the American people. The addresses are as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK KNOX, THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Right now we are facing the most momentous choice in the history of the Republic.

A titanic revolutionary struggle for the domination of the entire world is being waged in Europe, Asia, and Africa. This attack is directed at democracy, competitive trade, and individual freedom everywhere. It is drawing closer and closer to the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

Facing this danger, with isolation from it impossible, is an unprepared United States.

Our one hope of keeping this vast struggle out of the Western Hemisphere rests on the success of our efforts to build our defenses on such a scale and with enough speed, so that no combination of international brigands would dare to test our power. That is the only international language which they understand or respect.

We must be prepared to defend all we have and all we are, or perish as a free people.

This is not a choice of our making. It has been forced upon us.

In 3 months we have seen the lamp of liberty go out in Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, and France. These countries, like our own, faced the same choice, but they committed the fatal error of preparing too little and too late.

Britain is fighting desperately with her back to the wall, not knowing at what moment the Nazi blight will envelop her from the sea and from the air. If Britain falls and her vast sea power is broken or seized, the Atlantic Ocean will cease to be our great barrier of defense. The Atlantic will become a highway for attack upon us.

There are still those who deny that we face an emergency at all. They say that the wars of Europe will not engulf us—if we only mind our own business. They say that no dictator, however mad, would dare attack the United States or any other part of the Western Hemisphere. They contend that strict neutrality—and two oceans—are this country's true protection.

I wish this were true. But the tragic record proves the opposite. What the dictators want, they take. Every treaty they have signed, every pledge they have made, these power-crazed conquerors have thrown to the winds when it suited their purpose. When and if they complete the conquest of Europe and join hands with aggressors in Asia, they will desperately need the wealth of the Western Hemisphere. Their record in the past has proved that they would not hesitate to seize this wealth—if they can.

Hitler and Mussolini already have told us what they think of the Monroe Doctrine. The Nazi dictator has made it plain that he will waste little time or sympathy on American policies if these policies interfere with his dream of domination.

If treates of peace and pledges of security mean nothing to the Nazi-Fascist warlords, what may the United States expect when the Monroe Doctrine already is openly flouted?

It is plain enough that the European aggressors will not hesitate when the time comes for the plundering of the New World. With Europe and Asia under their domination, Hitler and Mussolini will have an overwhelmng part of the world's population as vassals. The gigantic industrial resources of these continents will be theirs. Only the raw materials of the New World will be lacking. It is inconceivable that the dictators will shy at seizing this last and most vital prize—the riches of North and South America.

Even if actual attack were long delayed, the United States would be caught in an economic squeeze play—facing the Nazi-Fascist combination on the Atlantic and an aggressive hungry power on the Pacific. If we did not adjust our policies to please these world masters, the squeeze play would begin. We would then exist by consent—the consent of ruthless tyrants.

That is the danger we face and Congress has been quick to realize it. The United States is now launched on the greatest rearmament program in history. We are prepared to spend $10,000,000,000 for ships and planes and tanks and all the other records of modern war. If we require greater proof that a national emergency exists, I do not know what it would be.

As the head of the Navy Department, it is my special duty to look after the expansion of our sea power—to build up our sea defenses. But our problem of defense today in the light of what has transpired in Europe is much greater than a Navy problem. It is clearly a matter of developing all our land, sea, and air forces if we are to meet new methods of attack. Time was when the oceans formed a great barrier; the airplane, the bombers, the parachutes, the submarines, have changed everything; once an enemy is based on this side of the Atlantic we are as vulnerable as if no acean existed between ourselves and our enemies.

True, our Navy must always be our first line of defense against a foreign aggressor. But until we get our 3,000,000-ton Navy, with an adequate air arm, land and air forces have a value and an importance that cannot be exaggerated. In this day and age we must use every arm of our strength, we must solidify our power, we must neglect nothing.

But building ships and planes and tanks is a vain and empty gesture without trained men to man them. Our greatest problem is manpower. If we are to achieve the greatest defensive armament the world has ever known, we must have the men as well as the machines and the ships. This is so plain, it says itself. But it presents the gravest question we have yet faced. We know from the experience of the last World War and from the tragic examples of the countries now conquered that it takes as long to train men as it does to build machines.

We know also from experience that there is only one fair and democratic way to secure manpower for adequate defense by land and sea and air. That is by selective universal military training. Any other method will produce nothing but confusion. And confusion is one of the weapons that Hitler and Mussolini have used with most deadly effects against the countries they have crushed. If we choose any other course than selective training we shall be taking that fatal risk.

What would be the use of a vast defensive machine operated by untrained and unskilled men? This would be nearly as dangerous as hurling brave but unarmed men against the juggernauts of modern war. Either course would invite destruction.

Still, in the face of grim realities, we hear many people say they do not believe in what they call "conscription in peacetime." They contend that military training is a step toward fascism. That it is against all American traditions. That it would make us a militaristic nation.

None of these contentions is sound. In the first place, selective universal training is the only democratic method of filling up and expanding our land and air and naval forces. Enlistment is not only insufficient, but in many ways dangerous. In the early part of the last war, we saw thousands of young men voluntarily leaving vital occupations to join the colors. This created industrial dislocation and provided only a fraction of the men needed.

Under a selective training system, the needed number of men would be called at the right time. This would prevent economic and industrial dislocation without violating a single basic American liberty. Liberty involves responsibility. The most important of these is the defense of liberty itself.

Now for the theory that compulsory training is against American traditions. It is true that we have never had such training in peacetime. But it is equally true that this country has never faced such a world as confronts it now. No one can honestly believe that these are days of peace.

In the past we have resorted to compulsory service whenever the Nation was threatened. Today we cannot wait until war is actually upon us. It would be too late.

Another opinion frequently heard is that the country has not sufficient equipment to train a large army; that our new ships will not be ready for years; that we should wait until the war machines and materials are ready before Congress even considers a compulsory-training measure. This is dangerous folly.

Because we propose to set up the lawful machinery of national defense does not mean that we propose to call a big army over night, or to enroll a huge navy or air personnel. But it does mean that, through registration, the Nation would have a reservoir of manpower to call upon at the right time and for the right service.

The basic problem lies in building our defenses, including our trained forces to such a size that we shall not be attacked. So big that possible enemies will be afraid to attack us.

We have a country that is worth defending. We possess a democratic way of life that is priceless, that we cherish beyond any other of our possessions. The responsibility for protecting these freedoms of ours is a common responsibility; all of us must do our part in keeping these liberties. It cannot be done by writing checks. It must be done by men who are trained and ready to use the weapons our checks provide.

The saddest words, born of the incredible travail of Europe, now under the heel of a ruthless conqueror are these: "Too little and too late."

We must heed this lesson if we are to be safe. Far better "too much and too soon," than that we too should be "too little and too late."

As one of those charged with a great responsibility in this grave moment, I say to you, my fellow Americans, with all of the sincerity and passionate earnestness I can command, it is later than you think.

RADIO ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT PORTER PATTERSON, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Ladies and gentlemen, today America needs an Army of about 1,300,000 men. That sounds like a great many soldiers. In fact, it is but 1 for every 100 of us. We need this force, not to wage aggressive war anywhere, not to send expeditionary forces to Europe, or to Asia, but simply to defend this continent against aggression. Let us see why.

In the first place, we are committed by the Monroe Doctrine to maintain the integrity of the Western Hemisphere. Such a policy implies not only the defense of continental America, from Point Barrow to Tierra del Fuego, but also the denial to an enemy of air bases on any one of the numerous islands within flying radius of the mainland. Above all, it means the maintenance of a Panama Canal continuously open for the transit of the United States fleet.

For the successful accomplishment of these strategic missions, the War Department believes that we must have as a minimum a powerful, mobile army, thoroughly trained and properly equipped, consisting of 27 infantry divisions, two cavalry divisions, and four armored divisions, with the necessary supporting corps, army, and general headquarters units. Based on our own previous peacetime standards, such an army is, indeed, a formidable array but, compared to what other powers have at present, it is relatively a modest figure. Germany, for instance, has between 200 and 250 divisions. Great Britain has crowded into the United Kingdom alone, an area comparable to that of New England, a total of at least 33 divisions. With a similar number of mobile units we hope to protect an entire continent.

In total strength this ground army calls for 850,000 men. To be sure, such a peacetime force would set a new precedent for America, but, in comparison, Germany has five to six million soldiers, while Great Britain has marshaled about one and one-quarter million to resist the Nazi threat.

Since war has entered the third dimension we must keep pace with air progress. War Department plans call for 150,000 men to operate and maintain the necessary Air Corps equipment. Comparison with Germany and Great Britain again illustrates the reasonableness of the Army's plans. The Third Reich boasts of a well-rounded air force of about one-half million men. The Royal Air Force has about 250,000.

To these 850,000 ground and 150,000 air troops we must add 100,000 for our overseas garrisons. These outposts in the Philippine and Hawaiian Islands, in Alaska, in Puerto Rico, and in the Panama Canal Zone provide security for naval and air bases from which our forces can operate to deny hostile access to our shores.

For fixed harbor defenses so necessary for the protection of seaports and naval bases in continental United States, the War Department estimates a need for another 50,000 men. Nor does this number appear excessive when we consider the length of our coast line and the vital importance of our many large cities exposed to attack from the sea.

In addition, 150,000 to 200,000 men will be required for the induction and the initial training of recruits; for their supply, equipment, and medical care; and for other administrative functions connected with the establishment and maintenance of the augmented military forces.

The total in required military manpower thus runs to about 1,300,000. All past and present experiences of the War Department, both in peace and in war, indicate that such a number cannot be recruited on a voluntary basis. The only certain way of getting these men is to adopt a system of compulsory military training.

Since coming to Washington, I have heard the proposition advanced that the reason voluntary enlistments do not produce the necessary numbers is because the term of service, 3 years, is too long; and that a short term of 1 year would bring the desired results.

The War Department does not believe that a system of 1-year voluntary enlistments would serve the purpose. Under such a method of recruiting, it would be impossible to provide orderly organization and training of military units on a time schedule. The number of enlistments would fluctuate from season to season, month to month, week to week, and even day to day. There would be a continuous flow of enlistments and discharges that would make impossible the semblance of smooth, efficient teamwork. It would necessitate a recruiting drive which might serve to win away from the bench and the lathe patriotic skilled workers who could serve best by staying on the job. Such an exodus from the factories might upset our whole program of industrial mobilization.

Voluntary enlistments are haphazard and catch men here and there by emotional appeals. The administration of universal service is orderly. It places men where they can be of most service to their country. It imposes no onus upon those not selected for duty with the armed forces.

The principal objection to voluntary enlistment, however, is that it is undemocratic. In return for equal rights and equal privileges, a democracy demands of its citizens equal duties and equal sacrifices. The obligation to defend America falls with impartial justice upon every citizen.

Voluntary enlistment places the burden upon the patriotic few. Compulsory military training extends it to all. It is the democratic way.

RADIO ADDRESS BY GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

I am speaking tonight because I consider it my duty. It is my duty to tell you that, in my opinion, we face problems of the utmost seriousness, that all the things we hold most dear are gravely threatened. I must tell you that we can defend them only if we make up our minds now to speak the truth without concealment; if we make up our minds to face the truth without flinching; if we make up our minds to act upon the truth without hesitating. I think you will believe me when I say that no war was ever prevented by hiding the danger and by arguing that the danger does not exist.

The men who are best qualified to know what is going on in Europe and in Asia and in this hemisphere, the men whose business it is to know the facts, are very nearly unanimous in believing what I am saying to you tonight—that grave danger for us lurks in the present world situation. So the time has come when we must rise up as a united people to make secure our country's independence and our great inheritance of constitutional liberty.

More than half the world is ruled by men who despise the American idea and have sworn to destroy it. They know that while one great people remains independent and free because it is strong and is brave they can never crush finally the people they have conquered. The example of liberty here will always continue to inspire the resistance to tyranny over there. They are fanatical and they are strong. They are efficient and they are ruthless. Eight nations have tried to appease them. The appeasers of eight nations are dead or in jail or discredited and ruined. In seven of these eight nations the appeasers who would not take the danger seriously, who would not prepare when there was still time, have led their countries to disaster.

It is not hysterical to insist that democracy and liberty are threatened. With democracy and liberty overthrown on the continent of Europe only the British are left to defend democracy and liberty in Europe.

By sending help to the British we can still hope with confidence to keep the war on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, where the enemies of liberty, if possible, should be defeated. But some are bold about what they would do tomorrow, if Great Britain is defeated, and the war comes to this hemisphere. I say to you solemnly that tomorrow may be forever too late to keep war from the Americas. Today may be the last time when by measures short of war we can still prevent war.

We must be ready to meet force with a stronger force. We must make ourselves strong by building up our Army and Navy and the establishment of the principle of universal selected service, which means merely that the men needed are chosen by lot.

And I am telling you tonight, because it is my duty to warn you before it is too late, that the British Navy needs destroyers and small craft to convoy merchant ships, to escort its warships, to hunt submarines, and to repel invasion. We have an immense reserve of destroyers left over from the other war, and in a few months the British will be completing a large number of destroyers of their own. The most critical time, therefore, is the next few weeks and months. If there is anything we can do to help save the British Fleet during that time, we shall be failing in our duty to America if we do not do it.

If a proper method can be found, America will safeguard her freedom and security by making available to the British or Canadian Governments at least 50 of the overage destroyers which are left from the days of the World War. If the destroyers help save the British Fleet, they may save us from the danger and hardship of another war. Americans should not shrink from duty because of possible hazards.

I know that many sincere patriots are frightened at the thought of even the smallest act because they think such acts would lead us closer to the day when another American Expeditionary Force sets sail for Europe. It is my opinion that in this war it would be absolute folly even to consider sending another expeditionary force. No one is considering it, and those who may say that anyone is considering it are deceiving themselves and deceiving you.

We must have the strength of character to face the truth. Foremost among the truths which we will ignore at our peril is that the time needed to build our own defenses may be lengthened if we have the courage to make the small but important contribution which is still within our power toward the sustaining of the British defense.

A new kind of war is loose in the world—fought with all weapons, including treason, and fought most insidiously during what some of our countrymen call "peacetime." It is a war against the civilization that we know. It is a revolution against all the values which we have cherished and which we wish our children to cherish in the future. It is a revolution which denies the dignity of man and which banishes the hope of brotherhood and comradeship on earth. We can see it developing right before our very eyes.

It must be faced with daring and with devotion. We must lift up our hearts. We must reaffirm our noble tradition. We must make ourselves so strong that the tradition we live by shall not perish from the earth.

Answer to Colonel Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last evening the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] delivered a very able address over the Mutual Broadcasting System in reply to Colonel Lindbergh's speech delivered on last Sunday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the last 4 years when war in Europe seemed inevitable, Franklin D. Roosevelt did everything within his limited power to persuade the nations of Europe to adjust their difficulties through peaceful means rather than war. Even to the last hour before Italy entered the struggle the President pleaded with Mussolini to avoid the calamities of war through the arts of peace. He has sent emissaries to Europe to discuss the basis upon which peace with the world could be attempted. For these gestures of good will toward mankind he has been berated in his own country as an interventionist and a warmonger.

But now, when Old World hate and destruction have been fanned into roaring flames by war, we find Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, one of the world's best air pilots, advising the United States to offer Europe a peace plan to end the war. No details of the plan in the colonel's mind are offered. It is a generality of the widest latitude.

However, in this same address the colonel admonishes the Nation not to interfere in the affairs of a foreign nation. What a paradox Colonel Lindbergh seems to think that offering a peace plan to the warring nations of the world would not be interfering with their internal affairs.

In all the advice given by this experienced flyer to the American people concerning our foreign policy there has been a continuous strain of criticism, indirectly at least, of the President of the United States. Again on yesterday Colonel Lindbergh ridiculed and brushed aside as war hysteria the President's statement made to the Congress of the United States that Greenland is only 4 hours by air from Newfoundland and 6 hours by air from New England. The colonel talked about Greenland's Arctic climate, mountainous terrain, and its ice-filled seas as though it were impossible for a plane to land there; yet, in 1933, Germany sent a crew of research men to Greenland who lived there for 6 months. I have talked with the photographer who was in that group. I have seen the pictures taken by him. Airplanes were in constant use during both the warm and cold weather. The leader of this expedition reported to Adolf Hitler, as a result of that survey, that whoever controlled Greenland in the future would control the economic and military policy between Europe and North America. We wonder sometimes about hysterical chatter.

There can be no question that Colonel Lindbergh, along with many others in this country, has attempted to pin, either directly or indirectly, upon the shoulders of the President of the United States the ignominious label of war. But on yesterday the colonel said that we shall not enter the war in Europe. In other words, he has changed his mind since June 15 last. At this moment it is well to examine the record and let the people of the United States know the facts, undistorted by those in this country who do not like President Roosevelt. I quote these statements to demonstrate that our President is a man of peace and not of war.

In August 1936, at Chautauqua, N. Y., President Roosevelt said:

"I hate war. I have passed unnumbered hours—I shall pass unnumbered hours—thinking and planning how war may be kept from this Nation. I wish I could keep war from all nations, but that is beyond my power."

In October 1937, in the city of Chicago, the President said:

"War is a contagion whether it be declared or undeclared. * * * If civilization is to survive, the principles of the Prince of Peace must be restored. Shattered trust between nations must be revived."

He continued:

"America hates war. America hopes for peace. Therefore America actively engages in the search for peace."

Again, in 1939, when the President called the Congress into extraordinary session for the purpose of passing the present Neutrality Act, and at a time when Colonel Lindbergh and others were telling the American people that the repeal of the embargo was a step on the road to war, the President said:

"Let no man or group in any walk of life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America, because I conceive that, regardless of party or section, the mantle of peace and of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the peace bloc. We all belong to it."

And then again, as late as July 10 of this year, in a message to the Congress, the President said:

"That we are opposed to war is known not only to every American but to every government in the world. We will not use our arms in a war of aggression; we will not send our men to take part in European wars."

It is indeed interesting to note in the Colonel's address the statement that this Nation is determined not to go to war. Obviously, I agree with that statement, except with respect to a war in defense of our soil and freedom. However, I am of the opinion that this determination to avoid involvement in the European conflict is not a recent decision but a firm purpose nurtured in the heart of every American for many years.

Yes, my friends; we all belong to the peace bloc in America; but every true and sincere patriot will battle to the last to see that the

ideals of democracy continue in this Nation, even though we might ultimately be surrounded by totalitarian powers on the east and the west. I confess that I was not only amazed but somewhat shocked by Colonel Lindbergh's attitude of complacency toward Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Government. Obviously, that is his American privilege, just as it is my privilege to express a sincere hope that England, the last democracy in Europe, is saved from brutal autocracy. It is freedom of expression, freedom of thought, and freedom of action which we enjoy in America that are always denied by the totalitarian governments once they conquer a country.

Colonel Lindbergh advises the American people that if Germany wins this war, cooperation will be possible. He further said that "cooperation is never impossible where there is sufficient gain on both sides, and that treaties are seldom torn apart when they do not cover a weak nation."

In other words, my friends, treaties with little, weak, and helpless nations mean nothing. And how true that is in the light of recent events. Even Colonel Lindbergh could not have forgotten the ruthless invasion by Adolf Hitler of Holland, a nation that had not drawn her sword for 147 years. No one has forgotten the rape of Denmark and Norway, or the complete annihilation of Poland in 14 days by the mechanized forces of Nazi Germany. None of us has forgotten the violation of the treaties with Austria, Czechoslovakia, and heroic Belgium. No one has forgotten the fall of democratic France; and yet in that address of yesterday Colonel Lindbergh advises us to be cautious about criticizing the present French Government under Marshal Petain, which, as everyone knows, is a Nazi Government. Yes; these are the peaceful, defenseless nations that have been trampled under the iron heel of the dictator, with some 200,000,000 people in complete subjugation and tyranny.

What does Adolf Hitler say about the United States of America? Let no one believe that he has neglected our continent in his plans, notwithstanding the inference of Colonel Lindbergh to the contrary. Hitler said:

"We shall soon have storm troopers in America. We shall train our youth. And we shall have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge. Into the hands of our youth will be given the great statesmanlike mission of Washington which this corrupt democracy has trodden underfoot."

Yes; we find him advising the world that he will restore the work of General Washington and carry on from that point. But Colonel Lindbergh scoffs at the protection the English Navy has given us. He ridicules the idea of an invasion. I hope he is right, but I solemnly remind the American people that the apparent impossible in the last few months in Europe has become accomplished fact.

Colonel Lindbergh said, among other things:

"I would be among the last to advocate depending upon treaties for our national safety. I believe that we should rearm fully for the defense of America."

Why, if, as Colonel Lindbergh says, our troubles can be solved through the treaty-making power, does he advocate in his address of yesterday that America rearm fully for her defense? Why is it that all Democrats and Republicans in both branches of Congress have supported the appropriation of billions upon billions for a sound and adequate national defense? Why is it that the people of this country are interested in a two-ocean navy if peace throughout the world can be maintained by treaty?

Whom do we fear? Is it England? Are we making all of these preparations for fear of the mother country, with her back to the wall, fighting the last great fight for democracy on the other side of the ocean? Do we believe that England somehow will turn and train her guns and men and her ships toward America's shores and invade us? Do we fear Canada with whom we have lived in peace for over a hundred years? If this is the case, why did we not become excited a year ago and appropriate billions for defense when England was at her peak with her Army and her Navy?

No; this rearming for national defense as advocated by Lindbergh and the people of this country is being done for just one purpose, and that is to keep the totalitarian germs of Europe and Asia away from the shores of America. Your people and my people have been migrating to this land of freedom and opportunity for the last 300 years. They left their homes in Europe to escape tyranny, oppression, intolerance, and persecution. It is our job, with unanimity of thought and action, to keep autocracy in the place of its birth.

If American people are looking for guidance and counsel in this hour of American uncertainty, I say, with all due deference to Colonel Lindbergh, that you should stop, look, and listen before you follow this youthful man who has blossomed overnight into an oracle who instructs the world and his country on such momentous problems as war, statesmanship, and diplomacy. Yesterday he admitted that he is no expert on these issues of world-wide significance, but then proceeded to condemn this era of experts, and finally concluded his speech by advising the American people that he has faith in the American Army, the American Navy, and the American air force. And yet these military leaders are the real experts upon whom this Nation must depend for our future guidance in national defense.

My friends, I still contend that Col. Charles A. Lindbergh is a great American flier.

Draft of Capital in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSH LEE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE BY ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today's issue of the Washington News carries on the front page a headline, "Draft idle capital, says Mrs. F. D." Then, in her column on page 18, under the heading "My Day," appears an article endorsing the conscription of capital if men are to be conscripted. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DAY—I AM GLAD TO AGREE WITH THE GENERAL

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Monday.—I am very glad to find myself in agreement with Gen. Hugh Johnson, whom I like personally very much, though I do not frequently have an opportunity to agree with his ideas. He has been writing in favor of the selective draft and in his column on Saturday says something which I believe is true:

"It is simply a question of whether or not we are going to get adequate defense against overseas attack and get it quick enough to keep war away from these shores. We won't get it if we don't get selective service and get it promptly."

With this I agree, but I should like to add something more which I believe every Senator and Congressman, as well as every public servant in the country, no matter whether he is Republican or Democrat, should be watching with the greatest care. We know that in the past some people have profited financially from war. It is one thing to draft young men to give their services to their country and another to draft such capital as may be lying idle for investment in ways which may be deemed necessary for defense and which may mean little or no return to the investor.

The obvious answer is that most capital is in the nature of a trusteeship. Those who have it to invest feel a responsibility to the people (you and me whom they represent in banks and companies) for the way in which they invest it. It is apparent that some people cannot afford to spare anything from small incomes. But the best minds in the country should be occupied at the present time with determining how it can be made equally certain that capital, wherever possible, is drafted for the use of the country in just the way that lives are drafted.

I am no economist. I am not a public servant. I am a mother and a citizen in a democracy, however, and I think it should be clearly put before us exactly how this is being done today. In Congress and in administrative circles this is a responsibility which the people are going to want to be sure is being considered and adequately safeguarded.

Preserving Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

RADIO ADDRESS BY FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the radio address made by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, on the subject, Preserving Our American Heritage.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

Everything that has transpired since the outbreak of the present European war has had a sobering effect on the people of the United States. We have witnessed with feelings of deep concern the triumphant progress of the totalitarian powers and the overthrow of popular institutions of government.

Today England, the last great democracy of Europe, is confronted with the most desperate emergency in her long history, and in the heroic battle she is waging in defense of her national life she has the prayers and the good will of liberty-loving people of the United States and of the whole world.

People are conscious of the fact that this is no ordinary war, but that it constitutes nothing less than a revolution against democracy itself, and that the final triumph of Hitlerism would lower the stature of the average man and woman and blot out most of the progress that has been made by the free nations of the world during many weary centuries.

Under these circumstances, it behooves the people of the United States to look to their own foundations and to take effective steps for the preservation of the ideals and institutions that are dear to every American heart.

OUR RICH INHERITANCE

No people in all history ever possessed a heritage comparable to that which is ours. The United States was generously endowed by nature, which gave us a healthful climate, a fertile soil, abundant mineral resources, and the finest forests in the world. But the fact remains that the preeminence of the United States in the family of nations must be largely attributed to the freedom and security we have enjoyed for more than 150 years, under the form of government established by the forefathers of this country.

Every American worthy of the name should be eager and willing to do his part to preserve, protect, and defend our national heritage and to pass it on unimpaired to our posterity.

We know that the leaders of the totalitarian nations consider the people unfit for self-government. While Mussolini rode into power as a stalwart advocate of popular rights, as soon as he found himself firmly entrenched, he brutally declared that liberty was a rotten corpse. For years Hitler has echoed and personified the same sentiment. What has happened in Russia since the people threw off the yoke of the czars, only to submit to the outrages and brutalities that have characterized the rule of their successors, forms one of the darkest pages of human history.

While no form of government is perfect, it cannot be denied that democratic institutions are far superior to any others, providing the people have the virtue, the intelligence, and the capacity to make them function.

PEOPLE MISLED BY DEMAGOGUES

In looking for the reasons that led to the comparatively easy conquest of France on the part of Hitler and and his mechanized legions, it would not do to ignore the fact that the French people abused their liberties and that to a large extent they were duped and misled by demagogic politicians.

There was a world of meaning in the words used by the venerable Marshall Petain when, in summing up the causes that led to national disaster, he said:

"The people demanded more than they were willing to give."

There is a lesson and a warning in those words that should be heeded by the people of the United States. While many men of the highest character and patriotism adorn our public life, it is true, nevertheless, that we have our full share of mere politicians and demagogues.

If our American system of government is to be maintained and perpetuated, it is necessary that the rank and file of our citizenship should be able to distinguish between the political mountebank and the statesman. As a rule, the demagogue succeeds in getting himself elected to office by catering to the spirit of class; by advocating all sorts of impossible reforms, and by organizing raids on the Public Treasury. All too often the people overemphasize the privileges that go with citizenship, but overlook the duties and responsibilities that in every free country rest upon the citizen.

One of the first duties of every able-bodied citizen is to do his part toward supporting the Government; any attempt to reverse this process, asking the Government to support the citizen, cannot fail in the long run to end in disaster. This is a fundamental principle that we should all keep in mind. Any candidate for public office, posing as a friend of the people, and advocating policies that run counter to this fundamental doctrine must be regarded as a public enemy and should be defeated.

OUR UNWIELDY NATIONAL DEBT

In piling up a debt of monstrous proportions, most of it in a time of profound peace, the United States has already traveled far along the primrose path that leads to decay and destruction. Confronted as we are today with the absolute necessity of raising billions of dollars to make the Nation secure in a military sense, it will soon be borne in upon us that one of the most important elements in any scheme of national preparedness is financial preparedness.

George Washington gave us good advice in his farewell address, when he said: "Cherish public credit." As he also sagely observed, "The way to preserve it is to use it as sparingly as possible." Having ignored this admonition, we must now atone for it by economies and sacrifices that would otherwise not have been necessary.

Wisdom and prudence alike demand that we should shun going into debt unnecessarily any further and that we should strive to regain the road that leads to financial solvency.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP

It is common for legislators and others holding high position to excuse themselves for pursuing unsound policies on the ground that they are responding to the demands of their constituents. But it should be remembered that a real representative of the people is not their unreflecting mouthpiece nor their truckling servant, altering his course to meet each shifting breeze of opinion or puff of passion. He should be the spokesman for their conscience and their better nature as his own deepest and sincerest convictions reveal them to him. Edmund Burke, one of the best friends of the Colonies in the English Parliament at the time of the American Revolution, speaking to the electors of Bristol, happily expressed the duty of a genuine representative to his constituency. He said:

"It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

While it is true that under our form of government Members of Congress are supposed, broadly speaking, to reflect the will of their constituents, those who measure up to their responsibilities and opportunities should also seek to guide and direct public opinion along safe and sound channels.

OVERCENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

The tendency toward overcentralization of government that has been in progress in this country for many years is one that should be checked in the interest of democracy.

While it may have stirred the civic pride of a certain proportion of the people who live in the Nation's Capital to learn that Washington had registered a greater percentage of gain in population than any other large city in the country during the past 10 years; this is not a healthy sign. According to the Census Bureau, the population of Washington during the past decade jumped from 486,000 to 663,000, representing a gain of 36 percent. If all the Government workers who are domiciled in nearby Virginia and Maryland had been included, the gain would have been much greater.

The larger Washington grows, so much the worse for the rest of the country. Let us not forget that there is only one way in which the powers of Federal Government can be expanded, and that is by contracting or restricting in a corresponding degree the rights of the States and of individuals.

This Nation, with its wide domain, its diversified interests, and its huge population, is too great to be either wisely or democratically governed, down to the most minute details affecting the lives of the people, from the seat of the Federal Government in Washington.

I have always believed that we will get the best results if every unit of government—National, State, and local—stays within its proper sphere, each faithfully and efficiently discharging the duties which devolve upon it, and with none encroaching on the rights and prerogatives of the rest.

Speaking of our American heritage, which should be guarded and prized by every man, woman, and child within our borders, let me recall to your minds one of the inspired utterances of George Mason:

"No free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Improvement in Economic Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, the definite upswing in business conditions has been most gratifying; and I have, in several instances, put in recent Appendixes of the

RECORD articles showing economic conditions. This stimulus to business in this season of the year is most unusual, as midsummer is generally a period of no profits.

An article appearing in the Washington Star covering the report of the National City Bank of New York giving the half-year profits shows a most substantial economic improvement. The report definitely states that the companies showing a great percentage of improvement are not companies producing war materials, but are companies covering different major industries. Certainly no one will claim that this source is prejudiced in favor of the administration, but it should be taken as a source of unbiased opinion simply reporting conditions as they exist.

The Star story reporting on the National City Bank of New York letter is written by the financial writer of the Associated Press. It is in part as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 5, 1940]

UPSWING IN PROFITS INDICATES BIG TAX YIELD FOR TREASURY—FEDERAL BUSINESS LEVIES MAY RETURN RICHEST SUM SINCE 1918 AND 1919

(By Frederick Gardner, Associated Press financial writer)

NEW YORK, August 5.—Corporate reports for the first half of 1940 have shown a sharp upswing in profits, indicating revised Federal levies on business earnings may yield the Treasury the richest harvest since 1918 and 1919.

Four hundred leading industrial concerns for the first 6 months reported combined net profit of $648,928,000, compared with $409,123,000 in the initial half of 1939, a gain of 58 percent, according to a tabulation by the National City Bank of New York.

It is only fair to state that I believe that the Roosevelt administration policies have been responsible for this great economic progress and the return of stable prosperity.

Quoting from the August letter of the National City Bank, of New York, I take several paragraphs relating to the half-year's profits and a tabulation of profits of the leading corporations. I ask that they be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HALF YEAR'S PROFITS

Reports issued during the past month by leading corporations show a sharp increase in earnings in most lines of business during the first half year over the earnings of a year ago, accompanying the increase in general business activity. A tabulation of the published statements of 400 industrial corporations gives combined net profits, after taxes and less deficits, of approximately $649,000,000 in the first half of 1940, which compares with $409,000,000 for the same companies in the corresponding period of 1939 and represents a gain of 59 percent. These companies had an aggregate capital and surplus of $11,896,000,000 at the beginning of this year, upon which the 6 months' profits were at an annual rate of 10.9 percent, against a rate of 7 percent upon a slightly smaller net worth a year ago.

* * * * * * *

An examination of the comparative profits for the first half year shows the sharpest gains to have been made in the industries which last year were still relatively depressed.

I call especial attention to this paragraph:

It is noteworthy also that the gains are not confined to the companies producing war materials for the British Government or for our own expanding national-defense program, but instead are widely distributed among the different major industries.

An outstanding gain was registered by the steel companies, whose high rate of operations permitted a lowering of unit costs and a widening of profit margins, despite the temporary reduction in price on certain products. Manufacturers of machinery, tools, and various types of equipment have continued to operate at a high rate, and in some cases have made a larger profit in the first 6 months of 1940 than in the entire year 1939. The automobile industry set a high record in production during the first half year, while auto equipment and accessory plants have been busy on orders from the aircraft industry also. Chemical companies have had heavy demand for their products from the steel and other active industries, but in some instances the increased defense taxes have cut into the margins of net profit.

Profits of leading corporations for the half year—net profits are as reported, after depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves, but before dividends—net worth includes book value of outstanding preferred and common stock and surplus account at beginning of each year

[In thousands of dollars]

Industrial groups	Number	Net profits, half year		Percent change [1]	Net worth, Jan. 1—		Annual rate of return—	
		1939	1940		1939	1940	1939	1940
							Percent	*Percent*
Baking	6	8,981,000	8,215,000	−8.5	211,655,000	208,255,000	8.5	7.9
Food products, miscellaneous	19	34,021,000	35,757,000	+5.1	607,688,000	614,329,000	11.2	11.6
Beverages	7	6,866,000	8,344,000	+21.5	116,655,000	122,704,000	11.8	13.6
Textiles and apparel	14	5,048,000	7,638,000	+51.3	134,764,000	145,051,000	7.5	10.5
Shoes and leather	4	3,284,000	2,989,000	−9.0	118,015,000	118,856,000	5.6	5.0
Wood products	7	144,000	1,770,000	+----	70,072,000	64,208,000	.4	5.5
Paper products	14	3,428,000	8,152,000	+----	151,359,000	160,883,000	4.5	10.1
Chemicals, drugs, etc	26	64,855,000	89,987,000	+38.8	1,181,829,000	1,223,575,000	11.0	14.7
Petroleum products	12	19,505,000	60,298,000	+----	1,394,724,000	1,419,065,000	2.8	8.5
Stone, clay, and glass	15	12,292,000	16,710,000	+35.9	314,662,000	317,894,000	7.8	10.5
Iron and steel:								
United States Steel	1	1,970,000	36,315,000	--------	1,298,907,000	1,314,807,000	0.3	5.5
Other	29	12,766,000	44,887,000	--------	1,423,434,000	1,456,323,000	1.8	6.2
Building equipment	12	2,641,000	7,400,000	--------	216,859,000	209,185,000	2.4	7.1
Electrical equipment	17	26,662,000	44,450,000	+66.7	614,834,000	645,533,000	8.7	13.8
Hardware, tools, etc	12	3,315,000	5,930,000	+78.9	95,259,000	98,881,000	7.0	12.0
Household equipment	10	2,898,000	3,459,000	+19.4	55,797,000	57,167,000	10.4	12.1
Machinery	31	6,876,000	16,420,000	--------	272,345,000	266,511,000	5.0	12.3
Office equipment	10	8,339,000	10,731,000	+28.7	168,918,000	171,344,000	9.9	12.5
Railway equipment	10	1,667,000	9,869,000	--------	181,918,000	173,979,000	1.8	11.3
Automobile:								
General Motors	1	100,993,000	113,575,000	+12.5	1,027,817,000	1,053,560,000	19.7	21.6
Other	10	24,342,000	33,362,000	+37.1	284,426,000	300,254,000	17.1	22.2
Automobile equipment	22	10,849,000	17,648,000	+62.7	159,396,000	170,175,000	13.6	20.7
Metal products, miscellaneous	28	8,971,000	18,644,000	--------	171,638,000	186,521,000	10.5	20.0
Miscellaneous manufacturing	17	8,476,000	7,246,000	−14.5	202,432,000	206,491,000	8.4	7.0
Total manufacturing	334	379,189,000	609,796,000	+60.8	10,475,403,000	10,705,551,000	7.2	11.4
Coal mining	10	[2] −3,020,000	[2] −430,000	--------	215,156,000	201,314,000	--------	--------
Metal mining	10	[2] 8,997,000	[2] 12,745,000	+41.7	288,833,000	292,479,000	6.2	8.7
Mining, quarrying, miscellaneous	9	[2] 6,488,000	[2] 8,043,000	+24.0	109,517,000	110,282,000	11.8	14.6
Trade (wholesale and retail)	21	6,979,000	7,739,000	+10.9	235,629,000	234,672,000	5.9	6.6
Service and construction	16	10,490,000	11,035,000	+5.2	341,532,000	351,835,000	6.1	6.3
Total	400	409,123,000	648,928,000	+58.6	11,666,070,000	11,896,133,000	7.0	10.9

[1] Increases or decreases of more than 100 percent not computed.
[2] Before certain charges.

Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on yesterday I had permission of this body to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely informative editorial pertaining to the situation in the Orient which I think really should be commended to the attention of every Member of Congress. The editorial was from the New York Daily News and was republished in the columns of the Washington Times-Herald. I ask that that be followed by publication in the Appendix of today's RECORD of another extremely interesting and informative article which was published in the columns of the Washington Times-Herald of August 5 under the heading "We have no excuse for war with Japan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NEWS—WE HAVE NO EXCUSE FOR WAR WITH JAPAN?

There can be no longer doubt that the United States Government is contemplating the projection of this Nation into war, not only with Germany and Italy but with Japan, and possibly, although unwillingly, with Russia as well.

Russia seems to be in friendly and profitable alliance with other totalitarian powers and to be participating in the fighting whenever it can advantageously add territory.

It has added territory amazingly up to date.

It has acquired part of Finland and probably will soon acquire all of that unhappy country.

It has possessed itself of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

It has taken over half of Poland and the Bessarabia section of Rumania.

In fact, it has gained more by the war than any other nation, because it has permanently acquired its occupied territories while Germany has only temporarily occupied a large part of her conquered terrain.

Japan, having made its peace with Russia and having been affronted by England, has definitely decided to oppose England's interests and to renew its association with Germany and Italy.

So it would be easy for the United States to precipitate hostilities with all four of these nations if it insists upon doing so.

In very fact, it would be difficult to engage one of them in conflict at the present time without involving the others in the conflict before it is ended.

Consequently, the lack of vision shown in the report of the United States naval high command to President Roosevelt becomes appallingly apparent.

There is every likelihood that Japan would, if attacked, have the same sort of assistance from powers friendly to it that Germany has had from Italy and Russia.

But even without that support the conception of the conquest of Japan in 3 weeks is so visionary as to spread alarm through the Nation.

If there is such a dull and distorted idea of the situation among our naval commanders before the war which Mr. Roosevelt is considering, how dull and how distorted might be the conduct of the war.

No naval war with a navy four-fifths the strength of ours and conducted at a distance of 4,000 miles from our base, and in close contact with its own fortified bases, can be concluded in 3 weeks.

Even the Cuban War, where the American Navy was twice the strength of Spain's and where the theater of operations was mainly at our door, was not concluded for a year.

And even then the United States never attacked or attempted to conquer Spain, the homeland of our opponent, but only to free Spain's colonies.

The very distance from the base of operations, which makes the United States comparatively safe from attack from Japan if we are at all adequately defended, makes Japan almost equally safe from attack from us.

Distance may lend enchantment to the view, but it certainly adds difficulty to any military or naval enterprise.

Theodore Roosevelt, who was a practical soldier, always realized this and considered war upon us by Japan and by us upon Japan equally impractical and improbable if both were adequately prepared for defense.

There is no doubt of the adequacy of Japan's preparedness.

There may be some doubt of our own on the west coast.

Nevertheless our Navy, if concentrated in the Pacific, would protect us from all aggression except sporadic air attack.

However, if any part of our Navy were required for defense of the Atlantic coast, our ratio of naval strength compared to Japan's would no longer be 5 to 3.73. It might be 2.50 to 3.73 in favor of Japan.

Then we could not be so sure that the air attack would be sporadic.

It might be sustained and might result in the destruction of our wonderful west-coast cities.

The plain facts are that we are not strong enough to be dictatorial.

We are not sufficiently prepared to wage offensive war and the wisest and safest thing we can do is to keep out of war, at least until we are prepared for it.

We cannot win battles with ships which are "under order" and which it will take 3 or 4 years to build.

We cannot make soldiers without equipment which it will take a year or two to provide.

We have not even got our air-defense forces on a modern basis, and as for coast-defense guns and air-defense guns, we are dangerously and ridiculously deficient.

For nearly 8 years nothing has been done, although billions have been spent to prepare for war, and now this impractical and improvident Government of ours is considering projecting us into war without adequate equipment or preparation—without effective defense from the attack we would invite.

Would it not be well to consider not only what might happen to Japan, but what might happen to the United States.

Do we desire, like poor France, to precipitate a war for which we are not prepared?

How silly it seems now for France to be indicting Daladier and his government for having gotten it into war.

What satisfaction can there be in such action?

How much better it would have been for France to have kept out of a war in which it had so much to lose and so little to gain.

How much better it would be for us to learn from the experience of others and keep out of a war for which we are in no way prepared—not to one-tenth the extent that France was prepared.

We have nothing to gain in a war with Japan.

We have everything to lose.

There is nothing that Japan has that we want to take.

There is nothing that we have that we want war with Japan to destroy—not our youth—not our cities—not our slowly reviving prosperity—not our social system—not our peace and happiness.

Let us realize and appreciate our benefits.

Let us conserve and protect our advantages.

Let us maintain the independence our fathers won for us and the isolation God in His goodness gave us.

South America Doubts United States Power in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, we are all extremely interested in what is going to take place in South America, perhaps before this war ends, but certainly immediately after the war ends, because within the past year we have suddenly become more thoroughly interested in our neighbors to the south than ever before, although our distinguished and beloved colleague, who unfortunately was taken from us a number of months ago, the beloved J. Hamilton Lewis, took every occasion to mention that interest on the floor of the Senate from day to day.

The Washington Daily News is now publishing—the series began yesterday—articles pertaining to the situation in South America, relating to all subjects in which we naturally find ourselves interested. These articles are being written by Mr. William Philip Simms, who has recently made a

15,000-mile tour of the republics in Central and South America. I am confident that some of our colleagues have taken advantage of the opportunity of reading these articles, because they are excellent, in my humble opinion. The first appeared yesterday, entitled "South America Doubts United States Power in Crisis." I ask that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH AMERICA DOUBTS UNITED STATES POWER IN CRISIS

(By William Philip Simms)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Mr. Simms, who got out of Paris just ahead of the German troops and flew back to the United States, left almost at once on an aerial swing around South America. Today, in the first of a series of dispatches, he tells what he found in the Latin countries.)

American history hangs in the balance. The way the balance will swing depends upon whether Hitler crushes England or comes to grief against the white cliffs of Dover.

That, in a paragraph, is the well-nigh unanimous conviction of statesmen, diplomats, and businessmen south of the Caribbean as expressed to me during a 15,000-mile journey by Pan-American Airways which took me almost to Cape Horn.

The whole of the Western Hemisphere, as they see it, is face to face with the acutest dangers. This, they agree, is particularly true of the United States.

If Hitler wins his "blitzkrieg" against the British Isle, South America will almost certainly go totalitarian. That is, the more important countries will. And if they do, their ties with Germany will immediately tighten, and the United States may find itself isolated.

The Havana conference, leading South Americans told me, changed none of the fundamentals. If and when it comes to a showdown, the United States will have to bear the brunt of any invasion—whether economic or military.

Economically, South Americans are prepared to play ball with a Hitler-dominated Europe and a Japanized Asia. I found surprisingly few who expressed fear that political control might follow in the wake of a revived German trade.

Militarily, in the modern sense, they have nothing to fight with. Hence the chief meaning of the act of Habana is that the United States is now privileged to use its own Army, Navy, and air force to prevent Germany, Italy, or Japan from taking over British, French, and Dutch possessions in this hemisphere—a privilege the United States has already been claiming under the Monroe Doctrine for 117 years.

SITUATION HAS CHANGED

Even so, there is a growing belief among South Americans that the United States, at present, is wholly unprepared to make the Monroe Doctrine stick as intended. In the past Uncle Sam has waved the Doctrine under the noses of meddling foreign powers and warned them to keep hands off the Western World, all the way from Alaska's Point Barrow to Tierra del Fuego.

"And it has worked," I told an Argentinean pridefully. "They've kept their hands off."

"Sure," he replied. "But that was because Britain has always maintained some sort of balance of power in Europe—the only area from which any real challenge might have come. In fact, it was a British foreign secretary, George Canning, who suggested a doctrine. And as long as Britain looked on it with favor, no other power felt like doing anything about it."

"And now?" I asked.

"If Germany wins, she will dominate Europe. There will be no balance of power, and probably no British Fleet to stand between us and whatever unscrupulous nations might wish to expand in our direction. With nothing to fear from a down-and-out England and France—or from Russia, whose chief desire of the moment is to see the United States and Japan in a war so she can gobble up the pieces—what's to keep Hitler from crossing the Atlantic?"

THREAT FROM ORIENT

I said Uncle Sam's Navy might keep it from crossing. He said: "And leave Hawaii, the Philippines, your rubber and tin routes to the East Indies, and the Pacific approaches to Panama Canal unguarded? Have you any guaranty that Japan won't strike the moment you mix with Germany in the Atlantic?"

"The dictators," he continued, rubbing it in, "have a way of striking without warning. That is one of the lessons of the past year. Another is that they hit when and where they know their victims are weakest. The States can rearm adequately, of course, for they have both the money and the men. But can they—and will they—rearm in time?"

It may surprise you and hurt your pride to hear this, but South Americans seem to doubt our ability to cope with the totalitarian world now aborning. It is not surprising, therefore, that they hesitate to antagonize the totalitarian powers now in control of the areas which, in the past, have provided a market for 60 to 70 percent of their exports.

They are waiting to see which way the cat is going to jump.

Lindbergh Pleads Against Mixing in Europe's Affairs in Soldiers Field Rally at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6 (legislative day of Monday, August 5), 1940

ADDRESS BY COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh will live in American history long after his little critics now swirling around his shoe tops are wholly forgotten. His outstanding Americanism cannot be questioned. His prophesies away back in 1936 as to the future course of history and the comparative strength of Germany's air force with other European nations now stand revealed as perfect and correct.

Let America never forget the great Lindbergh family. Their wisdom is the wisdom of great American patriots. The colonel has the good sense to follow in the footsteps of the fathers and founders of our country. Long live Colonel Lindbergh and the great cause he represents.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Colonel Lindbergh at Soldiers Field, Chicago, on last Sunday may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Several weeks have passed since I received the honor of your invitation to speak in Chicago. At that time it was essential to create strong and immediate opposition to the trend toward war which was taking place in this country.

The agitation for our entry into the war was increasing with alarming rapidity. Hysteria had mounted to the point where anti-parachute corps were being formed to defend American cities against air attacks from Europe. Greenland, with its Arctic climate, its mountainous terrain, and its ice-filled seas, was called an easy stepping stone for German bombing planes invading America.

FOREIGN PROPAGANDA CITED

Cartoons showed the Atlantic Ocean reduced to the width of the English Channel. American safety was said to depend upon the success of European armies. Foreign propaganda was in full swing, and it seemed in many ways that we were approaching the greatest crisis in the history of our country.

But events move swiftly in this modern world, and the true character of a nation lies beneath such surface foam. When the danger of foreign war was fully realized by our people the underlying tradition of American independence arose, and in recent weeks its voice has thundered through the weaker cries for war.

We have by no means escaped the foreign entanglements and favoritisms that Washington warned us against when he passed the guidance of our Nation's destiny to the hands of future generations. We have participated deeply in the intrigues of Europe, and not always in an open, "democratic" way.

CONSTANT VIGILANCE URGED—WARNING ISSUED ON INTERESTS SEEKING WAR ENTRY

There are still interests in this country and abroad who will do their utmost to draw us into the war. Against these interests we must be continuously on guard. But American opinion is now definitely and overwhelmingly against our involvement.

Both political parties have declared against our entry into the war. People are beginning to realize that the problems of Europe cannot be solved by the interference of America. We have at last started to build and to plan for the defense of our own continent. By these acts our eyes are turned once more in the direction of security and peace, for if our own military forces are strong, no foreign nation can invade us, and, if we do not interfere with their affairs, none will desire to.

Since we have decided against entering the war in Europe, it is time for us to consider the relationship we will have with Europe after this war is over. It is only by using the utmost intelligence in establishing and maintaining this relationship that we can keep America out of war in the future.

I have a different outlook toward Europe than most people in America. In consequence, I am advised to speak guardedly on the subject of the war. I am told that one must not stand too strongly against the trend of the times, and that, to be effective, what one says must meet with general approval.

OFFERS OPINION AS CITIZEN

There is much to be said for this argument, yet, right or wrong, it is contrary to the values that I hold highest in life. I prefer to say what I believe, or not to speak at all. I would far rather have your respect for the sincerity of what I say than attempt to win your applause by confining my discussion to popular concepts. Therefore, I speak to you today as I would speak to close friends, rather than as one is supposed to address a large audience.

I do not offer my opinion as an expert but rather as a citizen who is alarmed at the position our country has reached in this era of experts. As laymen we are often told that the solution of difficult problems should be left to the specialist.

But since specialists differ in the solutions they recommend, they must at least allow us the privilege of choosing those we wish to follow. And in making this choice it seems that we are back where we started and must form an opinion of our own.

FALSE IMPRESSIONS PREVALENT

I found conditions in Europe to be very different from our concept of them here in the United States. Anyone who takes the trouble to read through back issues of our newspapers cannot fail to realize what a false impression we had of the belligerent nations.

We were told that Germany was ripe for revolution, that her rearmament was a bluff, that she lacked officers, that she flew her airplanes from one field to another so they would be counted again and again by foreign observers.

We were informed that Russia had the most powerful air fleet in the world; that the French Army was superior to any in Europe; that the British Navy was more than a match for the German air force; that Germany lacked enough food, fuel, and raw material to wage war; that the Maginot line was impregnable; that Italy would never enter a war against England. Statements of this sort have issued forth in an endless stream from Europe, and anyone who questioned their accuracy was called a Nazi agent.

MISLED ABOUT EUROPE—BOTH MILITARY AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS DIFFERENT

These examples show how greatly we have been misled about the military conditions in Europe. If one goes still farther back, he will find that we have also been misled about political conditions. It has seemed obvious to me for many years that the situation in Europe would have to change, either by agreement or by war. I hoped that we had reached a degree of civilization where change might come by agreement. Living in Europe made me fear that it would come only through war.

There is a proverb in China which says that "when the rich become too rich and the poor too poor something happens." This applies to nations as well as to men.

When I saw the wealth of the British Empire I felt that the rich had become too rich. When I saw the poverty of Central Europe I felt that the poor had become too poor. That something would happen was blazoned even on the skies of Europe by mounting thousands of fighting aircraft.

GERMAN STRENGTH GIGANTIC

From 1936 to 1939, as I traveled through European countries, I saw the phenomenal military strength of Germany growing like a giant at the side of an aged and complacent England. France was awake to her danger, but far too occupied with personal ambitions, industrial troubles, and internal politics to make more than a feeble effort to rearm. In England there was organization without spirit. In France there was spirit without organization. In Germany there were both.

I realized that I was witnessing a clash between the heirs of another war. A generation had passed since the treaty of Versailles. The sons of victory and the sons of defeat were about to meet on the battlefields of their fathers.

As I traveled first among those who had won, and then among those who had lost, the words of a French philosopher kept running through my mind: "Man thrives on adversity."

The underlying issue was clear. It was not the support of democracy, or the so-called democratic nations would have given more assistance to the struggling republic of post-war Germany.

It was not a crusade for Christianity, or the Christian nations of the west would have carried their battle flags to the confiscated churches of Russia.

It was not the preservation of small and helpless nations or sanctions would have been followed by troops in Abyssinia, and England would not have refused to cooperate with the United States in Manchuria.

ISSUE ONE OF OLDEST—TERRITORY AND WEALTH ROOTS OF CONFLICT

The issue was one of the oldest and best known among men. It concerned the division of territory and wealth between nations. It has caused conflict in Europe since European history began.

The longer I lived in Europe the more I felt that no outside influence could solve the problems of European nations, or bring them lasting peace. They must work out their destiny, as we must work out ours. I am convinced that the better acquainted we in America become with the background of European conflicts the less we will desire to take part in them.

But here I would like to make this point clear: While I advocate the noninterference by America in the internal affairs of Europe, I believe it is of the utmost importance for us to cooperate with Europe in our relationships with the other peoples of the earth. It is only by cooperation that we can maintain the supremacy of our western civilization and the right of our commerce to proceed unmolested throughout the world. Neither they nor we are strong enough to police the earth against the opposition of the other.

NEW DOMINANCE POSSIBLE

In the past we have dealt with a Europe dominated by England and France. In the future we may have to deal with a Europe dominated by Germany. But whether England or Germany wins this war, western civilization will still depend upon two great centers, one in each hemisphere.

With all the aids of modern science, neither of these centers is in a position to attack the other successfully as long as the defenses of both are reasonably strong. A war between us could easily last for generations, and bring all civilization tumbling down, as has happened more than once before. An agreement between us could maintain civilization and peace throughout the world as far into the future as we can see.

But we are often told that if Germany wins this war cooperation will be impossible, and treaties no more than scraps of paper. I reply that cooperation is never impossible when there is sufficient gain on both sides, and that treaties are seldom torn apart when they do not cover a weak nation.

URGES REARMING FOR DEFENSE

I would be among the last to advocate depending upon treaties for our national safety. I believe that we should rearm fully for the defense of America, and that we should never make the type of treaty that would lay us open to invasion, if it were broken. But if we refuse to consider treaties with the dominant nation of Europe, regardless of who that may be, we remove all possibility of peace.

Nothing is to be gained by shouting names and pointing the finger of blame across the ocean. Our grandstand advice to England, and our criticism of her campaigns, has been neither wanted nor helpful.

Our accusations of aggression and barbarism on the part of Germany simply bring back echoes of hypocrisy and Versailles. Our hasty condemnation of a French Government, struggling desperately to save a defeated nation from complete collapse, can do nothing but add to famine, hatred, and chaos.

If we desire to keep America out of war, we must take the lead in offering a plan for peace. That plan should be based upon the welfare of America. It should be backed by an impregnable system of defense. It should incorporate terms of mutual advantage. But it should not involve the internal affairs of Europe; they never were, and never will be, carried on according to our desires.

Let us offer Europe a plan for the progress and protection of the western civilization of which they and we each form a part. But whatever their reply may be, let us carry on the American destiny of which our forefathers dreamed as they cut their farm lands from the virgin forests. What would they think of the claim that our frontiers lie in Europe?

COUNSELS GUARD OF INDEPENDENCE

Let us guard the independence that the soldiers of our revolution won against overwhelming odds. What I ask you, would those soldiers say if they could hear this Nation, grown 130,000,000 strong, being told that only the British Fleet protects us from invasion?

Our Nation was born of courage and hardship. It grew on the fearless spirit of the pioneer. Now that it has become one of the greatest powers on earth, ours must not be the generation that kneels in fear of future hardships, or of invasion by a Europe already torn by war.

I do not believe we will ever accept a philosophy of calamity, weakness, and fear. I have faith in an American army, an American navy, an American air force—and, most important of all, the American character which, in normal times, lies quietly beneath the surface of this Nation.

My Report to the People of Grays Harbor County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN F. SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my established practice, I hereby render my report and account of my official record to the citizens of Grays Harbor County.

I agree with the many thousands of citizens who have written to me that our first task remains that of keeping our country out of war. I shall continue my vigorous support of neutrality legislation. We are the only neutral nation in the world whose ships and citizens have not been attacked.

I shall cooperate vigorously in supporting President Roosevelt's national-defense program, and am remaining at my post of duty in order to do so.

May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank my fellow citizens for their kind expressions of approval of my work in Congress. Their generous letters have been a source of inspiration and encouragement.

Influence in Congress depends upon seniority of service on important committees. Why throw away the influence of seniority and experience? What do candidates have to offer except their own personal ambition? I now rank sixth out of a membership of 27 on the powerful Rivers and Harbors Committee, having started at the bottom of the ladder in 1933. As a direct result, we have had more regular worthy river and harbor, jetty and flood-control projects approved and carried out in southwest Washington during my period of service than during the entire previous history of our State. It is also my privilege to be chairman of the Pensions Committee, which gives me added rank and prestige in the House. I also am serving on the important Committee on Education, vital to the students and faculties in our public schools and colleges, and on the Indian Affairs and War Claims Committees.

When politicians are desperate they sometimes resort to issues of the most trivial and amusing nature, and this year for the first time the Congressman's county of legal residence is seemingly being made such an issue.

I have been a permanent resident of southwest Washington for 30 years and have been continuously visiting all the communities in the district and am therefore thoroughly familiar with conditions and problems in every community. However, length of residence in the district is important, for a comparative newcomer from a distant part of the State could not be expected to know our people nor our problems and would consequently not be qualified to represent our interests effectively.

The particular city or county in which the Congressman resides has absolutely no bearing on his effectiveness to serve his district, which depends on his length of service, his rank, and his experience.

SERVICE IN CONGRESS—THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman MARVIN JONES, of Texas, who is retiring after 24 years in Congress, paid a tribute the other day to the seasoned Members of the House.

The rest of the States, he said, should follow the example of Texas in reelecting its Congressmen, then they would control more committee chairmanships. Texas, with 21 Members in the House today, holds 5 chairmanships, he pointed out. It is exceeded only by New York with 6 out of its 45 Members holding committee chairmanships. The Texas Congressman ended by quoting former Speaker Champ Clark:

A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

IMPROVED BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The steady improvement in business conditions and recovery from the depths of 1929–33 continues.

I shall never forget the gloom and despair of the merchants, laborers, farmers, and people generally in 1932 in Hoquiam, Aberdeen, Montesano, Elma, Oakville, Porter, Malone, Copalis Beach, Quinault, Moclips, Pacific Beach, Taholah, and all the communities in Grays Harbor County. There were hardly any jobs or money in circulation—prices were down and there was no market. Conditions are vastly different now, and we are far better situated than we were then.

GOVERNMENT AND COOPERATION

Not only has this beneficial change been wrought but our Government has also aided and cooperated in the construction of many worth-while projects which make our local communities better places in which to live.

GRAYS HARBOR JETTIES—INNER CHANNEL OF GRAYS HARBOR

When I entered upon my service as a Member of Congress in 1933 and succeeded in obtaining membership on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I had two very difficult tasks, to the performance of which I had pledged my best and untiring efforts. The first was to secure, if possible, a reversal of the previous unfavorable engineering reports and failure to secure committee and congressional action on the Grays Harbor high-water-jetty projects, which we of Grays Harbor had sought without success for 20 years. I introduced a resolution for review of the unfavorable reports, and after obtaining its adoption by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, succeeded in my endeavors to have the Board of Army Engineers, Washington, D. C., go to Grays Harbor and make a personal inspection of the condition of the harbor and observe the extent to which the old jetties constructed 30 years ago had been beaten down and washed away. When the district and division engineers handed down conflicting reports, it became even more difficult to obtain the desired reversal of the previous rejections of the project by the entire Board of Engineers, but this was finally accomplished. Complete hearings were then held before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, before which I made a full presentation of the project. After receiving the approval of the committee the project was subsequently included in the omnibus river and harbor bill, and the project was authorized by Congress and items included for its construction in appropriation bills, until, altogether, $4,925,000 has been expended to date for the reconstruction of the south jetty, and the first $500,000 has been secured to commence the construction of the north jetty, at an estimated cost of $2,365,000, a total investment by the Federal Government of approximately $7,290,000 on a project which had been abandoned and was considered hopeless until I came to Congress.

My second task was to save, if possible, the citizens and taxpayers the cost of dredging the inner channel of Grays Harbor. This was also an extremely difficult task. From 1919 to 1934 the citizens of Grays Harbor paid annually $58,000 for dredging the inner channel of Grays Harbor, amounting to approximately $1,000,000, which we paid in millage on our taxes on our homes, businesses, and farms. In 1934, after following through the protracted procedure, and finally gaining the approval of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the engineers' reports, and then securing the legislative authorization by Congress and adoption of the project, and the necessary appropriations, we had this burden shifted to the Federal Government. In the past 6 years this action has resulted in an actual total saving to the taxpayers, home owners, businessmen, and farmers of Grays Harbor County of $348,000 in cash money, which we have not had to pay in taxes as we had done in the past. This saving of $348,000 is more than the entire cost of paying all the salaries of all the county officials of Grays Harbor County during this period. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have received at all times from the efficient port manager, W. J. Murphy, and the port commissioners.

MONTESANO POST OFFICE

The citizens of Montesano sought a new post-office building for 20 years previous to my election to Congress in 1932. I immediately introduced a bill to authorize its construction and in 1934 obtained the allocation of funds. Early in 1935 actual construction was commenced and on November 16, 1935, the fine new building was completed and formally dedicated. It is considered by postal officials to be one of the most beautiful and practical buildings of its size in the State and is a credit to the progressive city of Montesano. The building, site, furnishings, and fixtures cost $59,836.

Bills for new post-office buildings for Aberdeen and Elma have been advanced to favorable positions and they will be constructed whenever a new public building program is undertaken, depending upon the duration of the national-defense emergency.

FLOOD CONTROL—HOQUIAM

Following the floods in 1933 I secured the enactment by Congress in 1934 of the first bills ever enacted into law for flood-control surveys of the Chehalis, Cowlitz, Columbia, and Lewis Rivers. In 1935 I obtained a change in the requirement heretofore made by the Federal Government in other parts of the country that the local communities match the Federal

Government in defraying the cost of dikes and flood preventive work. The Hoquiam project was the first project in the State of Washington and in the United States where the Federal Government bore the entire cost, $205,000, which saved the property owners and taxpayers 55 percent of that sum, approximately $112,750, as the original basis was for a grant of 45 percent and a loan to the city of 55 percent at interest. City Attorney James P. H. Callahan had written me:

> The State has no funds to match the Federal appropriation * * * and the city cannot raise the amount required legally or otherwise.

Finally, after stressing to Gen. E. M. Markham, the Chief of United States Army Engineers, the financial straits Hoquiam was in, I was notified by him on August 22, 1935, that the Government would grant to the city of Hoquiam $205,000 as an outright grant, the only provision being that the city had to furnish the necessary rights-of-way and construct approximately 3,100 feet of wood sheet-pile bulkhead at an estimated cost of $20,000. City Attorney Callahan, who prepared all the applications and documents in behalf of the city of Hoquiam, and with whom I had all my correspondence relating to the matter, wrote me:

> On behalf of the citizens of Hoquiam, I sincerely thank you for your efforts.

Hoquiam has received numerous school, street, sewer, cemetery, tennis court, playfield, and other useful Federal projects costing approximately $600,000.

ABERDEEN PROJECTS

In addition to the jetties and inner channel, water system, streets, sewers, and culverts, storm sewers, drainage, park, Aberdeen Game Hatchery at a cost of $77,054, school, road, Aberdeen Target Range, and a great variety of municipal projects have been constructed in Aberdeen, aggregating a total cost of approximately $1,000,000. To this should be added the $200,000 W. P. A. city-wide street-improvement project which was recently approved by President Roosevelt, with work to start about the middle of August.

AIR AND SEAPLANE BASE

I have introduced a bill to authorize an appropriation of $1,000,000 for an airplane and seaplane base on Grays Harbor, as a companion measure to a similar bill for Willapa Harbor, aeronautical experts to decide which site is preferable. The proposal will be studied and considered as a part of the national-defense program.

BONNEVILLE—$70,000,000 PROJECT

I shall always be proud of my sponsorship of the original legislation creating the great Bonneville project and my active participation during the years in every step to bring its benefits to the citizens and communities of Grays Harbor County and our district. On March 4, 1938, the late John D. Ross, administrator of the Bonneville project, wrote me:

> I wish to express my deep appreciation of your efforts in obtaining the Bonneville appropriation through the House. The cooperation which I received while in Washington and since I left has pleased me very much.

Bonneville will always remain a monument to the memory of this sturdy champion of public power for all the people.

On March 27, 1939, Charles E. Carey, acting administrator, wrote me:

> With friends like you in Congress we feel that the future of Bonneville is in safe hands. We will do everything we can to see that your friends in southwestern Washington are fully advised of your service and active support of the Bonneville project.

In this session of Congress I appeared twice before the Appropriations Committee and testified at length in support of increased appropriations this year, which we succeeded in obtaining so the work can continue unabated.

Under date of June 20, 1940, Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, wrote me:

> I want to express my appreciation for the very able assistance which you gave this administration in connection with our request for an appropriation sufficient to meet our construction needs to get power from the Bonneville Dam to the market areas.

I have actively supported our rural-electrification projects, which are, of course, valuable adjuncts to Bonneville.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

During the period from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1939, there was expended by the Federal Government in Grays Harbor County, in addition to the jetties and inner channel, the sum of $8,804,150, and loaned therein the additional sum of $2,955,909, a total of $11,760,059.

Flood control, drainage, school, playgrounds, streets, fish hatchery, game hatchery, road, water system, sewer, park, bridge, cemetery, fire department, tennis court, city buildings, recreation camps, community buildings, athletic fields projects have been provided and will constitute valuable community assets for many years to come and serve future generations as well as our own.

MY PROGRESSIVE LABOR RECORD

During the period of my service as a Member of Congress I have supported and voted for every piece of legislation of benefit to labor. I realize that our business prosperity is measured by the income and wages received by labor and agriculture. I have therefore supported their reasonable demands 100 percent. We have conferred upon labor the same right as that enjoyed by their employers, namely, to bargain collectively in regard to wages, working hours, and working conditions. I have had the active support of every branch of organized labor and the railroad brotherhoods ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and intend to continue to merit and deserve their support in the future as I have in the past. I have likewise heartily supported all legislation designed to accord to our Federal and Postal workers more liberal treatment. They serve the public faithfully and efficiently and should be treated accordingly.

WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

For 4 years I served as a member of the steering committee of 22 House Members which led the successful fight for the soldiers' bonus. Instead of paying our veterans in bullets, tear bombs, and poison gas, the way the bonus army was "paid," we paid in cash in 1936 the bonus which had been delinquent since 1924. Veterans in Grays Harbor County thus received $1,307,487.64. They had considered it a matter of such vital importance that on December 18, 1934, and December 20, 1934, some 72 business firms and veterans carried full-page ads in the Aberdeen World and Hoquiam Washingtonian setting forth the benefits which would, and did, result from such payment.

I have sponsored two bills familiar to every Spanish War veteran, the Smith bill of 1935, paying their pensions in full, and the Philippine travel-pay bill of 1940, as well as numerous other measures for hospitalization, increased benefits, and so forth.

I have favored every bill in the interests of the veterans of the World War, their widows, and dependents which has come before Congress, and am nationally known for my active support of veterans' legislation. I shall continue this policy, for it is my firm belief that it is the solemn duty and sacred obligation of our Government never to forget but always to remember and to compensate to the fullest possible extent those who have defended our Republic. I hereby acknowledge the fine cooperation I have always received from the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United Spanish War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, and their auxiliaries.

FEDERAL HOUSING—HOME OWNERS' LOANS—BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPOSITS

As one of the five Members of the House who conferred with President Roosevelt March 20, 1934, and sponsored the first housing legislation in Congress, I am gratified at the benefits which have accrued therefrom to our people. In Grays Harbor County 253 citizens have received loans aggregating $721,100 for the construction, modernization, and repair of their homes. This has been of vast benefit to the workers in the building trades, including electricians, painters, and plumbers, and the lumber, plywood, shingle, and other allied industries.

I actively supported the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act and am glad that 521 citizens in Grays Harbor County have received loans aggregating $859,965.79. I expressed my belief in this legislation on April 28, 1933, in these words:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to render available the sum of $2,000,000,000 to restore, redeem, rehabilitate, and save the homes of many of the American people; and, Mr. Speaker, when we save the homes of the American people, we save America.

Depositors in the 8 banks in Grays Harbor County have their deposits up to $5,000 insured by the Federal Government under the acts of Congress which I heartily supported and voted for. The 5,640 depositors in 5 savings and loan associations likewise have their deposits insured under the same legislation. I am happy and proud that the Roosevelt administration has provided this protection and security for our people and that it has been my privilege to have a humble part in bringing about these great reforms which should have been introduced many years ago.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

I have been an ardent, outspoken advocate of old-age pensions during my service in Congress. I have continued the interest, which as a veteran member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, I have manifested for the past 25 years. I have on every occasion promptly signed every petition to bring old-age pension and general-welfare legislation before the Congress for action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly espouse the Townsend plan in 1934 and in a brief 6 years have, as a member of the steering committee, actively participated in the growth of our movement until today we are approximating a sufficient following in the House of Representatives to enact our legislation in its present form into law. The United States Senate recently for the first time authorized a thorough study of the Townsend plan. In view of this progress we confidently expect to reelect a sufficient number of our old supporters and elect a sufficient number of new supporters in the elections this year to enact H. R. 8264 into law in the next Congress.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

As an active member of the House Committee on Education, I have vigorously favored providing in public-works and relief-appropriation bills adequate funds to aid in paying the salaries of school teachers and maintain, repair, and improve our public-school buildings, as well as institutions of higher learning, as I consider the cause of public education and the recommendations of our Parent-Teacher Associations to be paramount.

I favor the following program:

First. Adequate free public education for the children of the United States.

Second. Adequate pay for public-school teachers as a matter of justice and as a means of retaining in and attracting to the teaching profession the most competent, devoted, and best-equipped men and women.

Third. An annual minimum of at least 8 months' teaching in the public schools of all the States.

Fourth. An adequate number of safe, commodious, and well-equipped school buildings.

Fifth. Free textbooks for all public-school pupils.

Sixth. Adequate assistance by the Federal Government, through appropriations and otherwise, in accomplishing the foregoing objects.

Seventh. Such of the allied purposes as may serve the best interests of the teachers and pupils and the Parent-Teacher Associations in making the public schools a more effective, far-reaching, and American force in local, State, and National life.

FARM LEGISLATION

The farm problem is recognized as the most difficult with which we have to deal, having been acute since 1920. We have done more for the farmer than any previous national administration and have, since 1932, doubled our farm income. We have recaptured our lost foreign export trade in agricultural products, without sacrificing our home markets, and should you desire the official Government statistics bearing on this entire subject, please write to the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., or write to me and I shall be glad to obtain them for you. Self-seeking politicians running for office do not hesitate to distort and misrepresent the facts. Therefore, if you are interested in ascertaining the true facts, I shall be glad to assist you in doing so. We have not entirely solved the farm problem, but we have made more progress toward a solution than any previous national administration.

The condition of the farmer everywhere is much better than it was in 1932, when his prices and market were the worst in the history of modern agriculture. Think back to 1932 and compare the lot of the average farmer in your own neighborhood as it was then with his condition today in 1940 and you will realize this fact. We intend to keep on helping the farmer. It remains my opinion that the Grange cost-of-production plan to insure the farmer parity prices with industry, offers the best solution of the farm problem. In the next Congress I shall again vigorously support it. During my entire service in Congress I have never cast a single vote detrimental to agriculture and would be glad to have you verify this fact by writing to Mr. Ervin E. King, Master of the Washington State Grange, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash., or Mr. Fred Brenckman, legislative representative, National Grange, 1343 H Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

FISH AND GAME RESOURCES

One of the most important enterprises which can be encouraged by the Federal Government is the developing, propagating, and conserving of our fish and game resources. I have, therefore, at all times cooperated with the House Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and the various pogy, wildlife, sportsmen's, game, and rod and gun clubs and associations in southwest Washington. I voted for the Robertson-Pittman Act last year and the appropriation this year of $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. The Federal contribution to our State is estimated at $60,575, to be matched by the State contributing $20,191.66, a total of $80,766.66. I have actively cooperated in obtaining W. P. A. and Federal funds for fish hatcheries, fish ponds, and fish and game preserves and wildlife projects in southwest Washington.

I have given prompt attention to the requests received from the holders of fish and game licenses in southwest Washington for information regarding the Federal laws and pending legislation relating to the subject of wildlife.

LUMBER, SHINGLES, PULP, PLYWOOD INDUSTRIES

During my entire service in Congress on every occasion, without a single exception, I have supported and voted for beneficial legislation desired by the lumber, shingle, pulp, and plywood industries and advantageous to their workers, and have at all times extended to them my whole-hearted cooperation. Self-seeking politicians apparently have no scruples in misrepresenting the facts. Therefore, if you wish to verify my statement in regard to my official record, I would suggest that you write to the official legislative representatives of the organizations to which our local industries belong: Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., 340 White-Henry-Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.; Henry Bahr, counsel, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1337 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Wash.; O. M. Porter, secretary, United States Pulp Producers Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

In the general election 2 years ago, in 1938, my Republican opponent had the nerve to display a bundle of shingles and talk about protection for shingles. At that time, and for 5 years previously, the shingle industry and workers enjoyed a 25-percent quota—the only protection in 25 years. The Republicans kept shingles on the duty-free list for 25 years

without any quota, causing Senator HOMER T. BONE, in the campaign in 1932, to say:

The shingle industry was ruined because of this fact.

In the period since I took my seat in Congress in 1933, the shingle industry has been revived, old mills remodeled and equipped with new machinery, and new mills built until now we have three times as many plants and number of shingle weavers employed in 1932.

November 18, 1935, Charles McGrath, secretary-manager of the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

I hasten to send you this brief note to thank you for the fine help we received from you in our fight to secure the import quota on Canadian shingles. I want to express to you my appreciation of your efforts in our behalf.

To render the quota more effective, I introduced the bill which became law for a census of the shingle industry. On May 27, 1937, Mr. McGrath wrote, when President Roosevelt signed my bill:

This news is about the most important that has come to red-cedar shingle manufacturers and the logging and lumber operators associated with the shingle business.

February 1, 1938, the United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

At the annual membership meeting of this association held in Tacoma, February 1, 1938, a resolution was unanimously approved instructing the secretary to write you expressing the gratitude of this association for your faithful services in our behalf in connection with the import limitations on red-cedar shingles.

On November 2, 1938, the following news article was published in the Hoquiam Washingtonian:

Shingle weavers commend SMITH. A resolution endorsing MARTIN E. SMITH in his campaign for reelection to Congress was passed this week by Grays Harbor Shingle Weavers, Local 2576. The resolution endorsing SMITH is being sent to all shingle-weaver unions in the district council. The resolution commends Congressman SMITH for diligent work in limiting importation of Canadian shingles into the United States.

In this Congress I have actively cooperated in efforts to secure aid for the workers and the shingle industry. Following vigorous efforts before the State Department and Ways and Means Committee, we have recently secured the passage of a bill providing for a duty of 25 cents per square on red-cedar shingle imported from Canada—the first duty imposed in 29 years. On June 28, 1940, David M. Williams, secretary-manager, United States Red Cedar Shingle Industry, Inc., wrote me:

The final passage of our shingle bill in the Senate on June 22 brings to a conclusion the long struggle to put shingles back on the duty list. To say that we are pleased expresses our feelings very mildly.

Having full knowledge of the difficulty of getting a tariff bill through Congress, and particularly one giving protection to the shingle or lumber industries, we are grateful for the continuous thought and effort you have given our affairs.

All during the struggle, since January 1, it has been heartening to know that you were tirelessly working for the passage of our shingle bill, and it has been of great value to the writer to be able to confer with you at any time when a conference was deemed necessary. You have been on the job for us, and we are very appreciative.

With best wishes for your continued success, we remain,

Yours truly,

UNITED STATES RED CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY, INC.,
By DAVID M. WILLIAMS,
Secretary-Manager.

I would suggest that when the candidates of the opposing party talk about shingles that citizens ask them about the do-nothing record of their party for 25 years, and the do-something record of the Roosevelt administration, and request an explanation. I would appreciate citizens writing me briefly what explanation, if any, they give. I am curious, as you must be, after reading the foregoing recital of facts, to know what alibi and excuse they have to offer.

LUMBER EXCISE TAX

The lumber business is the best it has been in 10 years. Last year pay rolls and wages in private industry were the highest in the history of the State.

A candidate for Congress should have respect for the voters and for the office he is seeking. What about the candidate who deliberately circulates malicious falsehoods? Two years ago and again this year the same falsehood is being circulated and published that Members of Congress from our State, including myself, voted to reduce the excise tax on lumber. The best answer to this campaign lie was made December 12, 1938, by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager and legislative representative of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, of which our local lumber firms are members:

The west coast lumber industry has had the effective and loyal support of Mr. SMITH on every occasion when we have been asking for his help. He has voted for renewal of the excise tax on imported lumber on every occasion when the matter has been before Congress. He has supported our efforts to have lumber properly defined for taxing purposes, as in the classification of large timbers and with withdrawal of allowances for planing and milling. He has helped us in every question arising for the clarification and administration of the excise tax.

The West Coast Lumbermen's Association keeps wholly out of politics. I just want, as a matter of fairness, to point out that Mr. SMITH has been a very loyal and conscientious supporter of the interests of the lumber industry since he entered Congress. I feel it only square that this fact be made known.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

My amendment of the lumber-import excise tax, known as the Smith amendment, introduced as H. R. 7934, was attached to the Revenue Act of 1938 and passed the Senate, was approved by President Roosevelt, and became law. It prevents deductions for tonguing, planing, and grooving of imported lumber, and is estimated to increase about 25 percent the excise tax, which is the tax unscrupulous candidates for Congress falsely accuse me of voting to reduce. April 4, 1938, Henry Bahr, counsel for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, wrote me, as follows:

Regarding your amendment of the lumber-import excise tax, which was tacked on to the revenue bill in the Ways and Means Committee, and retained by the Senate last week, I am sure Colonel Greeley must have told you how sincerely we appreciate your helpful cooperation in this matter.

Candidates of the opposite party should be asked by the voters why their party, under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922, left lumber and shingles on the duty-free list, without any import excise tax or quota limitation, and provided 100 percent free trade with Canada. Such an explanation, if made, would be interesting, probably amusing.

PULP LEGISLATION

I am the author of H. R. 7312, the Smith bill, to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, to plug up and curtail importations of foreign pulp in competition with our local product. This bill has received wide support from the pulp and sulfite workers unions, and the manufacturers. It has strong support in Congress. The United States Pulp Producers Association, O. M. Porter, has written me, as follows:

I am very glad to be able to tell you that the executive committee of this association has instructed me to do everything possible toward developing Nation-wide support of your bill (H. R. 7312) to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The changed conditions suddenly caused by the invasion of the Scandinavian countries and removal temporarily of competition from that quarter has deferred immediate action, but the legislation is in fine shape for consideration in the next Congress.

PEELER LOG LEGISLATION

Past national administrations have permitted the exporting of peeler logs without hindrance so many years that now this, too, has created a problem to deal with. This has nothing to do with the reciprocal-trade agreements, which have made no change whatsoever. The question is simply one of whether we should limit the export of raw materials, the supply of which is becoming limited on account of our generosity in the past, which we now need for our own domestic use and manufacture by our own labor. I have vigorously favored the enactment of this legislation, which presents difficulties

because it establishes a new precedent. Past neglect always renders application of the remedy difficult. The outlook for the enactment of this legislation in the near future is favorable on account of the hearings which have been held and the efforts which have been put forth in its behalf by the entire Washington congressional delegation. On May 24, 1940, Mr. Axel H. Oxholm, managing director, Pacific Forest Industries, with which plywood manufacturers in southwest Washington are affiliated, wrote me:

The board of directors held its annual meeting on May 21, and I was directed to express to you the board's appreciation of the valuable assistance which you have given in the peeler log matter.

APPOINTMENT TO ANNAPOLIS

Terry L. McGillicuddy, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dan McGillicuddy, of Aberdeen, was appointed to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, in June 1936, on my recommendation, and graduated with honors this year. With the rank of ensign he was immediately assigned to duty with the fleet at Pearl Harbor.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The National Youth Administration has made a splendid record in the State of Washington, and many young men and women in my district have greatly benefited from the program. Through the office of Mr. John H. Binns, Washington State administrator of the N. Y. A., I have obtained official figures on the out-of-school program and the school-work program which reflect the actual earnings of the young people. However, the figures for the college-work program do not take into account students living in my district but attending college elsewhere. There are, of course, a great many young men and women from southwest Washington at the University of Washington, Washington State College, and elsewhere, and they are receiving their full share of the college-work funds. In Grays Harbor County a total of 298 young men and women have participated in the out-of-school work program, receiving total monthly earnings of $5,662. Under the college-work program there are 29 students attending Grays Harbor Junior College, with a total yearly quota of $3,240. Ten schools of Grays Harbor County are included in the school-work program, with a total of 220 student workers and a total yearly quota of $8,194.

The useful and constructive work performed by the young men in the C. C. C. camps has received universal praise. In my district, in addition to building trails, roads, bridges, the prevention of floods and soil erosion, and other public improvements, their services in effectively fighting forest fires has resulted in a saving of millions of dollars. The young men themselves have benefited greatly from the training and instruction which they have received, and, of course, their own compensation and the allotments to their dependents have provided added purchasing power. The expenditures for materials and supplies in the vicinity of the camps have been a direct benefit to numerous business firms and merchants. C. C. C. camps have been in operation in practically every county in my district and the entire State of Washington.

AMERICA FOREVER—COMMUNISM, FASCISM, NAZI-ISM NEVER

On June 22, 1940, I voted for H. R. 5138, the most thorough and far-reaching revision of our immigration and deportation laws in the past 25 years. It is directed against all subversive, "fifth column," and un-American activities, and provides punishment for those who attempt to overthrow the Government by force and violence. H. R. 5138 as amended was carefully considered and provides effective remedies against all foreign "isms" without violating our Constitution and American traditions.

My friends, we have the finest country and best Government on earth. Let us keep them that way. There is no room in America for communism, fascism, nazi-ism. There is room for only one "ism," and that is Americanism. We are going to keep America out of Europe and are going to keep Europe out of America.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. ALEXANDER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a letter from a group of citizens in my district and commend its contents to the consideration of the administration and its leaders.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *August 1, 1940.*

The Honorable JOHN G. ALEXANDER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please do your utmost to cut down all appropriations that are not absolutely necessary. In the interest of economy, we are prepared to forego some of the expensive services offered by Government bureaus and subsidies. These services will be missed, but unless we give up the nonessential ones, we cannot hope to get out of debt. Please favor a stable currency. Endeavor to repeal the act which allows the President to issue up to $3,000,000,000 of fiat money. Do what you can to stop the devaluation of the dollar. Gold that costs (in some cases) only $11 per ounce to produce, should not be worth $35 of our money. We do not need to lack currency as the Federal Reserve banks have power to issue approximately $42,500,000,000 (on the basis of $2.50 for each dollar gold certificate they own) but have currently issued only $5,000,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes.

Before removing men from industry for compulsory military training as proposed in the current Senate bill (Burke-Wadsworth, S. 4164) we should use every effort to place our present nonproductive manpower in the armed forces. Compulsory military training in peacetime for any regularly employed individual is national economic suicide and should be abhorred in our free America. Do your best to divert our huge relief allotments into our current preparedness drive.

Endeavor to prevent our Government from being panicked into further huge military appropriations. The threat to our country thus far is only economic unless we choose to make it military. Should we take this latter step, it is not desirable for us to waste money by "galloping off in all directions." Our military experts tell us that planes built today will be obsolete tomorrow. Let's tool up at once, but let's not throw our money away. The current European conflict should not be used as a smoke screen to cover up our Government debt, to replace current Treasury deficits, or as a lever to perpetuate the present administration. Earmark defense taxes for defense, not for offense, and not for other Government expenditures.

Very truly yours,

MILTON E. SMITH.
F. B. HEILMAN.
Mrs. RUTH K. SMITH.

That "Spontaneous" Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1940

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans "listened in" on the proceedings at Philadelphia and Chicago when Wendell Willkie was nominated by the Republican Party and Franklin D. Roosevelt won the third-term nomination of the Democrats. They demonstrated the tremendous interest of the people of the United States in the democratic process. Until all hours of the night they remained at their radios to hear the nominations, to listen to history in the making. Every man and woman in the Nation was waiting for the news, waiting anxiously.

And lo! in the midst of the Chicago convention, there came a voice, a mighty torrent of sound welling up from the loudspeakers of a million homes, a voice stridently insisting, "we

want Roosevelt." Those who heard that repeated shout were hard put to it to understand the reaction in the Nation's newspapers throughout the week. They read repeatedly, "the convention was unenthusiastic. It was cold to the Roosevelt cry. It was positively frigid to the Wallace nomination."

All this was difficult to understand in the recollection of that penetrating voice. But the difficulty has been resolved, and in its resolution we meet a shocking situation which should be corrected, in the interest of accurate reporting.

Down in the bowels of the convention hall, a hidden microphone was at work. And seated before that microphone was Thomas D. Garry, superintendent of sewers in the city of Chicago. His was the magic voice which boomed out the name of the candidate at every possible opportunity. Seated at his place down in the cellar, this great spontaneous voice, placed before the microphone by the minions of Mayor Ed Kelly, became famous overnight as a horde of reporters swarmed out to trace down the source of the great noise.

In his modest way, Mr. Garry described himself as "just an ordinary lug who loves the game of politics." He authorized his hearers to "put it down that my heart and soul is in my work, and that I think Ed Kelly and Pat Nash are two of the greatest politicical figures in American history."

Mr. Garry is a picturesque fellow. When he learned that he was to be responsible for the task of organizing the Kelly clique at the stadium, he said that "it was a job right up my alley." Swarming to the convention, thousands of the Kelly-Nash machine got by the doorkeepers into the galleries. Mr. Garry was gleeful. Down in the electrician's room, where the public-address system was installed, Mr. Garry sat at the side of Ed Calihan, head electrician. Together they planned a spontaneous demonstration. As the speech of the Democratic permanent chairman drew to a close, the President's name burst out. This was Mr. Garry's cue. He threw a switch in the sound system, and roared into his private microphone, "We want Roosevelt." Over and over again he repeated it. Then he went into a few impromptu variations, "The party wants Roosevelt." He added New Jersey. He counted in Michigan. Then it was the world. And finally he said, Everybody wants the President.

Tom Garry was not satisfied yet. He deserted the booth to survey his handiwork. Up behind Mayor Kelly's box, he ran to watch the results. He waved his arms to one section of the gallery, and the noise lifted from the south side. He turned north and the north side of the stadium rocked with noise. Down stairs trotted Mr. Garry, to turn on a little more volume. Six times, the superintendent went up and down. From his booth, he instructed the organist to roar out a chorus of Happy Days Are Here Again. It was a masterful performance.

But the Nation knows that it was only a performance. It was as spontaneous as a meeting of the Reichstag. And it deceived about as many people as are deceived by a puppet show into believing that the thing is real.

The Nation will not soon forget Tom Garry's work. We shall remember it and register our complete refusal to become a party to such an exhibit.